UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 101—PART 5

MAY 5, 1955, TO MAY 25, 1955
(PAGES 5711 TO 7076)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1955

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, this sacred altar at which our spirits bow in the midst of another day's demands is the witness of our weakness and of how fruitless are our quests, how futile are our arguments, if we turn not to Thee in the humility of prayer. In these fateful days for whose decision the future will judge us, by Thine enabling might may we maintain our integrity unsullied by betrayal or appeasement, regarding always public office as a sacred trust.

Give us courage and strength for the vast tasks of social rebuilding that need to be dared if there is to come to this fear-haunted world a peace both just and lasting, and if life for all men, under all skies, is to be made full and free. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MONRONEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5695) to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5695) to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week, because I shall have to be absent from the city on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate on official business beginning Monday noon of next week and continuing through Tuesday, May 17, at 8 p. m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from today through Tuesday, May 10, in order to attend a conference, on official business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that following the morning hour I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the Senate will then proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior. When the Senate has concluded action on that bill, I shall ask the Senate to consider certain other bills which have been listed in the RECORD.

REVISION OF 1946 TRADE AGREEMENT WITH REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES — COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 155)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 5, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The President of the Republic of the Philippines, in a letter to me dated March 7, 1953, requested examination and adjustment of the 1946 trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines as being vital to the economic stability of his country and to its permanent trade relations with the United States. Discussions on specific Philippine proposals for revision began last September between a United States

delegation and a Philippine mission designated for the purpose, and culminated in the signing on December 15, 1954, of a final act of negotiations in which each agreed to recommend to its Government the revisions contained therein.

A copy of the final act, with corrections agreed to in an exchange of letters between the chairmen of the United States and Philippine delegations, and a copy of a memorandum from the Secretary of State on this subject, are transmitted herewith.

Revision of the 1946 agreement cannot be effected without the authorization of the Congress. I believe that the revision, as proposed in the final act of negotiations, would be beneficial to both the United States and the Philippines and would contribute materially to the improvement of the already friendly political and economic relations between them. I earnestly urge, therefore, that appropriate legislation be enacted at this session of the Congress to permit revision of the 1946 agreement in accordance with the recommendations contained in the final act.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, TO PROVIDE A STRONGER NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide for a stronger national transportation industry, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS IV AND LARGER AIRPORT PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of projects for the development of class IV or larger airports included in the current revision of the national airport plan (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain contracts made under the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458, 1459) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the salaries of the judges of the Supreme and Circuit Courts of Hawaii

"Whereas the judges of the Supreme and Circuit Courts of Hawaii are appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States; and

"Whereas payment of the compensation of the judges is the responsibility of the Government by whom they are appointed; and

"Whereas since 1945 the Federal compensation of these judges has been considered inadequate to maintain a reasonable standard of living and to protect the integrity of the judiciary branch of Government in the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas since 1945 the Territory of Hawaii has felt obligated to supplement the salaries of the judges of these courts by providing them additional compensation until the Federal Government increases their salaries; and

"Whereas repeated requests to the Congress of the United States to increase the compensation of these judges has brought no result; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently passed legislation to increase the compensation of judges of the Federal courts: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to increase the compensation of supreme and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 28th day of April A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing the funds to pay for a second bore to Kalihi Tunnel, island of Oahu, T. H.

"Whereas the Kalihi Tunnel on the island of Oahu, T. H., as authorized and now under construction consists of a single bore; and

"Whereas the tunnel is of great value to the Department of Defense of the United States in that it provides a short, low-grade highway between installations on the leeward side of the Koolau Range (such as Pearl Harbor Navy Yard, Barbers Point Naval Air Station, Fort Shafter, and Schofield Barracks), and installations on the windward side of the Koolau Range (such as Kaneohe Naval Air Station); and

"Whereas a second bore would increase considerably the value of the tunnel for Department of Defense purposes; and

"Whereas a second bore would also aid the Territory of Hawaii in many ways, among them that it would provide employment in an area which, although it may soon be classified as group IV (substantial labor surplus) by the United States Department of Labor, is not able to receive the assistance (such as placement of defense contracts, and receipt of accelerated tax amortization by defense plants) which the United States now proposes to give to such an area: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation providing the funds to be used by the Territory of Hawaii to survey, plan, and construct a second bore in connection with the Kalihi Tunnel.

"SEC. 2. A certified copy of this joint resolution be sent to each of the following officers of the United States: The President, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution takes effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 28th day of April A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to authorize the Territory of Hawaii, through its designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange, sell, or lease certain tidelands to owners of shorelands covered by land court application Nos. 314, 1549, 1653, 852, and 1092 (land court consolidation 32), and any and all other owners of shorelands abutting said tidelands, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of damage claims for littoral rights appurtenant to said shorelands

"Whereas Kaiser Community Homes (land court application 314), the Paoa heirs (land court application 1549), the Associated Hotels (Hawaii), Ltd. (land court application 1653), the Hobron Land Trust (land court application 852) and 1092 (land court consolidation 32), and others, if there be any, are the owners of certain shoreland properties abutting the tidelands hereinafter described, situated in the vicinity of the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor at Waikiki, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.; and

"Whereas the Territory desires to expend public funds in the development of Waikiki Beach by constructing an artificial public beach and groin in the area seaward of said properties; and

"Whereas a dispute exists concerning the alleged interference with the littoral rights of said properties by the proposed construction and previous acts claimed to have been permitted by the Territory in pocketing said properties and otherwise allegedly interfering with the littoral rights appurtenant to said properties; and

"Whereas it is proposed that such owners and the Territory settle all disputes and allow the proposed beach and groin to be constructed, with proposal entails such agreement between the owners and the Territory regarding certain tidelands, title to which is held by the Territory under Presidential Proclamation No. 1856 dated October 27, 1928, issued pursuant to section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and of all littoral rights appurtenant to said shoreline properties; and

"Whereas it is in the public interest to effect said proposal, to permit the filling of such tidelands which will constitute a valuable addition to the area of taxable property in the Territory, and to enable the construction of such public beach and groin as part of the overall plan of development of Waikiki Beach for the enhancement of the tourist industry, all of which will benefit the economy of the Territory: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii concurring), That in order to enable settlement of the existing disputes and the construction of a public beach and groin in aid of the overall reclamation of Waikiki Beach, that the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested, to enact a bill in substantially the following form:

"'A bill authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, of certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights

"*'Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

"'SECTION 1. The Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the concurrence of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands, and of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, is hereby authorized and empowered, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other law to the contrary, notwithstanding, to enter into a compromise agreement with the owners of certain shorelands in the Territory of Hawaii covered by land court application Nos. 314, 1549, 1653, and 852 and 1092 (land court consolidation 32), and with any other owner or owners of lands abutting any part of the tidelands described in section 2 hereof involving the conveyance by the Territory to said owners, or some of them, or all or any part of the tidelands described in section 2 of this act, or to make a sale of all or any part of said lands described in section 2, with said owners, or some of them, or to exchange all or a part of said lands described in section 2, with said owners, or some of them, provided that said owners, who may have littoral rights appurtenant to said shorelands, affecting the tidelands described in section 2, convey to the Territory with littoral rights, agree to the construction of a public beach and groin along the seaward side of the lands described in section 2 of this act, and release all claims for compensation, damages, or otherwise which they have or might have against the Territory of Hawaii by reason of acts or omissions of the Territory, or for which the Territory is claimed to be responsible, done or omitted in connection with the development of the shoreline, yacht harbor and beaches in and adjoining said area; and provided further that the Commissioner of Public Lands, with the concurrence of the Board of Harbor Commissioners, is hereby authorized and empowered, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to lease for a period of 55 years all or any part of said lands described in section 2, to said owners, or some of them.

"'SEC. 2. The tidelands authorized to be conveyed or leased by the commissioner of public lands by this act are described as follows:

"'Land at Waikiki, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.:

"'Being portion of the tideland, title to which was transferred to the Territory of Hawaii by Presidential Proclamation No. 1856, dated October 27, 1928, and lying seaward of the land described in land court application 1549 and land court application 314.

"'Beginning at the north corner of this parcel of land, being also the west corner of lot "B" of land court application 1549, and on the present high water line, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station "Punchbowl" being 10,328.25 feet south and 3,642.00 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 320° 22′ 18.48 feet along present high water line along lot "B" of land court application 1549;

"'2. 291° 45′ 15.75 feet along present high water line along lot "B" of land court application 1549;

"'3. 297° 01′ 22.75 feet along present high water line along lot "B" of land court application 1549;

"'4. 318° 42′ 32.70 feet along present high water line along lot "B" of land court application 1549;

"'5. 326° 46′ 15.03 feet along present high water line along lot "B" of land court application 1549;

"'6. 325° 00′ 35.00 feet along present high water line along land court application 314;

"'7. 334° 10′ 125.00 feet along present high water line along land court application 314;

"'8. 336° 15′ 189.00 feet along present high water line along land court application 314;

"'9. 334° 00′ 93.42 feet along present high water line along land court application 314;

"'10. 61° 30′ 60.00 feet along land court application 1653, along face of seawall along high water mark;

"'11. 61° 46′ 67.74 feet along land court application 1653, along face of seawall along high water mark;

"'12. 61° 56′ 273.88 feet along land court application 1653, along face of seawall along high water mark;

"'13. Thence along government land on a curve to the left having a radius of 1,000.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 108° 30′ 07″ 435.22 feet;

"'14. Thence still along government land on a curve to the left having a radius of 475.52 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being 88° 38′ 03″ 120.83 feet;

"'15. 230° 00′ 808.74 feet along government land to the point of beginning and containing an area of 6.489 acres.

"'SEC. 3. The commissioner of public lands, with the concurrence of the board of harbor commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the board of public lands and of the Governor is also authorized and empowered in the making of any such compromise agreement, exchange, sale or lease to covenant with such owners to create and maintain a public beach and groin on the seaward side of the lands described in section 2 of this act, so long as and to the extent that appropriations are and may from time to time be available therefor, and to permit access to and from said beach across courses thirteen and fourteen of the land described in section 2 of this act.

"'SEC. 4. This act shall take effect upon its approval'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the commissioner of public lands, the board of harbor commissioners and the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, 2 joint resolutions passed by the Legislature of the State of Maine, 1 memorializing the Congress to pass a joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in August of each year as Children's Day in Sports, and the other proposing an investigation and additional regulation of the mercantile exchange by the Congress. I request that these memorials be printed in the RECORD in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions, presented by Mr. PAYNE, were received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Memorial

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday in August of each year as Children's Day in Sports

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 97th legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the future of America depends upon our youth, whose basic training should include the requisites of good sportsmanship; and

"Whereas recreation is one of the necessary parts of any program affecting our children: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend to the Congress of the United States enactment of a joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday in August of each year as Children's Day in Sports; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"In senate chamber; adopted without reference to a committee April 20, 1955. Sent to house.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"Secretary.

"House of representatives, April 26, 1955; adopted in concurrence.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"Clerk."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Memorial

"Joint resolution proposing an investigation and additional regulation of the mercantile exchange by the Congress of the United States of America

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 97th legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may in-

vestigate and regulate in the public interest; and

"Whereas the mercantile exchange, as now operating, encourages and develops a large amount of speculation that is entirely disproportionate to the actual needs and requirements of the potato industry; and

"Whereas Maine is the only State on which the mercantile exchange deals in potato futures, prices of Maine potatoes being traded are reflected more quickly than that of other sections of the country; and

"Whereas the mercantile exchange does not allow trading in small consumer-type packs which the industry is trying to develop in line with a better marketing program; and

"Whereas it is recognized that, although the mercantile exchange offers the farmer an opportunity to safeguard trading, its disadvantages, which recently have become so evident, far offset this advantage; and

"Whereas the mercantile exchange has tended to depress prices, for during the latter part of February mercantile exchange prices were as much as 40 cents per hundredweight lower than the actual market; and

"Whereas the mercantile exchange is being used primarily as a speculating device, for in the month of February 1955, there were 2,531 cars traded on the exchange, but only 306 delivered and in most seasons deliveries run approximately 1 percent of sales; and

"Whereas at a recent meeting of over 400 Aroostook County potato growers it was overwhelmingly voted in favor of restricting potato trading on the mercantile exchange at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend to the Congress an investigation of the mercantile exchange for the purpose of providing greater stability in the potato industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That if further regulations be necessary, such legislation be enacted by the Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"House of representatives; read and adopted April 26, 1955. Sent up for concurrence.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"Clerk.

"In senate chamber; in concurrence April 27, 1955. Read and adopted.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"Secretary."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to the memorial of the Maine Legislature proposing an investigation and additional regulation of the Mercantile Exchange in connection with the potato situation this year. On March 1, 1955, I wrote to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, requesting him to have the committee staff look into this matter with a view toward a thorough investigation and new legislation, if the preliminary inquiries indicated such action would be necessary. The committee staff has been making a check on this matter and a report will be made by them in the near future. After there has been an opportunity to review this report, it will be possible to take appropriate action. The Commodity Exchange Authority is also looking into the potato situation. I simply wanted the RECORD to show the present status of this matter which is of great importance to the State of Maine. The Maine Legislature is to be commended for its interest in this matter.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a senate joint memorial, passed by the 22d session of the New Mexico Legislature, "memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the seeding of clouds or the use of other methods of inducing rain or snowfall until sufficient scientific data are collected to make more effective regulation possible."

During the 1st session of the 82d Congress, I introduced what was probably one of the first bills to provide for the development and regulation of methods of weather modification and control. The bill would have provided the necessary machinery for the control of weather experiments in rainmaking, the gathering of information and the evaluation of the results, in order to determine the effect of cloud seeding on the weather. What I was trying to do was to prevent the indiscriminate seeding of clouds. I wanted to make sure that we knew what was going on and that we would have an adequate opportunity to study the weather pattern that follows attempts at rainmaking. I wanted to bring about cooperation between the people and those conducting rainmaking operations and experiments in given areas. I believe some Federal control is necessary to bring that about. We were not successful in securing the passage of this proposed legislation because, after hearings, the Interior Committee decided that we were perhaps not yet ready for extensive controls and regulation. However, in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], along with myself and several other Senators, introduced another bill—S. 285—to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification. We were successful in securing the passage of this bill and it became Public Law 256 of the 83d Congress.

A good many people in the Southwest believe that the uncontrolled and indiscriminate efforts of many groups and persons in the seeding of clouds have induced changes in the weather and perhaps are responsible, to some extent, for the extended drought in the southwestern part of the United States. I believe that eventually some kind of legislation will be necessary to make sure that any attempts at cloud seeding and weather modification can be controlled so that the results can be studied and evaluated by competent meteorologists and scientific experts.

I believe we made some progress when we passed Senate bill 285 and established the Advisory Committee on Weather Control for the study and evaluation of public and private experiments. I am glad to know that this committee is now at work and will report to the President by June 30, 1956. I am anxiously awaiting their report in the hope that the committee will provide information on which we can base legislation that will provide for the future orderly experiments in weather control and modification.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the seeding of clouds or the use of other methods of inducing rain or snowfall until sufficient scientific data are collected to make other effective regulation possible

"Whereas the uncontrolled and indiscriminate efforts of many groups and persons to modify climates and induce changes in meteorological causes and effects by the use of chemical and physical devices such as cloud seeding has had unforeseen and adverse effects upon many localities; and

"Whereas there exists no legal, scientific, or physical means by which the effects of chemically or physically induced precipitation, can be accurately gaged or controlled; and

"Whereas sought-for beneficial effects of such artificial rainmaking have often not materialized and the effects induced have often been prejudicial and harmful: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully urged to enact legislation prohibiting the use of cloud seeding or other techniques to induce precipitation by artificial means until such time as scientific data and the establishment of administrative controls permit the adequate regulation by Congress of various means of climate control; and, be it further

"Resolved, That enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 7th day of March 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

RESOLUTION OF NORTH WISCONSIN SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today a grassroots expression from the secretary of the North Wisconsin Synod of the First Evangelical and Reformed Church, Pastor Grosshuesch. The members of his synod had adopted a resolution commenting on important issues, including endorsement of the Supreme Court's decision for abolishing segregation, sound encouragement of our program of humanitarian aid abroad, and exploration of constructive formulae for peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the pastor's letter, which embodies the resolution, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST EVANGELICAL AND
REFORMED CHURCH,
Colby, Wis., May 3, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Permit me to convey to you the following resolutions adopted by the North Wisconsin Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church:

1. The North Wisconsin Synod rejoices in steps that have been taken, including the Supreme Court pronouncement, to abolish segregation in our country and we urge our pastors and congregations to the end that this may truly become in fact and in spirit, an unsegregated Nation.

2. We favor wholeheartedly a program of increased food and other economic aid to needy peoples the world over.

3. The North Wisconsin Synod declares its earnest support of the efforts of the President of the United States to settle Far Eastern issues in a peaceful and conciliatory manner.

4. We strongly oppose the extension of military control over the lives of our youth as proposed in the national Reserve plan or any similar plan as well as any form of UMT for our country.

Respectfully submitted.

V. O. GROSSHUESCH,
Secretary, North Wisconsin Synod.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 614. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross (Rept. No. 271);

S. 1007. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 272); and

S. 1727. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 273).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 1006. A bill to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 274).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 4 Air Force officers to 3- and 4-star rank in positions of importance and responsibility as designated by the President under section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act, and the nominations of 3 flag officers, 1 to be placed on the retired list, and 2 for positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act, and ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were placed on the calendar, as follows:

Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of general;

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, 83A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Vice Adm. William K. Phillips, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral;

Vice Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commandant, National War College; and

Rear Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Mr. STENNIS. In addition to the above, I report favorably the nominations of 285 officers in the grades of colonel to second lieutenant for appointment and promotion in the Regular Army. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 1903. A bill to establish in the Library of Congress a library of weekly newspapers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1904. A bill to authorize the establishment by the Government of recreational facilities in certain reservoir areas of reclamation projects having a national significance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1906. A bill to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes; and

S. 1907. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1908. A bill providing for the purchase by the United States of lands within the Lewis and Clark Irrigation Farms project, McKenzie County, N. Dak; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1909. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain requirements with respect to television broadcasts by political candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN CERTAIN RESERVOIR AREAS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "to authorize the establishment by the Government of recreational facilities in certain reservoir areas of reclamation projects having a national significance, and for other purposes."

The history of efforts to improve and develop additional recreational facilities for the benefit of the general public covers many years. Especially is this true in the West where public-domain lands are utilized for reclamation and national forest purposes. Where reservoir areas are established as a part of reclamation projects, opportunities are presented for opening up new playgrounds in sections of the country not blessed with natural water playground areas.

My bill, if enacted, will establish a congressional policy that such reservoir areas shall be made available for public recreational purposes, unless they conflict with major purposes for which the reservoirs were constructed.

For many years areas with outstanding recreational potentials have not been developed because of present laws which do not give to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Secretary of Agriculture sufficiently broad authority.

As an example, the tremendous recreational advantages of Lake Mead, one of the country's largest man-made lakes located behind Hoover Dam, have barely been touched. Growing populations in the western areas are demanding improved recreational facilities, which they deserve. For almost 20 years on Lake Mead, the facilities supplied by the National Park Service have been pitifully inadequate compared with demands and the potential available.

The bill will give broader authority to the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and to the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service, to enter into leases or issue permits allowing proper development of these lands.

Likewise, this bill will allow the Federal Government to dispose of lands adjacent to reservoir areas to State and local governments when such lands do not have a national significance insofar as recreational development is concerned.

Such sales will be allowed if they do not conflict with major purposes for which the reservoirs were established. This provision will allow the development for recreational uses of State and local park areas which the Federal Government will not, and probably should not, move affirmatively to develop today.

I am hopeful that early committee consideration can be given to this bill looking toward the development of additional recreational areas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1904) to authorize the establishment by the Government of recreational facilities in certain reservoir areas of reclamation projects having a national significance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RELEASE OF REV. HAROLD W. RIGNEY, IMPRISONED BY CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution requesting the President to use all possible means and methods available to him to secure the earliest possible release of the Reverend Harold W. Rigney, a Divine Word missionary, who has been imprisoned by the Chinese Communists without trial since July 25, 1951.

Mr. President, it is my strong conviction that we should not sit down in any conference with the Chinese Communists until, as a prior condition, they have released all military persons and civilians whom they hold, including Father Rigney.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., a Divine Word missionary, while serving as rector of the Fu Jen University at Peiping, China, was arrested and imprisoned by Chinese Communist officials on July 25, 1951, for crimes alleged to have been committed by him against the Chinese Communist regime; and

Wheeras since that date the Reverend Harold W. Rigney has been unjustly imprisoned without trial despite efforts by the Government of the United States to secure his release: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to use all peaceful means and methods available to him to secure at the earliest possible time the release of the Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., a Divine Word missionary, from the custody of the Chinese Communists by whom he has been imprisoned without trial since July 25, 1951.

SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION WITHIN UNITED NATIONS TO STUDY EFFECT OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, it is a privilege to announce that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has agreed to cosponsor Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, submitted by me, and cosponsored by 27 other Senators. This concurrent resolution calls on the President to establish within the United Nations a scientific commission to study the effects of radioactivity on all living things.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Oregon be included on the list of co-sponsors when the concurrent resolution is reprinted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Address delivered by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay, in New York City, on April 29, 1955, commemorating the inauguration of George Washington as first President.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES F. BROPHY TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of James H. Brophy, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia, vice Joseph H. Young, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], chairman; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

THE SALK ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for about 3 or 4 minutes on the Salk antipolio vaccine situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I make the statement because the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had an informal meeting yesterday in which we discussed whether immediate legislation should be proposed. As was announced by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the committee decided at that time that it would postpone any legislative action until the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had made her report to the President. This is expected within the next few days. In the meantime, I have made some inquiries of the Department, in order that I might make a preliminary statement as to the Department's approach to this matter. While this statement is my own and I take full responsibility for it, it is made with confirmation by the Department of the facts and the positions herein stated.

Mr. President, the parents of the Nation and all who have the welfare of our children at heart have been watching very closely the progress of the nationwide vaccination program that is now being inaugurated under the auspices of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which is offering the antipolio vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk to all children in the first and second grades and to a relatively small number of other children.

Much news has emanated from all parts of the country in recent weeks concerning this great humanitarian campaign carried on with the support of the March of Dimes. Many statements have been made by men and women in public and private life which in their net effect have tended, I fear, to confuse or even mislead the American people.

It is my considered judgment, Mr. President, that at this time of understandable tension it behooves all of us to avoid speaking rashly or acting on the basis of less than full information. Let us have recourse, rather, to reason, especially in dealing with matters so grave as the health of the little children of the Nation.

What are the facts about the polio-vaccine situation? I submit that the essential, incontrovertible facts, based on information furnished by the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare, are these:

First, there is no safe way for the Government, the medical profession, or the pharmaceutical industry to make greater haste, no matter how urgent the need for the Salk vaccine.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, who met with our committee yesterday, is watching the situation closely and is being advised by a number of distinguished scientists, including Dr. Salk himself. I, for one, feel confident that these experts are reaching their decisions with as much haste as is consistent with complete safety. We would not have it otherwise.

Next, Mr. President, what is the situation with respect to the supply of the Salk vaccine? It is this: Virtually all vaccine now being produced is going to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis in fulfillment of a contract made many months ago. Moreover, all the manufacturers of Salk vaccine have individually agreed to distribute their entire output, after completing the Foundation contract, in accordance with any plan developed by the Government. Since completion will take some time, there is ample time for a workable, equitable distribution plan to be drawn up.

Will such an allocation or distribution arrangement be made in time? I am informed, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will recommend an allocation system to the President, following the decisions of the National Advisory Poliomyelitis Vaccine Committee of distinguished health authorities and laymen which Secretary Hobby has appointed to counsel her.

Proposed legislation has been introduced, as we know, calling for the allocation of Salk vaccine according to one or more of a variety of criteria. The sponsors of these measures have acted with commendable concern for the public health and welfare. It would seem, however, that they have acted either without knowledge of the fact that all the manufacturers of the Salk polio vaccine have already agreed to abide voluntarily by whatever distribution system is suggested to them by the President, or in the belief, which I do not yet share, that such a voluntary system will prove to be ineffective.

There are many difficult problems involved in assuring a proper distribution of the vaccine within each of the States and Territories of the Union. The Government can arrange for a speedy and equitable distribution among the States and Territories, but weeks of delay would inevitably result if an attempt should be made to recruit a corps of Federal officials to administer a completely Federal program.

Yesterday the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare met with the Governors. The sense of many of those who attended that meeting, I am advised, was that the Government should make certain that there is a fair allocation among the States, and that each Governor would assume the responsibility for the distribution of the Salk vaccine within his own State. That is as it should be, I believe. The Governors, State health officers, and other State officials are in the best position to solve their own distribution problems. No officials in Washington could possibly do a better job.

Mr. President, we have the assurance of President Eisenhower, given to the press yesterday morning, that no child who is eligible for the Salk polio vaccine by reason of his or her age will be denied the protection of this magnificent scientific development because of the economic status of the parents. Ability to pay will not be a factor. Many States and cities have already developed plans for free immunization of children whose families cannot pay for it, and I have sufficient faith in the ideals of the American people to feel confident that this will prove to be the rule throughout the Nation. And, as was announced at the White House yesterday, a Federal purchase program would be considered "if a situation ever develops in this country where children were deprived of the vaccine because of inability to pay or maldistribution of available supplies."

Mrs. Hobby's report is expected to go to President Eisenhower this very week. The President has already announced that it will be made public as soon as he receives it. I am happy to advise the Senate, as reported by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in a special meeting held yesterday to consider the proposed legislation that has been introduced, decided that before taking legislative action of any kind it would await the report of the Secretary. Dr. Scheele advised us this report would be received by the President within the next few days; and, as noted, the President will immediately make the report public.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that no amount of haste in considering or enacting legislation will serve to vaccinate even a single child more quickly than is already possible under the splendid voluntary system which now is operating so effectively.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL LEAHY ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for approximately 5 minutes, in tribute to a very great American.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Iowa may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, because I am informed that probably there will be no session of the Senate tomorrow, I desire to make this statement today, and at the same time to say that it more properly would be made tomorrow, if there were a Senate session then.

Mr. President, tomorrow, May 6, is the 80th birthday of one of the most distinguished officers in modern naval history, Fleet Admiral William Daniel Leahy. A few words of tribute on his birthday would seem little enough to accord a man whose career has spanned three wars, and who has contributed as much as any one person to the development of the United States Navy into the most powerful fleet in the world, and who was called to serve as Chief of Staff to two Presidents, during one of the most critical phases of our Nation's history.

William Daniel Leahy was born in Hampton, Iowa, on May 6, 1875. He attended school in Ashland, Wis., and was appointed to the United States Naval Academy in 1893, graduating in 1897. Upon leaving the Academy, he was assigned to the battleship *Oregon*, was with her when she made her famous dash from the west coast to the Caribbean in the spring of 1898, and served on her during operations against the Spanish fleet in Santiago Harbor in June 1898—operations which culminated in the destruction of that force on July 3.

In 1899 he was assigned to the Asiatic station, where, during the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Uprising in China, he saw active service in the U. S. S. *Castine* and the U. S. S. *Glacier*, and in command of the gunboat *Mariveles*. In June 1904 he was transferred to the U. S. S. *Boston*, stationed at Panama during an early period in the construction of the canal. He returned to the Naval Academy in 1907, to serve as an instructor in physics and chemistry; and later, during the American occupation of Nicaragua in 1912, he was Chief of Staff to the commander of naval forces there.

In September 1915, he assumed command of the dispatch gunboat *Dolphin*, which cruised in the West Indies in search of German supply vessels during the early months of American participation in the First World War. On July 13, 1917, he was ordered to the battleship *Nevada*, of the Atlantic Fleet, as executive officer; and in April 1918, he was placed in command of the U. S. S. *Princess Matoika*, employed in transporting American troops to France. He was awarded the Navy Cross for distinguished service in this command.

In April 1921, he was ordered to command the flagship U. S. S. *St. Louis* with responsibility for protecting Americans and American interest in Turkish waters and the Black Sea during the war between Turkey and Greece. He commanded the battleship *New Mexico* in the Pacific from June 1926, until October 1927, when he returned to the Navy Department, to become Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, with the accompanying rank of rear admiral. He served in that office until 1931, when he was appointed to duty as commander of destroyers, United States Fleet.

Admiral Leahy assumed positions of increasing responsibility in the Navy Department, serving as Chief of the Bureal of Navigation from 1933 until 1935, then reporting for duty afloat as commander of battleships, Battle Force, with the rank of vice admiral. On March 30, 1936, his four-star flag was hoisted on the flagship *California*, upon his appointment as Commander in Chief, Battle Force; and on January 2, 1937, he

was appointed to the highest position in the Navy command, the Chief of Naval Operations. He held that office until August 1, 1939, when he was transferred to the retired list of the Navy, with the rank of admiral. Prior to his retirement, he was presented with the Distinguished Service Medal by the President.

Admiral Leahy's career of public service did not end with his temporary retirement from the Navy. On June 13, 1939, he was appointed Governor of Puerto Rico; and he served in that position until November 23, 1940, when he was sent as United States Ambassador to France. It was on July 20, 1942, after our entry into the Second World War, that Admiral Leahy was recalled to active duty as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy. He served in this position of exalted trust and responsibility through the trying years of war, and the equally trying years of peace that followed it. On December 15, 1944, the President nominated Admiral Leahy to the specially created rank of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy. He was later confirmed in the permanent rank of fleet admiral.

He became the President's representative on the newly created National Intelligence Authority in January of 1946; and on February 6, 1946, the President personally presented to him a Gold Star, in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal, with a citation reading, in part, as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious service * * * as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, Army and Navy of the United States, and concurrently as member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Recalled to active duty on July 18, 1942, during the most dangerous crisis in the history of our country, Fleet Admiral Leahy brought to his task a wealth of experience, vision, and decisive judgment in evaluating conflicting world events * * * he fully justified the unquestioning reliance placed in his wise counsel in the concept of long-range strategy against the Axis Powers and his astute appraisal of overall plans for the complete coordination of the United States and all allied military and naval forces. * * * His service to the Commander in Chief and to the Nation climaxed a brilliant and long career in the Navy, reflecting the highest credit upon Fleet Admiral Leahy and enhancing the finest traditions of the United States naval service.

Admiral Leahy resigned as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy on March 25, 1949. In accepting his resignation, President Truman presented him with a Gold Star, in lieu of a third Distinguished Service Medal, the citation for which reads, in part, as follows:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in duty of great responsibility as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and concurrently as member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from February 1, 1946, to March 21, 1949. Eminently qualified by his experience in the fields of government and international affairs, Fleet Admiral Leahy contributed his deep wisdom and judgment to the guidance of his country following the victorious conclusion of the last war. His supreme loyalty to his country and his appreciation of its place in world affairs, supplemented by his fundamental concern in the welfare of humanity as a whole, transcended his already vast knowledge of military affairs to culminate in statesmanship beyond that required of any naval officer in our history. * * *

Mr. President, Admiral Leahy continues to serve on active duty in an advisory capacity, in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy in Washington. Surely this country owes no more substantial debt of gratitude to any officer in its military service than it owes to Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy, the greater part of whose 80 years have been spent in attending to the Nation's strength and readiness, and, from positions of increasing authority and trust, defending it from its enemies.

Mr. President, as a native of Iowa, I am proud to be able to salute a fellow Iowan and to pay him this small tribute for the great service which he has rendered to his country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senators on this side of the aisle wish to join in the fine and beautiful tribute just paid to a great American by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I desire to associate myself with the noble sentiments he expressed with respect to one of our great leaders.

Admiral Leahy was a tower of strength during a critical period in this Nation's history. He was the confidant and the trusted counselor of the Commander in Chief during the war period, when our very freedom and liberty were at stake. I join with the distinguished Senator from Iowa in saying "Well done" and in expressing, in my feeble way, the gratitude of all Senators on this side of the aisle, as well as of the American people and the free world, for the outstanding service of this great American.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to identify myself completely with the splendid tribute paid to Admiral Leahy by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa. I, too, appreciate the fine service rendered by this great American, and I am happy to be able to identify myself at this time with the celebration of the 80th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I think we honor ourselves in honoring Admiral Leahy. Admiral Leahy is a great military man, an outstanding diplomat, and a sterling American. I congratulate the Senator from Iowa for this eulogy of a man who so well deserves every honor a grateful nation can pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with Senators who have spoken in eulogy of Admiral Leahy. Admiral Leahy was not only a powerful defender of our country in the armed services, but he was also a great diplomat. He is a wonderful American. It is men like Admiral Leahy who have made this Nation great.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, several Senators have expressed very high praise of Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy. I ask unanimous conset to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared in tribute to Admiral Leahy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

I am greatly pleased to join with my colleagues today in eulogizing Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy, a native Iowan and one of America's greatest citizens, who has left a lasting imprint on our Nation's history and well-being.

Admiral Leahy was born at Hampton, Iowa, May 6, 1875. All Iowans are immensely proud of him, especially those of us who have been privileged to serve our Nation in Washington during World War II and thereafter, when Admiral Leahy proved time and again his sterling qualities and his great leadership. He is 1 of only 3 living fleet admirals, and tomorrow he will celebrate his 80th birthday.

Admiral Leahy has run the gamut of the entire Naval Establishment so far as duties are concerned. He graduated from the Naval Academy in 1897. He has seen service in many capacities from the famous cruise of the Oregon from the west coast to the Caribbean, to his present capacity as adviser to the Secretary of the Navy.

Admiral Leahy took part in the activity against the Spanish Fleet. He took part in the Boxer uprising in the Philippines. He has trained crews of ships about to be commissioned. He took part in the Panama Canal construction. He was instructor at the Naval Academy, navigator of a cruiser, fleet gunnery officer; he took part in the American occupation of Nicaragua, searched for German supply vessels in the Caribbean area prior to our entrance into World War I, and he transported troops to France in World War I.

Between World War I and World War II he served as a member of a board to recommend Navy policy for fire control in all classes of ships. He was the commanding officer of the naval detachment in the Turkish area, serving as commanding officer of the flagship U. S. S. *St. Louis*, during the war between Turkey and Greece. He was commanding officer of the flagship of Mine Squadron I.

Admiral Leahy has been the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, commander of the destroyers of the United States Fleet, member of a board to reorganize the Navy Department, commander of battleships, battle force, and finally Chief of Naval Operations.

He retired as admiral following this duty and during his retirement he was Governor of Puerto Rico and Ambassador to France. He was recalled during World War II to serve as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief and a senior member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. At present he is senior adviser to the Secretary of the Navy in the many matters concerning which he is eminently qualified to speak because of his illustrious career, and in addition he is doing constructive work as head of the Naval Historical Foundation.

Admiral Leahy is the author of a well-known book dealing with his experiences, particularly in World War II, entitled "I Was There."

DISPERSAL OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES INLAND

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a matter of increasing concern to our country's defense planners in recent years has been the failure of our key defense industries to disperse inland away from congested and heavily populated shipping points which present likely targets for enemy atomic attack.

This is a subject which should concern every Member of the Congress as we are called upon to authorize vast expenditures for military purposes. It can be readily understood that established industries, using the economic factors of good business as a yardstick, continue the tendency of expanding plants at locations conducive to meeting competition.

However, when the laws of good business come to grips with atomic weapons of widespread destruction, then we must make efforts to protect our national security in every possible way. Basically the problem is one of national security versus business economy.

In most instances competitive industry finds it next to impossible to make capital improvements such as the costly and time-consuming movements of an entire base of operations from an established center to a new location many hundreds of miles away. The expense involved in building up industrial centers in new locations with longer supply lines, new labor markets, and other obstacles, cannot be minimized. Actually, heavy and specialized defense industries were built up around populated areas and shipping points because of the economic advantages, and not the military advantages of self-protection.

With the advent of atomic warfare and heavy bombing planes whose most likely targets would be these congested industrial areas where the greatest damage could be done, another very real problem arises.

Possible atomic warfare is not a respecter of the economic laws of good business, which dictate that our defense industries, for the most part, be clustered together in heavily populated areas. Instead, those familiar with the dangers of atomic warfare and probable effects on our defense plants are seeking dispersal of these industrial giants inland to less populated sections. If some of our major industrial centers were crippled or destroyed, the plight of a country trying to fight a war of machines presents a dark picture indeed.

I invite attention to the testimony of Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott before a House Appropriations Subcommittee recently. He declared that the Air Force is actively trying to prevent further expansion of the aircraft industry on the west coast in order to minimize the danger of atomic attack.

In his own words, Secretary Talbott said:

> We would like to have the aircraft industry more dispersed. Twenty-five percent of industrial southern California is dependent upon military aircraft for its pay. That is dangerous. We are going to try not to allow further expansion on the Pacific coast of personnel.

Mr. Talbott pointed out that in one case the Air Force held up a final contract that was going to a west coast company for a large number of guided missiles. He told the committee:

> I have said they cannot have the contract if they are going to do their work in California.

In fact, Mr. Talbott said that he had made himself unpopular with Pacific coast airplane industry executives because he has been pushing so vigorously for dispersal.

Mr. President, this dispersal question is one which not only requires considerable thought, but affirmative action as soon as possible. It is a problem not peculiar to any one section of the country. It is a problem that cannot be put off until tomorrow. It should be met squarely today.

I have today dispatched letters to Secretary of Defense Wilson, Defense Mobilizer Flemming, and Secretary of the Air Force Talbott offering to some of these industries the advantageous locations which the State of Nevada affords. I request unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Secretary of Defense Wilson be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 3, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A matter of increasing concern to many of us was pointed up by Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott in testimony recently before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense when he advocated most strenuously the dispersal of the west coast aircraft industry.

Knowing this matter of the removal of our defense industries inland is one of the utmost importance to you, I feel it is appropriate that I urge your Department to give earnest consideration to what I believe to be advantageous locations for defense plants in the State of Nevada.

As you may be aware, the State of Nevada affords numerous and diversified advantages to correspond with the hope expressed by Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott that the vital Pacific coast aircraft plants move inland, thereby minimizing the dangers of atomic attacks on this important share of the Nation's aircraft production. Located behind the protective Pacific coast and Sierra-Nevada mountain ranges, running the full length of the State, Nevada offers land of varied terrains which are readily obtainable.

Nevada offers water sources in most areas so important to industrial plants. Power supplies are available in many sections presently and developments are progressing in others to meet this growing need. Nevada affords excellent transportation facilities including transcontinental railroads, cross-country highways of high standards intersecting all areas of the State and airlines serving our populated sections.

Likewise, Nevada offers growing communities who will welcome new industries. Climatically, Nevada has a wide range of weather conditions from the dry and semi-tropical weather of southern Nevada to the high plateaus and mountain ranges of the north where the four seasons of the year are definitely marked. Now the country's fastest-growing State, Nevada, has a growing labor market. However, it does not afford the disadvantages of large metropolitan centers insofar as possible military targets are concerned although it is only a few short hours away from all main Pacific coast cities.

I would be pleased to provide to officials of your Department full and complete data on opportunities open in Nevada for the location of defense plants. Furthermore, I would welcome the chance to confer with yourself, officials of your Department, and/or industrial representatives about possible Nevada locations.

Cordially,

ALAN BIBLE.

Mr. BIBLE. In conclusion, Mr. President, the time is short, and the stakes are high in this matter which is so important to the welfare of the country.

RIGID FARM PRICE SUPPORTS VERSUS A FLEXIBLE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last year the Congress approved the recommendations of the Eisenhower administration for a flexible farm price-support program. The so-called rigid price-support program, which was developed to meet the need for increased food production during the World War II emergency, was never intended to be more than a temporary program. The present attempts to repeal the flexible farm program before it has had an opportunity to be tested are not constructive. The restoration of high price supports would jeopardize efforts to put American agriculture on a sound and realistic basis. Rigid price supports benefit only upper-bracket-income farmers who produce so-called basic crops.

There is no connection between rigid farm price supports and increased minimum wages as certain labor leaders have contended. In actuality, rigid farm price supports are contrary to the best interests of the vast majority of American farmers, laborers, and consumers. Let us give the flexible farm program an adequate test before talking about repealing it.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial on this subject from this morning's New York Times be printed in the RECORD as part of these brief remarks:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PROPS VERSUS WAGE FLOORS

When the Senate voted last August for the abandonment of high rigid price supports for the so-called basic commodities it marked the culmination of one of the most courageous and politically difficult legislative battles in which the Eisenhower administration has engaged. It was a fight to dislodge powerful vested interests created under World War II emergency legislation. The legislation had been scheduled to expire 2 years after the fighting ended (which would have been at the end of the crop year 1947), but the farm bloc had succeeded in having the provisions extended every time the date of their expiration approached. After going through the motions of fighting for a return to flexible supports for several years the Truman administration was suddenly blinded, on the eve of the 1952 elections, by the light of a great revelation. This revelation, it seems, had to do with certain unsuspected, and as yet, unidentified, virtues, discovered in the 90-percent rigid supports it had been castigating at more or less regular intervals up to that time.

Now there is talk of a deal between labor-minded legislators from urban areas of the North and the agricultural legislators favoring a return to 90-percent supports. With the time approaching for the vote on a proposal by the farm bloc to restore wartime supports, one city Democrat—Representative ANFUSO, of Brooklyn—did make an appeal for

such a coalition of forces, or, as it is more colloquially referred to, logrolling. Representative AREND, Republican, of Illinois, has declared that in supporting 90-percent price props the urban Representatives hope to obtain help from southern Members in their efforts to have the minimum wage raised from its present 75 cents an hour to $1.25. (The President has advocated an increase to 90 cents an hour.) Representative COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, and chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, denies the existence of such a coalition. All that has happened, he says, is that some labor leaders have endorsed the pending bill "because they are aware that a strong farm economy is part of a national prosperity."

Labor leaders who believe that a strong agriculture is assential to a balanced prosperity are, of course, eminently correct. But any labor leader who believes that high, rigid price supports and a strong agriculture are interchangeable terms for the same thing, or that they are even compatible, is proceeding on a seriously mistaken assumption. And to the extent that they or others have fallen into this error the farm bloc must be charged with a large share of the responsibility. For the farm bloc, as Representative AREND has correctly pointed out, has diligently sought to identify declining farm prices, not with the huge surpluses created under rigid supports, but with the recent adoption of flexible supports.

Labor leaders have also been led astray if they have been persuaded that there is any similarity between high-level price supports and the minimum wage. In the first place, farm price supports have their own builtin provisions for escalators, which is not the case with the wage floor. In the second place, the beneficiaries of the minimum wage are a small segment of labor at or near the subsistence level; the chief beneficiaries of high level price supports (assuming that anyone benefits from them in the long run) are, on the whole, upper-bracket-income farmers who produce what are referred to euphemistically but arbitrarily and erroneously as our basic crops.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the CIO has made public an extremely informative letter which has been distributed to the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, dealing with the proposed program for foreign economic aid recommended to Congress by President Eisenhower in his message of April 20.

I commend to my colleagues the analysis the CIO has made of the President's proposals and I hope that careful and detailed consideration will be given to this foreign economic aid program when it comes to Congress in order that we may be assured that it is of sufficient scope and character to meet the high traditions and standards of past programs in which our Nation has extended assistance to underdeveloped countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

The Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS,
Foreign Relations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICHARDS: We are deeply disturbed by reports in the press that influential congressional leaders are cool even to the very limited foreign economic aid program recommended by President Eisenhower in his message of April 20.

Because of your significant influence over the course of America's foreign affairs and because of the urgency of all matters affecting our policies, toward Asia in particular, we are taking the liberty of bringing the viewpoint of our organization to your attention.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations takes pride in its early and consistent support for the Marshall plan and its successor programs. Today they are widely acclaimed, both for their broad humanitarian purpose and for their substantial and perhaps decisive role in checking, and then turning back, the menace of communism throughout Western Europe. Yet, 7 years ago, many bitterly opposed the Marshall plan.

At the present, as the President points out, the immediate threat to world security and stability is centered in Asia. In this area, within one vast arc, live 770 million anti-Communist or uncommitted people—one-third of the world's population. Most of them, the President points out, are citizens of newly created states; many have only recently been engaged in war against the Communists; all are threatened.

In this situation, military aid, although extremely vital, is not enough. In Europe we learned that hunger, disease, and hopelessness are communism's great allies. In free Asia, where capital and technical and administrative skills are sorely lacking and the underprivileged millions live in dire want, economic aid, as well as arms and ammunition, is critically needed. If America and other free and more industrious nations now fail to help these underdeveloped and threatened nations help themselves, is it not inevitable that they ultimately will be responsive to Communist threats or inducements?

President Eisenhower's message of April 20 is of historic significance in three respects:

First, it restates forthrightly the fundamental truth that the preservation of our own freedom and economic well-being depends, in large measure, upon rising living standards in other countries and upon higher levels of mutually beneficial trade among all the free nations of the world.

Second, it acknowledges the vital importance of cooperative programs of international economic assistance, both through the United Nations and through other multination projects, such as the Colombo plan, as well as through direct economic aid from the United States to individual countries.

Third, it recognizes that effective assistance to the underdeveloped nations will require a sustained effort of longer duration than just 1 year.

These three principles lay down basic policy guidelines for successful international economic cooperation. Their implementation gives promise of a monumental achievement which can well exceed even the accomplishments of the now completed Marshall plan for Europe, so deservedly applauded by the President.

Yet despite the President's excellent statement of objectives and of policies to achieve them, a careful analysis of the specific proposals in the message causes us to fear that our contemplated economic aid is both too limited in scope and too narrowly conceived as primarily a series of unilateral undertakings on the part of the United States.

The proposed appropriation for fiscal 1956 for the new Mutual Security program—announced during the recent Bandung conference and widely advertised as designed primarily for the benefit of Asia—involves a contemplated total expenditure of about $3.5 billion. However, $2.7 billion of this sum is earmarked for direct military aid and defense support; actually, less than $720 million is to be allocated for economic-development programs.

While the Marshall plan allocated over $5 billion for economic aid during its first year, in behalf of the 300 million people of Western Europe, the proposed Mutual Security program would allocate one-seventh of this amount for similar economic assistance, nominally in behalf of 770 million Asians. Actually, it is probable that much less than the $720 million appropriated would, in fact, go to Asia during the course of the year, since economic aid for non-Asians is included in this sum. In addition, $200 million from this total would be earmarked for the "President's Special Fund," which is to be available for use over several years.

We understand clearly that the success of any overseas economic-aid program does not depend on the size of the sum expended alone. The achievements of the Marshall plan were due to its boldness, timing, and scope, as well as to the magnitude of the money spent.

Yet, the tremendous stake of the free world in events unfolding in Asia, the critical need to mobilize every resource to stem the forward thrust of communism, and the particularly urgent problem of giving hope to the millions of Asia's underprivileged, if freedom rather than dictatorship is to be their choice, lead us to fear that the President's plan for economic aid may be far too little and perhaps, for some areas, already too late.

Surely America—in its own self-interest—can afford a greater effort. In 1948, when Congress appropriated billions for the Marshall plan, America's wealth-producing capacity was $100 billion less than it is today. We must be sure our Asian program is not too little when our resources are so clearly adequate to give enough.

Finally, we fear that the proposed mutual security program does not adequately face the need for greater international cooperation in the area of economic aid to underdeveloped countries, although more and more multination cooperation is imperative.

In his recent message the President properly pointed out:

"Our programs of national action are not in any manner a substitute for United Nations action in similar fields. Every instance of effective measures taken through the United Nations on a human problem improves the ultimate prospect of peace in the world."

Unfortunately, there is a clear implication, both in the detailed proposals of the President and from certain voices raised in Congress, that America intends primarily to go it alone.

An effective program of economic aid for Asia must dispel any prevailing apprehension that the generosity of the American people is dominated by a concept of either nation-to-nation charity, or imperialistic design. Having for so long suffered from domination by outsiders, the Asians have an understandable suspicion of aid which can be identified with the interests of any one nation, and we must act wisely and sympathetically in response to this feeling. We must be sensitive, therefore, to the particular preference of the Asians for aid which is rendered through the United Nations and other multination agencies in which the Asians themselves participate, in contrast to programs which even suggest a begrudging handout from the wealthy to the have-nots.

Therefore, we urge immediate support for the $80 million United States contribution required to launch the initial quarter-billion dollar program of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. Would this not be a small, but significant, supplement to the $200 million now being requested for a Presidential Special Fund for Asian Economic Development? The return in enhanced American prestige, which would result from our cooperation with the United

Nations in its program for underdeveloped countries, would be enormous. Surely it would help dispel any Asian apprehension that the proposed President's Fund reposes extraordinary power to dispense or withhold vitally needed economic aid in order to enforce acquiescence to American policy.

The services rendered by the United Nations, on the other hand, carry no such implication of unilateral authority. Consequently, in every aspect of overseas economic aid programing, both the success of the projects and the prestige of the United States will be enhanced by greater cooperation with the United Nations and other multinational projects.

Although the CIO strongly urges a more bold and far-reaching program of Asian economic aid, and we feel that too much of the President's proposal is based upon action initiated by the United States alone, we applaud President Eisenhower's call for action in behalf of the free nations of Asia. He has correctly and courageously stated that this aid cannot wait; it is not a postponable item of foreign policy; it is an immediate and vital necessity for the security and, perhaps, the survival of our Nation.

As spokesman for over 5 million American workingmen and women, the Congress of Industrial Organizations strives to weigh the critical problems of our country's international relationships and responsibilities without narrow partisanship or prejudice. As the Congress of the United States weighs the issues raised by the President's message in this same spirit, we feel certain it will view his proposals as the minimum our great Nation can afford to undertake in these dangerously critical times.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR G. REUTHER,
Assistant to the President and Director, Department for International Affairs.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Tuesday marked the 164th anniversary of the adoption of one of the great democratic documents of history, the Polish Constitution of 1791. This anniversary of the adoption of the May constitution by the Polish Diet in 1791 is observed by Americans of Polish descent and by all free peoples as a stirring reminder that the people of Poland were among the first of the modern nations to create a modern constitutional government—a government of law and of limited powers, vesting basic sovereignty in the people.

This action, coming shortly before the forces of Poland's aggressive neighbors overran this free country, served as a beacon to which the spirit of freedom and democracy in the hearts of the Polish people turned during the dark decades following Poland's tragic partition. The Polish people lived under the rule of foreign tyrants for over a century until again in 1918 they regained their freedom and independence.

The long history of the Polish people's struggle for freedom gives us fresh ground for hope that the present enslavement will not long endure. I am sure that an unyielding desire for liberty and for free democratic government will never fade from the hearts and minds of the Polish people. All of us in the free world have a special obligation to work for the day of liberation for the Polish nation. In addition, we in America must strive incessantly for programs and policies by our own Government which will clearly indicate the desire of the American people to aid the freedom-loving people of Poland.

We must strengthen and give substance to the Voice of America through which we can reach behind the Iron Curtain. We should work unceasingly to bring about a revision of our basic immigration and refugee laws in order that the United States may perform its historic role of providing a haven for a fair number of the refugees and escapees from tyranny.

Our present restrictive immigration and refugee laws, and the harsh administration of these laws, prevent many deserving Polish refugees from coming to the United States where they might begin life anew.

The Senate of the United States should ratify the Genocide Convention. This would be an action of great significance, and would symbolize our intention that the murder of the tens of thousands of Polish martyrs has not been forgotten.

These and other actions would serve to confirm the continuing friendship which the American people have for the freedom-loving people of Poland—and for all those who, seeking liberty, endure the unbearable indignity of oppression.

FLOYD J. PEMBERTON, DRIVER OF THE YEAR

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the people of Michigan are justly proud of Mr. Floyd J. Pemberton, of Redford Township, who this week is being honored by the American Trucking Association as the driver of the year.

Actions on his part resulted in the saving of two lives early on the morning of December 24 on an Ohio highway. The official report of these actions reads like a thriller, although it was all in a day's work for this outstanding citizen of my State.

In addition to this act of saving 2 lives, Mr. President, this modest man, whose thoughtfulness, alertness, and devotion have eased the cares and troubles of fellow motorists, has driven his vehicle over a half million miles in the past 9 years with only 1 slight noninjury accident.

The professional drivers of heavy-duty vehicles, Mr. President, are among the best drivers on the highway. To win this honor, Mr. Pemberton had stiff competition, because many other professional drivers have responded to calls for assistance, common to those who are constantly on the highways.

This good citizen, a former member of the United States Marines, was twice wounded. He is married and the father of three sons. He owns his own home and is a regular attendant at his church. I submit, Mr. President, that Mr. Pemberton is a composite of the most desirable American citizens. I congratulate his employers, Commercial Carriers, Inc., a Detroit automobile haul-away firm. It is my pleasure to salute him.

GOLD MEDAL AWARD TO SCHOOL SAFETY PATROLS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this afternoon, Vice President and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon will present 13 gold lifesafer medals to boys and girls of the School Safety Patrols who during the past year have performed outstanding acts of heroism while at their posts of duty. These medals are awarded annually by the American Automobile Association on the basis of recommendations of a distinguished board of judges.

Our thanks go out to all of the 600,000 boys and girls who serve on the patrols and who give daily protection to their classmates on the way to and from school. More especially we should pay tribute to the few who have risked their own lives in snatching young children from the path of imminent danger. One of these AAA lifesaver medals is being awarded posthumously; last October, 15-year-old John Minadeo of Pittsburgh, Pa., was struck down and killed while trying to get a group of children out of the way of a car that had gone out of control. Equally as much as our fighting men in the armed services who are guarding our frontiers abroad, these boys and girls of the School Safety Patrols are protecting our future generation of Americans as they watch over the safety of their schoolmates on our streets and highways. As a permanent record of the heroism of these brave youngsters, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the citations accompanying the medals which are being awarded today.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATIONS ACCOMPANYING AAA GOLD LIFESAVER MEDALS PRESENTED TO SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL MEMBERS BY VICE PRESIDENT AND MRS. RICHARD M. NIXON, MAY 5, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

RICHARD BAILEY, 11, STANTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

On September 23, 1954, Richard Bailey was on safety patrol duty at the 25th Street entrance of the Stanton Elementary School. A vehicle was moving north on 25th Street at 30 to 35 miles per hour when Roy Keats, 7 years old, started to cross the street. He was about halfway across when he fell forward into the path of the oncoming car. Richard, disregarding his own safety, ran out, grabbed Roy, lifted him up and pulled him back to safety. Had it not been for Richard's action, Roy would have been struck by the car.

Richard is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph J. Bailey, 3353 23d Street SE., Washington, D. C.

HATCHER WILLIAM PILAND, JR., 11, FRANCIS ASBURY SCHOOL, HAMPTON, VA.

While protecting school-bus passengers as a safety patrol member on September 22, 1954, Hatcher William Piland, Jr., saved 6-year-old Thomas Bryant from being struck by a speeding car while the school bus was stopped to discharge passengers. Several children had already crossed the road when Thomas started to cross. Hatcher noticed a speeding car approaching, the driver showing no intention of stopping. The small boy was unaware of the danger. Hatcher quickly stepped into the path of the speeding car and lifted and carried him back to safety. The car passed less than a foot away.

Hatcher is the son of Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Piland, Sr., 319 Atlantic Avenue, Buckroe Beach, Va.

EDWARD PRIEM, 12, PLAINFIELD SCHOOL, SAGINAW, MICH.

On September 30, 1954, Edward Priem was on safety patrol duty at the school crossing located at Bay and Shattuck Roads. Steven

Anscomb, a kindergarten pupil, darted under Edward's outstretched arm directly into the path of a car traveling approximately 50 miles per hour. Edward, disregarding his own safety, ran after the child and just managed to pull him out of danger, as the car swerved, with brakes squealing and dirt flying. Edward's quick action saved Steven from death or serious injury.

Edward is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Priem, 3810 Shattuck Road, Saginaw, Mich.

GARY NELSON, 11, ABE LINCOLN SCHOOL, ROYAL OAK, MICH.

While on safety patrol duty at the corner of North Kenwood Street and East Eleven Mile Road, November 5, 1954, Gary Nelson acted without thought of his own safety to prevent a driverless car with four child passengers from crashing into other automobiles. The driver, who had come to school to pick up her son, had forgotten to pull on the hand brake when she parked across the street from Gary's post of duty. Gary noticed the car rolling downhill away from the curb. He ran across the street, jumped in, and stopped the car by pulling on the hand brake, thus preventing what might have been a tragic accident.

Gary is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John Nelson, 1925 East Eleven Mile Road, Royal Oak, Mich.

JOHN MINADEO, 15, GLADSTONE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, PITTSBURGH, PA.

On October 7, 1954, at the intersection of Hazelwood and Second Avenues, John Minadeo, on safety patrol duty, saw a car, out of control, rushing downhill toward him and a large group of children waiting on the sidewalk. Disregarding his own safety, John pushed the children back. The driver of the car, which had had a brake failure, attempted to steer between a car waiting for a traffic light and the sidewalk on which the children were standing. The car jumped the curb and struck John and five other children. John and a girl were killed, and four children were injured. Yet the accident would have been far more tragic had it not been for John's heroic, sacrificial action.

John was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Minadeo, 242 Glenwood Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

ROGER HELD, 11, NO. 1 SCHOOL, ECORSE, MICH.

While on safety patrol duty at the corner of Labadie and High Streets, on January 12, 1955, Roger Held saved a 5-year-old child, Raymond Sablosky, from injury or death, when he darted into the street in front of a turning car. Patrol Capt. Kenneth Tackett, also serving at this intersection, saw the car begin to turn and shouted a warning to Roger. Believing there was a slim chance of saving the child from being struck by the car, Roger acted without thought of self and pulled Raymond back to safety just in time.

Roger is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ludwig Held, 4428 High Street, Ecorse, Mich.

PHYLLIS BOOSE, 12, JACOB EICHHOLTZ SCHOOL, LANCASTER, PA.

While on safety patrol duty on May 21, 1954, Phyllis Boose saved several children from traffic injury or death. A collision of 2 cars at the intersection of Hazel and Beaver Streets threw 1 driver out of his car, causing it to swerve toward her and a group of children waiting to cross the street. Without thought of her own safety, Phyllis pushed the children behind a telephone pole for protection. Although she and 2 of the 5 children she was protecting were severely injured by the driverless car, her action undoubtedly saved several lives.

Phyllis is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul W. Boose, 321 Beaver Street, Lancaster, Pa.

DOROTHY KOEHLER, 13, WILLIAM G. TAYLOR SCHOOL, COLUMBIA, PA.

On May 12, 1954, while on safety patrol duty at Seventh and Walnut Streets, Dorothy Koehler saved a 1-year-old child, John Andes, from serious injury or death when he darted into the street directly into the path of an on-coming truck. John's mother was waiting for a bus across the street. When John saw her, he ran into the street. Dorothy saw the child and realized that the driver of an approaching truck could not see him because of a parked car. There was no time to signal the driver. Dashing into the path of the truck, she snatched the boy as the vehicle brushed her dress and came to a stop some 20 feet past the spot where the boy had been.

Dorothy is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Koehler, 521 Walnut Street, Columbia, Pa.

RICHARD INNOCENZI, 12, WASHINGTON SCHOOL, TRENTON, N. J.

On February 1, 1955, Richard Innocenzi was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of Chestnut and Emory Avenues. At approximately 8:15 a. m., when traffic was heavy along Chestnut Avenue, 8-year-old Anthony Bencivengo ducked under Richard's extended arm and ran into the street directly into the path of an approaching car. The younger boy did not see the car. Richard, disregarding his own safety, ran into the street and grabbed Anthony, pulling him back to safety. The driver of the car braked and swerved to the left, but was unable to stop until the car had traveled well beyond the boys.

Richard is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Dante Innocenzi, 48 Charles Street, Trenton, N. J.

RAYMOND VAN FITZGERALD, 13, SIDNEY LANIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, GAINESVILLE, FLA.

On January 5, 1955, Raymond Van Fitzgerald was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of United States Route 441 and 16th Avenue. Under the diretion of a police officer, Raymond was escorting Gerald Foster, who was pushing his bicycle, across the street. An approaching truck with faulty brakes was unable to stop, though the traffic signal for it was red. The officer shouted a warning. Raymond saw the danger and grabbed the bicycle luggage carrier, giving it and Gerald a strong pull backward just as the truck went past. The truck hit a car in the intersection and continued down the road about 200 feet before stopping. Raymond's action saved Gerald from serious injury or death.

Raymond is the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. V. Fitzgerald, 1124 Northwest 15th Avenue, Gainesville, Fla.

WALTER R. LEE, III, 13, SIDNEY LANIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, GAINESVILLE, FLA.

On January 5, 1955, Walter Lee was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of United States Route 441 and 16th Avenue. Under the direction of a police officer, he was escorting Allen Stinson, who was pushing his bicycle across the street. An approaching truck with faulty brakes was unable to stop, though the traffic signal for it was red. The police officer shouted a warning. Walter, realizing that Allen was not aware of the danger, gave a hard shove on the rear fender of the bike, thus pushing Allen clear of the truck. Walter managed to jump clear as the truck swerved. The truck then struck a car in the intersection, and continued down the road about 200 feet before stopping. Walter's action saved Allen from serious injury or death.

Walter is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Lee, Jr., 915 Northwest 17th Avenue, Gainesville, Fla.

ROY WILLIAMS, JR., 12, HAPEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, ATLANTA, GA.

At the grade crossing of Ross Street SW. and Highway 41, Roy Williams, Jr., while on safety patrol duty, on October 11, 1954, saved 6-year-old Quinette Gay from the path of an approaching train. The little girl, who was partially paralyzed, stumbled and fell between the rails in crossing the tracks on her way to school. Roy saw that because of her injury and fright she was unable to move. Disregarding his own safety, he ran into the path of the fast-approaching train and carried the girl to safety.

Roy is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Williams, 279 Mudd Row SW., Atlanta, Ga.

PAUL GROBERT, 13, PUBLIC SCHOOL 209, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

On September 24, 1954, Paul Grobert was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of East 7th Street and Avenue Z. A policeman was standing in the center of the intersection directing traffic. Paul was stationed on the curb holding back a group of about 20 children. An 8-year-old girl, who had been talking with schoolmates, suddenly started to cross the street directly into the path of a fast-moving truck. Disregarding the danger to himself, Paul dashed into the street and pulled the girl back to safety, as the truck passed only a few inches from them.

Paul is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Grobert, 838 Avenue Z, Brooklyn, N. Y.

PRESENTATION OF SAFETY AWARDS TO RAYMOND VAN FITZGERALD AND WALTER LEE III, OF GAINESVILLE, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] that with great pride I invite his attention to the fact that two children from my State are here today, with other children from various States, who are being honored by the American Automobile Association for the saving of life, as members of the school safety patrol, during the past year. I regret that the Pennsylvania child who was mentioned by the Senator cannot be present, because the award is posthumous.

I am proud to advise the Senate, Mr. President, that these young people from Gainesville, Fla., will be present for the ceremony which is being held and in which awards for lifesaving will be given to them this morning. Their names are Raymond Van Fitzgerald, 13 years of age, the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. V. Fitzgerald, of Gainesville, Fla., and Walter R. Lee III, age 13, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter R. Lee, Jr., of Gainesville, Fla.

Mr. President, these two splendid boys were serving as safety patrols at a busy corner when two small children who were in the act of crossing were endangered by a truck which could not be brought to stop at the crossing because its brakes failed. The two safety-patrol youngsters rushed in, one pushing one of the smaller children to safety, and the other jerking back the other child, so that both were saved from injury or possibly from death. The truck proceeded across the intersection and crashed.

I think all Members of the Senate will delight today to honor these young Americans who are devoting so much of their own lives to the service of others as members of the School Safety Patrol. On behalf of my distinguished colleague and myself and, in fact, for our whole delegation, I call attention at this time to the fine service of these two youngsters and to the fact that they will receive life-saving awards today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the school patrol. While I served as Governor of my State, that was one of the projects in which I took much in-

terest. I wish to commend not only the parent-teacher organizations for their assistance in the development of such a program, but also to commend the veterans' organization, the American Legion of my State, who were the main sponsors and who helped to organize the school patrol throughout the State. The safety patrols have conducted many a child safely across intersections who might possibly have lost their lives had they not been escorted by a recognized and trained school patrol.

ENDING OF STATUS OF WEST GERMANY AS OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is an important day in the history of the world.

Earlier today President Eisenhower formally ended the status of West Germany as an occupied territory. The Office of United States High Commissioner was abolished, and the Commissioner himself has received special credentials as Ambassador to Germany pending his confirmation in that position by the Senate.

It is of the greatest significance to the world that Germany is once again a full member in the family of free nations. Proud German people, under a regime committed to the concepts of freedom, complete the strong wall which is stemming the Red tide of communism.

As one who was born and raised in the famous German section of central Texas, I have great respect and deep understanding for the Germanic people. I know of their intense patriotism, and capacity for hard, painstaking work and their determination to battle against great odds.

The wounds of war are healing rapidly, and it is my belief that the action taken earlier today marks an important step in the preservation of peace and freedom in our world.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I commend the able and distinguished majority leader for bringing to our attention today this new milestone in the development of international affairs and in an effort to resist communistic aggression and communistic endeavor to spread itself across the earth.

The Senator from Texas is also to be commended for paying such a high and eloquent tribute to the German people. In the State of Minnesota there are many families of citizens of German extraction who were immigrants from Germany and who blazed the trail to the North Star State of Minnesota. It has been a pleasure to listen to the eloquent remarks of the Senator from Texas regarding the German people in his State, because I know of their substantial character from my experience in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. When the German people are mentioned a Pennsylvanian can hardly refrain from raising his voice. Many Senators have visited the magnificent Pennsylvania German farming areas. The German people there are among the most law-abiding and God-fearing people it has ever been my privilege to know. If everyone in the United States and everyone in the world had some of the ideals possessed by the German people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we certainly would have a wonderful world in which to live. They will not even accept money from any subdivision of government. They take care of their own people. They do so because they feel that it is an obligation; that God has given them certain privileges and certain things which they must share.

I greatly appreciate the fact that the Senator from Texas has brought the subject before the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks which have just been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I just came into the Chamber and heard the discussion, which interests me immensely. My distinguished friend from Pennsylvania will perhaps appreciate a personal reference. He is probably familiar with the forks of the Delaware and Lehigh Rivers, and is familiar with Allentown and Easton. He knows the German Lutheran settlements there. I am glad to say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, as well as to the distinguished Senator from Texas, that my own mother came from that section. She was one of the original so-called Pennsylvania Dutch. I am proud of that ancestry, and I am proud to join in the tribute to the German Republic.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate is about to consider the Interior Department appropriation bill, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of the Interior—Office of Minerals Mobilization," on page 3, line 8, after the word "fuels", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources," on page 3, line 19, after the word "lands", to strike out "$13,400,000" and insert "$13,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Education and Welfare Services," on page 6, line 13, to strike out "$41,675,000" and insert "$41,864,995."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Resources Management," on page 6, line 22, after the word "law", to strike out "$12,332,000" and insert "$12,432,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 7, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "$2,847,356" and insert "$7,979,003, of which not to exceed $11,647 shall be available for reimbursing the city of New Town, N. Dak., for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for assistance to the public-school district for constructing additional classroom facilities at Seligman, Ariz.," and on page 8, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "eight" and insert "fifteen."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 9, at the beginning of line 15, to insert "advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the act of June 4, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 452), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tribal Funds", on page 10, line 3, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "$3,200,000" and insert "$3,100,000"; in line 14, after the word "contracts", to strike out the comma and "including $200,000 from funds to the credit of the Indians of California as defined and enrolled under the Act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, the successors in interest to claims against the United States as therein provided, for payment of compensation and expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred by attorneys prosecuting the claims of the Indians of California before the Indian Claims Commission under contracts approved by the Secretary," and on page 11, line 13, after the

word "Secretary", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $100,000 from the funds credited to the Indians of California under the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), for expenses of moving and relocating houses available to said Indians under the act of August 2, 1954 (68 Stat. 590, 613), but not more than $300 may be expended for any one house.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Geological Survey—Surveys, Investigations, and Research," on page 12, line 15, after "Washington, D. C.", to strike out "$26,285,000" and insert "$26,985,000," and in line 16, after the word "which", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines—Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources," on page 14, line 11, after the word "deposits", to strike out "$12,893,000" and insert "$13,393,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 15, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction of the necessary laboratory and pilot plant facilities for conducting research on the distillation of coal and the products obtained therefrom and the direct reduction of low-grade iron ores to their minerals, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the products derived from such facilities may be sold by the Bureau of Mines and the receipts therefrom deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service—Management and Protection," on page 16, line 18, after the word "Basin", to strike out "$9,800,000" and insert "$9,825,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 17, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "$3,725,000" and insert "$5,776,400; of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for additional payments for the execution of the new figure for the Yorktown Monument, upon the completion of the figure to satisfaction of the Secretary, and the Secretary may release the contractor from all obligations with respect to the removal of the present damaged figure, the repair of the shaft, and the mounting of the new figure on the shaft."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service—Management of Resources," on page 19, line 6, after the word "Service," to strike out "$6,650,000" and insert "$6,753,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Investigations of Resources," on page 19, line 20, after the word "law," to strike out "$3,977,000" and insert "$4,187,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction an acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $1 million to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the funds appropriated herein for the continuation of the construction of the Devils Kitchen Dam on the Crab Orchard Wildlife Refuge, Ill., shall be transferred to the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Territories—Administration of Territories," on page 22, line 12, after the name "Samoa," to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$2,619,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," on page 23, line 6, after the word "functions," to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000," and in line 9, after the numerals "1954," to insert "of which $500,000 shall be available for the establishment of a revolving fund for loans to locally owned private trading companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Alaska Public Works," on page 24, after line 6, to strike out:

Funds previously appropriated under this head shall remain available until June 30, 1959, for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 24, 1949, as amended (48 U. S. C. 486–486j): *Provided,* That not to exceed $525,000 of such funds shall be available for administrative expenses in fiscal year 1956.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 24, 1949, as amended (48 U. S. C. 486–486j), to remain available until June 30, 1959, $5,000,000, of which not to exceed $525,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided,* That funds previously appropriated under this head shall remain available until June 30, 1959.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction of Roads, Alaska," on page 25, line 1, after the word "only", to strike out "$4,800,000" and insert "$7,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administration, Department of the Interior—Salaries and expenses," on page 26, line 19, after the word "service", to strike out "$2,065,000" and insert "$2,081,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions, Department of the Interior," on page 27, line 1, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 12, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title", and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 20, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, after the word "made", to insert "to the Department of the Interior", and in line 6, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title or in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 20, after the word "appropriated", to insert "to the Department of the Interior", and in the same line, after the word "title", to insert "or in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 107. Limitations in this or any other act for the Department of the Interior on purchases of passenger motor vehicles shall not apply to vehicles known as coupe pickup trucks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Related Agencies—Department of Agriculture," on page 30, after line 18, to insert:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Research: For the construction of roads at the National Arboretum in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 4, 1927 (Stat. 1422, 20 U. S. C. 191–194), $150,000: *Provided,* That the construction of said roads may be performed by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 34, line 13, after "(7 U. S. C. 1010–1012)", to strike out "$32,411,500" and insert "$37,111,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 7, after the word "methods," to strike out "$2,570,000" and insert "$3,000,000"; in line 14, after "(16 U. S. C., Supp. V, 594–1–594–5)", to strike out "$2,367,500" and insert "$3,537,500"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$1,967,500" and insert "$3,137,500", and in line 18, after the word "conditions", to strike out "$4,937,500" and insert "$6,537,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$7,254,000" and insert "$7,754,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 20, to insert:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $190,000, to be available only for payment of the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 7, to insert:

Special Acts

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage

originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forest, in accordance with the provisions of the following act authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amount from such receipts: Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "State and Private Forestry Cooperation," on page 38, line 11, after the word "industries", to strike out "$10,683,690" and insert "$12,983,690."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "State and Private Forestry Cooperation," on page 38, after line 13, to strike out "(Definite appropriation, special account)", and in line 18, after "(16 U. S. C. 580h)," to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Smithsonian Institution," on page 42, line 23, after the figures "$4,000,000", to strike out *"Provided,* That the Secretary may, in accordance with such polices as the Board of Regents may from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel (not to exceed five) as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Smithsonian Institution under the act creating it, and, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, fix their rates of compensation at not more than that provided for grade GS 18", and in lieu thereof to insert *"Provided,* That the Smithsonian Institution is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place 4 positions in GS–17, and 1 additional position in GS–16 of the General Schedule established by said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General Provisions," on page 45, line 6, after "Sec. 401.", to strike out "Appropriations" and insert "Unless otherwise authorized by law appropriations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is unavoidably absent from the Senate Chamber at this time. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which he had prepared in reference to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, which is now under consideration, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, H. R. 5085

I should like to discuss several items in the 1956 appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies. The appropriation items that I am particularly interested in are embodied in this bill, H. R. 5085, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

The first topic I wish to discuss comes under the Bureau of Indian Affairs subdivision of the appropriation bill. Recently when the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1955, was reported out of this committee and subsequently passed by the Senate, additional funds were made available to my State, Montana, for the education of Indian children under the Johnson-O'Malley Act.

The necessity for this deficiency appropriation was the result of a misunderstanding or disagreement between officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and officials of the State Department of Public Instruction in Montana. The local school districts prepared their 1955 budgets anticipating an increased Federal contribution. After the budgets were set up these school districts eligible for Johnson-O'Malley funds learned that they would not receive funds in the amount they were instructed to plan for. Thus a supplemental was needed to take care of this deficiency in the local school district budgets.

It is my understanding that the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior Committee intends to study the Johnson-O'Malley program. I feel that the Senate should take the necessary steps to see that these misunderstandings and disagreements do not reoccur and thus avoid the necessity of any further deficiency appropriations in this respect.

Geological survey

Next I should like to turn to funds for cooperative water-resources investigation under Geological Survey in the Department of Interior. As Senators know, the Geological Survey has carried out cooperative investigations with States and subordinate Government agencies whenever the point interests warrant such joint participation. When these funds are available, it has been the practice to participate on a 50–50 basis.

The Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology has been working for over a year on plans for modern engineering studies of ground water resources of various critical areas in the State of Montana. As in 43 other States, the State hopes to make this a cooperative project with the United States Geological Survey. The Montana Legislature has agreed fully with the need for such studies and has authorized $14,000 per year.

There was some doubt as to whether the Federal ground water funds would be sufficient to meet the 50–50 cooperative agreement. Because this program is new in Montana and so greatly needed, it would be most unfortunate to be forced to postpone it.

I appreciate the fact that because of the continually increasing need for water facts, the Survey's cooperative program of water-resources investigations has grown rapidly and that cooperative offerings of cooperation have proved to be greater than the estimates of them at the time of the preparation of the budget. I understand that various States and municipalities have made available $4,714,000 to be matched with similar funds from the United States Geological Survey. The House Appropriations Committee, however, appropriated only $4 million.

I am delighted to see that the Senate Appropriations Committee has provided a $700,000 increase which will allow new States such as Montana to participate in this program.

In Montana there are signs that with the State's expected growth in the next few years, our ground-water problem may become serious, and it is important that basic data be gathered before the situation becomes crucial.

This is true not only in my State, but throughout the Nation. The need for more water-resources investigations is real and pressing.

Topographic mapping

The appropriation bill contains a Geological Survey request for topographic mapping in the amount of $11,320,000. In addition, I am told that the Geological Survey expects to receive through State cooperation and from other Federal agencies approximately $2,500,000. The allocation currently proposed for topographic mapping in Montana is $350,000 for fiscal year 1956.

Of the 147,000 square miles comprising the State of Montana, 119,000 square miles have no standard quadrangle topographic map coverage. Fourteen thousand square miles are covered by good maps suitable for modern usage and an additional 14,000 square miles are in various states of progress.

The cost of completing the mapping of the entire State, including the $975,000 for work now underway, is estimated at approximately $14,500,000. Under the present program it will be a number of years before the topographic mapping of Montana is completed.

At this point I wish to make a note of a Joint Memorial 6 coming from the house of representatives in the Montana Legislature "urging that the Congress of the United States make sufficient funds available to develop topographic maps for the entire State of Montana as soon as possible."

Topographic maps are important to many industries, including mining, lumbering, and the development of ore-bearing lands. They are invaluable in developing land and water resources. They are essential in locating rights-of-way for telephone, telegraph, and rural electrification lines, highways, railways, and pipelines, and in planning the operation and management of both State and National agricultural, grazing and forest lands.

In view of the importance of topographic mapping I wish to recommend that these funds be increased to meet the urgency of speeding up this program.

National Park Service

There are several items in the Interior Department appropriation request for the National Park Service to which I wish to make note. I am interested particularly in highway construction and repair funds in and around Glacier National Park in Montana.

I understand that the 1956 fiscal year estimates for highway construction in Glacier Park total $110,700. These funds will be used for campground roads and spurs at Kintla Lake, roads and parking areas at Swift Current Cabin and at Lake McDonald Hotel areas.

Construction and repair of highways and roads within Glacier Park are extremely important. Glacier Park is one of the most scenic and beautiful parks in the Nation and is becoming more popular each year. In order to accommodate the vast influx of tourists during the summer months, it is necessary to have an adequate highway system.

In addition to the maintenance of roads and highways within the park, I wish to make reference to the Blackfeet Highway, the eastern approach to Glacier Park. It is my understanding, from information received from Montana, that this road is in very poor condition and maintenance has been neglected. I urgently request that the 1956 fiscal-year estimate of $47,600 for annual recurring maintenance of the Blackfeet Highway be approved by the Senate. I also understand that this amount will not take care of the heavy backlog of deferred work which is necessary to maintain the road.

The reason I am so concerned over this particular highway is that the Blackfeet Highway is the only approach to Glacier Park from the east. In addition this highway is an integral part of the park system and is generally considered to be a seasonal highway.

Fish and Wildlife Service

There is an item under "Management of Resources" in the Fish and Wildlife Service section of the Interior appropriation bill which originally disturbed me very much. I am very pleased to learn that the House reduction of $78,000 in an Interior Department survey program in the Northwest has been restored.

The Coordination Act requires that the Service's Office of River Basin Studies appraise the effects of proposed water-development projects on fish, wildlife, and recreational resources. These surveys are for the benefit of Congress, which certainly should have all information on the merits and demerits of any water-development project.

Several large projects are under study in the Northwest, particularly in the middle Snake River basin. It is my belief that studies of these projects should begin as soon as possible. I therefore concur with the Senate committee action in restoring the full amount requested, $6,728,500.

I had hoped that this appropriation bill would include a request for Fish and Wildlife funds for improvement and expansion of the Federal fish cultural station at Creston, Mont., but I am informed that it does not.

It is unfortunate that the necessary funds for this project are not being requested. The Creston station was built to stock water in Glacier Park. Now it is being called on to stock trout in a great portion of the waters in the northwestern part of Montana. It is at peak production now. But increased fishing pressure and the greatly expanded tourist trade make it necessary that increased stocking of trout be used to supplement natural propagation. With the necessary improvements, the Creston station can double its production of these two species of trout for local distribution at much less cost per pound than is now the case, according to recent reports.

Since funds are not being provided for this project this year, I sincerely hope that it receives early consideration in the preparation of the 1957 budget proposals.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Now I should like to discuss several Department of Agriculture items in H. R. 5085. I submitted letters in support of funds in the second supplemental appropriation for a stepped-up program for spruce budworm control in our national forests. Briefly, I wish to voice my support of these funds which are so vital to combating the spruce budworm infestation in our Federal, State, and private forested lands.

In regard to funds for construction of needed range works and maintenance of existing improvement under jurisdiction of the Forest Service, I desire to say that I am in complete accord with the action taken by the Appropriations Committee. In the fiscal year 1956 the amount authorized to be appropriated by the formula contained in section 12 of the Granger-Thye Act was estimated at $730,000, the budget estimate was $280,000, and the House increased this amount to $400,000, the same amount appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1955. The Senate committee acted wisely in recognizing the necessity of these funds and recommending a $700,000 appropriation. I sincerely hope that the Senate send this request to conference.

WATERSHED STUDIES

The Forest Service budget for fiscal year 1956 includes a $200,000 increase for research as reported. This increase is intended for watershed-management studies at some 15 locations over the country. Now studies will be started at locations where the need for information is most urgent; at other locations studies now underway will be strengthened to provide more nearly adequate research programs.

The northern Rocky Mountains in Montana make up the headwaters of important streams tributary to the Missouri River. Water from these high mountain sources furnishes domestic supplies for numerous communities and provides the needs for thousands of acres of irrigated farmlands to the east of the mountain range. These uses require well-regulated yields of silt-free water. This area is also a major timber-producing region and furnishes forage for domestic livestock, and for deer, elk, and other big game animals.

No watershed studies are underway in the northern Rocky Mountain area. And yet there is an urgent need for information as to how these forested areas can be logged without accelerating runoff and erosion rates with resulting damage to the water resources. Studies are needed to furnish the guidelines for timber removal consistent with watershed protection. Additional studies are needed to point the way toward the proper integration of watershed management and range management practices so as to insure stable yields of good quality water and at the same time provide continued production of forage.

The budget increase will provide for the establishment of watershed studies in this area.

COOPERATIVE FIRE-CONTROL PROGRAM

The 1956 budget proposed $9,600,000 for the cooperative programs of the Forest Service with State and private interests. This was a reduction of $1,083,690 below the 1955 appropriation for the same purpose. It was proposed to apply this reduction to the State cooperative program for fire control. I am in full agreement with the restoration of these funds, and the recommendation for an appropriation for fiscal year 1956 amounting to $12,983,690. The increase of $2 million is provided for cooperation in forest-fire control. The remaining $300,000 increase is for cooperation in forest-tree planting and cooperation in forest management and processing.

In support of this action, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, two attached letters received from Gareth C. Moon, State forester in Montana, dated February 9 and March 18, 1955.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Before concluding my statement I should like to discuss this latter item under the general heading of State and Private Forestry Cooperation in the Agriculture Department section of this bill. The original appropriation request for cooperation in forest management and processing was only $632,429. This later item is the one under which the United States Forest Service cooperates with 38 States in giving advice and assistance in forest management to owners of small woodland properties. I am pleased to see that the Senate report on H. R. 5085 recommends that these additional funds assure the participation of the States of Montana, Pennsylvania, and Utah.

The small owners do not have the technical skill necessary to manage their forests for continuous crops of trees. Most of them do not have enough timber individually to make it practical to hire a forester even on a part-time basis. More than half of the privately owned woodlands are in the hands of small owners. Many of these forested areas have been improperly cut over the years and only through the advice of a farm forester can they be made productive and kept that way.

There has been no increase of Federal funds for this cooperative farm forestry work since the Cooperative Forest Management Act was passed in 1950. Prior to this legislation the work was carried on in a limited way under the Norris-Doxey Cooperative Farm Forestry Act of 1937. Montana discontinued cooperation in this program in 1949 because the State was unable to meet the matching funds provided by the Federal Government. Montana, as well as other States, is planning to rejoin this cooperative program if Federal matching funds are made available. Unfortunately, the present Federal appropriation does not provide enough funds for all the farm foresters needed in the 38 cooperating States. In almost half of the counties with small woodlands in cooperating States there are no farm forester services.

The increase provided in the Senate version of the bill is urgently needed in this item to permit this worthwhile cooperation with the States to be extended.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am in full accord with the justified increases made by the Interior Appropriations Committee. I sincerely hope that when H. R. 5085 is sent to conference that the Senate conferees will be able to maintain the bill substantially as it now reads.

STATE OF MONTANA,
February 9, 1955.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Montana State Senator,
The Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The President's budget, released on January 17, 1955, shows a cut in Clarke-McNary, section 2 funds in the amount of $1,083,690,

Montana's forest fire control organization on State and privately owned lands is far from adequate. This is a result partially of failure upon the part of the State legislature to appropriate adequate funds. In the fiscal year 1954, $30,782.68 was provided for this purpose. In making a complete study of the actual basic requirements to protect State-owned lands, it is felt that $50,795 is needed. I have submitted the request to the State legislature, now convening, for this amount. The State comptroller has recommended that this be cut back to $33,680. You are no doubt aware of the situation in Montana today in regards to the amount of money available for the various State departments as compared to the departmental requests. There is doubt in my mind that we will approach the $50,000 figure. It is absolutely necessary, then, that we receive the Federal Clarke-McNary moneys in order to survive.

On private lands a maximum assessment of 5 cents per acre has been made against the private landowners for the purpose of protecting the lands from fire. Actual costs approach 8 cents in most areas and consequently we must make up the 3 cents difference with Clarke-McNary moneys. If a cut in Clarke-McNary funds is made, the assessment on private landowners must be raised. A bill has been introduced to raise the maximum rate to 8 cents.

On the surface, it appears that the State Forestry Department received $76,531 for 1955. Actually, our share of this will be in the neighborhood of $14,500, the rest going to the various protection agencies (BFPA, NMFA and USFS) within the State after the deduction is made in Washington for administration and the cooperative forest fire prevention program.

The Clarke-NcNary, section 2 program, calls for 50 percent reimbursement on basic fire costs. The Congress has never appropriated enough money, and the actual reimbursement is much closer to 27 percent in our case. If 50 percent reimbursement is supposed to reflect basic fire protection

needs, it seems incongruous to reduce it when at present it is only 27 percent.

The Association of State Foresters has gone on record as favoring a $2 million increase. The increased costs in fire protection alone justify increases rather than decreases in the moneys used for that purpose.

I have been told that the proposed decrease would not affect Montana. From my contacts with the other State foresters, I know that their position is not much different from ours and that they will all suffer unnecessarily through such decreases. It seems unrealistic in that some States would be cut as a result of the reduction, while others would not.

Many Montanans feel, as do I, that once each State is able to carry a larger share of the full burden, reliance on Federal assistance should be gradually reduced, but none of us feel that the time for such reduction is here.

I hope that you will see fit to lend your assistance to restoring the proposed aforementioned cuts in the Federal budget.

Yours truly,

GARETH C. MOON,
State Forester.

STATE OF MONTANA,
March 18, 1955.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Montana State Senator,
The Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Reference is made to the Clarke-McNary law, section 2, covering cooperative forest-fire protection.

The Clarke-McNary law as passed in 1924 was intended to do two things: (1) To stimulate the States' interest in building adequate forest-fire protection to cover all nonprotected lands; and (2) to pay the States for the Federal responsibilities handled by State organizations. Most States at that time had very little in the way of protection programs. The resulting Clarke-McNary program stimulated many of the current advances that State forestry departments throughout the Nation have made in their forest-fire protection organizations.

The losses brought about by forest fires in both the Columbia and upper Missouri River Basins affects the entire Nation. Payment of the costs of fires started by the tourists from other States passing through Montana provided an unfair load on the State of Montana. In a similar way fires that started in neighboring States and spread to Montana brought about Montana expenditures. For these and many other reasons it was felt that the people of the Nation as a whole had a responsibility to meet. This responsibility has been met in the allocation of funds under the Clarke-McNary section 2 program.

The Clarke-McNary law is not comparable to the so-called grant-in-aid type of program, but is one whereby the Federal Government shares its responsibility with the State. It was created long before the advent of present-day grants-in-aid. The Congress of the United States, in passing the law, stipulated that up to 50 percent of the costs would be borne by the Federal Government. However, they have never appropriated enough money to actually affect that percentage of participation. Actual participation in Montana has been close to 27 percent of the reported costs.

It is my belief that the new area and cost study will show a considerable increase in actual costs. If we considered one-half of the Clarke-McNary appropriations were to serve as an impetus and the other half were to reimburse the States for the Federal responsibilities, then the amounts that are being expended at the present would approximate the proper amounts. The administration in stating that a responsibility for as many programs as possible should be shifted from the Federal Government to the States is entirely proper. Many people agree with that principle, but I doubt very seriously if they would agree that the States should assume the Federal Government's responsibilities. The proposed reduction in Clarke-McNary funds would serve to do that.

It is my feeling that a group making a study of how Clarke-McNary moneys have been spent by the various States and by the Federal Government will find that these moneys always have been wisely used and that the Federal Government has received benefits far in excess of the cost.

In summarizing I would like to point out that I feel that reductions in Clarke-McNary moneys at the present time would only serve to add responsibility to the taxpayers of Montana that is not rightfully their responsibility.

Yours truly,

GARETH C. MOON,
State Forester.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not offer any further amendment, but I think a word or two should be said especially with reference to the inclusion of an item by the subcommittee with reference to the Forest Service. I call attention to a $1 million increase which was adopted by the Senate committee, in the item Timber Resource Management.

This item pertains particularly to the marketing of timber, including the systematic marketing of young timber. The committee found that the Forest Service had not heretofore been allowed sufficient funds to market its timber according to the practices the Forest Service teaches to others. The Forest Service was so limited in the funds it received, and then in the use of those funds, that it could not actually carry out practices which had already been proved to be beneficial.

This committee amendment represents a big step forward in furthering this very constructive and proven program. I know the chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill is very much interested in the subject, and took quite a constructive viewpoint of it, as did other Senators. I do not know whether he has anything to say on the subject. If he has, I should like to defer to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is well to remember that the Forest Service is one of the agencies of Government that pays its own way. It should also be noted that timber in the national forests is ripening faster than it is being cut and used. Particularly at this time, when the demand for lumber from the building industry is very great, it seemed to the committee highly important that the Forest Service should be supplied with adequate funds so that the timber could be marketed and put to use.

On the other hand, there is involved not only the question of harvesting the ripe timber, but also the question of replanting and protecting the forests from fires and other hazards, so that this particular national resource may continue to be of benefit and be utilized.

Referring particularly to the subject matter in which the Senator from Mississippi is interested, namely, the development of work of this character in the South, we are all convinced that it is for the benefit in all respects of the Nation as a whole, as well as for the benefit of the South.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As a member of the subcommittee, and also, naturally, a member of the full committee, I should like to say that the particular item under discussion as a committee amendment is a most important one. In the first place, if the timber is not harvested when it is ready to be harvested, it is likely to be a loss. Secondly, an overly ripened tree becomes a hazard in the forest, because oftentimes it is nothing more than a host plant for a great many diseases and also for parasites, which are spread through the forests. So that the harvest should be conducted at a time when trees are ripe for harvesting.

Another point is that without proper reforestation, or planting of trees, future generations will not be assured that they will have a harvest of trees to utilize, as has been our privilege in our own generation.

Another factor, which is of much importance, is that without adequate roads and entrances to the forest areas, proper protection cannot be afforded against forest fires. Without adequate and proper protection against forest fires, we could not expect a private investor to invest in a tract of growing timber. He would fear that there might be a forest fire which would destroy his investment just before or at about the time the trees were ready for harvest.

Therefore, without all these little steps in the way of Federal action—proper appropriations, proper management, and proper control—the whole forestry industry would be subject to a lack of private and public interest. Lack of private interest would mean that investors would not invest, and there would therefore be danger that the Federal Government would have to assume a greater responsibility.

So all the funds which would be made available by the adoption of the committee amendment under discussion could do much to encourage private investors to utilize the properties and grow trees. It would bring about reforestation. It would help bring about the construction of roads for adequate fire protection. It would certainly permit the harvesting of trees when they were ripe and ready and should be harvested.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. He has a very profound knowledge of the subject matter, as well as a deep interest in it. I had the pleasure of visiting last fall in the Chippewa National Forest, where I saw the excellent work which had been done, the fine cooperation which had been given, and the actual fruits of the long efforts in the way of national forest research.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Arizone will yield further, I should like to say that I was most pleased that the

Senator from Mississippi took the time, notwithstanding his very busy schedule, to visit the national forest area in northern Minnesota. Because of his visit there, he gained an insight into what the forest problems are in the North. It was my pleasure to visit the South and learn what some of the forest problems are there, and to visit the Timber Belt in the Rocky Mountain area, and some of the great forests which exist in that mountainous section of the United States.

We in Minnesota today realize a greater return annually from our forest areas than we did at the time the great white pine forests, which are native to that northern region, were harvested. Today we grow pulpwood which supplies the demands of mills at International Falls, Cloquet, and Grand Rapids. We also grow other trees which are harvested and used as telephone poles, fence posts, and the like.

The annual income of that northern region, and of the State, is far greater than it was when we harvested the native timbers which grew in the great forest areas of that northern sector of the United States.

With proper management, we have encouraged many private investors to grow trees, to hold the property, and to pay taxes on it.

During the time I was governor of Minnesota, there was inaugurated a sort of community spirit. We had slogans such as, Keep Minnesota Green. We promoted fire protection by the posting of signs which constantly reminded individuals not to drop lighted cigarettes, and to be mindful of extinguishing any campfires which might be lighted in that northern region.

Such precautions are necessary in order to protect a valuable resource for future years.

For these reasons I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also chairman of the full committee, for his work in connection with the entire appropriation bill which is now before the Senate, but more especially for the particular committee amendment which covers this item. Because of what it provides we will not only safeguard what we have, but encourage more tree planting, and we will definitely assure some road construction which will assure better fire protection.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

There is another item to which I should like to refer, namely, the one which provides an additional $1 million for sanitation and care of public campgrounds in national forests.

Last year the number of visitors to the national forests totaled 40 million, which was more than a 100-percent increase over the number as recently as 1946. The crowds which visited the national forests have far outgrown the facilities necessary for ordinary sanitation requirements.

I saw evidences, again in Minnesota, of fine lake resorts, where so-called little people, with small financial means, could enjoy fine recreation facilities at low cost.

There is also an increase of $875,000 in the item for resource development.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I have listened as the Senator from Mississippi has extolled the grandeur and the beauty of Minnesota, where I have so frequently fished and vacationed. I desire to renew my invitation to him to visit the Blacks Hills of South Dakota, because I am sure that, having done so, he would regale the Members of the Senate and the people of the country with adjectives of the most superfluous degree, for I am confident that there he would find trout fishing and a vacation area of great interest to himself, as well as to everyone else.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate the kind words the Senator from Mississippi has spoken about our subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, in connection with our handling of the bill. The bill deals with the Nation's assets; and recognizing that fact, the subcommittee has done, in my opinion, what is right and what it could to protect and to expand and develop those assets.

I should like to have the Members of the Senate know that every decision made in the subcommittee was made by unanimous vote. At the same time, I should like to pay a little verbal salute to Bill Woodruff, our able clerk, who has been clerk of the subcommittee under both Republicans and Democrats alike, I believe, for as long as I can remember. He hails from the State of Tennessee, but serves as a real American in the interests of the interior resources of the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from South Dakota in his tribute to the Black Hills of South Dakota; and my interest in the Black Hills is another evidence of the affinity between our respective States and between ourselves.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I also join the Senator from South Dakota in his tribute to Bill Woodruff.

Mr. President, let me mention the $875,000 increase in the appropriation for the resource development program, because it is a fund which has been far short of the needs in the national forests in the areas I have visited.

Under the Vandenberg-Knutson funds, the work is limited to the actual area from which timber has been sold and from which proceeds have actually been collected, so as to result in income, whereas adjoining tracts, which have just as much need of this work, cannot be included. I refer to work such as removing the "wolf" trees, which shut off light from the small pines and otherwise obstruct normal growth. The expenditure of only a small amount of money per acre brings tremendous fruits within the brief span of a few years, particularly in areas where the timber grows more rapidly. I have observed the present need in such cases for the expansion of these funds, and I have seen the helplessness of the Forest Service under the present limitations of law.

So I am particularly glad that the committee has provided this small fund, which I believe will—barring an unusual calamity or act of God—bring 10 or 50 fold returns in 10, 15, or 20 years, and will actully put into production tens of thousands of acres of the national forest lands which now are not producing one-tenth or one-twentieth of what they can be made to produce by means of the expenditure of only a small sum of money per acre.

The appropriation for this purpose should be far more liberal than it is in this bill, Mr. President, in my humble opinion; and I trust that in the course of a very few years the appropriation will be increased.

I wish especially to thank the committee for looking into the great need for additional appropriations for a number of small experiment stations which extend all the way from Georgia to central Texas, in what we call the longleaf slash pine area, an area in which a special kind of pine grows. These stations have been unable to develop, because of a lack of funds. They have already shown their worth, and they are doing very fine work; and the $300,000 included in the bill will give them a tremendous boost. I feel that I can tell the Senate that I know there will be a most gratifying yield from their work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief letter showing the local interest and local cooperation of a lumber company in that area.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERKINSTON, MISS., *April 12, 1955.*

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand early next week the subcommittee, which handles the appropriations for the United States Forest Service, will begin hearings, and we, in south Mississippi in the timber business, are vitally interested in the Forest Service's request for an increase of $300,000 per year in their budget for research on longleaf and slash timber.

We, and the rest of the land owners, have worked very closely with the Forest Service through Harrison Experimental Station and they have been very helpful in working out some of the many problems of forest management.

I would appreciate any way that you could use your influence to help this project get the money they need.

With best personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. M. DANTZLER,
President,
L. M. Dantzler Lumber Co.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the past 30 years we have observed a complete reversal in the attitude of the lumber companies toward forestry. Of course, in making that statement I do not refer to the gentleman who has written the letter I have just placed in the RECORD; perhaps he was in the very forefront of the development. But the lumber companies and landowners generally have completely changed their attitude, which now is one in favor of complete reforestation and protection. That constitutes direct evidence of what the

forestry program has done. The additional $2 million included in the bill for forestry protection under the cooperative programs—one of the finest programs of which I know—between the States and the Federal Government, is most desirable. It applies to State areas, for instance, areas in my State of Mississippi.

I believe that development constitutes one of the most cooperative steps our board of supervisors, as we call them, has taken in the past 50 years. They have voted to engage in the cooperative program and to assess a special tax for that purpose, which is supplemented by a small sum from the State and also by a small sum from the Federal Government; and the Federal Government also furnishes the leadership. The annual yield per acre of the forest lands throughout that entire area has been greatly increased. So I know from practical experience and direct observation and study the very practical and constructive effects of the program; and I confidently predict a fine yield and great fruits, not for 1, 5, or 10 years, but for generations to come, from the very splendid work being done, as covered by these amendments.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to express my agreement with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi about the fine work the Appropriations Committee has done on the bill.

I should also like to say to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, speaking on behalf of the people of my State, that we are particularly appreciative of the increase in funds for the public-use areas in the national forests. Between 14 and 15 percent of the area of the State of Oregon is in national forests, and about 2 million people each year visit those forests for recreation. The committee has made a very generous appropriation for the upkeep of the campgrounds, and I hope the appropriation will be maintained in future years.

I should also like to say, in corroborating the words of praise uttered by the Senator from Mississippi, that the people of my State are particularly grateful that the Appropriations Committee restored the item of $78,500—which had been eliminated in the House of Representatives—for upstream investigations into the migratory fish runs in the Snake River Basin. In the Pacific coast area of my State, particularly at the mouth of the Columbia River, the people are very heavily dependent upon fishing; and if the anadromous fish returns or runs are not properly maintained in the upper river and in the upper basin, those people will lose their means of livelihood.

So I wish particularly to thank the Senator from Arizona for the restoration of those funds, which are used by biologists in maintaining and studying those runs; and I desire to concur in the words of praise uttered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee was unanimous in believing that work is important at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to comment on two changes from the House version of the bill which we find in the version of the bill as reported by the Senate Appropriation Committee; I refer to the changes in the appropriations for the development of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. President, on the committee there were members who favor the admission of Alaska as a State. There also serve on the committee members who do not favor the admission of Alaska to statehood. However, I wish to report that in the consideration of these two items, there was no difference of opinion whatsoever among the members of the committee and that the two items represents an approach to the development of Alaska which is necessary, regardless of what may be done on the question of statehood.

One of those items is the restoration of a budget estimate of $5 million, which was not allowed by the House of Representatives, for the continuance of the Alaska public works program. That is a 50–50 matching program, under which the Federal Government undertook several years ago—I believe in 1949—to encourage the speedier development of Alaskan communities in the matter of their community services, such as water systems, sanitary facilities, schoolhouses, hospitals, storm drainage, and the like, because our Government had found it impossible to attract permanent residents up there, to stay all the year round, in the number needed to maintain our Defense Establishments there.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I remember correctly, the Senator from Florida was instrumental in the enactment of that legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I did serve as chairman of the subcommittee, and, I believe, as floor leader for that legislation.

It may be of interest, in passing, to note that the floor leader in the House of Representatives was also from the State of Florida. I refer to the then Representative Peterson, who was chairman of the Public Lands Committee. So it happened, in that matter, so far as its representing a selfish interest was concerned, that it proved rather conclusively not to be such, because the two Members of Congress who were officially handling that program were from the most remote State in the Nation from Alaska.

The public-works program is of very great value, and has already proved its value in attracting families to move to Alaska, so that the head of the family may be available on a year-round basis, because those communities, through the 50–50 matching program, are afforded the opportunity to build all the types of public facilities which are so needed, and which, in Alaska, under conditions prevailing there, require heavier investments for material and heavier payments in wages than would be involved in the same kind of construction in the States.

Unfortunately, it is true that if this program were interrupted now, the communities which would suffer would be the weaker communities, which have found it more difficult to raise the matching funds by the issuance of bonds, and the like, as the committee found on inspecting the breakdown of the budget which was before us for this year.

So I am particularly happy that the $5 million was restored. I think it will pay off abundantly, regardless of what is done with reference to the future of Alaska. I feel that there should be some statement on this item in the RECORD, because, of course, the total amount will be in conference when the conference committee begins its labors.

The other item is the restoration of the full budgeted amount for the construction of public roads in the Territory of Alaska. The budget allowed $7,800,000. The House, in its wisdom, reduced the amount to $4,800,000. The Senate committee restored the $3 million.

It was the unanimous feeling of the Senate committee that the further construction of public highways in the Territory of Alaska ought to be pushed, and that in so doing we are not doing anything more than we are doing in such areas as national forests, national parks, and even the general public land areas within the States, with respect to all of which we have greatly increased the program of construction of highways by 100-percent use of Federal funds.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In fairness to the House of Representatives, let me say that I am satisfied the House committee was convinced that there were unexpended balances available for both housing construction and highway construction. On the other hand, our committee, upon looking into the facts, was fully convinced that such unexpended balances are all committed, and that the new programs, as approved by the House, and now by the Senate, cannot be carried on unless this additional money is appropriated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am particularly grateful for that comment. I had intended to say something on that point, and to add the statement that, because of the nature of the weather in Alaska, construction must be done in a hurry, in a very few months in the summer. If these funds were withheld, it would mean a year's delay, a greater delay there than would occur in most other places in the Nation. So our committee was unanimously of the opinion that the budget estimate should be restored.

I thank the distinguished chairman. I wish to add my voice to those of other members of the committee and other Senators, in praise of the fine leadership he has manifested in handling this important bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his fine work on this bill, for his kind and courteous treatment of me during my first appearance before his committee.

The Senator from Arizona is very well aware of the problem which I presented to the committee, concerning the tremendous backlog of cases in the Bureau of Land Management involving the management of lands and resources. There are nearly 17,000 cases pending today in Nevada, or approximately 24 percent of the Nation's total of 70,000 cases.

I invite attention to page 3 of the committee report, under the heading "Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources." I quote from the committee report:

Within the increase approved for the "Lease and disposal of land and mineral resources" activity the committee expects the Bureau of Land Management to take immediate steps to decrease the large backlog of cases in Nevada, and the Dakota-Montana area.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I may interrupt the Senator from Nevada, those two areas were shown to be the most congested in the United States. Nevada is worst of all. Last year the Bureau of Land Management had $12,263,000 made available to it. Taking into consideration the great backlog of cases, the Secretary of the Interior was able to persuade the Bureau of the Budget to recommend an increase in the total appropriation to $13,400,000. We were assured that if that amount were allowed, the work could be expedited and steps could be taken to bring the situation more nearly up to date.

With that assurance, we did not add more money for that purpose, but we felt justified in making the statement in the report to which the Senator referred, in order to emphasize to the head of the Bureau and the Secretary of the Interior that this is important work which ought to be done; and we sincerely hope it will be.

Mr. BIBLE. It is the considered judgment of the committee, is it not, that the amount proposed to be appropriated by the pending bill is sufficient at least to take care of a large part of the tremendous backlog of cases?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. That opinion is based upon information which we obtained from the Department.

Mr. BIBLE. As I understand, there is little question in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the Bureau of Land Management will immediately go to work upon this problem at the start of the next fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Bureau is very eager to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed at the conclusion of the debate on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Today's favorable action by the entire United States Senate in approving the $1 million appropriation brings Devil's Kitchen Lake closer to a reality. The matter now goes to House conference and with approval on that level the lake will rapidly become a reality.

There will be great gains for the whole area of southern Illinois from this action which will help meet the problems of water supply, and offer new inducements to industries to locate in that area and relieve the acute unemployment situation. The recreational opportunities will also be greatly improved. The Senate has taken a real step for the upbuilding of the southern Illinois economy. I am glad I could help in this significant action.

I am also glad that the Senate has approved an appropriation for research in the distillation of coal and the byproducts of coal. This should be of real aid in developing new uses for coal, and hence should build up the production of coal and therefore greater employment in the coal mines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5085) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. DIRKSEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of cooperative forest management programs. This statement relates to the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was passed earlier in the day. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the RECORD immediately following passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

The Senate Appropriations Committee has also recommended an increase of $300,000 to the Forest Service for Federal cooperation in forest tree planting and cooperation in forest management and processing over that amount recommended in the House bill. For reasons which I shall discuss in a moment, the small woodland farmer can be grateful.

When I learned that the cooperative forest management program had not been expanded since 1950, in light of the facts which I shall shortly discuss, I wrote several members of the Appropriations Committee, urging them to support a modest increase in this appropriation so that my own State of Utah, along with several others, could participate in the program. The impelling facts which caused me to do this are briefly these:

Our present forest lands total some 624 million acres, of which approximately 461 million acres produce substantial commercial forest products. Of this 461 million acres, of useful commercial forest lands, about 77 percent is represented by private ownership. Quite contrary to the opinion held by a great many people, it is not public forest lands which provide the great bulk of our sawtimber, but private lands.

Since it takes from 40 to 140 years for sawtimber to attain commercially marketable size, the timber-production cycle extends over several generations. Yet the competitive nature of our economic system often forces the individual private owner to "mine" their timber stands rather than to practice good forestry management. The seriousness of this problem is magnified when it is realized that the average holding of the small woodland farmer in the United States is 62 acres. All together there are 261 million acres in 4½ million such woodland tracts. This is three-fourths of all the privately owned commercial forest land and more than half of all forest land, public and private, in the United States. Three and one-quarter million of these small owners are farmers.

That our private timber lands are being mined is evidenced by the fact that whereas the annual timber cut has been approximately 50 billion board feet of saw timber, the annual growth rate has been only 35 billion board feet. If the present rate of cut timber production is to be just maintained—not even increased—the rate of timber growth must be increased about 65 percent. And in this connection, it should be observed that despite expanding substitution for lumber in construction and other uses, the annual timber consumption rate has not shown a decline in the last 20 years.

The need for expanding the objectives of good forest management to private lands at a much greater rate than we have in the past, in the light of these facts, is revealed by a recent study by the Forest Service which concluded that the nature of timber management was rated poor or worse on 64 percent of the timber operations on private lands compared with only 14 percent of those on public lands where the following general principles of good forest management are observed:

1. Reforestation to prevent erosion and flood control.

2. Reforestation to keep timber production on a sustained or increased yield basis.

3. Fire and disease control commensurate with prospective value of forest returns.

4. Adoption of good cutting and other management practices.

The need for encouraging, through cooperative Federal-State programs, the prevention of wasteful cutting practices and the restocking of private lands as these facts clearly imply, should be evident to us all. Yet the magnitude of this problem has been pushed into the background by all the attention which has been focused upon public forest lands and programs for their protection, costing millions of dollars annually. Yet we forget that such public lands pro-

duce ony 25 percent of the Nation's supply of commercial raw timber.

Another aspect of this problem which has gone unnoticed is the opportunity of helping the low income farmer through the expansion of the Cooperative Forest Management Program. About 75 percent of the commercial timber produced east of the Mississippi River is located in the Southern States where, incidentally, are located 7 of the 9 "serious" areas having a concentration of low income farmers. In these 9 areas are 1,100,000 farms; nine-tenths of them are classified as low income farms, since they had farm sales in 1950 of less than $2,500. Over 95 percent of these farms are located in the Southern States where about 65 to 70 percent, as I have indicated, of our commercial timber is located. You will recall that the figures I gave a few moments ago indicate also that the average size of private commercial timber holdings is 62 acres.

What appears to be the opportunity for timber production on these lands on a more sustaining basis? The report on problems of low income farmers released last week by the Department of Agriculture concluded that "a considerable number of low income and part-time farmers are located in marginal areas most suitable for growing trees as a crop. In such areas off-farm earnings from timber cutting can be increased by improved forest management" (p. 22).

What has been the result, for example, in foreign countries which have undertaken such cooperative programs? Norway, I believe, provides an answer. The Evening Star of several days ago carried this item:

"By following recommendations of the Norwegian Forest Society, Norwegian farmers have been able to increase their annual timber production 17 percent in the past 10 years, although 20 percent of the forest area has been set aside for new growth.

"New growth has been increased by 17 percent."

This, of course, has meant increased income to the Norwegian farmers, and it can also well be the source of additional income to our own farmers, especially those in the low-income areas. If we honestly want to help the small part-time farmer, we can help them to put their timber production—the receipts from which constitute a cash crop to these people—on a sustained and increased basis.

Now the scope of the Federal programs for the conservation and more efficient use of private forest lands—which constitute 77 percent of the useful commercial forest lands—consists primarily of technical services made available through cooperation by the United States Department of Agriculture with State extension services and State foresters. The program, however, with which we are concerned here is that known as the Cooperative Forest Management program, which operates in this manner:

Through the program the woodland owner gets 1 to 5 days' free technical management advice and assistance on problems peculiar to his own woodland (some States charge for this service). They are called farm foresters, service foresters, project foresters, or local foresters, depending on the State in which they work. Each covers an area varying in size from 1 to 5 counties. Insofar as the woodland owner is concerned, the Federal Government goes unnoticed, for he deals entirely with the State forest service and the farm foresters are State employees. The Federal Government's part in this cooperative program is to furnish some of the money to encourage State participation, to assist in developing new techniques, to assist in training farm foresters, and to make appropriate inspections and audits.

When an owner or operator requests assistance, the farm forester visits him to determine what the owner has in mind and what his woodland needs in the way of management. Sometimes the owner must be convinced that it is to his interest to adopt improved practices. The forester will make a simple management plan covering such operations as timber cutting, planting, thinning, pruning, and protection from fire, insects, and grazing animals. He also indicates practices that will benefit wildlife.

When the forester finds that the owner is ready to harvest the timber, he recommends a method of cutting. He further aids the owner in determining what trees to cut, helps estimate the volume, and advises on marketing the products.

When thinning, pruning, planting, or fire-protection measures are needed, the forester shows the owner what to do and how to do it.

In brief, what the farm forester does is to use his technical skill and knowledge to size up a particular forest property, make specific recommendations for that individual area, and assist the landowner in proper methods of carrying out these recommendations.

Where the landowner has already accepted good forest management practices or seeks advice regarding a large tract, he is referred to a private consulting forester who will advise and assist him for a fee.

That is the cooperative forest management program. In 1954 expenditures by the 38 States now cooperating in the program and the Federal Government were as follows:

State expenditures for farm foresters	$1,227,964
Federal contribution toward employment of farm foresters by States	632,429

This $632,429 has been the annual Federal appropriation for the cooperative forest management program since 1950.

At this time, several other States, including my own State of Utah, would like to participate in the program during the 1956 fiscal year. However, unless this modest appropriation is increased by the Congress, this will not be possible, since the present appropriation request has been budgeted and allocated to the 38 States now participating in the program. My own State, for example, would receive $6,000 which will be used to help develop a long-range plan for helping Utah farmers develop a forest management and timber processing program.

I urgently recommend to the Senate that it support the appropriation committee in its efforts to increase the scope and magnitude of this most worthy program. I also hope the Senate conferees will do all in their power to get the House to agree to this modest increase.

RETIREMENT, CLERICAL ASSISTANTS, AND FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 209, S. 1516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1516) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That each former President of the United States shall be entitled, as long as he shall live, to receive a monetary allowance at the rate of $22,500 per annum, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, provide for each former President a staff consisting of an administrative assistant, a secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants. Persons employed under this subsection shall be selected by the former President and shall be responsible only to him for the performance of their duties. Each former President shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for him under this paragraph which in the aggregate shall not exceed the aggregate amount provided by law for the basic compensation of the administrative assistant, secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants authorized for a Senator from the least populous State of the Union; and the persons so employed shall also receive additional compensation at the rates provided by law for employees in the offices of Senators.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall furnish for each former President suitable office space appropriately furnished and equipped, as determined by the Administrator, located in a Federal building at such place within the United States as the former President shall specify.

(d) Each former President shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its Territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him under his written autograph signature. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year out of the general funds of the Treasury in an amount equivalent to the postage which would otherwise be payable on such mail matter.

(e) The widow of any former President of the United States shall be entitled to receive a pension at the rate of $10,000 per annum, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury, if such widow shall waive the right to any annuity or pension under any other act of Congress.

(f) As used in this section, the term "former President" means an individual who shall have held the office of President of the United States, and whose service in such office shall have been terminated other than by removal pursuant to section 4, article II, of the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to give an explanation of the bill.

The principal purpose of this bill is to make provisions for meeting the living expenses and office expenses of former Presidents of the United States. The bill also provides for pensions of $10,000 a year for widows of former Presidents. The bill would be applicable with respect to Presidents whose terms of office have already ended and also with respect to Presidents whose terms of office will end in the future.

There are many reasons why legislation of this character is desirable and should be enacted. The Presidency is the greatest office within the gift of the American people. The words and deeds of the man who holds it are of vast significance not only to Americans but to the people of all the world. We expect—and rightly so—that he who holds that office shall dedicate himself with a consuming and single-minded purpose to discharging the duties of his office to the best of his ability. In return, we should do all we can to relieve his mind of concern over his personal affairs. This is not only a matter of equity, it is a matter of good business for the American people. The financial cost of maintaining the Presidential office is infinitesimal in relation to the critical importance—even the life-and-death importance—which the decisions of the incumbent of that office have in the lives of all of us.

The interest of the American people in the President does not cease when his term of office has ended. Neither does his obligation to maintain the dignity of that great office, nor his opportunity to be of service to the public good. There has been wide recognition of the fact that a man who serves as President gains a unique and invaluable experience thereby, and that somehow the benefit of this experience should be made available for public service. There have been a number of proposals as to how this might best be done. We do not at this time propose any definitive solution of this matter. We agree that the way should be open to utilize the services of former Presidents when that is appropriate. We are inclined to the view that no attempt should be made to establish a fixed pattern for doing this, but rather that it should be left to be determined according to the circumstances of each particular case. However, it is perfectly clear to us that the matter ought not to be determined on the basis of financial stringency in any case. In other words, when and if any former President can be called upon for public service, there ought to be no financial bars standing in the way.

Moreover, any man who serves as President, by that very fact, becomes an important public figure for the rest of his life. Whether or not he is thereafter called on for any official service, there are many demands upon him in the form of public appearances, correspondence, and otherwise. These are legitimate demands and they should be met; but they can entail substantial expenditures.

With all this, we expect a former President to engage in no business or occupation which would demean the office he has held or capitalize upon it in any way deemed improper. There are many ways in which a former President can earn a large income, but ought not to. Paradoxically, while his earning power is greatly increased by the fac of his having been President, the field in which it is right and proper for him to use his earning power may well be narrowed far beyond that which is available to other men. We believe that a former President should take very seriously his obligation to maintain the dignity of the Presidential office insofar as it appertains to him for the remainder of his life. If follows that there is an obligation upon the Government to see that it is financially possible for him to do so without hardship to himself and his family.

Some men who find themselves in this position may be wealthy enough individually to meet all the demands upon them without financial difficulty. But we do not want to depend upon this. With the Presidency, as with other political offices, the opportunity of holding office and meeting its demands should not be confined to the wealthy. In short, the Government should provide adequate compensation and other facilities for former Presidents so as to enable them without financial hardship to maintain the dignity of the great office they have held, to meet the public demands upon them, and to make themselves available for further public service whenever they are called upon in appropriate cases.

In the judgment of the committee, this bill (S. 1516) makes reasonable provisions for this purpose.

The first subsection of the bill, as reported, provides that each former President of the United States shall be entitled, as long as he shall live, to receive a monetary allowance at the rate of $22,500 a year, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I may say, parenthetically, at this point that the original bill provided compensation of $25,000. The committee felt the compensation should be made commensurate with the compensation being paid to Members of Congress.

Subsection (b) provides that the Administrator of General Services shall provide for each former President and administrative assistant, a secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants. All these staff assistants are to be selected and their respective rates of compensation fixed by the former President; but their aggregate compensation is not to exceed the aggregate authorized for the staff of a Senator from the least populous State of the Union. That amount, in dollars and cents, is $42,240 a year.

Subsection (c) provides that the Administrator of General Services shall furnish suitable office space for each former President, located in a Federal building at such place within the United States as the former President shall specify.

Subsection (d) provides the franking privilege for mail sent by each former President. The postal revenues are to be reimbursed out of the general funds of the Treasury in an amount equal to the postage which would otherwise be payable on such mail. This is in line with the policy established by the Congress last year for the reimbursement of the Post Office Department for penalty or franked mails.

Subsection (e) provides that the widow of any former President shall receive a pension at the rate of $10,000 a year. The Congress has from time to time in the past provided pensions at the rate of $5,000 a year for some of the widows of former Presidents by special legislation applicable to particular cases. This bill would establish a provision of general applicability for widows of former Presidents and would fix the rate of $10,000 for those who are already receiving pensions as well as any additional ones not now receiving pensions.

Subsection (f) contains a definition of the term "former President."

Mr. President, this matter was thoroughly discussed by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. There was no dissenting vote. I believe this is good legislation. I think it is time we should consider what should be done for former Presidents.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As a member of the committee which considered this very worthy bill, I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his sponsorship of this contribution toward maintaining the prestige and dignity of our former Presidents. I hope this idea in its inception will lead ultimately to providing on the floor of the Senate seats for former Presidents of the United States so that they may continue in active public service.

I was recently very much impressed when that great statesman of his own country and of the world, Sir Winston Churchill, retired as Prime Minister of the British Empire, a position which is comparable to our own Presidency. Yet he is not lost entirely to the British parliament. Many persons rejoice because of the fact that he still will sit, speak, and vote in the British Parliament as a member of that body.

I trust this bill will constitute an entering wedge to a movement which will result in former Presidents of the United States continuing their service by being accorded seats in the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1516) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CRITICISMS OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion regarding consumer prices, and much of it has been directed at the President in connection with the case of dairy products. I hold in my hand an excellent statement prepared by Elmer Towne, commissioner of agriculture for Vermont, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME COMMENTS ON CRITICISM OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

(Statement by Elmer Towne, commissioner of agriculture for Vermont)

The dairy industry is now going through a period of criticism from the staff writers of many of our weekly and monthly magazines that have very wide national circulation. The industry has constant, extensive

criticisms in newspapers. The same sort of criticism is directed at big business, big labor unions, and big government. This is the way abuses are brought to light, and corrected, and in general is one of the factors which has made this country great and keeps it that way. It is lamentable that dairy articles read by so many people are so often written by persons who have only the most superficial knowledge of the subject and are slanted to make headlines and stir up popular prejudice rather than to offer constructive criticism and factually inform the public of the good as well as the bad. Articles which by inference condemn the entire industry as being dominated by dealer monopolies, racketeering labor unions, and profiteering farmers, all operating under a complicated, idiotic maze of governmental sanitary and price-fixing regulations, are detrimental to the public interest. While true some of the time in some places, these conditions are not typical.

The dairy industry is the largest industry in the country. It furnishes employment to more people and uses more trucks than any other industry. Dairy products, exclusive of the incidental meat, hides, etc., sell for more money than all the wheat, cotton, and tobacco combined. Dairy products furnish this country with about 30 percent of all its food for 20 percent of its food expenditures. Dairy products have increased much less in price during the period of inflation than the average of all other foods. The cost of distributing milk is increasing, principally due to increased service, labor costs, and in some measure to increased dealer profits. Percentagewise, this increased cost of distribution is less than the average for other foods. The farm price has gone down drastically from the wartime peak. One hour of average industrial wages will now buy 9 quarts of milk. In 1940 1 hour's wages bought 4 quarts of milk. Not everyone has the money to buy all the milk they need. This same group cannot afford medical care or good education for their children. The problems of the lowest income groups cannot be solved by the dairy industry, but must be handled by society as a whole. If milk costs as much for the value furnished as other foods and services, these low-income people would be much worse off. Retail prices which occur at the low point in the many price wars are not a sound basis for comparisons or conclusions.

Only 13 percent of the people in this country are engaged in agriculture. Only part of these produce dairy products. All of the legal price-fixing provisions must be approved by this overwhelming majority of consumers. High support prices have always been opposed by the two largest farm organizations. All these laws have as their object an adequate supply, meaning a price depressing surplus, and consequently have consumer support. Legal retail price fixing is limited to a few States, and can easily be abused. When it is administered in such as way as to maintain competition in the public interest, it serves a useful purpose. This means establishing price regulations which discourage a multitude of high-cost, low-quality dealers, prevent monopoly by preventing the lowest-cost, best-financed dealer from eliminating all competition, and permitting any person with a high-quality product to enter the market.

The introduction of new kinds of milk and new types or sizes of milk containers is very common, as a means of competition among dealers. In isolated cases these have perhaps increased per capita consumption. Additional heavy investment in equipment is required. In general, the net result has been increased service to consumers and increased cost of distribution without any substantial increase in overall per capita sales. However, the only way to find out what will sell milk in any particular market is to try new ideas all the time.

The dairy industry is serving the public by furnishing the world's best, high-quality food at a very low price. Quality and efficiency is improving very rapidly. In some places some very obvious faults need correcting. Public health, good nutrition, and the general economy can best be served by giving due recognition to the excellence of the product furnished at a very low price and not by inferring that isolated abuses are typical of this vital, rapidly advancing industry.

STUDY OF AIR NAVIGATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 236, Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), to establish a joint committee to study the aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "of," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "six" and insert "eight"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "three" and insert "four", in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 8, after the word "Commerce", to insert "Foreign Relations"; in line 9, after the word "and", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "six" and insert "eight"; in line 10, after the word "Representatives", to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 14, after the word "Commerce", to insert "Foreign Affairs"; on page 3, line 9, after the word "taking", to strike out "sworn"; on page 4, line 20, after the word "paid", to strike out "one-half"; in line 21, after the word "Senate", to strike out "and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made", and in lieu thereof, to insert "upon vouchers signed by the Chairman: *Provided*, That on the termination of the work of the joint committee the contingent fund of the Senate is to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the total disbursements so made."; on page 5, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make its report to the Senate and the House of Representatives during the 84th Congress. Upon the submission of such report, the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make an interim report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1955, and shall make its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1955. At the end of the first month following the month in which the final report is submitted, the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were:

On page 4, line 11, after the word "the", to insert "reimbursable", and on page 5, line 7, after the word "Chairman", as proposed to be amended, to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That on the termination of the work of the joint committee the contingent fund of the Senate is to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the total disbursements so made", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee to be composed of 8 Members of the Senate (4 from the majority party and 4 from the minority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate after consultation with the chairmen and ranking minority member of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Foreign Relations and Armed Services, and 8 Members of the House of Representatives (4 from the majority party and 4 from the minority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives after consultation with the chairmen of the House Committees on Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services.

SEC. 2. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of six members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to—

(a) study thoroughly all aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States and the use in that system of air navigation facilities; and

(b) transmit to the Congress a report containing comprehensive statements of its findings and conclusions and its recommendations for the development, installation, operation, and improvement of the common system of air navigation in the United States.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such

witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The executive branch of the Government is hereby requested to postpone any action to implement any decision for the use of an air navigation facility in lieu of the very high frequency omni-directional range and distance measuring equipment air navigation facilities in the common system until the joint committee completes its study and reports thereon to the Congress and the Congress has acted upon such report.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make an interim report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1955, and shall make its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1955. At the end of the first month following the month in which the final report is submitted, the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, since the committee amendments have all been adopted, I should like to offer one further amendment in order to make the concurrent resolution consistent. On page 3, line 10, where the word "six" appears, I offer an amendment to strike out "six" and insert "eight."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from New Hampshire. I think the amendment he offers is a proper one, and should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question in on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that this concurrent resolution calls for another investigation. How much money is involved?

Mr. BRIDGES. It calls for approximately $125,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it necessary to have such an investigation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Louisiana is aware of the situation. Several years ago we established an air navigation system, in connection with which the Federal Government has spent a total of several hundred million dollars. We have required every airplane company and every owner of an airplane in the United States to install proper equipment. In this country at least $700 million has been spent in complying. We have been the means of having various foreign countries equip their airports so that our planes may safely land there. Our air navigation safety system is working very well.

Now we find another department of Government, the Defense Department, evolving an entirely new system, costing hundreds of millions of dollars. At least 3 committees of the House of Representatives and 3 committees of the Senate have started investigations. Instead of having 6 or 8 committees, all of them conducting investigations, it was felt they should be combined into 1, so they would not all be spending money on the investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has any Member of the Senate made a study of the proposal?

Mr. BRIDGES. All Members concerned began their study at the time the concurrent resolution was submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will become of the staffs of those committees? Will they still continue to function?

Mr. BRIDGES. They were the regular committee staffs. They had begun their studies in a preliminary way. The representatives of the Committees on Armed Services, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Foreign Relations, and Appropriations are all vitally interested in the matter, but have discontinued their work temporarily, hoping that the 8 committees of the Senate and House can unite their efforts in 1 committee, so as to prevent duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I understand correctly that the membership of the proposed joint committee will be composed of members of committees such as the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. BRIDGES. The proposal is that the Vice President shall appoint to the proposed joint committee two members of each of the present committees—for instance, of the committees on Appropriations and Armed Services—and that he shall consult with the chairman and the ranking minority member of each committee and accept their recommendations as to membership on the joint committee. The purpose of the joint committee is to bring the work under one committee, so as to avoid duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long does the Senator from New Hampshire contemplate will be required to complete the study?

Mr. BRIDGES. To be very frank with the Senator, I do not know. I think it could be done in a few months; but the matter is an involved one.

The main concern of the Senator from New Hampshire, as it must be of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, is that the United States Government itself has spent several hundred million dollars, and we are in effect forcing other nations to spend great amounts. I certainly do not want to see another system established, because we are now moving forward very rapidly under the present system. I think we ought to concentrate on one system, or at least know where we are going.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Hampshire knows of my interest in trying to save a few dollars here and there in providing for investigations.

Mr. BRIDGES. I commend the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. My hope is that the work can be done shortly; that the proposed joint committee will not be a perpetual committee, or at least one which will be in existence for years to come.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The establishment of the joint committee is intended to save money, and to obviate the necessity of having several committees investigate the same subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Louisiana that every committee concerned is interested in the matter. It was felt that by this measure the conflict of interest could be resolved by having each committee give up whatever jurisdiction it had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States has long recognized that a single basic system of air navigation and traffic control, known as the common system, must be developed and installed in the United States which will satisfy the requirements of all users to the greatest extent feasible; and

Whereas the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the 80th Congress and the Special Committee No. 31 of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics recommended and the appropriate Government agencies adopted and installed a system of air navigation facilities for the common use of military and civil aircraft operating within the United States, such common system being currently implemented by very high frequency omnidirectional range and distance measuring equipment air navigation facilities; and

Whereas it appears that by joint action of the Departments of Commerce and Defense in the Air Navigation Development Board it has recently been proposed to substitute a different air navigation facility in the common system; and

Whereas such proposal has been the subject of intense controversy and there is reason to believe that it may have been premature; and

Whereas the implementation of the proposal at this time would drastically affect all elements of aviation in the United States and abroad; and

Whereas all material and relevant facts relating to the present common system and changes proposed thereto should be explored by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

PLACING OF STATUE OF EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE, OF LOUISIANA, IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 237, Senate Concurrent Resolution 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "a", to strike out "statute" and insert "statue", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the late Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission of Louisiana is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had intended to move to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 238, Senate Resolution 94, but in view of a discussion I have had with the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the fact that he wishes to examine the resolution, the report, and the hearings on the measure, I shall not move the consideration of the resolution today. I believe the Senator from Louisiana was specifically interested in studying Senate Resolution 94.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Louisiana is a Senator who is most devoted to the work he has been doing. He has been engaged in committee work. Although I had given notice on two previous occasions that the resolution would be considered, the notice had not been called to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana. I certainly do not want to require him to perform his duties without advance notice. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Louisiana was in the Committee on Appropriations, trying to get appropriation bills ready for the calendar. That is an activity I appreciate. Therefore, I shall not move to take up Senate Resolution 94 today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was notified in the past when such resolutions were to be considered. To be perfectly frank and candid, I did not read the RECORD of yesterday this morning. As a matter of fact, I did not have time to do so. Therefore, I appreciate the Senator's consideration.

REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. JEROME C. HUNSAKER TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 239, Senate Joint Resolution 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Cambridge, Mass., on April 7, 1955, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

INVESTIGATON OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had intended to move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 240, Senate Resolution 33, providing for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission. I should like to ask my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], if Senate Resolution 33 comes in the same category as Senate Resolution 94, which we discussed previously.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have Senate Resolution 33 go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I give notice that Senate Resolution 33, Calendar No. 240, will be called up perhaps on Monday, or at the earliest possible date. In order to accommodate my friend from Louisiana, I shall not ask that it be considered now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assume that Calendar No. 238, Senate Resolution 94, also will be taken up on Monday, or at the earliest possible date?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall move to have it taken up at the earliest possible time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President with reference to Senate Resolution 33, I should like to say that the first resolution submitted provided for an appropriation of $250,000. The committee split that amount, and provided for $125,000. Then it was reduced to $75,000. Both Republican and Democratic members were unanimous in splitting the amount and in reporting the resolution in that form. That is the reason why $75,000 is provided in Senate Resolution 33.

Mr. President, I shall be out of town Monday, and will not be able to be present in the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator from South Carolina returns, we can take up the resolution at any time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall not be here Monday, but I should like to have the resolution taken up at a later time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall be glad to cooperate and to have the resolution considered whenever it is practical to do so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Senators on both sides of the aisle have agreed to it. I do not think there will be any objection. The Senator from Louisiana does not think there will be extended debate. Its consideration probably will not take more than a few minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will permit the consideration of Calendar No. 241, Senate Resolution 92. The able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] tells me he is prepared to explain fully, and, I think, to justify fully, the action which has been taken not only by the Committee on the Judiciary but also by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator from Wyoming is present as a result of two previous notices which have been given to the entire Senate.

If the Senator from Louisiana would be willing to listen to the explanation of the resolution, it is my hope that it could be acted on today. If not, I shall not be unreasonable with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Senate Resolution 92 relates to the creation of another committee to investigate, and it is in the same category as Calendar No. 238, Senate Resolution 94, and Calendar No. 240, Senate Resolution 33. I should like to have an opportunity to examine into Senate Resolution 92.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to make an explanation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Provided the Senate does not act on the resolution today, that will be perfectly agreeable.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was simply hoping——

Mr. ELLENDER. This resolution, which relates to an investigation of the Patent Office, was discussed with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain the Senator from Wyoming knows that the

Committee on the Judiciary has had appropriated in excess of $1 million with which to conduct investigations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, not that much.

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD will show the exact amount. However, I wish to look into the question. The Senator may make his explanation, so far as I am concerned; but I request the Senate not to act on the resolution today, in order to give me an opportunity to consider it. That is all I ask.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not want to precipitate a debate on the question of the consideration of the resolution. I was really hoping that if the Senator from Louisiana would listen, he might allow the resolution to be agreed to. I am not attempting to have it agreed to over his objection. Nevertheless, in 3 minutes I can tell him the story.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. May I inquire what calendar number is being considered? I am not seeking recognition. Is the Senate considering Calendar No. 262, H. R. 2581?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I am simply inquiring if it is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 241, Senate Resolution 92.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would rather have the resolution go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, I suggest that the Senate proceed to the consideration of some other measures, in the hope that the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Wyoming, who has remained in the Chamber because of this resolution, as a result of two notices which have been given, may be able to exchange their views concerning it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say that there are scheduled to appear before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations a number of witnesses from the West, and the subcommittee is about to meet. I would hesitate to disappoint those witnesses, who have come from afar to be heard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana and I have been conferring. It is clear that he wants an opportunity to look into these resolutions which involve expenditures calling for appropriations. I feel that when he has looked into Senate Resolution 92, he will agree that it should be adopted. One resolution providing for an investigation by a joint committee has survived his scrutiny already this morning. However, I am quite willing, Mr. President, to acquiesce in the desire of the Senator from Louisiana to attend upon his subcommittee, which illustrates the necessity for providing such funds as this resolution carries. So I shall not ask for action on it today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank the majority leader, as well as the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the cooperation of my two colleagues.

Mr. President, I desire now to make another motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

EXTENSION OF LOAN AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 246, S. 654.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 654) to extend the direct loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to correspond to the expiration dates provided for guaranteed loans under such title, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 512 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 6941) is hereby amended to read as follows.

"SEC. 512. (a) (1) Upon application by a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement, the Administrator is authorized and directed to make, or enter into a commitment to make, the veteran a loan for any of the following purposes:

"(A) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

"(B) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

"(C) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

"(D) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home;

if the Administrator finds that in the area in which the dwelling, farm, or farm residence is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, the purchase of farms with farm residences, or the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of farm residences, or other dwellings, as the case may be, by veterans under this title. In case there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan made under this section for the construction of a dwelling or farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien.

"(2) No loan shall be made under this section to a veteran unless he shows to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

"(A) that he is a satisfactory credit risk;

"(B) that the payments to be required under the proposed loan bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses;

"(C) that he is unable to obtain from private lending sources in such area, at an interest rate not in excess of the rate authorized for guaranteed home loans, a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified under section 501 of this title; and

"(D) that he is unable to obtain a loan for such purpose from the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or under the Housing Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. Section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) Loans made under this section shall be repaid in monthly installments; except that in the case of loans made for any of the purposes described in clauses (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the Administrator may provide that such loans shall be repaid in quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments.

"The amendment made by this subsection shall apply only with respect to direct loans held by the Administrator on the date of enactment of this subsection and direct loans made by the Administrator on or after the date of enactment of this subsection."

SEC. 3. (a) Clause (C) of subsection (b) of section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 513 of such act is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section 513 is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

(d) The first sentence of subsection (d) of such section 513 is hereby amended by striking out all beginning with "June 30, 1955," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957, such additional sums as the Administrator may request: *Provided*, That the aggregate so advanced in any one quarter annual period shall not exceed the sum of $50,000,000 less that amount which had been returned to the revolving fund during the preceding quarter annual period from the sale of loans pursuant to section 512 (d) of this title."

(e) The amendments made by this act shall take effect as of June 30, 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN WAR-HOUSING PROJECTS TO THE CITY OF WARWICK, VA., AND THE CITY OF HAMPTON, VA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I be recognized to ask the majority leader a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to ask about Calendar No. 245, Senate bill 755, to authorize the conveyance of certain warhousing projects in the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va. Has that bill been acted on?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. It is not scheduled.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill is completely noncontroversial, and even though notice has not been given, I am sure we can dispose of the bill. I am sure the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] will agree with me that there is no controversy about the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, I should like to reply to the Senator from Alabama. We follow a certain procedure in the Senate, namely, that of outlining the order numbers on the calendar which are to be considered, and submitting them to the minority leader. The minority leader usually has his own methods of checking with which I am not familiar.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well. I may say that the bill was agreed to, not only by all members of the committee, but by all Government departments concerned. There were three amendments which it was suggested should be added to the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I see no reason why Calendar No. 245 should not be passed, but it is satisfactory to me to have its consideration deferred.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I am informed that there is an error in the RECORD. When the order numbers of bills were read last night, Calendar No. 245 was read, and notice was thereby given, but that number was not included in the RECORD. I have been following the numbers listed in the RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 245, S. 755.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 755) to authorize the conveyance of certain war-housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va., which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "him", to insert "on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real estate expert"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "all", to insert "of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to both"; in line 19, after the word "determine", to insert a comma and "and the amount received for each project shall be reported by the Administrator to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives"; and at the top of page 3, to insert:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be effective only during the period ending 6 months after the date of approval hereof.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell and convey at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real estate expert (a) (1) to the city of Warwick, Va., or to a public housing authority for such city, or to any agency or corporation, established or sponsored in the public interest by such city, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to War Housing Project VA–44061, and that portion of War Housing Project VA–44067 which lies within the limits of said city of Warwick, and (2) to the city of Hampton, Va., or to a public housing authority for such city, or to any agency or corporation, established or sponsored in the public interest by such city, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of War Housing Project VA–44067 which lies within the limits of the city of Hampton, or (b) to the cities of Warwick and Hampton, Va., jointly, or to a public housing authority for such cities, or to any agency or corporation jointly established or sponsored in the public interest by such cities, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to both or either of the projects mentioned in (1) and (2) above. Any sale pursuant to this authorization shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine, and the amount received for each project shall be reported by the Administrator to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be effective only during the period ending 6 months after the date of approval hereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 217, Senate bill 153, and I call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Minnesota to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not have the floor. I made a motion.

Mr. STENNIS. Was the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas to withdraw the motion. This is the bill to which I objected during the first part of the week. There has not been time to examine into the far-reaching effects of the bill, which would abolish a national formula for the distribution of all the funds involved in REA loans. There is certainly no emergency about it.

Time has not been afforded me to look into the matter since I objected to the bill on the floor. As all Senators know, the Senate was in session until 10:30 p. m. last night, and meetings have been in progress all week by the Committee on Appropriations. I am planning to look into the bill over the weekend, which I definitely promise to do. However, there has been no opportunity up to now to look into the question on its merits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall be glad to withdraw my motion. However, I should like to announce——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion of the Senator from Texas is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I complete my announcement, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This bill has been on the calendar now since April 20. I realize the very deep interest which the Senator from Mississippi has in the proposed legislation. I have had several discussions with him about it in the past several days. There are also many other Senators who are interested in having the bill considered by the Senate, where it can be debated and voted on.

I do not know that any great emergency is involved; but I do know that many people throughout the Nation who are interested in REA feel that under the existing formula, money which is required to be allocated to the States is not used by the States.

I thought sufficient time had been given the Senator from Mississippi to look into the matter. When we passed over the bill in the early part of the week, it was announced then that it would be taken up as soon as it could be reached. We have free time now, and we probably shall have on Monday, also.

I will say to the Senator from Minnesota and to the other Senators who have talked to me about the bill that I hope they will understand our failure to take up the bill today. We shall have time to take it up on Monday, and on Monday I shall move the consideration of the bill.

I hope the Senator from Mississippi will have a chance over the weekend to look into the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Texas, and I will look into the bill over the weekend, and will try to be prepared on Monday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the majority leader has made, and also the consideration he has given to our friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

I wish the Senator from Mississippi to know that, following his inquiry about the bill, I contacted the REA Association and the National Electric Cooperative Association, as well as the professional staff of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as to the effect of the bill on his particular State. I can assure the Senator from Mississippi that every report I have received from all three of those sources indicates that the bill would be beneficial, rather than detrimental, to his State.

The problem involved here is that literally millions and millions of dollars of funds are tied up under a formula; no one can touch the funds because in the law there is a particular formula which no longer is applicable to the existing situation. The truth of the matter is—and the Senator from Mississippi has every right to be concerned, because his State has problems which are unique to it, in terms of the REA—that 15.6 percent of all the unelectrified farms in the Nation are in Mississippi; 25.4 percent of the farms in Mississippi are unelectrified.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Before the Senator from Minnesota leaves with the Senate the impression that there is any emergency in connection with this bill, or that anyone will suffer in the least if action on it is deferred, let me call attention to the fact that last week the Senate passed an appropriation bill carrying sufficient funds to insure that the operation of the present formula—which Senators have proposed to repeal—will not injure anyone.

Furthermore, the House of Representatives has passed the same appropriation bill, carrying the same funds, and even though the bill is in conference, those paragraphs of it are not in conference. So we may say that that particular appropriation lacks only the signature of the President of the United States to insure that no one will be hurt if the formula is not changed or if the bill we are discussing is not passed.

So I desire to assure the Senator from Minnesota and all other Senators that I am not trying to delay for one moment action on the bill. I am not any busier than any other Member of the Senate; but everyone knows what a busy week the Senate has had. I do not understand that there is any present urgency all of a sudden, to have the bill passed. No one is being hurt or injured.

I am referring these remarks to the Senator from Minnesota, who has urged me to lay all other business aside during the week and to confer with the REA authorities. I told those in the REA that I would get to the matter as soon as I could. I had in mind doing so on Friday.

The Senator from Minnesota has unusual energy, and I admire him for it; and I do not think he is trying to take advantage of anyone. But I wish to say that there is no emergency requiring us to take immediate action on the bill. There is time to have the bill follow the usual course.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was trying to say that there is good reason for the Senator from Mississippi to be concerned. I have no special interest, as such, in this measure, except under my responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee.

I am delighted that the Senator from Mississippi has more time in which to look into this matter, and I think he should have the additional time. I was only pointing out that this is a particular problem in the State which he is so honored to represent in part in the Senate, and that nothing which would jeopardize his State will be done. He will have my full cooperation, not only in this matter, but in a host of others.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say that I am the author of the bill and that I introduced it because of the fact that the administration and the REA directors recognized that under the old formula system, year after year, when certain funds were lying earmarked for a particular State, in many cases the State had no way of making use of them. Thus, we had a situation in which certain appropriated funds were not serving the purposes of the REA in the way all of us would like to see those purposes served. For instance, funds might be earmarked for Minnesota, whereas they might well be used in Mississippi, to improve the rural-electrification program in that State.

So much progress has been made that there is no longer any need to give special protection, by means of earmarking funds, to the States having the smaller populations.

At this time we would prefer to make the funds available to the entire REA program throughout the Nation, and have the directors of the REA use the funds where they can best be used to promote and further the program.

I have no desire to have the bill rushed through, if it pleases the Senator from Mississippi to have action on the bill delayed for 1 week. The bill has previously been passed over.

Of course, the quicker we get the program developed on the basis of freeing funds which now are tied up by being earmarked for a State which is not ready to use them, the more rapidly will the program be advanced. But I assure the Senator from Mississippi that I am not by any means trying to have sudden action taken on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to have the Senate consider the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad the Senator from Texas has acceded to my request.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK, N. DAK.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 251, Senate bill 1529, to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; and I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1529) to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, after the word "of", to strike out "200" and insert "140"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "easterly", to insert "10 feet", and after the word "and", to strike out "200" and insert "140", line 4, after the word "Avenue", to insert "to a point 150 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence northerly 20 feet along a line parallel to and 150 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street to a point on a line parallel to and 160 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence easterly along said line a distance of 150 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence northerly a distance of 40 feet along said westerly right-of-way line of Main Street to a point 200 feet northerly from the northwest corner of the intersection of Third Avenue and Main Street; thence easterly along a line parallel to and 200 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue"; and in line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "1,110" and insert "970", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby made a part of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto: Beginning at a point in block 11 of the village of Medora, N. Dak., said point being on the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue a distance of 160 feet westerly from the northwest corner of the intersection of Third Avenue and Main Street; thence northerly a distance of 140 feet to a point on a line parallel to and 160 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence easterly 10 feet along a line parallel to and 140 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue to a point 150 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence northerly 20 feet along a line parallel to and 150 feet westerly of the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street to a point on a line parallel to and 160 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence easterly along said line a distance of 150 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; thence northerly a distance of 40 feet along said westerly right-of-way line of Main Street to a point 200 feet northerly from the northwest corner of the intersection of Third Avenue and Main Street; thence easterly along a line parallel to and 200 feet northerly of the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue a distance of 970 feet to the northwesterly corner of lot 3 in block 8; thence southerly along the westerly line of lots 3 to 10, inclusive, in block 8 a distance of 200 feet to a point on the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence along the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue extended easterly to a point on the west sixteenth line of section 26; thence northerly along said sixteenth line to a point on the section line common to sections 23 and 26; thence westerly along said section line to a point which is 600 feet easterly of the section corner common to sections 22, 23, 26, and 27; thence northerly along a line parallel to and 600 feet easterly from the section line common to sections 22 and 23 to a point on the south sixteenth line of section 23; thence westerly along said sixteenth line a distance of 600 feet to a point on the section line common to sections 22 and 23; thence southerly along said section line to the section corner common to sections 22, 23, 26, and 27; thence southerly along the section line common to sections 26 and 27 a distance of 390.5 feet; thence westerly a distance of 421.7 feet to a point on a line parallel to and 390.5 feet southerly from the section line common to sections 22 and 27; thence southerly a distance of 360 feet to a point in block 4 on a line parallel to and 150 feet westerly from the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street extended northerly; thence southwesterly on a straight line through the southwesterly corner of block 4 to a point on the southerly right-of-way line of Second Avenue extended westerly; thence westerly along said westerly extension of the southerly right-of-way line of Second Avenue to a point on the northeasterly right-of-way line of United

States Highway No. 10; thence southeasterly along said northeasterly right-of-way line of United States Highway No. 10 to the intersection or juncture of said right-of-way line with the northerly right-of-way line of Third Avenue; thence easterly to the point of beginning; and all of that part of block 12 in the village of Medora that lies westerly of a line parallel to and westerly a distance of 140 feet from the westerly right-of-way line of Main Street; all in township 140 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian.

Also, that part of section 4 lying south of the north bank of the Little Missouri River, section 7, section 8, and northwest quarter northwest quarter section 9, township 147 north, range 99 west; section 12, township 147 north, range 100 west; northeast quarter section 20 and section 21, township 148 north, range 99 west; and east half section 20, north half section 21, and southwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, and north half northeast quarter section 29, township 148 north, range 100 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota.

SEC. 2. The following area is hereby excluded from the park: That portion of section 8 lying southwest of a line between the common corner of sections 8, 9, 16, and 17 and the northwest corner of the southwest quarter section 8; that portion of section 16 lying southwest of a line between the southeast corner southwest quarter and the northwest corner southwest quarter section 16; and section 17, township 147 north, range 100 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make further adjustments in the boundaries of the park along United States Highways Nos. 10 and 85 as he deems advisable and in the public interest if and when the alinement of these highways is changed: *Provided*, That not to exceed 500 acres may be added to the park and not to exceed 2,000 acres may be excluded from the park by such adjustments. Boundary adjustments made pursuant to this section shall be effective upon publication thereof in the Federal Register and all Federal land excluded from the park pursuant to this act shall be administered in accordance with the public-land laws of the United States.

SEC. 4. The land exchange authority relating to Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park prescribed by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 52), and by section 2 of the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 384), shall be applicable also to the lands described in section 1 of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1529) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF SCENIC VALUES ALONG OAK CREEK CANYON WITHIN THE COCONINO NATIONAL FOREST, ARIZ.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 252, Senate bill 52, relating to protection of scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon, in Arizona. The bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and has been reported by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I now call the attention of the junior Senator from Arizona to the motion I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 52) to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is a similar bill before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, namely, House bill 2679.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there seems to be some confusion. The acting minority leader [Mr. BARRETT] does not understand that any bills should be brought up for consideration except those noted in the RECORD. Several days ago the majority leader proposed to the minority leader the consideration of every bill on the calendar——

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not until I complete my statement.

The minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] conferred with other Senators on that side of the aisle, and indicated in his own handwriting on a copy of the calendar his approval of consideration of certain bills.

The Senator from Texas does not desire to rush anything. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has reported both bills. I assure the Senator from Wyoming that the minority leader has cleared the question of consideration of the bill, although it is not necessary for the minority leader to clear it. Last session the minority leader did not determine what business was to be brought before the Senate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator so desires, I shall be glad to postpone the consideration of the bill until Monday. However, as I stated earlier in the day, last evening there was read into the RECORD a list of certain bills for possible consideration today. Previous notice had been given, and the copy of the calendar which the Senator from Wyoming has before him indicates, in red pencil in the handwriting of the minority leader, his approval of consideration of these bills.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I misunderstood the minority leader. I understood him to say that he had agreed with the majority leader that the bills enumerated at the end of yesterday's proceedings were the ones which were to be taken up today. However, I am quite certain that the arrangement which the majority leader had with the minority leader is precisely as he has stated it.

I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 2679, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 2679.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2679), to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 52, is indefinitely postponed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE SALT RIVER AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND POWER DISTRICT, ARIZONA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 253, Senate bill 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is a similar House bill on the calendar, namely, House bill 1602.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1602) to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 53 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 263, Senate bill 266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 266) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.), to the State of Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "Lots" and insert "Southwest quarter northwest quarter, section 1; lots 3 and 4, west half southeast quarter, section 3; lots"; in line 10, after the numeral "7", to insert "southeast quarter northeast quarter section 13;"; on page 3, line 17, after the word "approximately", to strike out "seven thousand six hundred and eighty" and insert "five thousand seven hundred and eighty"; on page 5, line 21, after the word "quarter", to strike out "south half" and insert "southeast quarter"; in line 25, after the numeral "2", to strike out "lots 3 and 4, west half southeast quarter section 3;"; on page 6, line 6, after the word "quarter", to strike out the comma and "southeast quarter northeast quarter", in the same line, after the word "section", to strike out "13;" and insert "13, all in township 27 north, range 67 west,", and in line 8, after the word "township", to strike out "38" and insert "28"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the State of Wyoming certain property of the United States Government situated near Lake Guernsey, Platte County, Wyo., described as follows:

Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 of section 5; lots 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, east half southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter section 6; northwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter section 17; northeast quarter, north half northwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter section 20; all in township 28 north, range 66 west, sixth principal meridian.

Southwest quarter northwest quarter, section 1; lots and 4, west half southeast quarter, section 3; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half north half section 4; south half southwest quarter section 5; lot 1, section 7; southeast quarter northeast quarter section 13; lots 2 and 3, northeast quarter southwest quarter section 18; southeast quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 24; all in township 27 north, range 67 west, sixth principal meridian.

South half southwest quarter section 2; northwest quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, south half south half section 3; northwest quarter northeast quarter, south half northeast quarter section 8; northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter, south half north half, north half south half section 9; northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter section 10; north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter section 14; northeast quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 15; northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 17; northeast quarter southeast quarter section 20; west half southwest quarter section 21; north half northwest quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 22; southwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter section 23; east half northwest quarter section 24; northwest quarter southeast quarter section 25; east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter section 27; southwest quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter section 28; northeast quarter southeast quarter section 29; southeast quarter southeast quarter section 31; all of section 33; northeast quarter of section 35; all in township 28 north, range 67 west, sixth principal meridian; consisting of approximately 5,780 acres. Such property shall be conveyed, together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, and the Secretary of the Interior shall execute and deliver in the name of the United States in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the said transfer: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in said lands.

Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard or Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that, if the State of Wyoming shall cease to use the property so conveyed for such purposes, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Wyoming during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist and upon the determination by the appropriate Secretary that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Wyoming, for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency, and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Wyoming together with any or all facilities and improvements, appurtenances, and utilities thereon or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 2. (a) Where lands described to be conveyed herein are being used under valid outstanding United States grazing leases, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey the lands only after he finds suitable provision, equitable to such lessees, has been made to compensate them for losses resulting from the use of the lands for the purposes of this act and to assure them appropriate preference to such future use of the lands for grazing as may be consistent with the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, at the earliest possible date after the execution of the conveyance authorized by this act, shall issue a permit to the State of Wyoming allowing the State the free use of the lands described below for the purposes described in the first section of this act and subject to adequate protection of the lands for Federal purposes:

Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 1; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 2; northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 10; north half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter section 11; east half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter section 12; northwest quarter northeast quarter 13, all in township 27 north, range 67 west, southeast quarter section 35, township 28 north, range 67 west, sixth principal meridian, State of Wyoming.

SEC. 3. The State of Wyoming may dispose of interests and rights in the land by lease, license and easement, provided that the exercise of such rights and uses shall not impair the use of the land for the purposes set out in the first section of this act. Revenues derived from such transactions by the State of Wyoming shall be expended by the State for the protection, maintenance, and preservation of such land for the purposes expressed in this act and for the protection and preservation of the natural resources thereon. The United States and the State of Wyoming shall share equally in any residual revenue beyond the cost for those purposes. All moneys to which the United States is entitled under this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army are authorized to enter into any necessary agreements with the proper authorities of the State of Wyoming for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BONDING OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 259, Senate bill 391.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 391) to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to obtain blanket, position schedule, individual, or other type of surety bonds covering the officers and employees of the District of Columbia required by law or administrative order to be bonded. Any such bond may cover a period not exceeding 3 years, or any greater period required by law, as the case may be, and the premium for the full period for which each such bond is written may be paid at the time of the purchase of such bond from funds appropriated for such purpose. The Commissioners may, in their discretion, obtain such bonds by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C., sec. 5). Each bond shall be of the most economical type available for the number and type of personnel to be bonded, shall be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the duties of the persons or positions so bonded, and the term "faithful performance of duties" shall be deemed to include the proper accounting for all moneys or property received by virtue of the positions or employment of

the bonded persons, or by the officers or employees of the District of Columbia in positions covered by a bond, and all responsibilities and accountabilities imposed by statute or by regulation made pursuant to statute.

And insert in lieu thereof:

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to obtain blanket, position schedule, or other type of surety bond covering their civilian officers and employees required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. Each bond shall be of the most suitable type available for the number and type of personnel required to be bonded, and shall be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the duties of the persons so bonded, and the term "faithful performance of the duties" shall be deemed to include the proper accounting for all moneys or property received by virtue of the bonded persons' positions or employment and all responsibilities and accountabilities imposed by statute or regulation issued pursuant thereto. The bond premium may cover a period not exceeding 3 years and may be paid in advance from funds available for administrative expenses when the contract is made or continued. If the initial or subsequent premium cost exceeds $500 for any bond procured under authority of this section, advertisement for bids shall be required therefor and procurement shall be made from the responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the District of Columbia, price and other factors considered.

On page 4, line 6, after the word "or", to strike out "employment, or as a notary public in the service of the District of Columbia government whose notarial duties are confined solely to government official business," and insert "employment", in line 21, after the word "sentence", to strike out "Any such bond may cover a period not exceeding three years, and the full premium for each such bond may be paid at the time of the purchase of such bonds." And insert "The premium on any such bond may cover periods not exceeding three years and may be paid in advance."

On page 5, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 5. Section 561 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (31 Stat. 1189, 1279; sec. 1–504, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "Where any such notary public is an officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia whose notarial duties are confined solely to government official business, any bond covering such officer or employee for the faithful performance of such notarial duties obtained by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to the authority conferred on them by law shall be in lieu of the bond required by the first sentence of this section."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the last paragraph of section 2 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 103, ch. 180), entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia", as added by the first section of the act approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 430), as precedes the proviso in said last paragraph, is amended to read as follows:

"The said Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered to determine which officers and employees of the District of Columbia, or which positions occupied or to be occupied by such officers and employees, shall hereafter be bonded for the faithful discharge of the duties of such officers and employees or of such positions, and to fix the penalty or penalties of any such bond."

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to obtain blanket, position schedule, or other type of surety bond covering their civilian officers and employees required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. Each bond shall be of the most suitable type available for the number and type of personnel required to be bonded, and shall be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the duties of the persons so bonded, and the term "faithful performance of the duties" shall be deemed to include the proper accounting for all moneys or property received by virtue of the bonded persons' positions or employment and all responsibilities and accountabilities imposed by statute or regulation issued pursuant thereto. The bond premium may cover a period not exceeding 3 years and may be paid in advance from funds available for administrative expenses when the contract is made or continued. If the initial or subsequent premium cost exceeds $500 for any bond procured under authority of this section, advertisement for bids shall be required therefor and procurement shall be made from the responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the District of Columbia, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 3. Whenever any officer or employee of the District of Columbia, as a prerequisite to entering upon the duties of his office or employment, or as a condition to his holding such office or employment is required by any provision of law or regulation to execute or furnish bond, notwithstanding such provision of law, if any bond obtained by the Commissioners pursuant to the authority contained in this act covers such officer or employee, or covers the position of such officer or employee, in the amount and for such period as may be prescribed by such provision of law, such bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of the bond required to be executed or furnished by such officer or employee.

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 305 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, approved June 29, 1953, (67 Stat. 90, 101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The premium on any such bond may cover periods not exceeding 3 years and may be paid in advance."

SEC. 5. Section 561 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (31 Stat. 1189, 1279; sec. 1–504, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "Where any such notary public is an officer or employee of the Government of the District of Columbia whose notarial duties are confined solely to government official business, any bond covering such officer or employee for the faithful performance of such notarial duties obtained by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to the authority conferred on them by law shall be in lieu of the bond required by the first sentence of this section."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement with respect to this bill.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the District government, and for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia.

It is believed that the bonds of the officers and employees of the District government who are required to be bonded by reason of the positions they hold, protect the government and the public and, therefore, the government, rather than the individual, should bear the cost of such protection. Moreover, the Commissioners are of the view that certain positions in the District government, rather than individuals, should be covered by bonds in appropriate amounts, since the bonding of positions would permit flexibility in the assignment of personnel, and still afford protection to the public and the government.

This measure will relieve many District employees of the burden of paying for bonds for the protection of the public and the District government.

The bill would also permit the Commissioners to pay the premium for 3 years, rather than annually, on all bonds, including the Metropolitan Police force, which would result in a considerable saving, and provides that if the Commissioners obtain a bond for a notary public whose notarial duties are confined solely to District of Columbia business, then the bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of that required by law.

The bill was reported favorably by unanimous vote at the full committee meeting of April 27, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS AND THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 257, S. 727.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the fourth sentence of the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the municipal court for the District of Columbia,' to create 'the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia,' and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–771) is amended by striking out "$14,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000," and by striking out "$14,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,500."

SEC. 2. The fourth sentence of section 2 of such act of April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–753), is amended by striking out "$13,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,000," and by striking out "$13,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,500."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–920), is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The salary of the judge shall be $18,500 per annum."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 47–2402) is amended by striking out "$13,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide for an increase in the salaries of all municipal court judges of $5,500 annually; the juvenile court judge of $6,700 annually, and the tax court judge of $5,500 annually. The present local judicial salaries, established by congressional acts, are as follows:

	Present salary	S. 727 as reported
Chief judge of municipal court of appeals	$14,500	$20,000
Associate judges of municipal court of appeals	14,000	19,500
Chief judge of municipal court	13,500	19,000
Associate judges of municipal court	13,000	18,500
Judge of juvenile court	11,800	18,500
Judge of District of Columbia tax court	13,000	18,500

In recommending adjustment of the salaries, the committee took into consideration many factors. It was felt that since the judge of the juvenile court and the judge of the tax court are a part of the municipal judiciary, their salaries should be the same as those of the municipal court.

A salary differential of $1,000 per year has been traditional between the judges of the appellate court and the judges of the trial court. This measure continues in effect that differential.

The salary increases involve 18 judgeships, and the cost to the District government would be $100,200 annually. The bill was favorably reported by unanimous vote at the full committee meeting of April 27, 1955.

I recommend the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court."

PAYMENT OF MONEY ORDERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 265, S. 1488.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1488) relating to the payment of money orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 2, line 6, after the word "after", to strike out "six" and insert "eight"; in line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "six-year" and insert "eight-year"; and in line 15, after the word "orders", to strike out "after one year from the last day of the month of issue of such money orders", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 4 of the act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107), as amended and codified in section 730 of title 39, United States Code.

(b) That part of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 416), as amended and codified in section 731 of title 39, United States Code.

(c) Section 12 of the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1229), as codified in section 725k of title 31, United States Code.

(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883, as amended and codified in section 718 of title 39, United States Code.

SEC. 2. No money order heretofore or hereafter issued shall be paid after 8 years from the last day of the month of original issue. Claims for unpaid money orders shall be forever barred unless received by the Post Office Department within such 8-year period. Any excess of funds accrued because of money orders remaining unpaid may be transferred to postal revenues at such times and in such amounts as the Postmaster General shall determine. The records of the Post Office Department shall serve as the basis for adjudicating claims for payment of money orders.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of this act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month beginning after the date of its enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD following the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON

Senate bill 1488 would establish an 8-year statute of limitations on unpaid postal money orders. Money orders heretofore and hereafter issued and all claims for unpaid money orders shall be forever barred unless received by the Post Office Department within 8 years from the last day of the month of original issue.

The committee extended the 6-year limitation as requested by the Post Office Department to 8 years, thus giving claimants an additional 2 years, and also, deleted language which made distinction between money orders less than 1 year old and those over 1 year old.

Since the inauguration of the postal money order system in 1864, the Post Office Department has been maintaining complete records on those money orders which have not been presented for payment. As a result, over the past 91 years voluminous records have accumulated. The administrative expense of maintaining such records far surpasses the justification against the possibility of a claim.

In order to protect the rights of persons who now hold money orders which have been outstanding for more than 8 years, a saving clause is provided which makes the effective date of this section on the 1st day of the 6th calendar month after the date of enactment of this legislation.

Section 1 of the bill repeals procedural provisions of the present laws relating to the payment of money orders.

This legislation has the approval of the Comptroller General and the Bureau of the Budget.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to Order No. 262, H. R. 2581.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Ohio", to strike out "Improvements to an existing transonic tunnel, additions to two existing laboratory buildings, repairs and modifications to utility installations, $3,910,000" and insert "Component research facility for nuclear propulsion, improvements to an existing transonic tunnel, additions to two existing laboratory buildings, repairs and modifications to utility installations, and acquisition of not to exceed 500 acres of land, $8,760,000."; in line 22, to strike out "$8,450,000" and insert "$13,300,000"; and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,450,000" and insert "$13,300,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, following the passage of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explanatory of this rather important measure be printed in the RECORD. I believe the statement will be of interest to the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

The purpose of this bill is to provide $13,300,000 in new construction authorization for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The items proposed for construction from this authorization are detailed in the committee report and I shall touch on them only briefly in my remarks.

At the Langley Laboratory in Virginia the one big item is an air removal system for a 16-foot transonic tunnel. This will provide a more simple and less expensive method for testing large-scale airplane models.

At the Ames Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif., the bill would authorize a high speed free-flight facility. There are no facilities in existence at this time for investigating the tremendous heat generated by missiles traveling at speeds at from 7,000 to 14,000 miles an hour. I believe the military possibilities of such a missile are obvious. Other items at Ames include a steel pipe test chamber, a firing chamber, and an instrument room that will permit study of airplane heat and stability at speeds ranging from about 2,000 miles an hour to 6,000 miles an hour. These facilities would permit research under conditions closely approximating those of actual flight. The remaining item at Ames is the installation of equipment to record data received from the 1 x 3 foot supersonic tunnel. This construction should result in a saving in time and cost of about 25 percent and will permit the tunnel to handle at least one more major research program each year at no increase in operating cost.

At the Lewis Laboratory in Cleveland, Ohio, the most important item is for the construction of a component facility on nuclear research. This facility is not designed to conduct experiments with the problem of nuclear propulsion as such, but is intended to study the effects of fissionable materials on aircraft engines and airframes. The committee inquired carefully into the relationship of this facility to activites under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomc Energy. We were assured that the Atomic Energy Commission and the military departments endorsed the construction of this facility and that it has been fully coordinated with related activities in this field. The committee also required special justification on the location of this facility. The appropriate officials strongly maintain that it is more economical and efficient to locate this research tool near the existing Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory. This decision was reached after considering more remote sites and other areas where nuclear research is being done by the Government. A summary of the arguments supporting the location of this facility in the Cleveland area is that: (1) Both the capital cost and the annual operating cost will be reduced by locating near the existing NACA laboratory in Cleveland; (2) the effectiveness of the research work on aircraft application is greatly increased by its being conducted as a part of an integrated aircraft propulsion research program; and (3) the addition to the attractiveness of the Cleveland target area is said to be slight because the proposed construction will increase the existing NACA investment in facilities in the Cleveland area by only about 5 percent.

Other facilities at the Lewis Laboratory that would be authorized by this bill include the conversion of an 8-by-6-foot tunnel so as to permit transonic operation. The next generation of military airplanes will be capable of flying at speeds of about twice the speed of sound, or approximately 1,500 miles per hour. The passing of aircraft from subsonic to supersonic speeds present highly critical problems that require intensive investigation. Another item at Lewis is the construction of two test cells and the installation of collateral equipment in order to engage in research on high energy fuels for ram-jets and turbo-jets. Presently fuel storage tanks will be constructed and the laboratory shop building will be altered.

There is one small item at Wallops Island, Va., which is the location of the Pilotless Aircraft Station. This item is for the construction of a reinforced concrete magazine to provide storage for the larger rocket motors that are scheduled for firing in the near future.

Even from the limited discussion of these projects that I have just made, I believe it is obvious that a full understanding of the activities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics requires a scientific background and much technical competence. In a situation such as this, it is imperative that the persons charged with the conduct of the program be of the highest integrity and possess outstanding competence. With this in mind, I think that a brief statement on what the NACA is and how it functions would be worthwhile. In this connection I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an excellent report by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], on his visit to the facilities of the NACA. This report has been printed for the use of the members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. I should now like to quote from a portion of the report having to do with the organization and functions of the NACA:

"The NACA is a governmental research organization. In the three fields of aerodynamics, powerplants, and aircraft structures, the NACA is the main source of aeronautical research information in this country. The committee which directs its operations is composed of 17 distinguished men of scientific background appointed by the President. The present committee is:

"Jerome C. Hunsaker, Sc. D., Massachusetts Institution of Technology, Chairman.

"Detley W. Bronk, Ph. D., president, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, vice chairman.

"Joseph P. Adams, LL. D., member, Civil Aeronautics Board.

"Allen V. Astin, Ph. D., Director, National Bureau of Standards.

"Preston R. Bassett, M. A., president, Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc.

"Leonard Carmichael, Ph. D., Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

"Ralph S. Damon, D. Eng., president, Trans World Airlines, Inc.

"James H. Doolittle, Sc. D., vice president, Shell Oil Co.

"Lloyd Harrison, rear admiral, United States Navy, Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

"Ronald M. Hazen, B. S., director of engineering, Allison Division, General Motors Corp.

"Thomas S. Combs, vice admiral, United States Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

"Donald L. Putt, lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

"Donald A. Quarles, D. Eng., Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Development).

"Arthur E. Raymond, Sc. D., vice president, engineering, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

"Francis W. Reichelderfer, Sc. D., Chief, United States Weather Bureau.

"Nathan F. Twining, general, United States Air Force, Chief of Staff.

"The NACA was created by act of Congress in 1915 for the supervision and direction of the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"It now functions primarily as a research organization, which with the extremely wide representation on its committees of all branches of Government and industry, acts as an informal coordinator of all the aeronautical research being performed in this country.

"In addition to the presidentially appointed main Committee, there are four technical committees composed of outstanding personnel from Government, industry, and educational institutions. These are the Committee on Aerodynamics, the Committee on Powerplants for Aircraft, the Committee on Aircraft Construction, and the Committee on Operating Problems.

"One of the members of the main Committee serves as the chairman of each technical committee.

"These technical committees advise the main Committee of the NACA on problems in their fields and suggest research problems to be undertaken.

"Each of the 4 technical committees is assisted by 4 to 8 subcommittees, which are composed of still more representatives of all segments of the aviation industry, the military services, and other Government agencies.

"The committees include a large number of persons connected with educational institutions and research foundations. Through dissemination of the information gathered by the NACA, and by the exchange of information among the members of the many committees, duplicate research programs are avoided (for the full membership of the technical committees and subcommittees, which is over 400 people, see the Annual Report of the NACA, 1954).

"It is to be emphasized that none of the members of these committees receives any salary from the NACA except the few, of course, who represent the NACA at the working level on the committees.

"By this donation of their time to the NACA, the members of the main Committee and technical committees and subcommittees give invaluable service to the Government and provide a means for the coordination, at a high level, of the aeronautical research work being performed by schools and universities, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, engine, airframe, and aircraft components parts manufacturers, and by the civilian airlines.

"Final authority for research projects is given by the main Committee, and the work is carried out by the civilian employees of the NACA, under the direction of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, at 5 installations.

"About 7,500 persons are employed by the NACA. Approximately half are engineers and scientists, and about 40 percent are trades and crafts people. The remaining 8 to 10 percent are administrative personnel. The NACA is plagued by an engineer shortage, and reports a handicap in not being able to pay its personnel as well as private industry.

"Distribution of research information prepared by the NACA is accomplished by 1 of 3 methods:

"Publication of the information in a research memorandum (usually classified).

"By the holding of technical conferences of persons concerned with particular projects, and

"Through project consultations, which tend to bring together those most concerned with a particular problem in industry and the military.

"Specific research projects are often performed at the request of the Air Force or other service and for private manufacturers, if for an aircraft being built for the military. As much as 50 percent of the time of wind-tunnel operations is spent on work specifically requested by the services.

"In addition to its regular program of research, which is basic research designed to further aeronautical science generally, the NACA is often called upon to assist in the solving of specific problems pertaining to a particular type of aircraft which arise after the plane is in production."

I now would like to comment on several tangible examples of the beneficial results produced by the work of the NACA.

The Grumman F9F series of fighter airplanes has been an important part of the Navy's air arm for about 8 years. An early straight-wing model called the Panther was the first Navy jet to see combat and also was the first Navy airplane to destroy an enemy jet in Korea. A later model, called the Cougar, incorporated wings which were

swept back and other engineering improvements to permit attainment of higher speeds.

Even the improved Cougar, however, could not reach the speed of sound in level flight. At about this time, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics announced to the military services and the aircraft industry that a new technical concept had been discovered and proven in the NACA transonic wind tunnels which showed how aircraft could be designed to obtain a considerable improvement in high-speed performance. The Navy and Grumman started immediately to apply the NACA's new concept to another model of the F9F series. The flight tests show the new Tiger model to be capable of attaining supersonic speeds in level flight and of flying more than 100 miles per hour faster than its predecessor. This is one of many examples of the importance of the NACA's work to the quality of our military aircraft.

Landing and takeoff speeds and distances have increased rapidly as airplane speeds have increased. As a result, airport runways and carrier decks are getting longer, larger, and more costly.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has pioneered in advancing and developing new operational concepts aimed at reducing landing and takeoff speeds. One new concept is that of vertical takeoff, using direct thrust of the airplane powerplant to lift the airplane off the ground vertically. New and complex problems of airplane stability, control, and piloting characteristics were solved by NACA tests of numerous powered model airplanes. These efforts supplied the information needed for the development of the Navy's new vertical takeoff airplanes. Although radically different in concept and operation from other airplanes, these designs have flown satisfactorily. They offer great promise toward improving the effectiveness of tactical aircraft by permitting operation from unprepared locations near rapidly moving areas of combat.

Another concept advanced and developed by the NACA to reduce the dependence on runways is the application of water skis to fighter or interceptor-type airplanes. Ski-equipped airplanes could operate from readily available expanses of protected waterways or from the open sea in relatively calm conditions. The use of water-based aircraft is also attractive in that waterways are not suceptible to extensive damage during attack. Water skis are relatively small and can be retracted much in the same manner as conventional landing gears, thereby permitting a water-based fighter or interceptor airplane to have the same performance as its land-based counterpart. NACA research on the numerous problems of water skis has supplied the vitally needed information for the successful development of the Navy's Sea Dart water-based supersonic fighter airplane.

Modern military airplanes secure additional power for takeoff and for bursts of high speed in combat by the use of afterburners. The principles of afterburning involve first the feeding of additional fuel into the air leaving the jet engine and second the burning of such fuel in the exhaust or tailpipe. Afterburners increase the thrust approximately 50 percent at takeoff speeds and 200 to 300 percent at supersonic speeds. The use of afterburners made possible for the first time the use of supersonic aircraft with useful range. Without afterburners the weight of the powerplant would be greater by 60 percent.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has been engaged in a broad program of intensive research on afterburners for more than 10 years. This work required the organized effort of many specialists working in combustion, heat transfer, metallurgy, and allied fields, and permitted the successful incorporation of afterburners in modern aircraft engines. Afterburners are now in use in such modern military aircraft as the F–84 Republic Thunderjet; F–86 North American Sabre; F–89 Northrup Scorpion; F–94 Lockheed Starfire; F3H McDonnell Demon; F4D Douglas Skyray; F7U Vought Cutlass; and the most advanced of our fighter models, the Century series.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has also made some outstanding contributions in the field of improved aircraft safety. The knowledge gained by the NACA in its studies on atmospheric turbulence, lightning, and hail is well known throughout the aircraft industry and has contributed significantly to the exceptional safety records that have been achieved by the airlines.

Particularly noteworthy in the field of aircraft safety was the research carried on by the NACA that culminated in the development and demonstration of practical methods of applying heat for the prevention of icing. As a result of this work, icing, which was once one of the most feared and dangerous hazards to the operation of aircraft, is no longer considered to be a serious problem. The Collier Trophy, one of the foremost honors for significant contributions to aviation, was awarded to the NACA scientist in charge of this work.

Another outstanding achievement of the NACA in the field of aviation safety has been the recently completed investigation of the crash-fire problem. Through a carefully controlled series of crash studies conducted with highly instrumented surplus aircraft, the ignition sources and mechanisms of the start and development of fires following crash have been documented and methods of suppressing or preventing such fires have been demonstrated. This work has been completed so recently that it is difficult to evaluate fully its significance; however, there is no doubt that this hazard which at one time in the history of aviation was the principal cause of aircraft fatalities will be significantly reduced if not eliminated.

According to the Civil Aeronautics Board, turbulence was the biggest single cause of fatalities during the past year on the scheduled airlines. NACA's studies of the use of airborne radar as a means for turbulance detection will help improve safety of operations by permitting the avoidance of areas of severe turbulence. Not only will the use of airborne radar, when it becomes generally available, be helpful in avoiding areas of severe turbulence from a safety standpoint but it will also serve to increase the passenger comfort by permitting the avoidance of turbulent areas.

I do not believe that any Member of the Senate needs to be persuaded of the importance of air power in our plans for national defense. It is of transcendent importance that we do more than just to keep abreast of new developments in the field of aeronautical research. We must continue to hold the lead in this field.

Research of the type accomplished by the NACA is relatively inexpensive when compared with the sums that are being spent for development and for actual production of aircraft and related equipment. The committee is convinced that the research conducted under the auspices of the NACA has an indispensable relationship to the end product of air strength. For this reason we recommend this bill to the Senate.

SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS TO EMPLOYEES OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON FLOATING PLANT OPERATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 255, S. 1507.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1507) to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, S. 1507, introduced by request of the Department of the Army, would permit the Corps of Engineers to provide, without charge, subsistence and quarters on vessels to its employees when they are engaged in floating-plant operations.

The wage rates for floating-plant employees, of whom there are approximately 2,500, are based on land industrial rates prevailing in the locality of the work. Land employees, however, receive per diem or subsistence and lodging when they are required to work away from their official station.

The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, authorizes the granting of subsistence and lodging to employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Department of the Interior, the Transportation Corps of the Department of the Army, and of the Panama Railroad Company.

Thus, the Corps of Engineers is operating under a major disadvantage by comparison with private industry and other agencies of the Government since it is without authority to provide subsistence and lodging to its employees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider a similar House bill, Order No. 267, H. R. 4936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4936) to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1507 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIDEWATERS IN WATERWAY OVER POINT CHANNEL AT DORCHESTER AVENUE, CITY OF BOSTON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Order No. 261, H. R. 1816.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1816) to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point

Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to declare nonnavigable the tidewaters in the area named, in order to permit the construction of the John F. Fitzgerald Expressway across these waters without a draw span, and to permit also the operation of three existing bridges over these waters without a draw span.

The bill was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and there was no objection to it in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REHABILITATION AND PRESERVATION OF IMPORTANT HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 249, S. 732.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 732) to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to appoint an advisory board, to be known as the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board. The membership of the Board may not exceed 11 persons. The Secretary shall appoint one member to represent the city of New York, one member to represent the State of New York, and one member to represent the Borough of Manhattan, after consideration of such recommendations as may be made by the mayor of New York City, the Governor of New York State, and the president of the Borough of Manhattan for the appointment of the representatives of their respective jurisdictions. The remaining membership of the Board shall be appointed from the various historical and civic organizations interested in effectuating the purposes of this act. The Secretary shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members to serve as Chairman. Members of the Board shall receive no compensation for their services, but may be paid any necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties, when authorized by the Secretary of the Interior.

The functions of the Board shall be to render advice to the Secretary of the Interior and to further public participation in the rehabilitation and the preservation of those historic properties in the New York City area that are of great national significance, identified as the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and the Statute of Liberty National Monument. The Board shall conduct a study of these historic properties and submit recommendations concerning their preservation and administration to the Secretary of the Interior, such report and recommendations of the Board to be transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, together with his recommendations thereon, within 1 year following the date of the establishment of the Board. The Board shall cease to exist when the Secretary of the Interior shall find that its purposes have been accomplished.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept donations of funds for rehabilitation and preservation of the historic properties including any made upon condition that such funds are to be expended only if Federal funds in an amount equal to the donated funds are appropriated for such purposes. There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to match funds that may be donated for purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The Federal Hall Memorial National Historic Site, established pursuant to the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), shall hereafter be known as the "Federal Hall National Memorial."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle for the very efficient record they have made, not only on the Legislative Calendar but on the Executive Calendar and for their helpfulness to the majority leader.

When we were in the minority—and I assume we are most of the time, even now—I thought I was reasonably cooperative as minority leader with the majority leader and with the chairmen of the committees. However, no leader in any legislative body has ever received better cooperation than I have received from the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senators who have acted for him.

I am grateful to him, the committee chairmen, the ranking minority Members, and all the other Senators for the productive work they have done as Members of the Senate.

I also appreciate the constant helpfulness of the Senate staff. I believe we have the best staff that can be found anywhere in the world. They are loyal, they are objective, they are able, and they have but one purpose, and that is to serve the United States Senate.

The calendar is reasonably clear, but I would ask for the consideration of Order No. 218, H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, except that my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], has asked that an amendment he has prepared be considered. He is unable to be here at this time, and he will not be present on Monday.

I wish to serve notice that this is an important bill, as I have been informed, and one which should have the attention of the Senate. I shall try to schedule the bill for consideration by the Senate next week on a day satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

It may be possible to call up Order No. 217, S. 153, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, on Monday, if that is agreeable to the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If not, I shall try to have it go over until later in the week and find some time for it then. I shall try to do my best to accommodate all Senators. They have been very reasonable with their requests in the past, and I know they will be in the future. If they had not been both reasonable and cooperative we would not have the calendar so clear as it is today. I express my appreciation to all Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to suggest to the majority leader that in view of the conversation I have just had with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] we might well put consideration of the bill off for a few days next week until the Senator from Mississippi has had adequate time to look into it. I think it will be disposed of rather readily.

MINERAL INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a question. Is it agreeable to have the Senate consider at this time Calendar No. 250, Senate bill 748?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is entirely agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 250, Senate bill 748.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 748) to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Do I correctly understand that the bill relates to lands which may be acquired by the Federal Government in the future?

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill relates to land to be acquired in the future. The Government has just been through some litigation in connection with certain situations arising out of Indian claims in the State of North Dakota, where the Government sought to acquire land for the Garrison Dam. A settlement was negotiated. The Government paid, I thought, a million dollars or so more than the property was worth, because there was a possibility of oil being contained in the land. There is now a very

strong possibility of oil, and the people are saying, "The United States should not have acquired these mineral rights. The Government robbed us."

Where Indians are involved—and they are the Nation's wards—there is some justification for that feeling. In a case such as that the Government should acquire land for the purpose for which it is needed, namely, the construction of a dam, and not acquire mineral rights 1,800 feet below the surface, which it does not need.

The Government took action to acquire land for the purposes of an airport. In the particular instance referred to the Government did not want oil wells. When it acquired the airport site it required that a number of small strip wells be closed down. But the Government paid money to acquire the oil rights and to extinguish those oil wells. Later on, it was found there was a substantial amount of oil, and the Government is faced with the possibility that it may pick up a very substantial profit by the use of the condemnation procedure. The people wanted to keep their lands, but the Government had to have them for the purposes of an airport.

We have felt it would be cheaper in the long run for the Government to acquire only what it needs rather than to pay a substantial additional amount for oil and be an oil lease broker at the same time.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not wish to oppose the bill, but I wanted to check to see if it is retroactive in any way with regard to lands obtained in earlier years in connection with which mineral rights were acquired.

I have in mind a Federal land bank and perhaps other agencies of the Government that acquired title to lands during the depression period and retained the mineral rights. The former owners feel they were unjustly dealt with. The Government in reselling the land has always retained the mineral rights.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language of the bill, in part, is as follows:

> Except as provided in section 2, every deed conveying land to the United States which is executed after the date of enactment of this act—

And so forth. Unless I am wholly misinformed, it applies only to future transactions. Certainly that is the purpose of it.

The bill provides further:

> Except as provided in section 2, every judgment in proceedings for condemnation of land instituted by the United States after the date of enactment of this act shall contain a specific reservation of all mineral interests in such land to the defendant in such proceedings.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's statement. There is, however, some feeling in various sections of the Nation where, during the depression, individuals were forced to lose their lands to the Government, and the Government insisted on retaining the mineral rights.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator will recall that I was in the midst of that controversy when I was Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

The Government never intended to acquire the mineral rights, but it ended up with them. Certain persons tried to work out schemes whereby they could acquire the mineral rights separately, and all sorts of difficulties were caused. If mineral rights are not necessary to the Government it should not acquire them. If the Government needs the mineral rights it may acquire them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am wondering what the situation would be if the Government obtained possession of land for an airfield and the original owner retained the mineral rights and drilled for oil. There might be an oil well in the middle of the airfield.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the first place, a well cannot be drilled on the surface of an airport. The adjoining areas may be drained subsequently. It is possible to so space oil wells as to get around an airfield and do pretty well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there anything in the bill which would prevent such a situation as I have mentioned?

Mr. ANDERSON. My understanding of the law is that even though the mineral rights are possessed, the surface cannot be disturbed. I think the Senator from Wyoming can contribute something on that point.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, a situation such as the Senator from New Mexico has cited would permit the owner to use the land only in such a way as would not interfere with its use for an airport. A man would be required to place his well a distance away from the airport. He could drill a well in a directional manner so that the bottom of the well would be under the airport but would not interfere with the use of the land.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can very readily picture a situation where the man who sold the land to the Government would not own any land, but someone on an adjoining property could drill a well.

It might cause trouble if the Government in selling surplus farm land back to a farmer were to retain the mineral rights. I think it should make a clean sale of the property. It seems to me that if the Government wishes to buy a piece of property, it should buy it on the same basis.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Delaware, with this difference, however: Suppose the Government goes to a part of the country where some individual owns a tract of land and says, "We want that land." That is happening in the western areas today.

Suppose the owner says, "I don't want to sell it; I want to hold on to my mineral rights. I feel the mineral rights are worth more than the land."

The Government says, "We are not interested in the minerals." Nevertheless, the person refuses to sell. The Government then takes him into court and seeks to condemn the land.

When the case gets into court, the jury has to decide how much the surface is worth and what the possibilities of mineral development are worth. It is up to the jury to determine the future mineral possibilities, and that is absolutely impossible to do. The jury cannot calculate subsurface values.

I think the Government would be saved large sums of money and endless litigation if the provision as to mineral values were eliminated from the bill.

I can assure the Senator from Delaware that the operation of airports will not be interfered with; nor will there be interference with the operation of Garrison Dam or any of the other dams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The bill may be all right, but I think we should make certain that there are proper safeguards. I certainly hope it is not the intention to push for action on the bill today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware objects, I will withdraw my motion. We can take up next a conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the bill should be studied a little further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware can spend whatever time he wishes in studying the bill. I assure him that it will not be brought up until next week; perhaps it may be even later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT, RELATING TO PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR LOCAL SERVICE CARRIERS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY submitted a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, which reads as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "'(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph shall show that, from January 1, 1953, to the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant during the period since its last certification has

been inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certificates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this paragraph and the date of its application: *Provided,* That the Board in issuing the certificate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the managers on the part of the Senate, I wish to submit the following statement:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The bill as agreed to in conference is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, but, except for the points explained below, it is substantially the same as the bill the House passed.

Both the bill as it was passed by the House and the Senate amendment proposed to add to section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 a new paragraph providing for the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity, without limit as to the duration thereof, to certain air carriers which have been furnishing in the continental United States, under temporary certificates, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property, and mail. In both the House bill and the Senate amendment it was provided that, to obtain a certificate, application must be made within 120 days after the date of the enactment of the new paragraph.

In each instance it was provided that the new certificates should be issued solely upon proof of the fact that the applicant, or its predecessor in interest, had engaged in such local or feeder service for a specified length of time. Under the House bill, the applicant would have had to show that it or its predecessor had been furnishing such service from the date of the enactment of the new paragraph until the date it applied for the new certificate, whereas under the Senate amendment the applicant would have had to make this showing with respect to the period from January 1, 1953, until the date of making application for the new certificate. On this point the substitute agreed to in conference follows the Senate amendment.

The carriers which will be eligible to receive certificates under the new paragraph, assuming that they otherwise comply with the provisions of the paragraph, are the 14 local-service carriers (or any successor in interest to any of them) which were referred to in the report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce filed with this legislation when it was favorably reported to the House.

During the consideration of this legislation by Congress the operating rights of one of the 14 local-service carriers above referred to were acquired by another carrier. As a result, the temporary certificate held by the local-service carrier was cancelled and such temporary certificate was reissued by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the acquiring carrier with exactly the same operating rights and restrictions. Had the local-service carrier continued to operate the route it would have received the benefits provided by this legislation, and it therefore should be clear, and it is the understanding of the committee of conference, that those benefits will inure to its successor in interest to which the temporary certificate was so reissued.

The Senate amendment contained the following proviso which did not appear in the bill as it passed the House:

"*Provided,* That the Board in issuing the certificate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time."

The proviso is included in the substitute as agreed to in conference.

It is appropriate to include a brief explanation of this proviso. It is the intent of the committee of conference to give to the Civil Aeronautics Board flexibility in choosing the intermediate points which, under this proviso, may be given certificates of limited duration. Thus, while it is the general intent that the Board may limit the duration of the certificate as to not over half of the intermediate points on each segment, there may be occasional instances where there are only two or three intermediates and it is desirable to limit the duration as to both, or as to two out of three. In other words, the rule does not rigidly apply to each segment, but it is not to be given such flexible application as to distort a whole geographical area of a local service system into a whole structure of non-stop segments.

The Senate also amended the title of the bill. On this amendment the Senate recedes.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INSURANCE UNDER TITLE XII OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 247, Senate bill 741.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 741) to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 1214 of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by striking out "5" and inserting in lieu thereof "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the provisions of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years."

BIENNIAL INSPECTION OF HULLS AND BOILERS OF CARGO VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 248, S. 743.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 743) to authorize biennial insepction of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 4, line 11, after the word "within", to strike out "10 days" and insert "30 days", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4417 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 391), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4417. (a) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to inspect before the same shall be put into service, and at least once in every year thereafter, the hull of every steam vessel carrying passengers; to determine to its satisfaction that every such vessel so submitted to inspection is of a structure suitable for the service in which she is to be employed, has suitable accommodations for passengers and the crew, and is in a condition to warrant the belief that she may be used in navigation, with safety to life, and that the vessel is in full compliance with the applicable requirements of this title or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto and regulations thereunder; and if deemed expedient, to direct the vessel to be put in motion or to adopt any other suitable means to test her sufficiency and that of her equipment.

"(b) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to inspect before the same shall be put into service, and at least once in every 2 years thereafter, the hull of each steam vessel, not carrying passengers; to determine to its satisfaction that every such vessel so submitted to inspection is of a structure suitable for the service in which she is to be employed, has suitable accommodations for the crew, and is in a condition to warrant the belief that she may be used in navigation, with safety to life, and that the vessel is in full compliance with the applicable requirements of this title or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto and regulations thereunder; and if deemed expedient, to direct the vessel to be put in motion or to adopt any other suitable means to test her sufficiency and that of her equipment.

"(c) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to inspect before the same shall be put into service, and at least once in every year thereafter, the hull of each sail vessel of over 700 gross tons carrying passengers for hire and all other vessels and barges of over 100 gross tons carrying passengers for hire; and to determine to its satisfaction that every such vessel so submitted to inspection is of a structure suitable for the service in which she is to be employed, has suitable accommodations for the passengers and crew, and is in condition to warrant the belief that she may be used in navigation with safety to life.

"(d) Whenever it is found on board any vessel subject to the provisions of this title, or any acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, that any equipment, machinery, apparatus, or appliances do not conform to the requirements of law or regulations promulgated thereunder, the owner or master of said vessel shall be required to place the same in proper condition; and if there shall be found on board any such vessel any life preserver or fire hose so defective as to be incapable of repair, the owner or master shall be required to destroy the same in the presence of an official designated by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating. In any of the foregoing cases the requirements may be enforced by revoking the certificate of said vessel, and by refusing to issue a new certificate until the requirements have been fully complied with. In any case where the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating has delegated to a Coast Guard official the authority to enforce the said requirements by revocation of certificates of inspection, the action of said Coast Guard official may be reversed, modified, or set aside by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating on proper appeal by the owner or master of said vessel. Appeals shall be made to the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating within 30 days after the final action of the aforesaid Coast Guard official.

"(e) Vessels subject to inspection under this title or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto while laid up and dismantled and out of commission may, by regulations established by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, be exempted from any or all inspection under sections 4417, 4418, 4426, and 4427 of the Revised Statutes."

SEC. 2. Section 4418 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 392), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4418. (a) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to inspect, before the same shall be put into service and once at least in every year thereafter, the boilers, unfired pressure vessels, and appurtenances thereof, also the propelling and auxiliary machinery, electrical apparatus and equipment, of all passenger vessels subject to inspection.

"(b) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating also shall require the Coast Guard to inspect, before the same shall be put into service and at least once in every 2 years thereafter, the boilers, unfired pressure vessels, and appurtenances thereof, also the propelling and auxiliary machinery, electrical apparatus and equipment, of all vessels subject to inspection other than passenger vessels.

"(c) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to determine to its satisfaction by thorough examination that the boilers, unfired pressure vessels, and appurtenances thereof, also the propelling and auxiliary machinery, electrical apparatus and equipment of all vessels which are subject to inspection under subsections (a) and (b) herein are in conformity with law and the rules and regulations of the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, and may be safely employed in the service proposed. No boiler, unfired pressure vessel, or appurtenances thereof shall be allowed to be used if constructed in whole or in part of defective material or which because of its form, design, workmanship, age, use, or for any other reason is unsafe.

"(d) At each original inspection and at each annual or biennial inspection thereafter, whichever is applicable, all boilers, unfired pressure vessels, and main steam piping shall be subject to hydrostatic tests or such other tests as may be prescribed by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating. The ratio of the hydrostatic test to the maximum working pressure shall be determined by action of the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the act of May 28, 1908 (ch. 212, 35 Stat. 428, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 395)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to inspect, before the same shall be put into service and at least once in every year thereafter, the hull and equipment of every seagoing barge of 100 gross tons or over carrying passengers; and to determine to its satisfaction that such barge is of a structure suitable for the service in which she is to be employed, has suitable accommodations for the crew and passengers, and is in a condition to warrant the belief that she may be used in navigation with safety to life.

"(b) The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating also shall require the Coast Guard to inspect, before the same shall be put into service and at least once in every 2 years thereafter, the hull and equipment of every seagoing barge of 100 gross tons or over, not carrying passengers; and to determine to its satisfaction that such barge is of a structure suitable for the service in which she is to be employed, has suitable accommodations for the crew, if manned, and is in a condition to warrant the belief that she may be used in navigation with safety to life.

"(c) Upon the satisfactory completion of the inspection authorized herein, a certificate of inspection shall be issued in the manner and for the purposes prescribed in sections 4421 and 4423 of the Revised Statutes."

SEC. 4. Section 4453 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 435) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4453. In addition to the annual or biennial inspection, the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require the Coast Guard to examine, at proper times, inspected vessels arriving and departing to and from their respective ports, so often as to enable them to detect any neglect to comply with the requirements of law, and also any defects or imperfections becoming apparent after the inspection aforesaid, and tending to render the navigation of such vessels unsafe; and if there shall be discovered any omission to comply with the law, or that repairs have become necessary to make such vessel safe, the master shall at once be notified in writing as to what is required. All inspections and orders for repair shall be made promptly. When it can be done safely, repairs may be permitted to be made where those interested can most conveniently do them. And whenever it is ascertained that any vessel subject to the provisions of this title or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, has been or is being navigated or operated without complying with the terms of the vessel's certificate of inspection regarding the number and class of licensed officers and crew, or without complying with the provisions of law and her said certificate as to the number or kind of life-saving or fire-fighting apparatus, or without maintaining in good and efficient condition her lifeboats, fire pumps, fire hose, and life preservers, or that for any other reason said vessel cannot be operated with safety to life, the owner or master of said vessel shall be ordered to correct such unlawful conditions, and the vessel may be required to cease navigating at once and to submit to reinspection; and in case the said orders shall not at once be complied with, the vessel's certificate of inspection shall be revoked, and the owner, master, or agent of said vessel shall immediately be given notice, in writing, of such revocation; and no new certificate of inspection shall be again issued to her until the provisions of this title or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto have been complied with. Any vessel subject to the provisions of this title or acts amendatory or supplementary thereto operating or navigating or attempting to operate or navigate after the revocation of her certificate of inspection and before the issuance of a new certificate, shall, upon application by a department or agency charged with the enforcement of such title or acts, to any district court of the United States having jurisdiction, and by proper order or action of said court in the premises, be seized summarily by way of libel and held without privilege of release by bail or bond until a proper certificate of inspection shall have been issued to said vessel: *Provided*, That the owner, master, or person in charge of any vessel whose certificate shall have been so revoked may within 30 days after receiving notice of such revocation appeal to the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating for a reexamination of the case, and upon such appeal the said head of the department shall have power to revise, modify, or set aside such action of revocation, and direct the issuance to such vessel of her original certificate or of a new certificate of inspection; and in case the said head of the department shall so direct the issuance of a certificate, all judicial process against said vessel based on this section shall thereupon be of no further force or effect, and the vessel shall thereupon be released."

SEC. 5. Section 4454 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 436), is amended by deleting the word "steamer" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "inspected vessel"; and by deleting the words "Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "examining."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADVANCES TO ALASKA FROM THE FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 268, Senate bill 1650.

I may state for the information of the Senate that it is not proposed to have the bill considered today, but simply to have it made the unfinished business, if the motion shall be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, less than 20 bills remain on the calendar. Some of the bills were reported and placed on the calendar only on May 3.

I shall ask the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the minority staff to have a review made of the bills recently reported and not covered in the memorandum which was given to the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. It may be possible to consider some of the bills on Monday next. So far as I know, they are the only bills which will be considered on Monday.

On Monday I hope it will be possible for me to make an announcement as to the program for the remainder of the week.

DROPPING OF RICHARD H. POUGH AS CONSERVATION DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have read with concern the statements in the New York Times for May 3 that Mr. Richard H. Pough may have been dropped as conservation director of the American Museum of Natural History because of his active interest in the Echo Park Dam dispute.

In my opinion, no organization should be more dedicated to the protection of our National Park System than should the American Museum of Natural History. If that organization does not believe that protection of the Dinosaur National Monument is important to the natural history of the United States, then it is not fulfilling its functions and the purpose for which it exists.

I very much regret the dropping of Mr. Pough from the museum's staff, particularly because such a great conservationist as Horace M. Albright believes that this action against Mr. Pough stems from the active participation by Mr. Pough in the effort to defend Dinosaur National Monument from being invaded by a commercial development.

I call upon the directors of the American Museum of Natural History to safeguard that vast and important section of the natural history of the United States which up till now has been protected within the boundaries of our great National Park System.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Museum To Drop Echo Park Critic," from the New York Times of May 3, be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSEUM TO DROP ECHO PARK CRITIC—NATURAL HISTORY INSTITUTION'S POLICY SHIFT SEEKS TO AVOID DISPUTES ON CONSERVATION

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The American Museum of Natural History has decided to drop its conservation director, Richard H. Pough, in a policy shift that some conservationists linked to the Echo Park Dam dispute.

Museum officials denied that there was any connection with the Echo Park matter. They said, however, that in the future conservation would be approached from an "informational" rather than a controversial point of view.

Mr. Pough has been active in conservation for nearly 20 years. He joined the museum in 1948, when the directors decided to establish an active conservation department and give public leadership in this field.

Horace M. Albright, former director of the National Park Service, a veteran conservationist and one of the leaders of the opposition to the Echo Park Dam, expressed belief that the museum's action was a reaction to Echo Park and other major conservation disputes.

"Mr. Pough has the highest reputation in conservation circles," Mr. Albright said. "The action of the museum constitutes a very serious blow to the conservation movement."

CITES ACHIEVEMENTS

Among Mr. Pough's achievements that Mr. Albright cited in particular were his successful fight in behalf of the Corkscrew cypress swamp, the last of the big Florida cypress groves and the 2,200-acre island beach reservation on Barnegat Peninsula in New Jersey.

Mr. Albright suggested that Mr. Pough's forthright opposition to the Echo Park Dam may have aroused some reaction among financial supporters of the museum. Echo Park is a proposed hydroelectric development in the Dinosaur National Monument of Utah and Colorado that is now before Congress.

Dr. Albert Parr, director of the museum, said any attempt to connect the decision to release Mr. Pough with the Echo Park and other conservation disputes was "complete nonsense."

Dr. Parr was reluctant to discuss the museum's future plans, although he emphasized that it would remain in the conservation field.

Alexander M. White, president of the museum, deplored suggestions that it would abandon conservation.

Mr. White also denied that Echo Park played any role in the Pough decision.

Mr. Pough said he had never been given a clear explanation for the decision. His duties will end June 30, 1956.

He said he suspected the vigor of his fight for conservation projects had had something to do with his dismissal. He said he believed some museum trustees were concerned lest offense be given to potential contributors.

Mr. Pough said he had not hesitated to take up controversial positions, since he interpreted this as essential to giving leadership in conservation.

He expressed hope that the museum would stay active in conservation. He proposed to devote his future efforts to Nature Conservancy, an organization that he heads. It is particularly devoted to the preservation in natural state of "sample" portions of terrain and wildlife throughout the country.

DISTRIBUTION OF SALK ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a very illuminating editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Thursday, May 5, 1955, with two letters published in the same newspaper, over the signatures of Mr. Donald Montgomery and Mr. Philip Schiff. This material deals with the distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine during the remaining weeks of the school year.

Last Tuesday I had occasion to speak of the need for immediate and forceful leadership toward a program to assure fair distribution of the new wonder drug to children everywhere in accordance with clear priorities based on need, and I also pointed out that the lack of such a program would discriminate particularly against children in rural areas remote from centers of distribution.

I hope the appropriate committees of Congress will soon take up legislation which has been introduced to furnish the President with a directive and the funds necessary to carry out a sound program of distribution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARALYSIS OVER POLIO

This newspaper is disposed to share the confidence of the President and the Surgeon General that a voluntary program can serve to bring about equitable distribution of Salk polio vaccine. But a voluntary program can work only if there is a program. People can be counted upon to observe voluntary priorities only if they know what the priorities are. President Eisenhower's press conference yesterday left the impression that there is no program at all—no priorities, no controls, no clear purpose.

Mr. Eisenhower declared—all in the course of a single press conference—that a system of voluntary distribution "is the very best plan for getting this (the vaccine) to the children in the quickest possible time and on the most equitable basis," that the States rather than the Federal Government ought to be responsible for distribution, and that if necessary he will seek authority to buy up the entire supply of Salk polio vaccine to assure that every child gets shots. The statement was a miracle of confusion, coming on top of the vacillation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is time for the President to tell the vaccine manufacturers, the medical profession, the state health authorities, and the general public precisely on what basis he wants the vaccine distributed—who is to get it, in what order, and at whose expense. If he lays down a voluntary program plainly, we believe he can count on its being followed. If he does not do this, he is certain to find a chaos which will make compulsory controls inescapable.

VACCINE PRIORITIES

Your May 3 editorial disposes of the polio vaccine problem with the greatest of ease, but it is not going to be easy for conscientious parents or responsible doctors.

You say that children, ages 1 through 9, should get it first. Mrs. Hobby hasn't said that. She says States and local communities should set their own priorities. Two quite different schemes already have been announced for this city, one by the District Medical Society, another by Group Health. Now you state another.

Who are you to say? Who is the mother of a 12-year-old to listen to? How is her doctor to decide whether her child gets it or not? And if he makes a decision, how will he justify it to the mother he turns away?

Your priority will not help mothers or doctors during the next 3 or 4 months. There are 23 million children, ages 1 through 9, who are not included in the Foundation program. By Public Health Service estimates there will be more vaccine in May for only 7 million of these, and in June for only 9 million more. It's already apparent that these estimates are much too optimistic.

Why do you and Mrs. Hobby and the President try to make a virtue out of chaos when a firm hand behind a sound plan would help mothers and help doctors?

This is a traffic jam we're in. People want traffic lights, green for some, red for others, so they can all get home in one piece.

And the plan needs inforcement or at least some means of checking on performance. Before a nationwide TV audience Sunday, Dr. Scheele revealed no discernible displeasure about the 17 adults who are known to have got the vaccine in New York. He said, "You do have polio in adults as well, and one can't blame an adult for wanting to have the vaccine." Well, maybe he can't, but I can. If that's the kind of leadership Mrs. Hobby's voluntary plan is to have, Congress had better issue a few orders and straighten them out.

You say nothing about Federal funds to help local health services make sure that all children can be inoculated. Immunization and sanitation have been the key functions of the public health services for years. They should serve in this polio campaign just as they regularly serve in smallpox, diphtheria, and whooping cough inoculations. One-fourth of the children of preschool age probably will not get the polio vaccine if Secretary Hobby excludes polio from this established and successful Federal-State program by continuing to say, as she has said, that no appropriation is needed.

DONALD MONTGOMERY.

WASHINGTON.

Any impartial and objective study of the polio problem would indicate that the Nation faces a serious situation in getting Dr. Salk's great discovery to the children of the country in an equitable and expeditious manner. Those of us who have carefully studied this problem cannot understand the reasons for a lack of program by the Federal Government when our officials must have known months ahead of time of the potential success of the Salk vaccine.

It is no wonder that discouragement and disillusionment begin to set in when the newspapers of the country begin headlining stories of gray and black markets. What are the Nation's parents to think when they read stories of adults getting the vaccine shots before the children? While it is undoubtedly true that there isn't as yet too much of this despicable practice, what guaranty do we have that such practices can be controlled through voluntary efforts?

The fact remains that unless the President and Mrs. Hobby accept their responsibilities in terms of an emergency and adopt those measures which would guarantee victory in an all-out fight against this human scourge, the present situation might well deteriorate to the point where a national scandal might result.

This is the time for forthright thinking and action. I believe the following program, if adopted and clarified to the country, would redound to the credit of the administration and prove a tremendous boon to the parents and children of the Nation.

1. The passage of Federal legislation which would put present limited supplies of the vaccine under Federal control and provide for distribution to be made to State health departments on an equitable basis.

2. The Congress should appropriate enough money to guarantee that all children from 1 to 19 years of age will receive the third shot called for by Dr. Salk.

3. The Federal Government should temporarily fix the price for administering the vaccine on a fee basis fair to the doctor and the average family until the emergency is over.

4. That all children, regardless of race, creed, or economic circumstances, should be assured of receiving the vaccine.

5. That there be added to the present National Advisory Committee representatives from public-interest groups other than white and colored PTA groups, the only public interest groups now represented.

6. Priorities should be established so that those children most susceptible to polio at different age levels should be given first consideration, with adults (except pregnant women) coming last.

7. Most important is the need to have the President take the air to reassure the public that the Government will do everything in its power to make sure that a fair and equitable program is provided.

The timing element in all of this is important. If the major part of the problem is to be licked it must be done within the next 60 days, especially since all of the children will be out of school by the end of June.

May we, regardless of our political affiliations or beliefs, have the wisdom to serve the Nation's children at a time when they need us most.

PHILIP SCHIFF.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.

ELIMINATION OF THEATRICAL ELEMENTS FROM POLITICAL TV BROADCASTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain requirements with respect to television broadcasts by political candidates. I wish to speak briefly in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

The bill (S. 1909) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain requirements with respect to television broadcasts by political candidates, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have introduced the bill in order to eliminate elements of the theatrical and the synthetic from our political campaigns, and to require that TV audiences shall be informed when a candidate for public office is using either facial makeup or a contrived device for reading, which is out of the line of vision of his viewers.

We require today that radio listeners be informed when they are hearing a recording or a transcription. Yet we permit TV viewers to think that a candidate is speaking to them extemporaneously when, in actuality, he is reading from an artificial device like a teleprompter or "idiot board."

Furthermore, while I think a candidate has every right to use makeup to conceal his jowls or bald spot or beard—and I might add that I myself have a bald spot—I also believe that the viewers have an equal right to be informed that he is relying upon this use of theatrical props.

No one who has followed political campaigns in America in recent years can help but be concerned over the tendency to substitute play-acting for reality, to try to make men seem to be something which they are not. This may be all right for the theater; it is not all right when it comes to selecting who shall govern this great free Nation of ours.

My bill is terse and short. It merely provides that "any television broadcast of an address by or on behalf of a candidate for any public office shall include an announcement of whether the speaker is speaking extemporaneously or from prepared material and what facial makeup, if any, is being used by the speaker while making the broadcast."

I repeat—my bill does not forbid teleprompters or facial makeup. Quite to the contrary; it permits them. But it simply requires that the TV viewers, who are in substantial measure the voters of the United States, shall receive the information that these theatrical contrivances are being employed by the man who would be their President or Senator or Congressman.

For example, what is the purpose of a teleprompter? It is not necessary to the proper delivery of a TV address. A teleprompter exists for one specific purpose. It was invented to enable a speaker to read a speech while giving his audience the definite impression that he is not reading it. Is this what we want in our political campaigns? As I mentioned several times during the 1954 Senatorial race in Oregon, if a candidate will deceive the people as to the method and form of delivering his speech, might he not also fool the people as to the contents and substance of that speech?

I believe this poses a fair question. Thus, I am taking the definite position that the viewers on TV are entitled to know whether or not candidates and their backers are depending upon such things as teleprompters, "idiot boards," and facial makeup to convey impressions on television which may not wholly conform to facts as they actually are.

I sincerely hope and trust that the Senate will see fit to act favorably upon my bill, particularly in time to be effective during the presidential campaign of 1956.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks a very brief article written by me and published in The New Republic of May 9, 1955.

The article is entitled "The Professional Touch," and deals with the general subject of my bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROFESSIONAL TOUCH

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

On my desk is a bill which I soon intend to introduce. The bill is terse and short. It merely provides that "any television broadcast of an address by or on behalf of a candidate for any public office shall include an announcement of whether the speaker is speaking extemporaneously or from prepared material and what facial makeup, if any, is being used by the speaker while making the broadcast."

During the 1952 presidential campaign, the teleprompter made its original appearance—although it was seen only by the candidate and not by the viewing and voting audience. These people thought the nominee in the studio was speaking without benefit of notes,

manuscript or other reliances. What a marvelous command of his subject he seemed to possess. Even the most complex statistics did not throw him. He never stumbled over detailed explanations of bristling issues. Surely such mental wizardy, carried into the halls of the harassed Federal Government, might be of vast benefit to the Nation.

Of course, the candidate was reading from large capital letters on a slowly moving scroll, placed directly above the lens of the TV camera. All the work was done for him. Someone even turned the scroll at the candidate's regular reading pace.

Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission require today that listeners be informed when they are hearing a transcription or a recording, rather than a "live" broadcast. I regard it as far more important that they be acquainted with the artificial techniques used to prop up a man or woman who seeks to govern us. Facial makeup may not be as symbolic as a teleprompter or "idiot board," but is cut from the same fabric—namely, the warp and woof of the make-believe. The purpose is to present to the voters an unreal candidate. The nominee is deliberately separated from his normal frailties, whether they be of appearance or intellect.

What if an aspirant for high office has jowls, a bald spot like mine, swarthy complexion or a mole on his chin? Should pancake powder or grease paint conceal these imperfections? I am not one who would deny a nominee access to the makeup kit. It is his undeniable right to camouflage or modify what he looks like. Yet the viewing audience has an equal right, I think to be informed that the candidate is using makeup.

I am not particularly disturbed over makeup per se. It is, rather, what the makeup actually connotes. Here is a man who may sit in the White House, the President's Cabinet, or in the United States Senate. Before the TV camera he seems to be chatting away off the cuff about the gravest of topics—taxes, the armed forces, diplomacy, civil liberties. Yet he has been tutored in this relaxed and easy manner by Hollywood stars. He is reading from the teleprompter the speech written for him by political counselors or an advertising agency. Artfully used creams and powder pare a dozen years off his normal appearance.

What is the real difference between this and the legerdemain which transforms a Broadway playboy into Renfrew of the Mounted or prepares a former chorus girl to be a heroine of Conestoga-wagon days? Is not the next logical step in this process to run for President some professional actor who has successfully portrayed Lincoln or Jefferson or Teddy Roosevelt? Dress rehearsals might then be held to a minimum; he would be all ready for the part.

The Republicans have developed political make-believe into a fine art because they have funds with which to pay for it. Yet the Democrats may have been guilty originally of creating this monster.

At the height of the New Deal, Democratic national campaigns usually ended with two full radio hours of top Hollywood talent. This would be climaxed by a high-level talk from F. D. R. himself advising everybody to vote. It was effective because people never switched dials. The Democrats held them captive on election eve. But it introduced into Presidential politics the appeal of singers, comedians, and dramatic actresses. No longer was a decisive new policy a 10-strike; it became more important to sign up the leading crooner or lady-fair of the season.

The Republicans have gone on from there. They have made the candidate himself do some of the acting. Requiring the disclosure of facial paint and telepromoters will not automatically prevent this mixing of the drama with our political campaigns. In fact, I'm sure it won't. But it may make the voters even more skeptical than they are. If this skepticism persuades the public to inquire more searchingly into the substance of what is said by nominees who rely upon artifice for effectiveness, it will have served its purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was interested in the bill which the Senator from Oregon introduced relative to what might be called honesty on television. Would the Senator extend his bill by including a provision whereby radio audiences would be informed when speeches were being read from scripts?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the Senator from Arizona that on the radio a man does not come on the air and pretend to be speaking extemporaneously when in fact he is not. One assumes that something over the radio is read. Whether it is read or not, no false impression is conveyed. But on television, if a man uses a teleprompter, he seems to be speaking extemporaneously, when in fact he is not. For what reason is a teleprompter used other than to convey the impression that the one speaking is doing so extemporaneously, when he really is reading from prepared material? That is why I would not extend my bill to include speeches on the radio. I doubt that it is necessary for radio.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not intend the question to be personal, but would the Senator provide for correct information concerning the use of a toupee?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say, for the benefit of the Senator from Arizona, I do not wear a toupee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not wish to infer that the Senator did.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As the Senator might infer, if I wore a toupee it would be a very small one or a very old one. But I would say that I would not assume that one would don a toupee merely for the purpose of a television broadcast. I am referring to makeup that is worn solely for the purpose of a particular appearance. I do not think there are any such candidates on this side of the aisle, but if there should be on the other side of the aisle candidates who would don a toupee for the sole benefit of a television appearance, perhaps I should amend my bill to include not only facial makeup, but toupees worn solely and exclusively for the purpose of a particular TV appearance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator would consider putting in the bill a provision which would require candidates to publicize only pictures which had been taken recently. Many of them grow old, but have youthful photographs circulated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish the Senator from Louisiana to know that in my State we have done something about that. We have in Oregon what is known as the Voters Pamphlet. I think Oregon is unique in that respect. Whenever there is to be an election, there is published by the State government a folder giving the platforms and biographies of the various candidates, and their pictures appear in it. For a long time candidates were using their baby pictures. Voters would get a terrible shock when they would see some candidates in person. From seeing a picture taken of him when he was playing high school football, voters had been led to believe that a candidate was a young fellow, and then they would see him 70 years after the picture was taken. We now have a law in the State of Oregon that no picture can appear in the Voter's Pamphlet which was taken more than 5 years prior to the publication of that particular issue of the pamphlet. So the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will see that I am substantially in agreement with him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my colleague from Oregon. Would the Senator include in this declaration of honesty a provision that a candidate should express his interpretation of his party's basic political philosophy? In other words, let us say that a candidate on my side of the aisle—a Republican candidate—would be required to express his interpretation of the Lincolnian philosophy; and a candidate on the Democratic side of the aisle would be required to express his interpretation of the Jeffersonian philosophy.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is a rather subjective thing, Mr. President. In one of the political parties there seems to be a very sharp difference of opinion as to what is the Lincolnian philosophy. Last night, I heard one of the colleagues of the junior Senator from Arizona speak ardently in favor of free trade, and I heard another one of his colleagues say that all is lost because we passed the free-trade bill which was endorsed by the other colleague. So the question of what is Jeffersonian and what is Lincolnian is so subjective that not even the Supreme Court of the United States could decide it.

However, I do not think the people of the country should have to experience any difficulty in deciding whether a speaker on television is using a teleprompter or not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Oregon. But I wondered whether we could prevent people from traveling under false colors, just as the Senator from Oregon intends to prevent them from traveling under false hair—under toupees.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the toupee item has been placed in the bill by the Senator from Arizona. If he would like to join me in sponsorship of the bill, perhaps we could amend the bill so as to include such a section as he favors. The toupee section of the bill could be dedicated to him, and we could jointly sponsor the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest that we are splitting hairs. [Laughter.]

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kindness.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have been very happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say—and I think the Senator from Arizona will be interested in this—that I found that in the 1954 senatorial campaign in Oregon, the people whom I approached were pleased with the fact that our side did not use teleprompters or facial makeup. I wish to say that I am quite sure I would be improved by facial makeup; I am quite cognizant of that. But the fact that we did not use an artificial device, so as to seem to be speaking extemporaneously, when, in fact, we were reading, appeared to please the public a good deal.

I was particularly motivated in the sponsorship of the bill by the fact that the reading devices exist only for the purpose of confusing the viewing public; there is no other purpose for them. Of course, if one wishes to read a manuscript while appearing on television, he can hold up the manuscript for all the world to see; the sole reason for the little scroll over the TV lens, which we know as a teleprompter, is to make the public think one is speaking extemporaneously when he actually is not. The public thinks a speaker has a marvelous command of statistics and complex technical matters, whereas, in fact, all that the speaker really is doing is reading from a paper. But the audience cannot see that paper.

So I think the people should be informed about that, just as when they hear the radio they are informed whether they are listening to a transcript or to a recording.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Of course the Senator from Oregon realizes that not all the States in the Union are blessed with Senators of the glibness of the Senators from Washington; and sometimes other Senators may wish to use such aids, although personally I have never seen one in operation.

But I think the Senator has a proper approach in his bill, and I shall look forward with interest to its passage through the various stages of committee procedure.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the Senator from Arizona refers to the glibness of the Senators from Washington——

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should have said Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would not wish to be included, by inadvertence on the part of the Senator from Arizona, in a group of such distinguished orators. I am sure the Senator from Arizona meant the reference in all kindness, and perhaps he was referring to Senator MAGNUSON and Senator JACKSON.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said "Washington," I was one State too far north.

Mr. NEUBERGER. However, let me say—and if I am taking too much liberty in this connection, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is concerned, I am sure he will disclaim it at the proper time—that if the Senators from Oregon are reading from a prepared manuscript, they do not need to conceal that fact by using any particular artificial device. They are quite unashamed in letting it be known that in such cases they are reading from prepared material.

So far as glibness is concerned, I do not think that has any particular part in this matter. If a man is sufficiently glib, why should he be ashamed to be seen reading from manuscript? If he is not ashamed, why should he use a teleprompter? It seems to me that he would use one only if he were ashamed of reading his text. Certainly it is much easier to read from a manuscript which is close in front of one, rather than to have the words placed some feet away over the television lens. Is not that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Oregon misunderstood my inference. I do not disagree at all with the approach of the bill; in fact, I am inclined to agree that the bill, in at least some of its aspects, might be a very proper one for passage.

I was merely indicating that few Senators have the speaking ability of the two Senators from Oregon; and other Senators might be placed in jeopardy if a restriction were placed on the use of a device such as the one to which we have been referring.

I am not at all opposed to the suggestion which is made by the bill; in fact, I look forward with great interest to observing what will happen to the bill in committee, as the bill proceeds through the various channels.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I, also, will watch with interest what happens to the bill in committee.

Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Arizona for teaming me, in terms of oratorical ability, with my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE]. I have a great deal to learn before I shall merit so great a compliment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I realize that I am placing the Senator from Oregon on the first team; and I do that from personal experience.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Arizona very much.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM M. TOMLINSON

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, recently Mr. William M. Tomlinson passed away in a Washington hospital.

Mr. Tomlinson had won deserved reknown because of his achievements in fiscal affairs, while serving in several United States embassies abroad.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Mr. Tomlinson. The editorial was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 29.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM M. TOMLINSON

It is a pity that there was not more general public appreciation of the work of William M. Tomlinson, who died here last Sunday. Mr. Tomlinson was the epitome of the abiding American interest in European unity. He was the good right arm of David Bruce during the Marshall plan and later when Mr. Bruce was United States special ambassador in Europe; and he was a close associate and respected consultant of Jean Monnet in the establishment and operation of the European Coal and Steel Community. Technically Mr. Tomlinson's job was that of representative of the Treasury Department in France, but he was far more than that. He was the patient economic adviser who, working largely in the background, supplied continuing stimulus for fiscal reform in France and for cooperation across national boundaries. Leaders such as Adenauer, de Gasperi and Spaak consulted him frequently. Mr. Monnet paid him an effective tribute by suggesting his appointment as United States special representative to the Coal and Steel Community. Plagued by ill health since youth, Mr. Tomlinson gave tirelessly of his energy, and Europe is the better for it. His death at only 37 was just as much a sacrifice for his country as a casualty on the battlefield.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order of the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 9, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

William C. Kern, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1955, vice James M. Mead, term expiring.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned ensign

Marvin B. Miller, effective May 12, 1955.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Ackroyd, Gilbert G., O31813.
Aerni, Francis J., O31920.

Aines, Andrew A., O43463.
Albrecht, Albert W., O31558.
Albro, John N., O40217.
Alexander, Robert W., O40280.
Alexander, Rowan P., O42979.
Allen, Edward G., O31878.
Allen, Hugh E., O43348.
Allgair, John A., O20947.
Anderson, George L., O31762.
Anderson, Robert N., O21436.
Anderson, Roland, O31790.
Anderson, Woodrow W., O40220.
Anglin, William E., O31464.
Antozzi, William O., O43307.
Atkins, Woodrow W., O43292.
Austin, Frank J., Jr., O40207.
Baker, Marshall W., O43558.
Balas, Paul S., O40234.
Baldwin, Coy W., O31924.
Balkman, Austin F., O32285.
Ball, Raymond C., O52184.
Banks, Richard G., O43407.
Barber, Wilfred F., O31683.
Bare, Charlie G., O43050.
Barker, Leonard C., O40213.
Barker, Stockbridge H., O38949.
Barr, John, O40148.
Barth, Luther R., O43418.
Bartholomew, Howard L., O43524.
Beaty, Harold E., O38930.
Becker, Henry C., O31944.
Bell, Urcel La R., O31731.
Belland, Walter T., O43450.
Benedict, Harold B., O31566.
Benion, Harry G., O20872.
Benjamin, Don C., O43070.
Bennett, Dayton E., O40212.
Bennett, William E., O31754.
Berendt, Herbert W., O31861.
Bettien, Richard L., O43528.
Black, Peter T. L., O31900.
Blakistone, John F., O42586.
Boling, Jean H., O31817.
Botts, Joseph H., O31514.
Bratcher, Buck, O43409.
Brock, John A., O42914.
Brown, Ernest E., O51928.
Brown, John M., Jr., O31897.
Brown, Robert E., O52098.
Brown, William M., O31583.
Browne, John T., O40092.
Bruch, Ray K., O31688.
Buch, Floyd H., O43500.
Buckalew, Louis W., Jr., O43462.
Burke, Thomas W., O31508.
Burt, Walter L., O43093.
Byrne, Jerome S., O21404.
Byrne, Robert E., O43281.
Calvert, George N., O43053.
Campbell, Clarence S., O40163.
Campbell, William E., Jr., O43316.
Campbell, William R., Jr., O40267.
Caraballo, Raymond T., O31862.
Carney, Taylor E., Jr., O40264.
Carusone, John J., O21295.
Cassell, Lloyd W., O31586.
Casterline, James I., O43628.
Castle, Shirley M., O51850.
Chalk, Joseph L., O52112.
Chambers, John H., O21323.
Chandler, Edward V., O51931.
Chaput, Clayton L., O43314.
Chatham, Arthur B., O31480.
Cheal, Raymond C., O20845.
Childers, Joe E., O31936.
Chubbuck, James B., O21058.
Clanton, Henry M., O30771.
Clark, James B., O31723.
Clements, Thomas H., O31735.
Clirehugh, Robert W., O31833.
Cochran, Archie L., O43343.
Coleman, Byers H., O43342.
Coleman, Irving M., O31715.
Cone, Harold E., O43100.
Cooper, Joseph E., O43285.
Coote, John F., O31596.
Copeland, Kenneth W., O40177.
Craig, James T., O21248.
Craig, William A., O43505.
Crase, Harold J., Jr., O31771.
Crimmins, Joseph J., O43265.
Cromelin, John M., O20597.
Cross, Clifford E., O51733.
Cullis, Robert E., O31942.
Cundiff, Isaac W., O43096.
Currier, Roger M., O30522.
Curry, William C., O31677.
Cushing, Christopher B., Jr., O31836.
Dahl, Irwin A., O43356.
Dalton, James J., O40171.
Darrow, Howard W., O31488.
Davenport, William W., O43077.
Davies, Albert C., O38916.
Davis, John, O43012.
Davis, John M., O31761.
Davis, Wilbur E., O20716.
de Berg, Oak E., O42974.
de Russy, Rene E., Jr., O40164.
Dennis, Norman T., O43547.
Diefendorf, John E., O40009.
Dobrinic, Matt P., O42985.
Dodge, Howard D., O51550.
Doerflinger, Oscar M., O31972.
Donahue, Joseph R., O43294.
Dorsett, Harold L., O40194.
Dougherty, John H., Jr., O31582.
Drennen, William L., O31890.
Drews, Reno E., O43420.
Dudderar, Sam K., Jr., O31764.
Dunn, James S., O40173.
Durbin, Paul J., O52110.
Eaken, Andrew J., O40090.
Eckols, Truman D., O43078.
Ellis, Bertram J., O40244.
Emery, Jack R., O40276.
Emory, George B., O31903.
Entwhistle, Richard R., O40198.
Evans, Robert H., O31628.
Faribault, Ben M., O30801.
Farley, Julius B., O40226.
Fay, Charles E., Jr., O40231.
Fickes, William H., O43279.
Fields, Harry C., Jr., O43592.
Finch, John E., O31797.
Fleming, Clarence A., O51941.
Flesch, Joseph M., O31800.
Flewelling, John D., O38818.
Folen, Clifford G., O40255.
Fossum, Embert A., O40210.
Fox, Vincent W., O51871.
Franklin, Joseph B., O43304.
Franks, William A., O43301.
Frasor, George M., O31594.
Freeman, Henry McC., O51926.
Fritsvold, Melford P., O43473.
Fueg, John W., O40289.
Fuller, Cecil H., O40158.
Fullerton, LeRoy R., O31690.
Gaffney, Wendell W., O44235.
Gahr, John A., O51947.
Garden, Frank E., O31742.
Gardner, Lyman S., O40205.
Gardner, Paul E., O38951.
George, Claude D., Jr., O31788.
Gilman, Turner W., O31831.
Gilmore, William H., O43414.
Godshall, Melvin W., O40184.
Goettl, John P., O31682.
Goldsmith, Howard F., Jr., O31946.
Goodnow, James L., O31363.
Gough, Wesley R., O43474.
Gray, Walter A., O38939.
Gregory, Clyde, O43044.
Greiner, Robert E., O38925.
Griffin, Robert J., O43005.
Grogan, Francis J., O42949.
Gross, Leslie M., O38938.
Grotte, Helmer M., O31622.
Guletsky, Walter N., O21309.
Guthrie, James O., O31470.
Hackett, Perry B., O21443.
Hall, Robert J., O31882.
Halligan, Edward G., O40201.
Hamilton, Allan C., O42456.
Hanks, Lester, O30339.
Harding, John E., O31627.
Harkness, Lawrence R., O40066.
Harrigan, Thomas L., O43538.
Harris, Arthur C., Jr., O20874.
Harrison, Robert L., O40275.
Hart, John J., O51618.
Hatzfeld, Theodore S., Jr., O31778.
Hawkins, Boyce V., O40233.
Hayes, Taylor C. T., O43542.
Healy, Patrick J., O30657.
Helderman, Charles F., Jr., O31716.
Henry, Joseph P., O40241.
Hess, Gustin A., O40180.
Hicks, Fred A., O31948.
Hill, Kenneth R., O31898.
Hilsman, Edward H., O43021.
Hinchie, John C., O31537.
Hirschhorn, Lloyd E., O43433.
Hodges, Willard J., Jr., O21401.
Hodson, Kenneth J., O43268.
Holdridge, Walter H., O51895.
Holtz, Albert E., O40285.
Howell, Clifford W., O31462.
Hudson, James A., O52137.
Humphreys, Russell W., O31910.
Hunt, William A., Jr., O51866.
Hupalo, William, O40269.
Hurley, Wesley C., O43319.
Husband, Howard O., O52093.
Huston, Robert M., O38943.
Inglis, Edward, O31964.
Isaacson, Donald F., O31965.
Jackson, James H., O31580.
Jackson, Marion H., O31629.
Jacobs, Gerald O., O31548.
Jacobson, George D., O31703.
Jaffe, Morton S., O52105.
Jeffries, Charles E., O40208.
Jensen, Dovre C., O52166.
Jodrey, David B., O43590.
Johnson, Leonard H., O40227.
Jones, Bertil V., O31968.
Jones, George W., O31521.
Jones, Harold LaR., O43337.
Jones, Sherbert B., O42988.
Jones, Winston I., O51954.
Jost, Harry F., O40292.
Julian, Leonard J., O51814.
Kane, Charles F., O43046.
Kane, Michael, Jr., O31476.
Kederich, Charles H., Jr., O43556.
Kehoe, Frank M., O43380.
Kemm, Robert R., O52139.
Kennedy, Robert S., O20780.
Kincaid, Leonard C., O31732.
King, Francis J., O40265.
King, John L., Jr., O31491.
Klint, Edmund L., O42970.
Knoll, William F., O43535.
Koerner, Paul M., O40263.
Kostora, Lee H., O31598.
LaFlare, Benjamin I., O52159.
Laib, Arthur J., Jr., O43107.
Landry, Ernest S., O51932.
Larsen, George E., O31550.
Laurie, Patrick W., O40222.
Lazzarini, Louis T., O43425.
Leahy, Paul J., O43267.
Lee, Ray M., O31974.
Leech, Robert C., O40183.
Leffers, Richard, Jr., O31843.
Lewis, Evan H., O40238.
Lindberg, Paul S., O52194.
Linse, Francis D., O31858.
Long, Harlan J., O42994.
Lonsinger, Roy W., O52192.
Lynch, John W., O42984.
Lynch, William F., O40182.
Lyons, Carl F., Jr., O20824.
MacAllaster, Willard R., O51678.
MacConnell, Thomas, 3d, O40286.
Maffeo, Mario A., O43264.
Maguire, Kenneth, O39980.
Majors, Edward M., O31971.
Mall, Oscar A., O31796.
Malone, Duane W., O31479.
Margolies, Harry, O40235.
Markham, Michael C., O42986.
Mason, Don A., O31694.
Mastrucci, Joseph P., O31768.
Matteson, Orval Q., O43509.
May, Arthur G., O30335.
McCabe, Edward R. W., Jr., O40262.
McCaddon, Walter L., O40239.
McCallum, Charles F., O51952.
McConaughy, James G., O43272.
McConnell, Wayne D., O43457.
McCune, Samuel J., O51668.
McCutcheon, Howard S., O51703.
McDonald, Lee R., O52133.
McDonough, Robert J., O43591.
McElligott, Joseph P., O31482.
McGrady, Harper L., O30450.

McKenna, Robert A., O51907.
McKillips, Edward J., O40175.
McLain, Edward W., O20888.
McNally, James D., O43317.
McNear, Evan A., O31774.
Meade, Stephen J., O31834.
Meehan, Patrick H., O51889.
Meguiar, Robert G., O40314.
Merrill, Clinton G., O31849.
Meyer, George F., Jr., O31584.
Middleton, William R., Jr., O30338.
Miller, Edward M., Jr., O40167.
Miller, Sidney A., O52154.
Miner, Harold E., O43019.
Mitchell, Allan W., O31704
Moak, James G., O43454.
Moomaw, Otho A., O20905.
Moon, William P., Jr., O31589.
Moore, Lowell G., O43539.
Moore, Orven D., O43581.
Moreman, Otis S., Jr., O51856.
Morgan, Joseph H., O51743.
Mueller, Edwin L. P., O52181.
Murphy, William F., O31441.
Murray, Gordon C., O31644.
Musick, Lawrence A., O31811.
Nadal, Carlos A., O20670.
Neely, James E., Jr., O40093.
Nelson, Henry H., O31916.
New, James H., O43435.
Newsom, Marion E., Jr., O43378.
Nicholls, Andrew B. C. O31957.
Nilsson, Erwin G., O31593.
Noble, Joseph E., Jr., O31973.
Noel, John C., Jr., O31404.
Norgordt, Russell L., O43589.
Norris, Clovis B., O51861.
North, Harris J., O52158.
Northrop, Edward D., O40282.
O'Connor, John J., O52160.
Oeding, Ernest C., O43259.
O'Leary, Francis X., O40214.
Olsen, Harold O., O31726.
Oppelt, Robert H., O42969.
Oswald, Edward H., O43330.
Owen, William J., O43536.
Pace, George D., O31531.
Pallister, Francis J., O43476.
Palm, Ira A., O40245.
Palmer, Leslie F., O43531.
Patrick, William E., Jr., O30310.
Patteson, Harvey L., O43439.
Payne, Gilbert M., O31713.
Payne, Laurance B., O51830.
Peale, Walter O., Jr., O20946.
Pence, Harvey J., O43011.
Perry, Theodore D., O31725.
Peters, Milfred J., O43395.
Philbrick, Kenneth R., O31642.
Phillips, Henry J., O31839.
Phillips, John DeW., Jr., O31937.
Pierce, Bruce, O40200.
Pizzati, Henry E., Jr., O31679.
Plapp, Paul V., O43362.
Polifka, Frank J. F., O31943.
Pople, William H., O43525.
Post, Charles A., O31524.
Powell, Maurice G., O40259.
Price, William P., O30780.
Pritchard, John R., O52111.
Race, Anthony J., O52163.
Rader, Robert M., O31523.
Rafferty, Thomas A., O31793.
Ralls, Howard L., Jr., O40186.
Rankin, John B., O40209.
Ransick, Clarence E., O40147.
Reagan, Woodrow W., O43351.
Redd, Lemuel B., O43089.
Rees, Roger S., O31652.
Regan, Joseph B., O43105.
Remfrey, Curt A., O40169.
Reynolds, Lawrence R., O42982.
Rhody, Dean A., O30270.
Richmond, Budd W., O30658.
Ricks, Charles LeR., O43266.
Rigely, George A., O40204.
Riordan, Clifford T., O21318.
Ripley, Lyman H., O20891.
Ritchey, Andrew W., O31934.
Robbins, Jack A., O43543.
Robinson, Joda L., O51857.
Robinson, John S., O38948.
Rogers, William C., O31602.
Rood, John W., O52092.
Roper, David N., O31507.
Ross, Aaron P., O51794.
Rossi, Carmen A., O52165.
Rotharmel, Samuel B., O51929.
Rousseau, Thomas H., O52148.
Ruby, Donald T., O40151.
Rucker, Choice R., O31610.
Ruemmele, Albert M., O31824.
Russell, George B., O51913.
Rynearson, Charles B., O19722.
Salisbury, Howard G., O43510.
Salonick, Joseph L., O40266.
Samuel, Allen T., Jr., O40049.
Santora, Bert, O31758.
Sawicki, Stanley J., O40215.
Schaudt, Howard P., O31673.
Scherer, Bernard J., O52147.
Scheurlein, Frank W., O31810.
Schmelzle, Cornelius M., O31547.
Schweinler, Dale J., O51930.
Sclafani, Enofio E., O52097.
Selden, Dudley B., O51845.
Sell, Russell B., O38918.
Septfonds, Charles E., Jr., O31837.
Sevier, Joseph H., O43464.
Shaffer, Lewis N., O31541.
Shealy, Norris, O43088.
Shoemaker, Joseph A., O42993.
Shomion, Arthur M., O40094.
Shookus, Anthony H., O31772.
Shuler, Allen C., Jr., O31970.
Sites, Eugene P., O43526.
Sitnek, William G., O40142.
Slaughter, John E., O19921.
Sloane, Nicholas J., O43582.
Smith, Dan L., 2d, O40156.
Smith, Harold A., O31615.
Smith, Myron D., O31860.
Smith, Robert Q., Jr., O31636.
Smith, Stanley W., O43042.
Smoak, Marion H., O43288.
Snyder, Emanuel P., O43286.
Snyder, Frank L., O43061.
Sommers, William D., Jr., O43270.
Sorensen, Martin O., O31784.
Sorenson, Morris E., O31977.
Spaulding, Walter L., O31915.
St. John, Richard C., O43530.
Stack, Robert C., O32098.
Stacy, Robert S., O31905.
Staley, Robert B., O43331.
Stephens, John J., O31844.
Stevenson, Jerome M., O51897.
Stiefel, Arthur A., O38934.
Stone, Loren F., O31504.
Stopp, Joseph E., O31693.
Strawbridge, John T., O40287.
Stricklen, Simon A., O52136.
Stuverud, Homer A., O43523.
Sullivan, Joseph W., O43260.
Swan, Thomas H., O31471.
Swearingen, Samuel M., O21381.
Sweeney, James L., O31457.
Swortwood, Louis B., O31672.
Taber, William R., O51927.
Tait, Albert L., O31568.
Taylor, Carlisle C., O40150.
Thornton, Virgil H., O31503.
Thurston, Estill S., O43469.
Thurston, Marion F., Jr., O52088.
Tillman, Erland A., O20941.
Todd, Ralph R., O40242.
Tolly, Robert J., O31551.
Tonstad, Owen O., O43560.
Townsend, Clyde F., O31526.
Tracy, Orrin A., O31645.
Troll, John F., O43029.
Troutman, John C., O31841.
Tuebner, Harry R., O31624.
Tyler, Willoughby B., O31699.
Underwood, Clarence R., O31911.
Utterback, James W., O40174.
Valiante, Leo F., O31643.
VanGundy, Daniel F., O31938.
van de Velde, Louis duR., O31895.
Vaughn, Francis M., O31567.
Velasquez, Ben N., O31779.
Verde, Joe, O40218.
Victory, Homer J., O31826.
Vincent, Edward J., O38910.
Voyatzis, Paul A., O31499.
Wade, Dallas C., O30319.
Wagner, Jacob F., O30475.
Walker, Charles P., O19903.
Walker, Norman M., O31925.
Walker, Robert M., O31740.
Wallace, Charlton O., O42981.
Walter, Edward C., O31578.
Walterhouse, Harry F., O51882.
Ward, William R., O43262.
Waters, Martin J., Jr., O31939.
Watts, William E., O40291.
Webber, Ira B., O43375.
West, John T., Jr., O30825.
Westerman, George F., O52106.
Whaley, Eugene B., O52150.
White, John W., O21319.
White, Victor W., O43479.
Whiteside, Clyde C., O43010.
Whitsett, William L., O51892.
Wilder, Ernest B., O40271.
Wilkinson, Charles W., O43280.
Williams, Arthur H., Jr., O43436.
Williams, John R., O42996.
Wilson, James M., O40224.
Wilson, John S., O43271.
Wilson, Lynnford S., O51886.
Wittmayer, Raymond C., O31631.
Wolfe, Harold K., O31729.
Woodard, Vernon E., O31753.
Worley, Thomas G., O31494.
Wright, Charles E., O31564.
Wright, Jay W., O51916.
Wygant, Robert M., O31926.
Yakshe, John R., O31820.
Young, Charles G., O20739.
Young, Claude C., O31935.
Yuill, Harry F., O43571.
Zacherle, Alarich L. E., O42817.

To be lieutenant colonels, Chaplains

Blumenthal, Ralph H., O29318.
Brown, Charles E., Jr., O25845.
Donovan, Harold F., O26442.
Gaskins, Steve P., Jr., O26392.
Hiebert, Samuel L., O29321.
Hlopko, John J., O30841.
Huchthausen, Walther A., O39665.
Jenks, Loren T., O24356.
Jones, Emmett G., O51170.
Kennedy, Gregory R., O30847.
Killelea, William G., O51174.
Kregel, Herman J., O38845.
McMahon, James J., O26443.
Morreale, Samuel O., O41765.
Pugh, Ralph H., O24375.
Reiss, William J., O30853.
Russell, Roger D., O22797.
Saunders, Edward J., O30846.
Sowers, Kenneth M., O24357.
Sugg, Walton G., Jr., O24358.
Thompson, Leslie A., O23673.

To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps

Flachsland, Norma M., L37.
Linch, Pauline Van den B., L54.
Moses, Harriet N., L56.
Springfield, Nora G., L62.
Voinche, Mona L., L213.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Campbell, Robert P., O24633.
Carbonell, Arthur J., O24626.
Crosby, William H., Jr., O24639.
Crozier, Dan, O26408.
Eisner, David G., O30984.
Genetti, Emil J., O26965.
Geppert, Leo J., O26406.
Hughes, Frederic J., Jr., O26370.
Hursh, Laurence M., O25146.
Kiersch, Theodore A., O24386.
Le Golvan, Paul C., O24634.
Moore, William S., O30992.
Orbison, James A., O26405.
Parker, Henry S., O24317.
Rice, J. Sidney, O24326.
Sargent, Carlton W., O26991.
Smith, William T., O24341.
Vorder Bruegge, Colin F., O26958.
Willis, John M., Jr., O24389.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Caldwell, Jack B., O22316.
Christensen, John P., O22257.
Cook, Donald L., O22259.
Fallis, Reginald J., O22256.
Foote, George B., O22320.
Linn, Scott D., O22260.
Swanson, Raymond W., O30925.
Swink, Jesse M., O22315.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Deane, Don L., O20492.
Lancaster, Harry R., O30897.
Mace, Don L., O21737.
Maxey, Howard C., O51955.
Willers, Karl H., O21671.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Benade, Leo E., O37433.
Boeckman, Franklin P., O31247.
Carter, James A., O31315.
Coats, James G., O31260.
Cousins, Owen De F., O43222.
Cox, Ardis T., O56868.
Ferguson, Harry A., O31251.
Frazee, Edward B., O31165.
Frey, Clarence Van P., O40134.
Haase, Frederick J., O31320.
Hastings, William O., O31248.
Henderson, Clyde W., O31324.
Hoover, Chris D., O37408.
Hunt, Albert B., O31285.
Koehn, Carl J., O52048.
LaCombe, James L., O31284.
Lawford, Frank K., O37395.
LeMire, Joseph A. W., O37386.
McCleary, Gordon F., O37425.
Merriken, John E., O31253.
Miller, Robert C., O37409.
Monnen, Millard C., O37387.
Morrison, Manley G., O37389.
Pendlyshok, Charles A., O31304.
Richards, James T., O21707.
Sanders, Arvey C., O43236.
Sheehan, Gerard J., O43221.
Stith, Marion C., O37385.
Stout, Arthur O., O31255.
Taylor, Emerson B., O22794.
Thompson, Joseph C., O31250.
Trenholm, John H., O37427.
Tucker, Elon B., O52040.
Walden, Jack T., O37422.
Walker, Herman A., O37402.
Whittemore, Frederick W., Jr., O43255.
Zurcher, John J., 3d, O38888.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Abramoska, Helen M., N1878.
Barrett, Carrie E., N124.
Bateman, Mary C., N122.
Jacobson, Lucy E., N1873.
Lamansky, Ethel A., N41.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Haines, Marian H., N2663.
McHugh, Mary C., N2668.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Allan, James R., O71752.
Brown, Robert E., O71767.
Burdick, Leonard R., O71650.
Campbell, William E., O71768.
Churchill, Jack B., O071770.
Curtiss, Lester R., O71664.
Dunham, Gerald L., O71783.
Evanchick, John, O71787.
Glidden, Harry R., O71793.
Hall, Daniel D., O71674.
Hilborn, James R., O71679.
Hodgson, Lowell F., O71805.
Hyde, James L., O71811.
Jackson, James M., O71812.
Jackson, John H., O71813.
Klopp, Charles A., O71820.
Leyh, Robert J., O71825.
Lynch, Thomas P., O71696.
McCrone, Clarence L., Jr., O71701.
Metzner, Edward P., O71842.
O'Dea, Thomas F., Jr., O71709.
Sasseen, Jack A., O71866.
Smith, James D., O71873.
Thompson, Harry J., Jr., O71882.
Thurmond, Herbert K., O71883.
Van Winkle, Parker C., O71886.
Washington, Sylvester, O67492.
Wittbecker, Richard A., O71747.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Lesher, Edward R., O71933.
McFadyen, Ross M., O71703.
Pursley, Robert J., O71714.
Schiavone, Albert, O71959.
Williams, Vern M., Jr., O71745.
Zeiss, Warren W., Jr., O71750.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list from the temporary disability retired list, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be captain

Moore, Carl G., O59455.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be captain

Gilbert, Bertram C., O983510.

To be first lieutenant

Ruback, John C., O997271.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be captains

Donnelly, Henry J., MC, O998133.
Olson, Donald M., MC.
Pinkerton, Raymond E., MC, O966475.
Thompson, James W., MC, O1921477.
Zamora, Pablo J., MC, O1757164.

To be first lieutenants

Bennett, Claude E., MC, O1585160.
Hunt, Albert C., MC.
Wilkey, Mildred E., ANC, N765672.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Kernan, Philip M., Jr., O4033385.
Kiel, Frank W., O4033372.
Scherz, Robert G., O4027884.
Seitzman, David M.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Mollichelli, Edward V., O1931488.
Sydnor, Elliott P., Jr., O1877297.
Winegar, Lucien T., O1894082.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

McCullough, Jack D., Jr.
Pattakos, Arion N.
Wallace, Joel B., Jr.
Watts, Robert C.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Paris, Adolphus W., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Adams, Robert B.
Albrecht, Nelson O.
Albright, John E., Jr.
Allard, Richard R.
Amisano, Italo B.
Bailey, James B.
Bains, Darrell T.
Barnhill, David B.
Barry, Raymond D.
Baty, Roy S., Jr.
Benacquista, John J.
Bender, Richard C.
Benham, Fred G., III
Boyle, Richard P., Jr.
Brown, Joseph G.
Buford, Charles R.
Carrington, Hugh C.
Chamberlain, Charles M.
Clements, Philip J., II
Cooksey, David O.
Demick, Harold B., Jr.
Dorsey, John B.
Dusek, Edmund E.
Edmonson, Frank A.
Erkelens, Henri F.
Ferguson, Samuel C.
Finkle, Rodney T.
French, Sanford R.
Furash, Herbert A.
Giggey, Robert L.
Goodrich, Charles R. O.
Griffith, Donald L.
Hall, Stanley E.
Harvey, Richard W.
Henne, Carl, Jr.
Hereld, Gerald P.
Hoffman, Lester
Hoffpauir, Wray G., Jr.
Hosmer, Calvin, III
Howard, Richard A.
Huber, Paul J.
Jones, Warren A.
Jordan, John P.
Kelly, Donald E.
Kepler, Roger T.
Kiernan, Leonard A., Jr.
Kiser, Billy J.
Kleinkopf, Eugene M.
Kuper, James F.
Lemon, Gilman J. K.
Lewis, Henry J.
Logan, Rodney W.
Maccini, Francis L.
McGee, Ronald R.
McManus, Booker T.
Meehan, Edward J.
Meeker, Jo O.
Morris, Cornelius J.
Morris, Richard A.
Newman, Frank R.
Nichols, Denton E.
O'Kane, Robert F.
O'Shaughnessy, James P.
Parsons, Donald F.
Pemberton, Thomas G.
Phillips, Robert G.
Pohly, Glenn W.
Randolph, William M.
Reid, Robert C.
Rohland, Robert G.
Rutkowski, Richard A.
Schaub, Arthur J., Jr.
Shannon, John W.
Sharp, Hugh H., III
Shoemaker, Ronald Z.
Simpson, Charles
Singleton, Winfield A.
Smith, Edward P.
Stein, Alfred J., Jr.
Stevens, Edward A., Jr.
Thornton, John K.
Tyner, Dean A.
Vaughn, Bill J., O4024374
Weddle, Curtis E., Jr.
Wells, Milton E.
Wiggs, Jimmy D.
Winter, William J., Jr.

IN THE NAVY

Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Edward G. Ogden, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Verner R. Carlson
Francis C. Rose, Jr.
John E. Wildman

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles B. Arrington, Jr.	Irwin B. Levy
	Paul R. Merritt
Thomas J. Bath	Harry E. Shull
George F. Blank	Neil C. Smith
Franklin H. Briggs	Stephen E. Speltz
Cornelius P. Brogan	Kenneth F. Sumner
Dennison R. Brown	Domenic S. Terranova
Oscar C. Hamilton, Jr.	Charles B. Uber
Ervin E. Hanson	Morton E. Weichsel,
Robert E. Lester	Jr.

Benjamin E. Hoffman (Naval ROTC) to be ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William N. Ashbey	Charles W. Lee
James F. Babcock	Stanley S. Leese
Joseph H. Bacheller	Richard D. Lewis
Norman E. Beck	Thomas G. Lilly
James F. Blake, Jr.	William J. Lockhart
William R. Britton	James B. Lovelace, Jr.
George E. Brockett	Robert J. McKay
George W. Brockman III	James A. McMullen
	Robert E. Maher
Kenneth Carlson	Jerry "B" Maney
David B. H. Chaffe III	Richard B. Marx
Roy E. Collins	Thomas J. Miskovsky
Wayne T. Cooke	Albert G. Moe
Fred S. Coombs	Joseph C. Mullins
Stanley A. Corngold	Thomas J. Murphy
William W. Deacon	Alvin W. Neely, Jr.
Roger F. Dickinson	James R. Ocheltree
Ronald W. Dickson	Richard S. Olinger
Donald N. Dirks	James O. Perkins
Robert H. Dolloff	Joel S. Poorman
Jerry B. Douglass	Jack A. Pore
James LaC. Durham	William M. Powell
Hubert E. Dutil	Farrell J. Rader
George D. Eagleton	George W. Regan
Robert A. Ely	Michael C. Reu
Barry M. Erickson	Philip W. Richardson
Sidney "A" Farha	David C. Robertson
Edmond R. J. Farrell, Jr.	Donald T. Roeder
	Edward F. Ruese II
Joel L. Fleishman	Guy M. Schaefer
Phillip W. Flynn	Leon J. Scott, Jr.
William S. Ford, Jr.	William D. Shardelow
Ronald N. Friedrich	George H. Shelton
James B. Gallaher	David A. Singer
Harry R. Garing	Tex R. Sluder
James E. Gast	Gad C. Smith
William LeR. Gilbertson	Ludwig A. Smith, Jr.
	Pete F. Smitherman
Peter E. Gilles	William P. Sovey
John C. Grant	Robert L. Stark
Roger A. Graul	Michael T. Steadland
Lowell B. Greenwood	Andrew McK. Stiglitz
Thomas M. Hallin	Patrick D. Sullivan
James W. Hamilton	Robert R. Taylor
Harlan L. Hauskins	Carnot H. Thomas, Jr.
Hugh C. Haynsworth III	Jennings J. Thompson, Jr.
James D. Hennes	Ronald N. Tokay
John E. Hof	William P. Tuggle III
Jay S. Horton	Frank S. Virden
Blaine L. Hoskins	William P. Vogel
Robert LeR. Hubbard	Carl R. Webb, Jr.
Philip L. Hummer	Herbert "S" Weil, Jr.
Charles E. Husted	John R. Wilkins
Donald G. Jackson	Harold H. Willenborg
Gerald E. Jackson	Walter "E" Williams,
James B. Johnson, Jr.	Jr.
John R. Kaufman	Sheldon H. Wolfe
Donald M. Keller	Walter F. Wright, Jr.
Richard O. Lay	Maurie D. Yager
John C. Layman	

The following (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lawrence E. Day	Donald W. Perkins
Russell H. Giles	Bruce A. Pifel
James D. Hearn	Joseph A. Pusl, Jr.
John E. Koehn	Stanley H. Schoonover
John E. Marion	

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John S. W. Buxton	Donald E. Milone
Lorraine L. Forehand, Jr.	Donald R. Sparks

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Thomas M. Altee	Albert W. Howard, Jr.
Richard W. Bennett	Felton "M" Humphreys, Jr.
Donald B. Bennie	
Robert E. Blandine	Robert A. Kern
Theodore W. Booth	Edward C. Lehman, Jr.
John R. Bullard	Charles E. Lipford
Nathan T. Butcher	Robert E. Lynch
Gerald B. Champlin	William C. Marsh
Dominic E. Cirbus	Richard A. Mauldin
James O. Coleman	Howard C. Mitchell
Edward F. Cunningham	Carroll W. Park
	Donald R. Parr
Don J. Duhrkopf	Lowell E. Perry
Ray L. Dunkin	Thomas R. Pickett
Morton A. Eckhouse	Robert E. Porterfield
Craig R. Fawcett	Clarence L. Priddy, Jr.
Estal J. Fette	Raymond T. Riley
Harford Field, Jr.	Kenneth M. Scott
John C. Fisher	Clayton M. Simmons
Robert "E" Fraser	Donald L. Slater
John A. Furmanski	Clyde Stallings, Jr.
Richard F. Gordon, Jr.	Earl G. Thomas
Thomas B. Green	Samuel S. Walstrum
Benjamin F. Hackney III	John H. Weaver
	William R. Wilson, Jr.
George P. Hodges, Jr.	Walter D. Wray, Jr.

Edison W. Miller (naval aviator) to be first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Robert W. Didion (civilian) to be lieutenant in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald O. Camp	John C. Rumble
Edwin B. Crenshaw	Newton L. Vermilion
Raymond E. Halle	Eugene A. Watkins, Sr.
Robert B. Killion	George W. Wegmann
Henry Muller III	Robert H. Wright

Woodie E. Stone to be a temporary lieutenant commander in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Willem VanHemert (meritorious noncommissioned officer) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are again coming unto Thee in the fellowship of prayer, we in our need of a greater and more courageous faith in Thy divine presence and power.

May we feel that there is a real and vital connection between our fortitude in the times of difficulties and the faith we carry in our hearts.

Help us to believe that new capacities and energies for victorious and joyous living will be awakened within us if we only have a stronger faith.

Grant that in each day we may have a larger experience of that faith in God and man and the triumph of righteousness which was regnant in the life of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–15.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5695) to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

I may say that this request has been cleared with the leadership of the House and with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. The bill was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object only to say this. This bill has been unanimously agreed upon by all members of the Committee on Ways and Means, on both sides. It is a very necessary bill and should be passed. This bill is identical with H. R. 3202 introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. To my knowledge, there is absolutely no objection to this legislation from any quarter. It is essential in order to maintain an adequate supply of copper within the United States. At the same time, it contains safeguards for the protection of our domestic copper industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper," approved May 22, 1951 (Public Law 38, 82d Cong.), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on H. R. 5695 at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5695 would continue through June 30, 1958, the suspension of import taxes on copper and the copper content of ores, concentrates, and other articles. The present suspension of the import taxes terminates on June 30, 1955.

These import taxes have been suspended by the Congress continuously since April 30, 1947, except for a short period at the end of 1950 and the beginning of 1951. Although the import taxes on copper were suspended for the first time effective April 30, 1947, practically all of the imports of copper which were brought into this country during World War II were for the Government account, and therefore were admitted free of duty.

The principal items affected are refined copper and copper-bearing ores, which but for the suspension would be subject to an import tax of 2 cents per pound.

The basic law suspending the import taxes on copper is Public Law 38 of the 82d Congress. This law, which would be continued through June 30, 1958, by this bill, contains a provision whereby the President is required to revoke the suspension of the import taxes if the average price of electrolytic copper, delivered Connecticut Valley, for any calendar month falls below 24 cents per pound. This provision is designed to protect the domestic copper mining industry.

Our committee was advised that the domestic mining industry has no objection to the continuation of the suspension of import taxes provided in the bill. We were also advised that our requirements for imported copper are continually increasing. The United States has been consuming more than one-half of the total world consumption of copper in recent years, and for the last 3 years we have had to import over one-third of the copper which we have consumed.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has introduced a bill which is identical to this bill. The interested executive departments all supported the enactment of this legislation. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I support H. R. 5695, to continue for 3 years, through June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, a strategic and critical material in both war and peace.

This tax of 4 cents per pound was first imposed in 1932 to protect the domestic copper industry. It was, in effect, suspended during the years of World War II, when practically all imports were for Government account and thus entered this country free of import duty.

Except for the period from July 1, 1950, to April 1, 1951, the import tax has been suspended continuously by Congress since April 30, 1947. As a result of concessions granted by the United States in the general agreements on tariffs and trade, this tax was cut in half effective March 16, 1949.

This suspension of the import tax will end automatically if the price of copper, now about 36 cents a pound, falls below 24 cents per pound—thus continuing a safeguard to our vital domestic copper mining industry.

The United States is at once the world's largest producer and consumer of copper. Our demands are so large that more than one-third of our requirements in the past 3 years have been imported.

Last February 25, the Office of Defense Mobilization recognized a critical shortage and released 8,000 tons of copper that was under contract to the Government to be delivered to the stockpile. This was necessary to prevent a shutdown of factories and plants engaged in fabricating materials of copper.

Five executive departments—State, Commerce, Interior, Defense, and Treasury—have endorsed this bill. H. R. 5695 also has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Tariff Commission. It was favorably reported by a unanimous vote of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

A continuation of the suspension of the tariff would be in the best interests of this Nation.

TO AMEND SECTION 401 (E) OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. PRIEST submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, DINGELL, MILLS, JENKINS, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Barden	Gamble	Powell
Bolton, Oliver P	Gray	Prouty
Canfield	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Chatham	Holifield	Reed, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Riehlman
Dawson, Ill.	Judd	Roberts
Diggs	Kelly, N. Y.	Sieminski
Dingell	Kilburn	Walter
Eberharter	McCulloch	Wickersham

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 409 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. Are there any amendments to this section?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to extend my personal felicitations to a great American, a great legislator; one who has done such yeoman service for this country for years, who is 75 years young today, the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER.

If there is anyone in this country who deserves the title "watchdog of the Treasury," it is John. During his long service in this House he has saved this country many billions of dollars. Because of his service the taxpayers of America have been saved heavy taxes. He is a man who, regardless of political consequences, never failed to support legislation for the benefit of the country. May he continue to enjoy good health and continue his splendid service for America.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts in the remarks he has made concerning JOHN TABER. JOHN TABER is loved by every member of the New York delegation on which he has served as its chairman. Many of us at various times have differed with our able and devoted colleague on this, that, or another issue, but there is no one among us who does not hold for him unbounded respect and affection.

I am delighted that at 75 he is just as vigorous as he was at 35, and I can only hope he will be going strong as many years in the future as he has served in the past.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the longer you know JOHN TABER the better you like him. I have known him perhaps longer than anybody on our side, because he is the second oldest man in point of service. Mr. REED is the oldest, and Mr. TABER is second. Our distinguished former Speaker [Mr. MARTIN] and I came in at the same time, 30 years ago. That is when I first came to know JOHN TABER, and, as I said before, I think more of him today than I ever did. He is a grand man and a grand American.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in every kind word that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has said with reference to the personality and the services of our beloved colleague, JOHN TABER. He has been an outstanding Representative for many, many years. JOHN TABER'S word is his bond. I have enjoyed my service with him.

I trust the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the life and services of JOHN TABER in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may be permitted to extend their remarks on the life and character and services of JOHN TABER at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate JOHN TABER on his 75th birthday. His distinguished record in the House of Representatives is one that we should all try to emulate. JOHN TABER has been an inspiration to me throughout my years of service in the Congress. May he live long and happily.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of our former Speaker [Mr. MARTIN], honoring the Member from New York [Mr. TABER] on his 75th birthday.

It has been my good fortune to serve under Mr. TABER'S leadership on the Committtee on Appropriations. The American people have no more devoted and able public servant than JOHN TABER. Warmhearted, loyal and thoughtful, he has endeared himself to all those who are privileged to enjoy his friendship.

I congratulate him upon his long and distinguished career, and wish him many happy returns of this day.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I suppose if our esteemed friend, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN TABER, had his way this would be just another day in his long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives.

But the opportunity to pay my personal respects to him on the 75th anniversary of his birth is too good to miss.

JOHN TABER has dedicated the mature years of his life to the service of his country and the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude.

As colleagues of this kindly, helpful man we share in that debt, not only as citizens of America, but as Members of the Congress who have benefited beyond our ability to assess, by his wisdom, his integrity and his courage.

The extreme diligence with which our beloved friend has applied himself to duties as ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations has been an inspiration to all of us. The results of his efforts provide the most eloquent testimonial to his effectiveness as a stanch advocate of economy in Government.

When JOHN TABER speaks, his is a voice which commands, and receives, the closest attention, reflecting the veneration and deep respect in which he is held by the membership of this body.

I join with his countless friends over the Nation in wishing him many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the most pleasant experiences I have had since coming to the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress has been meeting, working with, and knowing my friend, JOHN TABER.

I join his many friends in expressing congratulations to him on his 75th birthday and wish him many happy returns of this day. May all the coming many years bring him and his charming wife much happiness and constant good health.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous birthday greetings given by Members of the House to our beloved colleague, JOHN TABER, the gentleman from New York, were well deserved and I am glad to have this opportunity to record my personal greetings to him on his 75th birthday.

Mr. TABER has devoted the greater part of his life to the service of his country and has never wavered from the high standards and the principles which have always guided him in his actions. He believes in honesty, he believes in efficiency, he believes in loyalty to one's country and, in the responsible position which he has held on the Committee on Appropriations, these qualities are always present in the decisions which he has made. Perhaps Members of the House are sometimes provoked because of his opposition to plans which they may have in mind for their districts but no one ever doubted the sincerity of the man and the honesty of his thinking.

It is a priceless pleasure and joy to know him and to serve with him in the House of Representatives. He has enhanced the standards of our Government and added luster to the fair name of the Congress. I trust that he will continue in active service and I know the years to come will bring him joy in the realization of the affection in which his many friends hold him and the knowledge of work well done.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to our attention that one of the great men of not only our time but of all times, today is celebrating his 75th birthday. I am referring to the Hon. JOHN TABER, the gentleman from New York.

Words fail me when I attempt to express my appreciation of the many kind things, the courteous treatment, and the consideration that has been shown me by JOHN TABER. He had attained high position but he never forgets the little man whether this individual is his colleague, his friend or—yes, even his political enemy. My experience has proven to me that JOHN TABER has only one rule and that is the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

He has never forgotten that he is a public servant and he is one who remembers not only the people that sent him to Congress but all the people.

And may I add, Mr. Speaker, just a note of praise and appreciation of JOHN TABER'S helpmate, his wife, Gertrude. She, too, follows the rules that I have expressed above and they together make a team that will be remembered by those who write for the Archives.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. One of the concerns of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which I serve, is the health of the people of our Nation. Each year funds are appropriated to the United States Public Health Service for the grant-in-aid program to the States. A large part of these funds are used for the control of tuberculosis which remains our leading communicable disease problem. One of the cornerstones of a successful tuberculosis-control program is the search for active TB among apparently healthy people by using portable and mobile chest X-ray units. Such a unit will be available to us, the members of our staffs, and our families beginning at noon on Monday, May 9, in the first-aid room of the Old House Office Building. The following week the unit will be located in the anteroom to the House Ways and Means Committee room.

Since we are living and working in a city where tuberculosis is so prevalent, I urge all of you and the members of

your staffs to avail yourselves of this service while it is so convenient. The survey is being conducted for us by the United States Public Health Service, the District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

In addition to being studied for the presence or absence of tuberculosis, your chest X-ray will be read for all other conditions which can be recorded on the film.

I again urge you to avail yourselves of this valuable service for which there is no charge.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse everything the gentleman from Indiana has said. I hope every Member of the House and every member of their staffs will take advantage of this X-ray that is going to be available to us next week and the following week.

The greatest job those who are fighting tuberculosis in this country have to do is search out and find the unknown cases. This is one of the sure ways of finding those who have tuberculosis in the early form, and it also helps in finding other conditions, especially those having to do with the heart, that affect all people. We know today that with the drugs we have and the new medicines that are available to medical science, if we find these cases early enough all can be cured and saved. I hope everyone will take advantage of these mass X-rays that are going to be held.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, like many other Members of the House I yesterday received a telegram which bears on the bill before us. I want to read it to the House. It comes from Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It reads as follows:

> We recommend defeat of H. R. 12, rigid price supports have contributed to present difficult marketing situation for many farm products by stimulating production in excess of consumer demand, by loss of foreign and domestic markets, and the creation of costly income depressing surpluses. Production controls are reducing farm income. The 1954 law which only begins to gradually take effect with the harvest of 1955 crops should be allowed a chance to help adjust production and increase consumption.

I think we ought to know the position of the greatest farm organization in this country.

I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding to me.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HOLMES), Mr. DIXON was permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the Post this morning contains a splendid editorial. It refers to the 90-percent parity program. It is entitled "Riding for a Bust." That is my thesis in the few minutes I have in which to speak with you.

Yesterday the 90 percent support prices on peanuts blew up in our faces because of an aroused public. Not long ago the entire potato program blew up in our faces for the very same reason. If H. R. 12 is enacted, other programs will blow up in our faces and the entire high-support program will be riding for a bust. I had in mind the wheat program. I would not doubt a bit but that our wheat farmers rather than continue high supports even if they were dropped to 82½ percent will vote out supports entirely and choose to take their chances on the market with only 50 percent supports rather than to take their acreage cuts required by high support prices. The entire dairy industry threatened to blow up in our faces just a little more than a year ago. The situation was so dark there seemed no way out. Flexible supports came in and what did we find? Prices of butter dropped 9 cents per pound. The housewives of the United States purchased 20 percent more butter last month than they did in February a year ago. Milk has dropped in most acreas from one to three cents a quart. The flexible price supports do benefit the consumers. Here is the undeniable evidence.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us any figures as to how many dairies have been closed in the last year?

Mr. DIXON. I have no figures on how many dairies have been closed, but I know that we produce more dairy products with fewer cows because the farmers are eliminating their boarders, they are more and more efficient and the organization is on its feet and it is getting back its markets in that wonderful, fine American way. I have talked to the leaders and they are optimistic, and they are more optimistic than they have been in a long time. Instead, the dairy products going into Government hands has been cut in half over the last year and these fine people are working their way out.

It has been charged that the flexible price supports are cruel to the farmer. Let us see which program has been cruel to the farmer, and let us see which program has been a friend to the farmer. I hold in my hand a bulletin from the United States Department of Agriculture, No. 135. We know that farm income has decreased since 1947 by 25 percent. But under which program has that decrease come about? Which program has been cruel to the farmer and which program has been kind to the farmer. In 1947, and I read from this bulletin, the parity ratio was 115 points. In 1948, it was 110. In 1949, it was 100. In 1950, it was 101. 1951, it went up to 107 and in 1952, it dropped to 100. In 1953, it dropped to 92 and in 1954, it dropped to 90. That is the first chance we had for flexible supports to go in—and that only on the dairy products. Under the rigid supports, the parity ratio dropped 27 percent. Under the flexible price supports, it has dropped 2 percent.

Now, who is the friend of the farmer, and who is cruel to the farmer? The decline in farmers income has come under rigid high supports.

I wish to say that H. R. 12 is a poor bill. First, because we are riding for a bust if rigid price supports are continued. It is apparent that the chickens are coming home to roost on this 90 percent program.

Second, I would like to see the peanut growers given a chance to take their problem back to the committee, because if supports are eliminated entirely on peanuts and they go on the world market which is 5 cents a pound when our market on peanuts is 28 cents a pound, the change might be too drastic—is too drastic. I believe the committee could help out if the bill were recommitted.

Third, while I am in favor of a reduction of brucellosis, and while I am in favor of increasing milk for the school program, I cannot vote for those two things under this bill because I am against rigid price supports. They should be out of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the implications of action taken by this House yesterday, when peanuts were removed from the list of basic commodities.

Price support for the 1955 crop of peanuts under the present law has not been announced, but in all likelihood it will be at 90 percent of parity, or 12.2 cents per pound.

If H. R. 12 should be enacted into law, carrying yesterday's amendment, the law would require no price support for peanuts. What the price might be under those circumstances, no one can tell. World prices of peanuts and peanut products give some guidance; based on such information as I have been able to gather, the price of peanuts in the United States might well be 5 cents per pound.

Not only this; if there is no price support program for peanuts, there is no basis for restricting imports through the use of section 22. Thus peanut producers would have no protection from foreign suppliers of peanuts and peanut oil.

Under the present law, the Department of Agriculture has been very considerate of peanut producers. Only yesterday, an increase of 7½ percent was announced in the 1955 marketing quota.

If I were a peanut producer, I would long remember a vote by my Representative in Congress, favoring a bill which contained a provision which, at one stroke, cut my price in half and subjected me to the unfettered competition of the world market. It would make no difference to me whether I favored rigid supports or flexible supports, whether I were a Democrat or a Republican.

If I were a peanut producer, with my price about to be cut in half, I would immediately lose interest in trying to obtain 90 percent of parity for wheat producers, or corn producers, or cotton or rice producers.

If I were a peanut producer, I would sense, in the action of this House yesterday, the fact that there was more safety for me in the moderate price support

levels of the Agricultural Act of 1954 than in the high rigid levels of H. R. 12.

I would prefer the demonstrated goodwill, moderation, and helpfulness of the administration, as expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1954 to the excessive and dangerous demands of H. R. 12.

And if I were a Representative from a peanut producing area, I would vote to recommit this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] has just said the peanut program "blew up in our face" yesterday because of consumer resistance. I think it is perfectly clear that any blowup that occurred was the result not of any consumer's complaint but of the outstanding and very able manipulation of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who has so ably controlled this debate for a great many years that there has never yet been a clear-cut vote on this floor between 90-percent and 75-percent supports. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has been successful in his effort to fix it so that there will not be any clear-cut vote today, unless we defeat this peanut amendment when it comes up for a vote in the House. I think it is clear that the gentleman from Indiana is more interested in putting the Representatives from peanut-growing areas in a position where they will have to vote against the bill. When the Republican leadership succeeds in this, where do the candy manufacturers find themselves? Where do the Democrats who pulled the Republican chestnuts out of the fire find themselves?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot yield further.

I agree with the gentleman, and I yield to no one in my admiration for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

I would like to suggest also that a minor influence in this matter goes back to a meeting of the peanut users in Chicago on August 5, 1952, when Mr. Charles Scully, who presided over the meeting, said that in order to save the peanut industry they would have to raise money first to win a vote in Congress, changing peanuts from a basic to a nonbasic commodity status; or, failing to do so, to win a disapproval of quotas in the next peanut-farmer referendum.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is evident that a lobby has been active in this field, and I think also it is obvious that these same people who say they need to save the peanut end users have been doing pretty well.

I hold in my hand a list showing the profits of some of the peanut end users of this country.

One of these companies made a profit last year of $1,035,000; one made a profit of $1,263,000; another made a profit of $230,559; another $768,820; another $7,090,707; and another $1,182,083. These are the people we are asked to save here by the passage on final vote of the amendment which was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole on yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, who is on the other side of this question? The answer is the smallest dirt farmers in the country. In 1932 peanuts sold in the State of Oklahoma for 25 cents a bushel, paying in net return to the peanut farmers less than 5 cents an hour for their labor. That was before we had a support program.

Somebody has said this will benefit the end users; of course it will benefit the end users. Someone has said that it will fire the furnaces of the peanut industry. Yes, it will fire the furnaces of the candy companies. It will fire the furnaces of the confectionery trust. But I ask you, on what fuel will that furnace be fed? It will be fed on the sweat, and the toil, and the standard of living of the families of the peanut farmers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the money that the peanut farmer gets from his crop goes into the absolute essentials of life. What we are discussing here is school books, school shoes, dresses, ribbons, and Sunday clothes for the children and families of the smallest farmers in America. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Chairman, over the last 20 years representatives of industry and agriculture, representatives of the farmer and the factory worker have gone down this aisle together writing a history of progressive legislation unparalleled in the annals of time. Hand in hand they have written a new record for the benefit of those who earn their bread in the sweat of their faces. Working together, they have placed upon the statute books of this country the wage-and-hour law, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Labor Relations Act, the social-security law, the Rural Electrification Act. This was progressive legislation. Today, if we follow the Committee of the Whole, we are taking a backward step. We are returning to the days of "boom and bust," of exploitation of little people.

Peanuts are a basic commodity in about eight States in this country. I ask you in simple justice to put back into this legislation a segment of American agriculture which more than any other that I know of depends upon the progressive farm legislation that has been passed in this House during the last 20 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma wants to see the peanut grower get the same quality of treatment as the beet-sugar growers in this country. I support the sugar-beet growers of this Nation, and I suggest peanut growers be given at least a small measure of their protection.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Speaking of a lobby, does the gentleman feel that businessmen who hold meetings and discuss their problems should not have that right? Does that make them a lobby?

Mr. ALBERT. No; I did not say that.

Mr. VURSELL. And if you want to get into lobbying, has there ever been a better lobby than the peanut lobby? How long does it take to get from Georgia up here for a night meeting? Many times they have come here for hurry-up night lobby urgent meetings.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman knows I was not criticizing any lobby. I was merely pointing out what happened.

Mr. VURSELL. Does the gentleman contend that the great candy business of this country has not the right to be heard?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield no further.

The gentleman knows I was not criticizing any industry. All Americans have a right to be heard. We want peanut end users to make a profit, but we do not want them to make exorbitant profits at the expense of the very livelihood of the people we represent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I wanted to point out a moment ago that the gentlemen for whom the gentleman from Illinois was concerned are not going to get a thing in the world, if the effort of the gentleman from Indiana is finally consummated because the only purpose of adopting the amendment yesterday was to defeat this bill. If they succeed in tying on undesirable amendments they put many Members in the position where they must vote against the bill and defeat the bill. Then what have they done to the gentlemen now in the gallery representing the candy industry? Actually they will not have done a thing for the candy manufacturers. All they will have done will be to defeat H. R. 12, and that is about all that three-fourths of those who voted for the peanut amendment wanted to do.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. Somebody said yesterday they will give them the candy today and take it away from them tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand from a quotation in the newspapers that the chairman of a committee in the other branch, which I am not able to refer to, states that this bill is not going to be considered this year. Where do you go if you pass this bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts is a very distinguished and an alert gentleman. He knows this body has its own responsibilities. The gentleman, I am sure, will agree that we should not look to any other body or anywhere else in the discharge of our duties.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is bringing up the question of the other side and I thought we ought to have the record very straight on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Being anxious to get that peanut amendment back, will the gentleman advise the committee as to why we adjourned yesterday at half past 3 to come in this morning at 10 o'clock? What was the purpose of the adjournment last night?

Mr. ALBERT. I did not make the motion to adjourn and I was not consulted about it, I may advise the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman from Utah is correct that this price-support business will go bust simply because the people will find out what is happening to them. I think it might be interesting for you to know where this price-support money goes.

There may be some room for argument as to how much the price support and Government purchase programs have cost the taxpayer and there may be some little inaccuracy in determining where the tax money supporting the programs goes. But I am sure that all of you, who are interested in schemes for redistributing the wealth of the country, will be interested in considering the statement of the Commodity Stabilization Service giving the State by State distribution of loans made on 1952 crops, together with the statement of the Internal Revenue Service showing the State by State payment of Federal taxes.

As you know, the State of New York pays the most—amounting to 18.6 percent of the total for the Nation. New York State pays 20 times the Federal taxes paid by Kansas. But Kansas gets 154 times as much of this loan money. New York pays 20 times as much Federal tax as Iowa. But Iowa gets 100 times as much as New York State in the distribution of these loans. New York State pays 8 times the Federal taxes that North Carolina pays. But North Caroline gets 58 times as much of this loan money as does the State of New York.

Texas, with all of its oil millionaires, pays less than half as much Federal taxes as is paid by Pennsylvania; but in the distribution of this Government bounty, Texas collects 75 times as much as Pennsylvania.

Minnesota pays just about half the Federal taxes paid by New Jersey, but, in price-support loans, gets over 90 times as much as New Jersey.

Mississippi has some ardent advocates of rigid supports, but you cannot blame them. Mississippi pays only one-fourteenth as much as Maryland in Federal taxes; but Mississippi takes 20 times as big a piece of this pie as Maryland. North Carolina pays less than one-third of the taxes that Pennsylvania does but gets 75 times as much of this price-support money.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to point out the special interests of the various geographical sections of the country, because I believe this House is entirely too much inclined to vote on a sectional basis. But, if ever there comes a time when Congressmen should be aware of the interests of their own districts in a piece of legislation, it is now, during the consideration of this bill.

Another example will emphasize the point. Delaware pays 12 times as much taxes as North Dakota and 11 times as much as South Dakota, but in distributing that part of the tax money which supports the farm price-support program North Dakota gets 80 times as much as Delaware and South Dakota gets almost 60 times as much as Delaware. This is redistribution of wealth on a grand scale.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask the Chairman how much time the members of the committee have had not only in the 4 hours of general debate but on the pro forma and other amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, right smart amount.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose in the minds of some of my colleagues that might call for an apology, because I am a member of the committee. But, I am not going to apologize.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is one point that we ought to emphasize here that has not been emphasized to the extent that it should, and that point is What are we going to do with the little farmer? Now, I admit that the great agricultural programs under which we have been operating have not worked to the extent that I would like to see them work to help the little farmer, but what plan has been offered to us to aid us better to keep 115,000 laborers who are leaving our small farms each year to go into the cities because they are having an increasingly difficult time to make a living on the farm? Mr. Chairman, in addition to these 115,000 people who are leaving the farms every year, there are about 20,000 to 30,000 more from the little towns who are dependent for their very lives on these farmers. They are joining this large force, and they are creating in our cities a problem that we are going to have to face sooner or later.

Now, the gentleman who just preceded me talked about the cost to the great State of New York for this farm program. I would like to remind him that during the past 10 years we have paid out in unemployment compensation over $2 billion, and I want to suggest to the gentleman that I think the taxpayers of New York will be saving money if they can help us in this farm program devise a better way to keep our little farmers on the farm and not cause them to have to go to the great cities of our country where you know now we are suffering in certain areas the great problem of unemployment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I cannot fail to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a little one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now when your folks are driven off the farms and go to the cities to get jobs, do they not then have to pay Walter Reuther or the other organization for the privilege of working?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know the answer to that question, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, they do. I know it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I just do not know it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But I know one thing. You will agree with me when I say that the problem of unemployment is one of the big problems we have to continue to try to face.

I have checked the President's program as carefully as I can, and he has given us now some ideas about how to help the little farmer, but I tell you I cannot see one thing that is a bit different from what we have been trying to do. The great problem of the little farmer is to find a market for his goods. How better can you help him find a market than by reason of this parity program that has been worked out painstakingly throughout the years, and if there be some defect in it, I think the responsibility lies upon the Members of Congress to improve the program rather than take away from the little farmer the markets that he has.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the committee approved an amendment that did away with the peanut program. I have some small farmers in my district who plant peanuts and I tell you it will ruin the economy, I think, of at least 1 or 2 counties in the 8th District of Florida.

Someone has criticised a previous Secretary for plowing under little pigs. I say to you, not in a moment of passion, but with all the sincerity I possess that I think it is far better to plow under little pigs than it is to plow under little farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that if anyone can offer any program that is fairer to the consumer, that is fairer to the farmers, that is fairer to the taxpayers, than this program that we have proceeded upon and the principles of which are elaborated upon in H. R. 12, I want to follow that program. I am not wedded to any particular program to help this great problem of agriculture, but I say to you that I think this program, the one we now have, is the best one that I see in the offing and I am going to continue to vote for the plan that I think is the only plan that I see to help the little farmer.

It is a tremendous problem and I hope during this debate we do not forget the plight of the little farmer.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. There are many of us whom the gentleman has convinced. We want to help the little farmer, too. But how can we in the cities help the little farmer and yet not give a killing to these big corporation-type farms? There are two kinds of farmers, one the little household type of farm we want to protect. But when you put these prices

away up and lay up all these surpluses, you finally come to the point where you have to ask, What are you going to do with the surpluses?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman has suggested a very important question. I think there are a number of answers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who, I am sure, has the answers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire whether the gentleman proposes to yield to other members of the committee who have already had, as the chairman has suggested, right smart time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I did not ask for the extra time but I shall yield to him, if he will stand up and ask me to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Florida be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] that we are dealing here only with the producers of basic agricultural commodities which are not grown in any abundance in the gentleman's State. The gentleman asks what we are trying to do to bring supplies in line with reasonable consumer demand. We are reducing acreage drastically in wheat and cotton and in these other commodities. Mr. Benson himself did not ask for a decrease in peanuts. He asked, yesterday morning, for an increase of 7.5 percent. Tomorrow morning he may ask for another 7.5 percent. The peanut farmers are eager to supply the market adequately. If you take away from Mr. Benson his control over acreage allotments and marketing quotas and price supports, I do not know what would happen to the peanut farmers.

Mr. Eisenhower, if I may say so, in his message, certainly did not recommend any change in the peanut law. Neither did Mr. Benson.

Why should Congress now take away from this law which is on the books the protection afforded and break faith with the peanut farmers and make it difficult for Mr. Benson to carry out his part of the bargain?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It does make me feel bad when I hear these statements that we are taking something away from the small farmer. What I think these gentlemen ought to do is to come up to Pittsburgh and get Ben Fairless and Dave McDonald and have them organize these small farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. All peanut farmers are small farmers. I have more small farmers in North Carolina than there are in any other State in the Union. I do not want to see them plowed under.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. We also are concerned about our small wheat farmers who are being forced off the farm, because acreage allotments are a necessary evil of higher price supports. But if I understood this same committee correctly, when we were talking about increasing the small cotton-acreage allotment and the small rice-acreage allotment, it was argued by the same people at that time that we had to increase those acreages to prevent this movement off the farm.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of course, that helped just a very small amount, I personally think the program has been a very good program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MUST THE FARMERS GET SLAPPED DOWN AGAIN?—IF WE MUST HAVE FLEXIBLE PARITY, HOW ABOUT FLEXIBLE EXPENSES?

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me everybody in Congress and most folks over the country agree that the farmer is in pretty bad shape. He is really in trouble. Since 1951, his net income has declined 28 percent. His costs are up 14 percent. How serious the situation is for agriculture is reflected in the decline of 34 percent in income taxes paid last year by the farmers. Over the Nation, business is on the upstream. The United States is enjoying the greatest peacetime prosperity ever known. Production is up. Income is up. That is, it is up for everybody but the farmer.

A recent survey of 20 occupations found all in a better position than last year, and with the prospect of a still better income for next year. For the farmer the situation is reversed. If flexible parity is maintained, he can be certain that his income for next year will be down to an alarmingly low level. No one objects to good times; to a sustained high level of business; prosperity for the country. But the farmer should share it.

And while Congress is debating the issue of flexible parity with the further decline of farm income, they are certain one of the next proposals will be a minimum-wage law for labor. Increases in postal pay and Congressional pay have been passed. And still there are those who want the farmer to take a worse beating than he has suffered and go for flexible parity. Excessive surpluses are held responsible for the present situation. But these surpluses could be wiped out by another drought—another national emergency and in a short time. The surpluses followed demands made on farmers during wartime when they were asked to expand; to increase their production. They did respond marvelously with the food and fiber that meant victory; food that kept a good part of the world in fighting trim. Because of that response, they find themselves down toward the bottom of the economic ladder while the rest of the country enjoys prosperity.

Better income for the farmer does not mean higher cost to the consumer. Two members of the Committee on Agriculture purchased on the open market 12 articles processed from the 6 basic commodities. The cost was $5.31; the farmer's share of this $5.31 was 79 cents. The balance of the retail cost was for processing, handling, and marketing. A loaf of bread sells at an averge price of 17 cents—the farmer gets 2½ cents for the wheat that is in that loaf of bread. Less than 30 cents represents the cost of the cotton in a $3.95 shirt.

Opponents of 90 percent of parity complain about the excessive cost of the price-support program. All of the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the conservation program, and the other help to agriculture for the period 1932 to 1954 total $8,469,200,000. It seems like a vast amount of money would be spent to maintain our farm markets. But it is small compared to the payments that have been made to industry and business over the same period. No one was alarmed over a 10-year postal deficit of over $4,300,000,000. Merchant marine subsidies total more than $100 million a year; airline subsidies $80 million a year. Industry was paid $14 billion to convert to wartime production, and another $40 billion to change back to peacetime production. Yet this item of cost has been one of the chief complaints against the maintenance of a program that means some stability for the man that feeds us.

Industrial production can be speeded up or slowed down according to the demands of the market. Farmers accepted restrictions and controls, but still the surpluses mount. Acreage reductions have come to the point where if there was a 100 percent of parity the farmer would be hardpressed to meet the economic pressures of the price operation. Perhaps we will never accomplish complete farm stability through legislation, but if we do not make the effort to put the farmer in a wholesome economic relation with the other segments of American life we are asking for trouble for the Nation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, in my congressional district 3 of the 5 counties are farming counties. In these 3 counties are 180,000 people.

The overwhelming majority of the farmers in these counties are for the flexible parity program and oppose a return to rigid parity.

Many hearts have bled on the House floor seeking support for the rigid par-

ity program as a help to the small farmer, the little farmer.

The farmers in my district are small farmers, a great many operating family farms. It is my impression that the big farmer with thousands of acres in his farm profits by rigid parity and seeks its return.

It has been amusing to listen to the debate today and yesterday and hear the name of our fine Secretary of Agriculture continually used by the rigid parity advocates in an effort to defeat the peanut amendment. It is realistic to say that when it comes to final passage no rigid parity advocate will be called upon to follow the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture for continuance of the flexible parity program.

The New Jersey Farm Bureau and the American Farm Bureau with 1,600,000 farm members are opposed to this bill.

I will vote against this bill in the interest of the consumer, the farmer, and for the national welfare. Rigid parity can only lead to continuation of our staggering surpluses.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from a consumer district, but from an agriculture-producing State I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 12 as submitted to us by the House Agriculture Committee which provides for a rigid 90 percent of parity on staple farm products. Under this policy tremendous surpluses pile up and Government subsidy continues to grow and increase which bring about the difficult and costly problems of storage and disposal problems of surpluses which the taxpayers of this Nation have been burdened with for years.

This 90 percent rigid parity program also requires control of acreage for planting of these staple crops, thus putting the farmers and ranchers under control of the Federal Government. This rigid 90 percent of parity also is driving the farm production into socialism and creating a demand by those farmers who do not produce basic crops that they also be subsidized because of the effect that 90 percent rigid parity has upon them.

It is also causing some industrial producers to demand that they are entitled to some consideration for subsidy from the Government the same as agricultural producers.

This is not a healthy condition and could lead to the nationalization of agriculture and industry which proved so unsuccessful in Great Britain.

I believe the program for reducing parity advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Benson is the proper course to follow. Under his plan the farmer will be free of Federal control, surpluses will be reduced and made far less costly, and food prices will be reduced and stabilized.

I favor the flexible parity price-support program for basic crops provided for in the Agricultural Act of 1954. I do not want to see the program repealed which H. R. 12 would do.

I think we should allow the flexible-price program to operate long enough to prove its full worth.

This flexible-parity program will:

Reverse the present recession in agriculture; prevent a possible breakdown of major operation of the small-farm program; avoid unemployment among workers in cities and the damaging effect on the whole economy that would result from continuing economic distress on farms; assure continued abundance of food and fiber for the Nation, at fair prices to consumers, and meet the needs of national defense and maintain a level of income in agriculture that will enable farmers to conserve and improve the soil, which is our most basic and indispensable natural resource.

Because I believe H. R. 12, providing for 90 percent of parity will not do these things which, in my opinion, are essential to the agricultural economy of the Nation, I will vote to recommit this bill and, if this fails, I shall vote against the passage of H. R. 12.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, the grave and urgent need for an absolute minimum of 90 percent of parity on basic farm commodities may be conclusively demonstrated by a recital of a few indisputable facts. I emphasize "facts" as distinct from theories or wishful thinking.

Ninety percent of parity is not only essential for the survival of our farmers. It is mandatory to prevent a general collapse of our economy.

First, let me cite a tragic paradox of the policy of the present administration. The President has already recommended an increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to 90 cents as a means "to increase consumer buying power."

Simultaneously, or rather earlier, the administration demanded and received a reduction in the parity price of farm commodities, which directly and effectively cut the purchasing power of millions of Americans who earn their livelihoods on farms.

The National Planning Association has already predicted a rise in unemployment this year unless "Government and industry act to increase consumer buying power and industrial production."

On the record the administration is seeking to raise the purchasing power of industrial workers, but at one and the same time it has effectively, and I may say, tragically, slashed the purchasing power of the American farmer by reducing parity on basic commodities.

I submit that the administration is pursuing a fantastic policy in seeking to increase consumer purchasing power, while at the same time it is reducing farm income below a bare subsistence level.

Now what about parity? I submit that the metropolitan press, propagandists for special interest and, I must add, high officials of this administration have perpetrated the falsehood that full parity means extravagantly rich farmers. That full parity means city people pay exorbitant prices for necessities of life while the farmers are riding around in high-priced automobiles enjoying their subsidized gains.

Gentlemen, this picture is untrue. But do not take my word for this. Let us look at the cold, hard facts.

In 1949 basic farm prices stood at 99 percent of parity. Not 90 percent but 99 percent. Now did the farmers of this Nation bask in the radiant sunshine of fabulous prosperity in 1949?

In 1949, the year of 99 percent parity, the average net income of farm people was only one-half that of nonfarm Americans.

But let us not judge this critical situation by one year alone. Let us take a look at 1951. In that year the average of basic farm prices was 107 percent of parity. Not 90 percent; not 95 percent; not 99 percent, but 107 percent of parity.

Surely, with basic farm products at 107 percent, the farmers should have been driving high-powered convertibles and looking at television on golden screens.

But what was the case? What were the facts?

In 1951, with parity at 107 percent, the average net income of farm workers reached the astounding peak of $1,718 for 12 months works. This amounts to almost exactly $33 a week. And remember, this annual earned income of $1,718 was when the prices were 107 percent of parity.

Now what was the comparative earnings of industrial workers in that year of 1951? Gentlemen, when the farmworker made $33 a week, with parity at 107 percent, his city cousin, working in industry, averaged $3,416 a year. The industrial worker made about $66 a week to the farmworkers' $33.

This bill is designed to establish parity at 90 percent. But I am sensitive to the fact that if this legislation is reported out and enacted into law, it will only provide the farmer a bare subsistence.

Authoritative estimates of 1955 income for workers in 20 different categories show that the income for this year for workers in 19 occupations is expected to be more than in 1954. The one category in which 1955 income is expected to go down is farming.

Let me emphasize, gentlemen, that we do not propose to reward inefficient farming operations. The farmer has lost none of his energy or industry. In fact, fewer farmers are producing more agricultural commodities than ever before in our history.

In 1910, 1 farmer produced only enough for himself and 6 others. In 1953, 1 farmer produced enough for himself and 17 additional individuals. Listen to this: In 1910 it required 35 Americans out of each 100 to produce crops and livestock to feed and clothe America. In 1930 only 25 Americans were required to produce needed crops and livestock; in 1945 only 18 were needed; and in 1954, only 14 Americans out of every 100 were needed to produce the crops we require.

These simple figures demonstrate graphically how the American farmer has increased his productive efficiency through the years. We hear a great deal about increased industrial efficiency, but I say to you that the increase in farming efficiency is no less dramatic.

The farmers' plight is admittedly bad. These 1955 estimates demonstrate conclusively that it is going to get worse.

I am attempting to get legislation enacted which will guarantee 90 percent of parity now. This will not solve the problem, but it may avert a disaster. Let me remind you that less than one-half of the farm homes of this, the most prosperous Nation in the world, have running water.

It is appalling to me that this effort to obtain 90-percent parity for our farmers encounters such relentless opposition from the Republican administration.

It seems to me that the Republican membership of the House might be concerned with living up to their party's campaign pledges, even though the executive branch of the Government has so brazenly abandoned its 1952 position:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

You recognize these words, I am sure, as those uttered by Candidate Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952. That was when the present occupant of the White House was seeking the votes of the farmers.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are not wooing the farmers for their votes. We are trying to enact legislation that will assure them a bare subsistence for themselves and their families.

Where is that bright promise to the farmers in 1952?

Like so many brash promises made by Candidate Eisenhower, it has been repudiated. And the farmers whom he pledged so glibly to help are now being faced with hardship and ruin because the Republicans have not kept their promise.

This measure to assure 90 percent of parity is not an administration bill that we on our side are supporting to help out the administration as we did on the Formosan question; as we did on reciprocal trade; as we have done so often.

No, Mr. Chairman, this is a Democratic measure, reported out by a Democratic committee majority. But it had to be a Democratic measure because the Republican Party has so shamelessly abandoned the pledges of its candidate in 1952; and I might add the pledge of the Republican Party.

The Members of this side of the aisle have helped this administration enact its program time after time. Now, I invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to help us Democrats write into law a solemn pledge that your candidate made in 1952.

I urge you that 90 percent of parity is absolutely essential to the continued survival of our farmers.

Despite the words of the Secretary of Agriculture; and reassurances of the bankers who have so loud a voice in agriculture policy, I know of my own experience; of my own contact with the farmers in my district that they face a desperate plight.

High stock prices on the exchange on Wall Street may mean prosperity to the inner circle of advisors to the President. High stock prices may mean millions to those who are so fortunate as to have a large holding of stock in the corporations of America.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that high stock prices and other indices mean nothing to the farmer who is being ground between high fertilizer, seed and feed prices on the one hand, and constantly declining prices for his products on the other.

Only recently, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report sounded a warning that lowered farm income presented, perhaps, the gravest threat to the Nation's economic prosperity. I say that, to a degree, we can here and now diminish that threat by enacting this legislation to assure prices at 90 percent of parity.

Need I remind you, gentlemen, that we are not discussing any small segment of the American economy?

Does not the specter of depression haunt you when you consider what has happened in the past when farm prices collapsed?

Never has the American economy been able to sustain itself without a healthy agriculture. The farmers of this Nation were suffering acutely long before the stock market crash of 1929 sent the Nation into an economic tailspin that imperiled its very existence.

This is no dole that we are asking for the American farmer. This is a subsistence price for the products of his enterprise; a bare subsistence price, I may add.

It is distressing to find so little understanding of the nature of price supports. Our manufacturers have the protection of tariff, historically. In fact, the second piece of business considered by the First Congress of the United States was concerned with protection for the infant Nation's industries.

Our great population of industrial workers have laws to protect them against unfair practices, and minimum-wage laws to assure them a fair return for their labor.

This Nation's investing public has the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect it from the conscienceless schemes of irresponsible promoters.

Our merchant shippers are provided with subsidies to enable them to compete with foreign fleets, which pay lower wages and otherwise hold an unfair advantage over domestic lines. We all know how the Government pays a portion of the costs of airline operation to offset disadvantages that confront them because of complex competitive factors.

I shall not even attempt to enumerate the advantages granted by the Congress to great business enterprises which are, for various reasons, given rapid tax writeoffs that run into the millions.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on. I do not contend that these special subsidies, these Government-granted advantages are evil. I think in many instances they are essential to our defense needs and the effective functioning of our free economy.

But I do ask, in all sincerity, why is the farmer picked out for criticism and ridicule when an attempt is made to gain for him a price support that will keep him in business?

In this matter of subsidies and aids to special groups of our citizens, I would, Mr. Chairman, like to invite your attention to some recent history.

For the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, Government spending for "Current expenses for aids and special services," as reported by the Bureau of the Budget, are as follows:

For agriculture, $3,773,000,000.
For business, $5,873,000,000.
For labor, $1,435,000,000.
For veterans, $32,678,000,000.
For general aid, $9,880,000,000.

It is evident from these figures that the farm program is not out of line with other expenditures of the Government for aids and services to other groups.

Federal aids and special services include such items as the postal deficit, subsidies to the merchant marine, and airlines; defense production expenses. However, tax writeoffs are not included in these figures.

We have all read in the metropolitan press and had dinned into our ears by administration farm orators that 90 percent of parity means that farmers will price themselves out of the market. Mr. Chairman, this just is not so.

Let us examine what parity means in terms of the price of the finished products that are purchased by you and me and our families and the millions of other American consumers.

The goal of the administration, heedless of Mr. Eisenhower's 1952 pledges, seems to be 75 percent of parity as against 90 percent of parity. Now, as regards the consumer, what is the difference? We know that this 15 in parity support means the difference between subsistence for the farmer, and bankruptcy. Now what does it mean to the consumer?

Ninety percent of parity as distinct from 75 percent of parity means 4 cents more on the cost of a $3 shirt. If the parity were reduced to 75 percent it would mean a maximum difference of 5 cents on a $5 cotton house dress.

Do you know any man or woman who is going to be deterred from buying a shirt or a dress by a difference or 4 or 5 cents? And the consumer would receive this minute saving only if the entire cut of 5 cents per pound on the price of cotton were passed on to the buyer.

The farm value of wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread, at 90 percent of parity—1953—was 2½ cents. This 1-pound loaf of bread was sold for a little less than 17 cents. The cut in price to the consumer if wheat supports were lowered would be much less than 1 cent. Wheat prices would have to be reduced by 80 cents a bushel to save the consumer 1 cent on the price of a loaf of bread.

All right, now what is the support price on tobacco? Do you know that the farmer's share of the price of a package of cigarettes is 3⅓ cents? When you pay 20 or 25 cents for a pack of cigarettes the farmer gets just over 3 cents as his pay for producing the tobacco.

To save the smoker 1 cent a package of cigarettes the selling price of tobacco would have to be cut 15 cents a pound. Even Secretary Benson does not openly advocate so drastic a cut.

The point I am making is that to cut parity on tobacco down to 75 percent will not save the consumer 1 red cent on the price of the finished product. Its only result will be the complete bankruptcy of tobacco farmers.

If low farm prices mean prosperity, as this administration seems to contend by its action, then I only have to remind you of the condition of our economy back in the days of the Hoover administration. Hogs sold for less than 6 cents a pound. Cotton was slightly more than 5 cents a pound. Tobacco was less than 9 cents a pound. Wheat brought the farmer as little as 39 cents a bushel, and corn sold for 32 cents a bushel.

If low farm prices mean general prosperity, then we should have been rolling in money in 1931 and 1932. But you know how near catastrophe we were in those dark days. Every segment of the economy was in a desperate condition, farmers included.

Farm prices have been going down ever since this administration took office. Unemployment is far above the norm for the level of our industrial production. One important reason for this is that the farmer today cannot buy the things he needs because he is not getting a living price for his products.

The high prices of shares on the New York Stock Exchange may mean new levels of prosperity for the millionaires who compose the Cabinet of President Eisenhower; but the low price of the basic commodities means hardship, destitution, despair, and foreclosure on millions of farms the length and breadth of this land.

Mr. Chairman, I implore the membership on both sides of this aisle to act now to redeem the promises of their parties, to strengthen the sinews of our Nation against the inroads of economic distress and devastation. With all the sincerity of which I am capable, I urge you here and now to vote for a mandatory price of 90 percent of parity for our basic farm commodities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 12, is a measure that is deserving of more support than it is receiving.

I do not think there is a single Member on the floor here today but who should be aware of the vital role which we are being called upon to play with regard to the farmers' present and future welfare and wellbeing.

It is certainly a most serious matter and our task would be immeasurably easier if there were, among the farmers themselves, more unanimity of opinion as to the course we should take for the greatest benefit to them as well as to the overall economy of our Nation.

For that reason, the bipartisan approach to this measure, H. R. 12, which was demonstrated to a great degree by the Committee on Agriculture is most commendable. The welfare of the farmer is deserving of every cooperative effort that is possible and should be approached and considered in that light.

As we know, there are certain of our agriculture and farm organization leaders who feel that a sliding scale of price supports, which was enacted into law in the previous session of Congress, should be continued. There are, on the other hand, a great segment of the farming community—a great many individual farmers of the Nation—who do not see in this system the solution to the problems of declining prices and lowered farm income.

Farm prices are down, as we all recognize. Farm income has declined approximately $1½ billion during the past year and this decline threatens to continue unless we do something to forestall it—to reverse the trend.

We may say that the agriculture economy of the Nation is in a recognized depression—the lower farm income is no myth but is a real and alarming reality.

The committee statistics and others show that since 1951 the average of farm prices has dropped 22 percent, while operating costs have remained high—near the record high. This drop, as we know, has occurred at a time when consumer prices have also remained high.

Other segments of our economy have prospered while the farmers of the Nation have been experiencing drought and depression. Their income is down—while they are required to pay high prices for farm machinery and the things they must buy.

Those are the facts—the question is how to stop this disturbing trend and restore agriculture prosperity before the drop increases further.

Certainly, I am most deeply concerned and want to take any action to bolster the weakening financial position of our farm economy—most particularly in the tobacco and dairy fields so closely tied in with the economy of the district which I represent—the Fourth District of Tennessee.

Therefore, I cannot see that any harm can be done—but only good—by raising the level of price supports from 82½ to 90 percent of parity on basic commodities. Certainly, no harm can come from continuing the present level for tobacco and by increasing the dairy products support level from 75 to 80 percent, and the great probability is that conditions would be improved by a return to the higher support level.

The problem of surpluses, it seems to me, is not now as pressing nor as critical as heretofore. The Secretary of Agriculture has indicated that surpluses are moving—that we are sending abroad increasing quantities of our surplus commodities and otherwise disposing of the excess which some have indicated as responsible for the depressed farm outlook.

The problem of surpluses is further relieved in the light of drought conditions and in the crop destruction following in the wake of the recent disastrous freeze in Southern agricultural region. In effect, we may soon look upon the stored staple commodities as something of an advantage in the light of the drought and freeze conditions.

So it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that a return to the higher support level cannot be denied on the grounds of depressing surpluses—a return to higher supports seems to be the answer to the great problem of depressed prices and lowered farm income and I shall certainly support the effort being made here today to give to American agriculture increased support for our basic agriculture commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I also briefly wish to indicate my very great support and approval of the proposal for the allocation of certain commodities in ample supply to the school-lunch program. This program is recognized as one of the most beneficial programs conducted by the Federal Government in cooperation with the State authority—its results are twofold: it benefits the school child and also puts to good use commodities in storage or in surplus and thus avoids waste and loss.

I hope this feature of the bill also will receive approval along with the economy-bolstering features of higher price supports for American agriculture.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against H. R. 12 because I feel that a return to rigid 90 percent of parity price supports is not the answer to the problems of our Nation's farmers. I do not contend that the present flexible supports will solve the tremendous problem of surplus agricultural commodities or provide the necessary stimulation to the purchasing power of the average farm family.

But the real answer to the farm problem goes beyond the scope of this debate on the level of price supports. High, intermediate, flexible, sliding, or any other type of price supports is not the ultimate solution.

We have seen that huge farm surpluses continue to mount regardless of the support level, and this comes at a time when unemployment and part-time work forces millions of American families to reduce their standards of living.

Meanwhile, farm income continues to decline. Farm families find that they can afford to buy less and less of the manufactured goods which are produced by the workers in industrial centers of this country. This results in the accumulation of bigger inventories of goods which farm people cannot buy and the eventual outcome is more unemployment in the cities. This vicious cycle works a hardship on both farmers and their city brothers.

The common denominator of both the unemployed worker and the farmer with inadequate income from his crops is the lack of real purchasing power which would enable both groups to buy the goods and services which all Americans need to maintain a decent standard of living.

There is no magic price-support formula which will guarantee farmers the prosperity which they seek just as no amount of unemployment compensation can provide a suitable substitute for steady work for the man in the factory.

The real answer lies in an affirmative program to restore full employment opportunities to the people of this Nation. We must enact measures to increase the purchasing power in the hands of the underprivileged segments of our population. Their increased demand for goods and services which they so badly need,

will in turn, reduce our surpluses of manufactured goods and put more people back to work.

A dynamic, expanding, full-employment economy is the only complete answer to the needs of the farmer as well as to other hard-pressed people in our Nation. We live under a complex, interdependent economic system. We cannot increase the prosperity of one group as if it were in a vacuum, having no relationship to the rest of the economy. We must act for the best interests of all groups by providing measures to boost consumer buying power. Such measures would necessarily include an increase in expenditures for public works, tax relief for the average citizen, a school- and hospital-construction program, an adequate increase in the minimum wage, a broad public-housing and slum-clearance program, more adequate social-security benefits, and other similar programs.

Mr. Chairman, only by the adoption of this type of realistic program which goes to the roots of the situation, can we find the eventual solution to the farm problem and the unemployment problem as well.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H. R. 12, not because it provides a long-term solution to the problem of maintaining farm income, but because it can help prevent a further decline in farm income while the Congress goes on, as I hope it will, to enact a comprehensive farm bill. Such a bill would serve the broad purposes of encouraging consumption of food and fiber by lower prices, maintaining the income of the family-sized farmer who practices soil conservation, and avoiding the creation of unwieldy surpluses.

The elements of a sound farm program are suggested in the supplemental report of Senators DOUGLAS, SPARKMAN, and O'MAHONEY, and Representatives PATMAN, BOLLING, MILLS, and KELLEY, contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, filed on March 10, 1955. It was there recommended to the appropriate legislative committee that effort be directed toward the drafting of farm legislation in the following direction:

> The basic purpose of agricultural supports is the protection of farm income. It seems desirable to move in the direction of permitting farm prices to reflect the supply-demand situtions in the market while at the same time moving to institute a system of farm-income protection which would protect the family-size farm and the small farms of our country by a system of income payments made whenever declining farm prices threaten an inequitable reduction in the standards of living of these farm families. The large, wealthy farms, or corporate farms, do not have the same pressing claim upon the Government's protection. Consideration might be given, therefore, to putting some ceiling on Government benefits per farm. This ceiling should be high enough to protect the standard of living earned by farm families by their own efforts, but not high enough to guarantee the total incomes of large farms able to stand market fluctuations (Rept. p. 34).

We cannot have an expanding economy of abundance for the 86½ percent of our population who live off the farm if the 13½ percent of our population who live on the farm exist at a depressed level. Industrial workers are well aware of the value of the farm market for the products of their hands. They know that workers and farmers are consumers of each other's goods, and that what harms one harms the other.

Before we abandon the partial protection of parity-price supports contained in H. R. 12, we should have ready for action a farm program, based on the recommendations of the above members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, that will truly assure an adequate income to the family farmers of this Nation.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the House, if America is to continue to grow and develop as a great Nation, we must do something to make it possible for our small farmer to remain on the land. The little farmer is more discouraged today than ever before in the history of our country. Successful farming is a skilled enterprise. Into such an operation a farmer puts capital, labor, natural resources, management and then is dependent upon weather. The farmer, as of today, has to pay more for fertilizer, labor, machinery, land, upkeep of property, than ever before in the history of our country. Yet he is getting less and less for the products he has to sell. He has been leaving the rural areas in recent years by the thousands and even millions. Where is he to go? In the large cities there is unemployment, lack of housing and juvenile delinquency. If we are to have a sound economy and a stable citizenship we must help our farmers to remain on the land. We have helped labor by doing away with child labor and by passing minimum wage laws. We have helped big business by Government contracts, interest rates and loans. We have helped small business by antitrust laws, RFC, and the Small Business Administration. We have helped countries all over the world by foreign aid.

Everything the farmer buys has gone up while everything he sells is going down. If this trend continues some day America will be in a great national emergency and there will not be enough farmers on the land to raise food and fiber. Tragic consequences may result. We can construct a bomb plant in a matter of weeks. We can build ammunition arsenals in a short while, but it takes years to make farmers out of people who have never farmed before.

This bill providing for 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities today might well prevent disaster tomorrow. I am only asking the same consideration for our small farmers that we have already given to other segments of our economy.

Our farming population has always been the backbone and foundation of our strength as a Republic. Our farmers are not asking for a handout or asking for something for nothing. They are only asking for an opportunity to survive. How can our small farmers sell in an open market when everything else is Government manipulated. Let's stand up today and give our farmers the same break we give others. He is only asking for an opportunity to work, sweat, and enjoy a fair return for his labors. The farmer is already in the midst of a severe depression. He does not want to flood the overcrowded cities of our country today. He only wants to remain on the farm and play his proper role in the advancement of America. He will succeed by his own efforts if we only give him an equal chance with capital, labor and our foreign friends. We can help do that today by passing this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that no amendments are pending.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I intend to present.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not interfering with the gentleman's proposed amendment.

I would like further, Mr. Chairman, at this time, to offer a committee amendment. I may say that the House Committee on Agriculture authorized and directed me by an almost unanimous vote to offer this amendment at this time. This has to do with section 2, dealing with the two-price system on wheat. I may say that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is the author of section 2, offered the motion in the committee to remove this section, and I suggest the Chair recognize the gentleman from Kansas to explain the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state to the gentleman from North Carolina that the committee amendment to the bill has not yet been reported. As the Chair understands, the gentleman's amendment is to the committee amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. It is a motion to strike out part of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will at this time report the committee amendment in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: "Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates"; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: "Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions and Appropriations"; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:
>
> "SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES
>
> *"Legislative findings*
>
> "SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate

commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"Domestic food quota

"SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"Apportionment of domestic food quota

"SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"Marketing certificates

"SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"Marketing restrictions

"SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"(e) as used in section 380e of this title the term 'marketing' means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"Conversion factors

"SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"Civil penalties

"SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"Adjustments in domestic food quotas

"SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case maye be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 380d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act.

"Reports and records

"SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"Referendum

"SEC. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1956 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and a marketing certificate program shall be in effect for the 1956 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle and marketing quotas and acreage

allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B.

"Price support

"SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas) may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor."

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For the period September 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, not to exceed $50 million, and for the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1957, not to exceed $75 million annually, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used exclusively to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under."

SEC. 5. Section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"As a means of stabilizing the dairy industry and further suppressing and eradicating brucellosis in cattle the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer not to exceed $15 million for each of the 2 fiscal years ending in 1957 and 1958, from funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to the funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for such fiscal years for the purpose of accelerating the brucellosis eradication program, for the purpose of increasing to not to exceed $50 per head of cattle the amount of the indemnities paid by the Federal Government for cattle destroyed because of brucellosis in connection with cooperative control and eradication programs for such disease in cattle entered into by the Secretary under the authority of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, for the purpose of increasing the number of such indemnities, and for the purpose of defraying any additional administrative expenses in connection therewith. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures pursuant to this section."

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as having been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman now desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out all of section 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 9, strike out all of section 2, beginning on page 1, line 9 and extending through line 5 on page 12; and renumber the sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that section 2 as contained in the bill was an amendment offered by myself in the committee and accepted by the committee. It provides for the so-called certificate plan of price supports for wheat.

After the amendment was adopted in the committee, some of those who are supporting the proposal felt it would be better if this provision were contained in a separate bill. In view of that fact, at a subsequent meeting of the committee I offered a motion providing that the chairman of the committee be authorized to offer an amendment when the bill came up for consideration to strike from the committee amendment section 2. That is the purpose of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, who is carrying out the instructions of the committee. The motion was adopted by an overwhelming vote in the committee.

I would not want the action of the committee or the action of the House to be considered as passing upon the merits of this provision. It is simply a question of when the matter should be brought up for consideration in the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I inquire whether this has anything to do with the action taken yesterday when the so-called peanut amendment was adopted?

Mr. COOLEY. No. When we appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule on this bill that motion was offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and in the committee I was directed to offer this amendment to remove section 2 from the bill, it being clearly understood that none of us wanted to do anything that would prejudice the idea of a two-price system, which we will consider at some more appropriate time and bring back to the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It has nothing to do with the amendment adopted yesterday with regard to peanuts?

Mr. COOLEY. No. That action was taken even before we knew the peanut amendment would be offered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does this proposed action relate solely to wheat?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] desire to say anything further?

Mr. HOPE. No; I have nothing further to say at this time except, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks just made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, high rigid supports are bad for the farmer, for the consumer, and for the taxpayer. There may be individual exceptions to that broad generalization, as in the case of certain of the large wheat or cotton or tobacco farmers. But by and large a flexible price support system is better for all segments of our economy.

In the first place, we should remember that 140 million Americans do not live on farms. Their principal stake in agriculture is as consumers of food and fiber. This vast majority certainly does not wish to exploit or oppress our farmers, and there has never been any considerable opposition to a fair farm price-support program. But these other taxpayers and consumers certainly have a legitimate interest in the cost of our farm program, and in the problem of keeping it reasonably in balance. They want to see this program employed to move the produce of our farms into channels of trade, not into Government storage.

The consumer, and that includes the farmer and the city dweller alike, is waking up and beginning to realize what the past system of rigid high supports has been doing to him. Every man, woman, and child in this country owns right at this moment over 6 bushels of wheat and 4 bushels of corn, along with a sizeable supply of cotton, wool, dairy products, feed grains, oil seeds, turpentine, rosin, rice, and I do not know what else. His total investment in these consumable food and fiber and forest products is something over $50, or about $200 for every family of 4. Everyday, for upkeep, he contributes a proportionate share of the daily storage costs of approximately a million dollars just to take care of all these things that he does not need and cannot use, though he has paid perfectly good money out for them. This situation is still going to get worse before it gets better. The taxpayers are becoming more and more alert to this situation and are looking to us to put a stop to the practices that have built up these huge mountains of commodities in Government warehouses.

The greatest surpluses, and the items which have been in the most difficulty pricewise, are exactly those to which the 90-percent formula, on stilts supplied by the Government, still applies. It should be obvious that this is precisely the heart of the problem, and that nothing but the

flexible adjustment of parity prices on these varied commodities will give us any relief.

Repeatedly in this debate the decline in farm income has been referred to as if the passage of this legislation might do something to cure that situation. Of course, the fact is that this decline has taken place under the very price support system that this bill seeks to reimpose on us. It is like saying the best way to get over a drunk is to imbibe more of the same.

It is especially significant that the American Farm Bureau Federation and other responsible groups among the farmers themselves have come out strongly in favor of the flexible parity plan. In my own State the New York State Farm Bureau Federation lined itself squarely behind the President on this issue from the outset. Those whose livelihoods depend on agriculture, excepting the privileged few who have been getting direct windfalls from the rigid subsidy program are not sold on being pushed willynilly into this great boondoggle.

For one thing, as the situation grows worse and the surpluses mount higher and higher, the entire price structure for the commodities which are being stored is increasingly undermined. At very least, the politicians who have never been able to see anything but a vote potential in this situation ought to cast an occasional eye at the long-run economic consequences of what they are doing, and specifically at the long-run prospects on the farm market. How can anyone have confidence in the price of wheat, for example, when the United States has enough wheat to feed the Nation for a year held up like a sword of Damocles to blast prices downward out of sight if and when it is released? How can we expect any stability in the foreign market when there is an even more imminent prospect of some or all of our surpluses being dumped at low prices there? Responsible farmers have been continuously pointing out that this great menace to the free market is something that rigid subsidies will not only fail to cure, but will inevitably make worse.

Moreover, there is at present a great inequity as among the crops which are still subject to the inflexible 90 percent support and those which have already been changed over to the flexible basis. It is very creditable to most of the farming community that the pressures of those who are now subject to the flexible plan to go backward to the rigid plan are minimal, whereas most of the racket comes from the producers who are still clinging to the 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I was by no means entirely happy with the Agriculture Act which we passed last year. You will recall that we made many compromises with what seemed then to be the urgent need for parity adjustments. It was half a loaf. But that act has not yet had time to take effect. Even the benefit expected to flow from it will not be fully realized until this year's crops are in. Therefore, under no circumstances ought we to scrap what it was designed to accomplish before it has any sort of trial.

We have fiddled and fooled with this thing while the surpluses continue to pile up on us and the American taxpayer is obliged to take on an ever-heavier burden. It would be folly for us to retreat now to a program that has already proved it is costly and unsuccessful. That would be economic nonsense. I urge full support for the program as proposed by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson to meet this problem.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the beloved Chaplain of the House opened the session of the House yesterday he included the phrase, "We humbly confess our sins, our faults, and our failures." It seemed to me in the process of the past 2 days that most of the debate on this bill has consisted of a discussion of the sins and faults and the failures of two opposing ideas on the farm program—a rigid system or a flexible system. On one side there seems to be a feeling that the rigid system has been responsible for most of our faults and our failures and our sins, if you want to call them that, and on the other side there has been the feeling that the flexible system, where it has been introduced—and let no one forget that it has often been introduced and used in recent years—has accounted for most of our big losses that the Government has registered in past years.

Everyone can agree at this point that it has been demonstrated by both sides that no farm program is perfect, and no one is contending that either program is perfect; but if one basic, fundamental truth has emerged from this debate, it is the truth on which everyone has agreed; a truth declared in the press by the President of the United States, declared by the Committee on Agriculture and many others, it is this: That the farmer, and especially the small farmer of America, is in trouble. He is in economic distress. Something has to be done to help him out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that can be said about H. R. 12 with certainty, it is this, that the effect of H. R. 12 will be to put more money in the pockets of the small farmers of the country at this time when they are in economic distress. When I am in economic distress, the one thing that helps me more than anything else is some cash in my pocket. That is what H. R. 12 will do if enacted.

The peanut growers are just as much in need of that assistance today, brought about not only by the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture to do something that he should have done, or something he should not have done, but by the drought that has stricken this Nation. We need something that will put some cash in the pockets of our farmers, and H. R. 12 will do it. It will increase the farm income. I see no way of escaping the truth of that fact.

The charges against H. R. 12 and against the rigid support system are that they are responsible for our large farm surplus, which is costing considerable money in warehouse storage. Is the price support program any more responsible than the fact that our exports have declined 30 percent? Is it any more responsible for surpluses than the fact that we had 3 million unemployed who are unable to buy the farmer's products today?

Then on this question of the great cost to the taxpayer, there has been a lot of talk about the terrific cost of the farm program, but I have yet to hear anyone deny the fact, the statistics here that the net cost of basic commodities over 21 years has amounted to a little over $21 million.

Contrast that with our big subsidy to the maritime industry, you gentleman from New York and Pennsylvania; contrast that with the big subsidies going to transportation, and contrast that with subsidies to other parts of our industry in this Nation. Your basic commodity farmer is not a heavily subsidized man.

Then we come to the final question of the high cost of food to the consumer. Last year the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and I went into a grocery store and spent $5.31 on 12 products representing six basic commodities. We took them over to the Committee on Agriculture and asked them how much of the cost represented money paid to the farmer who produced these basic commodities. Out of $5.31 for the basic commodities that were furnished, the farmer received 79 cents.

Do not you Members who are from the cities be deceived by the thought that any cut in the basic commodity price support is going to be reflected in a great deal of help to your consumers, because the consumer today is paying the bulk of his cost to merchandising, advertising, retailing, wholesaling and processing and not to the producer of the basic commodity.

H. R. 12 is the answer to the economically distressed farmer today, and I hope all Members who believe in fairness toward the producers of our Nation's wealth will see to it that the farmer receives his fair share by passing H. R. 12, with restored protection for the peanut growers, when it comes to final vote today.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. LAIRD. To offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending, the Chair will state to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment so we will have that behind us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin, but the gentleman from Wisconsin desired to offer an amendment. There is an amendment pending at this time, so the gentleman from Wisconsin did not wish to take his time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the Chair recognize Members in the order of the length of time they have been on the floor seeking recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has endeavored to practice the rules of the House in recognizing Members as equitably as possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I recognize the great fairness of the Chair and I just want to assist the Chair by advising him that I have been here since the first opening of the debate.

Mr. GAVIN. And I might call the attention of the Chair to the fact that members of the committee seem to be monopolizing most of the conversation, yet there are a few of us who would like to have a few minutes to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Iowa as being on his feet and feels he must support the recognition.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield that I may get a vote on the committee amendment?

Mr. GROSS. I yield if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the amendment not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. May we have the amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 1, line 9, strike out all of section 2 beginning on page 1, line 9, through page 12, line 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some amusing statements during the debate of the last 2 days. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] a few moments ago and others have described 90 percent of parity as being rigid. Ninety percent of parity is 10 percent flexible in my book, and I think it is in every book.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that parity itself is flexible to start with?

Mr. GROSS. That is certainly right and 90 percent makes it even more flexible. I wonder if the gentleman from New York, who comes from the highly honorable legal profession, believes that he could get along charging 10 percent less than the cost of providing his legal services.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman did not yield to me when he had the floor.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, let us be fair about this business. If it costs a lawyer 100 percent for his services he cannot stay in business forever at 10 percent less than the cost of providing those services.

We have heard a good deal about farm surpluses. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON], who is opposed to 90 percent of parity, spoke of the deathly fear of Canada, that we would dump our wheat on that country. What has Canada been doing to us? Canada in the last 2 years only dumped 58,842,000 bushels of barley on us; it dumped 142,539,000 bushels of oats on us; it dumped 36,198,000 bushels of wheat on us; it dumped 526,000 tons of bran shorts on us; it dumped 19,032,000 bushels of rye on us and 5,570 tons of soybean oil cake meal. All this piled on our small grain and feed grain surpluses.

It seems to me that the Canadians have done a pretty fair job of dumping on us just as Communist Poland and other European nations have been dumping their ham, bacon, and other meat and dairy products into this country to be charged against American farm surpluses.

I suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] that he give attention to these imports. Incidentally, as I remember it, Canada does not draft young men for her military establishment. We are drafting plenty of farm boys.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] infers that the law of supply and demand will cure the farm situation. I wonder if the gentleman from Utah was around back in 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 to witness the operation of supply and demand. I wonder if he knows how the law of supply and demand worked then. Our farmers had surpluses of all kinds, and consumers desperately needed the food and fibers of the farms. What was wrong with his law of supply and demand at that time? I am sorry he is not on the floor to tell me why he suggests that the farmer be thrown on the rack of the old deal of buying at the seller's price and selling at the buyer's price. He knows that the law of supply and demand will not work unless the medium of exchange is well distributed and so-called flexible parity means less income and fewer dollars for farmers.

I will be glad to have the gentleman explain what he means by advocating supply and demand in connection with a farm bill that seeks to establish fair prices for farmers.

Mr. DIXON. If the gentleman will permit me to make my own statement, let me say that I did not say get back to the law of supply and demand, or I did not intend to at any rate. I argued flexible price supports the whole way.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to get a copy of the RECORD and point out to him the reference he made to this subject. The gentleman does not believe that the farmer can be turned back to a supply and demand price basis with the economy rigged all around him?

Mr. DIXON. And I would not go so far as to repeal the law of supply and demand the way H. R. 12 does.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows that is a juvenile statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 1, line 9, add the following new section:

"Section 201 (c) of the Agricutural Act of 1949 is amended by changing the period at the end of the first sentence thereof to a colon and adding: '*Provided*, That through the marketing year ending March 31, 1958, the level of such support shall be not less than the maximum level of support for basic commodities provided in section 101 (d) (6) hereof.'"

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which insures equality in the treatment of the dairy farmer of Wisconsin and in fact equality for all dairy farmers throughout this great Nation. Dairy products are more important to the health and welfare of our Nation than are any other agricultural commodities. It would seem to me that they should be considered basic not only to the health of our country but basic when considering our agricultural economy.

Yesterday on the floor of this House I supported the House Committee on Agriculture in the designation of the basic commodities in the Agriculture bill. My vote yesterday was in support of the position of the Committee on Agriculture, in which I have enjoyed very much my association with members on both sides of the political aisle. Today I am in a position where I plead with you to give equal recognition to dairy products in the support section of this bill. If this amendment of mine insuring equality for dairy products is rejected, I of course will be in a position where I cannot defend to my Wisconsin dairy farmers the designation of peanuts as a basic agricultural commodity and of course would so record myself today.

In my last political campaign individuals with the support and approval of the Democratic National Congressional Committee pledged in Wisconsin and in fact outsiders even came into my congressional district and made the fantastic pledge that with a Democratic Congress, milk and dairy products would be supported at 90 percent of parity. In these same political speeches, these individuals representing the opposition party stated that dairy products were supported at 75 percent of parity because of the action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the Republican Party. Not in a single one of the speeches, and I have the press clippings here before me, was it ever suggested that if dairy farmers were to receive 90-percent supports they would also have to receive production controls and curtail the production of their milk

cows. This of course is a new gimmick that has been inserted into this discussion by some individuals since the political campaign. In public debate I stated that the responsibility for dairy supports could not be solely placed on the shoulders of the Secretary of Agriculture, but must be borne by the Congress of the United States. I explained production controls but the opposition threw back at me the challenge that "it was not a matter of production controls, it was a matter of underconsumption of dairy products and that 90-percent supports would be a reality in a Democratic Congress." Here are the press clippings. Look at them and see what these political candidates in Wisconsin promised. These are the statements made by the candidate for Governor, candidates for Congress, and other candidates running on the opposition's ticket in our State.

Gentlemen, I want to give all of you the opportunity today to insure to dairy products and milk equality of treatment under the support sections of this bill. I have definitely made up my mind that I will not support this legislation unless we are able to receive fair and more equitable treatment for the dairy farmer and for milk.

In my congressional district, which is the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin, more milk and cheese are produced than in any other congressional district in the United States. The vast majority of the milk which is produced in my district is used for manufactured dairy products. In the Seventh Congressional District less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the agricultural income to our farmers comes from basic commodities. In the State of Wisconsin less than 1 percent of the total cash agricultural income is from these so-called basic commodities. This amendment which I have placed before you today seeks to give milk and dairy products the same type of support treatment that is enjoyed by the so-called basic commodities.

The record is very clear. These candidates campaigned in Wisconsin with the pledge that they would singlehandedly see that dairy products were supported at 90 percent of parity, and did not even suggest any type of controls.

On page 31 of the committee report I have stated as concisely as I possibly could my position in regard to H. R. 12. I have come to the same conclusion reached by 10 other members of the House Agriculture Committee; that is, that H. R. 12 should be defeated in its present form. H. R. 12, as reported from the Committee on Agriculture, is highly discriminatory to that section of agriculture which has sustained the largest income drop since World War II. I refer, of course, to the dairy farmer.

Individual members of the majority have talked about the necessity of returning to 90 percent rigid supports for agricultural products. In reporting out this bill in its present form one must conclude that the majority are concerned only with 90 percent supports for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, but not for dairy products.

The support sections of this bill as reported by the committee serve no other purpose than to further increase the production costs of the dairy farmer. This new legislation would not have any effect upon the price of manufactured milk or cheese for the coming year, as the Secretary of Agriculture has announced that manufactured milk will be supported at 80 percent of parity for the marketing year which began April 1, 1955.

Dairy products are supported under a support section which was written into the basic Agricultural Act in 1948. Dairy products have always been supported on a flexible parity system.

Democrat candidates for office in the State of Wisconsin have tried to mislead the dairy farmer in our State into thinking that their party stands for 90 percent supports for dairy products. One has but to look at the record here in Congress to learn that the Democrat Party has never supported 90 percent supports for milk or dairy products. The present support section under which dairy products are now supported was the support section adopted and originally placed on the statute books by the Democrats. The Congress must take the responsibility for determining what level of support dairy products will enjoy in the future. That responsibility rests only with the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the laws passed by the Congress. I realize that the Democrats are in control in this Congress and it will indeed be interesting to see what action is taken on this amendment to insure equality of treatment in this legislation for the dairy farmer.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee that more Members of the House of Representatives will vote for H. R. 12 if this Congress goes along with fair and equal treatment for the dairy farmer than by going along with Walter Reuther and the CIO who support this bill in its present form.

I plead with the Members on both sides of the aisle to give careful and thorough consideration to my amendment. This amendment is fair and equitable. This amendment places the dairy issue squarely before this 84th Congress. The responsibility for dairy supports is the responsibility of this Congress. Let us assume that responsibility and act fairly and favorably on this amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the action of my friend from Michigan. I hope the membership of this committee will recognize that this amendment is, as the author has very frankly stated, a matter of bringing more politics into a measure into which we have already had more politics than we should. I speak to you not simply as a representative of a great agriculture district, but I also speak to you as a man who has a good deal of what little goods he has invested in the dairy business. I am supporting a dairy. I know something of the problems of the dairyman. I know something of the losses of a dairyman.

But I recognize in all fairness that I have not cut my milk production. I am trying to increase my production every way in the world I can. I am not doing, in the dairy business, what the cotton farmers are doing; I am not doing what the wheat farmers are doing. And neither are the dairy farmers of Wisconsin or anywhere else. We dairymen are not taking any production cuts. We are not limiting our production to bring it in line with demand. We are not suffering one iota of loss in our income as a result of any control. Our losses are the result of a drought, high costs, and low prices.

On the other hand, wheat acreage has dropped from 88 million acres to 55 million acres. Cotton acreage has dropped from a high of 49 million acres down to a present acreage of 18 million acres. Those producers of basic commodities have been taking tremendous cuts in their productive ability. And what is the reason they have taken them? Because they have been assured by our Government that if they did take cuts in production, the Government would see to it that they got at least nine-tenths of a fair price for their products; not because somebody said we will flex you up and down.

Members of this Congress just voted themselves an increase in salary, and I voted for that too. That was not long ago. We did not make our salaries flexible. We did not say it would be high today and down tomorrow. We did not say that we would accept a flexible salary. We said we were entitled to that much and we were going to have it and we wrote into the law that each of us should receive a fixed amount every month.

But the gentleman does not want to do that for the farmer. He wants to flex him up and down—mostly down. And then after he has paid the price for support in production controls, it is now suggested that we should open the back door and let these fellows who did not pay anything come in. I am speaking to you as a man who has got his money invested in a bunch of dairy cattle, but I have not taken any cut in my production.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] desires to apply the same rules to the dairy industry that have been applied to cotton and wheat, I would gladly go along with him. I so stated and many other members of the committee so stated to him in the committee. We have repeatedly offered the gentleman from Wisconsin the opportunity to have 90 percent for dairy products if he wanted to take the same kind of controls that the basic commodities have taken. He did not want to control the production of dairy products, but now he wants

all the benefits that the producers of basics buy at the cost of controls.

I can well understand why the gentleman is reluctant to accept controls because in all frankness, we dairy people are getting a better deal today with unlimited production and 75 percent supports than are the cotton or wheat or peanut growers even at 90 percent, and of course, unless this bill passes everybody is going to be down to 75 percent supports and the basics are still going to have controls. Of course, if this bill passes the dairyman is going to get 80 percent supports with no controls instead of the 75 percent which is his present floor. This bill gives dairy people more than they have ever had before.

I am surprised that the gentleman from Wisconsin is not supporting this bill with its attainable benefits for dairy farmers, rather than offering something which I am sure he realizes cannot be adopted. I would much rather get part of something than all of nothing. This bill will give the dairyman a large part of something. I fear the gentleman's amendment could only secure all of nothing.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to the gentleman that as far as an offer that was made in committee to accept production controls, I have not seen a satisfactory form of production controls that has been worked out yet that could be submitted to the dairy farmers; and I do not recall one being submitted in the committee.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Wisconsin has not offered us one, that is perfectly true. Whenever he offers us one, we are ready to listen to him.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He has brought something in here I would like to clarify.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I introduced the bill last year which does provide a self-help program. I could go into that in some detail. The legislation I introduced provides for a base-excess method of calculating payments to dairy farmers.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, the gentleman has introduced legislation. I hope I did not say that the gentleman had not introduced any legislation, but I said the gentleman had not come before the committee with any clear-cut written program for production control such as we have on the basic commodities. When he does, I assure him that every member of that committee I know of stands ready to give him the most sympathetic hearing we know how, because I think it is sound. I am perfectly willing to go along with that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I would like to state that I have introduced H. R. 4360, which provides for subsidy payments and 90 percent of parity, and I cannot say that as of this date the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]—Seventh District—has been supporting me any on this bill, in fact, I believe he is opposed to it.

Mr. POAGE. I for one have repeatedly offered my support to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] because I believe dairy people are entitled to every consideration or treatment that is accorded any other producer and on the same terms. I believe that the second gentleman from Wisconsin recognizes that the producers of the basics pay a high price in crop controls for the 90 percent supports they get. I feel the pending amendment overlooks that fact. I must, therefore, oppose the amendment in its present form.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take long to forget the lessons taught by the last great depression. We were headed into the depression by the Republican administration, and Members who have served here since 1933 and 1935 well remember the situation that confronted the Nation.

Wheat was selling for 26 cents per bushel and cattle less than 2 cents, and hogs were slaughtered by the millions while unfit for pork products. Farm foreclosures were rampant and banks and small business all over the country were closing shop. In a short time, when the farmer's buying power ceased to exist, the products of mills could not be sold, factories closed, and men were forced out of employment. At one time while I was a Member of Congress 15 million people were walking the streets for something to eat. Soup lines formed in all the great cities, and I can well remember that women with children made the rounds of congressional offices for something to eat. This condition prevailed all over the country, and the question presented to Congress was, "What could Congress do to right this situation?" Many theories were advanced but it was finally determined that since this unprecedented depression started in the Farm Belt, that the remedy would have to be applied where the depressions started.

It was decided, therefore, that agriculture must be put back on its feet or business would never revive. Hence support prices were offered. Here let me say that these supports were not advanced for the farmers themselves, but to revive their buying power in order for business to survive. The plan worked like magic, and soon manufacturing plants were reopened and the idle millions went to work again. Taxes were paid, interest and payments on mortgages were paid, banks, insurance companies received payments on loans overdue, and the whole country revived.

For several years this support price has been at 90 percent, which means that the farmers were discounted 10 percent on everything they sold, but no discount on what they purchased. This program in itself (at 90 percent of parity) would break the farmers finally, as no business can stand a 10-percent discount year after year and survive. Now with this sliding scale about to be approved—and the 90 percent of parity defeated—there is one thing of which I am certain. That there will be distress in the Farm Belt, and many farmers will go out of business. The farm income has gone down since 1952 by over a billion dollars. That is not all.

In order to keep down surplus, a drastic farm acreage program has been introduced and will eventually destroy the family-type farms of the country. Right now in Williams County, where I live, farmers with 320 acres of tillable land have, in some instances, been reduced to 48 acres. Since wheat is the principal source of income, there is no farmer in America smart enough to support a family of 5 on 48 acres of wheat.

The result will be that these farmers will sell out to the larger outfits, and move to the towns and cities and join the ranks of labor. Organized labor will increase, and many are alarmed now that organized labor will control the elections. In the last election we saw Michigan and Minnesota controlled by the labor vote, and if this present farm program is insisted upon, many more States will be in the same position.

The irony of the whole thing is that those who do not want labor to control the entire Government are doing the most to bring that situation about.

You well remember how the Republicans fought the McNary-Haugen farm bill just preceding the Roosevelt sweep in elections. The Republican Party is doing the same thing today, and if the situation develops which I predict, the Republican administration will be the cause of it. While there are some Democrats from the eastern seaboard States that will vote against 90 percent of parity, the great majority of the Republicans will support the President in his demand for the "sliding scale" program instead of the parity program. The Republican Party will have to repudiate its pledge to the farmers of the country, the President will have to repudiate his pledge made in his campaign for the presidency.

The whole argument against parity is that we have 2 years' surplus of wheat and surpluses in butter and other farm products, and it costs too much to store these products. This Government has been ingenious enough during administrations of both parties to spend $800 billion on our excursions around the world getting tangled up in agreements and alliances which ignored the warnings of our great men of the past. Do you not think this program of giving away could have included farm products, and if that had been done there would be no surplus today. Can we not give away wheat and butter just as easily as we can give away dollars?

In North Dakota we suffer the most on this wheat program. First-class flour cannot be manufactured without mixing wheat with the hard spring wheat of the Dakotas and Montana, and we have seen the time in recent years when we had to let in this kind of wheat from Canada to fill the demand of millers. Right today, according to the advocates against parity, there are only 180 million bushels of hard spring wheat in storage, and I very much doubt these figures. The other wheat we raise is durum, and I think

there is a shortage instead of a surplus of that.

Why say to the farmers of North Dakota that they must raise this scarce variety of wheat at a loss of their farms?

Also, remember that a year's supply of all wheat is not too much to have on hand in this country during this hysteria of a cold war. It is the best national defense we could possibly supply. The history of all wars shows clearly that food is more powerful than armies and warships, seagoing or in the air. Germany, in the First and in the Second World War surrendered because the people were starved out. What good is a firearm in the hands of a man who is starving?

Many Republicans have said to me, "Why don't you leave the Republican Party if you don't like the way we operate?" My reply has always been that when I am in a party and it is right, my desire is to stay in the party and keep it right; if I am in a party and it is wrong, my desire is to stay in the party and make it right. I have not left the original Republican Party of Lincoln, but I fear many who claim to be Republicans have already deserted.

If another depression starts in the farm belt because of the administration of Republicans, the next election will further reduce the membership of the party. I can be defeated for reelection, and if so, I will take it gracefully, but I refuse to be legislated out of office by my own party. The defeat of 90 percent of parity and a veto of the pay-raise bill will place in the hands of Democrats in the Farm Belt a powerful argument.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I have been around as long as the gentleman, and the Republican Party did not defeat the McNary-Haugen Act. It was passed by a Republican Congress and vetoed by a Republican President.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, that is all right, that is the same thing—that is the same thing—only worse.

I have a great deal of timidity about speaking on the farm question when I heard such great agricultural experts as the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the gentlemen from other sections of the country who spoke about the amount of money that North Dakota got out of what they put in. Well, let me tell you about New York. New York had 120 times the length of soup lines that North Dakota had. Have you forgotten—soup lines, I mean, in every big city in this country because there was no employment, and the reason for it was that the farm buying power had disappeared.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for another 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object. There have been a couple of us city boys here who are not farmers trying to get recognition for 2 days and we have not been able to get recognition yet. If we do not get recognition, I am going to object to all further requests for extension of time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I second that statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will tell us where Sitting Bull is buried, I might agree to let him go on. I think he ought to include that in his remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will ask for 2 additional minutes, I will not object.

Mr. BURDICK. You can just object all you want, but I notice the objections are coming from Republicans.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is well that we occasionally take stock of some experience of years gone by. In this regard, may I say to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that I am very grateful for his excellent speech. He stated the case so accurately and his Republican colleagues would do well to heed his words. The tremendous demonstration and applause which followed indicates that the Members of the House, especially on the Democratic side, agree with the gentleman.

I would like to have the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who offered the pending amendment. First, I wish to say that the gentleman is a very valuable and popular member of the committee. He has a very wide knowledge of problems confronting the dairy industry and dairy farmers.

He made a statement in presenting his amendment that all he wanted was the same treatment for the dairy farmers that we now give or have given or propose to give in this bill to cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanut farmers.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Would the gentleman be willing to accept a marketing control provision, if such could be drafted, to bring the marketing of milk in line with demand, as the law now requires of the so-called basic commodities in order to qualify for price supports? Would he be willing to accept that?

Mr. LAIRD. I would have to look over the proposal very closely and very carefully. We have several bills before the committee. It is a most interesting question that my friend propounds, and I think in all fairness I should have an opportunity to look at the specific proposal. I cannot completely reject controls. I introduced a self-help plan last year with a base-surplus control section.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman says he would prefer to look into it. I will ask the gentleman if the law does not provide that dairy products are supported at 75 to 90 percent of parity, with no controls, and no marketing quotas, and if it is not also true that the gentleman's own State has increased its milk production last year by 13 percent?

Mr. LAIRD. No, that is not true. The figure is from 1952 to 1954. There was a production increase of 16 percent, I believe.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then at the same time acreage for cotton, wheat, corn, and these other crops was cut back; the production was cut back, but the production of milk, particularly in the gentleman's own State, has been increasing constantly because you have no controls and you have a support price on unlimited production of 75 to 90 percent.

Mr. LAIRD. Does not the gentleman think the production has been kept in line?

Mr. ABERNETHY. But what I have stated is a fact. The gentleman's State has overproduced. It has increased production of milk. Basic acreages and yields have been reduced.

Mr. LAIRD. The production is up in Wisconsin, that is true.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And you have an unlimited program from the standpoint of production, with supports at from 75 to 90 percent of parity irrespective of how much you produce.

Mr. LAIRD. No, we have a program at which milk is presently being supported at 80 percent of parity.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Seventy-five to ninety percent of parity, and then in addition to that you have marketed a great deal of your surplus in the school-lunch program.

Mr. LAIRD. Well, that is mostly fluid milk.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, but you do have that extra market. There is no corn, no wheat, no cotton, and no peanuts, and only a very little rice, that goes into such an extra outlet for surpluses. Would you be willing to give up that extra outlet so as to have comparable treatment with the basics for which you appeal?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not yield. I have yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I favor equal treatment for the basics.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would you be willing to give up that which the basics do not have, that is, a portion of the school-lunch program, plus a $50 million extra amount put into the bill last year for the marketing of surplus milk through school lunches, which this bill, incidentally, increases to $75 million?

Mr. LAIRD. I feel that the basic commodities should be used in the school-lunch program also. I have always been for expanding the school-lunch program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is not what I asked the gentleman. I asked the gentleman who stated that he wanted to put dairy products on the same basis as the basics, if he would be willing to give up something which the basics do not have.

Mr. LAIRD. I would be willing to extend to the basics the same benefits. My amendment is to section 1.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You also have other advantages and fringe benefits which basics do not have. You market

some of your surpluses through the Veterans' Administration hospitals, do you not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I ask if the gentleman would be willing——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is not talking about his motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi will proceed in order.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I ask the gentleman now if he would be willing to strike out that provision of the law which provides for the marketing of surplus milk through the Veterans' Administration hospitals?

Mr. LAIRD. I really do not get the point of this particular discussion my distinguished friend from Mississippi is carrying on here. I do not want to make a comparison with the amount of money we spend on wheat gifts to Pakistan, for instance, with the amount that has been given in dairy products. I think you will find that the amount of funds that were used on certain basic commodities have been quite large, but I do not think that has any place in this discussion. I favor equality in the treatment of all sections of our agricultural economy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Mississippi has made a motion to strike out the enacting clause and report the bill back to the House with that recommendation. I challenge his right to speak unless he is in favor of his motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair assumes the gentleman is in favor of his motion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing myself to the contents of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point of order is that the motion is dilatory and that the gentleman does not intend to support the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The merits of the bill are open to discussion under the gentleman's motion.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have had this discussion. I think this is helpful in bringing out the true facts as to the situation which confronts Wisconsin farmers at the present time. I do not think that some people have been fair in discussing this problem in my particular State, and I am glad to have the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on dairying carrying on this discussion today. I think we can bring out some real information that will be helpful in having a clear understanding of what the dairy picture is.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What I am trying to point out—and I think the gentleman agrees with me—is that there is a distinction, a particular and proper distinction in the two programs. I think the gentleman will also agree that the gentleman does not want to give equal treatment between the basics and the dairy farmers because, so to do would require controls for dairy farmers, which I doubt they want but which I am willing for them to have if they want them in consideration of price supports at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. LAIRD. It will assure equal treatment as far as the percentage of support level is concerned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is correct, but unequal treatment when considering the fact that basics are produced and marketed under rigid controls. So there would not be absolute equality. Actually your amendment would give the most preferential treatment to dairy products. The only equality would be the level of supports.

Mr. LAIRD. And that is all that I stated, I believe, in my remarks.

I certainly would have no objection to increasing the school-lunch program in the Nation for I have long been a supporter of that. I certainly feel that if there is a place where we can use more of our surplus commodities that we have in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation at the present time we should do so, and I will support the gentleman's amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have no amendment; I am simply asking the gentleman if he would agree to put the basics on the same level with dairy products or vice versa.

Mr. LAIRD. I want to use the greatest amount possible of the commodities that are in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation to reduce the surplus which we have on the agricultural markets all over this country today, and if you know of any way in which we can use more of the basic commodities I will introduce an amendment to provide for their use in the school program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I also point out, Mr. Chairman, that dairy farmers have the benefit of the brucillosis campaign, which is another fringe benefit with nothing comparable for basics. Dairy farmers have marketing orders, both State and Federal. They benefit by price-fixing boards. They have many programs and fringe benefits which basics do not have. And they have unlimited freedom of production with a pretty good support price.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure my friends from the Dairy Belt that anytime they will agree to take the same controls, the same quotas, and exactly the same sort of program which the basics have I will be perfectly willing to help them get it. But it certainly would not be fair to the basics and I doubt that it would be sound to support the unlimited production of dairy products at 90 percent of parity. I repeat, when dairy farmers ask for a control program and are willing to accept marketing quotas in consideration of 90-percent supports—a program comparable to that which we seek for basics—I will be on their side. I will contribute my effort and make just as hard a fight for them as I have made for the basics.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point of order is this: The gentleman from Mississippi made a motion to strike out the enacting clause of the bill, the entire bill, but his entire speech has been with reference to one particular provision of the bill and he has not said anything about striking out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has yielded the floor. The gentleman was privileged to talk about any part of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object to withdrawal of the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] rise?

Mr. ANFUSO. To strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be recognized for that purpose; there is a preferential motion pending.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition to speak in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this motion because it would have the effect, if carried, of limiting discussion on the measure and disposing of it in a rather backhanded way. I think the Committee should complete the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Michigan delegation particularly to a communication received from our Governor, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams. I invite the attention not only of the Republican Members from Michigan but also the Democrats, because Governor Williams' letter, which purportedly was a result of a thorough study of this legislation, instructs the Michigan delegation how to vote. It also contains some misleading statements, the basis for his advice.

Governor Williams' letter might well interest other Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, because he obviously has aspirations to national office on the Democratic ticket. You ought to have some advance warning, therefore, how he thinks about problems of this character.

He made the first error in his letter by blaming the reduced income of Michigan farmers on the flexible price-support program. He apparently does not

know that the program has not yet gone into effect. That indicates sloppy thinking on Federal issues, and it would indicate that a man who thought so superficially cannot be entrusted to handle national problems.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman talking about the Democratic or the CIO Governor?

Mr. MEADER. I am talking about the present Governor of Michigan who seems to be in close rapport with Walter Reuther, whom I understand the gentleman desires to discuss.

Let me point out that the Governor in his letter—and I call the attention of the Michigan delegation particularly to this point—cited a drop in dairy farm income in Michigan between 1952 and 1954. What he did not tell you was that that drop in dairy prices occurred while the 90-percent support price was in effect.

What is the truth about the matter? Since the 75 percent of parity order of February 15, 1954, which became effective on April 1, 1954, the dairy industry in Michigan has done far better than before. The blend price of all milk in the Detroit area for March of 1955 was 11 cents per hundred higher with Government price support at 75 percent of parity than it was in March of 1954, with supports at 90 percent of parity. A fact of equal importance is that the consumption of milk in the same period in the Detroit milkshed has increased by 6 percent under the 75-percent support, whereas the production of milk increased by less than 2 percent. The law of supply and demand operated effectively even in so short a period of time and the dairy industry is far better off in 1955 under the 75-percent price-support program than it was under the 90-percent price support in 1954.

So the Governor of Michigan, aspiring to national office, and taking his time away from difficult and complex problems of the State of Michigan, now proceeds to instruct our delegation on the basis of misleading figures and misconstrued facts.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I do not believe that the Governor of Michigan is germane to the motion now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I want to caution the members of the Michigan delegation to read the letter of the Governor very carefully in the light of all the facts, and not be misled by his high office and his leadership of the Democratic Party in Michigan.

Governor Williams' letter to me and my reply to him are as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, April 11, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: It has come to my attention that both Houses of Congress will soon debate the farm price-supports issue. This is a subject of great concern to us here in Michigan and I should like to present my views for your consideration.

Since 1952, farm-labor income in Michigan has dropped from almost $3,000 to $2,200 a year. This represents a drop of almost 30 percent and it is expected to go down another 4 percent or 5 percent this year. Farm labor income is defined as the income the farmer has left after all expenses, depreciation, family labor and interest at 5 percent have been deducted from gross income.

Such a drop in income for our farmers has meant in the past a consequent severe impact on the rest of our economy. We know that the farm population of our country consumes a significant portion of durable products, particularly steel, rubber, petroleum and other heavy industrial goods. A drop in their income can only mean that other industries must cut back their production.

The administration's present flexible-support system has, in my opinion, been one of the major factors in this decline. Our Michigan dairy industry was the first to feel the effects of the administration program and the results are quite apparent. In 1952 the rate to the farmer per hour of labor in dairy production was $1.66 an hour. By 1954 it had dropped to 90 cents an hour. In 1952 the net profit to the farmer per hundredweight of milk was 55 cents. In 1954 it was minus 36 cents. Quite obviously no producing segment of our economy can continue when it is losing money on a basic commodity.

These facts, I hope, will be helpful to you. They certainly indicate that the present system of flexible price supports has had a very adverse effect on the Michigan farmer's chief cash crop. Consequently, I hope you will support a better system.

Sincerely,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1955.

Hon. G. MENNEN WILIAMS,
Michigan State Capitol,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR WILLIAMS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 11, 1955, urging my endorsement of rigid farm price support legislation.

Your letter would seem to imply a thorough study of the subject matter before taking your position on this matter of controversial national policy.

Because your conclusions and some of your statistics seem to differ from the understanding I have of the farm price support problem, I investigated the matter in some detail. I am satisfied either that you were misinformed by your advisers or that your study must necessarily have been somewhat superficial.

Since your interest in this problem seems to be a serious one, I offer the results of my study.

You assert that the drop in farm prices resulted from the adoption of the flexible farm price support program advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

You apparently are unaware that the program is not yet in effect. Therefore, it could not be resonpisble for the drop in farm prices. The drop occurred under the rigid 90 percent of parity law which has been responsible for the building up of the huge surpluses which have depressed the market.

You also ignore the effect of the build-up of farm production during the Korean war and the slackening of demand after the war. The drop in farm prices and income began before the Eisenhower administration took office and has not been affected by the flexible price support policy which will become effective only with the 1955 crop which has not yet been harvested.

You write of the decline in farm income: "The administration's present flexible support system has, in my opinion, been one of the major factors in this decline. Our Michigan-dairy industry was the first to feel the effects of the administration program and the results are quite apparent. In 1952 the rate to the farmer per hour of labor in dairy production was $1.66 an hour. By 1954 it had dropped to 90 cents an hour. In 1952 the net profit to the farmer per hundredweight of milk was 55 cents. In 1954 it was minus 36 cents. Quite obviously no producing segment of our economy can continue when it is losing money on a basic commodity."

Your figures on the drop in farm labor hourly rates and profits in Michigan's dairy industry do not support your conclusion that the reduction in dairy price supports was at fault. The price-support reduction from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity on dairy products, as required by the price support law before it was amended, was ordered February 15, 1954, and became effective April 1, 1954. The drop in price and farm labor rates you cite occurred before the effective date of that order during the period when dairy product prices were supported at 90 percent of parity.

Your statement that Michigan dairy farmers are suffering from lower price supports is not correct. The records show that the blend price of all milk in the Detroit area for March 1955 was 11 cents per hundred higher with Government price supports at 75 percent of parity than it was in March 1954 with supports at 90 percent of parity. Reports from 8 major milk condenseries in the State of Michigan show that the price paid to farmers for milk in the month of March 1955, with 75 percent supports was 16 cents per hundred higher than in 1954, with the support prices at 90 percent of parity.

Your facts and mine condemn the rigid price support policy you urge me to accept.

I might point out that your letter is wholly deficient in discussing the policy question involved in this legislation, namely, whether you favor a free economy or a pseudo-socialistic economy. That question should receive your careful thought since many Michigan voters—and if you seek national office, the American public—would very much like to have a clearcut statement from you as to whether you favor measures tending toward socialism or whether you have a sincere and steadfast faith in the ability of the American people to make their own economic decisions to the maximum possible extent under modern conditions.

Many farmers, as you must know, believe they are capable of running their own farms and resent autocratic dictation from Washington, which necessarily flows from a Government rigid price support and allocation system.

Since you have undertaken to instruct the Michigan congressional delegation on this most important Federal problem, I suggest that you take the additional time from your difficult and manifold duties as Michigan's Governor to make the necessary factual inquiries and policy decisions which would render your advice helpful rather than misleading.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during 2 days of debate on the floor, I have listened to a great

deal of talk about the rigid and flexible price supports.

A few minutes ago the gentleman from North Dakota started to give us some history about the start of the depression of the thirties. Before he finished he made some reference to the McNary-Haugen bill, which was long before my time. There was a great deal of glee and applause on the part of my Democratic colleagues on the right.

Well, if I remember correctly, the depression that he referred to went on for a period of 10 years. There was pump priming in all directions and the spending of some $75 billion of the American taxpayers' money that cured nothing.

I wonder if my colleagues on the right will cheer now, when I say to them that it was the sacrifice of half a million young American lives on fields of battle throughout the world that was the only cure for that depression. No man living or dead can say that he cured it. It was cured by the spending for war, regardless of who was responsible for it.

Now, regarding this price-support program, there is one point upon which I am not clear. A year ago we voted for a flexible price-support program of approximately 82.5 percent. Today, and before that bill has even had a chance to go into effect, we are asked to repudiate that legislation and return to 90 percent of parity.

Let us look at the record very briefly. In 1951, according to the testimony, farm prices began to slide off, and according to the statements made on this floor, under the Democratic administration there had been a drop of 19 points prior to 1953. Now, if the 90 percent of parity was in effect at that time and is still in effect today, how can you say that 90 percent is going to cure the sliding off of farm prices? We voted last year for flexible supports to try to cure the evil. I must say, that from the reports I have received from the farm bureaus, from the farm organizations, and from the farmers of the great State of New York, they all appear to be in favor of putting in the flexible price-support program to see how it will operate as against the rigid price supports.

Mr. Chairman, I ask today, speaking not as a farmer but as one, who comes from a once great farming area of Long Island, and who lived all his life there, that the farmers and the consumers be given a chance. All of the farmers that I know, every single one of them on Long Island, and those of my acquaintance in upstate New York, as well as the consumers, want us to support the flexible price program and give it an opportunity to work. It is the only fair and sensible thing to do at this time.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to congratulate the gentleman for his forthright statement and say as another Long Islander, representing a farming district, that our farmers to a man agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an expert on this subject of farming, but I do know one thing, that all of the experience in the world is not worth anything unless that experience is backed up by the heart. I would like to have every member of this committee know that my sympathies lie with the little fellow, whether the little fellow is on the farm, working there, toiling every day, or whether he is toiling in the factories. That is the reason I am in favor of this support program, because it protects that little man on the farm.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the peanut amendment was introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN]. This amendment was immediately embraced as no woman has ever been embraced by the Republican leadership on that side of the aisle. I intended to vote for that amendment because it appeared to me that it would reduce the price of peanuts used in candy, to millions of schoolchildren. But I had a very strong suspicion that the Republican leadership, which had embraced that amendment, was not really sincere; that it did not intend to walk with this amendment all the way down the aisle to final passage, that it had been accepted for the purpose of weakening this entire farm program. This suspicion became a reality last evening when I heard from reliable sources that when it came to final passage a motion was going to be made to recommit this entire bill and to scuttle the entire farm program.

If that is not so, Mr. Chairman, then I defy those in command on the left side of the aisle to get up now and say that it is not so. I defy them to say that they are for H. R. 12 as amended by the peanut amendment.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to say to the gentleman, as one who introduced a peanut amendment last year and who supported it this year, that I introduced it in the interests of employment of people. It is my sincere hope that it will be passed and ultimately will become law.

Mr. ANFUSO. Will the gentleman vote for the bill with the amendment?

Mr. VURSELL. I shall vote for the bill with the amendment, if we can have the flexible price-support bill.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the distinguished gentleman's time be extended for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, on the basis, as already stated, that we have been trying to get recognition heretofore, I am constrained to object.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I understand there have been no hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, either in the last session or in this session, on a peanut amendment taking peanuts out as a basic commodity; is that correct?

Mr. ANFUSO. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. Do I understand also that the gentleman is prepared to introduce a bill to take peanuts out as a basic commodity?

Mr. ANFUSO. I shall be more than happy to do so, and I am sure that I can get our distinguished chairman to hold hearings on it.

Mr. MULTER. May I ask the chairman of the committee to indicate whether or not we can have hearings on such a bill?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman yields to me for that purpose, I can assure him that I shall be very glad to arrange for hearings and to arrange for Mr. Benson and his associates to come before the committee and express their views on the matter; but as to what action will be taken, I am not in a position to predict.

Mr. ANFUSO. That is fair enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a Representative who comes from a city or an urban area, I would like to speak for the consumers of this Nation on this bill. The present attempt, under H. R. 12, to restore the rigid support prices which were voted out by the 83d Congress, is not fair to consumers because, as yet, the country has not been able to find out how the flexible parity support program voted last year will work. With only one-sixth to one-eighth of the entire population of the United States being directly concerned with farm work, the greatest bulk of our residents are consumers and certainly we owe them the duty of protecting their interests.

As a city Representative, I firmly believe that, in the interests of our national welfare, we must support the farmers in some manner. Unquestionably, there is a direct correlation between the level of prosperity of the farmers and the general level of prosperity of the whole economy of the United States. As a city Representative, and, I am sure I am speaking for the greatest bulk of my constituents, we want to help the farm people to maintain prosperity because we will be helping the general welfare of the United States. I believe that the best way to help the farmers is to defeat this bill under consideration, H. R. 12, and to give the flexible price support program which was voted on last year, a chance to operate.

In plain, nonfarm language, it appears to me that the committee's report indicates that agriculture is weak. It is weak because the Government hired the farmer to overproduce during the war, and he liked it so well we have kept on hiring him to raise big surpluses after the need for them was over. We did it, I guess, because it seemed to be good politics.

As a Representative of a nonfarm area, let me say that I do not think it was

good politics at all. I think the farmer is smart enough to realize that he is getting progressively worse off under rigid price supports; and I am sure the urban segment of our population is getting pretty tired of paying heavy taxes to support farm prices and raise the price of the foodstuffs which they, as consumers, must buy.

Whether we live in the city or on the farm, we are all consumers and taxpayers; and as loyal Americans we resent having these additional burdens placed on us without cause.

The city housewife who struggles to stretch a limited budget to buy proper food for her family, the taxpayer who sees a large portion of his income going to the Government in taxes, and the farmer who finds his condition worsening every year—all will testify that the high mandatory price supports under which the farmers have operated during recent years have not been helpful to them.

Why, then, are we asked today to reverse the action of the 83d Congress and continue the mandatory supports which have brought hardship on these people?

The proponents of this bill are telling us that the grocery-buying housewife, the taxpayer, and the farmer are thriving under rigid price supports. They ask us to continue these so that these people will continue being as prosperous as they are today. Yet, under our past program of rigid supports the farmers' income has declined over the last several years.

As a city dweller, I want to tell you that the housewives, the taxpayers, and the farmers do not want a continuation of the rigid supports which have brought us where we are today. I believe that the best way to serve the farmer, as well as the consumer, is to defeat the bill now on the floor and to give the farmer the flexible price supports which we promised him last year.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I object.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible even to sketch this question in 5 minutes but I shall proceed to use the 5 minutes I have.

First, I want to compliment the handful of distinguished gentlemen on the lefthand side of this aisle, and I say "handful," who have had the courage and the statesmanship as they stood up on the floor of this House and in their work in the committees and demonstrated that they had the courage to enunciate on the floor of this House the things they believe in and the programs they stand for.

The gentleman who just left the microphone said he wanted to help the farmer out. I hope he will pardon me when I say that gentlemen like him, and many others, really want to help the farmer out. They want to help him entirely out, off his farm and out of business and into bankruptcy.

I hate to speak on H. R. 12 in a political manner, but there is politics in everything in these United States. The bread you buy, the clothes on your back, the job you have, depend on politics. You can say you do not want to have anything to do with politics if you want to, but you cannot help it.

We hear a lot about the Republican farm program and the Eisenhower farm program. The Republicans do not have a farm program and they never have had one. All they are seeking to do on the floor of the House today is to scuttle and hamstring and cripple the program that was handed down to us by the Democratic Party. The Republican Party celebrated their 100th anniversary in March 1954. They have been in control of the Federal Government 64 of that 100 years. Do not say you never had a chance.

Did your party ever make it possible to have a Federal land bank in the United States? Did your party make it possible for REA co-ops to get some money at low interest rates so that the farmers could get electric lights and refrigeration out to the farms where the farm women had spent their lifetime rubbing out dirty clothes on a washboard and living with old coal-oil lamps to see by? Did your party ever establish a minimum wage? Did your party ever guarantee a bank deposit? Did your party ever establish a social security program? In those 64 years, Republican gentlemen, just what did your party do for the good of the common man of the United States?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I cannot yield now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell you what we did, but you do not want to know.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will give you a chance after I sit down. You can speak on your own time, and I hope then that you will tell me.

Mr. Chairman, here is the reason we need these price supports. I have farmed with price supports and I have farmed without price supports. I was farming in 1920 and 1921. In June 1921 corn in Missouri was worth $1.80 a bushel. In December, it was worth 56 cents a bushel. I would not sell my corn for that price so I kept it until August of 1922, and then I sold it for 26 cents a bushel. I had no price supports. And once through that in a lifetime, ladies and gentlemen, is enough for any farmer. The net farm income from farming during the year ending January 1921 was $6.9 billion. The net income from farming for the year ending January 1922, was $3.7 billion, a loss in 1 year of $3.2 billion, or almost 50 percent. As soon as the Republican administration was elected in 1920, they cut the farm income in the United States in half. If it were not for the program that they are trying to scuttle on the floor of the House today, we would have 75-cent wheat, 8-cent hogs, 40-cent corn, and 10-cent cotton. We have to have 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities, and we ought to have a lot better supports than we have on the nonbasic commodities that the gentleman from Wisconsin was talking about a while ago.

Perhaps you have forgotten to just how low a point agricultural income had sunk 22 years ago? I will give you some Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures that will indicate prices farmers were receiving for the food and fiber they produced at that time. Twenty-two years ago the per capita income of farm people from farming operations had sunk to the unbelievable figure of $94. The average price of wheat 22 years ago for the entire year of 1932 was 38.2 cents per bushel; the corn crop sold for 31.6 cents; the oats crop that year brought the farmers 15.7 cents; barley, 22.1 cents; cotton 5.6 cents per pound; tobacco, 10.5 cents; peanuts, 0.015 cent; the average price of all cattle and calves 1 year old and over was $17.78 per head; sheep and lambs, $3.44 and the wool clip brought 8.2 cents per pound. The mortgage debt against the American farms had reached the staggering total of more than $9,600 million and much of this vast amount was on a 5-year basis where the borrower paid a commission in many cases as high as 5 percent with 6 to 8 percent interest. In 5 years the loan was due and often a renewal commission of 2.5 percent was charged. Conditions had gotten so bad that the farmer was unable to pay his interest and a storm of farm foreclosures was sweeping the land. More than 9,000 banks had failed during the 12 year period just prior to 1932 and not a single deposit was insured. Now, as a result of the help and encouragement extended the farmers by these programs, we have a different picture.

Wheat in 1952 sold for $2 per bushel; corn, $1.58; oats, 80 cents; barley, $1.17; cotton, 37 cents per pound; peanuts, 0.109 cent; tobacco, 0.516 cent; and cattle and calves averaged $160 per head; sheep and lambs $26.40; the wool clip 57.9 cents per pound; and farmers had reduced their mortgage debt to $4,200,000,000 having paid almost $5.5 billions on the original debt.

During this 22-year period the per capita income of farm people from their farming operations had increased from $94 to $636. The farmer was not the only segment of our population that had benefited by this great program of liberal legislation. The income of nonfarm people had risen from $464 in 1934 to $1,563 in 1952, which gave the nonfarm population an income that would permit them to buy products of the American farm at a little more than the cost of production.

It seems to me a strange coincidence, but none the less true, that whenever a Republican administration takes over the reins of our Government five things immediately come to pass:

First. Drastically lower prices of the food and fiber produced on the American farms;

Second. A stock market boom that bursts right through the ceiling;

Third. Higher interest rates;

Fourth. Tighter credit;

Fifth. Tax cuts that go to the extremely rich and our giant corporations.

Check what is happening in the United States today and you will readily see that the present Republican administration is no exception to that old rule.

All this price-support program has ever sought to do was to give the American farmer something near a fair share of the national income, and a reduction in the price supports on his basic commodities is bound to reduce his income, which is already far too low, and thereby make him a poorer customer of business and industry. Every Member of this Congress should vote for H. R. 12 in the interest of the people in their district, because the prosperity of the nonfarmer is so interwoven with the farmer's prosperity that one class cannot prosper for long unless the purchasing power of the other is at par.

Industry has its protective tariff, labor has its minimum wage and H. R. 12 is the farmers' minimum wage. How can you deny to the American farmer, the protection you so readily accord to the other segments of our national economy?

Even though it has cost the people of the United States approximately 50 cents per person, per year, to support the price of our basic commodities, I contend that it is a small price to pay for staying out of a depression such as we had in the early thirties. The American farmer is feeding and clothing this Nation better than any nation was ever fed and clothed in the history of the world; and I can see no just reason why he should be penalized and his purchasing power destroyed just because he has done a good job.

The price of supporting our basic commodities at 90 percent of parity has been so low as to sink into insignificance when compared to the subsidies granted to business and industry. We must not allow the American farmer to sink again to bankruptcy—and gentlemen, he is started in that direction now. Shall we push him further down that road by failing to pass H. R. 12?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that some very amusing things have happened on this floor. Personally, I do not think it has been very amusing. I think a great deal of it has been tragic. I think the description of our farm population and the conditions under which they live, as given by many of the distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture is extremely tragic. I do not think it is particularly amusing that the speaker before me described the gentleman from North Dakota as a handful. I have always thought he was a handful in every sense of the word; I think the description was apt, but not at all amusing.

Now, it so happens that I represent one of the biggest dairy districts in the United States of America. I know that it is the fashion on the floor of this House, whenever New York is mentioned in comparing it with other agricultural States, that everyone smiles because most people seem to think that our great State is bounded by Broadway and 42d Street. This, however, is not the truth. The dairy farmers and the poultry farmers of my district are unalterably opposed to this bill. They do not consider that they are living on such a low level. They do believe that a great deal of harm has been done to the agricultural economy as a result of the 90 percent price support program on basic commodities. They feel that the present law has not been given a chance to operate, and they ask you very simply, and, as I think, very fairly, to give it a chance. After all, this law only became effective on January 1, 1955. All the horrors that have been described today and yesterday, and perhaps will be described tomorrow if this goes on, certainly never took place under the law that went into effect on January 1, 1955.

Mr. Walter Reuther testified before this great Committee on Agriculture. I, for one, am delighted that he did testify. I, for one, believe that every segment of our economy has to fit in together, has to compare notes, has to work together. Certainly his contribution to these deliberations was a worthwhile contribution, but I might say, for my part, that I prefer to follow the guidance and advice of Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, when my vote comes on this matter. Mr. Shuman, as you know, has sent telegrams to many of us, and has said, "We recommend the defeat of H. R. 12." In my book, speaking for the farmers, I know that he speaks better and more sympathetically for the farmers of my district than anyone else who could testify, and for that reason I shall oppose this bill and shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the rigid price-support program and I intend to do it again today. I supported the peanut amendment last year, and I did yesterday, but I am beginning to wonder whether or not the victory that was accomplished on the peanut amendment yesterday was not brought about at least by some people who want to scuttle the entire program and see this bill defeated.

I have noticed that most of our Republican colleagues walked through the tellers yesterday in support of the peanut amendment. I ask now how many of them who voted for the peanut amendment yesterday will vote for this bill if the peanut amendment remains in the bill? Those of you who will, please do me the favor of rising in your seats.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I object to that as being contrary to the rules. The gentleman has no right to call for a rising vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer his question?

Mr. MULTER. No, I will yield at this point only for a show of hands or a rising by those Members on the left-hand side of the aisle who will vote for this bill with the peanut amendment in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is out of order, and under the rules his request should be stricken from the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is well taken. Questions can be put only by the Chair. The Chair trusts the gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MULTER. I apologize. I am sorry. I ask those on the left-hand side of the aisle to seek time, after I sit down, and to tell us in all fairness: Will they or will they not vote for this bill if the amendment remains in it? If they do not seek such time, we will have the right to assume that they voted for the amendment, intending thereby to beat this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has no right, under the rules, to make that challenge or to ask for that indication on the part of the membership. It is a challenge to the membership of the House as to how they will vote.

Mr. MULTER. I withdraw the challenge, if it is one, but I do make that suggestion to our distinguished colleagues. We should be fair with one another.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk here about some deals between farmers and labor. I for one say there is nothing invidious about such a deal if one has been made. I would like to see the time come when the farmer and the wage earner in this country did get together and join in a program for their mutual benefit and the improvement of their standards of living. Every time we bring about such an improvement we improve the standard of living of the whole country. There is not the slightest doubt but that the wage earner and the farmer together constitute the backbone of our economic system, and unless they prosper the country cannot prosper. When we give the farmer a fair return for his product he has more money with which to buy the city man's goods, and when we give the city man a better wage he has more money with which to buy the farmer's commodities. I would like to hear some of those who inveigh against collaboration between the wage earners and the farmers speak out against the big-business mergers and consolidations.

If the defeat of the peanut amendment will bring about the amalgamation of labor and the farmers in this country then I say let us defeat the peanut amendment. If we can get these people together, working side by side for their mutual advantage, we will be doing a good thing for the Nation. Let us get them together and then hope they will remain united. Let us do everything possible to bring that about, for I say that will be a good deal, a fair deal, even if it may not be a new deal.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to remind the gentleman and other Members of Congress on this side who voted for the peanut amendment that before that

amendment was offered the leadership on the Republican side announced that an effort would be made to recommit this bill.

It is perfectly obvious to everyone that the one purpose in putting this peanut amendment in the bill was to make the bill unpalatable to some of us on this side in the hope and almost with the assurance that the bill would be recommitted. Then they would accomplish nothing for the great manufacturers of candy they are trying to help.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Are we not entitled to know the name?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MULTER. Not if it is taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman is out of order in that he is not addressing himself to the pending amendment but has gotten off onto the subject of peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The suggestion is made that I should name the person I referred to. CHARLIE HALLECK, the majority leader, made the statement, that every effort would be made to recommit the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for clarification?

Mr. MULTER. This much appears crystal clear at this moment and I am sure needs no clarification. The members who voted for the peanut amendment must make up their minds as to whether or not they want the pleasure of having passed the peanut amendment, and then having that amendment together with the entire bill rejected by this House, or give up the empty victory they have attained and eliminate the amendment and pass the bill. We have been assured that a bill will be introduced dealing solely with an amendment to the act to take out peanuts as a basic commodity. We have been assured of a full and fair hearing on that bill. We can then present that sole issue for action by the Congress.

As I indicated, if the amendment remains in this bill, the bill will then be defeated and absolutely nothing will be accomplished either for the peanut farmers, the users and consumers of peanuts, or for any of the farmers of the country. Defeat of this bill will mean no change in the law this year.

My own opinion is that it is much more important to bring about a change in the law and reestablish 90 percent of parity for all of the commodities covered by existing law, than to have the empty victory for a few minutes of eliminating one commodity which does not belong in the law and thereby preventing any change of any kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] rise?

Mr. GAVIN. To move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting here for 2 hours while the members of the Committee on Agriculture have monopolized most of the time even though there are other Members who would like to be heard on this proposed legislation. I have waited so long it is quite difficult to recall exactly how I wanted to approach and present to you my thinking on this legislation to which I am vigorously opposed.

It has been interesting for me to listen to all of the bleeding hearts on both sides of the aisle about the poor farmer. The poor farmer. And just recently I recall when you came in here and asked for an extension of cotton and tobacco acreage to take care of the poor little farmer, however you forget the fact that when you agreed to certain cotton and tobacco acreage allotments and those allocations were reported back to your respective States and the respective States reported back to the county committees in your respective districts, you found you had forgotten about allocating sufficient acreage to the little farmer and the little farmer received but little consideration on the allocations so you returned to Congress to plead for increased acreage to take care of the little farmer when you should have taken care of him in the first instance.

So now do not try to make it appear that you feel badly about the little farmer; and I might say it brings tears to my eyes when I hear these pleas made for the little farmer. I want to help the little farmer and do everything I can for his welfare but let us not be misled. A great interest is always shown for the big commercial farmer who is the one responsible for these huge surpluses. Now to get back to this bill. I hold no brief for either side, but the facts are the Republicans have been just as much in favor, in years past, of rigid price supports as the Democrats; so do not take too many bows on the other side of the aisle because the Republicans have contributed just as much to the continuation of these programs as the Democrats. However, let me state I have always vigorously opposed them. But you have all had your nose in the trough for the past several years and you like it. Now let me recall to you that back in 1935 and 1936 we had the dust-bowl storms, the floods, and the droughts. It was not a depression that started the subsidy programs. Nature gave the farmer a hard time that necessitated help for the farmer and he deserved it so the Federal Government moved in to help and that in my opinion is where subsidy programs started. After that came the war and then the cry was to continue subsidy programs as an incentive to the farmer to increase the food supply to meet the needs and demands to fight a war. That was all right and the farmers were entitled to it and they turned in a magnificent performance of which they can well be proud. That was all right and one could readily accept such a program. But after the war was over, you had a great liking for these subsidy programs and I address myself to both sides of the aisle. You liked them, it is a great vote getter and as a matter of political expediency both sides were anxious that they be continued. But the only person who would possibly not agree and who has not been heard here today is the American consumer, the taxpayer who pays the bills. The day will come when Mr. Taxpayer will rebel and these programs will be out. Not many have heard from him but the day will come when you will hear from him in no uncertain terms.

You develop subsidy programs to take foodstuffs off the market and put them in bins, warehouses, and storage places to deteriorate and rot, and later to turn rancid. Then an effort is made to give them away or get rid of the food in any possible manner. All these useless programs cost billions of dollars which are added to your already overburdened national debt, so you can hand down a legacy of a $300 billion debt to generations that follow, a backbreaking burden of debt and taxation. Even if it was paid at the rate of $3 billion a year it would take 100 years to pay off the national debt and still every effort is made to continue these programs.

So you are here today pressing this farm legislation, not from a common sense viewpoint, but from the standpoint of political expediency and how many votes does it mean back home. You have not the courage of your convictions to stand up here and vote your convictions as you really think. You know this legislation for rigid price supports is not sound, it is not practical. Does it make sense to convert, as we did several years ago, young hogs into fertilizer, to distribute the fertilizer to farmers, to yield a production to be plowed under? Those programs never made sense then and they do not make sense now. However, they are approached a bit differently but the objective is the same.

So let us not talk too much about how you want to help the little farmer. What these programs have developed and who profits by them at the expense of the American taxpayers is the big commercial farmer, the big farmer, the fellow with 5,000, 10,000, or 15,000 acres. He is the man who is growing foodstuffs for the Government to pile in storage bins and warehouses to spoil. He is not growing foodstuffs for the consumer, the American people. You all recall the situation when we had the potato program, buy them up, pile them up, pour kerosene on them, burn them up, or feed them to the hogs. There were subsidies of $100,000, $200,000, $300,000 that some of the big potato growers were getting. But when you took off the support price, when you stopped the subsidies and cut out this program, what happened? You

went back to supply and demand that built America. The potato market became stabilized and we have not heard much about potatoes since and that could apply to all of these programs.

My friend from Missouri asked, What have the Republicans done in the last 64 years? I will tell you what we have done. We have increased the production in this country to such an extent that we have an approximate $400 billion income today with over 60 million workers employed. The foundation for all of our real prosperity was developed under the American system. That is what the Republicans have done, and do not forget that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman tell us what the national income was in 1932?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to proceed for 2 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, why not approach this legislation as good, sound, clear-thinking, practical, realistic Americans as we all know that this program does not make sense?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman takes credit for the $400 billion of national income. Will he tell us what it was in 1931?

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly the gentleman does not take credit, does he?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, we do.

Mr. GAVIN. You cannot take credit for that.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, we take credit for it.

Mr. GAVIN. Why does the gentleman not tell us what the national debt was back in 1932? It was about $17 billion. Today it is $280 billion and we have another $4 billion deficit coming up for fiscal year 1955. Now, I would agree with the gentleman if we had paid our bills as we went along the way; it would be a contribution, but we did not. We just added on to the national debt until it reached $280 thousand million; that is the legacy you are going to hand on to the boys and girls of tomorrow, one they will be paying for the next 100 years if it is ever paid. Why do you not think for a minute about the American consumer who pays the bill? He should be considered as well as anybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask my colleague if he is going to talk about the national debt of $280 billion?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, that is what I am going to talk about. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman is going to discuss the $280 billion debt, I will yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman would not answer the question asked by the gentleman from North Carolina. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GAVIN. Go ahead.

Mr. BOGGS. How much has the national debt been reduced in the last 3 years?

Mr. GAVIN. How much has it been reduced? With these kinds of programs, how do you think it ever will be reduced?

Mr. BOGGS. How much?

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield further.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The only time the national debt has been reduced—and it was reduced $5 billion—was in the 80th Congress.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. You know my good friends from the farm States, and you are my good friends, you remind me of the fellow that is always crying the blues carrying a ham under each arm.

So, therefore, I am appealing to you today to be thinking of your communities, your counties that you come from, the States you represent, to use good judgment and not be influenced in your thinking today from the standpoint of political expediency, whether you are Republicans or Democrats, but what is good for America, what is good for all the people of America, and exercise good, sound common sense and vote your convictions accordingly.

In closing I want to pay tribute to a great American, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. He is trying to do a good job to the best of his ability and to solve the complex and perplexing problems of agriculture. The vicious attacks that are made on him certainly are not warranted and are unjustified. He deserves our hearty commendations for his fine work. I think he is a great American trying to do a good job for the benefit of all the American people and for the future growth, progress and prosperity of our Nation.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thought it was customary to alternate from side to side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has endeavored to recognize all gentlemen as rapidly as possible who desire to be heard. The Chair did not realize that the gentleman from Ohio wished to be heard at this time. He has already recognized the gentleman from Wyoming and trusts that the gentleman from Ohio will bear with the Chair.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back to the amendment before the House in regard to dairy products. The issue has been raised that the Republicans have not had a farm program, yet here is the place that we have had a farm program. In connection with that, I think we have a testimonial to that farm program by the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee. When an attempt is made to put him under this price support law, what does he tell us? "No. Do not do that to me. I am in the business. you are going to ruin me. The dairy farmer is better off under flexible price supports than he was before, under 90-percent rigid supports. It is better for the farmer. We have increased production, and our prices are about the same." But then he says, "Wait a minute. You cannot apply that to the other basic commodities, because they have surpluses." This is what I would like to point out to you should have been added to his argument. What has been good under flexible price supports for the dairy farmer has been good for the Government. Unsold supplies of butter have been reduced from a peak of 467 million pounds last summer when we had high rigid price supports to the present figure of 262 million pounds under flexible price supports. What has been good for the dairy farmer has also been good for the Government. It has been good for the people. I submit that if the same program is applied and is permitted to operate for the benefit of my wheat farmers and your wheat farmers and your corn farmers that program again will prove its effectiveness and will keep them from being forced off the farms. High rigid supports force the little farmer off the farms, as has been proved in connection with rice, cotton, and tobacco, where we have increased acreages even during this session of Congress; and I went along with that. Flexible price supports offer to remove the threat to my little wheat farmers of the same thing happening to them.

This Republican program has proved itself in the dairy industry.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman in favor of the pending amendment or is he opposed to it?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is opposed to the pending amendment?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate on the floor of the House on fixed versus flexible price supports for basic farm commodities with attention and interest. The philosophies presented are diametrically opposed.

The problem of the House is to act in the best interests of the country in general, and the farmer in particular.

We are concerned with the price support on five basic crops, and since wheat is the only one of these crops that is raised in substantial quantities in Wyoming, I shall largely confine my remarks to that particular crop. It also happens that it is the crop that is probably of greatest concern to us today by reason of the greater accumulations of surplus. When we consider the production from the country as a whole, the amount of wheat raised in Wyoming is not of great significance. It is of great significance, however, to Wyoming, where it is one of our principal cash-farm crops.

We have heard many persuasive arguments. In fact, some are so persuasive as to lead us us away from the fundamental basic principles on which I am sure we all agree. The farmer, like anyone else, depends upon net income for a living for himself and his family. It is that net income which is of most importance to him, and neither he, nor we, should be misled by talk of such terms as parity, gross national income, and so forth. Price times production, less expenses, equals net income, and no action this body takes is going to change that, and let us not forget it.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas, a member of the Agriculture Committee, in particular, spoke so persuasively that I caught myself becoming so impressed with the oratory that I almost forgot to analyze what he said. He spoke of the comparative stability of the unit price of the basic commodities, and particularly wheat, over the past few years, as compared to the greater fluctuation in the unit price of other non-supported commodities. What was omitted was the fact that our wheat farmers are experiencing a 40 percent cut in production, which is the equivalent of a 40 percent cut in price. Under our basic formula of net income equals price times production, less expenses, this is the equivalent of receiving $1.25 for the wheat, with no cut in production.

Wyoming wheat farmers, who cannot diversify to other crops, cannot live with this situation. We further cannot justify it when the great majority of the wheat which they are producing is of premium quality milling wheat of which there is no surplus but a shortage, as proven by the premium prices that they received last year in excess of support price. Yet to produce this wheat for which there is a demand, our farmers must pay 45 percent of parity as a penalty on the excess over their allotment.

I think the American farmer now sees the truth of the proposition, that we cannot have high price supports without having rigid Government controls. The law, by its provision for eventual controls, recognized this from its inception. Because of being bailed out by two wars, it took us over 15 years to work into this situation. It is true that we are not going to suddenly work ourselves out. Probably, we will have some controls during the time that we are bringing the surpluses, created by the past, within reasonable bounds. During this time, it is my sincere hope that we will recognize differences in quality, so as not to impose controls on production indiscriminately. If we must have controls, I hope we will consider allotments based on bushels that can be sold, and elimination of the Government storage program.

High, rigid price supports have brought about this problem. I fail to see how we can logically say that by their continuance we expect to solve the problem. Ninety percent price support did not bring us a price for good milling wheat over the support price. That was brought about by the law of supply and demand. The abandonment of high price supports is, as far as I can determine, the first necessary step toward doing away with acreage controls.

I cannot justify a program which is foreign to our basic American philosophy; a program which causes the farmer to produce for the Government, instead of for consumption; a program which has created surpluses, the storage on which runs over $800,000 a day, and threatens soon to be over $1 million a day, when that program, at the same time, is contrary to the best interests of the farmer because it brings about a drastic reduction in his net income. I urge the defeat of H. R. 12, which would restore the very condition under which our agricultural ills, as so ably presented by the proponents, have developed. Flexible price supports have been blamed for these ills before they really became effective. I urge that we give flexible price supports a fair trial.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to follow the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] because it was a great revelation to me to hear him display his wide range of knowledge on the agricultural question. I had not realized that he knew so much about it. The only agricultural product I ever heard him talk about before was on the 2d of February when he usually talks on the care and raising of groundhogs.

The gentleman finished his statement with praise for the Secretary of Agriculture. I would like to point out to him that delivering the American farmer to the present Secretary of Agriculture is just like delivering the gentleman's Punxsutawney groundhog to the middle of the Atlantic Ocean and dropping him in.

Mr. GAVIN. Or into the gentleman's own district.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That would be worse for him, because we would realize that he was a fake groundhog. The Republicans had gotten Mr. True D. Morse to come up to my district last year to do a little political campaigning. He spent the best part of 3 days out there defending this program and attacking me for not supporting it. Mr. Morse is the man who, according to the newspapers, says that the trouble with the American farmer is that there are too many of them, they are inefficient, that we ought to get rid of a good percentage of them, and that we ought to have the efficient corporate type of farm. I followed Mr. Morse around my district and I pointed out to him and to the people that in the one country where they had attempted collectivized farming and had done away with the one-family farm, as he seems to advocate, they were starving or nearly starving and were not producing agricultural products, and their people were semihungry. Of course, I realize that some people here are saying that there are no political implications in this, but there are political implications and I would like to point one out. After Mr. Morse got through campaigning, especially in this one county in my district, they had an election the next week. I had the pleasure of calling him up a couple of days after the election and telling him that I always like to give credit where credit is due and since he had spent about 2½ days in this particular county, I thought it was only fair to let him know that for the first time since 1852 a Democrat had carried that county for Congress. That is how he succeeded in selling the program to the people upon whom it operates.

When a dairy farmer is getting 6 cents a quart for milk—and many of them were getting 6 cents a quart or less last year—they are not very enthusiastic about 75 percent of parity. I do not consider the Wall Street Journal to be an outstanding agricultural newspaper, but it gave about as good a definition of parity as I know. The Wall Street Journal said that 100 percent of parity is 100 percent of a fair price. It would follow then, that 90 percent of parity is 90 percent of a fair price, and 75 percent of parity for a dairy farmer is three-fourths of a fair price.

The only thing that I objected to about the political situation was 2 years ago or 3 years ago when the Democrats seemed to be a little bit on the cheap side, because with the Democrats promising about 90 percent of parity, some Republican speech writer got the bright idea—apparently he had studied higher mathematics—that 100 percent was more than 90 percent. He wrote a speech about 100 percent of parity which was delivered out at Kasson, Minn. That was on the stump. But after the administration came into power Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, said that while 100 percent of parity might be good in the political campaign, 75 percent of parity would be sufficient when you come to put it into action.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I take it the gentleman is supporting my amendment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I certainly am.

Mr. LAIRD. Does not the gentleman agree that the Secretary of Agriculture had no other alternative in view of the Solicitor's opinion last year, or does he think the Solicitor's opinion was in error and it does require action by this Congress to set that minimum floor?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would answer that as I did the President at lunch one day. When I asked him how his cattle were getting along on his farm he said he had to sell them because the Attorney General said he should not be in the dairy business if he was making decisions that would affect the dairy industry. I said, "If I am elected President I'm not going to sell my cows." He said, "What

would you do?" I said, "In that case, I guess I'd have to get a new Attorney General."

So perhaps your solution is a new Solicitor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, will it be something new if I admit in the beginning that I am not a farm expert, and I suspect there may be other Members of the House in the same category? I am perfectly aware of the fact that certain other members of the body politic and of the electorate are not farm experts. I represent approximately the same number of people interested in this bill as are represented by any other Member. Those people are the consumers of this country.

In my city of Philadelphia, our share of the cost of the more than $7 billion already overhanging the market in farm surpluses is in excess of $75 million. That amount of money which we are on the hook for in Philadelphia, even with our present extravagant city administration, would run the city for a good part of the year. Therefore, we have an interest in the program. We have an interest in the fact that the Government now has enough wheat to give every man on earth 15 loaves of bread; enough cotton to clothe 40 million Americans for a year; enough dry milk to give every American 3 quarts of fresh milk; enough corn to supply every United States family for 5 months; enough butter to supply every United States family for over 2 months.

More than that, my city and the people of my city do not like the fact that this program is for the benefit neither of themselves nor of the average small farmer, because they know that 91 percent of our farmers received less than half of those price-support payments. They know that 1.9 percent of our farmers got more than 25 percent of the total price-support benefits in this high-support, big-farmer bill. They know that 9 percent received in excess of 50 percent of the benefits.

The Governor of our great State is in town today. I have found it necessary to say that I am not able to go downtown to visit with him while he discusses the problems of Pennsylvania, because I think my job is to stay up on the Hill and discuss the problems of Pennsylvania where we have a chance to do something about them. All he is doing about the consumer is to propose the most discriminatory and outrageous and irresponsible wage-tax program in the history of our State. Gov. George Leader's administration learns nothing from the ill-fated George Earle's governorship. George II is giving us worse government than George I, with taxes more oppressive than George III. To call away from attendance on the floor of this House a great many Members who ought to be here right now fighting the fight of the consumer to reduce the cost of living in the State of Pennsylvania and in the city of Philadelphia is another instance of irresponsibility in Government. So I do not have time for lunches downtown and for talks that take people away from legislative duties at a time when we have problems like this to work out.

I submit as a consumer it seems to me we cannot delay longer in attempting to build farm and food programs in line with the welfare and interests of the consumers and producers alike, because the 149 million nonfarm people in our land are certainly conscious of and concerned with what happens to agriculture. They will go along with a reasonable price-support program that serves all the people, but they are becoming more and more alert against anything that discriminates against them. They do not want to see food stored out of their reach or to see products that they might like to have such as butter, eggs, and potatoes stored to the point where they spoil and are wasted. And just as the farmers would probably say to us that he doesn't want the laborer to have unemployment insurance so high that he will no longer have the incentive to work, neither does the housewife want the farmer's price support or price protection at a level where it is an incentive for him to produce far more than we can consume. There is an extremely delicate balance in our economy, and if that balance is not maintained, it is the taxpayer who pays for it, and he is entitled to get his money's worth. The welfare of the consumers and the farmers is closely tied together. Neither one can long expect to profit at the expense of the other. Together we will move forward to higher standards of living by promoting their common interest and by working always for the best interest of the whole American Nation. Most consumers recognize, I believe, that the Nation needs a farm program to help keep agriculture sound, productive and prosperous. Housewives know that agricultural abundance is important to them because it provides the food and fiber for the health and happiness of their families. Many consumers also recognize the need for price supports to keep farm price and farm incomes from falling at times when supply and effective demand get out of balance. But what virtually all consumers do not understand are some of the obvious inconsistencies of the price-support program. They do not understand why some farmers, mostly big cooperative farmers should benefit for not producing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the Laird amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to impose myself upon the good graces of the membership, and I will try not to use the entire 5 minutes.

I have always been a firm friend of the rigid-support program for agricultural products. I voted for the rigid-support program last year as against flexible supports even in spite of certain deficiencies and shortcomings in the bill. It makes it rather difficult for me to support a program of rigid supports coming from a district such as I represent where the winters are very long and the pasture season is very short. We have a very long inside feeding period in northern Wisconsin.

The inside feeding period for dairy cattle in the area from which I come extends to in excess of 7 months. The cost of wheat and corn is important in feeding costs. It is rather difficult for me, in spite of the fact that in the past I have always supported the rigid-price-support program, to do so because when we support corn and wheat at 90 percent of parity and let dairy products drop to from 75 percent to 80 percent of parity, it means that we are legislating here to keep the feeding costs of dairy farmers in my district high despite the fact that the price that they get for the products that they produce under a flexible program is very low. I think the addition of dairy products as a basic commodity would strengthen this bill. I think you will gain many friends for the final passage of this bill, if dairy products are included as a basic commodity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Along with the gentleman from the 10th District of Wisconsin, I also voted last year against flexible farm price supports and for rigid supports at 90 percent of parity.

I might state to the gentleman from the 10th District that in the House Agriculture Committee meeting of March 8 we tried to get 90-percent supports for dairy products without quotas or controls. After this motion lost, I offered an amendment to support dairy products at 85 percent of parity without quotas or controls.

On the vote, which lost by 14 to 13, I had the support of 10 Democrats and 2 Republicans in addition to my own vote. Eleven Republicans and three Democratic members of the committee voted against my motion.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, which provides for quotas and controls. I shall support the present amendment for 90 percent. I am in the same position as the gentleman from the 10th District. If we are unsuccessful in passage of this amendment, I wonder if the gentleman will support me in my effort to make dairy products a basic commodity if the dairy farmers of the United States want such a program with the same procedure for controls and quotas that apply to other basic commodities.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think so. I think one of the reasons for the illness in the dairy industry is the lack of marketing quotas. I think one of the basic reasons why the dairy industry is in the pinch and the mess it is in today is because we have not had these controls.

For instance, whenever a farmer in Kansas was cut down on his wheat acreage, he turned those acres into a dairy farm. As the acreage was cut for the wheat farmer and the corn farmer and the tobacco farmer, they turned those acres into dairy farms. If we had controls to prevent those people from going into the dairy business on the side, we would not have the difficulty we have today. I do not believe we should have 90 percent of parity and pile up surplus upon surplus. I want to be reasonable about this. I think if we do have dairy

products included in this bill as a basic commodity, that we also ought to have the Department of Agriculture work out a system of quotas, because it is the only way in which we could operate within reason.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

My purpose in introducing that legislation was to find out what the farmers in the dairy area really wanted, so that we could have hearings and determine just what they wanted. If the dairy farmer does not want it, I would be the last one to urge it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In conclusion, I repeat and emphasize that you would strengthen support behind this bill in its final passage if you would adopt the Laird amendment to include dairy products as a basic commodity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, but I have been around here for the past 2 days hoping to say a few words on this particular bill.

Before making the two points I wanted to make, I did want to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], who I regret did not yield to me, to supply the statement that he quoted Mr. True D. Morse, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, as having made. I have heard Mr. Morse's views on this subject, and they do not coincide with the views which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] expressed. So if he would supply for the RECORD the speech of Mr. Morse to which he has referred, or state specifically where the quotation comes from, perhaps we could clear up that misunderstanding, because I am certain that Mr. Morse recognizes the position of the small farmer in this country and is very much interested in his welfare.

Secondly, I want to refer to some remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] about the position of some of us on the left side of the aisle, and I include myself among them, with regard to the peanut amendment. I would be glad to express my viewpoint on it. I think many others share the same view.

I am opposed to this rigid support bill and will vote against it. I am also in favor of eliminating peanuts as a basic crop. I do not believe it should ever have been there. I am therefore trying to correct a bill that is more to my liking. If we can eliminate peanuts, I think we can have the bill in much better shape. On the other hand, I think the more serious issue involves rigid supports, and therefore I would vote against the bill and hope that sometime later we could take care of the peanut situation. I think such a position is consistent.

I want to call the committee's attention to one very important aspect of this farm question that has not been discussed in the entire 2 days of debate on this mater, nor was it mentioned in the committee report. In order to do that I am going to refer to my supplemental views that appeared in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in regard to the agricultural situation.

I said this:

The committee report discusses a decline in farm income. The matter of immediate concern to our people is per capita farm income, not total farm income as long as farm production continues to rise and meet the demands of our population. Per capita farm income has increased in the past few months and seems to be rising. Farm population is continuing to decline which lies at the base of the foregoing economic fact. Of course, in a proper appraisal of the economics of our society the ratio of farm income to national income is an important factor. However, the ratio has been declining since pre-Revolutionary days as our society has continued to industrialize. I believe we can expect the ratio to continue to decline. What is of immediate concern, however, is the fact that per capita farm income has not been rising to the same extent that per capita national income has.

Actually per capita farm income is the real issue. Back in 1789 the percentage of farm income to our national income was around 90 percent; today it is around 5 percent. But the percentage is going to decline as we continue to industrialize.

The second point I want to make concerns the small farmer. All this talk on the floor in behalf of the small farmer, of course, meets with my deepest interest and I am deeply concerned about it, but I want to point out something about these price supports. Last year 1.9 percent of the farmers of this country got 25 percent of these supports.

Nine percent of the farmers of the country got over half of the dollars that the Federal Government paid out. Those are not small farmers, Mr. Chairman. If you will refer to a table put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, page 9557, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], when we were considering a bill to support agricultural prices you will get a picture of it. Sixty-four farmers received over $100,000 in support. Two of them received over a million dollars.

That is what is happening under this rigid price farm program, the bulk is going to the larger farmers. I am inserting into the RECORD the table showing the producers with the largest quantity of corn, wheat, and cotton under loan, 1953 crop:

Producers with largest quantity of corn, wheat, and cotton under loan, 1953 crop

Name and address of producer	Quantity under loan	Amount of loan
ALABAMA		
COTTON		
J. B. Hain & Co., Sardis	989 bales	$178,171.35
J. A. Minter & Son, Tyler	816 bales	146,525.75
ARIZONA		
COTTON		
Bogle Farms, Chandler	1,870 bales	503,908.11
B. F. Youngker, Buckeye	1,911 bales	298,129.46
J. G. Boswell, Litchfield Park	406 bales	198,972.82
ARKANSAS		
WHEAT		
Wesson Farms, Inc., Victoria	88,756 bushels	209,034.31
COTTON		
B. C. Land Co., Leachville	2,291 bales	412,361.10
St. Francis Valley Farms, Marked Tree	1,067 bales	192,072.15
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson	875 bales	152,462.98
Roy Chaney, Coy	581 bales	103,499.10
L. W. Rodgers, West Memphis	577 bales	102,191.50
ILLINOIS		
CORN		
Lester Pfister, El Paso	71,712 bushels	116,173.44
INDIANA		
CORN		
Emil Savich, Rensselaer	102,648 bushels	166,289.76
IOWA		
CORN		
Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt	124,800 bushels	$190,944.00
KANSAS		
WHEAT		
Carl Smith, Goodland	64,277 bushels	139,237.00
Fred Schields, Goodland	57,669 bushels	125,198.00
Garvey Farms, Colby	43,132 bushels	104,263.00
LOUISIANA		
COTTON		
Ray P. Oden, Shreveport	876 bales	153,339.43
MISSISSIPPI		
COTTON		
Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott	7,220 bales	1,269,492.66
O. F. Bledsoe Plantation, Greenwood	2,328 bales	394,351.03
B. F. Harbert & Co., Robinsonville	1,889 bales	359,204.39
Sturdivant, Yandell & Wilburn, Vance	1,061 bales	191,256.48
Circle X Plantation, Indianola	1,127 bales	183,371.69
MISSOURI		
COTTON		
E. P. Coleman, Sikeston	3,655 bales	643,993.37
MONTANA		
WHEAT		
U. S. Wheat Corp., Hardin	184,516 bushels	348,646.20
H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester	116,118 bushels	232,527.90
J. R. Katzenberger, Highwood	50,875 bushels	101,982.80
Roy Killenbeck, Scobey	48,639 bushels	101,675.83

Producers with largest quantity of corn, wheat, and cotton under loan, 1953 crop—Continued

Name and address of producer	Quantity under loan	Amount of loan
NEW MEXICO		
COTTON		
Hayner Ranch, Las Cruces	1,080 bales	$177,836.37
Thigpen & Funk, Lake Arthur	890 bales	149,009.93
J. P. White, Jr., Roswell	764 bales	139,704.31
Hal Bogle, Dexter	801 bales	131,510.28
Bowman & Son, Artesia	761 bales	126,112.63
CALIFORNIA		
WHEAT		
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles	68,471 bushels	147,007.24
COTTON		
Giffen, Inc., Huron	7,314 bales	1,246,516.46
Charles Schwartz, Stratford	3,947 bales	604,321.89
Wheller Farms, Bakersfield	3,373 bales	499,008.22
Roberts Farms, McFarland	2,910 bales	456,133.74
A. Shrier and Sons, Delano	2,785 bales	440,695.56
COLORADO		
WHEAT		
J. H. and N. M. Monaghan Farms Co., Derby	157,443 bushels	338,535.55
Box Elder Farms Co., Denver	71,939 bushels	171,801.82
IDAHO		
WHEAT		
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culdesac	85,842 bushels	172,677.00
A. E. Bott, Newdale	66,294 bushels	109,158.00
Ira McIntosh and Sons, Lewiston	55,978 bushesl	112,401.00
NORTH DAKOTA		
WHEAT		
Witteman Co., Mohall	58,850 bushels	127,281.48
OREGON		
WHEAT		
Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton	124,002 bushels	270,607.00
Hill Ranches, Pendleton	85,858 bushels	178,070.00
Marion T. Weatherford, Arlington	84,304 bushels	197,939.00
E. R. McCanse, La Grande	57,184 bushels	116,631.00
H. A. Miller, Bond	51,756 bushels	119,445.00
SOUTH CAROLINA		
COTTON		
McColl Realty Co., Bennettsville	1,293 bales	$208,475.24
SOUTH DAKOTA		
WHEAT		
J. E. Cheek, Pierre	46,150 bushels	101,530.00
TENNESSEE		
COTTON		
H. S. Mitchell, Millington	597 bales	109,277.77
TEXAS		
WHEAT		
W. T. Waggoner Trust Estate, Box 2130, Vernon.	73,087 bushels	175,660.71
COTTON		
Ralph Farms, San Elizario	1,096 bales	323,686.78
J. E. Porter, Caldwell	1,293 bales	208,139.36
Carl Clawson, Lubbock	1,209 bales	201,492.05
Dooley & Hendricks, Roscoe	1,210 bales	201,007.43
Claude Collins, Jr., and S. Y. Wilson, 3135 Wheeling Street, El Paso.	694 bales	162,875.03
WASHINGTON		
WHEAT		
Horrigan Farms, Prosser	152,840 bushels	354,339.00
Horrigan Investment Co., 1411 4th Ave. Bldg., Seattle.	92,382 bushels	201,832.00
E. C. Hay, Tekoa	87,376 bushels	178,196.00
The Sheffels Co., Govan	86,294 bushels	182,756.00
Don Damon, Cunningham	85,262 bushels	182,717.00

Ninety-one percent of our farmers are getting less than 50 percent of the price-support benefits. I think it is time that we begin thinking in terms of big farmer and little farmer just as we have for some time been thinking in terms of big business and little business. I mean thinking in fair terms—not to make a villain out of the big farmer as some try to do out of big business. There is a proper and good place for both big and small organizations in our economy but big and small have different problems which need to be considered somewhat separately.

I suggest that the Agriculture Committee make an analysis of this price-support program, whether flexible or rigid, and just see who is coming out on top, big or little farmer. After this study is made perhaps more light and less thunder will demonstrate just which program really is for the little farmer.

In the meantime, I suggest the statistics reveal that the present program essentially benefits the large operator. It is from him that the great surpluses are generated which hurt the little fellow. Secretary Benson's program should be given a chance to operate and this untimely bill defeated.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment be limited to 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think if we are all frank with ourselves we will acknowledge that this bill is here before us for only one purpose, that is to put the Members on record. I think we all recognize it has no chance of becoming law. We know it is certainly in opposition to any program of the President, that certainly the President is going to veto it. There will be a close vote here in the House on passage. There is a serious question as to whether it will pass the House. These facts have been known all along by the chairman of the committee and the supporters of the bill. It has been announced that the other body either will not consider it or it will be defeated there. So what we are doing here is just to put the Members on record for political purposes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman suggest that the President would veto a measure that he endorsed during his campaign for the Presidency?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He certainly did not endorse it. We went all through that last year. The gentleman was not a Member of the House last session but if he will read the RECORD of last session the answer to his question will be very clear. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. The President's position is very clear.

Now, as long as we are going to go on record let me make my position very clear. I believe it is essential to the success of any farm price-support program, if it is to function in peacetime, that it be on a flexible basis. I also believe, however, that this is an appropriate time, since we are going on record as far as price levels on the so-called basic commodities are concerned, to have the record clear with respect to the support level for milk. We in Wisconsin only last fall, very few months ago, heard speech after speech by representatives of the Democrat Party and Democrat candidates for office insisting that the support price for milk should be 90 percent and even going to the extent of saying that it should be 100 percent. Some of these speakers were Democrat Members of Congress imported from other States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], in his amendment simply says that dairy products should be supported at the same level as basic commodities. The issue now is crystal clear.

The question is, What is the present position of these men who were making those speeches a few months ago? I think the Laird amendment and the opposition to it by the Democrat spokesmen certainly dramatizes the inconsistency and the insincerity which characterized the various speeches they made during last year's political campaign. When

they were making political speeches they were for 90 percent, and even 100 percent, for the dairy farmers. Let me mention to some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that then there was no reference to controls, there was no reference to regimentation in connection with this right of the dairy farmer to have 90 percent or 100 percent. That is a new gimmick that they now rely on to defeat the Laird amendment. They have a chance right now to make good on their promises and their word. Let it be known to the dairy farmers that these men who posed as their great friends last year, are today running out on them. Today they are singing a different tune.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, there is unquestionably a very great dilemma concerning this legislation. I can well understand and deeply sympathize with the problems of those who represent farming areas in the Middle West, the West, and the South. They have reason to be concerned with the declining farm income even though the reduction has not reached very significant proportions.

With due respect for their views, I do not believe that the measures they now propose to be a panacea for their own economic problems are at all helpful; indeed, they would be undoubtedly harmful to the interests of the consumers, the taxpayers, and the Nation as a whole.

The process of providing huge Government funds to support certain commodity prices at artificial levels, stimulating production beyond normal needs and piling up gigantic surpluses in our warehouses to deteriorate and rot—as they often do—strikes me as being grossly violative of both economic and moral law. I read a report the other day that the daily cost to the Government of storing these great surpluses in warehouses would soon reach the staggering figure of $1 million per day, or in the neighborhood of $365 million per year. This, I submit, is a truly fantastic situation, and frankly it must give us all cause to pause and ponder on the remedies and the solutions for such deplorable waste of precious foodstuffs and such paradoxical storage expense.

How much farther can we go along the road of rolling up these enormous surpluses? If we continue commodity price supports, how soon will our warehouse space be exhausted? Are we to take action here to store as yet unmeasured and unascertained quantities of foodstuffs to waste, to degrade, and to rot? Of course, such a result in an intelligent, civilized society is shockingly preposterous.

Now what is the next alternative? The first is to give these commodities away to needy foreign peoples. There is considerable humanitarian validity to this proposal. It would be far better to give them away than to let them spoil and rot. But we have to consider the impact of such programs on other economies and the world market and the very heavy transportation costs that would have to be borne by this Government in carrying out such a program. It is a matter requiring very careful consideration.

While the disposal of the surpluses is a matter of very considerable urgency which should be consummated as soon as practicable, in the long run it will be of no appreciable advantage to eliminate existing surpluses if we, on the other hand, as proposed by this bill, by Government fiat and at Government expense, continue to accumulate steadily new and growing surpluses.

The advocates of the bill complain that there is a farm recession so-called, that farm prices and farm income have gone down substantially since 1951. During practically this entire period a high parity bill has been in effect; hence, it is hard to understand how and why a return to the high-parity principle would be beneficial in correcting these alleged undesirable conditions.

I would remind the House that farm areas are not the only areas in the Nation that have been beset by some degree of recession. Although we have more people gainfully employed than ever before in peacetime—for which fact we can be most grateful—that is indeed a most inadequate answer to give to the very many unemployed who have lost their jobs and are currently without means of support for themselves and their families except what they receive in the form of social-security benefits or direct relief.

To make the status of workers and businesses in industrial areas worse, the reciprocal trade treaties are pouring cheaply produced foreign goods into the competitive markets of America to disrupt business further and create additional unemployment.

The plain evidence reaching me indicates that present price supports on peanuts are working great damage and hardship upon certain segments and a considerable number of industrious workers in the New England and general candy business.

The able distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend and esteemed colleague [Mr. O'NEILL], has pointed out with consideration, elaboration, and unanswerable arguments the harmful effects of the high priority support of peanuts upon prosperity and employment in the candy business in his district. I am therefore, in eager support of the Green amendment to remove supports from prices on peanuts.

Not for one moment would I minimize the seriousness or the difficulty of these problems. I am not completely convinced that the flexible program is a complete answer. My attitude is in a distinct measure that of a realist who, recognizing that past policies have not succeeded in solving these great economic questions is now willing to try another plan, which on its face appears to be sound and practicable, in the hope that upon trial and test it may prove to be in the direction of a tolerable and substantial solution.

Any plan to peg prices of food and fibers artificially is bound to produce serious effects upon consumers and small farmers as well as upon the functioning of our entire distributive system. It throws out of joint and out of gear the regular machinery of the free-enterprise system by interfering with fundamental economic law. Let me assert that I am not contending that there are no conditions under which the Government should so interfere when the general and national interest requires, but that such action should not be taken in peacetime and in normal circumstances as a substitute for the natural forces and factors which lie at the base of our great competitive system. In a word, I do not argue against proper, well-considered regulation of the abuses and excesses that may develop in our capitalistic society. But I am, in general, opposed to governmental tampering and meddling with basic economic laws and with affairs and activities which under our traditional American system are peculiarly the province of the individual citizen and individual businessman. Cooperation may be a benefit, but regimentation of the economy may well prove to be a hazard and a detriment.

It is my view that the flexible plan may, by fair administration, by eliminating extremes, by coping more realistically with current farm problems, by tackling disposal of surpluses, perhaps extend more adequate protection to consumers, taxpayers, and small farmers, reduce costs, keep prices stabilized in relation to wages and income and also perhaps—and I must qualify my opinion—in time satisfactorily work out the problems of overproduction and surpluses which cause us such concern and occasion us such great expense in the present hour.

At least the Congress should try an alternative to a program that has generated so many expensive and intolerable consequences. We want our farmers and all other classes in our great Nation to be prosperous. Above all we should be resolved never again in this Nation to permit recessionary forces to gain mastery over our economy and cause dislocation, unemployment, and hardship among our fellow citizens.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Laird amendment which will bring some relief to that segment of the agriculture industry, the dairy industry, which to me is the most depressed industry in the entire agricultural field.

H. R. 12 as recommended by the committee, in my opinion, is highly discriminatory. The Laird amendment which we now have before us under debate would take a great deal of the discrimination out of the bill. If there is justification for the five basics; corn, wheat, rice, cotton, and peanuts, to have a 90 percent of rigid parity, then the same consideration should be given to dairy products.

Mr. Chairman, I believe you are cognizant of the fact that the basic ingredients used in the manufacture of dairy feeds for the production of milk are basically wheat, corn, and cottonseed meal. If we are going to adopt 90 percent of parity on the five basics, then there is

every reason in this world, and it is highly justifiable, to adopt the Laird amendment so dairy products will receive the same parity rating as the aforesaid basic commodities. I cannot believe that this Congress is going to pass legislation which would require the dairy farmer to pay the high basic price for dairy feeds to be manufactured through the cow into dairy products, and expect the dairy farmer to market his dairy products at 80 percent of parity.

I am supporting the Laird amendment and should it be adopted, I would then vote for the bill. If the Laird amendment is defeated, I shall oppose the passage of the bill because of its rank discrimination against the dairy farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated, the substance of this amendment was carefully considered by the House Committee on Agriculture and was rejected by a very substantial vote, according to my recollection. I know of the great interest of the gentlemen from Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other States in the problems of the dairy farmer. I have never heretofore favored and never shall hereafter favor high supports on the unlimited production of any commodity. Whenever the dairy farmers are willing to accept some sort of control of production, I certainly will be very much interested in trying to work out a program or in assisting in working out a program in their behalf. It seems to me that we must realize we are in a bad situation now so far as the dairy industry is concerned because of the fact that for 14 long months Mr. Benson held the price at 90 percent of parity when he could have lowered it at any time from the very moment he took over office.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

THE DEFEAT OF LAIRD AMENDMENT

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. In my remarks earlier today there was no inference that the gentleman was the one who had come in and advocated that type of support for dairy products in Wisconsin. But it did become quite a political issue in our State and I think we should bring it out on the floor today so that all the facts can be presented and be made a part of the record.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman, perhaps it did become a political issue, but we should not deal with it as such here. Some of the best friends of the dairy farmer are members of our committee. At all times I have had an open mind and have tried to be helpful. We did report out this year an 80-percent-price-support program for dairy products. We have that in the bill now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think that possibly if he would accept this amendment he might pick up a few votes?

Mr. COOLEY. It has been suggested that might happen, but I am not willing to surrender my own views on this matter to gain a few votes over there.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAIRD) there were—ayes 39, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POLK to the committee amendment: Page 13, line 1, strike out "two" and after the word "ending", insert "on or before June 30," and on line 2, strike out "in 1957 and" so that the amended phrase reads "not to exceed $15 million for each of the fiscal years ending on or before June 30, 1958."

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavor to avoid using all of the time. This amendment which refers to the brucellosis section of the bill has one purpose, and that is to make sure that the brucellosis program will be continued for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958. I have discussed this amendment with the ranking minority member of the committee; I have also discussed it with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The purpose of the amendment, which I am supporting, is to do exactly what the Committee on Agriculture intended to be done, to continue this brucellosis eradication program for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

Mr. POLK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The amendment should be agreed to, because it was unanimously approved in our committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to agree with the observation just made and say I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. POLK. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My innate modesty prevents a request to speak for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 12, which is under consideration, calls for the continuation of a policy which experience shows has failed to remedy the situation it was designed to correct, and the enactment of which inevitably will intensify the ills we seek to avoid. Too much efficiency has resulted in a surplus of farm commodities.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Inasmuch as the gentleman just made a statement that he would like 5 additional minutes, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not request the additional time, but am grateful, and if it is given, will not only accept but attempt to use it to some advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Permit me to advise the Chair that upon the conclusion of my 5 minutes, a preferential motion now at the desk will be offered. That, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], will give me the 5 minutes to the granting of which he objected.

Because, too efficiently during the war and since, the farmers answered their country's call for production, they are now taking an unmerciful beating.

Wages, salaries of Government officials and employees, of industrial employees and farm labor, are ever increasing. Farmers are receiving less and less for what they produce, paying more and more for what they must buy.

Farmers of the Midwest—I personally know no others—are honest, hardworking, loyal, patriotic citizens, willing to make sacrifices. They are law-respecting, law-abiding, independent citizens. They ask nothing except fair treatment, opportunity to exercise their independence as well as their ability. They want only "equal justice under law," a return to sound policies which will make secure for coming generations the rights which they have enjoyed.

Being informed individuals, farmers know that, as of April 20, 1955, the value of the surplus commodities which they have produced and which today are held by the Government—paid for by the taxpayers—was more than $4,406,928,000.

They know that the monthly storage charge is upwards of $23,600,000. They know that the daily storage charge in 1954 was $718,000 plus—today, reported by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and others, and apparently on reliable authority, as being upwards of $1 million per day.

Thinking farmers, who have the welfare of our people as a whole at heart; who give some consideration to the future value of our currency—their savings, their investments—know that the present program cannot be successfully indefinitely continued. They know that every day it adds a million dollars to the national debt.

So it is that, being patriotic—and let me repeat, willing to make personal sacrifices—they are willing to forego subsidies for farm products.

They expect others to make like sacrifices in the national interest.

Since Tuesday noon I have been waiting an opportunity to speak. Right well did members of the committee use the 4 hours allotted for general debate.

Nothing that will be said is said by way of complaint or criticism. I was on the floor during the general debate. I was here until we adjourned yesterday afternoon. I have been here since 10 o'clock this morning.

Some have complained, apparently with bitterness, that they were not recognized under the 5-minute rule. In my judgment, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has been not only extremely fair in his performance of a most difficult task, but he has been very considerate and courteous.

Every minute of the time that I have been on the floor listening to debate or seeking recognition has not only been instructive, but has been thoroughly enjoyed.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] just said: "It is obvious why we are here." This might be termed a "political bill." We all try to make political hay. I cannot recall any time when I cast a vote while thinking that the measure for which I was voting, or which I was opposing, would be helpful or harmful to the people of my district, that I was not incidentally hoping all the time for favorable political repercussions when election day rolled around. So why shy away from the fact?

Ours is a political Government, not a tyranny, under a dictatorship. Without a political opinion, no member would be justified in coming here, in remaining here to debate or cast a vote.

The debate has disclosed a political alliance in connection with the passage of H. R. 12 between, may I say, the chairman of the committee and Walter Reuther and four other labor leaders. No one criticizes that; at least, I do not. Why should I? If they all think it is good—fine. They should support it.

But who is Brother Reuther? The gentleman from North Carolina suggested yesterday, by inference at least, that I was sneering at Walter Reuther. No greater mistake was ever made so far as I am concerned.

Walter Reuther is an able man. Walter Reuther is an eloquent man. He is a persuasive orator. He is an efficient organizer. Walter Reuther is an ambitious man.

If you think that unjustified, read of his activities in connection with the sit-down strikes which began on the 1st day of January 1937.

He is a ruthless man. Walter Reuther is, in my judgment, if we have in mind a free, independent economy, a constitutional form of government, one of the most dangerous individuals in this country.

If I read the signs aright, he intends to give this country a labor government. And our Democratic friends had better profit by what happened in Michigan.

Walter Reuther and Gus Scholle, president of the State CIO, aided by the money which they collected from employees—sometimes against their will—with the aid of ambitious Democrats tolerant of methods and procedures, politically took over the State of Michigan.

They not only four times defeated a Republican candidate for governor, but in the last two elections, have filled every previously Republican-held State office with a Democratic candidate wherever opportunity has offered.

The leadership of the Democratic Party should take cognizance and be warned by what has happened in Michigan.

Industrial plants are moving south because of the demands which have been fastened upon industrial enterprises in the North by the CIO and other labor organizations. But southerners should not forget that the industrial plants which have moved south have been followed by union organizers.

They should not forget that, if Reuther and certain other union officials have their way, soon southern employees, including those who work on the farms, will be paying tribute to tyrannical union bosses.

Nor should southern Members of this body forget that soon Reuther will take over some of their States politically and they will not come here as Democrats, if they come at all. They will come, if they come, as representatives of the union, with the union as boss of their thinking and voting.

And, when the two great labor organizations have completed their efforts and act as one, no longer will we have in the South a Democratic Party—a party which believes and fights for the constitutional rights of the States—a party which is willing to exert itself in favor of the individual or the organization which creates, maintains jobs, pays taxes.

That domination of the Government by the labor organizations is the purpose of Reuther and of others is evident from many a news dispatch which comes to us day after day.[1]

And when that day rolls around, as apparently it will, we shall have a government—not only in the States but in the Nation—not of, by, and for the people, but a government to not only protect the rights of employees, but a government which will give employees belonging to certain organizations special privileges, special benefits, special opportunities, the granting and exercising

---

[1] LABOR HISTORY IN THE MAKING—UNIONS GOING POLITICAL, BUT PLAN NO NEW PARTY

(By Don Whitehead)

Organized labor—15 million strong—is going deeper into United States politics, but the high command is strongly opposed to a political labor party such as that in Great Britain.

Labor's top chiefs say the coming merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations will not mean a third party movement by labor.

Unions, they say, will remain an independent political force, giving allegience neither to the Democrats nor Republicans as a party. But they concede that Democratic candidates are far more likely to benefit from labor's political action than Republican candidates.

However, there is an implied warning by some labor leaders that is unions cannot achieve their goals through the two-party system—then they may head in another direction.

MEANY STATES VIEWS

AFL President George Meany, who will head the merged AFL–CIO organization, gave these views in an interview:

"As long as I have anything to say about it, the AFL will not tie itself to any political party. I don't believe in a labor class or a labor party along class lines such as the British Labor Party. I don't believe in it just as I don't think there should be a political party in this country along denominational lines.

"There will be increased political action by labor in 1956. But political action by organized labor doesn't mean we will tie ourselves to any party. There is talk that labor is going to join forces with the Democratic Party. Well, I'm not going to tie the AFL to any party, any time, anywhere.

"This doesn't mean, of course, that we won't support more Democrats than Republicans because that probably will be just the way it works out. The facts are that more Democrats have favorable records from our point of view than Republicans. We aren't damn fools. We know there will have to be cooperation with political parties on the local level—but that doesn't mean we're going to tie ourselves to any one party in any shape or form."

ONE POLITICAL GROUP

The merged unions will make their political drive through a single organization which will be formed with the merger of the A. F. of L.'s Labor League for Political Education and the CIO's Political Action Committee.

The A. F. of L. and CIO set up these political action groups after passage of the Taft-Hartley laws in 1947, which forbid unions from taking dues money out of union treasuries and spending it in support of any candidate running for Federal office.

These groups accept voluntary contributions from workers and since it is not dues money—there are no strings on spending it in direct support of any candidate.

But won't the effect of such political action actually mean drawing labor into closer working arrangements with the Democratic Party which now gets most of labor's support?

Mr. Meany: "I will say this: If the time should ever come when we are forced to do such a thing—tie ourselves to any party—then it will be our own party.

"We are going to try to achieve our aims on a nonpartisan basis. But if the nonpartisan effort fails, then we'll go somewhere else. We'll go where we must go. And we'll go as far down that road as it is necessary to go."

It is known that Walter Reuther, president of the CIO, and John L. Lewis, chief of the United Mine Workers, both share Mr. Meany's misgivings toward a national labor party in the United States.

NO LABOR PARTY NEED

Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the UMW, whose views often reflect the thinking of Mr. Lewis, had this to say:

"There is no need for a labor party in the United States. The American labor movement is essentially an economic movement and if it fails to realize this and to continue to act in behalf of its own membership to win better wages and working conditions through economic action, the UMW feels that it will suffer the fate of much of the European labor movement."

Generally, the feeling of union leaders is that labor best can achieve its aims through existing political parties rather than by setting up a third force in politics aimed at complete control of Government.

of which will be injurious to the rest of the people who do not pay tribute to the union bosses—a dictatorship for the benefit of a comparatively few.

Do not forget that Walter Reuther and his brother Victor got a part of their education in Russia. Do you remember that letter which was attributed to Victor Reuther written in behalf of himself and Walter when they were in Russia, which carried the advice—and you will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of days gone by—"Vote for a Soviet America?" No, I made a mistake—"Fight for a Soviet America."

And how long has it been since, because of adverse public sentiment, the CIO itself was forced to expel six of its unions because they were dominated by Communists?

And what has been the purpose of the Communists in connection with labor organizations?

John L. Lewis never was a fearful man. He is considered a realist. Even though the sit-down strikes in Michigan in 1937 were carried on under Lewis' direction, as the then president of the CIO, Lewis apparently was fully aware of what the Communists were seeking to do.

Read Lewis' 1924 denunciation of the policies and methods of the Communists. In Senate Document No. 14 of the 68th Congress, 1st session, a document compiled under the direction of John L. Lewis, the then president of the United Mine Workers of America, we find on page 1, these statements:

> Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American Continent.
>
> The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.
>
> The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions, but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States.

Nor were the Communists alone in their determination to take over industry. In Guy Rexford Tugwell's Industrial Discipline we find this statement:

> Planning will necessarily become a function of this Federal Government; either that or the planning agency will supersede the Government. * * * Business will logically be required to disappear.
>
> This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis—it is literally meant. * * * The future is becoming visible in Russia. * * *
>
> Perhaps our statesmen will give way or be more or less gently removed from duty. Perhaps our Constitution and statutes will be revised. Perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without violent resistance.

Why, Members ask, these apparently extraneous quotations?

Because in this proposed legislation will be found the beginnings of Government control of farms through the use of subsidies. Because, as will be later shown, some of the more powerful supporters of this bill are today—by force and violence, by rioting and by bombing, attempting to take over industry in the Southern States as they dominate some plants in the North.

My assertion is that today Reuther and some of those who are working with him are attempting to take over industry, subject employees to their dictatorial demands.

As early as November in 1937, at Detroit, Homer Martin, then powerful in the CIO, said that labor's entrance in the political scene was "just the beginning."

> We expect to build our political forces in every city of this State, and we expect the farmer to reach out his hand to help us.

Frankensteen, another early associate of Walter Reuther, on April 8, 1937, when he was the CIO's chief organizer, speaking of the first Ford said:

> Henry will either recognize the union or he won't build automobiles.

John L. Lewis said on the same day:

> Henry Ford will change his mind, or he won't build cars.

Listen, Representatives from the South, get a picture of what is coming to you.

How accurate the prophecy was has been shown by subsequent happenings. Martin, powerful in the CIO at that time, and apparently because Reuther was still further to the left, announced that it was his purpose to transfer Reuther, Mortimer, and Kraus to territory outside of the Detroit area. At that time, both Reuther and Kraus were charged with the destruction of property in a strike demonstration at Flint, Mich.

Now let me summarize my statement.

My charge is that the Reuther who appeared before the Agriculture Committee is today the same Reuther whose union in the sit-down strikes and since has defied and disregarded the law, the orders of the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. ABBITT) Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Let me repeat, I am not critical of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]; not at all. But I do desire, from the bottom of my heart, in an effort to be helpful, to call his attention to his political bedfellows, to their methods, their acts, their purpose.

What happened yesterday that justified the charge of political alliance made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was critical?

In my hand I hold a 10-page publication printed by the Government, the first page of which is as follows:

[84th Cong., 1st sess., committee print]

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM ON BASIC COMMODITIES

H. R. 12, A BILL TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED, WITH RESPECT TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

(March 15, 1955)

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture.

(U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1955)

The first inside page carries the names of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, together with the names of the

---

Mr. Meany, Mr. Reuther, Mr. Lewis and other labor leaders have studied the European labor movement closely and most of them have come to the same conclusion: A European-type labor movement in the United States would be bad for labor because it is too political.

And it is understood that Mr. Lewis believes Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther are going too far into politics even with their present plans for more vigorous political action.

QUILL DISAGREES

But there are some who believe labor should have its own State labor parties if not a national party. The viewpoint of this group was voiced last December in the CIO convention by Mike Quill, president of the Transport Workers of America. Mr. Quill said in part:

"I am afraid as we roll along year after year that we are tying ourselves tighter and tighter to the Democratic Party. As a mater of fact, if we keep going this way, we will find ourselves in a very few years as the most live and active wing of the Democratic Party and I think it is a danger. * * *

"I believe * * * serious consideration should be given to building in America a really and truly independent political party of CIO, so that the workers will have the choice to stand up separately and apart from any of the existing parties.

"I am not talking about a third party like the Progressive Party of Henry Wallace. That was created solely to split the liberal and progressive vote in this country. I am talking about a true party of labor that would give aid and comfort and rally a progressive vote for good candidates. * * * If we are not ready for national party in this country, then we should at least give serious consideration to forming labor parties in the States throughout the country where it is impossible for us to walk with the existing Democratic Party."

REUTHER REPLIES

To Mr. Quill's argument, Mr. Reuther replied:

"Building third parties will get no one anywhere. Every try has failed miserably, not because the motives or the reasons or the morality behind it was wrong, but because we are dealing with a structure in America that does not lend itself to the creation of third-party movements. * * *

"A labor party would commit the American political system to the same narrow class structure upon which the political parties are built * * *

"Basically what we are trying to do is work within the two-party system of America and bring about within the two-party system a fundamental realinement of basic political forces so that political parties can become responsible."

Mr. Meany himself believes the coming AFL-CIO merger, with the creation of a single political-action department, will take labor farther away from the idea of a national labor party.

He said: "Under unified leadership, I'm convinced we will be more successful in the course which we have followed. This course is in choosing the candidates we can support without becoming a part of the political party. I think we'll be more successful in electing people who are friendly to us—and there will be even less possibility of moving in the direction of a labor party."

committee's clerk, assistant clerk, counsel, and consultant.

Among other things in the foreword written and signed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I find the following:

> Mr. Walter Reuther, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, actually made the best farm speech that I have heard in our committee room during the entire 20 years that I have served on the House Committee on Agriculture. I commend Mr. Reuther's speech to the careful consideration of both producers and consumers, to the end that both groups might have a better understanding of the many problems involved.

The chairman also commended the president of the American Federation of Labor; the executive vice president of the Textile Workers Union of America; the general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; and Mr. J. A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, for the letters which they had written endorsing, as officials of their respective unions, H. R. 12 or similar legislation. The letters from those four union officials are carried on pages 9 and 10 of the committee print.

Eight pages of the committee print carry a statement by Mr. Reuther, a statement not verbally made to the committee by Mr. Reuther, but filed with the committee when Mr. Reuther appeared.

Appended to that statement was the farm program resolution adopted by the 16th Congress of Industrial Organizations' constitutional convention, December 1954 and the four letters from the labor leaders.

In substantiation of my statement, indicating joint political efforts, I quote from page 7 of the Power of Abundance—CIO Views on the Farm Problem, a brochure with pictures, published by the CIO with a foreword under date of March 16, 1955, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

From that CIO publication I quote Mr. Reuther when he appeared before the committee. He said:

> I have a formal statement which I would like to put in the record, and then I would like to elaborate on it orally if I might.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You may do that.

In the footnote to Mr. Reuther's request we have the following:

> Mr. Reuther's prepared statement is omitted from this publication. A copy may be obtained by writing to the Legislative Department, Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C.

It was that prepared statement which went out under frank.

Referring back to the committee print, it will be noted that document, "printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture," was submitted to, accepted by, but apparently not read to members of the committee. Nevertheless, the committee print carries the statement in full, the letters of endorsement of H. R. 12 by the four union officials, the foreword by Mr. COOLEY, a list of the committee members and staff, and nothing else.

It is my understanding that at a cost of $571.40, 57,000 copies of the committee print were ordered from the Public Printer.

Some 20,000 of those copies went down to the CIO headquarters here in Washington, though of that statement, I am not certain, that they were there addressed, sent back to the "Hill" and then mailed out under the frank of the chairman of the committee.

To my desk, and I assume to other Members of the House, on May 4, 1955, came a copy of a letter dated April 29, 1955, purporting to be written by Robert A. Heil, of 2328 Heliotrope Drive, Santa Ana, Calif., and addressed to Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

The first paragraph of the letter reads as follows:

> In today's mail I received a copy of a pamphlet printed by your committee, entitled "Price-Support Program on Basic Commodities: H. R. 12, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities." This pamphlet was mailed at taxpayer's expense and was franked under your signature.

Then followed certain critical remarks by Mr. Heil.

Earlier today, over the telephone, I called for Mr. Heil at the address given on his letterhead. The gentleman replying advised me that he was the individual who had written the letter to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and having read the first page to him, assured me that he had received a copy of the committee print, and that he was a member of the board of directors of the California Orange County Farm Bureau. He also advised that other members of the board of directors had received copies of the committee print.

It is not my purpose, and I do not now wish to be misunderstood. Neither directly or indirectly am I criticizing the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for permitting the CIO to mail out the committee print in order to obtain support for the passage of H. R. 12, even if that was his purpose. What the gentleman did in connection with the printing of the document to which reference has been made was a matter for his determination.

Now, please do not misunderstand. Permit a repetition so that the record may be clear. Neither directly nor indirectly am I critical of what the gentleman did. He has long been a Member of the House, long noted for his ability, for his earnestness, for his activities, for his adroit and effective support of legislation which he favors.

The gentleman might have put the testimony into a speech in the RECORD and then franked out not 57,000, but 100,000 or any other number. Nor am I critical because he permitted the use of a CIO or any other mailing list.

My suggestion in connection with this particular phase of the manner in which the proposed legislation was handled, if I may be permitted to make a suggestion, is first, if the committee print was "printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture," and reprints were desired, it might have been more desirable to have committee action taken.

Again, if any document was to be franked out by any Member of Congress in support of H. R. 12, more properly it should have been made a part of the record, and if it was to give the impression that it was a committee document, it should have carried something other than a prepared statement of just one witness, with routine letters of endorsement, submitted to but not read to the committee.

One receiving this Government print might well conclude that it carried all of the testimony which had been given to the Committee on Agriculture, which it did not.

Inasmuch as I am not critical of the procedure followed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in the printing or mailing of this committee print, might not Members well ask then, "Why should reference be made to the publication, to the manner in which it was sent out, of the selection of those to whom it was addressed?"

The legitimate purpose of calling the situation to your attention is to show the sources from which support of this legislation comes. Not because anyone should be criticized for support of any particular proposed legislation, but because, to justly consider and properly weigh their support, the objectives of the individuals and organizations giving it, as well as their political philosophies, their methods of obtaining the enactment of what they desire, should be known.

By sanctioning the printing of the committee print, by permitting it to be sent down to the CIO or some other organization for addressing, by then franking it out to officers or members of the Farm Bureau or other farm organizations, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and the president of the CIO joined forces and efforts to put over H. R. 12.

There is nothing in the making of that joint effort for that purpose which can be criticized. We all know the truth in the old statement that "politics makes strange bedfellows."

Again, Members may ask, if not critical of this association of individuals and labor unions in support of this legislation, why make reference to it?

Again, the answer is that the weight to be given to the recommendations of any individual or organization inevitably must be influenced by the political views and the practices of that individual or organization.

Again, my purpose is to call the attention of those supporting this legislation, and especially the attention of the chairman of the committee, to the political philosophy, to the methods and the procedure followed by those who in this particular instance, are his political associates.

My thought is that, however much the chairman may need the support of his present political allies, their philosophy, their methods, are not those which he conscientiously adopts or employs.

Associating with this gentleman and these organizations whose help he now

welcomes, whose efforts he now aids through the use of his frank, he and others who entertain the basic belief of most of the Democrats from the South will shortly find themselves displaced by their present allies.

Now, why do I say that? In this little pamphlet, our good friend—and again, it is no criticism—endorses what Mr. Reuther says and before the committee advocated. He endorses Mr. J. A. Beirne. And who is Mr. J. A. Beirne? Mr. Beirne is the president of the Communications Workers, which has the telephones in seven southern States tied up almost as tight as a drum. A railroad system in the South has also been struck for some time.

Mr. Reuther is not an ignorant man. Mr. Reuther undoubtedly reads the papers. Mr. Reuther, it may be assumed, is well aware of what has been, what is, happening, in connection with the strikes of the Communications Workers and with the strike which involves 25,000 nonoperating employees of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad and its subsidiaries in 14 States.

In the Communications Workers strike against the Southern Bell Telephone Co.—it was 9 days old on March 22—the press reports that vandals attacked with guns, hatchets, and wire cutters, telephone cables providing service to thousands of subscribers. The press reported that the home of a nonstriker was battered with eggs, bricks were thrown through the windshield of a woman's car parked near her home, the tires on another car were cut, that numerous workers reported to the police they had threats that their homes would be burned down, their homes destroyed, other damage would be inflicted upon their persons or property if they did not join the walkout.[2]

[2] WORKERS' CARS, HOMES PELTED BY PHONE GOONS—OTHER NONSTRIKERS GET THREATS OF VIOLENCE

ATLANTA, March 22 (Special).—Workers' property was the target of eggs, bricks, and knives today as goon violence flared over the South at scattered points in connection with the 9-day-old CIO strike against the Southern Bell Telephone Co.

But the highest monetary damage was done to company property which vandals attacked with guns, hatchets, and wire cutters to sever telephone cables providing service to thousands of subscribers.

NONSTRIKERS GET THREATS

Violence mounted against workers who didn't go on strike. The home of a nonstriker in Albany, Ga., was pelted with eggs. In Atlanta, bricks were thrown through the windshield of Mrs. Jack Grant's car, parked near her home, and all 4 tires on Smith Hunter's car were slashed.

Numerous workers reported to police they had received telephone threats their homes would be burned down, their autos destroyed, and other damaged inflicted upon their person and property if they didn't join the walkout.

Fourteen new incidents of cable slashings were reported last night and today in the Atlanta area, raising the total of such vandalism to 79 cases since the strike began.

EXCHANGES CUT OFF

Wires used by two large telephone answering exchanges were severed, halting service to hundreds of business persons. On the east side of the city a 200 pair cable was cut and in the northwest section a 100 pair cable was slashed.

Heavy steel guy wires were cut from a utility pole at the eastern outskirts of Atlanta. Company officials said the pole was about to fall into State highway 12 when they discovered it. Its fall would have broken numerous toll and local lines it supported.

HIRE EXTRA DETECTIVES

At Albany overhead cables were shorted by a wire thrown across them, causing a temporary disruption of service. The slashing of two major toll cables near Savannah halted long distance service between that city and Atlanta and points north until the damage was repaired.

Sixty additional detectives were employed in Atlanta by the telephone company to join supervisory employees in patroling strategic cable points in this area to try to halt the vandalism. They were equipped with radios so they could call service men to damage scenes.

Detective Supervisor Glenn Cowan issued instructions to all Atlanta police patrol cars to be alert for cable vandalism and to tighten up policing of cables and telephone company buildings.

Telephones have been removed from the homes of numerous strikers because of the company's complaint the instruments were being used to threaten workers and to hamper service by flooding some exchanges with calls intended only to disrupt operations.

In the strike against the railroads, there was violence, an attempt to wreck a train, and one train, the Dixie Flyer, was derailed. There is no proof that the union authorized any of this violence, or that it was conducted by union members.[3]

It is a fact, however, that the violence and the threats of violence and the damage to company property and the property, including the homes, of employees who had not joined the strike or the

[3] GOONS ELUDE SEARCH; RAIL STRIKE GROWS—REPORT NEW ACTS OF VIOLENCE

NASHVILLE, Tenn., April 16—[Special]—The Federal and Tennessee bureaus of investigation today entered the inquiry into the wrecking of the passenger train Dixie Flyer near here yesterday, but no clew to the identity of the saboteurs has been found.

Meanwhile, sporadic violence and vandalism continued throughout the south in two 34-day-old strikes. These involve 25,000 AFL nonoperating employees of the Louis- & Nashville railroad and its subsidiaries in 14 States, and 50,000 members of the CIO Communications Workers of America employed by the Southern Bell Telephone Co. in 9 States.

The derailment of the Dixie Flyer, in which the train's crew and 30 passengers escaped with only minor injuries, topped all previous acts of sabotage in either strike. The train was running between Atlanta, Ga., and Nashville on tracks of the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis railway, an L. & N. subsidiary.

SPIKES, PLATES REMOVED

Saboteurs had removed spikes and plates securing one section of rail on a curve. When the 11-car train hit the curve the section of rail gave way.

C. E. Piper, special agent in charge of the FBI's Memphis office, ordered FBI agents into the inquiry today, and Gov. Frank Clement directed the Tennessee bureau of investigation to join the probe.

The railroad discontinued runs of the Dixie Flyer until further notice.

Presidents of two nonstriking unions, the Railroad Yardmasters of America and the American Train Dispatchers Association, today called strikes against the L. & N. system, effective at noon Monday. They said the railroad has discharged some of their members who refused to cross picket lines.

NONSTRIKERS TARGETS

The Brotherhoods of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and of Railroad Trainmen have issued Monday strike calls for the same reason.

L. & N. strike violence today centered in Corbin, Ky., where bricks were thrown through a nonstriker's windows, the garage of another was set afire, and a dynamite blast shook the home of a third. The lawn of another L. & N. nonstriker was dynamited at Birmingham, Ala.

In the telephone strike 4 cables were cut in east Tennessee, 2 were cut near Atlanta, Ga., and a pole near Pensacola, Fla., collapsed after saboteurs cut its guy wires. This last act of sabotage broke Government military communications circuits and cut off long-distance service between Pensacola and points east.

Mob violence occurred at the Sheffield, Ala., exchange, where 30 CIO goons broke five windows by hurling bricks. The shattered glass showered nonstriking operators, but none was hurt. The hoodlums then hurled lighted firecrackers through the broken windows.

[From the Washington Star of April 23, 1955]

L. & N. STRIKE WIDENED—THREE MORE LINES AFFECTED

The 41-day-old strike by Louisville & Nashville Railroad workers widened today as passenger and freight operations of three additional lines were curtailed at Birmingham, Ala.

Picket lines were set up at the joint yards of the Illinois Central, Frisco Lines, and the Central of Georgia. Pickets said the yard had been handling freight from nonstriking crews of the L. & N., whose nonoperating crews have been on strike since March 14.

The fresh trouble came as members of the National Mediation Board prepared to make new attempts to settle the long and costly dispute.

The board planned talks with rail and union officials today, which was set recently at a meeting of southern governors as a deadline for settlement of the strike involving 25,000 workers.

HEALTH PLAN BIG ISSUE

The governors did not disclose what action, if any, they planned if a settlement is not reached. Chief stumbling block is the union's demand for a jointly financed health insurance plan.

Meanwhile, the main L. & N. track near London, Ky., was dynamited early today. The Federal Bureau of Investigation called it another case of sabotage.

Edward L. Boyle, FBI special agent in charge at Louisville, said 4½ feet of 1 rail was blown out and the track was buckled for a considerable distance.

Efforts also are planned today to settle the other big strike which has been in progress for 41 days in 9 southern States, involving 50,000 CIO Communication Workers against the Southern Bell Telephone Co.

MEETING SCHEDULED

Governors of Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia scheduled a meeting in Atlanta with union and telephone company officials to attempt to end the walkout, which, like the railroad strike, has been marked by violence.

The telephone company says a no-strike clause is holding up settlement. The union says wages and an agreement for full arbitration are the chief issues, not the no-strike clause.

The violence which marked the first 2 days of the strike at the big Sperry gyro-

picket line tended to aid the purpose of the union by intimidating those who opposed the union's demands. The press,

scope plant at Lake Success, N. Y., appeared ended after the striking union agreed to limit pickets to five at each plant gate.

MEDIATOR ACCEPTED

In New York attorneys for the company and the CIO International Union of Electrical Workers agreed to accept a State supreme court justice as mediator. The union, which represents 9,000 of the 16,000 made idle at the company's 3 plants, also promised no more violence. The company manufactures electronics equipment, mostly for the Armed Forces.

Sperry officials today called on nonstrikers to return to work Monday.

In another major strike, involving some 23,000 CIO textile workers against 24 mills in 4 New England States, there was some hope of settlement.

A Federal mediator opened talks at Lewiston, Maine, with representatives of the Bates Manufacturing Co. and spokesmen for 6,000 of the firm's workers who are on strike. The hope was for a pattern of settlement for all of the strikers. The chief issue is wages.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

SOUTHLAND STRIFE—VIOLENCE INCREASES IN NINE-STATE PHONE STRIKE—SERVICE NEAR NORMAL—DYNAMITINGS IN TENNESSEE, LOUISIANA—SEIZURE TALK FROM ALABAMA'S GOVERNOR—ISSUE: A NO-STRIKE CLAUSE

(By A. E. Jeffcoat)

NASHVILLE.—Hoodlums in the hills of Tennessee shinnied up telephone poles and hacked down eight cables of the strikebound Southern Bell Telephone Co. The culprits got away, but by the next morning nonstriking emergency crews repaired the wires and had 3,000 affected telephones back in normal service.

This is a typically daily occurrence in the 51-day old telephone strike covering nine Dixie States. Leaders of the striking Communications Workers of America, CIO, say they deplore such tactics. But strikers or sympathizers increasingly are resorting to violence and vandalism in frustration over their failure to cripple telephone operations.

SERVICE NEARLY NORMAL

By enlisting support from loyal employees and making full use of automatic equipment, the American Telephone & Telegraph subsidiary has maintained almost normal service. By offering rewards for information leading to conviction of strikers for destruction, it has also succeeded in convincing a good part of the public that it stands for law and order over irresponsible hoodlumism.

Says a high Tennessee State official: "Every time a stick of dynamite is thrown, or a cable is hacked, 9 out of 10 citizens hold it against the strikers, regardless of who is responsible or right or wrong in the dispute."

Even some labor leaders here admit these developments have been bad public relations for unions, which are trying to step up organizing of southern workers. But caught as they are in deadlocked negotiations, they're continuing this battle against mounting odds.

ONE HUNDRED FIVE WILDCAT STRIKES

The strike started March 14 when the telephone company and union parted over a company demand for a no-strike clause in its new contract with 50,000 employees, 40,000 of which are CWA members, according to the union. The company insisted on this clause because its service had been interrupted 105 times by quickie wildcat strikes over local grievances in the past 4 years. At the same time, it agreed to a $6.5 million annual wage increase applying to nearly all employees.

The union agreed to accept the no-strike clause on condition that company also agree to full arbitration of grievances arising under the new contract, a condition which neutral Federal officials declare is written into a majority of existing contracts which contain no-strike clauses.

The company, however, refused to relinquish its "management prerogatives" over administration of the contract, provisions concerning health and safety practices, its company-financed pension plan, employee leave of absence, demotions of employees with less than 3 months service and discharges of those with less than 12 months service.

RAILROAD STRIKE COMPARISON

Regardless of the merits of either side of the dispute, the company from the start has had a much stronger position than the Louisville & Nashville Railroad in the other 51-day-old southern strike which now appears to be moving toward settlement in Washington, despite a new sympathy walkout by workers on a small southern road over the weekend. The railway unions have a higher percentage of membership and more regimented membership than telephone workers. As a result, the striking nonoperating employees supported by operating employees completely halted passenger service and all but about one-fourth of normal freight service on company lines.

Yesterday Alabama's Gov. James E. "Kissin' Jim" Folsom said he expects to ask the State Legislature to pass a law permitting seizure and operation of strike-bound telephone and railroad facilities. "I'm worried to death about the poor, little $15 billion telephone company * * * that all-powerful monopolistic telephone company," he said, adding: "I'm solid worried about them, my heart bleeds for them." (Presumably the Governor's dollar reference was to the assets of the enitre Bell System; they totaled about $12.8 billion at the end of 1954.)

Since 4 million of 4.6 million telephones served by Southern Bell operate on automatic dial systems, replacement of striking workers has only been necessary on such jobs as information and long-distance operators and maintenance crews. And the replacement job has been facilitated because most Bell employees have come up from ranks where they've been trained to do variety of jobs.

This situation resulted in a defeat for the union in its last major strike attempt—its effort in 1947 to obtain a nationwide $6 weekly wage increase for all Bell Telephone System employees. At that time it was an independent union and partly as a result of its defeat it affiliated with the CIO soon thereafter.

ONE THIRD ON JOB

About one-third of the Southern Bell workers have remained at work from the strike's start, according to the company. Secretaries, accounts clerks, and salesmen have left desks and put on headsets to operate long-distance lines and engineers and other supervisory personnel have undertaken the job of repairing damage to equipment. Southern Bell says in the first 20 days of April it was able to complete 3 percent more long-distance calls than a year earlier, although two manually operated exchanges in Tennessee are closed because police couldn't offer adequate protection to nonstrikers.

All 1,040 other exchanges in the 9-State area are operating smoothly, though there are undoubted delays in new equipment and service installation.

Company officials who are busy issuing daily strike bulletins to employees and newspapers from the central office in Atlanta say more employees are returning to work every day. Although the union on March 23 reported 50,000 workers on strike, the company this week reported more than 30,000 employees back at work and the union refused to comment.

WORD FROM WORKERS, CUSTOMERS

Many telephone workers and thousands of customers have written to newspapers or to Southern Bell expressing their support for the company. In one typical employee letter to a Florida newspaper, telephone operator Dorthy Thomas wrote, "It is my humble opinion that our beloved leaders have led about 50,000 people into a disaster and that the people that feel they're doing so much good for the poor workingman are defeating their own ends * * *. I feel that any organization which uses threats, abuse, violence and intimidation to accomplish what it cannot do by persuasion has forfeited any claim upon loyalty of those who respect rights and property of others."

Wrote a Florida installer repairman who is on the job: "Like fellow workers I have been receiving 3 to 4 annoying phone calls an hour. My picture has been taken upon entering and leaving my office. My family has been publicly snubbed by strikers. These rather childish actions cannot and will not deter me from performing my work."

Most Southern newspapers have roundly berated unions in editorial columns for this strike. One, the Brooksville Sun of Florida, went so far as to refer to "the source of trade unionism as the modern day degeneracy." Another, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, urged Tennesseans not to "knuckle under to hoodlumism."

Robert Taggart, a Florida telephone customer, sent this message to governors of the nine States: "If you are sincere in wanting industry to move south you can now prove it to one and all by your actions. Let industry know that its property and employees will be protected."

SUPPORT FOR STRIKERS

The strikers have gotten some public support, too. In Atlanta, a citizen named T. Stubbs wrote to a local newspaper: "I would like to raise one lonely voice in support of union workers who are on strike." And in Americus, Ga., Mayor J. E. Logan is letting the strikers use his home as headquarters, with free coffee and Coca-Cola available. "It's a disgrace for the telephone company to hold up these workers and try to bust the union," says Mayor Logan.

In Cedartown, Ga., the local drive-in theater has given strikers passes good until 7 days after the strike ends, and the police chief's wife walks the picket line. The owner of a piano store in Florence, Ala., W. O. Graham, ran a three-column ad in the Florence Times supporting the strikers and marched with them in a rally. The Times' executive editor, Louis Eckle, guesses the public is divided about 50–50 over the strike in Florence.

Strong disapproval of violent methods was expressed last week by W. A. Smallwood, district manager of the nine-State area for the communication workers. "Our cause has been damaged by these acts of violence wherever perpetuated and regardless of any determination as to whether such acts have been committed by friend or foe," he said in a letter to all local union presidents in the area. He reminded them that under the union's constitution a member bringing the union into disrepute may be tried and expelled.

Every day since the strike began there has been some cable or other property damage in the nine-State area which embraces

if you care to peruse back issues, will give you more detailed information.

After these acts of violence, the Associated Press reported on April 29, 1955, from Atlanta, Ga., that a half-million dollar gift from an anonymous source had been made to the communications

workers as violence continued in the strike against the Southern Bell Telephone Co. The same press dispatch reported that violence in connection with the rail walkout continued to occur.[4]

Notwithstanding this information of violence carried by the press, the union of which Mr. Reuther is the head announced on May 3, 1955, that a group of its locals had arranged to lend the CIO Communications Workers of America $1,250,000 to help in its 50-day strike against the phone company.[5]

No one can criticize one union for either lending or giving another union funds to assist its members in distress, provided those funds were not by force or intimidation collected from individual workers for some other purpose.

It is an altogether different proposition, however, if union funds collected for one purpose, that is for legitimate union purposes, are to be either loaned or given to promote violence and rioting, destruction of company or individual property. Mr. Walter Reuther is no novice when it comes to conducting a strike. Many a strike in which he and his goon squads have been interested has been carried on through open defiance of the law, the law-enforcing officers, and court orders.

What the gentleman forgets, and what I am afraid some of my colleagues in the House forget, is this—I said it before, it will be said again—the union bosses will take over, that is, the election of Members from the South, and then we Republicans will no longer have any more Democrats here to love and follow, with whom we can differ.

Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. In Atlanta alone the company has reported 225 incidents of cutting telephone wires or other major damage, much of it done by persons firing shotguns.

SABOTEURS, DYNAMITE

In the West Palm Beach, Fla., area last week Southern Bell officials accused saboteurs of destroying a telephone exchange by fire, causing $50,000 worth of damage. In the same area a telephone operator narrowly escaped death when a stick of dynamite exploded under her switchboard. Also during the past week homemade dynamite bombs blasted a hole in the concrete roof of a telephone building in the suburbs of New Orleans and damaged or destroyed company property at Mobile and Winfield, Ala., and Green Back, Tenn.

In some cases violence has been clearly traced to striking union members. A 25-year-old Orlando, Fla., striker, Donald E. Carpenter, admitted to police that after leaving a union rally and wiener roast he slashed six telephone cables with an ax stolen from the company. Orlando Sheriff Dave Starr traced Carpenter, a former cable-splicer helper, to three different telephone poles by footprints of cowboy boots he was wearing.

Henry H. Bolin, president of the Birmingham, Ala., CWA local, was arrested and charged with planting a stink bomb across an alley from strikebound telephone company offices. Arthur B. Chism, president of another striking local in Louisville was 1 of 4 men arraigned in criminal court in connection with the dynamiting of 2 telephone cables.

GRAND JURY INDICTS

Two striking Atlanta telephone workers were indicted by a grand jury on charges of shooting with intent to murder a nonstriking telephone repairman who was splicing damaged cable. H. W. McCain, a striking telephone worker in Montgomery, Ala., was arrested by Alabama police for allegedly assaulting the husband of a telephone worker who was waiting in a parked car for his wife to leave the building. And police at Pensacola, Fla., arrested 16 strikers assembled at telephone building for assertedly throwing eggs and yelling "scab" at nonstrikers.

In a few other cases culprits have not been telephone company employees. Bethel Thomas Judd, a nonemployee, was picked up by police in Tennessee and charged with taking a swing at a telephone company plant foreman for crossing the picket line in Maryville. Judd was later found in a car which police said carried New York license plates registered in name of the New York CIO office. Police said there was a loaded shotgun in the car's trunk. When Judd told police that about 10 company men had attacked him, the police chief remarked that this contradicted testimony of pickets. Commented Judd, "That just goes to show you what kind of pickets we're getting nowadays."

Chicago police are holding three men for questioning about alleged plans to recruit saboteurs to destroy property of Southern Bell. Although CWA officials have denied any knowledge of such a plan, one of the men found possessing maps and instructions said he was hired by union officials to organize crews.

"OPERATION ZILCH"

In a suit filed last week in Atlanta Superior Court, asking for $60,000 damages against the union, Southern Bell accused the union and some leaders of conducting a campaign to disrupt long distance telephone service.

The company submitted what it said were instructions handed out by union strike director G. E. Gill for "Operation Zilch." Strikers assertedly were told to make long distance calls to some non-existent person such as "a long lost uncle, J. P. Zilch," giving the operator the number of another striker. The operators presumably could be kept busy this way repeating the same call over and over without ever reaching Mr. Zilch.

Southern Bell has also accused strikers of telephoning some citizens to tell them their phones were contaminated and must be placed in hot water, thus causing additional difficulties for operators.

Union officials assert telephone company people themselves have been guilty of violence, although their list of accusations is considerably shorter than that of the company. They have asserted that a company supervisor drove over the foot of a picketer, that a nonstriker waved a pistol threatening a group of pickets and that a company sympathizer fired a bullet into a crowd of pickets. They also maintain they had to obtain an injunction from a Knoxville, Tenn., court prohibiting the company from sending armed men unlawfully near picket lines and from hurling lighted cigarettes at pickets or offering pickets alcoholic beverages. Company officials deny any knowledge of this injunction.

[4] STRIKE AIDED BY GIFT OF $500,000

ATLANTA, April 29.—A half-million-dollar gift was poured anonymously into the war chest of the Communications Workers of America (CIO) today as violence continued to mark its strike against the Southern Bell Telephone Co.

CWA Regional Director W. A. Smallwood said that at the request of the donor the source of the $500,000 gift could not be disclosed. But, he declared:

"This contribution will assure the continuance of the strike against Southern Bell and as a part of larger pledges made to the union will make sure that we win an equitable settlement."

Violence continued also to mar a concurrent rail walkout. A blazing telephone pole in one section of Atlanta and three burning railroad boxcars in another set off the 47th day of the two strikes.

A report that a bomb may have been mailed to the Coral Gables branch of the Southern Bell Telephone Co. prompted Miami post office officials to order interception of all parcels addressed to the company in the Miami area. Fifteen men were assigned to checking packages.

There were no moves reported by the Communications Workers of America (CIO) or Southern Bell toward ending the telephone strike.

The National Mediation Board resumed meetings in Washington in efforts to settle the Louisville-Nashville Railroad dispute but there were no immediate prospects of an agreement.

L. & N. strikers extended their picketing, halting or interrupting service on five additional lines into Louisville. This left only 2 of 9 railroads serving the city—the New York Central and the Pennsylvania.

[5] CIO TO LEND $1,250,000 TO TELEPHONE STRIKERS

The CIO said yesterday a group of its unions has arranged to lend the CIO Communications Workers of America $1,250,000 to help its 50-day strike against the Southern Bell Telephone Co.

CIO President Walter Reuther said the loan "will enable the union to provide necessary relief and assistance to the strikers and their families.

"The telephone workers are carrying on a campaign to win a decent contract, including a system of arbitration of areas of disagreement, which has long since been recognized as standard in most industries," he said.

"In insisting that the company should have the final word on disputes, Southern Bell refuses to accept fully the spirit of true collective bargaining."

Reuther said the loan is "a symbol of the CIO's determination that this strike against stubborn and shortsighted management must, and shall, be won."

The CWA announced last week it had received an anonymous donation of $500,000 toward its strike fund.

CWA headquarters here said the union had approximately $2 million in its strike fund when the Southern Bell walkout began March 14.

Approximately 40,000 workers have been involved in the walkout in 9 States.

In strike violence yesterday at Jackson, Miss., the sleeping 4-year-old daughter of a minister was covered with debris from her damaged home when a bomb was exploded nearby. The blast damaged six homes in the area and destroyed a telephone company building housing expensive automatic equipment.

The threat to the child's life was one of several instances of violence that included dynamitings and bridge burnings in the strikes against Southern Bell and the Louisville & Nashville Railroad.

The strikes have become so disorderly and costly to the South's economy that Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama, yesterday said he plans to ask his State legislature to pass a public-seizure law to permit the State to take over and operate strikebound utilities.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman says he does not object to the fact that I shook hands with Mr. Reuther.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly I do not object.

Mr. COOLEY. I said yesterday I had no apologies for that. I have done a lot of things worse than that; perhaps, shaking the hand of the gentleman from Michigan. I do not apologize for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You do not need to.

Mr. COOLEY. No; you do not need to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And you do not even have to shake hands with the gentleman from Michigan if you do not want to, though it would honor me.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not have to be afraid about Walter Reuther swallowing the gentleman from North Carolina. And the gentleman cannot mean to suggest that anybody in this House ever attempted to make any trade with Mr. Reuther.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not charge that. I may assume you welcome the aid of those who seek passage of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly you do not. I am sure you do not and I do not think anybody in this body would ever be involved in such a proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; I did not say that directly or indirectly. Do not read something that I do not mean into something that I say.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think anybody would believe that I would trade my vote or that anybody else would trade their vote. In good faith I wanted to know what the industrial workers of America thought about this program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right; that is all right; and no one can have objection. It might have been well to call a few from the employee groups as well as the union officials. But I am not critical.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, Mr. Chairman, I make my motion so as to get that other 5 minutes, for I am opposed to the bill, and the sooner it is killed the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] offers a preferential motion.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, let me inform my friends on the Republican side, if I may, that I am not criticizing the gentleman from North Carolina. He may perhaps be proud of the fact that he is recognized by so great, so capable, so ambitious a man, a man who may shortly be the President or Vice President, or perhaps more accurately, a dictator of the United States.

But this is the point I want to make to my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The gentleman is politically in bed with Mr. Reuther right now, is he not? My suggestion: Make him cut his toenails before he scratches you from the back of your neck to the bottom of your heel, because that is what he will do to you politically.

Look, and I call this to the attention of my friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I hold in my hand this notice from the bulletin board of a factory which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] just gave me. It was sent in by a union member. I read:

NOTICE TO ALL MEMBERS OF LOCAL 856, UAW-CIO—DUES FOR THE MONTH OF MAY 1955 WILL BE $7.50

This increase as per official notice from the office of international secretary-treasurer, Emil Mazey.

This action was taken by delegates to the 15th UAW-CIO International Constitutional Convention on March 29, 1955.

W. E. MELVIN,
Financial, Secretary-Treasurer,
Local 856, UAW-CIO.

Here is the relevancy of this notice. Recall I just referred to a loan of $1,250,000 that CIO unions made to those who are on strike against the telephone company, to the Communications Workers of America, headed by this Mr. Beirne, whom the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY, referred to in his foreword of the committee print.

Here we have our good friend, working hand in hand, which is all right—which is all right—with Walter Reuther who loans—or his union at least, loans $1,250,000 to a union in the southern States which is defying the law-enforcing officers; who recently, Monday it was—no, they did not—sympathizers did—bombed six homes in one of which a 4-year-old girl was almost killed.

Oh, that is a strange crowd—that is a poor crowd to tie up with politically or any other way. Tie up with Reuther politically on this bill if you wish. Pose with him for pictures for his propaganda if you desire—that is your privilege and right—even though at times CIO unions follow the Communists' methods and practices but do not, I beg of you, stay married to his political philosophy over long for I know you cannot stomach any of it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman said that I am in bed with Reuther?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that?

Mr. COOLEY. You said that I am in bed with Walter Reuther?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Politically or figuratively speaking. If that is offensive, I will withdraw the "in bed." The gentleman is associated with him in a political endeavor. I will substitute "political endeavor."

Mr. COOLEY. Neither am I associated with him in a political endeavor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, but you are. You both want this bill passed. On this bill you are both engaged in a joint effort.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman refer to Walter Reuther as a hoodlum?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, sir. Not intentionally.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman refer to me as a hoodlum?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, sir. I certainly had no such intention. I recognize the gentleman as a loyal, able Member of this body—a good citizen—just for the moment temporarily, inadvertently, in bad company with able, ambitious, ruthless individuals who do not like constitutional procedure when it hampers their desires.

Walter Reuther has been a driving force in strikes where the goon squads took over. I did say and I have seen the goons of the CIO operating in Michigan, in Detroit on the Miller Road in Wayne County and in Kalamazoo, 23 miles from my home. I have seen the results of their actions in many places. If you want facts, read the sworn testimony of hearings we held during the 80th and the 83d Congresses.

Mr. COOLEY. Just clear up one thing. You did not intend to use the word hoodlum?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; those who engage in unlawful activities, in destruction of property, in beating men and women who desire to work are known as goons, not hoodlums. I know, and you know how they operate. If the gentleman does not like it—if the gentleman does not believe it, you can come and look at the pictures which came from the United States District Court in Detroit which are hanging on the walls in my office which show the beatings administered by the goon squads of the CIO unions whose activities Mr. Reuther directs.

Mr. COOLEY. I have seen those pictures.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the same photo you will see CIO members who were Communist beating men who wanted to work. Beating up honest citizens. Walter Reuther stands for what? Who collects dues for what? Who calls for legislation so that no man in America can work until he contributes to the union dominated by Walter, or contributes to some other union. And then he approves of a loan of over a million to support those whose supporters are kicking in the doors of the telephone offices and wrecking the trains down in the Southern States—seven of them. They got the South tied up down there. They kick around citizens who want to work—they damage their homes; they derail a train; they tie up transportation and your law-enforcing officers and your governor, aping a Michigan governor, sit on their hands.

What I am wondering is if there are no more Gene Coxes and no more John Rankins on that side who will come to the well of the House and protest this defiance of the law, beat back this danger.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that you have not the slightest sympathy with the unions, but what kind of danger is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The danger which always comes from the tolerance of lawlessness—the denial of civil rights.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. As one who has about 70,000 members of Mr. Reuther's union in his district, I can appreciate how the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], having worked in his district 3 years some time ago, could get hooked into a deal like this—he does not have any CIO leaders down there. However, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan there are many of us who can be thankful that Walter Reuther does not speak for the rank and file of his membership. The late Senator Taft proved that. CIO members are good honest, God-fearing people—they think for themselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. The notice which he received from a member of Local 856, UAW-CIO, protesting the arbitrary imposition of monthly dues of $7.50 by certain delegates to the 15th UAW-CIO international constitutional convention of March 27, 1955, is typical of the hundreds of protests which have come to me from individual members of both the UAW-CIO and AFL.

They resent the imposition of arbitrary levies, like the one of 15 cents per member levied for political purposes in Michigan, and like others where the workers' contributions, voluntary or forced, are wasted or expended for improper purposes; used for political, rather than union, activities.

From the very adroit presentation made by Mr. Reuther in the 36-page illustrated brochure put out by the CIO and which, on the first page, carries the large photographs of the chairman of the House committee [Mr. COOLEY] congratulating Mr. Reuther on the conclusion of his statement, the casual reader might gather that farm and labor organizations are united in their political objectives.

Mr. Reuther, on page 7, quotes from a statement made by the House Committee on Agriculture last year when it wrote:

> The committee deplores any tendency, in the consideration of farm programs, toward a separation of the interests of the farmers and our great consuming populations of the cities. These interests are one and the same. They are inseparable.

If the committee or if Mr. Reuther had in mind the welfare of all our people, the statement is correct.

But the interests of organized labor and organized farmers are not always the same. Often they are on opposite sides of the bargaining table. Sometimes the farmer wants to sell, again he wants to buy; the same is true of the industrial worker who may do his own purchasing, sell through his employer. Both wish to pay as little as possible, sell for as much as can be obtained.

Two quotations from Reuther's statement made verbally before the House Committee on Agriculture show the inconsistency in his argument.

Referring to the membership of the average CIO union, Reuther—page 8, The Power of Abundance—CIO Views on the Farm Problem—said:

> They did not all grow up in Detroit, or in Pittsburgh, or Chicago—they came from the farms, many of them. And we have always said that the most wonderful and the best crop raised on the farm is the children who finally come to the cities.

And permit me to add that, when they get to the cities, young women and young men who wish to work in industrial plants, yes, even in retail establishments, Reuther and the boss of the AFL insist that before the farm girl or boy can go on the job upon which he is dependent for a livelihood, he must buy a work permit, pay tribute to a labor organization for exercising his God-given right to work and he must, as long as he continues to work, pay monthly dues and special assessments, often fixed at the arbitrary dictation of the union bosses.

Listen to another Reuther quote—page 11—illustrating his great solicitude for the welfare of the farmer:

> We in the Automobile Workers Union have most of the farm-equipment plants organized under the jurisdiction of our union. We have the Harvester plant, we have the Massey-Harris, the John Deere, the J. I. Case plant, the Allis-Chalmers plant, where they make most of the agricultural implement equipment, and we know that while we have had very real and sizable and serious unemployment in the automobile industry proper, we have had a higher percentage of unemployment in the agricultural implements industry than in any other major industry. Why? Is it because the American farmers do not need equipment?

And what has Reuther and his outfit done to aid the farmers in purchasing more farm equipment?

By insisting upon higher wages to the employees in the plants to which reference has just been made, he has boosted the price of farm machinery so that all too often the farmer has been unable to purchase. Exercising his great love for the farmer, his wife and his children, Reuther has consistently made it more difficult for him to purchase the equipment which he must have if he would operate his farm.

Reuther is primarily concerned with the acquisition of political power. His primary purpose appears to be the establishment of a labor government. This is indicated by the recent amalgamation of the two great unions.

Apparently organized labor's leaders have abandoned the real, legitimate purpose of labor organizations, that is, the advancement of the welfare of the worker through an increase in wages, a lessening of hours, improvement of working conditions.

One of the main tenets of the Russian philosophy is control by the State, regimentation.

Reuther consistently advocates the establishment by the Government of a minimum wage, of maximum hours, of a closed shop.

Vehemently and rightly, labor leaders condemned the "yellow dog" contract—a contract which prevented a man obtaining or holding a job if he belonged to a union. Congress in 1935 outlawed that contract, but today Reuther and those who subscribed to his philosophy advocate the opposite, that is, that no man shall work unless he belongs to the union. The latter is just as unfair and vicious as the former contract.

Reuther and other union officials have consistently insisted that no man shall be forced to work; that enforced labor is slavery.

With that overall assertion I agree, provided the one who does not desire and who will not work has some other resource which will enable him to eat, be clothed, and have shelter. And, naturally, we all are willing to contribute toward not only the support, but the comfort of the unfortunate who is unable for any reason to care for himself.

In addition to asserting that no man should be forced to work, Reuther's philosophy, and that of many others, asserts that every individual is entitled to a job at a compensation which will enable him to live decently, adequately, and in accordance with the American standard of living.

This last assertion implies that someone must furnish the individual desiring a job with a job, that is, a place and a task at the required wage.

This again calls for the necessary assumption that some individual or those who finance an organization must work or inherit the funds to create the job, have ability enough to conduct the business profitably so that the required wage can be paid.

So, logically, we get back to the proposition insisted upon by Reuther and others that, for example, Individual A must work, provide the funds to create a job for Individual B, who, according to the theory advanced, is not required to employ himself at the task provided.

Some just cannot see the cold, hard fact that, if anyone is to have a job at a living wage, someone, prior to the giving of that job, must have worked and saved to create it.

The bill before us is unsound in principle because it takes from the members of one segment of our society their earnings to finance the activities, create a market for, another segment.

It is unworkable, as has been demonstrated, because, in operation, it necessarily creates an ever-increasing surplus—an unnecessary burden upon all of us—or, if an increasing accumulation of surpluses is to be avoided, allotment of acreage must be drastically imposed. That means the end of the independent farmer. It means the Government-operated farm.

Followed to the logical end, such a theory would require the payment of a fair profit to those engaged in business—a market at a Government-fixed price for the products of all industrial plants.

The reasoning carried in this bill, used by Mr. Reuther and others of like mind, means modified socialism and, in the end, complete control of all activities by the state, which comes very close to the communism practiced in Russia.

I cannot believe our people want that type of Government. I know I do not.

Reuther's real purpose is to entice the farmers into the dues-paying member-

ship of the CIO to use them as political puppets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a new element has entered into this debate. Perhaps we should all go home and look under the bed before voting on this amendment or on this bill.

I want to commend the chairman of our committee whose astuteness is best revealed by the amount of time that he gave to a certain gentleman a moment ago.

I have two amendments which I am offering but which I will withdraw, but I am offering them to prove a point. The first would restore to the allocation of cotton quotas among the States a calculation of trend. In tobacco there is a trend for allocation of quotas among the States. In corn there is a trend. In wheat there is a trend. In the case of rice there is a trend calculation. The only crop that does not have a trend calculation, with the exception of the lowly peanut, is cotton. That illustrates some of the inconsistencies of these various commodity laws. It is impossible to look with intelligence at 90 percent of parity or some other figure of parity as a crystal, shining clear example of good or evil. Laws have to be considered in their complete context and parity laws have a great many ramifications.

I want to make clear why I am in opposition to this bill, which is supported by our very able chairman, gentlemen like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and others. I think it is a poor effort at correcting the basic problem which exists with respect to present-day agriculture. Past solutions have included both flexible and rigid price supports, initiated by President Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress. Those programs have been tried in many ways. Flexible price supports have been in effect, but conditions have changed, and I think we need a clearer look at the proper agricultural law, than is contained in this bill. And that is why I am voting against it very reluctantly, because I have great respect for the chairman and the members of the committee who are advocating this bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Do we not have in existing law provision for trends within the States with respect to cotton acreage?

Mr. HAGEN. There is no trend calculation with respect to cotton allocations among the States. Within the States there is, which is another example of inconsistency.

For the benefit of the gentleman from Texas and others I will read my amendments into the RECORD at this point.

The first reads as follows:

Page 13, after line 17, add the following new section:

"SEC. 6. Section 344 (f) (6) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending the first proviso thereof to read: *'Provided*, That the county committee shall apportion such county allotment by first establishing minimum allotments in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection and may in its discretion limit any farm acreage allotments established under the provisions of this paragraph for any year to an acreage not in excess of 50 percent of the cropland on the farm, as determined pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection'."

My second amendment reads as follows:

Page 13, after line 17, add the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Subsection (b) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words 'abnormal weather conditions' the words 'and trends in acreage'."

My first amendment would restore the requirement which prevailed before 1955 that county committees in assigning cotton allotments to farms would make first provision for highest plantings up to 5 acres. The second amendment would restore to the cotton law the requirement that national cotton-acreage allotments to States include extra acres to those States which have experienced a growth of production which is not reflected accurately in a 5-year average. This last amendment places cotton on a parity with rice, wheat, tobacco, and corn and corrects an obviously political application of a commodity law.

I offer these amendments at this time, not with the idea of pressing them presently in this debate, but for the purpose of illustrating some of the reasons why we from the West are opposing a shotgun restoration of 90 percent of parity which tends to produce the surpluses and quotas which are unfairly applied to us.

You may wonder why I am suggesting restoration of protection of the farmer of 5 acres or less in view of the fact that California small farms are not that small in terms of acreage. You may ask why this amendment is not proposed by representatives of areas containing many 5-acre farmers. I cannot answer for them, but my reasons are clear. I want them to take care of their 5-acre farms out of their own community allotment and not out of the hides of my small farmers, and I am watching with interest the actions of their State and local committees in caring for these farms in 1956, as they have the discretion of doing.

I am withdrawing these amendments for the reason that, even if adopted, they would be only a partial correction of the many faults in our present support laws which come into play with surpluses induced by excessive support levels for all categories of commodity growers.

The simple fact is that 90 percent of parity is a mere symbol signifying nothing if the ground rules which it calls into play are political and unfair. These rules are political and unfair and an increase in the parity level at this time without their correction aggravates their impact.

I yield to no one in my concern for the small farmer but I am convinced that 90 percent of parity administered under present statutory and administrative ground rules will slowly but surely run the dirt-farmer off the farm and leave a class of corporation farmers and subsistence farmers doing all or most of the farming.

Laws should be changed to reflect changing conditions and conditions in farming have changed. Neither our present support law nor the proposals of H. R. 12 are proper answers to these present conditions and we are shirking our duty if we think we can satisfy it by the passage of H. R. 12. The late defunct 90 percent of parity law and the present flexible laws and those flexible laws which preceded it have served a useful purpose but conditions have changed. I want to see the Democratic Party develop a farm program which applies a scalpel rather than a butcher knife to farm cancers.

In saying these things I hold no brief for the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. I think he is seriously derelict in his duty in not presenting a real farm program to our committee. He should know that a flexible-support program as presently established is no better answer to the long-range problems of agriculture than the proposal of H. R. 12. Yet he is silent. In effect he is saying to us: Agriculture has an endemic disease and is declining in strength but all I recommend is a reduction in the amount of salve applied in order that we might save money to other taxpayers.

As a Californian I want to support and devise a proper farm program. That program may include provision for mandatory 90 percent of parity for designated crops, but the program presented here is not that program.

I will also say that I intend to vote against the amendment to take peanuts out of the category of basic crops. My action will not be dictated by a belief that peanuts deserve to be a basic crop but rather by the motivation back of this amendment. It is purely political.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, from the time this session started, Democrat leaders in the House boasted of their intention of support for the President and his program.

First, we had the tax bill offered by the Democrat leaders in the House, against the wishes of the President, which was passed in the House by a small majority, and, finally, the purpose of that bill was defeated through the help of the Senate.

Now, the bill that is before us today would repeal the President's flexible farm program before it can become fully effective, and before it has a chance to prove its worth to the farmers of America, and to the economy of our country. The passage of this bill would show up, in bold relief, the inconsistency of the Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in our Government, as all the Members are; I am interested in the welfare of it in the years to come, I am interested in the Congress keeping the finest possible reputation with the people and the

greatest confidence on their part; but if there is anyone within the sound of my voice who thinks it is good politics to continuously embarrass the President and put him up against possible vetoes, let me say to you that popular as the President is today, when he has to come to the rescue of the great majority of the people who have confidence in him, and he has to use his veto power to protect the interest of the people when the Congress has failed to do so, his popularity will continue to rise, but as it rises, the confidence of the people of this country in the present Congress will become lower.

May I warn you it is not good politics to oppose the President as he has been opposed and as he is being opposed by first one sort of political combination and then another. And it is not serving the best interest of our country.

Some Members have expressed their desire to do something for the little people. Let me suggest that the little farmers of this country could not generate the steam that has been exhibited on the floor of this House for the 90-percent parity bill; only the big commercial farmers and the big landowners who want to continue to sell their surplus to the Government could generate that much steam to do away with this bill before giving it a chance. Where is the support coming from for 90 percent of parity? It is coming from the Members from the great wheat areas all over the great Northwest, all over the great Southwest, and from some of the bigger cotton farmers of the South. Those are the people who are supporting this bill.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is representing the little farmers of this country.

The big commercial farmers who want to produce all they can and sell their surpluses to the Government are the ones who profit by rigid high price supports. The little farmer, because of the excess surpluses, finds his prices for the little he has driven downward.

The majority of the opposition to this bill comes from the States in the North and the East who are supporting the flexible program, from the States where the farms are small, where the little farmers come from. They are the members who are giving the greatest support to the flexible program, and are opposing its repeal.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as Walter Reuther's name has been mentioned often in the debate, I want to say that I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture acted within his rights in asking the great leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO to come and testify. We need to get the viewpoint of all groups.

However, I would like to give some facts which will show that while farm prices were dropping 17 percent, the farmers were further distressed by wages being pushed up 27½ percent by the CIO employees in the various industries making farm machinery.

Now, of course, no one can object seriously to the high officials of the CIO in cooperation with their men, employed in the industries making farm machinery, in helping them to increase their wage. Yet, at the same time, the question can well be raised as to whether or not the big labor leaders in the CIO might not have taken notice of the fact that peace had come and with it the farmers were being distressed with lower prices.

They could have shown a genuine interest at that time in the farmers, whose prices were falling rapidly, if they had not continued to press for higher wages, which did add to the distress of the farmers.

They could also have taken into account that pressing at that time for higher wages increased the inflation and raised the high cost of living to where much of the increase in wages was offset with an increase in inflation, and higher prices, which again added to the burden of the farmers, to the consumers, and to everyone in the Nation as well.

Now, to prove my point which I think is important, may I point out to you that when farm prices started to drop early in 1948, they declined rapidly with a 20 percent drop in farm prices. To make matters worse, livestock prices tumbled downward, hogs fell from a high of 31½ a hundred to 12½ a hundred. Cattle and other livestock followed the precipitate drop, until they were checked by the sudden overnight impact of the Korean war in 1950. However, when we got into the Korean war, and as we spent billions of dollars, farm prices started back up again, but they did not start up until we began spending the billions and until the casualties, meaning the killing and wounding of the American boys on the battlefields of Korea, began to mount as well, and continued until the casualties of American boys reached over 140,000.

Now, while these farm prices were dropping over 20 percent from 1948 until the close of the fiscal year 1952, wages of employees in the International Harvester Co., John Deere, and other companies which made the farm machinery the farmers had to buy increased 27½ percent, with farm prices falling 20 percent and with wages of these people going up 27½ percent, you can imagine the distress that was brought to the farmers.

During the last 4 years of the Truman administration, 1948 to 1952, you will remember that President Truman, in an effort to trade favors for votes, during the great steel strike went to the extreme length of seizing the vast steel industry of the Nation, and held control of it until the Supreme Court ruled that he had exceeded his authority under the Constitution.

Now, let me quote you some revealing figures as to how the farmers were affected by the actions, to which I have referred, in the years from 1948 to the close of 1952.

AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGES

Mr. Chairman, weekly earnings of the employees in the International Harvester Co. making farm machinery, and other like companies, in 1948 averaged about $60.59 a week. At the close of 1952, in 4 short years, and early in 1953, the weekly average earnings of those working in these same jobs producing farm machinery of all kinds had gone up to $77.21 a week, or in 4 years, wages had gone up 27½ percent.

During these 4 years, while farm prices went down from 13 to 20 percent, with wages advancing 27½ percent, the price of machinery they made that the farmers had to buy went up while all the time the farmers' prices were going down.

Of course, no one can blame the workers in the factories for wanting an increase in their wages, and no one can blame the head of the CIO for cooperating with the employees. Everyone, and that includes me as well, wants labor steadily employed at a high-wage level. What I am trying to point out was the effect increased wages had upon the farmers.

ILLUSTRATION

Mr. Chairman, let me illustrate how the price of farm machinery went up: In 1948, a Farmall M farm tractor cost the farmer $1,586. Four years later, in 1952, it cost the farmer $2,490, an increase in price of $904.

In 1948, a 2-bottom 14-inch plow cost the farmer $150. In 1952, it had gone up to $240, an increase in price of $90.

In 1948, a 7-foot disk harrow cost the farmer $175. In 1952, it cost him $285, an increase of $110.

Prices of other concerns manufacturing like products for farmers were raised accordingly throughout the various industries making farm machinery.

GROSS FARM INCOME

Mr. Chairman, I want to insert a table of figures secured from the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture, showing the gross farm income for the year 1948 and 1952, also, the gross cost to the farmers in planting and harvesting their crops, for the year 1948 and 1952:

Gross farm income:	
1948	$34,520,000,000
1952	36,526,000,000
Production expenses:	
1948	18,916,000,000
1952	23,027,000,000

From the above table you will note that it cost the farmer $18,916,000,000 to put in and harvest his crops in 1948, but that in 4 short years, in 1952, his cost rose to $23,027,000,000, which cost the farmer $4,111,000,000 more to produce and harvest his crops in 1952 than it did in 1948.

In other words, the increased cost the farmers had to pay for farm machinery and the increased cost because of the increase in wages forced up 27½ percent and the general increase in wages, and the cost of everything the farmer had to buy, took, in fact, $4,111,000,000 out of the farmers' profits he otherwise would have been able to keep for himself had wages been stabilized at the 1948 level rather than being raised 27½ percent, while the farmers' prices were dropping from 17 to 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I have been a little surprised at the apparent political combination that has been brought about by those who now seek to overthrow the Eisenhower farm program, and return to the high rigid price supports that have brought about billions of dollars in farm surplus com-

modities that are now overhanging the market and depressing farm prices.

I firmly believe that a majority of the Members of this House, whether they be in farm areas or in consumer areas, realize that the present flexible farm support program is a move in the right direction that has helped to stop inflation, and that the administration, which is meeting with marked success in increasing our export markets, and in rapidly reducing the mountain of farm surpluses now on hand is working not only to the interest of the farmer but the consumer as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is a time for the Members of this House to lay aside every thought of seeking a political advantage of any kind. We are dealing here with the biggest domestic problem that has ever presented itself to the American people, and to their representatives in the Congress. The great majority of the farmers, and all the rest of the people, know that the flexible price support law, passed last year, should have an opportunity at least for a fair trial. If this Congress fails to vote to continue the present flexible program, the people will lose, in my judgment, a large degree of their confidence in the Congress of the United States. We should show our consistency by voting to continue the present flexible farm program. If we do, the great majority of the people of this country, including the great majority of the farmers, will applaud our action.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Add the following new section:

"SEC. —. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding after the word 'honey' where it first appears in said section the words 'grain sorghum' and by adding at the end of said section the following new subsection:

"'(d) The price of grain sorghum shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a level not in excess of 85 percent nor less than 80 percent of the parity price therefor'."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with a farm commodity that is raised in the great Southwest, most of it coming from Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico. It is what we call grain sorghum. In order to clarify the situation I want to point out to those of you who are not familiar with it that it is what is commonly referred to as milo maize. It is a plant of the sorghum variety or family and it is raised for the grain content in the head of the plant.

For the 2 previous crop years that particular plant has been supported—it is a nonbasic commodity—at 85 percent of parity under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

In December of 1954 the support price for the coming crop year was announced, and that support was reduced from 85 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity, which is the largest cut that has ever been made in connection with that particular commodity and probably in connection with any commodity.

A 15-percent reduction simply means this in that particular area: It simply means that a lot of the little farmers—and those are the people I want to talk about—are going to have to go out of business. Now, it hit our economy in two ways: In the first instance, it took away what might be all of the profit and some of the cost in what it requires to raise milo maize. The second thing it did was this: It hurt the economy of our section because it is the only cash crop that can be raised in many of those areas. And also many of those people, many of those farmers, have been faced for a number of years with a drought, that is, for the last 4 years. We are going into the fourth year of drought. The wheat crops have been ruined in many instances, and the people have turned to milo maize.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I would like to join with the gentleman and point out that in the Dust Bowl area of Colorado this can be used as a substitute crop, and with a little moisture it acts as a cash crop to the farmers in that area.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much. I was coming to that, and it is a very good point in this discussion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's amendment. I think it is valid, and I hope it will be supported by all the friends of agriculture. I have been working with the gentleman for weeks on this matter, and I hope we may achieve success on the amendment now before us. It is urgently needed to prevent economic disaster in many areas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that, because I think this amendment is very important to those people who have been plagued by the drought situation and who are now plagued with the dust storms that you folks have been reading about in your local papers.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has not pointed out, but I believe it is true, that there is a greater acreage in grain sorghums than there is in cotton in the United States, and it is one of the real important crops of this country from an acre standpoint. Your amendment does not ask for an unlimited amount. It puts a top limit of 85 and falls down to 80, on which we support dairy products on which there is no production control.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. It is very difficult for me to cover all of the many things to be said in behalf of this amendment, and I appreciate those contributions.

Let me go one step further in this respect. This is not the situation of a farmer or a farm group asking for anything. All we want is fair treatment in this situation and something that we think will contribute to the welfare of this Nation in what has been termed the long haul. Now we know that the drought situation has brought about a new Dust Bowl era. We hope that it is short lived, but we cannot afford to take any chances.

The passage of this amendment will serve two basic purposes: In the first instance, it will stabilize the economy of those men who are engaged in growing this particular farm commodity, and the other contribution, which is equally important in my way of thinking, is this: it will furnish a cover crop to hold the soil in that area where the wind blows all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It will serve as a cover crop to hold together the land in that section of the country and stop the blowing. Now, we have reports at the present time of that dust going into east Texas, as far east as St. Louis, clear to the Gulf of Mexico, and you will see more of that if something is not planted to hold that ground down. If you let that land continue to blow, you are going to put this Government in a position where they are going to have to go back into a land-buying program of the submarginal land that will cost millions of dollars.

This amendment is good, sound, common business sense because it will protect not only the economy of those people, but it will protect the rest of the taxpayers in future years through the protection of the lands we have in that area.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. IKARD. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman in this amendment and compliment him on offering it. I think it is important to note, as the gentleman has stressed, that this is not a small commodity but one that is very essential to a large segment of our whole agricultural economy.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Is there acreage control over this crop at the present time?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. There is no acreage control, because it is a nonbasic commodity. What we are asking here is simply this, that we do not have the rug pulled out from under us all at once. We are willing to submit to acreage controls. We had a delegation from this section of the United States go before the Department of Agriculture and discuss this matter with Mr. Benson. We were told that he was going to take it into consideration and see what he could do about it. Of course, we had complete faith in Mr. Benson. We believed he would do that, and probably he is doing that. But what we need is some kind of assistance at the present time. I would be willing to say this, that those farmers will support submission to basic acreage controls next year or the year after if this Congress sees fit to approve this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that under existing law the Secretary may impose acreage controls on grain sorghum? The people would not expect indefinite support without acreage controls if acreage controls should prove to be necessary and if the support were relatively high. What we need is immediate relief. If a reasonable acreage control program is later required it can be placed in operation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right. The Secretary also has the authority at the present time to support this particular commodity up to 90 percent of parity. We are not asking that in this amendment. He supported it last year at 85 percent of parity. We want him to have some flexibility as long as it is not under controls. We are only asking that this be supported at not less than 80 percent nor more than 85 percent so that these people may have an opportunity at least to stabilize their economy, so that they will not have the rug jerked out from under them all at once and catapult them into bankruptcy. And that is where they are going, because here is what has happened. Some of that country out there is irrigation country. Money has been borrowed from the FHA to drill wells. Money has been borrowed from the FHA in the dry land sections, and when you jerk the rug out from under the farmer on his cash crop, how in the world do you expect him to be able to meet the note when it comes due? He cannot do it. And if you are going to put him in default with the FHA, you have one of the best contrivances that can be thought of to destroy the family-size farm that everyone in this House of Representatives wants to support.

I think it would be tragic if those people were allowed to get in default and become bankrupt simply because everything was pulled out from under them at once and they were not even given a chance to stabilize their economy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that the support prices on some other grains have also been reduced in the same proportion?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. I believe in some instances.

The situation we are confronted with is simply this, that we have a situation that in some cases might be considered unique at the present time, because that is the cash crop of that great segment of this country, in the Southwest and the other States that have been mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I, of course, know of the great interest that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] has in the problem which he has just presented to the House. I know also that many other Congressmen from the State of Texas and in other parts of the country are likewise interested in this problem. I do not, however, believe, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment should be adopted at this time and made a part of the pending bill. I, therefore, urge the House to defeat the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if there are any other amendments on the desk to be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes no amendments on the desk at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, for the last 2 days we have listened to some great orations, all of which were appealing for sympathy for the little farmer. Everyone has great sympathy for the little farmer, but the fact is they did not tell you why they have this sympathy for the little farmer.

Under this price-support act we have been working and living for a number of years, this is what has happened. Since 1935, the number of farms of 1,000 acres or more has increased 37 percent. These farms now contain a total of 494 million acres of 42.6 percent of all of the farm land in the United States. Not only that, but the facts reveal that in 1953, 1.9 percent of the farmers of the United States received over 25 percent of the subsidies and 9 percent of the farmers received 50 percent of the subsidies, which leaves this fact—91 percent of the farmers of the country received only 50 percent of the subsidies. There is no wonder that you gentlemen, here on the right, have great sympathy for the little farmer whom you have crucified under this price-support bill over the years it has operated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas) there were—ayes 47, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent in view of my understanding that there are no further amendments to be offered to the bill that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto, close at 2:35 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder how many want to talk between now and the next 15 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. There are only about 5 or 6 Members standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must state that objection at this time comes too late.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. GAVIN. The Chair recognized the gentleman before we voted on this motion. At that time I felt that he would be entitled to 5 minutes. He has waited several hours for an opportunity to be heard, and I think that his 5 minutes should be granted him and not taken out of this time.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman from Mississippi had not been recognized for 5 minutes at that time. Since the time for debate on the pending amendment was fixed, the gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GAVIN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman be granted 5 minutes, notwithstanding the action taken by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the Committee.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the action taken.

The CHAIRMAN. This is coming out of the gentleman's time. Does the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be granted to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the Nation received 12 percent of the national income in 1946, 11.6 percent in 1948, 9.4 percent in 1951, and, in 1954, the farmers' share of the national income dropped to 7.2 percent.

Opponents of 90 percent supports for basic commodities point these facts out as evidence that the farmer's income has gone down while he was assured 90 percent support. They try to say that a 75 percent of parity support will not hurt him because he is already getting hurt under 90 percent.

The farmer's income is dependent upon the volume he produces, multiplied by the price he receives, less his cost.

In recent years the farmer's costs have gone up greatly, more than 12 percent in the past 2 years. And now the President requests an increase in the minimum wage and in just about everyone's income except the farmer's; and the farm costs are bound to continue to go up.

Now with his income dependent upon price times volume, reducing the price cannot help but make the farmer's situation worse.

What we need do is to at least maintain the price the farmer has been receiving and increase his volume of production by selling in world markets what he produces.

What has really hurt the farmer is that what he has produced has not been sold in world markets because the Department of Agriculture would not offer them for sale at truly competitive prices. While refusing to sell, the CCC built up its stocks to billions of dollars' worth, then such commodities were counted to reduce the farmer's acreage and marketing quotas. Thus his trouble and reduced income under 90 percent supports came about because his constant price multiplied by a constantly reduced volume, less ever-increasing costs meant less and less income to him.

We will not help him by reducing his price, but we will further hurt him.

What is needed is to increase his volume by selling his production in world markets, competitively, and regain our share of the market. Then his price times an increased volume will help.

Of course, we must also try to help him hold down his cost.

Mr. Chairman, I have just about enough time remaining to remind this Congress once again that the $4 billion worth of farm commodities which are being used by the Department of Agriculture in justification of reducing prices of the American farmer are in the hands of the Government because the Department will not sell them in world markets because they will not make the sales price truly competitive. That is supported by the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture. He has not offered them and will not offer them for sale in world markets on a truly competitive basis. Since he has not offered them, he then counts them to reduce the acreage of American farmers. The income of the farmers which has gone down in the last number of years has gone down not because of the prices that they received under the farm price supports of 90 percent, but the income has gone down because of this buildup of commodities that has been used to reduce his volume.

With his volume held down by his Government through this erroneous policy, we heap coals of fire on his head when we reduce his price as well.

President Eisenhower knows the situation facing our farmers is bad, for last week he told the Congress in a special message:

> In this wealthiest of nations where per capita income is the highest in the world, more than one-fourth of the families who live on American farms still have cash incomes of less than $1,000 a year. They neither share fully in our economic and social progress nor contribute as much as they would like and can contribute to the Nation's production of goods and services.

And yet there could be no poorer approach to the farmers' problems, in my judgment, than that presently offered by the Department of Agriculture. By refusing to sell, it holds down his production, has reduced his price, and now Mr. Benson endorses the increased minimum wage, which can only increase his costs. No wonder it is expected the farmers' income—already less than half that of other Americans—will decrease another 1.2 billion dollars this year while the national income is expected to increase by about $20 billion. Such a situation cannot long continue for a constantly declining farm income can only pull the rest down with it. We should remember every depression has been led off by similar drops in farm income. I am afraid we are on our way if we do not change our course. We must pass this bill restoring supports to 90 percent of parity and then, if necessary, we must force the Department of Agriculture under its present authority to sell in world markets competitively at least to the point of recapturing our former share of world markets.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HATE CAMPAIGN AGAINST FARMERS AND MERCHANTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, Secretary of Agriculture Benson started a campaign in 1953 to incite the city consumers against the farmer. The city consumers were told that the farmers were getting so much for their products that it caused the city consumers to be compelled to pay unreasonably high prices. Informed people know this is not true.

Then the Secretary of Agriculture commenced a campaign to make both city consumers and farmers hate the grocers and other distributors. He contended the farmers would get more for what they sold and the consumer would pay less for what they bought if the middleman did not make an unreasonable profit. Informed people know this is not true but it was good propaganda for a hate campaign.

The result is the farmers are suffering and this administration is not doing anything, that I know anything about, to right the wrongs committed against the farmers.

The farmers and small business are being sadly neglected.

SMALL BUSINESS

It is timely to review what has occurred in the past to help small and independent business.

BANKS, RAILROADS, AND INSURANCE COMPANIES SAVED BY RFC

I could not fairly review the great events during my time in Congress without mentioning the RFC. That agency, as we know, was first created in 1932 on the recommendation of President Hoover. It was created to bail out the financial institutions and the railroads at a time when the credit structure of the country had collapsed. When the Democratic administration took over in the next year, this agency was put to work not only to rescue our financial institutions and railroads, but to help almost all varieties of business, to lend a helping hand to State and local governments, and to just ordinary people.

In its early years the RFC invested nearly $4 billion in our financial institutions. About a third of this was loaned to pay depositors some part of their deposits in banks which had closed. Another third was loaned to help banks stay open. And the other third went to strengthen the credit structure by investing Government money in the preferred capital of banks, trust companies, and insurance companies. During the first 10 years of its existence the RFC aided more than 7,000 banks and 100 insurance companies.

One-third of the railway mileage of the country fell into bankruptcy even after help from the RFC, and another third would have gone the same way if it had not been for RFC assistance.

When the Republican administration went out of office in 1933 a special theory of government also went out of office. This is the theory that the people of this country can advance their welfare and their legitimate aspirations through the agency of Government only by the trickle-down method. After the Democratic administration took over the doors of the agency in which the credit resources of the Government were mobilized were they opened to all classes of business and all classes of citizens.

To aid farmers the RFC made loans of $1½ billion, about half of which was distributed through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Most of these loans were repaid with interest, and in any case this program occasioned no loss to the taxpayer.

To help relieve the crisis in home and farm mortgages the RFC made loans to private mortgage companies, to insurance companies, and to home and farm owners. Government credit for this purpose saved from foreclosure a million urban homes and half a million farms. The RFC financed the Rural Electrification Administration and the Electric Home and Farm Authority. It made loans to over 30,000 disaster victims, including earthquake victims in California, tornado victims in Georgia, and flood victims in the Missouri Valley. It lent money or purchased the securities of countless local public agencies, such as school authorities, hospital authorities, waterworks authorities, and so on.

The RFC's contributions to our Nation during World War II were far too wide and numerous to mention. It built and expanded factories, mines, and transportation systems. Its money built most of the airplane plants, the high-octane gasoline plants, the synthetic-rubber plants, the new aluminum and steel plants; and it built, expanded, or converted plants for making jeeps, tanks, bombs, guns, shells, and for making the machinery to build all these things. In

total, it provided the money for building or equipping more than 2,000 industrial plants, substantially all of which are in operation today, providing employment and turning out goods which the American people need. Its money provided for insurance against war damages to the people of the United States. Its money financed the Defense Homes Corporation which provided homes for workers in crowded defense areas.

After World War II the RFC established and financed the Export-Import Bank to assist private traders in reestablishing our foreign trade. And during substantially all of its life, from 1934 until it was abolished by a Republican Congress in 1953, it made loans directly to industrial, mining, and other enterprises, both large and small, where legitimate needs for capital were not met by private financial institutions. In all, during its 21 years and 8 months of operation, the RFC lent more than $12 billion. These loans saved or expanded tens of thousands of small businesses. They created new business in those sections of the country where capital is scarce, such as in the South, the West, the Plains States, and upper New England. They created new businesses and new competition in several highly monopolized industries where the private financial houses would risk no money on a new firm to challenge the monopoly giants.

No wonder the present big business administration was so quick to kill this goose that had been laying the golden eggs. The big financial institutions no longer need help; they now have all the money in the world, and they are increasing their stranglehold on the credit resources of the country by combining and merging. Only the several thousand small banks on the several thousand main streets of this country need credit to serve the needs of their local communities. Big industrial concerns no longer need access to capital; they have the big financial institutions for this purpose, and they have billions of dollars of undistributed profits. Now only the small firms and the medium-sized firms are unable to obtain a sufficient share of the Nation's savings to serve their needs for expansion and for working capital. Monopoly industries have adequate access to the Nation's savings, and they do not welcome the idea that any of these savings might be used to create competitors.

In all of the hundreds of thousands of loans which RFC made, some of them of course did not pay out. There were some business failures, and some foreclosures had to be made. That is the experience of any private lending operation. But, on the whole, the RFC lending program was very profitable, even in the narrow terms of dollars and cents paid into the Treasury. This program paid a fair rate of interest on the money it borrowed from the Treasury, it paid all of its expenses, including office rent and salaries, and on top of this it returned a profit to the Treasury.

SPECIAL BENEFITS ALLOCATED

Then, of course, there was another reason why the big business administration found it imperative to liquidate the RFC. The RFC had, in mid-1953, more than a billion dollars worth of nice, sound business assets. These included sound, interest-paying loans; they included railroad and industrial bonds and stocks; and they included a variety of valuable physical properties, such as the synthetic rubber plants. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury takes great pride in the rapidity with which these assets have been disposed of. The administration's disposition of what is called the small loans will illustrate my point.

First of all, a review was made of all the loans with balances of less than $100,000, and the guilt-edge ones—some 2,800 of them—were put into a pool. Then arrangements were made by which the banks bought shares in this pool, by purchasing what are called "interest certificates." The Government pays the banks 3½ percent interest on these certificates. In other words, the Government did not relieve itself of any obligation by this pool arrangement; it merely borrowed money it did not need, and is paying the banks 3½ percent interest on it. Moreover, the Government did not relieve itself of the risk that some of these loans may not be paid off. It allowed the banks to purchase the first mortgage on this pool for 64 percent of its value, so the Government will get the residue after the banks get all the principal and interest due them. This is, of course, good business—for those that can get it—and it illustrates nicely the sound business methods by which the country is being run. But this is not all. The banks which have been so generous as to accept some of the Treasury's interest certificates are also made the depositors for payments on the loans in this pool, and for this they receive an additional fee. For example, on a loan with a balance of less than $25,000, the bank receives a fee of 2 percent on the principal and interest collected, plus another fee of $2 per month. Finally, as the banks look the loans over, they are privileged to select individual ones they would like to have, and purchase these at face value. These loans pay 4 to 5 percent interest, and after they have been paid off to the point where the balance due is small compared to the security pledged, they are guilt-edged investments. So, the same financial institutions which the RFC was originally set up to save from bankruptcy, have now butchered the cow and are dividing up the carcass.

THE BIGS PROSPER, THE SMALLS SUFFER

No; big business no longer needs credit assistance. Under the new tax law, big-business profits are higher than ever, while small-business profits have dropped. According to the administration's official reports, profits of the giant corporations in the manufacturing field were at the rate of 12 percent, after taxes, in the first 3 quarters of last year. These are the corporations that have more than $100 million of assets, including those that have up to 6 or 8 billions of assets. In contrast to this profit rate of 12 percent, the smaller corporations—those with less than one-fourth million dollars of assets—had a profit rate of 5 percent. Two years earlier, in the last year of the Democratic administration, the profit rates of the small companies had been about the same as for the supergiants; both were about 11 percent in the first three quarters of 1952. In other words, under the big-business administration, profits of the giant corporations have gone up, and profits of the smaller corporations have been cut in half. What the figures for the whole of last year look like we do not know. I assume they do not look good, because the administration is holding up their release.

MORE BANKRUPTCIES

This week the House Committee on Appropriations reported to the House that the officer who requests appropriations for running our Federal courts has made a significant plea for more money. He reported to the Appropriations Committee that at the present rate with which bankruptcy petitions are being filed, the courts expect to have to handle 65,000 bankruptcies in the present fiscal year, and 75,000 during the next fiscal year. This will be the greatest number of bankruptcies on record, even exceeding the number in 1932.

I am not a profit of gloom and doom. I am merely pointing out what is reported from our Federal courts. I do not even predict that the stock market will soon crash. This huge increase in bankruptcies includes few, if any, big corporations. It merely reflects the worsening status of individuals and small businesses.

FTC DEEMPHASIZES DROP IN SMALL-BUSINESS PROFITS

I have had a look behind the story which appeared in the yesterday morning papers, which story is to the effect that profits of manufacturing corporations last year were about the same as in the previous year. The Washington Post and Times Herald headlined this story: "Tax Cuts Kept Profits for 1954 Near 1953."

The FTC's press release on these figures slants the story about the same way, except more so. This release opens up with the statement:

> In 1954, profits after taxes of manufacturing corporations amounted to $11.2 billion, about the same as 1953 and 5 percent higher than 1952.

Then the FTC's press release continued with this statement:

> The fourth quarter of 1954 showed a marked pick-up over the corresponding quarter of 1953.

Thus the reader would think that the profits picture is bright: that in the whole year 1954 the profit picture was as good as in the previous year, that it was better than in 1952, and that at the end of 1954 profits were on the way up.

Buried down in FTC's release however, there appears this unobtrusive little sentence:

> Generally, small- and medium-sized firms showed the largest declines while the largest size groups showed little change in the rate of return.

This sentence may turn out to be the understatement of the year. Now what are the facts, according to the FTC's own figures?

The fact is that only the giant corporations had a profit rate, after taxes, as high as in 1953. The profit rate of corporations in every other size class dropped. The smaller the corporation the greater the drop; and for the smallest corporation, the drop was precipitous. The profit rate of even big corporations just below the giant size class dropped. Specifically, the rate for those corporations with $50 million to $100 million of assets dropped. The rate of those corporations with $10 million to $50 million of assets dropped. And the rate dropped for every other smaller-sized class.

What has happened to the smallest-size class? According to FTC figures the rate of profits of this class—corporations with less than $¼ million of assets—was less than half what it was in 1953, and only about one-third what it was in 1952. In other words, the profit rate of these smaller corporations dropped by 27 percent from 1952 to 1953, and dropped by another 53 percent from 1953 to 1954.

PROSPERITY FOR SUPER GIANTS ONLY

Furthermore, the profit rate for all corporations below the giant-sized class dropped from 1952 to 1953, and dropped again from 1953 to 1954. Only the profit rate of the giant corporations has increased since 1952. This rate was 11.8 percent in 1952; it rose to 12.1 percent in 1953; and it remained at 12.1 percent in 1954. In short, the new business prosperity is strictly a prosperity of the giant corporations. It may, in fact, be a prosperity of only the supergiant corporations. The FTC's grouping method groups together the figures for all corporations above $100 million of assets, so as to conceal differences between the supergiants, the medium giants, and the just plain giants. For example, they combine the profits of those corporations with $100 million of assets with those corporations like Standard Oil and General Motors which have $5 billion and $6 billion of assets. This means that when they get to the big corporations they combine the figures where the biggest corporation is at least 60 times as big as the smallest corporation in the group. In contrast when they get to the smaller sizes they arrange their grouping so as to put together corporations of a more similar size. For example, the figures for corporations having between $50 million and $100 million of assets, so that the largest corporation in the group could not be more than twice as large as the smallest corporation in the group.

TREND FOR BIGS UP, FOR SMALLS DOWN

Now what about the direction of profits at the end of the last year? Were they actually on the way up? For the biggest-size classes—yes. The annual profit rate for the giant group increased from 10.8 percent in the third quarter of last year to 13.7 percent in the final quarter of last year. Similarly, as between these two quarters of the year the rate for the $50 million to $100 million asset group increased from 8.3 percent to 9.2 percent. But what happened to the smaller-size classes? The profit rate of the next smallest-size class—those in the $5 million to $10 million asset group—remained the same; the next smaller-size class, those with $1 million to $5 million assets, decreased from 5.6 percent to 5.4 percent; those in the next smaller-size class, the $¼ million to $1 million asset size, dropped from 8.1 percent to 4.6 percent; finally the profit rate of the smallest-size group—those corporations with less than $¼ million of assets—not only dropped between the third and final quarters of last year, but the figures for the final quarter of last year indicate that these corporations as a whole operated at a loss. Their profit rate was minus 3.5 percent.

The profit rates for all size classes of corporations, after taxes, and the percentage changes in these rates are shown for the last 3 years below:

Corporations with total assets of—	Profit rates			Percent changes	
	1952	1953	1954	1952 to 1954	1953 to 1954
Less than $0.25 million	9.3	6.8	3.2	−65.6	−52.9
$0.25 million to $1 million	7.2	7.1	6.4	−11.1	−9.9
$1 million to $5 million	8.0	7.5	5.6	−30.0	−25.3
$5 million to $10 million	8.8	9.2	7.4	−15.9	−19.6
$10 million to $50 million	9.7	9.9	8.7	−10.3	−12.1
$50 million to $100 million	9.9	9.4	8.7	−12.1	−7.4
Over $100 million	11.8	12.1	12.1	+2.5	0
All classes	10.3	10.5	9.9	−3.9	−5.7

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] desire to be recognized at this time?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will use my time later.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. FORRESTER. I ask unanimous consent to give my time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, is the time set for 25 minutes to 3 definitely set, and is this holding back in time taken out of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the time is definitely set. The Chair is endeavoring to get to the gentlemen who were standing as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. May those Members who have asked that their time be reserved until later, ask unanimous consent to yield that time to someone else?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, the Chair is of the opinion that would be possible.

Does the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] desire recognition?

Mr. ALBERT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks at this point.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most fallacious arguments that we hear in connection with the farm-price-support legislation is that flexible-price supports will bring lower prices to consumers. It has been proven that this simply is not true.

The fact of the matter is that the price received by farmers bears little relationship to the price paid by consumers for farm products.

In the last 5 years prices received by farmers have declined 7 percent. During that same period prices paid by consumers for farm commodities have increased 13 percent.

In 1953 and 1954, while the farm price of wheat was declining 8 percent, the retail price of cereals and bakery products increased 5 percent.

In January 1948 the price of wheat reached a peak of $2.81 a bushel, and the average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was 13.8 cents. The price of a bushel of wheat has declined to $2.14 a bushel, but the average price of a loaf of bread has increased to 17½ cents. Thus, the price of wheat declined 24 percent, while the price of bread was advancing 27 percent. The farm value of the wheat in a loaf of bread is 2.8 cents.

There have been corresponding declines in the farm price of corn and oats and corresponding increases in the price paid by consumers for corn flakes and rolled oats.

The same relationship of farm price to consumer prices is shown in the case of meat products. The average city family spent $261 a year for meat products in 1947–49 and in 1954 spent $263 for the same quantity and quality of meats. Farmers received $176 a year for these meat products in 1947–49 and $164 in 1954. Thus, the retail cost increased $2, while the value at the farm dropped $12 during this period.

The same pattern is shown in fruit and vegetable prices. The typical city family spent $195 a year for fruit and vegetables in 1947–49 and $206 for the same quantities and qualities of fruits and vegetables in 1954. The retail cost was increased by $11, while there was a cut in the prices received by farmers of $1.

There is a variety of reasons for the disparities in farm and consumer price relationships. Higher labor costs, increasing transportation costs, larger profits in some instances, and increased costs of processing and packaging have contributed to the higher prices for consumers. But the evidence proves conclusively that the farmer has not contributed to higher consumer prices. On the contrary he has suffered a loss of income, while consumer prices have moved steadily upward.

We who favor a 90-percent price-support program for basic commodities do not contend that our proposal will cure all of the ills of farming. But it will help to stabilize farm prices and reverse the trend of recent years of steadily declining income received by farmers.

The average farm price is down 22 percent since February 1951. Net farm income in 1954 was 28 percent below 1947 and 10 percent below 1953. Further declines are in prospect for 1955 and 1956.

Congress must take action to help the farmer recover from the losses he has sustained since the end of World War II. Although this program is not the complete answer, it will provide the necessary stability for farm prices and contribute toward an improved agricultural economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this great debate is now about to be ended. Soon the last word will be spoken, and the vote will be taken. We are coming to the "showdown." All of us must soon stand up and be counted. As chairman of the committee, I think it only appropriate that I should say to you now that when we go back into the House I shall demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman GREEN. In this debate the amendment has been referred to as the peanut amendment. I have cherished the friendship of my colleague, BILL GREEN, for many years. I do not doubt for one moment his great sincerity, but I believe that even he now realizes that the friends he had on yesterday will leave him and desert him today, and will vote to recommit the bill when the roll is called on the motion to recommit. The Republican leadership voted for the Green amendment, and many Members voted for the amendment, knowing at the very time they cast their votes that they intended, even if the amendment were adopted, to vote to recommit the bill. This was the ultimate objective sought to be accomplished by the Republican leadership. It was a smart political maneuver to prevent an outright vote on the real proposition which is now presented to the House. The Republican leadership outsmarted us a year ago when they pulled a "rabbit out of the hat," and offered the 82½ percent price-support amendment. That was clearly a compromise, but even that amendment was an outright repudiation of their own Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. This time the Republican leadership is trying desperately to prevent a true vote on the real issue.

Today we have witnessed demonstrations of real statesmanship. Yesterday the Republican leadership sought to divide us. Yesterday we were divided, but today we know the truth, and we understand the ulterior purposes which influenced the vote which was taken in this House yesterday afternoon. I want to compliment Congressman ABE MULTER, of New York, who in great sincerity supported and spoke for and urged the adoption of the Green amendment when it was presented to us yesterday. When Congressman MULTER realized just what had happened, and when he understood the ultimate objective sought to be accomplished, he took the floor today for the purpose of testing the sincerity of Members who had voted for the Green amendment in which he was interested. Congressman MULTER looked the Republican leadership straight in the eye, and put Members to the test of real sincerity. Congressman MULTER said:

> How many of you who voted for the Green amendment will now stand up and say that you will vote for the passage of the bill as amended?

Not a single Republican stood, nor did a single Republican indicate that he would vote for the passage of the bill, even after the Green amendment had been adopted. Perhaps Congressman MULTER was slightly out of order in subjecting the Republican Members to this test of sincerity. He had no right to demand Members of the House to respond to his suggestion, but certainly no one would deny him the right to invite Members of the minority to indicate their views on the important proposition he was discussing. After Congressman MULTER realized that an effort would be made to recommit the bill, even after the Green amendment had been adopted, he had the courage and the statesmanship to stand on the floor of this House, and to urge the defeat of the amendment, because he was unwilling to be used as an instrumentality to bring about the destruction and the repeal of the farm program which has meant so much to the welfare and the happiness of all the people of this great country.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to compliment and pay brief tribute to our able and distinguished colleague, CARL ANDERSEN of Minnesota. CARL ANDERSEN stood like the rock of Gibraltar. He could not be moved, nor could he be shaken, nor did he bow down under the lash of the whip of partisan politics. He stood here like a man, and he spoke his own mind, and he reflected the views of his honest heart, and he labored in behalf of the people whom he has had the honor to represent. CARL ANDERSEN is a man of conviction and courage, and a great champion of the farmers of America. His constitutents have a just right to take great pride in the man that they have sent here to represent them in this the greatest lawmaking body of the world.

As I said when this great debate started, this is the time for facts and figures and not for fraud, fallacy, or fancy. This is the time when the people of America should know the truth. This is the time for forthright and fearless action.

To lead the end users of peanuts—the manufacturers of candy—to believe that great relief was about to be afforded them was nothing more nor less than fiction and fancy—and now the cruel truth they must know.

If the peanut amendment remains in the bill, obviously the bill will be recommitted. If the bill is recommitted, the end users of peanuts will find themselves just exactly where they were before this great fight and effort in their behalf was undertaken. Yes; they will be right back where they were night before last. You have won only a temporary victory. As my colleague from Mississippi, TOM ABERNETHY, has said to me, the Republican leadership gave you a lollipop yesterday, but they will take it away from you today.

Let us be realistic. Let us all be fearless and fair, and face this issue. By the adoption of the peanut amendment, you Republicans have repudiated the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, neither of whom have advocated the abandonment of the program which provides acreage allotments and marketing quotas and price supports for the producers of peanuts. The vote on the peanut amendment is just as vital as its adoption was vicious. The peanut amendment must be defeated. This bill must not be recommitted. Let us come to the final test and to the showdown, and let us here and now say to the country we are either for the mandatory 90 percent of parity price support program, or we are in favor of the slideaway, hideaway, giveaway program, which is the only program of the present administration.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot permit this great debate to come to an end until I have paid at least a brief tribute to CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, the Democratic whip. I have served in Congress for 21 years, and for about 15 years of that time I was an assistant Democratic whip. I have served under many whips, and I want to say to this House, and especially to the Democratic Members, that CARL ALBERT is one of the very best whips the Democratic Party has ever had. No man could have worked more diligently, more faithfully, more constantly than CARL ALBERT has in trying to present to the Members of this House the views of the party of which he is a very vital part. CARL ALBERT is a great American—a great citizen and a great champion of the farmers of his district, his State, and his Nation. He is courageous, he is fearless, he is honest, and he is worthy of every confidence that the people of his district could ever entrust into his care. His heart and his soul are devoted to the welfare of farmers and ultimately to the happiness of the people of this great Nation.

The showdown is at hand—the chips are down—and I am ready for the rollcall.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and yield my time to the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as was said by the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee [Mr. COOLEY], in his opening remarks Tuesday, the issue before the House is in no sense new. I have listened to the debate and have heard nothing that I had not already heard. There is no question in my mind as to the sincerity and good intentions of every Member who has spoken either for or against fixed price supports.

Leaving aside the opinions expressed to me by the grass roots farmers of my district, I cannot help recalling some of the business people who have discussed the subject with me. These are bankers and merchants in the communities which serve my farmers. They have been among the most emphatic in urging that price supports be fixed, and they give as their principal reason the fact that they extend credit to the farmers—credit with which to buy machinery and fertilizer and seed, they feel that unless they have some definite price support, their equity is not particularly dependable and the amount of the credit which

they would extend would be cut accordingly.

Just as a workman can obtain credit on the basis of his minimum wage, so is the farmer extended credit on the basis of his minimum wage which, in this case, is his price support. There is no more reason to ask a farmer to accept a sliding scale on his minimum income than to ask a workman to accept it for his. Also, it should be remembered that the sliding scale on farm products is designed to apply when the need is the greatest. The worse you need it, the less you get.

There is one group connected with the cotton business which is very frank in favor of cutting price supports down, and if they had their way they would remove them entirely. These are the people who profit only through the handling of the cotton after it leaves the farm. Some of them are completely selfish and say without hesitation that they want to fix it so that the farmer will produce more in order that they may have more buying and selling transactions and, thereby, increase their own income.

I hasten to add that this does not apply to all in this category. Some of them are farsighted enough to realize that their prosperity would be short-lived; and that without some sort of a farm program and some reasonable prosperity for the producer, the goose that lays the golden egg would very soon be dead.

I am impressed with the fact that alined on the flexible side of this controversy you will find all of the people who will tell you that they would like to see the whole farm program killed. In this Chamber there are many who have no interest, or at least no direct interest, in the problem at hand. They may be swayed by the fact that many members of national farm organizations and some farm organizations as such recommend flexible as against fixed price supports.

Let me remind these neutrals that a majority of the individuals engaged in agriculture and members of farm organizations do not produce the basic crops which are affected by today's decision. The basic producers are very strongly in favor of the fixed program which we now recommend to you.

I urge you, therefore, to listen to the request of the man who is involved and vote with committee in favor of H. R. 12.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to yield my time to the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I spoke in favor of the bill, H. R. 12, which is the pending business before the House. The bill seeks to restore 90 percent parity price supports for the basic commodities of cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, instead of the sliding scale supports of 82½ to 90 percent of parity as now in effect.

It should be pointed out that under the law now in effect, these same price supports will next year slide or operate between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity, unless we pass this bill.

At the outset, I want to express my hope that when the debate on amendments to the bill is finished this afternoon, the House will reverse the action it took yesterday when it removed peanuts from the list of the six basic farm crops for parity price-support purposes.

In other words, the first vote this afternoon will be on the question of whether or not peanuts continue to be one of the basic crops, along with cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco and, if such, supported by the price support level prescribed for the basic crops.

I have listened to most of the debate on this bill, and I have gotten the definite impression that the Secretary of Agriculture has not asked that peanuts be eliminated from the list of six basic crops. There is no intimation that the President has asked that peanuts be eliminated. In other words, the people charged by law with directing our agricultural policy, namely the President of the United States and his Secretary of Agriculture, have not asked that peanuts be stricken from the list. The candy manufacturers have asked that peanuts be stricken from the list of six basic crops.

So, Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is Who is to determine the farm policy of this country, the Secretary of Agriculture or the candy manufacturers?

Unfortunately, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture do support sliding-scale parity prices, this year between 82½ and 90 percent, and next year between 75 and 90 percent.

Many members of the President's political party cry that the sliding scale of parity supports has not yet had a fair trial. They ask that the new sliding scale be given a period of time in which to operate.

Those of us who support this bill say that we are trying to save the American farmer, caught in the clutch of a cost-price squeeze which recently has been reducing his income at the rate of 10 percent a year, from the further reductions in his income that will necessarily follow the further reduction of his parity price supports.

I think I have the right to speak for the small farmer. The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is a district of small farmers. The 1950 Census recorded that our district had more than 34,000 small farmers. The small farmer cannot stand another reduction in his income. As a matter of fact, he cannot stand the reductions he has already had.

Government cannot do everything. But, one of the things it can do is keep parity price supports for farm products at the level of at least 90 percent. Ninety-percent parity price supports will not solve the farm problem in America. But to lower those supports will, within a short time, make the farm problem much worse than it now is.

Mr. Chairman, Members of this body know that I have fought for the interests of the small farmer. They know that I tried earlier this year to obtain an amendment to the cotton-allotment laws that would have provided that no cotton farmer be allotted less than 5 acres of cotton under this program. We have come to the point in the administration of our acreage quota and allotment laws that we must write a floor into the law, and provide that no farmer will be given an allotment of less than 5 acres of cotton.

Of course, no one would argue that the farmer can make a living on 5 acres of cotton. His economy must be diversified, and he must have more than one source of income that cotton provides. However, his cotton acreage must not be reduced to the point where it is ineffective as a real source of his income.

The time has come in this country when we must have a realistic farm policy that will bolster the individual farm, and provide means whereby the small farmer can diversify and can earn for himself a living that is comparable to that of his city cousin. To do this, he is going to need more credit, more convenient sources of credit, and longer terms of repayment. He must be encouraged to diversify, and must be encouraged to own his own farm.

I represent a district in which there continues to be a lot of farm tenancy. I know what it is to be the son of a tenant farmer on a hillside farm. I know the problems, the heartaches, the want, the loneliness, and the lack of opportunity that is so often associated with farm tenancy of the type we have known in the South. We must pass laws that will lead to farm ownership. We must encourage farm ownership. We must encourage diversification. We must encourage the continuance of the stabilizing influence of the farm on our American life.

I want to compliment the House Committee on Agriculture, and its chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], for bringing this bill to restore 90-percent parity supports to our basic crops. I hope the bill passes.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge that the Committee on Agriculture hold early hearings on the problems of the small farmer. The Government must do what it can to help him solve these problems and preserve and protect the economic and social integrity of the small farm.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KNOX, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. POLK, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. BASS of Tennessee, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. ANFUSO yielded their time to the Speaker.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. How much time has been allotted to the distinguished Speaker?

The CHAIRMAN. As well as the Chair is able to tabulate the time now, 6 minutes have been yielded to the Speaker, but the Chair would like to point out that some of the time fixed

has been lost through parliamentary inquiries, points of order, and other inquiries directed to the Chair. It is entirely conceivable that it may not be possible to reach all Members whose names are listed.

Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] desire recognition?

Mr. GROSS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. In this 1 minute allotted to me, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out for the benefit of those whose districts are comprised largely of consumers, that consumers paid 3 percent less for farm products in their market baskets in the first quarter of this year, while farmers received 8 percent less. How anyone can support a parity program of less than 90 percent and expect to maintain the economy of this country I do not know.

I should also like to go back to the colloquy I had this morning with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON]. I said that yesterday the gentleman, in opposing the 90-percent program, insisted upon invoking the law of supply and demand. He apparently thought he did not make that statement. I should like to read an excerpt from what he said yesterday:

> We must remember that the American economy is still based upon supply and demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished Speaker of the House, to close the debate, for 6½ minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have watched with a great deal of interest this debate as it has gone along. I find this to be true, that practically everyone who votes, especially on my left, for the so-called peanut amendment is against this bill in toto. Therefore, it is good strategy, and I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for this strategy, because I feel sure that they think if the so-called peanut amendment is adopted we will not have a chance to vote on 90 percent parity and in all probability this bill will be killed by being recommitted. So it would appear to me that everyone on both sides of the aisle who are for 90 percent of parity for these basic products will certainly vote against the amendment when we go back in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how anyone, even the peanut candy manufacturing people themselves, would be benefited by this amendment, as the gentleman from North Carolina has so well stated. To those of us who believe in 90 percent of parity, in the face of falling farm prices, it would seem that we should not try to put anything in this bill that will hamstring that effort, especially for those farmers who farm the least unit of any farmer in the United States. Those farmers, and I know because there are peanuts produced in my neighborhood, are in a desperate situation at this time. I believe that it will help no one, and let me repeat, not even the candy manufacturing people. I do not criticize them for being here. They think they are right, I think they are wrong. I believe they are flying in their own faces and that in the future and on future legislation they may regret their actions in this matter. Yet I do not criticize them, I do not threaten them, I do not view legislation with prejudice. I try to view things as they are.

So if we want a bill at all, the only thing to do, when we get back into the House, is to vote down the so-called peanut amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities, pursuant to House Resolution 224, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Green amendment, the so-called peanut amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: On page 1, after line 2, insert the following new section:
>
> "That (a) section 101 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'and peanuts' in each place it appears therein. Section 408 (c) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'
>
> "(b) (1) Part VI of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (relating to marketing quotas for peanuts), is hereby repealed.
>
> "(2) Section 301 (b) (1) (B) of such act is amended by striking out 'cotton, rice, or peanuts' and inserting 'cotton or rice.'
>
> "(3) Section 301 (b) (3) (A) of such act is amended by striking out 'corn, rice, and peanuts' and inserting 'corn and rice.'
>
> "(4) Section 301 (b) (6) (C) of such act is hereby repealed.
>
> "(5) Section 301 (b) (10) (A) of such act is amended by striking out 'wheat, and peanuts' and inserting 'and wheat'; and by striking out '20 percent in the case of wheat; and 15 percent in the case of peanuts' and inserting 'and 20 percent in the case of wheat.'
>
> "(6) Section 301 (b) (13) (B) of such act is amended by striking out 'or peanuts' in each place it appears in the first sentence; and by striking out the second sentence.
>
> "(7) Section 301 (b) (13) (E) of such act is amended by striking out 'cotton, or peanuts' in the first two places it appears and inserting 'for cotton'; by striking out 'corn, cotton, or peanuts' in each place it appears and inserting 'corn or cotton'; and by striking out the sentence which begins as follows: 'For 1942, the normal yield for any farm, in the case of peanuts.'
>
> "(8) Section 301 (b) (16) (A) of such act is amended by striking out 'rice, and peanuts' and inserting 'and rice.'
>
> "(9) Section 361 of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'
>
> "(10) Sections 371 (a) and 371 (b) of such act are each amended by striking out 'peanuts.'
>
> "(11) The first sentence of section 373 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows: 'This subsection shall apply to warehousemen, processors, and common carriers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco, and all ginners of cotton, all persons engaged in the business of purchasing corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco from producers, and all persons engaged in the business of redrying, prizing, or stemming tobacco for producers.' Section 373 (b) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'
>
> "(12) Section 374 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts.'
>
> "(13) Section 375 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'peanuts'."

Mr. MASON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objecti

The SPEAKER. The ..estion is on the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 193, nays 215, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—193

Adair	Donohue	McIntire
Alger	Donovan	McVey
Allen, Calif.	Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Ill.
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Mack, Wash.
Arends	Fenton	Maillard
Auchincloss	Fino	Martin
Avery	Fjare	Mason
Ayres	Fogarty	Meader
Baker	Ford	Merrow
Baldwin	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Md.
Bass, N. H.	Fulton	Miller, Nebr.
Bates	Gamble	Miller, N. Y.
Baumhart	Gavin	Minshall
Beamer	Green, Pa.	Morano
Becker	Gubser	Nelson
Belcher	Gwinn	Nicholson
Bennett, Mich.	Hale	Norblad
Bentley	Halleck	O'Brien, Ill.
Betts	Hand	O'Hara, Minn.
Boland	Harden	O'Neill
Bolton, Frances P.	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
	Hays, Ohio	Ostertag
Bosch	Henderson	Patterson
Bow	Hess	Pelly
Bray	Hiestand	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Hill	Phillips
Brownson	Hillings	Pillion
Budge	Hinshaw	Prouty
Bush	Hoffman, Ill.	Quigley
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Carrigg	Holmes	Ray
Cederberg	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Chase	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Hosmer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chiperfield	Hyde	Robsion, Ky.
Church	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	James	Sadlak
Cole	Jenkins	St. George
Coon	Johansen	Saylor
Corbett	Johnson, Calif.	Schenck
Coudert	Jonas	Scherer
Cramer	Judd	Schwengel
Cretella	Kean	Scott
Crumpacker	Kearney	Scrivner
Cunningham	Kearns	Scudder
Curtis, Mass.	Keating	Seely-Brown
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Sheehan
Dague	Knox	Short
Davis, Ga.	Laird	Siler
Davis, Wis.	Lane	Simpson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Derounian	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Devereux	Lipscomb	Smith, Wis.
Dixon	McConnell	Springer
Dolliver	McDonough	Taber
Dondero	McGregor	Talle

Taylor	Velde	Williams, N. Y.
Teague, Calif.	Vorys	Wilson, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.	Vursell	Wilson, Ind.
	Wainwright	Withrow
Thomson, Wyo.	Weaver	Wolcott
Tollefson	Westland	Yates
Utt	Wharton	Young
Van Pelt	Widnall	Younger
Van Zandt	Wigglesworth	Zablocki

NAYS—215

Abbitt	Flood	Mollohan
Abernethy	Flynt	Morgan
Addonizio	Forand	Morrison
Albert	Forrester	Moss
Alexander	Fountain	Moulder
Andersen, H. Carl	Frazier	Murray, Ill.
	Friedel	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews	Garmatz	Natcher
Anfuso	Gary	Norrell
Ashley	Gathings	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ashmore	Gentry	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	George	Passman
Bailey	Gordon	Patman
Barden	Granahan	Perkins
Barrett	Grant	Pfost
Bass, Tenn.	Gray	Pilcher
Bell	Green, Oreg	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Griffiths	Poff
Berry	Gross	Polk
Blatnik	Hagen	Powell
Blitch	Haley	Preston
Boggs	Hardy	Price
Bolling	Harris	Priest
Bonner	Harrison, Va.	Rabaut
Bowler	Harvey	Rains
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Reuss
Boyle	Hayworth	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Hébert	Richards
Brooks, Tex.	Herlong	Riley
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Rivers
Broyhill	Holtzman	Robeson, Va.
Buchanan	Hope	Rodino
Burdick	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Burleson	Hull	Rogers, Fla.
Burnside	Ikard	Rogers, Tex.
Byrd	Jarman	Rooney
Byrne, Pa.	Jennings	Roosevelt
Cannon	Jensen	Rutherford
Carlyle	Johnson, Wis.	Selden
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Shelley
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Shuford
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Sikes
Christopher	Karsten	Sisk
Chudoff	Kee	Smith, Miss.
Clark	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Keogh	Spence
Cooley	Kilday	Staggers
Cooper	Kilgore	Steed
Davidson	King, Calif.	Sullivan
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Teague, Tex.
Deane	Kluczynski	Thomas
Delaney	Knutson	Thompson, La.
Dempsey	Krueger	Thompson, N. J.
Denton	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Dies	Lanham	Thornberry
Diggs	Lankford	Trimble
Dingell	Lesinski	Tuck
Dodd	Long	Tumulty
Dollinger	Lovre	Udall
Dorn, S. C.	McCormack	Vanik
Dowdy	McDowell	Vinson
Doyle	McMillan	Watts
Durham	Macdonald	Whitten
Edmondson	Machrowicz	Wickersham
Elliott	Madden	Wier
Engle	Magnuson	Williams, Miss.
Evins	Mahon	Williams, N. J.
Fascell	Marshall	Willis
Feighan	Matthews	Winstead
Fernandez	Metcalf	Wolverton
Fine	Miller, Calif.	Wright
Fisher	Mills	Zalenko

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Andresen, August H. Multer

NOT VOTING—24

Bolton, Oliver P.	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
	Holifield	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Kelly, N. Y.	Riehlman
Canfield	Kilburn	Roberts
Chatham	Kirwan	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	McCarthy	Sieminski
Eberharter	McCulloch	Walter
Fallon	Mumma	
Gregory	O'Konski	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Heselton for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. BUCKLEY. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BUSH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. REED. Were he present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HILL. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HILL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture for further study.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, on this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 212, answered "present" 3, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—199

Adair	Broyhill	Delaney
Alger	Budge	Dempsey
Allen, Calif.	Bush	Derounian
Allen, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Devereux
Arends	Carrigg	Dixon
Auchincloss	Cederberg	Dodd
Ayres	Chase	Dolliver
Baker	Chenoweth	Dondero
Baldwin	Chiperfield	Donohue
Bass, N. H.	Church	Donovan
Bates	Clevenger	Dorn, N. Y.
Baumhart	Cole	Ellsworth
Beamer	Coon	Engle
Becker	Corbett	Fenton
Belcher	Coudert	Fernandez
Bentley	Cramer	Fino
Betts	Cretella	Fjare
Bolton, Frances P.	Crumpacker	Fogarty
	Cunningham	Ford
Bosch	Curtis, Mass.	Frelinghuysen
Bow	Curtis, Mo.	Fulton
Bray	Dague	Gamble
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Wis.	Gary
Brownson	Dawson, Utah	Gavin
Gentry	Lipscomb	Scherer
Gubser	McConnell	Schwengel
Gwinn	McDonough	Scott
Hagen	McGregor	Scrivner
Hale	McIntire	Scudder
Halleck	McVey	Seely-Brown
Hand	Mack, Ill.	Sheehan
Harden	Mack, Wash.	Short
Harrison, Nebr.	Mailliard	Siler
Harrison, Va.	Martin	Simpson, Ill.
Harvey	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Henderson	Meader	Smith, Va.
Hess	Merrow	Smith, Wis.
Hiestand	Miller, Md.	Staggers
Hill	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Hillings	Miller, N. Y.	Talle
Hinshaw	Minshall	Taylor
Hoffman, Ill.	Morano	Teague, Calif.
Hoffman, Mich.	Nelson	Thomas
Holmes	Nicholson	Thompson, Mich.
Holt	Norblad	
Holtzman	O'Neill	Thomson, Wyo.
Horan	Osmers	Tollefson
Hosmer	Ostertag	Udall
Hyde	Patterson	Utt
Jackson	Pelly	Van Pelt
James	Philbin	Van Zandt
Jenkins	Phillips	Velde
Johansen	Pillion	Vorys
Johnson, Calif.	Poff	Vursell
Jonas	Prouty	Wainwright
Judd	Radwan	Westland
Kean	Ray	Wharton
Kearney	Reece, Tenn.	Widnall
Kearns	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wigglesworth
Keating	Rhodes, Pa.	Williams, N. Y.
King, Pa.	Robeson, Va.	Wilson, Calif.
Kirwan	Robsion, Ky.	Wilson, Ind.
Knox	Rogers, Mass.	Withrow
Laird	Sadlak	Wolcott
Lane	St. George	Wolverton
Latham	Saylor	Young
LeCompte	Schenck	Younger

NAYS—212

Abbitt	Dorn, S. C.	Lesinski
Abernethy	Dowdy	Long
Addonizio	Doyle	Lovre
Albert	Durham	McCarthy
Alexander	Edmondson	McCormack
Andersen, H. Carl	Elliott	McDowell
	Evins	McMillan
Andresen, August H.	Feighan	Macdonald
	Fine	Machrowicz
Andrews	Fisher	Madden
Anfuso	Flood	Magnuson
Ashley	Flynt	Mahon
Ashmore	Forand	Marshall
Aspinall	Forrester	Matthews
Avery	Fountain	Metcalf
Bailey	Frazier	Miller, Calif.
Barden	Friedel	Mills
Barrett	Garmatz	Mollohan
Bass, Tenn.	Gathings	Morgan
Bell	George	Morrison
Bennett, Fla.	Gordon	Moss
Bennett, Mich.	Granahan	Moulder
Berry	Grant	Multer
Blatnik	Gray	Murray, Ill.
Blitch	Green, Oreg.	Murray, Tenn.
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Boland	Griffiths	Norrell
Bolling	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Bonner	Haley	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bowler	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Boykin	Harris	O'Hara, Minn.
Boyle	Hays, Ark.	O'Konski
Brooks, La.	Hays, Ohio	Passman
Brooks, Tex.	Hayworth	Patman
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Perkins
Buchanan	Hoeven	Pfost
Burdick	Hope	Pilcher
Burleson	Huddleston	Poage
Burnside	Hull	Polk
Byrd	Ikard	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Preston
Cannon	Jennings	Price
Carlyle	Jensen	Priest
Carnahan	Johnson, Wis.	Quigley
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Rains
Christopher	Jones, N. C.	Rees, Kans.
Chudoff	Karsten	Reuss
Clark	Kee	Richards
Colmer	Kelley, Pa.	Riley
Cooley	Keogh	Rivers
Cooper	Kilday	Rodino
Davidson	Kilgore	Rogers, Colo.
Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Rogers, Tex.
Deane	Kluczynski	Rooney
Denton	Knutson	Roosevelt
Dies	Krueger	Rutherford
Diggs	Landrum	Selden
Dingell	Lanham	Shelley
Dollinger	Lankford	Sheppard

Shuford	Thompson, N. J.	Wickersham
Sikes	Thompson, Tex.	Wier
Sisk	Thornberry	Williams, Miss.
Smith, Kans.	Trimble	Williams, N. J.
Smith, Miss.	Tuck	Willis
Spence	Tumulty	Winstead
Springer	Vanik	Wright
Steed	Vinson	Zablocki
Sullivan	Watts	Zelenko
Teague, Tex.	Weaver	
Thompson, La.	Whitten	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Fascell	Herlong	Yates

NOT VOTING—20

Bolton, Oliver P.	Fallon	Mumma
Buckley	Gregory	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Holifield	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Roberts
Eberharter	Kilburn	Sieminski
	McCulloch	Walter

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Fascell for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Heselton for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. CHATHAM. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. DODD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. BUCKLEY. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 201, answered "present" 5, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—206

Abbitt	Bell	Burnside
Abernethy	Bennett, Fla.	Byrd
Addonizio	Bennett, Mich.	Byrne, Pa.
Albert	Berry	Cannon
Alexander	Blatnik	Carlyle
Andersen, H. Carl	Blitch	Carnahan
	Boggs	Celler
Andresen, August H.	Bolling	Chelf
	Bonner	Christopher
Andrews	Bowler	Chudoff
Anfuso	Boykin	Clark
Ashley	Boyle	Colmer
Ashmore	Brooks, La.	Cooley
Aspinall	Brooks, Tex.	Cooper
Avery	Brown, Ga.	Davidson
Barden	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Burdick	Dawson, Ill.
Bass, Tenn.	Burleson	Deane
Denton	Kee	Preston
Dies	Kelley, Pa.	Price
Diggs	Keogh	Priest
Dingell	Kilday	Rabaut
Dollinger	Kilgore	Rains
Dorn, S. C.	King, Calif.	Rees, Kans.
Dowdy	Klein	Reuss
Doyle	Kluczynski	Richards
Durham	Knutson	Riley
Edmondson	Krueger	Rivers
Elliott	Landrum	Rodino
Evins	Lanham	Rogers, Colo.
Feighan	Lankford	Rogers, Tex.
Fine	Lesinski	Rooney
Fisher	Long	Roosevelt
Flood	Lovre	Rutherford
Flynt	McCarthy	Selden
Forrester	McCormack	Shelley
Fountain	McDowell	Sheppard
Frazier	McMillan	Shuford
Friedel	Machrowicz	Sikes
Garmatz	Madden	Sisk
Gathings	Magnuson	Smith, Kans.
Gentry	Mahon	Smith, Miss.
George	Marshall	Spence
Gordon	Matthews	Springer
Granahan	Metcalf	Steed
Grant	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Gray	Mills	Talle
Green, Oreg.	Mollohan	Teague, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Morgan	Thompson, La.
Griffiths	Morrison	Thompson, N. J.
Gross	Moss	Thompson, Tex.
Hardy	Moulder	Thornberry
Harris	Multer	Trimble
Hays, Ark.	Murray, Ill.	Tuck
Hays, Ohio	Murray, Tenn.	Tumulty
Hébert	Natcher	Vanik
Hoeven	Norrell	Vinson
Hope	O'Brien, Ill.	Watts
Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Huddleston	O'Hara, Ill.	Whitten
Hull	O'Hara, Minn.	Wickersham
Ikard	O'Konski	Wier
Jarman	Passman	Williams, Miss.
Jennings	Patman	Willis
Jensen	Perkins	Winstead
Johnson, Wis.	Pfost	Wright
Jones, Ala.	Pilcher	Zablocki
Jones, Mo.	Poage	Zelenko
Jones, N. C.	Polk	
Karsten	Powell	

NAYS—201

Adair	Devereux	Kean
Alger	Dixon	Kearney
Allen, Calif.	Dodd	Kearns
Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Keating
Arends	Donohue	King, Pa.
Auchincloss	Donovan	Kirwan
Ayres	Dorn, N. Y.	Knox
Baker	Ellsworth	Laird
Baldwin	Engle	Lane
Bass, N. H.	Fenton	Latham
Bates	Fernandez	LeCompte
Baumhart	Fino	Lipscomb
Beamer	Fjare	McConnell
Becker	Fogarty	McDonough
Belcher	Forand	McGregor
Bentley	Ford	McIntire
Betts	Frelinghuysen	McVey
Boland	Fulton	Macdonald
Bolton, Frances P.	Gamble	Mack, Ill.
	Gary	Mack, Wash.
Bosch	Gavin	Mailliard
Bow	Gubser	Martin
Bray	Gwinn	Mason
Brown, Ohio	Hagen	Meader
Brownson	Hale	Merrow
Broyhill	Halleck	Miller, Md.
Budge	Hand	Miller, Nebr.
Bush	Harden	Miller, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.	Minshall
Carrigg	Harrison, Va.	Morano
Cederberg	Harvey	Nelson
Chase	Hayworth	Nicholson
Chenoweth	Henderson	Norblad
Chiperfield	Hess	O'Neill
Church	Hiestand	Osmers
Clevenger	Hill	Ostertag
Cole	Hillings	Patterson
Coon	Hinshaw	Pelly
Corbett	Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin
Coudert	Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips
Cramer	Holmes	Pillion
Cretella	Holt	Poff
Crumpacker	Holtzman	Prouty
Cunningham	Hosmer	Quigley
Curtis, Mass.	Hyde	Radwan
Curtis, Mo.	Jackson	Ray
Dague	James	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.	Jenkins	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dawson, Utah	Johansen	Rhodes, Pa.
Delaney	Johnson, Calif.	Robeson, Va.
Dempsey	Jonas	Robsion, Ky.
Derounian	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Va.	Vursell
Sadlak	Smith, Wis.	Wainwright
St. George	Taber	Westland
Saylor	Taylor	Wharton
Schenck	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Scherer	Thomas	Wigglesworth
Schwengel	Thompson, Mich.	Williams, N. Y.
Scott		Wilson, Calif.
Scrivner	Thomson, Wyo.	Wilson, Ind.
Scudder	Tollefson	Withrow
Seely-Brown	Udall	Wolcott
Sheehan	Utt	Wolverton
Short	Van Pelt	Yates
Siler	Van Zandt	Young
Simpson, Ill.	Velde	Younger
Simpson, Pa.	Vorys	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Dolliver	Haley	Williams, N. J.
Fascell	Herlong	

NOT VOTING—22

Bailey	Fallon	Reed, Ill.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
	Heselton	Riehlman
Buckley	Holifield	Roberts
Canfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Sieminski
Chatham	Kilburn	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Walter
Eberharter	Mumma	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Williams of New Jersey against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Heselton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. POWELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. CHATHAM. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS. Had he been here he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. EBERHARTER. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. KILBURN. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the confusion in the House, and because of the closeness of the vote, I ask for a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the vote is close enough to have a recapitulation.

The Clerk will call the names of those voting in the affirmative.

The Clerk called the names of those voting "yea."

The SPEAKER. Are there any corrections to be made where any Member was listening and heard his name called as voting "yea" who did not vote "yea"? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will call the names of those recorded as voting "nay."

The Clerk called the names of those voting "nay."

The SPEAKER. Is there any Member voting "nay" who is incorrectly recorded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the title by striking out the language in the last paragraph of the bill beginning after the semicolon "to authorize a domestic marketing certificate plan for wheat"; and that will make the title conform to the bill as now passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: In the title to the bill, strike out the words "to authorize a domestic marketing certificate plan for wheat"; so as to read "A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the title.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to renumber sections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) entitled "An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK AND ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I do this so that we may hear from the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to ask that we go over until Monday.

I make that request now, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the inquiry of my friend from Massachusetts, the program is as follows:

On Monday the conference report on the postal salary increase. There will be a rollcall on that.

Then it is District day. There are several small bills, as follows:

H. R. 1806, to consolidate the Roosevelt Memorial Association.

H. R. 1825, relating to auditorium construction.

H. R. 2986, to adjust judges' salaries.

H. R. 4909, consolidation, National Tax Association.

Thereafter, the Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill will be taken up, and general debate will continue until it is finished. We hope to get through with it on Tuesday. I understand there are 7 hours' general debate.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the gentleman is quite ambitious.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I mean if the rule is adopted.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1956, and then the national Reserve plan, the manpower bill. Also the bill relating to Saline Water Act, H. R. 2126, in case it is reached.

Also the usual reservations with reference to conference reports.

Mr. MARTIN. I am told the Defense appropriation bill will take at least 2 or 3 days. If that is the case, I do not see how you can get to the legislation on the armed services bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Defense appropriation bill takes that long, of course it will have to go over until the following week, but I am putting it on the program in case the situation develops where it can be taken up and considered.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman cannot say definitely when the Reserve bill will be called up for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer the question specifically. All I can say is that if we have an opportunity next week it will follow the Defense appropriation bill. I know it will not be before Thursday and probably not until Friday.

Mr. SHORT. I should think consideration of the statehood bill and the appropriation bill for Defense would take all of next week so that Members could count on the Reserve bill being called up the first of the following week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement may prove to be correct as the business of the week unfolds, but I am putting it in the program in case we can bring it up. The probability is that what the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts say is correct, but I am putting it on the calendar just in case we can reach it.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POSTAL PAY INCREASE BILL

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the bill (S. 1) to increase the basic compensation of employees and officers of the Post Office Department be given until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on the Armed Services, reported the bill (H. R. 6042, Rept. No. 493) which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit Monday during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on H. R. 12, I offered two amendments. I was recognized at a time when another amendment was pending. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments I offered be printed in the RECORD at the point where I discussed them and that I may be permitted to extend my remarks thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ONE DOLLAR AND TWENTY-FIVE CENTS MINIMUM WAGE NEEDED TO EXIST

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, how can a single girl get by on $30 a week? Or a married man survive on $30?

Before taxes—seen and unseen—plus the prices that are fattening corporate treasuries, cause low-income groups to go looking for the holes in their pockets and purses that are not there.

The plain fact of the matter is that some unscrupulous employers want to keep the minimum wage frozen at substandard levels in order to make double profits at the expense of the workers whom they unashamedly exploit.

Only some, to be sure, but they are doing great harm to honest businessmen, to organized labor, and to the reputation of the United States.

The present 75-cent minimum is a crime.

The proposed increase to 90 cents is not much better.

All the tired, unrealistic, and poker-faced arguments are being dusted off again to oppose progress.

When the minimum wage was increased in 1950 from 40 cents—yes, the figure was 40 cents in our modern, prosperous Nation—to 75 cents per hour, some employers cried out in anguish. They protested that they would not be able to stand the strain. They tried to scare us by predicting that plants would shut down and that heavy unemployment would result.

The Department of Labor studied the effects of the 75-cent minimum in 5 low-wage industries—southern sawmills, men's dress shirts and nightwear, fertilizer, men's seamless hosiery, and wood furniture.

The verdict?

"Only very minor determinable effects."

Even the prevailing minimum wage—as distinguished from the legal—that is paid in the hard-hit textile industry of the North is considerably above the minimum being paid in southern mills.

The legal minimum that is barely met in some other industries, is so far down that it is cruelly fantastic.

"Within the law" in such cases, becomes a cloak for treating workers as less than human beings.

It is a device for getting twice as much work and profit out of an American worker than you are paying him for.

Every reliable fact proves that the minimum wage has lagged behind the general increase in wages, and has failed to keep up with increase in living costs and in productivity.

A deplorably low minimum wage is also responsible for slum conditions that we try to correct indirectly, instead of facing up to the issue and insisting upon a decent wage that will give a man a fighting chance to maintain his self-respect and to provide the essentials of life for his family.

Low wages breed illness, slums, illiteracy, crime, and juvenile delinquency.

The American community will not tolerate the outmoded laws, the superficial reasons, and the selfish people responsible for such conditions.

The rising standard of living in the United States, based on increased production and consumption, requires that all of our people must share in the fruits of progress.

The present minimum wage is deliberately excluding some of our people from this basic economic right.

The proposed increase to 90 cents an hour is a half-measure that straddles the issue.

A minimum of $1.25 is the least we can do to bring underprivileged workers out of the economic cellar and into the light of day, where the dignity and the reward of honest labor is given the healthy recognition that it earns.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined with Senators IVES and LEHMAN of my State in sponsoring in the House a resolution which will confer upon the Federal Government, acting through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producing laboratory to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions and absolute priorities according to need.

I consider the adoption of this resolution a matter of immediate necessity. Action by the Congress is imperative, because it is already apparent that disorderly and ineffectual procedures are growing out of the existing improvised and voluntary control system for the distribution of the vaccine.

Whenever the gap between supply and demand is as great as it is in this instance, and where the atmosphere is so charged with emotional factors, no system of voluntary controls could possibly be effective. The serious problem with respect to supply, that is quantity, has already led, as it inevitably does, to a problem of quality. Haste makes waste, and here the possibility of a lessening of quality controls because of disorganization in the supply system presents a picture too horrible to contemplate. True, the Federal Government undoubtedly has the authority under the National Biologics Control Act to control the quality of the vaccine as it demonstrated when it withdrew the Cutter Laboratory product from the market, but how long can it control the floodgates against the pressure of an enormous demand when the problem of supply and distribution is handled in a multiplicity of ways by 48 States and an untold number of local governments all competing in the market place. For this reason responsibility now falls upon Congress to take leadership and provide for uniform control at the national level.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed an alarming headline to the effect that "Ten Million Shots of Salk Vaccine Seem To Be Missing"—Washington Daily News. Even more alarming is the possibility that the pellmell competition for the vaccine has resulted in a lessening in quality controls, as evidenced by headlines of polio outbreak among inoculated children. The matter of quantity and quality are one and the same problem, which should be coordinated at one and the same source. We cannot sacrifice one for the other.

Headlines speak of black and gray markets in the vaccine. Although the vast majority of people can be counted upon to act rationally and unselfishly in seeing that sensible priorities are followed, human nature being what it is, there are always those who make rationing or some other orderly procedure a necessity. We have not hesitated to impose similar controls when matters less important than the lives of our children were at stake. In national emergencies when supply and demand have grown far apart, we have not hesitated to invoke rationing and to establish controls. We are faced with an emergency in a very narrow but very important field. A national blessing is presenting a national emergency, requiring the passage of this resolution.

All this, Mr. Speaker, certainly emphasizes the need for effective action at the national level in order that the natural and understandable fear and concern of parents for their loved ones be allayed and their confidence restored. I earnestly and sincerely ask that this resolution be given the immediate attention of this House.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, May 3 was the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. This cherished document has been turned into a mockery since Poland's borders have first been invaded

and her country partitioned by the tyrants and the dictators of Europe.

Since the days of our Revolutionary War, Polish citizens and patriots have willingly served the cause of America and her passion for freedom. It is indeed disgraceful then that this Nation should be shorn of its identity, its liberty, and its life blood today. The secret conferences of Yalta and Potsdam spelled out in tragic symbols the appeasement of the Communist henchmen and their designs to occupy and control Poland.

The plea for international rest and peaceful coexistence rings hollow from the spokesmen of the Communist camp who at the same time submit the countries of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains to endless toil, suppression, and slavery.

The proposed deoccupation of Austria by the Russian invaders may be a turning point in making a reality of freedom for the Iron Curtain nations. But the struggle for liberty and peace is still far from won. We must continue to shout above the meaningless din of totalitarian doubletalk for human rights for Poland and the other valiant nations who have been so horribly wronged.

SALK POLIO VACCINE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to provide the President with authority and funds to purchase all commercial supplies of Salk polio vaccine necessary to provide vaccine for children whose parents are unable to pay for it.

We have orphanages, children's homes, and other institutions where the young must not be neglected. There are also families with children who will be forced by circumstances to forego the protection of Salk vaccine unless we take steps to provide the funds necessary for a 100 percent inoculation program.

The resolution provides that the Congress set aside $1 million for this purpose. This is a large amount and may be much more than is needed. But in circumstances such as this, too much is better than too late for those who might be exposed to crippling polio in the next few weeks during the height of the polio season.

If and when it becomes necessary for the President to ask Congress for the funds, money should be immediately available. This resolution will provide such funds. If not needed, the money will be returned to the Public Treasury.

No child in America need be without polio vaccine protection if this resolution is adopted, as I am sure it will be.

I am confident that the Salk vaccine is as good as American scientific minds and production can make it. Certainly, in the midst of America's prosperity not a single child should be permitted to suffer or die because of lack of money to provide the vaccine.

There follows the text of the joint resolution:

Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to purchase supplies of Salk poliomyelitic vaccine to ensure that certain children in the United States, regardless of the economic situation of those charged with their welfare, shall receive the necessary inoculations with such vaccine without cost for the vaccine

Whereas the distribution of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine may result in some of our children being forced by circumstances to be neglected because of the cost of the vaccine and because no child should be without the protection offered by the vaccine; and

Whereas the Federal Government has a deep and continuing interest in the welfare of children of all walks of life; and

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed his intention of purchasing whatever supplies of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine may be necessary to ensure that each child, regardless of economic situation, receives the necessary inoculations with the vaccine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not in excess of $1 million, for the purpose of purchasing a sufficient supply of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine to ensure that all children in the United States whose parents, guardians, or those otherwise charged with their welfare, are unable to pay the cost of inoculations with such vaccine, shall receive the inoculations without cost for the vaccine.

SEC. 2. The funds authorized to be appropriated by the first section of this act shall be made available for use by such agencies of the Federal Government as may be selected by the President to carry out the purposes of this act, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by him.

SEC. 3. The authority granted under this act shall terminate not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, at which time any unexpended balance remaining of funds authorized to be appropriated by the first section of this act shall be covered back into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. As used in this act, the term "United States" includes the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include statements excerpts, and newspaper articles, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE MOORE PRITCHARD

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, with sadness I announce to the House the death of a distinguished North Carolinian, and a former Member of this body, the Honorable George Moore Pritchard, of Marshall, N. C. He died in an Asheville, N. C., hospital Sunday morning, April 24, 1955, following several years of declining health and an acute illness of some 3 weeks. He formerly represented the congressional district I have the honor to represent, though it was then designated the 10th North Carolina Congressional District.

George Pritchard was born near Mars Hill, in Madison County, N. C., January 4, 1886, the son of Jeter Connelly Pritchard, a former United States Senator and judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and Augusta (Ray) Pritchard, a woman of exceptional character and ability. After attending the public schools of Marshall and the city of Washington, D. C., he continued his studies at the Universities of North Carolina and South Carolina, receiving his law degree from the latter university in 1908. From that date until 1911 he practiced law in Greenville, S. C.

In 1911 George Pritchard returned to the county of his birth and opened his law office in Marshall, N. C. He early took an active part in Republican Party affairs, following in the footsteps of his noted father. He served in the House of Representatives of the North Carolina General Assembly from 1917 to 1919 and thereafter as solicitor of the 19th judicial district—composed of Buncombe and Madison Counties—for a term of 2 years, 1919 to 1921, during which time he moved his residence and office to Asheville, N. C. He served as chairman of the Buncombe County Republican Party and in 1928 was elected to represent the old 10th North Carolina Congressional District in the 71st Congress. During his single term in the Congress—he did not seek reelection—he was a valued member of the important House Military Affairs Committee. In 1930 he was the Republican nominee for the United States Senate and then delegate at large to the 1932 Republican National Convention. He was the keynote speaker at the 1942 Republican State Convention and served one term as a member of the board of trustees of the University of North Carolina. In 1948 he was his party's nominee for governor. In that campaign, though defeated, he attracted wide and considerable attention with his demand that the State use its surplus funds for the building of public schools.

George Pritchard resided in Asheville for approximately 20 years, returning to Marshall to live about 8 years ago. He divided his time between his Asheville and Marshall law offices until ill health curtailed his activities. While a resident of Marshall he again sought a congressional seat from the present 11th North Carolina Congressional District. In this campaign he was defeated by the present incumbent, the Honorable WOODROW W. JONES.

George Pritchard had a long and distinguished career. He bore an honored

named and dignified it in a lifetime of civic usefulness. He was devoted to the highest ideals of public service and his influence for good will long be remembered. He was a vigorous and successful advocate but never struck a low blow. He was a man of sterling character and unquestioned integrity, devoted to church and family.

In the death of George Pritchard I have suffered a keen personal loss. He will be greatly missed in his native State.

To his fine family and loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I learned of the death of the late George M. Pritchard, who passed away at a hospital in Asheville, N. C., on April 24 of this year.

Mr. Pritchard was closely associated with my section of western North Carolina all his life. As a Republican Representative to the 71st Congress from the old 10th Congressional District of North Carolina, he represented three of the counties now embraced in the district I am proud to represent. These are the counties of Rutherford, Polk, and McDowell.

Rutherford County is my home county and as such, while I was still in my teens on the farm, Mr. Pritchard was my Representative in the Congress from March 4, 1929, to March 3, 1931. Years later, in the general election of 1952, Mr. Pritchard, as the Republican candidate, opposed me for reelection to the 83d Congress. I was successful in that contest. He was a worthy opponent in every respect and was fair and clean in the fight.

Mr. Speaker, George M. Pritchard will be remembered for his sterling character and his devotion to the fundamental principles of our American way of life. During his term in the Congress, he was always faithful to the public interest and ably served his State and Nation. To members of his family I extend my sincere condolences.

Mr. SHUFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying a tribute to the memory of the late Honorable George M. Pritchard, a former Member of this House.

Thousands of people all over North Carolina, and particularly throughout the great mountain section of our State where George Pritchard was born and where he lived all of his life, mourn his passing. I include myself among that number.

I first came to know former Congressman Pritchard when he served here in the House of Representatives with my father in the 71st Congress. Congressman Pritchard and my father were lifelong friends. They fought shoulder to shoulder in many a political battle. They served together in Congress and were the last Republican Congressmen from North Carolina until my election in 1952.

Not being a contemporary of Congressman Pritchard, I cannot say that we were intimate friends. I looked upon him as one of the elder statesmen of our party in North Carolina and held him in the highest esteem as a leader of great ability and as a man of strong moral courage and of high character and integrity.

Congressman Pritchard did not seek reelection to Congress in 1930, but chose instead to run as a Republican candidate for the United States Senate. Although not successful in that contest, Mr. Pritchard conducted a vigorous campaign throughout the State of North Carolina and received 210,761 votes, compared to 324,393 for his opponent. This was a magnificent vote for a member of the minority party to receive in a statewide election in our State in 1930 and will stand as a lasting testimonial to the high regard in which George Pritchard was held by the voters of North Carlina.

In 1948, former Congressman Pritchard was his party's candidate for Governor of North Carolina and again engaged in an active canvass of the entire State. During that campaign he strongly advocated investing surplus State funds in public school buildings. In this respect, as in many others, George Pritchard was ahead of his time. The classroom deficit in our State today might have been avoided, or at least materially reduced, if his advice had been followed.

Pritchard is one of the honored names in our State. The father of George Pritchard, the late Honorable Jeter C. Pritchard, was one of the most distinguished and respected men ever produced in North Carolina. He served as a United States Senator for 8 years, from January 23, 1895, to March 3, 1903—having been first elected to fill out the unexpired term of Zebulon B. Vance and was then reelected to a full 6-year term in 1897. He was the last Republican to hold office as United States Senator from our State. Later he served as a justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; and from June 1, 1904, until his death on April 10, 1921, as a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, over which court he presided as the senior circuit judge for a number of years prior to his death.

For many years prior to his service on the bench, Senator Pritchard was the recognized leader of the Republican Party in North Carolina. It was largely through his efforts, and to the qualities of leadership which he possessed to a marked degree, that the Republican Party of North Carolina, although a minority party since 1900, has remained strong and militant down through the years.

It has never been easy for a son to live up to the fine record of a distinguished father. Living under the shadow of a great name sometimes causes a son to develop an inferiority complex. People frequently expect too much from the sons of great men. These things never discouraged George Pritchard. He was determined to build a career for himself and not to bask in the reflected glory of his father's name. Using the example set for him by his distinguished father as a guide, George Pritchard achieved outstanding success as he sought to mold his life in that same pattern.

Although he never occupied a seat in the United States Senate, and never sat on the circuit court of appeals, George Pritchard became a great leader in his own right. He was selected by the people to serve them in many important offices, including that of solicitor of the 19th judicial district of North Carolina, member of the State legislature, and Member of the United States House of Representatives.

George Pritchard had the same dedication to principles so manifest in the life of the elder Pritchard. He held strong convictions on all of the important issues of the day and never hesitated to express them. He will long be remembered for the courage and zeal with which he always fought for the things in which he believed. When it came to a matter of principle, George Pritchard did not mind being in the minority. Even though the odds were usually against him, due to the political complexities of the times, he was always ready and eager to battle for any cause he felt was right. Sometimes he won, but frequently he lost. He did not give ground or become discouraged when he lost, but returned to the fray and was to be found in the thick of the fight when the next issue was drawn.

Congressman Pritchard is survived by his widow, 1 son, and 3 daughters. A sister, Mrs. Ida Pritchard Shultz, of Chevy Chase, Washington, also survives.

To his widow, his devoted children, and the other members of his family, I extend warm and sincere sympathy in this hour of their bereavement. They have sustained the incalculable loss of husband, father, and brother. The people who knew George Pritchard intimately have lost a tried and true friend. All western North Carolina has lost one of its stalwart leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, as a part of my remarks on this occasion, the following editorials, which appeared in the Asheville Citizen and the Asheville Times on April 26, 1955. These newspapers are published in the city of Asheville, N. C., where George Pritchard resided for so many years. They circulate throughout the mountain sections of North Carolina, and in these editorials they express the sentiment of the people who knew him best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Asheville Citizen of April 26, 1955]

A MAN IN GOOD MEASURE

George M. Pritchard bore an honored name and dignified it in a lifetime of civic usefulness.

He served as solicitor, legislator, and Congressman.

He was his party's nominee for Governor and Senator.

He gave his time and energy most generously to church and civic club affairs.

He was an able attorney and enterprising citizen, dividing his time and his career between Marshall and Asheville.

When he ran for governor in 1948 George Pritchard gave the Democrats something to think about as a Republican advocate of investing surplus State funds in school buildings. A part of North Carolina's trouble now is that it awoke almost too late to the capital needs of education. It might have listened earlier to Candidate Pritchard.

This newspaper counted Madison's first citizen as a good friend and respected advocate.

In its constant quest for leadership the mountain region will seek after men of George Pritchard's qualities. By all these measures, it will miss him.

[From the Asheville Times of April 26, 1955]

GEORGE PRITCHARD'S SPLENDID RECORD

The Pritchard name has stood for many good things in this mountain region for many long years. Jeter C. Pritchard, of Madison County and Asheville, gave it great distinction nearly six decades ago when he was elected to the United States Senate. Not long after his death in 1921 the triangular park in the heart of downtown Asheville was named in his honor. It was not easy for a son to live up to, and carry on, the fine record and traditions of such a famous father. But George M. Pritchard, of Madison County and Asheville, did a superb job of it.

Like his father before him, George Pritchard was best known perhaps as a Republican Party leader. He followed in his father's footsteps fairly closely in many ways—in the practice of law, in civic affairs, as a member of the North Carolina General Assembly. In 1930 he was the Republican nominee for United States Senator, and in 1948 he was his party's nominee for governor. While George was unsuccessful in those two bids for high political office he continued to be an active and highly respected Republican leader for the rest of his life.

George Pritchard was a credit to his profession and to the religious, fraternal, and civic organizations to which he belonged. He was passionately devoted to his native mountain region and did everything he could to promote its best interests. His death is a great loss to western North Carolina and the entire State.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to join the gentleman from North Carolina in his expressions of regret at the death of George Pritchard. I was a Member of Congress when he was here. He was a man of great ability, a very humane man, one who had a host of friends. We all rejoiced at the record he made here. It was also my privilege to know him in political circles in the years that followed his leaving the House.

I know that North Carolina has lost a great son. It has lost a man who was devoted to the State and to the country. I join with the gentleman in offering my condolences to the members of his family.

REDS GET AWAY WITH MURDER IN NORTH VIET-NAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Washington, D. C., Sunday Star, April 24, 1955, in which the writer, Mr. Earl H. Voss, explains in detail the horrible experiences of Catholics and other non-Communists in North Viet-Nam, which is now under the heel of implacable and unconscionable tyrants, the Communist government. This situation is just another graphic example of how well Communist governments recognize agreements. In this case, the Geneva agreement of last summer apparently means absolutely nothing to the Communist government of North Viet-Nam. There are millions of people living under its barbarous rule who should be free.

The United States Government should do everything possible to free these souls.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article:

REDS FLOUT TRUCE RULES, GET AWAY WITH MURDER IN NORTH VIET-NAM

(By Earl H. Voss)

The Communist government of North Vietnam is killing, torturing, kidnaping, and jailing anti-Communists who want to exercise their right to flee to free South Viet-Nam.

Little is being done about it.

Of an estimated 11 million people north of the 17th parallel—including 2 million Roman Catholics—only 550,000 have managed to escape Communism. These have gone over to freedom less because of last summer's Geneva agreement than in spite of Red obstructionism and terror.

The Catholics, especially, have been persecuted. How many of these Christians will escape—and what will be the fate of those who do not—are disturbing questions for the future to answer.

The Geneva truce sets May 19 as the deadline for movement of civilians across the 17th parallel. The South Viet-Nam Government has demanded an extension, but so far has not succeeded in drumming up much enthusiasm among its friends. Meanwhile people in mortal peril are losing their chance for freedom.

MANY NATIONS INVOLVED

This is not a matter to be solved by the governments of North and South Viet-Nam alone. Other nations have a finger in the pie.

The French last year bought a "truce with honor"—and free movement of refugees was one of the main honor points.

The Poles—Communists like the Viet Minh—are convenient friends of the Reds on the International Control Commission, which theoretically is bound by the Geneva agreement to enforce that pact's provisions.

With the Poles on the Commission are the Indians and Canadians, whose supervision of the truce could be expected to be more objective.

The United States, too, is involved, as a leader in Asian affairs, though not as a signer of the Geneva agreement.

Yet none of these "third parties" has raised an audible voice in protest against gross breaches of the Geneva pact by the Red Government of North Viet-Nam. Only the pitifully weak South Viet Namese Government has protested.

Why this apathy?

The Sunday Star has been trying to find out. It has tried in North and South Viet-Nam, through its correspondent, James E. Roper. It has tried in Ottawa, where Canadian Special Correspondent Gerald Waring has confronted the External Affairs Office with reports of Red obstructionism and terror. It has tried in Washington and at the United Nations, among spokesmen for the French, American, Indian and Polish Governments.

In all its searching, the Star has found on the part of most governments only a desire not to rock the boat.

THE OBSTRUCTION

Here is what the Communist Viet Minh are doing to keep the refugees from leaving the northern Red zone, as reported from Viet-Nam by Star Correspondent Roper and by Viet Namese officials here.

1. The yarrest organizers of evacuation movementsand imprison them in concentration camps.

2. They station troops among Catholic groups and other units asking permission to leave.

3. They try to bribe people to stay—with promises of rice, cloth, mats, and money.

4. They encircle hamlets with troops during the visits of International Control Commission teams, to prevent the escape of any who may be encouraged to leave.

5. They ambush evacuation groups along roads, waterways or at crossings on the way to Haiphong, the chief evacuation port.

6. They issue short-term permits to evacuees, then refuse to extend the expiration dates when the refugees, most of whom must walk, cannot reach the coast or the 17th parallel exits.

7. They kidnap children to keep the parents in the north.

8. They spread rumors that French evacuation ships are really Soviet ships headed for Siberia.

9. They entice would-be evacuees into fake Control Commission "hearings," then jail the applicants for exist permits.

Father Patrick O'Connor, correspondent of the Catholic Standard, reported recently that Viet Minh troops attacked some 10,000 unarmed Catholic refugees. They fought back with poles and sticks. Four Communist soldiers were killed, 50 wounded. The exact number of refugee casualties is unknown, but it was large.

This tragic incident occurred just after the Control Commission proposed to investigate charges that the Viet Minh were blocking departures in that area. The Commission was not allowed on the scene until after the Viet Minh had had a chance to clean up the carnage.

French ships are forced to sneak ignominiously along the coasts at night, picking up refugees clever enough to evade the watchful Reds. The Communists quite illegally punish those whom they trap.

Typically, the Communist Viet Minh use individual as well as mass terror. One Catholic priest, Mr. Roper reports, had chopsticks thrust into his ears and was whipped with sugar-cane stalks. Others were shot, or paralyzed by blows on the head.

While the control group admits it knows these truce violations are going on, it claims it cannot get proof. It accepts the clinical evidence that the priest's eardrums were pierced. It does not accept his testimony that his tormentors were Reds.

The hapless refugees, of course, have no protection except from the Control Commission. And this group either will not or cannot—at any rate, does not—afford such protection.

INDIA

As chairman of the International Control Commission, India's member is perhaps the key figure.

Poland's member is obviously a Red; Canada's might be considered a western. But the Indian is supposedly neutral.

India, however, has been slow to see—or admit—that the Viet Minh are guilty of gross violations of the Geneva Pact. India's policy seems to be to worry about strict legalisms first and atrocities second. And because the Control Commission is small, the Viet Minh have little trouble in confusing every issue that arises.

Only recently has India come around to the realization that there is considerable monkey business afoot. And even now, India still prefers the undercover diplomatic approach to what might be called a bull in the china shop attitude. She thinks more Vietnamese can be moved by this means than by moral and propaganda pressure.

This, of course, was a defensible position earlier in the truce period. But now there are only 3 weeks and 4 days left. Even if the Viet Minh were to relax, it would be hard to move south by May 19 all those who wish to go.

There is really no realistic basis for hope that the Viet Minh will extend the period for exchanging would-be refugees.

But Indian representatives in Washington believe that their government would support any move to extend the deadline beyond its May 19 expiration date.

CANADA

Special Correspondent Waring, in Ottawa, reported last week that Canada's primary concern is a permanent peace. Too big a public hubbub about Viet Minh terror, Canadian diplomats feel, might split the Commission wide open, end its usefulness, and jeopardize the truce.

This attitude leaves the refugee problem in a place of secondary importance.

Canada also believes that as a practical matter, more can be accomplished by pushing, prodding, and pressing the Viet Minh behind the scenes than by a public propaganda assault on them.

Under the armistice terms, Canadian officials point out, the Commission can only cajole, not enforce. Its only other recourse is to report serious violations to the Geneva conference powers.

Retired Brigadier Sherwood Lett, chief Canadian representative on the Commission, says many persons still want to go south. The Commission, he reports, is now conducting a survey to find out how many there are. So far, he says, investigating teams have been unable to substantiate charges that Communists were blocking the southward movement. He added that the Commission's mobile survey teams were meeting with full cooperation of the Communists.

Canada's Foreign Minister Lester B. Pearson comments, however, that in the movement of refugees, the record is not satisfactory.

"This has been a matter of great concern to us," Mr. Pearson says. "Our representative has spared no effort to see to it that the Commission does all within its power to facilitate the movement of persons from one zone to the other as provided in the armistice agreement itself. In this the Commission has had some success, but it has also encountered many difficulties—particularly, it is fair to add, because of the obstructive tactics of the Communist government in northern Viet-Nam."

Canada is now reported ready to blast Red obstruction of refugees—but not until it will be too late to improve the situation. From Ottawa there come rumors that the denunciation will be made one week before the May 19 deadline. From Viet-Nam, Mr. Roper reports that Brigadier Lett may even wait until the deadline has passed.

POLAND

No Polish comment was available. The Embassy here referred the Star to its United Nations delegation. The U. N. group first referred the inquiry back to the Washington Embassy, but later a delegation spokesman agreed to arrange a telephone conversation with his chief. At the appointed hour the delegation chief was reported out of town indefinitely. No one else would comment.

The Poles activities on the Viet-Nam Control Commission give all the clue that is needed to that country's attitude, however. Mr. Roper reports that Polish representatives frequently stall by getting "diplomatically sick" or complain that charges against the Viet Minh aren't true. This stymies everything because the Commission operates under a unanimity rule.

Also, they apparently tip off the Communists when an inspection team prepares to visit suspect areas. On these occasions, the Reds have been known to clear out the bona fide residents of an entire village are replace them with happy, laughing party stalwarts.

Mr. Roper reported recently that Poland has suddenly volunteered to help move refugees south in the Communist ship that formerly was used to take Viet Minh troops out of southern Viet-Nam.

Apparently the Polish have two motives: First, to infiltrate the refugees in southern Viet-Nam with Communist agents; second, to make propaganda capital about their solicitude for civilians in northern Viet-Nam who want to go south.

FRANCE

The predominant French attitude seems to be: "Let George do it."

The French have made dozens of protests about Communists' obstructionism. But most of these actually originated with the southern Vietnamese, who do not recognize the authority either of the Geneva truce or its Control Commission.

Despite these protests, France has no plan to take the refugee problem to higher authority. She takes the position that India, Canada, and Poland are doing what they can to make the Communists conform to the armistice. She thinks it would do no good to protest.

Perhaps the only way to bring south all of the Vietnamese who want to move would be to send French troops after them. That would no doubt mean war, and France has no intention of reopening hostilities.

The French consider their "honor" to have been preserved by their part in the movement of 550,000 civilians and 150,000 troops southward. But there still are well over 1 million Catholics—or one-time Catholics in North Viet-Nam. They were the core of the anti-Communist resistance for 8 years. The Viet Minh will be the last to forget that, and the first to deal with them.

VIET-NAM

The South Vietnamese Government makes three points about Viet Minh obstruction of refugees:

1. Ordinary humanity should force the free world to exert pressure to extend the May 19 deadline.

2. One of the principal reasons the Communists are holding people back is to prevent them from voting anti-Communist in the nationwide elections scheduled for 1956. If the Reds cannot be forced to give up the people they now hold back, the southern Vietnamese Government can hardly agree to cooperate in elections.

3. The truce itself is inhumane. It violates article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which provides that "Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state." There should be no deadline on travel between North and South Viet-Nam.

Because the Vietnamese do not recognize the Geneva truce, they are carrying their demand for an extension of the May 19 deadline directly to the United Nations.

They also point out that in spite of the uproar in southern Viet-Nam—including incipient civil war—there has been no fall-off in the southward flow of refugees.

UNITED STATES

The American Government sympathizes with the Vietnamese complaints and approves their recent moves to publicize the refugee problem.

But the United States, too, is keeping hands off. There are no plans to help the Vietnamese get their plea for an extension of the May 19 deadline before the United Nations, although the American vote probably would be in favor—if the issue ever came up.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

The temper of the times being what it is, no one wants to renew the Indochina war. The Reds have gaged this feeling accurately, and are proceeding accordingly.

What moves short of war could be made to ease the plight of the would-be refugees and force strict observance of the Geneva truce?

South Viet-Nam says it could be done by fixing responsibility for Viet Minh obstructionism and terror, and extending the deadline on grounds of truce violation. This, of course, would require an end to the self-imposed unanimity rule under which Red Poland must agree with India and Canada before any Commission action can be taken.

If the non-Communist majority on the Commission should cancel this rule, it would have two courts of appeal:

First, the leaders of the Geneva Conference, specifically British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden and Soviet Foreign Minister, Vyacheslav Molotov, who acted as chairman at Geneva.

Second, the United Nations, of which South Viet-Nam is not a member. Though the Saigon government is sending a plea to the U. N., they will need support from member nations.

If neither of these steps is effective, India, Poland, and Canada—all U. N. members—or any of them, could introduce the matter in the Security Council.

The French have more than a passive role; they have a moral obligation to intervene at the U. N. in behalf of anti-Communists in the north who otherwise would face abandonment.

There is also a school of thought that gets the United States into the picture. This school holds that if the United States hopes to maintain its position in the Far East as a protector of the pitiful, it must stand by its friends when the going is tough as well as when the going is easy. The door to the U. N. Security Council, of course, is always open to the United States.

WEST'S INTEREST

The West has a vested interest in bringing the situation in North Viet-Nam into the open, just as the Communists have a stake in keeping it concealed.

The first and greatest value to the West would be in showing the world again that Communists are Communists wherever they may be, that they cooperate freely in making rules but have no compunctions about breaking them.

The world would also be put on notice that any elections in which the Viet Minh participate are almost certain to be fraudulent. If Ho Chi Minh was even reasonably confident of victory in next year's scheduled election, he would have no reason to obstruct refugees. By obstructing them, he shows the world he is afraid of their votes. If by blocking their passage south, he can now enter an election campaign, Ho will be confessing to the world that he now has the situation under control—by illegal means.

There is something more to it than propaganda, of course. There are the lives of several million human beings at stake.

MOST POWERFUL GROUP IN UNITED STATES IS OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Journal of Commerce, of New York, on Wednesday, May 4, devoted its editorial to a discussion of House Resolution 210 which I introduced in order that a legislative committee of the Congress should have its first opportunity in more than 20 years to look into the operations and activities of the powerful Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board.

There are a few misconceptions in this editorial which I should like to set straight. First, I have never proposed rigid price fixing of Government bonds. I do not see any reason, however, why the credit of the United States Government is not sufficient so that no United States Treasury obligation ought to fall below its face value. I am perfectly willing to see fluctuations take place above par. I do not want to fix prices at par. More important, I think, excessive fluctuation in the price of United States Government securities such as we have had in the last 3 years does not contribute to the financial stability of the economy. I do not see either, why anyone should want to block a study designed to determine if there has been any unnecessary speculation on the United States Government bond market and if certain individuals or institutions by reason of a preferred position are unduly profiting from such frequent and wide fluctuations in the prices of United States Government securities as we have seen in the last 3 years.

I doubt whether very many people in the country or even Members of the Congress are familiar with the structure of the Government bond market, its relationship to our economy and the public debt, the mechanics and role of the Open Market Committee in regulating the Government securities market, the relationship between the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the Open Market Committee; and finally the relationship between the Open Market Manager and the so-called recognized dealers including the big New York banks.

I think we ought to find out something about margin trading in United States securities, and the relation of margin trading to so-called free riders.

If there has been any advantages gained in trading by reason of inside knowledge, or if the possibility exists that such a situation could occur, the Congress should know about it in order that it may remedy such an undesirable condition.

Many changes in policy have been effected since the so-called Douglas and Patman subcommittees conducted their studies of the Federal Reserve. The inquiry last December by the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee was a brief one and did not permit the kind of detailed scrutiny that is proposed in House Resolution 210.

Contrary to the insinuation in the Journal of Commerce editorial the proposed study is not designed to prove anything other than what the objective facts show about the workings of the Open Market Committee.

I hope the Members will read the editorial carefully since it will give them some idea about the importance of the study I have proposed.

If there should be an emergency which caused a run on the trust funds of the many social security and employment groups which required the liquidation of a substantial part of twenty-five or thirty billion dollars in United States Government bonds, what would happen to the prices of the bonds? The Federal Open Market Committee refuses to promise any support. This is a serious matter.

I insert the editorial from the Journal of Commerce, Another Friendly Probe, at this point in the RECORD:

ANOTHER "FRIENDLY" PROBE?

Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, the Democratic Representative from the State of Texas, thinks that Congress ought to pass a law "fixing all Government bonds at par and not letting them go below par."

To prove his point, he wants to set up a new congressional committee for the purpose of making a thorough investigation of the Government bond market, including—or even with particular emphasis on—the activities of the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System.

To get such an investigation rolling he introduced a House resolution (No. 210). This resolution has been approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee, which voted along straight party lines: all Democrats for it, all Republicans against. However, the resolution still has to get by the House Rules Committee and the House Authorizations Committee before the new group can come into being.

The proposed new group would be a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee—but it would not be the ordinary type of congressional subcommittee.

Representative PATMAN wants a special staff, subpena powers, and funds to conduct hearings, summon witnesses and books for the proposed new group.

What he has in mind seems to be something to rival the recent Fulbright investigation—with the scene shifted from a Senate to a House group and the subject from the stock market to the Government bond market.

The investigation, as he envisions it, would deal with the Federal Open Market Committee; fluctuations in interest rates and prices of United States Government bonds and their effect on the public debt, general price level, employment and the cost of State and municipal financing; Government financing procedures; and the various proposals for Federal assistance, other than grants, in the financing of State, county, and municipal highway and school programs.

That is quite a big order. Mr. PATMAN is obviously trying to make it more palatable by stating, in the resolution, that no matter will be investigated which is under active consideration by another committee of the House. However, this avowed intention to avoid duplicating other House activities does not appear to extend to other congressional activities.

For instance, the various proposals for Federal assistance in the financing of highway and school programs have been under extensive study for some time by the Senate Public Works Committee. Some of the other subjects listed have either been studied or are the subject of continuing study by the Joint Senate-House Committee on the Economic Report.

When Mr. PATMAN introduced his resolution he commented that the operations and activities of the Open Market Committee had not been the subject of inquiry by a legislative committee of Congress since the Open Market Committee was established by Congress in 1933.

This is true. However, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which is not a legislative committee, has made a number of detailed studies of Government monetary policies, including Open Market Committee activities and operations.

As a member of the joint committee as well as the House Banking Committee, Mr. PATMAN has been in a strong position all along to prove his pet theories by calling witnesses and asking them the kind of questions he considered necessary. As recently as last December, the entire membership of the Federal Open Market Committee was summoned before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Under these circumstances, one is entitled to ask why a new committee and a new probe should be necessary at all?

There is a strong suspicion that Representative PATMAN wants a sounding board for his own ideas—and Mr. PATMAN, to say the least, certainly is not always a conformist.

When he introduced his resolution he emphasized as of special importance in connection with the planned study of Government securities issues, "the question of whether the public interest is served by sporadic issue of long-term issues carrying high interest rates which must necessarily go to a premium in view of the large amount of outstanding long-term debt as substantially lower interest costs." And he added that "the degree of speculation which may have been permitted by the manner in which such long-term securities are issued, would also be a subject of inquiry under the resolution."

A few days later, speaking on the House floor, Mr. PATMAN accused the big bankers of gaining enormous profits by buying Government bonds at low prices and selling them again after a price rise. He said that Congress ought to put a stop to this—and offered price fixing of all Government securities as the panacea to accomplish his goal.

It would be useless to tell Congress what economic areas it ought to investigate and which others it ought to leave alone.

Mr. PATMAN, moreover, is a serious student of money and banking problems whose views are respected even by those who differ with him strongly. However, when it comes to price fixing of Government securities—for the purpose of perpetuating easy money conditions—Mr. PATMAN is way off the beam.

What bothers us most about the proposed new investigatory group is that, except for areas where it would generally duplicate other current or recent congressional investigations, it would tend to center on activities which are highly sensitive, from an economic point of view. This creates the danger that—if zeal in inquiry were not carefully matched by caution in procedure—adverse market developments might easily be set off which would be difficult to correct.

This danger would be accentuated by the plan to use subpena powers in making the study and the risk of partisan pressure to make political capital of the investigation.

It is needless to point out that the economic significance of some of the issues Mr. PATMAN has raised is matched fully by their political significance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for Thursday, May 5, 1955, on account of illness.

Messrs. HORAN and DONDERO (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 4 days, until May 11, 1955, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. LESINSKI in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. DAVIDSON and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. FLOOD in support of a resolution he introduced in reference to the fate of Poland's underground leaders.

Mr. FLOOD and to include copy of a letter he sent to the Secretary of State in connection with the Austrian Treaty.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include an exchange of correspondence between himself and the Governor of Michigan.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Mr. DOYLE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 9, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

763. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide for a stronger national transportation industry, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

764. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 17 (a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

765. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to revision of the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines (H. Doc. No. 155); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PRIEST: Committee of conference. H. R. 2225. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended (Rept. No. 486). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 490. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 491. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5559. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6042. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Conference. S. 1. An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 494). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi; with amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Gloria Fan; without amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam Bonk; with amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 6040. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 6041. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 6042. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6043. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 6044. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6045. A bill to amend the sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to sessions of the legislature and the budget; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6046. A bill to increase the basic compensation of the Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6047. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense to convey to the Territory of Hawaii title to certain lands and improvements at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6048. A bill to amend section 26 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to increase the compensation of members of the legislature, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 6049. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6050. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6051. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6052. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation improvement of agricultural soil and water resources in relation to watershed development, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6053. A bill to authorize the tribal council of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians to lease certain lands of the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation, Calif., for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6054. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of

State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6055. A bill to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 6056. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall reimburse the several States and the political subdivisions thereof for the cost of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine used in carrying out approved plans for the inoculation of children with such vaccine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6057. A bill to further extend the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories; to provide for the continuation of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 6058. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 6059. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6060. A bill to authorize the tribal council of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians to lease certain lands of the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation, Calif., for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 6061. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain material by a Member of Congress, under his frank, to destinations outside the State or district which he represents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6062. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to permit the making of payments to farmers for certain water-conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6063. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 6064. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 6065. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 6066. A bill authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6067. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act to authorize the insurance of loans made to finance the installation of irrigation systems and facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6068. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled 'An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 14, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 6069. A bill to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 6070. A bill relative to the jurisdiction over criminal offenses or civil actions committed or arising on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6071. A bill to authorize the conveyance of lands acquired pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to purchase supplies of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine to insure that certain children in the United States, regardless of the economic situation of those charged with their welfare, shall receive the necessary inoculations with such vaccine without cost for the vaccine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to exercise, for a limited period of time, certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to establish the Crazy Horse Memorial Commission to provide for the construction of a permanent national memorial to the North American Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a national seed-storage facility should be established by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution favoring United States participation in a scientific commission within the United Nations to study certain effects of nuclear explosions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 235. Resolution requesting the President to take immediate action to ascertain the whereabouts and secure the release from prison of certain leaders of the Polish underground now held in Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 97th legislative session recommending the restriction of potato trading on the mercantile exchange at the earliest possible date, and an investigation of the mercantile exchange for the purpose of providing greater stability in the potato industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 97th legislative session recommending that the Congress of the United States enact a joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday in August of each year as Children's Day in Sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Territory of Hawaii, through its designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange, sell, or lease certain tidelands to owners of shorelands covered by Land Court Consolidation Nos. 314, 1549, 1653, 852, and 1092 (Land Court Consolidation 32), and any and all other owners of shorelands abutting said tidelands, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of damage claims for littoral rights appurtenant to said shorelands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the salaries of the judges of the supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 6072. A bill for the relief of Ben Gee-Bun Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 6073. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the School District No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 6074. A bill for the relief of Madeline Vollaro Raccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 6075. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kimiyo Elick, nee Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6076. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Arnesch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6078. A bill for the relief of Alison MacBride; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6079. A bill for the relief of the estate of Matilda Faufata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy (Lucia) Bisanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6081. A bill for the relief of Patricia May Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6082. A bill for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 6083. A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Kostidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6084. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6085. A bill for the relief of Klaus Samuli Gunnar Romppanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6086. A bill for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6087. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Emmanuel Maltese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

237. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 114 residents of the State of Washington to help bring up mentally and morally sound children and to conquer the juvenile delinquency now in our midst by exercising the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

238. By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition presented by a group from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delaware and residents of Wilmington, Del., protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers, and urging support of Senate bill 923, introduced by Senator LANGER in the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commemoration of the Inauguration of George Washington as First President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech delivered by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay in New York City on April 29, 1955, commemorating the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States, in 1789. In his address, Secretary McKay enthusiastically endorsed S. 732, which I believe is on the calendar, and which I had the privilege of introducing on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and myself. This bill would promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area. I urge that the Senate favorably consider this needed legislation in the near future.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS MCKAY TO THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, FEDERAL HALL MEMORIAL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 29, 1955

Since February, when Gardner Osborn of the New York Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, persuaded me to get excused from the regular Friday Cabinet meeting in Washington today to come here, I have been looking forward to this occasion with great pleasure.

I am delighted to be here.

To me it is a distinct privilege to join with you at this national historic site to commemorate the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States 166 years ago tomorrow.

For the Department of the Interior I extend sincere thanks to the New York Chapter of SAR for sponsoring this annual observance.

In this way the chapter is helping to keep alive in the minds of the people the import of the historic events which occurred here.

It is a particular pleasure to recall the events which led to the establishment of the three significant areas which we administer in New York as national shrines for the inspiration of all Americans—Federal Hall Memorial, Castle Clinton, and the Statue of Liberty, and to assert my strong support of pending legislation directed at adding to their usefulness.

As you have just noted, there is now an added reason why I am pleased to be here today.

Though I do not minimize the major importance of the historic event we celebrate, I would be less than human if I did not rejoice at receiving this handsome Chauncey M. Depew medal for public service.

I am profoundly grateful to my compatriots in the SAR for the signal honor which has been bestowed on me.

As a Son of the American Revolution in the Oregon chapter for many years past, I have deemed my affiliation with that organization as an extraordinary privilege.

It is a privilege enjoyed by virtue of my great great grandfather, Joshua Armstrong, a Philadelphian, who fought in the Revolutionary War.

It is with a deep sense of humility, therefore, that I accept this significant SAR award, the Chauncey M. Depew medal.

I shall always cherish it as a remembrance of this occasion and as a symbol of the public-service achievements of that honorable American whose memory it perpetuates.

This medal shall serve as a constant reminder of his achievements and an inspiration to strive for greater personal attainment for the public good in the years to come.

It is because the spirit of a free people is formed and animated out of the storehouse of historical recollections that Federal Hall Memorial has been set apart here as a national historic site.

This is the site of some of the most momentous events in American history.

But more than any other of the historically important occurrences, the inauguration of George Washington as our first President in the old Federal Hall has perhaps given this site its chief claim to fame.

Reviewing these momentous events, we know that we are on truly hallowed ground here. Because of this, the site and this building, which was completed in 1842, were designated in 1939 as the Federal Hall Memorial National Historical Site, under authority of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935.

As such, it is preserved as an area of the national park system and administered by the National Park Service with the cooperation of the Federal Hall Memorial Associates.

All of us who are interested in our historical heritage are indebted to the Federal Hall Memorial Associates for helping to rescue this historic place from possible sale as surplus Government real estate and for aiding substantially in its preservation and development over the past 15 years.

We also are indebted to many other civic and patriotic groups in New York City—the city council, the office of the mayor, the office of Manhattan Borough president, the honorary commissioners of the department of Commerce, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Downtown Manhattan Association, and numerous others for their interest in the development of Federal Hall and the Castle Clinton and Statue of Liberty National Monuments which are closely associated geographically here.

We in the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service take very seriously our obligation to preserve these three historic places for the benefit and inspiration of the American people.

We believe, as do the city and State governments, and the patriotic organizations, that the full development of these sites will be of immeasurable help in making Americans more conscious of their past history and will strengthen their devotion to their country.

With funds available, work of restoration and for interpretation is going forward but much remains to be done at each of the sites before they can provide their full measure of benefit and inspiration.

Along with Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Federal Hall occupies a site so rich in historic events of national importance that very few others are comparable to it.

While we have made admirable progress here, the physical fabric of the memorial building itself is in need of rehabilitation. The great rotunda—an impressive setting for patriotic gatherings—badly needs rehabilitation and furnishing. Displays and exhibits, done by modern methods, are needed to interpret the founding of our Government and the characters and accomplishments of those great personalities, such as Washington and Jefferson, so closely associated with it.

The Peter Zenger memorial room and the inspiring exhibits installed there through the generosity of fourth estate have set the pattern for what is needed to make this site fulfill its memorial function with maximum effectiveness.

Castle Clinton was the last of a series of forts which guarded lower Manhattan from the time of the Dutch settlement in 1624 until after the establishment of the Republic.

Through 146 years of our history as a Nation, it has had intimate association with a succession of historical figures—General Lafayette, President Jackson, Samuel F. B. Morse, Jenny Lind, and many others.

Named for DeWitt Clinton, Governor of New York when George Washington was inaugurated, it was the Nation's principal immigrant depot in the last half of the 19th century.

Since it was established as a national monument in 1950, the exterior of Castle Clinton has been restored yet only a start in its development has been made. It needs some of the military character it had when it was a fort. It needs a museum to interpret how the old forts protected New York Harbor. We hope to succeed in these endeavors.

Out on Bedloes Island, in New York Harbor, stands the statue of the Goddess of Liberty holding aloft the flaming torch of freedom. It was given to America by the French people, paid for by their schoolchildren and their workingmen. It was sent here in 1886, 110 years after Thomas Jefferson had formulated the Declaration of Independence proclaiming to the world the equality of all men and their inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

When the statue was erected, it symbolized the friendship between the Republics of France and the United States. In the intervening years its significance has deepened. To many millions of the oppressed and of the venturesome of other lands who have crossed the ocean in hopeful search of greater freedom and opportunity, it has become the symbol of those ideals of human liberty upon which our Nation and its form of government were founded.

Because of its significance to those of all nations and peoples who have come to these shores in their search for a better way of life, the plan to establish in the base of the statue a Museum of American Immigration seems to be a peculiarly happy and suitable conception. This Nation of ours has been good to millions of her adopted children, and I am deeply confident that many of them who have prospered here will be glad to contribute to the funds required to make a reality of this plan.

State and city authorities and a group of some 20 organizations of New York are now working to help us solve the problem of further financing the development of these three significant properties in the New York area. As a move in that direction, they have sponsored identical bills, introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives, which look to public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the historic sites.

The bills, known as S. 732 and H. R. 3120 propose the establishment of a special advisory board which would endeavor to determine what is needed to increase the public benefit and inspiration from the three areas. The legislation, if passed, would authorize the acceptance of donated funds and the appropriation of such Federal funds as may be necessary to match funds donated contingent upon that requirement.

I have studied this proposed legislation and am heartily in favor of it.

We have recommended its enactment, believing that it will provide an appropriate method for enlisting and encouraging private and public cooperation with the Federal Government in the preservation and satisfactory development of these historic shrines.

In this effort you and other Americans can be of much help.

Federal Hall, Castle Clinton, and the Statue of Liberty belong to you, to me, and to all the people.

They are important parts of our heritage.

Whatever you can do, whatever I can do, to help impart that feeling of pride in our historic past in all who visit them will redound to our own benefit and the benefit of those who will follow us in the years to come.

The Proposed Austrian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to the Secretary of State:

Hon. JOHN F. DULLES,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am taking the privilege of including in this letter to you brief remarks made by me on the floor of the House today in connection with the proposed Austrian treaty.

I am concerned, as I am sure you can well imagine, with this country approving language as found in the so-called article XVI, which will permit in any way the bringing about the shocking circumstances which developed in Europe following World War II, when so many thousands of anti-Communist prisoners and escapees were forcibly returned to Russia and torture and death.

I am aware of the appearance of the word "voluntary" in the language of the proposed article XVI, but knowing as we do the long history of the Soviet attitude toward these people the word is a mockery. To disband and penalize committees or groups of men and women in these cantonments, who have expressed anti-Communist beliefs; to open without protection or reservation these cantonments to committees or commissions of Russian "agents," can only produce a repetition of many sad and unsavory events of the past under like or similar agreements.

You are aware, of course, of the current forceful propaganda drive by all-Soviet to induce the return of many of these persons to their homelands, with the resulting propaganda victory to the eastern bloc in the eyes of the world, if these desperate, frustrated, and disillusioned people should return.

In this feeling of desolation which overwhelms these refugees, coupled with anything but proper treatment they have received from the western nations, they are entitled to be protected from inducements and blandishments of Soviet propagandists operating under the cloak of the language originally proposed in article XVI, of the Austrian Treaty.

I trust, with your full awareness of the circumstances, you will see fit to direct the spokesman in the Vienna conferences for the United States, to be alert to the dangers and the subject matter of this communication.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

Tabulation of Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out a 12-question poll to 28,000 Union County, N. J., citizens requesting their views on issues presently facing the Nation and the Congress. The response to my questionnaire was most gratifying and is, I feel, a graphic demonstration of the vitality of our democracy. I have found the questionnaire to be an invaluable instrument for establishing contact between myself and my constituents and would urge every elected Representative to utilize this means of ascertaining his constituents' views on issues.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the results of this poll be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would like to point out in particular the response to my first question concerning reciprocal-trade legislation. I think it most important to bring to the attention of the Congress that a typically eastern industrial area indicates such an overwhelming interest in and support of continuation of the reciprocal-trade program.

The results of the poll are as follows:

1. Do you favor the continuation of the reciprocal trade program of negotiating with other nations to jointly lower tariffs as a means of expanding world trade? Yes, 83 percent; no, 15 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

2. Do you favor granting statehood to Alaska? Yes, 82 percent; no, 15 percent; undecided, 3 percent. Do you favor granting statehood to Hawaii? Yes, 81 percent; no, 17 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

3. In the light of the present world crisis, as well as our budgetary situation, do you believe the proposed cutback of the Army is warranted? Yes, 38 percent; no, 54 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

4. The last pay raise granted to postal and other Government workers was in 1951. Do you believe their salaries should be increased by: 5 percent, 27 percent; 10 percent, 49 percent; 15 percent, 16 percent; not at all, 6 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

5. Do you believe the present minimum wage should be increased from 75 cents an hour to: 90 cents an hour, 22 percent; $1 an hour, 35 percent; $1.15 an hour, 5 percent; $1.25 an hour, 18 percent; not at all, 17 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

6. The present immigration law operates in favor of immigration from northern European countries and against immigrants from southern Europe and other parts of the world. Do you believe this law should be altered to eliminate this discrimination? Yes, 53 percent; no, 40 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

7. Do you favor the continuance of the "point 4" technical assistance program which extends technical help to underdeveloped areas of the world? Yes, 78 percent; no, 18 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

8. Do you favor the proposal which would establish universal military training? Yes, 70 percent; no, 22 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

9. Do you favor the establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to insure that discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color is not practiced in employment? Yes, 69 percent; no, 29 percent undecided, 2 percent.

10. Do you favor continued United States support of the various activities of the United Nations? Yes, 78 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

11. Assuming the continuance of the present operations of our Government and the present economic conditions in the Nation, do you favor an across-the-board lowering of the personal income tax? Yes, 42 percent; no, 55 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

The Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the postal pay raise bill in this instance has been made an instrumentality to test the

average Member of Congress and to determine the mettle of which he is made. Since the beginning of this 84th Congress an effort has been made to reduce the pay raise from the 10 percent across-the-board proposal, with a retroactive provision, as advocated by myself in the House, and by my good friends Senators JOHNSTON and NEELY in the Senate. I have done everything down to the point of compromising with my conscience on certain provisions which I deemed essential to the welfare of postal employees in order to meet objections and speed enactment. I believe my original thoughts were even more liberal than the provisions contained in the Johnston-Neely bill, but for the sake of uniformity and acceleration in passage and of collaborating with the distinguished Senators I introduced an identical measure in the House.

Now it was not sufficient for the so-called administration spokesmen and the White House to express disapproval and make known the President's displeasure. Nearly all, if not all, Republican leaders, and I am sorry to say a few, very few, Democrats have used the threat of a Presidential veto to discourage pay raise proponents. They have passed this on to House Members with such absolute assurances as to indicate direct expressions of the adverse attitude of the White House; namely, to the effect that the President would veto any bill above, as I recall, 6.5 percent, and eventually I believe this was raised to 7.6 percent.

At any rate, the Senate had passed a 10-percent raise with a retroactive provision and other features, which it sent to the House for action. The House, without any doubt on the score, declared itself fearlessly and positively by voting upon the three amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] and approving them. One bore directly upon the reclassification feature, one was on retroactivity, and the other was to raise the amount of the percentage increase to 8.2 percent. There was no doubt about where the House stood on these questions nor was there any doubt as to where the Democratic and Republican Parties stood on the questions. The Republicans in the House almost to a man and woman, some of whom actually voted for their own 50-percent pay raise, alined themselves with the enemies of the faithful and devoted workers who serve the public so thoroughly and well under circumstances which are frequently not the best. The Democrats, on the other hand, true to form, voted in support of a fair and reasonable increase and stood by the postal workers, as they will by the classified employees of this same Government of ours when that question comes up for disposition a little later. This rankles in my heart and stimulates belligerency to do combat against the determined minority and the White House, and including President Eisenhower, all of whom have stood in the way of a reasonable increase for Government workers, and reaches the point where I am ready to accept the Presidential challenge and the threat of veto by putting it to a test.

Under the circumstances, there was only one thing which the House and Senate conferees could do as regards the amount of the pay increase. They had to take the maximum under the Senate bill and the maximum permitted under the House bill and compromise between the two figures. The figure of 8.8 percent is the total provided for and submitted to both Houses by their conferees as an essential part of the conference report. The House conferees, in fact, had no choice or latitude any more than did the conferees of the Senate. The rule of conference is to compromise between the dictum of both Houses. I have served on too many conferences not to know, and the House conferees of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, too, are familiar with this rule.

I resent wholeheartedly the use of a veto threat by the Executive, and that applies to any President whether of my party or not. I am positive that the veto can and will be overridden, if it occurs, and I would wager that the President will not dare to veto the measure. It is a parliamentary trick and threat which altogether too frequently boomerangs against the White House or presidential spokesman. It is one thing for the President to oppose and to plead, but it is quite another for him to repeatedly threaten the legislative branch which, too, has its responsibility. I take my responsibility as the Representative of the 15th District of Michigan very seriously and I attach great dignity to the course which I pursue in legislating for the benefit of the people.

I have held for years that it was the disposition of Congress to lag behind the needs of the workers, and this is not said in any derogatory sense because the demands altogether too frequently are excessive. The pie is only so big and the number of cuts per pie are limited. It is the responsibility of Congress to try as best it can to be liberal with Federal employees, with its wards, and all others who must come to Congress with their problems be they financial or otherwise, and Congress must cut the cloth according to a reasonable pattern. The budget does not always control. It is not the final word. Thus when we deal with an emergency and it concerns a balanced budget or a balanced ration for the hungry we must provide first against starvation. If it is a matter of the Nation's safety and security the budget again is secondary to survival. In this instance, with the postal and classified employees it is a question of trying to meet a condition and solving the problem and finding a means and a method of overcoming any deficit. I am willing to go to any extent necessary to balance the budget, whatever the legitimate means may require.

The Presidental action as regards the pay bill which he vetoed after the 83d Congress went home was wanton, premeditated, distasteful, and unjustified, because Congress, too, has its responsibilities. The President could have vetoed the bill before adjournment despite the fact that pay action bills were delayed until the very last. I shall always remember this action and point out that that is not my way of legislating nor arriving at a responsible understanding between the executive and the legislative branches.

The McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would completely revise and replace the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. This bill is a codification of all existing immigration, naturalization, and citizenship laws, clarifying and simplifying the present act. This in itself would be an important step toward eliminating the confusion which exists both in our own country and abroad as to the real policy of the United States toward those who seek to enter her boundaries. But above all, this bill would give positive and real meaning to the democratic principles which we, in this country, hold as a shining beacon to those beyond our borders.

It is no secret abroad that the present immigration laws of the United States belie our expression of "Welcome" to those brave enough to flee their oppressors—indeed, every day our radio broadcasts are beaming American ideals of freedom and democracy and opportunity for all to the downtrodden people behind the Iron Curtain. We tell the peoples of Europe and Asia of the real humanitarianism of the United States, and then set legalistic boobytraps for those who take us at our word. This is a shameful manner in which to act, and certainly no thinking American can fail to see the very real consequences of such a policy.

It is time that we, as American citizens and as legislators for the American people, see that this disparity between word and deed is ended. And the only way to do this is to enact a fair and comprehensive law.

Now I realize that such a sweeping law is open to critics who say that all immigrants are a danger to the United States, and that any immigrant may be a Communist wolf parading in the proverbial sheep's clothing. Let me reply to such critics that my bill provides full and comprehensive security against subversive and undesirable aliens; it actually tightens existing laws which permit thousands of unscreened aliens to cross our borders. Certainly what this Nation needs is a law which permits desirable people to come to the United States, and a law which absolutely protects those in the United States from the seditions of subversives, and this bill does both.

My bill would also eliminate all racial and national bias, establish a uniform right of review and appeal from administrative decisions, and remove the distinctions between native-born and naturalized American citizens. Certainly there can be, in this Nation of equality, no "second-class" citizens. My bill would also replace the national origins quota system with a new unified quota system. It would provide for a separate single agency to handle all immigration and naturalization functions, which are now divided between the Consular Service of the State Department

and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department. It would also differentiate between aliens seeking permanent residence here and alien visitors coming here for scholarly or scientific purposes, for business or pleasure.

May I remind the spokesmen of both major political parties that the American people have been promised revision of existing immigration laws. Both candidates for the Presidency in 1952 declared that such revision is essential to the good name of the American people, and I believe the American people think so too. President Eisenhower reiterated this declaration in his state of the Union message in 1953, and in April he specifically requested such legislation in letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. We cannot continue to maintain what has been called a "redtape curtain" in our immigration and refugee laws and still in all honest sincerity criticize the Iron Curtain abroad.

May I propose to the Members of Congress, then, that we, each of us, rid our Nation of the hypocritical sham and pretense of democracy contained in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and show the world that the American ideals of freedom and justice are realities both at home and abroad.

The Fate of Poland's Underground Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the last war the Soviet Union with diabolical calculation set out to destroy all sources of Polish democratic leadership that might arise in the postwar era and thus frustrate Communist objectives of making Poland a satellite state. In Katyn Forest the cream of the Polish officer corps was wantonly massacred by direction of the Soviet Government. In the futile but heroic Warsaw uprising the Soviet Army waited silently and deliberately at the gates of Warsaw while the Polish Underground Army was ruthlessly devoured by the Nazi war machine. And finally in March 1954 the leaders of the Polish underground were misled by acts of Soviet treachery and ultimately were arrested and imprisoned by the Soviet Government.

Prior to the formation of the Polish coalition government in 1945, Moscow agreed to allow 12 underground Polish leaders to consult with the Polish Government in London on the arrangements for the coalition regime. The Polish underground leaders, among whom were Gen. Leopold Okulicki, commander of the Polish Home Army, Jan Stanislaw Jankowski, Stanislaw Jasiukowicz, and Antoni Pajdak, received an invitation through indirect channels to confer with Colonel General Ivanov, of the Red Army. Colonel Pimenov, of the Soviet NKVD, assured the Polish leaders that "as an officer of the Red army who has been entrusted with such a greatly important mission, I guarantee to you, under my word as an officer, your fate will be in my hands and that after your arrival at our quarters you will be absolutely safe."

But on March 27, 1945, when General Okulicki and Vice Premier Jankowski presented themselves at the headquarters of Colonel General Ivanov, in accordance with previous arrangements, and on the following day, when three members of the Home Council of Ministers and 8 representatives of the principal political parties took the same step, they were all arrested. Not until May 5, 1945, was there any statement regarding their whereabouts. Subsequently 3 of the men were acquitted, while the others were given sentences up to 10 years in prison.

This entire proceeding, needless to say, was a flagrant violation of all established principles of international law and of justice. I, therefore, respectfully recommend that the resolution that I introduced today be acted upon as a demonstration of our desire and the desire of the American people to redress this wanton miscarriage of justice.

Fleet Adm. William Daniel Leahy Reaches 80th Milestone on Life's Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today America has another opportunity to honor a most distinguished naval officer, Fleet Adm. William Daniel Leahy, on his 80th birthday. So as to indicate the distinction due this great American, I am going to mention the highlights of his career, which more eloquently than any words of praise reflect his service to his country.

Admiral Leahy was born on May 6, 1875, in Hampton, Iowa, the son of M. A. and Rose Hamilton Leahy. Upon graduation from high school in Ashland, Wis., he entered the Naval Academy in 1893. After completion of the course at the Academy he was assigned to duty aboard the new battleship *Oregon* which was then stationed in the Pacific. It soon became apparent that war with Spain was imminent. So as to have her available for possible operations against the Spanish Fleet, the *Oregon* was ordered from the west to the east coast. She executed these orders by her famous 14,700-mile voyage around Cape Horn at the then record speed of 11.6 knots. More important, when she arrived in the Carribean, the *Oregon* was in readiness for battle which shortly came with the Spanish Fleet in Santiago Harbor. In the engagement which resulted in the destruction of that fleet, the crew of the *Oregon* distinguished itself and among the ship's officers who were commended in the report of the commanding officer was W. D. Leahy, naval cadet. The distinguished conduct under fire by Naval Cadet Leahy in his first assignment aboard ship became the pattern for his future illustrious career.

During the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion he was assigned to the Asiatic station, where after service in the *Castine* and the *Glacier* he received his first command in the gunboat *Mariveles.*

After several assignments ashore and afloat, his outstanding qualities of leadership and ability to shoulder responsibility were recognized by his appointment in 1911 as fleet ordnance officer of the Pacific Fleet, and the following year by his assignment as chief of staff to the Commander Naval Forces in Nicaragua. Late in 1912 Admiral Leahy was given shore duty in the Navy Department but by 1915 World War I was having its effect on the United States and he took command of the dispatch gunboat *Dolphin* engaged in the hazardous search for German supply vessels. After a short tour in 1917 as executive officer of the battleship *Nevada,* attached to the Atlantic Fleet, he took command of the troop transport the U. S. S. *Princess Matoika.* For his distinguished service as commanding officer of this vessel in transporting troops and supplies to European ports through waters infested with enemy submarines and mines, he was awarded the highest naval decoration, the Navy Cross, and also a special letter of commendation by the War Department.

The end of World War I did not enable Admiral Leahy to rest on his laurels. Instead, even more exacting and important assignments were soon to come his way. In 1921 he had command of the flagship *St. Louis* with responsibility for protecting Americans and American interests in Turkish waters and the Black Sea during the war between Turkey and Greece. After assignments in the Bureau of Navigation and in command of the battleship *New Mexico,* he was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in 1927 with the rank of rear admiral. Although by this time he had completed 30 years of outstanding naval service, it seems that this service was just a practice for that which was yet to come.

After duty in the fleet and on a Navy reorganization board, Admiral Leahy was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. It is a signal honor to serve as chief of one bureau of the Navy but to be honored by an appointment to serve as chief of a second bureau is indeed rare.

However, outstanding performance of duty was to bring more responsibility and higher honor. He again returned to sea, this time as Commander Battleships with the rank of vice admiral and soon to be commander in chief, battle force, with the rank of admiral. I can well imagine that he may have felt that he had reached the pinnacle of a naval career. But by 1937 the dark clouds of World War II were gathering and on January the 2d of that year, Admiral Leahy was appointed Chief of Naval Operations, the only officer in naval history to receive that appointment who had

already served as chief of two bureaus of the Navy Department. As was his habit he served with distinction and was responsible for laying the groundwork of the two-ocean Navy which swept the enemy fleets from the seas in World War II, carried troops and supplies to our allies and to which all the allied nations should be thankful for its great contribution to victory.

After completion of his term as Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Leahy retired from naval service. Upon this occasion, the Secretary of the Navy wrote him:

Your career in the active naval service extending over a period of 46 years has included many activities within the varied scope of the naval profession. You have seen active service in two wars. * * * You have represented the Government on diplomatic commissions, and have served on vessels of the "Old Navy" as well as the latest of the "New Navy." Your sea service terminated as commander, Battle Force United States Fleet, and from that command you were selected for the highest post in the Navy, that of Chief of Naval Operations. Your conduct as Chief of Naval Operations has been marked by sound and original thinking, as well as vigorous action and has greatly contributed to the welfare of the service. These and all the other duties which have been assigned to you have been discharged competently, ably, and to the fullest satisfaction of the Government.

Sixty-four years of age—forty-six years of arduous naval service including two wars—certainly now he could rest. But to those who are dedicated to the service of their country, rest is more often a hope than a reality. Six weeks after his retirement he was named Governor of Puerto Rico and a year later was called from that post to be Ambassador to France which at that time was under the occupation of Nazi Germany. There he laid the groundwork for French collaboration with the United States. To him is due much of the credit for the neutralization of the French Fleet and preventing its addition to the Nazi and Italian navies which were seriously threatening our shipping at that time. His work in this regard was a triumph over an extremely intricate complex of French politics and personal loyalty.

He was recalled to active duty on July 20, 1942 and given the unparalleled appointment as Chief of Staff to the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In this appointment he served as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Here, and as personal adviser to the President he played a large part in formulating the political and military decisions which led to the victory in World War II.

In December 1944, he was honored by appointment to the newly created rank of fleet admiral.

Fleet Admiral Leahy continued to serve as Chief of Staff to the President as Commander in Chief until March 25, 1949, when his resignation was reluctantly accepted. On that occasion the President presented him with a gold star in lieu of a third Distinguished Service Medal. The citation reads in part:

His supreme loyalty to his country and his appreciation of its place in world affairs, supplemented by his fundamental concern in the welfare of humanity as a whole, transcended his already vast knowledge of military affairs to culminate in statesmanship beyond that required of any naval officer in our history.

Fleet Admiral Leahy's record serves as an inspiration and a challenge to every American. He presents an example of dedication to his country; of inspired service which disregards all personal considerations; and of strong individual character derived from habitual discipline and scrupulous regard for obligation and duty. In a word, he is the personification of the traditional Navy spirit of self-sacrifice in the service of his country. God grant that we shall always have officers like Admiral Leahy to call on in time of need.

American Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through its Loyalty Day observance on May 1 of each year, desires to help combat anti-American propaganda at home and abroad. This effort, dating back numerous years in the annals of the VFW has grown in scope each year. The Communist demonstrations that have taken place in this country annually on May 1 have been effectively counteracted. Thousands of patriotic Americans take an active part in Loyalty Day parades and celebrations that are sponsored by VFW posts and their auxiliaries in towns and cities throughout the Nation. It has been proved that loyal Americans are more than willing to demonstrate their allegiance to the principles of Americanism. The VFW should be congratulated and profoundly thanked by every loyal American for its use of the weapon of truth.

As far back as 1929 the Veterans of Foreign Wars defined Americanism in the following timeless phrases:

Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag, and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity.

This definition follows somewhat the preamble to the Constitution of the United States. Loyalty becomes something more than a theory or a postulate when it is translated into practice.

We Americans are a logical people when it comes to matters pertaining to organization. We have a genius for the creation of the mechanics of civic organizations. There is no country in the world with our multiplicity of civic efforts. Service club follows service club—for both men and women.

The same tendency is obvious in the field of the printed word. Magazine follows magazine in abundant profusion, many dedicated to reforming something. Topics vary all the way from foreign policy to mosquito extermination.

It has been said that America is a slave to resolutions, and that the average citizen feels a thrill of exaltation when he attends the annual dinner of his trade society, and votes aye to numerous resolutions all aiming at reform or regeneration of someone else.

Again we have a very riot of special days: Father's Day, Mother's Day, Army Day, Navy Day, and so forth, all designed to focus attention on some concrete definite policy or group.

Thus, logically, we have an American Loyalty Day to call attention to the needs of such efforts. If we can only get people to think American loyalty just once a year, something at least has been accomplished in the cumulative effort, a habit of mind has been formed. Such a day has numerous implications. The date itself is important—May 1—the famous Red May Day, the day of international protests. This day has always been regarded with apprehension in the capitals of Europe, and, to some degree, in our crowded eastern seaboard cities and the industrial centers of the Nation. May 1, set aside in the minds and hearts of all loyal Americans, can reduce the Red May Day aspects to the dull level of anticlimax.

American Loyalty Day is not merely for native-born citizens of this land, but for all who have chosen this fruitful, democratic way of life. It is not a selfish, personalized observance, but gives opportunity for the individual to examine his American loyalty and decide whether or not he is actively making use of it for the good of all mankind.

Effective loyalty must be inspired and strengthened by a capacity to see beyond the material facts which surround us. Otherwise, it can never survive the inevitable changes which take place daily in material things. "The things which are seen," wrote St. Paul, "are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal."

True American loyalty demands a capacity to look beyond the immediate difficulties. That is the secret of its power. It is an age-old promise. History is filled with apparent miracles achieved by men who, in the face of impossible odds, held loyal to their basic principles of life and looked beyond the immediate present, regardless of current skepticism. Consider the incredible things in which the great inventors have believed, the impossibilities which the scientists have created, the miracles that have occurred upon our own athletic fields.

Loyalty is certainly not a blind devotion; it is ready to transform beliefs into action; it must recognize the responsibilities of American citizenship; it has an appreciation for the perils arising in everyday life but chooses to overcome them.

Loyalty may be difficult to define. It is not something that is bought and paid for. It is not purchasable on an open market. It must be given open heartedly, freely, with the kind hope that the recipient will find happiness and com-

fort in it. It must be felt as a warmth of welcome, a deep sincerity. It must leave an indelible imprint which is unforgettable and is remembered long after the deed which it accomplished is forgotten. It cannot be demanded or commandered.

The loyalty that these United States expects of us on May 1, 1955, and the other 364 days of the year, is the loyalty it deserves—no more, no less.

Again, may I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their patriotic endeavors and urge each citizen to become active in the demonstration of American loyalty.

Roosevelt Subcommittee—Small Business Applies Requirements of House Resolution 151 to First Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for your information, and also the information and guidance of my other distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, the full text of a letter dated May 2, 1955, to me from Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, Los Angeles County, Calif., in answer to my letter to him of April 21, 1955, on the same subject.

I wrote the distinguished California Congressman, in my letter of April 21, the text of which is hereinafter set forth, for two reasons:

First, the hearings of the Roosevelt Subcommittee on Small Business were the first committee investigations, I believe, held following the unanimous approval of House Resolution 151, on March 23, 1955, and as author of said resolution I sought to have the earliest possible benefit and information about any experiences the Roosevelt subcommittee might have had operating under House Resolution 151.

Naturally, as author of the resolution, I did and shall undertake to keep as fully informed as possible as to the operations thereof in connection with House committee investigations.

Second, I was informed that some newspaper comment was made out West claiming that there was a possibility that the prompt functioning of the Roosevelt subcommittee hearings would be limited or hampered by reason of the requirements of House Resolution 151.

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members of this great legislative body will note the letter statement by Mr. ROOSEVELT with exceeding interest. And, because during the debate on House Resolution 151, the brief question was raised as to the intent and spirit thereof with reference to when closed committee sessions were required, I wish to say that the statement made by the chairman, Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, of the House Rules Committee, to Congressman ROOSEVELT in describing the type of testimony which was required to be in closed session meets with my hearty approval and I respectfully urge that each and every chairman and subcommittee chairman of House investigative committees carefully note the reasonable and sound explanation made by the distinguished Representative from Virginia, Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH.

In this connection, I will state that during the time Subcommittee Chairman ROOSEVELT was making inquiry I was not available in Washington because I was presiding as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Milwaukee, Wis. I make this explanation in connection with Mr. ROOSEVELT's letter to me for the reason that several Members have asked if I concurred with the interpretation placed upon this section of House Resolution 151 by Rules Committee Chairman SMITH and Subcommittee Chairman ROOSEVELT who was so fine and fair in undertaking to apply the full intent and spirit of House Resolution 151 to his subcommittee hearings.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
1030 New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLYDE: Responding to your letter of April 21 requesting full information as to the application of House Resolution 151, of which you are the sponsor, and which passed the House of Representatives unanimously March 23, 1955, I am happy to send you the following report:

Pursuant to section 2 (m) of House Resolution 151, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5, House Select Committee on Small Business, I consulted with the Parliamentarian of the House concerning anticipated testimony which might conceivably be incriminating to certain large firms in the oil industry. The Parliamentarian advised that it would be wise to hold executive hearings until the nature of the evidence was completely established. The committee, therefore, held its first hearings in executive session. It soon became apparent that the testimony was of a responsible and factual nature, and the committee, therefore, voted to make the testimony public in its entirety as per section 2 (o), and the oil firms were advised that they would have full opportunity to respond.

As chairman of Subcommittee No. 5, I then consulted with the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, and described to him the type of testimony received by the committee in the previous session. Chairman SMITH advised that in view of the responsible testimony he believed future testimony should be open in character, inasmuch as the spirit of House Resolution 151 indicated that witnesses were not to be held in closed session unless their testimony was expected to be irresponsible and of a harmful nature which could not properly be defended against. Subcommittee No. 5, therefore, in agreement with and in conformity with Chairman SMITH's suggestion, has held the rest of its hearings in public session, and I believe that they have been generally by all parties considered to have been fair and impartial.

We, therefore, feel that under this interpretation of House Resolution 151 the committee's work has not been hampered and that the rights of all concerned have been respected. In accordance with section 2 (h) the committee has also always had at least 2 out of the 3 of its members present at all hearings.

I trust that this will give you the information you desire, and with appreciation for your good wishes, which I reciprocate most heartily, I am

Very sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

APRIL 21, 1955.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am communicating to you at this time and asking your cooperation along the lines requested by me herein as an aid to me in connection with the practical application and working out of the Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, which passed the House of Representatives unanimously on March 23, 1955.

As you and your subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of the House apparently held the first investigative hearings by a subcommittee subsequently to the enactment of House Resolution 151, I am interested in your full advices and information to me of how the aforesaid resolution worked out in connection with the important subcommittee hearings here at the Nation's Capital and then out in California. Did you have any occasion to apply any particular paragraph of House Resolution 151? If so, how did you apply it and what the practical result?

I will also thank you for any comment or suggestions you may have in this connection.

Thanking you in advance and with personal regards, I remain,

Cordially yours,

CLYDE DOYLE.

Floyd J. Pemberton Named "Driver of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride today that I point to a high honor which has recently been conferred upon a Detroit citizen and resident of my district.

He is Floyd J. Pemberton, a driver for Commercial Carriers, Inc., of Detroit. Mr. Pemberton has just been named the trucking industry "driver of the year," the highest award given by the industry in recognition of safe driving habits and personal heroism. One driver is selected each year from among the 6 million on the highways.

Not only does driver Pemberton have an excellent safety record—over a half million miles with only a minor mishap in which an automobile bumped the rear of his truck—but last December he risked his life to save two women, helpless in a burning car. They are Miss Dorothy Powell and Miss Eleen Cooper, both of Ypsilanti, Mich.

It was Christmas Eve and Floyd was heading toward Detroit, and home. He had safely delivered a load of new cars to Cincinnati.

Suddenly, about 300 feet in front of him, 2 cars collided head-on. The driver of one was thrown out and killed

instantly. The other car burst into flames.

Mr. Pemberton pulled to a stop and risked an explosion of the gasoline tank to use the fire extinguisher he carried in his cab to put out the flames. He placed flares on the highway to prevent other motorists from crashing into the two wrecked cars.

He then removed Miss Powell from the wreckage and applied a tourniquet to her leg, which had been nearly severed at the knee. He did not remove Miss Cooper because as he explained afterward, "she was bleeding too badly at the throat to risk being moved." However, he did place cloth padding under her chin to check, as far as possible, the bleeding.

A physician who cared for Miss Cooper later said "her survival could have been termed a miracle" and was due largely to Mr. Pemberton's quick action at the scene of the accident.

Michigan is proud of Floyd Pemberton. But the pride goes much deeper than mere respect for his new honor.

Floyd has an honorable discharge from the Marines and was wounded at Saipan and Okinawa. He and his lovely wife, Bonnie, live with their 3 sons in their own home in Redford Township, just outside Detroit.

With no time for the usual scoutmaster's schedule, Floyd makes up for it by taking his boys and fellow members of Troop 227 on special fishing and bowling outings.

The Pembertons are a typical, happy American family group.

And it is for this that Michigan primarily honors Floyd. It is respect for the solid American citizen, who did not hesitate to plunge himself unselfishly into the midst of a dangerous situation to aid his fellow beings.

His kind are the citizens of whom we all are proud.

Effect of Automation on Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced a resolution which was referred to the Rules Committee. It provides for the creation of a select committee of seven Members of this House to study the effects of automation on our economy.

I humbly ask the support of the Members of the House for the early establishment of this committee. I believe the urgent need for the study envisaged in my resolution, House Resolution 221, is clear. The resolution would authorize the creation of a select committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the growing use of automatic machines to make decisions previously requiring the exercise of human judgment, and to perform functions previously requiring human participation or supervision. I feel an analysis now is necessary with regard to the effect of automation on the American economy.

That definition, in the vernacular, is a mouthful. I tried to find a simpler definition and turned to the dictionary in my office. We have a 1951 edition of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary; and, do you know, the word "automation" is not in there. I then asked the Library of Congress for a definition of the word. They report it is not contained in any dictionary they have. Despite this, we have all, however, heard a great deal about automation recently. Just a day or so ago, a certain great American industrial company sent out its employee relations newsletter, "for circulation among management." It is entitled "Automation—Friend or Foe?" On page 5 of that newsletter this concern said that today the employer must automate to stay alive, and to automate, he must get his costs down appropriately and "remove from his payroll any substantial surplus of employees not needed." The company continues, saying:

> The point is that there is no royal road to technological progress and if we want to continue to see our level of living go up, some risks by all are inescapable. Since it is no longer a question of whether industry in general will automate, but only whether a given company will be a leader or fall behind, anybody who is temporarily displaced by improvements in that company would lose his job anyhow—along with all the other employees in that company losing their jobs—if it should fall back in the parade.

What that company is really saying is this: There is no longer any question about industry adopting automation. Companies which do automate will have to fire substantial numbers of employees and those who do not automate—and reduce their payrolls to remain competitive—will be unable to remain in business, and all their employees will be put out of work. That is what this concern told its management.

Certainly no one here wants to put a damper on the increased expansion and growth of American industry. One of the marvelous results of the genius of the people of the United States is an economic machine capable of building our Nation into a true paradise. I say—full speed ahead. There can be no turning back, no halt to progress. If we falter, we plant the seed of our own downfall. However, we must proceed carefully and not foolishly; intelligently and not wastefully; forcefully and not destructively. This same wonderful economic machine which we have built can very easily turn upon us, devour our workingmen, eliminate our consumers, and like the Frankenstein monster, destroy its creator.

There can be no doubt that economic planning is an absolute necessity today. Recognizing this, the Federal Reserve Board has raised the margin requirements for stock purchases twice in the last 4 months and has taken other steps to help guide our economy and our well-being. We must not neglect the labor and industrial situation and the helpless condition of the millions of American employees.

You may be sure if we do, the Communists may be counted upon to seize upon every dislocation and resultant period of unrest and unemployment to further their own plans.

And please, let us not deceive ourselves: automation has arrived and will continue to expand with ever-increasing rapidity. The labor supply is, according to all predictions, scheduled for great increases. With the simultaneous increase in automation, what will these prospective employees do. I do not know and I do not believe any one person knows the answer. According to governmental reports, industrial employment decreased again in March, reaching the lowest level since last September.

The best available data shows that the packing industry is being seriously affected today by automation. Due to automation in that industry, more job rates were "bargained out" of the new contract with one packer this year than in all the last 15 years put together.

The electronics industry, in the well-chosen phrase of Robert Bendiner, of the Reporter magazine, "the fountainhead of automation," which should be employing many new people in producing the new mechanical wonders, shows that employment just is not keeping pace with production. "Electronics output in 1952 was 275 percent higher than in 1947, but was produced by only 40 percent more workers," according to Bendiner.

The telephone industry furnishes a daily example of the effects of automation. Many of the calls which once were toll calls needing a special operator are now dial calls and can be completed by the individual placing it. Fifty thousand telephone operators have been replaced so far by this new dial system.

Life magazine, with calm aplomb, says:

> With a total of 2.7 million not working, we have been able to turn out and consume virtually as much goods as at the record heights of the boom. What this indicates—

And this is the point—

> is that the United States may be able to produce and consume at boom-time levels, yet still have a "permanent reserve" of unemployment, which may increase.

That is a fine way to describe a worker with a family to feed: "Permanent reserve of unemployment." We cannot just set aside these men and women and call them trained reservists like the National Guard or Reserve.

The Factory Management and Maintenance industrial editor had this to say, according to Bendiner's excellent article, which I highly commend as "must" reading—the Reporter, April 7, 1955:

> The jobs that are "duck soup" for elimination by automatic production are mainly the semiskilled ones, such as machine operating and materials handling. Some observers believe the factory of the future will go so far as to wipe out this great "middle class" of industry.

The effects of automation will first be felt in the areas of the country most heavily populated and industrialized. These areas, my own New York, New England, Ohio, Michigan, and other industrial States, are all in the path of

catastrophic dislocations. As automation accelerates, the obsolescence of present plant facilities mounts, thus causing mass exodus of industry from these areas having skilled, trained labor pools.

While the effects of automation have not as yet been completely recognized, automation today is like a slow, creeping paralysis. The employee who is being replaced by a machine is in many cases rehired for merely temporary work, while the millions now unemployed cannot find new work. It is this employee who is not hired who is the most seriously affected at the moment.

Certainly in the long run automation, like all progress and industrial advancement, will prove highly beneficial to all. More jobs will be created. More goods will be produced. More leisure and more pay will be available to everyone. Walter Reuther, of the CIO, recognized this when he said that we will achieve an "abundance in terms undreamed of before," with "vast improvements in the living conditions of the American people."

Before we reach this pleasant state, however, we must face the problem which automation is now creating. Newsweek reported:

> Ford's automatic engine plant turns out twice as many engines as before with one-tenth the manpower. A radio assembly line producing 1,000 radios a day uses only 2 workers where 200 were used before. An average refinery which employed 800 people without instrumentation, now uses 12.

The man put out on the street today or tomorrow is not in the least concerned with the land of plenty we will achieve in 1975. He needs help now. Life's vast "unemployed reserve" must have help now.

Obviously the State and local governments cannot assume this immense task alone. Federal guidance and planning are essential. What is needed, how much help, and what kind of help the Federal Government should supply is unknown and should be explored.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY has made the point most forcefully when he said that we must "find out how automation may be made to pay its way in terms of human welfare."

It is clearly the human problem with which we are concerned. The material values we have in ever-growing abundance, but the individual must not be lost and buried in a mound of statistics.

This Congress can establish itself as one of the wisest and best America has known. We have the golden opportunity now to evaluate and assess, in advance, the benefits, problems, and difficulties which automation will create. If we seize this chance we can truly help mold a greater and healthier society.

We must act now. We cannot allow an era of "technological unemployment" to come upon us, for if it does, international communism will seize the opportunity to feed upon this disaster. It is our duty to avert this calamity.

I implore your support and prompt approval of this study of automation.

General Pulaski: American Benefactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, about 2 months ago was the 207th anniversary of the birth of General Pulaski. As a person with dogged determination, General Pulaski has few, if any, equals. His perseverance to accomplish his mission marked him by his enemies as a "must" to be disposed of. Only due to his likewise determination to be free was he able to acomplish so much before death finally overtook him at Savannah.

A review of his background in Europe, his continued fight for freedom and finally his meeting with Benjamin Franklin in Paris, led him to battles in America which should inspire all of us with greater hope. His ability to overcome so-called insurmountable difficulties should inject us with new vigor to accept the challenges thrown before us today.

One day in September 1775, 28-year-old Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski wrote the following dramatic words in a letter addressed to his close friend, Prince Radziwill:

"Education received in earlier days prevents me from raising my own hand against myself; but the prolonged hours of this torture do not bring the deserved end to my life."

Little did Pulaski know that 3 years later he was to become a protege of George Washington and that his fame and glory would be part of American history.

Who was this Polish general, whose monuments cover the American continent and whose name will be repeated in classrooms for generations to come?

Kazimierz Pulaski was born in nobility in the Podole Province of Poland on March 4, 1747. His life on his father's estate passed without any special significance. In comparison with the upbringing of other youngsters of that violent era, Pulaski's father had been an able jurist who lived a retired life, devoting his time to the education of his sons in accordance with the tradition of the country. Apart from a military training, horseback riding and political indoctrination, his sons received the best education one could get through private tutors. It was at the age of 17 when young Pulaski learned to despise the Czarist regime and all it had stood for, and he had learned to suffer from privation when he and his family were locked up in a castle by the Russians. It was there that young Pulaski learned more, through practice, about the art of open warfare. This experience came in handy later when Pulaski bravely opposed the enemy in the skirmishes at Starokonstantynow and at Chmielnik, which he defended in the name of the Bar Confederation.

His attitude and stand at that time came as a result of the unprecedented arrest by the Russians of four Polish deputies to the Sejm. The Sejm, being paralyzed by the threatening force of 30,000 Russian soldiers, could not do much to defend the arrest of its deputies. Neither did King Stanislaw August Poniatowski take any action. The only answer to the Russian outrage was a firm plan for an uprising, which was drafted by Jozef Pulaski. He found an able and loyal supporter in his own son, Kazimierz. On January 29, 1768, the insurrection was proclaimed at bar and from then on Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski fought uninterruptedly one battle after another. He was in charge of the armed positions at Zwanice and at the Holy Trinity trenches. He crossed the swollen Dniester River, when outnumbered by 4,000 Russians, and, unimpressed, he led his attachment of 400 horsemen through Bukovina to Karkow. Meanwhile, Jozef Pulaski, the general's father, had died in a Tartar prison, his younger brother was arrested, and he himself was called by the enemy an ambitious opportunist. Pulaski did not lose his courage. He once more started an offensive after having joined remnants of the Confederates at Sanok. After an unsuccessful attack upon Przemysl, he went north to Lithuania in order to start an uprising there. But here again he was defeated, and added to everything else, he lost his brother, Francis, who fell in the battle against General Suvorov's forces. With only a handful of men Kazimierz escaped into Hungary in order to form new forces and to get courage for new battles to come. Kazimierz Pulaski did come back into Poland and in September 1770 he occupied the famous Chestochova Convent, forcing the Russians to retreat. Yet, despite this and many other victories of the Tsarist armies, the Bar Confederacy was growing more and more desperate. In addition General Pulaski was being accused by his own compatriots of having planned the kidnaping of King August Poniatowski, a plan he had rejected when it was secretly offered him. Pulaski defended himself in a proclamation that he had written, but to no avail. He was pronounced a criminal, and from fear of being delivered into Russian hands he began moving from place to place. He would find refuge in Dresden and when the trail after him became hot he moved to Strasbourgh and thence to Paris. Although denounced by the High Court in Poland as a renegade, Pulaski remained loyal to his cause. His only sin was a desire to overthrow the Tsarist regime in Poland and to liberate his beloved country. Once again he made the attempt. At the very moment when Turkey had been defeated after the Turkish-Russian War, Pulaski, with only a few enlisted volunteers, appeared in the Balkans at the camp of the Grand Vizier. He arrived too late. From Rodosto he went to Smyrna and from there to Marseilles. Luck had left him completely. In Marseilles he was robbed of his personal papers and money. He was thrown into jail like a common criminal for his debts. As he was sitting and brooding in jail over his past, the French who had felt responsible for Poland's misfortunes notified Pulaski about the presence in Paris of Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane, who had been

recruiting volunteers for America. In the spring of 1777 Pulaski met Franklin in Paris. The latter gave Pulaski a letter of introduction to George Washington, saying:

"Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of liberties of his country against the great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into Your Excellency's hands. The court here has encouraged and promoted his voyage, from an opinion that he may be highly useful to our service. Mr. Deane has written so fully concerning him, that I need not enlarge; and I only add my wishes that he may find in our armies under Your Excellency, occasions of distinguishing himself."

A new unexpected chapter in General Pulaski's life had begun. At the end of July, Pulaski landed at Boston. At that time there was fierce fighting on the Hudson River and on the shores of Lake Champlain. Like a firehorse, temporarily disused, Pulaski grew impatient and wrote the following to George Washington himself:

"I wish to receive under my command a detachment of cavalry volunteers, and to hold such a rank as would authorize me to command a whole division if I deserve it. * * * I should like to receive a position in which I would be under orders only from the Commander in Chief. If this is impossible, I would like to share the hardships of war with the Marquis de Lafayette, and to execute the Commander in Chief's orders as the subordinate of the Marquis. The chief thing for which I ask is to be near the enemy, to have the opportunity to earn the name of a good officer. I had under my command in Poland in various battles 18,000 men; attacks and sieges which I commanded allow me to count myself among those who have acquired experience in war. You should not slight such men; I have come from Europe in the hope that I may be accepted in the ranks of those worthy citizens who fight for their country and independence."

On August 28, 1777, the President of Congress received the following letter from George Washington:

"To think of some mode of employing him (Pulaski) in our service there is none occurs to me liable to so few inconveniences and exceptions as the giving him the command of the horse."

Meanwhile, until commissioned by Congress, Pulaski had the opportunity to show craftsmanship in military art at the battle near Warren Tavern. Not only did he check the British but he personally saved General Washington's life, insisting to see the latter when he found out that British forces were mistakenly taken for Americans. As a result of Pulaski's conduct in the Battle of Brandywine, Congress awarded him a commission, and on September 15, 1777, he became a brigadier general in command of the entire cavalry of the American forces.

On Christmas Eve of 1778 British forces, after having captured Savannah, threatened Augusta, Ga., and Charleston. Pulaski, who was serving under the command of General Washington, arrived just in time to push the British back. In this battle he lost his second in command, Colonel Kowacz, a compatriot, and 50 men of his legion. Had it not been for Pulaski's display of bravery and personal combats, Charleston would have been lost to the enemy.

During the summer military operations were suspended and the silence on the front frustrated Pulaski. In consequence on August 19, Pulaski wrote the following letter to Congress:

"Enthusiastic zeal for a noble cause and for life in America, and disregard for death made me enlist in your ranks, and I flattered myself that I should work to your satisfaction and earn your approval. It must be my fate that nothing but honor to which I have ever been faithful, makes me continue in this service; but I am disheartened by ungenerous treatment. * * *

"Be just, gentlemen, and I think as I could not bow before the powers of Europe I came here to sacrifice everything for the independence of America. I wish to live in a free country, and before I settle down I wish to fight for that country's freedom. * * * Maybe I shall have the opportunity to prove that I am a friend to your cause, though I have not been lucky enough to commend myself to some person."

Pulaski's desire to take to arms came sooner than he had expected. In an attack to recapture Savannah, Pulaski led his cavalry under the command of Count d'Estaing. When d'Estaing fell wounded, General Pulaski took over, but he soon fell too, hit by a grapeshot. As a result of infected gangrene the brave fighter for Poland's and America's independence died in agony on board the *Wasp* on October 11 and he was buried in the watery grave. Thus, this great son of Poland never lived to see the finished fruits of his adopted country, whose foundations he so vigorously helped to lay.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish Daily News recently printed an article by Joseph Wytrwal in which he presents Pulaski Proclamations issued by 12 of our State Governors. The survey on General Pulaski which is reported in this article was conducted by students in his American history class at Eastern High School in Detroit. Contributing work to the survey came from Larry Blair, Richard Pastick, Howard Cloutier, Dwight Alison, Patricia Verlinden, Ernestine McNeece, Carlos Broadley, Louis Gaines, Richard Stys, Cynthia Beaudion, Curtis Butler, and Norman Geohring.

The article is as follows:

TWELVE GOVERNORS ISSUED PULASKI PROCLAMATIONS

(By Joseph Wytrwal)

President Eisenhower made the following statement in his General Pulaski Memorial Day proclamation for 1954:

"The story of this Polish patriot's supreme contribution to our independence is a treasured chapter in the annals of a grateful nation."

According to a recent survey, conducted among the governors of the United States, Count Pulaski's deeds of valor on behalf of the American colonists in their fight for freedom have not gone unnoticed or unsung by subsequent generations of Americans.

Last year, to commemorate the 175th anniversary of Pulaski's death at Savannah, Ga., 12 governors issued proclamations.

They were:

Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut; Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts; Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York; Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan; Gov. Hugh Gregg, of New Hampshire; Gov. Lawrence W. Wetherby, of Kentucky; Gov. Robert E. Meyner, of New Jersey; Gov. Robert B. Crosby, of Nebraska; Gov. George N. Craig of Indiana; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland; Gov. C. Elmer Anderson of Minnesota, and Gov. Dennis J. Roberts of Rhode Island.

Gov. Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts, made the following observation in his proclamation:

"After the last partition of Poland, Pulaski was forced into exile to Turkey and later to France, where the news of the American struggle for freedom reached him. Therefore, at Paris, he at once presented himself to Benjamin Franklin as a volunteer, was readily accepted, and in July 1777, landed, at his own expense in Masachusetts, being immediately invited by George Washington to serve as an officer on his staff.

"Shortly afterwards, as a result of Pulaski's praise-worthy conduct in the Battle of Brandywine, Congress awarded him a commission as brigadier general to form and command the entire cavalry of the American forces. Thus Count Pulaski earned the title of 'Father of American Cavalry,' which units led so effectively at Germantown, at Charleston, and at Savannah. At the latter place, leading his legion to the defense of our French allies, Pulaski was fatally wounded. Two days later, on October 11, 1779, at the age of 31, he had made the supreme sacrifice on the Altar of Liberty."

Gov. Hugh Gregg, of New Hampshire, stated:

"Informed Americans are grateful for the memory of the gallant Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who so bravely aided our people to win their independence in a past generation."

Gov. S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, made the following statement in his proclamation:

"On the honor roll of heroes and patriots who suffered and died that we might enjoy the priceless boon of liberty, the name of Count Casimir Pulaski stands forth with great distinction."

Gov. Lawrence W. Wetherby, of Kentucky, declared:

"In battle, General Pulaski's devotion to the great American cause was demonstrated by his gallant charge into the enemy lines, and his tragic death has served to ennoble him in the eyes of the entire liberty-loving world; and, it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War."

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, stated:

"Casimir Pulaski came from his native Poland to offer, without reservation, his assistance and his fortune in developing the cavalry for the Army of George Washington. Fighting not for personal advantage but the principles and ideals to which he was dedicated, he died, on October 11, 1779, in the battle of Savannah, that the liberty he loved so well might live."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, said:

"Count Pulaski's exploits at Brandywine were such that Congress made him a brigadier general and chief of cavalry. The gallant defense of Charleston by the Pulaski Legion in May 1779, which he organized, is an unforgettable chapter in the military history of our country. General Pulaski literally gave his life for our freedom when he perished October 11 of the same year from wounds he sustained at Savannah."

Gov. Robert B. Crosby, of Nebraska, said:

"A Polish patriot, Casimir Pulaski, was a man who so fervently believed in the principles of freedom that he was willing to fight and die for this cause. He was killed during the American Revolution defending the rights of a people who, like him, wanted above all else to be free. So great a patriot was he that the Nebraska Legislature some years ago saw fit to call the attention of its citizens to this martyr by proclamation each year."

Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, asserted:

"His contribution to our cause, and through that cause to liberty in the world, gives him a permanent place in the history of this Nation which is today's main bulwark of freedom and the hope of oppressed peoples everywhere, including those of Pulaski's beloved Poland."

Gov. Elmer Anderson, of Minnesota, said:

"General Pulaski's dedicated and devoted service to this Nation has provided inspiration not only for the service men and women of this country but also for the freedom-loving people of his native Poland."

Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, of Rhode Island, said:

"He was assiduous in hoping to find opportunities of proving his devotion to the American cause, although he encountered opposition and discouragement in trying to put his ideas into effect. At the age of 32 he was mortally wounded at the Battle of Savannah and did not live to see the victory to which he had contributed."

Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut, declared:

"For his bravery and splendid leadership at Brandywine less than a month after he had been given his command in America, Pulaski was accorded the rank of brigadier general. His example was an inspiration to all Americans, and especially to the men of the famous Pulaski Legion, who performed signal service in the War for Independence."

Gov. George S. Craig, of Indiana, made the following observation in his proclamation:

"The passage of the years since General Pulaski's death had not dimmed the glory of his sacrifice or the luster of his fame; and his selfless devotion to the cause of freedom stands today as a challenge to all men who work for freedom in all nations."

No; the glory of Pulaski's sacrifice, or the luster of Pulaski's fame has not been dimmed by the passage of the years. With every passing year, the memory of Count Casimir Pulaski is held in ever greater reverence.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski is acclaimed with warmest affection by our entire Nation. This affectionate place his memory holds in the hearts of millions of Americans is well earned—for General Pulaski is truly one of our national glories.

The Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to protest the apparent efforts of Director Oveta Culp Hobby and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele to delay and perhaps avoid committee questioning on the safety factor and the Public Health Department control of the Salk vaccine.

Except for the review of the so-called protocol on the drugs and tests on partial supplies of the vaccine, the Department of Health obviously did not extensively analyze the vaccine prior to approval and release for public use. The Department relied almost completely on the tests of the private producers. In failing to conduct tests on all vaccines prior to public approval and dissemination, the Department failed to do what it had the authority and the duty to do, particularly in view of the mass innoculations which were planned. In seeking to test all vaccines at this late hour, the Department is hopeful to repair the dike and control the damage already done.

There can be no voluntary control by the individual States. The American public in all of its promotional hysteria still relies on the stamp of approval of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health. The State and local authorities rely upon the advice and the counsel of the Federal authorities—and if the Federal authorities have failed to act or if they have acted irresponsibly, this confidence in the Department of Public Health may have been misplaced. If the Secretary of Health was hasty in licensing, she should be held to account. If the Department has taken this matter too lightly, its attitude should be explained.

It is a congressional function and duty to determine the extent and effectiveness of the Federal testing of biologicals before they are distributed on public markets. Certainly prior to a mass innoculation, it is the duty of the Department of Health to conduct its independent tests to determine the safety of the vaccine rather than rely solely upon the tests of the independent producers. In the production of defense material, the Government never relied fully upon the producer's warranty but always conducted its own testing process. This same principle must apply to the fight against disease.

The American public had a right to assume that the vaccine administered to their children in a mass innoculation was 100 percent safe. If the degree of safety in the use of the vaccine was any less, they should have been so advised. They took the Department of Health's approval to mean the vaccine was safe. If the American public has a misconception of the Public Health Department's functions on these points, it should be so advised. If the laws relating to biological control should be redefined, a congressional committee hearing is the place to begin. If the Department of Health is commencing at this late hour to check into the safety factor of a vaccine which it has already approved, the public has a right to know that.

Statements after statements are pouring out to the public from the Department of Health. No satisfactory explanation is given for reversals. The officials seem to prefer the security of making news releases rather than expose their statements to committee scrutiny and cross-examination. It looks like a coverup for possible public dereliction.

If the Secretary of Health can take the time to tell political gatherings of the developments in this matter and if the Surgeon General can take the time to participate on Ed Murrow's TV program, they should both be available for immediate congressional interrogation. Congress should not be compelled to get its answers second hand.

An Analysis of the New Trends in the Russian Propaganda Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I had the privilege to appear on TV station WXEL, Cleveland, on the program, Tell Your Congressman. On this occasion I had as my guest, Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, a longtime student of communism who has served in numerous official capacities here in Washington. Because of the warm response I have had from the people of Cleveland to this program, under unanimous consent, I include the full transcript of that program in the RECORD:

Mr. FEIGHAN. The big news in Washington this week had to do with the question of peace or war—something which is, of course, of keen interest to all Americans.

President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress including recommendations relative to a mutual security program. At the same time, we here in Washington watched with keen interest the Bandung Conference. Then there was the proposal made by Chou En-lai, the Russian stooge in Red China, suggesting the possibility of a peaceful settlement in the Far East. These events were topped by the Russian maneuver on the Austrian peace treaty leading to their independence. Because these were the big events in Washington this week, I have invited a well known and recognized authority on international affairs to be with me today. I would like to introduce Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the United States Government.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, it is a pleasure for me to appear on this program with you. I have followed your work and your keen analysis on these vital problems which affect the security of the American people. You have my congratulations for the principled and courageous stand you have always taken on the fundamental issues.

As you have stated, President Eisenhower has recommended $3½ billion for the mutual-security program in next fiscal year. How do you feel about this proposal?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Well, I think I should point out that of the total amount recommended by the President, $1¾ billion go for military assistance, and the balance for economic development and technical assistance to the free nations of the world—particularly for those nations which recently acquired their national independence in south and southeast Asia.

Dr. O'CONNOR. What do you feel is the best way to evaluate the need for such a program?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Events of the past week indicate the need for a practical and well-administered mutual-security program. For example, the conference of Asian and African nations held at Bandung, Indonesia, last week, very clearly pointed out that the Chinese Reds are bent on bringing all Asia and Africa under Russian slavery. Chou En-lai, a notorious Moscow stooge, tried desperately

to turn all the nations of Asia and Africa against us and to brand us as aggressors because we had the moral courage to stand up for the human rights of the Koreans, the free Chinese located on Formosa, as well as the people and nations of Asia.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Mr. FEIGHAN, I followed very closely your analysis of the issues involved in the Bandung conference long before it opened, as well as your evaluation of the conference before it ended. In particular, I feel that your estimate made public a week ago Thursday, to the effect that the newly independent nations of south Asia would not be taken in by the clever propaganda of the Communists, stands as a real tribute to your study and practical knowledge of the methods, tactics, and objectives of the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I appreciate your saying that because I feel that unless we carefully study the enemy, we will never be able to work out plans or programs calculated to bring about his defeat and at the same time prevent war, if possible. Months ago, in a discussion on the subject of communism and its techniques and objectives, I stated that unless we undertake a positive and determined stand against Communist aggression, world war III would certainly result. Altogether too many people then took the position that if we stood up for what was right we would offend the Russians and they would consequently start a war. Fortunately, very few today take that point of view and more and more Americans are demanding that we undertake a positive political action program against the criminal conspiracy of communism.

Dr. O'CONNOR. I presume, Congressman, that you also have reference to the so-called experts who claim that there are only two courses open to the free world—either we accept peaceful coexistence with the Communists or engage in preventive war.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; I do. I oppose both peaceful coexistence and preventive war because as I have so often said neither one serves the interests of the American people. Peaceful coexistence is an old-fashioned Russian bear trap, which is only another phrase for surrender. The phrase "preventive war," in my opinion, was cooked up in the Kremlin in order to prevent red-blooded Americans from standing up for what is right and defending our interests when occasion demands.

Dr. O'CONNOR. You and I would certainly agree that the Communists are just as clever as they are evil. For example, the maneuver of Chou En-lai, over the past weekend in which he expressed a desire to negotiate with the United States in order to prevent war in Asia. That is a maneuver we had better take a couple of good looks at before we begin to move.

Mr. FEIGHAN. To understand the proposal made by Chou En-lai to negotiate with us we first have to remember that his timetable for the conquest of all of Asia and Africa was upset at the Bandung Conference. At that conference the intelligent leaders of the newly independent nations of Asia identified communism as a new type of Russian colonialism, more despotic and tyrannical than any experienced by the people of Asia in the past. These enlightened leaders served notice on Moscow and all others who are attempting to engage in any form of imperialism or colonialism that they are prepared to fight for the sovereign rights of their nations. This display of enlightened statesmanship forced Chou En-lai to make what appeared to be a sensational proposal in order to get his name in the headlines. This is what caused him to propose that the United States and Communist China could settle their differences by peaceful negotiation.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, do you feel that in connection with the so-called proposal by Chou En-lai that some people in Washington spoke out too soon as to whether we should or should not sit down at a conference with Communist China?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I most certainly do. I feel some people here in Washington spoke out before they knew the real contents of the Communists' proposal. To put it bluntly, I think they grabbed the Communist bait, which, of course, was dressed up in pretty ribbons, before they took a real look at the bait itself. It is now obvious that the proposal made by Chou En-lai is in no way different from that which he has been demanding for a very long time. He now offers, as he has in the past, to sit down with us providing the free Chinese are excluded and at this conference we are to hand over to him the still free Chinese, so that he in turn can put them in Russian slave chains. We must avoid the well-laid Communist trap of surrender by cease-fire. We must never forget that when we entered into what we thought was a cease-fire in Korea, we opened the door to an all-out Communist war in Indochina.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Mr. FEIGHAN, I agree with you that Chou En-lai pulled a very clever stunt at Bandung, but it seems to me that our experience over the years should have taught our leaders to have all the facts at hand before giving a reaction to any proposal made by the Communists. I don't see how it would be possible for us from both the moral and legal point of view to attend any conference with Red China unless the free Chinese are sitting as coequals at the conference table.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; we have made a treaty with free China, which has been ratified by the Senate, and should we sit down with the Russian stooge, Chou En-lai, we will, for all practical purposes, be abrogating that treaty. Also, I couldn't imagine us sitting down at a conference table at which we were going to give away some of the territory of the British or French or Italians without their representatives present. It is preposterous for anyone to propose that the United States give away the territory that belongs to another nation and that is exactly what Chou En-lai is proposing in his latest propaganda statement. To engage in such a conference has the effect of granting de facto recognition and therefore opening the door wide for admission of Red China into the councils of the U. N. I remain convinced that the American people oppose such foolhardy action.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Mr. FEIGHAN, all of us are very much concerned with the latest Communist maneuver on the peace treaty with Austria. Only last week, Chancellor Rabb was summoned to Moscow by the Kremlin leaders to discuss outstanding differences leading to such a treaty. How do you look upon this latest development?

Mr. FEIGHAN. In order to understand the Russian maneuver on the Austrian peace treaty, we have to recall to mind that for the past 9 years the United States has desperately sought to bring about the independence of Austria. The Russians have done everything imaginable in order to obstruct and to make impossible a real and decent treaty of peace with Austria. As you well know, we have had over 100 conferences with the Russians on this subject, none of which bore any fruit which is a good indication of Russian intentions with respect to Austria.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Yes, that's true, but do you think there are some special reasons why the Russians suddenly make what appears to be generous overtures to the Austrians and attempt to propagandize the whole world about their desire to give Austria its independence?

Mr. FEIGHAN. To me it is clear that the latest Russian propaganda maneuver on Austria is calculated to prevent the rearmament of Germany, to prevent the admission of a free Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and finally the destruction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which we have labored so hard to create as our common defense against the Red aggressor. The Russians know that a Germany able to defend itself, a Germany granted its sovereignty and admitted into the great alliance of peace and freedom of the West, will immeasurably strengthen our chances for peace. What the Russians are trying to do by using Austria as a guinea pig, is to convince the German people that they can be free and united only if they will plead their cause in Moscow.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, in light of your practical analysis of this Russian maneuver, do you think that the Western leaders should sit down with the Russians on such a treaty when we know in fact that it is no treaty at all, but merely a propaganda weapon?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I believe that before we sit down either with our Allies or with the Russians, either the President or Secretary of State should, in a public statement, make it clear to the whole world just who has been seeking a treaty of peace and independence for Austria during these past 9 years. The record of events pertaining to the efforts of the United States should be brought out in the public light as well as the Russian obstructionism and Russian thievery of the natural resources of Austria. We should also warn in advance our Allies and our enemy that we will not be a party to any so-called treaty of peace which requires the Austrians to deny the principle of political and religious asylum which is so basic to our civilization.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, there has been a great deal of talk here in Washington about a clause in the Russian version of the treaty which in effect, would require the Austrians to turn back to the Russians all those freedom-loving people who have managed to escape into Austria from behind the Iron Curtain. I can't help but recall that we got burned very badly before in a deal very much like this, entered into at Yalta, which brought about the forced repatriation of approximately 4 million people to the slavery of communism.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is the very thing we have got to avoid in the future. We will never find the key to peace and freedom unless we get across to all the people enslaved by communism that we in the West will never be a party to turning back those heroic souls who escape from Russian communism. As a special warning to the administration, I would like to point out that if we ever enter into a treaty which requires the Austrians in any way to deny the right of political and religious asylum, the Russians will have scored their greatest propaganda victory since World War II. By this maneuver they will be able to convince all the resistance forces behind the Iron Curtain that their cause is hopeless and that the United States is a party to tyranny.

Dr. O'CONNOR. It seems to me that you have presented in our discussion the most convincing arguments I have yet heard on the need for programs and policies which best defend and advance the interest and security of the American people. I can well understand why so many people here at home as well as in other parts of the world have such great admiration for the foresight and leadership you have demonstrated for the cause of human freedom and individual liberty.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Ladies and gentlemen: The issues which we in Washington must resolve in order to preserve our American way of life and to keep the spark of liberty and freedom alive elsewhere in the world require all of us to work together. Thank you, Dr. O'Connor, for appearing with me on this program.

The States Stage a Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address given by our courageous Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, at the 21st Conference on State Labor Legislation, held in Washington on May 11, 1955. This speech is particularly germane within the President's efforts to remove the Federal Government from various areas of State responsibility.

THE STATES STAGE A COMEBACK

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to the 21st Conference on State Labor Legislation, Washington, D. C., May 11, 1955)

It is my privilege and pleasure to welcome you to the Nation's Capital and to the 21st Conference on State Labor Legislation.

Because many of you are here for the first time, let me say that this conference is a voluntary assembly. It commits nobody to anything. We want to promote free discussion on the various aspects of State labor legislation and administration. We believe the voluntary character of this meeting is its strength. Ideas grow best on free soil.

As the Nation's Capital, Washington is the symbol, not the source, of the Nation's strength. Our strength is in our people. It is in the country at large that we see in operation the real fiber and backbone of our democracy. It is in the thousands of cities and villages from coast to coast that the people of this country live out their daily lives, raise the food we eat, manufacture the products we use, and develop the culture and standard of living which are significant American contributions to civilization.

You are here as the representatives of those people. Consequently, you are more important in the order of things than we.

There is occurring in the United States today a fundamental change in the course of Government. I hope that this change will be apparent at this conference.

Since the founding of our country, the States have been the great social innovators which first developed new social and economic legislation and originated programs to improve the welfare of working people. In the course of the past 20 years, we have tended to forget that the first minimum-wage laws and general maximum-hours laws were State statutes, that workmen's compensation was developed by the States, that the first child-labor laws were State statutes.

In these and other areas, the States have traditionally led the way. And, thanks to President Eisenhower, they are leading the way once again.

This does not mean that the Federal Government does not have its responsibilities. Quite to the contrary, there are numerous areas where it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to promote the welfare of wage earners. Last year, President Eisenhower recommended and the Congress enacted legislation to provide extension of coverage and an increase in benefits under the Social Security Act and the first Federal extension of coverage of the unemployment insurance system since it was created in 1935. This year, the President has recommended a 20-percent increase in the Federal minimum wage and a substantial extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the enactment of a general hours law, and temporary disability insurance for workers in the District of Columbia. These are all evidences of the Federal Government's determination to assume its proper role and exercise its responsibilities in the social and economic fields.

The country's workers are vitally interested in a comeback now being staged by the State governments. The States are once again demonstrating to the delight of their friends and the surprise of their critics that they can meet the social and economic needs of their own citizens. They are showing that they can in many ways do more for working people than it is possible or practicable for the Federal Government to do. In addition they can adapt their legislation to the special needs of their State and thus help their people make more progress in certain areas than they sometimes can under a more general Federal law which has to be broad enough to apply to all 48 States.

When the sovereign States of 1787 banded together in a Federal Government under a Constitution, they gave up some of their sovereignty. They were careful, however, to declare in 1791 in the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Shortly after President Eisenhower took office, he stated that "The present division of activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is the product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth. This growth in recent decades has proceeded at a speed defying order and efficiency. One program after another has been launched to meet emergencies and expanding public needs. Time has rarely been taken for thoughtful attention to the effects of these actions on the basic structure of our Federal-State system of government.

"Now there is need to review and assess, with prudence and foresight, the proper roles of the Federal, State, and local governments. In many cases, especially within the past 20 years, the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local governments. This has tended to blur the responsibilities of local government. It has led to duplication and waste."

The Eisenhower administration has made a determined effort to encourage social and economic progress by the free action of labor and management. We have also encouraged the State governments to develop their own labor standards for their own citizens and thereby improve the social and economic welfare of all the workers in all the States.

We have felt certain that progress could be achieved and that people's needs and hopes would be met and satisfied more easily, fully, and economically if they took action to help themselves or if their State Governments took action to help them than if sole or even primary reliance were placed on the Federal Government.

The President in his state of the Union message and economic reports has recognized the appropriate role of the States and has urged them to act to promote social and economic progress. In addition, I have followed up the President's request by writing to the State governors and calling upon them to improve their labor legislation. In meetings with State governors and in speeches to groups around the country I have consistently advocated improved labor legislation by the States.

One of our basic needs is the development of more effective labor standards legislation in the United States. For the past 20 years or so the supporters of this type of legislation have hammered away at the Congress, trying to improve labor standards largely through Federal legislation. It has been shown that, although there are some broad areas where Federal laws are very necessary and effective, such as the Social Security Act and Fair Labor Standards Act, for example, there are others where, as President Eisenhower said, Federal centralization breeds duplication between Federal and State efforts and waste of the taxpayers' money.

The philosophy of President Eisenhower and his administration is that, as far as possible, greater responsibility for labor standards legislation should be exercised by the States, since they are in a peculiarly good position to know their own needs.

Admittedly this approach usually takes more time and requires both more effort and more patience than Federal action would. It builds a sounder structure, however, and one that is likely to last longer. It is easier to enact one Federal law than 48 State laws. On the other hand, it is also easier to repeal one Federal law than 48 State laws. In addition, of course, State legislatures can make those variations and special provisions required to accommodate the law to the local situation and the needs of the people affected.

This campaign is paying off. The 1955 State legislative sessions are not over, but we already have had more State activity on behalf of workers than has been achieved at any time since 1939. The record to date demonstrates that an effective Federal-State partnership in the labor field can be developed and that significant and lasting progress in social and economic legislation can be made by encouraging State action.

I should like to summarize the action taken by the States so far this year. The legislatures of 45 States (all except Kentucky, Mississippi, and Virginia) and the 2 Territories have met in regular session in 1955. They have been active in every aspect of labor standards legislation.

Workmen's compensation laws exist in every State. Amendments to strengthen workmen's compensation laws were introduced in almost every legislature, and most of these included one or more types of increased benefits for workers. In 20 States,[1] Alaska, and Hawaii, workmen's compensation amendments have been approved; and in all but 2 of these, benefits of one or more types were raised. In some States all types of benefits were raised. Two States increased the maximum weekly benefits for temporary total disability to $40 or more, making a total of 13 jurisdictions now providing weekly benefits of $40 or more.

Bills amending unemployment insurance laws were introduced in practically all State legislatures. Maximum weekly benefits have been increased in 18 States,[2] Alaska and Hawaii. Eight States, Alaska and Hawaii now have a basic maximum weekly benefit above $30, and six others have increased theirs to $30, bringing the total of such States to 19. The 29 States which have a maximum of $30 or better account for over 68 percent of all the workers in the country covered by unemployment insurance laws.

Pennsylvania has changed its 26-week variable duration period to a 30-week uniform duration period. Vermont increased its 20-week uniform duration period to 26 weeks. Five States now have a 26-week uniform duration period.

Rhode Island extended coverage to employers of one or more, and New York extended coverage to employers of 3 or more as of January 1, 1956, and to 2 or more on

---

[1] Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Caroline, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming.

[2] Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington.

January 1, 1957. Rhode Island also extended coverage to State employees, with elective coverage for employees of political subdivisions.

There appears to be no more activity in the direction of restrictive disqualification legislation than in previous sessions.

Minimum-wage bills were introduced in 33 States and two Territories, including 11 States without minimum wage laws. In 3 of these 11 States (Idaho, New Mexico, and Wyoming) laws have been enacted. All three apply to both men and women. All three set a 75-cent basic minimum-wage rate. These three laws have broad coverage, including retail and wholesale trade. In Nevada and Alaska existing laws were amended. In Nevada the statutory rate of 75 cents an hour for women was raised to 87½ cents. The Alaska law, as amended, applies to both men and women, and sets a $1.25 minimum hourly rate, with overtime required at time and one-half for hours in excess of a 8 a day or 40 a week.

Many bills relating to temporary disability insurance have been introduced in State legislatures. Most of these are proposed amendments to the four existing laws (California, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island). In eight other States, the bills would create new temporary disability insurance programs, most frequently coordinated with the State unemployment insurance program. In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower called for the enactment of a temporary disability insurance law in the District of Columbia.

Migratory farmworkers would be affected by bills introduced in 20 State legislatures this year relating to labor standards for agricultural workers. Most of the bills would provide for coverage of hired farmworkers under workmen's compensation, minimum-wage, and child-labor laws and for the regulation of labor contractors and labor camps.

The State of Washington has enacted a law providing for regulation of labor contractors, and New York continued its joint legislative committee on migrant labor.

Bills still pending in the State legislatures would bring agricultural workers under coverage of workmen's compensation laws, regulate labor camps in which migrants are housed, or set up commissions to study migrant labor problems. In two States (Connecticut and Pennsylvania) agricultural workers would be brought under minimum-wage laws.

Equal-pay bills were introduced in 8 States not formerly having such laws, and amendments were proposed to 4 existing laws. Arkansas, Colorado, and Oregon have passed equal-pay laws this year for the first time, bringing to 17 the number of States and Territories with such acts. Eighteen States introduced amendments to other labor laws for women, such as regulation of hours of work and provision for meal and rest periods. In general these amendments would add flexibility to existing laws.

Maryland, Nevada, and Hawaii have adopted new industrial safety laws which would strengthen the States' accident prevention programs. The Maryland law transfers the safety activities, formerly spread among several departments, to a safety division in the department of labor and industry. Nevada created a new industrial safety department in the industrial commission; the act provides for safety inspectors and tightens the provisions relating to safety orders. The Hawaii amendment generally strengthens the act and provides for additional safety engineers and inspectors.

A New York law has been approved that makes provision for special counseling and placement service by the labor department to persons over 45 years of age.

This action by the States does not in all cases meet President Eisenhower's and my recommendations. It does, nevertheless, indicate substantial efforts on the part of the States to exercise their responsibility for improving State labor legislation and carrying out their obligation to promote the welfare of their people.

This is a trend which I am sure the Founding Fathers would applaud. In the 10th amendment to the Constitution they carefully associated the States and the people as the reservoirs of governmental power. By placing primary emphasis on the discharge of their responsibilities the State governments are showing that they were correct when they insisted they could and would use this power wisely.

The Eisenhower administration is devoted to progress for working people. We believe that the Federal Government is not the sole source of the facilities and know-how for promoting the welfare of workers. Labor, management, and State and local governments are also willing and able to help improve the well-being of working men and women. With the encouragement of President Eisenhower and his administration, labor, management, and the State and local governments are assuming their responsibilities in this area and are doing a good job.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for this world of beauty in the midst of which we walk; for the dawn of a new day; for the stars in the night sky; for the growing things that, answering the call of the springtime, are bursting into bud and flower; for the gifts of love and of friendship; for sacred and sunny memories, and for every radiant hope which inspires us on our pilgrim way.

Help us this day to live worthily as Thy children, to be true and just in meeting every experience, to rise above all anxious fear and hatred, and to live in an atmosphere of spiritual serenity. Come to us in the common life that entangles us. Meet us in the thorny questions which confront us amid the tragedies that have befallen men and nations. We do not ask that Thou wilt keep us safe in these dangerous times, but that Thou wilt keep us loyal to the ideals of this dear land of freedom.

Led by the kindly light, may we go forth along the path of duty with dauntless faith, having no fear save that of failing Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BIBLE and Mr. SCOTT were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and during the remainder of the week in order to conduct official meetings on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which subcommittee the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is chairman, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF VICTORY IN EUROPE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement.

It was just 10 years ago yesterday that the guns and the bombs were silenced and the lights went on again all over Europe.

The power of the Nazi armies—one of the most formidable military machines ever put together by tyranny—was finally crushed. The maniacal ambitions of Adolf Hitler were buried in the ruins of Berlin.

It was a strange—somehow unreal—end to a vast conflict that had absorbed the energies and thoughts of all mankind for more than half a decade. There was no heroic last-minute charge; no flaming or inspiring phrases.

There was an end to a long nightmare, and a hope that somehow, when the last surviving Axis Power, Japan, was defeated, there would be a better world.

There was, of course, dancing in the streets. The plain people of the world felt that a bad dream had ended, and the end of the bad dream brought an exhilaration rare in the history of humanity. In the first flush of enthusiasm, men and women everywhere felt the universal bond that holds us all in kinship.

Ten years later, that fine flush of enthusiasm has vanished. We soon awoke to the fact that liberty is never finally won; that it is a precious gift which can be preserved only by men who are always willing to fight for it and who will not relax their efforts.

We found that we had defeated one dictator only to be confronted by another. There were even some who questioned the value of the sacrifice we had made—forgetting what would have been the consequences had we failed to make it.

To me, V–E Day has one great significance. It is that any dictator, no matter how powerful, any despotism, no matter how strongly entrenched, will always perish in the face of a firm stand by determined men.

V–E Day means more than a commemoration of things past. It is also a time to pledge our fortunes—our stake in the universe—to the proposition that we must hold fast to the victories already gained.

We are now engaged in a great cold war struggle fully as crucial, fully as vital to the future of humanity, as the struggle against the Axis Powers.

On V–E Day we can look back at the Americans and the freedom-loving people everywhere who threw their bodies into the path of the Nazi machine and fought it to a standstill. We can resolve that we will be worthy of those men, and that our way of life—the path of freedom—shall not perish under the new tyranny.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished majority leader for a fine statement, in which I think all Americans could properly join.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from California.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on activities of the Department of Defense, including reports of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his third biennial report, as of December 31, 1954, (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 30th quarterly report on export control of the Secretary of Commerce (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, in the Federal Communications Commission, as of March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NATHAN L. GARNER

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Nathan L. Garner (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

A letter from the president, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the audit of the financial transactions of that Council, for the year 1954 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN NONIMMIGRANT ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain nonimmigrant aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 629

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for immediate completion of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam and certain other projects on the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized a public works project to improve the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama; and

"Whereas two phases of this project are now under construction: the Jim Woodruff lock and dam on the Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, Fla., and Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River at Buford, Ga.; and

"Whereas there are three additional phases of the project for which construction funds have not been provided, namely, the channel in the Apalachicola River between the Intracoastal Waterway near Apalachicola, Fla., and the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Columbia lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Columbia, Ala., and the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Fort Gaines, Ga.; and

"Whereas each phase must be completed in its entirety, before maximum use can be realized and the cost-benefit ratio be obtained as established by the United States engineers; and

"Whereas the 2 million Americans living in the tririver valley will be greatly benefited if an accelerated construction program is adopted whereby all approved phases of the authorized project are placed on a simultaneous construction status: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide sufficient construction moneys to continue construction of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Buford Dam, and to commence construction on the Apalachicola River channel, the Columbia lock and dam, and the Fort Gaines lock and dam, during the next fiscal year, July 1, 1955, to July 1, 1956; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; to each of ablest congressional delegation in the United States Congress, the Florida delegation; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D. C.; to each of the governors of the States of Florida, Alabama, and Georgia; and to the president of the Three Rivers Development Association, the Honorable Jim Woodruff, Sr., Columbus, Ga.

"Approved by the Governor May 5, 1955."

Resolutions adopted by Kirk-Casey Post, No. 366, The American Legion, Seneca Falls, and the Seneca County Men's Republican Club, both of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Daniel R. Mones, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Worcester, Mass., favoring the

enactment of legislation to provide a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the student government of the City College of New York, main center, day session, New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for Federal scholarships and loans to college students; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of P. Carbonetti, and sundry other citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Allegheny (California) Development League, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the development of hydroelectric power on the Trinity River by local enterprise; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union

"Whereas by act of Congress Minnesota was admitted to the Union May 11, 1858; and

"Whereas plans are being made for a statewide celebration of this centennial in the year 1958; and

"Whereas Congress has many times previously authorized the issuance by the United States Treasury of commemorative coins for other States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring, That the Congress be requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary to authorize and direct the United States Treasury to issue 150,000 commemorative half-dollar coins, of appropriate design, dated 1958; and be it further

"Resolved, That said coins be delivered to the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission upon payment therefor and that said commission be, and it hereby is, authorized to sell and distribute such coins; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"KARL F. ROLVANG,
"President of the Senate.
"ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"HY SERREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 19th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved April 23, 1955.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

FOREIGN COMPETITION—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution which was forwarded to me today by George W. Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor. This resolution raises the important problem of protecting American producers and workers in the building trades from unfair foreign competition.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution, which was approved by the delegates at the Wisconsin AFL convention, be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 1

Whereas the increased importation of building materials that come into competition with the output of the building industries is a constant menace to the welfare of our State and building industry; and

Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price-cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportion that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto lest we become insolvent; and

Whereas pressure that comes from import of Japanese plywood, Finnish doors, Swedish sash, Belgian nails, British wallpaper, German plumbing, Italian tile, and many other items (our own people make that are in the same category) will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult unless all import trade is placed on a fair and competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus contained: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in convention assembled in the city of Eau Claire, Wis., August 16 through 19, 1954, petition the State legislature and the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in traffic and trade legislation against destruction or lowering of our standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and the existing trade-agreement legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States.

Referred to the Committee on Legislation.

FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE—DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE—RESOLUTIONS OF REVERE (MASS.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Revere, Mass., relating to the Federal minimum wage, and the purchase and distribution of the Salk vaccine to the Public Health departments of individual States.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the medical team working on the Salk vaccine has given said vaccine to humanity without personal profit to themselves; and

Whereas the entire concept of polio prevention and cure has been carried on within the framework of a common effort by the people of our great democracy; and

Whereas the necessity for completely avoiding the categorizing of children as "needy" is fundamental to the elevation of the personal dignity of mankind; and

Whereas the dispensing of the Salk vaccine free to all children irrespective of race, creed, and color is also fundamental to our ideals of democracy; therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Revere, meeting in regular session, April 25, 1955, urges the President of the United States to sponsor the purchase and distribution of the Salk vaccine to the public health departments of the individual States for mass immunization, free to the youth of our country.

In city council April 25, 1955.
Ordered adopted.
Attest:

JOSEPH F. MCCHRISTAL,
City Clerk.

Whereas the President of the United States has proposed, and Congress is now considering legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; and

Whereas a fair and reasonable minimum wage would raise the living standards of underpaid workers, increase the national income, stimulate business activity, minimize unfair industrial competition based upon sweatshop wages, and help to solve the problem of runaway shops;

Whereas the city of Revere, Mass., has suffered serious competition because of the inadequacy of the present minimum wage, and is threatened with further difficulties unless action is taken quickly; and

Whereas the President's proposal of a 90-cent minimum falls far short of meeting the needs of underpaid workers or of the population as a whole: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized by the City Council of the City of Revere to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour in the interest of both our community and of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL and Congressman LANE to enlist their support for the enactment of such legislation.

In city council April 25, 1955.
Ordered adopted.
Attest:

JOSEPH F. MCCHRISTAL,
City Clerk.

INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE—PROCLAMATION OF MAYOR, SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by Mayor William J. Donovan, of the city of Somerville, Mass., relating to the 134th anniversary of the freedom of Greece from the Ottoman-Turkish Empire.

There being no objection, the proclamation was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas March 25, 1955, marks the 134th anniversary of the momentous day when the nation of Greece gained its freedom and independence from the Ottoman-Turkish Empire; and

Whereas those of Grecian birth or descent among us here in Somerville, along with Greek people throughout the world, will commemorate this great day in the history of their motherland with appropriate observances and exercises; and

Whereas the glory that is Greece lives on in the splendid heritage of human arts, sciences, and democratic ideals; and

Whereas the Greek nation fought gallantly for the cause of freedom 134 years ago, and ever since has consistently joined in struggles, along with other freedom-loving nations, in the defense of civilization and against the foes of humanity; and

Whereas even today the Greek nation stands as a bulwark of liberty, civilization, and democracy by the side of all the freedom-loving nations of the world; and

Whereas our citizens of Greek origin have made and are making a great contribution to the improvement of our community.

Now, therefore, I, William J. Donovan, mayor of the city of Somerville, in tribute to the people of Greece and their ancestors, do hereby proclaim Friday, March 25, 1955, as Greek Independence Day in our city of Somerville, and do urge its observance by all our citizens.

Given in the executive chamber, under my hand and under the seal of the city of Somerville, on this 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 179th.

WILLIAM J. DONOVAN,
Mayor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif. (Rept. No. 275).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 88. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura (Rept. No. 276);

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller (Rept. No. 277);

S. 715. A bill for the relief of Toy Lin Chen (Rept. No. 278);

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Irfan Kawar (Rept. No. 279);

S. 1513. A bill for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis (Rept. No. 280);

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Rosita A. Jocson (Rept. No. 281);

S. 1521. A bill for the relief of Garabed Papazian (Rept. No. 282);

S. 1581. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis (Rept. No. 283);

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa (Rept. No. 284);

S. 1705. A bill for the relief of George Paul Khouri (Rept. No. 285);

H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Sacatti Salliani (Rept. No. 286);

H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello (Rept. No. 287);

H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Sardo (Rept. No. 288);

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej (Rept. No. 289);

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes (Rept. No. 290);

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez (Rept. No. 291);

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin (Rept. No. 294);

H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Noble (Rept. No. 293);

H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen (Rept. No. 292);

H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec (Rept. No. 295);

H. R. 924. A bill for the relief of Joseph Marrali (Rept. No. 296);

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser (Rept. No. 297);

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou (Rept. No. 298);

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka (Rept. No. 299);

H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis (Rept. No. 300);

H. R. 1008. A bill for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova (Rept. No. 301);

H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of William Ligh (Rept. No. 302);

H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow (Rept. No. 303);

H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado (Rept. No. 304);

H. R. 1130. A bill for for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone (Rept. No. 305);

H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of Florence Meister (Rept. No. 306);

H. R. 1177. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski (Rept. No. 307);

H. R. 1192. A bill for the relief of Angelita Haberer (Rept. No. 308);

H. R. 1196. A bill for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa (Rept. No. 309);

H. R. 1203. A bill for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson (Rept. No. 310);

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli (Rept. No. 311);

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko (Rept. No. 312);

H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler) (Rept. No. 313);

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis (Rept. No. 314);

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha (Rept. No. 315);

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III (Rept. No. 316);

H. R. 1511. A bill for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath (Rept. No. 317);

H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds (Rept. No. 318);

H. R. 1645: A bill for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg (Rept. No. 319);

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of David Manuel Porter (Rept. No. 320);

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz (Rept. No. 321);

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Orlando Lucarini (Rept. No. 322);

H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee (Rept. No. 323);

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh (Rept. No. 324);

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Erika Rambauske (Rept. No. 325);

H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo (Rept. No. 326);

H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Vida Kosnik (Rept. No. 327);

H. R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda (Rept. No. 328);

H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul) (Rept. No. 329);

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of John P. Farrar (Rept. No. 330);

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Theodora Sammartino (Rept. No. 331);

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Basil Theodossiou (Rept. No. 332);

H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro (Rept. No. 333);

H. R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Sing Fong York (Rept. No. 334);

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Bent Petersen (Rept. No. 335);

H. R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein (Rept. No. 336);

H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi (Rept. No. 337);

H. R. 2954. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson (Rept. No. 338); and

H. R. 4043. A bill for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek (Rept. No. 339).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Elsa Lederer (Rept. No. 340);

S. 1035. A bill for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox (Rept. No. 341);

H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv (Rept. No. 342); and

H. R. 1012. A bill for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly (Rept. No. 343).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas (Rept. No. 345); and

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refuge Relief Act of 1953, as amended (Rept. No. 346).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy (Rept. No. 344).

WITHDRAWING SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF BERNARDINO CANARES SACLO—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, withdrawing the suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Saclo, and I submit a report (No. 347) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Bernardino Canares Saclo (A–9799304) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress under date of July 29, 1953, by Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, 83d Congress, 2d session.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1910. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1911. A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1912. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize

the Secretary of Agriculture to make direct loans and to insure loans made by private lenders to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing indebtedness in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1913. A bill for the relief of S. H. Prather; and

S. 1914. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1915. A bill to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1916. A bill to provide that Federal assistance to State veterans' homes shall be discontinued if fewer than half the beds in the home are available for domiciliary care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1917. A bill to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1918. A bill for the relief of Pheroze Ardeshir Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1919. A bill to modify the project for Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. BRICKER) (by request):

S. 1920. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

SAMUEL E. ARROYO

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo, which has been submitted by the Secretary of the Army. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, to accompany this bill, the letter forwarded with this proposal by the Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1911) for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed here with a draft of a bill for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo. The submission of this proposed legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this proposed bill is to reimburse this Reserve officer for the complete destruction of his household goods. The loss occurred while the officer was on active duty with the Army of the United States and while the household goods were bailed to the United States incident to transportation in connection with a permanent change of station of Lieutenant Arroyo.

In March 1953 Lieutenant Arroyo, then stationed at Anchorage, Alaska, received orders to proceed to the Alaska Communications System Headquarters in Seattle, Wash. His household goods were packed and crated shortly thereafter and his household effects were transported to the Port of Whittier, Alaska, for further shipment to the United States via ocean transportation. While the goods were in a Government warehouse at Whittier a serious fire broke out in that port which resulted in the total destruction of Lieutenant Arroyo's household effects.

Lieutenant Arroyo was subsequently released from active duty and submitted a claim under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c), for reimbursement in the amount of $6,192.73. The claim was processed within the Department of the Army under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra. After giving effect to depreciation of the items involved in the claim, it was determined in this Department that the claim was meritorious in the amount of $3,911.84. However, Public Law 439, 82d Congress, dated July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 321), placed a maximum limitation of $2,500 on the amount which could be administratively paid under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra, which was the only statute under which the claim could be considered. Accordingly, Lieutenant Arroyo's claim has been administratively allowed in the maximum amount of $2,500. He has not been compensated for the remaining portion of his loss which has been determined by this Department to be $1,411.84. There is no way in which Lieutenant Arroyo can be compensated for this remaining portion of his loss other than through the enactment of special legislation for his relief. The loss occurred incident to his service, while his household effects were bailed to the United States and without any fault or neglect on his part.

The Congress, from time to time, has favorably considered claims of members of the Armed Forces for loss of personal property in excess of the $2,500 limitation placed upon administrative payments under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra. Recent cases are Private Law 494, for the relief of Paul G. Kendall (H. R. 5025); Private Law 497, for the relief of Walter Carl Sander (H. R. 685); and Private Law 933, for the relief of Staff Sgt. Frank C. Maxwell (H. R. 7835), all enacted by the 83d Congress. An additional case, S. 3515, for the relief of John B. Gibbons, Jr., was under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, at the close of the second session of the 83d Congress, but was not acted upon.

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $1,411.84.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT, RELATING TO LOANS TO CERTAIN FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I am about to introduce a bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make direct loans and to insure loans made by private lenders to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing indebtedness in certain areas, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Colorado may proceed.

The bill (S. 1912) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make direct loans and to insure loans made by private lenders to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing indebtedness to certain areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the weather bureau records of the Great Plains area have indicated a declining rainfall and substandard moisture conditions since 1950. Most individual farmers, stockmen, and ranchers in the Great Plains area have suffered partial or complete crop or stock loss during each of the 5 succeeding years. With a subnormal moisture content in the mountains and the high winds of this spring, there seems little prospect for crops upon the so-called dry land farm area, and the many persons who live in irrigated sections are finding themselves pressed financially to maintain their operations and homes.

With these thoughts in mind, and after talking with literally hundreds of farmers in the Great Plains area in the last 16 months, two features of their plight stand out:

First. Few are interested in a Federal "handout."

Second. The farmers and ranchers of this area want only the assurance and means by which they may finance themselves during this period of subnormal moisture.

Through the so-called High Plains area, the evidence of subnormal crops and declining herds of livestock for the past 5 years is seen on every hand. Retail purchases are down. The economic life of the area has slowed down great-

ly. New purchases of badly needed machinery have fallen off greatly. Gasoline and oil bills for tractors to work the land and minimize soil erosion continue to grow, and wholesalers in many instances are not able to carry farmers further on such gasoline purchases.

I have carefully analyzed the six types of loans which compose the FHA, or Farmers' Home Administration. These were tacked on to the original act 1 by 1 as the need arose, and the act remains a patchwork, each type of loan being limited to small areas of need. It is true that there are special livestock loans and there are emergency loans; but the essential element of being able to refinance completely is absent under FHA. Under FHA, the six general types of loans available are as follows:

First. Operating loans for those family type farms which qualify and enter into a planned type of operation.

Second. Production and subsistence loans for the purchase of equipment, seed, fertilizer, and so forth, with a limitation of $7,000 on the initial loan and $10,000 to any one borrower.

Third. Farm ownership loans to pay and develop family type farms.

Fourth. Soil and water conservation loans, limited to $25,000 per individual or $250,000 for associations to carry out soil conservation, water development, and drainage.

Fifth. Emergency loans in designated areas where other credit is not available for the continuance of normal operations. Refinancing of existing indebtedness is not permitted.

Sixth. Special livestock loans to help established producers and feeders—but not commercial feed lot operators—to maintain normal livestock operations cannot be used to pay existing debts.

I recognize the need for a type of credit unavailable through present FHA loans. FHA does have, however, the personnel, the experience, and the administrative facilities to handle these loans without creation of an additional agency.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill which provides the following:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make or insure loans to landowners or tenants who are farmers or stockmen for refinancing, consolidating, renewing, or extending all or parts of the existing debts of the applicant farmers or stockmen and for farm operating and subsistence expenses.

Second. These loans would be applicable in distress geographical areas determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in general need of such refinancing credit. The areas would be determined in a similar manner as is now used for the hay and feed programs.

Third. Such loans may be made only to established farmers and/or stockmen who are unable to pay their existing indebtedness and are unable to refinance through private or cooperative sources under terms they could reasonably be expected to meet.

Fourth. A statement must be obtained by the applicant and approved by the local FHA board that the applicant is unable to procure the credit as described in paragraph 3.

Fifth. Such loans will contain a provision that they must be refinanced with private or cooperative sources when it can be done by the borrower. This in conformity with the principles of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Sixth. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to insure private loans fulfilling the above conditions.

Seventh. Such loans may be made up to 90 percent of the normal market value of the applicant's farm and/or personal property. In the case of livestock and farm equipment, the loan is repayable during the normal, useful life of such chattels and, in the case of real estate loans, for a term not to exceed 40 years. The obligations on chattel loans shall be limited to not exceeding $15,000 in one year.

I have introduced this bill, embodying the above features, for the reason that my experience in this area for 25 years has taught me that the present situation may be as much of a disaster as a tornado, a hurricane, or a flood. So far as I know, no one in the area wishes the Government to come in with grants. The High Plains area has played, and will continue to play, a vital part in filling the food needs for our country as our population increases.

I might interpolate at this point, Mr. President, to say that I am informed by some of my friends from the Southern States that a similar situation exists because of drought in their own States.

The welfare of each and every farmer and rancher in the area in the maintenance of his home and family and the preservation of the land from destruction is of vital concern to our country. More than this, we cannot ignore the humanitarian need for assistance under such circumstances.

This is no Government "giveaway" program, nor will it place the Government in competition with private lending agencies. Ample protection provisions have been made for that, which are the following:

First. This act is applicable only to those areas certified by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in need of this type of credit.

Second. Statements must be obtained and proof made to local FHA committees that credit, in sufficient amount and on terms which the applicant could be reasonably expected to meet, is not available, under ordinary bank-loan procedures.

Third. Recipients of loans must refinance with private or cooperative agencies when they are able to procure loans on such rates and terms as they may reasonably be expected to meet.

I firmly believe in the principles of this bill and in the necessity for its immediate enactment.

I should like permission, if I may, to have the bill remain on the desk, so that other Senators who may desire to join me as cosponsors of the bill may do so, and I respectfully invite them to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will lie on the desk.

PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, several weeks ago, a high-level Cabinet committee, known as the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization, of which Secretary Weeks is the Chairman, issued a report titled "Revision of Federal Transportation Policy." This report has since been endorsed by the President.

I have joined with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in introducing, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, a series of amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act, which constitute, I am informed, an attempt to put into legislative form the recommendations of the Cabinet committee.

I must stress that this is not a package or omnibus bill, although in its physical form it is a single bill. That is merely for the convenience of introducing it. As I have stated, the bill comprises a series of amendments, and will be handled in that way by the Committee.

The amendments are highly controversial, and I am of the opinion they will necessitate rather extensive hearings.

We shall proceed as expeditiously as is proper, with full opportunity for all interested persons to present their views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a preliminary explanation by me of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1920) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. BRICKER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. SMATHERS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

I am informed that among other things this series of amendments contemplates a complete revision in the Government's approach to the transportation problem. It proposes to change present policy of regulating transportation so "as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages" of "all forms of transportation," to one of "dynamic competition," and "to encourage and promote full competition between modes of transportation." The proposed policy would "reduce economic regulation * * * to a minimum" and would place "increased reliance on competitive forces in rate making."

The bill would—

1. Use competitive forces in rate making by—

(a) Limiting the ICC rate power to the setting of minimum and maximum rates, but the minimum would not be less than compensatory, and the maximum would be at least above the full cost of performing the services.

(b) Cut the period the ICC could suspend proposed rates from 7 to 3 months.

(c) Remove the requirement that carriers obtain prior approval for long and short haul rates, if necessary, to meet competition.

(d) Make volume freight rates lawful, if necessary to meet competition.

2. Redefine private carrier so that private truck operators would be limited to carrying the owners' products, and the return trip limited to supplies for the owners' use.

3. Redefine contract carriage so that such carriers would be required to publish their actual rather than minimum rates.

4. Repeal the bulk commodity exemptions applicable to water carriers.

5. Tighten standards under which freight forwarder associations operate.

6. Empower the ICC to override State bodies on the continuance of services operated at a loss.

7. Reduce the exemptions now enjoyed by the Government on its rates.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement regarding the bill, by the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

At the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I have joined with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in introducing a series of amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act.

The amendments are designed to implement the various features of the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization.

May I point out that this legislation and the report of the President's Cabinet Committee are very very controversial. In some quarters the Presidential report met with high praise; many others feel that it will set the transportation clock back 50 years.

The report's recommendations to expedite rate proceedings and to develop equitable rate structures are realistic. But I cannot agree with the recommendations or the legislative provisions in the bill that will permit undue interference with or jeopardize the existence of any type of transportation essential to our national security.

Nevertheless, since the report was prepared by a high-level Cabinet committee and its basic principles have vigorously been endorsed by the President of the United States, and since the report formally has been transmitted to the Congress, in accordance with the usual practice of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we are introducing the implementing legislation by request so that it may receive whatever consideration the Congress deems advisable.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it is my intention to refer the amendments and the Cabinet report to the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of which the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is chairman, so that public hearings may be held and all interested parties given an opportunity to present their views.

I sincerely hope that when the Surface Transportation Subcommittee holds its public hearings the shippers and the consuming public who, in the final analysis, pay the bill, will make their views known. After all, this is a matter of the utmost importance to them. The American public is spending around $72 billion a year for domestic transportation. And something like $20 billion of that goes to carriers that are regulated by the Federal Government.

By its very nature this bill cannot be forced draft legislation. It will require long hearings. Careful thought must be given to the recommendations on the part of all segments of transportation, shippers, and the public. Today we have by far the best transportation system the world has ever known. We cannot afford to lightly cast aside the policies and legislation which have made this progress possible.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at the Taft memorial dinner, in Boston, Mass., on May 6, 1955.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Address on the subject of our foreign policy in the Pacific, delivered by Senator MAGNUSON at San Mateo, Calif.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article published in the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1955, describing awarding of three honorary degrees to three distinguished Americans by the University of Wisconsin.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MOTHER'S DAY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Mother's Day is commemorated in the United States and many other countries of the free world with flowers, gifts, and family gatherings expressing love and esteem for motherhood. Yet in the Communist-dominated countries there is no respite for mothers in their daily struggle against brutal regimes bent on destruction of family life and of the very fiber which ties parents and children together. On Children's Day, the Communist world will extoll virtues of the Communist child eager in tasks assigned by the party and loyal in spying upon their own parents. Mother's Day will be commemorated, not in intimate family circles, but—under direct orders of the Communist regimes—in squares, mines, factories, and offices, with medals for mothers who exceed the quota of child-production for slavery. In July, a World Congress of Mothers, masterminded by Communists, will aim its propaganda at the hearts of all mothers of the free world, with appeals for banning atomic war and for world peace. Before this propaganda is unleashed, let us declare the American people's dedication to world peace, repeatedly attested by their foreign policy and their generous help to needy parts of the world. Let us tell the Communist propagandists that American mothers heed warnings such as those the women for freedom of Europe address to them on Mother's Day. Among their membership, which units American and foreign-born women, are eyewitnesses to the Soviet-made peace which brought slavery to their homelands behind the Iron Curtain. Their tragic experience is an important lesson, and their sincere warnings are most timely. American mothers love peace, yet never at the price of freedom and loss of the dignity of man.

PROPOSED MEETING WITH SOVIET TOP OFFICIALS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for 7½ minutes on the subject of the proposed top-level meeting with Soviet officials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there has been much talk about a meeting with the Soviet officials at the top level. One may hazard the guess that a good deal of pressure is being brought to bear on our President to agree to the holding of such a conference.

In my point of view, Mr. President, this proposal opens up great possibilities, but also great dangers; and I am sure the President is aware of both. Nevertheless, it might be worthwhile to state them on the floor of the United States Senate at this time.

Any such conference without agenda, or with agenda which cover a wide range of subjects, is bound to be a failure. It would afford a wonderful stage for the devious, complicated diplomatic diversions in which the Soviet representatives have so successful an experience. On the other hand, if the conference is devoted to the one subject of universal, complete, controlled disarmament, it might bear fruit for all mankind.

The conference might be between the heads of state of the three European powers, the Soviet Government and the United States, or, alternatively, on a broader basis it might include Bulganin, Eden, Nehru, Mao, Faure, Adenauer, St. Laurent, Chiang, and Hotoyama. The decision as to this matter might well be left with the President. Let them meet without detailed agenda. Let them meet without a multitudinous and cluttering secretariat. Let each have at the most 1 assistant in the conference room, and 3 or 4 interpreters and recorders. Let it be a discussion between responsible and concerned leaders of nations, not between State Departments and Foreign Offices.

It would be a new kind of meeting. Let them first of all determine whether they can agree to treat disarmament as a matter of prime importance, regardless of whether they will agree to make it the first order of business for all their countries. This is the thing to talk about first. At the beginning, let us avoid having lower officials meet and work up gradually to a conference of top officials. This procedure, which is the normal one in such matters, bogs down in disputes over detail, and gets nowhere. Let us find out where each nation stands on the fundamentals of peace.

If there were a meeting of minds on the first question, that of the priority of disarmament, the conferees could go on to further discussions. They could deal with such basic questions as the kind of disarmament they contemplate. For example, would it be complete disarmament down to the level of lightly armed and strongly limited forces for internal order only? Would they be willing to go beyond the mere reduction or limitation of armaments? Only if national forces are abolished can there be hope of abolishing international war. Would they consider a disarmament which would be achieved quickly, or one which would be achieved over a considerable period, such as 10 years, and be subject to careful

supervision at each stage? It would be very important, indeed, to have each government submit to such verification, carried out under international auspices, with complete freedom of inspection and complete authority of control. That our own Government has offered to do.

The conferees must finally reach a consideration of the means for establishing a world military force to protect every nation against possible violations. They could discuss the strength of such a force, how it should be recruited, commanded, equipped, where it should be stationed. Will they agree that the best form for a disarmament plan is by way of a thorough revision of the United Nations Charter? Or will they have in mind the dubious alternative of a universal treaty outside the charter, despite the fact that the necessary world machinery would completely overshadow the United Nations?

These are a few absolutely basic questions which would naturally arise, even in a broad and general conference at the summit; but the conference would not engage in detailed negotiation. After a broad exchange of views, it would delegate to subordinates the long and painful job of working out the detailed disarmament plan. It would admittedly leave out of consideration the captive nations. But their status would improve with the curtain pierced by the administration of disarmament. The practical reasons for holding them in slavery would disappear in a disarmed Europe, with their captor free to devote the great resources of Russia to the well-being of the nations within her geographic boundaries.

This project of universal, complete, controlled disarmament is, in fact, in the interests of the Soviet Government and the Russian people. If such disarmament should go into effect, the Soviet Government could devote itself to the well-being of the Russian people, and thereby could firmly establish itself. Let us find out by means of this conference whether the Soviets have a clear vision of their own self-interest, as well as that of their people.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD M. KLEBERG, OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with a keen sense of personal loss that I announce the news of the death during the past weekend of Mr. Richard M. Kleberg, Sr., of Kingsville, Tex.

Mr. Kleberg served for 12 years as a Representative in Congress from the 14th District of Texas, ending his service in 1944. I was privileged at one time to be a member of his staff. In fact, my first job in Washington was as his secretary in 1935.

Mr. Kleberg was a cattleman all his life. He was chairman of the board of the King Ranch Corp., which owns the vast King Ranch. He possessed in full measure the proud independence and sturdy self-reliance that are traditional virtues of the Texas cattleman. As a Member of Congress, he stood forthrightly for the principles which had been ingrained in him as a youth.

Dick Kleberg was a worthy citizen of Texas and of America. His passing shrinks still further the ranks of those who bridged the time gap between the cattle frontier of yesterday and the first decade of the second half of the 20th century.

This great Texan is survived by his widow; a son, Richard, Jr., three daughters, a brother, and two sisters. Mr. President, I wish today to express to these survivors my heartfelt sympathy in their loss and to voice publicly my gratitude for the opportunity that was afforded me, as a young man, to be associated with a great American like Dick Kleberg.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have learned with deep regret of the death of former Representative Richard M. Kleberg, Sr., of Kingsville, Tex. Our State has lost one of its most colorful citizens. Lawyer, banker, rancher, and statesman, Richard Kleberg devoted much of his life to raising cattle and fine horses.

Along with Robert Kleberg, and other heirs of Capt. Richard King, Richard Kleberg helped build the King Ranch into the most famous and largest ranch in the world. They developed the Santa Gertrudis breed of cattle and produced some of the world's finest race and quarter horses.

Richard Kleberg was known to many Members of the Senate who were in Congress when he was a Member of the House. I am sure that they join me today in expressing sympathy to the members of his family.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from today's Washington Post and Times Herald, announcing the death of Mr. Kleberg, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. M. KLEBERG DIES; HEADED KING RANCH

Richard M. Kleberg, Sr., 68, chairman of the board of the multi-million-dollar King Ranch Corp. and a former Member of the House of Representatives from Texas, died of a heart attack yesterday in Hot Springs, Ark.

As one of the owners of the 102-year-old agricultural-industrial empire at Kingsville, Kleberg County, Tex., he had devoted most of his life to cattle raising.

The former Representative (1932–44), banker, lawyer, and rancher, a red-blooded Texan, known for his quality of making many friends, had spent his last 10 years developing the King Ranch, one of the world's biggest.

His ranch, which covers 1,250,000 acres, has branched out into Pennsylvania and Kentucky, Cuba, Australia, and Brazil. Its land in Texas alone is equal to a strip of land a half mile wide and 3,000 miles long, running from New England to California.

It encompasses entire villages, complete with schools, and some of its 650 ranch employees spent their entire lives on the ranch, as did their fathers and grandfathers before them.

Bought by Capt. Richard King in 1843 when it was a modest 15,000 acres, the ranch had expanded to about half its present size by 1925 under the guidance of King and his son-in-law, the late Robert Justus Kleberg.

Ten years later the ranch was divided among heirs, and Richard Mifflin Kleberg, grandson of Richard King, was made chairman of the board.

Born near Kingsville, Mr. Kleberg attended public schools and was graduated from the University of Texas at Austin in 1911. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1909.

He was elected as a Democrat to the 72d Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Harry M. Wurzbach. He was reelected to the 73d and to the 5 succeeding Congresses.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as one Senator on this side of the aisle, I should like to join in the sentiments expressed by the two distinguished Senators from Texas relative to the passing of former Representative Kleberg.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senators from Texas in the sentiments they have expressed upon the passing of former Representative Richard Kleberg. It was my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives with Dick, as we called him. He was always a gentleman, and his public career demonstrated that he was a statesman. He rendered great and valuable service to his State and to the Nation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

TREATIES OF FRIENDSHIP WITH GERMANY AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING WITH PANAMA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, transmitting certain treaties, and calls this matter to the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 84th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, together with a protocol and two exchanges of notes relating thereto, signed at Washington on October 29, 1954, and Executive F, 84th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of mutual understanding and cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, and the memorandum of understandings reached, signed in the English and Spanish languages at Panama on January 25, 1955, and that the treaties, together with the President's messages, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears no objection.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, together with a protocol and two exchanges of notes relating thereto, signed at Washington on October 29, 1954.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Washington on October 29, 1954. 3. Two exchanges of notes, signed at Washington on October 29, 1954, with translations of German language notes.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit the Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, and the Memorandum of Understandings Reached, signed in the English and Spanish languages at Panama on January 25, 1955.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State, with an accompanying explanatory statement, concerning the treaty and the memorandum.

It is urged that the Senate give favorable consideration to the treaty in order, as indicated in the preamble thereof, "further to demonstrate the mutual understanding and cooperation of the two countries and to strengthen the bonds of understanding and friendship between their respective peoples."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying explanatory statement. 2. Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation, signed January 25, 1955, with Panama. 3. Memorandum of Understandings Reached, signed January 25, 1955, with Panama.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal, division No. 2, district of Alaska.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John T. Williams, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice William Ernest Smith, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James B. Conant to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations on the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADVANCES TO ALASKA FROM THE FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1650.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, last year the Congress passed the Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1954, Public Law 587, 83d Congress. The purpose of the act was to make it possible for the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, on application of their respective governors, to obtain advances from the Federal fund to finance their unemployment insurance programs under specified conditions.

However, subsequently the Attorney General of the United States, in an opinion rendered to the Department of the Interior, held that under section 9 of the Alaska Organic Act, an act passed by the Congress in 1912 setting up the present civil government for Alaska, the Territory could not apply for benefits under the 1954 act because of a provision in the section prohibiting the incurrence of debt.

The Attorney General construed the provisions of the 1954 Federal act to be an incurrence of debt within the prohibition of the 1912 Alaskan Organic Act.

Very clearly Congress intended, when it passed the 1954 act, to waive the provision in the Alaskan Organic Act relating to the incurrence of debt with respect to application of the Social Security Act.

However, because of the Attorney General's ruling, it was necessary to introduce Senate bill 1650. This bill merely provides that the Governor of Alaska, in accordance with the conditions of the 1954 act, may make application for assistance under the 1954 law. Thus, S. 1650 would carry out the clear intent of the 83d Congress in specifically extending the provisions of Public Law 587 to include Alaska and Hawaii.

The situation at the present time in Alaska is that Territorial funds to pay unemployment insurance benefits have been exhausted. They were depleted on March 22, and the Territory then advanced money from its general fund to the extent of $1 million. However, a taxpayer's suit has prevented further use of general funds and at the present time there is no money available to pay unemployment insurance compensation claims in Alaska. Hence, an emergency exists which requires action by the Congress to make it possible for the Territory of Alaska to be on an equal footing with the Territory of Hawaii and the 48 States under the provisions and benefits provided in the Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1954. Prompt action is necesary in order to prevent suffering and hardship being inflicted on the jobless and their families, and to prevent economic dislocation.

I may state, Mr. President, that Department of Labor officials gave expert testimony before the committee to the effect that the Territory has taken the necessary steps to deal with the situation and that the Alaska fund would become solvent in a relatively short time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska, or any other act of Congress, or any of the Territorial laws, to the contrary, to obtain from the Federal unemployment fund, established pursuant to the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954 (Public Law 567, 83d Cong., approved Aug. 5, 1954), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the Territory of Alaska may qualify for and as may be necessary to obtain for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to claimants entitled thereto under the Alaska employment security law.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS ERRONEOUSLY CONVEYED TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 270, S. 824.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 824) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 5, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 5. The following-described land containing 39.84 acres, more or less, shall be conveyed to Harvey F. Jones and Joan E. Jones, husband and wife, of Wilbur, Washington: All that portion of the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 14, township 28 north, range 33 east, Willamette meridian, lying southerly of a line described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 14 which bears north 00 degrees 09 minutes 30 seconds west 1,268.17 feet from the quarter section corner on the south line of said section 14 and running thence north 75 degrees 29 minutes 15 seconds east 180.91 feet, thence north 89 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds east 1,214.93 feet; thence north 85 degrees 49 minutes 39 seconds east 1,240.11 feet to a point on the east line of said section 14 which bears north 00 degrees 13 minutes 58 seconds west 1,404.31 feet from the southeast corner of said section 14.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed in accordance with the following sections of this act all of the right, title, and interest of the United States, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, in and to the lands described in such sections, which were erroneously conveyed to the United States.

(b) Such conveyances shall be subject to the following donation easements and releases:

(1) Donation easement and release from Walter McAviney and Gertrude H. McAviney, wife, to the United States of America, dated March 2, 1954, and recorded in book 151 of deeds, pages 130 and 133, records of Stevens County, Wash.;

(2) Donation easement and release from Walter Thomas McAviney and Winifred Joyce McAviney, his wife, to the United States of America, dated March 2, 1954, and recorded in book 151 of deeds, page 131, records of Stevens County, Wash.; and

(3) Donation easement and release from Cull A. White and Katherine M. White, his wife, to the United States of America, dated March 1, 1954, but not recorded in the Ferry County records.

SEC. 2. The following-described lands shall be conveyed to Walter McAviney and Gertrude H. McAviney, husband and wife, of Gifford, Wash.:

(a) A parcel of land containing 11.81 acres, more or less, being all that portion of the following-described tract of land lying in lot 3 less the northerly 375.0 feet thereof, of section 4, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian: Beginning at the southeast corner of said lot 3 (which corner is identical to the quarter section corner on the east line of said section 4) and running thence north 89 degrees 52 minutes 8 seconds west along the south line of said lot 3 for a distance of 582.52 feet; thence north 8 degrees 52 minutes 00 seconds west 337.28 feet; thence north 16 degrees 53 minutes 00 seconds east 175.0 feet; thence south 64 degrees 57 minutes 00 seconds east 70.03 feet; thence north 13 degrees 36 minutes 00 seconds east 63.79 feet; thence north 33 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds west 85.18 feet; thence north 20 degrees 29 minutes 40 seconds east 491.71 feet; thence north 55 degrees 10 minutes 20 seconds east 239.34 feet; thence north 17 degrees 21 minutes 50 seconds east 122.85 feet to a point on the north line of said lot 3; thence south 89 degrees 52 minutes 11 seconds east 114.43 feet along the north line of said lot 3 to the northeast corner thereof; thence south 1 degree 24 minutes 52 seconds east along the east line of said lot 3 for a distance of 1,320.07 feet to the point of beginning; said parcel of land also being described as all that portion of lot 3 of said section 4, less the northerly 375.0 feet thereof, lying easterly of the boundary traverse of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly known as the Columbia River Reservoir); and

(b) A tract of land containing 0.36 of an acre, more or less, being that portion of lot 1, section 4, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian, described by metes and bounds as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 1 of said section 4 and running thence north 89 degrees 52 minutes 11 seconds west along the south line of said lot 1 a distance of 114.43 feet; thence north 17 degrees 21 minutes 50 seconds east 156.08 feet; thence north 38 degrees 11 minutes 50 seconds east 100.59 feet to a point on the east line of said lot 1; thence south 1 degree 24 minutes 52 seconds east along the east line of said lot 1 a distance of 228.35 feet to the point of beginning; said tract of land also being described as that portion of lot 1 of said section 4 lying easterly of the boundary traverses of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly known as the Columbia River Reservoir).

SEC. 3. The following-described land shall be conveyed to Walter T. McAviney and Winifred McAviney, husband and wife, of Gifford, Wash.: A tract of land containing 2.20 acres, more or less, being all that portion of the north 375.0 feet of lot 3 of section 4, township 32 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian, lying easterly of the easterly line of the right-of-way for abandoned Primary State Highway No. 22, excepting therefrom that portion heretofore conveyed to the United States of America by warranty deed from Ollie Winings (sometimes known as Ollie Winnings), as guardian of the estate of Verva Yeager (nee Gifford) and Roland Gifford, minors, dated November 21, 1938, and recorded in book 103 of deeds, at page 619 under auditor's file No. 17027, records of Stevens County, Wash., and by warranty deed from Elmer J. Gifford, and others, dated August 1, 1938, and recorded in book 103 of deeds, at page 435, under auditor's file No. 168052, records of Stevens County, Wash.; said tract of land also being described as that portion of the north 375.0 feet of lot 3 of said section 4 lying easterly of the boundary of Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (formerly known as Columbia River Reservoir).

SEC. 4. The following-described land shall be conveyed to Cull A. White and Katherine M. White, husband and wife, of Quincy, Wash.: The east half of the west half of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 9, township 28 north, range 32 east, Willamette meridian.

SEC. 5. The following-described land containing 39.84 acres, more or less, shall be conveyed to Harvey F. Jones and Joan E. Jones, husband and wife, of Wilbur, Wash.: All that portion of the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 14, township 28 north, range 33 east, Willamette meridian, lying southerly of a line described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 14 which bears north 00 degrees 09 minutes 30 seconds west 1,268.17 feet from the quarter section corner on the south line of said section 14 and running thence north 75 degrees 29 minutes 15 seconds east 180.91 feet, thence north 89 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds east 1,214.93 feet; thence north 85 degrees 49 minutes 39 seconds east 1,240.11 feet to a point on the east line of said section 14 which bears north 00 degrees 13 minutes 58 seconds west 1,404.31 feet from the southeast corner of said section 14.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this is a very simple bill. It has for its purpose correcting an error made in the Department of the Interior, which erroneously conveyed certain land. The bill has the approval of the Department of the Interior and of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINERAL INTERESTS IN LANDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 250, S. 748.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 748) to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill would merely fix the policy of the Federal Government with regard to the taking and expropriation of mineral rights belonging to citizens. In many instances the Government has unnecessarily condemned and expropriated such mineral rights. The bill provides that the Government shall take the mineral rights of citizens only when the Government finds it necessary to do so, or when the use to which the Government intends to put

the land would be impracticable or infeasible if the Government did not take the mineral rights.

In the past a considerable number of complaints have been made, in most instances by citizens who, on the basis of good legal advice, have taken the precaution to protect their mineral rights when the Government has sought to acquire their land. It is unfortunately true, however, that many persons who have not had legal advice did not resist the taking of their mineral rights, and therefore in many instances, the Federal Government has unnecessarily deprived them of their mineral rights.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the Federal Government now owns more than 25 percent of all the land in the United States, and it already has mineral rights to all the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. Therefore, in most cases, there is no real need for the Federal Government to condemn or to expropriate mineral rights of citizens. The pending bill sets forth the conditions under which the Federal Government may take mineral rights if it finds it to be necessary to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) except as provided in section 2, whenever the United States acquires any land, by any means whatsoever, it shall not acquire any mineral rights or interests in or in connection with such land.

(b) Except as provided in section 2, every deed conveying land to the United States which is executed after the date of enactment of this act pursuant to negotiations carried on, and a consideration agreed upon, after such date shall contain a specific reservation of all mineral interests in such land to the transferor thereof. The provisions of subsection (a) shall be effective notwithstanding that any such deed does not contain the reservation required by this subsection.

(c) Except as provided in section 2, every judgment in proceedings for condemnation of land instituted by the United States after the date of enactment of this act shall contain a specific reservation of all mineral interests in such land to the defendant in such proceedings. The provisions of subsection (a) shall be effective notwithstanding that any such judgment does not contain the reservation required by this subsection.

SEC. 2. (a) The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to the acquisition by the United States of mineral interests in and to land acquired by the United States in any case in which the head of the department, agency, instrumentality, or independent establishment acquiring such land determines, and the deed or the judgment in proceedings for condemnation of such land recites, that—

(1) the acquisition of such mineral interests is necessary to serve the purpose for which the land is being acquired; or

(2) the national security requires that the United States own all right, title, and interest, including mineral interests, in and to the land being acquired; or

(3) the use to which the United States intends to put such land renders its development for mineral purposes infeasible.

(b) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter or amend any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "United States" includes all departments, agencies, instrumentalities, and independent establishments of the Government of the United States.

INCREASE OF LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO DESERT LANDS UNDER THE NONMINERAL LAND LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 254, S. 265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 265) to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "who", to insert "prior to the date of approval of this act"; in line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "this act" and insert "such acts, as hereby amended", and at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "July 17, 1914," and insert "June 28, 1934", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands," approved June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. 583), is amended by deleting the following: "no desert entry made under the provisions of this act shall contain more than 160 acres, and."

SEC. 2. The first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, or asphaltic minerals," approved July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509), is amended by deleting the following: "; but no desert entry made under the provisions of this act shall contain more than 160 acres."

SEC. 3. Any person who, prior to the date of approval of this act, has made a valid desert-land entry on lands subject to such act of June 22, 1910, or of July 17, 1914, may, if otherwise qualified, enter as a personal privilege, not assignable, an additional tract of desert land subject to the provisions of such acts, as hereby amended, and section 7 of the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269; 1272; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315f). Such additional tract shall not, together with the original entry, exceed 320 acres. The holder of an additional entry authorized under this section shall comply with all the requirements of the desert-land law on the lands embraced by such additional entry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, last year the Senate passed a bill similar to the pending bill, but the House of Representatives failed to take action on it. I hope that if this bill is passed by the Senate, it will receive favorable consideration by the House.

The purpose of the bill is to bring about conformity with regard to three different laws affecting nonmineral desert-homestead entries. Under the act of 1877, such entries may be made for a total of not more than 320 acres. However, under the acts of June 22, 1910, and July 17, 1914, only 160 acres are permitted under desert entries.

The pending bill would make entries of 320 acres possible on a uniform basis under each of those laws. The minerals are reserved under each act.

The bill will not affect in any way the provisions of the Reclamation Act regarding acreage limitations.

The bill has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and of the Bureau of the Budget, and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STRENGTHENING OF INVESTIGATION PROVISIONS OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 272, S. 1398.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1398) to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana to give a brief explanation of S. 1398, the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to permit witnesses to be subpenaed for the purpose of investigations under the Commodity Exchange Act. At present witnesses may be subpenaed for the purpose of proceedings, but not investigations. This additional authority would strengthen administration of the Commodity Exchange Act, and in some cases might make the institution of formal proceedings unnecessary. The substance of this

bill was included in S. 1990, which was considered and passed by the Senate in the last session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 6 (b) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U. S. C. 15) is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of securing effective enforcement of the provisions of this act, and for the purpose of any investigation or proceeding under this act, the provisions, including penalties, of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended and supplemented (49 U. S. C. 12, 46, 47, 48), relating to the attendance and testimony of witnesses, the production of documentary evidence, and the immunity of witnesses, are made applicable to the power, jurisdiction, and authority of the Secretary of Agriculture (or any person designated by him), the commission, and any referee designated pursuant to the provisions of this act, and to any person subject thereto."

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if it is his intention to call up today Order No. 271, Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; that joint resolution was passed over at the request of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to propose an amendment to the bill. If the amendment is satisfactory and can be agreed to, I shall not interpose an objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader did not plan to move to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill at this time. If the Senator from Illinois will discuss his amendment with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who reported the bill, it may be possible to consider the bill later today, provided it is not controversial.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

INDEMNITY FOR LOSSES CAUSED BY DESTRUCTION OF SWINE AND SWINE CARCASSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 273, S. 1133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1133) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954, in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine and swine carcasses infected with vesicular exanthema.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the bill authorizes the Federal Government to participate with the State of Iowa in paying indemnities for certain swine which were killed prior to the authorization which the State of Iowa eventually gave for its participation in the program. That authorization was given at the present session of the legislature of Iowa. It is necessary to pass the pending bill in order to authorize the participation of the Federal Government.

So far as the Federal Government is concerned, the amount of money involved is approximately $30,000, which is about half the total of about $60,000. In other words, the Federal Government would pay half the cost and the State of Iowa would pay the other half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to indemnify in an amount equal to 50 percent, but not exceeding the indemnity paid by the State in which such losses and expenses were incurred by all persons whose swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses were destroyed, treated, or processed, under authority of law, in July 1954, as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease known as vesicular exanthema.

SEC. 2. The payment of indemnities under the provisions of this act shall be limited, in the absence of Federal appraisal, to those losses and expenses where required proof of such losses and expenses has been made to the State in which such losses and expenses were incurred and 50 percent of such loss and expense has been paid by such State.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be made from funds currently available to the Department of Agriculture.

EXEMPTION FROM PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES HELD AS PRISONERS BY COMMUNISTIC-CONTROLLED AUTHORITIES—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1653, for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by Communistic-controlled authorities, be indefinitely postponed for the reason that there has been other proposed legislation introduced in both Houses which is now pending before the appropriate committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1653 is indefinitely postponed.

PROTECTION OF INNOCENT PURCHASERS OF FUNGIBLE GOODS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 274, House bill 1831.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "warehouseman", to insert "or other dealer"; in line 10, after the word "was", to strike out "also" and insert "regularly engaged"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "warehouseman" and insert "seller"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "warehouseman's" and insert "seller's"; and in line 8, after the word "goods", to insert "To be entitled to relief under this section a buyer must assert as an affirmative defense and establish by a preponderance of the evidence the facts necessary to entitle him to such relief."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation for conversion, where the purchase was made for value in good faith and in the ordinary course of business from a person regularly engaged in the buying and selling of such goods. It covers existing claims, which amount to approximately $3½ million, as well as possible future claims.

The bill provides a special rule for the Corporation not applicable to other depositors of grain, because the facts appear to require a special rule. The Corporation has in storage extensive quantities of grain, the amount far surpassing that stored by any other depositor. When a number of warehousemen converted the Corporation's grain several years ago and the Corporation elected to follow the grain into the hands of those who purchased it, the entire industry was confronted with a serious problem. The purchasers, many of whom had no way of knowing or determining that grain belonged to the Corporation, now face substantial losses; and every person who purchases grains knows that he runs a risk against which he cannot protect himself. On the other hand the Corporation, because it is a large depositor, is in a better position to protect itself through bonds, inspection, and other means.

The general rule which permits these claims against innocent purchasers has been widely criticized by lawyers, and its change has been recommended in the Uniform Commercial Code by the American Law Institute and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform

State Laws, with the approval of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. This bill would change the general rule insofar as it relates to the Corporation's claims.

As passed by the House the bill applied only to goods sold by a warehouseman who was also a dealer in such goods. This might protect the purchaser of grain from a warehouseman who was also a dealer, but subsequent purchasers would have no way of determing the facts and would, therefore, be forced to continue to make purchases of grain at their peril. The committee amendments, therefore, extend the bill to cover fungible goods sold by any dealer regularly engaged in buying and selling such goods provided, of course, that the purchase of such goods was otherwise within the provisions of the bill.

The committee amendments would also add a final sentence to the bill making it clear that the buyer has the burden of proving the facts necessary to entitle him to the special defense provided by the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From reading the language of the bill itself, I am a little unclear as to its meaning. If a buyer purchases goods and believes that the title in them is good, I am wondering whether the amendment on page 2, line 8, would require him to set up an affirmative defense. Why should he have to set up an affirmative defense? I should think that the other side would have to set up an affirmative defense.

Mr. ELLENDER. The buyer might be sued by the Commodity Credit Corporation for conversion if it were the owner of the goods. Then the buyer would have to set up as an affirmative defense that his purchase was made in good faith, in the regular course of business, from a person regularly engaged in the grain business, and the other elements necessary under the bill to constitute a defense. The language referred to makes it clear that the buyer has the burden of proof in making this defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the purpose is to provide an affirmative defense which the buyer must prove by a preponderance of the evidence, if the second seller does not have title to the goods. Otherwise, he is liable for the goods.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation."

DONATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 275, Senate bill 614.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 614) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of the General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended by renumbering subsection (1) of section 203 as subsection "(m)" and adding subsection (l) as follows:

"(l) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate to the American National Red Cross, for charitable purposes, such property, which was processed, produced, or donated by the American National Red Cross, as shall have been determined to be surplus property."

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 276, Senate bill 1007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1007) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington give us a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to establish a central statutory depository for agreements or compacts between the several States, for proper preservation and for servicing by the archival services of the General Services Administration. Its approval would further implement the purposes of Reorganization Plan No. 20 of 1950, which transferred from the Secretary of State to the Administrator of General Services functions having no connection with the conduct of foreign affairs, in order to establish a centralized records management service. The bill is permissive and not mandatory, and its primary objective is to aid the States by providing a central governmental depository for such compacts and agreements, and a medium through which appropriate inquiries may be cleared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) By adding a new subsection (g) to section 507 to read as follows:

"(g) The Administrator is hereby authorized to receive duplicate originals or duly authenticated copies of agreements or compacts entered into, pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, between States now or hereafter admitted to the Union, and to take all necessary actions for their preservation and servicing."

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 277, Senate bill 1727.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to provide basic legislative authority for certain authorization provisions which have been included from year to year in the Treasury appropriation acts.

I may say that the provisions would have been subject to a point of order if such a point of order had been raised.

A draft of the bill was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury, with a request for its enactment into law in order to avoid possible points of order which might be raised against such provisions.

The basic legislative authority is considered desirable with respect to the specific items contained in the bill, which have been approved annually in the enactment of the Treasury appropriation acts.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, has advised the committee that the bill "would be advantageous to the legislative process," and that "certainly basic legislative authority is preferable to continuing such provisions in annual appropriation bills, subject as they are to a point of order."

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in a letter addressed to the committee, commented as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to provide basic authority for the legislative provisions in the

bill which have been included each year in Treasury Department appropriation acts. Since points of order might be raised with respect to these items, basic legislation is desirable. It is recommended that your committee give favorable consideration to this bill.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury may make the following expenditures:

(a) Expenditures for arms and ammunition required by civilian employees of the Department of the Treasury in the performance of their official duties.

(b) Expenditures to reimburse Federal Reserve banks and branches for necessary expenses for services performed as Government depositaries and as fiscal agents of the United States.

(c) Expenditures not to exceed $10,000 per annum for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic-law violators who are fugitives from justice.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept services without compensation in connection with the program for the sale of United States public-debt obligations.

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (40 Stat. 292; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 760), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "During any period for which a definite appropriation has been made for expenses for which this section makes as indefinite appropriation, the definite appropriation shall be available under the terms of this section and the indefinite appropriation shall not be available for obligation."

RECIPROCAL FIRE-PROTECTION AGREEMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 278, Senate bill 1006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1006) to authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That as used in this act—

(a) The term "agency head" means the head of any executive department, military department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government;

(b) The term "fire protection" includes personal services and equipment required for fire prevention, the protection of life and property from fire, and fire fighting; and

(c) The term "fire organization" means any governmental entity or public or private corporation or association maintaining fire protection facilities within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and any governmental entity or public or private corporation or association which maintains fire protection facilities in any foreign country in the vicinity of any installation of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) Each agency head charged with the duty of providing fire protection for any property of the United States is authorized to enter into a reciprocal agreement, with any fire organization maintaining fire protection facilities in the vicinity of such property, for mutual aid in furnishing fire protection for such property and for other property for which such organization normally provides fire protection. Each such agreement shall include a waiver by each party of all claims against every other party for compensation for any loss, damage, personal injury, or death occurring in consequence of the performance of such agreement. Any such agreement may provide for the reimbursement of any party for all or any part of the cost incurred by such party in furnishing fire protection for or on behalf of any other party.

(b) Any agreement heretofore executed which would have been authorized by this act, if this act had been in effect on the date of execution thereof, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

SEC. 3. In the absence of any agreement authorized or ratified by section 2, each agency head is authorized to render emergency assistance in extinguishing fires and is preserving life and property from fire, within the vicinity of any place at which such agency maintains fire-protection facilities, when the rendition of such assistance is determined, under regulations prescribed by the agency head, to be in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 4. Any service performed under section 2 or section 3 of this act, by any officer or employee of the United States or any member of any armed force of the United States shall constitute service rendered in line of duty in such office, employment, or force. The performance of such service by any other individual shall not constitute such individual an officer or employee of the United States for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended.

SEC. 5. Funds available to any agency head for fire protection on installations or in connection with activities under the jurisdiction of such agency may be used to carry out the purposes of this act. All sums received by any agency head for fire protection rendered pursuant to this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill was submitted to the Senate by the Department of the Navy on behalf of the Department of Defense, with a request for its enactment. It would authorize executive branch department and agency heads, including the heads of the military departments, to enter into mutual-aid-fire-protection agreements with local governmental units, public or private organizations, or foreign governmental public or private units, engaged in fire-fighting activities near Federal installations or activities. It would establish no new policy, but would merely provide statutory sanction for a practice which has been in effect for a number of years, but which, in 1952, was held by the Comptroller General to constitute an unauthorized use of appropriated funds, in the absence of specific congressional authority.

The primary objective of the measure would be to authorize the continuation of this long-established practice which enables the Federal Government to provide maximum fire protection for its installations and activities throughout the world at a minimum cost by utilizing local civilian fire-protection personnel and facilities on a reciprocal basis, thus obviating the necessity for maintaining the large numbers of fire-fighting personnel and expensive equipment which would otherwise be necessary for the adequate protection of these installations and properties.

The bill has the full approval of the appropriate agencies of the executive branch of the Government, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes."

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 271, Senate Joint Resolution 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments on page 10, line 22, after the word "An", to strike out "S. J. Res. 42—2", and on page 11, line 3, after "September 1", to strike out "1951" and insert "1955", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was signed in the city of Dallas, Tex., the 16th day of February 1935 by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and at the same time and place was signed by the representatives, as a recommendation for approval to the governors and legislatures of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and prior to August 27, 1935, said compact was presented to and approval by the legislatures and governors of the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, which said compact so approved by the six States last above named was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress, and the Congress gave consent to such compact by House Joint Resolution 407, approved August 27, 1935 (Public Res. No. 64, 74th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period

of 2 years from September 1, 1937, by an agreement executed as of the 10th day of May 1937 by the representatives of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, Illinois, and Colorado, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 183, approved August 10, 1937 (Public Res. No. 57, 75th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1939, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Michigan, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 329, approved July 20, 1939 (Public Res. No. 31, 76th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1941, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois, Michigan, Arkansas, Louisiana, New York, and Pennsylvania, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 228, approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 246, 77th Cong.), and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, by an agreement executed and ratified by representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Louisiana, and Kentucky, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 139, approved July 7, 1943 (Public Law 117, 78th Cong.) and thereafter the representatives of the States of Montana, West Virginia, Alabama, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida, Tennessee, and Indiana executed counterparts of said agreement, and said counterparts so executed were deposited in the Department of State of the United States; and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of September 1947 by an agreement executed and ratified by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Indiana, which was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress, and Congress gave its consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 122 (Public Law 184, 80th Cong.); and thereafter the representatives of the States of Kentucky, Illinois, Mississippi, and Michigan executed counterparts of said agreement, which executed counterparts were deposited in the Department of State of the United States; and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of September 1951, by an agreement executed and ratified by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia, which was deposited in the Department of State of the United States and such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress and Congress gave its consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 42 (82d Cong., 1st sess.); and thereafter the representatives of the States of Illinois, Kansas, North Dakota, and Nebraska executed counterparts of said agreement which executed counterparts were deposited in the Department of State of the United States.

The agreement to extend and renew said compact for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, to September 1, 1959, duly executed by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virvinia, has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and reads as follows:

AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Whereas, on the 16th day of February 1935, in the city of Dallas, Tex., there was executed "An Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas" which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"Article I

"This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"Article II

"The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"Article III

"Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

"(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any State.

"Article IV

"Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"Article V

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"Article VI

"Each State joining herein shall appoint 1 representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, the duty of which said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said Commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"Article VII

"No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"Article VIII

"This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein, may upon 60 days notice, withdraw herefrom.

"The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified."

Whereas the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1955; and

Whereas it is desired to renew and extend the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, to September 1, 1959: Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

It is hereby agreed that the compact entitled "An Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas" executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., on the 16th day of February 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby

is, extended for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1955, its present date of expiration. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in article I of the original compact.

The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which is deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

Executed by the several undersigned States, at their several State capitols, through their proper officials on the dates as shown, as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State legislatures.

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,
By GORDON PERSONS, *Governor.*
Dated: June 29, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] MRS. AGNES BAGGETT,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF ARKANSAS,
By FRANCIS CHERRY, *Governor.*
Dated: June 14, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF COLORADO,
By DAN THORNTON, *Governor.*
Dated: May 3, 1934.
Attest:
[SEAL] HOMER M. BRUCE,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,
By CHARLEY E. JOHNS, *Governor.*
Dated: September 13, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,
By ----------, *Governor.*
Dated: -------
Attest:
[SEAL] ------ ------,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF INDIANA,
By GEORGE N. CRAIG, *Governor.*
Dated: May 21, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF KANSAS,
By EDWARD F. ARN, *Governor.*
Dated: November 18, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF KENTUCKY,
By LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY, *Governor.*
Dated: October 19, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA,
By ROBERT F. KENNON, *Governor.*
Dated: July 5, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] J. R. NELSON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,
By G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, *Governor.*
Dated: December 14, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] OWEN J. CLEARY,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
By HUGH L. WHITE, *Governor.*
Dated: August 19, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA,
By J. HUGO ARONSON, *Governor.*
Dated: May 26, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.
By: CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

THE STATE OF NEBRASKA,
By ROBERT B. CROSBY, *Governor.*
Dated: June 22, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
By EDWIN L. MECHEM, *Governor.*
Dated: May 12, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] BEATRICE B. ROACH,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
By THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Governor.*
Dated: October 7, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] RUTH M. MINER,
Executive Deputy
(For Secretary of State).

THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
By C. NORMAN BURNSDALE, *Governor.*
Dated: August 16, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.
By FRANK DIETTMAN,
Deputy.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
By FRANK J. LAUSCHE, *Governor.*
Dated: July 26, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] TED W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
By JOHNSTON MURRAY, *Governor.*
Dated: April 1, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] JOHN D. CONNER,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
By JOHN S. FINE, *Governor.*
Dated: August 27, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] GENE D. SMITH,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TENNESSEE,
By FRANK G. CLEMENT, *Governor.*
Dated: August 10, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] G. EDWARD FRIAR,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
By ALLAN SHIVERS, *Governor.*
Dated: April 27, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] HOWARD CARNEY,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
By WILLIAM C. MARLAND, *Governor.*
Dated: November 1, 1954.
Attest:
[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution before us would give approval to the States to enter into a compact covering gas and oil, and has particularly the objective of averting foreseeable waste of these natural resources.

The proposal was first made in 1935. This will be the fifth 4-year extension of the compact. Under the constitutional authority, consent of Congress is required.

I know of no objection to the measure, but my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has an amendment which he proposes to offer. I have examined the text of the amendment. In so far as I can determine, I find it unobjectionable, but if for any reason some modification of language may be necessary when the joint resolution goes to conference, I should like to make a reservation on that point. I see no objection to the amendment otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall, within 1 year from September 1, 1955, and annually thereafter for the duration of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, make a report to the Congress as to whether or not in his opinion the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact (1) have remained with the purpose of such compact as set out in article V thereof, and (2) have resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation or perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production or sale of oil or gas; with the understanding that conservation and the protection of the small producer are the paramount purposes of any rules and regulations issued under the compact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment is designed to help make effective the declaration of purpose in article 5 of the interstate compact. That article, now in the joint resolution, reads as follows:

It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

Mr. President, the purpose stated is excellent, but with the compact in its present form there is no means of ascertaining whether or not the regulations which will be issued will conform to this statement of principles.

The amendment which I have prepared requires an annual report by the Attorney General as to whether or not the stated principles are being observed, and, as a further qualification, the amendment provides that the protection of the small oil producer is a legitimate purpose.

In view of the fact that an interstate compact is an unusual grant of authority, allowed, under the Constitution, only with the consent to Congress, it seems to me it is proper that Congress should have a yearly report on the activities under the compact to see that they are in accordance with the declaration of purpose.

My amendment would at least require the Attorney General to watch the situation and see whether or not the unlimited grant of power which Congress authorizes is in fact being used for the purpose of preventing monopoly, or quasi-monopoly, or the fixing of prices.

I hope my amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 238, Senate Resolution 94, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I should like to make the announcement that if the motion is agreed to, I plan to have the resolution go over, because certain Senators who are interested in the resolution cannot be present at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 94) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that completes the call of bills on the calendar which the Senate is in position to consider today. I hope that when the Senate completes its business today, it can recess until Wednesday. That will give the committees time to consider proposed legislation which it is hoped can be reported this week.

Mr. President, the Senate has passed the urgent deficiency appropriation bill and the additional Department of Justice appropriation bill, and both of those bills have been signed and have become law.

The Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill has been passed by the Senate, and is now in conference. It may be that during the present week the conference report on that bill will be available for consideration of the Senate.

The appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare was passed by the House of Representatives on March 22, and the bill is now in the Senate Appropriations Committee. We hope it will be possible for the Senate to take action on the bill either this week or early next week.

The second supplemental appropriation bill has been signed and has become law.

The Interior Department appropriation bill has been passed by the Senate, and will go to conference.

The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is in conference.

The independent offices appropriation bill was passed by the House of Representatives on March 30, and is still before the Senate Appropriations Committee. I understand that hearings on the bill will resume soon; and it may be that by next week there will be a report from the committee.

The State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill has been the subject of hearings by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I understand that the hearings will conclude this week. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on April 14.

Mr. President, when the Senate meets on Wednesday of this week, I do not know what our schedule will be. It may be the conference report on the postal pay bill will come before the Senate, if the House acts on the report today. It could be that later in the week the hearings on the roads bill will have been concluded and the report on that bill will be ready.

However, so far as I can see at this time, it is not likely that any major proposed legislation will be ready for our consideration on Wednesday.

I hope the Members of the Senate who serve on subcommittees, particularly the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, having before them bills which have not yet been reported, will be able to use the time while the Senate is in recess to get ready to report the bills.

Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, May 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility, designated under subsection (b) of section 504, in the rank indicated:

To be generals

Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, 83A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William K. Phillips, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commandant, National War College.

Rear Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of James F. Adams, O29963, and 284 other officers for promotion or appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of James F. Adams, which is shown on page 5025, and ending with the name of Charles M. Hughes, which appears on page 5026.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the great source of life and light and always seeking to direct and win us to the nobler and more magnanimous ways of living, may our minds and hearts this day be radiant and vibrant with a sense of Thy peace and power.

Grant that in all the perplexing decisions and hard choices of life we may hear and heed Thy voice saying unto us, "This is the way, walk ye therein," for Thy ways are the ways of pleasantness and Thy paths are the paths of peace.

Show us how we may be channels of inspiration and instruments of help and hope in lifting men out of darkness into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

May we come to the close of each day having gained a richer experience of Thy presence, a surer mastery of ourselves, and a deeper and more healing sympathy with struggling humanity.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States;

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 266. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming;

S. 391. An act to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 654. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes;

S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court;

S. 732. An act to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes;

S. 741. An act to extend the provisions of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 755. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war-housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va.;

S. 1488. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

S. 1516. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizens Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; and

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Douglas Edward White, of Louisiana.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5085. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. TABER.

THE LATE HONORABLE RICHARD M. KLEBERG

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce that on yesterday, May 8, 1955, death came to Richard M. Kleberg, of Kleberg County, Tex. Mr. Kleberg was a former distinguished and colorful Member of the Congress of the United States, and he was one of my able predecessors.

Mr. Kleberg was first elected as a Democrat to the 72d Congress to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Harry M. Wurzbach. He was reelected to the 73d, 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, and 78th Congresses, and served from November 24, 1931, to January 3, 1945. Thereafter he resumed ranching activities, and at the time of his death was chairman of the board of the King Ranch, which is probably the greatest ranch in the world.

Mr. Kleberg was highly intelligent, intensely patriotic, and steadfast in his political convictions, and strong in his advocacy of the American system and American way of life.

He did not yield to the popular demand of his time. He remained true to his beliefs and his convictions. He was a colorful Member of this House, a distinguished and able Representative from the 14th District of Texas.

Hon. Richard M. Kleberg was born on the King Ranch, Kleberg County, Tex., November 18, 1887. He attended the public schools, and was graduated from Corpus Christi High School in 1905. He received a degree from the University of Texas in 1911. He studied law and was admitted to the bar of Texas in 1909.

Hon. Richard M. Kleberg was the son of the late Robert Justus and Alice King Kleberg, and from 1913 to 1924 he was active in the management of the vast King Ranch, of Texas, and at the time of his death he was chairman of the board of the King Ranch, the largest ranch in the United States, and one of the world's greatest cattle empires.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mamie Searcy Kleberg, and his son, Richard M. Kleberg, Jr., and 3 daughters, 1 brother, Robert Justus Kleberg III, and 2 sisters, Mrs. T. T. East and Mrs. Tom Armstrong.

Through his efforts and the work of other members of his family, the famous King Ranch, of which he was chairman, developed the only distinctly American breed of cattle known as the Santa Gertrudis. This vast ranch, containing over 1 million acres, has done much to improve animal husbandry and develop sound practices of soil and water conservation along with the preservation of wildlife. Its method of production and management are studied not only by other ranchmen in this country but by governments and individuals of other nations of the earth.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Texas mourns his passing. He was a great Texan; he was a great American.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to learn of the passing of my devoted friend, and a great public servant, Richard Mifflin Kleberg. I served with him from 1931 until we both left Congress in 1945.

Throughout his long and constructive public service Dick Kleberg endeared himself to all of us who served with him by his many sterling qualities of mind and heart. He possessed great moral and political courage. He preferred the approval of his own conscience to the applause of the multitude. He never hesitated to put his country's welfare above every other consideration. He did not "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee where thrift might follow fawning." He practiced the eternal truth expressed by the immortal Shakespeare in language that will live forever:

> To thine own self be true, and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man.

He did not trim his political sails to catch each passing breeze of popular fancy. He loved America and the principles for which she stands. He never case a vote or championed a cause that was dictated by political expediency.

Dick was a kind man. In all the years I served with him I never heard him speak harshly of anyone. He had strong

convictions which he announced frankly and followed courageously. But he was tolerant of the opinions and the weaknesses of others. He was a true man, loyal and steadfast in his devotion to his friends. He had a keen sense of humor and knew what many men never learn, that while we must take our job seriously it is not wise to take ourselves too seriously. He did not nurse grievances nor permit political conflicts or reverses to embitter him.

Texas and the Nation have lost a valiant defender.

May God comfort and console his bereaved family is the prayer of all of us who knew and loved him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, other Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Richard M. Kleberg at this point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn of the passing of Richard Kleberg. He and I were friends for more than 40 years. We were classmates as junior law students at the University of Texas. Dick was a sturdy citizen who loved his country and served it well.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Dick Kleberg, the country lost a very fine, public-spirited, patriotic citizen. He was an outstanding American statesman. Although he had strong convictions, arrived at after careful study and thought, he was tolerant of the views and convictions of others. I had the privilege of serving with him from the time he took his seat in the 72d Congress until he retired from Congress in 1945. He was one of the most versatile men I ever knew. He was always looking for an opportunity to do a friend a favor. His many warm friends in Congress regret his passing. He has surviving a wonderful family who have my sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much grieved to learn of the passing of our former colleague, Richard M. Kleberg. In the early years of Mr. Kleberg's service in the House, the district I now represent was a part of his district. Thereafter, I served with him as a member of this body for some 6 years. In both the status of one of his constituents and as one of his colleagues, I had the opportunity to judge of his service here. He was an outstanding Member of the House, consistent in his efforts to sustain and promote the welfare of our Nation. He made a real contribution to the legislative process during the years he served here.

I extend to his widow, his children, and other surviving relatives my sincere sympathy and condolence in this sad hour.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed to learn of the passing of our former colleague, Richard Kleberg, of Texas. He served in this body for a little over 13 years. During that time I became intimately acqainted with him and his fine family. He became one of my very best friends in Congress.

While Dick belonged to other than my political party, we held much the same philosophy of government. We agreed on fundamentals. Our differences were largely on details rather than principles. Dick was a fellow who thought things through, arrived at his own conclusions and had the courage of his personal convictions.

I extend my deepest personal sympathy to his wife and family, with the hope that they will find some consolation in the knowledge there are countless numbers who share their loss.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dick Kleberg comes as a shock to all of us who knew him. He served with distinction in the House of Representatives for 12 years. During my 12 years here I have served with few men who measured up to Dick Kleberg's courage and statesmanship. Every vote he cast was prompted by a sincere desire to do what was best for the country, regardless of political considerations. He was a big man in every sense of the word.

Dick Kleberg served in Congress during a critical and trying period in our history. It was a time which often called for cool heads, clear minds and a careful analysis of the problems that arose. He was always equal to the task before him. His friends and admirers were numbered by the hundreds, and his counsel and advise were often sought. He had a way of calming the troubled waters, and of always weighing the issues in keeping with the best traditions of democracy and of sound government. He believed in free enterprise and everyone knew it. He believed in constitutional government and everyone knew that. He was not content to give lip service to those things—he was always on the firing line, fighting for what he believed in. And he made a great contribution to the cause to which he was so devoted and dedicated.

Mr. Speaker, America needs more men like Dick Kleberg. Let us take inspiration from the type of public service he rendered, and carry on the great fight for good government which characterized his service. Texas and the Nation have lost a great patriot. I extend to the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to a man widely known in these Halls, Richard M. Kleberg, who died on May 8, 1955, at the age of 68. His 68 years of life were given over to dedicated public service to his community, his State and his Nation.

It is not easy to pay adequate tribute to Richard Kleberg. He was a man of many abilities, all of them outstanding. He was a brilliant lawyer. For this, alone, his name could have gone down into history. He was a wise and a prudent banker. Once he believed in a cause, he would invest in it to the hilt—supported by his inner faith and his natural integrity of character. He was, by choice, a rancher. During the time he participated in the management of the vast King Ranch its holdings were doubled. He had helped direct the develop of the only United States breed of cattle as one of the highlights of his service to the big ranch.

He was a legislator. Twelve years in the House of Representatives left no doubt in the minds of his colleagues in Washington or his constituents at home that he was a courageous and a progressive Congressman. He was a diplomat. As he broadened the King Ranch to Cuba, Australia, and Brazil, he carried with it his own part of Texas to leaders of those countries.

Above all of his accomplishments he had the God-given talent of making—and keeping—friends.

Rudyard Kipling wrote these lines long before Richard Kleberg, yet he thoroughly described his with:

If you can meet with triumph and disaster
And treat those two imposters just the same.
If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with Kings—nor lose the common touch.
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it
And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son.

Richard Kleberg reared his own monument during his own lifetime.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Avery	Grant	Powell
Bailey	Hand	Prouty
Bolling, Mo.	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill.
	Hayworth	Reed, N. Y.
Canfield	Heselton	Richards
Chatham	Horan	Riehlman
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Riley
Coon	King, Pa.	Roberts
Cramer	Knox	Shelley
Dawson, Ill.	Laird	Steed
Diggs	McConnell	Utt
Dondero	McDowell	Walter
Eberharter	Mumma	Westland
Fallon	Norblad	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 494)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955'.

"TITLE I—DEFINITIONS, COVERAGE, AND EXEMPTIONS

"Definitions

"SEC. 101. For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) 'Department' means the Post Office Department established by section 388 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 361), and the postal field service of the Post Office Department;

"(2) 'postal field service' includes all operations and organization units of the Department, other than the departmental operations and organization units in the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government, and includes postal inspectors assigned to the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government;

"(3) 'employee', unless the context otherwise indicates, includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, and all other persons employed in the postal field service, regardless of title, other than persons who provide services for the Department on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

"(4) 'position' means the duties and responsibilities assigned to an employee, other than duties performed on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

"(5) 'key position' means an existing position, described in section 203 of this Act;

"(6) 'salary level' means the numerical standing in the Postal Field Service Schedule assigned to a position in the postal field service;

"(7) 'basic salary' means the rate of annual or hourly compensation specified by law, exclusive of overtime, night differential, and longevity compensation;

"(8) 'basic compensation' means basic salary plus longevity compensation; and

"(9) 'persons' has the meaning prescribed for such word in section 1 of title 1 of the United States Code.

"Coverage

"SEC. 102. This Act applies to all positions and employees in the postal field service.

"TITLE II—RANKING OF POSITIONS

"Administration

"SEC. 201. (a) The Postmaster General shall determine the personnel requirements of the postal field service, and fix the number of supervisors and other employees in such service, except that not more than one assistant postmaster may be employed at any post office. He shall define the various positions other than the key positions specified in section 203 of this Act and the standard positions of postmaster in a fourth-class office and rural carrier. He shall assign each such position to its appropriate salary level in the Post Field Service Schedule. He shall ascertain the appropriate salary level of a position (1) by comparing the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the position with the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of key positions described in section 203 of this Act, and (2) by ranking the position in relation to the key position most closely comparable in terms of the level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements.

"(b) In ranking positions, the Postmaster General shall apply the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and give effect to substantial differences in difficulty of the work to be performed, in the degree of responsibility to be exercised, in the scope and variety of tasks involved, and in the conditions of performance.

"(c) The Postmaster General's determinations under this section shall be the basis for the payment of compensation and for personnel transactions.

"Appeals

"SEC. 202. Any employee, either individually or together with one or more other employees with a similar grievance, may appeal at any time, in person or through his representative specifically designated for that purpose, to the United States Civil Service Commission to review (1) if such employee is in a position other than a key position described in section 203 of this Act, any action taken by the Postmaster General under section 201 of this Act, in order to determine whether his position has been placed in its appropriate salary level in accordance with such section, and (2) if such employee is in a key position described in section 203 of this Act, any administrative action taken or determination made under this Act, in connection with such employee, in order to determine whether such employee has been placed correctly in a key position on the basis of and in accordance with the descriptions of key positions and the assignments of such positions to salary levels specified in section 203 of this Act. The Commission shall act upon such appeal at the earliest practicable time, and its decision on such appeal shall be certified forthwith to the Postmaster General who shall take action in accordance with such certificate.

"Key positions

"SEC. 203. Key positions in the postal field service consisting of standard, related tasks commonly performed in that service are described and assigned to salary levels in the Postal Field Service Schedule, as follows:

"(1) Position.—Janitor—Level 1.

"Basic function: Cleans, sweeps, and removes trash from work areas, lobbies, and washrooms.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Sweeps and scrubs floors and stairs, dusts furniture and fixtures, cleans washrooms, and washes windows (except exterior glass in high buildings).

"(B) Moves furniture and helps erect equipment and fixtures within offices of the building.

"(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Cleans ice and snow from the sidewalks and driveways, and tends the lawn, shrubbery, and premises of the post office.

"(ii) Washes walls and ceilings.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(2) Position.—Elevator operator—level 2.

"Basic function: Operates a freight or passenger elevator.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Operates elevator.

"(B) Cleans cab of elevator and polishes metal fittings.

"(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Pushes handcarts of mail on and off elevator or assists in loading or unloading material carried on elevator.

"(ii) Tends the heating plant or performs cleaning duties in the vicinity of the elevator.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to an elevator starter or other designated supervisor.

"(3) Position.—Order filler—level 2.

"Basic function: Selects, assembles, and makes ready for shipment items requisitioned by postal field establishments.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"Is assigned any of the following duties:

"(A) Separates sheets of the requisition form, fastens copies to clipboards and places on appropriate conveyor line.

"(B) Clarifies writing on carbon copies of requisitions in order to minimize errors in filling requisitions.

"(C) Sets up and prepares shipping containers.

"(D) Places in cartons on conveyor lines the quantities of items requisitioned from an assigned station, indicating action taken opposite each item.

"(E) Fills and labels bulk shipping orders and moves bulk material to dispatch area.

"(F) Replenishes from stock items stored in individual stations and keeps stations neat and orderly to facilitate filling of requisitions.

"(G) Transports bulk and individual shipments on hand trucks.

"(H) Assembles materials for each requisition where conveyor lines converge.

"(I) Places cartons on assembly table for coordination and packing.

"(J) Checks requisition copies and items to assure that proper action has been taken.

"(K) Directs items not requiring packing to dispatch area.

"(L) Combines shipments to reduce packing.

"(M) Transmits bulk slips and shipping labels to the appropriate person.

"(N) Labels bulk and individual packages with printed labels to avoid hand labeling.

"(O) Prepares labels by use of appropriate rubber stamps.

"(P) Seals cartons with stapling machine or tape.

"(Q) Packs supplies for shipment.

"(R) Stacks and trucks completed orders.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(4) Position.—Clerk. Third-class post office—level 2.

"Basic function: Sorts incoming and dispatches outgoing mail for a small number of points of separation and destination; provides a limited number of services at public windows.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Sorts incoming mail for general delivery, lock boxes, and one or more delivery routes.

"(B) Postmarks, and prepares mail for dispatch by train or other mail route; closes, locks, and affixes labels to pouches and mail sacks.

"(C) Performs services at a public window, such as selling stamps, stamped envelopes, or other routine functions.

"(D) As the needs of the service require, may perform other related duties incidental to the operation of the post office.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster.

"(5) Position.—Guard—level 3.

"Basic function: Makes rounds of the post office building, and punches clocks at designated stations.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Patrols buildings, punching watchman's clock where furnished, checking door and window locks, noting and reporting fire hazards and other irregularities, such as running water, and unclosed doors and windows.

"(B) Sounds fire alarm.

"(C) Preserves order in corridors and, when necessary, detains persons for interrogation by post-office inspectors or local police.

"(D) In addition may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Gives directions to the public in building lobby.

"(ii) Raises and lowers the flag.

"(iii) Retrieves lost and found articles and delivers them to the appropriate place.

"(iv) Obtains names of victims, doctors, police, and witnesses in the event of accident.

"(v) Guards property entrances and prevents damage to property by the public.

"(vi) Tends the heating plant of the building.

"(vii) Operates elevators on a relief basis.

"(viii) Does incidental cleaning and laboring work.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a lieutenant of the guard, a building superintendent, or other designated supervisor.

"(6) Position.—File clerk—Level 3.

"Basic function: Sets up and maintains files on one or more subject matters.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Prepares new file folders and maintains existing folders in correct order as prescribed in the established filing system.

"(B) Transmits folders or information contained therein to authorized personnel (for example, forwards personnel folders to requesting supervisors, or copies data from folders to satisfy requests).

"(C) Opens, sorts, and searches file material, and maintains files in up-to-date condition.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Types from rough draft or plain copy.

"(ii) Answers telephones.

"(iii) Prepares requisitions for supplies.

"(iv) Operates a mimeograph machine.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

"(7) Position.—Typist—Level 3.

"Basic function: Types material such as forms, correspondence, and stencils from rough draft or plain copy; performs general office work.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) In accordance with instructions and information furnished by supervisor, types forms, standard reports, and documents such as invitations to bid, orders, contracts, invoices, personnel actions, and related materials.

"(B) Types correspondence and memoranda from rough drafts or general information.

"(C) Cuts stencils for instructions, circulars, and other general uses.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Transcribes from a dictating machine.

"(ii) Operates a mimeograph machine.

"(iii) Files, checks requisitions, prepares vouchers, and answers the telephone.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

"(8) Position.—Mail handler—Level 3.

"Basic function: Loads, unloads, and moves bulk mail, and performs other duties incidental to the movement and processing of mail.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Unloads mail received by trucks. Separates all mail received by trucks and conveyors for subsequent dispatch to other conveying units, and separates and delivers working mails for delivery to distribution areas.

"(B) Places empty sacks or pouches on racks, labels them where labels are prearranged or racks are plainly marked, dumps mail from sacks, cuts ties, faces letter mail, carries mail to distributors for processing, places processed mail into sacks, removes filled sacks and pouches from racks, closes and locks same. Picks up sacks, pouches, and outside pieces, separates outgoing bulk mails for dispatch and loads mail onto trucks.

"(C) Handles and sacks empty equipment, inspects empty equipment for mail content, restrings sacks.

"(D) Cancels stamps on parcel post, operates canceling machines, carries mail from canceling machine to distribution cases.

"(E) Assists in supply and slip rooms and operates addressograph, mimeograph, and similar machines.

(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Acts as armed guard for valuable registry shipments and as watchman and guard around post office building.

"(ii) Makes simple distribution of parcel post mail requiring no scheme knowledge.

"(iii) Operates electric fork-lift trucks.

"(iv) Rewraps soiled or broken parcels.

"(v) Performs other miscellaneous duties, such as stamping tickets, weighing incoming sacks, cleaning and sweeping in workrooms, offices, and trucks where such work is not performed by regular cleaners.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(9) Position.—Garageman—Level 3.

"Basic function: Performs a variety of routine services incidental to the proper maintenance of motor vehicles.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Lubricates trucks in accordance with lubrication charts and type of truck.

"(B) Changes crankcase oil and filter cleaners and cleans case in conformance with instructions and vehicle mileage.

"(C) Changes tires and makes necessary repairs.

"(D) Washes and steam-cleans trucks.

"(E) Assists automotive mechanics.

"(F) Fuels and oils trucks.

"(G) Cleans garage, garage office, swing room, and washroom, as assigned.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

"(10) Position—Special delivery messenger—Level 4.

"Basic function: Is responsible for delivering, on foot or by vehicle, special delivery letter mail and parcels to city patrons. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Receives special delivery mail for delivery and signs c. o. d. and registered items at post office before beginning route.

"(B) Delivers on foot and by vehicle special delivery mail to patrons; obtains signatures when required; collects amounts and fees on c. o. d.'s; in case of absent patrons, exercises judgment in determining whether to leave mail or leave notice and return mail to post office.

"(C) Returns receipts and moneys collected to authorized personnel at post office.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Faces and cancels mail and makes routine distribution of incoming and outgoing mail.

"(ii) Delivers and collects mail other than that requiring special delivery handling.

"(iii) Loads and unloads or carries bulk mail and parcels.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(11) Position.—Motor vehicle operator—Level 5.

"Basic function: Operates a mail truck on a regularly scheduled route to pick up and transport mail in bulk.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Picks up and delivers bulk quantities of mail at stations, branch offices, and terminal points; as required, picks up mail from collection boxes and deposits mail in relay boxes.

"(B) Operates truck in conformity with time schedules and rules of safety, and in accordance with instructions regarding the route for which responsible.

"(C) Ascertains the condition of the truck prior to leaving and upon returning to the garage; reports all accidents, mechanical defects noted, and mechanical failures while on route.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Drives a tractor and semitrailer on occasion, unloading bagged mail and packages at post offices and picking up mail for delivery to a central point.

"(ii) Prepares daily trip reports showing work performed.

"(iii) Makes minor mechanical repairs to truck in emergencies while on route.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a superintendent of motor vehicles or other designated supervisor.

"(12) Position.—City carrier—Level 5.

"Basic function: Is responsible for the prompt and efficient delivery and collection of mail on foot or by vehicle under varying conditions in a prescribed area within a city. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with route patrons and others, requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used, and with the geography of the city.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Routes or cases all classes of mail in sequence of delivery along an established route. Rearranges and relabels cases as required by route adjustments and changes in deliveries.

"(B) Withdraws mail from the distribution case and prepares it in sequence for efficient delivery by himself or a substitute along an established route. Prepares and separates all classes of mail to be carried by truck to relay boxes along route for subsequent delivery.

"(C) Enters change of address orders in change of address book and on appropriate form. Readdresses mail to be forwarded and marks for appropriate handling other mail addressed to route patrons who have moved. Sorts such mail into throw-back case for convenient handling by clerks.

"(D) Delivers mail along a prescribed route, on a regular schedule, picking up additional mail from relay boxes. Collects mail from street letter boxes and accepts letters for mailing from patrons. Such service may be rendered on foot or by vehicle and in some instances may consist exclusively of parcel post delivery or collection of mail.

"(E) Delivers and collects charges on customs, postage-due, and c. o. d. mail matter. Delivers and obtains receipts for registered and certain insured mail. Receipts for such matter, except insured mail, at the post office before beginning route and accounts for it upon return by payments of the amounts collected and delivery of receipts taken.

"(F) Deposits mail collected in the post office upon return from route; faces such mail for stamp cancellation.

"(G) Checks, and corrects if necessary, mailing cards presented by advertisers bearing names and addresses of patrons or former patrons of the route.

"(H) Furnishes patrons with postal information when requested, and provides change of address cards and other postal forms as requested.

"(I) Reports to supervisor all unusual incidents or conditions relating to mail delivery, including conditions of street letter boxes and time cards.

"(J) Regular city carriers assigned to foot delivery routes are required to become proficient in the casing of mail on at least one other foot delivery route.

"(K) Substitute city carriers may be assigned to perform clerical duties and may be required to pass examinations on schemes of city primary distribution.

"(L) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Checks hotels and other such establishments to insure that mail for residents undeliverable as addressed is not improperly held.

"(ii) Delivers stamps or other paper supplies to contract or classified stations.

"(iii) Serves at carriers' delivery window.

"(iv) Receives and registers, where practical, all letters and packages of first-class matter properly offered for registration and gives receipt therefor.

"(v) Makes delivery on other routes as assigned.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster or assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

"(13) Position.—Distribution clerk—Level 5.

"Basic function: Separates mail in a post office, terminal, airmail field, or other postal facility in accordance with established schemes, including incoming or outgoing mail or both.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of incoming mail by delivery point (for example, classified or contract station or branch or other delivery unit, general delivery, lockboxes, rural or star route, or city carrier route) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme established for that office.

"(B) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of outgoing mail for dispatch (for example, by city, State, region, train, highway or railway post office, or airmail flight) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme prescribed by the Postal Transportation Service.

"(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Maintains records of mails.

"(ii) Examines balances in advance deposit accounts.

"(iii) Faces and cancels mail.

"(iv) Ties mail and inserts facing slips.

"(v) Opens and dumps pouches and sacks.

"(vi) Operates cancelling machines.

"(vii) Records and bills mail (for example c. o. d., registered, and so forth) requiring special service.

"(viii) Renders service at public windows.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(14) Position.—Window clerk—Level 5.

"Basic function: Performs a variety of services at a public window of a post office or post office branch or station. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons and others requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) As a regular assignment, performs any of the following duties:

"(i) Sells postage stamps, stamped paper, cards, internal revenue stamps, migratory bird stamps, and postal savings stamps and certificates.

"(ii) Accepts from and, after proper identification, delivers to patrons parcel post, insured, c. o. d., and registered mail; makes collection of required postage, issues necessary receipts, and issues general delivery mail to patrons.

"(iii) Verifies second-, third-, and fourth-class mailings, computing and maintaining on a current basis mailers' credit balances.

"(iv) Assigns special delivery and registered mail for delivery.

"(v) Checks and sets post office stamp-vending machines, postage meters, and large mailers' stamp permit meters.

"(vi) Receives, follows up, and recommends action on patrons' claims and complaints.

"(vii) Issues and cashes foreign and domestic money orders and postal savings certificates.

"(viii) Rents post office boxes, receives rental payments, conducts reference checks, and completes related forms.

"(ix) Provides information to the public concerning postal regulations, mailing restrictions, rates, and other matters involving postal transactions.

"(B) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Makes emergency calls on patrons to adjust service complaints.

"(ii) Makes emergency carrier relays.

"(iii) Assists in alien registration and census matters.

"(iv) Separates and distributes mail.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

"(15) Position.—Automotive mechanic—Level 6.

"Basic function: Repairs mail trucks, including the removal and installation of complete motors, clutches, transmissions, and other major component parts.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Diagnoses mechanical and operating difficulties of vehicles, repairing defects, replacing worn or broken parts.

"(B) Adjusts and tunes up engines, cleaning fuel pumps, carburetors, and radiators; regulates timing, and makes other necessary adjustments to maintain in proper operating condition trucks that are in service.

"(C) Repairs or replaces automotive electrical equipment such as generators, starters, ignition systems, distributors, and wiring; installs and sets new spark plugs.

"(D) Conducts road tests of vehicles after repairs, noting performance of engine, clutch, transmission, brakes, and other parts.

"(E) Operates standard types of modern garage testing equipment.

"(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Removes, disassembles, reassembles, and installs entire engines.

"(ii) Overhauls transmission, rear end assemblies, and braking systems.

"(iii) Straightens frames and axles, welding broken parts where required.

"(iv) Makes road calls to make emergency repairs.

"(v) Makes required truck inspections.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

"(16) Position.—Transfer clerk—Level 6.

"Basic function: Arranges for transfer of mail at junction points between trains and other mail units and observes the separation loading and unloading of mail by railroad employees to make certain that this is done properly.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Provides for the most expeditious transfer of mail from observations of the operation of trains, star route or mail messenger vehicles, Government-owned vehicles and platform vehicles.

"(B) Examines outgoing and incoming cars to determine maximum utilization of space and proper adherence to railroad safety requirements; reports findings, when necessary, to the district superintendent.

"(C) Decides whether outbound cars in full authorizations should be held beyond the first available dispatches in order to obtain fuller loading and maximum utilization of the space paid for, making certain that this will not unduly delay the arrival of the mail at destination.

"(D) Studies the routing and loading of mail dispatched from his station in storage cars in order to recommend changes which would bring about economies in line haul and terminal charges and effect earlier arrival. Gives similar attention to incoming mail to assure that dispatching divisions are using best routing and loading methods; reports facts to the district superintendent.

"(E) Maintains close liaison with foremen of appropriate incoming and outgoing trains and vehicles to assure prompt receipt and expeditious dispatch of mail.

"(F) Keeps informed on local holding orders for each outgoing dispatch and requests that departure of unit within these limitations be withheld when scheduled connections are delayed.

"(G) Prepares list of railroad cars (except railway post office cars) in which mail is loaded and maintains record of mail loaded and unloaded in outgoing and incoming trains. Serves notice on railroad company to cancel operation and purchases lesser storage unit in its place when necessary. Prepares official diagram and appropriately labels outgoing cars to indicate destination or next relay point.

"(H) Inspects the loading and unloading of storage mail to secure individual piece count of lesser storage units (thirty feet and less); estimates volume when more than thirty feet.

"(I) Observes and reports to designated supervisor any failure of the railroad company to afford protection for the mail.

"(J) Qualifies periodically through examination on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train connections.

"(K) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Receipts for, transfers, and delivers registered mail between trains or between train and post office.

"(ii) Distributes mail prescribed for distribution in transfer office.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(17) Position.—Distribution clerk, R. P. O. or H. P. O.—Level 6.

"Basic function: Distributes mail in railway or highway post office prior to departure and while en route.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Determines the fastest or most expeditious dispatch of mail from the standpoint of assignment. In emergencies, such as floods, storms, wrecks, strikes, and missed connections, redistributes the mail so as to reach destination by the most expeditious alternative means, for example, by other railway post office or highway post office, airmail route, or star route.

"(B) Distributes mail rapidly into letter case or pouches and sacks.

"(C) Hangs pouches and sacks in racks and places labels in holders provided; labels letter cases in accordance with official diagram.

"(D) Prepares mail for dispatch, involving labeling and tying of letter mail in packages for distribution in pouches, closing and locking sacks and pouches, and maintenance of proper separations for connections en route.

"(E) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Receives and dispatches mail en route.

"(ii) Unloads mail and equipment at terminal of run.

"(iii) Examines car to ascertain that no mail is left.

"(iv) Convoys registered mail to post office and connecting lines.

"(F) Qualifies through examination periodically on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train schedules.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman in charge of the railway post office car or highway post office.

"(18) Position.—Claims clerk, paying office—Level 6.

"Basic function: Examines claims for loss or damage of insured or c. o. d. mail matter and determines and approves for payment the amount found to be due under postal regulations.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Receives and reviews prescribed claim papers to ascertain whether:

"(i) All necessary items of the appropriate claim form have been properly completed.

"(ii) Proof of value has been properly determined.

"(iii) Appropriate check has been made of applicable records.

"(iv) Other necessary information has been supplied.

"(B) Determines whether amount of claim exceeds amount of loss and the proper amount payable is within the limits of the indemnity.

"(C) Conducts necessary correspondence in connection with the claim.

"(D) Approves amount to be paid, and directs disposition of damaged articles.

"(E) Maintains prescribed record of claims.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to an assistant postmaster or other designated supervisor.

"(19) Position.—Postmaster, small third-class office—Level 6.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a small third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window service, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has no employees other than the postmaster and a replacement to serve during his leave; has annual receipts of approximately $1,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Conducts the activities of the office in such manner as to provide prompt and efficient postal service to the patrons of the office.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

"(D) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

"(E) Prepares and submits estimates of operating allowances as required.

"(F) Makes deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills.

"(G) Maintains required office records; prepares and submits necessary reports in accordance with instructions.

"(H) Maintains files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(20) Position.—Claims clerk, common and contract carriers—Level 7.

"Basic function: Audits carriers' claims for the transportation of mail to insure their accuracy and correctness of form prior to certifying them for payment.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Checks original or draft of claims submitted by carriers using space procurement data, records of air carrier flights and weight allocations, reports of railroad space utilization, emergency space procured, and other pertinent reports and data submitted by the districts.

"(B) Corrects errors in drafts of claims and returns them to the carrier for resubmission in final corrected form.

"(C) Expedites the processing of claims by continuous coordination with the carriers to minimize the incidence of error on claims submitted.

"(D) Rechecks resubmitted claims prior to certifying them for payment.

"(E) Maintains records pertinent to carrier claims such as unscheduled air carrier flights, weight allocations for mail on flights of air carriers, and air line flight schedules.

"(F) Accumulates data and prepares periodic and special reports on subjects related to the purchase and use of railroad space, and air carrier weight allocation.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to the supervisor in charge of the fiscal section in a Postal Transportation Service division office or other designated supervisor.

"(21) Position.—Postmaster, third-class office—Level 7.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has one part-time clerical employee; has annual receipts of approximately $4,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Supervises and conducts the activities of the office in order to provide prompt and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations.

"(D) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

"(E) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

"(F) Makes required deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills and makes salary disbursements.

"(G) Prepares and submits annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances as required.

"(H) Maintains required office records; prepares and submits necessary reports in accordance with instructions.

"(I) Maintains files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(22) Position.—Foreman mails—Level 8.

"Basic function: Supervises a group of employees engaged in carrying out assigned tasks connected with the processing of incoming or outgoing mail.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Lays out work for employees; insures attendance to duties and proper performance of assignments; shifts employees from one assignment to another to meet fluctuations in workload; answers questions respecting work progress.

"(B) Trains new employees and provides continuous on-the-job training for all employees under his supervision.

"(C) Reports unusual difficulties to a general foreman and suggests solutions. Personally resolves problems of a routine nature.

"(D) Keeps required records for such matters as time, mail on hand, and mail processed.

"(E) Recommends personnel actions respecting subordinates; maintains morale among the employees in the group; adjusts complaints; supplies leadership necessary to secure maximum interest and effort from men and promotes cooperation and harmony.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a general foreman or other designated superior. Supervises approximately twenty or more employees.

"(23) Position.—Postmaster, third-class office—Level 8.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has two clerical employees and annual receipts of approximately $6,000, and rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Supervises the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees and is responsible for the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window services; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mail; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

"(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks for employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

"(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries and schedules of disbursement.

"(I) Maintains all files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(24) General foreman.—R. O. P.—Level 9.

"Basic function: Directs mail service operations in a railway post office train with two or more authorized cars. Supervises a crew of foremen and clerks whose primary function is the distribution and exchange of mails en route.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Provides for the proper distribution, exchange, and dispatch of mail regularly assigned for handling in the railway post office cars. Makes decisions concerning the most expeditious dispatch, rerouting and utilization of alternative connections involving irregularly received mail and also in emergency situations.

"(B) Directs mail service operations in the railway post office train including:

"(i) Rapid distribution of all classes of mail in accordance with official diagrams and via most advantageous routing.

"(ii) Handling, recording, and protection of registered mails.

"(iii) Makeup and exchange of mail at intermediate and terminal offices.

"(iv) Proper utilization of space in each railway post office car with relation to other storage space in train and, except as charged to transfer clerks, for proper handling of all storage mail in train.

"(v) Loading and unloading of railway post office cars to assure maximum use of available storage space without additional cost.

"(vi) Proper usage of mail equipment and supplies.

"(vii) Maintenance of distribution schemes and schedules of mail routes in corrected condition.

"(C) Supervises the activities of foremen and clerks in the cars and reassigns them to various duties as may be required to complete maximum distribution. Instructs clerks on proper practices and procedures and reports failures to meet operating standards to the district superintendent.

"(D) Inspects condition of railway post office cars and reports to the railroad company unsatisfactory situations.

"(E) Completes trip report form covering service operations, including particulars of

train operation, roster of clerks on duty, mails received, worked and dispatched, and mails not worked; prepares a list of all cars on train in which mail is carried, a record of the mail, and a report of any irregularities in service. Observes and reports to district superintendent any failure of the railroad company to afford protection to the mail.

"(F) May personally distribute letter mail for one or more States, and maintain record of pouches received and dispatched.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through one or more subordinate foremen, clerks assigned to the run.

"(25) Position.—Assistant postmaster, small first-class post office—level 9.

"Basic function: Serves as the over-all assistant to the postmaster, providing general direction and supervision over mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately sixteen employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000 and eight carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate employees in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(26) Position.—Postmaster, second-class office—Level 9.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a second-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has approximately six employees, annual receipts of approximately $16,000, and has rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Supervises and coordinates the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; is responsible for the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window service; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mails; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

"(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks for employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

"(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries and schedules of disbursement.

"(I) Maintains all files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(27) Position.—General foreman, mails—Level 10.

"Basic function: Directs foremen in the distribution of all or part of incoming mails, outgoing mails, or both, at a first-class post office.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Lays out work for foremen at the beginning of a tour and issues instructions.

"(B) Oversees work in progress to prevent accumulation of mail.

"(C) Insures that mail is distributed in accordance with established orders and instructions.

"(D) Shifts men from one foreman to another to keep mails moving.

"(E) Reports difficulties and suggests corrective measures to superior.

"(F) Maintains required records.

"(G) Assures that adequate on-the-job training is carried out to promote employee proficiency.

"(H) Reviews and forwards recommendations of foremen respecting discipline, promotions, or changes in assignments; approves time and leave requests; submits manpower estimates.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent or assistant superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through approximately four foremen, employees as assigned.

"(28) Position.—Postmaster, small first-class office—Level 10.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately sixteen employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and city delivery service consisting of eight carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

"(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

"(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

"(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

"(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(29) Position.—Building superintendent—Level 11.

"Basic function: Directs the janitorial, maintenance, and operating services of a large post office building and branches and stations covering an aggregate area of approximately 700,000 square feet, including security, heating and ventilating, mechanical and electrical equipment, and elevator services.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Plans and prepares work schedules and supervises the custodial forces in cleaning, heating, guarding, operating, and repairing the post office building and equipment.

"(B) Makes frequent inspections to determine maintenance needs of the building and equipment, and to determine the efficiency of the janitorial and maintenance force.

"(C) Prepares and answers correspondence relating to custodial service.

"(D) Plans and supervises maintenance or alteration work under contract.

"(E) Supervises the office force in the preparation of vouchers, requisitions and reports incidental to custodial service, and in the maintenance of required accounts and records.

"(F) Recommends transfers, promotions, and disciplinary measures for custodial personnel.

"(G) Inspects mechanical equipment to determine repair needs and adherence to standards of preventive maintenance.

"Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to the postmaster or other designated superior. Directs, through a general foreman of laborers and a chief engineer, approximately 100 employees, including electricians and other skilled trades.

"(30) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 11.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately twenty-seven employees, annual receipts of $129,000, and eleven city delivery and rural carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; and is responsible for the proper administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

"(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

"(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

"(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

"(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(31) Position.—Tour superintendent, incoming or outgoing mails—Level 12.

"Basic function: Directs general foremen in the distribution of incoming mails or outgoing mails on a tour at a large first-class post office.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Provides for the prompt and complete operation of a tour activity, such as incoming mails, outgoing mails, or all first- and third-class outgoing mails.

"(B) Reassigns employees as necessary to meet peakload demands; provides direction to subordinate foremen, coordinating the portions of work assigned to them.

"(C) Answers questions of subordinate foremen regarding operating problems; refers policy questions to his superior with appropriate recommendations.

"(D) Reviews requests for personnel actions by subordinate foremen, recommending final action to superior.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower required, consolidating for recommendation to superior.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to an assistant superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through general foreman, employees assigned to the tour.

"(32) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 12.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately fifty-three employees, annual receipts of $314,000, six Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and twenty-five city and rural delivery routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

"(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(G) Prepares numerous reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

"(H) Advertises for bids for various services including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

"(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

"(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(33) Position.—Postal inspector—Level 13.

"Basic function: Is responsible in an assigned territory, usually including all classes of post offices, for inspection and investigative programs covering all phases of the postal service. In heavily populated areas may be assigned a majority of the time to selected types of work as determined by the inspector-in-charge.

"Duties and responsibilities: Assigned territory:

"(A) Inspects post offices and related postal units to insure compliance with postal laws and regulations, protection and proper expenditure of postal revenues and appropriated funds, and evaluates and reports to administrative officials on operational efficiency.

"(B) Maintains close working relationship with regional officials and submits to them factual information and recommendations on conditions and needs of the postal service; acts as counselor to postmasters and other postal officials and employees in explaining instructions, regulations, applicable laws and decisions.

"(C) Investigates violations of postal laws, including, but not limited to, armed robbery, mailing of bombs, burglary, theft of mail, embezzlements, obscene literature and pictures, and mail fraud.

"(D) Determines the validity and seriousness of charges against postmasters and other officers and employees and makes pertinent recommendations.

"(E) Investigates local and area operating problems and recommends corrective action, and within his prescribed jurisdiction, initiates necessary corrective action, including restoration of service immediately in disaster areas caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other catastrophes.

"(F) Maintains liaison activities (i) with military installations to insure adequate postal service for the military forces; (ii) with Federal and State civil defense authorities at the area level; (iii) with branches of Federal and State law enforcement agencies.

"(G) Ascertains postal needs for post offices and stations, rural and city delivery, changes in schedules, quarters, equipment, manpower, and procedures and reports findings and recommendations to appropriate officials.

"Selected cases:

"(H) Investigates the loss, theft, destruction, and damage to mail matter through technical analyses of complaints and other specialized procedures.

"(I) Investigates money-order forgeries; investigates complaints of use of the mails to defraud and to operate lotteries.

"(J) Investigates personal injuries, motor-vehicle and other accidents; develops evidence for defense of suits under the so-called Federal Tort Claims Act; recommends out-of-court settlements.

"(K) In any criminal investigation, develops evidence, locates witnesses and suspects, apprehends and effects arrests of postal offenders, presents facts to United States attorney, and collaborates as required with Federal and State prosecutors in presentation before United States commissioner, grand jury, and trial court.

"(L) Surveys postal service on an area basis to ascertain and recommend ways of improving service and effecting economies.

"(M) Makes investigations of a variety of other matters and performs related duties as assigned.

"Organizational relationships: Responsible to the inspector-in-charge or the assistant inspector-in-charge of the division. Supervises trainees and other inspectors as assigned.

"(34) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 13.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services. This office has approximately seventy-two employees, annual receipts of $797,000, six Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and seventeen carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(35) Position.—Station superintendent, large classified station—Level 14.

"Basic function: Directs the operations of a large classified station, including the distribution, delivery, and dispatch of mail and all required window services to the public.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Plans and supervises the distribution of incoming and outgoing mails, the delivery service, including special delivery, and the dispatch of outgoing mail.

"(B) Supervises services to the public at windows, including sales of stamps and stamped paper, money orders, postal savings

stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, registry and insurance of mail; handling of c. o. d. items; general delivery and box mail.

"(C) Supervises city and rural carriers and determines that delivery schedules are maintained; consults in the adjustment and establishment of routes to reflect changes in volume, patronage, or population; and recommends establishment or changes in location of collection boxes.

"(D) Directs and maintains required records for personnel of station, verifies and approves timecards for payroll purposes; makes manpower estimates and reports; trains new supervisors and employees in various aspects of station operations.

"(E) Requisitions supplies and equipment, stamps, stamped paper, and accountable forms from main post office, reissuing to subordinates as required. Is responsible for entire fixed credit of station and for operation within the allowance granted.

"(F) Maintains effective relations with large mailers and the public; simplifies handling of mail, and takes appropriate action to meet complaints.

"(G) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Supervises the cleaning and custodial maintenance of the station building.

"(ii) Makes necessary arrangements for special services such as alien registrations, special census reports, or handling of special purpose mailing.

"Organizational relationships.—Administratively responsible to a superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through subordinate supervisors, approximately one thousand or more employees.

"(36) Position.—Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. The office has approximately four hundred and fifty employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, fifty Government-owned vehicle units, one classified station or branch, and one hundred and thirty carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives sasistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(37) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including the direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately one hundred and eighty employees, annual receipts of $1 million, twenty-one Government-owned vehicle units, three classified stations, and sixty-five carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organize the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(38) Position.—Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately one thousand and two hundred employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, one hundred and seventeen Government-owned vehicle units, sixteen classified stations and branches, and two hundred and ninety carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationship with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(39) Position.—Postmaster, first - class office—Level 15.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately four hundred and fifty employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, fifty Government-owned vehicle units, one classified station or branch, and one hundred and thirty carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(40) Position. — Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately three thousand two hundred employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, two hundred Government-owned vehicle units, thirty-four classified stations and branches, and one thousand carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(41) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations and branches. This office has approximately seven hundred employees, annual receipts of $4,470,000, seventy-seven Government-owned vehicle units, eight classified stations and branches, and two hundred carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(42) Position.—General superintendent, PTS division—Level 17.

"Basic function: Directs all activities of a division of the Postal Transportation Service of average size and complexity in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, or in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the division.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail handling and transportation, schedules, security of mail in transit, and rates.

"(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

"(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units such as transfer offices, airmail fields, terminals, railway post oifice lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

"(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, trucklines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

"(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

"Organizational relationships: administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, up to three thousand three hundred employees.

"(43) Position.—Assistant postmaster, large first-class office—Level 17.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately eight thousand employees, annual receipts of $48,000,000, four hundred Government-owned vehicle units, fifty classified stations and branches, and one thousand four hundred carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(44) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 17.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately one thousand two hundred employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, one hundred and seventeen Government-owned vehicle units, sixteen classified stations and branches, and two hundred and ninety carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(45) Position.—General Superintendent, largest PTS division—Level 18.

"Basic function: Directs all activities of one of the largest divisions of the Postal Transportation Service in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, as well as in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the division.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail-handling and transportation schedules, security of mails in transit, and rates.

"(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

"(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units such as transfer offices, air mail fields, terminals, railway post office lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

"(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, truck lines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

"(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, approximately three thousand three hundred or more employees.

"(46) Position.—Assistant postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 18.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately twenty thousand employees, annual receipts of $140,000,000, one thousand one hundred Government-owned motor-vehicle units, sixty-six classified stations and branches, and three thousand two hundred carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(47) Position.—Postmaster, first-class office—Level 18.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately three thousand two hundred employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, two hundred Government-owned vehicle units, thirty-four classified stations and branches, and one thousand carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(48) Position.—Postmaster, large, first-class office—Level 19.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a large first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately eight thousand employees, annual receipts of $48,000,000, four hundred Government-owned vehicle units, fifty classified stations and branches, and one thousand four hundred carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(49) Position.—Postmaster, largest, first-class office—Level 20.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of one of the largest first-class post offices, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately twenty thousand employees, annual receipts of $140,000,000, one thousand one hundred Government-owned vehicle units, sixty-six classified stations and branches, and three thousand two hundred carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center of the Department.

"Organization relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director.

"(50) Position.—Regional director—Level 21.

"Basic function: Directs the management of all postal activities within the jurisdiction of an assigned region in accordance with basic departmental policies and with functional direction and guidance from Assistant Postmasters General.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Develops and formulates policies and practices for the region within basic policies and instructions of the Postmaster General.

"(B) Manages post office operations.

"(C) Administers routing, distribution, and transportation of mail within and in transit through the region.

"(D) Arranges for the provision of adequate facilities and equipment for all postal functions in the region.

"(E) Administers the personnel program of the region, including employment, placement, training, evaluation of positions, employee relations, and other personnel functions.

"(F) Authorizes and issues allowances for all expenditures and exercises budgetary controls.

"(G) Administers cost reduction programs and provides industrial engineering services to operating segments of the region.

"(H) Maintains effective public relations with the general public, large mail users,

and with Federal, State, and municipal authorities.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the Deputy Postmaster General. Directs, through subordinate officials, approximately thirty thousand to thirty-five thousand employees in some three thousand offices within the region.

"DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA DUTIES

"SEC. 204. (a) An employee may be appointed to more than one position and shall be paid compensation at the rate provided by law for each position, without regard to the provisions of section 1763, 1764, and 1765 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 58, 69, and 70).

"(b) As the needs of the service require, an employee may be assigned from time to time to perform, without change in compensation, duties and responsibilities other than the duties and responsibilities specifically set forth in his position description; however, if any employee is assigned for more than thirty days in any calendar year to duties and responsibilities of a salary level which is higher than the salary level to which his position is assigned, except to perform service in a relief capacity for a supervisor granted compensatory time pursuant to section 603, he shall be paid for the period of his assignment in excess of thirty days a basic salary computed in accordance with the provisions of section 502.

"REPORT OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

"SEC. 205. (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1946, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

"(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are assigned, and the reasons for such actions;

"(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

"(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

"(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress).

"(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day, and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. The report shall be printed as a House document.

"TITLE III—BASIC SALARY SCHEDULES

"Postal field service schedule

"SEC. 301. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 302 and 303 of this Act, basic salary shall be paid to all employees in accordance with this schedule.

"Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

"(b) The basic salary for hourly rate employees shall be computed by dividing the per annum rates prescribed in the Postal Field Service Schedule (1) by 2,080 in the case of hourly rate employees other than substitutes, and (2) by 2,016 in the case of substitute employees.

"Rural carrier schedule

"SEC. 302. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "RCS", for carriers in the rural delivery service, which is based in part on fixed compensation per annum and in part on specified rates per mile per annum. Basic salary shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"(b) A rural carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the length of the route served by him. A rural carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the combined length of the two routes.

"Rural carrier schedule

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,538	$1,578	$1,618	$1,658	$1,698	$1,738	$1,778
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63	65	67	69	71	73	75
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,538	------	------	------	------	------	------
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63	------	------	------	------	------	------
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

"(c) The Postmaster General may pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes not exceeding sixty-one miles in length. He may not pay additional compensation to a carrier serving such a route in an amount which would exceed $4,700, when added to the basic salary for the maximum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for his route. In case any such heavily patronized route is extended in length, the rural carrier assigned to such route at the time of such extension shall not be reduced in pay.

"(d) The Postmaster General may pay additional compensation to rural carriers who are required to carry pouch mail to intermediate post offices, or for intersecting loop routes, in all cases where it appears that the carriage of such pouches increases the expense of the equipment required by the carrier or materially increases the amount of labor performed by him. Such compensation shall not exceed the sum of $12 per annum for each mile such carrier is required to carry such pouches.

"(e) In addition to the other compensation, rural carriers shall be paid the authorized fee for making special delivery of mail. Such fee shall not be paid when (1) no special delivery service is rendered, (2) delivery is made into a rural mail box, or (3) delivery is made to the addressee or his representative on the rural carrier's route.

"Fourth-class office schedule

"SEC. 303.(a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the gross postal receipts as contained in returns of the post office for the calendar year immediately preceding. Basic salary shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"Fourth-class office schedule

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,514	$2,598	$2,682	$2,766	$2,850	$2,934	$3,018
$900 to $1,299.99	2,304	2,381	2,458	2,535	2,612	2,689	2,766
$600 to $899.99	1,886	1,949	2,012	2,075	2,138	2,201	2,264
$350 to $599.99	1,467	1,516	1,565	1,614	1,663	1,712	1,761
$250 to $349.99	1,048	1,083	1,118	1,153	1,188	1,223	1,258
$200 to $249.99	838	866	894	922	950	978	1,006
$100 to $199.99	629	650	671	692	713	734	755
Under $100	419	433	447	461	475	489	503

"(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in gross receipts at the start of the first pay period after the beginning of each fiscal year. In adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted gross receipts of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in gross receipts shall be deemed the equivalent of a step-increase under section 401 of this Act and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

"(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category or class indicated by the receipts of the preceding quarter. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category or class pursuant to this subsection shall remain in such category or class until the start of the first pay period after July 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category or class indicated by the receipts for the preceding calendar year.

"(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as such postmaster.

"(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

"(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods such office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"(g) Where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the third class for each of two consecutive calendar years are less than $1,500, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $1,400, such post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"Conversion

"SEC. 304. (a) Each employee whose basic salary is paid under the Act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, or under the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended, and who on or prior to the effective date of this section has earned but has not been credited with a higher automatic salary grade increase under the Act of July 6, 1945, or a higher within-grade step-increase under the Classification Act of 1949 for his position, or whose basic salary would have been increased on July 1, 1955, by reason of changed postal receipts, shall be given credit for such increase before his basic salary is adjusted under subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The basic salary of each employee in effect immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, and the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, shall be adjusted to the basic salary in the schedules in the following manner:

"(1) If the basic salary of the employee is equal to any step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

"(2) If the basic salary of the employee is less than the entrance step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such entrance step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

"(3) If the basic salary of the employee falls between any two steps established for his position in the appropriate schedule, the higher step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

"(4) If the basic salary of the employee is greater than the highest step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such basic salary shall be established as the new basic salary of the employee.

"Addition of longevity step-increases

"SEC. 305. (a) When the basic salary of an employee, except an employee whose basic salary immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, is established under section 304 of this Act, each longevity step-increase which such employee has earned prior to the effective date of his schedule shall become a part of his basic compensation and shall constitute a longevity step-increase under section 404 of this Act.

"(b) In the case of an employee whose compensation immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, all creditable service under section 404 shall be counted in order to determine such employee's eligibility for longevity step-increases under such section.

"Retroactive basic salary increases

"SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the Act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 7 per centum effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the Act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death.

"TITLE IV—STEP-INCREASES

"Automatic advancement by step-increases

"SEC. 401. (a) Except as to a substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–6 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, each employee whose position is allocated to the Rural Carrier Schedule, the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, or salary level PFS–10 or a lower salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, who has not reached the highest step for his position, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step for his position at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of each fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service, if no equivalent increase in basic salary from any cause was received during such period of fifty-two calendar weeks. The benefit of successive step-increases shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the Armed Forces.

"(b) Each employee whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–11 or a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be advanced to and including step four of his salary level in the manner provided in subsection (a) of this section. Advancement of such employee to steps higher than step four, exclusive of longevity step-increases, shall be granted by the Postmaster General on the basis of superior performance under regulations issued by him, but no such employee is eligible for more than one step-increase within the time period specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Each substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service, whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–6 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, shall be advanced in the manner prescribed for other employees under subsection (a) of this section, but such substitute shall not be advanced beyond step four of salary level PFS–6.

"Creditable service for advancement

"SEC. 402. Each employee in the postal field service is eligible to earn step-increases in accordance with this Act. Except for temporary rural carriers serving in the absence of regular rural carriers on leave without pay or on military leave, credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for one year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

"Adjustment of service credit

"SEC. 403. For the purpose of establishing eligibility for step increases under section 401, the Postmaster General is directed to preserve for employees presently in the automatic grades, other than the maximum automatic grades, their present anniversary dates: *Provided,* That no employee whose anniversary date occurs before the anniversary date of a senior employee shall be advanced ahead of such senior employee. For the purposes of this section, the term 'senior employee' means an employee in the same position in the post office or organizational unit concerned, who, by virtue of his length of service or position, has superior seniority rights. The anniversary date of any employee whose present anniversary date cannot be preserved without advancing ahead of such senior employee shall be that date which results in the shortest additional waiting period for such employee. Each employee in a maximum automatic grade or a single salary grade shall begin the waiting period for his anniversary date on the effective date of his transfer into the appropriate schedule contained in sections 301, 302 or 303 of this Act.

Longevity step increases

SEC. 404. (a) There are established for each employee longevity steps A, B, and C. For each promotion to a longevity step—

(1) each postmaster at a post office of the fourth class shall receive an amount equal

to 5 per centum of his basic salary, or $100 per annum, whichever is the lesser, and

(2) each employee (other than a postmaster at a post office of the fourth class) shall receive $100 per annum.

In computing the percentage increase under this subsection the amount of the increase shall be rounded to the nearest dollar. A half dollar or one-half cent shall be rounded to the next highest dollar or cent, respectively.

(b) Each employee shall be assigned to—

(1) longevity step A at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 13 years of service;

(2) longevity step B at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 18 years of service; and

(3) longevity step C at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 25 years of service.

(c) (1) There shall be credited, for the purpose of subsection (b)—

(A) all time on the rolls, except time on the rolls as a substitute rural carrier, in the postal field service or in the Post Office Department;

(B) all time on the rolls in the custodial service of the Department of the Treasury continuous to the date of the transfer of the employee to the custodial service of the Post Office Department in accordance with Executive Order Numbered 6166, dated June 10, 1933;

(C) all time on the rolls as a special-delivery messenger at a first-class post office; and

"(D) all time on the rolls as a clerk in a third-class post office for which payment is made from authorized allowances.

"(2) In determining longevity credit for the purposes of subsection (b) in the case of an employee whose continuous service in the postal field service or in the departmental service of the Post Office Department shall have been interrupted by service with the Armed Forces or to comply with a transfer during war or national emergency as defined by the United States Civil Service Commission, all time engaged in such service with the Armed Forces or on such transfer shall be credited pro rata for each week of such service. All service specified in this subsection, whether continuous or intermittent, shall be credited on the basis of one week for each whole week the employee has been on the rolls, except that credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for one year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

"(d) Employees on the rolls on the effective date of this section who are entitled to promotion credit for longevity purposes under section 2 of the Act approved May 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 102; 39 U. S. C. 889), shall retain all rights and benefits established or continued under such section to the same extent as though such section had remained in effect.

"(e) Increases under this section shall not be deemed equivalent increases within the meaning of section 401.

"TITLE V—GENERAL COMPENSATION RULES

"Appointments

"SEC. 501. The Postmaster General may appoint any person who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the Government to any position in a regional or district office or to any professional or scientific position and may place such person in any step in the salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest basic salary which such person received from the United States.

"Promotion

"SEC. 502. (a) Any employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid basic salary at the lowest step of such higher salary level which exceeds his existing basic salary by not less than the amount of difference between the entrance step of the salary level from which promoted and the entrance step of the salary level immediately above the salary level from which promoted. If there is no step in the salary level to which the employee is promoted which exceeds his existing basic salary by at least the amount of such difference, such employee shall be paid (1) the maximum step of the salary level to which promoted, or (2) his existing basic salary, whichever is higher.

"(b) Regular clerks and carriers in first- and second-class post offices are not eligible for promotion to positions of higher salary levels in their respective offices unless they are in the maximum steps of their respective salary levels. If for any reason such clerks and carriers in such maximum steps are not available those clerks and carriers in the lower steps in such offices shall be eligible for such promotion.

"Compensation of certain temporary employees

"SEC. 503. Each temporary employee who is hired for a continuous period of one year or less for a position under the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid a basic salary at the entrance step for the salary level of the position to which he is appointed.

"Prohibition on reduction of former compensation

"SEC. 504. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or Fourth-Class Office Schedule to an amount less than his basic compensation immediately prior to adjustment to such schedules.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, 'basic compensation' includes basic compensation under the Classification Act of 1949.

"TITLE VI—PAY ADMINISTRATION

"Pay periods and computation of rates

"SEC. 601. (a) Employees in the postal field service shall be paid compensation in twenty-six installments. Each such installment shall be the compensation for a pay period of two weeks.

"(b) As basic compensation for a full pay period, an employee, other than an hourly rate employee, shall be paid an amount equal to one twenty-sixth of his annual basic compensation. As basic compensation for a portion of a pay period, such employee shall be paid basic compensation computed in accordance with subsection (d) of this section for the number of days and hours of service for which he has credit.

"(c) As basic compensation for the pay period, an hourly rate employee shall be paid an amount equal to the product of his hourly rate of basic compensation and the number of hours of service for which he has credit.

"(d) For purposes of computing rates of compensation other than annual rates the following rules shall govern:

"(1) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for employees other than substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,080.

"(2) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,016.

"(3) To compute the daily rate of compensation for postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 312.

"(4) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for annual rate employees other than postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the hourly rate of basic compensation shall be multiplied by the number of daily hours of service required.

"(e) Except for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave upon the termination of employment, an annual rate employee shall not be paid more than one twenty-sixth of his basic compensation as basic compensation for a pay period.

"(f) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(g) When a pay period for employees to whom this Act applies begins in one fiscal year and ends in another, the gross amount of the earnings of such employees for such pay period may be regarded as a charge against the appropriation or allotment current at the end of such pay period.

"Hours of work

"SEC. 602. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, employees shall not be required to work more than eight hours a day. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the eight hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than ten consecutive hours.

"Compensatory time, overtime, and holidays

"SEC. 603. In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to work more than eight hours in one day, or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays. For such service he shall grant employees in the 'PFS' Schedule compensatory time or pay such employees overtime compensation under the following rules:

"(1) Each employee in or below salary level PFS–8 shall be paid for all work in excess of eight hours in one day at the rate of 150 per centum of his hourly basic compensation.

"(2) (A) Each employee in or below salary level PFS–8 who performs work on Saturdays or Sundays shall, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the excess time worked within five working days, except that, in lieu of such compensatory time, the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize such employee to be paid, for work performed on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December, at the rate of 150 per centum of his hourly basic compensation.

"(B) If the work performed by such employees on Saturdays and Sundays is less than eight hours, such service, in the discretion of the Postmaster General may be carried forward and combined with similar service performed on other Saturdays and Sundays. The employees may be allowed compensatory time for such combined service or any part thereof at any time, except that, whenever at least eight hours of such service has been accumulated, the employees shall be allowed eight hours compensatory time on one day within five working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday on which the total accumulated service was at least eight hours.

"(3) For time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (5 U. S. C., sec. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees generally, each employee in or below salary level PFS–8, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall either be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such time worked within thirty working days, or be paid premium compensation at a rate equal to his hourly basic compensation for the time so worked. For work performed on Christmas Day, premium compensation shall be paid at a rate equal to 150 per centum of the employee's hourly basic compensation.

"(4) Each employee in or above salary level PFS–9 who performs overtime or holiday work as described in this section, under regula-

tions prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such overtime or holiday work.

"Night work

"SEC. 604. Employees who perform work between the hours of 6 o'clock post meridian and 6 o'clock ante meridian standard or daylight saving time, depending upon which time is observed where such work is performed, shall be paid extra compensation for each hour of such work at the rate of 10 per centum of their hourly basic compensation. The differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which such employees may be entitled.

"Exemption of certain employees from certain provisions relating to pay administration

"SEC. 605. (a) Sections 602, 603, and 604 of this Act do not apply to the heads of regional or district offices and such other employees of the headquarters staff of regional and district offices as the Postmaster General designates, or to postmasters, rural carriers, post office inspectors, traveling mechanicians, and traveling examiners of equipment and supplies.

"(b) Sections 602 and 603 of this Act do not apply to substitute employees and to employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty.

"(c) Section 602 of this Act does not apply to employees in post offices of the third class.

"(d) The provisions of section 603 of this Act relating to compensatory time and overtime compensation for work on Saturdays or Sundays do not apply to hourly rate regular employees.

"Substitute employment

"SEC. 606. (a) Subject to subsection (c) of this section, the Postmaster General shall prescribe the conditions under which substitute positions may be established.

"(b) Each substitute, hourly rate, and temporary employee who reports for duty in compliance with an official order shall be employed for not less than two hours following the hour at which such employee is ordered to report.

"(c) In the case of positions which are the same as or equivalent to the positions enumerated in the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes", approved June 4, 1936, as amended (39 U. S. C., sec. 834), the ratio of classified substitute employees to regular employees shall not be more than one classified substitute to five regular employees or fraction thereof with respect to each such position, except that in offices having fewer than five regular employees there may be one substitute clerk and one substitute carrier, and one substitute in the motor vehicle service.

"Employees in the Postal Transportation Service

"SEC. 607. (a) The Postmaster General shall organize the work of employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty into regularly scheduled tours of duty. Such tours of duty shall aggregate an average of not more than eight hours a day for two hundred and fifty-two days a year, including an allowance of one hour and thirty-five minutes for work to be performed on layoff periods. He shall not grant allowances of time for work performed on layoff periods to employees other than employees engaged in the distribution of mail.

"(b) Employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty, except substitute employees, who are required to perform work in excess of the scheduled time of their regular tours of duty as established by the Postmaster General shall be paid at the rate of 150 per centum of their hourly basic compensation for such overtime work. In arriving at the amount of overtime to be paid at any time during the calendar year, any deficiencies accrued up to that time during the same calendar year shall be offset against any overtime work by the employee.

"(c) Substitute employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty shall be paid on an hourly basis for actual work performed according to the time value of each trip of such road duty, including an allowance of time for all work required on layoff periods.

"(d) In addition to compensation provided under this Act, the Postmaster General, under regulations prescribed by him, may pay not more than $9 per day as travel allowances in lieu of actual expenses, at fixed rates per annum or by such other method as he deems equitable to regular and substitute employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty, after the expiration of ten hours from the time the initial run begins.

"(e) Substitute employees in the Postal Transportation Service shall be credited with full time while traveling under orders of the Post Office Department to and from their designated headquarters to take up assignments.

"Equipment maintenance allowance for special delivery messengers

"SEC. 608. (a) In addition to the compensation provided under this Act regular and substitute special delivery messengers at first-class post offices shall be paid an automotive equipment maintenance allowance at the rate of 7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof for miles traveled under the direction of the Department in making delivery of special-delivery mail or at the option of the Postmaster General at the rate of 90 cents per hour spent in making delivery of special-delivery mail. Payments for equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

"(b) The Postmaster General may provide or hire vehicles under an allowance basis for use in the delivery of special-delivery mail whenever the needs of the postal field service so require.

"Equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers

"SEC. 609. (a) In addition to the compensation provided in the Rural Carrier Schedule, each rural carrier shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 9 cents per mile for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled. The Postmaster General may pay such additional equipment maintenance allowance as he determines to be fair and reasonable, not in excess of $3 per day when combined with the equipment maintenance allowance provided by the preceding sentence, to rural carriers entitled to additional compensation under section 302 (c) of this Act for serving heavily patronized routes. Payments for such equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

"(b) Any employee in the postal field service who is assigned to serve any rural route, and who furnishes the vehicle used in the performance of such service, shall be paid the equipment maintenance allowance provided for the route so served, in addition to his compensation.

"Allowances for postmasters in fourth-class post offices

"SEC. 610. Postmasters of fourth-class post offices shall be paid as allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment an amount equal to 15 per centum of the compensation earned in each pay period, at the same time and in the same manner as their regular compensation.

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Classes of post offices

"SEC. 701. The Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of gross annual postal receipts. He shall place in the first class those post offices at which such receipts are $40,000 or more. He shall place in the second class those post offices at which such receipts are $8,000 or more, but less than $40,000. He shall place in the third class those post offices at which such receipts are $1,500 or more, but less than $8,000. He shall place in the fourth class those offices at which such receipts are less than $1,500.

"Assignment of employees

"SEC. 702. With the consent of the employee, the Postmaster General is authorized to detail any employee, including any employee of the departmental service, between the postal field service and the departmental service to such extent as may be necessary to develop a more efficient working force and more effectively to perform the work of the Department. Each such detail shall be made for a period of not more than one year and may be made without change in compensation of the employee so detailed.

"Increases in basic compensation not 'equivalent increases'

"SEC. 703. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of enactment of this Act shall not be considered as an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 701 (a) (A) of the Classification Act of 1949, in the case of employees who transfer or are transferred to a position coming within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949.

"Postal employees of the Canal Zone Government

"SEC. 704. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to adopt applicable provisions of this Act for postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, as of the respective effective dates of such applicable provisions.

"References in other laws with respect to Public Law 134 Seventy-ninth Congress

"SEC. 705. (a) Whenever reference is made in any other law to the Act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, such reference shall be held and considered to mean this Act. Whenever reference is made in any other law to a 'grade' of such Act of July 6, 1945, such reference shall be held and considered to mean the corresponding basic salary step in any schedule contained in this Act.

"(b) The application of this Act to any position or employee shall not be affected by reason of the enactment of subsection (a).

"Applicability of act to Guam

"SEC. 706. This Act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"Regulations of Postmaster General

"SEC. 707. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this Act.

"Civil service act and rules, Veterans' Preference Act of 1944

"SEC. 708. This Act shall not be construed to modify the application of the Civil Service Act and Rules or the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the postal field service.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 709. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 710. (a) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) Section 601 of this Act shall take effect on any Sunday following the date of

enactment of this Act designated by the Postmaster General but not later than the first Sunday of the first calendar month which begins more than sixty days after such date of enactment.

"(c) The remainder of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(d) (1) The adjustment of the basic salary of each employee to the basic salary established for the position he was occupying on the effective date of this Act shall be completed within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of section 304 (b).

"(2) The applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the Act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), as amended, or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be, shall continue in effect with respect to each such employee until the date on which his basic salary is adjusted under such section 304 (b).

"(3) Such adjustment of basic salary of each such employee shall be made effective as of the effective date of section 304 (b) and payments of basic salary on the basis of such adjustment shall be decreased by the amounts of basic salary received by such employee during such period under the applicable provisions of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be."

And the House agrees to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MATTHEW M. NEELY,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
FRANK CARLSON,
WILLIAM LANGER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same. Except for technical and clerical changes, the differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are discussed below.

The Post Office Department estimates that this conference agreement will increase Post Office Department costs by $179,800,000 annually. Several items which are included in this estimate are neither salary increases nor reclassification adjustments. These items, which relate only to limited groups of employees, are: travel allowances for Postal Transportation Service employees, $3,600,000; longevity for substitute employees, $1,000,000; a new formula for computing pay of substitute rural carriers substitutes (312-day instead of 360-day basis), $2,000,000. Thus the cost attributable to salary increases and reclassification is $173,200,000, annually, representing 8.59 percent of present payroll.

In the House amendment, the description of the basic function of a typist, level 3, contained in paragraph (7) of section 203 includes the function of performing "general office clerical work." The conference substitute retains this function generally but strikes out the word "clerical" from the phrase "general office clerical work" in order to remove any implication that an employee in the position of typist, level 3, will be required to perform, as a part of the basic function of such position, clerical duties of a higher level.

Section 304 (a) of the House amendment provides that, before the adjustment of the basic salary (in effect immediately prior to the effective date of section 304) of an employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), or the Classification Act of 1949, to the appropriate new basic salary in the appropriate new schedule, such employee shall be given credit for each automatic salary grade increase under such Act of July 6, 1945, and each within-grade step increase under the Classification Act of 1949, which he has earned, but has not been credited with, on or prior to the first day of the first pay period following the date of enactment of the bill—the effective date of section 304.

Section 304 (a) of the conference substitute retains the above provision of section 304 (a) of the House amendment and, in addition, makes such provision applicable in the case of an employee whose basic salary would have been increased on July 1, 1955, by reason of changed gross postal receipts of his post office under provisions of law in effect prior to enactment of the conference substitute. As a result, under section 304 (a) of the conference substitute, each such employee will be given credit, before his basic salary is adjusted under the conference substitute, for increases in his basic salary which would have occurred on July 1, 1955, under existing provisions of law by reason of changed gross postal receipts of his post office.

Section 306 (a) of the House amendment relates to increases in the basic salary, in effect immediately prior to the effective date of section 306 (the first day of the first pay period following the date of enactment), of (1) each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended; and (2) each employee paid under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, whose basic salary is adjusted to one of the new basic salary schedules provided by the House amendment for the postal field service. In general, such section 306 (a) of the House amendment provides that such basic salary shall be increased by 6 percent, effective March 1, 1955.

Section 306 (a) of the conference substitute is the same as section 306 (a) of the House amendment except that such increase of 6 percent is increased by the conference substitute to 7 percent.

Section 403 of the House amendment relates to the adjustment of service credit for purposes of establishing eligibilty for step increases under section 401 of the House amendment.

In general, such section 403 provides—

(1) that each employee whose basic salary is adjusted as of the first day of the first pay period beginning after the date of enactment of the bill shall begin his waiting period of fifty-two weeks on the date of such adjustment; and

(2) that each employee in one of the automatic salary grades (other than the maximum grade) under the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, immediately prior to such adjustment of his basic salary may retain, for step-increase purposes under section 401, his anniversary date established under such act of July 6, 1945, if his increase in basic salary by reason of such adjustment is less than a certain proportionate part of the next automatic salary grade increase which he would have received under such act of July 6, 1945.

Section 403 of the House amendment, in effect, preserves the anniversary dates of employees by considering conversions to the new salary schedules as equivalent increases in basic compensation.

It is the opinion of the committee of conference, however, that the House amendment does not preserve existing anniversary dates for employees to the maximum extent consistent with the new classification and compensation system provided for by the House amendment.

Section 403 of the conference substitute replaces the above-discussed provision of the House amendment with language which constitutes a directive, coupled with a grant of the necessary authority, to the Postmaster General to preserve for employees now in the automatic grades (other than the maximum grades or single-salary grades) their respective anniversary dates now in effect. Such provision of the conference substitute provides that the Postmaster General shall exercise such authority in accordance with the following principles:

First, the existing anniversary dates of employees in the automatic grades (other than the maximum grades or single-salary grades) shall be preserved to the maximum extent consistent with the new classification and compensation system.

Second, in no case shall an employee who, as a result of conversion under this Act, is in the same salary level as a senior employee and whose anniversary date occurs prior to the anniversary date of such senior employee be advanced to the next higher step in such salary level before such senior employee. The term "senior employee" is defined as an employee (1) who is in the same position and in the post office or organizational unit as the junior employee concerned and (2) who, by virtue of his length of service or position, has seniority rights which are superior to those of such junior employee.

Third, in the case of any such junior employee whose present anniversary date cannot be preserved without advancing before such senior employee, the Postmaster General will be required to determine for such junior employee, as a new anniversary date, that date which will result in the shortest possible additional waiting period before such junior employee is advanced to the next higher step in his salary level. It is contemplated generally that, in the case of any such junior employee, the new anniversary date will be fixed as the first day of the first pay period which begins after the anniversary date of such senior employee.

The conference substitute also provides that each employee who is in the maximum automatic grade or who is in a single salary grade will begin a waiting period of 52 weeks for his anniversary date upon the effective date of his transfer into the appropriate salary schedule.

Section 606 (b) of the House amendment provides that each substitute employee shall be employed for not less than two hours when he reports for duty after receiving an official call to duty. Section 606 (b) of the conference substitute retains this provision of the House amendment and, in addition, extends such provision to all hourly-rate employees and temporary employees.

Section 710 (d) (2) of the House amendment provides that all applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the Act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, shall continue in effect for each employee until his basic salary is converted to the appropriate new schedule under the House amendment.

Section 710 (d) (2) of the conference substitute is the same as section 710 (d) (2) of the House amendment, except that the

conference substitute contains a reference to applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in order to make clear one of the purposes of section 710 (d) (2) of the House amendment.

Such purpose is to the effect that the applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall remain in effect for each employee paid under such act (whose basic salary is to be adjusted to one of the new basic salary schedules for the postal field service) until such basic salary is actually converted to the appropriate new schedule contained in the conference substitute.

Section 710 (d) (3) of the House amendment provides—

(1) that when the adjustment of the basic salary of each employee has been made through conversion under the House amendment, such adjustment shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment; and

(2) that payments of basic salary because of such adjustment shall be decreased by whatever amounts of basic salary the employee received, during the general period of conversion, under the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

Section 710 (d) (3) of the conference substitute is the same as section 710 (d) (3) of the House amendment, except that the conference substitute, in conformity with the clarifying change made by the conference substitute in connection with section 710 (d) (2), adds a reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in order to make it clear that payments of basic salary because of such adjustment shall also be decreased by whatever amounts the employee received, during the conversion period under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report signed by 5 managers on the part of the House and 5 managers on the part of the Senate.

The conference report is not too much different from the bill H. R. 4644 as finally approved by the House. The only major change in the bill is that the House bill provided for a minimum increase of 6 percent for every postal employee. The conference report raises that minimum increase from 6 percent to 7 percent. There are other minor changes in the legislation as reported by the House, but they are not material and do not alter the general principles of the legislation.

I think the House conferees did some pretty good trading and were able to report back a good compromise between the two bodies. However, as I said on the floor of the House when the original bill H. R. 4644 was being considered, if the amendment known as amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] was adopted, that then, in all good conscience, I could not support my own bill. The Moss amendment was adopted. In my opinion, the adoption of this amendment makes the bill full of injustices and inequities and distorts the proper salary relationship and reclassification structure. For that reason I voted against the bill. However, when I went to conference with the other conferees of the House I made this statement at the conference. I said, "I opposed this bill because of the Moss amendment, but I am here as a conferee of the House to support and defend the position of the House." I did not regard my own personal wishes in the matter—in view of the action of the House—although I considered the Moss amendment most obnoxious and unfair.

I think this conference report should be sent to the President for action. There have been many predictions, both pro and con, about the action of the President on this legislation. I have said repeatedly that in my opinion I did not believe the President could approve this legislation and I still stand on that prediction. However, I am going to vote to send this conference to the President. While I am going to oppose a motion to recommit, I want to make it crystal clear, so that no one will misunderstand my position, that if the President in his wisdom and judgment sends back to the Congress a veto on this legislation I will support the veto of the President. I made that statement when this legislation was being considered, and my position has not changed.

This legislation has been before the House on three separate occasions. It was first here in February; again about a month ago, and now for the third time it is here on the conference report.

The President in his message to Congress in January recommended a 5 percent increase and reclassification of the pay structure.

His recommendation would have cost $129 million. The House held 17 days of hearings on the President's bill and in executive session the committee decided that the bill should be changed and made many changes. As the result of the majority wishes of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service we reported out a new bill, H. R. 4644. This was a fair bill until it was practically wrecked and destroyed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. That filled it with inequities. It gives undue advantages to certain groups of clerks and city carriers and penalizes certain city carriers and clerks in the middle grades. It does not treat the rural carriers fairly. For that reason I am opposed to the bill, but I think it is time that this legislation now be sent to the President. It has been kicking around here long enough, and I ask you to support the unanimous report of the conferees in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss.]

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to support the conference report generally as an improvement over the bill passed by this House. In doing so I want to deal specifically with some of the comments by the Postmaster General contained in his letter to the distinguished minority leader of this House wherein he states that the bill which has been brought about as a result of the combined majority judgment of the two Houses of Congress presents an administrative impossibility. I might add that if the amount of increase were 7.6 rather than 8.6 the difficulties of administering the bill would apparently evaporate.

There is a statement made by Mr. Summerfield that the amount of increase is excessive. He says that since 1945 the employees have had an increase of 90 percent and that the cost of living during that same period has gone up but 48 percent. Let us look at the facts and consider them well, because Mr. Summerfield's statement is another example of what you can do with figures.

Since 1939 the total salary increase of the field employees in the Postal Service has been 93 percent. The cost of living since 1939 has gone up 93.8 percent. You have at this moment almost an exact parity between the cost of living and the percentage increase afforded people in the postal field service. The picture nationally for our industrial employees and for the national income generally shows a strikingly different pattern; for salary increases ranged from 200 to 500 percent in the same period of time. The only advantage the Federal employee enjoyed has been wiped out. To take the increase from 1945 only as a measure for proper evaluation is in no way fair, because prior to 1945—due to the war and the freeze on salaries—we did not treat our Federal employees at all fairly. This is the opportunity to give them decent treatment.

Comment is made that the amendments I proposed are a penalty against certain groups.

One group mentioned as a perfect example of my so-called abusive tactics was the special-delivery messengers. Those people who work as special-delivery messengers always have received a salary less than that paid a city carrier. In the administration proposal it was contemplated that they would be brought into full equality with the city carriers for the first time. The responsibility of the position is in no way the same as that of a city carrier; the examination itself is in no way comparable. In restoring the balance—not distorting it—but restoring the balance between the special-delivery messenger and the carrier—you are bringing about equitable treatment and leaving the special-delivery messenger still with a percentage of increase in this legislation as great as, or greater than, the carriers themselves will get.

We are told that we did not treat the supervisory personnel properly. That is a determination which, under this legislation, is within the power of the Postmaster General. He will allocate these jobs. I tried my best in committee to put in more positions at the supervisory level. I thought we should at least define the position of the superintendent of mails, because under this legislation no one at this moment can tell you what his salary will be. But it was the determination of the Department and the committee that that should not be done.

Mr. Chairman, as to the rural carriers I have this statement to make.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. While the great bulk of employees get a 7-percent increase under the reclassification, some of these postmasters and supervisors, as I understand it, can get an increase of over 50 percent, is that correct?

Mr. MOSS. As high as 58 percent.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to these rural carriers, I felt that the bill reported by the committee did not do them full justice. In the minority views which accompanied that bill to the floor there was clear language proposed to deal more equitably with them; but the representatives of the rural carriers came to me and asked that it not be offered. They said they were satisfied completely with the bill as it was written. They get more than just the increase proposed in the bill. They get a recomputation of the base for their annual wage and they get an increase in their equipment-maintenance cost, so they are not treated too badly. However, they are not treated as well as I would like to have had them treated.

I think it is a perfect example of the difficult job facing the Congress when it tries to write reclassification and salary increases in one package. You cannot convert a salary schedule to a new one without bringing about some inequities.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman stated that the bill allowed an increase in equipment allowance for rural carriers. The gentleman I know did not intend to make that statement because, as he knows, the bill does not provide an increase in the equipment allowance for rural carriers.

Mr. MOSS. It allows an increase in the per diem operating cost for the equipment, as I recall it. There are increases which under your conference report amounts to about $2 million.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman is incorrect about that. The bill does provide for an increase in per diem for postal transportation, but we are talking about rural carriers.

Mr. MOSS. There is an increase which applies to the cost of the operation of the equipment by the rural carriers proposed in the bill, as I understand it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am sorry the gentleman is incorrect about that. If he will investigate he will find he is wrong.

Mr. MOSS. I will correct the record at this point. I intended to refer to the computation for mileage allowance for rural carriers. Not only does the increased percentage affect the fixed salary of rural carriers, but it applies to their annual mileage allowance. This annual mileage allowance is, in effect, for the maintenance of equipment. By increasing both the mileage allowance and the fixed salary of rural carriers, they are benefited substantially.

The gentleman will also recall that in the minority report there is a proposed new schedule which I wanted to offer on behalf of the rural carriers but which their representatives said they did not want.

To point out the support the conference report has from the representatives of the employees who will be directly affected by this legislation, I want to bring to the attention of the Members the following letter I received:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE AND GENERAL SERVICE MAINTENANCE EMPLOYEES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE AND POSTAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE MAIL HANDLERS, WATCHMEN, AND MESSENGERS; NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE MOTOR VEHICLE EMPLOYEES; NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION; UNITED NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,

May 9, 1955.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: The national representatives of the six organizations listed on the letterhead above are authorized and directed to advise you of the unanimous support of their membership for the conference agreement on S. 1—the postal-pay bill.

We sincerely urge you and your colleagues in the House of Representatives, without regard to political affiliation, to support the conference agreement on the postal-pay bill. It represents legislation which will meet with the overwhelming approval of a majority of the employees affected by the bill.

Thanking you for your consideration of our request, we are

Respectfully yours,

ROSS A. MESSER,
Legislative Representative, National Association of Post Office and General Service Maintenance Employees.

W. M. THOMAS,
President, National Postal Transport Association.

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

SAMUEL E. KLEIN,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.

PAUL M. CASTIGLIONI,
Legislative Representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees.

HAROLD MCAVOY,
President, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question. If this conference report is adopted, and it goes to the White House and is vetoed, and then is sent back to our committee which would report a 7.6 bill, does the gentleman then intend to resubmit his amendment when it comes back to the floor?

Mr. MOSS. I think that is a question which I would probably cross when faced with it. At the moment we are considering a conference report representing the judgment of the two Houses. I am acting on that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman does not care to answer that question now; it that right?

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman not only does not care to but definitely states that he will cross that bridge when he gets to it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, to some people the action on this conference report here today seems to provide the Members of this body an opportunity to vote once again on whether or not they are friends of the postal employees and whether or not they are interested in the welfare and the working conditions of the postal employees. Unfortunately the issue is not quite that simple, as we are all friends of the postal employees. There are serious disagreements, however, as to what the proper amount of this increase should be. There is also serious and honest disagreement as to how the amount of increase should be distributed among the various employees. Of course, a lot of us here are very anxious to vote for a measure that has a chance of becoming law and that will put the money into the pockets of the employees that we are trying to help. I am not going to get into this threat of the veto again. We have heard enough about it. It is a matter of opinion, of course, whether or not the President will veto this bill. I think there is practically unanimous agreement now that he will veto a 10-percent raise. Certainly no effort was offered in committee to put a 10-percent increase in this bill, but as far as I am concerned, I am convinced, just as sure as I am convinced that I am standing here, that this bill will be vetoed and any action on my part to support this measure in its present form would be an idle gesture. We will yet have the opportunity to come back and vote on a 7.6 bill. It seems improper to me to place the responsibility for the proper distribution of this income on the shoulders of the President. I think we should exercise that judgment ourselves and get out a bill that has a chance to become law and a bill that he will sign. However, many of us are very much concerned about the plight of the classified employees. As we know, they have followed the action taken on the postal employees, and they have been the victims of strategy, right or wrong, used by the supporters of the postal employees. We have tried to get action on the classified bill for several weeks, to come on out with an 8 percent or 7.6 percent classified bill and get it on down to the White House and not wait for final action on the postal bill. However, there was general assumption that this postal bill would never be enacted into law; that it would be vetoed. With this presumption and with the commitment of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], that we would come back into committee as soon as this bill was vetoed and sustained and act on both a postal and classified bill at the same time, and that would come out on the floor of this body to act on simultaneously, we agreed to hold up action for the time being on classified pay. We know during the past years this has been

repeated several times. The classified employees have not fared as well; the percentage of increase has not been as high. I think there is general agreement among the members of the committee that we will come out this time with the same amount of increase for the classified employees that we vote for the postal employees, and we think that will be 7.6 percent. We will go back in committee with the measure and I believe we will come out with a classified bill of 7.5 or 7.6 percent. I would like at this time to urge all the Members of this body to act with the same enthusiasm, with the same interest, the same concern in the interest of the approximately 1 million classified employees as they have expressed for the 500,000 postal employees.

There have been charges made that there is more political power among the postal employees. Of course we all know that that is not so. We all want to be just as fair with one group of Federal employees as another. I believe that this body will be as fair with the classified employees and will act on a bill providing for a 7½-percent raise for classified employees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought I read in the papers—and if I am incorrect, I should like to be corrected by the gentleman—that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] was for a 10-percent increase for postal employees.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. How does the gentleman reconcile that with his present position which is that he is against this conference report?

Mr. BROYHILL. I likewise understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was for a 10-percent increase for the postal employees; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but I am for this, too.

Mr. BROYHILL. Why is the gentleman not for a 10-percent increase? I answer the gentleman's question this way. I am for the maximum increase that I feel has a chance of becoming law. I feel that my reasons are the same as those of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who came down from 10 percent to 8.2 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is subordinating his views, is he?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, if at any time any Member on the majority side of the aisle, in committee or otherwise, offered a 10-percent amendment for the consideration of the committee? To my knowledge, it was never offered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report, and would like to say that all of the arguments on this matter have been heard by the House once before. The main difference here is an increase in cost from the original bill passed by the House from $170 million to the conference substitute of $179.8 million. That comes about principally by an increase of 1 percent in the conversion factor, from 6 to 7 percent, running from March 1 to the date of enactment, with an approximate increase of one-half percent from then on.

I should like to commend the chairman of the conference committee and the other managers on the part of the House for having done such an expeditious job and for having retained the bulk of the House bill.

The other changes that are set forth in the conference report are corrective for the most part and are not of too great concern. I feel, therefore, that the House would be proper in supporting the conference committee report, in view of the action it has already taken.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], there are two things that occurred in the committee. No. 1, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] offered an amendment in committee providing for 9.3 percent increase. Those who claim they are for a 10 percent increase voted against that. Let us keep that in mind.

No. 2, I was the first member in that committee who realized the situation and introduced a bill for a 10 percent increase, including reclassification.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Is the gentleman saying that at this session the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was given an opportunity to vote upon a 10 percent postal pay raise bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Not a straight 10 percent increase.

Mr. GUBSER. In a reclassification bill or otherwise?

Mr. LESINSKI. Not a straight 10 percent increase.

Mr. GUBSER. Was such an amendment ever presented in executive session of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by any member of the committee either on the majority or minority side?

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] offered an amendment to the bill, providing for 9.3 percent, and the so-called minority members, who were the majority of the committee, voted against it.

Mr. GUBSER. That is right; I do not remember voting against an amendment providing for 9.3 percent.

Mr. LESINSKI. Very well; let us call the staff of the committee and verify that. But I should like to point out something else at this point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. In order to get the record straight, I should like to inform the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] that the first amendment I offered proposed a 21-level schedule which provided an average cost of 9.3-percent. It was voted down. I subsequently offered 2 other amendments effecting a 21-level schedule.

Mr. LESINSKI. The Postmaster General seems to think that this legislation is very unwieldy. For the information of the House, the chairman and the other members of the committee had all the amendments accepted by the Post Office Department before being accepted by the committee. That is definite. They had conceded to every amendment. Then there were 3 amendments introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], on the floor of the House, and the only one I can see at the present time they are against is the one providing that the Post Office Department has to report back to the Congress after the first of next year. What is wrong with that? What department has the right to dictate to Congress what we should do or cannot do?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think anybody ever opposed it.

Mr. LESINSKI. No, but the Department evidently is opposed to it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Three amendments were offered by the gentleman from California. I accepted two of the amendments and opposed only amendment No. 2.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is right. What is wrong about this legislation, then?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I would not want to take up all the gentleman's time explaining the many things wrong with it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Does the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee mean to tell me that 1 percent is causing all the trouble here, that it should be not 10 percent, only 8.2 or 8.5?

I can assure the Members of the House that the only thing wrong with this legislation is that the Postmaster General does not like, is the fact that he has to come back after the first of next year and report to Congress as to what he has done.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has arrived in this matter of postal pay legislation when we ought to take stock of the situation as it actually exists. This controversy has been going on for well over 2 years. It has reached a stalemate every time it has been considered. The record votes on it are numerous. Politics has been served. Everyone is on record. One of next year's issues has been created while the postal worker works for inadequate wages. I suggest that the time has now arrived when we had better forget the politics and give serious consideration to giving the postal workers a raise. The issue is now like and old, deflated political football. It is old, it is worn out. I suggest that if any of you are truly serious, truly desirous of giving the postal

workers a raise now, you vote to recommit this bill and bring back a bill which has a chance of being signed. If deep in your heart, you are truly desirous of doing what is right for the postal workers, you will vote them a raise now and stop this delay.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a replay of an old record. We have a very practical problem before us. A week or so ago the House passed an 8.2 raise. I reiterate today what I said then. I think both side of the House are sincerely endeavoring to get a raise that will actually produce cash in the pockets of the employees instead of filling their ears with arguments, countercharges, and counterblasts.

I do not know what the President is going to do. I read in the paper that he said he may or may not veto it. I have great respect for what the minority leader says. He says the President will veto it. Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], says he will. So right now we are in a game of prognostication, we are crystal-ball gazing.

I think we ought to pass the conference report and send it to the President and see what he does. If he vetoes it, we will be back with another raise. If you recommit the bill, you are right back where we started 3 or 4 weeks ago. We still do not know what he—the President—is going to do. You say he will veto, we say he will not. The one way to find out what he will do is to put the document in his hands and let him do whatever he wants to do.

My feeling is we should pass it. I say this not in any partisan sense at all. I know that the gentlemen of the minority have tried. Naturally, we want more money for the postal employees. Being Democrats, we are more generous. We are more conscious of the little fellow. A person who has the grocery bill that I do is more apt to vote for more money for the postal employee and his family. But remember, the people who are involved here are the postal employees, wives, and children. They are entitled to this money. Let us resolve our difficulty. We will never resolve it by debating back and forth. The President alone can resolve it. If it is vetoed, as the chairman has said, we will have another bill and you will have an opportunity to give them a raise. But the wives and children of the postal employees are entitled now to get the cash. Arguments are splendid but you cannot buy bread with arguments. I know of one group who state that they are for 10 percent or nothing. That is a wonderful idea, but you go home to your wife and say, "Sweetheart, we can have 10 percent or nothing." She will say, "Isn't it wonderful, let us take the 10 percent." And you say, "Oh, but we got nothing." She will say, "Listen, honey, take off and don't come back for a long time." Let us not be dumb. It seems to me, we have a very practical problem. Will the President go for an 8.8 percent increase? I do not know. Will he listen to Mr. Summerfield? I do not know. Will he listen to the people who are waiting for the raise? I rather suspect he will. He signed our pay raise, and it seems to me he is a fairly pleasant man. I think he understands the problems of the little fellow. Why do we not give the President a chance to be generous and adopt another Democratic measure, as he has been doing right along so successfully.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, once again we have heard the plea by my good friend from New Jersey about how the Democrats are always concerned about the little man. Of course, I think we ought to have the record set straight. They will find that the Republican Party has always been more concerned for all of the little men everywhere. We are not segregating any one little group here and another little group there playing them against one another. Let me say to you, we never will because we are interested in all the citizens of the United States regardless of what their status in life may be. This business of getting up and talking and pleading for all the little men for political advantage in my opinion, is a classical demonstration of political demagoguery. Let me just say, as far as this bill is concerned, it is in the same status as it was when it came from our committee. Seven and six-tenths percent is going to be in the bill that will eventually pass through this House, and you know it and I know it. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to get all of the political mileage out of it that they can get. That is why I asked my good friend, the gentleman from California, whether or not if this bill is vetoed, he was going to resubmit his amendments to the new bill. I say to you, I do not believe he will unless he wants to drag it out further and I do not believe the postal workers want to drag it out further. My mail indicates that they would like to get this increase and get it now. This 7.6 percent bill is a good bill. I have compared the wages of semiskilled workers in my area, and I come from an area which is highly industrialized, and I find that the average hourly wage of semiskilled workers in my home town, which is the largest city in my district, is $1.86 to $1.96 per hour. That is the maximum. This bill provides $1.75 to $2.24 maximum. Let us look at the fringe benefits—and I have no opposition to them, but I think the public ought to know about them. The maximum fringe benefit for postal workers is 26 days vacation a year. That is 5 weeks and 1 day. You show me any place in your district where anybody gets 5 weeks and 1 day vacation. In addition to that, they have 13 days sick leave, which is cumulative and that is fine. They get 9 paid holidays a year and in an election year, it is 10 paid holidays. That adds up to a minimum of 48 days per year, which is 9 weeks and 3 days. I know of no place where that can be compared with in industry or any municipal government of any city that I represent, or in the State government of Michigan. If anyone can do it so far as his own State is concerned, I would like him to stand up and tell me where it is. I think this bill is a fine bill. For anyone to say it is not easier to vote for 10 percent than 7.6 percent is somewhat ridiculous. It is always easy to vote for more money, but it is another problem to raise it. We have a responsibility to be fair to our employees and also to all of the citizens we represent. This 7.6 percent salary bill meets these responsibilities and I intend to support it as in the past. I shall continue to refuse to play politices with the salaries of our employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has said on a number of occasions that when he makes recommendations to the Congress it is up to the Congress to work its will; that he will not dictate to Congress, and that he would give profound respect to the views of Congress. Only the other day in a press conference he clearly indicated that he had not made up his mind on what action he would take when this bill is presented to him. It looks to me as though some of my Republican friends are trying on the floor of this House to pressure him into a veto, and also that it is clearly the position taken by the Postmaster General in his letter yesterday to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] according to the newspapers. It seems rather difficult for me to believe that the President of the United States would sign a bill with an average of 7 percent increase in pay for most of postal employees with an average 7.6-percent increase for all postal employees, and refuse to sign one carrying an average increase of 8.6 percent, when we have in mind that the great bulk of the employees at a straight 7 percent, with the extra 1.6 percent for the increase that will take place under the reclassification provisions of this bill, is what the administration asked for. The 8.6 average is the result of the reclassification provision. In some cases under reclassification, there will be an increase in salary of over 50 percent. Certainly it seems to me that the President of the United States would not say to the country, "I will sign a bill carrying an increase of over 50 percent for some employees, and I will deny an increase of 7 percent for the great bulk of employees."

This bill is about the best practical result that I have seen in many years on a bill of this kind. I am opposed to the reclassification provisions of this bill, and so is the Speaker. So are the great bulk of Democrats, but we accepted it in order to try to bring about a compromise and to arrive at a practical solution.

In this bill going to the President are provisions that I am opposed to, but I went along with them in order to bring about a practical solution, a compromise of the conflicting views. Each and every one of us knows from our own experiences that in legislation of this kind conflicting views present extreme diffi-

culties. So, as I see it, this is about as good a practical result as I have seen on any legislation of this kind during my period of service here. If a veto is made and if the veto should be sustained, of course we will have to start the journey over again, but I am not sacrificing my position to advocate the responsibility of Congress, to the head of any agency, as represented by the reclassification provision in this bill, if that happens. I am sure that a great majority of the Democrats will oppose delegating legislative authority to the Postmaster General in the field of reclassification that is contained in this bill. You may not get an average of 7.6 percent. As far as I am concerned, we will insist that Congress legislate on reclassification; that all we give to the Postmaster General is the power to make recommendations back to the Congress, or that there be a joint committee appointed for that purpose. So at least these considerations are involved. Now it is not going to be all honey if there is a veto and if the veto is sustained.

Now I am going to talk about the action of the Postmaster General in trying to dictate to the Congress of the United States a separate but coordinate branch of the Government as he did yesterday.

Why. The President of the United States did not do that in his press conference the other day; he deliberately refrained from doing that; he has proper respect for the Congress of the United States. But the Postmaster General showed a complete lack of respect. I think the letter of the Postmaster General yesterday not only undertook to put Congress on the spot through the medium of dictation, but it also puts the President on the spot when this bill goes to him. Not only is he undertaking to dictate to the legislative branch of the people but he is also by the action in his letter undertaking to dictate to the President of the United States, and the people of the country will be watching whether or not the Postmaster General is such a dictator that he is able to accomplish that. Certainly, we in the House today should repudiate dictation of that kind by any Cabinet officer. It never took place under the Democrats.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend wants to defend them; of course, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, if he would call it dictating had the tables been reversed and he wrote to a department head and inquired as to his opinion on certain legislation? Would not the gentleman expect an answer?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would expect an answer, but I would expect an answer which did not constitute dictation to the legislative branch of the United States by the head of an agency.

Mr. MARTIN. The head of every department is obliged to respond to a request of any Member of Congress if he wants to do his job properly. There was no dictation in the letter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman approve of the letter he received? And, if so, does he recognize that it is going to be a precedent for the future? Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. MARTIN. When I write to a department official for his opinion, I expect to get the facts and I expect to get his honest opinion, and that is what he gave me.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made a statement which may in the years to come be a ghost of the past staring him and his party in the face. Statements made today have a habit of becoming ghosts of the past and staring one's leadership in the face in the future. I was surprised when I listened to the statement made by my friend from Massachusetts in his position of leadership.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my other distinguished friend on the Republican side.

Mr. HALLECK. I am the gentleman's friend.

The gentleman spoke of the manner in which the Democratic department heads had operated and also spoke of the President's position.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I said was that no Democrat——

Mr. HALLECK. Let me correct the gentleman and remind the gentleman of something.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that during the Democratic administration no head of an agency or department ever threatened while a bill was pending in Congress to recommed a veto to the President if a bill passed.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further that I may complete the observation I wanted to make?

Mr. McCORMACK. Observation or question?

Mr. HALLECK. It will be a question, then.

I do not know whether the gentleman was present or not, but the present Speaker of the House was. I recall very vividly one occasion during the 80th Congress when we were called up to the White House about a certain piece of legislation pending before the Congress and were there told by the then President of the United States that if that bill were passed he would veto it. He told us that unequivocally, without a question of doubt. I certainly felt it was a threat of a veto and, to be perfectly frank about it, I resented it.

I think the President in the present instance has conducted himself very well.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are separating yourself from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not separating at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Or even are differing with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HALLECK. I am saying it is perfectly proper for department heads to express their views on legislation affecting their departments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now the gentleman is making a speech. I have not much time and I have a few more remarks to make about the Postmaster General that my Republican friends will be pleased with, I think.

Mr. HALLECK. Up to now, of course, I do not have any time. I do not know whether the gentleman from Tennessee has any time left, but I would just like to make this observation, if the gentleman will permit me, the President responded to a letter from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman mean the Postmaster General?

Mr. HALLECK. No; the President. The President responded to a letter of the gentleman from Tennessee about the proposal and said that he was concerned about the action of the committee in increasing the amount from 5 to 6 percent. Further than that he said that he would view with the greatest apprehension any further increase in the amount. To me that is a fair statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am not criticising that statement.

Mr. HALLECK. He is within his rights in making that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, wait a minute. I have not said anything as to the President and his position. As a matter of fact, the President specifically said at his press conference the other day that he had not made up his mind yet as to what he will do, despite the statements made on the floor of the House today and heretofore. My remarks were directed toward the Postmaster General.

We all know what the Postmaster General did last year. He was so provoked that we would not give an increase in first-class mail from 3 to 4 cents that he persuaded, apparently, President Eisenhower to veto the bill. That is not even in this bill, so it is out. We know that he has been up in this Capitol for days and days and weeks last year while the bill was pending lobbying and pressuring Republican Members of Congress. We know his assistants, former Members of this House, have been on the floor last year and this year lobbying, and I have had it from Republican friends of mine, colleagues of mine here, that they resent it. We know they have even threatened Republican Members that they would have candidates against them in their primary fights or that on election day they would not get financial support. I know that because I got that from Republican friends of mine, Members of the House, who resent it. That is not the kind of tactics that any man should engage in. They are arrogant, they are domineering; they are not the tactics of the head of an agency under democratic government, they are the tactics of the head of an agency under a dictatorship. His letter to the former Speaker, whom I admire very much and for whom I have a strong feeling of friendship, is such that every Member of this body who respects himself as a Member should vote to adopt the conference report.

If it is vetoed, and I do not think it will be—my right to predict is as good as anyone else, I think the President will use his judgment, he will survey the whole picture—if it is vetoed, then we ought to pass the bill over the veto.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the following communication:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE AND GENERAL SERVICE MAINTENANCE EMPLOYEES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE AND POSTAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE MAIL HANDLERS, WATCHMEN, AND MESSENGERS; NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE MOTOR VEHICLE EMPLOYEES; NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION; UNITED NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,

May 9, 1955.

To the Members of Congress:

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the postal employees asked for a salary increase, not having received any increase in salary since 1951. Since 1939, postal salaries have not kept pace with salaries paid throughout industry.

The Post Office Department at the same time submitted a general reclassification proposal. The House of Representatives and the Senate passed separate bills and, through conference, they have decided on a bill that retains the major portion of the reclassification proposal submitted by the Post Office Department, and presents a compromise on the amount of pay increase. This compromise does not entirely satisfy the Post Office Department, nor does it entirely satisfy the postal employees. This is considered the mark of a good compromise. If the Congress had decided to disregard completely the needs of the employees and adopted the proposal of the Post Office Department, it would have acted most unfairly. On the other hand, if Congress had totally disregarded the wishes of the Post Office Department, it could have been subjected to criticism by the administrative branch of the Government.

Instead, Congress worked out a compromise that we believe is a fair compromise, one that should be unanimously approved by the Congress, and should receive the support of the legislative branch of the government. On behalf of the six employee organizations, representing better than 60 percent of all nonsupervisory employees in the postal field service, we appeal to you to support the conference report on S. 1, the postal pay and reclassification bill.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL E. KLEIN,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.

PAUL M. CASTIGLIONI,
Legislative Representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees.

HAROLD MCAVOY,
President, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service, Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers.

ROSS A. MESSER,
Legislative Representative, National Association of Post Office and General Service Maintenance Employees.

W. M. THOMAS,
President, National Postal Transport Association.

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and disturbed by the statement of the distinguished majority leader who just left the floor. He charges a Cabinet member with being arrogant. I think his statement goes a little beyond what he would want it to say, upon reflection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have no time to reply to that statement. I am just making an observation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman would not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct some statements that ought to be clarified that have been made on the floor of this House. I agree that everyone should vote for or against legislation on its merits.

Now, something has been said about a certain party being unfriendly to the postal employees. I was chairman of the House Post Office Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress. I had the full and complete support of the present chairman of that committee. The largest single increase, $450 a year, ever given to postal employees was voted during that Congress.

The distinguished leader of the House has just called attention to the reclassification features of this bill. The truth of the matter is that 90 percent of the employees in the Post Office Department are classified by Congress right in this bill, and the Postmaster General will make classifications, affecting less than 10 percent of the employees in the postal service. He must follow a strict standard set by Congress in rating these positions—and his decision may be appealed to the Civil Service Commission.

Now I would like to clear up one more thing. As chairman of the committee every time a piece of legislation came before our committee affecting the Post Office Department I wrote the Postmaster General and asked his opinion. Yet here we are today with the leader of the House on the Democratic side indicating that we had no right to ask the Postmaster General what he thinks about a piece of legislation affecting the Post Office Department. Think of it. I do not understand his position.

I would like to add right here that I have received a number of letters and other messages from postal employees, particularly clerks, who believe the reclassification would injure their rights and security in the jobs they presently hold. They are sincere in their concern. If I thought the rights and privileges of earnest, hardworking employees would be jeopardized by the chairman's bill, I would be among the first to see that such injury is corrected.

I have always tried to be fair and forthright toward the employees, all of them, in the postal service. I am trying to secure approval of legislation that is fair and reasonable and has a fair chance of being enacted into law at the earliest date. All postal employees are entitled to this consideration.

By the way, a good deal has been said about this 10 percent business around here.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, a former valued member of the Post Office Committee of the House.

Mr. MASON. Was there anyone in conference, either from the opposite body or this body, who insisted upon or asked that 10 percent should be adopted by the conference?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference has left this legislation in the same situation in which it was when it left the House. That is, the pay schedules in it have become so distorted and the inequities multiplied to the point that it will never become law.

This is indeed unfortunate because postal employees, whose salaries will be affected by this legislation, have been looking forward to some material evidence of the salary increases which I am sure that virtually every Member of Congress here would like to give them.

May I review just a little bit what has happened in the course of this legislation. To begin with, the President, in his message to the Congress, stated that he favored an adjustment in the salaries of postal employees in an amount of about 5 percent. This 5 percent increase was substantially more than the increase in the cost of living since the last pay raise in 1951. The increase in the cost of living was just a little over 3 percent. The President warned that we must accompany such a salary increase with a reclassification of postal positions.

Both the chairman and I, as ranking member of the committee, introduced this legislation when it was submitted to the House. Our committee scheduled hearings on it almost concurrently with the organization of our committee in this Congress.

It has been said that the threat of veto has hung over the heads of the legislative bodies, that is the committee and the House and Senate during our deliberation of this measure. Let us, however, be fair about this threat of veto. There was no threat of veto as far as legislation is concerned which would approve a proper job reclassification plan and a reasonable salary increase. The only reason there has been a threat of veto has been because the bill has been loaded with larger salary increases than seem justified and the pay schedules distorted that make larger salary increases for certain groups of employees, but not others.

As the salary schedules were presented by the Postmaster General in legislation submitted to the Speaker of the House, they were drawn up after careful study and designed to present a proper relationship between pay and the job to be performed by the individual employee. The study and assignment of this job relationship indicated that certain groups of employees were receiving a higher rate of pay for the job they were doing than other groups of employees.

To correct this, naturally, it was required to give a smaller increase to some employees when compared to others. This resulted in the charge that certain employees were being given the smallest pay raise. That, of course, is not correct. Every one received the same pay raise under the committee bill, which was 6 percent.

The differences in pay raises were because of reclassification and that was

based upon the relative responsibility of the job. When you look at what has happened to this legislation, it should be clear that as a result of twisting the pay schedules, inserting an additional job level and increasing that level again on the floor of the House, it has resulted in raising the increase under this bill for certain groups from one of the smaller increases to one of the larger increases.

It should be clear to the Members here that the solution to the problem of pay for postal employees is not to accede to the unreasonable requests and demands and to overlook fairness and justice to those employees who are willing to abide by the decisions of Congress. Let us take, for example, the rural carriers. The rural letter carriers traditionally have been paid at a level comparable to city letter carriers. This was based upon the average rural route of 45 miles in length. Today the rural carrier at the top grade on a 45-mile route receives the same pay as a city letter carrier in the top grade. As this bill was introduced, the city letter carrier and the rural letter carrier on the 45-mile route would have received the same pay. However, this relationship was thrown out of balance by an amendment made in the committee creating a new level 5 and giving level 5 higher raises to the city letter carriers. There was no commensurate increase in the schedules for rural letter carriers.

While it is true the rural carriers, as did at least four other large groups of postal employees, prefer the bill the committee recommended and did not want to be counted in as favoring crippling amendments. This was because they favored exactly the type of bill I am talking about. They preferred pay raises rather than have the bill killed with kindness. Neither, and I emphasize this, did they favor increasing other groups of employees to throw them out of balance with their position on the bill which is done by the amendment that was proposed.

When this bill came to the floor of the House, an amendment was made in order raising the city letter carriers even further. This amendment was adopted. Because of the terms of the rule under which the bill was being considered, it was impossible to make this same adjustments for the rural letter carriers. The same situation existed in conference. Since the schedules for the rural carriers were a part of the reclassification, it was impossible to raise them in the conference because that would have gone beyond our authority. So you can see that every step of the way there have been changes.

These changes have not seemed too large in and of themselves but each change affected favorably the same few groups of employees to the disadvantage of the rest.

As this pay legislation—H. R. 2987—was introduced, it was estimated the cost was $129 million. As it stands now, its estimated cost is $179 million. Virtually all of the increase of $50 million has gone to the clerks, city letter carriers and postal transportation clerks. Many others, such as postmasters have had their benefits reduced.

I would like to just say this to the House, that we have let ourselves be drawn into the trap of talking about this pay raise in the term of percentage increases—and an overall figure of percentage increases covering both the pay raise and the reclassification as well as other benefits.

If we wanted to consider it only on that basis, we would have a bill here that was calling for us to increase postal salaries in a mount equal to three times that of the cost of living since the last pay raise. If we want to talk about it in terms of dollars, we have pyramided it up to nearly $180 million a year in increased postal costs. If we want to talk about it in terms of a job classification, it can be described by one word, "failure."

I signed the conference report in order to bring it back to the House so that the others may have the opportunity to vote for it and, also, because I realize that if we are to have the chance to get back to a fair and equitable pay bill. S. 1 will have to be disposed of first.

There are no threats in my statement. I do want legislation that is fair and I hope will become law. What you are doing and what you have already done in the House is this. You have thrown the whole thing out of kilter. The bill now costs $180 million, as compared to $130 million when introduced. Almost all of this $50 million going to clerks, carriers, and motor-vehicle employees. Many others will be reduced. That is what you did when you voted the other day. The thing to do is to go back and pass the bill as our committee recommended it. I expect, at the proper time, to offer a motion to recommit this proposal that is before the House now with instructions that we support the original bill of the chairman and make it retroactive to March 1, 1955. That would be fair and right.

There has been a lot said here about hurrying this thing along. I am in just as much of a hurry as anyone, but I think we ought not to vote for this report before us today, not so much, as I said a moment ago, because of a possible veto, but because the original bill was right.

Something has been said about the Postmaster General's statement. I am going to read a part of it, and I am going to ask unanimous consent to include all of it in the RECORD.

As I said a moment ago, there is nothing wrong with an inquiry made of a member of the President's Cabinet, and a reply is proper and required. Here is what the Postmaster General says:

Because of the far-reaching impact of this legislation upon the postal service, I welcome your request for my reaction to the postal-pay conference report now before the House.

There is nothing wrong with that.

We are now in this situation: Both the administration and the Congress are eager to provide fair compensation and an equitable salary and incentive structure for all the half-million employees of the Post Office Department; yet, the legislation now before the House to serve this common purpose, instead of helping all postal workers, would fail to correct many serious inequities which we have sought to correct and, in addition, would create many new ones.

There is nothing wrong with that. He says further:

The facts are unmistakable. Approval of the postal legislation in its present form would discriminate against thousands of postal employees. I know the Congress does not desire this.

The legislation would create serious pay distortions; it would raise the pay of some by as much as 9 percent, while leaving at only 7 percent the increase of many employed at like duties. Thereby it would invite widespread dissatisfaction and serious morale problems.

It would raise havoc in the relationships of city carriers and rural carriers; these relationships in turn would be distorted in respect to the road clerks of the Postal Transportation Service; * * *

And there are other serious implications. Since 1945 most postal employees have had more than a 90 percent increase in salary. In the same period living costs went up 48 percent. * * * For example, senior letter carriers and clerks, now receiving an average of up to $2.10 an hour, would receive under this legislation up to $2.27 an hour. The revised scales would be well above the salaries paid by private employers for work of comparable responsibility. * * *

It is inherent in what I have said that should the Congress forward this legislation in its present form to the President for signature, I could not in good conscience, in consideration of the welfare of the postal employees and the Postal Establishment, recommend its approval.

He does not say that he is going down and tell the President not to sign the bill, but that if he is asked for a recommendation, he will recommend that the President do not approve it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter of the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1955.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: Because of the far reaching impact of this legislation upon the postal service, I welcome your request for my reaction to the postal pay conference report now before the House.

We are now in this situation: Both the administration and the Congress are eager to provide fair compensation and an equitable salary and incentive structure for all the half-million employees of the Post Office Department; yet, the legislation now before the House to serve this common purpose, instead of helping all postal workers, would fail to correct many serious inequities which we have sought to correct and, in addition, would create many new ones.

The facts are unmistakable. Approval of the postal legislation in its present form would discriminate against thousands of postal employees. I know the Congress does not desire this.

The legislation would create serious pay distortions; it would raise the pay of some by as much as 9 percent, while leaving at only 7 percent the increase of many employed at like duties. Thereby it would invite widespread dissatisfaction and serious morale problems.

It would raise havoc in the relationships of city carriers with rural carriers; these relationships in turn would be distorted in respect to the road clerks of the Postal

Transportation Service; additional distortions would work to the disadvantage of special delivery messengers; the legislation would arbitrarily reduce the amount of increase available for supervisors, assistant postmasters, and postmasters.

Moreover, the legislation would throw salaries of many tens of thousands of postal employees far out of line with the pay of corresponding workers in America's private enterprise, and, within the Postal Establishment itself, it would destroy the basic concept of equal pay for equal work.

All of these things I am confident the Congress does not desire.

There is another fundamental I must mention. This legislation is now so drawn as to make it utterly impossible for any Postmaster General to administer it with fairness. Many employees, by force of this law, would necessarily be unjustly treated. This, again, I know the Congress does not want.

And there are other serious implications. Since 1945 most postal employees have had more than a 90 percent increase in salary. In the same period living costs went up 48 percent. Since the last postal pay increase, living costs went up only 3 percent; this fact was one of the important considerations in determining our initial recommendation for a 6.5 percent pay increase. Yet, the pending legislation would now impose pay increases not only out of line with the living cost increases of the past 4 years but also, in large measure, out of line with private industry wage scales. For example, senior letter carriers and clerks, now receiving an average of up to $2.10 an hour, would receive under this legislation up to $2.27 an hour. The revised scales would be well above the salaries paid by private employers for work of comparable responsibility. This comparison, of course, does not apply to supervisory employees whose salaries remain well below their counterparts in private industry.

I shall not catalog many additional deficiencies in this legislation. What I have already stated clearly demonstrates that its approval in its present form would be, for thousands of postal workers, unfair and discriminatory and, for the Postal Establishment as a whole, would create a multitude of unsolvable administrative problems and impose excessive costs which would vex us all for years to come. I hope, therefore, that in its zeal to join the administration in benefiting the postal service, the Congress will not adopt legislation which would in fact work against the best interest of the postal service.

It is inherent in what I have said that should the Congress forward this legislation in its present form to the President for signature, I could not in good conscience, in consideration of the welfare of the postal employees and the Postal Establishment, recommend its approval.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said on this matter already, I do not know what anyone could add. I had not expected to say anything, but after what in my opinion was an unwarranted attack upon the Postmaster General, I felt it incumbent upon me to say something. I have known Arthur Summerfield for a long time. He is no dictator. He is a great American. He has done a good job. He has brought efficiency and economy into the operations of the Post Office. When he has been called upon, he has responded with advice as to what ought to be done.

One trouble apparently with some of my good friends on my right is that they have not served under departmental heads of the other party for so long that they forget some of the recent occurrences in the executive branch. Many of these occurrences are very much alive with me. Every Postmaster General in my time has said what he believed in and has fought for it. As for other departmental heads, I have not forgotten that Mr. Ewing went around the country bucking for his socialized medicine, while Mr. Brannan went around the country bucking for his farm plan. It has always been that way.

As far as the President's attitude is concerned, I have no doubt about it at all and I think some of the people who are talking so glibly here about what he is going to do are playing fast and loose with the real facts. This is because in a fair and proper way he made his views known to the chairman of this committee; proper, I say because those views were asked by the chairman of the committee, and I think rightly so.

Do not forget that this bill first of all was the bill of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee wrote the bill. The membership increased the amount and made many changes as against the administration's proposal. Already this bill as it went from the House represented a compromise. The administration started with 6.5. The committee got that up to 7.6. Then the House made it 8.2. I say that it is now up to almost 9 percent.

As the gentleman from New Jersey says, generally speaking, the folks on his side of the aisle like to pay people a lot of money. It happens to be the taxpayers' money. We have to get it from somewhere. Apparently you are not very anxious about a rate increase. You already have a $400-million deficit in the Post Office, and you are going to add $179 million more a year if you pass this bill.

Certainly, I like to be open-handed. I voted for increases for the postal employees. The Republican 80th Congress put through the biggest single increase they have ever had. This process of making across-the-board increases brought about distortions so that some in the higher positions are getting a greater increase, and it is high time that correction came about.

As I view it, and there has been a lot of talk about using words like "responsibility," I feel a responsibility to the people of this country, to the whole fiscal situation, to the tax burdens that confront us all, whenever I come up to a matter like this.

Pressures? You have talked about pressures. There have been plenty of pressures exerted by the people who want this legislation.

Again, may I say I want them to get a raise. The 7.6 proposal is sound. It is a raise that can become law. I am going to vote to recommit this bill, and if that fails I am going to vote against the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate to the House that I am going to vote to send this conference report to the President and vote against a motion to recommit. I want it especially understood that in the event the President in his judgment and wisdom sends down a veto on this issue, I am going to vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF POSITION OF POST OFFICE SALARY INCREASE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that I did not get to the floor in time to vote against the motion to recommit the conference report on the postal employees' pay raise bill. I was detained in an executive session of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Department of Commerce which subcommittee was marking up the bill for final floor action.

I am a supporter of the pay raise efforts made in this session and had hoped that we could vote for a 10 percent increase. However, in view of the administration and the minority side successfully blocking consideration of an increase in that amount, I most wholeheartedly support the conference report and if I had been able to get to the floor in time I would have voted against the motion to recommit the report.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General of the United States has becomed obsessed with the idea that the Congress has nothing to say about operations the Post Office Department. In a communication to the minority leader of the House he has once again assumed a dictatorial attitude, which ill-becomes a public servant.

Mr. Summerfield's threat to do his utmost to obtain a Presidential veto of the postal pay increase bill unless the Congress bows to his mandate is entirely in keeping with his attitude toward the laws on the statute books, which he has seen fit to disregard. He has been able to violate those laws with impunity. It is high time that we put him on notice that the Congress did not enact the statutes with regard to the appointment of postmasters and veterans' preference as an empty idle gesture and that we expect the Postmaster General to respect those laws and conduct the affairs of his department in accordance with their provisions.

The veterans' organizations of our Nation have found just cause to be concerned about and resentful of the Postmaster General's subversion of the veterans' preference law to political expediency and his disregard for the rights of veterans, particularly of the disabled.

Recently I called the attention of this honorable body to a flagrant violation of the law by the Postmaster General in his failure to appoint a postmaster at Portales, N. Mex., although a list of 3 eligibles, all disabled veterans with 10 percent preference, had been set up by the Civil Service Commission and provided to the Post Office Department on December 18, 1953. To date, despite the fact that this same register of eligibles is

before the Post Office Department no postmaster has been appointed at Portales. The three eligibles on this list have ratings from 87.5 precent up to 97.25 percent. They have survived two reopened examinations which even a cursory investigation shows were called entirely for political reasons in an effort to displace the three eligibles, whom the Postmaster General and his partisan affiliates in New Mexico deem to be politically undesirable.

The eligible list carrying the names of the same three disabled veterans was returned by the Civil Service Commission to the Post Office Department for the third time about a month ago. Yet no action has been taken on it. The examination was reopened for a second time at the request of one man who flunked the first reopened test and did not take the first examination. He failed to make passing grade in the second reopened test which frustrated the political connivance that has kept the people of Portales from having the services of a duly appointed postmaster for a year and a half. The Postmaster General apparently has as little regard for the patrons of that post office as he has for the rights of disabled veterans and the proper remuneration of the employees of the Post Office Department. He has made the provision of the law that postmasters be appointed without delay meaningless. The Congress did not intend that a postmaster vacancy should be unfilled for 2 years—from April 30, 1953 until now. If that is not undue delay within the meaning of the law it seems to me that the Postmaster General should be called upon by the proper committees of Congress to explain his interpretation.

Mr. Summerfield's obsession that he has dictatorial powers over the Post Office Department and its employees and that he is above the law has continued long enough. Our obligation to the employees of the Post Office Department, to the veterans and to the American people as a whole, demands that we take steps to set Mr. Summerfield straight.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support the conference report on the Postal Service Act of 1955.

Although I feel that an 8.6 percent postal increase is inadequate, I accept the judgment of the committee conferees that the conference report represents the best opportunity to boost postal salaries this year.

No group of public employees works under more rules, regulations and supervision than the postal employees. These rules and regulations have widescale application, including the activities and conduct of personnel during off-duty hours, which few American workers would accept. The postal workers are dedicated—dedicated to public service as well as to the public trust.

Is there any reason why these public servants should be forced to live at a lower standard of living than their opposite numbers in private life? Is there any reason why the postal worker's wife must be a working wife in order to keep the family going? Is there any reason why postal workers must be forced to hold part-time and weekend occupations in order to provide for their families?

In these days of rapid technical advance and constant manpower displacement, it becomes increasingly necessary to provide the principal family wage earner with an income sufficient to provide adequately for family support. Forced work to supplement the family budget consumes employment opportunities which are needed by an ever-present segment of our unemployed. Our entire economy will profit by providing our postal workers with compensation sufficient to provide adequately for the support of their families. If postal workers can give up their part-time jobs, if the wives of postal workers can afford to give up their efforts to supplement the family income, job opportunities will increase for others.

There has been much debate on the possibility of a Presidential veto on this conference report. I do not believe a veto will occur. The exercise of a veto on this fair and equitable bill would be tantamount to an abuse of discretion which the President will not commit. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that our choice is not between an 8.8 percent and a 7.6 percent average-wage increase for postal workers; but between 7.6 percent and nothing. I hope the Congress will not do as it did last year and prevent the postal workers from getting anything at all. So I shall vote for the motion to recommit because it is apparent the bill cannot become law. If that motion fails, then I shall vote for the conference report because that is the only way it can be sent on its way to the President and final disposition. If he vetoes it, the bill will promptly come back to the Congress where the veto will be sustained, the Murray 7.6 percent increase bill H. R. 4644, for which I voted originally will be reported out with the pay raise retroactive to March 1, and the President has said he will sign that bill.

It is too bad for the postal workers that so much politics has been played with their interests by those claiming to be their best friends. They have been injured, not helped, by all these maneuvers and delays. It is long past time to get the 7.6 percent increase established and then go on from there, if the Congress so wishes.

POSTAL PAY RAISES SHOULD BE RETROACTIVE TO LAST SEPTEMBER

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this compromise postal-pay-increase bill is not generous enough to suit many of us who wanted to see the 10-percent bill go through. But if this is the best we can get through the Congress at this time—in the face of a constant threat of Presidential veto—then, of course, it must be supported, and I shall vote for it.

I am glad there is some provision in it for retroactivity of the pay increases. But that provision, also, is not nearly good enough. In all fairness, the pay raises provided here—little as they are—should be retroactive to last September.

Here is why I say that: When the President vetoed the postal pay bill last August 23, he gave as his reason the fact that it did not call for increases in postal rates to bring in more money. That was his reason, as given to the Congress. We did not think it was a good reason then—for we had refused to raise postal rates in that same bill—and we do not think it a good reason now, because we again do not provide for postal-rate increases in this legislation. The two are altogether different problems and should be in different bills. The postal worker's right to a fair wage should not hinge on how much money the postoffice is making or losing. If we were going to single out Government workers for that kind of treatment, then all employees of the Department of Defense would have to take big pay cuts, rather than receive the same fair treatment as other Government employees, because their Department has the biggest responsibility for the Government's deficit.

I am aware that the President—or some of his advisers, in any event—are talking about the possibility of a veto of this bill, inadequate as it is in giving the postal worker a deserved raise in pay. There are a number of reasons being given for this possibility of a veto, but I do not recall that any of them involves the matter of postal revenues—or mail rates. That seems to be a dead issue as far as pay raises for postal workers are concerned.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think the President would now acknowledge that his veto last year was based on a pretext—that it just happened to be a handy reason rather than the real reason for a veto. Would not fairness therefore indicate that these pay raises should go back to last September?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill to increase the pay of postal workers is again before us. This time it is in the form of a conference report that provides a compromise between the bill passed by the Senate and that passed by the House. The latter bill provided an average 8.2-percent increase. The Senate bill a 10-percent increase. The House committee had previously reported a 7.6-percent increase bill and the Senate a 10-percent increase. Thus, it will be seen that the 8.8 percent provided in the present conference report is a fair compromise between these differing viewpoints. Over the period of years I have served in the House I have found that in legislation such as this it is usually resolved in the final analysis by a compromise that provides unity of action in both Houses of Congress.

Thus, from a practical standpoint, in an effort to pass legislation that will have support both in Senate and House, the present compromise is fully justified. But, in my opinion, there is further reason for the increase above the House action that mere practicability; namely, a justification arising from the present inadequate pay schedule of the postal workers. Since the last salary adjustment for postal workers there has been an increase in the cost of living. While it is true there has been a halt in further increased living costs over recent months, yet the fact remains that going

back to the last salary increase and between that and the present time, there has been an increase in living costs that justifies a present increase of pay to meet it.

There has been much talk as to what percentage of increase will have Presidential approval and what will not. The President as yet has made no definite statement. In this, as in all other matters, he prefers that Congress exercise its free will and not be restrained by a threat of a Presidential veto. It might be assumed that as the Postmaster General does not approve of the present bill, he will so advise the President. It might also be assumed that the President would follow the advice of his Postmaster General and, accordingly, veto the bill. However, this argument against the bill is based upon an assumption. In view of the fact that the responsibility in this matter first devolves upon the Congress, it, consequently, rests upon us at this time to exercise our judgment as to the percentage of salary increase the postal workers are entitled to have. In the exercise of that responsibility I am of the opinion that the conference report should be adopted with the 8.8 percent it recommends. Then, if this does not meet with Presidential approval, and he vetoes the bill, then we will meet that situation, if and when we are faced with it.

In conclusion, we must not overlook the fact that everyone, including the President and Postmaster General, admits the justification of an increase of salary for the postal workers. The only difference of opinion has been with reference to the percentage. This is not insurmountable and can be satisfactorily settled.

This matter has been long enough before the Congress awaiting final decision. It is time we gave to our postal workers the increase they deserve. They have been patient and long suffering. Let us do something for them without further delay. If we get this bill settled, it will then be possible to take up the salary increase bill for the remainder of our Government employees. They likewise deserve the increase they seek. Without further delay let us get this bill to the President so that the workers will get what is honestly due them as faithful employees of our Government.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at the release on the eve of this action of a letter from the Postmaster General to the former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative MARTIN, attacking the report of the conference committee on the postal-pay-raise legislation.

I do not like the repeated efforts of the administration to hand down its supreme mandates on postal pay legislation, by use of the letter device. It was first employed by the President himself and now used by the Postmaster General. This is a most flagrant attempt of the executive to invade and assume the prerogatives of the legislative.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as a duly established committee of the Congress, is charged with the responsibility of acting in the overall best interests of the postal service, its efficient administration, its rates of service, and the pay scale of its employees. We have proceeded through the established legislative process to pass legislation which a majority believes will carry out the purposes of that responsibility.

Yet, the appointed Cabinet officer takes it upon himself to call the action of Congress "unfair and discriminatory." The facts are that the bill as recommended by the Post Office Department was discriminatory in the true sense of the word. It would have raised the pay of some postal employees as much as 58 percent, while giving the great majority only a 6-percent increase. That bill was improved somewhat by the committee and later by the House when it adopted the Moss amendments.

The Postmaster General warns of serious morale problems which would result from the adoption of this legislation, which Congress in its wisdom has agreed upon. If the Postmaster General had even a little knowledge of present conditions in the postal service and the reaction of the postal workers to his policies and recommendations, he would know that morale is now at its lowest ebb in many years.

Mr. Speaker, let us repudiate this attempt to dictate to Congress what it should or should not do in the carrying out of its responsibilities. Let us overwhelmingly support this conference report and send the bill to the White House. And, if the Postmaster General carried out his threat to recommend to the President that he veto the measure, let us reassert our independence by overriding that veto.

The vote on this report will test the sincerity of all who say they want to be fair with the postal employees. The vote that you cast, not the words you say, will determine where you stand on this issue.

No one will be fooled, and particularly not postal and Federal employees, by those who vote against this report on the grounds that they want to be fair to the workers in the Federal service.

It is the right of Members to support the Postmaster General on this legislation. But it is somewhat amusing when some of these Members claim that their opposition to a better pay raise and to improvements in the bill is inspired by a desire to help the postal employees. What they say is that we are against you, but it is for your own good. Some say they want Federal employees to have a 10 percent raise, and then refuse to vote for an 8 percent "hike." It is the deed that counts, not words. The record speaks for itself. It will be most interesting to see what the record is going to say when the chips are all down.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the sentiment favoring a pay increase for postal workers is almost unanimous.

Even the President agrees in principle.

The Senate and House have resolved their small difference of opinion. A common area of agreement has been reached in conference, and the united bill will be approved in decisive fashion by the House, and will be just as heartily endorsed by the Senate.

From then on, it is squarely up to the President.

If he is well-advised, he will sign it.

If he chooses to exercise the power of veto, he runs the risk of being repudiated.

He could refrain from doing either, and permit the bill to become law by congressional mandate, disengaging himself from approval or disapproval.

We would prefer to see him sign it, not only to provide a well-earned pay increase for postal workers, but as an expression of the Nation's appreciation for, and confidence in, these faithful public servants.

The Congress has generously increased its own pay, and that of the Federal judiciary.

Career personnel of the armed forces have been given financial incentives.

We are in the process of legislating retirement pay, clerical assistance, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States.

These developments, in addition to the compelling arguments advanced in behalf of the postal employees, make it inevitable that fair play now demands a fair pay increase for them.

The conference report recommends an 8.8 percent average increase, including basic plus reclassification raises.

It is indicated that the President sets a limit of 7.6 percent.

Is this difference of 1.2 percent sufficient justification for the White House to adopt a rigid and unyielding attitude when a little flexibility would best serve all concerned?

The public finds it difficult to understand why foreign aid bills involving much larger appropriations are passed with little delay, while a measure to improve the economic position of those civilian workers of Government upon whom the public at large depends for an essential service is talked into paralysis.

Postal pay increase legislation has been over-debated.

All the facts are in, and they are most convincing.

The House of Representatives is in no mood to start all over again.

We want action.

This is no time to play politics at the expense of the postal workers.

To pass this bill, and thereafter wash our hands of it, is not enough.

I suggest that we appeal to the President for his support in order that a reasonable pay raise will become effective just as soon as possible, and not become lost in partisan jockeying for an advantage, or in a contest between the legislative and executive departments.

The 1.2 gap is not a valid reason for the President to veto this bill.

It can be bridged by a little good will from the White House, to promote harmony all around. Or, it will be bridged by a resentful Congess that is determined to put through a postal pay increase bill at this session.

Today our immediate responsibility is to approve the conference report by an impressive majority.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas moves to recommit the bill S. 1 as amended to the committee of conference with instructions to report back an agreement which would include the provisions of H. R. 4644 as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, with the additional provision that the 6-percent increase be retroactive to March 1, 1955.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit. As I understand, the motion instructs the conferees to do something less than the House voted. We are bound to follow the instructions of the House in the conference. That matter is not even in conference.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that the language does not describe the motion to recommit. It refers to it by bill number only. It is not sufficiently specific.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in the first place a motion to recommit is clearly in order. The only question involved is whether or not the specific instructions contained in this motion to recommit are such as to make it lacking in that germaneness that we all understand is necessary. As far as the action of the conferees themselves is concerned, they are necessarily required to operate within the limits of the proposals enacted by the two bodies. However, it occurs to me, and it does seem to me, that this is a different situation. Here the House of Representatives, speaking as the House, its entire membership, is undertaking to say that this sort of conference report is what we insist upon. Under the circumstances, it does not seem that the rule which ordinarily applies to the actions of the conferees themselves would apply in this situation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that this question has been passed upon many times in the past. An exactly similar question was raised on September 15, 1922, when a very distinguished gentleman by the name of John N. Garner made a similar motion to recommit with instructions to the conferees to lower the rates contained in either the bill or in the amendment. Mr. Edward Taylor, of the State of Colorado, made the point of order. Speaker Gillette sustained the point of order, and that decision may be found in Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 3244. It is exactly on all fours with this. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas moves to recommit the conference report on S. 1 to the conferees with instructions to promptly report back a new bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 118, nays 275, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—118

Adair	Gamble	Martin
Alger	George	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Meader
Andresen, August H.	Gubser	Miller, Md.
Arends	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Baker	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Bates	Halleck	Phillips
Becker	Harden	Pillion
Belcher	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Bentley	Harvey	Prouty
Berry	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Bosch	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bow	Hill	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Hillings	Scherer
Brownson	Hinshaw	Schwengel
Broyhill	Hoeven	Scrivner
Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Scudder
Bush	Holmes	Siler
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Hope	Smith, Kans.
Chase	Horan	Springer
Chenoweth	Hosmer	Taber
Clevenger	Hyde	Talle
Cole	Jackson	Teague, Calif.
Coudert	Jenkins	Thompson, Mich.
Crumpacker	Jensen	Thomson, Wyo.
Cunningham	Johansen	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Colo.	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	Judd	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Vursell
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Wainwright
Derounian	King, Pa.	Weaver
Devereux	Latham	Wharton
Dixon	LeCompte	Wigglesworth
Dolliver	Lovre	Williams, N. Y.
Ellsworth	McConnell	Wilson, Calif.
Fjare	McDowell	Wilson, Ind.
Ford	McGregor	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McIntire	Younger
	Mack, Wash.	

NAYS—275

Abbitt	Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, N. Y.
Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Dorn, S. C.
Addonizio	Buchanan	Dowdy
Albert	Buckley	Doyle
Alexander	Burdick	Durham
Allen, Calif.	Burleson	Edmondson
Andersen, H. Carl	Burnside	Elliott
Andrews	Byrd	Engle
Anfuso	Byrne, Pa.	Evins
Ashley	Cannon	Fascell
Ashmore	Carlyle	Feighan
Aspinall	Carnahan	Fenton
Auchincloss	Carrigg	Fernandez
Ayres	Celler	Fine
Baldwin	Chelf	Fino
Barden	Chiperfield	Fisher
Barrett	Chudoff	Flood
Bass, N. H.	Church	Flynt
Bass, Tenn.	Clark	Fogarty
Baumhart	Colmer	Forand
Beamer	Cooper	Forrester
Bell	Corbett	Fountain
Bennett, Fla.	Cretella	Frazier
Bennett, Mich.	Dague	Friedel
Betts	Davidson	Fulton
Blatnik	Davis, Ga.	Garmatz
Blitch	Davis, Tenn.	Gary
Boggs	Deane	Gathings
Boland	Delaney	Gavin
Bolton, Frances P.	Dempsey	Gentry
Bonner	Denton	Gordon
Bowler	Dies	Granahan
Boykin	Diggs	Grant
Boyle	Dingell	Gray
Bray	Dodd	Green, Oreg.
Brooks, La.	Dollinger	Green, Pa.
	Donohue	Gregory
	Donovan	Griffiths
Hagen	Mahon	Rogers, Tex.
Haley	Mailliard	Rooney
Hardy	Marshall	Roosevelt
Harris	Matthews	Rutherford
Harrison, Va.	Merrow	Saylor
Hays, Ohio.	Metcalf	Schenck
Hébert	Miller, Calif.	Scott
Herlong	Miller, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Hess	Mills	Selden
Hoffman, Ill.	Minshall	Sheehan
Holifield	Mollohan	Sheppard
Holtzman	Morano	Short
Huddleston	Morgan	Shuford
Hull	Morrison	Sieminski
Ikard	Moss	Sikes
James	Moulder	Simpson, Ill.
Jarman	Multer	Sisk
Jennings	Murray, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Johnson, Wis.	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Va.
Jonas	Natcher	Smith, Wis.
Jones, Ala.	Nicholson	Spence
Jones, Mo.	Norrell	Staggers
Jones, N. C.	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Karsten	O'Hara, Ill.	Taylor
Kearney	O'Konski	Teague, Tex.
Kearns	O'Neill	Thomas
Keating	Osmers	Thompson, La.
Kee	Ostertag	Thompson, N. J.
Kelly, N. Y.	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
Keogh	Patterson	Thornberry
Kilday	Pelly	Tollefson
Kilgore	Perkins	Trimble
King, Calif.	Pfost	Tuck
Kirwan	Philbin	Tumulty
Klein	Pilcher	Udall
Kluczynski	Poage	Vanik
Knutson	Polk	Van Zandt
Krueger	Powell	Vinson
Landrum	Preston	Watts
Lane	Price	Whitten
Lanham	Priest	Wickersham
Lankford	Quigley	Widnall
Lesinski	Rabaut	Wier
Lipscomb	Radwan	Williams, Miss.
Long	Rains	William, N. J.
McCarthy	Ray	Willis
McCormack	Reuss	Winstead
McDonough	Rhodes, Pa.	Withrow
McMillan	Rivers	Wolverton
McVey	Robeson, Va.	Wright
Macdonald	Robsion, Ky.	Yates
Machrowicz	Rodino	Zablocki
Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Zelenko
Madden	Rogers, Fla.	
Magnuson	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—41

Avery	Fallon	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Hand	Reed, Ill.
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hayworth	Richards
Canfield	Heselton	Riehlman
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Riley
Christopher	Knox	Roberts
Cooley	Laird	Sadlak
Coon	McCulloch	Shelley
Cramer	Mumma	Steed
Dawson, Ill.	Nelson	Utt
Dondero	Norblad	Walter
Eberharter	O'Brien, N. Y.	Westland
	Passman	Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Sadlak against;

Mr. Reed of New York with, Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Young.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Hayworth with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Coon.

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Avery.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 328, nays 66, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—328

Abbitt	Dixon	Kee
Abernethy	Dodd	Kelly, N. Y.
Adair	Dollinger	Keogh
Addonizio	Dolliver	Kilday
Albert	Donohue	Kilgore
Alexander	Donovan	King, Calif.
Allen, Calif.	Dorn, N. Y.	Kirwan
Andersen, H. Carl	Dorn, S. C.	Klein
	Dowdy	Kluczynski
Andresen, August H.	Doyle	Knutson
	Durham	Krueger
Andrews	Edmondson	Landrum
Anfuso	Elliott	Lane
Ashley	Ellsworth	Lanham
Ashmore	Engle	Lankford
Aspinall	Evins	Latham
Auchincloss	Fascell	LeCompte
Ayres	Feighan	Lesinski
Baker	Fenton	Lipscomb
Baldwin	Fernandez	Long
Barden	Fine	Lovre
Barrett	Fino	McCarthy
Bass, N. H.	Fisher	McConnell
Bass, Tenn.	Flood	McCormack
Bates	Flynt	McDonough
Baumhart	Fogarty	McDowell
Beamer	Forand	McIntire
Becker	Forrester	McMillan
Belcher	Fountain	McVey
Bell	Frazier	Macdonald
Bennett, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	Machrowicz
Bennett, Mich.	Friedel	Mack, Ill.
Betts	Fulton	Mack, Wash.
Blatnik	Garmatz	Madden
Blitch	Gary	Magnuson
Boggs	Gathings	Mahon
Boland	Gavin	Mailliard
Bolton, Frances, P.	Gentry	Marshall
	Gordon	Mason
Bonner	Granahan	Matthews
Bosch	Grant	Merrow
Bow	Gray	Metcalf
Bowler	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Boykin	Green, Pa.	Miller, N. Y.
Boyle	Gregory	Mills
Bray	Griffiths	Minshall
Brooks, La.	Gross	Mollohan
Brooks, Tex.	Hagen	Morano
Brown, Ga.	Haley	Morgan
Brown, Ohio	Hardy	Morrison
Buchanan	Harris	Moss
Buckley	Harrison, Va.	Moulder
Burdick	Hays, Ohio	Multer
Burleson	Hébert	Murray, Ill.
Burnside	Henderson	Murray, Tenn.
Bush	Herlong	Natcher
Byrd	Hess	Nelson
Byrne, Pa.	Hiestand	Nicholson
Cannon	Hill	Norrell
Carlyle	Hillings	O'Brien, Ill.
Carnahan	Hinshaw	O'Hara, Ill.
Carrigg	Hoeven	O'Hara, Minn.
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Konski
Chelf	Holifield	O'Neill
Chenoweth	Holmes	Osmers
Chiperfield	Holt	Ostertag
Chudoff	Holtzman	Patman
Church	Hosmer	Patterson
Clark	Huddleston	Pelly
Colmer	Hull	Perkins
Cooley	Ikard	Pfost
Cooper	James	Philbin
Corbett	Jarman	Pilcher
Coudert	Jenkins	Pillion
Cretella	Jennings	Poage
Cunningham	Jensen	Polk
Dague	Johansen	Preston
Davidson	Johnson, Wis.	Price
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Priest
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Prouty
Dawson, Utah	Jones, Mo.	Quigley
Deane	Jones, N. C.	Rabaut
Delaney	Judd	Radwan
Dempsey	Karsten	Rains
Denton	Kean	Ray
Dies	Kearney	Reuss
Diggs	Kearns	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dingell	Keating	Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers	Sieminski	Tuck
Robeson, Va.	Sikes	Tumulty
Robsion, Ky.	Simpson, Ill.	Udall
Rodino	Sisk	Vanik
Rogers, Colo.	Smith, Miss.	Van Pelt
Rogers, Fla.	Smith, Va.	Van Zandt
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Wis.	Vinson
Rogers, Tex.	Spence	Watts
Rooney	Springer	Wharton
Roosevelt	Staggers	Whitten
Rutherford	Sullivan	Wickersham
Saylor	Talle	Widnall
Schenck	Taylor	Wier
Schwengel	Teague, Tex.	Williams, Miss.
Scott	Thomas	Williams, N. J.
Scudder	Thompson, La.	Winstead
Seely-Brown	Thompson, Mich.	Withrow
Selden		Wolverton
Sheehan	Thompson, N. J.	Wright
Shelley	Thompson, Tex.	Yates
Sheppard	Thornberry	Zablocki
Short	Tollefson	Zelenko
Shuford	Trimble	

NAYS—66

Alger	Gamble	Phillips
Allen, Ill.	George	Poff
Arends	Gubser	Rees, Kans.
Bentley	Gwinn	St. George
Berry	Hale	Scherer
Brownson	Halleck	Scrivner
Broyhill	Harden	Siler
Budge	Harrison, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Hoffman, Mich.	Taber
Chase	Hope	Teague, Calif.
Clevenger	Horan	Thomson, Wyo.
Cole	Hyde	Velde
Cramer	Jackson	Vorys
Crumpacker	Johnson, Calif.	Vursell
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Wainwright
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Weaver
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Wigglesworth
Derounian	Martin	Williams, N. Y.
Devereux	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
Fjare	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Younger

NOT VOTING—40

Avery	Hays, Ark.	Reed, N. Y.
Bailey	Hayworth	Richards
Bolling	Heselton	Riehlman
Bolton, Oliver P.	Kelley, Pa.	Riley
	Knox	Roberts
Canfield	Laird	Sadlak
Chatham	McCulloch	Steed
Christopher	Mumma	Utt
Coon	Norblad	Walter
Dawson, Ill.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Westland
Dondero	Passman	Willis
Eberharter	Powell	Wilson, Calif.
Fallon	Reece, Tenn.	Young
Hand	Reed, Ill.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Laird against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Young.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Coon.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Hayworth with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Bolling with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Avery.

Mr. BROYHILL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is recognized.

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 1806) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc., and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920 (41 Stat. 691), as amended by the act approved May 21, 1953 (67 Stat. 27), which changed the name of such association to Theodore Roosevelt Association, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. That this corporation shall have the power at any time to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc., a nonstock and nonprofit corporation organized and existing under the New York membership corporations law, so as to form a single surviving corporation which shall be this corporation. The corporate entity, existence and name of this corporation shall continue unchanged after the consolidation.

"The consolidation shall not be effected unless the agreement for consolidation is approved by act of the trustees of this corporation, who shall be the members of the corporation entitled to vote with respect to consolidation.

"Such trustees may act on any question respecting the consolidation by a resolution adopted by two-thirds of those present at any meeting of the board of trustees at which a quorum of 10 is present. Written notice of the time, place, and purposes of such meeting shall be sent to each trustee at his last known address appearing on the books of the corporation by first-class mail, postage prepaid, at least 10 days prior to the meeting.

"The consolidation shall be effected in the manner prescribed in this section 7 and in the New York membership corporations law and shall become effective when a certificate of consolidation is filed pursuant to said law."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit the Roosevelt Memorial Association to consolidate with the Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.

In order to effect such consolidation, it will be necessary for the National Association to obtain an act of Congress in substantially the form of the bill which is attached hereto. This necessity arises because the National Asso-

ciation does not presently have the express power to consolidate with other corporations.

The Women's Association was incorporated in 1919 under the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. It is the owner of his birthplace at 28 East 20th Street and the adjoining house at 26 East 20th Street, Borough of Manhattan, New York City, which buildings are known collectively as Theodore Roosevelt House. The principal activities of the Women's Association consist of maintaining and operating Theodore Roosevelt House as a historic shrine in cooperation with the National Association and conducting an education program, primarily for New York City school children.

The National Association, which was incorporated in 1920 by act of Congress—Public Law 233, 66th Congress, 2d session, approved May 31, 1920 (41 Stat. 691) as amended by Public Law 29, 83d Congress, 1st session, approved May 21, 1953 (67 Stat. 27) for the same purpose as the Women's Association, has occupied 26 East 20th Street since 1923 pursuant to a 999-year lease from the Women's Association. The National Association's principal activities consist of maintaining and operating Sagamore Hill, Theodore Roosevelt's home at Oyster Bay, New York, as a national shrine, cooperating with the Women's Association in the maintenance and operation of Theodore Roosevelt House, cooperating with the National Park Service in the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the District of Columbia, contributing each year a fellowship for historical research at Harvard University and awarding annually the Theodore Roosevelt Medals for distinguished service.

For many years the work of the two associations has been adversely affected because of the confusion created among the public by the existence to two separate corporate entities, with separate activities, officers, staffs, and property, attempting to perform a common purpose. The existence of such separate corporate entities has also resulted in expenses which would not have been incurred if one corporation were carrying on the work of the two associations.

For several years the Women's Association has been unable to meet out of its income from capital and dues its share of the expenses of Theodore Roosevelt House and its other commitments. The Women's Association has been able to meet these obligations without invading its capital funds, however, because of sizable contributions received from the National Association, which has substantially more assets than the Women's Association.

Because of the foregoing, and for other reasons, it has become evident to both associations during recent years that they should unite to form one association. The two associations have determined that such a union may best be achieved by their consolidation pursuant to the laws of the United States and of the State of New York, and that their interests and the public interest will not be adversely affected by such consolidation. The two associations believe that the National Association is better equipped than any other organization to take over the work of the Women's Association and that the union of the two associations will increase the effectiveness of the entire Theodore Roosevelt memorial movement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION AND TAX INSTITUTE, INC.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 4909) relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York, with amendments, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the provisions of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of the Code Law of the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, and acts of Congress amendatory thereto, and organized for the purpose of educating and benefiting its members and all others interested in the subject of taxation and the subject of public finance be, and it hereby is, authorized to consolidate with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York and organized for the purpose of research in public finance, conducting symposia on tax problems, to serve as a clearinghouse of information on governmental revenues and expenditures and to inform the general public concerning tax matters. The said corporations may be consolidated so as to form a single corporation, having the same purpose for which said corporations are organized, which may be either a new corporation organized under the law of the District of Columbia or under the law of any one of the 48 States of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. The consolidation of the corporations shall be effected by the procedure prescribed for the consolidation of foreign and domestic membership corporations by sections 51, 52, and 53 of article VII of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of an agreement for consolidation as provided by the membership corporations law of the State of New York, by the governing bodies of the National Tax Association and the Tax Institute, Inc., the agreement for consolidation shall be submitted to each member of the National Tax Association who has the right to vote for the election of the members of its governing body at a meeting, called for the purpose of taking action for the adoption or rejection of the agreement for consolidation. Due notice of the time, place, and object of the meeting shall be mailed to the last known post office address of each member who has the right to vote for the election of the members of the governing body of the National Tax Association at least 30 days prior to the date of such meeting, and at such meeting the agreement for consolidation shall be considered and a vote by ballot, in person, or by proxy, taken for the adoption or rejection of the same, each member who has the right to vote for the election of the members of the governing body being entitled to 1 vote. If the votes of two-thirds of the total number of members who have the right to vote for the election of the members of the governing body of the National Tax Association shall be for the adoption of the agreement for consolidation, then the president or a vice president and the secretary or assistant secretary shall make an affidavit that they have been authorized to execute and file a certificate of consolidation by the votes cast by two-thirds of the members of the National Tax Association entitled to vote thereon, present in person or by proxy, at a meeting held upon notice as prescribed by the provisions of this act at which a quorum was present in person or by proxy, and the date of such meeting.

SEC. 4. If the consolidated corporation is to be governed by the laws of any State other than the District of Columbia, it shall file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—

(1) an agreement that it may be served with process in the District of Columbia in any proceeding for the enforcement of any obligation of the National Tax Association; and

(2) an irrevocable appointment of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as its agent to accept service of process in any such proceeding.

SEC. 5. National Tax Association shall, upon the completion of the consolidation, convey its real and personal property, including any trusts or endowment funds which it has or enjoys, to the consolidated corporation, to be used by it to the same extent as the National Tax Association have used or enjoyed the same.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to prevent Congress from altering, amending, or repealing the same.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Tax Association is a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia for the general purposes of gathering and disseminating information with respect to tax matters and matters of public finance. It is presently negotiating consolidation with the Tax Institute, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and having comparable general purposes. The two corporations anticipate that consolidation will reduce overlapping activities and will further the accomplishment of their stated purposes. During the consolidation negotiations a question has been raised as to the authority of the National Tax Association to consolidate unless the continuing corporation is organized under the laws of the District. This bill would provide for the consolidation and would permit the continuing corporation to be organized under the laws either of the District or of any one of the States.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

On page 2, lines 6 and 7, capitalize the initial letters of "Membership Corporations Law."

On page 2, line 13, strike "purpose" and insert in lieu thereof "purposes."

On page 2, line 14, after "either", insert "one of the constituent corporations or".

On page 2, strike out lines 18 through 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The effect of the consolidation and the procedure to be followed in carrying it out, shall be that prescribed in sections 51, 52, and 53 of article VII of the Membership Corporations Laws of the State of New York."

On page 2, line 24, capitalize the initial letters of "Membership Corporations Law."

On page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out "who has the right to vote for the election of the members of its governing body."

On page 3, lines 9 and 10, strike out "who has the right to vote for the election of the members of the governing body.

On page 3, lines 15 and 16, strike out "who has the right to vote for the election of the members of the governing body".

On page 3, lines 17, 18, and 19, strike out "who has the right to vote for the election of the members of the governing body".

On page 3, line 23, insert after "file" the following: "with the Secretary of the State of New York and with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

On page 4, line 4, insert at the end of section 3, the following: "The word 'member' as used herein shall include an individual, partnership, society, association, corporation, a public office board or commission, a library and any other organized group or institution."

On page 4, strike out section 5 (lines 16 through 21) and renumber section 6 as section 5.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREATION OF FEDERAL COMMISSION TO FORMULATE PLANS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1825) creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia is going to give us an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "District of Columbia Auditorium Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") for the purpose of formulating plans for the design, location, financing, and construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 13 members appointed as follows:

(1) Three persons appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Three members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate;

(3) Three members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(4) One person selected by each of the following national organizations: The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, and the Disabled American Veterans.

(c) The Commission shall—

(1) consider a suitable site for the civic auditorium referred to in subsection (a);

(2) procure such plans and designs and make such surveys and estimates of the cost thereof as it deems advisable;

(3) endeavor particularly to formulate a method of financing the project on a self-liquidating basis; and

(4) make a report to the President and to the Congress, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date.

(d) The Commission is authorized to accept in its discretion from any source, public or private, money and property to be used in carrying out its functions under this act.

(e) The Commission is authorized to avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning Council, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, which shall upon request render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 2. (a) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation; but travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds available for expenditure by the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized, within the limits of funds available to it, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and other employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions, and to make such other expenditures as it may deem advisable in carrying out its functions.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created an Advisory Board, which shall advise and consult with the Commission in carrying out its functions under this act. The Board shall consist of—

(1) one person selected by each of the following national organizations: The American Legion Auxiliary, the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, the Marine Corps League, the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation, the American Veterans Committee, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, and the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States;

(2) one person selected by each of the following national labor organizations: The American Federation of Labor, the American Federation of Musicians, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United Steel Workers of America, and the United Mine Workers of America;

(3) one person selected by each of the following national organizations serving farmers and rural people: The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, the National Farmers Union, the National 4–H Club Foundation, the American Home Economics Association, and the National Home Demonstration Council;

(4) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of business and civic affairs: The United States Chamber of Commerce, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Foreign Trade Council, the National Planning Association, the Committee for Economic Development, the Committee for a National Trade Policy, the National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program, the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the American Trade Association Executives, the Exhibitors Advisory Council, the Auditorium Managers Association, the National Association of Exhibit Managers, and the Medical Exhibitors Council;

(5) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of State and local government and civil affairs: The Council of State Governments, the American Society of Planning Officials, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the Society of Landscape Architects;

(6) one person selected by each of the following women's national organizations: The General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Division of the Democratic National Committee, the Association of Junior Leagues of America, the Women's Division of the Republican National Committee, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the American Association of University Women;

(7) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of education: The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Educational Theatre Association, the Music Educators National Conference, the National Art Education Association, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the College Art Association, the American Musicological Society, the Association of American Colleges, the American Political Science Association, and the American Federation of Teachers;

(8) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of plastic arts and letters: The Committee on Government and Art, the American Institute of Architects, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, the American Federation of Arts, the National League of American Pen Women, the National Society of Arts and Letters, the American Association of Museums, the American Institute of Decorators, the Association of Art Museum Directors, the National Association of Women Artists, the Sculptors Guild, the National Society of Mural Painters, and the Society of Architectural Historians;

(9) one person selected by each of the following national music organizations: The National Music Council, the National Federation of Music Clubs, the American Symphony Orchestra League, the Music Teachers National Association, the American Guild of Organists, the American Guild of Musical

Artists, the National Association of Schools of Music, the Music Library Association, the National Association of Teachers of Singing, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, the Music Publishers' Association of the United States, Broadcast Music, Inc., and SESAC, Inc.

(10) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of drama: The National Association of Community Theaters, the National Theater Conference, the Children's Theater Conference, the American National Theater and Academy, the Actors Equity Association, and the Chorus Equity Association;

(11) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of mass communications: The Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Film Council of America, and the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television;

(12) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of recreation and sports: The American Recreation Society, the National Recreation Association, the United States Olympic Association, the National Federation of State High-School Athletic Associations, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Amateur Athletic Union, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Athletic Institute, and the Sports Fishing Institute; and

(13) one person selected by each of the following national service organizations: The United Service Organizations (USO), the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Association of Social Workers, and the National Social Welfare Assembly.

(b) The Advisory Board may exercise its functions through a Working Committee composed of 13 members, one selected jointly by the organizations named in each of the categories enumerated in subsection (a).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $25,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The Clerk read the committee amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "thirteen" and insert "twenty-one."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "Three" and insert "Seven."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out all of section (2) and insert: "Seven persons appointed by the chairman of the Senate District Committee; and."

Page 2, line 9, strike out all of section (3) and insert: "Seven persons appointed by the chairman of the House District Committee."

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON:

On page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out "chairman of the Senate District Committee;" and insert "President of the Senate."

And on page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out "chairman of the House District Committee." and insert "Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, strike out subparagraph (4), lines 11 through 14.

On page 2, lines 24 and 25, strike out "at the earliest practicable date" and insert "by February 1, 1956."

On page 3, line 23 through line 9 on page 9, strike section 3.

On page 9, line 10, renumber "SEC. 4" as "SEC. 3."

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission for the purpose of formulating plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center.

The Commission would be composed of 21 members as follows: 7 persons appointed by the President of the United, 7 persons appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and 7 persons appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $25,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The Auditorium Commission would be vested with the following functions:

First, to consider a suitable site for the civic auditorium referred to in subsection (a);

Second, procure such plans and designs and make such surveys and estimates of the cost thereof as it deems advisable;

Third, endeavor particularly to formulate a method of financing the project on a self-liquidating basis; and

Fourth, make a report to the President and to the Congress, together with its recommendations, by February 1, 1956.

Fifth, the Commission is authorized to accept in its discretion from any source, public or private, money and property to be used in carrying out its functions under this act.

Sixth, the Commission is authorized to avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning Council, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, which shall upon request render such assistance and advice.

Extensive hearings were held before a special subcommittee created for the purpose of considering this and other similar bills pending before the House District Committee. Many Government officials and public-spirited citizens testified at the hearings and there was no opposition to the principles involved in the bill.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia appeared before the subcommittee and testified in favor of this legislation provided that the District of Columbia would not be required to bear the cost of constructing any building pursuant to this act or to bear the cost of maintaining and operating such building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman must have some idea what this building is going to cost.

Mr. MORRISON. The purpose of the committee is to study and go into all of the details, considering cost and everything else.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman consider that this is foot-in-the-door legislation?

Mr. MORRISON. No, I do not think so. When the Commission reports every Member of the Congress will have ample opportunity to submit any bill he wants to or to oppose any bill that is submitted as a result of this Commission's recommendation.

Mr. GROSS. I presume this building is to be located in the District of Columbia. With warnings of atomic warfare, does the gentleman think this is a good time to be adding to buildings in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MORRISON. That is one of the problems that the Commission is being formed for; that is, to make a study and see where it should be located.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that I can see the necessity for essential buildings being constructed, that is, buildings that are absolutely essential being constructed in the District of Columbia, but I cannot see this sort of structure being put up at the present time.

Mr. MORRISON. This does not authorize the construction of anything. It merely sets up this group of people to make a compete study and to serve without pay.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa that the subcommittee has reported this study proposal and that ultimately, even assuming that there is approval of this building project, private sources have already indicated their complete willingness to underwrite the entire expense.

Mr. GROSS. And the appropriation under this bill is limited to $25,000; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is exactly correct. And the members of the Commission serve without pay.

I would like to begin by devoting a minute or so of the time allotted to me in outlining my own concern with the legislation under consideration.

There is in Trenton, in New Jersey's Fourth District which I have the honor and privilege of representing, a great war memorial building which is similar though smaller than the structure which these bills call for. This building overlooks the Delaware River and is located about a block from the statehouse, and the Hessian Barracks which figured so prominently in the Revolutionary War.

Many of the official functions of the State government and of the city of Trenton, as well as cultural programs of the city, are carried on there, events which in many cases would not be held if this magnificent facility were not available. I would hope, when the civic and cultural center which these bills would provide is finally established, that many of New Jersey's cultural programs will be presented in it. Here I am thinking of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra and the former NBC Symphony of the Air, if Newark is successful in its current negotiations to secure this great orchestra. The music and drama productions of Princeton University in my district, and of Rutgers University could also be presented here as well as some of the very fine productions of St. John Terrell at the Lambertville Music Circus. The work of New Jersey's many outstanding painters, sculptors, playwrights and composers, and its artists in many other fields could also be presented here in this showcase of the Nation before a truly international audience.

Pennsylvania is proud of the National Gallery of Art which was presented to our country by one of its citizens, Andrew Mellon, and accepted by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I am sure that all of the citizens of New Jersey would be equally proud if a cultural center in the Nation's Capital, which my predecessor, Charles R. Howell, did so much to advance, rose after 155 years on the banks of the Potomac. In his message on the state of the Union last month the President declared that—

> In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities.

I have introduced several bills in this Congress which are designed to enhance the cultural and artistic prestige of our country for I am convinced that this is as important as any of the guns-and-butter programs which we support. One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cue from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist Parties in the various countries and the U. S. S. R. find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

I, for one, do not propose to make it easy for the U. S. S. R. to win the minds, the hearts, and the loyalty of men and women throughout the world. I believe the time has come, indeed it is long overdue, for the United States to mount an important counteroffensive against the huge Soviet cultural drive which includes everything from athletes to ballerinas to chess players and on which they are spending enormous sums. As former Congressman Jacob K. Javits said at the hearings on the 14 bills before the 83d Congress, if "we do not want to fight the Russians with the atom bomb," then "we have got to defeat their effort to have communism take over the world with two other weapons—economic and cultural, but in the cultural field, we have not even touched it."

We must also frankly recognize and be prepared to deal with the tendency in certain quarters to regard creative artists with suspicion and to think of the arts as, shall we say, effeminate if not downright subversive. As if Shakespeare, Milton, Michaelangelo, Dante, and Cervantes were not manly and patriotic. It reminds me of the Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering line: "When I hear the word culture I reach for my gun." The fine arts are a unifying force, as Washington and Jefferson knew, and they are especially important to us now when our country is assailed from within and from without by divisive and undemocratic forces from the right and from the left. At no time in our history, perhaps, has it been more important than it is today for the dynamic conservative and liberal forces to rally around proposals such as these before the 84th Congress to place our Nation's Capital in the vanguard of our country's cultural development in order that the fine arts may exert their benign and healing influence.

Last summer the French Government suggested that the United States stage an American Festival of Arts in Paris. The opera, several theaters, and concert halls were made available. The United States Ambassador to France, C. Douglas Dillon, believed the gesture so important to Franco-American friendship and to the defeat of the Russian cultural effort that he accepted the chairmanship immediately. No funds of the Federal Government being available for this important project, Robert W. Dowling, president of the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy and the City Investment Company of New York City, undertook the immense task of raising the necessary $400,000 through private subscription. The participation of our Federal Government in international cultural festivals, or the lack of it on any basis except that of giving its blessing to these activities, seems to be chronic and is most deplorable. I am reminded of the stirring plea of Gian-Carlo Menotti for the creative artist in which he said:

> It is pathetic to see the timidity and apologetic air with which Americans introduce their creative artists to Europe. (I insist on the distinction between creative and interpretive artists.) Who can ever forget the shabby concerts of American music half-heartedly organized all through an expectant Europe by well-meaning souls in the State Department shortly after the war? At one of the Lucerne festivals, while England sent an orchestra conducted by Sir Adrian Boult to represent its composers, and France an orchestra conducted by Muench, American composers were embarrassingly represented by a concert of records—the kind of concert one might expect in a summer camp. (After the concert, however, cocktails served by the American Embassy to the stunned body of international critics were by far the best served by any embassy.)

In his very effective testimony before the subcommittee on February 15, Mr. Dowling pointed out that there is no place in Washington and no place elsewhere in our country where foreign artists and companies, national theaters and orchestras, opera, and ballet groups can visit and perform on a reciprocal basis. He urged the subcommittee to guide this legislation through to a point where it can have the benefit of the Commission's more thorough study of the problem. As you may know, Mr. Dowling and Blevins Davis, the producer of the very successful American opera Porgy and Bess, which is proving to be one of the very best ambassadors ever to represent this country abroad, went to President Truman when he was in the White House and offered to raise through private subscription from businessmen, foundations, and wealthy individuals whatever sums were necessary, in addition to the contribution of land by the Federal Government, to build the kind of cultural center envisioned by these bills. The same day he appeared before the subcommittee Mr. Dowling repeated this offer, and he also offered to make available to the Commission, which these bills would establish, plans for a cultural center worked out for the American National Theater and Academy by the firm of architects which developed the plans for the National Gallery of Art. I hope when Mr. Dowling begins his fund-raising campaign that every American will be given the opportunity to contribute toward building a great cultural center in Washington which will make the Federal City the Paris of America. Money is raised for the Metropolitan Opera Company and the Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra of New York on a national basis and the advancement of the cultural status of our National Capital is a challenge to the loyalty and patriotic love of country which is present in each and every one of us.

This bill will create a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center. An appropriation of $25,000 is authorized for the blue-ribbon commission whose members would serve without pay in considering a site, procuring plans and designs, and formulating a method of financing the project on a self-liquidating basis. The Commission is directed to make a report to the President and to the Congress, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date and within 1 year's time.

WASHINGTON: CULTURAL CENTER OF THE WORLD

Making Washington the cultural center of the world would be one of the very best and most effective ways to answer the Russian lies, while the proposal advanced in these many bills would, if established, generate enough new activities to repay the original investment by

the Congress many times over. The people of the District of Columbia pay nearly $170 million in Federal taxes each year. This is more than is paid by a good many States. Yet the citizens of Washington are deprived of all voice or representation in local or National Government, and the District's Commissioners are appointed by the President. Washington cannot build a sewer, collect garbage, or put a dog in the pound without the consent of Congress. Forty percent of Washington's real estate is reserved for Federal purposes, which effectively removes it from the tax rolls. The Government started out with a 50–50 division of costs of running the Federal city, but has reduced its contribution over the years until now it is about 15 percent. No other American city is treated like this by private business located within the city's limits.

Congress must sympathetically consider the need of the residents of the Federal city—and the visitors who come from all parts of our country and from all parts of the world—for a civic and cultural center in its role as the City Council of Washington, which is what the House District of Columbia Committee is. As long as Congress deprives Washingtonians of the vote and acts as City Council of Washington, just so long must it clearly accept the full responsibility for the deplorable cultural status of the Nation's Capital. It cannot blame that status on the citizens of the District of Columbia while it jealously maintains its unique prerogatives and reserves to itself the decision as to how this tax money shall be spent. Taxation without representation, as always, produces a withered fruit.

I have been told that the Federal contribution to the civic center at Columbus Circle in New York City was about $6,500,000. American tax dollars have also been used to rebuild opera and music buildings in Europe. Why cannot similar funds be spent at home on cultural programs in San Antonio, Seattle, Sarasota, Cleveland, Trenton, and Washington and in other cities and towns across our country? Surely, more money should be spent in each State and in each community on the advancement of the various activities which make our civilization endure and flourish, for, as you well know, all of our cultural programs are finding it increasingly difficult to continue in the face of constantly rising costs.

In view of these many roadblocks which have defeated all efforts of earlier Congresses to enact legislation similar to the bill which you are considering here today, it is my considered opinion that it is very important to make a thorough and detailed study of American subsidy, direct, or indirect, of foreign art programs and cultural centers. This information should be available through the Department of State and the Foreign Operations Administration.

We are told by competent observers who cannot be accused of making political hay or of trying for partisan advantage that the Nation's Capital is particularly disadvantaged and underprivileged in cultural matters in comparison with other world capital cities and many cities in our own country. We find W. M. Kiplinger reporting in his book, Washington Is Like That, published in 1942, that—

> Despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the nation, Washington, as a city, has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington, but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on.

In a speech to the National Symphony Orchestra Association in the fall of 1952, when he was given a testimonial scroll calling him the most musical President in the history of our country, former President Harry S. Truman said Washington should be developed into the greatest musical center in the history of the world. In urging a civic auditorium and cultural center, Mr. Truman recalled that as a Senator he had twice helped to push through the Senate legislation providing such facilities. He observed, however, that the bills had been defeated in the House by the lobbyists acting for cities around Washington. "They did not appreciate the fact that Washington was to be the capital of the world," he added, and he pointed out that he had seen such show places in Mexico City, Paris, and Rio de Janeiro.

I have been very happy to observe that there is a new feeling in Congress and a new concern with the problem of the status of our Nation's Capital in cultural affairs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUST SALARIES OF JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that a point of order will be made against H. R. 2986. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred back to the committee for further study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee of the House Committtee on Government Operations may be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I read, on April 27 last, of the death of my valued friend, Congressman John W. Flannagan, of Virginia. I knew John Flannagan well, and admired him deeply. He came into Congress in 1931, about three years after I did, and our relations were very close and friendly from that time until ill-health forced his retirement in 1949, after eighteen years of outstanding service in this body to his State, his party, and his country.

John Flannagan was recognized as almost without peer as an orator, even among the splendid speakers that the Commonwealth of Virginia has sent to the halls of Congress. I have always felt that his oratory was not something studied and developed for the sake of effect, but grew, in every case, out of intense study of the subject at issue, in consequence of which John Flannagan would come to an intellectual conclusion on the right course to pursue; and on that road, his mind and heart would drive forward as one. Words leapt to his tongue out of this unity of mind and heart, and in all that he said you could hear the force of courage and of firm conviction. He voted as he spoke, in accordance with his judgment and conscience, untouched by political influences, and disregarding political consequences. He was fearless in performing his public duties.

I have never served with anyone who displayed greater courage in serving our country, and in voting in accordance with his principles, his judgment, and his conscience, than John W. Flannagan. Like Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson, he looked upon the Democratic Party as a political group and family who achieved a certain political unity by adherence to a body of political principles. And he stood ready to oppose any man or measure, even though bearing the Democratic label, that seemed to him to be against those basic political principles. He was a firm-hearted, bright-souled idealist, and yet he had a practical mind. He was one of the most skillful and formidable legislators with whom I have ever served. Due to the respect in which he was so generally held, the name of John Flannagan alone carried a great political influence in

Virginia up to the time of his death. His memory will long be honored and treasured by the people of his district and Commonwealth, as well as in these halls where his eloquence and his courage were so long displayed.

To his loved one I extend my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

HAWAII AND ALASKA STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 223 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 7 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except the committee amendments printed in the bill but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2535, a bill to change the status of Alaska and Hawaii from Territories to States. Complaints are heard that the rule is a closed one thereby linking these two farflung Territories together, and requiring that they be voted up or down as one. It is difficult for me to understand how any member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs can justly complain of this procedure by the Committee on Rules when his own committee reported them out together in one package. If it were proper for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to provide them with a twin status, then certainly there can be no ground for complaint against the Committee on Rules in permitting them to retain that status in consideration by the House. In fact, I think I am justified in assuming that this action was taken by the legislative committee reporting the bill for the reason that last year the other body tied them together and sent them to the House. Therefore, it is assumed that the able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs thought it good strategy to report a one-package bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will support your Committee on Rules, which by a better than 2 to 1 vote, reported out this rule.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman, however, is not opposing the rule, I take it?

FOR THE RULE—AGAINST THE BILL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, while I support the rule, I want it made distinctly clear that I am unalterably opposed to the bill. I would that I possessed the power of speech to express in the most convincing language possible for human tongue to utter my deep and earnest convictions against the principle of the admission of either or both of these Territories into the sisterhood of States. To my mind it is inconceivable that the little band of patriots, often referred to as the Founding Fathers, ever entertained for even a fleeting moment the thought that some day the proposal of taking into the sisterhood of States any land or group of people noncontiguous to existing States would be entertained by the Congress of the United States. Certainly it was beyond the conception of the most vivid imagination that such a thought of reaching out more than 2,000 miles across a trackless ocean to annex an island or a string of islands into statehood ever entered their heads. Or, for that matter, can one believe that these ardent patriots, who had so recently fled from the oppression of foreign governments and ideologies, conceived of a United States of America split in a widely scattered empire of States? You and I are fully cognizant of the fact that while their own voices are long since stilled in death their reaction, if such were possible, to obtain would be a chorus of emphatic noes. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, you and I in this modern day, in our deep appreciation of the heritage which they have handed down to us in this glorious young Republic, realize in our hearts that they were right. It is my honest conviction, from my knowledge of the history of those heroic days and the motives that sponsored our Constitution, that had there been even one among the architects of that great document possessed of sufficient imagination to apprehend that any such move would be seriously advocated, he would have seen to it that an affirmative prohibition against such annexation was written into that precious document.

NONCONTIGUOUS

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed unalterably to the admission into this great Union of States any parcel of land with its inhabitants, few or large, that is contrary to what I believe, with reason and justification, to have been the conception of that group of benefactors, our Founding Fathers, to whom we are so deeply and lastingly indebted. As long as I am privileged to serve in the Congress of the United States, I shall adhere to this principle.

Therefore, it follows that if I were forced to make a choice between Alaska, separated from us only by the great friendly nation of Canada, and Hawaii, I would of course accept Alaska on the theory that it at least was a part of this continent. But to argue that we should so far deviate from the principle of contiguity as to reach out more than 2,000 miles and bring into this Union a string of islands, noncontiguous themselves, is to my mind inconceivable and violates the very foundation and principles upon which the Union of States was founded.

Mr. Speaker, many arguments, specious and otherwise, are made for the admission of one or other of these Territories. Possibly, the most illogical argument made is that we must admit Hawaii in order to prevent the Communists from spreading the doctrine that we are holding the citizens of Hawaii in a state of serfdom. This is weak argument. Those who know the methods of the Communists must certainly be aware of the fact that their technique is to deal with the material at hand. Is it not also true that if we were to take farflung Hawaii in as a State, the Communists would revive with emphasis their slogan of "Imperialistic America"? Is not this argument just another form of appeasement of Russia? If this is to be followed, then when Russia charged us with imperialism after taking in Hawaii as a State, would we then be forced logically to remove them from statehood?

HAWAIIAN ECONOMY CONTROLLED

Mr. Speaker, there are many other reasons why I am opposed to the admission of Hawaii as a State. I shall leave to others a discussion of Communist influence in that farflung string of islands. It is my understanding that that influence is prevalent and possibly gaining ground.

But, if for no other reason, as a humble Representative in the Congress, I would be opposed to the admission of that Territory on the ground that the economy there is subject to the control of two great divergent influences. One, that a good portion of the normal economy is dominated by a few powerful landlords; and, two, even that objectionable type of economy in the final analysis is controlled by Harry Bridges' communistic longshoremen union. This powerful organization has in the past brought that economy to its knees and we have no assurance that it will not do so in the future.

ALASKA CANNOT AFFORD STATEHOOD

Mr. Speaker, some 2 years ago I spent a couple of weeks in Alaska. I think I got a fair picture of its economy, and I am definitely convinced that the worst thing that we could do for the people of Alaska would be to bring that Territory into statehood.

Over 99 percent of the land area of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government. There are 95 million acres actually withheld or reserved, and much of the rest is glaciers, mountains, and tundra.

Numerous problems of financing a new State exist, and a State could operate only with special treatment and subsidies from the Federal Government. Even the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs admits in its report that possibly

the most serious problem in connection with the granting of statehood to Alaska is that of how the proposed new State could finance the basic functions of State government.

The Bureau of the Budget has supplied a tabulation of the present cost to the Federal Government of those functions which would normally be the responsibility of a State. The budget's tabulation, based on budget requests for fiscal year 1955, totals $11,401,000. The Bureau then deducts anticipated revenues that would accrue to the State, amounting to $2,322,000. This leaves a net annual cost of statehood of $9,079,000 to be borne either by the taxpayers of Alaska or by those of her sister States. The present level of territorial income tax is 10 percent of the amount that the individual pays to the Federal Government, and the committee concludes that, since the per capita tax burden of Alaskans for State and local functions is already comparatively high, special Federal financial assistance is the only solution. So it has scattered through the bill various provisions to ease the financial burden on the proposed new State during a transition period of 15 years by having the taxpayers of other States assume the responsibility in the form of authorizations for special Federal appropriations for road construction and maintenance, et cetera. These special subsidies would amount to about $7 million the 1st year, $4 million the 6th, and possibly $2 million from the 11th to the 15th year. In short, the committee confesses that the proposed new State could not stand on its own feet, but would have to be bolstered up for at least 15 years by subsidies from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it the purpose of this rule, which is virtually a closed rule so far as the offering of amendments is concerned, to prohibit the separation of this issue as between Hawaii and Alaska?

Mr. COLMER. May I say to my friend I tried to cover that in my opening statement. If the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs saw fit to put them together, I do not think anybody on that committee has the right to complain about it. This issue has been before us in every Congress, and I think the time has come when we ought to settle that issue and settle it so far as both Territories are concerned once and for all.

CONCLUSION—DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

Mr. Speaker, should this Congress take such affirmative and erroneous action, that within itself would be bad. But possibly even worse would be the dangerous precedent set by such unfortunate action. For, surely this would be but the opening wedge. The camel would have his nose under the tent. Who is there here today who would gainsay that once Hawaii were accepted into the sisterhood of States that Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, yes, even farflung Samoa, Cuba, and possessions and islands, indefinite in number, would not seek admission as States in the United States of America? In fact, I ask you in all fairness and candor if there is not equal, if not better reason for admitting some of these Territorial and other peoples closer to this continent than there is for the admission of farflung Hawaii, which is barely within the Western Hemisphere? Once the precedent has been set by the admission of one or both of these noncontiguous Territories—Alaska and Hawaii—there will be no stopping. The time to settle this question of whether the United States is to remain what it was intended to be, a closely knit, homogeneous group of contiguous States on the American Continent, or whether it is going to become an empire of farflung disconnected States with every conceivable people, many with principles, ideals, and ideologies foreign to our own conception, is now.

And while I realize that there are principles of political expediency involved; that both political parties have from time to time incorporated platitudinous gimmicks in their respective platforms, I am constrained to believe that both you and I know that when the chips are down and we are face to face with the issue, this great injustice to the American Republic will not be done. My confidence in the judgment of the Members of the Congress impels me to believe that in the end patriotism and not political expediency will prevail.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit tomorrow during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HAWAII AND ALASKA STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I support statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and because of my experience in Utah I feel particularly qualified to speak on one aspect of the pending legislation, that is the loyalty of the Hawaiian residents of Japanese ancestry who compose nearly 40 percent of the population of the islands.

To my mind one of the blackest pages in our history will be that on which the account of the relocation of our citizens and residents of Japanese ancestry during World War II is written. I do not know where our Constitution was when these people were forced to move from the Pacific coast and were herded into relocation camps after they had sold their homes and businesses at sacrifice prices.

Here, if ever, one would think, would be rich ground for the growth of communism, bitterness, and rebellion. Who could blame a member of a minority race if he embraced a foreign ideology under these circumstances? Could one reasonably expect the sons and daughters of parents so mistreated by a government to defend with their lives that government?

But the record clearly shows that our people of Japanese ancestry—both here and in Hawaii—did more than was required of them. To their everlasting glory and credit is the record of the 442d Infantry team which at the cost of the greatest casualty rate suffered by any unit in the war, rescued a battalion which otherwise would have been doomed to destruction by the Nazis who had surrounded it.

That is just one example of many of how these people have proved themselves worthy of full citizenship in time of war. Their record is equally fine in time of peace.

The tragic relocation order worked to Utah's benefit. For after the war and hysteria were over, many of the Japanese-American, and I hate to use this hyphenated designation, people decided to remain in my State.

They were welcomed and they are fine residents, hardworking, literate, and loyal. By exemplary conduct, they won the admiration of other Utah groups. Our State legislature finding outmoded laws discriminating against them as a race, reacted by repealing these laws.

The testimony of Admiral Nimitz, General Herron, the FBI, and other high authorities concerning the 100-percent loyalty of the residents of Hawaii, confirms what we heard from every side during statehood hearings both in Washington and in Hawaii.

My personal and public experience confirms these reports. It is with a great deal of enthusiasm that I support this measure.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has just made a statement on this bill. I think if I were a member of the Committee on Rules and had opposed statehood for Hawaii and Alaska I would have voted out the same kind of rule that was voted out by the Committee on Rules. They were very diligent in giving the Committee on Interior Affairs some time to discuss the problem pro and con before the Committee on Rules. I want to say that neither my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] nor myself or any member of the legislative committee asked for a closed rule. We definitely asked that it be an open rule in order that certain amendments might be adopted to the legislation, which we felt would make it a better bill.

One of the amendments we wanted to adopt is contained in a letter from the President of the United States in which he had some question about the statehood for Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this complete letter may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1955.

The Honorable A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. MILLER: As indicated by your letter, the admission of the Territory of Alaska to statehood, the principle of which I have in the past publicly supported, has a number of troublesome aspects. Among these is the problem to which your letter principally refers—that of providing adequately for our national defense needs.

You are aware, of course, of the tremendous strategic importance of this region to our Nation's defense. Our military programs and plans oriented to this region and to the threat facing us there are premised upon full freedom of Federal action both for defense and for peacetime policing action.

Conversion of the Territory to a State cannot but raise difficult questions respecting the relationship of the military to the newly constituted State authority. Neither the Nation nor Alaska could afford any impairment of the freedom of movement and of action by our forces in large areas of this critical region. In our present state of world affairs I believe that it would be imprudent to effect so fundamental a readjustment unless a formula can be devised and approved by the Congress which will adequately meet these defense needs.

I am in doubt that any form of legislation can wholly remove my apprehensions about granting statehood immediately. However, a proposal seeking to accommodate the many complex considerations entering into the statehood question has been made by Secretary of the Interior McKay, and should legislation of this type be approved by the Congress, I assure you that I shall give it earnest consideration.

A letter similar to yours has come to me from Senator Jackson and I have made the same reply to him.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Again I would like to say to you that this is not the type of rule that was asked by the legislative committee. I respect the Committee on Rules, but I have always thought that they were a sort of screening committee, not a committee to block legislation.

I submit that there were 8 days of hearings before the Committee on Rules and as I looked down either side of that committee I think I saw about 8 votes against the statehood bill, and perhaps 4 sympathetic faces. But we did oppose the type of rule we got, and we asked for an open rule in order to adopt amendments such as we have here and other amendments that were made in the bill. But the Committee on Rules reported out a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 40 years since a new Territory has come into the United States of America. These are the last two Territories that will have an opportunity to come in as States. I do not see, in the foreseeable future, when the question will come up again. Alaska and Hawaii, especially Hawaii, have been investigated from stem to stern. Some 14 or 15 congressional committees have been in Hawaii. Thirty-five Members of Congress have been there, and more than 4,000 pages of testimony has been taken. More than 700 witnesses have been heard. Ninety percent of the press has written favorable articles for statehood. Seven polls taken by Mr. Gallup since 1941 show an average of about 70 percent for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. A poll that I took recently in my own district in Nebraska shows that 76 percent were for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. The governors of the 11 Western States, when they had their conference in New Mexico last year, came out for statehood for Hawaii. The President of the United States, former President Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, and others have been for statehood for Hawaii.

I never voted for statehood for Alaska, but 3 or 4 times this House has voted statehood for Hawaii, and once it passed a bill for Alaska. In the 83d Congress, you will recall, the other body passed the Siamese-twin bill. We passed a bill just for Hawaii. What happened? Well, we got over here and we found a rather unsympathetic climate, just as we find it today. I am unhappy that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the ranking member on the majority side, and I suspect perhaps the Speaker of the House, and some of the leadership on my side have not been favorable to this joint bill. No action could be had in the 83d Congress on a single bill—so now we have the joint bill for consideration.

While I would like to have had them separated and tried to separate them in the committee, I am satisfied that if the Rules Committee in their great wisdom had reported out the rule that was asked for by the legislative committee there would have been some separations on the floor. In the Rules Committee those who are opposed to both statehood bills reported out a monstrosity of a rule, a Frankenstein type of monster that in their opinion defeats both bills. Nevertheless I am going to ask my colleagues to accept the rule. We are going to try to put it through under the rules of the House, because the Rules Committee knows this is a privileged matter. If this does not pass today I can tell you that it will be back again perhaps this session, certainly in the next session. The Speaker of the House has already said it was a privileged matter. It can come up then where every Member will have an hour's debate upon every amendment. We might be here along in July or August for 30, 40, or 60 days discussing statehood bills.

I am sorry that the Rules Committee has acted as a block to legislation that ought to pass. They should have listened to the legislative committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself and others who appeared before the Rules Committee asked that there be an open rule. It was not granted.

I leave it to the members to say why they reported out a rule such as they have, one that is not in good taste with the committee and one that gives the legislation a considerable number of hurdles to overcome.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to revise and extend my remarks. In that extension I shall include a letter from the President of the United States in which he indicates that while he would have some feeling and apprehension about admitting Alaska, that if we did adopt the so-called McKay line—and I hope the motion to recommit will include it, if not then in conference between the two bodies that it will be included—then it might be acceptable.

There has never been any question about Hawaii. I think the majority of the House has voted three times for statehood for Hawaii, and I am hopeful they will pass it again not only for Hawaii but also for Alaska.

In the revision of my remarks I will place some statements I expected to make during general debate on the subject.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I might state to the gentleman from Illinois that I have no further requests for time. I expect to speak a few minutes myself. Is the gentleman going to use further time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is sort of like where we came in. I remember standing here 2 years ago talking about this bill which has been with us for so long a time.

My friend from Nebraska says they have had 700 witnesses before the Committee on the Interior, yet he wonders why the bill has not passed. That is the reason why the bill has not passed. There have been 700 witnesses, and out of all the witnesses and all the hearings I think the country and the Congress have become very well satisfied that this bill ought not to pass.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Ninety percent of the witnesses were for statehood. The Rules Committee is the minority that has been blocking it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not so sure about that. Whenever a bill does not pass it has always been my experience that there has been some pretty good reason, whether it comes out on the surface or remains under the table; there is generally a pretty good reason to defeat such a bill.

Mr. Speaker, this question has been with us for a long time. I think statehood for Hawaii has been before the Congress for nearly 20 years. As stated by my friend, it passed the House on two occasions.

I am sorry my good friend criticizes the Rules Committee for giving everybody an opportunity to be heard on this bill, but we wanted to do so to accommodate the folks. It was not any pleasure to the Rules Committee to sit up there day after day and hear everybody, but we said when we started out that

anybody who wanted a chance to have his say on this bill would be given the opportunity. And we did, and we got pretty tired of it before we got through, but finally when the committee sat down in executive session to consider whether to grant any rule on it, or if we did grant any rule what kind of rule it should be, we decided the very natural thing, namely, that here were these two areas seeking statehood and that had been before the Congress for years seeking statehood. The committee heard 700 witnesses and concluded that they ought to be put together and that they ought to be admitted together or they ought to be excluded together.

We did not consider this matter of putting them both together at all. The committee did that itself and came in with this kind of a bill. We thought, like we say out in the country, let the hide go with the tail. So we decided we would let it go that way; therefore we put them together and we are saying to you gentlemen, "Now, if you want them both, take them both; if you do not want them both, why, do not take either."

That is a reasonable position, it seems to me. The committee voted to tie them together. We did not tie them together. The committee tied them together.

Now the gentleman from Nebraska is up here complaining because we put them together. We did not put them together. His committee put them together.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. If there was good reason for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs putting them together, is there not an equally good reason for the Rules Committee to keep them together?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what we thought, but that seems to be faulty reasoning on our part.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I tried to separate the bills in committee and did not prevail. But I want to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if either the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] or myself, or any member of the legislative committee, asked for a closed rule? Did they ask for a closed rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know as they did, but when it came down to voting on the rule then the Committee on Rules voted on that question. The gentleman from Nebraska had voted on it before. He had had his day in court in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and that committee voted to put them together. When we came to vote in the Rules Committee we just sustained the majority of his committee. It seems to me that was the proper way to do it. I am glad to hear him say there will not be any dispute about this rule. I am glad he has reconciled himself to that, because it will give us a chance to settle this thing once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the House, in my opinion, will not have a measure before it during this session of the Congress that will exceed the importance of this bill. I do not know whether I have stated my position or not, but perhaps I had better do so right now. I am opposed to statehood for Alaska, I am opposed to statehood for Hawaii, I am opposed to both of them together, I am opposed to them separately. I am opposed to bringing in Puerto Rico, which has been promised statehood by both of the great political parties like these two outlying Territories have. I am opposed to Puerto Rico, I am opposed to the Virgin Islands, I am opposed to all of them. I want to keep the United States of America on the American continent. I hope I have made my position clear.

Mr. Speaker, may I say further that this measure is of great importance and there will be no opportunity for debate under the 5-minute rule. When the 7 hours of general debate is completed, this bill goes to a vote, and it will be a rollcall vote. Therefore, in view of the importance of it, Members ought to stay on the floor and understand what this bill is about, they ought to hear the arguments, because there are going to be some arguments made against this statehood bill, particularly with respect to Hawaii, that are really going to surprise you very considerably.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe there will be one motion to recommit that is permitted, with instructions, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; there is always a motion to recommit permitted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We hope it will contain a bill that is more acceptable to us.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, there will be a motion to recommit. I hope it will not be necessary for those who oppose this bill to continually make points of order in order to get somebody here to listen to general debate. But I think we are going to have to do that if the Members do not stay. Therefore the Members ought to stay on the floor and listen to both sides of this argument.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RADWAN. Perhaps we ought to defeat the rule, and dispose of it speedily.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the gentleman's privilege. It is also the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RADWAN) there were—ayes 109, noes 10.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 323, nays 66, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—323

Abbitt	Dollinger	Kilgore
Abernethy	Dolliver	King, Calif.
Adair	Donovan	Kirwan
Addonizio	Dorn, N. Y.	Klein
Albert	Dorn, S. C.	Kluczynski
Alexander	Dowdy	Krueger
Alger	Doyle	Landrum
Allen, Calif.	Durham	Lane
Allen, Ill.	Edmondson	Lanham
Andresen, August H.	Elliott	Lankford
	Engle	Latham
Andrews	Evins	LeCompte
Anfuso	Feighan	Lesinski
Arends	Fenton	Lipscomb
Ashley	Fernandez	Long
Ashmore	Fine	Lovre
Aspinall	Fisher	McCarthy
Auchincloss	Fjare	McConnell
Ayres	Flood	McCormack
Baker	Flynt	McDonough
Baldwin	Fogarty	McDowell
Barden	Forand	McIntire
Barrett	Ford	McMillan
Bass, N. H.	Forrester	Macdonald
Bass, Tenn.	Fountain	Mack, Ill.
Bates	Frazier	Mack, Wash.
Beamer	Frelinghuysen	Madden
Belcher	Friedel	Magnuson
Bell	Fulton	Mahon
Bennett, Fla.	Garmatz	Mailliard
Berry	Gary	Marshall
Blatnik	Gathings	Martin
Blitch	Gavin	Mason
Boggs	Gentry	Matthews
Boland	Gordon	Merrow
Bolton, Frances P.	Granahan	Metcalf
	Grant	Miller, Calif.
Bonner	Gray	Miller, Md.
Bosch	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Nebr.
Bow	Green, Pa.	Mills
Bowler	Gregory	Minshall
Boykin	Griffiths	Mollohan
Boyle	Gubser	Morgan
Bray	Hagen	Morrison
Brooks, La.	Haley	Moss
Brooks, Tex.	Halleck	Moulder
Brown, Ga.	Harden	Multer
Brownson	Hardy	Murray, Ill.
Broyhill	Harrison, Nebr.	Murray, Tenn.
Buchanan	Harrison, Va.	Natcher
Buckley	Harvey	Norrell
Budge	Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Ill.
Burdick	Henderson	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burnside	Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.
Bush	Hiestand	O'Konski
Byrd	Hill	O'Neill
Byrne, Pa.	Hinshaw	Patman
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Patterson
Cannon	Hoffman, Ill.	Perkins
Carlyle	Holifield	Pfost
Carnahan	Holmes	Pilcher
Carrigg	Holt	Pillion
Celler	Holtzman	Poage
Chelf	Hope	Poff
Chenoweth	Horan	Polk
Chudoff	Hosmer	Preston
Church	Huddleston	Price
Clark	Hull	Priest
Colmer	Ikard	Prouty
Cooper	Jackson	Quigley
Corbett	Jarman	Rabaut
Coudert	Jenkins	Rains
Cramer	Jennings	Ray
Cretella	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Crumpacker	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Cunningham	Johnson, Wis.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtis, Mass.	Jonas	Rhodes, Pa.
Davidson	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Robeson, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, N. C.	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson, Utah	Judd	Rodino
Deane	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Delaney	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Denton	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.
Dies	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Diggs	Kelly, N. Y.	Rooney
Dingell	Keogh	Roosevelt
Dixon	Kilday	Rutherford

St. George	Staggers	Velde
Saylor	Sullivan	Vinson
Schwengel	Taber	Watts
Scott	Talle	Weaver
Scrivner	Taylor	Wickersham
Scudder	Teague, Tex.	Widnall
Selden	Thomas	Wier
Sheehan	Thompson, La.	Wigglesworth
Shelley	Thompson, Mich.	Williams, Miss.
Sheppard		Williams, N. J.
Shuford	Thompson, N. J.	Willis
Sieminski	Thompson, Tex.	Wilson, Calif.
Sikes	Thomson, Wyo.	Wilson, Ind.
Siler	Thornberry	Winstead
Simpson, Ill.	Tollefson	Withrow
Simpson, Pa.	Trimble	Wright
Sisk	Tuck	Yates
Smith, Miss.	Tumulty	Younger
Smith, Va.	Udall	Zablocki
Spence	Vanik	Zelenko
Springer	Van Zandt	

NAYS—66

Andersen, H. Carl	Fascell	O'Hara, Minn.
	Fino	Ostertag
Baumhart	Gamble	Pelly
Becker	George	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Phillips
Bentley	Hale	Radwan
Betts	Harris	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Scherer
Burleson	Hess	Seely-Brown
Cederberg	Hillings	Short
Chase	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Hyde	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Johansen	Teague, Calif.
Cole	Kean	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Vorys
Dague	Kilburn	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	King, Pa.	Wainwright
Dempsey	McGregor	Wharton
Derounian	McVey	Williams, N. Y.
Devereux	Meader	Wolcott
Dodd	Morano	Wolverton
Donohue	Nelson	
Ellsworth	Nicholson	

NOT VOTING—45

Avery	Hays, Ark.	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Hayworth	Reed, Ill.
Bolling	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	James	Richards
	Kelley, Pa.	Riehlman
Canfield	Knox	Riley
Chatham	Knutson	Roberts
Christopher	Laird	Sadlak
Cooley	McCulloch	Steed
Coon	Machrowicz	Utt
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, N. Y.	Walter
Dondero	Mumma	Westland
Eberharter	Norblad	Whitten
Fallon	Osmers	Young
Gwinn	Passman	
Hand	Powell	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Passman with Mr. James.
Mr. Hayworth with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Coon.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2535, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] will be recognized for 3½ hours and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 3½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us today is probably historically the most important this Congress will consider. On that point, Mr. Chairman, and I think on that point alone in this matter, I am in hearty agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

This bill if enacted into law will change permanently the legal structure of our country. It will add 2 stars to our national flag, and 4 new Senators in the Congress of the United States. Our action will be studied and restudied in every schoolhouse in America in this and coming generations. It will be noted in foreign lands around the globe. It will give to two incorporated Territories the stature of full sovereignty and equality within the Union of American States. It will refresh the proof of the belief of the American people in the principles of self-determination, self-government and freedom. It will bring to a conclusion a half century of tutelage in economic and political growth for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. If this legislation fails it may postpone for many years, if not forever, the entrance of these incorporated Territories as States of the Union.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say again, in agreement with my distinguished friend from Virginia, that this legislation deserves the very careful and serious attention and consideration of every Member of the House of Representatives.

In all probability no bill will come before the House during this session of the Congress which has been so long and so carefully considered, and on which there has been so much in the way of hearings and evidence, and so often considered by the House of Representatives and the other body.

This legislation has a long history of consideration by both Houses of Congress.

Hawaiian statehood has been the subject of 12 complete hearings, over 5,000 pages of testimony and over 700 witnesses. On 15 occasions the Territorial legislature has petitioned Congress for statehood. Forty-one statehood bills have from time to time been introduced.

In June of 1947 the House passed an Hawaiian statehood bill by a vote of 196 to 193. In March of 1950 the House again passed Hawaiian statehood legislation by a vote of 262 to 110. In March of 1953 the House passed statehood legislation for Hawaii by a vote of 274 to 138. And in April of 1954 a joint Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood bill passed the United States Senate by a vote of 57 to 28. The bill before you was passed out of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in March 1955, by a vote of 19 to 6.

The Territory of Hawaii in 1950 adopted a constitution for the State of Hawaii, approved by the voters of Hawaii by a margin of 3 to 1, and that constitution was approved unanimously by the Territorial legislature.

Statehood for Alaska was proposed first in 1916. Seven complete hearings have been held, with hearings in the Territory of Alaska in 1947, 1951, and 1953. Hearings were held in Washington in 1949, 1950, 1953, and 1955, comprising nearly 3,000 pages of testimony. In the 81st Congress, Alaska statehood passed this House by a vote of 186 to 146. In the 83d Congress a bill was favoraly reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Alaska Statehood but died in the Committee on Rules. In the same Congress a joint Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill passed the Senate, as previously stated, by a vote of 57 to 28.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska or for both has been favorably acted on three times as follows: Once by a Republican House under a Democratic President; once by a Democratic House under a Democratic President; once by a Republican House under a Republican President. The single remaining combination is the one that exists in the present case. H. R. 2535 faces a Democratic House with a Republican President.

But, I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that legislation for each of these territories has at one time or another passed both of the Houses of the Congress.

In addition to that, no single piece of legislation to my knowledge has wider support or longer standing support in the major parties of this country.

Both the Democratic and the Republican Party platforms contain commitments for immediate statehood for Hawaii. The Republican platform in 1944, 1948, and in 1952 all called for statehood for Hawaii. The Republican platform in 1948 favored eventual statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. The Republican platform of 1952 favored immediate statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska under an equitable enabling act, which the bill before you now presents.

The Democratic platform in 1944, in 1948, and in 1952 recommended statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. The 1952 platform of the Democratic Party urged statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii "by virtue of their strategic geographical locations as vital bastions in the Pacific which contributed greatly to the welfare and the economic development of our country and have become integrated into our economic and social life. We therefore urge immediate statehood for both of these Territories." That

is the language of the platform of the Democratic Party in 1952.

In addition to this signal support of both parties for statehood for both of these great Territories, the public-opinion polls of this country in recent years have all strongly favored statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. In the latest Gallup poll in February 1955, public opinion on the admission of Hawaii to the Union is shown as follows: For, 78 percent; no, 12 percent; no opinion, 10 percent. Alaska statehood was favored by an even greater percentage, with yes, 82 percent; no, 9 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of the Interior McKay, both major political parties, Chief Justice Warren, 32 national organizations, and 95 percent of the Nation's newspaper editors, as well as approximately 80 percent of the people of this Nation strongly favor statehood for these Territories either now or under an equitable enabling act.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, probably never in history have two Territories ever come before the Congress of the United States with more unanimous support throughout the country, the press and the major political parties, than these two that are tied together in this legislation before you today.

Hawaii and Alaska are the only two remaining incorporated Territories in the United States. The importance of this fact is that incorporated territory has always been the legal basis for statehood. Incorporation itself is a legal step toward statehood, a declaration of intention to make a Territory a State.

As recently as April 11, 1955, the Supreme Court of the United States has reviewed our historic precedents on this subject. I want to read from this very new decision issued on April 11, 1955, in the Granville-Smith case relating to the divorce laws in the Virgin Islands. Here is what the Supreme Court said about it:

> A vital distinction was made between incorporated and unincorporated territories. The first category had the potentialities of statehood like unto continental territories. The United States Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, fully applied to an "incorporated" territory. See, e. g., *Rassmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 516). The second category described possessions of the United States not thought of as future States. To these only some essentials, withal undefined, of the Constitution extended.

The exact point of that proposition is this, that there are only two incorporated areas left applying for statehood in the Union of States in this country. They stand in a very special legal status. They are incorporated within the body of our country. They cannot get out. They must either remain as Territories or they must proceed on to become States. There is no way by which an incorporated Territory can disincorporate itself or can separate itself from the Union. To admit to the opposite view would be to concede the validity of the repudiated doctrine of secession. If either one of these great Territories undertook to secede or to withdraw from the territorial limits of the United States we would have a repetition of the situation which we had in the famous War Between the States.

Hawaii was made an incorporated Territory by the Hawaiian Organic Act of 1900 with its implicit promise of statehood for Hawaii. Alaska, purchased in 1867, became an incorporated Territory by the Organic Act of 1912. One of these Territories, Hawaii, has been in the status of tutelage premature to statehood for a period of over half a century; the other, Alaska, for almost half a century. It seems to me they have a right to ask whether or not the door is now going to be closed upon them or whether they should remain forever in the inferior status of a Territory, taxed without representation? The Territory of Hawaii pays taxes equivalent to those of the ninth State in this Union.

These facts clearly distinguish Hawaii and Alaska from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and other areas. Admission of these incorporated Territories to statehood therefore establishes no precedent for other areas not similarly situated. There are no others. The granting of the incorporated status carries with it the implicit promise of statehood. In fact, they have no other place to go. They will either become States of the Union or they will continue as Territories, taxed and held within the incorporated limits of this country without voting representation on the floor of the House or in the Senate of the United States.

Furthermore, these great Territories, one in a territorial status of tutelage for statehood for almost 50 years and the other in a territorial status of tutelage for over half a century, have complied and qualified under every basic qualification for statehood.

What are they? They are generally regarded as three.

First, that the people are American in thought, action, culture, and ideals fully embracing the principles of democracy and freedom in our own American system of government.

Second, that the proposed new State have sufficient population and resources to support State government and at the same time carry its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

Third, that a majority of the electorate wish statehood.

I say these two Territories have in each instance qualified without any dispute under each one of these principles.

Let us take the first principle, the proposition that the people seeking statehood must be American in thought, action, culture, and ideals, and wholly embracing the principles of democracy and freedom in our American form of government. That is the essential thing, after all, that they be fundamentally American in thought, action, and ideals.

Each of these great Territories has an American school system, and has had for a long, long period of time. Ninety-nine percent of the pupils in the Hawaiian school system, which is one of the best, and which was established as early as 1840, are American citizens. A visit to the schools in Alaska would not indicate any real distinction between their schools and the schools we have in this country.

Both have lived under the American Constitution for a long period of time, Alaska for 43 years, Hawaii for 55 years. They are used to the American system of government and they believe in it. Both have demonstrated political maturity, the governments in both Territories operating on a solvent basis and a balanced budget and according to American traditions. Little change is needed in the territorial structure of the governments if they are granted statehood under this legislation.

Both have demonstrated their patriotism and loyalty to America. It is hardly necessary for me to mention the wonderful record of Hawaii in the last war, with its 442d Combat Team, which was the most decorated single combat unit participating on the American side in the last world war, or to mention the contribution of Hawaii in the conflict in Korea, where the Hawaiian enlistments suffered casualties three times the average for the rest of our country.

The position of Alaska, of course, is similar. In each of these instances the people of these Territories have demonstrated their patriotism and their loyalty to America.

Recently there was a document circulated among the membership relating to communism in Hawaii. That is going to be dealt with more directly a little later, but let me say that there was not one single case of sabotage in Hawaii during the last World War, nor was there one single defection to communism among the Hawaiian people.

Culturally, these people are also inherently and typically American. They speak the same language we do, they read the same newspapers, they earn their living in the same way, and buy the same things. They live the same way as the people do in the other parts of the United States. They are strictly and typically American. If you visit Hawaii you cannot come to any other conclusion; and if you visit Alaska you cannot come to any other conclusion. Indisputably these people have qualified under the first requisite of statehood, that is, that they are American in thought, action, culture, and ideals, wholly embracing the principles of democracy and freedom in our American system of government.

On the second point, that the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and at the same time carry on its share of the Federal Government: here again each of these Territories has fully demonstrated its qualification for statehood.

Populationwise, Hawaii has half a million people, Alaska 182,000. Hawaii has more people now than four States of the Union, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada, and more than any other territory admitted to the Union of States except Oklahoma. Alaska has more population now than Nevada, and more than 30 present States when admitted to the Union of States.

The Hawaiian economy compares favorably with that of any State in our Union.

In 1952, the Hawaiian mainland dollar earnings was $645 million. The value of the 1952 sugar crop was $139 million. The pineapple crop was valued at $100 million. Tourist income amounted to just under $33 million. In the fiscal year 1952–53 the clearings of Hawaiian banks, 44 in number, amounted to $2½ billion. The net assessed valuation of real property was $640 million, exceeding that of several States. Hawaii was subject to the same Federal taxation as the 48 States and consistently pays into the United States Treasury considerably larger amounts than the Federal Government expends in Hawaii, not including, of course, expenditures for national defense.

In 1953, Hawaii paid nearly $136 million in Federal taxes, more than any of 9 States—Nevada, New Hampshire, Montana, Vermont, Idaho, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, and New Mexico. In the past decade, the territory paid over $1¼ billion in Federal taxes, and since being admitted to a territorial status has paid nearly $2 billion in Federal taxes, without a single vote on the floor of this House or in the United States Senate.

My recollection is that we fought a Revolutionary War because we did not subscribe to the principle of taxation without representation. How much longer can we keep the Territory of Hawaii embraced within the incorporated limits of our country and not give to Hawaii Federal representation here in this House and in the Senate?

The Alaskan economy has shown a balanced budget in recent years for its Government, which is dealt with more particularly on page 43 of our committee report, indicating that territorial revenues in 1953 and in 1954 totalled $30,-221,633. Against this revenue, the territory had budgeted approximately $25 million. In other words, the Territory of Alaska, which some people around here like to say is too immature to maintain statehood has at least gotten itself a balanced budget, which we have not been able to do in Washington for some time.

The economy of Alaska has been affected by the fact that 99 percent of the area of Alaska is in Federal ownership. Ninety-nine percent of the land of Alaska is in Federal ownership, which has curtailed the economic activity of that area, and which under our bill we intend to change by turning over approximately 100 million acres to the new State.

Alaska is the same size as Iceland, Scotland, Norway, Denmark and Finland, all put together and in approximately the same latitude, and with the same general climatic conditions. Those six small countries are supporting a population of 24 million people. The Alaskan population at the present time is 182,000—more than the present State of Nevada.

I venture to prophesy that in another 25 years, Alaska will exceed in population and in economic importance its sister incorporated territory, Hawaii, now seeking admission to the Union.

I think it is apparent, Mr. Chairman, from these facts that those two areas do qualify under the basic qualifications, the traditional qualifications for statehood. They have not only indicated they are typically and fundamentally American in ideals, culture and thinking, but they have the economic strength to maintain a State government as part of the Federal system.

The third point, of course, is whether or not the people in the territories themselves do want statehood. Their delegates are here to speak.

I have heretofore mentioned the pleas that have gone up for statehood from those areas. They feel abused that they are the last two incorporated Territories in the American system and have not been given statehood in this Nation.

On the other hand, there are some arguments against statehood which you frequently hear. One is the argument about noncontiguity; that they are noncontiguous. The fact of geographical closeness is not a material point except in terms of time and the difficulty of getting there. What difference does it make to you whether there is an ocean between the east coast and California, or 1,500 miles of wilderness and wild Indians? California was admitted to the Union, separated by other areas noncontiguous by 1,500 miles of wilderness, wild animals, and savage Indians.

The fact is that either one of these Territories is closer today to Washington, D. C., this very Capitol where we are discussing their fate, than Boston and New York under the Original Thirteen States back in 1776. It actually took longer to go from Washington to New York or Boston in those days than it takes to go from here either to Alaska or to Hawaii. In point of time they are incomparably closer. In point of facility of transportation they are incomparably closer. The fact that geographically there is water instead of wild desert and unconquered savages between the edge of this country and the edge of the new State is, in my opinion, wholly immaterial.

In addition to that, these two areas are incorporated into our Union as a part of our defensive system. We all know that. General MacArthur told me in 1947 in Japan that for all practical purposes Hawaii is a part, defensewise, of the Pacific coast, and that whatever we did to lock it closer into the American system of States the more we did to help to defend our country.

The position of Alaska with reference to the defense of this country is well known.

I had hoped to have a chance to take some time with reference to the particular provisions of this bill because I know some of you would like to spend some time on them, but my time is running out; however, I would call attention to page 8 of the report which deals with the major provisions of the bill regarding the admission of Hawaii. Title I deals with admission of Hawaii. Title II deals with admission of Alaska. On page 8 of our report you will see a brief summary in 7 points of the major provisions of the bill, explaining what this legislation does on statehood for Hawaii.

On page 28 of the report you will find a brief summary of title II of the bill relating to statehood for Alaska, giving in 11 separate and short summary paragraphs the specific provisions of this legislation with reference to statehood for Alaska.

The bill is entirely severable by title, each one standing separately, the provisions being not intermixed, title I relating to Hawaii and title II relating to Alaska.

In summary, the time has come to complete action on statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Frankly, I am concerned that if we do not get it done this time it is probably off for a long time in the future. Both have been favorably passed on several times by both Houses of Congress. I have recited to you the long legislative history. Both major parties have, time and again, endorsed statehood at various times for both of these Territories.

The American people by ever-increasing majorities are favoring statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii by majorities of 7 and 8 to 1. These are the only two remaining incorporated Territories entitled to statehood; they are the only two left, and their admission to statehood establishes no precedent with reference to other areas which belong to the United States but which are not in the legal status of incorporated areas of this country.

No reasonable or compelling argument has been made either against the admission of these Territories to statehood, or for postponing statehood.

The privileges and responsibilities of self-government are the final aspirations of all free men. We owe it to the people of these two Territories now; they have earned it in every way that it can be earned.

We cannot continue to collect taxes from them without voting representation to them, and we cannot prate or preach about self-determination and representative self-government and deprive these people of it. I hope this Congress will no longer deny justice to the people of Hawaii and Alaska which 80 percent of the people who elect us agree they should have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman points out that the budget of Alaska is balanced and compares that with the fact that we have not balanced our own budget. Is it not a fact that Alaska is not handing out billions of dollars a year to foreign countries?

Mr. ENGLE. As far as I know Alaska is not supporting any foreign country.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not seriously use that as an argument for statehood for Alaska, the fact that they have a balanced budget and we do not have a balanced budget; he is not using that seriously as an argument in behalf of Alaska; is he?

Mr. ENGLE. I am seriously using the argument that when a Territory has demonstrated its political maturity by its ability to conduct its own government in a territorial status within the framework of its taxes and its appropriations, it demonstrates a competency

to govern and a competency to become a State.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would rather not yield until I make my statement.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from California said he would yield, but did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time a combined bill which would admit two Territories to the family of States has been before the House of Representatives. If the bill is passed it will be the first time in more than 40 years that a new Territory has come in to be a member of the States.

Hawaii for more than half a century has been progressing year by year and approaching the time when she should have statehood. Statehood was promised to Hawaii.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 53]

Adair	Eberharter	Mumma
Albert	Fallon	Norblad
Auchincloss	Gathings	Passman
Avery	Gray	Powell
Ayres	Green, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Gwinn	Reed, Ill.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Riehlman
	Hayworth	Riley
Bowler	Heselton	Roberts
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Sieminski
Celler	Jackson	Spence
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Steed
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Taylor
Christopher	Knox	Utt
Cooley	Knutson	Walter
Coon	Krueger	Westland
Dawson, Ill.	Laird	Wharton
Deane	McCulloch	Wilson, Calif.
Dempsey	Mason	Young
Dingell	Miller, N. Y.	
Dondero	Morrison	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 2535, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 355 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that a combined bill which would admit two Territories to our family of States has been presented to the House of Representatives. If the bill is passed, it will be the first time in 40 years that a new Territory has been admitted as a State.

Hawaii, for more than half a century, has been progressively approaching and preparing for statehood.

This will probably be the last time, at least in the foreseeable future, that any new Territories will ever be admitted as a new State. It is a momentous occasion and a heavy decision that must rest upon the shoulders of Congress and the Chief Executive.

There are good men in this Congress who have strong convictions against admitting either Hawaii or Alaska as a new State. They have honest convictions. The debate this week will hammer out on the anvil of debate the pros and cons as to whether either or both of these Territories should be admitted to the family of States. If this move fails, you can be sure the problem will be back again.

REASONS FOR ADMITTING HAWAII

Hawaii has been a subject of some 13 congressional investigations covering 57 subjects ranging from agriculture to the war record of the Hawaiians. Every possible conceivable facet pro and con has been exhausted. There have been more than 4,000 pages of printed hearings and reports. There have been more than 100 days of testimony with more than 700 witnesses presenting their views. Thirty-four Members of Congress have visited Hawaii as members of the Statehood Investigating Committee. The last five of these congressional committees strongly recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii.

Both political parties have several times at their convention recommended statehood for Hawaii. President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his state of the Union message had this to say:

> The platforms of both political parties promised immediate statehood to Hawaii. The people of that Territory have earned that status. Statehood should be granted promptly with the first election scheduled for 1954. Legislation to admit Hawaii to the Union will be a part of the program I submit to Congress.

Former President Truman had this to say in his state of the Union message to Congress when he urged that Congress to "promptly accede to the wishes of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our Union."

Vice President NIXON had this to say in part:

> Hawaii is a living tribute to democracy in action. Hawaii wants statehood, but more important, we of the United States want Hawaii to become a State.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur had this to say when he returned from Korea and had a stop in Hawaii:

> We hope that when we meet again Hawaii will be a full-blown State.

Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz had this to say in part:

> I have given close study to the islands—I perceive no objection from a military or naval standpoint to the Hawaiian Islands achieving statehood.

The Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, said in part:

> I believe that Hawaii is fully qualified for statehood.

The former Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, said in part:

> There is no question in my mind that by any standard of judgment these citizens of the United States have demonstrated their readiness for self-government as a State.

The majority leader in the other body said in part:

> The record of loyalty in peace and war by the people of the Territory of Hawaii cannot be challenged.

The late senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, Hugh Butler, chairman of the Interior Committee, who made a thorough investigation in Hawaii had this to say:

> I believe the residents of Hawaii during the past 4 years * * * have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold—I recommend that statehood be granted to Hawaii.

A Member of this House, HAROLD VELDE, who was chairman of the House Un-American Activities, when he completed his investigation in Hawaii on communism, said:

> No one is more keenly aware of the menace of communism than the people of Hawaii themselves.
>
> It is also my conviction that communism can be more effectively dealt with under a strong State government than under the present territorial status.

Another member of that committee, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTERS, had this to say about communism in Hawaii:

> At no time (were there) more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. My guess as of today (February 15, 1953) it does not exceed over 60. The people of Hawaii understand that communism is a worldwide conspiracy and given the opportunity they will put their own houses in order.

The governors of the 11 Western States passed the following resolution at their meeting in November 1953:

> The western governors urge the Congress of the United States to pass without delay the pending Hawaii statehood bill so as to bring this American commonwealth into the Union as the 49th State.

Nearly two-score national organizations with combined memberships running into tens of millions have endorsed statehood for Hawaii. They are the American Legion, chambers of commerce of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, Lions Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and many, many more.

The Gallup poll has conducted six polls since 1941 on the question of statehood. Their survey has shown that the average favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is more than 70 percent. Those opposing average about 14 percent with another 14 or 16 percent undecided. My own poll in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska continued this year showed that 76.4 percent favored statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska and 23.6 percent opposed.

The House of Representatives in 1947 approved statehood for Hawaii by 196 to 133. Again in March 1950, the vote for Hawaiian statehood was 262 to 110. In March 1953, the House of Representatives approved a statehood bill by a 274-to-138 vote. There were 17 of the State delegations who voted unanimously for the bill. The same bill has passed the House on three different occasions. A joint bill for two new States passed the Senate 57 to 28.

The Nation's press, by far more than 90 percent, have written favorable editorials endorsing statehood for Hawaii.

THE OPPOSITION

The opposition opposes statehood because of the distance from the United States. They question the cause of communism. They question the representation in the House and the Senate. They question the loyalty of the citizens. Let's look at these objections:

THE DISTANCE FROM WASHINGTON

The distance from Washington in this air and electronic age with radio, television, telegraph, and jet aircraft brings Hawaii closer to Washington, D. C., than the majority of the States when they were admitted to the Union. One needs only to read the debate when Mississippi, Nebraska, California, and the other States were admitted as new States to realize that the same arguments against their admission were used as is now being used against Hawaii and Alaska. In those days, these States were reached either by covered wagon or sailing ship. The men who made those arguments in that day have proved to be eternally wrong, as I am sure time will prove the same arguments now being made against Hawaii and Alaska will be wrong on the tomorrow.

COMMUNISM

J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the FBI, placed the number of Communists in Hawaii at 36 in 1951. Since then, 7 Hawaiian residents have been convicted of violating the Smith Act. Actually, Hawaii has fewer Communists percentagewise than New York, Chicago, Boston or several other large cities of the United States. The ILWU, an international labor organization, with headquarters in San Francisco has been the key to Communist activity.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951 had this to say:

> The evidence shows that as of 1951, the people of Hawaii have successfully cast communistic influence out of all phases of their political, social, cultural, and educational activities.

The State constitution adopted in 1950 had this to say:

> Any person who advocates, aids or belongs to any party or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State or of the United States shall be unqualified to hold any public office or employment.

LOYALTY OF THE CITIZENS

It should be remembered that 80 percent of the population are now Americans. Ninety-nine percent of all schoolchildren of the Territory are native-born American citizens.

The 442d Combat Team from Hawaii had a splendid record in World War II. Gen. Mark Clark had this to say:

> It was the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States.

The FBI reported, and reports show, that there was not a single case of sabotage by any segment of the civilian population during the Pearl Harbor incident. Not one case of desertion to the Communists by an Hawaiian soldier has been recorded. The percentage of Hawaii's battle casualties in the Korean fighting was three times that of other countries. There is no question about the loyalty of the Hawaiian people.

REPRESENTATION—HOUSE AND SENATE

Those who attacked the fact that there will be two Senators from each of the new States, plus representation in the House, are attacking the Constitution of the United States. This Constitution has operated for more than a century and a half. No attempt has been made to amend this part of the Constitution.

Hawaii is able to pay its own way. It pays more taxes to the United States Treasury than nine States. It is larger in area than 3 States, and has a population exceeding that of 4 States—greater than any State was when admitted to the Union except Oklahoma.

Hawaii is an American community. Hawaii was promised statehood. Hawaii understands statehood. She deserves statehood. She has served her apprenticeship with honor and distinction. Admitting Hawaii as a new State will help her combat communism just as we do in the United States.

Statehood for Hawaii will permit her to—

First. Elect its own government.

Second. Elect a Representative to the United States Congress.

Third. Own and control all of their land.

Fourth. The right to latitude in lawmaking by its own legislature.

Fifth. The right to choose its own governor and to carry on functions of the government by its own elected officials instead of by Federal administrators.

Sixth. The right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

Seventh. The right to an equal share, on a per capita basis, in Federal grants.

Eighth. The right to a voice in any proposed amendment to the Constitution.

To sum up, since the 66th Congress, there have been more than 35 bills introduced in the Congress asking for statehood for Hawaii. There have been 7 congressional committees which made investigations on the spot with 35 Members of Congress listening to the arguments. More than 700 witnesses, covering more than 4,000 pages of printed materials covering 57 subjects, have been listed.

It is time that Hawaii, which has been an incorporated part of the United States, be admitted to statehood. It will fulfill our pledge to the Territory. Statehood will bring the final reward of full citizenship to the people of Hawaii.

ALASKA

This bill includes the proposition of admitting Alaska to statehood at the same time Hawaii is admitted. I have never voted for statehood for Alaska. The last bill which passed the House gave Alaska only 2 percent of its land. I contended the new State could not exist on such a small portion of their land. This new bill gives Alaska a large portion of the land, and she can select some of the best land for the new State. I can support this bill.

Alaska is the last large frontier. The population will shift to Alaska. As a new State, with much land to attract citizens, I believe the population would double and triple several times in the next half century.

Alaska, with the so-called McKay line that sets aside a large part of Alaska as a military reservation, will in the words of the President: "I assure you that I shall give it earnest consideration." I am sure that this line will be adopted either here or in the other body and certainly in conference and this will be acceptable to the administration. I am, therefore, supporting the rule and the combined bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman will tell me this: It is a little disturbing and confusing. Who promised Hawaii statehood? That statement was made time and again on this floor. I understand only the Congress can give statehood. Who promised Hawaii statehood?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think I can say to my colleague that that is going to be discussed a little more fully later on. They are incorporated territories when they come in, as all of the States have been incorporated territories, which carriers an implied understanding that statehood will eventually be given to that territory. I think that has always been true.

Mr. Chairman, I inserted in the RECORD, during debate on the rule, a letter from the President of the United States in which he pointed out that the proposed McKay line would come as near to meeting his objections as could be, and he said of this type of proposed legislation, that if approved by Congress, it will be given his earnest consideration. That means that if the House, in its wisdom, sees fit to pass this joint bill, both these territories may receive the approval of the administration.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact is it not, that in his letter to the gentleman, the President went about as far as he could go without saying point blank that he would sign the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I think that is true. To me it is a great deal of encouragement to believe that if we can adopt the McKay line in setting aside a large part of it for a military reservation, it will be acceptable.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad the gentleman brought that out because I think it is important for the House to know that we are doing our very best on this committee to formulate legislation which will meet the approval of the White House. We think we have done it. We know we have done it on Hawaii and we think we have done it on Alaska. At least the President has gone a long, long way in this regard and if we cannot get this amendment in here, because of the nature of the rule, the amendment will be proposed in the other body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I was not here a few moments ago; would the gentleman be good enough to explain what the McKay line is, if he has not already done so?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The McKay line, in brief, takes up a large part of the northern part of Alaska. The number of acres I am not quite sure of, but it is an uninhabited area that would be set aside for a military reservation, and which runs down north of Anchorage and then goes east and takes out a large area for a military reservation. Apparently, this is wanted by the military and by the administration, and the President has indicated that with that line in there, he would certainly give this proposal most serious consideration.

Mr. GROSS. It is a sort of partitioning process.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. As I understand it, the McKay line proposal is not in this proposed legislation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; the rule was so drawn that it was impossible to do that.

Mr. MORANO. My next question is, Is the House going to be given an opportunity to vote on this so-called McKay line that the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska speaks of?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If we can work out a motion to recommit with instructions to include the McKay line, that would be true.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman propose to offer such a motion?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not eligible to offer a recommittal motion because I am for the legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to commend the gentleman from Nebraska on the excellent statement that he has made for the bill. I should like to say to those Members who raised the question with regard to the McKay line that the best description that I can give of that is as follows. It begins at a point 1 mile north of the Porcupine River on the Canadian border, proceeds down 1 mile north of the Porcupine River to the junction of the Yukon River, 1 mile north of the Yukon River to the 160th parallel, down the 160th parallel to a point 1 mile north of the Kuskokwim River, then 1 mile north of the Kuskokwim River to Kuskokwim Bay, and then cuts off the so-called Aleutian Chain.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. How many people are there in Alaska, and how many people will there be left in this Territory that is cut by the McKay line?

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] can correct me if I am wrong in this, but as near as I know there are less than 2500 people north of the line.

Mr. MORANO. How many people in all Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. The number is considerably larger than that. May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska, who has made a fine contribution to this subject, this question: The President would not be required to establish any national defense withdrawals north and west of that line, would he?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, he would not be required to do so, as I understand it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Or he could make a number of small ones if he cared to. Is it not a fact that all the exterior boundaries of Alaska would be incorporated in the new State even with the so-called McKay line adopted?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe that is true. It would be known as part of the military reservation.

Mr. MORANO. I have not yet had the answer to the question as to how many people are in Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will ask the gentleman from Alaska to tell us the number of people in Alaska.

Mr. MORANO. How many military people will be excluded from the State of Alaska if this bill is adopted?

Mr. BARTLETT. These lines have been changing so rapidly I would not care to attempt to speak with preciseness, but I should judge there would be about 20,000 civilians involved and just a scattering of military people.

Mr. MORANO. How many Eskimos in Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. These people who would be north and west of that McKay line who would be included in any national defense withdrawal the President might make would still be citizens of the State of Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They would have a right to vote also. How many Eskimos are there in Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. About 14,000 or 15,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How many Indians and Aleuts?

Mr. BARTLETT. The total native population, Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos, amounts to about 34,000 or 35,000. Of course, there are a good many thousand Indians in the so-called panhandle, which would be within the area where national defense withdrawals could not be made.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The total population of Alaska is what?

Mr. BARTLETT. The total civilian population of Alaska, according to the last estimates, was about 180,000.

Mr. MORANO. If it is not a military secret, how many military people are there in Alaska?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is partly a military secret.

Mr. BARTLETT. The answer to that is that up until about 2 years ago the figures were released, but they no longer are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What condition is this bill in without the so-called McKay line? Is this bill acceptable without it?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is not acceptable to me, no. I am sure if we do not put it in here it will be put in in the other body or in conference.

Mr. GROSS. What would the admission of Hawaii to the United States as a State do to the sugar situation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not a thing. We are under a law now that cuts Hawaii, Cuba, and the Philippines.

Mr. GROSS. The sugar quotas would not be changed in any way if Hawaii came in as a State?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not at all. I am from a sugar State, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Would the gentleman tell what the total area of the Territory is, and the total of the area which is to be excluded under this McKay line?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Again, I am going to have to refer that to the Delegate from Alaska, the number of acres in Alaska and the number, as he understands the McKay line, that would be excluded.

Mr. HOSMER. Possibly, we could have the figures in square miles.

Mr. BARTLETT. The total number of square miles in the Territory of Alaska is 586,000. The number of square miles within the area which could be constituted as national defense withdrawals by the President under the so-called McKay line amounts cumulatively to 283,100 square miles.

Mr. HOSMER. That is over half of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. No, it is somewhat less than half of the total number of square miles.

Mr. HOSMER. I understood the population estimate that is the civilian population exclusive of Indians and military personnel was 180,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. The total civilian population at this time is about 180,000. Of that number, possibly 35,000 are American citizens of Eskimo, Indian, or Aleut blood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might add that about 85 percent of the people will be below the McKay line.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further in clarification of the 180,000 figure, does that include military personnel?

Mr. BARTLETT. It does not.

Mr. HOSMER. Could the gentleman state what the 1950 census report was of the citizenship population of Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. As I recall, I think the civilian population according to the 1950 census, and I do not want to be bound by this because I speak from recollection, was about 105,000 or 128,000.

Mr. SAYLOR. According to the official census, the civilian population in 1950 was 108,000 and the total population was 128,000.

Mr. HOSMER. If the civilian population in 1950 was 108,000 and now it is 180,000, have there been 72,000 migrants to the area in 5 years?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, there has been quite a large exodus of the citizens of the United States to Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, my time is all gone but I want to state that when the great State of California came into the Union, the statesmen of that day said that California would never have more than 100,000 people and that it was so far from the rest of the States that it could never, never be admitted as a State. Of course, the statesmen of that time were honest and sincere in their belief, but they were so wrong as time has proven. I might say that as time goes on, and as our grandchildren migrate to Alaska, the population will double and triple several times in the next half century.

Mr. HOSMER. This, I believe, is an important thing which was not brought out in the hearings at least to my knowledge concerning this tremendous immigration to the Territory of Alaska in the last 5 years. I would like to know what is responsible for it.

Mr. SAYLOR. It was brought out in the hearings and it is shown on page 200 of the report, which indicates that the Census Bureau at our request furnished figures and stated that Alaska in the past 3 years has had a growth of 59.2 percent.

Mr. HOSMER. However, my question is directed to the reason for that growth.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the population of the United States has grown for much the same reason, for example, the growth of population in California where you had a tremendous growth and in Oregon and in some of the other States. Meanwhile, some States have even lost population. Alaska happens to be in a favorable position to be gaining in population.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the main reason for the great increase in population in Alaska is that so many American boys served in Alaska during the war. A great many of our boys came to know Alaska, they liked the Territory and they liked the people. They like the way of life in Alaska and they are now moving there especially to the southern part of Alaska in the Kenai Peninsula where a great area has been opened up to farming. Many of our boys are moving there and making their homes there.

I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for the fine statement he has just made regarding statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I concur with everything the gentleman has said. As against the few arguments that we have heard against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, there are dozens of reasons why they should be given statehood in our American Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitutional and State government and to be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, directed him to report it had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDING THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers to be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 486)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this paragraph shall show that, from January 1, 1953, to the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant during the period since its last certification has been inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certificates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this paragraph and the date of its application: *Provided*, That the Board in issuing the certificate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The bill as agreed to in conference is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, but, except for the points explained below, it is substantially the same as the bill the House passed.

Both the bill as it was passed by the House and the Senate amendment proposed to add to section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 a new paragraph providing for the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity, without limit as to the duration thereof, to certain air carriers which have been furnishing in the continental United States, under temporary certificates, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property, and mail. In both the House bill and the Senate amendment it was provided that, to obtain a certificate, application must be made within 120 days after the date of the enactment of the new paragraph.

In each instance it was provided that the new certificates should be issued solely upon proof of the fact that the applicant, or its predecessor in interest, had engaged in such local or feeder service for a specified length of time. Under the House bill, the applicant would have had to show that it or its predecessor had been furnishing such service from the date of the enactment of the new paragraph until the date it applied for the new certificate, whereas under the Senate amendment the applicant would have had to make this showing with respect to the period from

January 1, 1953, until the date of making application for the new certificate. On this point the substitute agreed to in conference follows the Senate amendment.

The carriers which will be eligible to receive certificates under the new paragraph, assuming that they otherwise comply with the provisions of the paragraph, are the 14 local-service carriers (or any successor in interest to any of them) which were referred to in the report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce filed with this legislation when it was favorably reported to the House.

During the consideration of this legislation by Congress the operating rights of 1 of the 14 local-service carriers above referred to were acquired by another carrier. As a result, the temporary certificate held by the local-service carrier was canceled and such temporary certificate was reissued by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the acquiring carrier with exactly the same operating rights and restrictions. Had the local-service carrier continued to operate the route it would have received the benefits provided by this legislation, and it therefore should be clear, and it is the understanding of the committee of conference, that those benefits will inure to its successor in interest to which the temporary certificate was so reissued.

The Senate amendment contained the following proviso which did not appear in the bill as it passed the House: *"Provided,* That the Board in issuing the certificate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time."

The proviso is included in the substitute as agreed to in conference.

It is appropriate to include a brief explanation of this proviso. It is the intent of the committee of conference to give to the Civil Aeronautics Board flexibility in choosing the intermediate points which, under this proviso, may be given certificates of limited duration. Thus, while it is the general intent that the Board may limit the duration of the certificate as to not over half of the intermediate points on each segment, there may be occasional instances where they are only 2 or 3 intermediates and it is desirable to limit the duration as to both, or as to 2 out of 3. In other words, the rule does not rigidly apply to each segment, but it is not to be given such flexible application as to distort a whole geographical area of a local service system into a whole structure of nonstop segments.

The Senate also amended the title of the bill. On this amendment the Senate recedes.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand the gentleman from Tennessee has advised the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] that this conference report would be taken up?

Mr. PRIEST. I have advised him, and I am informed he is on his way here. The gentleman from New Jersey told me he had no objection to bringing it up at this time. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] also knows that the conference report was scheduled to be taken up, and I understand he is at another conference meeting and does not care to be here at this time.

Mr. MARTIN. Neither of them had any particular desire to be here when the matter was called up?

Mr. PRIEST. That is what I have been informed. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is on his way here, but he said it would be all right for me to have the conference report brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes just to make a brief statement.

This is a unanimous report from the committee of conference. The bill is in practically the same shape as it passed the House, but the House receded and accepted 1 or 2 Senate amendments that were in the bill. One of those amendments I should refer to because of some interpretations that may have been given the language down at the Civil Aeronautics Board. That is the date January 1, 1953, which was in the Senate amendment, and the House receded and accepted the Senate language insofar as the date January 1, 1953, was concerned.

Prior to that date all of these local service airlines were in operation and carrying passengers. There have been 1 or 2 operations started since, namely, some helicopter operations, that were not in operation carrying passengers prior to January 1, 1953. It was the feeling of both the Senate and the House committees and the conferees that this date should be included in the bill. There was no intention on the part of the conferees to freeze any route structures as of that date. It was simply a date for establishing the right of the carrier to make application for a permanent certificate.

Both committees feel that there certainly is no desire to discriminate in any way against helicopter service. We feel, however, that it is a different type of service from the local service airlines, and rather than name them as such in the report the Senate simply put this date in the bill and we accepted it in order to make certain that this covered only the 14 service airlines that were indicated to be covered by the original bill.

There is one other point: The House conferees accepted a Senate bill proviso which would permit the CAB to certificate on an indefinite basis at least 50 percent of the intermediate points on any one line, intermediate points between the terminals. That was done to assure that at least 50 percent of the intermediate points would be certificated permanently and that at least there would be an opportunity to study all the points that were intercommunicating on the lines.

I might make this statement, that all of the House bill with those minor exceptions, including the date 1953 and the proviso with reference to intermediate points was accepted, and the bill is generally the bill that passed the House.

I notice the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] on the floor at this time. He may wish to add something to what I have said. For his benefit, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have just explained to the House the Senate amendments with reference to the 50 percent of the intermediate points between terminals and also the inclusion of the date January 1, 1953.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what has already been said by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee. It is a matter that has had very careful consideration by our committee. It was passed unanimously by the committee, and by the House. The slight changes that were made resulted in a unanimous conference report.

I sincerely hope the House will give its approval.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit tomorrow during general debate on the bill granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE LATE RICHARD J. FINNEGAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Chicago, Ill., and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the passing of Richard J. Finnegan, consultant editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, who today was buried in the city of Chicago.

The sad mission has been given me by the dean of the Illinois Democratic delegation, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, to make announcement of the message of death that has brought deep grief to every Member of this body from the city of Chicago.

For over half a century Dick Finnegan was the beloved friend of the dean of our delegation, Mr. O'BRIEN, of Congressman JAMES BOWLER, and of me. In more recent years he had been the friend and the inspiration of the younger men of our delegation. With us who knew and loved Dick Finnegan, this has been a day heavy with grief.

We extend to his devoted widow, his children, his grandchildren, to his brother, the Honorable Phillip Finnegan, judge of the circuit court of the United States, and to the other members of his family our deep sympathy.

Richard J. Finnegan was one of the really great men in the history of Chicago. From the many years that I have been privileged to observe events and personalities that were building Chicago into a city of transcending greatness, I

would appraise the contribution of Richard J. Finnegan as unexcelled by that of any other person.

As a newspaperman Richard J. Finnegan was responsible to a greater extent than any other journalist of my time in changing a trend toward dramatized sensationalism into the growing trend of today toward giving more emphasis to the good and the wholesome in the daily reporting of current happenings. He will be remembered for many long years as one of the greatest editors in the history of a city that has a rich heritage in its journalistic traditions.

When next the press veterans of Chicago meet in their annual dinner there will be warm memories of old associations with a friend and coworker that everyone loved and everyone admired, and there will be in every heart an ache.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Richard J. Finnegan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join myself with my colleagues from Illinois in expressing deep grief over the passing of Richard J. Finnegan. I had known him since he was a young newspaperman on the old Chicago Journal, and on through the years when he became the editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, and I always prized my friendship with him. He was in every sense a great newspaperman, brilliant, fair, human, and understanding. I extend expression of my deep sympathy to his wife, his children, and the other members of his family.

Mr. BOWLER. I have been deeply grieved to learn of the death of Richard J. Finnegan. He was one of the great editors of all times. He was my friend for half a century or more. Chicago has lost one of her greatest sons. My heart goes out to his wife, and all the members of his family.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Chicago has lost another great newspaperman. Richard J. Finnegan, consulting editor of the Chicago Sun-Times and a Chicago newspaperman for more than 50 years, died last Friday. In rising from newsboy-reporter, delivering papers which carried his own stories, to the highest office in metropolitan journalism, he wrote still another American success story.

Mr. Finnegan was not only a great newspaperman and reporter but a great promoter of causes that aided the commonwealth. He played an important role in the development of Illinois highways. His reporting led to the formation of the Illinois Highway Improvement Association in 1912, and Mr. Finnegan was its first chairman and later secretary.

In a public address, Mr. Finnegan called for more political action on the part of youth and an outgrowth of this address was the organization of the Young Men's Political Association of the 10th District. In 1910, Mr. Finnegan became the association's candidate for the United States House of Representatives and narrowly missed election. From 1911 to 1914 Mr. Finnegan was a member of the Cook County Jury Commission.

Mr. Finnegan was a great humanitarian always championing the cause of the poor and the unfortunate. An outstanding example of this facet of Mr. Finnegan's character was his untiring effort in the famed Jesse Lucas case. Mr. Lucas, a poor riverman of unfortunate rearing, was convicted of murder, but in 1931 he was released from prison on parole because of the deathbed confession to that murder by George Pond. Mr. Finnegan contended that if Mr. Lucas were innocent, he should be granted a pardon and his citizenship should be restored. A full pardon was ultimately granted to Mr. Lucas only because of Mr. Finnegan's continued interest in his cause.

One of the many charities close to Mr. Finnegan's heart was La Rabida Jackson Park Sanitarium, specializing in treatment of heart disease.

Chicago and the Nation have lost a great humanitarian and a great individual, and our city and the Nation proudly pay tribute to his wholesome and unselfish contributions.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives a resolution introduced by me, House Resolution 210, which provides for an investigation of the Federal Open Market Committee.

The Rules Committee conducted a hearing on the resolution last Tuesday, May 3. A decision on the matter will likely be made by the Rules Committee this week, I am informed by the chairman, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia.

The Constitution of the United States delegates to the Congress the power over money and the regulation of its value. Obviously, Congress cannot assume and properly administer this power, and it has, therefore, properly delegated it to an agency of the Congress. However, in changing this responsibility over the years, and particularly during the last half century, the power has gotten away from the public officials charged with a public duty and has largely been placed in the hands of those who have obligations to the private banks.

The Federal Open Market Committee was created in 1933, but considerably revised in its membership in 1935. No changes have been made in the qualifications of those who are to compose the Federal Open Market Committee since 1935. Since that time and now, it is composed of 7 members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and 5 presidents of the Federal Reserve banks. In the selection of the 5 presidents of Federal Reserve banks, the services of the presidents among the 12 banks are alternated except the president of the New York bank; he is a permanent member.

The Federal Open Market Committee of 12 members, 7 obviously public members and 5 who were selected by the private banks, have delegated their power to 5 members of this Open Market Committee, 3 members from the Federal Reserve Board and 2 members from the presidents of the banks, 1 always being the President of the Federal Reserve Board in New York. These five members, known as the executive committee, have delegated the power to carry on the transactions for the board to an appointee of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. This appointee, or manager of the account, buys United States Government bonds with the printed money of the United States, and he also sells United States Government bonds and accepts money or credit in return therefor. The theory is to furnish reserves to banks upon which they can make loans equal to more than $6 for every $1 reserve to make money plentiful or scarce through these transactions.

The fact is that the person who is administering the affairs for the Federal Open Market Committee is employed by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, is paid by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and was appointed by the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York is operated by 9 directors, 6 of them selected by the banks in that area and 3 by the Board of Governors here in Washington.

During 1953, through the operations of the Open Market Committee and the manager of the account in particular, Government bonds were forced down in value. The low point was 89 about May 1953. Then, the policy of the committee was changed; the committee took an about-face and caused the bonds to go up in value until they all reached above par. During this time, banks were buying bonds while they were low, and after they went up, of course, they could sell them at a good profit. The last 4 years, through this method, bonds have been going up and down with the smart operators being able to buy them low and sell them high. This has resulted in tremendous profits being made by the dealers in Government bonds and particularly the large banks in New York City.

ONE GOOD REASON FOR INVESTIGATION

One good reason for this investigation is to determine whether or not the Government's money and bonds should be used in such a speculative way, particu-

larly below par. Little can be said in opposition to speculating in Government bonds above par, but there is certainly a good argument against allowing private individuals and people not charged with the public interest using public money and Government bonds to whip down the price of Government bonds much below par and thereby permit enormous windfall profits.

ANOTHER REASON

There is another good reason among many that can be presented, and that is we have in the trust funds of the many social-security accounts, including private funds and the Government social-security fund, United States Government bonds aggregating approximately $81 billion. If there should be a disaster of any kind or mass unemployment causing an unusual demand upon these funds, it is possible that the bonds that would have to be sold to get the money to pay the claims would have to be sold at a reduced price.

Federal securities held by trust accounts (estimated)

[In billions of dollars]

Government		45.0
Old age and survivors	20.0	
Unemployment insurance	8.7	
Civil service	6.0	
Railroad retirement	3.3	
Veterans insurance funds	6.5	
Corporate pension		2.5
State and local government pension		4.5
Personal trust funds		29.0
Total		81.0

The Federal Open Market Committee has consistently refused to make a promise that the Government bonds would be supported in a case of that kind. It could be disastrous to our social-security system. It would be possible for these bonds to sink in value to 89 or to even 75, as they did immediately after World War I.

We should determine in this investigation if the Federal Open Market Committee should be required to support the prices of these bonds and thereby protect these funds from ruin.

CHAIRMAN MARTIN'S TESTIMONY ON SUPPORTING PRICES OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1955, the chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Martin, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. His testimony was as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Martin, you mentioned about the par a while ago. You have noticed, I know, that these bonds are down nearly 4 points now, some of them, the long-term bonds.

Mr. MARTIN. Some of them are down; yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. In fact, they are down lower now than they were during a comparable period in 1953 when the hard-money policy started, aren't they?

Mr. MARTIN. I haven't got a list before me.

Mr. PATMAN. I have, and I can tell you now that they have been going down faster this year than they did in 1953.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, take one issue, the 3¼ are not comparable to what they were in 1953.

Mr. PATMAN. No, they are not. Of course, that is a kind of isolated and exceptional case, the 3¼. They should never have been issued at all. The Government had several times as much money as it actually got on those 3¼ and it wasn't necessary to issue them, and the rate was outrageously high. So they just represent an exceptionally isolated case.

Mr. MARTIN. I was merely calling attention to their fluctuation. They went up to 112, you see.

Mr. PATMAN. I understand. They fluctuated from 98 up to 112. That is about 14 points, isn't it?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. All in 1 year. And then you add the 3¼ percent onto that, and that is 17¼ percent somebody made on those bonds in 1 year. That is a pretty good return, isn't it, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, assuming that such a return was made.

Mr. PATMAN. It was possible, wasn't it?

Mr. MARTIN. It was possible if you bought at the bottom and sold at the top.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, and some of them did, I suppose, because we have a few lucky people in the country.

Now, on these Government bonds, does the Board propose to do anything about that? Are they going to let them keep on sinking? They are down to 96. Are they going to let them go down to 89 as they did 2 years ago?

Mr. MARTIN. The Open Market Committee, through its executive committee and through the manager of the account and the staff is watching them every hour of the day, I might say every minute of the day.

Mr. PATMAN. What are they doing about it? They watched them go down to 98, and now 96. What are they going to do? When are you going to take some action?

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot speak for the Open Market Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, you are chairman. What is your idea? Don't you think you ought to do something?

Mr. MARTIN. My idea, Mr. Patman, is that by and large the market forces will prevail.

Mr. PATMAN. That goes back to where you think that the market forces are going to run the Federal Reserve when you have the power to create money and they don't.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, that goes back to the fundamental disagreement that you and I frequently have.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. And you don't have any plans, now, about supporting that? Mr. Martin, I want to call your attention to this one thing. It looks like a dangerous situation to me, and I am prompted to bring it up by reason of the statement that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, made. In December he made this statement. He said in substance there are about $20 billion in these trust funds, invested in Government bonds, and he said that if there should be a demand on these trust funds, they would have to begin selling the Government bonds to supply that demand for money. What will happen if there is no support under those Government bonds?

Don't you view that as a dangerous situation, Mr. Martin? Here you have the Government trust funds invested in Government bonds, and the Federal Reserve System is just sitting idly by and letting those bonds drop from 100 to 99, 98, 97, 96, and if they act like they did 2 years ago, they will go down to 89. You could have a chaotic situation and a panic if an emergency demand on those trust funds developed, could you not, Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Patman, I want to make it very clear that the Open Market Committee is not just sitting idly by.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, what has it done?

Mr. MARTIN. We have done many things as reported in our weekly statements.

Mr. PATMAN. Tell me one thing you did last week that would help out.

Mr. MARTIN. Last week I gather that we neither bought nor sold securities. I don't have the statement before me, but we didn't either buy or sell. We have many factors coming into the money market at all times. We have a demand for currency that becomes quite large at certain periods of the year, around Christmas time, and then after people have made their purchases——

Mr. PATMAN. I am not talking about Christmas time, I am talking about the week before last. What did you do to keep those bonds from going down?

Mr. MARTIN. I unfortunately didn't refresh my memory as to what we did week before last.

Mr. PATMAN. What did you do last month, or in the month of January?

Mr. MARTIN. I have not got the figures before me, but we publish a statement every week, and I would say that generally, because it does relate to the Christmas period, we have been letting bills run off, or selling securities in order to offset the return flow of currency from the Christmas holiday period. That is a normal operation at this time of year and it has to be measured very carefully in terms of the growth factors of the economy, so that we keep an even flow of credit.

Mr. PATMAN. January 25, Mr. Sproul made a speech to the New York State Bankers Association. You remember his speech, don't you, Mr. Martin, in which he said that you were going to change the money policy, to make it a little harder. You read that?

Mr. MARTIN. I saw some comments.

Mr. PATMAN. That was the first announcement that had been made along that line and it was surprising to me that it would come from the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and not from a member of the Board or the Chairman of the Board. It was a very important announcement. You agree to that, don't you?

Mr. MARTIN. I take it it was an important announcement of policy, but Mr. Sproul was speaking as an individual.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, he was telling the policy of the Open Market Committee. Now when you distinguished gentlemen of the Open Market Committee were before our committee in December, you didn't give us any reason to believe that you were going to harden the policy at all, but the impression I got during those hearings was that there was no reason why you shouldn't consider an easier policy as you had in the past, and here in January, as a bombshell, coming from the President of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York, an announcement of the policy shift of the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Sproul was speaking as an individual, not as a representative of the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee, at the time he spoke.

Mr. PATMAN. But he was announcing the policy that you would have to agree on, wasn't he?

Mr. MARTIN. Not as I would have interpreted it exactly.

Mr. PATMAN. I see.

Mr. MARTIN. We have a good many people sitting around the table. That is one of the advantages of boards, and people arrive at different conclusions for different reasons.

Now Mr. Sproul made some comments as an individual. I have not studied those comments carefully, but by and large the actions of the Open Market Committee have been designed to stand as actions and not as announcements.

Mr. PATMAN. Well I will not take up any more time, but this important person who is manager of the Open Market Committee and has the power to draw out the Federal Reserve notes by the billions of dollars, these new crisp bills from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and exchange them for new Government securities and keep the securities for the banks and require the Government to pay interest on them, that particular manager is not even paid by the Board

of Governors at all, but he is paid by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, isn't he, and he is under the jurisdiction of that bank and not under your jurisdiction?

Mr. MARTIN. He is an officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. However, once a year we do approve the manager of the open market accounts, provided for in the bylaws of the Open Market Committee, and the bylaws of the Open Market Committee are adopted by the Full Open Market Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Sproul's statement on which I invited your attention, Mr. Martin, was that statement true or false?

Mr. MARTIN. I would have to have the statement before me.

EDITORIAL POINTS OUT POWERS OF FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Voter of April 9, 1955]

The Open Market Committee has no counterpart in any country on earth and its great power comes from the fact that the men comprising it control—without answering directly to anyone—the expansion and contraction of the $25 billion security portfolio owned by the 12 Federal Reserve banks. This portfolio is invested in United States securities. The Open Market Committee handles it as a single fund although it is owned, for bookkeeping purposes, by the 12 Reserve banks. Under United States law all commercial banks that are members of the system (and they hold 85 percent of the deposits) have to maintain reserves amounting to a specified percentage of their deposits. The total reserves available at any particular time set a limit on the amount of credit that commercial banks can extend. When the limit rises credit gets easier; when it is lowered credit has to shrink.

The great power of this committee comes when, operating as the Open Market Committee for the Federal Reserve System, it sells or buys securities in the open market. To buy means open the credit valves; to sell means shut them down. This procedure is its money control power, and money control, Business Week explains, is one of the most important instruments that modern governments can use to damp down the swings of the business cycle and keep the country running at high level.

The hush-hush atmosphere that has surrounded the committee is, of course, to keep dealers from taking advantage of price movements. Federal Reserve officials not attached to the committee know little, if anything of what the committee ever intends to do. When credit was getting dangerously tight in the spring of 1953 the committee bought; just before that its policy had been restrictive trying to hold down Korean war inflation by selling securities. Last December the committee refused to go into the market and refused to make additional purchases.

A. L. Mills, Jr., is one of five on the executive committee of the 11-man group. On it are William McC. Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; Allan Sproul, president of the New York Federal Reserve Board between whom there are considerable difference of opinion; Mr. Mills, and J. K. Vardaman, Jr., both governors of the Federal Reserve System and Hugh Leach, president of the Richmond Federal Reserve Bank.

A partial explanation of the easing of the secrecy in which the committee works may be the criticism of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN who has charged that it is too secret a body to have "more power than almost any group in shaping the destinies of the economy of the Nation." He would abolish the committee.

RESOLUTION APPROVED

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of April 27, 1955]

PROPOSED PROBE INTO BIG BANKER PROFITS DRAWS FIRE

WASHINGTON.—A warm scrap appears to be developing over demands by some House Democrats for an investigation. This would be into alleged "windfalls" to big bankers from Federal financial policies.

Representative PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, chief sponsor of the proposed inquiry, said today, "Banks have been buying Government bonds at low prices. Then they sell them at high prices, for big profits."

SEES DANGER IN PROBE

Patman said an investigation should determine if "they have been getting information illegally." He said the inquiry should center on the open market committee of the Federal Reserve System.

This committee, PATMAN said, wields "tremendous power" over bond prices and yet is controlled by private bankers.

Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, protested that any such investigation "is completely unjustified and would be a very dangerous thing." The proposed investigation, WOLCOTT said, "could destroy our economic equilibrium by rocking the boat at a most inopportune time."

WOLCOTT added: "The economy is weighed on very delicate scales. An unjustified investigation of the Open Market Committee could easily tip the scales toward either inflation or deflation."

Both lawmakers commented after the House Banking Committee, in a 15 to 11 party-line vote, yesterday approved a resolution by PATMAN. It would authorize the Banking Committee to make a broad investigation of the Open Market Committee and other operations of the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury.

To take effect, the resolution still must be approved by the House Rules Committee and by the full House.

The Open Market Committee acts for the Reserve System in buying and selling Government securities in the open market. By soaking up or increasing money supplies, it also has a big influence on the availability of money and credit.

The Committee is comprised of the 7 governors of the Federal Reserve Board, appointed by the President, and 5 presidents of Federal Reserve banks.

PATMAN said the Committee, created in 1933, "never has been investigated." He said it was "dangerous" for the Government "to farm out so much power to private bankers." WOLCOTT said this and other Federal Reserve operations have been investigated many times.

PATMAN said under the influence of the Open Market Committee, Government bond prices have been "run up and then down and then up and down again. A lot of banks have made big windfalls," and he added:

"I don't know how much information they have been getting illegally, but it is very suspicious."

WOLCOTT said this and other proposed fields of inquiry "have been thoroughly covered. I can't see any benefits from the investigation and I can see a lot of harm. It could affect the marketability of Government bonds and in turn affect our whole economy."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit tomorrow during general debate on the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BIGOTRY AND BIGOTED MOVEMENTS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the series of articles on bigotry and bigoted movements within the United States written by Jack Steele, Scripps-Howard staff writer, and which appeared in the Washington Daily News last week, and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, are a timely and constructive contribution to decent thought and action on the part of our people. The articles are not only revealing in their contents, but also alert our people to un-American organizations within our midst, the organizers of which are usually confidence men in one form or another, who are trying to array our people against each other because of the difference of race, color, or creed.

Such persons are engaging in practices contrary to the intent and spirit of the Constitution of the United States. They are un-American in thought, intent, and action.

In my experiences in connection with investigating, as I did, 21 years ago, such organizations, I have found out that the organizers engage in their vicious un-American efforts to make money, and it could well be termed "filthy money." They play upon the fears and emotions and prejudices of some in order to bring about hatred of others because of a difference of race, color, and creed. They play upon any debasing influences to create group hatred and national disunity and, as I have said, for the purpose of making money for themselves.

As a result of my investigations, I found out that some of them have money, of course, were willing in the early 1930's to even play with Hitler and his movement in America, which was the German-American Bund.

I have read each one of Jack Steele's articles. I know from reading them that he did a tremendous amount of research work and study.

Some of the persons named in his articles, as well as organizations such as the Silver Shirts and the German-American Bund, were investigated and exposed in 1934 by the special committee of which I was chairman.

In the history of our country, various bigoted movements have developed from time to time, some growing tremendously in membership and in influence.

It was not so many years ago that the Ku Klux Klan thrived and with its message and movement of hate wielded in many sections of the country powerful political influence. Its ultimate goal politically was the election of a President.

The splended articles of Jack Steele are designed to warn the people that contemptible individuals are again in the march in their efforts to create fear and emotionalism and to gear such feelings into the avenue of hate and bigotry.

For one of the main duties of our newspapers is to fearlessly disseminate news and information and through their powerful media of communication, to educate and enlighten, and in the case of these articles, to warn and alert our people. The articles are most constructive in that they put our people on their guard against these false prophets of hate. This is real constructive work. These series of articles constitute one of the most constructive pieces of newspaper work I have seen in many years.

They are designed to warn and alert our people to the efforts now going on so that the false prophets of hate and bigotry will be exposed and thereby cannot succeed. In other words, by public exposure, to break up their vicious un-American efforts before they get started.

I congratulate Jack Steele on his articles. In congratulating him, I also congratulate the Washington Daily News and the other Scripps-Howard newspapers throughout the country for presenting these articles through their columns to the American public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON on the subject Mother's Day.

Mr. YOUNG in two instances.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include a speech he made on May 4.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Michigan), indefinitely, on account of illness and hospitalization.

Mr. AVERY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, May 9 to May 16, 1955, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 266. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 391. An act to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 732. An act to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 741. An act to extend the provisions of title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 755. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war-housing projects to the city of Warwick, Va., and the city of Hampton, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1516. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizens' regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Douglas Edward White, of Louisiana; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States;

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1956 for the Department of Defense—Civil Functions and for the Department of the Interior, involving a net reduction in the amount of $3,183,000 (H. Doc. No. 156); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

767. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the third biennial report listing all authorized military, naval, and Air Force public works projects for the completion of which adequate funds have not been appropriated for the period as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 408 (b) of Public Law 564, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

768. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

769. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report by the Army, Navy, and Air Force that no new contracts were negotiated under sections 2 (c) (11) and 2 (c) (16) during the 6 months period from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

770. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 30th quarterly report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

771. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1955, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

772. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing a summary of contracts made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 4 of the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458, 1459); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

773. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "For the relief of Nathan L. Garner"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

774. A letter from the president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1954, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

775. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 1, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Arkansas River at North Little Rock, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 17, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

776. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

777. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered in the case of Benito Quintana Seara, A–4363045, relative to rescission of adjustment of status granted this individual under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, (8 U. S. C. A. 155 (c)), pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

778. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

779. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

780. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

781. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 20, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Sammamish River, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

782. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 9, 1954, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Weber River Basin and Willard Mountain area, Utah. This report is submitted under the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of streams draining into the Great Salt Lake and the Great Basin, Utah and Nev., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 158); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1802. A bill to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2682. A bill relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5223. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5300. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5376. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5877. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6015. A bill to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1768. A bill for the relief of the Jefferson and Plaquemines Drainage District and certain persons whose properties abut on the Federal Government's right-of-way for Harvey Canal in Louisiana; with an amendment (Rept. No. 551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4514. A bill to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5650. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5787. A bill to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5417. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps; with an amendment (Rept. No. 555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru; without amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maida; without amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 988. A bill for the relief of Susanne Fellner; without amendment (Rept. No. 498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 990. A bill for the relief of Takako Riu Reich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang; without amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas; without amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich; without amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of George Paul Khouri; without amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali; without amendment (Rept. No.

504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Henry Kraemer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of Caterina Ruello; with an amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Helen E. Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of Helga Kutschka; with an amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis; without amendment (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1651. A bill for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams; without amendment (Rept. No. 511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Luis Deriberprey; without amendment (Rept. No. 512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello; without amendment (Rept. No. 513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati; with an amendment (Rept. No. 514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou; with an amendment (Rept. No. 515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa; with an amendment (Rept. No. 516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 5456. A bill for the relief of Emil Arens; without amendment (Rept. No. 517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 208. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5543 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 229. Resolution providing for sending the bill, H. R. 5630, and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 230. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 1901, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Ora L. Powers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1415. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond; with an amendment (Rept. No. 522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Porter; without amendment (Rept. No. 523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Howard Rieck; with an amendment (Rept. No. 524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Bullette; without amendment (Rept. No. 525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie; with an amendment (Rept. No. 526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2768. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts; without amendment (Rept. No. 528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond; without amendment (Rept. No. 529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of E. S. Berney; with an amendment (Rept. No. 530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer; without amendment (Rept. No. 531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Julius G. Watson; without amendment (Rept. No. 532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Kingan, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Gray; with an amendment (Rept. No. 534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4902. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl; with an amendment (Rept. No. 536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5494. A bill for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5633. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5634. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney; without amendment (Rept. No. 539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5635. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5809. A bill for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5907. A bill for the relief of Albert Woolson; without amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6088. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 6089. A bill to provide financial assistance to certain Sioux Indians employed in courses of apprentice or other training on the job; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6090. A bill to provide for the development of minimum basic recreational facilities in connection with Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6091. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 6092. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 6093. A bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 6094. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6095. A bill to provide for issuing a death certificate to the next of kin in the case of each member of the Armed Forces who died in the service after September 16, 1940, or who hereafter dies in the service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6096. A bill to reduce the interest rate from 5 percent to 3 percent on certain emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6097. A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 6098. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 6099. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6100. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 6101. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 6102. A bill to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Dam, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lewisville Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief to livestock growers who are forced to sell their herds because of drought; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6104. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 6105. A bill to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 6106. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 6107. A bill to exclude corn used as silage from the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6108. A bill to extend and improve the program of assistance under Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 6109. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 427); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6110. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6111. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the transportation of certain disabled persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 6112. A bill to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6113. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 6114. A bill to improve legal procedures in the executive branch of the Government through the enactment of an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6115. A bill to improve legal services in the executive branch of the Government by establishing certain offices within the Department of Justice and defining the functions thereof, creating a legal career service, establishing certain offices within the Department of Defense and defining the functions thereof, and creating a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6116. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6117. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 6118. A bill to provide income-tax relief in the case of members of the Armed Forces held against their will by Communist government authorities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 6119. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6120. A bill to regulate the distribution and inspection of the Salk antipolio vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6121. A bill to amend section 610 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to broaden the coverage of its provisions prohibiting election expenditures by national banks and corporations organized under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6122. A bill to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6123. A bill to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway No. 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6124. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the establishment of Devils Tower as the first national monument in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 6125. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest-land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 14, 1948, to increase the appropriation authorized therein and limit the amount which may be paid from such appropriation to the World Health Organization by the United States for any fiscal year; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to encourage the study of foreign languages by citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 236. Resolution to commend Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL for the statesmanship displayed by him at the recent Afro-Asian Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 237. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of methods of promoting the establishment and improvement of international trade centers, trade fairs, and expositions in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 238. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 239. Resolution to commend Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL for the statesmanship displayed by him at the recent Afro-Asian Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA: Memorial of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to favor legislation concerning tax-exempt property owned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Maine State Senate and House of Representatives to the United States Congress requesting a joint resolution proposing an investigation and additional regulation of the Mercantile Exchange by the Congress of the United States of America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Maine State Senate and House of Representatives to the United States Congress requesting that a joint resolution be passed designating the fourth Saturday in August of each year as Children's Day in Sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study the problems involved in civil defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for immediate completion of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam and certain other projects on the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to recommending an investigation of the Mercantile Exchange for the purpose of providing greater stability in the potato industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to recommending enactment of a joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday in August of each year as "Children's Day in Sports"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to enable the construction of irrigation projects to serve Hawaiian homes lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by amending section 77 thereof, and by adding thereto a new section 77A, relating to a postauditor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to permit entry into the United States of wives and minor children of citizens of the Republic of the Philippines who entered the United States prior to 1946 and have established permanent residence therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend its air-parcel-post rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6126. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 6127. A bill to authorize sale of up to 250,000 cubic feet of helium to C. H. Propst for use in an airship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 6128. A bill to authorize sale of up to 250,000 cubic feet of helium to C. H. Propst for use in an airship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6129. A bill for the relief of Ramon Tavarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6130. A bill for the relief of Elisa Martinez-Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 6131. A bill for the relief of Annetta N. Thalassinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6132. A bill for the relief of Georgina Mercedes Llera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6133. A bill for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 6134. A bill for the relief of Dora Claire Lynch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6135. A bill for the relief of Jude Anthony Branch (Koji Aoyagi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6136. A bill for the relief of Ralph Wilson Reid, Eleanor Mary Reid, Marguerite Fay Reid, John Wilson Reid, and Robert Wilson Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6137. A bill for the relief of Herman Floyd Williams, Bettie J. Williams, Alma G. Segars, and W. C. Segars; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

239. By Mr. GATHINGS: Petition of several members of the First Methodist Church of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

240. Also, petition of Mrs. Dayton Sackett and others of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

241. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Oxford Pomona Grange, Maine, that the Congress of the United States enact legislation that will declare the grange a nonprofit organization and not be obliged to contribute to the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, or to any similar organization, where they are holding dances and other entertainments for the social and financial support of the grange; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

242. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Worcester, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the enactment of a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

243. Also, petition of the secretary, the Student Government, the City College of New York, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of a bill providing for Federal scholarships and loans to college students now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

244. Also, petition of Frank Salamone and others, New York City CIO Council, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the Federal minimum wage be increased to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

245. Also, petition of Victor M. Ortiz and others, New York City CIO Council, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the Federal minimum wage be increased to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

246. Also, petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, Bettendorf, Iowa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to inquiring relative to a redress of grievance involving his attainder petitions, Nos. 87 and 119, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foreign Policy in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on April 13 my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] delivered a very interesting address concerning our foreign policy in the Pacific at the Democratic fund-raising dinner at San Mateo, Calif. Because this subject is of such extreme interest to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DULLES DILEMMA

I have come to you this evening to make a brief report on foreign policy in the Pacific—a policy which summed up is the Dulles dilemma. It is a dilemma vitally—maybe mortally—important to us on the Pacific coast. It is also, like any dilemma, frighteningly confused—in this case more than usual because of a last-minute discovery by Mr. Dulles of a paper tiger—a tiger which he claims to be this country but which many feel is merely this country's Secretary of State.

In a consideration of foreign policy of the United States, there is one all-important point to remember. We are told of the administration-Republican foreign policy—of the Democratic foreign policy and of the bipartisan foreign policy. The administration-Republican foreign policy can only be defined if you name the day and define it.

Of the Democratic foreign policy we have a clear idea indelibly written in history of which we are inordinately proud; of the bipartisan foreign policy we have no idea whatsoever. You first must decide which fraction of the Republican Party you will bipartisan with. However, none of these policies are the American foreign policy. The American foreign policy can only be decided by the American people themselves—people such as you who I am addressing tonight. It is you who must and shall set policies of the United States—domestic or foreign. To do this, you must be appraised of the facts—of the choices before us and their dangers.

I have come tonight to tell you as many of these as I have time for so that you can help dissipate both the Dulles dilemma and the paper tiger.

To begin with—to you as Democrats—as one of your Democratic Senators, I want to say that there was never anything wrong with the basic Democratic foreign policy set down by Truman and Acheson. It was the policy of containment—the policy of implacable opposition to aggression. The Communists understood it that way and respected it. Today the Republican Party is trying its best to get back to it as quickly as possible. In fact, the heart of the Dulles dilemma is how they can get back without having the Democrats say, "I told you so"—without the Communists putting us behind an iron curtain instead of us keeping them behind one.

For campaign purposes purely, the Republican Party today is making a terrific ado about two things. First, they are claiming that the Yalta Agreement was the original sin so far as the Orient is concerned. From it they claim stem all the problems of China, Korea, Indochina, Matsu and Quemoy, and Formosa. Second, they say that the only way we can possibly extract ourselves from our present dilemma is to trust implicitly in the clear judgment of our military leaders—the foremost of whom is our President.

With this we must take emphatic exception. Our present situation has been caused to a large extent by too great dependence upon the judgment of our military leaders. After the Second World War we found, as did the old Tiger of France Clemenceau after the First, that "War is too serious a matter to be left entirely to the generals."

Regardless of its merits, the Yalta Agreement was signed by President Roosevelt at the insistence of the military leaders of the Republican leaders in the United States Senate in order to shorten the war and to save 500,000 American lives.

That the military leaders were dead wrong, that they miscalculated our strength, the devastating effectiveness of the atomic bomb and the capacity of our scientists and industry to make bombs, is the tragedy of Yalta—if tragedy there is.

You have heard of the insistence of our Joint Chiefs of Staff that we must get Russia to take an active part in the Pacific in order to save our boys. What you probably have not heard is what the Republican Party itself was saying at the time. I have in my hand a speech given on the Senate floor at this time by Senator WILEY of Wisconsin, one

of the ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Here is what he had to say:

"Why then should we pussyfoot with our Russian ally and not declare only that we want them to make common cause in the Pacific? Why then should we not strengthen President Truman's hand by making known this desire from here at home in no uncertain terms? * * *

"Why should we act like helpless milktoasts when we have vast financial and other bargaining power to use as pressure on Russia? Why should we follow the lead of the 'nice Nellies' of our State Department who have been more concerned with diplomatic niceties than with the preservation of American interests and lives? * * *

"Thus America has everything to gain and thousands of her boys' lives to lose unless Russia joins in the Pacific struggle. * * *

"I would be remiss in my obligations as a United States Senator if I did not voice, in all humility but with all the force at my command, the feeling of millions of Americans that Russia do her part in the Pacific."

Our second great example of military judgment occurred in Korea. We undertook Korea with the complete support of the Congress of the United States. We undertook our responsibilities instantly. I know because it happened that I was at Blair House, the White House at the time, the evening we took that action. Republicans, Democrats, military staffs all agreed that this action was imperative and confirmed it next day.

In Korea we fought a confined, highly successful and—to begin with—not an excessively costly war, up to the great error in military judgment. We had rolled the North Koreans back to their own borders when the military decided they would push on to the Yalu. You remember that incident. The Chinese said: "If you do, we will get into this ourselves." The military leaders said, "We don't believe you. You can't and you won't." So they crossed over into North Korea. They pushed to the Yalu and they were wrong. Not only did the Chinese Communist armies get into the fight, they pushed us clear down to the southernmost tip of Korea and cost us the long and bloody war that followed.

This is the war that the Republican Party promised to end if they were reelected and they did. They ended it in a way President Truman could have ended it at any time—by surrendering.

You will remember when your San Francisco newspapermen interviewed a dejected Gen. Mark Clark when he came home from that surrender. They asked him why we gave up airfields and island that were strategic. He answered, "I guess because they wanted them." The Washington papers characterized it as the "voice of the mouse" and the first surrender in American history.

After Korea comes the third great example of military judgment—Indochina. Mr. Dulles and every expert on Asia said that once the Communits armies were freed in northern China they would move down to southern China and attack Indochina. They reported that these armies were moving in that direction—that they were building up for an invasion. Finally they did invade.

No preparations were made by our Government to meet this invasion. We closed our eyes and hoped it wouldn't happen. We refused to pour in arms and assistance to our allies as we had in previous wars. We left them helpless quarry of the red snake. But we did trust in the military appraisal of the situation. This was that the defenses of the French could stand without us—that the strategy of Dienbienphu would be successful. Well, it wasn't.

Mr. Dulles said that Indochina was absolutely necessary to the defense of the whole of southern Asia. You remember the statement that all southern Asia would fall—like a house of cards.

He went to Geneva to say that we were going to be tough. We made promises to the French and moved our aircraft carriers into the gulf to back him up. But he held a news conference just the night before the Geneva meeting and said, "Well, of course, he didn't mean it." That was the time they cartooned him as rushing to Geneva but leaving his head behind.

You can see what Clemenceau meant when he said that war is too serious a matter to be left entirely to the generals.

Today we must make another fateful decision. Whether to defend Quemoy, whether to use atomic bombs. The military tell us that the Chinese cannot withstand our first assault—that Russia will not back up China. But don't forget that if they are once again wrong and Russia does keep her treaties and back up China, we are in for a major war.

In digging up Yalta as a campaign issue, the Republicans are hoping to attract our attention from their two surrenders and their bumbling foreign policies.

In passing we might also point out that if Yalta is the original sin in the Pacific—the refusal to follow Prime Minister Churchill's advice and enter Europe through the Ljubljana Gap into the Balkans gave eastern Europe to the Communists—and in that the President cannot say he had no part.

The first step toward our present dilemma in the Pacific was taken on February 2, 1953, by President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message. In the Republican campaign for votes, regardless of truth or national safety, that party turned its back upon the policy of containment for one they described as broad and daring. It was not the containment but the liberation of Communist China. In line with it, the President unleashed Chiang Kai-shek. Said the President:

"There is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. This order implies no aggressive intent on our part, but we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea."

It sounded comforting, but it was the first roar of the paper tiger. I knew—I had been in Formosa. The military knew and the Communists knew that Chiang Kai-shek had no army worth unleashing. It was like unleashing me in the ring with Marciano next month. The operations of our 7th Fleet did not change; they flew and sailed the same patrols.

But it certainly gave Communist China something to think about. They looked upon Chiang's 50,000 men on Quemoy and his increasing fortifications, not as far from their mainland as Oakland is from San Francisco and decided they should do something about it. They announced they were going to drive the Nationalists out of these islands and out of Formosa too, by the way.

As for the defense of Formosa, we are all firmly, unanimously, and wholeheartedly committed to that adventure. Last January—lest China or the world have any doubt as to our determination and provoke a war by accident—we made it brilliantly clear by passing the Formosa resolution in the Senate. We gave the President no new powers, but we did confirm our unhesitating support of his constitutional powers.

We made it clear that the American people would make war against China or any other nation if such a course was thought essential to national safety; that we did not favor waiting supinely until attacked but were drawing a line—a distant line—which we would not permit to be crossed by a hostile force.

There is a fraction of the Republican Party—and your Senator KNOWLAND is among them—that do not think this goes far enough. They believe that China must be liberated, that the Communists must be utterly crushed—atomic bombed to surrender, and that such a bloody course is essential not only to world peace but our own survival. In this they have the ears of the administration—the support of the generals. Their demands for preventative war furnishes the only reason for the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. We must realize this and take our part in this debate. If these two inconsequential islands, as some Senators claim, are invaluable as a springboard to launch a full-scale war to liberate China, then the American people should know that this is their value. They should know the cost. It is no matter for secret deliberation and decision.

What devilish, ghastly irony it would be for all of us here on the Pacific, if after so emphatically eliminating the chance that China accidentally set off a world war because she did not clearly know our intentions, we ourselves set off one because we did not believe the Chinese and Russians.

I have been to Formosa several times. I have listened to the debates and I believe it is clear beyond a reasonable argument that these offshore islands are in no sense essential to the defense of Formosa. Arguments to the contrary are almost frivolous. As the New York Times says, "It is almost like arguing that the loss of Staten Island—a ferry boat ride from Manhattan, would jeopardize the defense of Bermuda."

Two reasons are given for our defending these islands to the bitter end. The first is that if we don't we will be considered a paper tiger. The second that if we lose them, Chiang's troops will lose their morale and might even defect.

As to the paper tiger, he was discovered by Mr. Dulles himself and described to the Nation in a speech upon his return from the Bankok conference on March 8. He said we must not make any further concessions that would lend support to the Communist charge that the United States is such a flimsy animal.

It is useless for us to protest now that Mr. Dulles should have thought of this eventuality before the administration unleashed the noneffective Nationalist armies, before he declared "massive retaliation."

There is no use of my pointing to the speeches I have made on the floor of the Senate—and Senators LONG, JACKSON, etc., have made—protesting Mr. Dulles' policy and predicting its inevitable outcome. He has most certainly brought it on himself. All I can insist upon is that the paper tiger is not the United States—but the Secretary himself and an administration that has put political expediency before wise and courageous action.

As to the humor of Chiang's troops—to this end we can scarcely risk atomic war—justify the millions of inevitable casualties and back up an army that can get no fresh recruits or reenforcements except from ourselves.

If we defend Quemoy, it will mean the use of small atomic bombs. It will mean that we will fight with only two allies—Chiang and Sigmund Rhee. Even Canada has said it will refuse to come along. If the Russians keep the mutual defense treaty with China it will mean submarines, planes, and even small atomic bombs to resist us. Only one hydrogen bomb on Formosa would end all of this dilemma for eternity. It is just the right size for such a bomb.

It is my opinion that it is high time we end this dilemma. Let us with protests, votes, and every means at hand, make it crystal clear to the White House that we want no part of these offshore islands. That we want no part in experiments with atomic warfare that is cheap in money but astronomically costly in human life.

Let us also demand an end to the bumblings of our State Department—to the put-

ting of politics before wise policy and money before national defense.

We must, as the administration said it would do 3 months ago, introduce clarity and certainty into our relations with the Chinese Communists and the whole world. We must let America be America—have an American foreign policy which is a fearless Christian foreign policy.

As to this in conclusion, I would like to point out that world events are showing us that even our democratic policy of containment may not be enough. We live in a day when the underprivileged of the world are on the march demanding equality of opportunity, freedom from economic exploitation, and the enjoyment of a better life. The Communists are capitalizing on this to the ultimate enslavement of nations. Until we can capitalize upon it too, and bring hope to these people of a new and fresh day, we will really have no effective American foreign policy.

If only they had a faint ray of hope that they might enjoy a pitiful little of what we enjoy they would never become Communists. Every one of us here wants them to have not only the hope, but to actually have what we have. For that we would gladly fight in the American tradition—to make them feel it, know it, and to realize the benefits of it, must be your American foreign policy.

University of Wisconsin To Honor Three Distinguished Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to know that at the commencement ceremonies of the University of Wisconsin on June 17 next, three distinguished Americans will be honored.

There are a noted labor leader, Jacob F. Friedrick; a famous architect, Wisconsin's world-renowed Frank Lloyd Wright; and a great women leader, Mrs. Lillian Gilbreth.

Each of these outstanding Americans well deserves the plaudits which will be given them.

In the April 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as appears on page 4892, I personally paid tribute to Frank Lloyd Wright at the time I had reprinted an NBC radio interview and a Diplomat magazine interview with him.

Mrs. Gilbreth, a famous wife of a famous husband, has been part and parcel of the whole new science of industrial engineering which she and the late Frank Gilbreth pioneered in this country.

I should also like to say just a word about Jacob Friedrick, not only is he an universally respected leader in the ranks of labor, but he is held in greatest admiration in the community, as well, and throughout all segments of Wisconsin life.

The honor which will be accorded to Mr. Friedrick at the University symbolizes the honored new role of American labor. Time was when labor, in its legitimate efforts to organize, in order to achieve a higher standard of living, was smeared and denounced. Labor leaders of the highest patriotism were treated as if they were "Red revolutionaries," simply because they sought the right of the workingman to bargain collectively.

But now, fortunately, that unhappy day has passed. Labor has come into its own. There is no field of community or patriotic endeavor in which the leaders of organized labor do not contribute alongside the leaders of every other section of society. So I am delighted that this fine AFL spokesman is to receive honor at the hands of my alma mater.

I send to the desk an article published in the Saturday, May 7, Milwaukee Journal, announcing the intention to award the three honorary degress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN TO HONOR LABOR LEADER—FRIEDRICK NAMED WITH FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT AND MRS. GILBRETH

A Milwaukee labor leader, a world famous Wisconsin architect, and a noted woman author and industrial consultant will be awarded honorary degrees by the University of Wisconsin at commencement ceremonies in Camp Randall stadium, Madison, at 5 p. m., June 17.

University regents Saturday confirmed degrees for:

Jacob F. Friedrick, general secretary-treasurer of the AFL Milwaukee Federated Trades Council. Doctor of laws.

Architect Frank Lloyd Wright, of Spring Green, Wis. Doctor of fine arts.

Mrs. Lillian Moller Gilbreth, of Montclair, N. J., president of Gilbreth, Inc., construction engineers in management and currently Knapp visiting professor of mechanical engineering at the University of Madison. Doctor of science.

Friedrick, 63, is one of the most highly respected labor leaders in Wisconsin. He has been cited as the model of the self-educated man who has worked selflessly to enable others to benefit by education. He has been called the man most responsible for the strong support given the University of Wisconsin by the Wisconsin labor movement. Friedrick came to America from his native Hungary when he was 13. His formal schooling was limited to an eighth grade education plus a year and a half at what is now Boys' Technical High School. He joined the AFL International Association of Machinists in Milwaukee in 1913, almost immediately became an active unionist and rapidly moved up in the local IAM organization.

WAS REGIONAL DIRECTOR

From 1935 to 1945, Friedrick was general organizer of the Federated Trades Council. For the next 6 years he was AFL regional director here. He then became general secretary of the trades council, the county central AFL body, and last Wednesday became general secretary-treasurer of the council with the formal abolition of tne separate treasurer's post.

Friedrick is chairman of the city sewerage commission and has been a member of the advisory committee of the University of Wisconsin's school for workers since its inception and a member of the State industrial commission's advisory committee on unemployment compensation since 1932.

LEAVES MARK AROUND WORLD

Wright, 85, has been widely recognized as one of the great creative artists of the century. After more than a half century of architectural pioneering, he has left his unique mark on landscapes around the world. Born at Richland Center, Wis., Wright studied civil engineering at the University of Wisconsin in the middle 1880's and in 1887 went to Chicago where he became an apprentice of the late Louis Sullivan, one of the architects in American history.

The Imperial Hotel in Tokyo was only the first of the daringly original buildings that brought Wright world recognition. Some 500 buildings around the world, each representing a new facet of Wright's genius, are testimony to his pioneering.

Wright in 1911 built Taliesin ("radiant brow" in Welsh) at Spring Green, Wis. Wright since 1932 has trained young men in his architectural methods at Taliesin East, which he has, thrice rebuilt after fires, at Spring Green.

Only last year, Wright said he would leave Wisconsin after the State supreme court ruled that the foundation that runs Taliesin was not tax exempt. Wright later relented.

During his long career, Wright has been accorded numerous honors. Among them are honorary degrees from Wesleyan, Princeton, Temple and Yale universities, Florida Southern college, and an award from the University of Venice.

Mrs. Gilbreth's fame has been spread in two books, "Cheaper by the Dozen" and "Belles on Their Toes," written by 2 of the 12 Gilbreth children. Mrs. Gilbreth, 76, was born in Oakland, Calif. She married Frank B. Gilbreth, a pioner industrial efficiency engineer, in 1904. After her husband died in 1924, Mrs. Gilbreth turned her attention to science and engineering in order to take up her husband's work where he left off.

She earned a master's degree in engineering at the University of Michigan in 1928 and a doctorate in engineering at Rutgers in 1929. From 1935 to 1948, Mrs. Gilbreth was director of courses in motion study and utilization of technological progress and professor of management at Purdue university.

During World War II, Mrs. Gilbreth was a member of advisory committees to the office of war information and the war manpower commission.

Mrs. Gilbreth is the author of many articles in the field of education, management, psychology and time-motion study. She has received many awards, among them two in 1954 never before won by a woman—the Washington award conferred by 5 major United States enginering societies and the gold medal of the International Committee of Scientific Management.

Tribute to Robert A. Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I delivered at the Taft memorial dinner, before the Suffolk County Republican Club, in Boston, Mass., on last Friday, May 6, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, I am pleased once again to be in the city of Boston and the State of Massachusetts.

For many years I have known your distinguished Governor, Chris Herter, who has

made such an outstanding record as your Chief Executive. This is also the home State of my good friend and colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, who serves as Senate Republican whip.

I am also happy to be here tonight with Lloyd Taft, the son of the man whose memory we are to honor.

Robert A. Taft was generally known as "Mr. Republican." In a larger sense, however, he was "Mr. American" as well. His death was not only a great loss to his family, his friends, and his colleagues in the Senate, but to the Nation as well.

In the course of events someone had to be selected to succeed to his position as Republican leader of the Senate. However, in the broader sense, no one could ever replace Bob Taft, the great leader that he was.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee while he was Republican leader of the Senate. As a result, my association with him was a pleasant and cordial one and we worked very closely together in developing the legislative proposals of the first Republican administration in 20 years.

From the earliest meetings at the White House with the Republican leaders of the House and Senate, President Eisenhower had made it clear that he recognized, under the Constitution, that Congress was and is a coequal branch of the Federal Government. He requested a full and frank discussion of the various problems brought up for consideration at these gatherings.

During the 20 years of the New Deal a misconception had developed in some quarters as to the place of Congress in our constitutional system.

We will not find President Eisenhower seeking to seize American industry, large or small, without authority of law and under the vague doctrine of inherent powers in the Presidency.

On the doctrine that Congress was not intended to be and should not be a rubberstamp or a subordinate body to the Executive, Bob Taft and President Eisenhower were in full agreement. Needless to say, I completely concur in this viewpoint.

The first section of article I of our Constitution states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

As can be readily seen, this is not a partial grant of legislative power, it is total in character. The Congress is where "all" legislative power was intended to be and where it will continue to remain if our constitutional Government is to survive. The American public has an intuitive understanding of what is at stake. They understand the importance of maintaining the coequal and coordinate status of the three great branches of our Government.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted to subordinate the Supreme Court by his Court-packing legislation public opinion rose to support the opposition to that legislation in the Congress.

When the same President attempted to purge members of his own party who were exercising their independent judgment and following their convictions, that purge attempt badly failed. The Nation does not want nor in the end will it tolerate either the Supreme Court or the Congress abdicating their responsibilities or becoming subordinate to the will of the Executive.

Fortunately for the Nation we have in President Eisenhower a man who recognizes this fact and the constitutional limitations of Presidential power under the American Constitution.

The Republican convention recognizing the sound principle that we should be the government of laws and not of men and having great faith in our Constitution wanted to make certain that there would be no shortcut method of depriving Americans of their constitutional rights. In this regard the 1952 platform states: "We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution."

From time to time, however, it has to be pointed out to some of the columnists and to the New Deal opposition that the party leader in the Senate has a dual responsibility. It is not only to help interpret the views of the administration to his colleagues, but it is also to help convey the views of the Members of the Senate to the executive department.

He is not and, in my judgment, should not be like a Cabinet officer who can be dismissed at will or a military officer who can be disciplined. For the Senate leader of either party to be placed in that position would, in fact, help to establish the doctrine that the Congress was a subordinate rather than a coequal branch of Government. The party leaders in the Senate and the House, along with the President, also have the responsibility of carrying out the pledges of the party platform during the period between the meetings of the national nominating conventions.

In the past, Republicans have been properly critical of Democratic platforms that have not been carried out during the term for which their candidates received their mandate from the people. We must be alert to the fact that if we ourselves do not have a good batting average in this regard our derelictions would be pointed out by the opposition.

Personally, I believe that the party platform adopted in 1952 in Chicago is as sound today as it was on July 10, 1952, when it was adopted.

A section of the platform reads as follows: "Our goal is a balanced budget, a reduced national debt, an economical administration, and a cut in taxes. We believe in combating inflation by encouraging full production of goods and food, and not through a program of restrictions."

Part of this platform pledge has been met and we have less than 2 years left to comply with the balance.

The Republican Party as a basic matter of principle has stood for a balanced economy, a solvent Government, and a sound dollar.

I believe that before the next Republican National Convention meets in San Francisco in 1956, the Republican Party will have carried out a substantial majority of its pledges. Such an accomplishment will require a continuous devotion to this objective by all Republicans in the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

For we have been faced with the unusual situation that after 20 years under the New Deal, the Republicans were given a mandate and control of the executive branch, and a narrow control of the legislative branch, of the Government for a period of the first 2 years. This year the opposition party gained control of the House and Senate.

I want to remind this audience and the country of several key paragraphs in that party platform:

"The Government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings such as those of Yalta which aid Communist enslavements. It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples."

The publication of the Yalta papers was a necessary step in giving to the Congress and to the Nation the full facts relative to the Yalta Conference. It is equally important that there be a prompt publication of the papers of the Teheran, Cairo, and Potsdam Conferences.

It was not until the publication of the Yalta papers that the Congress and the country had the information that the then Secretary of State Stettinius in January of 1945 ordered that all the papers being prepared for consideration of the President at the February Yalta Conference of the Big Three should be forwarded to the President through Alger Hiss.

This placed Hiss in a position to know in advance the various recommendations on policy being recommended to the President by the various executive agencies.

In view of the fact that it was some years earlier on September 2, 1939, information was first taken to the executive branch of the Government relative to the Hiss activities with espionage groups it places a heavy responsibility upon the then administration for permitting him to hold such a key position on the eve of the Yalta Conference and to attend the sessions.

On page 91 of the recently released Yalta papers it states:

"At the Secretary's staff committee meeting of January 10, the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

It was also quite clear that the party platform pledged the administration to enter into no deal or understanding with the Soviet Union that would destroy the hope of the enslaved people of the world, be they in Europe or Asia, that some day they might be free. In this regard the platform reads:

"We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile and immoral policy of 'containment' which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and Godless terrorism, which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction."

* * * * *

"The policies we espouse will revive the contageous, liberating influences which are inherent in freedom. They will inevitably set up strains and stresses within the captive world which will make the rulers impotent to continue in their monstrous ways and mark the beginning of their end."

In the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Our policy is and should be, "peace with honor," not peace at any price.

The world should have learned at Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of freemen largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact and mutual defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last 2 treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals, and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of

Representatives passed the Formosa Resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our Allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

In violation of the terms of the Korean armistice, the Chinese Communists still hold 15 American prisoners of war. Eleven of them have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years.

I believe that the position taken by the State Department on Saturday, April 23, was sound when they stated our policy would be to have the Communists show their good faith by the forthwith release of the American prisoners they now hold.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory in Asia and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communist of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Germany, because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to the take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks, we broke the 1948 blockade of Berlin by the air lift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of the island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad which have indicated that we must placate communism when they get aggravated for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is no.

At Munich, Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have "no further territorial demands in Europe".

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience, Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression. But the guaranty given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight, largely because they had lost their faith in the Western Allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory and they are not today.

That these outposts have a military value, no man can deny, for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of Amoy and Foochow as long as the Free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to Free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan and elsewhere where people understand the brutal and aggressive nature of communism.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as steppingstones toward Formosa and the Pescadores.

When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts? If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and their reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reenforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross your heart and hope to die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-faced violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

I want to share with this audience tonight a letter I recently received from an American pilot now stationed on the island of Formosa. He wrote me as follows:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years I'm sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any Americans. The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I'm quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcefully represent.

"I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Calumet-Sag I: An Authoritative Statement by Congressman Thomas J. O'Brien in Behalf of All Members From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the statement on May 6, 1955, of the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, speaking by bipartisan designation and for the entire delegation from Illinois, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ILLINOIS, SIXTH DISTRICT, CHICAGO, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PANEL NO. 1

At this time I find it most encouraging, gratifying, and hopeful to realize that the Calumet-Sag Channel project has finally reached this stage of discussion. Actually, this approach to constructive action has been long overdue. For in this project we have one that is of paramount importance, not only to the citizens of Illinois, but to the whole vast and vital midcontinent area of the United States.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the subject of Cal-Sag did not reach this stage of discussion years earlier. For Cal-Sag has been the No. 1 bottleneck in our system of inland waterways for more than 30 years. The responsibility for the neglect of Cal-Sag must rest with those agencies and organizations which failed to impress upon Congress and the public the vital nature of the Cal-Sag project.

For my own part, I must admit that I knew little about this project even though it lies in the Chicago area in which I reside. Probably I would have continued in my lack of knowledge had it not been for the magnificent educational and publicity program staged by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee and through the personal contacts and discussions which grew out of the information broadcast in this campaign.

For too many years the Cal-Sag project was admittedly ignored and rejected. Then, about 2 years ago, the long-overdue campaign on behalf of the project was staged. The campaign was a magnificent one, bringing home to all of us the importance of Cal-Sag and the manner in which it was holding back an estimated $3 billion industrial expansion and an estimated 500,000 new job opportunities in the area while at the same time it strangled the whole of our development of our inland-waterways system.

CREDIT DUE KILLIAN AND ALLISON

Too much credit cannot be given to those individuals responsible for this campaign. By this I mean specifically Mr. John L. Killian, legislative vice president of the committee, as well as Anthony G. Allison, its executive vice president.

The campaign organized and carried through dynamically under the leadership of these men put Cal-Sag squarely into the limelight for Congress and the public. Through the educational program of this committee, my fellow Congressmen from Illinois and I were made aware of the true facts concerning Cal-Sag and the necessity for vigorous action on its behalf.

It is for this reason that I have decided to limit my remarks to a general outline of the project and potentialities and to leave the more detailed presentation of the project to the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee whose spokesman will follow me as a witness before this committee.

It was an awareness of the critical importance of the Cal-Sag Channel project, as brought to me by the Cal-Sag committee, that last year motivated me and my colleagues of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives to sign a resolution petitioning the President and the Director of the Budget to place this worthy and necessary project in the budget. Now that this has been done and the project is being given proper consideration I feel that it is highly important that all concerned should be made aware of the economic importance of this long neglected though vital key in our otherwise magnificent system of inland waterways.

HOLDS A VITAL KEY POSITION

To anyone not conversant with the critical importance of the Cal-Sag Channel I suggest a study of the location of this waterway on a map of the midcontinent area. A glance is sufficient to force appreciation of its vital key position. It lies, as a mere glance shows, squarely at the crossroads on one of the world's greatest inland waterways system. To the north lies the Great Lakes where a huge fleet of ore carriers move the mountains of iron ore which feed our basic industry—steel. Because of this, we have had the tremendous development and expansion of the steel industry, particularly in the Chicago area, which has during the past few years, risen to the position of the leading steel producer of the Nation.

To the south lies the inland waterway system formed by the Mississippi and its tributaries. This system veins the whole vast and productively rich midcontinent area that now contains over half the wealth and population of the United States.

Squarely between these two independent systems lies the Cal-Sag Channel. Let me stress this interdependence of these two waterway systems. For, as the fleet of Great Lakes carriers feeds industry with iron ore and other raw materials, so the Mississippi system of inland waterways carries an equally critical burden of other raw materials to industries such as petroleum, chemicals, grain and others.

Of this great national system of primary production located in the heartland of America, Chicago is the economic capital city and nerve center. By the same token, the Cal-Sag Channel is the connecting link that allows Chicago to function in its role of economic capital and ties the two waterway systems into one unified and efficient whole.

INDUSTRIAL CENTER OF NATION

This has been the position of the Cal-Sag Channel throughout the years that the Mid-Continent area developed into the No. 1 industrial area of the Nation. However, during all that time the Cal-Sag Channel was practically ignored, its critical position disregarded, its tremendous potentials never developed or realized in terms of material economy and industrial efficiency.

That the Cal-Sag Channel exists, even in its present inadequate form, is a tribute to the energy and foresight of the people of Illinois. A Cal-Sag Channel was an absolute necessity since Chicago began to develop as a great commercial and industrial center. Because of this local agencies constructed the present channel and have paid for its operation and maintenance for over 50 years of its existence.

The replacement cost of work done by the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago on this link of our inland waterway system would be over $350 million.

Realizing the key importance of Cal-Sag, Congress acted in 1930 to make Cal-Sag a Federal waterway. Because of its key position and its obvious indaquacy, Congress acted again in 1946 to declare Cal-Sag a Federal public works project. But at that time no further action was taken. No funds were allocated. So Cal-Sag remained a neglected, though still a critically important, job to be tackled.

DEVELOPING A MODERN WATERWAY

During this time the economic importance of our inland waterway system drew attention and attendant action. A great system of modern transportation developed along the Mississippi and its tributaries. New locks and dams were constructed. The Illinois River, to cite an instance, was developed as a modern waterway.

However, while this constructive action on our inland waterway added greatly to our industrial efficiency and aided in the growth of prosperity in the midcontinent area, it actually threw a greater and greater burden upon the obsolete and inadequate Cal-Sag Channel. For, as these waterways leading north were improved, a constantly growing volume of waterborne traffic pressed upon the Cal-Sag Channel which, year by year, became a more serious bottleneck and an impediment to the movement of freight and the expansion of industry.

Thus, the position of Cal-Sag became more and more impossible. Now, this position has been made even more intolerable. For, just as the development of the waterways to the south have credited a stalemate at Cal-Sag, so, now, plans for further development to the north make action on Cal-Sag absolutely imperative. I refer to the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. As everyone knows, this project will open the Great Lakes, not only to Atlantic shipping, but to the newly discovered and developed rich ore bodies of Labrador. As this invaluable flow of ore reaches the ports of the Great Lakes, no city will feel greater effects than Chicago. And, if the beneficial effects of this new ore body is to be felt in increased prosperity throughout the midcontinent area, the avenue through which the benefits must flow will be the Cal-Sag Channel.

IMMEDIATE ACTION IMPERATIVE

It becomes obvious, therefore, that immediate action must be taken to break the bottleneck of Cal-Sag and allow general prosperity and industrial expansion to flow through the one channel that Nature has designated as the only available avenue.

In all discussion of Cal-Sag we should note that Chicago is now in process of an ambitious program of port development. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, it is believed Chicago will become the greatest inland port in the world. But, again, Cal-Sag is a key piece in all plans. For, Chicago cannot realize its port potentials, nor can it serve the huge and rich area of which it is the economic capital unless Cal-Sag is modernized. Such modernization would make Cal-Sag what it should be, the efficient key channel linking Atlantic sealanes and the ores of Labrador to the Mississippi Valley, the Gulf of Mexico, and the seas beyond.

In the Chicago area alone, it is conservatively estimated, completion of Cal-Sag would spark an industrial development involving billions of dollars in new and expanded industries, thus creating many thousands of new jobs while at the same time it would stabilize and make more secure those industries already operating in the area and maintain the established high level of prosperity enjoyed by all workers in this area.

WOULD BENEFIT ENTIRE NATION

In appealing to this committee for the most sober and thoughtful consideration of this project, I would point out that no single project in years has such wide possibilities of benefit to so many people. For there can be no calculating the wide, even all-embracing character of this project. It is physically located in Illinois, but the benefits deriving from its completion would be felt from the Appalachian Range to the Rockies, and from the northern ports of Duluth and Superior to New Orleans and the whole gulf coast.

Therefore I urge this committee to approve the appropriations on the budget for the Cal-Sag project so that construction can get underway immediately.

In conclusion, I should like to express my deep appreciation to this committee for the opportunity afforded me to present my views on this vital project.

Calumet-Sag II: Background History of Vitally Necessary Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following statement on the history of the Calumet-Sag project submitted by Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN at the conclusion of and supplementing his argument on May 6, 1955, before panel No. 1 of the Committee on Appropriations:

BACKGROUND HISTORY OF CALUMET-SAG

Construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel was begun in 1911 and the channel was completed in 1922. This period of construction was much longer than it should have been, due to the delay occasioned by World War I.

The use of the Calumet-Sag Channel for navigational purposes came about through necessity, because this channel bisects the ridge of land that lies as the major barrier between navigation on the Great Lakes and the great inland waterway system that leads to the Gulf of Mexico. A channel through this ridge of land has been a prime necessity ever since Chicago began its rise as a great national industrial and transportation center. While the Calumet-Sag Channel never proved adequate for navigational purposes, the demands of the waterways forced its use as a barge canal.

Recognition of this fact by the Federal Government was evidenced in 1930, when the Calumet-Sag Channel was made a Federal waterway by act of Congress. At this time, the inadequacy of the Calumet-Sag Channel was also recognized locally, and modernization of the channel was requested by various groups at sundry times.

APPROVED BY ARMY ENGINEERS

Such demands resulted in further action by the Federal Government in 1946, when the projected work on Calumet-Sag was approved by the United States Army engineers and was auhorized as a Federal works project by act of Congress.

However, nothing was ever successfully done about Federal appropriations for the construction of the Calumet-Sag, even though barge traffic on this waterway rose from a few thousand tons carried in 1930 to an estimated 4 million tons which will be

carried on the canal this year. Naturally, public demands for modernization of the Calumet-Sag Channel have grown in exact proportion to the rising burden of freight borne by the waterway.

The United States Army engineers, as a result of studies carried on for years on the Calumet-Sag and the area it serves, have conservatively estimated that the potential tonnage to be carried on a modernized Calumet-Sag should amount to some 18 million tons annually.

UNITED SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION

It is against this background that the following resolution is presented:

"Whereas because of its critical position as a link between the waterborne traffic of the Great Lakes and the vast inland waterway system leading to the Gulf of Mexico, the Calumet-Sag Channel, with its present inadequate width and its obsolete locks and installations, seriously hampers the normal flow of trade and commerce on a national scale; and

"Whereas the Calumet-Sag Channel is vital to all industry and commerce in the entire midcontinent area from the headwaters of the Mississippi waterway system at Duluth-Superior and St. Paul-Minneapolis, and in the area served by the Ohio and Monogahela Rivers to the Gulf ports of New Orleans, Pensacola, and Mobile, as well as to Houston and other ports on the intercoastal canal; and

"Whereas this channel is absolutely essential to the needs of national defense, as was so clearly proven during World War II; and with the growing threat of atomic warfare, the Calumet-Sag Channel becomes of even greater importance to the future of our national defense; and

"Whereas there has developed a critical and intolerable traffic congestion at the foot of Lake Michigan, in which this channel is the key factor in a situation affecting railroads, highways, and other forms of transportation, and which cannot be corrected without the modernization of Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas all planning for Chicago port development, road and bridge building, and other such attempts to break this traffic congestion hampering the movement of trade and commerce in the area, is dependent upon the decision to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas practically all costs connected with the channel up to the present time—an estimated total of over $400 million at current values—has been borne by local authorities and agencies; and

"Whereas all of these agencies have indicated agreement to make all necessary concessions, turn over needed property, and to cooperate in every practicable manner with the Federal Government, thus reducing the probable cost of construction to a fraction of what it would be without this very substantial local participation; and

"Whereas the United States Army engineers have reported that the Calumet-Sag Channel project offers a ratio of benefits to be derived against costs incurred of about 3 to 1 (2.55 to 1), and this is reported to be the most economical with the highest ratio, of any major large-scale Federal works project in the country; and

"Whereas this project can be carried through to completion without any stoppage of navigation or the flow of traffic on any other form of transportation, and, at the same time, will not hamper the operations of any industry already producing in the area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the undersigned, do hereby unanimously petition the Bureau of the Budget to include an adequate amount of funds to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel in its budget for the fiscal year of 1956; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Calumet-Sag Channel, as authorized by act of Congress in 1946 as a Federal works project, be specifically eliminated from any ceiling criteria.

"John C. Kluczynski, Thomas J. O'Brien, Thomas S. Gordon, William L. Dawson, Melvin Price, Sidney B. Yates, Peter Mack, Jr., Barratt O'Hara, James B. Bowler, Harold H. Velde, Chauncey W. Reed, N. M. Mason, Leo E. Allen, Charles W. Vursell, Marguerite Stitt Church, Sid Simpson, R. B. Chiperfield, Edgar A. Jonas, Richard W. Hoffman, Fred E. Busbey, William E. McVey, Timothy P. Meehan, William L. Springer, L. C. Arends, C. W. Bishop.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 7, 1954*."

Mining Claims on the Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there have recently been introduced in the House a number of bills that correct abuses of the mining laws on public lands. A proposal which has the strong support of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, the mining industry, and a number of conservationist groups has been introduced by four Members of the House, including myself.

This measure would—

First. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act. This provision is similar to the Regan bill in the 82d and 83rd Congresses, which had the endorsement of the Forest Service.

Second. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent—

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources—except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws—and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

Third. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a quiet-title action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area. This procedure calls for adequate notice to mining claimants in the area involved, and a local hearing to determine any rights to surface resources that may be asserted by claim holders. If a mining claimant fails to assert rights to surface resources, or if the rights he asserts are not upheld, or if he voluntarily waives such rights, the claim would thereafter have the same status as claims hereafter located, with the Government having the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage and to manage other surface resources in accordance with sound principles of good management.

In the May issue of the Mining Congress Journal, there appears the following editorial pertaining to this measure which I would like to call to the attention of the House:

NOW WE'RE GETTING SOMEWHERE

(By John C. Fox, editor)

Recent introduction in the House and Senate of measures designed to curb abuses of the mining laws without disturbing their basic principles has the support of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and many users of the public domain.

For many years a continuous barrage of adverse publicity has been leveled at abuses of existing mining laws. The general mining laws have been called archaic and outmoded. Actually, where the mining laws have been abused, the fault has largely lain in lax administration and not in the laws themselves.

Myopic critics have completely overlooked the part our mining laws played and are continuing to play in the devolpment of the West, and in assuring a supply of vital raw materials for our growing civilian economy and the defense needs of our Nation, needs that are likely to continue high for the foreseeable future.

It is a basic principle of our mining laws that every American may enter on the public lands to search out mineral deposits. It is also a basic principle that every American having found evidence of mineralization has the right to locate a mining claim and furthermore, when he has invested time and money in the development of such claim to the point where it justifies the granting of a patent, he is entitled to a full "fee simple" title, with the security of tenure and the sound basis for future financing of mining operations which such a title provides.

Our Nation depends on mining for its supply of metals, minerals, and fuels. Mining, in turn, needs encouragement to explore for and develop mineral deposits. The principles upon which our mining laws were built supply the kind of incentive needed. The industry has never condoned the abuses that have provoked such floods of criticism. Instead it has sought means of curbing those abuses without abandoning the fundamental principles of existing law.

The proposed legislation is the product of intensive work by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and conferences between representatives of those departments and of the mining industry. Its enactment would remove the primary causes of abuse of the mining laws and provide for multiple use of the surface of mining claims hereafter located, prior to patent. It would provide the Federal Government a means of clearing up title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, while protecting the claim-holder's basic rights. It would guarantee to the miner full rights for prospecting, development, and related activities and preserve his right, upon patent, to the same full

title to his claim as under the existing mining law.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would solve a problem that has been before the Congress and the public for two decades. It should have the support of every mining man and every user of the public lands.

Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a situation involving the relations of this country with Japan, which, in light of the aid we are giving that country, seems to me to be a proper subject for consideration by the Congress.

We entered into a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with Japan in 1953. Under article XIV of that treaty, it was specifically provided that no discrimination shall be practiced with reference to any restrictions on exports and imports of goods between the two countries, over and above the restrictions imposed with respect to any other nations.

However, in the face of this treaty and the GATT agreement, which contains similar provisions, and to which Japan has adhered, Japan has embargoed shipments to the United States only of certain merchandise without such an embargo being placed on such shipments to any other country. The Department of State has called this treaty violation to the attention of the Japanese very forcefully, and finally on April 22 presented to the Japanese Foreign Office a formal note setting out the treaty violation and asking that if a further delay in replying is required, the effective date of the embargo be postponed. To date, no reply whatever has been received to this note, and the embargo has gone into effect. As a result, the American interests, who entered into contracts in Japan in good faith and based on the integrity of our treaty obligations, have suffered very substantial losses.

Granted our desire to work with our friends abroad, as indicated by the tremendous military and economic aid program of this country, this cooperative spirit should in no manner interfere with our protection of the legitimate interests of our businessmen abroad. If our current attempts to encourage foreign investment and enterprise by Americans is to succeed, it behooves our Government to stand by our businessmen. The situation I have outlined is a vivid example, and I sincerely hope that our Department of State takes whatever measures it feels necessary to secure fair and legal treatment through compliance by the Japanese with their treaty obligations. Only in this way can we demonstrate the courage and conviction consonant with our position of leadership in world affairs. Without this courage and conviction, the development of American enterprise abroad must suffer heavily.

Problems of a Republican President and Democratic Congress in Working Together—Talk by Congressman William T. Granahan Before Sentry Club, Wednesday, May 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a copy of a talk which I delivered Wednesday night, May 4, to the members of the Sentry Club, an organization of outstanding Philadelphia women. In it I discussed on an objective level the problems which arise with divided responsibilities in Government—that is, divided between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, or vice versa. As I tried to point out in that talk, it is natural in a two-party system, such as we have, for partisan politics to become injected in many policy decisions, but at the same time the strength of our American system lies in the fact that we can and do work together whenever the safety of this country and the basic freedoms of Americans are concerned.

PROBLEMS OF A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT AND DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS IN WORKING TOGETHER

Beginning back in the election campaign last fall, the question of how a Republican President and a Democratic Congress can work together in harmony and in good faith has been worrying a great many people.

To some students of political science, this sort of situation of divided responsibility in Government between two political parties is considered extremely unfortunate. It seldom happens in other democracies for the reason that the executive head of the government is usually the leader of the majority party in the parliament. To some people, then, the fact that it can happen and does happen periodically in the United States is supposed to be one of the big faults with our constitutional system of elections.

As a matter of fact, we can remember back to 1946 when an able, outstanding Democrat, Senator FULBRIGHT, seriously suggested that President Truman appoint a prominent Republican as his Secretary of State and then resign, so that the Republican could then succeed him as President. That was, of course, before the passage of the new succession act which provides that in the absence of a Vice President, the Speaker of the House and then the President pro tempore of the Senate should be in line for the Presidency before any Cabinet member.

When Senator FULBRIGHT made that suggestion, he was fearful that the divided Government created by the election of a Republican Congress during a Democratic President's term of office would bring us chaos. As a one-time Rhodes scholar, Senator FULBRIGHT was very familiar with the English system in which the Prime Minister always represents the majority party.

As it turned out, Senator FULBRIGHT's fears in 1946 were overly pessimistic. And so were President Eisenhower's last fall when he predicted in Republican campaign speeches that if the Democrats won Congress the country would have two drivers and go in the ditch. It is significant this time, I think, that no one has suggested that both Eisenhower and NIXON resign so that Speaker RAYBURN could be President. And Mr. Eisenhower himself has acknowledged that his talk about the country going into the ditch was mostly campaign exaggeration.

So it looks as if we can get through the next 2 years with a Republican President and a Democratic Congress without any breakdown of the American political system. We learned in 1947–48 during the 80th Congress that most Members of Congress are patriotic enough to suppress bitter partisan obstructionism in time of national danger.

On the other hand, there are problems—a great many problems—in this kind of situation. It would be silly to shut our eyes to them or to pretend that they don't exist. The best policy is to face up to these problems and do what we can to iron them out.

In talking to you this evening, I want to try to bring into focus the two sides of this troublesome problem of divided political responsibility in government—the President's problems in dealing with a Democratic Congress, and the problems of the majority party in Congress itself. For there are problems on both sides.

But in no case are they insurmountable, if there is good will and good faith on both sides. And I hope we can achieve that.

But let me point out one very important fact before we go into this any deeper. It is this:

Under no circumstances should we expect to see President Eisenhower stop being a Republican or those of us in the majority party in Congress stop being Democrats just because we've got to work together. We choose up our political sides on the basis of certain principles of government in which we believe. It would be a sad thing indeed for American democracy—based on a two-party system—if those political beliefs were just superficial—if we had to throw them overboard as the only means of achieving harmony and progress in a period such as this.

I want to emphasize that point, for I think it is very important. The Democrats in Congress do not have to run out on everything they believe in just in order to cooperate with Eisenhower. And the President does not have to turn into a Democrat in order to cooperate with us. So please, in the coming 2 years, don't be either surprised or disappointed that these changes in basic principles and views have not occurred.

If the President holds stubbornly to some position and the Congress holds stubbornly to another—and this may happen from time to time—then the question is not whether the Democrats should give in because the President is Republican, or whether the President should give in because the Congress is Democratic. The only question will be. Which side is right? Or, if that can't honestly be determined in the circumstances, then the question is: How do we find a middle ground?

For when you come down to it, nearly all legislation passed by Congress and signed into law by the President is a compromise This is fundamental in American government.

You may be surprised to hear, in fact, that most of the bills which pass Congress and become law are passed by unanimous consent. That doesn't mean everybody agrees wholeheartedly about everything in each of those bills. What it does mean is that in order to get those bills through, so many compromises have to be made between strong views on both sides that finally a middle ground is reached and the less-than-perfect compromise is accepted.

This happens whether the Congress is Republican or Democratic; it happens, too, whether the Congress and the President belong to the same party or to different parties. That's because within the two parties there

are strong differences of opinion on many issues; and also because party lines often cut across geographical or sectional or economic issues. Therefore, eastern Republicans and Democrats are often joined on one side against western or southwestern Democrats and Republicans, on the other.

So there is much precedent for a Republican President and a Democratic Congress finding a common ground for a middle course on many of the big issues to come up in these next 2 years.

But behind this cooperation and harmony, there will always be partisan political considerations, too—so don't be surprised when you see them crop up.

Now let's look at some of the problems involved in this cooperative effort to provide effective Government leadership with divided political responsibility in Washington. First of all, let's look at it from the President's viewpoint; President Eisenhower—and this would be true of any President in the same situation—wants to make his administration succeed. He certainly would not want to climax a distinguished military career with a failure in the greatest and most responsible job in the world, as President of the United States.

Every President develops a sense of history—and of his place in it. But, while looking at the long-range evaluation of his place in the history books, he must also be acutely conscious of his place in current history—in the newspapers and magazines and in the minds and hearts of the people. He knows he can accomplish more, both within his own administration and in dealing with Congress, if he is popular with the public generally. But sometimes he has to run the risk that some policies which he feels are very important to the Nation might be unpopular with the people.

If the program is very unpopular, he has a tough time, indeed, getting Congress to accept it, for, after all, every Member of the House of Representatives has to run for reelection every 2 years or else quit and get out. If he gets out voluntarily or is defeated, he loses his seniority automatically; therefore, if he comes back to Congress later, he comes back as a freshman all over again and has to start again from the bottom of the ladder. So in the House, and to a certain extent in the Senate, too, even though they have 6-year terms over there, an unpopular program has tough sledding; many Members feel they vote their own political suicide if they approve an unpopular measure.

But they will do it—and they have done it often—if the President convinces them of his sincerity, of his good faith, and of the underlying vital nature for the whole country of the policy he has recommended.

Now, when the President and the congressional majority are of the same party, the President can get further on this kind of approach. The Congress knows the President would not deliberately cut the ground out from his own party members in the House and Senate.

But when a Republican President tries to sell a Democratic Congress on an unpopular course of action—or the other way around in the case of Truman and the 80th Congress—many Members might feel the President isn't really a bit interested in whether they are reelected or defeated; some might even suspect the proposal of being deliberately calculated to hurt the opposition in the forthcoming election.

Does this sound overly suspicious? Perhaps so. I am only reporting on how Members sometimes feel in a situation like this, and many will continue to remember that the President's party leaders in effect called Democrats pro-Communist in 1954 in order to try to defeat them. That rankles deeply as one of the worst things that could be charged to any patriotic American.

So the President is under a handicap in selling Congress on unpopular legislation, even though, as President, he may have to try his best to do so.

Now, suppose he were to go to the extreme length of praising individual Democrats to the skies as great Americans, honoring them and flattering them in various ways to prove his friendship and good faith in seeking their help on a very unpopular course of action. The President's own party would then scream to high heaven, particularly in the States and districts represented by the Democrats he praised so highly. This might cause him a loss of support from his own party in the Congress, since many Republicans of the rgiht wing have never really accepted Eisenhower as a true Republican anyway.

Therefore, he must call his shots as he sees them; he must sometimes break with his own party leaders when they insist on going after the Democrats as a party of treason; his Vice President, whose campaigning was considered below the belt by many Democrats, cannot help him very much in dealing with those same Democrats in leadership positions in the Congress.

So the President has got to work hard and constantly at maintaining the confidence of the opposition party in the Congress, particularly where he and we agree on objectives. This is particularly true in the foreign-policy field; most of the President's difficulties on this have come, in fact, from within his own party, so he must depend largely on Democrats to get these measures through. Therefore, you see him by and large soft-pedaling the political attacks where this issue is concerned.

Yet, right after the reciprocal trade-agreements bill went through the House successfully only because of the magnificent work of Speaker RAYBURN, you had the situation of the President unleashing a terrific attack on the Democrats and even including the Speaker for alleged irresponsibility on the tax-reduction proposal. This was apparently his way of backing up and bucking up the Republicans to get them to unite solidly behind him on that proposal and keep them happy with his leadership.

So that is often how it goes. One day the opposition party is hailed by the President as patriotic, and the next day as irresponsible. He plays down the political battles where the issue is vital to the country's foreign policy but gets his partisanship into it in some other way on domestic issues. It is a difficult role for the President to play, and we often think he overdoes quite a bit in letting some of his friends inject partisanship and animosity against the opposition party in every possible way. Of course, these same administration officials probably think we overdo the attacks—so you see it's a question of which side of the fence you're on coloring your view of this problem.

Now let's look at some of the practical problems on the other side of it—for the Democrats in the Congress. Year in and year out, both parties are always anxious to capture the presidency and the administrative machinery. Patronage is one aspect of that, but certainly not a major one. The real stakes are the decisions on national policy. Again, I repeat, we have pretty deep-seated views about government and we want to see our views prevail for what we sincerely believe are the best interests of the whole country. This is true of both parties. Democrats believe a Democratic administration is better for the country; Republicans believe their party can do more good for the country. I say that is fine; that's the way things should be. We should have strong views on issues and policies.

Thus, when a Democratic Congress supports a Republican President, because we think he is right on a particular issue, we know we may be making him and his party look better politically than they would otherwise. Nevertheless, we have got to do the same thing the President must do in this situation: We've got to bury party considerations time after time in order to serve national interests. Even while doing this, we know that the President in 1956 will be out to beat us, no matter how well we might have cooperated with him on the really vital issues If he weren't out to beat us, then he wouldn't be much of a Republican Party leader, would he?

Another thing; we may be buttered up by the administration from time to time to get us to vote for something the President wants, but then, as the opposition party, we see these policies administered, frequently, by officials who are completely out of sympathy with us. The Republican administration is composed largely of active Republican partisans—many of them much more partisan than the President. And they use the machinery of Government to try to beat Democrats and elect Republicans,. This is not a complaint; it is a fact. The Republicans said the same thing about the Truman administration during the 80th Congress.

On the other hand, the Democrats had been in power so long during the Roosevelt and Truman years that the newness of power had worn off and frequently the goal was to get a particular job done regardless of whether Democrats or Republicans did it and got the credit. Many Republicans had very high positions in the Democratic administrations—some even as Cabinet officers. So far as I know, however, there is only one really high Democrat in this whole administration, Ambassador Bruce who is almost irreplaceable.

So we feel left out of the day-to-day decisions on policy. We get no credit for supporting the administration when we do; we get all kinds of criticism for opposing it.

All this means is that under our 2-party system, there are problems on both sides; there are frustrations and headaches for both the President and the Congress when they belong to opposing parties.

But these are not the really serious, insurmountable problems of government. We can work things out in an atmosphere of good faith—for the simple reason that we have to, for the good of this country. Both sides will play politics when it is safe to do so—safe for the country, that is. They will both have their eyes constantly on 1956. But not to the extent of blinding themselves to the needs of 1955 or of the future, either, in those instances in which American safety, American prosperity, and American decency and justice are at stake.

John William Flannagan, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal sadness that I read the obituaries of John William Flannagan, Jr. The press accounts of his passing took note of his distinguished record in the Congress and of the esteem in which he was held in Virginia. My recollections of our former colleague were occupied more with the human qualities not readily translated into print.

It was my high privilege to know Mr. Flannagan during my first years in this House. I learned early in my experience here that he was a man whose counsel

was much sought by his colleagues and whose judgment commanded great respect and influence. On nine occasions this merited confidence also was manifested by his fellow citizens in Virginia, who elected him to Congress. He served faithfully and with distinction from 1931 until 1949. When he decided to return to private life this House lost one of its most earnest and astute Members.

On countless occasions Mr. Flannagan gave me the benefit of his experience and sound reasoning. When he left these Halls I was deprived of a friendly hand along the way. These few words are poor acknowledgment of the manifold kindnesses he extended. My sincere sympathy, Mr. Speaker, goes out to his family in this bereavement.

Nero Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this means of nominating the Veterans' Administration for the Nero Award.

If the Nero Award is not yet as famous as the Oscar Award, it is only because the Nero Award is a new invention.

Let me explain how it came to be.

This famous Roman Emperor, as we all know, is remembered for his fiddling while Rome burned. The Veterans' Administration, which I am hereby nominating to be its first recipient, has nonmusically equalled his efforts while a housing project in my State sinks into the ground.

Late in 1952 construction was started on Sun Gold Manor, consisting of 100 houses located in Panaca, Nev. Twenty-five of these houses were sold to veterans under the loan-guaranty program, and seven were sold under loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The subdivision was promoted and built for the employees of the Combined Metal Reduction Co., of Caselton, Nev., which operated a lead and zinc mine nearby.

Construction of the homes was completed in 1953. Before the end of the year the occupants of the homes were somewhat intrigued to find that their floors were sinking away from their walls, ceilings were cracking, driveways disappearing, and the very attractive project turning into rapid chaos.

The builder was called back to make repairs. The occupants were even more intrigued to find that the repairs sank, too.

When they became sufficiently intrigued, they naturally contacted their Congressman.

In September of 1954 I contacted the Veteran's Administration in behalf of the residents of Sun Gold Manor. My questions were simple, I thought. I only wanted to know why the homes were sinking and what the Veterans' Administration was going to do about it.

Sixteen days after writing I was advised that the Veterans' Administration "fully realizes the seriousness of such a situation and you may be assured that every effort, within the authority of the Veterans' Administration, will be exerted to alleviate the condition."

In the 8 months that have elapsed since that date, the condition of the Panaca sinking homes has been anything but alleviated.

Since the first of the year, I have been in almost weekly contact with the Veterans' Administration officials handling the case in an attempt to expedite some action.

Last week I finally received some definite word. This definite word is that no further report of no progress can be expected until the week of May 16.

When I am out in the field and ask for answers, they refer me to Washington. Back here they say they will have to check out in the field.

The problem has been back and forth between the Washington office and the regional office of the VA with the same regularity of a shuttlecock in a badminton game.

In badminton, however, somebody wins. The tenants of Panaca's sinking homes continue to lose.

There have been enough official investigations conducted to do credit to the FBI.

The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration have just about decided what makes the houses sink. It is believed this is because the ground on which they are built also sinks.

Apparently, the ground is light alluvial and blow sand that compresses when water is applied from landscaping or sewage disposal.

The Federal Housing Administration seemed to have the interests of the tenants well in mind.

The builder had offered to refund $1,000 to each of the 7 purchasers of FHA-insured homes. This would have left these families in a fairly good position. Their monthly payments would have been regarded as rent and there would have been no deficiency judgment against them.

However, because of delays and an apparent effort to collect $1,000 from the builder for the 25 VA-insured homes—money that would have gone to the agency and not to the individual veteran—the Veterans' Administration caused the builder to withdraw the offer.

Now the FHA purchasers are back where they started from—without the $1,000 and minus the 6 weeks' time it took the Veterans' Administration to cause them this new problem.

Six weeks to produce a new obstacle is about par for the bureaucratic course.

I might also point out that the 32 families who have purchased these homes have not been able to sell them. As we know, the lead and zinc mining industry has been tragically depressed since the end of the Korean war.

These 32 families now find themselves with no jobs in their communities, homes that are sinking away, and a Government agency that has set a new record in bureaucratic delay and buck-passing.

To date the VA has caused the FHA-insured tenants to lose their chance for recovery from this disaster, and has demonstrated no apparent concern for the veterans involved.

I am more than happy to nominate the Veterans' Administration for the Nero award. I can think of no one more deserving.

Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker: Virginia's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 1, 1955, the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF, Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, delivered a very interesting address at the Bethlehem Methodist Church at Moneta, Va., incident to the presentation of an award to Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker as Virginia's Mother of the Year. Mrs. Rucker is highly deserving of the honor bestowed upon her and Mr. POFF's tribute is altogether appropriate.

At this time all of us are mindful of our obligation and devotion to motherhood and I extend hearty congratulations to Mrs. Rucker, who typifies all that is fine and noble among the mothers of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Mr. POFF's address, which is as follows:

I am humbly grateful for the honor you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to pay tribute to one of your fellow citizens who has so nobly distinguished herself.

One rainy day a mother sat in her rocking chair mending clothes. Her noisy little boy, unable to go outside to play, was about to drive her to distraction. In desperation and in an effort to keep him quiet, she tore from a magazine a leaf on which was printed a map of the world. With her scissors, she cut it into a jigsaw puzzle. She scrambled the pieces together, handed them to her son and told him to fit them back together again. Thinking that would keep him occupied the rest of the afternoon, she went back to her mending. However, in less than 10 minutes the boy was back at his mother's elbow with the map of the world intact. His mother could scarcely believe her eyes, and she asked him how he had completed the task so quickly. Sheepishly, he looked up at his mother and explained, "On the back of the map was the picture of a man, and when I put the man together right, the world just took care of itself."

This is the story of the life of Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker. For half a century she has been helping to take care of the world by fitting together the pieces of the lives and characters of men and women. It has been well said that a "mother in her office holds the key of the soul and stamps out the coin of character."

To her providential care and guidance God saw fit to entrust the keys of 13 souls, and the coins of character which she has stamped

have circulated throughout the realm of human experience. Few parents have been so abundantly blessed as have Dr. and Mrs. S. L. Rucker. Still fewer can point with so much justifiable pride to the achievements of their children. How many parents can count among their offspring 2 physicians, 2 dentists, 1 pharmacist, 1 chemist, and 5 homemakers? And how many children owe so much to their mother—a mother who, after the death of a beloved husband and father 24 years ago, took upon herself the burden of feeding, clothing, sheltering, and educating such a large family?

As they—mother, children, and grandchildren—are gathered together here in their hometown, here within the hallowed walls of their home church on this wonderful Lord's Day, what glorious thoughts must crowd their minds and warm their hearts. Ringing and echoing down the long corridor of the years that have passed come the memories of hours of pain and pleasure; hours of woe and joy, gladness and sadness, tears and laughters, play and toil, failure and success. How humble and yet how very proud they must be.

And how very grateful must be the hearts of these fine children for a mother who has labored so long, so faithfully, so untiringly, and so unselfishly in God's great vineyard. How often has she, who 13 times entered the valley of the shadow of death to win a life at the peril of her own, laid down bit by bit and day by day a small segment of her life for her children? How often has she abandoned sleep to sing lullabies? How many times has she bandaged a wound or kissed a bruise; how many clothes has she mended; how many floors has she swept; how many meals has she prepared; how many dishes has she washed; how many stories has she read; how many lessons has she taught; how many times has she smoothed a rough path and brushed away a tear to make room for a smile?

Yes, Miss Bessie's hands have held the key to men's souls and I know through their minds today must be coursing the words of the poet who said:

"My mother's beautiful hands!
They're neither white nor small;
And you, I know, would scarcely think
That they were fair at all.
I've looked on hands whose form and hue
A sculptor's dream might be;
Yet are those wrinkled, aged hands
Most beautiful of all to me.

"Such beautiful, beautiful hands!
Tho heart were weary and sad,
These patient hands kept toiling on,
That the children might be glad;
I always weep when looking back
To childhood's distant day,
I think how those hands rested not,
When mine were busy at play."

But her labors have not been in vain. God has used her richly to bless not only her children but the members of this congregation and the citizens of the community in which she lives. By her Christian example, she has, in the windows of the lives of generations still unborn, lit a candle of faith and hope and inspiration, and in so doing has laid up for herself treasures in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and where thieves do not break through or steal. And long after the Supreme Architect of the Universe, the Father of all mankind has seen fit to call this mother to her eternal reward, the fragrance of her life will linger on in the garden of humanity.

"Her heart is like her garden,
Old-fashioned, quaint and sweet,
With here a wealth of blossoms,
And there a still retreat.
Sweet violets are hiding
We know as we pass by,
And lilies, pure as angel thoughts,
Are opening somewhere nigh.

"Forget-me-nots there linger,
To full perfection brought,
And there bloom purple pansies,
In many a tender thought.
There love's own roses bloom,
As from enchanted ground,
And lavish perfume exquisite,
The whole glad year around.

"And in the quiet garden—
The garden of her heart,
Songbirds are always singing
Their songs of cheer apart.
And from it floats forever,
O'ercoming sin and strife,
Sweet as the breath of roses,
The fragrance of her life."

I think God in His Heaven must be smiling down on us today, and if His Son Jesus were here in the flesh, as He most certainly is in the spirit, I know He would say, "Well done, thy good and faithful servant."

The Russian Menace at Next Year's Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of May 5, 1955, reported that the Soviet Union, in an apparent bid for the 1960 or 1964 Olympics, has announced that it was spending approximately $62 million this year to expand athletic facilities in Moscow. Work has started on the construction of a gigantic stadium, indoor tennis courts, and a summer artificial ice rink. Moscow already has the big Dynamo Stadium and a second smaller stadium.

In a speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst Jr., following his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead fast. From Moscow, he said:

Radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism.

Avery Brundage, in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955, reported that things look bad for us at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, Australia. He said that Russia is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known. Unless there is a sudden awakening in this country, Soviet sportsmen are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia.

They threaten to seize the initiative even in track and field, the feature phase of the games, in which United States athletes have always been supreme—although to a lessening degree—since the games were revived 60 years ago—

Mr. Brundage warned.

Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists.

I have developed a plan, and presented it to this Congress, for meeting the propaganda offensive of the Russians. This plan is developed in several bills—H. R. 5040, H. R. 4307, H. R. 4215, and H. R. 4109—which are specificaly designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst. There is very little money involved, but, if adopted, they would go far toward meeting the major attacks the U. S. S. R. is making upon us in the fields of culture and sports.

Because the very survival of our way of life may depend on taking action now I urge their early consideration and enactment by the Congress.

H. R. 4109 would establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia. The text of my bill is included here. Also included is the text of the New York Times report on the Moscow plans, as well as a recent article by David Sentner, chief of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner. This article also appeared in the Chicago American, the San Francisco American, the Boston American, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, the New York Journal-American, the Milwaukee Sentinel, and the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

H. R. 4109

A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944, is amended by redesignating section 3 as section 4 and by inserting immediately after section 2 the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall advise and consult with the commission in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution. The advisory board shall consist of—

"(1) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of recreation and sports: The United States Olympic Association, the American Recreation Society, the National Recreation Association, the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Amateur Athletic Union, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Athletic Institute, and the Sports Fishing Institute.

"(2) one person selected by each of the following national organizations: The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans, the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, the Marine Corps League, the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation, the American Veterans Commitee, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, and the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States; and

"(3) one person selected by each of the following national service organizations: The

United Service Organizations (USO), the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

"(b) The advisory board may exercise its functions through a working committee composed of 6 members, 2 selected jointly by the organizaitons named in each of the categories enumerated in subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. The first section of such joint resolution is amended (1) by striking out "an athletic field and stadium" and inserting in lieu thereof "an athletic field, stadium, and parade ground," and (2) by striking out "World War I and World War II" and inserting in lieu thereof "World War I, World War II, and the Korean hostilities."

[From the New York Times, of May 5, 1955]

RUSSIANS ARE SPENDING $62 MILLION ON ATHLETIC FACILITIES—ACTION A PRELUDE TO OLYMPICS' BID—RUSSIA REGARDED AS SEEKING 1960 OR 1964 GAMES—MOSCOW SUBURBS GET NEW STADIA

LONDON, May 4.—The Soviet Union, in an apparent bid for the 1960 or 1964 Olympics, announced today it was spending 250 million rubles ($62 million) this year to expand athletic facilities in Moscow.

S. V. Pushnov, chairman of the Moscow City Committee on Physical Culture and Sport, said in a Moscow radio broadcast heard here:

"During this year alone 250 million rubles will be spent on sports facilities.

"Work has started on the construction of a gigantic stadium in Luzhniki (a Moscow suburban district).

"In Sokolniki (another Moscow district) a summer artificial ice rink will be opened on which hockey players, ice skaters and figure skaters can compete. Construction is being completed on new indoor tennis courts."

Pushnov said nothing specifically about trying to obtain the games for the Soviet Union. However, the Russians have been privately talking about it since the Olympic committee meeting in Athens last May.

In talks with foreigners they admitted the only thing preventing their lodging a bid for the games was lack of facilities in Moscow.

STADIUM GROUNDS SMALL

Hungary has been prominently mentioned as a possible 1960 site but the Russians may be aiming at 1964. Next year's games will be held in Australia.

Moscow already has the big Dynamo Stadium, but the grounds around it are small. There's another stadium in the Stalino district, but isn't big enough for the Olympics.

By using the available stadiums—and centering activities in the new one in Luzhniki—the Russians could easily handle the Olympics.

Housing would offer no particular problems to the Russians. If they did not put up an Olympic village, they could do as they've done for other international events—just empty several hotels and use them.

Pushnov also announced this summer would see the inauguration of the first Moscow games. About 300,000 athletes will take part.

SPECIAL POLICE FOR OLYMPICS

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA, May 4.—Melbourne officials announced today that a special police corps had been organized for the 1956 Olympic games "for the protection and general assistance of overseas competitors and visitors."

A committee of senior officers of all branches of the police force will work in close liaison with the organizers of the games. The police station building in the Olympic village of Heidelburg will be staffed by policemen speaking at least two foreign languages.

Special squads of plainclothes policemen will be assigned to safeguard the visitors against pickpockets and confidence men. All incoming ships and airliners will be scrutinized for foreign criminals, descriptions of whom are being obtained from the international police organization.

Meanwhile the Olympic games construction committee, after a stormy 2-hour meeting today, decided to proceed with a 333-meter concrete cycling track at Olympic Park. The track will cost 200,000 Australian pounds ($448,000).

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of April 29, 1955]

HOUSE URGED TO CONSIDER HEARST ART, SPORT PLAN TO COMBAT REDS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, today urged consideration of congressional measures to promote American culture and sports events in line with the program for "competitive coexistence" with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

Concurrently, the House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON's first bill on the subject, providing for the creation of a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts and mass communications center.

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers and Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing its supremacy at the international games.

PROPOSALS

THOMPSON said his legislation is specifically designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain, where he interviewed the four top leaders of Communist Russia.

The measures would create a national advisory committee under the welfare secretary to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby has approved a bill introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Democrat, of New York, for establishment of a Federal Commission on the Arts "and for other purposes."

WARNING

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

THOMPSON called attention of Congress to both the warning of Hearst and Olympic Committee President Brundage on the sports challenge from the Soviet Union.

He referred to a current magazine article by Brundage warning that Russia is building "the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic Games unless "there is a sudden reawakening in this country."

TWENTY YEARS OLD

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex," THOMPSON said.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, which was started more than 20 years ago, was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his recent speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

PRESTIGE

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic Games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-cosncious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

THOMPSON added the legislation introduced by himself, Representatives ROOSEVELT (Democrat, California), and REUSS (Democrat), Wisconsin, was designed to carry out "the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst."

Twentieth Anniversary of the REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the REA program, I deem it appropriate to give the Congress a report on the actions of the program in the First District of Arkansas.

There are 10 counties in the first district, and electric lines extend into each of these counties under member-owned electric cooperatives operation. There are 4 electric cooperative corporations located in the first district, and 2 of them are the largest in the entire State of Arkansas.

The Craighead Electric Cooperative Corp., with headquarters located at Jonesboro, Ark., is the largest in Arkansas, serving 16,500 members on 3,900 miles of line in Craighead, Greene, Poinsett, Lawrence, Crittenden, and parts of Independence and Randolph Counties. This cooperative was first put into operation in November of 1938, and in the years since has served an area principally devoted to agricultural crops of cotton, corn, rice, and soybeans, although the area is growing in the production of beef cattle, dairy animals, hogs, and poultry.

The Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp., with headquarters in Forrest City, Ark., is the second-largest electric cooperative in Arkansas. This cor-

poration has 3,400 miles of line serving 12,500 members. This organization went into operation in 1938, and serves members in St. Francis, Lee, Phillips, Cross, Crittenden, Woodruff, and Monroe Counties.

The Clay County Electric Cooperative Corp., located in Clay, Greene, and Randolph Counties, has its headquarters at Corning, Ark. This cooperative, since going into operation in November of 1939, has expanded to 1,798 miles of lines serving 6,207 members. Agricultural loads served by this cooperative are broiler operations, livestock, dairying, row crop and rice irrigation and cotton gins.

The Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters in Blytheville, Ark., serves one of the richest agricultural areas in the Midsouth. This pioneer cooperative now has 800 miles of lines serving 4,200 members.

It would not be fitting to report on these fine cooperatives without mentioning some of the men who have made these organizations so successful. For these are the men who have worked through the years to bring electricity to the farms.

I would like to recognize the tireless work of such pioneers as Mr. Leon Presson, president of the Clay County Electric Cooperative Corp., and Mr. Adolph Lillard, their able manager. Others in this organization are Mr. J. Frank Ellis, Mr. Thomas Hall, Mr. Paul Moore, Mr. Clois Butler, Mr. C. T. Johnson, Mr. Mack Dalton, Mr. Roy Creek, Mr. W. Z. Porter, and the Honorable E. G. Ward.

In the Craighead organization are such fine men as Mr. S. C. Chapin, the president, and their fine administrative manager, Mr. Earl Walden. Working with these men are Mr. G. C. Jernigan, Mr. Oscar Robinson, Mr. E. L. Stillions, Mr. L. C. Sloan, Mr. C. H. Montieth, Mr. G. M. Shipman, Mr. W. A. Cunningham, Mr. Raybon Sullivan, Mr. Ode Chipman, Mr. Garland Arrington, and the Honorable Charles Frierson.

Associated with Mr. Charley Lutes, president of the Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, and their fine manager, Mr. H. C. Knappenberger, are Mr. Tom Callis, Mr. Charles R. Coleman, Mr. B. B. Threlkeld, Mr. Claude Duncan, Mr. G. W. Garrigan, Mr. J. B. Johnson, Mr. W. E. Hagan, Mr. R. L. Houck, Mr. Lloyd Shelton, and Mr. Earl Wildy.

In the large Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp. and working with their president, Mr. John Doyel, and their fine manager, Mr. T. E. Bostick, are Mr. J. E. Breeding, Mr. V. O. Turner, Mr. James Smith, Mr. E. E. James, Mr. Joseph Whittenton, Mr. J. Crossett, Mr. Carson Brown, Mr. John Brooks, Mr. Homer G. Townes, and their excellent attorney, the Honorable John Eldridge, Jr.

These men, pioneers all in this great work, are continuing to give their service to their neighbors in the work of the REA.

The Meaning of Mother's Day in the Free World and Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have been setting aside special days to emphasize certain human relationships, among them Mother's Day. We have agreed that on the second Sunday in May of each year we will pay tribute to the virtues of motherhood, the love, the courage, and the strength of mothers down the ages, which we recognize as the molding and steadying force in every normal childhood and in every happy home.

There are many things I could say about the custom we are establishing—for to me these days are useful only if they give to every one of the 365 days of our calendar year a deeper sense of what these relationships mean. But today I want to speak for a few minutes about the use being made of Mother's Day and of Children's Day by the Communists who have become so consummately skillful in using the emotions of men and women to hide their purposes.

Women who believe in God—no matter what their form of belief—cannot do less than resent the the use the Communists are making of women in all lands—using words to deceive, to cover up reality. And they exploit these words and send them out to all the corners of the earth.

DANGER SIGNALS

Let me give you some danger signals:

On March 8 of each year, the Communist world celebrates International Women's Day. On this day the International Federation of Democratic Women mobilizes its 66 million women all over the world. On this day Communist women display their power and their contribution to building up the Communist world. All Communist governments, all Communist parties of all countries give special attention to this day, and praise the women for what they have done and scold them for what they failed to do. This is the day when Communist women feel the public tribute paid to them and when they are made to feel how important and how needed they are as a factor in building up communism. The wife is expected to influence her husband, the mother to educate the children, the working woman to speed up production to build the Communist state. Women in politics are expected to do a tremendous job as propaganda agents, as information agents, and as legislators to press for laws that aid the Communist plan.

On June 1 of each year the Communist-dominated world celebrates Children's Day on the national and international level. On this day they show the world "the wonderful Communist children"—loyal to the State, and so mature when they reach the age of 14 that they do not need the guidance of their parents any more. They are free to do what they please. At this time it becomes their right and duty to spy on their parents and to do all assignments given them by the party leaders.

I would urge you to read the readily available Communist pamphlets on the Education of Communist Youth, to understand what is actually being done to youth.

COMMUNIST MOTHER'S DAY

On the 18th of June, a matter of only a few weeks from now, Communist Mother's Day will be tuned to the note of hate of the West, and above all else, hate of America. And in July another World Congress of Mothers will be called. At this Congress an appeal will be addressed to all mothers everywhere—an emotional appeal—to ban atomic war, to stop "American imperialism" and its interference in the affairs of other countries. It will urge all mothers to work for peace and brotherly love among all nations. It will be beamed to the hearts of the mothers of the West—to the trusting women of the free world who listen eagerly to all voices in support of peace. But we women of America—yes, and our men as well—with women everywhere should listen intelligently. We should not permit ourselves to accept these high-sounding words until we have examined the kind of "peace" that is being offered us by the Communist leaders. We should be keenly aware that the Communist Mother's World Congress combines its channels of propaganda with those of the Vienna Peace Conference. We should be alert to see what a truly terrific outlet this gives with which to flood our press, etc. Somehow we must be prepared to refute this propaganda immediately and effectively, or we give the impression that what they say is true: that America is the aggressor and the warmonger, while Communists are doves of peace.

We who live in this free America—especially we who are women, whether we be mothers in fact or not—feel an especial urgency to bring to all people everywhere the realization of what the inevitable results will be should communism be able to becloud the true issues so thoroughly that women and men as well permit themselves to be taken in by their words.

What channels do we free people here in America have to counteract the floods upon floods of propaganda that are constantly poured over us and the increased flood that will be loosed on these special dates?

We have the United States Information Agency and we should use it more intelligently. We should see to it that it has the personnel and the tools to do a real job for us. I am thoroughly aware of the criticisms that have been hurled at it—some justified but much not justified—but it is our one general channel. Then there is Radio Free Europe that is doing much. We could concentrate our subject matter and refute the dove of peace of the hammer and sickle.

WOMEN FOR FREEDOM OF EUROPE

We have in our midst also a woman's group whose knowledge is far beyond our own, because it is drawn from personal experience and from the constant flow of information from the curtained countries that are theirs.

I speak of Women for Freedom of Europe, Inc. This organization at 8 West 40th Street, New York, is a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Its president is Geraldine Fitch; the chairman of its advisory board is Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, one of the finest representatives of American womanhood. These women have undertaken to study and analyze from first-hand information, the social changes introduced in these Communist and Communist-dominated lands, and to learn the effects of these changes upon the lives of women and their families. A seminar now in progress at the Baltic House of Freedom in New York City is giving out important information about the laws recently introduced in order to Sovietize the pattern of family life, the education of children—and again I urge you to read Lenin's brochure on the Education of Communist Youth—and the working conditions imposed upon women. We Americans should know more of the actual conditions. It is so difficult for us to picture such a situation. We do not realize how vital it is that we who are still free should work together to retain our freedom.

As you well know, Communist propaganda is constantly telling their own people and the world that only the U. S. S. R. works for peace—that America is responsible for all the war talk—all their need for ever more war strength. And they are good at it. Do not mistake that.

CONTRASTS IN PEACE EFFORTS

Let me review a few things which would seem not only to disprove their contentions, but to paint the picture in its true colors.

The historic record of the American people for peace stands despite the Communist labels of "warmonger" and "aggressor." The quick demobilization of the American forces after the war, tells clearly our dislike of war and love of peace. By contrast the whole Russian Army is still under arms and ready for action, with armies of the captive countries gradually integrated into a joint Soviet military plan. Drawn up this February by Soviet officiers and military delegates this plan designated Hungary, together with Bulgaria and Romania, as the second defense line. The delegates of the satellite states proposed that each country have its own military command with Soviet officers as "liaison." The Russians counterproposed that Russian military headquarters be set up in each country and their "proposal" was "accepted" by all the delegates, as the Minsk resolution. In view of the impending ratification of the Austrian Peace Treaty which implies withdrawal of Russian troops from Austria, Hungary and Romania, the Minsk resolution supplies another pretext for keeping the Russian armies in these countries.

After the Second World War the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan for international agency control of atomic production was blocked by Soviet veto in the United Nations. Also another generous effort for the sharing of "atoms-for-peace" was presented by President Eisenhower to the United Nations and accepted by the General Assembly in November 23, 1954.

Assistance was originated and largely underwritten by the United States through the Marshall plan, NATO, and the point four program for the underdeveloped countries. This is eloquent testimony of the American people's striving for world peace based on higher standards of living, with freedom and justice strengthened by economic security and without political influence.

In the treatment of former enemies America actually donated billions of dollars for the reconstruction of Japan and Italy, while Soviet Russia looted billions' worth from the captive countries. Today Japan is a free country, with its own foreign policy as is Western Germany.

I could name many more matters which show our good faith, and the Communist infidelities. But my purpose today is not tied to these things. My purpose is to draw the attention of all women to the need for intelligent thought and action lest we let the soft words of those who talk peace, deafen us to the steady and persistent beat of the drums of war from which they emanate.

Peace never comes easily for it is a quality of the heart, of the personality. The work for peace is not a matter of mass gatherings, and propaganda banners. The work for peace involves instead a constant vigilance against the slavery which the Soviets are forcing upon millions and millions of people in the name of peace.

We who are free women in a free land must keep faith with our own dedication to peace and also with the trust that women of the rest of the world have placed in American womanhood. We must recognize the false and stand firmly behind each true and since step toward a just and lasting peace.

Such a rededication of ourselves to the true meaning of freedom, which after all is our responsibility to the Infinite, can bring new meaning to our so-called Mother's Day. May we work unceasingly and humbly that freedom may be reborn across the world.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Even before I had the responsibility of chairmanship of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs having to do with national and international movements, the committee that drafted the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, I had concerned myself with communism and its teachings, it methods, its goals. Insofar as I have been able, I have followed the tragic history of those peoples and countries who are behind the curtain, hoping that other countries and other peoples might learn from these tragedies and not be engulfed.

Let me give you something of the history as it has been laid bare:

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Ever since World War I, as an active and loyal member of the League of Nations, Czechoslovakia kept a constant record for peace and international cooperation. Confronted by the increased Nazi menace, it supplemented its system of alliances with France and the Little Entente by a treaty with the Soviet Union in 1935, which was renewed in December 1943, and was clearly based on nonintervention by the U. S. S. R. in the internal affairs of the postwar Czechoslovak Republic. Yet, its genuine effort to promote European reconstruction and the work of the United Nations was abruptly ended by combined machinations of the Soviet Union and its Communist agents within. By a violent coup Czechoslovakia was deprived of its traditional role of working for peace, its democratic system was overthrown, and its people drawn into the orbit of Soviet slavery.

BALTIC STATES

Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, existed in peace with Russia ever since the establishment of their independence in 1918. In the course of good neighborliness, peace treaties were made, nonaggression pacts signed, and mutual-assistance treaties concluded. The mutual-assistance treaties were for a term of 15 years. Yet within 8 months these Baltic States fell under such ruthless occupation as history has seldom recorded.

In Estonia, according to verified data, about 60,000 persons were deported to the Soviet Union in 1940–41. About 2,000 men and women were executed on the spot; 9,229 of the deported or murdered were minors or children under 20 years of age. In 1949 a considerably larger number of people were deported than during the mass deportation in 1941.

In Latvia, during the first occupation in 1940–41, a total of 37,500 persons was deported. Including the subsequent deportations after the reoccupation of the country in 1944, the allover amount is far over 100,000 persons.

Since the first mass deportation of the horrible night of June 13–14 in 1941, in Lithuania, six other deportations have taken place, taking young people, fathers, mothers, and children. Eighty-three thousand Lithuanians were driven off in the early part of May 1945. In May 22, 1948, Lithuania lost more than 100,000 of her inhabitants in a single night.

DEPORTATIONS

Today deportations proceed under the guise of voluntary work in remote regions of Russia, where the deportees are forced to perform specified duties and labor voluntarily. They are forced to sign a statement that they are leaving voluntarily for work in such-and-such brotherly republic or autonomous district. At designated points, these deportees are classified, some to go to penal camps, some to forced labor, some to free exile, which covers women and children. The places of deportees are filled by newcomers from Russia. Recent escapees from Vorkuta and other camps bring news of thousands of those Balts, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Poles laboring unto death in the mines, railroad building, fisheries, and forests of the western Ural region.

This is the Communist peace that was accorded the Baltic States when they trusted the false independence, autonomy, and coexistence promised by the Soviets. Similar Soviet pattern was followed in other countries, like Bulgaria, which was also taken over, the Russian troops exercising pressure which gradually led to the transformation of the coalition cabinet in September 1944 into purely Communist government. From 1945 to 1947 thousands of members of the Peasant Party of the opposition in Parliament were imprisoned and their leader, Nicolas Petkoff, executed.

RUMANIA

Next was Rumania. On April 3, 1944, Molotov, the Soviet Minister of Soviet Affairs, in the course of the Rumanian armistice negotiations, made the following statement:

The Soviet Government declares that it does not pursue the aim of conquering any part of Rumanian territory or of changing in whatever manner the existing social order in Rumania. It equally declares that the entry in Rumania of Soviet troops is solely the consequence of military necessities and of the continuation of resistance of the enemy troops.

This solemn statement was repeated by Molotov on August 23, 1944, when Rumania joined the allied forces:

In the face of events in Rumania, the Soviet Government considers that it would not be without value to confirm the declaration it made in April this year, to the effect that the Soviet Union does not intend to appropriate any part of Rumania or to change the established social regime in that country, or, furthermore, to limit in any way whatever the independence of Rumania.

Almost at the same time, Vishinsky arrived in Rumania to overthrow the coalition government under the pressure of Russian tanks and force upon the country the Communist regime. Right now the Sovietskaya Moldavia of March 31, 1955, announced the planned displacement of the whole population of Bessarabia and Moldavia to Astrakhan, Rostof, and Pavlodar in Central Asia. One million six hundred thousand people, women and children and old people, are among those to be moved to a virgin cold region, where there is nothing but the bare frozen ground. These people are Rumanians, and the territory was incorporated in the U. S. S. R. at the peace treaty.

The same pattern was used in Hungary. In Hungary reports tell that in March 1955, while the Communists vigorously stepped up their peace campaign, the Government issued a decree stipulating that within a period of 14 days the enemies of the people be evicted from Budapest and other major cities.

The people of the captive countries have peace treaties, but they have no peace. Their countries have been looted under various pretexts. The misery and suffering of their people is hard to imagine by American standards. They have lost their freedom and are cut off from the rest of the world. Their people are subject to slavery, imprisonment, and mass deportation.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the peace the Communists offer the world.

Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Medical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government dealing with veterans' hospitals and benefits makes me think that the Commission was far more aptly named by the public in calling it the Hoover Commission than in its own formal title. The consideration shown our veterans in the Commission report, it seems to me, is comparable to that shown veterans under the Hoover administration at the time of the famed veterans bonus march on Washington.

It is true that, given the composition of the present Hoover Commission, as appointed by President Eisenhower, and the Republican leadership of the 83d Congress, we might have predicted that social welfare matters would be treated on a cold cash-and-carry basis, without regard for the human principles involved. The fact that as the Commission reports come out they go right down the line in recommending elimination or reduction of many such programs is not too surprising—in spite of the fact that the previous Commission, appointed under a Democratic administration, had adopted a much more sympathetic attitude toward social-welfare programs in general. It might be well in passing also to mention that the present Commission seems to have gone a long way out on the limb in the way of recommending changes in basic and fundamental policy without confining themselves to considerations involving organization of the executive agencies or administration of policy.

However, despite the bias of the Commission implicit in its membership, we might have hoped that they would soften their strict dollars-and-cents thinking in view of the tremendous debt the country owes to the veterans of our Armed Forces. Analysis of the report on medical services as it applies to veterans' hospitals and benefits shows, however, that this was not the case.

The Commission seems to have used as their yardstick for operation of veterans' hospital, as an example, the sole question of whether or not such a hospital can be "operated effectively and economically," with callous disregard for all the human and humane factors involved. Certainly their recommendation "that all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals be rescinded except for those now under construction or contract" shows a cynical attitude toward the situation in many areas of the country where hospital facilities are sadly lacking. The Commission calls attention to their claim that during the past 20 years all service-connected cases could have been taken care of in existing hospitals without any new construction as justification for their recommendation. Their other recommendations calling for a crackdown on hospitalization for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, coupled with this statement, give a clear indication of the Commission's feeling that the Federal Government should get out from under its strong moral and legal obligation to provide medical treatment for needy veterans unable to provide such treatment for themselves.

I know from personal experiences with hundreds of cases how difficult it is for any veteran to establish service connection for any of the ailments, physical and mental, which may attack him following his service. The Commission's recommendations for cutting down on non-service-connected cases, together with their recommendation to tighten up on the already strict criteria for establishing service connection, would work untold additional hardship on the many deserving veterans now denied adequate treatment because of faulty medical records maintained by the services, or because of the Administration's unwillingness to accept medical evidence indicating service connection unless the medical records for the veteran's period of service give proof positive that the specific ailment had its onset during the period.

This situation is particularly bad in cases where mental illnesses have occurred as an aftermath of wartime service although at the time of discharge the condition may not have been evident. In northern California alone, as an example, the existing Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital at Palo Alto has a waiting list of over 1,000 cases of veterans classified as non-service-connected crying for admission and the treatment they so badly need. In the meantime our State institutions or the families of the veterans must bear the burden. Yet, for almost 10 years the construction of another such hospital in the San Francisco area has been authorized, only to have construction delayed year after year on one excuse or another. Money has now been appropriated, but the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have not yet given the final all clear which would permit signing of contracts and start of construction. Presumably, if the Hoover Commission has its way, the construction would never be started, since, technically, these are non-service-connected cases. Yet I would like to know who would dare to stand up and say that, medical records or no, most of these cases are not the direct result of the wartime strains and stresses to which the individual veterans were subjected.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the Congress does not abrogate its own responsibility to make policy determinations on how far care for veterans should be extended. If I am any judge the Congress will give the inhumane recommendations of the Commission the treatment they deserve. I, for one, will oppose any move to put them into effect with few exceptions and will support consigning them, for the most part, to the wastebasket.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1955

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, we are daily praying that the hearts of men everywhere may be kindled with a new spirit and a stronger desire for a social order wherein dwelleth justice and righteousness, peace and good will.

Help us to realize that we cannot build a nobler civilization except by putting into it a larger measure of the spirit of friendship and fraternity.

Grant that in the great task of solving the difficult problems of human relationships there may be more of the community and cooperative spirit, the spirit of tolerance and forbearance, the spirit of sympathy and kindly judgment.

May all the members of the human family be inspired and controlled by the spirit of love which alone can bring them together and hold them together, bridging their differences and healing their dissensions.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 265. An act to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres;

S. 614. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross;

S. 748. An act to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired;

S. 824. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States;

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes;

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses, incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1398. An act to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act;

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes;

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Adair	Fallon	Patman
Ashley	Feighan	Powell
Avery	Gamble	Prouty
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gray	Reece, Tenn.
Bowler	Gregory	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Reed, N. Y.
Canfield	Heselton	Rogers, Mass.
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Shuford
Chatham	Jackson	Sieminski
Coon	Kearney	Smith, Miss.
Davidson	Knox	Steed
Dawson, Ill.	Laird	Taylor
Diggs	Lesinski	Thomson, Wyo.
Dingell	McCulloch	Utt
Dondero	Mollohan	Walter
Durham	Morrison	Westland
Eberharter	Mumma	Wigglesworth
Elliott	Nelson	Young
Evins	Norblad	
	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HAWAII AND ALASKA STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2535, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, speaking of national political platforms, as someone was during debate yesterday, I am glad to inform the Committee that the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, was chairman of the platform and resolutions committees at the 1944 and 1952 Democratic conventions, when statehood was endorsed, and Republican endorsement has come on many occasions, too.

The last States were admitted in 1912 when Arizona and New Mexico came in. Then Dwight Eisenhower had not been graduated from West Point. Another year would pass before Speaker RAYBURN would start his distinguished service which now has been continuous since 1913. Another 13 years would go by before former Speaker JOE MARTIN would start on his great congressional career. Arizona and New Mexico had long, hard fights before they won admission. It had been argued, among other things, that conferring statehood on them would be granting votes to the rattlesnakes and desert rocks. Every argument was advanced against them, advanced against almost every Western Territory, and against Alaska now. Too much land. Too few people. Too far away. A distortion of the voting representation of the more populous States—a point which has been made over and over again during the years and was even asserted most strenuously against Illinois.

Even so, it has been only 43 years since a new State was admitted. To hear some opponents of Alaska and Hawaii statehood, you might believe that at the outset a perfect Union of 48 States had been established and the proposal to add 2 more now was contrary to every principle of the Founding Fathers. Hawaii and Alaska had been marked out, had been destined for statehood even before Arizona and New Mexico were admitted. They had been incorporated even before those States were added to the Union. The act of incorporation, as the Supreme Court pointed out in the guiding Insular cases, is an implied promise of statehood to a territory, a promise which never yet has been violated. This was mentioned in a Supreme Court decision only the other day. The gentleman from California, the able chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, commented on this decision when he addressed the committee yesterday.

The Supreme Court pointed out the essential differences between Territories incorporated and those unincorporated. That should be the effective answer to those who seek to couple Alaska and Hawaii with Guam and the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico and the other islands of the seas. But even if it were not, even if it is true that some future Congress could make Guam a State of the Union, and even without first incorporating it, I submit that proposition has no relevance here. I submit that this Congress has before it the proposition of admitting Hawaii and Alaska—and nothing else. You cannot, no matter what your desires, bind a future Congress. You can refuse to accept Alaska and Hawaii now. That lies within your power. But you cannot instruct the 90th Congress, or any other Congress, not to accept Guam. My very strong personal conclusion and even conviction is that when Hawaii and Alaska come in as they surely will, now or later, that will complete the grand pattern of States, will

carry out the design set even before the turn of this century. But I cannot guarantee that even as none of you can guarantee it. I do have full faith that future Congresses will act in wisdom and in the best interests of our Nation in the light of circumstances that obtain then and not in the light of 1955.

Many of my friends have asked me if I am truly for Hawaii statehood. The answer is "yes"—a "yes" which is given without qualification. The answer was "yes" even before I had seen the islands or their people. Following two visits, my belief was fortified that Hawaii would be a strong and noble State composed of a citizenry dedicated to every fundamental principle we hold dear, a people eager to play the role in American affairs to which they are entitled and who are fully prepared by reason of long preparation to move onto another and important stage—that of statehood.

I am not one of those who feel statehood for Hawaii and Alaska more than any other reason will hold Asia from the Communists. I doubt not other and larger elements will decide that. But not for one moment will I grant that conferring of statehood will not be of real importance in swaying the minds of Asiatic people. The significance of this was correctly expressed by the Department of State on February 4 last in reporting on the combined statehood bill in these words:

> Among the more important tests applied to American policy and actions by the nations of Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America is the extent to which we manifest our support for the aspirations of dependent peoples for self-government. Inasmuch as the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union would fulfill the aspirations of the peoples of these Territories as expressed in popular referenda, it should redound to our credit among these nations of the free world. Such action would also be in stark contrast to the policies of the Soviet Union which practices a systematic denial of political liberty in the areas where it exercises control.

Now I come directly to Alaska. Once it was asserted that in seeking statehood we had nothing to offer but the patriotism of the people and scenic values. I had not known our presentation was so limited, and in fact it was not; in any case, I glory in the fact that our Alaska people are highly patriotic, and that the land is indeed one wonderful to behold. In addition, we have the solid riches which come as an endowment from nature to make Alaska a State with measureless possibilities. I shall not take your time here to name our resources one by one, or to tell you what our contributions have been to the general economy under the straightened circumstances which bound us as we tried to make proper use of them.

Alaska is an American land. That is the point which I desire to emphasize. The overwhelming majority of its citizens were either born there of American fathers and mothers, or came there from the States, or in the case of the Eskimo and the Indians and the Aleuts have an original American heritage all of us can envy.

We are as every other western Territory—encumbered and bound down by the rules which apply to a territory and which prevent the free operation of our private enterprise system—the fact is that the restraints on Alaska have been even tighter. Statehood would in large measure remove them—would give us land, would permit us to make all our local laws instead of having constantly to come to the Congress and to the Federal executive department.

Doubt has been expressed as to our ability to finance ourselves. My reply is that will be our job. If we do not find statehood's early path paved with roses—and I do not think we will—I ask you to ask yourself if your own State finds its fiscal sailing always fair—and I convey to you a sincere belief that the hardy, pioneering persevering Americans who have had the courage and the fortitude to work away at opening up this, our last great northwestern frontier, will not be cowed by any hazards statehood may present.

There it lies ready for the great development which will come only with statehood. You have the power this week to speed Alaska, and Hawaii, on the way to statehood.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I suppose if you are able to finance statehood in Alaska, it will be unnecessary to have the $48 million, mentioned on page 63 of the bill as coming from the Treasury of the United States, and also the $30 million mentioned on page 64 as coming from the Treasury of the United States. Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. We shall be very happy to accept those grants incorporated in the bill that come to us over a period of years because it was the judgment of the committee that it should be done to make what was demanded—a so-called equitable bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I wish the gentleman from Florida would also include in the RECORD the amount of Federal money that goes into the State of Florida for rivers, canals, and all sorts of other purposes. Would the gentleman be able to enlighten the House as to how much Florida has received from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BARTLETT. I refer that to the gentleman from Florida. I suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota that ought to be in the RECORD, too.

The bill before you is a fair bill. In practically all essential features it is the same bill approved by the other body last year. It was examined by the committee over there, and reexamined by the Senate; it has been closely examined by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It has been said that in 1955 we should not be so venturesome as to admit as a State an island group far removed from our western coast; or to admit as a State a Territory to the north and west of Washington, the most northwesterly of our States, with a foreign nation between.

It has been said that this would be too daring, too much of a break with precedent, too much of everything if we were to allow Hawaii and Alaska to be the 49th and 50th States.

I have remarked that although it was only 43 years ago since Arizona and New Mexico came in, men who lead us now were only youngsters then. Since then there have been two World Wars. The face of the world has been changed—and more than once. There have been revolutions—social, economic, and political. The Europe of 1955 is far different from that of 1912; and great changes have come to Asia, and elsewhere. The United States has altered somewhat too. Every concept we held in 1912 relating to foreign involvement has changed. Then we were, we thought, secure behind our ramparts, safe from foreign intervention and certainly with no intention of becoming involved in the affairs of other nations.

Since then our power has grown. Our strength has increased. We lead that part of the world which believes as we do. We have accepted many a challenge, dared many an adventure, in absolute breaks with our past. We met each test when it came.

In 1912 the airplane was an uncertain machine; the automobile barely past the development stage. The battleship ruled the seas. Now all has changed and we ourselves have changed. The A-bomb has come, and the H-bomb is here. We accept them; if not in our stride, nevertheless we accept them as realities which must be lived with. I suppose that history does not record another 43-year period during which the old has so given way to the new, and in which man's ideas have been so basically shifted. I submit to you that in view of all this it would not be so very venturesome to add Hawaii and Alaska to the list of States. After all, by so doing you will only be putting the seal on the compacts informally entered into with these Territories long ago. You will be shaping the future to the advantage of these United States; you will be placing on the flag not only two new stars but you will be fixing the ones already there in more secure positions. You will be carrying out the spirit of representative government that has animated this country from its founding and you will be doing that which will reflect credit and glory on you individually and on this 84th Congress.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, with one exception, the arguments that are being advanced by the opponents of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii are the same objections that have been advanced against the 35 States that have been admitted to the Union since it was formed from the original 13.

The most popular argument in opposition is that there are not enough people in the Territories which are candidates for statehood. When those of us who support statehood point out that Alaska and Hawaii have more population today

than a great many States had at the time of their admission, the opponents of statehood reply that it is still unfair to the populous States to let a lesser number of people have equal Senate representation. They bring up an astounding array of figures to prove how unfair it is to give Alaska and Hawaii 2 Senators each when the other States with larger populations have only 2. Had we followed this concept from the earliest days, we still would have only 13 States.

We would still be a fringe of States along the Atlantic seaboard. No new State was ever admitted that did not have a smaller population than most of the States already in the Union. And yet by the very practice of admitting Territories with relatively small populations has our Union grown to its present greatness. However, this logic does not seem to satisfy the opponents of statehood. They say that we made a mistake in admitting a number of States, but that nothing can be done about it. The States are already in. But there is no use, they say, to add more States with a small population. I think the argument provided in the Constitution that two Senators represent an area, regardless of population, and that Representatives represent the population, should be sufficient. However, let it be pointed out that the population of no State is fixed and permanent. It seems unlikely that the population of Hawaii, which is now larger than four States of the Union, will increase greatly in the future—although it could increase substantially. But in the case of Alaska, we have the interesting comparison — and contrast — between Scandinavia and Finland in the same latitudes as Alaska. These four North European nations have ideas of freedom which correspond with ours. They have approximately the same climates, and no greater endowment of natural resources—if indeed their endowment is as great. They have an area three-fourths the size of Alaska, yet they have a population of 16 million people. Nor would anyone assert that the 16 million people of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland have not erected a fine, high type of civilization, and have not worked out a stable and a going economy. Alaska can and should be the equivalent of Scandinavia and Finland in the Western Hemisphere. If Alaska is granted statehood and freed from the binding restrictions imposed on it by Territorial status, Alaska, too, can and will become a great, populous State. Are there those who would challenge this forecast? Let us recall that Senator Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, opposing the admission of California, over a hundred years ago, said:

> With all the extent of California, it will never sustain one-half the population of the small State of Ohio, not one-half. The population will be very small indeed.

I need not point out that California today has become the second State in the Union in population, and that at the present rate of increase it will soon pass New York and become the first. The same argument of insufficient population in a new aspirant for statehood has been voiced again and again. And again and again time has proved it groundless. Surely there is nothing in the population argument that should deter us from admitting Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

Second, there is the argument based on the composition of population. It would be painful and embarrassing to recall the unkind things that were said about the people inhabiting the great State of Florida at the time its admission was proposed. It would be laughable today to recall what was said about the so-called wild men of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States included in the Louisiana Purchase at the time it was made. It would be unkind to recall that among the arguments voiced against the admission of New Mexico and Arizona was that a large number of the inhabitants were Spanish-speaking. Yet at the very time these arguments were advanced, our Nation was building its strength through the very variety of ethnic stocks which had come, were coming, and were still to come across the Atlantic, to diversify and strengthen the composition of the American people. Of different racial origins, they combined and fused into a strong amalgam of common purpose and common ideals. It is one of the major factors in America's greatness. It will be even more so when we add one more ethnic component to our family of States, in admitting the part Caucasian, part Polynesian, part oriental citizens who have shown themselves to be such good Americans in Hawaii.

Third, there is the argument that the resources are insufficient to support a State. It is being alleged against Alaska now. It was alleged frequently in the past in the case of other territories seeking statehood. In the case of Arizona and New Mexico, eloquent opposition spokesmen pointed out that the Southwest was a desert, that it was nothing but sand and sagebrush, cactus and jackrabbits, that these never could support a State. How fantastic then to raise the same argument against Alaska, with its vast forests, it fisheries, its minerals, its untapped waterpower resources—far greater than those of many long-established and prosperous States. I think we can safely dismiss these time-honored and frequently refuted arguments.

There is another argument, however, which is slightly though not wholly new. It is the argument of noncontiguity. It is said by opponents of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, that it would be establishing a new precedent to go outside the limits of the 48 States and take in areas that do not actually touch the main body of States, but are separated from them either by a land mass of a foreign country or by the international waters of the open ocean. In the case of Alaska, it is the 700 miles of Canada which these opponents view as a serious obstacle to Alaskan statehood. In the case of Hawaii, it is the 2,100 miles of Pacific Ocean which they view as a barrier to the inclusion of Hawaii. In their zeal to pursue this train of thought, these opponents of statehood become more and more fanciful in their alarms. They say if we include Alaska and Hawaii as States, we shall then be obliged to include Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, the Virgin Islands.

This argument has no merit. Alaska and Hawaii are the only two incorporated Territories. The act of incorporation, according to Supreme Court decisions, binds them permanently into the Union, and provides only the two alternatives—to retain them in their present colonial status as second-class citizens or to admit them to the full equality, under the traditional American pattern, of statehood.

Now in the case of Puerto Rico, the people of that island desired, sought, and obtained an entirely new arrangement which was appropriate to their economic condition and their traditional culture. Puerto Rico's difficult problem has been solved for the time being.

The United States wisely applied to the island, the principle of self-determination, and put an end to more than four centuries of colonialism, first for four centuries under Spain, then for half a century under this country.

But the Puerto Rican formula is neither appropriate to Alaska and Hawaii nor is it legally possible. Above all, the Americans in those two Territories will have nothing of it. They do not wish to be relieved of any tax burdens. They wish to share with the citizens of the 48 existing States all the burdens and responsibilities of statehood together with the rights that go with equality.

In the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa—tiny areas with permanently limited and small populations—the United States has already made an excellent start toward giving them the maximum measure of self-government and improving their economic conditions. To mention them as potential candidates for statehood is not realistic.

This argument of the danger of including as States areas other than Hawaii and Alaska has been carried to the point of absurdity. Opponents of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii have mentioned as potential future applicants for statehood such political entities as Okinawa, Formosa, New Zealand, Australia, Newfoundland, any or all of the Central or South American Republics, and virtually every country on earth that might want to join us. Could anything be more far-fetched? The point would not even be worth discussing had not a number of very estimable and respected Members of Congress so argued in the past.

Actually, it should be made clear that there are only two possible applicants for inclusion in the family of States. These two are incorporated Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. They are the only 2 candidates because they are the only 2 incorporated Territories and their history, in its relation to the United States reaffirms the reality that they—and only they—have been destined for statehood. An incorporated Territory, as numerous Supreme Court decisions have made clear, is, an inchoate State. It has only one future, namely statehood, unless the Congress should decide to keep it indefinitely in a colonial status. This is scarcely a desirable prospect—indeed it is an unthinkable one. The status of an incorporated Territory can-

not be diminished; it cannot be altered, except by promotion to statehood. There are only two alternatives.

Now, actually, if we are going to be realistic, we will concede that there are only two more States to be admitted to the Union. They are Alaska and Hawaii. None of the other possessions of the United States can, by the remotest stretch of the imagination be considered candidates for incorporation. And if they were candidates for incorporation, the decision would be up to future Congresses which need take no such step—and are not likely to take it. The same is true of the foreign areas which have been at various times imaginatively alluded to as potential aspirants for statehood. Of course I will admit that the word "never" is far-reaching. No one can, in this rapidly changing world, say what changes may not be brought about in a hundred years, 500 years, a thousand years, or longer. But as far as the human eye of this generation can foresee, we shall be closing the books on statehood if and when we admit Alaska and Hawaii. We shall have an even 50 States. We shall have an even membership of 100 in the Senate. That is a good round number with which to conclude.

The argument of noncontiguity is also nullified in other ways. It is nullified by modern invention and the accelerated speed with which that modern invention is producing profound changes on this planet.

When the Original Thirteen States formed our Union, transportation and communication had not changed since the days of ancient Greece. That was still true when the first additional States—Vermont in 1791, Kentucky in 1792, and Tennessee in 1796, were admitted to the Union. The fastest method of travel on land was by horseback or by the horse-drawn vehicle. The fastest method of locomotion by sea was by sailboat. The fastest method of communication was the handwritten missive dispatched by horseback rider, horse-drawn stagecoach, or sailing vessel. The steamboat, invented by Robert Fulton, did not come into being till the end of the first decade of the 19th century. Train travel began over a quarter century later.

Right now we can reach Alaska and Hawaii from the Nation's Capital—either by mail or in person—far more quickly than we could reach any but the immediately adjacent States during most of the 175 years of our history. And with jet propulsion on its way, the time required is being steadily reduced.

In the early days of our Republic, when Philadelphia was the Nation's Capital, it required several days to a week to reach it from even the western part of the great State of Pennsylvania, or from the northern part of adjacent New York It required 2 weeks or more to reach the Capital from the States of New Hampshire and Georgia. The horse or the horse-drawn coach, or coastal or river sailing vessel was the only method of locomotion.

When the new States across the Alleghenies began to be admitted, Kentucky in 1792, Tennessee in 1796, Ohio in 1803, it still required 1 to 3 weeks to make the journey from their wildernesses to the National Capital. Mail took much longer.

When California was admitted in 1850, it was a matter of many weeks across the country by pony express or on horseback, and equally as long for those who decided to go by sail or steam or a combination of sail and steam around Cape Horn. These conditions still prevailed when Oregon was admitted in 1859.

Even when the last two States, New Mexico and Arizona, were admitted in 1912, it required 4 days by the trains of that period to reach the Capital.

Air travel has greatly reduced distance. We shall shortly reckon flying time from Alaska and Hawaii not in terms of less than a day, as it is now, but in terms of a morning, an afternoon, or an overnight flight.

But there is still another factor, which has not merely reduced but has annihilated distance, and has at the same time gone far to annihilate the argument of noncontiguity. That is the instant communication by radio telephone. Not only is it possible to telephone from virtually any part of Alaska and Hawaii to the National Capital or to reach any part of them from Washington, but telephonic communication is possible en route. Communication, in short, for the first time in the history of the admission of States is not only instantaneous, but potentially continuous. Contiguity, as a prerequisite to statehood, has become a wholly obsolete phrase even while it is being coined.

Those who base their objections to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii on the argument of noncontiguity appear to see a certain physical strength and symbolism in our land mass. They feel there is something novel, unprecedented—and by that token perilous—in the inclusion of these two areas because they do not physically touch the existing 48 States at any one point. Let me quote, in answer to this, what Collier's magazine wrote in its leading editorial in the issue of March 18 last:

This argument—

And I quote—

was blown out of the water by a series of explosions beginning at Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941, and culminating with the first hydrogen blast beyond the Urals. * * *

The events of the past 13 years have thoroughly gutted the concept of the 48 States as a smug fortress with an ocean for walls. A nation's strength, in this age, is an amalgam of many elements—scientific and military wherewithal, the speed and mobility of its striking power; its economic know-how and stability, its access to far-flung vital raw materials; and perhaps most important of all, the faith it inspires in its people.

Hawaii and Alaska, in the atomic age, are part and parcel of this pattern of American strength. They are military outposts of incalculable value. They are reservoirs of vast and varied natural resources. And they are communities of people—citadels of great potential spiritual strength. What we make of them is up to us. What we have made of them up to now, compared with their potentials, is very little.

That is the end of the quotation from Collier's editorial, and I hope that the entire editorial will be read by every Member of Congress.

No; the noncontiguity objection falls out finally with the fallout of atomic and postatomic explosions, and the ever-increasing speedup that science has wrought.

Alaska and Hawaii will be the first States admitted in the air age, the radio age, the atomic age. They admirably fulfill the added requirements of this age as well as the old unchanging requirements of faith in our way of life, and works to prove that faith. Their inclusion in our Union will strengthen our beloved country, will extend its symbolism, will reaffirm rather than impair its most vital tradition.

I respectfully submit that the decision the House of Representatives must make today is a bold one—but I do not see how we can resist the march of history.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, there are two prime consequences of this bill which deserve our serious attention.

The first result of the enactment of this bill would be the transfer to Hawaii and Alaska of an excessive and disproportionate power in the United States Senate at the expense of the people of the 48 States.

The second effect of this bill is that we will be giving aid and encouragement to the strongest, most militant, and best disciplined single organization in Hawaii, the Communist Party.

Reduced to its fundamentals, statehood would grant to Hawaii and Alaska 4 Senate seats out of a prospective 100 seats in the United States Senate. The 1950 census states the population of Hawaii to be 499,000 and that of Alaska 128,000. The combined population is 628,000. The average representation will be 1 Senator for each 157,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States, on the other hand, only possess the average representation of 1 Senator for each 1,589,000 persons.

Statehood will entitle Hawaii and Alaska one twenty-fifth of the total membership in our United States Senate. Yet their combined population is only one two-hundred-and-forty-second of the United States. Thus, the inhabitants of Hawaii and Alaska will enjoy representation in the United States Senate more than 10 times greater than the average representation of the people of the 48 States.

To equal the voting power of 1 voter of these Territories in the election of a United States Senator will require the votes of 33 voters in California, 6 voters in Connecticut, 27 voters in Illinois, 15 voters in New Jersey, and 11 voters in Missouri.

This excessive representation is acquired by these Territories only by the

corresponding reduction of the powers of the people of the 48 States.

The disproportionate advantage of Hawaii and Alaska would also apply in the presidential elections. Upon admission these States would have a total of 7 electoral votes, an average of 1 vote for each 89,000 residents. This compares with 1 electoral vote in the 48 States for each 287,000 citizens. The average voting power will be 3.2 times greater for every voter in Hawaii and Alaska than in the 48 States.

To equal the voting power of 1 voter in these Territories, in the election of a President, will require the votes of 3 voters in Alabama, 3½ voters in Indiana, 3½ voters in Michigan, 3 voters in Wisconsin, and 3 voters in Oklahoma.

Again, this power can be transferred, only by the reduction of the voting rights of the citizens of the 48 States.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Adair	Feighan	Powell
Avery	Fogarty	Prouty
Bolton, Oliver P.	Forrester	Reece, Tenn.
	Gamble	Reed, Ill.
Bowler	Gray	Reed, N. Y.
Boykin	Gubser	Riehlman
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	St. George
Canfield	Heselton	Shuford
Celler	Holifield	Sieminski
Chatham	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Knox	Steed
Diggs	Laird	Taylor
Dingell	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Dixon	McDowell	Thomson, Wyo.
Dondero	Mollohan	Utt
Durham	Morrison	Vursell
Eberharter	Mumma	Walter
Edmondson	Nelson	Westland
Elliott	Norblad	Withrow
Fallon	Patman	Young

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2535, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 369 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, it is contended that the power of two seats each for Hawaii and Alaska is sought only for the protection of their interests. Unfortunately, the voting powers of these Senators cannot be limited to measures which affect these Territories alone. The senatorial power proposed in this bill would, of necessity, include the power to decide upon, and to vote against, the interests of each of the 48 States.

It is a recognized maxim that power without corresponding accountability and responsibility invites abuse and maladministration.

For example: Alaska, with 2 Senators, would possess one-fiftieth of the power to pass on appropriations of $60 billion per year. That share of power to spend is $1,200,000,000. Yet Alaska's responsibility for the collection of taxes, as represented by her 1954 Federal taxes, is only $48 million or 1,000 times less than the total budget. Alaska's Senators would be accountable to only 128,000 people—27,000 voters—although the $1,200,000,000—her share of the spending power—is collected from more than 3 million people.

It is contended that Hawaii is entitled to statehood by reason of the fact that her population is greater than that of either Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, or Delaware.

It should be noted that each of these States was admitted before the ratification of the 17th amendment. This amendment fundamentally altered the basis for the allotment of two Senators to each State. The change in the mode of selection of Senators, to that of popular suffrage, totally destroyed the justification for equal representation, that of two Senators for each State.

This 17th amendment recognized the trend toward a national government and away from the Federal union of sovereign States. No State has been admitted to the Union since the adoption of the 17th amendment. Thus, other States furnish no valid precedent for the admission, today, of territories on the basis of representation by two Senators in the United States Senate.

Mr. Chairman, the correct and the equitable principle for the distribution of power in a national legislative body, elected by direct popular suffrage, is that of representation proportional to population. The apportionment of Senators on any other basis violates the basic concepts of constitutional representative government.

There is ample authority in the deliberations at the Constitutional Convention for the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would admit States, hereafter, upon the basis of representation in the United States Senate in accordance with population.

At the time of the adoption of our Constitution, the largest State, Virginia, had a population of 747,000; the smallest State, Delaware, had 59,000; a ratio of about 12 to 1. Today, the ratio between the largest and the smallest State is about 100 to 1. The gentlemen of that Convention had the foresight to make our Constitution amendable to provide for this type of contingency.

The convention specifically deleted, by a vote of 9 to 2, a proposal that new States be admitted on the same terms with the original States. In fact, article V of the Constitution is one of the clauses which cannot be amended. It provides in part, that no State can be deprived of its power to consent to accept less than equal suffrage in the Senate.

This bill should be laid aside, until such time as Congress shall, have had an opportunity, to give consideration to a constitutional amendment that would either limit the senatorial representation of States to be admitted or one that would admit States by the same procedure as is required for the adoption of a constitutional amendment.

COMMUNISM

The Hawaiian statehood bill was last considered by this House on March 10, 1953. Since then, there have been startling disclosures of communistic controls in Hawaii. Although the Communists began their activities in 1937, the full force of their power did not become apparent until recent events.

In attempting to assess the extent of the influence of communism in Hawaii, we should keep in mind that Hawaii can be fairly compared in population and area to an average congressional district. I am sure that every Member of this House would view with greatest alarm the prospect of having the same degree of communistic power in their districts, as now exists in Hawaii.

In Hawaii, communistic power is centered in and its influence emanates from two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—the ILWU—and the United Public Workers Union—the UPW.

The ILWU has a membership of 25,000. About 2,000 of them are stevedores and dock workers. The balance work on plantations and in various type industries. This union dominates and is the leader in union activities in Hawaii. The international president of the ILWU is Harry Bridges. He has been cited time after time as a Communist. Next to William Z. Foster, who heads the Communist Party in the United States, Harry Bridges is the most powerful figure in the party.

Jack Hall is the regional director of the ILWU in Hawaii. He is one of seven defendants convicted by Federal prosecution on June 19, 1953, for conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government. His photo is the first one on the left in the newspaper account on the blackboard.

These convicted Communists are on bail awaiting their appeal. Although it is almost 2 years since their conviction, they continue in the same communistic activities today, unhampered. A newspaper account on the blackboard quotes Jack Hall as taking credit for the sweeping political victory in last fall's Hawaii elections. In fact, one territorial senator went to Jack Hall's aid as a character witness during his trial and another senator furnished bail for him.

The UPW is another cloak to cover communistic activity in Hawaii. It has a membership of 2,000 government public workers. They include government employees in the jails, fire department, and the public works. This union is headed by known and publicly identified Communists. It collaborates 100 percent with the ILWU in the fields of labor, politics, and communistic education.

It is common knowledge in Hawaii that both unions are completely communistic controlled.

The CIO expelled both the ILWU and the UPW in 1950 on the ground that they were Communist controlled.

We can fairly judge the control of the Communists over the ILWU and the adherence and the sympathy of the membership for the communistic cause by re-

ferring to the dock strike on June 19, 1953. Within an hour after the jury had convicted Jack Hall and his coconspirators, 24,000 members of the ILWU went on strike. These strikers even refused to load military cargo for Korea. The Navy-Army personnel had to take over the work of loading ships when the ILWU strike paralyzed the docks, sugar, and pineapple plantations.

This strike was not called because of any legitimate labor dispute. It was a strike to demonstrate the power and to attempt to intimidate our governmental processes.

This board contains newspaper accounts of this strike in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and in the Honolulu Advertiser. They are the leading newspapers in Hawaii.

The Honolulu Advertiser refers to this strike of June 19, 1953, in its editorial as "one of the ugliest demonstrations of bad citizenship on record. Their defiance of due process of trial by jury constitutes a direct threat to the maintenance of law and order."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin uses the following language in its editorial on June 22, 1953, in reference to the strike:

> The other, of course, is the determination of the ILWU leaders to mold the thinking as well as the actions of its members. That determination has carried the ILWU to the extent of taking union workers off the job within hours after the jury of 12 good American citizens had given its honest verdict. But even the shock of anger does not justify this walk-off action, which is in effect a rebellion against the American jury system.

The outstanding local Hawaiian newspapers, the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser, each of them indict and convict both the leadership and the 25,000 members of the ILWU of knowing, willful, communistic, and rebellious defiance of lawful authority.

This was not the first Communist sympathy strike by the ILWU. In August 1950, this same ILWU staged a strike to protest the jailing of Harry Bridges, its international president, in connection with his conviction for perjury arising out of communistic charges. A newspaper account of this strike is on the blackboard.

The Commission on Subversive Activities for the Territory of Hawaii is composed of 4 Republicans and 3 Democrats. It submitted its report of 2 years of investigation, containing 300 pages, to the Hawaiian Legislature on February 28, 1955. This is a copy of the report.

On page 218 of this report, this Commission had this to say about the UPW:

> It is the considered opinion of this Commission that this control (referring to control of public workers by the Communist Party) UPW presents a potentially grave security problem in case of a national emergency, and that this problem has been intensified by the coalition of the Communist leadership of the UPW with the Communist leadership of the ILWU.

Now this Commission is composed of men who know conditions in Hawaii. They are the best informed authority on the subject of communism there. They are telling us, in plain language, that one of our most strategic outposts is honeycombed with traitors and saboteurs. They are serving notice that in event of war, these Communists could and would paralyze the island's public works and her economy, and pose a serious threat to our military operations.

Let us look into the propaganda and the educational apparatus of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

The Communists publish three different newspapers in Hawaii. One is an ILWU publication, another is the Honolulu Record, and the third is a Filipino language newspaper.

A copy of the Honolulu Record is on the board. Five of the convicted Communists are associated with this newspaper as owners, editors, or employees. Both the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Territorial Subversive Commission have branded this newspaper as part of the worldwide Communist propaganda apparatus.

All of its writers are Communists. The record of their communistic affiliations are contained on the board.

Since the conviction of the 5 persons associated with this newspaper, the anniversary edition has grown from 48 pages in 1952 to 72 pages in 1954. The advertisements in the paper increased from 2,137 ads in one issue in 1953, to 2,586 ads in the one comparable issue in 1954. Ninety-eight percent of these advertisers, these 2,500 people, must be regarded as part of the hard core of the communistic reserve forces in Hawaii.

The increasing public acceptance of this paper and the recognition of the political power of the Communist Party can be judged from these figures:

In the 1952 elections, 38 candidates for public office advertised in the Honolulu Record. In the 1954 elections, 62 candidates—in elections for 76 public offices—placed ads in this publicly known Communist newspaper.

As part of its communistic educational program, the ILWU in July 1954 established 16 book-lending libraries in Hawaii. Their books have been examined by the Commission on Subversive Activities and are found to be uniformly subversive. They teach the classic doctrine of class conflict and revolution. An example is a book which is entitled "Strike Strategy." It is a handbook on mass strike techniques which apply military theory to the conduct of labor disputes.

The paid educational director of the ILWU is an identified Communist. Within the last year this director engineered a very clever arrangement with the Library of Hawaii, a public governmental library. He has placed with the library a series of communistic films. They became available there for public use and propaganda. In return the library is storing and shipping them on schedules furnished by the ILWU, maintaining records, and repairing the films. Under this scheme the taxpayers pay for serving this communistic propaganda outlet.

This same educational director systematically bombards the teachers of the public schools with communistic literature. He recommends books and propaganda courses to be taught to the children by the teachers.

Four radio stations are regularly scheduled every day to hammer the current Moscow propaganda line to the people of Hawaii. These radio broadcasts are made in the English, Filipino, and Japanese languages daily and systematically. The daily schedules are contained on the blackboard.

The Commission on Subversive Activities reports that the Communist Party spends $200,000 annually for propaganda purposes. It has succeeded in inculcating a whole generation of Hawaiian people with communistic doctrines.

Let us see how far the Communist Party has progressed in their political objectives. Jack Hall, the convicted Communist, coordinated and directed the union support for his candidates in the last election of November 1954. In 7 senate contests, the ILWU endorsed 6 candidates; 5 of the ILWU-endorsed candidates won. With the holdover senators, the ILWU-endorsed senators constitute a majority in the senate.

In the Territorial house of representatives, 22 ILWU candidates were elected out of a total membership of 30. In the county elections, 32 ILWU candidates won in 38 contests.

It is an accepted fact in Hawaii that the ILWU and the Communist Party not only influence but also dominate the Territorial legislature. Only 2 weeks ago, Newton Miyagi, an identified Communist ILWU leader, stated publicly that more than one-third of both houses of the legislature committed themselves to the ILWU and UPW communistic legislative programs.

On March 4, the New York Daily Mirror printed an article by one of its writers, Lee Mortimer, who was making a study of conditions there. He wrote, in reference to the Territorial legislature:

> In its first few days, the Red dominated majority disclosed that its program would be:
> 1. To destroy the present police commission and turn the department over to the ILWU.
> 2. To exempt the ILWU property from taxes.
> 3. To invalidate leases and force the sale of properties to the tenants.
> 4. To repeal the 1950 dock seizure law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the dock seizure law was enacted to prevent a prolonged Communist dock strike which could starve out the island.

A copy of this article is on the board.

A copy of the April 6, 1955, issue of the Peoples Daily Worker, a Communist newspaper published in California, is on the board. It prints the account of the present of a gavel from Charles Kauhane, Speaker of the Hawaiian House of Representatives, to Harry Bridges, the ILWU president.

In March 1955, the Territorial legislature passed a bill to exempt the ILWU Memorial Association from real estate taxes. This association is a real estate holding company for the ILWU. It houses the headquarters and offices of the ILWU. Seven out of 10 of its incorporators are identified Communists.

On April 24, 1955, the Communist ILWU publicly threatened the Hawaiian Legislature with a mass retaliation strike on the island if the elected legislators

did not keep their political promises to the ILWU.

Here is what Senator Dillingham said on the floor of the Senate on Saturday, April 23, 1955:

> It's time the people woke up and found out what we are dealing with. The people should know that the only thing that stands between ourselves and chaos is the position of the governor. If he were subject to the same pressures of the ILWU, we would be closer to a satellite of the Soviet Union than a territory of the United States and I'm not kidding.

On the same day Senator Tsukiyama said this on the senate floor:

> The thing that I'm alarmed about is the fact, that there is a sense of fear. When legislators seem to be afraid of any particular group, we are going to run into a very precarious situation. I feel that in order to make good legislation, we must free ourselves from this sense of fear.

The fear that this senator was referring to is the same fear that exists behind the Iron Curtain. The fear of an organized merciless, cold conspiracy that would resort to physical, economic and any other measure to retaliate against those who oppose it.

Gentlemen, the last session of the Hawaiian Legislature was a Communist holiday. They passed bill after bill on the orders of the Communist ILWU. Yet, not one anti-Communist or anti-subversion bill was reported out of any committee.

By reason of years of systematic undermining and propaganda, the Communists have made themselves and their doctrines acceptable to the people of Hawaii.

If this measure is enacted Hawaii will become entitled to 2 Members in this House and 2 Members in our Senate. Who will be elected by the citizens of Hawaii to represent them in Congress? The answer is obvious. The Members will, in all probability, come from the present Territorial Legislature. They have the political background and the support of the ILWU. This prospect is not a happy one. This bill will guarantee giving Harry Bridges 2 seats in this House and 2 seats in the United States Senate.

Statehood at this time would only serve to deliver the Hawaiian State government to the Communist Party on a silver platter. It would grant state sovereignty and free that Territory from Federal restraint. It would clothe the Communist power with the protection of the United States Constitution. It would completely turn over to the Communist Party the police force, the educational system and the public works of the island.

Our defeat of this bill will serve notice to the people of Hawaii that this Congress will not countenance a Communist police state anywhere within our boundaries. It will, also, serve to give encouragement to the very many good, loyal Americans in Hawaii who, up to now, have been fighting a courageous but losing fight against communism on the islands. Or defeat of this measure may electrify and arouse the citizenry there to make a supreme effort to free that Territory once and for all from the Communist octopus.

The Hawaiian Commission report of February 1955, states:

> The principal barrier to the Communists' efforts to create a revolutionary situation in the islands and seize power, is the presence here of large military forces.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is giving a very fine, able, and earnest report. I know he has strong convictions on the Communist infiltration not only in Hawaii but in this country. I hold in my hand a FBI report of March 30, 1951, showing the total number of Communists in the United States—43,217 at that time. In New York State, there are 20,575—more than half the number of Communists in the United States. Then, in Hawaii, it shows that Hawaii had 36 at that time. Does the gentleman not feel the fact that Hawaii moved promptly to convict the seven known Communists might very well be very much in their favor?

Mr. PILLION. You cannot determine the power and the influence of Communists by numbers. For instance, in Russia, when Lenin took over from the Kerenski government, the Communists only had 80,000 adherents and only 23,000 party members and candidates, and probably only 2,000 top flight Communists, but they, too, have over 140 million people.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What is the gentleman's own State doing about the 22,575 known Communists in the State of New York? Have they convicted anyone?

Mr. PILLION. I regret that there is one Communist in New York. They have paseed legislation there and they are trying to do what they can to clean out the educational system. But it is difficult to fight whether it is in New York or Hawaii except that the difference is that they do not control the political machinery and the government in New York anywhere near to the extent that they control it in Hawaii where seizure is imminent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman complained about the foreign language broadcasts in Hawaii. Does the gentleman realize that in New York City there are 409 broadcasts, 39 of them in different foreign languages.

Mr. PILLION. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are you doing anything about that?

Mr. PILLION. Doctor, we are not complaining here about foreign language broadcasts, but I am complaining about these foreign language broadcasts in Hawaii which are completely communistic. I am not complaining about foreign language broadcasts. In fact, I think culturally, they are very fine.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Three of these New York Communists just the other day were ordered by the so-called International Court of Justice to be reinstated in the United Nations or be paid $43,000.

Mr. PILLION. That is a shameful situation.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how the State of New York can get rid of these Communists as long as they are protected by the United Nations and subsidiary organizations.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I regret that I was unable to be present in the Chamber during the earlier part of the gentleman's remarks because I was in committee. I wonder if the gentleman has called attention to the evidence which was produced before our committee that the Territory of Hawaii is under a three-man police commissionership, and that the Communists have infiltrated to such an extent that one of these three commissioners was a known Communist.

Mr. PILLION. On top of that, they are trying now to take the police power out the commission's hands and place them in the islands where they have complete communistic control. They do not have quite enough control on the main island and they are attempting to split it up so that they will have complete control of these counties.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman tell the Members what the editorial position of the two Hawaiian newspapers is on the question of statehood? I think the gentleman referred to the Honolulu Star Bulletin and the Record.

Mr. PILLION. I think they are both for statehood, as everyone else, because they recognize the increased political power that statehood would give those people—the sugar interests and all the other interests. Of course, the Federal Government is the biggest business in Hawaii.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Will the gentleman state where are the headquarters of the ILWU?

Mr. PILLION. It is in California.

Mr. UDALL. As a Member who sat with the gentleman on the committee which heard these hearings, I have been particularly disturbed by this presentation, because I think it creates a feeling of alarm, perhaps designedly so. The main conclusion of the gentleman is that there is a growing influence of communism in Hawaii?

Mr. PILLION. That is a fact.

Mr. UDALL. Is it not a fact that the only facts before our committee, determined by the Department of Justice, the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. WALTER and Mr. VELDE, people who ought to know, is that the influence of communism is declining?

Mr. PILLION. The greatest specialists are right there. You do not find out about communism on Waikiki Beach or in the fine hotels. You find it out in the planting fields and in the shops. The greatest experts are the gentlemen

appointed by the territorial legislature who are intimately acquainted with the problem and who have presented a 300-page report saying that communism is on the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has again expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] on the able presentation he has made here. He brought the same facts before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and also the Committee on Rules. I will be glad to take part of the blame for the quorum call that brought many Members back to the House, because I think it is a very important matter, and I wanted you to hear the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is going to make an important speech. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present; a quorum.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue my remarks regarding the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] to say that I pay tribute to him for the great amount of work he has done on these bills and on the problem that I think is one of the greatest we face in this Nation. I want to predicate my remarks by praising two wonderful people, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON], and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

I have opposed statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, either or both. I do want to say, however, that I have the deepest respect for these two fine people, and I want to pay tribute to the great work they have done in trying to bring about statehood, although I have opposed it. I know they are sincere and certainly I would not challenge them for 1 minute as to their sincerity.

I also would like to pay tribute to the late Joseph Farrington, who was a delegate in this House from Hawaii, and who did such great work in the committee and in the House. But we are not interested today so much in personalities as we should be in issues. That is what I want to talk to you about.

Much has been said about the long hearings on this bill and the great understanding that has been had by everyone, of the problems involved. This matter has been brought before Congress, of course, at every session for many years. It has been said, facetiously I believe, that the Interior Committee was making another annual trip to the floor of Congress to present the Hawaiian bill. Let us look at the situation and see where we are.

The last session, of course, was really my first primary experience with this legislation. At that time the bill was brought to the floor and I offered several amendments. I was mistreated verbally, I felt, at the time by some remarks by certain members of the committee who outranked me and indicated that I was offering those amendments for the simple purpose of delaying the bill, in other words, that I was prompted by ulterior motives. Of course, I was not prompted by ulterior motives as was proven later, for if it had not been for my amendments I doubt if the bill would have passed; and I am sorry I offered those amendments, because I believe without them the bill would not have passed. But the bill passed the House of Representatives and I was scared almost to death for fear it might also pass the Senate. Nevertheless, the bill is before us again, reported out by the committee, not perfected but recommending 56 amendments. I mean that the bill has been written and rewritten; it has been argued and reargued—yet they tell you there are no problems now. They tell you that we worked out all these things, yet they bring a bill in that has been up time and time again, it has been argued in every forum of this Nation, it has been argued in Hawaii, it has been argued in Alaska, yet a bill cannot be written at this time without requiring the committee hearing it in this Congress to add 56 amendments before it could be acceptable to the same committee that has heard it many times and, further, we are told that there are other amendments that must be added to this bill before it will be acceptable to the President of the United States.

I point this out to you merely to show you that this is not a matter to be taken lightly; it is one of the most serious pieces of legislation that has been before the United States Congress in a long time, and one of the most important that will ever be before this honorable body. I want you to stop and think about the situation as it has been brought through these several years and understand what the problems are and what the problems may be next year. You cannot pass this bill without meeting problems never before confronted by any country in the world.

Now, I want to move on to some of the arguments that have been advanced for statehood and I want to say in the beginning that all of these arguments could be applied singly or in total to any other territory just as well. You could bring any territory of the United States in as a State under any one of the arguments that has been presented, or all of them with one exception. The one that might not apply and that is the argument that Alaska and Hawaii are incorporated Territories, and this being so they should be brought in. I see no basis in this as a reason for statehood. But the most fallacious of the arguments and one they have never been able to prove is that Hawaii and Alaska were promised statehood. I challenge anyone to show me that there has ever been an official promise made to bring Alaska or Hawaii in as States of the Union.

There just has not been any such promise made and no one can show it to you. That question was asked on the floor of the gentleman from Nebraska yesterday, and I refer to the RECORD. If I recall correctly he said, "Well, it was implied." That is a mighty violent implication for bringing in another State 2,000 miles off the borders of the continental United States into the United States of America, and when it is not even a part of America. Do you not think that is implying a little bit drastically.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman accept the view of the Supreme Court as having any bearing on whether or not a commitment has been made?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am afraid I cannot because the Supreme Court is not the governing body of this Nation. I have been afraid several times that it has developed into that, but I am still fighting against it.

Mr. ENGLE. The Supreme Court of the United States interprets the law and when the Supreme Court interprets a law we accept that interpretation. If the gentleman will listen, I would be glad to read to him what the Supreme Court said on April 11 of this year in an opinion in the Granville-Smith case in reference to this very point:

> Territorial government in the continental United States was customarily viewed as a transition step to statehood, and statehood in fact resulted.

Going on, the Supreme Court said:

> A vital distinction was made between incorporated and unincorporated territories. The first category had the potentialities of statehood like continental territories. The United States Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, fully applied to an incorporated territory.

The plain fact is whenever Territorial status has been granted to an incorporated Territory, it has been interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States as the initial step toward statehood and nothing less than that. If that is not good enough for the gentleman, I do not know what we can get for him.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is not good enough for me because that is nothing more than dicta. There are no facts upon which to base that conclusion. When the Supreme Court reaches out into thin air and says if something is a customary view as such and finds a reason to reverse the positions that they have followed through the years, then I say that the legislative body of this Government had better keep a sharp eye on what is going on and see that they have the express authority to do anything in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman believe that the two great political parties have been wrong through the years in advocating statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman saying that, but I think he will find that national party political platforms are not made to stand on; they are made to get votes on. I think that applies to both the Democrats and the Republicans. At least, the farmers who were promised 100 percent of parity think so.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Chief Justice Taney away back said:

> A territory is required to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority. He spoke of territorial status as a condition of vassalage.

What I am asking the gentleman is this: Does he believe that the Supreme Court on April 11 of this year changed the whole doctrine? If he does, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that for over a hundred years the Supreme Court of the United States has made it very plain that any unincorporated territory is thereby put in line for statehood and that thereafter the granting of incorporated territorial status to these two areas carried with it the implicit promise of statehood.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman is putting me in the position where the question is longer than the answer. Let me say that in my opinion the Supreme Court is not the one that should determine the boundaries of this Nation. That right belongs to the people. I have been taught since I was a very small child that this is a Government by the people, that the people are supposed to run a democracy. Yet the gentleman says Chief Justice Taney could bind us. The Delegate from Alaska who appeared a moment ago made the unqualified statement that this Congress cannot bind a future Congress. No Congress can bind a future Congress. Our Government is not a democracy unless the people determine these questions through their duly elected representatives. On the merits rather than because of some promise, expressed or implied by some unauthorized appointed official. Where does the promise come from?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Our distinguished friend quoted from a decision of the Supreme Court which merely says that in the past it has been the custom for Territories ultimately to become States. Now, from that can you deduce any implied obligation on the part of the people of the United States to admit them to statehood?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. You cannot deduce any implied promise, and if you could, I do not think an implication is sufficient to change the boundaries of this Nation. We are walking into a serious situation, and if I have time, I want to explain some of the political repercussions, and I am not talking about political parties.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Whether or not there is an implied promise, is it not true that every incorporated Territory up to this time has been admitted as a State into the Union?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, I do not know.

Mr. DIES. What has that got to do with it?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the point I am making. I do not want to get off on a facet here that we are not interested in. That is water under the bridge.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLER of New York. It is a fact that every incorporated territory up to this point has been admitted to the United States, but there has been no territory up to this point admitted to the United States that has not been contiguous to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is certainly correct, and that is a point I am going to make in a moment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman would not contend, I am sure, that California was contiguous to any other State when admitted or that Louisiana was.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No. It was contiguous to the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. But not to any other State.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No; not to any other State, but it was contiguous to the United States as such.

Now let me go ahead here for just a few moments. We are off the promises, and I submit to you as yet we have had nobody who has brought forward any promise, express or implied, unless you go around the mountain to misinterpret something and call a statement by an unauthorized man an implied promise.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about these people out there being second-class citizens. They dropped that pitch. I do not know why they dropped it, but they talked for a long time about them being second-class citizens because they said they did not have the right to vote and had to pay taxes. Again I want to ask you this, if that argument will not apply to every Territory of the United States. Because the people in every Territory are in position to hold themselves out as second-class citizens, if they use that yardstick, unless they are admitted as a State. The only difference would be from an economic standpoint of wealth. Therefore, from the outset, you are deciding between first class and second class by their own arguments on materialism alone. Now, I have been raised to believe—and maybe I was wrong; it seems I might have been if these arguments are correct—that we did not found this country on materialism; that there was some spiritualism involved in it, and if a man was poor or wealthy, it had nothing to do with his station in life. Yet they say that the Virgin Islanders should not be admitted as a State because they are not economically strong, but the Hawaiian Islands should be admitted as a State because they are wealthy. Now, that is not right, and if I should refer to the wealth of any Member on this floor as being some brand upon him, some Member would rise and ask that my remarks be taken down, and rightfully so.

Now let me go on for just a moment here about the voting and the taxes that you have heard so much about. You do not have to go out into the middle of the Pacific Ocean if you want to help somebody out that is paying taxes and not getting the vote. You can do that right here in the District of Columbia. You do not have to go 2,000 miles off the shores of this land to do that. And these people, I suspicion, would like to have representation in Congress, even of a Delegate status. I think I read something in the paper not long ago about some of these people wanting to do that. I think it would be unfair for us to move out, off of this continent, and grant something to people out there, on the basis of such an argument, when we are not even granting it to the people among whom we live here.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. If these people now claim they are second-rate citizens, then the people of the District of Columbia must be about fourth-rate citizens. They do not even have the right to elect a voice here in the Congress and they have no voice even in the government of their own city; is not that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is no question about that.

Mr. HALEY So they would be fourth- or fifth-class citizens; and there are about 1 million of them.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If we are going to rate citizens by degrees in order to change the face of this Nation, we may have to go into fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh-class citizens.

I should like to conclude on this subject of representation and the political repercussions that follow. The representation proposal is fallacious, for this reason. We have in the State of Texas—I do not want to be in a position of bragging about Texas, but we have a few districts in the State where they have twice as many people as inhabit the Hawaiian Islands and the Territory of Alaska put together. We have 1 Representative representing those people. The point is that 1 man in some of those districts represents as many people as the combined populations of these 2 Territories.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. As a matter of fact, is it not true that there are 78 congressional districts in the United States at this time whose Members each represent more than 400,000 people?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right.

Mr. HALEY. And I am informed in some instances a Member represents over a million people.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Can the gentleman tell me whether additional Members will

be added to the total of 435 now in the House, or will the total number still remain 435?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. As I understand it, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, there will be 3 more Members elected to this House for the present; then when reapportionment time comes around again, we will go back to 435 Members. Then 3 Members, representing districts in the present United States will be kicked out to make room for the new 3 from the Territories.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So that my State, which is on the ragged edge now, is bound to lose someone and we will elect somebody in Hawaii or Alaska to represent my State.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman's deductions are well justified by the facts.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman's conclusion is based upon the fact that Congress will not change the number of Members in the House. After all, it is up to Congress to decide the number of Members who will sit in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have not implied that. I do not want to get into the implying business. I am just taking the situation as it is.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Is it not true that if our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] were to lose his seat, for the reason given, he will lose it to a man whom we deported?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly correct. We can go all around the mountain on these arguments and find arguments that are much stronger against than we can find arguments for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. With reference to the constitutions of these proposed states, as I understand it, those constitutions would come to Congress for ratification?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Within 60 days or some such matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And if Congress did not take action, they would go into effect?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Would Congress have the opportunity to amend the constitutions, or would they merely have the opportunity of voting them up or down?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am in a little bit of a cloud on that; but, as I understand it—and I hope the committee will correct me if I am wrong—if Congress finds something wrong with them, they can send them back to have them amended.

Mr. GROSS. But Congress itself would have no authority to amend either of the constitutions that might be sent here for ratification?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I understand they could make suggestions; but as I understand it, the people of Hawaii or Alaska in the final analysis must approve those suggestions.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. In other words, Congress has never told any State what it should have in its constitution.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Let me say one thing about this Russian situation. That is one thing that does not appeal to me. There has been a lot of talk around here that if we do not take Alaska and Hawaii in we will be criticized on the world front for being a colonial government. If we paid more attention to our own business and paid less attention to what Russia will think about us we would get along better. I am not interested in Russia's views on this. It does not make any difference what we do, you can bank on one thing for sure, and that is that Russia is going to criticise us for it. Do not fool yourself about that. If anybody thinks this Harry Bridges the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] was talking about is asleep out there in those islands, he is just being naive, that is all. That man who was played against the best brains in this country and retained his position, insofar as staying in this country is concerned, is a sinister power to be contested. What we had better do is start fighting him instead of doing things that will let him run a party of this country. By one order he could absolutely throttle the economy of the Hawaiian Islands if it became a State, and probably would.

I want to talk to you about the basis for it. What we are fixing to do by the passage of a bill like this, and God forbid that it does pass, is to change the boundaries of this Nation. We are fixing to walk into a new political area that is absolutely unexplored. We are fixing to put ourselves into a position where we take in two States which we cannot reach without going onto the high seas or across foreign territory. That is a short statement but it is important, and I hope you will remember it. You cannot get to the Hawaiian Islands without going into a jurisdiction outside of the jurisdiction of the United States of America. You cannot get to Alaska without going into a jurisdiction outside of the jurisdiction of the United States of America.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Is it not also true that if the Congress in this session should pass this bill, there is nothing we could ever do in the future to change it?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is a permanent mistake. It is one of those situations like where boys used to say they would play "skip the third rail" on the elevated. You could ask some boy what the penalty was if a boy hit the third rail, and he would say, "You don't need any penalty; he gets killed. That is the end of the game." That is the situation we are in on this. It is like Russian roulette, you make but one mistake. You cannot go back and do it over again. You can make but one mistake, and you cannot correct it.

I want to talk to you further about this political situation. When we get into Hawaii, what does Hawaii consist of? According to the map in the report, it consists of eight main islands, all separated by the high seas, not in the jurisdiction of the United States. In other words, one part of the State cannot be reached without going outside of the jurisdiction of the State and of the country of which such State is a part. Anyone can visualize the Pandora's box that would be opened, with relation to legal—domestic and international—that would arise concerning commerce and all other segments of the economy Such a State will be under the Maritime Commission, not the Interstate Commerce Commission that has jurisdiction in the other States.

Alaska would create another Pandora's box of problems too numerous to mention in the limited time available.

I wish that I had time to discuss each of the points that are in my mind, but others want to be heard. Therefore, let me conclude with the warning to this House that this legislation must not pass.

Our responsibility demands that we be guided by reason, not emotion. I respectfully urge you to defeat this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON]. The Delegate from Hawaii is following in the footsteps of her illustrious husband, Joe Farrington. It seems to me we ought to have a quorum here. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for 57 years the issue of statehood for Hawaii has been before the Congress of the United States in some form or other. For 35 years, during my entire adult life, I have been closely associated with the fight for statehood. Today, I find myself as the duly elected spokesman for the people of Hawaii. They see my colleagues in a debate on this issue. I make no apology for the fact I am a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. But, this is my first experience in debate on the floor of this distinguished body. I hope that my mind rather than my heart that is so deeply involved will control what I have to say today. A bill for Hawaiian statehood has passed the House of Representatives three times—in the 80th, 81st, and 83d Congresses. Today, there would be no necessity for me to repeat the many arguments supporting it except for the benefit of the new Members of the 84th Congress, and that is important. The overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives today, I believe, is in favor of Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is definitely no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Adair	Feighan	Passman
Avery	Fenton	Phillips
Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Barden	Heselton	Prouty
Belcher	Hinshaw	Quigley
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
	Hyde	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Burdick	Kilburn	Riehlman
Canfield	King, Calif.	Shuford
Carnahan	Knox	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Laird	Spence
Chelf	Landrum	Steed
Christopher	LeCompte	Teague, Tex.
Chudoff	McCarthy	Thompson, Mich.
Clark	McConnell	
Dawson, Ill.	McCulloch	Thomson, Wyo.
Deane	McDowell	Udall
Dingell	Mollohan	Utt
Dondero	Morrison	Walter
Durham	Mumma	Westland
Eberharter	Nelson	Wilson, Calif.
Elliott	Norblad	Young
Fallon		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2535, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 358 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON] is recognized.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for 57 years the issue of statehood for Hawaii has been before the Congress of the United States in some form or other. For 35 years, during my entire adult life, I have been closely associated with the fight for statehood. Today I find myself, as the duly elected spokesman for the people of Hawaii, facing my colleagues in a debate upon this issue. I make no apology for the fact that I am a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, that this is my first experience in debate on the floor of this distinguished body. I hope that my mind, rather than my heart that is deeply involved, will control what I have to say today.

A bill for Hawaiian statehood has passed the House of Representatives three times; in the 80th, the 81st, and the 83d Congresses. Today there would be no necessity for me to repeat the many arguments supporting it except for the benefit of the new Members of the 84th Congress; and that is important. The overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives today, I believe, are in favor of Hawaiian statehood. But the problem confronting both Alaska and Hawaii is a joint bill that was reported out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Hawaii owes that committee a great debt of gratitude.

Then the bill went to the Rules Committee. At this point I would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee and particularly the chairman for the consideration of the measure. In spite of the opposition of a majority of the members they listened patiently over a period of three weeks to the arguments presented by the friends and foes of statehood. At the conclusion of these hearings, in spite of the objections of every Member who appeared before the committee, whether he was for or against the issue of statehood, the Rules Committee voted a closed rule. The friends of statehood asked for an open rule or no rule at all. The foes of statehood asked for no rule.

Despite these protestations, the Rules Committee voted a closed rule, which the House has now adopted, so we are faced with a very unusual parliamentary procedure established for consideration of H. R. 2535.

Time and again in the hearings before the Rules Committee we were reminded that one of the most solemn, irrevocable, and nonrecallable actions which our parliamentary body could perform is that which enables a United States Territory to achieve its full maturity by becoming a State. I agree that this is so, as do all my colleagues.

But now that the closed rule has been adopted, and I am glad that it has been under the circumstances, this body is called upon to perform its duties under the most restrictive and narrowest procedure it is possible for the Rules Committee to establish.

Never in the history of this Government has a new State been taken into the Union without the full membership of the House of Representatives being allowed to contribute their thinking to perfect an enabling act.

On the basis of the best advice I have been able to obtain, not one of the enabling acts came into being without the full advice of both the House and the Senate. Not one of those acts went into the statute books without every Member's having an opportunity to express his views and to propose amendments if desirable.

But today the full membership of the House of Representatives has been denied that right. But in spite of that fact, I am here today to plead with you to vote for the measure, Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. My sole concern is that this bill reach the President's desk in a form acceptable to him.

A few weeks ago when this bill was being considered by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, as we proceeded to consider the language and the thought of the 39 sections contained in H. R. 2535 the members of the committee had honest and reasoned differences of opinion as to the form and substance of the bill.

The committee in the 84th Congress has a membership of 29 voting members plus the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii, a total of 32 people, less than 10 percent of the whole House membership. While many of these 32 people have participated in committee consideration of the several bills acted upon in the past 8 years, for reasons not entirely clear, the House Rules Committee, which in a real sense lays out the road this body must follow if the legislative destinies are to be reached, did not reflect in the resolution reported the sentiments expressed by the members of the Rules Committee on the nature of this legislation.

If Alaska and Hawaii are admitted, the acts are irrevocable—no return, no reconsideration, no subsequent act of Congress. On that, the members of the Rules Committee and I are in complete agreement. But the road laid out by this resolution which you have adopted, and I agree that it should have been adopted, as there was no alternative, is a narrow one. The 406 Members who did not participate in the committee consideration of H. R. 2535 are by this resolution denied the right to consider any procedure other than that contained in the bill as introduced or as that procedure is proposed to be modified by the committee by recommended amendment. As to the other obvious alternative procedure, 29 Members are required to speak for 435, if judgment is to be rendered. Twenty-nine, if a voice is to be heard at all, must speak for 435. Therefore, the House of Representatives today is faced with this situation. A voice, which we have listened to from the Rules Committee, has said to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, "Here is your bicycle. We have removed the pedals—now ride it to your destination."

Mr. Chairman, the resolution which this House has adopted is the narrowest possible parliamentary procedure which could be established by the Rules Committee. It should have been broadened to its maximum, but that was not possible for this House to do without killing the bill yesterday. Therefore, I plead with you so that Alaska and Hawaii might enjoy the full counsel of this body and that the Members put the pedals back on the bicycle by voting for this joint bill. Then, it can go to the Senate where the debate will not be restricted and returned to this body for further consideration. I will now proceed to summarize for you, as briefly as I can, a few of the arguments raised in the matter of Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. I will not take your time to have you listen to a long recitation of the history of this legislation or the history of Hawaii. Many other speakers can present the subject to you and the many specific issues involved more eloquently than I. But, I would like to point out that in general there are three arguments applicable to both Territories, which are always offered by the proponents and opponents of Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. First, there is the argument over noncontiguity which, in my opinion, is an exceedingly fallacious one. When I can leave my home here in Washington, D. C., at 2:30 p. m. and have breakfast in my other home in Honolulu at 6 a. m. the next morning, which is actually 11 a. m. in Washington, D. C., I believe those who argue against statehood on that basis are as antiquated as a surrey with a fringe on top. Hawaii and Alaska are more contiguous to the continental United States than to any other land area. In this atomic age of ours, there is nothing more contiguous than the air in which we live and travel. The second argument regarding Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood is usually that of disproportionate representation in the United States Senate. To those who argue in

that fashion, I suggest that legislation be introduced in the Congress of the United States, and be passed by two-thirds of the Members, and ratified by the three-fourths of the States. That is the only way to resolve the issue. That is the only way it can be resolved. To penalize the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska in this manner is really an admission that the gentlemen who favor proportionate representation in the Senate know full well that their issue is not a popular one nationally, but their arguments go home for consumption to the districts from which they come. The third argument relative to Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood is the issue of national defense.

In this instance the argument for the two Territories is somewhat inconsistent, because when it comes to Hawaii it is normally argued that the defense of Hawaii would be better served by statehood, whereas with regard to Alaska the same gentleman argued that the national defense would be better served by Territorial status. The fact of the matter is that Territory or State status has nothing whatsoever to do with defense. Anyone who has experienced a war on American soil knows that. The difficulty in this situation is that some of our distinguished and able military leaders have never experienced an attack or a war on American soil. Their experience has been in dealing with foreign allies on foreign soil, and their thinking has not been directed to leading a war on American soil where loyal American citizens would be their bulwark in carrying their campaign forward to victory. Their conception, because of their kind of experience is one with foreign allies, purportedly loyal to us, who naturally have caused our military leaders when on foreign soil, concern from time to time.

We all agree that Alaska is our front line of defense today, but let us suppose that tomorrow, by a turn of circumstances, our front line of defense should suddenly change to the great State of New York. What then would our military leaders do? It goes without saying that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, would delineate military zones of national defense in that State. In Alaska today I do know that our military advisers are deeply concerned with the defense problem, but that is no reason why they should be asked at this particular and delicate time to make withdrawals and reveal our defense plan to enemies. But there is every reason to support them if they wish to have Congress spell out in legislation a certain area for withdrawals, if and when they choose to make them. Although the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to do so at any time, whether Alaska is a State or a Territory, it stands to reason that the President may like to have this particular point defined in the bill, in order that, if it is necessary to make such withdrawals, he will have the complete support of the Congress of the United States, and therefore the people of this country, including the citizens of Alaska.

It was not necessary for the President to go to the Congress to ask support in the matter of the Formosan issue, but there was every reason for the Congress to give our President this reassurance. So it is in the case of Alaskan statehood. The bill, as it is written today, includes a committee amendment in defining a line for future defense withdrawals that, in my opinion, would not be satisfactory to the President of the United States. But that is no reason for defeating the bill. On the contrary, there is every reason, in my opinion, to support the bill and send it to the Senate where this particular amendment can be resolved.

As other spokesmen for the bill have pointed out, we do have the language of the amendment, and a line that we have every reason to believe would be acceptable to the President. But, by the rule which has been adopted, we are denied the privilege of offering this amendment on the floor. Since this is so, I urge you again to vote for this bill so that we can send it to the Senate and achieve this purpose.

With reference to the specific arguments brought into any debate on statehood, there are two of them. One is the issue of communism. We have just listened to my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. PILLION] plead his case. I was delighted to hear him speak today. Mr. PILLION, who has never stepped foot in the Territory of Hawaii, by his own admission before the Committee on Rules, stated at that time that he would not go to Hawaii for fear he might change his mind. I admire him for that honest statement, for I do believe he was sincere and correct in what he said. If I had never stepped foot into the congressional district of New York, from which my distinguished colleague comes, if I did not know the local personalities and the local issues involved, I would not try to evaluate an election in that district on the basis of cold statistics on paper.

Today when he brought here that horrendous exhibit of newspapers and pamphlets, and spoke as he did I hardly recognized myself, because there I learned about the editorial policy of my own two newspapers; I learned why we were supporting statehood; for the first time I learned about dives down in the part of town where communism breeds.

Now, seriously, let us get down to the points my colleague made. On May 6, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], by letter addressed himself to Members of the House on charges of communism in Hawaii. Those charges were made from this floor today, but again none of his allegations were supported by documentary evidence of Communist infiltration into the territorial government of Hawaii, its educational system, the political parties, the newspapers, or radio. On the contrary, the documentary evidence that he produced showed that the newspapers of Hawaii are fighting communism, that the people of Hawaii have convicted our leading Communists, and the exhibit in person is the delegate from Hawaii, and if there was any fight by the ILWU it was for this office.

On Tuesday, April 19, 1955, just this last month, I appeared before the Rules Committee to reply to these very extravagant and unsupported charges. Evidently the committee, after exhaustive hearings, agreed with me; they granted a rule which sent the statehood legislation to the floor of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], says Communist power is centered in and emanates from the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union with a membership of 25,000, and the United Public Workers' Union, with a membership of 2,000. We admit that the issue of communism in Hawaii centers about the leadership of the ILWU, but the fact is that the people of Hawaii through their elected representatives were the first to call attention to the fact that the ILWU in Hawaii, an extension of Harry Bridges' west coast longshoremen's union, might be Communist-dominated.

At the petition of the Territorial Legislature a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities went to Hawaii in 1950 to conduct an investigation of Communist activity. The chairman of the subcommittee was the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE]. They reported that they found no cause whatever for withholding statehood from the Territory.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. First of all I want to compliment the gentlewoman on the very fine statement she is making on behalf of statehood for Hawaii. I may say further that she is a very worthy successor to our very dear friend, the late Honorable Joe Farrington.

I believe some of the Members to whom I have listened in debate here are deliberately attempting to exaggerate the influence of communism in Hawaii in order to defeat statehood for Hawaii.

I cannot disagree with my good friend from New York [Mr. PILLION], in some of the statements, practically all of the statements that he made about the influence of communism in Hawaii, but let me remind the gentleman from New York that the influence that the Communist Party in Hawaii has at the present time stems from the mainland. Further than that, it stems from the great State of California where the headquarters for the 13th district of the Communist Party is and has been located for a good many years. The 13th district of the Communist Party is comprised of California, Nevada, and the Territory of Hawaii.

During my experience as an FBI agent stationed at San Francisco during the war years and since I have been a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities I have watched with increasing concern Communists being sent from the mainland by such men as Harry Bridges and Bill Schneidermann to Hawaii deliberately to cause strikes, foment trouble, and to organize the Communist Party in Hawaii. I say we cannot cut off the influence of the Communist Party in Hawaii without first destroying the Communist Party in the United States, on the mainland, and the influence that it has, not only upon

our Territories but upon our own internal security. We have tried three times to get rid of the influence of Harry Bridges by court action to deport him but each time we have been unsuccessful.

I believe that we should consider cleaning up the influence that emanates from the mainland before we start worrying about the influence on the Territory of Hawaii. Furthermore, I am of the opinion, and I was of this opinion 5 years ago and 3 years ago when I voted for admission of Hawaii into the Union, that the State of Hawaii would be better able and more inclined to fight the influence of communism as a State than as a Territory for the reason that I believe the good people, the great majority of the patriotic citizens in the Territory of Hawaii would upon their admission to the Union gain a new sense of loyalty and would carry on a cause that would completely eliminate the influence of Communist traitors who have been sent from the mainland. In that way it would destroy communism more effectively in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was hoping that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] would be on the floor. When he returned in 1953 from Hawaii as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities he made a report, from which I quote the following:

> At no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. My guess as of today, February 15, 1953, it does not exceed over 60. The people of Hawaii understand that communism is a worldwide conspiracy and given the opportunity they would put their own houses in order.

I think that answers the questions of the communistic influence. There are Communists in Hawaii, there are Communists in Nebraska. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] understands that New York State has more than half of the Communists in the United States within its own borders.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Is it not true that Senator Cordon and Senator Butler made intensive investigations of this charge of communism in Hawaii?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. That is true. There have been several on-the-spot investigations into Hawaii's readiness for statehood.

Mr. ENGLE. Is it not also true that both of those distinguished gentlemen came back and said they did not find communism to be a serious menace? I would like to read what Senator Cordon's subcommittee reported. This is a statement from their official report:

"No evidence was presented to the subcommittee of communism in the Territorial legislature or other elective bodies or offices. Hawaii's political life has been traditionally sound and free from radical leadership in the government."

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman from California. His statement is exactly correct. There has never been any evidence found of communism in the Territorial legislature.

Now, Mr. PILLION offers the fact that Harry Bridges is president of the ILWU; that Jack Hall is the Hawaiian regional director of the ILWU; that in 1950 the CIO expelled both the ILWU and the UPW as Communist dominated, and that on June 19 Jack Hall and six others were convicted by a Federal jury in Hawaii of violation of the Smith Act as indications of growing influence of communism in Hawaii. The contrary is true. These facts are an indication of the decrease of Communist influence in Hawaii. It was an all-Hawaiian jury that convicted Jack Hall and six others. It was after a lengthy Federal trial which was presided over by a Federal judge long a resident of Hawaii who was appointed by the President of the United States that these defendants were convicted. They are now on bail, the case having been appealed to the 9th Circuit Court of San Francisco. Hawaii has nothing to do with the case now. The people of Hawaii generally are chafing at the delay.

Mr. PILLION states that on June 19, 1953, 24,000 ILWU members went on strike to protest the conviction of the seven and refused to load military cargo for Korea. The fact is that the ILWU membership was ordered by its leadership to walk out, which is totally different procedure from voting to strike, and the fact also is that within 24 hours, when the membership learned the true cause of the walkout, they went back to work. They learned the truth through the Honolulu newspapers, which, instead of supporting the Communist cause, as Mr. PILLION would have you believe, used every means at their command by news stories, editorials, and radio broadcasts to inform the rank and file of the membership of the ILWU in order that they, loyal Americans, might evaluate the situation.

Mr. PILLION says the Honolulu Record is a newspaper front for the Communist Party and that individual and business ads increased from 2,137 in 1953 to 2,586 in 1954. The Honolulu Record may be a front for the Communist Party. The fact is that it also is a labor organ, and during the campaign the candidates who advertised in this paper may have done so in the belief that they were reaching the organized labor vote. If these candidates failed to evaluate the significance of advertising in a paper that may be Communist dominated, they likewise failed to evaluate the fact that their ads were wasted because the Record only has a circulation of approximately 3,000, which Mr. PILLION neglected to tell you, in contrast to the other dailies with a total circulation of 175,000.

Also I would like to ask you, if the Communists are so powerful in Hawaii through this particular medium, the Honolulu Record, why is it that they cannot even force their own membership of 25,000 to subscribe to the paper? The truth of the matter is that those ads you saw up here on the board are put in at 50 cents a throw from the boys when they go out and collect from the labor unions.

Now, Mr. PILLION says that the ILWU elected 58 candidates out of 71 endorsed in the November 1954 elections. There is one thing I have in common with my distinguished colleague from New York. We are both Republicans. But we disagree on this point. I am generous enough to give the credit of that election to the Democrats in Hawaii. The fact is that the people of Hawaii elected the candidates. The ILWU can claim anything it wants to. The Democrats for the first time in the history of the territory won control of the territorial legislature. The Republicans won the delegateship and the two largest mayoralties in the territory. Now, the largest of these mayoralties is particularly significant because the ILWU sustained a resounding defeat. John H. Wilson, a veteran Democrat and seven times mayor of Honolulu, whom the ILWU was out to reelect in 1954, could not even be nominated. After 50 years in public life in Honolulu he lost the nomination to a young Democrat, Frank Fasi, who has been a resident of Hawaii only since 1946. Furthermore, if more truth is needed for the refutation of Mr. PILLION's allegation, the ILWU threw the weight of its leadership's support to the candidacy of John A. Burns for the delegateship, and he was defeated by the incumbent.

Mr. PILLION also has neglected to tell you that of the membership of the ILWU of 25,000, possibly only one-third of those are citizens. Most of them are alien contract laborers and are not eligible to vote.

Mr. PILLION says that on April 6, 1955, the Communist Daily Worker printed an article concerning the gift of a gavel by Speaker of the House of Representatives Charles Kauhane to Harry Bridges, president of ILWU.

The "People's Daily Worker" can print anything it chooses. Charles Kauhane, speaker of the Territorial house of representatives, had denied publicly that he made a gift of a gavel to Harry Bridges.

Mr. PILLION states that the Hawaiian House of Representatives passed a bill last March to exempt the ILWU Memorial Association from taxes by a vote of 27 to 1 and 7 of the 10 incorporators of this association are publicly identified Communists.

What Mr. PILLION neglected to tell you also was that a month later, after it was revealed that 7 of the 10 incorporators of this association are publicly identified Communists, the measure was vetoed by Hawaii's governor, Samuel Wilder King, partly on charges that Communist activity in Hawaii appears centered around the ILWU. This we have never denied or minimized.

Mr. PILLION wrote that on April 24, 1955, the ILWU publicly threatened the Hawaiian Legislature with a mass retaliation strike if their endorsed elected representatives and senators did not keep their political promises to the ILWU.

Mr. PILLION neglected to tell you that an ILWU spokesman has publicly denounced the legislature for its refusal to adopt tax legislation favorable to the

union. Furthermore, no mass retaliation ever came about.

Mr. PILLION writes that the ILWU uses four radio stations to daily preach the Communist line in the English, Filipino, and Japanese languages.

There are 407 of the nation's 2,800 radio stations which broadcast a daily fare of 36 languages and dialects, ranging from Arabic to Zuni and including the Russian languages.

I do not intend to defend the activities of the ILWU leadership or its radio commentators in Hawaii. However, I can assure you that these programs contain no more Kremlin propaganda than do those coming from some of our mainland labor reporters. This 15-minute-a-day fare from the ILWU commentators is offset by some 250 hours of typically American radio and television programs over 14 stations throughout Hawaii, all of them certificated by the Federal Communications Commission.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is absolutely incorrect when he tells you that since the Hawaiian statehood bill was last voted on, March 10, 1953, "there have been startling disclosures of Communist controls in Hawaii."

Do you think for a minute that the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General would recommend statehood for Hawaii if a situation existed there such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] claims?

None other than the Attorney General of the United States, in a letter dated January 13, 1954, stated emphatically that communism was on the decline in Hawaii. He said:

> The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate any reason to believe that communism is a greater menace in Hawaii at the present time than it was in 1950. As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950. Undoubtedly the recent conviction of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has contributed to this decline in Communist Party membership. I believe it inevitable that this conviction will have a weakening effect on the strength of communism in Hawaii.
>
> The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

Now I should like to tell you a little bit about the second argument regarding Hawaii, and it is made on the basis of race. It is argued that we are a group of many racial extractions and therefore not qualified to be a State. I am proud to say that we are of many racial extractions and that in most of us the blood of several races flows. We are proud of that.

There is no race prejudice in Hawaii, but there is much race consciousness. We take pride in the American descendents of the many peoples who came from many foreign lands. They have contributed greatly to our American civilization and culture in Hawaii.

The first to go to the shores of Hawaii from foreign lands were the people from New England who went out to Hawaii in 1820 and there founded an American community. In 1820, when Honolulu was a typically going American community, there was not a single settlement west of the Mississippi. To be sure there were a few friars breaking their way through the mustard cane in California. By 1840 the people of Hawaii had a constitution based upon the theocracy of the great State of Massachusetts, and a compulsory free public school system patterned after the State of New York. As a result, Hawaii has no illiteracy. Today every registered voter has to fill in a long printed questionnaire to determine that he is acquainted not only with reading and writing but also with the principles of government, and to this day no voter has ever questioned that requirement. As a result, 87 percent of our registered voters vote, and 65 percent of our eligible voters vote, which I think challenges the record of any State in the Union.

These same foreigners that went to our shores gave the people of Hawaii a written language—the English language. They gave them Christianity, a stable economy, and racial tolerance, and as the result of those American principles, Hawaii for many years has enjoyed four of the basic five principles of American freedom. Those principles are Christianity and religious freedom, racial tolerance, free education for all, and economic stability. The fifth principle of American freedom, complete self-government, is the one we seek today.

The privilege and responsibility not only for voting presence in the Senate and House of Representatives, for voting for the President and Vice President of the United States, and our own Governor and other officials, but the privilege and responsibility of contributing our thinking to the framing of legislation for these United States, is what we seek. Not only do we think that we would benefit by voting representation in the Congress, but we believe that we have a great contribution to make. Particularly do we feel that contribution could be given in the field of foreign affairs, because we live in the Pacific area and are more closely associated with the thought of the people of the Pacific than are any of those in this body elected from the continental United States. We would be the first to vote for legislation to support the freedom-loving peoples of the world in their struggle against communism, because we in Hawaii as a Territory have done as much if not more than any State in the Union about communism.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. May I ask the gentlewoman whether or not she referred in her remarks to the letter of January 13, 1954, by Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, in which he discussed the charges of communism in Hawaii?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I have the date right here.

Mr. ENGLE. If not, at the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I propose to ask to include this letter following the remarks of the gentlewoman. I again call the attention of the committee to the fact that not only has the President of the United States endorsed statehood for Hawaii, which he would not think of doing in the face of any significant threat from communism, but in addition he has been backed up in that statement by his own Attorney General.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. That is the January 13 letter.

I have heard it said time and again during the debate on this bill that it matters not what the Communists think because they will twist the argument to their own purposes. I am concerned not about what the Communists think, but what the freedom-loving peoples think. We could also contribute much to the concept of freedom in the Congress, by helping to frame legislation from our great experience for more than 100 years where we have lived in a test of democracy, where all creeds and all colors are accepted exactly as our Founding Fathers intended that the phrase should be interpreted, where we have a living example of what the world is striving to find today.

Several in this debate have mentioned the issue of taxation without representation and pointed out that this issue is similar to that in colonial days. I would like to mention one difference—in the days of the colonies there was a difference of opinion among the American settlers. Some and many preferred to stay with the Crown without a vote in the Parliament, without breaking their bonds with the British Empire. The majority preferred independence and so we had a revolution, thus founding the United States of America.

But in Hawaii, although we have taxation without representation there is not a soul that would choose independence rather than staying with the United States even without a vote in the Congress. We are first and last irrevocably Americans, and whatever your decision may be in the matter of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, you may be sure that the decision will be accepted in the spirit of true Americanism. You may also be sure that if that decision should be unfavorable, we will continue to fight on until we have achieved our rightful destiny.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I had planned today to approach my part of this discussion from the viewpoint of national defense and international implications. But, I feel in view of the statements which were made by my distinguished friend from New York, a Representative from upState New York, which in part I, also, represent, that there has been injected into this discussion an emotional wallop. I am very sure there are many Members who would hesitate on the question of statehood if they believed that either or both of the Territories in question were controlled or might be controlled by Communists. I should like to call to the

attention of the gentleman from New York the question asked of him by the gentleman from Nebraska: Is it or is it not true that there are 22,000 known Communists in the State of New York? I do not know how exact that figure is, but I will say this—that I have seen some of them in operation in my State. I have seen them march on the capitol at Albany and conduct their meetings on the front steps of that capitol. As a newspaperman, I was in our capitol for an entire weekend because a group led by Communists seized the Senate chamber of the State of New York and held it during that weekend. This occurred during the governorship of a former Republican candidate for President, Mr. Dewey. The Daily Worker is published in my State. Now, if I have given the impression that New York is communistic, I would like to change that as quickly as possible. I would resent, as deeply as did the Delegate from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON] the suggestion that because we have 22,000 Communists in my State that my State is not loyal. We have 15 million people in New York State, and I do not need here to defend the reputation of that State for loyalty nor do I have to defend the reputation of Hawaii and Alaska for loyalty because their patriotism is written high in the skies, in our wars and in peace. I note that the opposition, at least the opposition within the committee, to statehood, said that sacrifices on the battlefield do not constitute legitimate political, economic, or social premises for the admission of these Territories to statehood and that these highly emotional appeals are irrelevant to this debate. I would concede that point if we had not injected the highly emotional appeal of internal communism. When the charge of communism is raised against a State or Territory, then I say the emotional impact of proven patriotism is legitimate and no one can deny that patriotism. It has been attested to by our leading military figures. Then, we were told very briefly that the question of statehood is solely a domestic problem of our internal affairs. What a nice, cozy, comfortable, easy solution. All we have to do is to close our doors here and we no longer hear the whining winds of the cold war. It is very easy to push aside the thought of the psychological impact upon other countries of what we do here.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] said he does not care what the Russians say. I do not, either, but I do care about the reaction of our friends in Asia and elsewhere, and what might be said. At Bandung not too long ago we were all happy to note, even though it was an unofficial meeting to a great extent, that our friends won the propaganda battle there. They defeated the Communists and their willing allies in an attempt to aline white people against other peoples of the world. I can see the propaganda value of again rejecting statehood for these Territories. I can see its impact upon the peoples of this world who are gravely concerned about their own place in the sun, who are normally for proper nationalism. I can see them coming to the conclusion that while wo do not believe in colonialism of the type practiced by France or, in the past, by Great Britain, and while we do not believe in Red colonialism, we appear to believe in a colonialism of indifference.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am glad the gentleman brought up the subject of colonialism and what the people may think of the United States with reference to it. I want to call attention to the foreign-aid program and what it has done insofar as our international activities are concerned. The people in the Far East are deeply concerned about this Nation granting foreign aid to those nations who have practiced colonialism.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. In reply to the gentleman's remarks about the march on the State legislature in Albany, I happened to be in Albany at the same time, as the gentleman knows. In connection with that march, did the speaker of the lower house ever present any gesture of good will, any gift, such as a gavel, to the Communist leaders? Did the press or the leaders of the New York State Legislature ever meet in a basement of the capitol with known communistic leaders in cooperation on legislation? Were bills in Albany ever checked with the Communist Party leaders before being laid on the desk of the legislature? Did those things ever happen in the city of Albany, the seat of the New York State government?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would sincerely hope not, but I do know what did happen in Albany; that if the senate of the legislature, of which the gentleman was a distinguished member, had desired to meet on a particular weekend they would have found it impossible to gain their seats.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am delighted with the statement the gentleman has made. I would like to call attention to some articles that appeared in New York papers in March in regard to the violence on the waterfront with the ILA. Did they not tie up the docks in New York and prohibit all traffic, including troop ships, from being loaded or unloaded?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I believe that is a matter of proven record.

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Did not this Congress approve a compact between the States of New York and New Jersey to take care of that dock situation, that labor trouble in New York City; and is it not true that the speaker had the galleries cleared in Albany as soon as this Communist march began and they attempted to disrupt the proceedings of the New York State Assembly? I think the gentleman will recall that.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I recall that very well. And, referring to the compact made with reference to the difficulties on our waterfront, that was accomplished with the States working with the Federal Government. I suggest that if we give statehood to Hawaii probably they could deal more effectively with the problem they have.

In conclusion may I say that I think when all the emotion is placed to one side, we have to keep clearly in our minds that these two Territories are occupied by people who are now in the United States, if not of the United States; people who have demonstrated their complete patriotism to our country in war and in peace; people who are vital to our national defense. Keep in mind that our defense will be bolstered if they become States.

Let me conclude with this quotation:

> Those friends thou hast, and their adoption tried,
> Grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am sorry to disturb the applause which is so justly deserved, but I would like to call the gentleman's attention to Article 464 of our Constitution, which in part reads as follows:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

Would it not be the duty of the United States upon the admission of Hawaii as a State to guarantee to her a republican form of government under that provision of our Constitution?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TUMULTY. Would you not therefore give the Federal Government the right and the duty to protect the State of Hawaii from any Communist infiltration which might change a republican form of government?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would think that would be a most important duty of the United States Government in case of statehood.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me that quite often it is more wise to bring about the reformation before marriage.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think that is very true, but sometimes it is very difficult to do a complete job of reformation before marriage.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much today about statehood for Hawaii; we have heard very little about statehood for Alaska. I presume the distinguished chairman of my committee took care of that situation very effectively when he said that before a Territory could obtain the status of statehood it must be on its economic feet, so to speak. I suppose therefore he figured that Alaska was taken care of and eliminated by pages 63 and 64 of the bill where it is stated that we guarantee to take from the other citizens of this country and the other States in addi-

tion to all the other taxes your State and my State pay an additional $78 million for Alaska.

Much has been said about the long hearings in regard to statehood for Hawaii. I think it is only fair to give you a demonstration here and show you how little hearings you may really have had in the 5,000 pages of testimony. I hold in my hand the hearings before my committee this year on statehood. It is a big volume. But let us see what it contains, then go back over some of these other books and see how much of the meat of the cocoanut you have.

First, out of the 503 pages let us take off 85 for the bill itself. Then there is the appendix. Let us take off an additional 65 pages. Then we read the bill in committee, so we will take that off. Then we read the bill again in committee. Then we get around to explaining the bill. That is a member of the staff of the committee, so we will take that off. We come down to Dr. Taylor explaining the bill. This is on another day. So we take that off. Now, let us see what we have.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. In just a moment. Then we voted on the bill in committee. That is 36 pages. So we take that off. It is getting pretty thin, is it not?

Now, let us see what we have left in the bill. First, we have the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska who was just trying to get me to yield, stating his objections to the bill. I think they were good ones, and I believe I will read them to you. We will go to page 93. The gentleman said that there were 8 or 10 new members of this committee. Well, there are some forty-odd new Members of the Congress who have never heard this Hawaiian statehcod matter discussed. Let us see what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] wanted the committee to do.

He said:

Let us have some hearings on this and give these 10 new Members a chance to hear it.

He stated furthermore:

You are going to be in a very vulnerable position when you get on the floor of the House.

He said:

They are going to ask you some questions and here is what they are going to ask you:

"Where is your report from the Department?

"There is no favorable report.

"Where are your hearings?

"We have had no hearings."

The distinguished gentleman then said:

Then one is in a vulnerable position. I should like to see us come out with at least some hearings, and maybe we can sum up the objections. I personally would like to invite 6 or 8 of those people who expressed themselves to me, to give them an opportunity to be heard and say in public what they told me when I was in Hawaii.

I think you would reasonably expect to have some people in here to hear this discussion. After all, as I say, we had 10 new members of the committee that had never heard this thing discussed before.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the gentleman, when he tore out the testimony—he made a statement on Hawaii—took that out? Also did the gentleman stay in Hawaii for all the hearings that were held there?

Mr. HALEY. I might state to the distinguished gentleman that I stayed longer than the chairman did. I stayed there until after he apparently could not take any more of it and returned to the States. I might also read to the gentleman something that I asked the gentleman in committee.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has such meager hearings there. I would like to bring down to the well the hearings held in the 83d Congress and leave them there. The gentleman may use them.

Mr. HALEY. I will use them. The gentleman can do that on his own time. But I will use some of those, too.

Let us see what we have in this big volume I brought down here. It is very small now. We have Dr. MILLER's objections to the bill, then we have a statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD] who brought up some new issues.

We had then the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, a report from the Census Bureau, and the State Department, I believe, and we have the summing up of the administration's views. They say they favor statehood but they do not give you any report. This is the information now that is left here, and this goes on with some of the administration views, I guess. I would like to read to the committee here some of the things that go in these 140 pages that I have left. Here is a little communication which reads:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 2, 1836.

Fellow Citizens of Texas:

The enemy are upon us. A strong force surrounds the walls of the Alamo, and threatens the garrison with the sword. Our country imperiously demands the service of every patriotic arm, and longer to continue in a state of apathy will be criminal. Citizens of Texas, descendants of Washington, awake. Arouse yourselves.

That is part of the hearings that we had. Now, what that had to do with statehood for Hawaii and Alaska I do not know. It is signed by Henry Smith, governor, I presume at that time, of Texas, but that was in 1836.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman will agree that that will rescue the report from oblivion.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his contribution. It at least helps it some.

Let us turn over now a few more pages. Let us go over another 10 or 12 pages and see what it says about Hawaiian statehood. This is from the Texas secretary of war addressed to Brig. Gen. M. Arbuckle, United States Army:

CITY OF AUSTIN, *June 11, 1840.*

SIR: You will please accept the thanks of His Excellency, the President and of this Department for your communication of date Fort Gibson, April 28, 1840.

We have suffered and are still suffering most serious injury from the intrusive advances of the Cherokee people, within the limits of our jurisdiction and territory.

That communication is signed by B. T. Archer, secretary of war. So, that is all we have here.

Now, in fairness to the distinguished chairman of the committee, he makes no claim that anybody has put the blessing on this thing. He makes no claim that the committee have called anybody to be heard, because in the report he says that the full House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs began hearings on H. R. 2535, the Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood bill, on January 25, 1955, and states no witnesses were summoned from the Territories.

So, the gentleman is not misleading anybody. Now, here is the remainder that I have here of the hearing. Where is the hearing that this Congress had a perfect right to expect on this bill before the Congress today? It is not here.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Could it possibly be that everyone who has ever wanted to has testified so many times for and against Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood that nobody wanted to show up either from Alaska or Hawaii all the way to Washington in order to say again what they said 12 or 15 times before?

Mr. HALEY. No, sir; I do not think that is correct, because, if the gentleman will notice, these witnesses brought here by the Hawaiian Statehood Commission were brought here at a cost to the people of Hawaii of approximately $600,000 and the gentleman will see that they have just had a merry-go-round. The gentleman talks about 700 people who came here; just count how many of them came back time and time again. I think that it must be a real profession out in the beautiful islands of Hawaii to come here to testify at these hearings.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. My colleague was in Hawaii during the hearings last December and he will remember that there was an invitation given to all of those who wished to testify against statehood for Hawaii. Although the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] had to leave before the hearings were held on statehood, only one witness appeared in the city of Honolulu in opposition to statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. In reply to the distinguished gentleman I may say that regardless of how many hearings we may have had last December in Hawaii, I ask

him to show me the record of those hearings. They are not here. They are not before this committee. Perhaps something did come out in those hearings that was of tremendous importance and would have had tremendous weight here. But those hearings are not before this committee. If they are I ask the gentleman to show them to me. They are not available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Much reference has been made here to hearings that were held heretofore during other sessions of Congress. This bill has never passed the Congress before; has it?

Mr. HALEY. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Those hearings that were made available to Members were had in prior sessions of Congress and Congress had a chance to vote on that proposed legislation, but did not see fit to pass it.

Mr. HALEY. That is correct. I am sorry I do not have time to go into what happened in the 83d Congress, because I think I could show the distinguished gentleman many such things as I have demonstrated here today. If you take those 5,000 pages of hearings and strip them down, you will have practically nothing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope no one will be misled and believe that there have not been ample hearings in the past on the issue of statehood. There have been many hearings, and so many facets of the question have been explored. Fifty-seven subjects were covered, from the subject of agriculture to the war record of the people in Hawaii. There were more than 4,000 pages of testimony, more than 700 witnesses. Definite instructions were left in Hawaii that anyone who wanted to write to the committee, to the minority side, could do so. One hundred and twenty-five people indicated their willingness to appear for statehood and there were only 2 who were opposed, and they did not have the courage even to write a letter to the committee opposing statehood. So there have been exhaustive hearings and every facet of the subject has been carefully examined. The last three committees who were in Hawaii have recommended statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The plain fact is that people have just worn themselves out coming here to Washington to testify. So far as these hearings are concerned, they were in progress for 10 days, and anybody who walked through the door and expressed a desire to be heard either for or against Hawaiian or Alaskan statehood would have been given the opportunity to say his piece.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I should like to say to the chairman of the committee that had I known that, and had I known that the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] was not going to bring forth the witnesses that he had requested, if he had permitted me I certainly would have been able to bring some witnesses from Hawaii.

Mr. DOLLIVER. During the debate on the rule the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules made a statement concerning the importance of this legislation. He indicated that probably we would have no measure before us in this Congress, perhaps not in this decade, nor have we had in the last 40 years since the last admission to the United States was made, of greater ultimate consequence to the United States of America. I thoroughly agree with that statement. This measure is of vital importance not only to the generation now living but to generations yet unborn in the limitless future of our great country.

Some statements have been made here by other people that they approach this matter dispassionately and objectively. I must say for myself that I do not approach it in that mood. I am emotional about this. I am passionately in favor of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

Why? These people are American citizens. They have endured territorial status long enough. They have stood in a stepchild relationship to the United States Government, one of them for nearly 100 years and the other for approximately 50 years. Did we accord the people who live in these Territories the blessings of American citizenship to say, "We will postpone and postpone and postpone and never give you a chance to become full-fledged possessors of the rights that other Americans have"?

So I do not approach this dispassionately. These people are our fellow citizens and deserve the rights and privileges that belong to the rest of us.

Local self-government: Why? The genius of our system on this great continent is contained in those words. Local self-government: How else can the people of Hawaii and Alaska take care of their local problems?

The Delegate from Alaska knows that I visited his Territory 2 years ago and spent some weeks there. I found some of the most appalling situations existing in the towns and the countryside of that vast, almost limitless, Territory, because of this very reason: They cannot control their own affairs. I daresay the Delegate from Hawaii would tell us the same thing.

These people want to live their own life, they want to govern their own affairs, they want to control their own schools, their own police force, their own courts. Yet, under present conditions, from an office here in Washington, 3,000 miles away, our Government bureaucrats undertake to tell them what to do in Anchorage and Honolulu.

This is a place where our American citizenship ought to come to the front. We should accord these people who are our brothers the rights of American local self-government.

It is a fact that both the great political parties have promised this to Hawaii and Alaska. These promises have been made repeatedly. That has been pointed out here.

Do we, who are Republicans and Democrats, renounce now today those pledges which were made in our national conventions? Do we tell the world we are not going to remember what we pledged to the people on the islands in the Pacific and in the Territory to the north?

Oh, but you say, there are some partisan things involved in this, and one of them is Democratic and the other is Republican. My knowledge of the history of my own State reveals to me that there were 2 States that came in as a pair back in 1846—Iowa came into the Union as a free State and Florida to the south. It is not an unusual pattern here that we are confronting. This has happened time and time again in American history.

As for the qualifications of these two Territories, and their economic stature and their stature so far as self-government is concerned—in every way, they are just as much entitled to statehood as was my own State back in 1846 or as your State was when it became a part of the Union.

Attention has been especially called to the fact that Hawaii will have 2 Senators, if it is admitted as a State, and, likewise, Alaska will have 2 Senators—true enough. The opponents of this legislation say, "Well, that is terrible because our largest State has 15 million inhabitants and probably there are less than 200,000 people in Alaska and approximately 500,000 in Hawaii, and the disparity is too great."

Mr. Chairman, that issue was decided in the Constitutional Convention in 1787 under the guidance of a great Virginian whose name was James Madison. The Virginia plan was the one which prevailed providing that the States should be represented by 2 Senators, but the people should be represented according to population in the House of Representatives.

So, when Alaska and Hawaii are admitted, they will have the same representation in the Senate as every other sovereign State, but here in the House they will be represented according to population, as it has been from the beginning. It was settled one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years ago.

I am not impressed by the arguments about communism which have been presented here. Communism is a curse and a cancer upon our modern society. But, do you think for a moment that we are going to do better in eliminating communism in Hawaii and Alaska or wherever it may be by crippling the people who live there and denying to them the rights of American citizenship or local self-government? Ah, no, the thing that will happen, in my honest judgment, if you refuse statehood they will say, "Well,

perhaps we cannot rely on the American system and we must seek some other system where we can have self-government." Actually, the argument about communism, therefore, to me sums up an argument for statehood rather than against it. Because by granting statehood will we be better able to tear down and destroy communism in the islands and in Alaska.

Another argument, which has been presented here, is the argument of noncontiguity.

Hitherto every State that has been admitted to the Union has been contiguous to the rest of the country. But in these modern days that is not a compelling argument. When Iowa was admitted in 1846 it took longer to go from Washington, D. C., to Davenport than it takes now to go from Washington, D. C., to the farthest reaches of the world.

The Delegate from Hawaii told you a few minutes ago how she could reach her home in Honolulu in less than 24 hours from this very spot. The magic of the airplane and the miracle of air transportation has decreased the size of the world we live in to the point where noncontiguity means nothing.

Not only do we have the speed of transport but we have instantaneous communication. We can talk to Hawaii on the telephone any time we choose. Likewise, we have instantaneous communication with that outpost to the north. So it seems to me we must approach this on the basis of modern travel and modern communication. Here are two Territories of the United States that are close to us and are now to be taken into the family of States. Land, sea, and air transport have brought us near to these once-far-away outposts.

I say I am not unemotional about this. Let me tell you why I am somewhat fired up. Joe Farrington represented the Territory of Hawaii here for many years. He was a man of great personal charm who brought me within the orbit of his influence. I had a brief opportunity to visit Hawaii a number of years ago, and while there I was enchanted by his friendliness and hospitality. I shall never forget it. Alas, that he could not see the day when his beloved archipelago became a State of the Union.

But happily for us, his mate, now his widow, is here, and I, for one, am 1,000 percent for "BETTY" FARRINGTON in her desires for statehood for Hawaii.

And for Alaska, here is my long-time friend, Delegate BOB BARTLETT. Also I have a little closer interest. My only daughter spent 3 years in Alaska, working in a children's home in Seward. One summer I took the trouble to drive up over the Alaskan Highway to see her and see what kind of surroundings there were in that supposedly far-off place. I found it was not so far off as I had thought, and not so forbidding as I had feared. I came back thoroughly convinced that those people deserved the boon of statehood just as they do in Hawaii. They need it. They deserve it.

Now finally, one last word. I thank God that Hawaii and Alaska are a part of these United States. In the words of the late Joe Farrington, they are "two fists" to protect us from aggression on the West and on the North. What a graphic description that is. These two Territories, soon to be the 49th and 50th States will be even stronger bastions of defense than now.

I earnestly urge an overwhelming vote for this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has again expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I would say in all probability that the strongest arguments both for and against statehood for Alaska and Hawaii have already been offered. But certainly there is one thing I would like to comment on at this particular time, and that is the fact that as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I am thoroughly convinced that this bill which we have brought to the floor of the House today is a good bill; it is a good measure, and it should be passed.

I for one am here to support this bill; I for one am here to comment that I shall vote against any move to recommit this bill, because I believe it is a just and equitable bill for the people of both Hawaii and Alaska. In the deliberations of the committee it was our belief that it was a fair ball and that it had a good chance of acceptance by both the other body and by the President of the United States.

So, first I would like on behalf of the committee to ask the Members of this House to support this bill in exactly the form in which we have it today. I agree with some of those who have spoken that it is unfortunate the Committee on Rules did not give this House an opportunity to discuss to a greater extent the pros and cons of statehood, but since we come here under the circumstances we do and under the terms laid down by the Rules Committee I think we must make the best of it.

I would like at this time to comment for just a moment upon a statement made by a distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Texas. There have been a number of statements made with reference to whether or not statehood has been implied or promised, or whether or not this Nation has committed itself to give statehood or to grant statehood to these two Territories. I refer to the statement by the distinguished gentleman from Texas with reference to planks in the platforms of the two great parties in this country. I believe those planks were a commitment to the American people. We have that as a commitment from the Republican Party, and we have it also as a commitment from the Democratic Party. I for one firmly believe it is a commitment to the American people, and when I ran for this office on the planks of the Democratic platform I considered it a commitment to the people I represented to stand by and fight for the things contained in that platform.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Am I to understand that the planks contained in a political platform concerning Territories are binding, but that promises contained in a political platform made by Members running on that platform to the American farmer are not binding?

Mr. SISK. I would like to say to the gentleman in answer to his question—and I do not want to get into politics on this particular question—that I consider all planks in a platform as being binding, and I would so consider it upon me as a candidate upon any given platform, that it was binding whether it pertained to the farmers of this country, to the Territories under discussion today, or any other subject which I think was made as a commitment to the American people.

For just a moment I would like to call your attention to the State from which I come as it may relate to this particular problem with which we are confronted here today.

It is strange how history repeats itself. It is even stranger how little each succeeding generation learns from the lessons of history.

As we review the history of our Union, as we hark back and harken to the debates that preceded the admission of the States that now compose it, we find an almost uncanny repetition of the same arguments against the admission of each new State. Sometimes we find those objections expressed in almost identical language. Way back in 1818 when Illinois was seeking admission, a Representative from New York opposed the admission of what has now become the empire State of the Middle West on the ground that its population was small, that it was composed of crude frontiersmen, and therefore not entitled to full equality with the civilized and far more numerous people of the State of New York.

It is amusing when we look back at that now.

The fight for and against the admission of the great State of California, the empire State of the West, now second in population among the States, and I suspect before long likely to be first, presents some interesting analogies with the current opposition to the admission of Alaska.

Like Alaska today, when California was seeking admission in the late 1840's, California was a noncontiguous area. It was separated from the nearest State of Texas, admitted some 5 years earlier, by nearly a thousand miles of what was known then as a part of the great American desert. Farther north, California was separated by some 1,500 miles from the States of Iowa and Wisconsin, admitted respectively in 1846 and 1848. It was indeed a noncontiguous area whose admission the Members of Congress were debating, separated by desert, the Sierras and Rocky Mountains, and by land inhabited by hostile Indians.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Did I understand the gentleman to say that these territories were not contiguous to the United States when they were brought in?

Mr. SISK. They were not contiguous so far as being a part of the United States at that time was concerned.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. But they were contiguous to land owned by the United States?

Mr. SISK. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that California in 1848 was no more contiguous to the United States than the Territory of Alaska is today contiguous to the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There has never been an ocean between the United States and California, has there?

Mr. SISK. The Territory of Alaska, I will say to the gentleman, is a part of the North American Continent and is attached thereto.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Was a foreign nation between us and California?

Mr. SISK. No; there was not a foreign nation, but certainly there was a large area. I might say that in order to travel from the then established State of Texas to the State of California you needed a troop of cavalry. It took you quite a number of weeks to make that distance. Certainly today we do not need a troop of cavalry to get either to Alaska or to Hawaii.

And what were the arguments raised in opposition to the admission of California? First, its remoteness. Second, its great extent. Third, the smallness of its population which it was declared would probably never amount to much. Fourth, its doubtful productiveness. Fifth, the dubious character of its people. Its admission, in the words of Senator Pierre Soulé, of Louisiana, "threatens to shake to its very foundations the whole Government"—CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Appendix, part II, 31st Congress, 1st session, August 10, 1850, pages 1519–1520.

What was said about the people of California? Representative J. A. Seddon, of Virginia, in the House of Representatives on January 3, 1850, declared:

I mean, Mr. Speaker—

He said—

no disrespect or disparagement of the population of California. I have among them a few friends, to whom in their far off wanderings my sympathies strongly cling, but it is not to be denied that the population of California is of a most heterogeneous composition—Mexicans, Indians, Chinese, Otaheitans, adventurers, and gold hunters from all the nations of the earth—of every language, complexion and race. A very large proportion of them are mere sojourners, adventurers, and wayfarers, roaming over a wild, uninhabited expanse in quest of treasure with which to return to their homes. * * * The right of such a population * * * to establish a State government can surely not be gravely entertained by any. * * * It is not to be tolerated, and at whatever hazards California ought to be remanded to territorial subordination.

A similarly unfavorable characterization of Californians was voiced by Representative John McQueen, of South Carolina, on June 8, 1850, who said:

The inhabitants—I beg pardon—the floating population of every color and nation, who happened in California, have, since that time, clothed themselves in the habiliments of sovereignty and demand admission as one of the States * * * upon equal terms with the others. * * * This whole thing of the sovereign State of California would look better in the pages of the Arabian Nights than in the archives of this body.

As to the potentialities of the State for growth, they were presented disparagingly on August 6, 1850, by Senator Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, who, let it be noted, nevertheless voted for admission, as follows:

With all the extent of California—great as it is represented to be, and it is very great in its extent—it will never sustain, gold mines and all, one-half the population of the small State of Ohio; not one-half. There is not in it territory that is capable of cultivation equal to one-fourth the State of Ohio.

And Senator Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, who was to become Vice President of the United States in President Lincoln's first administration, and likewise voted for the admission of California, declared on March 5, 1850:

There cannot be a single doubt that the capacity of Illinois, the capacity of Indiana, of Pennsylvania, or Ohio, or any of our first-class agricultural States is vastly greater to sustain a population than the territory embraced within the limits of California.

It is something of a coincidence that one of the strongest and most vigorous protagonists of the admission of California as a State was none other than William H. Seward, then Senator from New York, who later, as Secretary of State, almost single-handed achieved the acquisition of Alaska. Said he, in an address that has reechoed through the decades:

Shall California be received? For myself, upon my individual judgment and conscience, I answer, yes. * * *

Every new State, whether she come from the East or from the West—every new State, coming from whatever part of this continent she may—is always welcome. But California, that comes from the clime where the West dies away into the rising East—California, which bounds at once the empire and the continent—California, the youthful queen of the Pacific, in her robes of freedom, gorgeously inlaid with gold—is doubly welcome.

There is certainly an interesting analogy in Senator Seward's reference to California bounding the empire and the continent, and as the youthful queen of the Pacific, gorgeously inlaid with gold and Alaska today.

Alaska, even more than California, today bounds the continent, not only on the west but on the north. Alaska is not only the youthful queen of the Pacific Ocean but also of the Arctic Ocean, extending as it does, uniquely among the areas of this continent, into the eastern hemisphere, and thus making it our farthest west into the Pacific and our farthest north into the Arctic.

As a gold-producing area, Alaska ranks third, with California and Colorado first and second, respectively, from the time of the first gold strikes, though in various years Alaska has exceeded both in gold production.

After referring to the formation by Californians of their State government which they were seeking to have admitted to the Union, Seward continued:

Indeed, California is more than justified. She was a colony—a military colony.

What a pertinent and correct description also of Alaska today: "A colony—a military colony"—since we have been told by high administration spokesmen that reasons of national defense, which, however, have never been specified, should cause its rejection as a State of the Union and its maintenance as a military outpost—in short, a military colony.

Senator Seward continued:

All colonies, especially military colonies, are incongruous inconsistent with our political system.

That is no less true today than it was a 105 years ago when Seward so declared. And he added that these military colonies were not only incongruous inconsistent with our political system but they were "equally open to corruption and exposed to oppression." And he added this signicant comment:

They are, therefore, not more unfortunate in their own proper condition than fruitful of dangers to the parent democracy.

If corroborative evidence is desired as to what happens in the way of corruption and oppression under military rule, see Hawaii Under Army Rule, by J. Garner Anthony, just published by the Stanford University Press.

There are other interesting parallels between California and Alaska.

At the time of the passage of the act of admission, on September 9, 1850, California contained a large number of Indian tribes which were asserting claims to a large portion of the State by virtue of aboriginal occupancy or through the actions taken by previous sovereigns.

There have been similar claims in Alaska. In previous debates on the admission of Alaska it has been urged that these claims be settled prior to the admission of Alaska as a State. The claim of aboriginal rights in Alaska by the so-called native population, Indian and Eskimo, has even been cited by some of the opponents of statehood as a cloud over the prospective titles of land in Alaska, discouraging settlement and investment, a cloud which must be dispelled before Alaska is admitted to the Union. Alaska, however, is in far better shape than was California in this respect, and far better than when these arguments against the admission of Alaska were advanced in recent years. For earlier this year, on February 7, 1955, the Supreme Court of the United States, in rendering its decision in the case of the Tee-Hit-Ton Indians against the United States, disposed of the question of aboriginal and possessory rights of the aborigines of Alaska forever. It declared there were no such rights. In rendering its decision the Supreme Court affirmed an earlier decision by the United States Court of Claims.

But to return to California, it was not until after the admission of California that Congress authorized steps looking to the settlement of Indian claims. But the measures adopted proved ineffective. It was not until half a century later, in 1901, that the land titles in California were finally freed from the cloud of Indian claims through a Supreme Court decision.

Again, among the arguments used against the admission of Alaska has been

the almost total ownership by the Federal Government of Alaska's land. And it is true that despite the unceasing protests of Alaskans, delivered through legislative memorials for the last 32 years, protests by Alaska's elected Delegates and its appointed Governors, the failure of the Congress to adopt suitable land legislation and to provide for surveys is responsible for the fact that less than 1 percent of the public domain of Alaska has passed into private ownership. The bill before us, H. R. 2535, in title 2, dealing with Alaska, will rectify that long-standing impediment to settlement and growth. But it may be pointed out that the California act of admission did not grant a single acre of public domain to the new State. It was not until 3 years later, 1853, that legislation was enacted granting two sections per township to the new State.

California was admitted to statehood by a vote of 150 to 56 in the House, and 34 to 18 in the Senate, the House majority being just under 3 to 1 and the Senate majority just under 2 to 1.

The subsequent history of California has not only full vindicated the affirmative action that was taken, but refuted the gloomy prophecies and forebodings of its opponents. The very foundations of our Government were not shaken by the admission of California, as Senator Pierre Soulé, of Louisiana, prophesied. Nor will the admission of Alaska "mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it," as a distinguished but mistaken Senator declared not long ago. On the contrary, the Nation will become greater and stronger by the admission of Alaska, just as it became greater and stronger through the admission of California. By the admission of California we extended the Union to over 1,000 miles of coastline on the Pacific. By the admission of Alaska we shall extend it still farther west into the Pacific and also onto a new and henceforth important ocean, the Arctic.

I venture to suggest that the interesting parallels which I have cited between California and Alaska will continue. Alaska, if admitted to statehood, will populate its vast area. Great in extent, as was California—indeed, actually greater—it will likewise become great in population. It will not remain, in terms of the census, a small State. Given self-government, its pioneers will do for that abundant empire of the north what the pioneers did in California. Let us not forget that across the world, in corresponding latitudes, with similar climates, a sturdy race of people, the Scandinavians and Finns, the descendants of many of whom traveled from the Old World to the States and from the States to Alaska, have built a great civilization and a stable economy in a society now numbering 16 million people, in an area but three-fourths that of Alaska. Thus statehood for Alaska, I confidently prophesy, will duplicate, will reenact, the great and glorious history of what Seward hailed as the "youthful queen of the Pacific," just as Seward foresaw the greatness and the destiny of Alaska.

It is pertinent at this point to quote what a great Californian said on the subject of Alaska statehood.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 5 years ago, Earl Warren, then Governor of the State of California, where he served as its chief executive for 11 years, and now Chief Justice of the United States, said, and I quote him in part:

> I am appearing here as a neighbor, from a neighboring State, a State that is friendly to Alaska and that is hopeful for the opportunities that it may have in the future. * * *
>
> We in the West believe that the development of any part of the West is of great benefit to the entire West, and we consider Alaska as an integral part of the West. * * *
>
> We believe that we have a particular interest in the defense of Alaska, and we believe that if Alaska is given statehood, is given an opportunity to develop its resources and its civilization, that it will be a greater factor in the defense of our Nation than it could otherwise be. We believe, in the last analysis, the defense of Alaska will come from the civilization that we develop there rather than just from the airplanes that we send there, or the fortifications that we develop. We are of the opinion that Alaska will not develop to the fullest extent of its potentialities unless it does achieve statehood.
>
> We believe that no Territory of this country that is owned, more than 98 percent, by the Government and managed by it, by bureaus as far away as Washington is from Alaska, can give the people the opportunity to develop in accordance with American principles and ideals.
>
> We believe that this is a particularly significant time, so far as the development of Alaska is concerned, because it is the outpost of our civilization, it is the outpost of our democracy, and we fervently believe that if people are encouraged to go to Alaska and develop its resources that we can make that portion of our country more secure than could otherwise possibly be done.
>
> We believe that statehood will increase the population of Alaska much faster than it has developed in the past. While we are interested in the welfare of Alaska, we are also interested in our own welfare, and we believe that the development of Alaska will help our economy. We believe that the more people there are there, the more trade they have, the more we will share in it, and the better it will be for our people.
>
> We believe that it is only justice for the people of Alaska that they be admitted into the Union of the States. For 83 years Americans have lived in Alaska, and for the last 38 years they have lived under a Territorial government. The people have served in two wars, they have served faithfully and loyally, they have paid the taxes that our Government has imposed upon them, and we believe that they have earned statehood in every sense of the word.
>
> On the question of the population, I want to say that Alaska has more people now than my own State had when it was admitted to the Union 100 years ago.

At this point, Senator Cordon, of Oregon, interposed, saying:

> May I also suggest, Mr. Governor, that at the time your State was admitted it also was noncontiguous with another State.

Governor Warren replied:

> Yes, sir. Senator, I was about to say that, and also to point out that I left San Francisco yesterday afternoon at half past 4 by the fastest mode of transportation that we have, arriving here at 9:30 this morning, and I could have gotten to southern Alaska quicker than I could have gotten to Washington by the same mode of transportation. So, we do not feel that the distance out there on the Pacific coast is material to this issue. We are used to distances, and we believe that the great distances in the West represent a great part of its strength.
>
> So we feel that the people of Alaska have earned the right to statehood, and we believe they have earned the right to full development under statehood.

Subsequently, on the same occasion, Governor Warren also testified no less strongly for statehood for Hawaii, urging its admission to the Union at the earliest possible day.

I heartily agree with that great American, now Chief Justice of the United States, that both Alaska and Hawaii should be made States now, and the front line of our democracy advanced to a new farthest west and farthest north.

Now, certainly, as we consider the statements by these men, these great men, and they were great in the years gone by, when we consider the vision which they had with reference to many things and yet the lack of vision as it concerns the admission of new States, certainly it seems to me that today we need to look back at history just a little bit. We need to consider some of the possibilities; we need to realize the potentialities that exist for these two peoples, the people of Alaska and the people of the Hawaiian Islands, because certainly to me it is unfair and it is unjust, it is a tragedy to continue to deny these people the right of first-class American citizenship, to allow them to become a part of the United States of America in truth and in practice, so that they may carry on the affairs of their various areas in like manner with that of the other States of this great country in which we live.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this bill gives us an almost unequaled opportunity to demonstrate before the world whether we in the United States really believe in the things we so often talk about or whether we do not believe in them.

I am in favor of the bill for a good many reasons, and the more I study it the more I am in favor of it. I recognize that the case for Alaska is not yet as good as the case for Hawaii, but considering the total picture and with the proposed modifications of Alaskan boundaries so that the new State would not be too overburdened with certain vast areas that are already Federally owned and are important largely for national defense, I believe not only that Alaska is entitled to statehood, but that it will be of great advantage to the United States to have her as a member of our sisterhood of States.

When it comes to Hawaii, with which I have had a good deal more experience, I have an even greater conviction that we should pass the bill overwhelmingly. We need Hawaii as much as Hawaii needs us. We need her not only because of what she can contribute to our security and our overall position in the

Pacific, but because of what she demonstrates to people all around the world regarding the nature of American democracy at its best.

Nobody will deny that we are living in a period of worldwide conflict between the only two basic forms of government which, I think it is correct to say, there have ever been. One is government from the top down, with final decision in the hands of the few. It is government by dictatorship—whether dictatorship by a man or a party or a class or a race or an economic bloc; government from above.

The other basic form of government, with many varieties, of course, is government from the bottom up, with final decision in the hands of the many. The people control the government instead of the government controlling the people. It might be described as government by federation, in the broad sense of that word. It is a free association of peoples under agreements voluntarily entered into in order to achieve objectives that are in the interests of all; instead of involuntary control of a people against its will by some person or group that is stronger than they are, strong enough to impose its will, whether consented to or not.

This bill will test whether we believe in extending to these two qualified Territories the federation principle, which is the secret of our own growth and strength; or whether we believe in the dictatorship principle when it comes to these two members of our own society. Our standing with much of the world, especially Asian peoples, and their confidence in us when we denounce Communist imperialism, will go up or down according to our action today on this bill.

I cannot see a single, good reason against the admission of these two areas to full statehood, and I see many good reasons for their admission.

I have heard all the arguments against, and am fully aware of them; for instance, that these Territories are not contiguous to the United States. But, actually, my State of Minnesota was farther away from Washington and more inaccessible when she was admitted as a State than is either Alaska or Hawaii now.

I have heard the argument about communism in Hawaii. The same problem exists there as exists here. I do not deny the problem in either place; but the question is, which is the better way to handle it—with people who are kept as second-class citizens and who become sullen and resentful because our Government does not play square with them? Or with people who are full and equal citizens of this Republic?

Surely we want to handle the Communist problem in the most successful way possible. Surely the most successful way is to enable the people in Hawaii to deal with it in the same manner as we wrestle with it in our own States and cities right here at home.

I know the argument about these folks being of different national origins than most of us on the mainland. Particularly, objection is raised because many of them came from Asian races and cultures. Actually that is one of the glories of the situation—the fact that peoples from Asian backgrounds understand and dedicate themselves to American ideas and institutions as fully as do those from Europe or those who are native born.

Why do so many of us underestimate the strength of our own America? Do we imagine that people who are way back in medieval, feudalistic conditions can understand communism and be drawn to it and give themselves to it with total dedication and understanding; but that those same people cannot understand Americanism, with its ideas and practices of freedom, self-government, equality of opportunity, and will not be attracted to it and give their allegiance to it with equal enthusiasm? If that were the case, then our side would be bound to lose in this world struggle.

But it is not the case. We should not underestimate the pull, the allure, the attraction to all peoples everywhere of the philosophy of government that brought our Nation into being, and that our Nation has generally stood for before the world.

To the people behind the Iron Curtain and the peoples on the fence, those who are uncertain or trying to be neutral until they are sure which side to choose, it is we who are on trial today, not Hawaii and Alaska. What do we really believe and stand for? That is what more than half of the people of the world, not just a handful in Hawaii and Alaska, are wanting to know.

It is said that Hawaiians of Asian ancestry will vote as racial blocs. It is said that they will vote as Japanese, or as Filipinos, or as Chinese, because of their racial ancestry. There is no evidence to support that. Certainly there is no indication that they will do so in Hawaii more than Americans of European origin do here at home.

Last winter I had occasion to go to the largest of the islands, the island of Hawaii. More than half the population on that island are of Japanese ancestry. What happened in the election they had there last fall? A man, of Japanese ancestry, was a Nisei running for the legislature. The majority did not vote for him. They elected a man of Filipino ancestry, although there is only a handful of voters of Filipino ancestry in that legislative district. They voted just the way you and I do for the man they thought was the best man for the job. They are not Japanese, or Chinese, or Filipinos, or even Hawaiians any more. They are Americans.

That is one of the greatest glories of Hawaii—and, as I have said, it is the glory of America—the ability of our American philosophy of life and system of government, which is our unique contribution to the world, to be understood and welcomed by all peoples who are exposed to it, and to inspire their full allegiance and command their loyalty.

It not only attracts people of European origins and cultural backgrounds which, while differing among themselves, are basically all of the white race; but in Hawaii it has demonstrated its capacity to appeal equally to people of all races.

This is the ultimate test of universality and true Americanism can meet that test. If I did not believe that our system is the one that will be best for all peoples, then I would believe it is not the best for you and me right here in the United States of America. I wonder sometimes if we here on the mainland understand that as well as those on our front lines in the Pacific.

Let me summarize what seem to me the basic reasons why we ought to pass this bill.

The first is the moral consideration. This applies with particular cogency in the case of Hawaii, because we did not annex Hawaii by conquest. She came in as a Territory by a treaty between sovereign governments. It was a voluntary act on her part, an agreement into which she entered in the same way as Texas did when she joined the Union. It was explicitly understood by all when Hawaii became an incorporated Territory that as soon as she qualified, she would be admitted as a State. She qualified long ago.

One, she is qualified as to population. She has more people than at least four States. Two, she is qualified as to economic soundness. She has more wealth and pays more Federal taxes than several States. Three, she is qualified as to education and health standards, and the well-being of her people. In some fields, such as rural education and rural health and agricultural experimentation, we on the continent look to Hawaii for guidance. They are ahead of us in many respects.

When it comes to loyalty, they do not have to take a back seat to anybody. I do not forget this, that when Pearl Harbor came and Hawaii took the most severe blow any part of America has ever suffered from a foreign foe, there might have been, and many expected, all sorts of sabotage. But there was not a proven case of sabotage by those of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii.

Then what did we do? Because we were scared, we seized all people of Japanese ancestry, native-born Americans as well as aliens, and we tore up their rights and guaranties under our Constitution. We put them in concentration camps. We destroyed their rights under the Bill of Rights.

What would you and I have done if our Government had treated us that way? I suspect we would have brooded about it after this fashion, "What kind of government is this that takes me, a native-born American, and just because my father and mother came from a country which has attacked America, and because I am of another color, a color I cannot change, puts me in a concentration camp in violation of the very Constitution they exhort me to be loyal to?"

I suspect I would have been full of bitterness and might have turned against America.

There was a handful of Japanese who did that—some who had come from Japan itself. They said, "There is no justice in this land. Americans will not treat us on the basis of our worth or rights as individuals. We are the wrong color. We will go back to Japan."

But what did the overwhelming majority of them do? They proved themselves better Americans than those who

imprisoned them. They sat in the camps and talked about it among themselves and made up their minds to petition our Government to let them go into the armed services as volunteers, to give them a chance to prove whether or not they were good Americans. After a great deal of discussion and delay their petition was finally granted.

You all know the rest of the story. Their unit made the finest record—in medals for bravery, and Purple Hearts for wounds—of all similar units in the United States Armed Forces. They proved that they understood the heart of Americanism better than many of us here today seem to understand it, we who boast that our folks came over on the Mayflower. We who have been so accustomed to the wonderful privileges of American citizenship that we often do not appreciate the real nature of it as much as do some of those who know what it is not to have such opportunity elsewhere.

The first reason, then, to me is a moral reason. They have earned it. They deserve it. We promised it to them. I believe in the United States keeping its promises.

The second is the economic reason. America grew rich by two processes: Increasing production and increasing trade, by developing and expanding markets here at home and then abroad. Where are the undeveloped areas of the world today? Not in Europe or America. The greatest ones are in Asia. Africa and South America have great undeveloped natural resources but they do not have adequate manpower. Asia has half the manpower of the world. It has great undeveloped natural resources plus undeveloped human resources—a billion people, a billion potential soldiers, a billion potential producers, a billion potential customers. America's trade needs to grow and expand during the next half century. Does she want to have the inside track in the economic development of that part of the world with benefit to all? Or does she want to limp along behind?

The door to much of Asia is still open. All we have to do to win their confidence is to continue the role that historically we have played, and to which they look especially on the basis of what we have done in the Philippines, with great anticipation and hope.

What are we to do now with Hawaii?

Hawaii is our bridge to Asia. It is our showcase, the best we have anywhere in the Pacifica area. In fact, it is the best showcase we have anywhere in the world of the real nature of the society which we hope people everywhere will choose for themselves. Justice to Hawaiians will keep it so. It will encourage all people in Asia to resist Communist blandishments and turn more in our direction for economic relations.

More important still are the political reasons, including considerations of national security. Asia is in turmoil. The old patterns are shattered. The people there cannot be put back into the old patterns. What is the new pattern to be? Ours or that of the Communists?

Well, here is this great outpost of our pattern, right in the center of the Pacific. Can anybody doubt that it will be a far more effective outpost for freedom and a more secure bastion of our security if it is a full State and its citizens are full citizens, proud members of this Nation? Is it not certain to be a less firm bastion if its people are held in a state of half-citizenship, restless and unhappy, taxed without opportunity to vote on the taxes that are levied upon them here in Washington?

The greatest urge of most peoples in Asia today is not for larger economic benefits and well-being, as much as they want those. What they want most in Asia is equality of political status. They want their national independence. They want self-respect. They want dignity. They want to be treated as equals on the basis of their being children of God—human beings like the rest of us. Historically that is what America has stood for. Do we stand for it today?

We are at a crossroads, deciding whether we are going to be true to one of the greatest things in American history, or whether, out of fears and doubts and lack of confidence in ourselves, we are to turn our backs upon a part of that heritage.

Out in Bandung, there has just been held a conference representing a little more than half of the people of the world. Most of them are not white people. They are awakening. We ourselves for a century have done more than anyone else to awaken them. They are aware of their potential powers. Which way are they going to go? Are they going to go the way that Japan tried to take them—racism? Asia for the Asiatics or the colored people against the whites?

Do not make any mistake about this—the only reason Japan failed was because her leaders were so foolish as to treat the people of Asia worse than the white man had treated them. But because she failed does not mean her idea did not take root. If these people do not see that their hope for themselves lies in the possibility of moving along with the whites on a basis of equality, then one day out of the ranks of the Chinese or the Japanese or the Filipinos or the Indians or the Malaysians, there will rise some man, or men, with a hypnotic personality and a sense of mission, who will preach in earnest: Asia for the Asiatics. Many would go with him with a song on their lips not because they wanted it but because they saw no hope of equality of treatment from the whites. In any such race war we would be bound to lose because they outnumber us 2 to 1. They can outwork us and undereat us. They can outwait and outsuffer us and they will outbreed us.

If America chooses a course which leads to such a race struggle, then we are walking to our doom.

All these are involved in the bill today. It is not just the fate of Hawaii and Alaska. I want my own country to survive. I want her to continue to occupy a high position among the nations of the world and to prove by our actions before the world now that we deserve such a place—as we have in the greatest moments in our past.

So, for moral reasons, for economic reasons, for security reasons, and for political reasons we should admit our Hawaiian Island Territory to statehood in the Union. It is an opportunity to take a positive political step of the greatest importance at a time of the greatest importance—when the world is fluid and many peoples are undecided, watching.

We draft men and build planes and bombs and appropriate billions to protect our country. But they are not enough. Do we believe in the things we talk about—the right of peoples to governments of their own choosing and equality of opportunity?

We have today a chance to do a positive act which will be understood around the world and which will make other peoples know that America, having thought the thing over and thoroughly debated it, believes in and is going to be true to herself.

In much of the world today the trend is from the status of citizen to the status of subject. If we will take this step today, we can come as near as by any act that I can think of to reversing that alarming trend and can expand the areas where the direction is from subject to citizen.

To give statehood to people who have proved worthy and have earned the right will be a vivid demonstration of the reality of our American faith.

To have one of our great States in the center of the Pacific as a conspicuous example of our American way of life will have obvious great advantages.

It will focus attention throughout the vast Pacific Basin on the capacity of our form of government to inspire the loyalty of all racial and national strains.

Such deeds are the way to overcome Communist lies about us and restore America to her place of leadership in the half of the world that hangs in the balance.

Passage of this bill by the Congress, I believe, will have an immeasurable value in strengthening our influence and good relations with every people in that whole area. What can be more important?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. I think each of us should realize that there is more to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States than the mere fact that they will be placed on an equal basis with the present 48. Truly, the eyes of the world are directed at us on this issue. We can prove to the rest of the world that we are truly a Christian nation interested in the welfare of our friends by granting Hawaii and Alaska statehood. Let us face up to our responsibilities and put aside our petty prejudices.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill. I am convinced that to admit these two Territories to

Statehood at this time would be unwise and dangerous. My motives are not political because I am against the admission of either Hawaii or Alaska, or both of them. I am convinced that to admit these Territories would in some measure weaken the superstructure of the Union.

There are, as I see it, many good reasons to support this position. Most of them have been thoroughly developed. What is important at the moment is that the Members study well the implications of their vote today. This vote is indeed important. Here today you may very well be playing for keeps. If a mistake is made, and admission is finally approved, there will be no chance to correct the error in the future. So let us most carefully weigh the issue before us.

There are many good reasons why this bill should not be enacted. Among the arguments against statehood that appeal to me are these:

WOULD BE DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

First, the precedent that would be created. If Hawaii and Alaska are admitted, an intensive drive to admit Puerto Rico is sure to follow. And then there will be stepped up efforts to grant statehood to the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and perhaps the Marianas.

Let us look at Hawaii for a moment. It is composed of 20 islands scattered out over the Pacific, within a space 350 miles long and 50 miles wide. Nine of these are populated. Between the islands are international waters. Only 8 percent of the land of the islands is tillable, yet aside from such transitory factors as tourists and the military, agriculture is the principal industry that sustains the economy. But my main point here is the distance from the continental United States, which is around 2,000 miles, and the precedent that would be established by attaching States that by the nature of things are not attachable.

COMMUNISTS DOMINATE

Secondly, aside from the dangerous precedent that would be set, the evidence is overwhelming that Hawaii should be required to get its own house in order and show a capacity to cope with its own domestic problems before serious consideration is given to statehood. I refer to the Communist control of those islands. That is not idle talk. It is a fact. If you are so naive that you do not want to think so, study the records. Go to Hawaii, get a briefing by the military there, and talk to some of the people who know and who are willing to talk freely. Study the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Study the records and the findings of the Territorial Commission on Subversive Activities. Study the newspaper files out there and trace the progress of the political influence exerted by the Communist leaders who throw a lot of weight around. The record is too well documented to leave any trace of doubt. Let us not in our zeal and enthusiasm blink our eyes to reality. There is nothing quite as obstinate as a fact. And it is a fact that the Communists today have a virtual stranglehold on the economy of those islands and also exert a rather dominant influence in politics, as evidenced by the last general election.

Listen to this: In a survey made by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin after the November 1954 election, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—endorsed 71 candidates. Of these, 58 won, or 81 percent. In the senate, 5 out of 6 ILWU-endorsed candidates won. There are a total of 15 seats in the senate. In the house, 22 ILWU-supported candidates out of 28 won. There are 30 seats in the house. In the county, 32 ILWU-supported candidates won out of 38 contests.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that Harry Bridges, our No. 2 Communist in this country, is supporting statehood for Hawaii? Is it any wonder that Bridges' right hand man, Jack Hall, is demanding statehood?

Here, among other similar statements, is what Jack Hall said in a public speech:

> Do not forget we are aching for statehood, and then we will be able to elect our governor and our judges, and we will have control of the police.

And here are the words of Harry Bridges in a Labor Day speech in Honolulu:

> Never for a second forget that statehood for Hawaii is our most important political objective.

It is important to keep in mind that there is a membership of 25,000 in the ILWU, headed by Harry Bridges. And the United Public Workers Union has a membership of 2,000 public employees. It is headed by a well-known Communist named Henry Epstein. It works hand in glove with Harry Bridges and the ILWU.

FORMER GOVERNOR OF HAWAII OPPOSES STATEHOOD

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that anyone who questions the fact that the ILWU is Communist-dominated is naive. I just cannot believe anyone can be serious who takes that position. That fact has been thoroughly documented. But let me ask your indulgence while I cite another authority. The Honorable Ingram M. Stainback, former Governor of Hawaii, should be a good authority on the subject, if additional authority is needed. In testimony before the Senate committee studying this subject he told them he had gone to Hawaii more than 40 years ago to practice law. He served as attorney general of the islands, later as United States attorney, and still later as United States judge for the district of Hawaii. In 1942 he was appointed Governor and served in that capacity until 1951 when he became justice of the Territorial Supreme Court. Now what does this distinguished citizen say about it?

He had a lot of say, including his conviction that the ILWU "is the so-called labor union, but really is just a disguise for the Communist organization in the Territory," and "the men that control it absolutely follow the Communist line and they follow Jack Hall and Bridges."

When asked if Bridges' union controls the economic life of Hawaii today, the Governor replied:

> There isn't any question about it, not the slightest. They have sugar, pineapples, and transportation right in the hollow of their hands, and those hands are Communist hands, or rather controlled by them.

It has been contended that communism in Hawaii is not so bad, that it is growing weaker. Surely no one can look at the record and be serious about that position. Governor Stainback was asked about that when he testified on January 7, 1954, and here is his answer:

> In my opinion, it has been increased; particularly the last year they have shown their power, or at least they have shown it to me more dramatically than at any previous time.

And now listen to this. On the question of the effectiveness of the Communist political power, Governor Stainback who should know as much about politics in the Territory as any living person, stated:

> I do not think there is any question; they would have influence in the election of the Senators and Representatives just as they have in the members of the legislature.

Then he added:

> I do not think there is a State in the Union that can compare with Hawaii for political domination. I think they (the Communists) can veto the election of anyone. They might not be able to elect any man, but I think if they went out to beat a man, they probably could do it. Even now their power seems to me to be growing, so far as political power.

The Governor, who 10 years ago favored statehood, said he had reluctantly come to the conclusion that there would be "considerable danger to the National Government if Hawaii is admitted to statehood at this time," and added:

> I do not think you can answer the argument for statehood other than saying national security requires a delay.

COMMUNIST STRIKE

Reference has already been made in this debate to the crowd of Communist leaders in Hawaii who were convicted on June 19, 1953, by a Federal jury there for conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. There were six of them, headed by Jack Hall. To demonstrate their power, a protest strike was immediately called and 25,000 ILWU workers walked off their jobs, thus closing down the economy of the island. They even refused to load military equipment for Korea. That walkout was described by the press as "a rebellion against the American jury system," and "one of the ugliest demonstrations of bad citizenship on record."

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE RISING

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has rendered a great service by collecting data on the upsurge of Communist influence and power in Hawaii. He reports that the Honolulu Record is the newspaper front for the Communist Party. Four of the Communists convicted in 1953 operate this paper. Individual and business advertisements in that paper increased from 2,137 in one 1953 issue to 2,586 in 1954. In 1954 elections, 62 candidates for 76 public offices placed advertisements in the Honolulu Record.

Mr. PILLION has listed radio programs, carried over four stations daily, in English, Filipino, and Japanese languages, which daily preach the Communist line. He also documents the facts regarding

an arrangement by the ILWU to have the public library handle a series of communistic films for public use, and this at public expense. And this is only a part of the sordid story of what is going on in Hawaii today.

WOULD DILUTE VOTING STRENGTH IN STATES

Another good reason why these Territories should not be admitted, Mr. Chairman, is the disproportionate power in the Congress which would result to them. If, for example, Hawaii and Alaska are privileged to send Members to the House it will be at the expense of Representatives from the States—since the number of present Members would be reduced accordingly. If Hawaii, for example, should send 2 men to the Senate, each person in Hawaii will have a voice in the Senate 16 times as great as each citizen of Texas.

If admitted to statehood the power of the two Territories would also dilute and diminish the power of existing States in presidential elections. The Territories would have approximately one seventy-fifth of the strength of the electoral college. They would become entitled to representation in the United States Senate 10 times greater than the average representation of the people of the 48 States.

And not only do we need to be concerned about the representation angle, but there should also be concern—grave concern—about the caliber of men who would be elected, particularly in Hawaii. In a book called Hawaii, the 49th State, a handbook put out by and for the statehood lobby, Jack Hall, the convicted traitor and stooge of Moscow wrote:

> If Hawaii becomes a State, we can send some good men to Washington from here—not only to represent the majority in the islands but also to strengthen liberal forces in the National Congress.

TRADITIONS AND CUSTOMS DIFFERENT

Another problem in the case of Hawaii is that of assimilation of the people, their customs, traditions and background with those of the States. Our people will not be free to travel back and forth, nor will the island people travel freely to the United States. That is because it costs money to travel and very few can afford the luxury of traversing that 2,000 miles that separate the continent from those Pacific islands.

While the 48 States were settled by people from other States, the Hawaiian population is made up primarily of people from outside of the United States, and very few—perhaps not 1 percent—have even visited this country.

In racial origin, Hawaii's population breaks down thus:

	Percent
Japanese	40.2
Part Hawaiian	16.9
Caucasian	15.3
Filipino	13.2
Chinese	6.8
Pure Hawaiian	2.8
Puerto Rican	2.3
Korean	1.6
Others	.9

Out of the total population of Hawaii, approximately 65,000 are aliens who have not bothered to take out American citizenship papers and therefore owe no allegiance to the United States.

If we admit Hawaii, we are admitting a Territory whose genealogical background is different from any of the 48 States; whose culture, customs, and history belong for the most part, to another hemisphere. It has little in common with the histories of other States that compose this Republic of 48 States.

ALTERNATIVE PLAN—COMMONWEALTH STATUS

There is an alternative plan far safer for our Union and also better for the Hawaiian people, and for Alaska, too, for that matter. This alternative is commonwealth status, which would give the people of Hawaii and Alaska complete local self-government—freedom to choose their own executives, legislators, and judges, and to conduct their own local affairs as they wish. But even that alternative would have to be preceded by a study of the capacity of the people in Hawaii to govern themselves without Communist domination.

But assuming for a moment that they are capable of democratic self-government, it is pointed out that within their own Commonwealth citizens would enjoy virtually all the privileges granted to citizens in our 48 States. In addition, a commonwealth would have one great advantage over a State—the power to raise and retain all tax revenue originating in its area; its citizens would not be subject to Federal income tax.

Citizens of a commonwealth are in no sense beneath those of the mother country. I am sure no Canadian feels inferior to a Briton, and there is no reason why he should. I have heard of no movement in Canada to make that member of the British Commonwealth of Nations a more direct participant in the Government of the British Isles.

In the case of Alaska, the country has not been developed sufficiently and there is not enough population to justify statehood. With only 132,000 people, including Eskimos, the voting strength of the entire Territory is around 25,000. The people there, with their limited resources, simply cannot afford the luxury of statehood. It costs too much money to run a State government. I hope the time will come when statehood for Alaska can be justified, and perhaps that day will come unless commonwealth status should be preferable.

Mr. Chairman, I close with the urgent plea that this bill be voted down. Let us not weaken the superstructure of the Republic by passing this measure.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message to Congress last January said:

> As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved, that Territory should expect to receive statehood.

Now he appears to have shifted his ground from the position taken in that message to Congress. He recently has indicated that Alaskan statehood should be deferred for reasons of national security. However, neither he nor the Defense Department has responded to the request of Congress to spell out in what ways Alaska's becoming a State would in anywise impair the national security. To date, all the evidence from military men has been to the contrary, to the effect that statehood for Alaska would strengthen its defense and thereby strengthen the whole national security. There is much such evidence in the record—and, indeed, only such evidence. However, President Eisenhower might conceivably return to the position taken in the state of the Union message, especially as it becomes clearly demonstrable, as I am convinced it will, that statehood will not only not jeopardize the defense of Alaska but will promote and strengthen it.

Moreover, the thought expressed in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message of last January is similar to that advanced in the past by other opponents of Alaskan statehood. In previous hearings, representatives of the Alaska canned salmon industry, whose opposition to Alaskan statehood is well known—as indeed has been its opposition for generations to any increase in Alaska's power of self-government—these canned salmon spokesmen listed a variety of reforms they considered essential before Alaska could be considered ready for statehood. So it might be well to analyze the state of the Union message's pronouncement of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's as one of the arguments advanced against the admission of Alaska to statehood now by those opposed to statehood.

Commenting on the President's state of the Union message, the Scripps-Howard papers declared editorially that it was equivalent to asking a youngster to learn to swim before going into the water. The analogy is exact. What President Eisenhower referred to as "the complex problems of Alaska" cannot be resolved as long as Alaska remains a Territory.

They will not be resolved as long as Alaska remains a Territory.

The problems arise from Alaska's condition as a Territory.

They will continue to exist as long as Alaska remains a Territory.

They can be resolved by statehood.

They can be resolved only by statehood.

What are these problems? And are they really so complex? They are problems against which Alaskans have struggled unceasingly from between 40 and 88 years. Their protests have been delivered by public meetings from the very beginning; since 1884, by the federally appointed governors; since 1906, by Alaska's Delegates, and since 1913 by Alaska's Legislatures. All these protests have gone unheeded. The matters which have been and continue to be the subject of Alaskans' protest are fundamental to the development of Alaska. Unless these abuses are corrected, unless these problems are resolved, Alaska's progress will be, as it has been for the last 88 years, slow and painful, and involving a great waste of human effort and energy. It will be costly in material and in spiritual terms not to resolve them. The entire Nation, not merely Alaska, will be the loser. Resolve these problems by conferring statehood and Alaska will, in an incredibly short time, become a great,

thriving, growing, populous, militant outpost of the American idea. Statehood will make Alaska a bulwark of strength for the Western Hemisphere. Statehood will make available the great reservoir of vast natural resources in Alaska which our economy can well utilize. Above all, statehood will be a vindication of our professions about self-government. Statehood will prove to a divided world that America does practice what it preaches.

These problems, which we are told ought to be resolved before statehood, concern chiefly land, transportation, natural resources. They are basic to the growth of Alaska's economy, and to Alaska's development.

In previous debates, some opponents of statehood have reproached Alaskans because 99 percent or more of the land in Alaska is still public domain. Alaskans have been criticized because after 88 years under the flag so little of that land has passed into private hands. Yet an examination of the facts reveals that the Federal Government—in which Alaskans have no voice—alone is responsible.

For the first 33 years after the purchase, despite the unabated pleas of Alaskans, no Federal land legislation was extended to Alaska. Private ownership of land was literally not possible. The settler could not even secure title to the cabin he had hewn from the wilderness. It was not only not permitted, it was actually forbidden for anyone to acquire 1 square foot of land by any method. It was not until 1903, 36 years after the treaty of cession, that the Homestead Act was extended to Alaska.

Now this long delayed, this belated extension of a law passed largely for our Central and Western States in 1864 was actually not appropriate to Alaska, as was pointed out by Senator John L. Wilson, of Washington, in the course of the debates at the turn of the century. Even so, some measure of success, that is to say, some settlement, might have resulted from this legislation, despite its inapplicability and its unsuitability to Alaska's conditions, had Federal surveys been provided. But the failure of the General Land Office to make surveys, and the failure of Congress to appropriate for them, largely nullified the Homestead Act in Alaska. Today, 88 years after the flag of the United States was raised over Alaska, less than two-thirds of 1 percent of Alaska's total area has been surveyed. Frequent attempts by Alaska's Delegates to get the land laws completely revised and rewritten to make them suitable for Alaska, have failed. There have been some minor amendments which have produced some slight improvements. But given the lack of surveys and the slightness of these reforms, settlement of Alaska has been not merely retarded but almost completely hindered. In Alaska, settlers have had to struggle with a double obstruction which no other settlers in the history of the Union have had to face. They have had, first, to battle with and overcome the natural hardships imposed by terrain, climate, distance; and, second, to overcome the manmade obstacles erected by a distant Congress and a distant bureaucracy in the National Capital.

The statehood bill now before the Congress, with its grant of 100 million acres of national domain to be selected by the new State, would put an end to this tragic discrimination. That statehood bill would inaugurate a new era in which settlement will become possible, to the advantage not merely of the settlers, but of the entire Nation. It would greatly and rapidly help populate and strengthen Alaska as an outpost of military, economic, and spiritual strength. The statehood bill also provides some money for the making of surveys, a proper attempt to rectify and atone for a long-standing neglect. It may be argued that such land grants and such surveying provisions could be made without enacting statehood legislation, but it has not been done in 88 years and is not likely to be done.

This is one of the so-called complex problems, although it really is not so complex, which would be resolved by statehood.

Three types of transportation in Alaska suffer the evil consequences of Alaska's Territorial status.

Let us take roads, for example. Alaska is the only considerable area under the flag which has been excluded from participation in the Federal-aid highway act. The 48 States, of course, enjoy its provisions. So does Hawaii. So does the District of Columbia. So does Puerto Rico, although Puerto Rico pays no income or excise taxes into the Federal Treasury and is allowed on top of that to keep all its customs receipts. But Alaska, which pays all Federal taxes—income, excise, and even the Federal gas tax—has been consistently excluded now for nearly 40 years from the benefits of the Federal-aid highway legislation first passed in 1916 and subsequently amended. Every attempt by Alaska's Delegates to secure inclusion in our national highway program has been defeated. Every plea from Alaska's successive territorial legislatures—for nearly 40 years—for inclusion in that vital and beneficial arrangement has gone unheeded. As an alternative, the Federal Government is supposed to appropriate directly for Alaska's highways. But Alaska has lost out heavily by the application of that unsatisfactory alternative. Such few highways as Alaska has have been built by a combination of Federal and Territorial revenues. However, the Federal appropriations have been devoted largely to building roads for military purposes, and military purposes almost exclusively. And while all roads in Alaska are useful, its highways are in many instances not those which Alaskans would have selected and which would have helped most to develop the Territory.

For the first 38 years that Alaska was under the flag—that is, from 1867 to 1905—Alaska was an area of practically total public domain, and hence doubly a Federal responsibility. Yet not one cent was expended for highways in Alaska. It was not until 1905 that the Alaska Road Commission, an agency of the War Department, was created. Then, and only then, with a combination of direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury and contributions from the Alaska fund secured by license taxes in Alaska, and paid by Alaskans, was construction begun. It was begun on a very, very modest scale. No attempt was made to atone or make up for the 38 years with no construction whatsoever.

In 1930, the Alaska Road Commission was transferred to the Interior Department, and the road program, never adequate, was slowed down to little more than maintenance. During the entire decade of the 1930's there was virtually no new highway construction. There was a resumption in the 1940's due to defense requirements. And only because of them. Today, the total highway mileage in Alaska, an area one-fifth as large as the United States, is only some 3,500 miles, an utterly inadequate extent. Is it any wonder that Alaska's growth has been slow and its development further impeded?

One small section of the Federal Aid Highway Act, that applying to forests and forest highways, was extended to Alaska. But even here, through the years, Alaska was discriminated against by the action of Congress in withholding from Alaska the share Alaska was entitled to under the legally established formulas, and in distributing that share among the forest area States. Please note that the diversion of several million dollars of Alaska's forest highway funds was not an economy measure, although Alaska is fully accustomed to seeing Federal economies inaugurated at the border of the Territory. In this case, however, in the case of Federal highway national forest funds, the money taken from Alaska did not go to the Territory but to the States whose Representatives and Senators had the power so to vote. Alaska's voteless Delegate could only protest, and, needless to say, protest in vain. Statehood would automatically bring Alaska under the provisions of the Federal aid highway legislation. Alaska would of course have to pay its share, and Alaskans would be happy to do so. Alaska would then have the beginnings of a real highway system such as does not now exist in Alaska. This is one of the so-called complex problems which would be resolved by statehood and apparently only by statehood.

So much for highways.

What about marine transportation?

Until 1940, when the first commercial air connections between the States and Alaska were established, the only transportation which linked the States and Alaska was by sea. In 1920, Congress enacted a Merchant Marine Act which is officially known as the Maritime Act of 1920. This act established a substantial departure from existing merchant marine law. It provided that shippers across the Nation for points on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts or beyond across the Atlantic or Pacific could, in the transportation across the continent, avail themselves interchangeably of foreign, which meant Canadian, or domestic carriers. A shippers, for instance, from New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, or any other American city, to the Orient, or from Seattle, Portland, or any other Pacific coast port to the East or across the Atlantic, could ship by either Canadian or American

railways or by a combination of both, and beyond these points across the seas in either American or foreign bottoms. But in the heart of the article of the bill which provided this new arrangement were inserted two words, the words "excluding Alaska." By these two words a unique discrimination was imposed on Alaska and Alaska only. The result of the act was to prevent Alaskans from shipping as they had through the nearer ports of Prince Rupert or Vancouver, and subjected them to the absolute domination of the Seattle steamship monopoly. The sponsor of this bill was the late Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington. In Alaska, the legislation is known as the Jones Act.

The immediate effects of this act were to put a number of enterprises, which had been started in Alaska by local initiative and with local capital out of business. It established automatically a discriminatory set of freight rates for shipments of goods to and from Alaska. It penalized every Alaskan shipper, every Alaskan merchant, every Alaskan consumer—in short, every Alaskan—for the benefit of a small group of businessmen in Seattle and for American railroads. No other area, American or foreign, was so penalized. It was, and continues to be, a crass example of colonialism.

Alaskans were not slow to protest and protest vigorously.

Although Alaska had barely assumed the inadequate and skimpy garments of self-government supplied it by the restrictive organic act of 1912, the Territory promptly protested against this act as discriminatory and as violative of the commerce clause of the Constitution. The territorial legislature requested the territorial attorney-general to take the case to court. He did so. Ultimately the case reached the Supreme Court of the United States. There it was decided—in *Alaska* v. *Troy* (258 U. S. 101)—on February 27, 1922 that while the Jones Act was clearly discriminatory against Alaska, nothing in the Constitution forbade the Congress from discriminating against a Territory. Had Alaska been a State, the act would have been clearly unconstitutional. It would have violated the Constitution's commerce clause.

Statehood would automatically nullify the discriminatory povisions of this act. It would relieve Alaska of a crushing economic burden. It would reduce the excessive freight rates on goods destined for Alaska, and on the added handling and transshipment charges in Seattle. These charges often exceed 100 percent of what has to be paid by shippers to and from other points on the Pacific coast or in the Orient. Statehood would equalize these charges with all other charges for goods consigned to other destinations.

This is one of the so-called complex problems that would be resolved by statehood.

Discriminations exist in a third mode of transportation—air transportation. In this case, however, the discrimination is largely executive and bureaucratic, and not—as in the case of highways and shipping—of legislative origin.

Air transportation is more vital in Alaska than in any other part of the United States. It is more vital because the other means of transportation available in the United States, highways and railways, are largely lacking in Alaska. I have already pointed out the reason for the lack of highways. There is likewise no railway system in Alaska comparable to that in the States. There is but a single-line track of railway extending some 500 miles between Seward on the Pacific coast and Fairbanks.

Alaskans are the most air-minded people on earth. They fly from 30 to 40 times as much as other Americans. They have had a continuing uphill battle against a long-range bureaucracy embodied in the CAA and the CAB. These agencies' decisions in Alaskan matters have been arbitrary and frequently show a disregard of Alaska's needs. Alaskans have tried and tried again and again to bring home the realities of Alaska in the matter of air transportation in their Territory to those two Federal Bureaus. These efforts have not been too successful.

The CAB long since put all the Alaska nonskeds out of business, although the nonskeds were furnishing a vital and essential service to Alaska. Certification of scheduled airlines to and from and in Alaska has likewise never been adequate. It has always lagged far behind need.

But Alaskans, denied the effective protest of two Senators and voting Representatives, have to take what they can get and attempt to like it. They do not like it, and one cannot blame them.

This is another one of the so-called complex problems which might not be resolved immediately and entirely by statehood, since the above-mentioned Federal agencies have not functioned too satisfactorily anywhere. But at least Alaska would, by statehood, and the voting representation that statehood confers, achieve equality with the States in its efforts to secure adequate consideration.

Thus in all forms of transportation Alaska as a Territory has suffered the grossest handicaps—man-made handicaps. Statehood would either automatically resolve the problems thus created or facilitate their resolution.

Alaska alone among the Territories was, in its organic act, denied the right to control and regulate its natural resources, particularly its fisheries and wildlife. This unprecedented and unparalleled discrimination was wrought through the same forces, the same absentee forces, which have persistently opposed any increase in Alaska's powers of self-government. For 42 years, Alaskans through their Delegates and by the protests of their legislatures have sought to change the situation—to secure the same treatment accorded every other American Territory. Bill after bill has been introduced into the Congress to transfer this control of the fisheries to the Territory. None has been enacted. The Federal bureau is always opposed. No bureau ever wants to give up its perquisites or its powers.

Under the joint domination of an absentee industry and a long-range bureaucracy, this great natural resource has been scandalously mismanaged, and is being steadily depleted. It diminished steadily from a high of some 8,437,603 cases in the middle 1930's to a low of 2,882,083 cases in 1953. The economic effects on Alaska have been disastrous, so much so that President Eisenhower felt obliged to declare the fishing villages a disaster area. The year 1954 showed only a negligible improvement, despite the most drastic curtailments which worked a further hardship on Alaska's fishermen and on Alaska's economy.

Statehood would automatically transfer these fisheries to the Territory, and make possible the beginning of restoration of this great natural resource. This is another one of the problems which would be resolved by statehood and, apparently, only by statehood, since every attempt to resolve the problem prior to statehood has been defeated.

The suggestion to resolve Alaska's problems first so that thereafter the Territory may "expect to receive statehood" is putting the cart before the horse. Or, it is like telling the youngster that he must learn to swim before going into the water. Alaskans have been so handicapped by the restrictive provisions of their Territorial organic act, and by other acts of Congress discriminatory against Alaska either by omission, as in the case of Federal-aid highway legislation and land legislation, or by commission, as in the case of the Jones Act, that it is to be wondered that Alaska has been able to progress at all. Such progress as has been made reflects great credit on the indomitable spirit and energy of Alaskans.

Even if we overlook the pleas and needs of the more than 200,000 Americans in Alaska; even if we turn a deaf ear to their cry for justice and for fair and equal treatment, the interest of the whole Nation calls loudly for the development of that great and strategically placed area: Alaska. In a world in which many areas and many markets formerly accessible to us are increasingly being denied, or likely to be denied to us, it seems the height of folly not to help develop Alaska by removing the shackles which territorialism has placed on it.

If Alaska were a foreign country, a wavering neutral country, it would long since have had far more aid than Alaskans have ever dreamed of requesting.

All they want is equality of treatment. For, apart from the specific discriminations and obstacles which I have cited, there is the total inappropriateness, demonstrated for 88 years, of the long-range Federal misrule which has held Alaska back.

The Constitution makes no provision for second-class citizens. Being a territory is supposedly only a condition of temporary disadvantage. It has always been considered as a period of pupilage, to be discarded at the earliest moment. Alaska has endured this colonialism for 88 years.

Action to make Alaska a State is long, long overdue. Only by statehood can that great area be developed for our Nation's and for the free world's benefit.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed sometimes as I listen to the proposals which have been made in support of this bill. It is an amazing thing to me that the pattern which the United States of America has followed and the rules of commonsense which we as a nation have observed, and which have made us in the short period of 179 years the strongest, the greatest, and the richest nation in the world, have suddenly been found to be worthless; that we have suddenly found that we can no longer follow this pattern, that we can no longer observe the rules which we have observed and which have made us a great Nation and a great people.

As I listened to the talk of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], who has just preceded me, it occurred to me that if at some later time a proposal should be made to admit Formosa to became a State of the United States of America, we could hear the gentleman on the floor of this House argue with his great eloquence and present the same reasons which he presented today as to why we should take Formosa in as one of the States of our great country. I can imagine he would be here arguing with the same vehemence to take in Puerto Rico, to take in the Virgin Islands, or any other string of islands or any other far placed land.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman can imagine it, but he cannot find a shred of evidence to support any such position on my part.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It would be just as logical, and the same reasoning would apply and would be of equal force, as the reasons which the gentleman has given in behalf of Hawaii and Alaska.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] also told us in his remarks that we need not be concerned over charges that the Japanese would engage in block voting if Hawaii should be admitted as a State. He undertook to support that statement by citing an instance of a candidate with some degree of Japanese ancestry in his pedigree who was defeated by a candidate who had some degree of Filipino ancestry in his pedigree. He said this occurred in a recent election in Hawaii.

The gentleman did not name the candidates or the office in question, and I do not know anything about the case to which he refers.

But I do know that I have in my file a statistical breakdown of the nationalities of candidates who were elected to office in Hawaii in the general election on November 2, 1954. This breakdown and report was compiled by an election inspector in Honolulu, who stated that a check through the ballots disclosed that the Japanese block voted.

This breakdown of the election results in the 1954 general election shows that of the 15 members of the Hawaiian Senate, 7 are of Japanese ancestry, and that of the 30 members in the Hawaiian House of Representatives, 15 are of Japanese ancestry. I would say that the results of the election clearly confirm the statement of the election inspector that the Japanese do block vote.

I list here the names of persons of Japanese ancestry in the Hawaiian Legislature, as furnished to me, and also the names of other Hawaiian officials of Japanese ancestry.

I believe this is conclusive proof of the charge that the Japanese do block vote:

GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS OF 1954 THROUGHOUT THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII—JAPANESE ANCESTRY ELECTED TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE IN THE TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE, CITY AND COUNTY OF OAHU, HAWAII, MAUI, AND KAUAI

SENATE

1. Nelson K. Doe.
2. Sakae Takahashi.
3. Wilfred C. Tsukiyama (holdover in the senate in 1952).
4. Kazuhisa Abe (holdover in the senate elected in 1952).
5. Toshio Ansai (holdover in the senate elected in 1952).
6. Joseph Itagaki (holdover in the senate elected in 1952).
7. Noboru Miyake (holdover in the senate elected in 1952).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

8. Daniel K. Inouye.
9. Masato Doi.
10. George R. Ariyoshi.
11. Yasutaka Fukushima.
12. Spark M. Matsunaga.
13. Russell K. Kono.
14. Steere G. Noda.
15. Raymond M. Kobayashi.
16. Stanley I. Hara.
17. Sumio Nakashima.
18. Robert N. Kimura.
19. Nadao Yoshinaga.
20. Toshio Serizawa.
21. Toshihara Yama.

COUNTY OF OAHU

22. Mitsuyoshi Kido (supervisor).
23. Matsuo Takabuki(supervisor).
24. Richard M. Kageyama (supervisor, member of the Communist Party, who later turned against the party).
25. Mitsuo Fujishige (supervisor).
26. James K. Murakami (city auditor).
27. Lawrence Goto (city treasurer).

COUNTY OF HAWAII

28. Hiroshi Tanaka (supervisor).
29. Yoshito Tanaka (county attorney).

COUNTY OF MAUI

30. George Fukuoka (supervisor).
31. Dr. Shigeru Miura (supervisor).
32. Tom Tagewa (supervisor).
33. Goro Hokama (supervisor).
34. Toshio Enomoto (county clerk).

COUNTY OF KAUAI

35. Hiromi Choriki (supervisor).
36. George K. Watase (supervisor).
37. Tony Kunimura (supervisor).
38. Tom Okura (supervisor).
39. Toshio Kabutan (county attorney).

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to passage of this bill.

My opposition is based on study and consideration of the facts. I believe that the issue at stake is too vital to the future of the United States of America to permit its decision to depend on emotional, ideological or partisan foundations.

The question of granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, separately or together, has been explored in minute investigative detail by congressional agencies during both Republican and Democratic majorities. It is not my purpose to use my limited time in recapitulating the pro-statehood presentations. That has been, is being and will be adequately portrayed by those who favor statehood.

Four principal points in opposition have been made in hearings on this current statehood movement by Hawaii and Alaska, and during this debate. They are:

First. So far as Hawaii is concerned, Communists, through control of certain powerful labor unions have dangerously infiltrated the economic base of the territory.

Second. There is a large percentage of non-Caucasian population.

Third. The territories are noncontiguous, and hence outside the pattern of the present Union of States.

Fourth. Admission of the two Territories would give them 4 Senators and at least 2 Representatives, a representation wholly out of ratio with that of 44 of the 48 States in our national legislative bodies.

These 4 points, in order, deal with the ideological, racial, geographical, and political aspects of the problem.

Not one, nor all of these four approaches reaches the heart and core of the issue. I propose to discuss briefly, the four listed points. Then I want to present the vital, historical past and pregnant future, involved.

On the question of communism the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security have defined and documented the existence of a hard core of Communist infiltration in both Territories as recently as 1953. No Member of this House believes that the short space of 2 years is adequate to eliminate and destroy the ideological roots of such a tenacious and insidious political concept.

The 1950 census figures show a population of 128,643 scattered over the 586,400 square miles of Alaska. Of these, according to the World Almanac, 33,000 are Indian or Eskimo.

For Hawaii, with a population of 499,799 in the 6,423-square-mile area of the 9 inhabited islands of the total of 20 in the group, the 1950 census shows 183,000 Japanese, 114,000 white, 87,000 Hawaiians, 33,000 Chinese, and 88,000 of other racial or national backgrounds.

This is no reflection on the nonwhite population, but I contend that the cross-currents of racial feeling create political and administrative whirlpools too dangerous to yet be allowed the authoritative voice in the American Government that goes with full statehood.

The third point—that of noncontiguity—comes into both the area of national defense and that of economic self-sufficiency.

World history shows that the growth of most dangerous enemy of the free world today—the Soviet Russia and her

satellites—has been based on expansion of territory only on her perimeter for the last 700 years. Soviet Russia has never included territory that could not be reached by direct land route. Her lines of communication, for war or peace, have been interior lines of communication and supply. The great powers of the past which depended on overseas communication between areas of empire have steadily receded through the centuries. Spain's dual hemisphere power crumbled. The flight from colonialism has taken its toll from Great Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands—most of that toll in direct chronological parallel with the growth of Soviet and Communist power.

There is grave doubt in the minds of many of us that the present war-threatened age is the time to abandon our historical position of contiguous territory in favor of a similar geographic alinement to that which has proved disastrous to all nations which have tried it in the past.

The fourth point—that of producing unbalanced representation in the Congress—applies more to Alaska than to Hawaii in point of numbers. No State of the present Union has a population as small as that of Alaska.

Four States—Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming—have smaller populations than Hawaii. Delaware was one of the original Colonies signing the Declaration of Independence, with ratification of the Constitution in 1787. Vermont has been a State since 1791, Nevada since 1864, and Wyoming since 1890. None are affected by the question of Communist infiltration, non-Caucasian majorities of population, or noncontiguity to the degree of the candidates for statehood. Certainly their acceptance in the Union for periods ranging from 65 years, in the case of Wyoming, to 168 years, in the case of Delaware, overrides any question of present population in determining their right to their representation in the Congress.

If we compare Hawaii with Territories which have been admitted to statehood in our Union, we find that many striking differences are evident. All of the Colonies and Territories admitted to statehood have been located on the North American Continent. Each Territory before admission adjoined our country, and when admitted became a part of the unbroken, contiguous area which makes up our country.

Hawaii is not itself a contiguous solid-land area. It consists of some 20 islands, about 9 of which are inhabited. It is accessible, of course, only by air or sea.

Had we aspired to annex islands and make States of them, we certainly would have turned our attention first to Cuba, which is only 90 miles off the tip of Florida. From a standpoint of desirability it has much more to offer than Hawaii. Because it is so close to us an unfriendly power in control of Cuba would make Cuba a real danger to our defense. Cuba, with an area of 44,000 square miles, all in one mass, compares in overwhelming favorable contrast with Hawaii's 6,000 square miles contained in some 20 islands, and so far distant from our shores as to make Hawaiian defense a mighty problem.

Cuba's population is approximately 11 times that of Hawaii and no more diversified as to racial origin than that of Hawaii.

Cuba's production of sugar cane is five times that of Hawaii.

In the 19th century, there were many demands in this country for annexation of Cuba, but we turned a deaf ear to such proposals and, instead aided Cuba in obtaining her independence, just as we subsequently guided the Philippines to self-government and her status today as a Republic.

I have read the booklet issued by the Hawaii Statehood Commission to see upon just what is based this claim of the right to statehood in the United States of America.

Now, Hawaii is not a part of America, either North or South. If Hawaii were to be admitted as a State, the term "United States of America" would be a misnomer. We could no longer refer to our country as the United States of America. It would become what? The United States of America and the Pacific. We could no longer write, talk, or say "The good old U. S. A." We would have to refer to it as the "good U. S. A. P." from that time on.

In the Hawaiian Statehood Commission booklet there are such phrases as "its rightful place as a State in the Union," its "inherent right to statehood," the "demand for statehood" and many others.

I do not concede that Hawaii, or Alaska, or Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, or any other area has any "inherent right" to become a State or have an equal voice in our government with the States of our contiguous area.

I do not think that any State which was ever admitted had any "inherent right" to such admission. They were admitted because they wanted to come in and because our Government was willing. There was no question of "inherent right" involved. There is no such right involved in this instance.

There is a section in this booklet entitled "Why Statehood for Hawaii Will Benefit the Nation," and I assume that all the alleged benefits to the United States are set out there. The benefits which are listed there are inconsequential. They say that statehood for Hawaii would bestow new dignity and prestige to the country's westernmost outpost.

Although I wish Hawaii and its people well, I certainly do not regard that as a substantial reason to admit Hawaii to statehood. If that is beneficial at all, it is a benefit to Hawaii to a far greater degree than to the United States.

Another statement is that denial of statehood to Hawaii contributes to the propaganda of those who call the United States imperialistic. That is no reason to pass this bill. The Communists are going to continue their propaganda, and would still call us imperialistic, if we grant statehood to Hawaii, Alaska, or to any other area.

Thirdly, the Hawaiian booklet contends that it would be economical to give Hawaii statehood because it would transfer to the State government the present Federal cost of administering Hawaii as a Territory. If any economy resulted from such a change, it would not amount to more than a drop in the bucket. The people of Hawaii now have nearly everything they would have as a State. They have local self-government. They have their own legislature, which they elect themselves, to make their own laws. They receive money from the United States Government. They participate in our Federal health program, our educational program, our road-building program, our agricultural program, and all the beneficient and benevolent programs which are maintained by our United States Government. In addition to that all citizens of Hawaii are citizens of the United States.

Statehood would add nothing to their citizenship except the right to vote for President, the right to have Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress and the right to set up a system of local courts in addition to the system of Federal courts which they now have and would continue to have as a State.

They do not have Senators or Representatives but they do have the right to send an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives.

On the other side of the ledger, there are some substantial disadvantages to us if this bill should pass. It would increase the United States Senate to 100 Members if both Hawaii and Alaska attained statehood. It would send at least 2 more Representatives to the House, and mean that at least 2 States would lose 1 Representative each under our present fixed House membership of 435 Members.

That is a pretty high price to pay to give statehood to Hawaii and Alaska, to give them added prestige.

It has been claimed that Hawaii has been promised statehood. I disagree with that claim. No one except the Congress of the United States has had authority to promise statehood to Hawaii, Alaska, or any other area, and no such promises have been made by Congress.

I have read the acts incorporating Hawaii and Alaska as Territories and I find no such promises in either document.

Advocates of statehood for Hawaii have compared the size and population of Hawaii with some of the States of our Union.

It is true that Hawaii contains more land area than Connecticut, or Delaware, or Rhode Island. However, it does not begin to compare with any of these States in production or in payment of taxes. Not only that, it receives back far more in money, both in dollars and percentages, than any of those States.

In 1951 Connecticut residents paid $1,099,000,000 in Federal income taxes; Hawaii paid $135 million. Connecticut received $33 million in that year, or 3 percent of the money it paid in. Hawaii received $23 million from the Federal Government, or 17 percent of the money paid in.

Delaware paid $769 million income tax and received back $7,800,000, or 1.3 percent of the amount of income tax paid. Rhode Island paid $293 million and received back $23 million, or 6.9 percent

as compared to Hawaii's 17 percent of revenue returned.

So far as size of Hawaii is concerned, its 6,400 square miles compares with 586,000 square miles in Alaska, 263,000 square miles in Texas, 58,000 square miles in Georgia, 97,000 square miles in Wyoming, and on down through the roster of States.

According to the report of the Governor of Hawaii to the Secretary of the Interior, in 1951 there were 63,575 aliens in Hawaii, or approximately 15 percent of the total population.

I have read the constitution which has been adopted by the people of Hawaii. While it has many good features, it has some provisions which are vital and which offer an opportunity for dangerous manipulation. The constitution does not provide that the governor must receive a majority of the votes cast in a general election in order to be elected. It simply provides that the person receiving the largest number of votes shall be the governor. With the genius which Harry Bridges has shown for organizing the people in Hawaii, it needs no strong imagination to see what could be done by Harry Bridges in an election for governor with 3 or 4 candidates running. Such an election would offer one of the greatest opportunities for the manipulation of bloc voters it is possible to imagine. Yet that provision is a part of the constitution which has already been approved in Hawaii.

This Constitution also contains in article 8 provisions under which it will be possible to set up an elaborate "cradle to the grave" system of public-welfare payments and subsidies. It provides, among other things, that "the State shall have the power to provide assistance for persons unable to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and health." That constitutional provision does not refer to aged persons, blind persons, disabled persons, or children. It simply says "persons" and that includes everybody.

In Hawaii citizens have full control and management of all property which they own. They have no guardians, supervisors, or agents whatever to hold title to their property, to withhold that property or its income from them, either as individuals or as a class.

There are many thousands of American Indians in this country who are deprived of the substantial rights of full ownership and management of property which rightfully belongs to them, and which this Government still assumes to manage and control.

I ask why we must find it necessary so hurriedly to break a precedent which has stood throughout the entire history of this country and take into our Union a string of distant islands in the Pacific Ocean, almost out of the Western Hemisphere, and say we owe this to them because they fought in a war, and paid taxes, while at the same time we deny here on the American mainland full citizenship to people whose ancestors were here even before Columbus came. Our Indians also fought in these same wars, paid taxes, and met other obligations. It may well be remembered that one of the figures in the statue Raising the Flag at Iwo Jima was an American Indian.

If participation in our wars and paying taxes is to be the future criterion for statehood, we must introduce a bill for statehood for Puerto Rico. Puerto Ricans fought in Korea. They have paid taxes and done the other things which Hawaii sets up as a claim to an "inherent right" for statehood.

The enactment of this statehood bill is not called for or justified by any of the reasons advanced. To enact it would set a precedent which in my opinion is unwise. It is an act we are not called upon to perform. It is not necessary. It is not in our best interests as a Nation. It is contrary to long established policy. If we go through with it, it will rise up to plague us many times in the future.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. I have already received permission in the House under a unanimous-consent request to submit for the RECORD a study by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress giving the estimated traveling times in days from State capitals to Washington, D. C., at the time of admission of all other States admitted after the formation of the Union by the Thirteen Original States. It lists also the populations of all these States at the time of admission to the Union.

Hawaii shows today a population in excess of every other State except one at the time of its admission to the Union. Alaska shows a population today in excess of more than two-thirds of all the other States admitted to the Union at the time of their admission. The traveling time between the capital of Hawaii and the capital of Alaska to Washington today is less by far than from the capitals of all other States at the time of their admission into the Union.

I am personally convinced and I am profoundly convinced that no move that can be made by this Congress will do more to strengthen the Union both at home and abroad from the standpoint of defense and from every other standpoint than to admit both Alaska and Hawaii to statehood now. There are many valid arguments why both of these Territories should be made States now.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

There are many valid arguments why Alaska should be made a State now.

The fulfillment of promises explicit and implicit over a period of 88 years.

The advancing of the frontier of democracy to a new farthest west and new farthest north.

A ringing repudiation of the fantastic and ridiculous claim by the Kremlin that the sale of Russian America by the czar in 1867 was invalid, and that Alaska still rightfully belongs to Russia.

The release of a long-shackled and long-retarded area of tremendous potentialities, and the impetus that statehood would give to its development.

The inclusion in our national councils of Senators and voting Representatives of a robust, hard-working, independent-minded, pioneering breed of Americans, with their special knowledge about this important strategic area.

The demonstration before the whole world that the United States does not merely give up lipservice to the basic principle of self-determination.

Finally, and not the least important, the strengthening of Alaska's defenses.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, and one who has personally visited Alaska and kept in close touch with it, I can personally testify to my conviction of the validity of all these benefits to result from statehood, particularly in the strengthening of defense.

It is therefore a matter of profound surprise that we find President Eisenhower, not so long ago an enthusiastic proponent of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, now belatedly bringing up the natoinal defense as an argument for delaying the admission of Alaska.

President Eisenhower's arrival at this point of view provides a deep mystery. Less than 5 years ago, when General Eisenhower was president of Columbia University, he made a magnificent statement in a public address in Denver. The date was September 17, 1950. Before an audience of 1,500 people gathered at the Freedom Bell, he said:

> Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches.

What he said was profoundly true, and it was a gallant expression of a noble sentiment.

However, less than 3 years later, after he had been elected President of the United States, he startled everyone, in his state of the Union message to the 1st session of the 83d Congress, on February 2, 1953, by omitting Alaska but urging that statehood be granted to Hawaii, and, moreover, that it should be granted promptly with the first election in 1954.

An unkind suspicion was voiced, and not an unnatural one, that President Eisenhower, having made up his mind that he was a Republican, was interested in securing two Republican Senators from Hawaii in the national election of 1954, since the margin of Republican superiority in the 83d Congress was negligible. Alaska, it was generally assumed, might commit the sin of electing Democrats to the Senate. Actually, this was only a fancied danger as far as 1954 was concerned. For the people of Hawaii had held a constitutional convention, had drafted a constitution for the proposed State, and had secured popular approval of that constitution from the people of Hawaii. Alaska had not done so. Therefore, enactment of statehood bills for these two Territories by the 83d Congress would have permitted Hawaii to elect its Senators and Representatives in 1954, whereas Alaska would have had to wait until 1956. That disparity between the two Territories will soon be disposed of, since the last Alaska legislature, this spring, provided for a constitutional convention to meet this year—on November 8—and draft a State

constitution, which should be ready for presentation to Congress sometime next spring. Therefore, Hawaii and Alaska, should the 84th Congress have the wisdom to grant them both statehood, will both be able to elect their State officers, their Senators and Representatives, in the 1956 national election.

But to return to defense as one of the strongest arguments for the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii. I will not debate the question in the case of Hawaii, since the administration takes the position that in the case of Hawaii statehood would strengthen the national defense. I am prepared to agree fully.

In the case of Alaska, the administration's contrary position is only of recent origin. When first questioned at press conferences during the spring of 1953, after his espousal of prompt statehood for Hawaii and nothing for Alaska, as to why he now favored Hawaiian statehood but not Alaskan, the President suggested something about his feeling that maybe Alaska was not quite ready. That was a faltering from his previous position, because when the President had made his Denver declaration in 1950 the census figures showed Alaska with a population of 128,000. But by 1953, that figure had risen to 180,000. Alaska was certainly readier in 1953 than in 1950. It is still readier now, with a population of over 200,000, and a newly established pulp industry.

Likewise, President Eisenhower's Defense Department, in reporting its views in 1953 on the two statehood bills, made it crystal clear that, while it enthusiastically favored the admission of Hawaii for defense reasons, it neither favored nor opposed the admission of Alaska for defense reasons. In response to extensive questioning which is to be found in the printed House hearings, Acting Secretary of Defense James H. Douglas, who was presenting the view of the Department of Defense, made it clear that there was nothing in statehood for Alaska which in any way weakened the national defense.

It was perfectly obvious that the Department of Defense was merely following the indications of its Chief, the President, in going all out for statehood for Hawaii and neither endorsing nor opposing statehood for Alaska. However, the Defense Department was departing from the unvaryingly given testimony by previous Secretaries of Defense and military experts to the effect that statehood for Alaska would help its defense and therefore strengthen the national defense.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Territory of Alaska would not be as well defended if it remained in a territorial status as it would be if statehood were granted?

Mr. PRICE. I will say that I have not said that yet, but I intend to say it before I complete my statement. Certainly the defense of Alaska will be improved with statehood. I firmly believe that to be the truth.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I disagree with that conclusion.

Mr. PRICE. I think my statement will show why I feel that to be the fact.

We have the testimony in 1950 to that effect of former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson.

We have the declaration in favor of statehood for Alaska of the late and great Gen. "Hap" Arnold, who was particularly familiar with Alaska, which is and has been an air command.

More recently we have the testimony of Gen. Nathan F. Twining, who from 1947 to 1950 was the commander in chief of the Alaska command and, subsequently to leaving that post, testified as Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force that Alaskan statehood will help the military. General Twining, as we all know, is now the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and is certainly familiar with Alaska, its defense needs, and the value of statehood.

I might say that no one has presented the value of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii to the national defense any better than a distinguished former Member of this body, a man of national eminence. Five years ago, this Member of the House of Representatives wired his strong support of statehood for reasons of national defense to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, who was conducting hearings on Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills. The Member in question was none other than RICHARD M. NIXON, then a Representative from the 12th California District, later elected to the Senate from California, subsequently elected Vice President of the United States, which exalted position he now holds.

This is what Mr. NIXON wired on the subject of statehood:

> Urge immediate passage of Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills. Hawaii and Alaska represent outer defenses of west coast, and all other arguments fade away when we face that uncontrovertible fact. They are the bulwark between the mainland and enemy invasion. These outer defenses will be much better manned when they become full-fledged States, and it is imperative to our security that west-coast defenses are immediately and strongly built up. (Senate hearings, 1950, p. 514.)

I want to extend my congratulations to our Vice President for the correct and statesmanlike attitude he took not merely on statehood for our only two remaining incorporated Territories, but for his clear vision in seeing the close relationship of what he properly termed these outer defenses of the west coast and statehood, and of their important role as a bulwark between the mainland and enemy invasion. I particularly want to call attention to his sound view that Hawaii and Alaska will be much better manned when they become full-fledged States.

It would seem hardly fair, if the people of Alaska and Hawaii are going to play that important role—of being our Nation's bulwark in the event of enemy invasion, should we unfortunately get into a shooting war—that they should have to continue to fight and die as second-class citizens. They have done so in the past—and most gallantly. But in common fairness, common appreciation, common gratitude, and common decency, we should not expect the Americans of Alaska and Hawaii to keep doing so any longer—that is, to keep on doing so as second-class citizens.

I will say that President Eisenhower's recent positions on statehood have not been at all clear. I know that efforts are being made in both Houses of Congress to have him clarify exactly what it is that he has in mind that has caused him to vacillate on the question of Alaskan statehood for one reason or another, and now on the ground of defense. In a press conference not long ago, in answer to a question as to why he felt it easier to defend a Territory rather than a State, he was reported as saying:

> He didn't say it would be easier to defend; he said it was easier to use, because in one case, it was under the absolute control of the central Government, and in the other case it wasn't.

Well, if we are to understand that, then it would follow that the defense of the 48 States is rendered more difficult by the fact that they are States and not Territories. I, for one, declare that that position is nonsensical. But it is worse than that. It suggests the viewpoint of a dictator over a subject people. That is precisely one of the things that we should wish to avoid in this country, and should avoid at all costs. We want no military dictatorship over any part of our country or any group of our people. If the country goes to war, we shall give the President, as Commander in Chief, the powers he asks for, and they should be exercised equally for all Americans and over all Americans.

That brings us to the underlying question of what, in the event of war with totalitarian imperialism, we are fighting for? Survival, of course. But survival so that we may continue to enjoy the freedom which has always been ours. Freedom has been destroyed in the Iron Curtain countries—even that lesser degree of freedom which is all that some of them have known. In the iron-curtained world all freedom has been destroyed, as the rulers would destroy it for the peoples they seek to conquer. Freedom is therefore in peril throughout the world. We can scarcely espouse the cause of freedom convincingly if we do not practice as we preach, if we maintain Alaska, as it is now suggested, under a military absolutism.

How long will this absolute military control for Alaska be maintained? We know that communism directed from Moscow and Peiping may be with us a long time—perhaps beyond the lifetime of living men. Perhaps for a century. Who knows? Are we to contemplate seriously the prospect of keeping Alaska under military servitude as long as the Soviet menace persists? To do so would be a betrayal of the very cause we are purporting to defend against foreign tyranny. It would in fact be the imposition of a form of totalitarian tyranny upon our fellow Americans by our own Government.

The people of Hawaii had prolonged and bitter experience with it during World War II. When, on the morning

of December 7, 1941, our military and naval commanders were not sufficiently alert to the enemy's sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, they sought to compensate for their own shortcomings by imposing martial law on their fellow citizens. Under the stress of this great emergency they persuaded the aging civilian governor to abdicate his functions. It may have seemed necessary and desirable at the time and for the moment. But once in absolute control, the military rode despotically over the civilian population long after the emergency had passed, and the enemy was on the defensive and in retreat thousands of miles away. Nevertheless, civilians continued to be tried by provost courts for offenses in no sense related to the conduct of the war, and meted out ferocious sentences—jail and heavy fines—for minor traffic violations or lesser infractions. The accused were frankly warned that unless they pleaded guilty their sentences would be far heavier. Many citizens were obliged to appear without counsel. Some were convicted of no known offense, but found guilty of such vague and undefinable offenses as having violated the spirit of martial law, or for violating the spirit of general orders.

Some idea of the character of the so-called justice of the military may be gleaned from the fact that out of a total of 22,480 persons arrested and brought to court, 22,029 were found guilty. During a single month, in March 1942, 183 persons were fined $92,901, or an average fine of $500 a person. Some years afterward, when the military absolute control had been lifted, the war had ended, and the few cases that had been appealed finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States, the Supreme Court declared the taking over of the courts by the Army to have been illegal—*Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku* (327 U. S. 304). But, of course, very few indeed were those whom this belated reversal of military arbitrariness and tyranny benefited. They had paid their fines and served their sentences. Their oppressors had long since been transferred elsewhere.

This is now past history. I have no desire to rehash this tragic tyranny imposed on a people whose loyalty and devotion were not marred by a single exception, by a single case of subversion or disloyalty, and whose performance in war was unsurpassed. But for those to whom these facts I have just cited are news, who want to know my authority, who may want to read the documented story, I recommend a book just published by the Stanford University Press, entitled "Hawaii Under Army Rule." It is written by J. Garner Anthony, former Attorney General of the Territory of Hawaii and a former president of the Hawaii Bar Association—a distinguished member of the bar, and a thoroughly trustworthy and responsible member of society.

But I do most fervently desire to prevent any repetition of this un-American military despotism. The suggestion that Alaska would be easier to use if under the absolute control of the central Government fills me with the gravest forebodings.

Lord Acton, the great British historian, once declared that power corrupts and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. This has become almost an axiom among the free peoples of the world, and therefore the whole concept which we as a free people hold rebels against giving absolute control over the lives of others to anyone. Yet that is what is seriously proposed by high authority as a reason for denying Alaska the equality of full citizenship.

I believe the Congress has a right to know far more specifically and far more convincingly why the President has shifted his position from enthusiastic espousal of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii to enthusiastic espousal of statehood for Hawaii only.

It is my belief that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and that we should put an end to the colonialism that we practice as long as we keep Alaska and Hawaii as Territories. We should make them both States, and do it now.

I would like to cite a few further positive reasons why I know that statehood for Alaska would strengthen our national defense. These are in addition to the reasons that have been given by the military experts testifying in favor of statehood, namely, that statehood would increase the population, promote the economy, increase the stability, and so forth.

My additional reasons are derived from my observations of the history of Alaska's defenses; or perhaps I had better say the history of the lack of Alaska defenses.

At the outbreak of World War II, Alaska did not have a single completed base. It had neither an Army base, an airbase, or a Navy base. Prior to the belated and hastily improvised defense measures when war was practically upon us, the only military establishment in Alaska was Chilkoot Barracks. This was a survival of a post created for policing purposes during the gold rush days. It was manned by 200 infantrymen, armed with Springfield rifles. They did not even have an antiaircraft gun. It was a relic of the vanished past, and as useful for national defense in the 20th century as some of those western Army posts dating from the days of Sitting Bull and General Custer. It was not intended for defense against a foreign aggressor. In fact, neither the Congress nor the Military Establishment had ever even given serious thought to the great potentialities of this strategically superlative area, Alaska. We had been and were continuing to build and strengthen bases along our Pacific and Atlantic coasts, but we never considered it was worthwhile building one in Alaska.

In the election of 1932, Alaska elected Anthony J. Dimond as its Delegate. He served with great distinction and ability in this House for 12 years. The older Members will remember him and recall their regret at seeing him leave the Congress to take up a post as a Federal judge in Alaska. From the beginning of his service in the House in 1933, Anthony Dimond missed no opportunity to call attention to the defenselessness of Alaska. In committee and on the floor he pointed to its great strategic importance. As early as 1934, with a foresight that was almost uncanny, he foretold the war with Japan, and that Japan would attack without warning. He emphasized again and again the important part that Alaska could play in any war in the Pacific. He emphasized again and again, what was little appreciated at that time, that the great circle route which passed through Alaska was much shorter than the route across the mid-Pacific.

Had Delegate Anthony Dimond's warnings and repeated requests for the fortification of Alaska been heeded, the costly Aleutian campaign need never have been fought. As a result of being undefended when World War II broke out, Alaska was the only part of this continent that was invaded and for a time held by the enemy. And while it is true that the Japanese enemy was ultimately driven out of Alaska, the entire campaign to expel him, with its loss of 2,500 American lives, could have been avoided.

Delegate Dimond likewise for 7 years before Pearl Harbor urged the importance of building the Alaska highway. He called attention to its strategic importance.

But neither his sound advice to build Army, Air, and Navy bases in Alaska nor his plea to construct the Alaska Highway was heeded. It was not heeded because he was a voteless Delegate. Had Alaska had two United States Senators and a Representative with a vote at that time, the story would have been very different.

As we know, none of the Military Establishments in Alaska which it had been hastily sought to provide on the very eve of the outbreak of hostilities was completed when the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor. Our military chiefs had little information about Alaska. Practically every base built in Alaska during the war was either built in the wrong place or improperly built, as their subsequent reconstruction or abandonment demonstrated very clearly.

Alaskans repeatedly sought to call attention to some of the grossest errors that were being committed by the military there, but in vain. Again, they had no Senators to get their protests to register effectively. To the horror and stupefaction of Alaskans, practically the entire Military Establishment erected during World War II was promptly abandoned after V–J Day. The elaborately constructed bases were decommissioned. Their equipment was sold as junk. Our excellent Alaska Delegate, E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, protested as emphatically as he knew how, and he can testify that nobody paid much attention. It seems hard to believe that in the face of the growing menace across Bering Strait our military could be guilty of such shortsighted folly, but the fault was partly ours, too, right here in the Congress.

A subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee visited Alaska in 1950, and was shocked at the weakened condition into which the defenses of

Alaska had been allowed to fall. One of the members of that committee, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, declared on the floor of the Senate:

> The defenses of Alaska would never have reached the weakened condition into which they were permitted to get following World War II if the Territory of Alaska had had voting representation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.
>
> Such voting representation—
>
> Senator MORSE affirmed—
>
> would have brought * * * the evidence and argument which would have prevented Congress from figuratively sticking its head in the sand while the great defenses of Alaska were permitted to become weakened—
>
> And thereby imperiling—
>
> the security * * * of 160 million American citizens.

It was due in part to the activity of this Senate committee and in part to other factors that the Congress and our Defense Establishment finally woke up to the tremendous importance of Alaska from the military standpoint.

Now, it will be argued that such neglect is not likely to recur. I state most emphatically that it is very likely to recur. Under our military system, the commanding officers and their staffs are rotated every 2 years. Consider that Alaska is an area one-fifth as large as the United States, with conditions of climate, terrain, and logistics that have no parallel elsewhere under the flag. Two years is not time enough to secure the real knowledge which a lifelong resident of Alaska invariably has, and which two United States Senators and a Representative with a vote could supply.

If it was true, as that great military genius and prophet, Gen. Billy Mitchell—"a prophet without honor" until after his death—declared on frequent occasions, and for the last time in 1935, that "he who holds Alaska will hold the world," and that in his view it was "the most important strategic place in the world," Alaska has become infinitely more important now. It has become infinitely more important because we know now, which we did not know 20 years ago, when Billy Mitchell made this historic utterance and sounded this great warning, that Alaska lies within naked-eye view of enemy country.

If we have an enemy we know well that its direction originates in the Kremlin in Moscow, and that its domain extends across Eurasia to Bering Strait. It is only 54 miles across Bering Strait. On a clear day the headlands of Siberia can be seen from a number of points on the Alaska mainland. In Bering Sea are two islands, Little Diomede and Big Diomede, the former American and the latter Russian, only two and a half miles apart. How fortunate we are that Alaska is today under the American flag. And what tragic folly that we have so long failed to appreciate its value to us militarily, economically, spiritually. Alaska is far too important to risk any more errors in maintaining it as a great bastion for defense and, if need be, for offense. It is not yet adequately so equipped today. As a State, its voting representatives would make sure that it, and therefore the entire Nation, was adequately defended, and that the blunders, stupidities, and neglect of the past would not be repeated.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska and Hawaii are closer to Washington in traveling time than any of the 35 States admitted to the Union after its founding with the Thirteen Original States. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared statistics for me on this and, under unanimous consent, I include herewith a table of the estimated traveling time from State capital to Washington, D. C., at the time each State was admitted to the Union:

State capital to Washington, D. C.,[1] at the time admitted to Union

State or Territory	Date of entry	Population at census nearest to entry	Estimated traveling time in days
Alabama	Dec. 14, 1819	127,901 (1820)	Montgomery to Washington, 12 days.
Arizona	Feb. 14, 1912	204,354 (1910)	Phoenix to Washington, 3½ days.
Arkansas	June 15, 1836	97,574 (1840)	Little Rock to Washington, 12 days.
California	Sept. 9, 1850	92,597 (1850)	Sacramento to Washington, 26 days.
Colorado	Aug. 1, 1876	194,327 (1880)	Denver to Washington, 10 days.
Florida	Mar. 3, 1845	87,445 (1850)	Tallahassee to Washington, 7 days.
Idaho	July 3, 1890	88,548 (1890)	Boise to Washington, 3 days.
Illinois	Dec. 3, 1818	55,211 (1820)	Springfield to Washington, 14 days.
Indiana	Dec. 11, 1816	147,178 (1820)	Indianapolis to Washington, 12 days.
Iowa	Dec. 28, 1846	192,214 (1850)	Des Moines to Washington, 14 days.
Kansas	Jan. 29, 1861	107,206 (1860)	Topeka to Washington, 7 days.
Kentucky	June 1, 1792	220,955 (1800)	Frankfort to Washington, 17 days.
Louisiana	Apr. 30, 1812	76,556 (1810)	Baton Rouge to Washington, 31 days.
Maine	Mar. 15, 1820	298,335 (1820)	Augusta to Washington, 7 days.
Michigan	Jan. 26, 1837	212,267 (1840)	Lansing to Washington, 12 days.
Minnesota	May 11, 1858	172,023 (1860)	St. Paul to Washington, 4 days.
Mississippi	Dec. 10, 1817	75,448 (1820)	Jackson to Washington, 12 days.
Missouri	Aug. 10, 1821	19,783 (1820)	Jefferson City to Washington, 19 days.
Montana	Nov. 8, 1889	142,924 (1890)	Helena to Washington, 3½ days.
Nebraska	Mar. 1, 1867	122,998 (1870)	Lincoln to Washington, 7 days.
Nevada	Oct. 31, 1864	6,867 (1860)	Carson City to Washington, 25 days.
New Mexico	Jan. 6, 1912	327,301 (1910)	Santa Fe to Washington, 3 days.
North Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	190,983 (1890)	Bismarck to Washington, 2½ days.
Ohio	Mar. 1, 1803	45,365 (1800)	Columbus to Washington, 17 days.
Oklahoma	Nov. 16, 1907	1,657,155 (1910)	Oklahoma City to Washington, 2 days.
Oregon	Feb. 14, 1859	52,465 (1860)	Salem to Washington, 35 days.
South Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	348,600 (1890)	Pierre to Washington, 2½ days.
Tennessee	June 1, 1796	105,602 (1800)	Nashville to Washington, 25 days.
Texas	Dec. 29, 1845	212,592 (1850)	Austin to Washington, 15 days.
Utah	Jan. 4, 1896	276,749 (1900)	Salt Lake City to Washington, 3 days.
Vermont	Mar. 4, 1791	154,465 (1800)	Montpelier to Washington, 11 days.
Washington	Nov. 11, 1889	357,232 (1890)	Olympia to Washington, 3⅔ days.
West Virginia	June 19, 1863	442,014 (1870)	Charleston to Washington, 1 day.
Wisconsin	May 29, 1848	305,391 (1850)	Madison to Washington, 20 days.
Wyoming	July 10, 1890	62,555 (1890)	Cheyenne to Washington, 2½ days.
Alaska	----------	128,643 (1950)	Juneau to Washington (15 hours flying time), 1955.
Hawaii	----------	499,794 (1950)	Honolulu to Washington (20 hours flying time), 1955.

[1] Omitting the Thirteen Original Colonies.

Source: Based on World Almanac 1955, Paullin's Atlas of Historical geography and Association of American Railroads information by telephone.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the rule under which we are operating is a package deal. We either vote for statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska or we vote down the proposal.

I have advocated statehood for Hawaii a number of times. Hawaii has a population that would entitle her to two Representatives in Congress, should she become a State. I have never advocated statehood for Alaska, for reasons which will appear hereafter.

I dislike very much to oppose statehood for Alaska because of my admiration for Delegate BOB BARTLETT. He is everything that a legislator should be. He is tolerant, courteous, objective and in every way a fine representative for the people of Alaska. However, I think there is danger in permitting a territory to come into the Union as a State when the population is so small as it is in Alaska. It gives to a very small group of people political power to which they are not entitled. One of the answers we get to this objection is that, if statehood is granted, then the population will increase. To me this is a fallacious claim. I need but point to the fact that Hawaii has grown rapidly as a territory. Alaska has scarcely grown at all. If the Territory really has something that people want in the way of opportunities in the economic field this should have manifested itself long before this.

For every person in Alaska there are 1,171 in the United States. For every person in Alaska there are 82 in California. Should Alaska be admitted, it means that the political power of one voter in Alaska would be 82 times as powerful as that of a voter of California. It had a population in 1950 of 128,643. To indicate how ridiculous the claim for statehood by Alaska is, I need but state that 76 American cities have a larger population than Alaska. A table hereafter lists them.

The answer usually made to this wide difference in population is that the Constitution settled that question by giving each State two Senators. To this we say that when a territory seeks admission, we should carefully consider the effect which its entrance might have on other States or groups. Certainly no State should be created when its admission would give its people extraordinary

political power and tremendously reduce the political power of the people of other States.

With an estimated 1953 population of 155,000, Alaska has less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the population of the 48 States. For those who argue that disparity in size existed when our Constitution was adopted, I would like to point out the following figures:

Delaware had 1.6 percent of the total population;

Rhode Island had 1.8 percent and Georgia 2.2 percent.

From these statistics we can see that even the smallest State had 16 times as large a population compared to the total in the United States at that time as Alaska has when compared to the present United States population.

In a treaty fight Alaska would have devastating political power. With two Senators in the United States Senate this small group of people could neutralize the votes of California and New York. These two States have a combined population of over 25 million. With a population of slightly over one-half of 1 percent of the population of those two States, Alaska could neutralize their vote.

If Alaska should be admitted, the 25 States with the lowest population would have a combined population which is only 19.1 percent of the total population of the entire United States. Less than one-fifth of the population would, if the States combined, have control of the United States Senate.

I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to answer 11 questions which bear on the statehood problem as it presents itself by Alaska's bid for statehood.

Under leave to extend my remarks, granted me by the Speaker, I am including certain tables and other data which the Library of Congress compiled for me.

I wish every Member could find time to read and digest this data. If that were the case, Alaska would never be admitted to statehood until she had shown a far greater increase in population than is now evident.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

Hon. LEROY JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In response to your inquiry of April 19, 1955, in which you requested information on 11 specific questions concerning the Territory of Alaska, we are happy to report as follows:

1. Population of Alaska: [1]

A. Total population:

July 1, 1953 (estimated)	205,000
Apr. 1, 1950 (census)	128,643

B. Civilian population:

July 1, 1953 (estimated)	155,000
Apr. 1, 1950 (census)	108,000

[1] U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, series P-25, No. 97 (Aug. 6, 1954).

2. Education in the Territory: [2]

A. Illiteracy in Alaska: There are no accurate figures, but the number of illiterates 10 years of age or over is believed to be scant.

B. Number attending literacy classes:

None in territorial schools.

No classes believed held in Alaska native service schools.

C. Number of children of school age:

Total	32,728
Indigenous	13,738
Nonindigenous	18,990

D. Number of schools (all schools are mixed):

	Public	*Independent*
Primary	198	16
Secondary [3]	31	2
Vocational [4]	1	1
Higher education	1	1

E. Number of pupils:

	Indigenous		Nonindigenous	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Public schools:				
Primary	4,319	4,191	7,118	6,709
Secondary	672	658	1,316	1,175
Independent schools:				
Primary (total)	429		433	
Secondary (total)	145		8	

3. Populations of Alaska and United States compared: A. The population figures of Alaska and the United States used in computing the ratio of the number of people in Alaska as compared with the United States are based on the total population of the United States and Alaska at the census of Apr. 1, 1950:

Population of Alaska	128,643
Population of United States	150,697,361

For every 1 person in Alaska there were 1,171 in the United States.

4. Populations of Alaska and California: A. The population figures of Alaska and California used in computing the percentage of the number of people in Alaska as compared with the United States are based on the total population of Alaska and California, at the census of Apr. 1, 1950:

Population of Alaska	128,643
Population of California	10,586,223

There were approximately 82 persons in California to every 1 person in Alaska: A percentage of 1.2.

5. Comparative influence in the Senate of Alaskan and Californian voters: A. With a ratio of 82 persons in California to every 1 person in Alaska, the influence in the Senate of the United States as between California and Alaska would be grossly disproportionate. In California there would be 1 Senator representing 5,293,111 persons, whereas in Alaska there would be 1 Senator representing 64,321 persons. Every Alaskan thus would have 82 times the voting power of every Californian with respect to senatorial representation.

6. The ratio of prospective influence of Alaska in the United States Senate as compared to the influence (voting power) of the 10 States with the smallest population.[5] (With only 1 Senator of a State usually being elected at a given time, the population of each of the 10 States, as well as that of Alaska, is halved for the purpose of determining voting ratios.)

State	Population (divided by 2)	Ratio of Alaska's voting power to that of State (rounded)
Alaska	128,643= 64,321	
Nevada	160,083= 80,041	1.2
Wyoming	290,529=145,264	2.3
Delaware	318,085=159,042	2.5
Vermont	377,747=188,873	2.9
New Hampshire	533,242=266,621	4.1
Montana	591,024=295,512	4.6
Idaho	588,637=294,318	4.6
North Dakota	619,636=309,818	4.8
South Dakota	652,740=326,370	5.1
New Mexico	681,187=340,593	5.3

7. The total population of the 25 States with the lowest populations according to the census of April 1, 1950, and the ratio (and percentage) of that total to the total population of the United States:

Total population of the 25 States	28,828,904
Total population of the United States	150,697,361
Ratio of 25 States (total) to United States total	1 to 5.2
Percentage of 25 States (total) percent	19.1

8. Cities in the United States with populations larger than that of Alaska.

(See Legislative Reference Service report, List of Cities in United States Which Have a Larger Population Than That of the Territory of Alaska.)

9. Adequacy of Alaska's resources to support statehood:

A. When the question of statehood for Alaska in 1947 was first seriously proposed, the Territory was undergoing a financial crisis; all appropriations were frozen because tax revenues were not sufficient to meet appropriations.

B. With the basic tax program enacted in 1949, many new levies were added, causing a sharp increase in Territorial tax revenues beginning in 1951.

C. Territorial revenues in 1953 and 1954 totaled $30,221,633.01. Against this revenue the Territory had budgeted approximately $25 million.[6]

D. If Alaska is given statehood at this time, it will begin as a State which has brought in a net surplus over budgeted needs—at least in recent years. If this surplus should continue in the future as it has during the past 5 years, it will be sufficient to pay most of the cost of statehood during the first year.[7]

E. There have been estimates of the increased annual cost of statehood presented during past hearings. These figures range from $4,279,000 per annum (by proponents of statehood) to $15,666,000 (by opponents). The United States Bureau of the Budget has supplied a tabulation of the cost to the Federal Government of assuming the burden of a State and carrying on those functions required by any normal State. Such costs aggregate $11,401,000; anticipated revenues which will accrue to the State (of Alaska)

[2] Source for Education Statistics: Alaska. Information on the Territory of Alaska for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. Transmitted by the United States to the Secretary General of the United Nations, pp. 40–41.

[3] Secondary schools are maintained by the same agencies as primary and, except for two vocational schools, do not add to the total number of schools in Alaska.

[4] Included in secondary schools.

[5] U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of April 1, 1950.

[6] U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 84th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 88, Mar. 3, 1955, p. 43.

[7] Ibid., p. 43.

amount to $2,322,000, leaving a net annual cost of statehood of $9,079,000.[8]

F. There are in H. R. 2535 a number of provisions designed to ease the burden of the new State during the transition period. These provisions include: Federal appropriations for road construction and road maintenance. If these appropriations are granted Alaska would be able to save $6 million the first year; $3 million the 6th year; and $1 million the 11th through the 15th year.

10. Economic development of Alaska in the last decade:

A. In some areas of the Alaskan economy progress has been substantial. The annual value of the salmon product was $31 million in 1940; in 1950 it was approximately $100 million. In 1951 mining and other industrial activity sharply increased, with "the establishment of the Alaska Copper Mines, Inc., in the Wrangell Mountain area, the expansion of the United States Tin Corporation's operations from a small placer operation to a large lode mining and milling operation, instituting of other tin, tungsten, nickel, and bismuth operations, the construction of Permanente bulk cement facilities at Anchorage, the petroleum development work of the Northern Development Co. and Alaska Petroleum Syndicate, and the establishment of a number of new shellfish processing and canning plants."[9]

B. In 1952 the Ketchikan Pulp & Paper Co. began the construction of a pulp mill near Ketchikan, which, it is estimated, will eventually employ some 1,800 persons. At the same time, the Alaskan Plywood Corp. began building an $800,000 mill at Juneau, which is expected to produce annually 30,000,000 square feet of finished plywood.[10] Construction of the plywood plant was completed in fiscal year 1952–53,[11] work on the Ketchikan plant, too, is now completed.[12]

C. Perhaps the most significant indication of progress is represented by the business expansion Alaska has undergone in recent years. In 1945 only 42 new Alaska corporations were organized; in 1952 a total of 228 new corporations were registered with the territorial auditor.[13]

11. Comparison of votes cast in 1954 election in Alaska with vote cast in certain States:[14]

A. Ratio of the vote cast in Alaska for Delegate to the vote case in Nevada for Senator was 1 to 2.9 (Nevada vote: 77,513; Alaska vote: 26,999).

B. Ratio of the vote cast in Alaska for Delegate to the vote cast in Wyoming, Delaware, and Vermont for Representative at Large:

State	Vote	Alaska's ratio
Wyoming	108,771	1 to 4.0
Delaware	144,236	1 to 5.3
Vermont	114,289	1 to 4.2

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

[8] Ibid., p. 42.

[9] Alaska Statehood Committee, Alaska statehood; Analysis and Refutation of Minority Views on S. 50, January 1952, p. 21–22.

[10] Ibid., p. 22.

[11] Annual Report of the Governor of Alaska to the Secretary of the Interior, 1953, p. 24.

[12] U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. 84th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 88, p. 42.

[13] Alaska Development Board. Charting Alaska's progress; the biennial report, 1951–52, p. 5.

[14] Congressional Directory, 84th Cong., 1st sess., March 1955.

List of cities in United States which have a larger population than that of the Territory of Alaska

City	State	Population
New York	New York	7,891,957
Chicago	Illinois	3,620,962
Philadelphia	Pennsylvania	2,071,605
Los Angeles	California	1,970,358
Detroit	Michigan	1,849,568
Baltimore	Maryland	949,708
Cleveland	Ohio	914,808
St. Louis	Missouri	856,796
Washington	District of Columbia	802,178
Boston	Massachusetts	801,444
San Francisco	California	775,357
Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	676,806
Milwaukee	Wisconsin	637,392
Houston	Texas	596,163
Buffalo	New York	580,132
New Orleans	Louisiana	570,445
Minneapolis	Minnesota	521,718
Cincinnati	Ohio	503,998
Seattle	Washington	467,591
Newark	New Jersey	438,776
Dallas	Texas	434,462
Indianapolis	Indiana	427,173
Denver	Colorado	415,786
San Antonio	Texas	408,442
Memphis	Tennessee	396,000
Oakland	California	384,575
Columbus	Ohio	375,901
Portland	Oregon	373,628
Louisville	Kentucky	369,129
San Diego	California	334,387
Rochester	New York	332,488
Atlanta	Georgia	331,314
Birmingham	Alabama	326,037
St. Paul	Minnesota	311,349
Toledo	Ohio	303,616
Jersey City	New Jersey	299,017
Fort Worth	Texas	278,778
Akron	Ohio	274,605
Omaha	Nebraska	251,117
Long Beach	California	250,767
Miami	Florida	249,276
Providence	Rhode Island	248,674
Dayton	Ohio	243,872
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	243,504
Richmond	Virginia	230,310
Syracuse	New York	220,583
Norfolk	Virginia	213,513
Jacksonville	Florida	204,517
Worcester	Massachusetts	203,486
Tulsa	Oklahoma	182,740
Salt Lake City	Utah	182,121
Des Moines	Iowa	177,965
Hartford	Connecticut	177,397
Grand Rapids	Michigan	176,515
Nashville	Tennessee	174,307
Youngstown	Ohio	168,330
Wichita	Kansas	168,279
New Haven	Connecticut	164,443
Flint	Michigan	163,143
Springfield	Massachusetts	162,399
Spokane	Washington	161,721
Bridgeport	Connecticut	158,709
Yonkers	New York	152,798
Tacoma	Washington	143,673
Paterson	New Jersey	139,336
Sacramento	California	137,572
Albany	New York	134,995
Charlotte	North Carolina	134,042
Gary	Indiana	133,911
Fort Wayne	Indiana	133,607
Austin	Texas	132,459
Chattanooga	Tennessee	131,041
Erie	Pennsylvania	130,803
El Paso	Texas	130,485
Kansas City	Kansas	129,553
Mobile	Alabama	129,009
Alaska		128,643

NOTE.—All statistics as of 1950 census.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1954 (75th edition). Washington, D. C., 1954

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1955.

Hon. LEROY JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: This is in response to your inquiry of May 9, 1955 for figures on the population of the Thirteen Colonies of the United States for the 1790 census. The figures are as follows:

Massachusetts	378,787
Rhode Island	68,825
Connecticut	337,946
New Hampshire	141,185
New York	340,120
New Jersey	184,139
Pennsylvania	434,373
Delaware	59,096
Maryland	319,728
Virginia	691,737
North Carolina	393,751
South Carolina	249,073
Georgia	82,548

The total population of the Original Thirteen Colonies as of the census of 1790 was 3,681,308.

This information was obtained from the United States Bureau of the Census.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, this issue has been before the Congress many times. The proponents of statehood have been unsuccessful in securing a favorable verdict. I think there is a good reason for their failure. There has always been a very deep feeling in Congress that this is not a wise thing to do. We have heard many arguments advanced why our Congress should admit Hawaii and Alaska to statehood. But the fundamental question before us is whether it is in the best interest of the United States. I cannot subscribe to this old argument that I have heard ever since I came to Congress that we owe a duty to do this or to do that, and that it will aid us psychologically in our conflict with the Communist ideology to demonstrate to the world our fairness by admitting Hawaii and Alaska. I recall the same argument was used on the floor of the House in 1932 when my bill came before the Congress to deport and exclude Communist aliens. It was said on the floor of the House and on the floor of the other body that the bill would offend peoples throughout the world; that they would gain the impression that we were unfair and intolerant. Then for 7 years when we sought to destroy the Communist conspiracy in the United States, the policy of coddling and protecting Communists in the Government, in labor unions and in media of information was justified on the grounds that it would gain us favor throughout the world. I am not impressed by that argument because I know that the Kremlin will not be influenced by our decision with respect to Alaska and Hawaii. I know what I have said for many years, that the question of war or peace with the Kremlin will be determined by the military, economic, and spiritual strength of the United States. I confess I am an old-fashioned American and I do not agree with the maudlin sentiments that are constantly expressed here and elsewhere that we ought to subordinate the interest and welfare of our country in an effort to appease potential enemies throughout the world. I know the proponents of statehood have sought to minimize the

threat of communism in Hawaii. They quote from Mr. Hoover to show that there are only a handful of Communists in Hawaii. Now what are the facts? We investigated Harry Bridges and the union which he and other Communists dominated for 7 years. We undertook to secure his deportation. His union and 10 other unions were affiliated with the CIO and in 1938 I went to John L. Lewis and pleaded with him to get rid of the Communist unions that then formed a considerable block of his support. Finally, after a decade, the CIO expelled this union, the ILWU and the UPW in Hawaii and some 11 or 12 unions altogether. Notwithstanding the unanimous findings of our committee and the eventual endorsement of those findings by the CIO, that union continued to keep Harry Bridges as its head and its dictator. Now it may be true that the members of the unions are not card-holding members of the Communist Party. I presume there is no way to prove or disprove that fact. But the fact that a union after the repeated disclosures and the widest publicity would keep as its head a man who is the representative of the Kremlin and one of the most powerful Communists in the world, is convincing proof to me that the 25,000 members of that union are Communists in sympathy, if they are not in official affiliation. As long as those unions control the economic life of Hawaii, American citizens will view with considerable concern the proposition of admitting Hawaii to our Union of free States.

The best proof they could furnish to the peoples of this country and of the world that the union is not a Communist organization is for the membership of the union, in obedience to public sentiment, to expel Harry Bridges and Jack Hall and all of the Communists who are in control of it. That is what the CIO finally did, although we waged a long battle with them before they made the decision. They finally demonstrated to the people of the country that a vast majority of the members of the CIO would not tolerate dictation by the agents of the Kremlin; and if they were able to do that, why cannot this union expel Harry Bridges and why can they not develop a sufficient sentiment in Hawaii to compel the union to do it? To say that it does not present a threat to the security of our country, to permit a union which is under the domination of Russia to control the economic life of Hawaii, is to simply ignore the facts and realities of the situation.

Mr. Chairman, what can Hawaii and Alaska contribute to the United States? That is the question. We are under no obligation, moral or legal, to admit Hawaii and Alaska. When we admitted Texas to the Union we did so because the Congress of the United States looked upon that vast expanse and believed it would contribute to the strength and stability of the American Union. The action was not dictated by sympathy for Texas but by considerations of the best interests of the American Nation. I have yet to hear any valid argument that the admission of Alaska and Hawaii will contribute anything to the United States that we do not now enjoy. I can understand their desire to be admitted to this Union. It is a laudable ambition. I can understand that Alaska would like to have as much voice in the Senate of the United States as the State of New York or the State of Texas. I can understand that both Territories would like to have four Senators, but I know that they would wield a tremendous power in the councils of our Nation; and in the critical years that lie ahead, when decisions made by our Senate may be of far-reaching consequence to the preservation of our freedom and the peace and security of the world, I am not prepared by my vote at this time to give them that power. I can believe that there may be questions that will be decided by four Senators. I do not disparage the people of Hawaii or Alaska, nor would I intimate that because of their racial origins they are not entitled to the fullest considerations. But I know that the people of Hawaii and Alaska have not demonstrated to my satisfaction that they are capable of self-government to the extent that I would require to give them in the Senate the power of life and death over this great Republic. I shall therefore vote to recommit this bill or to defeat it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard this question debated many, many times on the floor of this House. I have heard during this debate that some element of politics may be involved. I cannot conceive of any Member of this House, conscious as he must be of the fact that much depends upon his vote on a question of this kind—that of adding another State to this Union—who would let his decision depend on politics; I could not conceive of his passing on this from a political point of view.

Much has been said about the hearings—the thousands of pages of hearings. I have not read all these hearings, but I have heard enough on this floor today and yesterday to raise such a doubt in my mind that I cannot, with my love and my feeling and my devotion to this country, vote to bring in these areas so far removed—one 3,000 miles away—to make it a part of the great United States of America.

In the defense of this country and the contiguous Territory thousands and hundreds of thousands of men have given their lives; and, if necessary, thousands more stand ready now to die again to defend it.

I regret that I must listen at times to talk about that character Harry Bridges. I have voted to do everything to him I can think of—he is truly an enemy of this country. We have tried every way on earth to get rid of that man. He means no good to this great land of ours; and yet there he is—a great power and wielding a tremendous influence.

All the sugar in Hawaii would not make a sweet character out of that guy.

And I am a little skeptical of an area where a man of that character can hold within the palm of his hand the life or death of the economy of such a great number of people.

I take my patriotism rather seriously. I like to think of the United States of America as being in truth and in fact the United States of America. I would not like to have to sit in one of these seats and listen to a man take the well of this House and expound the same philosophy as Harry Bridges.

I doubt if I could take it. Yet, is there anyone in this House who doubts the possibility and probability that he will undoubtedly elect part of the representation that comes to this House from his private domain of Hawaii? And is there anyone who doubts that he can control their political life at his whim?

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, without prolonging this debate unnecessarily, I sincerely hope this House will not take an island 3,000 miles away and attempt to make it a part of the United States of America as we know it. It is inconceivable.

The evidence here today, the newspapers, the actions, the debate have brought to my attention facts that raise such a doubt with me that I cannot give my consent.

I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable humility that I stand here in the well to state my views on this issue. I only do so because they are very strong. I felt it necessary to write a separate dissenting view in connection with the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and for this reason I feel compelled today to speak to you for a few minutes, not on the issue of communism, or the ethnic issue, or the number of Representatives or any number of other things that have so far been discussed here today, but about the situation of Alaska from perhaps just a little bit different viewpoint.

In 1950 the civilian population of Alaska was 108,000. According to the United States Census Bureau it has gone up to 171,000 as of 1954, an increase in population of 62,000 people in 4 years. In a like period of time there was an increase of 24,000 in the military population in the Territory of Alaska.

When the debate was closed yesterday afternoon I sought to ascertain the reason for this increase of 62,000 in the population. One gentleman advised me that it was perhaps due to the fact that a number of servicemen had gone up there, they had seen the country, they liked it and after they were discharged came back to live there because of love for it. I thought about that reasoning last night and it occurred to me that it might not be quite correct. Since there was an increase of 24,000 in military personnel in the area in that 4 years and since at least one-third of them had brought their families, taking a family averaging 3 or 4, that would take care of 24,000 of that increase in population. So you would have left an increase of 38,000 to account for. But in those 4 years a tremendous amount of construction and other activity by the Federal Government was taking place, so

you can say that another 30,000 came in just to go on the Government construction payroll and on the payroll of those servicing the Armed Forces in that area. That leaves an increase of 8,000 in the Territory of Alaska in this period of 4 years to go to work in the pulp mills, to do a little bit of farming and a few other things they may do there.

I ask, Where could there be in Alaska, where is there in Alaska, the centers of business, industry, finance, commerce, culture and education that are basic requirements for a condition of statehood and for the foundation of a self-sustaining society? I ask that question again. It has been asked before.

Mr. Chairman, we are not here to legislate for anybody but the United States of America and our concern should be with the question: How will this benefit the United States of America? Not how it might or might not benefit the people of Alaska. Where in Alaska are there the foundations of a stable economic community or a stable political community? How can the Territory with its 171,000 people, perhaps 30,000 or more of them transitory military personnel, support the additional burden of statehood? How can it operate a State government within its half million square miles of territory? How can this be done in that sparsely populated Arctic area, that frontier? How can it be done, particularly under the conditions which were recited yesterday, that over one-half of the area of this territory must be excluded physically from the boundaries of the proposed State?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read in my remaining time just a portion of the very short statement of minority views that I made, and that is this:

> The entire population of the Territory of Alaska is far less than that of any of the 435 congressional districts in the existing 48 States. Under the circumstances, there simply does not exist in the Territory of Alaska the basic minimum number of people to warrant or support statehood status.
>
> Although some States had no more population than Alaska when admitted, the situations are not comparable due to reasons of geography, economic potentialities, and time in history.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, when the question of statehood for Hawaii was before us in the 83d Congress I said that I was opposed to it and that it would not help the situation any insofar as I was concerned to throw Alaska into the same legislative pot, because I believe that neither of these Territories should be admitted to statehood in this Union.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat today that my view does not rest on the question of present or future disloyalty in either Territory nor does it rest in any respect on the racial or ethnic background of the people of these areas.

I believe that the United States should limit this Union to its present membership.

We are big enough now.

Our structure of government is already very large, cumbersome, and unwieldy.

We have all we can do within the continental United States without extending statehood particularly to distant islands and Territories.

As I read history, nations that have extended themselves as is now suggested for us in this way, have sown the seeds of their ultimate weakness and destruction. The United States can best fulfill its great destiny by making itself strong and by cooperation with and through protective help for free people everywhere.

By reaching too far and spreading ourselves too thin we will not be strong and we cannot help others.

Thus, I am opposed to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii or any other area, commonwealth, possession, or Territory.

Throughout the debate in the 83d Congress and again on the floor of this House yesterday and today it has been repeatedly suggested that under our system a denial of statehood amounts to assigning the people of the Territories to a position of inferiority.

To put it another way, it is suggested that those who are residents of the States are superior to those who are residents of Territories.

If this is true, then under the American system there are only two choices.

Namely, that of Territorial inferiority and that of State superiority.

If this is true, then indeed we will have difficulty in facing the Puerto Ricans, the people of the Virgin Islands, those of Guam, and even those in the Marianas, the Marshalls, and the Carolines.

Is this Congress to say to these people that there is no way to have full freedom and a permanent association with the United States except in statehood?

The answer is "No," for we have already said something else to the people of Puerto Rico.

The Puerto Ricans occupy a happy situation in what is most accurately described as a commonwealth status, and I am confident that the people of Puerto Rico do not feel that they are an inferior group under the American flag.

They are our equals in every respect that counts.

Their Commonwealth status is different but not inferior.

Yet it is interesting to recall that Democrats and Republicans a few years ago were both demanding statehood for Puerto Rico. It was popular political propaganda, and it was inserted in party platforms.

As late as 1952, the Republican Party platform advocated "immediate statehood for Hawaii; statehood for Alaska under an equitable enabling act; eventual statehood for Puerto Rico."

The Republican platform writers apparently did not know that in March of 1952, several months before the Republican National Convention, the people of Puerto Rico had ratified by a popular vote a new constitution making Puerto Rico not a State but a free Commonwealth associated with the United States.

The solution for Puerto Rico is the solution for Hawaii and Alaska, and it is the third and the proper choice for the people of the United States and for the people of these Territories.

If we defeat this bill today, the committee should thereafter make a real study of commonwealth status for these Territories. Then we will be approaching this problem from the standpoint of reason and of fairness.

Finally, let me again suggest that the matter of admission of new States should not be handled by the Congress.

In the 83d Congress I submitted a bill which provided for a constitutional amendment. Under this amendment the question of admissibility of new States to the Union would be passed upon by three-fourths of the member States.

This would give the people of the country a better opportunity to understand the issues and to fully discuss and debate the questions.

I shall introduce a similar measure in the 84th Congress.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2535, to admit the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska into statehood.

This is not a new issue, but is one that, in the best interest of the United States, should be settled affirmatively and without further delay. Bills to grant statehood to Hawaii have been passed by the House on three separate occasions—in 1947, 1950, and in 1953. Alaskan statehood legislation was also passed by the House in 1950.

Opponents to legislation making Alaska and Hawaii the 49th and 50th States of the Union are making the same arguments today which were made on these other occasions. They are even less convincing now than they were then.

Opponents say that because neither Territory touches continental United States that should automatically exclude them from statehood. We have only to refer to our history books to point out that many States came into the Union at a time when they were separated from the then existing States by countless miles of plains, mountains, and deserts. Transportation and communication were extremely difficult and dangerous. These new-admitted States were often weeks or months away from the last outposts of civilization. The Territories of Hawaii and Alaska are, by comparison, closer to Washington than the city of New York was when this Nation was founded. Today we may reach the capital cities of Hawaii or Alaska by air from Washington in only 18 hours. Modern transportation and communication have literally placed these Territories on our continental doorstep.

A favorite argument against Alaskan statehood is that the Territory has too few people. Alaska now has approximately 180,000 people. This is a larger population than that of 23 other States when they were admitted to the Union. Furthermore, it can be reasonably expected that when statehood is conferred it will open the way for new development and a rapidly growing population.

Opposition to Hawaiian statehood seems to center on race and culture. It is difficult for me to understand how we can object on such grounds if we are sincere about our own religious teaching,

and if we sincerely subscribe to our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Our fellow citizens of Hawaii are good people. They are good Americans and are dedicated to democratic principles and our way of life. Their young men adequately demonstrated their courage and loyalty when their homeland was attacked and our Nation plunged into world war.

A vote for statehood is a vote to strengthen their ties to the United States and to our way of life. To vote statehood is to keep a pledge both parties have made. The people of Alaska and Hawaii are entitled to become first-class citizens.

When we cast suspicion on the people of Hawaii or Alaska we not only do them a great injustice, we also do great harm to the United States and unconsciously give aid and comfort to our Communist enemies. We help drive the wedge to divide us at a time when unity, cooperation, and strength is imperative to our survival as a great nation.

To grant statehood to both these Territories will have a dramatic effect on the peoples of Asia and Africa by proving to them the falsity of Communist propaganda, alleging that America is racially antagonistic to the dark-skinned peoples of the world, that our democracy is sham, and that we really fear the people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the best interests of our Nation would be served by voting statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska without further delay and without regard to party politics. It would strengthen the ties of the people of both these great outposts to our own destiny and open the way for new economic and resource development on a large scale in these lands of promise and opportunity.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we are not going to sidestep our responsibility by dragging in the Communist issue. I yield to no one in my opposition to Communist tyranny. The Communist record of aggression, terrorism, brutality, torture, suppression of freedom, and cold-blooded murder is revolting to every normal and decent human being.

The totalitarian philosophy of envy and hate is a challenge to all who believe in human freedom and the dignity of man. But we are mistaken if we permit ourselves to believe that denying statehood to Hawaii will help in any way in our fight against Communist infiltration and Communist totalitarianism.

In my humble opinion the opposite is true. To oppose statehood by raising the Communist issue is grist for the Communist propaganda mill. The Communists do not want statehood for Hawaii or Alaska. They prefer the present status because it gives them such an excellent argument in telling the people of the dark-skinned races that our talk about democracy and equality is insincere.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlewoman from Hawaii has replied to the charge of communism in Hawaii which has been dragged into this debate. No one can doubt where the lady from Hawaii stands on the Communist issue.

Her answer to what she called "extravagant and unsupported charges" should reassure all of us that the Communist fear is overemphasized and should not stand in the way of prompt and favorable action on the statehood bill.

As so often is the case, those who are most vocal in their opposition to communism are unconsciously serving the Communist cause. Only the Communists gain when confusion, fear, and distrust replace reason and good commonsense.

If we follow the reasoning of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] his own State as well as Hawaii would not qualify for statehood. The Communist influence is more strong there than in Hawaii. But that is no reflection on the people of New York, who are represented by a fine delegation of 26 Republicans and 17 Democrats in this House. Hawaii has a 100 percent Republican delegation in the Congress. There is no doubt but that all these Representatives despise communism.

Even though there is a danger of growing Communist influence in Hawaii, which the gentlewoman denies, I see no reason why we should not meet whatever threat there is by affirmative action on the bill before us. Nothing has been said during this debate to convince me that opposition to statehood will in any way assist us in resisting and successfully defeating the efforts of the Communists.

The opponents to statehood have said nothing to prove that our efforts against communism will be best served by keeping Hawaii a Territory rather than a State. To follow the reasoning of opponents we might sever our relations entirely with the people in the island Territory. Much has been said about the importance of Formosa and even Matsu and Quemoy to the free world, yet from the criticism of Hawaiian statehood it would appear that some are willing to sacrifice Hawaii.

We need not fear of the kind of Representatives that would be elected to Congress if statehood is voted. We have an example now in the Delegates in the House from these Territories. And no matter who the four Senators might be, they would have little influence without support of a majority in the Senate. In the House, Representatives from Hawaii and Alaska, if statehood is voted, would be but 2 or 3 in a total of 435. Sure there is no need to fear.

If we want to make our country more strong and more firmly united, and if we want to strike a blow at communism, we can do it most effectively by prompt and favorable action on this statehood bill.

POPULATION ARGUMENT AGAINST STATEHOOD NOT VALID

One of the most persistent objections to the admission of a new State is that it has insufficient population.

With few exceptions, in the congressional debates preceding the admission of earlier States it was pointed out by opponents of their statehood that it would be grossly unfair to States already admitted to give this smaller population of the prospective State two United States Senators, and therefore equal representation with States with populations often several times larger. A Representative from New York State strongly objected on these grounds to the admission of Illinois in 1818.

To be sure, this question was disposed of by the Founding Fathers when they drew up the Constitution, and when it was ratified by the Thirteen Original States. If it had not been settled to the satisfaction of the smaller States, the Union could probably not have been formed. No one will gainsay that the Union has been a success under that system.

Nevertheless, the argument persists, and is renewed whenever Territories knock at our door requesting admission as States. The argument takes varying forms, all hoary with a century and a half of repetition. Sometimes it is asserted that adding States with less population than those already admitted will dilute the representation of those older States. Few have been the debates prior to the admission of new States in which some variant of this argument has not been vigorously expressed.

One of the favorite phrases of statehood opponents is, "I have more people in one of my counties than in the area that you are proposing to bring in as a State." In many instances, these assertions have been accompanied by prophesies that the proposed State would never increase its population. But every State since the original 13 has increased in population. In the case of California, every standard objection was raised. One, insufficient population; 2, noncontiguity; 3, too great distance from the Capital; 4, inhabitants alien in customs and character; 5, too great size; 6, inadequate resources. Well, California has now become second in population and will undoubtedly be the first before many years. It has drawn its citizenry from every State of the Union, as Alaska is doing today.

In the case of Hawaii, the population argument is still used although Hawaii has, and for some time has had, a population greater than four States in the Union: Delaware, Vermont, Nevada, and Wyoming. Yes, it is admitted, that is true, but those States are in and nothing can be done about them.

However, it is against Alaska that the argument is presented with the greatest flourishes. It is interesting, therefore, to note that today Alaska, with a population of approximately 205,000—and growing despite the handicaps of its Territorial status—has more population than had 25 of the 35 States which were admitted after the original 13.

Alabama, admitted in 1819, had a population of 127,901, of whom, incidentally, nearly one-third were slaves.

Arkansas, admitted in 1836, had a population of 52,240, of whom a fair number were slaves.

California, in 1850, had a population of 92,597.

Colorado, admitted in 1876, had an estimated population at that time of 150,000. We may not be exactly certain of this figure, but we know that at the census previous to its admission, in 1870, the population was 39,864, and at the census of 1880, 4 years after admission, it was 194,327.

Florida, when admitted in 1845, had a population of 72,000, of whom a substantial proportion were slaves. We do not know the exact number. The census of 1840 gave the slaves at 25,717. The census of 1850 gave the number at 39,310. If we assume that half way through that decade, in 1845, the figure was midway between the 1840 and 1850 figures, we get a slave population of 32,513, or some three-sevenths of the total population.

Idaho, admitted in 1890, had a population of 88,548.

Illinois, admitted in 1818, had a population of 53,211.

Indiana, in 1816, had a population estimated at under 100,000. It had been 24,520 in the census of 1810, and was 147,178 in the census of 1820, 4 years after admission.

Iowa, admitted in 1846, had a population of 102,388. It had risen to that point from a figure of 43,112 in the census of 1840, and 4 years after admission, in 1850, the population had grown to 192,214.

Kansas, admitted in 1861, had a population of less than 150,000. In the census of 1860, taken a year previously, its population is reported as 107,206.

Kentucky, the first State west of the Alleghenies to be admitted, had, according to the census of 1790, 73,677, of whom over 12,000 were slaves. How much total population Kentucky had achieved in the next 2 years after the first national census was taken is not a matter of record, but we may safely assume that in 1792, the year of admission, Kentucky had fewer than 100,000 inhabitants.

A similar situation is found in Louisiana, admitted in 1812. The census of 1810 gave its population as 76,556, of whom 34,660 were slaves. Eight years later, by the census of 1820, it had reached 153,407.

Michigan was admitted in 1837. It had fewer than 200,000 people at the time, although they came in fast during that fourth decade of the century. In 1830, the population was given as 31,639. By 1840, 3 years after admission, it had risen to 212,267.

Minnesota, admitted in 1858, had a population of 123,053. Eight years previously, at the census of 1850, its population was a mere 6,077. Two years after admission, in 1860, it had reached 172,023.

Mississippi, admitted in 1817, had fewer than 75,000 people. At least we know that in the census of 1820, its population is recorded as 75,448, of whom more than 30,000 were slaves.

Missouri, admitted in 1821, is recorded by the census of a year earlier as having 66,586. More than one-seventh of these were slaves. Nine years later, in the 1830 census, it had reached 140,455.

Montana, admitted in 1889, was shown in the following year's census to have a population of 142,924. In the previous census, that of 1880, the population was 39,159.

Nebraska's population prior to admission in 1867 was estimated at 28,841. It increased rapidly after the Civil War, but by the census of 1870, 3 years later, it was only 122,993.

Nevada, in 1864, had a population estimated at 11,000. In 1860 it was recorded as 6,857, and in the following census, that of 1870, had reached 42,491.

North Dakota, admitted in 1889, had a population of 190,983. At the previous census, that of 1880, the two Dakotas combined in Dakota Territory had a population of 135,177.

Ohio, admitted in 1803, had a population of 45,365.

Oregon, admitted in 1859, had a population of 52,465. It was probably less than that, but that is the figure in the census of 1860.

Tennessee, admitted in 1796, had an estimated population of 60,000 at the time of admission. Some of these were slaves.

The population of Vermont, admitted in 1791, the first State after the original 13, was probably slightly in excess of its 1790 census figure of 85,425. By 1800, the population had risen to 154,465.

And finally, Wyoming, admitted in 1890, had a population of 62,555.

Thus we will see that 25 States out of 35 had less population, many of them substantially less, than Alaska has today.

Alaska today, with over 205,000, has more population than two-thirds of the States of the Union admitted after the original 13. It has more population than at the time of their admission had: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, and Wyoming. In other words, Alaska today has 77,099 more people than Alabama had at the time of its admission in 1819; 152,760 more than Arkansas at the time of its admission in 1836; 112,403 more than California at the time of its admission in 1850; 55,000 more than Colorado at the time of its admission in 1876; 133,000 more than Florida at the time of its admission in 1845; 116,452 more than Idaho at the time of its admission in 1890; 151,789 more than Illinois at the time of its admission in 1818; 180,480 more than Indiana at the time of its admission in 1816; 102,612 more than Iowa at the time of its admission in 1846; 97,794 more than Kansas at the time of its admission in 1861; 131,323 more than Kentucky at the time of its admission in 1792; 128,444 more than Louisiana at the time of its admission in 1812; 20,000 more than Michigan at the time of its admission in 1837; 81,947 more than Minnesota at the time of its admission in 1858; 129,552 more than Mississippi at the time of its admission in 1817; 138,414 more than Missouri at the time of its admission in 1821; 62,076 more than Montana at the time of its admission in 1889; 82,007 more than Nebraska at its admission in 1867; 194,000 more than Nevada at its admission in 1864; 14,017 more than North Dakota at its admission in 1889; 159,635 more than Ohio at its admission in 1803; 152,535 more than Oregon at its admission in 1859; 145,000 more than Tennessee at its admission in 1796; 119,575 more than Vermont at its admission in 1791; and 142,445 more people than Wyoming at the time of its admission in 1890.

I should like to introduce at this point in my remarks a table showing the 25 States in alphabetical order, with the year of their admission, the census taken before their admission when that figure was obtainable, their population when admitted, their population in the census after admission, and, in the case of the slave States, their slave population:

State	Year admitted	Census before	Population at admission	Census after	Slave	
					Population	Year
Alabama	1819	----------	127,901	127,901	41,879	1820
Arkansas	1836	30,388	52,240	97,574	4,576	1830
					19,935	1840
California	1850	----------	92,597	379,994	----------	----------
Colorado	1876	39,864	[1] 150,000	194,327	----------	----------
Florida	1845	54,477	72,000	87,445	25,717	1840
					39,310	1850
Idaho	1890	32,610	88,548	161,772	----------	----------
Illinois	1818	12,282	53,211	55,211	----------	----------
Indiana	1816	24,520	24,520	147,178	----------	----------
Iowa	1846	43,112	[1] 102,388	192,214	----------	----------
Kansas	1861	107,206	107,206	364,399	----------	----------
Kentucky	1792	73,677	73,677	220,955	12,430	1790
Louisiana	1812	76,556	76,556	153,407	34,660	1810
					69,064	1820
Michigan	1837	31,639	[1] 185,000	212,267	----------	----------
Minnesota	1858	6,077	123,053	172,023	----------	----------
Mississippi	1817	40,352	75,448	75,448	14,523	1810
					32,814	1820
Missouri	1821	66,586	66,586	140,455	10,222	1820
Montana	1889	39,159	142,924	243,329	----------	----------
Nebraska	1867	28,841	122,993	122,993	----------	----------
Nevada	1864	6,857	[1] 11,000	42,491	----------	----------
North Dakota	1889	[2] 135,177	190,983	319,146	----------	----------
Ohio	1803	45,365	45,365	230,760	----------	----------
Oregon	1859	13,294	52,465	52,465	----------	----------
Tennessee	1796	35,691	60,000	105,602	3,417	1790
					13,584	1800
Vermont	1791	85,425	85,425	154,465	----------	----------
Wyoming	1890	20,789	62,555	92,531	----------	----------

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes South Dakota.

It will be said, in answer to the striking fact that Alaska's population today exceeds that of 25 States when they were admitted to the Union, that, nevertheless, Alaska has fewer people in comparison with the total population of the Union today than had those States in comparison with the total population of the Union when they were admitted. But even this figure no longer holds up. Half a dozen States, as the figures will show, had a smaller percentage of population of the total at the time they were admitted than Alaska has today. And I might add that none of them suffered such restrictions from their territorial status as has Alaska. None of them was in a position to benefit more greatly by the change from territorial to statehood than Alaska. Nor is Alaska, let it be said in passing, likely to remain, as a few of our States have, a relatively small State. By that I mean small in population. Given statehood, I confidently visualize Alaska as having half a million people by 1970 or earlier, and 2 or 3 million by the end of the century. But statehood will be essential if that desirable growth is to take place.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to confer the rights of statehood on Hawaii and Alaska. I must say at the outset that I think it unfortunate that the legislative committee brought forth these two Territories as Siamese twins. Of course, they are not Siamese twins.

Alaska and Hawaii are far apart physically; they are far different climatically, and in almost every other way one can think of. But they do have this in common, they are both Territories, they are both noncontiguous to the present Continental United States. However, Alaska is on the land mass of the North American Continent and separated by only a relatively short distance from the northwest portion of the United States. Hawaii is much nearer San Francisco, in fact much nearer Washington, D. C., than my own State of Maine was in the year 1820 when it was admitted to the Union. That is by present comparatively slow airplanes.

Ten years from now we shall go to Hawaii in half the time it takes today.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that when my State of Maine was admitted to the Union we had 7 Representatives in this body, and today we have 3. I make no complaint about that. It is not because the population of the State of Maine has diminished, it is because other parts of the country have grown more rapidly; in fact, the Territory of Hawaii has grown more rapidly. If in 1960 I have to give up my seat for somebody in Hawaii, I will not pretend to like it but I will bow to the inevitable facts of geography and the movement of population.

I do not at all subscribe to the argument that no other State should ever be admitted to the Union. Of course, that is what the argument of contiguity means. On the contrary, I definitely accept the theory, which is amply documented, as the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, has shown, by judicial authority, that the territorial status is a probationary status, that the Territories do have the right to expect that sooner or later they will be admitted to statehood, just as every child in this country has the right to expect that when he or she reaches a certain age he or she will acquire political rights.

All the former Territories have been admitted to the Union. Only Alaska and Hawaii stand outside. This disposes of the talk about our other overseas possessions, which have nothing in common with Alaska and Hawaii. Of course, when some gentleman dragged Formosa into the debate it could not be less apropos.

I do not believe the principles of democracy on which our country was founded and on which our destiny depends are based on any theory of geographical contiguity. I think the principles of democracy go a long way further than that. A Territory is ready for statehood when it has the population, the economic ability, the cultural maturity, which should be the attributes of any State of this Union. I do not know of any measuring stick which could possibly be applied to Hawaii without reaching the conclusion that it is ready for statehood. It has more population than several of our present States of which 4 even now have only one Representative in this body, and 2 of those 4 States were in the original 13 States. In other words, in nearly 180 years they have not been able to get themselves above the one-Representative status.

The contributions of Hawaii to the Federal Treasury have been and will be touched upon. There is more tax revenue from there than many States have been able to contribute. The gentleman from Texas rather cynically observes, "What do we get out of Hawaii?" One quick and ready answer might be "Money," but I would not be so base or so material as to give that answer, because I confess that what appeals to me most about Hawaii is the manner in which the people of various races and racial groups live together in a democratic society and in perfect harmony. I say that in that respect the Territory of Hawaii is a model for every State in this Union, a model by which any State might well perfect itself. It makes a great impression on anyone who visits the islands, as I did last summer.

At a time when this country is under reproach for imperialism and racism, it does seem to me that to refuse statehood to Hawaii would give a great propaganda opportunity to our enemies. Those opposed to the passage of this legislation claim that there are Communists in Hawaii. I am sure there are. There are some Communists in my district, and I do not believe there is a single Member here who can rise in this body and assure us he has no Communist constituents. What is more—I have been a Member of this body for 13 years—I have sat here in this body with Members who seemed to me to follow very consistently and constantly the Communist Party line. I will not say what States they came from. They were not from Hawaii and they were not from Alaska. I do not believe that the Communists are one bit more influential in Hawaii than they are in any one of a dozen States of this Union. I say that despite the very invidious and, I think, very unfair collection of newspaper clippings which was displayed here this morning. I believe every statement made by the gentleman from New York who was so excited about the Communists in Hawaii is susceptible of a very ready answer.

All of us know the people whom the electorate of these islands have sent to represent them in this body. Certainly we never had an abler or more distinguished Representative than the late Joseph Rider Farrington who, I am proud to say, had his origins in my own State of Maine. He was dedicated to the cause of statehood for Hawaii and gave his life in that undertaking. The gracious lady who succeeds him who came here with, I believe, the greatest majority ever given in the Islands was certainly not chosen for her Communist sympathies. There is not a scintilla of evidence to sustain the view that Communists are more likely to be elected to public office in Hawaii than they are in any other State. But even if there were more Communists in Hawaii, I believe that a State government would be in a better position to deal with this problem than a territorial government. In fact if you want to help the Communists inside or outside Hawaii, inside or outside the United States, vote against this bill.

Bear in mind that we are not debating whether or not to annex Hawaii. This archipelago has been American soil for 3 score years and more. It is going to continue to be American soil whatever action we take on this bill today. It is just as much American soil as Buffalo, New York, or as Washington, D. C., another politically underprivileged enclave. Three times already we have passed legislation conferring statehood on Hawaii. I believe that the House will continue to pass this legislation until it is concurred in by the other body. The sooner it is so concurred in the better.

Last year's statehood bill for Hawaii passed the House; the Senate passed another statehood bill. It was only for highly technical reasons that the legislation did not go to conference so that statehood for Hawaii could eventuate.

I shall be very frank about the Territory of Alaska. It has not heretofore seemed to me that the size of the Alaskan population justified Alaska's admission to the Union. However, I believe that this time will come. It has already been brought out that the population of Alaska is increasing rapidly. Nevertheless, I am still hesitant to vote statehood for Alaska. But I had much rather admit Alaska prematurely than to do Hawaii the injustice of denying her admission, an injustice which I think would be more harmful or at least would reflect more discredit upon this country than it would on the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of being in Hawaii for 7 or 8 months, or thereabouts, in the early part of World War II. Based partly on that experience, partly on independent study of the question, and also on close friendship with many people there, I very much favor statehood for Hawaii. I also favor statehood for Alaska.

Passing this bill will clearly demonstrate to the world and to ourselves that we believe in the idea of self-government and self-determination.

Those areas have shown by way of population, wealth, economy, and political stability that they are able to be States. Their future prospects are excellent. I believe it would strengthen the United States to have those two States added.

The admission of these States to the United States will strengthen the defense of the United States and will not weaken it. It will demonstrate to the world that those areas are important and integral parts of the permanent components of the United States. That is important from a defense standpoint.

Further, granting statehood would increase prosperity, and it would increase the population and stability of those areas. Certainly if you are going to have a point out toward the enemy somewhere, you want the strongest point you can have. If Alaska is encouraged to be a stronger area, to have a stronger population and a stronger economy, that will give us strength in an area where we want greater strength. The same way with Hawaii. We would be strengthening our bulwarks and our bastions against possible attacks from across the seas. By thus increasing our defenses we would increase our chances for peace.

So I urge the passage of this legislation to make Hawaii and Alaska a part of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in the Portland Oregonian recently there was an article which stated that—

> In the current agitation over statehood for Alaska one item, of special interest to Oregonians, has seldom been mentioned. That is the novel fact that from 1884 to 1900 Alaska was Oregon so far as laws were concerned. For 2 years after the purchase of "Seward's Icebox" in 1867 that great area was a political orphan, just as Oregon was from 1846 to 1848. It was no longer under the rule of the czars of Russia and not yet under the Government of the United States. Here Alaska becomes, as it were, for the first time Oregon.

And it stayed that way for 16 years.

However, Mr. Chairman, the people of my State are interested in the future of Alaska. And, in my opinion, there is only one possible future for our two incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii—that is statehood. Unless, of course, we want to keep them indefinitely in their present colonial status.

GOVERNMENT BY THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

America was conceived in the idea of government by consent of the governed. It has been dedicated to that doctrine for a century and three-quarters. America has grown great because of it. The Constitution makes no provision for second-class citizens. No one expects or should expect that these incorporated Territories shall be kept in that inferior situation indefinitely. They have been kept there altogether too long already. Alaska has been under the flag for 88 years; Hawaii has been under the flag for 57. Alaska has been an incorporated Territory for 87 years, Hawaii for 55.

Alaska was incorporated, according to the Supreme Court, by admission of its citizens under the treaty to "all the rights, advantages, and immunities" of citizenship, and by the fact that the ratification of the treaty was not only by the Senate but likewise by the House of Representatives, plus the fact that the customs, commerce, and navigation laws were extended to Alaska shortly after the purchase. With only one exception, that of Oklahoma, Alaska has been awaiting statehood longer than any other territory.

A PROMISE TO GRANT STATEHOOD

We might well ask, Is incorporation an implicit promise to grant statehood? Repeated opinions of the Supreme Court so indicate. In the famous Dred Scott case, Chief Justice Taney wrote:

> There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given; and if a new State is admitted, it needs no further legislation by Congress because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State, and the citizens of the State, and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character * * *. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority.

Of course, the Congress has the power to decide when the time has come that Alaska and Hawaii should cease to be colonies. And there may be differences of opinion on that question of timing, and only on the question of timing. As for me, I am fully convinced that the time when they should have been admitted has long since passed. I am convinced that to hold them for a day longer in colonial bondage is perpetuating a great injustice, not only to their people but to the good name and good faith of the United States.

HOW RESPONSIVE IS OUR GOVERNMENT TO PUBLIC OPINION?

Public sentiment is decisively in favor of admitting our only two incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, to statehood. That sentiment has been growing. It has been reaffirmed from year to year, and with increasing majorities.

In the case of both Alaska and Hawaii, the Gallup polls show that more and more people favor their admission. In 1941, 48 percent of the people favored making Hawaii a State, 23 percent, or less than half, were opposed, and 29 percent had no opinion. Still at that time, 14 years ago, when the question was relatively new—Hawaii having voted on it only the year before—there was a slight minority of those polled, 48 percent, that definitely favored statehood.

By 1946, however, that minority had risen to a majority of 60 percent. The percentage of those opposed had dropped to 19 percent, and of those with no opinion to 21 percent.

In the presidential election year of 1948, 2 years later, the margin had still further increased: 66 percent favored statehood, only 15 percent were opposed, and 19 percent had no opinion.

In 1954, the majority had grown still further, to 78 percent in favor. It remains the same in this current year, 1955.

Decisive as is this showing in favor of admitting Hawaii to statehood, it is even more so in the case of Alaska, which rose from 68 percent in 1949, with 7 percent opposed and 25 percent having no opinion, to 76 percent in favor in 1952, to 81 percent in 1954, and to 82 percent in this current year, 1955.

Public support has now reached an all-time high.

I think the Members of this Congress and the Executive might well ponder this sustained and growing popular verdict for admitting the forty-ninth and fiftieth States to the Union. Both Territories have the widespread support of many national organizations, in fact, of the principal organizations. No attempt has been made to keep the endorsements current from year to year. But Alaska, for instance, has received the repeated endorsements of almost every type of national organization, business, labor, patriotic, fraternal, service.

Statehood for Alaska has been endorsed by such diverse organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, by the Junior Chambers of Commerce of the United States; by all the major labor organizations: the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Railway Brotherhoods. It has been endorsed by the veterans' organizations: the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the American Veterans Committee, by the Catholic War Veterans. It has been endorsed by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, representing some 11 million American women; by the National Grange; by the National Farmers' Union; by the National Association of Attorneys General; by such fraternal organizations as the Loyal Order of Moose, and such service clubs as the Kiwanis International and the Lions International. It has been endorsed by the Congress of Home Missions, representing some 30 or more Protestant organizations.

At the Senate hearings in 1950, the Catholic bishop of Alaska authorized the two priests of longest service, Father G. Edgar Gallant and Father Paul C. O'Connor, to come present their views on statehood, which were emphatically in favor of immediate statehood for Alaska. Father Gallant, the senior of these two priests in point of service, has since been

made the vicar general of the diocese of Alaska.

From 1947 to 1952, inclusive, the annual governors' conference, composed of the Governors of the 48 States and Territories, endorsed statehood unanimously for both Alaska and Hawaii. At the 1953 and 1954 conferences, the Governor of Alaska appointed by this administration apparently because he was lukewarm on statehood, did not propose such a resolution, and no action was taken.

Finally, the press of the Nation is overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Public sentiment today is stronger than ever for the admission of both these Territories. Is it not time that the Congress and the Executive caught up with public sentiment and at long last completed the Union with the 49th and 50th States?

It is not time for all of us to inquire whether the promises and pledges made on the issue of statehood for our only two incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, are to be fulfilled.

On the floor of this House both yesterday and today, the Members of this Congress have been reminded that both the Republican and Democratic platforms have been specific in their recommendations for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

IKE ASKS FOR STATEHOOD

It might be well to remind ourselves, also, that the Nation's Chief Executive, Dwight D. Eisenhower, when president of Columbia University, 4 years ago, made a ringing declaration on the subject. Speaking to an audience of 1,500 in Denver on September 17, 1950, he said, and I quote:

Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches.

It was a clarion call for dedication to our most cherished principle—government by consent of the governed.

This is not time for equivocation on an issue so long before us and so implicit in the faith we profess.

This is no time for cynical disparagement of these proclaimed commitments.

This is no time for weaseling on such specific and responsible utterances.

This is no time for improvising new pretexts and new pretenses for delay.

The eyes of the Nation, whose public sentiment overwhelmingly favors statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, are upon us. Indeed, the eyes of the whole world are upon us. And, in the words of a venerated American document, "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind" should not permit us to falter again.

How shall we retain our own self-respect if we do?

How shall we endeavor to impress the wavering peoples of this troubled world with our high purposes, our noble intentions, and our good faith, if we again repudiate the solemn pledges and commitments made to our own citizens of Alaska and Hawaii?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, colonialism is colonialism no matter by what name it be called.

Alaska is a colony—a colony of the United States. It has been a colony for 88 years. It continues to be a colony during an era of liquidation of colonialism by the once great world powers, and the transformation of their colonies into self-governing political entities. The United States made an excellent start when it granted independence to the Philippines, but it must be remembered that to have retained the Philippines would have presented serious problems that the United States properly sought to avoid and did avoid. It should also be remembered that there were substantial pressures from interested groups in the United States that wanted to remove the competition of Philippine products from the Nation's free tariff area. Nevertheless the action stands as a fulfillment of an earlier pledge to grant the Philippines full independence.

The United States applauds and at times even abets the liquidation of colonialism abroad. The liberation of the Dutch colonies in the Far East and the consequent establishment of the Indonesian Republic was a process which was applauded and even encouraged by the United States.

Granting self-government and encouraging self-government where it is sought is consistent with our history and traditions. It is also in conformity with the obligations assumed by the United States in accepting the declaration regarding self-government set forth in chapter 11 of the United Nations Charter.

But as far as Alaska is concerned, the United States has not adhered to its worldwide professions and its official commitments. The colonies of Great Britain and France and of the Netherlands are the motes which Uncle Sam perceives in the eye of his sister free nations. Alaska is the beam in Uncle Sam's own eye.

Uncle Sam helped remove these beams from Spain's eye in 1898, excepting in Africa. It helped remove the beam from Germany's eye after World War I, and from the Mikado's after World War II. Today the United States can and should develop a strong case against Soviet colonialism which is becoming more widespread and cruder than that of any other great power. It could well be the essence of much of our appeal to the Asian and other peoples who detest and fear colonialism. In fact, Asian spokesmen gratifyingly denounced the Kremlin's colonialism at the recent Bandung gathering, to the annoyance of the totalitarian representatives there.

All the more reason why, when we are properly directing attention to Russia's rampant and ruthless colonialism and gently nudging the free nations to get rid of theirs, we should establish a consistent record of our own.

Five years ago, President Eisenhower, of Columbia University, declared publicly that "quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood" would "show the world that America practices what it preaches." Both major political parties have endorsed statehood for both our incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, a course overwhelmingly favored by American public opinion. The Gallup polls prove this conclusively. The list of national organizations of every type that have endorsed statehood for Alaska is long and impressive.

But since General Eisenhower ceased to be president of Columbia University, and became instead President of Columbia, the gem of the ocean, he has apparently come to feel that America need not practice what it preaches in the case of Alaska. So the question before the Nation today is whether, despite all these high-sounding pronouncements, Alaska shall remain a colony and whether the United States shall maintain there a policy of colonialism.

What is colonialism?

A colony, as it has become, is well described in a standard college textbook entitled "European Colonial Expansion Since 1871," by Mary Evelyn Townsend, professor of history at Teachers' College, Columbia University, published in 1941:

A modern colony—

Wrote Miss Townsend—

has come to mean a territorial unit, geographically separated from a state but owing allegiance to it in some specific and tangible way, rather than a settlement of the subjects of a state beyond its frontiers, as historically it originally meant. The modern colony is a geographic area held for political, strategic, and economic advantage.

I propose to demonstrate that Alaska is just that—"a geographic area held for political, strategic, and economic advantage."

Inherent in colonialism is an inferior political and economic status of the people resident in the dependency. The inferior economic status results from discriminatory practices imposed upon the colonials by means of the greater political strength of the colonial power in the interest of some of its citizens.

What, then, is the character of Alaska's political and economic disadvantages which make our country guilty of practicing colonialism?

Politically, the Americans of Alaska suffer the discrimination first cited and attacked in our own Nation's Declaration of Independence, 179 years ago: Alaska's Territorial government does not derive "its just powers from the consent of the governed."

Alaskans suffer taxation without representation.

Alaskans volunteer and are drafted into the Nation's armed services, engage in its battles, shed their blood, and contribute their treasure whenever the Nation engages in armed conflict. They are proud and happy to do so, yet they are without any representation in the national councils which declare war and conclude treaties of peace.

Alaskans are denied a vote on national policies and yet are subject to laws which they have no voice in making, and are at times excluded from beneficial legislation which is extended to the 48 States.

Alaskans suffer a discrimination under our present immigration law which

no citizens of the 48 States are made to suffer. When they arrive in the 48 States, they are held up for screening like foreigners. They are not accorded the same treatment that is enjoyed by the returning citizens of any of the States. This is a new discrimination originating in the McCarran Immigration Act. It did not exist for the first 85 years of Alaska's possession by the United States. In this respect, the status of Alaskans has been worsened.

Alaskans are specifically discriminated against by various laws which impose on them definite economic handicaps. It is this combination of economic disadvantage wrought by legislation over which Alaskans have no control and against which they protest in vain that is the quintessence of colonialism. The disadvantage of Alaskans redounds to the advantage of others dwelling in the States—the hall-mark of colonialism.

Alaskans are denied inclusion in the Federal-aid highway legislation. From this beneficent legislation, adopted in 1916, nearly 40 years ago, and repeatedly amended and amplified, Alaska, alone among the States and incorporated Territories, is excluded. Even Puerto Rico, which pays no Federal taxes, is included. Yet Alaskans pay all taxes, including the Federal gasoline tax.

There is a belief held, no doubt, by many Members of Congress—a mistaken belief—that Alaska's road necessities are taken care of by the Federal Government in another way, and that this other way is reasonably satisfactory. But any examination of the facts will reveal that the Federal policies and road programs in relation to Alaska constitute a grave discrimination against Alaska. After 88 years under the flag, and nearly 40 years after the joint Federal and State highway aid program, Alaska has only some 3,500 miles of highway, a negligible extent in an area one-fifth as large as the United States and with only one railroad. Yet Alaska has contributed substantial amounts to the construction of that mileage.

For the first 38 years after the cession of Alaska there was no road construction by any Government agency. With Alaska well over 99 percent public domain, this was clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government. The first Federal construction began in 1905, by the War Department, which continued in charge for the next quarter of a century, when the function was transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior. Between 1905, the beginning of Alaska's highway construction, until the eve of World War II in 1941, that is to say, 36 years, the Federal Government appropriated about $19.5 million, an average of barely over half a million dollars a year—not exactly a princely sum. Alaska, during that same period, contributed to the road construction some $9 million. Thus the Federal contribution was 68.4 percent of the total of $28.5 million, and Alaska's was 32.6 percent, a far greater proportion than Alaska, with its virtual totality of public domain would have had to pay under the Federal Aid Highway Act from which Alaska, alone among States and Territories, as I have stated, was excluded.

Moreover, Alaska's road construction has been largely in the interest of defense. While all roads are useful in Alaska, these were not the roads which were designed to bolster the civilian economy; they were not the roads which Alaskans free to develop their Territory would have selected. Their own preferences, as repeatedly voiced through their Delegates, have been disregarded.

After road construction had been transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior in 1930, for the next decade or more, throughout the 1930's and early 1940's, when the Federal Government and the States were jointly expanding the national network of roads, Alaska was given no new construction of highways. It was merely maintenance. In the late 1940's, a highway program built to satisfy military necessities was begun and carried out for 5 years, but it was brought to an end under the present administration. The present greatly reduced highway appropriations for Alaska contain no new construction projects, and the present program of the administration is merely to complete and pave the military highways which were begun some 8 years ago.

If Alaska were a State, Alaska would be automatically included in the highway program. But as a colony, it continues to be discriminated against and that discrimination, instead of lessening, is being aggravated. For while the Federal-aid program for the States and other Territories is being increased, reaching the largest sums in history in the current biennial appropriation passed by Congress in the 2d session of the 83d, Alaska's appropriations are being steadily reduced.

By the same token, Alaska was not included in the administration's proposed $101 billion highway program. We have been hearing lately that one of the justifications, perhaps the principal justification, for this lavish proposal, is that it is designed in part as a civilian defense measure, to aid evacuation in the event of a shooting war with atomic weapons. Yet Alaska was excluded from this safety measure, although the same administration that is pushing a $101 billion highway program wishes to keep Alaska in colonial bondage because of alleged national defense reasons.

It might be pertinent to note at this point that the Administration, while apparently not at all interested in developing Alaska through its highways, or increasing their mileage in the interest of national defense, is strongly in favor of prompt completion of the inter-American highway.

We may well applaud the purpose to complete the inter-American highway, with its economic benefits to Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Salvador, Nicaragua, and Panama. But we may well wonder why similar consideration is not vouchsafed to Alaska, whose economic needs are great and whose relation to national security is certainly much closer than that of the Central American republics. Particularly is this question pertinent because the President seems to exhibit concern about Alaska's defense problem in connection with statehood.

Alaskans, discriminated against in the matter of highways, in comparison with the States and other Territories, may well wonder whether they are not equally so discriminated against in comparison with foreign countries.

One of the arguments that is advanced by some against Alaska's admission as a state is its remoteness. Another season is its vastness and relative emptiness in terms of population. These two facts are intimately related to transportation. To the extent that Alaska's remoteness and its vastness are disadvantages, they could be modified, improved, and largely rectified by better transportation. I have just pointed out how, in the matter of highways, one of the basic forms of transportation, Alaska is disadvantaged and discriminated against by both Federal executive and legislative branches.

However, Alaska fares no better at the hands of the central government in other forms of transportation. In them too it is subject to special discriminations wrought by distant Federal executive and legislative authorities.

Alaska suffers a unique discrimination in our maritime law.

Though it is often pointed out by opponents of statehood that Alaska is a noncontiguous area, and that it is separated from the main body of the 48 States by some 700 miles of foreign territory, or 700 miles of either international waters, or 700 miles of foreign coastal waters, the United States persists in maintaining the coastwise shipping laws against Alaska. That this is not a necessary corollary of being a colony is proved by the fact that the United States has suspended the coastwise shipping laws in the case of the Virgin Islands. But it has declined to do so in the case of Alaska.

In 1920, the Congress passed a Merchant Marine Act which is generally referred to as the Maritime Act of 1920. In Alaska, however, it is known as the Jones Act, after its sponsor, the late Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington. This act embodied in article 27 a departure from existing maritime legislation. It provided that goods shipped across the United States and destined either for the coastal ports of the Atlantic or Pacific or for shipment beyond them across the Atlantic to Europe or across the Pacific to Asia, could use interchangeably American or foreign carriers—foreign, in that case, meaning Canadian. That is to say, a shipper from the Atlantic seaboard of goods destined for the Orient could ship these across the country wholly on American railroads or wholly on Canadian railroads or he could ship them by a combination of both. He might, for instance, ship them to Buffalo from New York on the New York Central Railroad, thence he might ship them over the Great Lakes by American or Canadian vessel, thence he might ship them the rest of the way by Canada's Canadian Pacific Railway or by United States Great Northern or Northern Pacific or any other American railroad or railroads. And, when these goods arrived at their

Pacific coast destination—Vancouver or Seattle or Tacoma or Portland or San Francisco—the shipper could send them across the Pacific in either American or foreign bottoms, or southward along the coast in either. But at that point, two words had been inserted in article 27. Those two words were "excluding Alaska." Now what did those two words mean? They meant that Alaska, alone among the nations or possessions of nations on earth, was denied the advantages afforded to all others by this legislation.

What was the purpose of this discrimination? Its purpose was to subject Alaska to a steamship monopoly centered in the city of Seattle. Senator Jones no doubt thought, and correctly, that this would be most helpful to his constituents there, as indeed it proved to be, but at the expense, the heavy expense, of our voteless and disadvantaged second-class citizens of Alaska.

This was in 1920. Under the limited self-government which had been granted by Congress through the organic act of 1912, 8 years previously, Alaska was still a youngster in knee pants. Nevertheless its fifth Territorial legislature, meeting in 1921, protested violently against this specific and flagrant discrimination, and ordered its attorney general to take the matter to court. The Territorial legislators believed, and so expressed themselves, that this new legislation passed by the Congress at the instance of Senator Jones, of Seattle, was a violation of the commerce clause of the Constitution, which forbids discrimination between the ports of the United States.

The case came to the Supreme Court of the United States on an appeal from a decree of the United States district court dismissing the suit brought by the Territory and by an Alaska shipper, the Juneau Hardware Co., which sought to restrain the collector of customs in Alaska from confiscating merchandise ordered by the hardware company and others in Alaska from points in the United States shipped over Canadian railroads, through Canadian ports, and thence to Alaska by Canadian vessels, or merchandise to be shipped from Alaska to the United States in like manner.

In pleading the cause of the Territory Alaska's attorney general argued that the provision in article 3 of the Treaty of Cession with Russia granted the inhabitants of the ceded territory "the enjoyments of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States," and argued further that the Constitution had been specifically extended to Alaska not only by that fact but by section 3 of the organic act of 1912, which declares, and I quote:

> The Constitution of the United States and all the laws thereof which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory as elsewhere in the United States.

The case for the Government was presented by the Solicitor General of the United States, the Honorable James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania, a distinguished lawyer.

Please note well the language of his argument.

> It is an economic and political question—

Solicitor General Beck said.

> The immunity from discrimination is a reserved right on the part of the constituent States. The clear distinction of governmental power between States and Territories must be constantly borne in mind.

And Solicitor General Beck concluded:

> If the Fathers had anticipated the control of the United States over the far-distant Philippine Islands, would they, whose concern was the reserved rights of the States, have considered for a moment, a project that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require for the ports of entry of the several States should by compulsion be extended to the ports of entry of the colonial dependencies?

You will note that the case for the United States was presented on the basis that discrimination against a colonial dependency was proper and legitimate. And so the Supreme Court decided.

Mr. Justice McReynolds, in rendering the decision of the Court, declared: "The act does give preference to ports of the States over those of the Territories," but, he added, the Court could "find nothing in the Constitution itself or its history which compels the conclusion that it was intended to deprive Congress of the power so to act." It was therefore officially established by the highest Court of the land that Congress had discriminated against Alaska and that, because Alaska was a colonial dependency, such discrimination was permissible and legal.

Now the question naturally arises whether that discrimination, imposed by the legislative branch of the Federal Government and sanctified by the judicial branch, was more than a mere statement of the legality of such a discrimination. The further question is: Did this legislative and juridically affirmed discrimination carry with it economic disadvantages? Indeed, it did.

Several budding enterprises in Alaska were immediately put out of business by the action of Congress in 1920, even before the Supreme Court had upheld the legality of that congressional action.

A resident of Juneau, the Territorial capital, had established a mill for the processing of Alaska Sitka spruce. In the vast national forests of Alaska, the principal timber is Western hemlock and Sitka spruce. Excepting some small quantities of red and yellow cedar, these are the only 2 woods—spruce and hemlock—of commercial value in Alaska's national forests.

Sitka spruce is particularly valuable in airplane production. This Juneau enterpriser was paying the required fees to the Forest Service, cutting the spruce, and developing a market for its use among the airplane manufacturers of the Middle West. He was shipping it through the British Columbia port of Vancouver, where it cost him $5 a thousand board-feet to place it on the cars destined for his customers in the Middle Western States.

The passage of the Jones Act in 1920 automatically compelled him to ship his spruce boards by way of Seattle. Here he was charged $11 dollars a thousand board-feet, or $6 per thousand more to load his produce on the railway cars, which was more than his profit. As a consequence, his mill was shut down and a promising infant industry, utilizing an abundant but little used resource, was nipped in the bud. This was not the only instance of its kind. Not only did the legislation put several enterprises out of business, but it prevented others from starting, and has presented them ever since. If anyone doubts that political control of the Territory through remote forces and absentee interests does not work economic damage to the people of Alaska, they had better examine into the workings of the maritime legislation which effected this discrimination against Alaska and against Alaska alone.

The immediate and direct effects of the Jones Act were to more than triple the costs of handling Alaska freight in Seattle, on Seattle purchases, as compared with locally bought cargoes destined for Hawaii or for the Orient. Alaska's Delegate, at that time the late Dan Sutherland, testified that the Seattle terminal charges on local shipments to the Hawaiian Islands or to Asia were 30 cents a ton, and all handling charges were absorbed by the steamship lines, the result of competition between Canadian and American railways and Canadian and American steamship lines. But for Alaska, where the Congressional legislation had eliminated competition, the Seattle terminal charges on local shipments, that is to say, on goods bought in Seattle destined for Alaska, were 100 percent higher, or 60 cents a ton as against 30 cents a ton, plus 50 cents a ton wharfage. So Alaskans paid $1.10 a ton for what cost Hawaiians and Asiatics 30 cents a ton. Thus the act of Congress in favor of the Seattle steamship and other business monopoly has been costing Alaskans hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for 35 years.

But this was by no means all. On shipments made from the east of the United States through Seattle, that is to say, from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or from cities farther west, and destined for points in the Pacific other than Alaska, the total handling charges were 30 cents a ton wharfage, and all other costs were absorbed by railroad and steamship lines. But for identical shipments consigned to Alaska, an unloading charge of 65 cents a ton was imposed, plus a wharfage charge of 50 cents a ton, plus a handling charge from wharf to ship of 60 cents a ton. These charges aggregated over 5 times the cost to a shipper to other points in the Pacific and had to be paid by the Alaska consignee or shipper.

If there is a clearer and cruder example of colonialism to be found anywhere, I would like to have it produced. Here is a clear case where the Government of the United States, through its legislative branch, the Congress, which enacted the legislation, the executive branch through the President who signed it, and the judicial branch which through its courts upheld it, imposed a heavy financial burden on Alaskans exclusively for the advantage of private business and shipping interests in the United States.

Nor is this by any means all on the subject of railroad and steamship dis-

crimination against Alaska, and against Alaska only. In addition to all the above special extortions against Alaska's shippers, suppliers, and consumers, the direct result of discriminatory legislation, all the railroads of the United States which transport products to Alaska and from Alaska charge a higher rate, sometimes as much as 100 percent higher, for shipping goods across the continent which are destined for Alaska.

There is a so-called rail export tariff, and a rail import tariff, which apply to a defined geographic area with exceptions made for other areas, which penalize Alaska and Alaska alone. Please note that the service rendered by these railroads, and for the same articles transported, is exactly the same, whether the article to be shipped ultimately goes to Alaska or elsewhere on the Pacific, either in the United States, to some islands in the Pacific, or to the mainland of Asia. But the charges for Alaska, and Alaska only, are specifically higher, as I have said, sometimes up to 100 percent. This abuse, as well as the others dating from the Jones Act, have been the subject of repeated protests from Alaskans. Alaska's Legislatures have repeatedly memorialized the Congress and the Federal executive agencies asking for equal treatment. Alaska's Delegates have repeatedly attempted to have this discriminatory clause in the maritime law repealed. But each time the steamship lobby has been successful in preventing any relief action.

If Alaska were a State, the whole discrimination in the Jones Act would go out of the porthole. Alaska would then get the same treatment in the matter of transportation of freight that is accorded to every other area under the flag and to foreign countries.

To complete the picture it may be pointed out that beginning last year, all passenger travel on American boats has ceased. The Alaska Steamship Line has eliminated it. It is no longer possible to travel northward on an American-flag vessel from Seattle to Alaska points, or to travel by an American-flag vessel between Alaska points. And the Canadian vessels which still carry passengers from Vancouver northward are forbidden to carry passengers between Alaska ports. To sum up, if ever there was a crass and unjustified example of oppressive colonialism, of economic disadvantage imposed on the nonvoting citizens of Alaska by the voting representatives of the voting citizens of the States, it is here.

I have now pointed out two flagrant examples of discrimination and colonialism in two of the major means of communication, highway and maritime transportation. I will now come to a third, air transportation.

Alaskans are the most airminded of all Americans. They travel between 20 and 30 times as much by air as do other Americans, measured either by the number of flights per capita or the number of passenger miles per capita flown in Alaska.

Alaskans early pioneered in this new form of transportation. When Maj. Henry H. Arnold, better known as "Hap" Arnold, who commanded our Air Force during World War II, and was properly rewarded for his outstanding services by becoming the first and only General of the Air Force, headed, in 1934, the first nonstop flight from the States to Alaska by Army airplanes, he remarked:

> I thought I had seen and talked to airminded people, but I had to come to Alaska to really find a place where air transportation is taken as a matter of course and has become a necessary adjunct to the economic life of the country.

The reasons why Alaskans took so readily and so early to air transportation were twofold.

First, they are pioneers by instinct and by nature. The air was merely another frontier to them—to be conquered. They took readily to this new form of locomotion.

Second, Alaska's distances and the absence of the other means of transportation common in the States, made air transportation a necessity. For reasons already made clear, Alaska had virtually no highways, and to this day is gravely deficient in them. It has only one railroad, a single-track line running from the coast to Fairbanks. At that time, 1934, Alaska's only highway was a wagon road, likewise extending from the coast to Fairbanks. Alaska's transportation was pretty much as if, in the United States, the total rail and highway system consisted, shall we say, of a railroad from New York to Chicago and a highway from Baltimore to Chicago. Under these circumstances, air transportation grew by leaps and bounds. It was wholly an Alaskans' enterprise. They flew the planes and they financed their operation. Alaskans did this without benefit of airports or other aids to navigation. The Air Commerce Act of 1926, which was designed to assist States in providing these facilities, did not supply them to Alaska, although Alaska was included in the legislation. Again Alaska suffered the penalty of being a colony—this time at the hands of the Federal executive agency entrusted with the execution of the act. This time it was the bureaucrats who excluded Alaska.

But the bush pilots flew anyhow. Their landing fields were sandbars in rivers, beaches, little clearings, on lakes with float planes, and the snow-covered tundra in winter with skis. Without benefit of weather reports or radio range stations, the pilot would merely hold up a moistened finger to the breeze and take off. The financing of these bush pilots who gradually developed their lone and single prop planes into larger operations, was wholly by Alaskans and wholly within Alaska. It was another stirring chapter in the little-known epic of Alaskans' pioneering.

But air service from the States to and from Alaska, which required the approval of Federal bureaus and the investment of outside capital, lagged far behind. The first commercial flight connecting the States with Alaska did not take place till 1940, long after American commercial carriers had spanned the rest of the hemisphere by air and had established regular service across the Pacific. In the meanwhile, the newly created bureaucracy of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration moved into Alaska. It began cracking down on local enterprise. In the late 1940's, over the unanimous protest of Alaskans, it began cracking down on nonscheduled operations and finally eliminated the nonscheds completely. It did not do so in the 48 States. Alaska was again the victim of its colonial status. Alaska had no Senators or voting Representatives to fend for her.

In the various certification cases which have dealt with transportation from the States to Alaska, the Pacific case in 1945, the United States-Alaska service case in 1951, the Board invariably denied Alaska the services needed although in the latter case, fortunately, President Truman overruled the Board and gave Alaska the additional service that it needed. To this day, the Civil Aeronautics Board has never been able to grasp that air transportation is relatively more important in Alaska than in any other part of the United States, since Alaska, lacking roads and having but one railroad and a most inadequate steamship service—for reasons I have just cited—is dependent as no other American area on air transportation. In the 48 States, if one wishes to travel or ship, one has three alternative methods of transportation: One can travel or ship by train over our ample continental system of railways. Or one can use the highways, passengers traveling by motorcar or bus, and shipping by truck. Or one can avail oneself of the vast network of air transportation by scheduled and nonscheduled carriers. But in large sections of Alaska only air transportation is available, and, as a result of the attitude of the CAB, only by a limited number of scheduled carriers, the number of which it is steadily trying to reduce. Again, in this third and most vital method of transportation—air transportation—Alaska is the victim of American colonialism.

Our Nation is effectively covered by a network of highways, railways and airways. Transportation has developed America. Without such transportation, America would still be a wilderness. Yet Alaska is reproached for not having developed faster. It is long-range government and only long-range government that has denied to Alaska, a colony, the same means for developing its transportation systems that it has made available to the States. More than that, it has by legislation and by arbitrary bureaucratic action gone far to prevent and obstruct Alaskans from developing their transportation facilities. The record is clear and unmistakable. Colonialism has stifled transportation in Alaska and with it, the development of Alaska.

For the first 17 years under the flag, Congress provided for Alaska no government whatsoever. When, in 1884, Congress passed the first organic act—after the intervention of 8 sessions of Congress and 4 Presidential administrations—it was so restrictive that it was practically worthless. It forbade Alaska's having even a voteless Delegate. Although Alaska was a vast, empty territory awaiting settlement, Congress extended no land laws to Alaska. It made even local government impossible, forbidding the creation of counties and of municipal government under any workable formula.

It was not until the gold rush in the late 1890's brought some 50,000 Americans, who wrote caustically to their Senators and Representatives about the absence of proper legislation, that Congress and the Federal executive agencies for the first time began to display a mild interest in Alaska. But it was not until the turn of the century, 33 years after the cession, that land legislation was extended to Alaska, and then in a form which has proved largely unworkable. To this day, despite minor changes, and reiterated protests by Alaska's legislatures and delegates, no workable body of land legislation has been provided for Alaska. Alaskans cannot do it for themselves, since the first organic act provided no land law, and the second organic act, passed in 1912 and still the law for Alaska, forbids any territorial legislation dealing with the primary disposal of soil.

It was not until 1906, nearly 40 years after the purchase, that Congress even allowed a voteless delegate, and not until 1912, 45 years after purchase, that a limited measure of self-government was extended to Alaska.

This Organic Act of 1912, though an improvement on its unworkable predecessor, is notable chiefly for the things it forbids Alaskans to do. It is an outstanding example of colonial legislation. While the act included all the restrictions imposed in earlier days on American Territories, it adds others which they never suffered.

Again Alaskans were prohibited from forming counties; they were not allowed to have their own judiciary, unlike Hawaii, which was granted the right to stablish its own judiciary within 2 years after coming under the flag. After 88 years, this elementary right has not been extended to Alaska. To aggravate the situation, in its establishment of the judiciary in Alaska the Congress provided salaries for only four district judges who handle both Federal and Territorial cases. Under these four district judges, some fifty-odd lower court judges, bearing the title of United States Commissioner, have been denied a salary by the Congress. They were obliged, and continue to be obliged, to subsist on the fees they can collect, chiefly from the Alaska public. Thus, although denied any voice in the appointing of these lower court judges, Alaskans in effect largely pay for their support.

This support is inadequate. In only 5 or 6 of the principal communities in Alaska are these fees sufficient to allow these lower court judges to keep body and soul together. This unsalaried judiciary has been the subject of unremitting protest for over half a century. The system was attacked by President Theodore Roosevelt in a message to Congress in 1904. Since that time Alaskan Governors, and since the creation of a legislature in 1912, Alaskan Legislatures, and, of course, every Alaskan Delegate, have protested ceaselessly against this unique discrimination. Not one word of approval from any source is to be found in the long history of protest. Bill after bill, in session after session, has been introduced by Alaska's voteless Delegates to rectify this flagrant injustice in the very heart of the agency supposed to dispense justice. This simple reform has been recommended each time the bill was introduced by all the Federal agencies concerned, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior which retains supervision over Alaska, and, since its creation, by the Administrative Office of the Courts. But salaries for these Federal lower court judges in Alaska have never reached enactment. Yet Congress insists on maintaining the judiciary in Alaska as a Federal responsibility. That word responsibility might well be placed in quotation marks. It has been an outstanding example of Federal irresponsibility imposed only in the colony of Alaska. Naturally the administration of justice in Alaska suffers—and the people of Alaska are the victims.

Alaska's Organic Act of 1912 responded to the pressure of the absentee interests which have dominated Alaska from its earliest days. First these were the fur and fishery interests. After 1910, when the fur seal resource had been ruined—and had been taken away from private enterprise and become a Government monopoly to prevent its total destruction—the salmon fishery interests alone called the legislative and executive shots.

Throughout our history no American Territory other than Alaska has ever been denied the right to manage its own fisheries. Alaska is the only example of this expression of colonialism. Various Alaska Governors, all the Alaska Legislatures, and all the Alaska Delegates have sought to achieve the transfer of the fisheries to Territorial management, not merely in the interest of the Territorial economy but for the preservation of this great natural resource. The change has been steadily opposed by the absentee salmon canning interests and by the Federal agency which was in charge of the fisheries regulation in Alaska and never has wished to relinquish its bureaucratic control. Under each of several Federal bureaus the attitude has been and is the same. Successively the Alaska fisheries have been managed for better or worse—and now decidedly for worse—by the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Interior. Their administration has been invariably discriminatory against Alaskans and in favor of the absentee interests.

Not only have the representatives of Alaska protested against a continuation of this system, but the people of Alaska themselves, on referenda, have by overwhelming votes asked for the transfer of the fisheries control and for the abolition of the fish trap—a monopolistic and destructive device which exists only in Alaska and which has been abolished in the States of Washington and Oregon and in neighboring British Columbia. But no heed has been paid to the wishes and aspirations of the Alaskan colonials.

The reason for their request is not only in the interest of the Alaskan economy but for the preservation of the resource, which, in the hands of absentee interests and distant regulatory Federal agencies, is gradually being destroyed.

No one has made the real reason for the Federal retention of control clearer than the present Administrator of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, Mr. John L. Farley.

Mr. Farley was appointed Director of this Service after Albert N. Day, a career official and a competent biologist, was removed by this administration largely because of his efforts to enforce conservation regulations and preserve the resource from depletion. Mr. Day knew, as did his able predecessor, Mr. Ira N. Gabrielson, that unless these regulations were enforced this great natural asset, the Pacific salmon, would disappear as the fur seals and sea otter, once so abundant in Alaskan waters, disappeared, because of unrestrained slaughter in the interest of immediate pecuniary gain. So Albert N. Day was removed, and Mr. Farley, nominated by the industry he was presumably to regulate, was appointed.

Now Director Farley has given us a lucid explanation of why the fisheries are retained under the joint control of the absentee fishery interests and the Federal regulatory service he heads. In an address before the American Fisheries Society of September 17, 1953, shortly after he had been placed in office, he said, and I quote him:

> Because Alaska is a Territory, and because the salmon industry there is represented by investments primarily of residents of the continental United States, management of this natural resource has been reserved to the Federal Government as being of national concern rather than of local importance.

I would call the attention of my colleagues particularly to this statement, that because absentee capital has largely invested in Alaska's canned salmon industry, the management and control by the Federal Government must be continued, as against the local control by the Territory.

When the West was opened up, through the efforts of the pioneers who crossed the country in covered wagons, the capital to initiate new enterprise came largely from the East. It was eastern capital which extended the railroads, which opened the mines, developed the lumber industry. But did the United States keep the western territories as vassals for that reason? No, the Congress extended statehood to them, over the opposition, let it be said, in most instances, of those very eastern interests: the railroads and the big mining companies. But Alaska, being more of a colony from the beginning than any of these had ever been, and continuing to be such, was kept as a colony for the exploitation of these absentee interests. It is the outstanding example of colonialism under the American flag.

Alaskans throughout their history have, of course, struggled against natural obstacles. That has been the story of all our early pioneers and settlers moving westward into unexplored wildernesses. It is the epic of America. But no pioneers have suffered the man-made and unnatural obstacles that from the start have been imposed on Alaska by unseen men far away in the seats of political and economic power. Nearly

40 years ago, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior in President Wilson's Cabinet, declared:

> The statement that the people of Alaska have borne more handicaps than any other people who have pioneered new, undeveloped territory, at least on the North American Continent, has been made so often that it has become trite. Nevertheless, it is true.

Not only was it true in 1917, when Secretary Lane so declared, but it continues to be true. Rampant colonialism has been the curse of Alaska, and is undiminished, if not, indeed, intensified, today.

The steamship monopoly which brought about the passage of the discriminatory Jones Act in 1920, and has maintained it against all efforts for reform, has its seat of power in Puget Sound.

The absentee control of fisheries, which has caused a steady diminution of that resource for the last 19 years, is concentrated in the Seattle area. It is from these interests that stems the only organized and concerted opposition to the emancipation of Alaska which statehood would bring.

It was these same interests who managed to keep Alaska from having any government for the first 17 years under the flag; that prevented it from having a workable government for the next 28 years; that so gravely restricted its present form of government for the last 43 years, and prevented any increase in Alaska's powers of self-government.

It is gratifying to record, however, that the Washington delegation, represented by its two Senators and most of its seven Representatives, has not succumbed to the pressure of these interests. That pressure, however, is exerted in other ways, and judging by the results, is as effective as ever. What are those results? The results are that none of those abuses which have existed for the 88 years of Alaska's coming under United States rule have been abolished or materially modified. Alaska still remains the outstanding victim under the Stars and Stripes of absentee government control, absentee industry control, and absentee labor control. Alaska's history shows that whatever the differences between labor and management in the States, the absentee labor bosses of Seattle and San Francisco are in bed with absentee management when Alaska's interest is at stake.

Despite the fact that the United States preaches its lack of sympathy with and its opposition to colonialism, through declarations both by President Eisenhower and the repeated declarations of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the United States officially affirms the non-self-governing character of Alaska.

It insists on a report by Alaska and on Alaska—as well as Hawaii—under chapter 11, article 73, of the United Nations Charter. Under section E of article 73, the "members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government" commit themselves "to transmit regularly to the Secretary General statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible."

Although repeated attempts have been made by Alaska's able Delegate E. L. BARTLETT to have this requirement, in the case of Alaska, waived, both the State Department and the Interior Department have rejected his plea and insists that that official admission of Alaska's "not having attained a full measure of self-government" shall stand.

Indeed, there is 1 and only 1 solution for Alaska's colonialism, namely, to give to Alaska the self-government and the emancipation which its people seek. It is the emancipation which 35 States have sought and secured since our Nation of 13 States was founded. It is the emancipation which has become the tradition and practice of these United States, and everywhere on this continent except in Alaska.

It is high time—indeed, it is long overdue—that the United States should cease to practice colonialism, and instead practice what it preaches by conferring statehood on Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, during my first term in the House it was my privilege and pleasure to serve on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Together with the other members of that committee I made a study of the question of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. I was convinced that both these Territories were entitled to statehood, that they had earned it and should be welcomed into the sisterhood of the States, and that they would make a contribution to this Nation.

If I speak more of Alaska than of Hawaii it is not because of any less interest in Hawaii, for I certainly believe Hawaii is entitled to statehood, but it is because perhaps Alaska has not been discussed to the extent I feel it should be. I shall therefore confine myself to some extent to Alaska.

In my service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I traveled in Alaska, I traveled to Kotzebue north of the Arctic Circle. We have heard a lot of talk about Arctic Alaska, that we should not give it statehood because it was an Arctic waste. The chairman of our subcommittee was our late beloved colleague Chester McCullen, of Florida. We traveled together throughout Alaska, in all areas, and speaking about Alaska as the great Arctic waste I should like to say to you that on the 8th day of November when we were in Juneau, Alaska, we had a great deal of fun with our good friend Chester McMullen, because the temperature was higher in Juneau, Alaska, on November 8th than it was in Jacksonville, Fla. The flowers were blooming on November 8 in Juneau, Alaska. You must see the Territory to know it; to get away from the idea that Alaska is a country of igloos, dog sleds and so forth. It is a fine, thriving community.

It has long been my opinion that once we take the heavy hand of bureaucracy from the control of the Territory and admit them to statehood, you will see an industrial expansion in the Territory of Alaska such as we have not seen in this Nation for a long time, because industry hesitates to go into those areas when they know that control is in a bureaucracy here in Washington. Those who believe in States' rights should take this bureaucracy away from the great Territory of Alaska and admit those people to statehood, to give them the right to expansion with the same freedom that we have, to build their industries and to create a fine State.

I should like to say to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who this morning was asking what promise had been made for statehood, this fact. We made no promise, he said, there were no commitments that we will give either Alaska or Hawaii statehood. He was reminded that the party platforms of his party and my party have in the past contained planks of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I was somewhat surprised at his answer, which was, "Oh, well, planks are not particularly promises, they are not holding out a promise that we are going to do this or that. We put the planks in our platforms to get votes."

I will say to the gentleman from Texas if they are put in the platform to get votes, whose votes? The votes of the people of Alaska? Oh, no. They cannot vote. The people of Hawaii? No; they cannot vote. If you put that plank in your platform to get votes, it is because you believe the people of the United States who vote for the political parties are in favor of it. So whether you take that as a premise or whether we become practical as the gentleman from Texas said, that we put them in to get votes, it was because you believed the American people that you are appealing to are in favor of statehood.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I do not think the RECORD will show that I said that we put them in to get votes. We did not have anything to do with that. I was not consulted about the platform of the Democratic Party, and certainly was not consulted about the platform of the Republican Party. Had I been I would have voted against putting in any such plank as that. I still say that those planks many times are put in to gain votes, they are not intended to be kept, and if they were intended to be kept why has the American farmer been kicked in the teeth as he has been several times in the past few years? Are we bound to Hawaii and Alaska but not to citizens in this country?

Mr. BOW. I do not believe the American farmer has been kicked in the teeth, but we will debate that when the proper time comes. If it is to get votes, you are appealing to the American people and it is because you believe the majority of the people believe in statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. That is why you put that plank in, as the parties have in the past. That has been an implied promise and this is the time for us to keep that promise.

Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with everything that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] said in reference to what this will mean to the world and to the people throughout the world. We will take away from the Russian propaganda machine one of the strongest things that they have had against us. You talk about ethnic groups. If one of my colleagues here again this afternoon makes a point of order and we call the roll, I ask the membership of the House to listen to that rollcall and see where the ethnic groups that make up this great body today come from. This is America.

Now, in addition to that, somebody has said that this was not going to bother the Kremlin any. I agree with that, but it will make a great deal of difference to the peoples of the world when the propaganda goes out from the Soviet that we engaged in colonialism. We have that charge here. Of course, the Kremlin is not going to care, but to the people that they are trying to reach, to convince that we are engaged in colonialism, it is going to mean a great deal.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the great Territory of Alaska has earned and is ready to take on for herself statehood and that they will be successful. And, of course, as to the grand Territory of Hawaii, I need say nothing more than has been said here today.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, that history repeats itself is a truism. It can be illustrated from the previous attempts of many of our former Territories to achieve statehood. In not a few instances the resemblance between the plight and aspirations of the people of earlier American Territories and the plight and aspiration of the people of Alaska is striking. Indeed, it is almost uncanny.

My State of Montana furnished an unforgettable example of what that Territory was up against before it became a State. It illustrates what Alaska is up against now.

The first Governor of the State of Montana was Joseph K. Toole. Before his election as Governor he was a voteless Delegate to the Congress in this House. While the House of Representatives was debating the enabling act for Montana, Delegate Toole made a strong speech in favor of the admission of Montana as a State. That speech could be made today, unchanged, and be wholly applicable to Alaska. Said he:

> We are bound by the highest duty to admit these Territories. * * * We are a Republic of States and not of Territories. * * * Our Territories * * * are dominated and controlled by a centralized power at this Capitol which was never designed to continue a day longer than the necessity therefor existed. Professions of sympathy no longer assuage us, and no amount of insincerity will hereafter put us aside. The brief time allotted me is insufficient for a recital of our wrongs, but I will venture to inquire for a moment what Congress has done for the Territories. * * *
>
> It has given us a system of courts inherently wrong. * * * It has regulated the number of our judges which is grossly inadequate in every instance, resulting in the delay, and, in many cases, the denial of justice.

Let me pause here for a moment in quoting former Delegate Toole, and point out how applicable to Alaska today is that condemnation of the judicial system which Congress had imposed on Montana Territory. In Alaska, despite the unceasing protests of Alaskans, Congress has insisted on reserving the entire judicial machinery for Federal control. The only exception is that of municipal magistrates, who deal with only minor offenses within the limits of incorporated towns. Outside of these towns every judicial officer in Alaska is Federal. Alaska does not have, and cannot have under the organic act of 1912, which is its basic charter today, its own judiciary, unlike both Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

There have never been a sufficient number of judges in Alaska, and repeated efforts to secure an adequate judicial representation have been thwarted again and again. Under the four United States district judges, before whom are tried both Federal and Territorial litigation, there are between 50 and 60 lower-court judges, who bear the misleading title of United States Commissioners. At the turn of the century, 55 year ago, the Congress provided that these lower-court judges should not be paid a salary. Alaska's lower-court judges were and to this day are compelled to subsist on the fees which they may be able to collect from the public for their services. The result is that in all Alaska not more than 5 or 6 of these lower-court judges are able to earn enough to keep body and soul together. Needless to say, the administration of justice suffers severely. This system of the unpaid lower-court judge has been condemned unceasingly by Presidents of the United States, by the Federal district judges, by Alaska's voteless Delegates, and protested against repeatedly by the Alaska Legislature in memorials to Congress. It was condemned 51 years ago by President Theodore Roosevelt, in a state of the Union message to Congress on December 6, 1904.

But repeated attempts by a succession of Alaska's Delegates for half a century to establish even minimal salaries have failed somewhere along the line between the introduction of the bill and its nonenactment by Congress. These bills to provide salaries for Alaska's Federal lower-court judges have failed of enactment despite the fact that they invariably had the endorsement and support of the Federal executive departments concerned with the matter—the Department of the Interior, which has overall control of Alaska, the Department of Justice, and, during the last decade and a half, since its establishment, the support of the administrative office of the courts.

The proper administration of justice is the cornerstone of a democracy. Yet the Congress has never been willing to provide adequately to carry out the responsibility of the Federal Government in the administration of justice in Alaska.

The lower-court judges in Alaska, who are appointed by the district judges, frequently have to engage in other work besides their judicial duties—an undesirable solution. It is understandable that many qualified Alaskans, when asked to serve in this capacity, refuse to do so. This scandalous condition has lasted for 55 years. Statehood, and statehood only, will rectify it.

So much for the parallelism in the administration of justice between the Territory of Montana and the Territory of Alaska.

I now continue to quote Delegate and later Governor, Joseph K. Toole, of Montana. He was referring to the acts of omission and commission of the Congress:

> It—
>
> The Congress—
>
> has reserved the right to invalidate any law which our legislature may pass, thereby destroying the full faith and credit which our legislation ought to command.

That is the case with Alaska today. The Congress reserves the right to invalidate any act of the Alaska Territorial Legislature. Delegate Toole also said:

> It—
>
> The Congress—
>
> has withheld from us our dowry of land * * * and refuses to give us any kind of supervision or control over it until we become a State, and then sets deliberately to work to prolong the time when that shall happen.

For 88 years, since the day of the purchase, the people of Alaska have protested unceasingly against the absence of suitable land legislation. For the first 33 years, from 1867 to 1900, it was impossible to acquire a foot of public domain. The homesteader could not even acquire title to the few square feet of land on which he had built his cabin, which by his own toil he had hewn from the wilderness. It was not until 1903 that the Homestead Law was applied to Alaska. But even then it proved unworkable for two reasons: First, this legislation, which had been enacted for the States in 1864, was not suited to Alaska; and this was pointed out at the time, but without result. Second, the Congress failed to provide funds for surveys, and has continued to fail to supply them to this day. At this time, 88 years after Alaska has come under the flag, less than two-thirds of 1 percent of Alaska has been surveyed. It was estimated by one of our senatorial colleagues at a hearing a few years ago that, at the present rate of Federal surveying, it would require 17,000 years to complete the surveying of Alaska. On top of that, so many reservations and withdrawals for all kinds of purposes have been made that an area of some 93 million acres is not available to the people of Alaska. That is an area approximately the size of my State of Montana.

From the time of the first legislature in Alaska, in 1913, the inadequacy of the land laws, the failure of the Federal Government to provide surveys, and the steady increase of withdrawals and reservations by Federal Bureaus has been the subject of Alaskan protests, but these abuses persist not appreciably abated. Surveying is still negligible. Although there have been some minor amendments in the land laws, their comprehensive revision, which Alaskans have unceasingly sought and which would speed settlement in Alaska, has not been forthcoming. Please remember that the Alaskans themselves are estopped by the Organic Act of 1912 from enacting any basic land legislation.

I quote further from Delegate Joseph K. Toole:

It—

The Congress—

has professed to give us a representative in the lower House of Congress, but denies to us a vote, the only element of representation which gives character or influence to a Member.

That, obviously, is still the case with Alaska. Under statehood, Alaska's voteless Delegate would be put on a par with the other Representatives in the House and be able to vote in committee and on the floor. Needless to say, this is particularly important on legislation which concerns Alaska.

Again in the words of former Delegate Toole, of Montana:

It—

The Congress—

has left us without any kind of representation in the Senate and remits us to the beggardly methods of the lobbyist.

That, of course, is still the case for Alaska. Statehood would give Alaska the two Senators which would enable the State to secure fair and equal treatment in the other House of the Congress.

In that speech 65 years ago Montana's Delegate Toole said:

It—

The Congress—

has imposed upon us with an iron hand the obligations and burdens of citizenship, while it withholds its corresponding benefits by steadily denying to us participation in the framing of Federal legislation and the right of suffrage in national elections.

Unmistakably, that is still true in both our two incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, whose admission to statehood we are debating here today.

I quote further from Delegate Toole:

It—

The Congress—

has refused to appropriate sufficient money to extend the surveys in the Territories, but has doled out annually its driblets.

I have already covered this long-standing and continuing failure of Congress to appropriate for surveys, thus nullifying even such inappropriate land legislation as Congress has extended to Alaska.

In conclusion, let me quote this summary from Montana's Delegate—and later Governor—Joseph K. Toole:

A Territory which, if measured by the grandeur of its mountains, the fertility of its valleys, the majesty of its rivers, the splendor and utility of its waterfalls, the richness of its mines, the number and value of its herds and flocks, the wealth and density of its forests, the health and vigor of its climate, the intelligence, aspirations, and patriotism of its citizens, ought to admonish you that the time is at hand when we should be accorded a political status upon this floor which will no longer be an empty honor and a delusion, but the full realization of the benefits designed by the Constitution, and for the expected coming of which we shall anxiously wait and watch.

That description of Montana likewise is a description of Alaska, a country of great beauty, an area of great potentialities, inhabited by the finest type of Americans, imbued with the pioneering spirit, eager and ready to develop that area into a great northwestern bulwark of the American idea, but frustrated in those efforts by the degrading and shackling status of territorialism. What Alaskans have accomplished to date—and they have accomplished much—they have achieved in spite of the obstacles which distant manmade forces have erected in their path.

The fact is that the discriminations which Montana as a Territory suffered, and which Alaska continues to suffer, do not begin to tell the whole story of Alaska's plight as a Territory. They do not by any means include all the obstacles that long-range government and absentee interests have placed in the way of Alaska's progress. Listing them all would require far more time than is at my disposal. Against the imposition of these obstacles Alaskans have protested not merely for years but for decades, and largely in vain. Their lack of political power has made it impossible to secure the redress that they rightly should have.

Alaska suffers the gravest kind of discrimination in every kind of transportation—maritime transportation, highway transportation, airway transportation, railway transportation.

An act of the Congress passed 35 years ago, the Maritime Act of 1920, known in Alaska as the Jones Act, has subjected all Alaskans to higher freight rates than are paid by the people of any area, domestic or foreign. Alaska's economy has had to bear this heavy burden for 35 years, and continues to bear it.

Alaska has been denied inclusion in the Federal Aid Highway Act, whose benefits are enjoyed not only by the States but by Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and even Puerto Rico, which pays no Federal taxes whatever.

Alaskans have encountered similar discrimination in air transportation. Air transportation is relatively much more essential to Alaska than to any other American area because of Alaska's lack of roads and railways. Alaska was excluded from the benefits of the Air Commerce Act of 1926—the first comprehensive legislation to promote commercial aviation. The stepchild treatment thus initiated was continued after the CAB and the CAA were established. At this very moment, Alaskans are desperately trying before the CAB to hold on to the certifications which have been given States-Alaska carriers, and which should be increased rather than diminished.

Although Alaska's only railroad, the one single track, 500-mile Alaska Railroad, from Seward to Fairbanks, is really an adjunct to defense, and a very large part of its freight destined for the Defense Establishment in Alaska, the Interior Department which operates the railroad maintains freight rates at an excessively high level, which private enterprise in Alaska has to pay.

Less than 4 years ago, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services ascribed these "extremely high"—that is what the Senate committee called them, "extremely high"—rates in part to the Alaska Railroad's being "required to operate many services at a loss to meet the military requirements in the Territory." The committee recommended that these excessive rates be charged where they properly belong—to the Defense Establishment—and that the cost to the consumers be correspondingly reduced.

But no such action by the Interior Department has followed, and the burden imposed by a long-range Federal bureaucracy continues to be borne by the civilians of Alaska.

These are only a few of the handicaps which territorialism imposes on the Alaskans. Theirs is truly a shocking example of colonialism practiced by the United States of America.

Montana fortunately became a State 65 years ago, and all other incorporated territories excepting those two whose fate we are discussing today have long since become States. Let us here, who come from States which enjoy the rights and privileges of full equality and first-class citizenship, at long last do justice to the people of Alaska. Let us do it not only for their own sake, but for the benefit of the entire Nation. Let us bring both Alaska and Hawaii into the family of States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I speak for the second time on this bill because I think it is in the interest of time. I want to say in the beginning that many of the Members on our side wanted to speak in opposition but realized that this has been a tiring and trying day and they are willing to forego further remarks. They have asked me to make 2 or 3 clarifications, and then we are going to rest our case with the Members on the sound, basic reasons that they have been given in opposition.

There are two things that I want to point up and they are these. Much has been said on this floor today about promises to these Territories and also there has been reference made to the effect that opponents of this bill had referred to racial situations in support of their position against statehood. I think the record will reflect that there have been no references to racial situations made on this floor today by the opponents of this bill. If there have been any such references or arguments I do not recall having heard them. Certainly if a man feels deeply on the subject, and is an opponent of this legislation he has not based such opposition on a racial issue. The racial issue has not been raised

except by those who claim to be proponents of this bill, who are apparently undertaking to appeal to the emotions of the people in order to create an effect that could not be created otherwise.

Let me say this about promises. They have said "promise," "promise," "promise," but no one has yet produced a promise from anywhere to Alaska or Hawaii that they would be granted statehood. I have never seen such a grandiose display of mental gymnastics as has been going on on this floor today trying to find something that could be called a promise.

What has happened in both the racial situation and the promise situation is this: These people without thinking have gone out here and said, "This is a good point." We will say they promised, we will say they are using racial prejudice to try to defeat this thing. No one apparently ever thought they would have their hand called about it, and somebody might say, "Where is the promise? Who made the statement about the racial prejudice?" When that was done they were caught off balance, because they cannot produce anything to support what they have said. So what do they do? They do the same thing as any other man who has been caught in that position, they continue to repeat promise, racial prejudice, promise, racial prejudice, promise, racial prejudice, in the hope that you will forget that they failed to produce that which they said was so. They could not produce any evidence, documentary or otherwise, that such was the fact. So they have decided, "We will just repeat this until people finally will believe it." That is a propaganda approach at best.

I beg of you not to let your emotions govern you in this vote. It is one of the most serious you will cast during your term in Congress, and I do not care how long you stay here. Let your reasoning control, because you are going to have to answer to your children for this vote. I hope when that time comes you can say that you protected the United States of America and that you did not try to move out into a world government—political area that has never been explored and at a time of world tension that could jeopardize the future of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill. I am impelled to do so by the Chamber of Horrors chart of newspaper clippings which was displayed on this floor this morning by my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION]. That displays the people of Hawaii as a seething volcano of communism likely to explode and destroy the wellbeing and security of the Nation.

I know there are Communists in Hawaii, but I doubt that there are any more Communists in Hawaii than in my own State of Washington, or in Oregon, or in California, or even in New York, the State of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

A great deal has been said about Harry Bridges. I agree with what gentlemen have said about him, but why blame Hawaii for not controlling Harry Bridges. We, the Congress of the United States and the Federal Government, have not controlled Harry Bridges. Why should we punish Hawaii by depriving her of statehood for something that we ourselves have not done?

The gentleman from New York in a rhetorical question as he completed his remarks said, "What kind of people will Hawaii send to Congress if she is made a State?"

I am no prophet. I do not know. I do know, however, that there is no better way of judging the future than by the past. And judging by the past, when we look at the unquestioned patriotism of the late Joseph Farrington and of Mrs. FARRINGTON who have been sent here as Delegates to represent that Commonwealth, I think we may feel the people from Hawaii will send patriots, like them, here to represent Hawaii if this statehood bill becomes law.

The strongest point made by the gentleman from New York was that the small, in population, Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, if they become States, each will have the same number of votes in the Senate of the United States as does the great State of New York. He objects that Hawaii with 550,000 people will have just as many votes as does New York with 15 million people. That is a good argument. The only trouble with it is that it comes 168 years too late. That is exactly the same argument that they settled in the Constitutional Convention. Every one of the 35 Territories which were admitted to statehood after adoption of the Constitution had a smaller population at the time of admission than some of the States already in the Union then possessed.

Why should we deprive these two Territories, Hawaii and Alaska, of statehood when all of these other 35 States were admitted on that basis?

We talk of contiguous territory. It took George Washington 8 days to travel in 1789 from here to New York City to be inaugurated President of the United States. It was as far in 1789 from Washington, D. C., to Baltimore, in travel time, as it is today from Washington, D. C., to Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, our forefathers who founded this Republic fought a costly and bloody war to free themselves from the tyranny of taxation without representation. Yet we, their descendants, today, impose taxation without representation upon the inhabitants of Hawaii and Alaska.

Hawaiian and Alaskan youths are drafted to serve in the Armed Forces of our country. The Hawaiian and Alaskan people must pay the same tax rate as those levied upon the citizens of our 48 States. They must abide by our Federal laws. But they have no vote in the making of draft laws, in the fixing of tax schedules or in enacting any law.

This obviously is unfair and not in keeping with America's historic traditions. The situation should be speedily remedied by the enactment early in this session of Congress of a law that will make Hawaii and Alaska the 49th and 50th States.

We Members of this Congress say we believe in a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The people of Hawaii want statehood. They have demonstrated it time and time again in every plebiscite that they have taken. If we are for government for the people, we ought to be for what the people of Hawaii want. They want statehood. We say we believe in government of the people. Every poll that has been taken on this issue by national organizations, by Members of the Senate or of the House have shown that the people of this country are 75 percent to 85 percent in favor of these two Territories becoming States. If we believe in a government of the people and for the people, the Members of this House should surely vote for statehood for both these Territories.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—H. R. 2535—again brings for decision the question as to whether the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska should be given statehood and admitted to the Union of States.

I am opposed now, as I have been heretofore, against admission of either Hawaii or Alaska to statehood. The reasons that justify in my opinion this opposition are varied and numerous. It is not my intention to set forth in these brief remarks all of the reasons that prompt me to vote against the bill. However, I will mention a few that in my judgment are of sufficient importance to justify my opposition.

First, there is no impelling reason that requires their admission. I am strongly of the opinion that there should be some outstanding and incontrovertible reason that requires it either from the standpoint of the two Territories or more especially from that of our present Union of States. I have searched diligently, and, have listened intently to the arguments that have been advanced over a period of years, and, I can find no justification for granting the status of statehood.

What advantages are offered by either or both of these Territories to the other States of our Union that would justify their admission? So far as I have been able to discern, there is no contribution they can make, either from the standpoint of strengthening our security or improving the economic status of either of the Territories or our own as a nation, or, in any other way promote the welfare of their own people or our own. Certainly, any condition that is so void of substantial reason needs more than mere sentiment to justify it. As a matter of fact, I can more readily see the justice of extending the privileges of unrestricted citizenship to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

Second. Most, if not all, of the advantages that would come as a result of

statehood could be granted by appropriate legislation of Congress. In fact, both of these Territories have already received most of such. They are, in general, only lacking (a) the power or right of representation in the Federal Government, and (b) the same sovereign and political powers as possessed by other States to conduct the affairs of these areas without Federal supervision or control.

Statehood is not essential for the grant of power to the Territories to enact laws relating to their property, affairs, and government. Congress has the power to transfer full and complete legislative powers with respect to local affairs to legislatures elected by the Territories. Both Hawaii and Alaska now possesses general legislative powers for these purposes, with a slight exception in Alaska relating to public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources. Executive and judicial powers could very well be transferred to the Territories. However, so far as I know, no reasonable proposal has been made to Congress for the extension of the jurisdiction of the Territorial courts.

The chief concern of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska is not a desire or need for additional power to conduct the affairs of the Territories, but rather in a desire for political power through representation in Congress, other than by Delegate, which they now have, and in the election of a President.

Thus, the desire to share in the Federal Government would consist of—

(a) The right to be represented in the United States Senate by two Senators.

(b) The right to be represented in the United States House of Representatives.

(c) The right to participate in the election of a United States President.

In considering these rights which are inherent to all the States, it is appropriate to examine whether right and justice would be done to existing States to extend the same privileges to Hawaii and Alaska by granting them statehood.

The latest United States census population estimates—1954—for these Territories are:

Alaska, civilian	132,000
Hawaii, civilian	467,000

Thus, Alaska if granted statehood would be entitled to 2 United States Senators for a population of 132,000. This would be the same as now given under our Constitution to all States. The injustice of any such representation for Alaska, when compared with the millions of population in each of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, New Jersey and all of the other States of the Union, is so apparent that it needs no argument to be made against it. Furthermore, they would each have a Representative in the House of Representatives, although in most existing congressional districts, including my own, the First Congressional District of New Jersey, the population is in many cases nearly 4 times as great as the entire population of Alaska, and, as great as the entire population of Hawaii. In fact, on the basis of the 1950 census, Hawaii would probably claim the right to 2 Representatives in the House of Representatives.

Third. From the standpoint of national defense there are many arguments that are forceful and strong that can be urged. It can be readily seen that both Alaska and Hawaii are highly strategic from a military standpoint. Alaska within a few miles of Russian Siberia with only the Bering Strait separating them, and, Hawaii midway in the Pacific, are highly essential to our national defense. Neither as a State could give the protection we need. They would have to depend upon Federal facilities to a greater extent than is required in any State of the Union. Their position creates that situation. I am not unconscious of the fact that proper defense is a Federal obligation, but, my point is that as it is so highly essential to these American outposts of defense that it would be far better and more sensible to leave both Hawaii and Alaska as Territories and, thereby, under the complete jurisdiction of the United States without any of the handicaps that might or could follow from the granting of complete statehood.

In this matter of granting the privilege of statehood we cannot be too careful. In my judgment there is no reason substantial enough at this time to justify our granting statehood. Consequently, I shall vote against the pending bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the committee, I heard the testimony on this statehood bill for Hawaii and Alaska. I heard all the arguments presented before that committee against statehood which have been presented here today. It is a rehash of the same thing we had before the committee. I voted to report the bill out favorably to the floor of the House, and I shall support it on a final rollcall and vote against any motion to recommit because I am of the opinion Alaska and Hawaii will make two as good States as there are in the Union, if given an opportunity. The principal part of the argument which was belabored before our committee and also on the floor of the House is not to admit Hawaii because they have a few Communists there. If we can believe certain very distinguished gentlemen of the United States, there are very few places at home where you could not find a few Communists. There is no one who hates a Communist or the things that they stand for any more than I do. But I am not disposed to get so scared of Communists that I am going to look under my bed every night with a flashlight before I retire. We have the FBI and they are very competent under J. Edgar Hoover and one thing that I am very tired of hearing is sections of the country and individuals and associations and now the Territory of Hawaii branded and accused—and still no one indicted, no one tried, no one convicted. I think as little of Harry Bridges as any man in this House, but we ought to have done something about Harry Bridges when we had him here in the United States. In fact, I would not object if someone went and got him and put him in the penitentiary where he belongs. But you know, I belong to a party which was recently accused by a very distinguished man in the United States of having just finished 20 years of treason. That is one of the reasons I resent things said about folks which cannot be proven.

To say that the population is low in Alaska and that there is not enough of Hawaii to justify statehood, give them statehood and give them a chance to grow. There are certain interests in the United States that have been reaping a rich reward in Alaska by depleting her natural resources. Statehood might put a crimp in their business. I just have a lingering suspicion that they are opposed to statehood for Alaska for that reason. As far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote for statehood for the two Territories. I know they will be hard to defend in case of an attack on the United States, but that is outside the question entirely. They are already a part of the United States. Do you think for a moment that if they were attacked we would not defend them? That was brought out at Pearl Harbor. It would be the same thing today in either Hawaii or Alaska. They are now a part of the United States. Our burden of protecting them is just as great when they have the status of a Territory as it would be if they were States in the Union.

As far as their representation in Congress is concerned, I am not afraid of that either. As the gentleman from Oregon just said, the kind of folks that Alaska and Hawaii have been sending to this House are as good as we find anywhere in the main body of our country. I see no valid reason, and I do not think any valid reason was presented to our committee or on the floor of this House, why those two Territories should not be admitted to statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, like the rest of you, I feel we have about worn ourselves out discussing this thing and have pursued it as far as we can.

There are 1 or 2 things, however, that I want to leave with you today on this question. I happen to think that the Communist issue that has been brought up today as the chief argument against this bill is really a smokescreen, because I think you would have to concede that if the State of New York were applying for admission today any of us could get from publications printed in New York City a display which would far outrival the exhibition that was put in the well of the House today. So that is really a side issue.

There are many Members who sincerely hold the opinion that the noncontiguity argument is a strong one and that it should prevail. I respect their opinions. There are others here who have things in the back of their minds which have not been uttered openly. There are some who have fears as to the type and caliber of representation that might be sent here by those two Territories if they were made States.

I want to give you a little reassurance on that. Certainly the type of representation they have here today is a credit to our body, which I think you will all admit.

I happen to come from the baby State of the Union. Our State was admitted 43 years ago. We had about as long and hard a fight as these people to get into the Union, and therefore I have a little emotional feeling about this. Yet at this time some of the principal arguments made against Arizona—we had less population than Alaska at that time—are advocated by members at this time. They said in 1911 that there were too many people who were Spanish-speaking, and it is true there were a great many of them. They said many of our citizens did not even speak English.

One Senator even got up and said it would be ridiculous to admit Arizona and New Mexico. He said the Senators and Representatives should come to Congress to represent people and not rocks and sand. We, of course, are proud of our rocks and sand because it happens that we have some very fine scenery in our rocks and sand. But I want to tell you this, in 1912 when we were finally admitted, and I hope this will reassure you as to the type of representation these new States will send, the man we sent back here to Congress is the same man who is here today, a man who has been here longer than anyone else in the Congress, even the illustrious Speaker of the House. I refer to Senator CARL HAYDEN who came to Washington in 1912. He has served a longer time in Congress than anyone else. This speaks for the type of representation Arizona and New Mexico sent to Washington. This man has been here all these 43 years. If the experience of Arizona has any meaning for you today it should be this: Let us not fear this thing, let us look forward and, who knows but what these two new Territories, if we give them statehood, will provide an example that will be equally illustrious and worthwhile.

These 2 Territories have been coupled in 1 bill. We must act on them together. I personally happen to think that it is best that it is so because if there is any piece of legislation on which the Congress has been wishy-washy it has been on the question of statehood for these people. Let us meet the issue. They are going to be admitted some day. I personally have enough confidence in these people to believe these areas should be admitted and that they will become stronger as time goes on. Let us make a new departure, let us go forward with our vision clear as our colleague, Daniel Webster, did. As we sit in this room we read the inscription quoted from Webster above the Speaker's rostrum: "Let us go forward and develop the resources of our land." I think if we take this action today and admit these Territories as States, in the future we can look back and say with Webster that we performed something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I had not planned to speak on this subject today, but the chairman of this great committee was kind enough to allot 5 minutes to me, and I felt that in justice to the issue involved I should say a few words.

I have had the privilege of visiting the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska several times and the opportunity of getting to know the people of those Territories. For many years here under the sponsorship of the able delegate, Joseph Farrington, I was pleased to support the principle of statehood for Hawaii, and I was very proud today to see the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON] make such a magnificent defense of the charges which had been brought against the Territory of Hawaii. I think she ably answered the criticisms.

In thinking about the acceptance of these two Territories into the Union as States I believe we should give some thought to the character of the people who comprise these Territories. We should make a fair evaluation of the people themselves. We know they come from many races, that many blood strains are represented there, but let us consider the attitude of these people in times of stress. Let us think back to December 7, 1941, when an enemy force struck Pearl Harbor. What was the attitude of the people there at that time? How did they react under the stress and strain of that horrible trial of blood and fire. We know that it was one of the most horrible experiences that American citizens have ever experienced and that American fighting men have ever gone through. We know that they rallied in that moment of stress and proved their metal and proved their right to be called Americans in the full sense of the word.

I do not have to recall to your attention the 442d combat team of Hawaii composed of people of another racial group, a racial group that we were at war with at that time, the aggressors who struck Pearl Harbor. This 442d combat team made one of the most magnificent contributions to the cause of freedom of any division in the United States Army. We know that their casualty rate was higher than any division in the United States Army and that they acquired more medals in the discharge of their duty, fighting for freedom and in the defense of our Nation, the people we represent here on the mainland, than any other military unit.

I do not need to refer further to the caliber and character of the people who live in the Territory of Hawaii.

Going to the far north, to the Territory of Alaska, we know the type of people living in Alaska. Many of us who have served in this House over a decade remember the Delegate from Alaska, Anthony Diamond, we remember his distinguished career here in the House and later on as a Territorial judge in Alaska. We are all acquainted with the Delegate at the present time, Mr. ROBERT BARTLETT. We know of his kindness, of his generosity and the caliber of representation which he gives to the people of Alaska on the floor of this House.

If I may be pardoned for a personal reference to members of my own family, during the war two of my younger brothers served in Alaska part of the time in the Air Force. After the war was over these two young men were demobilized and later returned to Alaska. They came back to the mainland, married their childhood sweethearts and are now living in Alaska as a matter of choice. So I have a personal interest. I would not let that personal interest sway me in this particular instance, but I am proud of the fact these two young men decided to go to the last great frontier, to make their home in Alaska and to become a part of the civic and community life of Anchorage, Alaska.

I have talked to the fishermen, the merchants, and other groups in Alaska about their problems when I was up there several years ago handling a subcommittee which investigated the matter of military housing. I had a chance to become acquainted with the civic leaders and the Territorial legislative leaders in Alaska. I say that not only from the standpoint of the caliber of these people but also from the standpoint of the fact that this is our military outpost, we should give favorable consideration to this bill. Alaska will probably be the Territory which will receive the first brunt of the Soviet attack, if it occurs, and Hawaii in the Pacific will also be the brunt of an attack if it comes from the Far East. Their people will take the first shock. I say both should become members of our great Union. The pride of full citizenship should fill the hearts and minds of these people. There should be a feeling of "oneness" with the balance of American citizens. No feeling of division as to their interest with the common interest of our country should arise. In the time when unity and strength is needed as never before, we should leave no stone unturned to assure that strength to withstand potential foes whether they be within or without our Nation.

THE CHARACTER OF THE ALASKAN PEOPLE

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the character of the Americans in Alaska. I know them well. I have visited Alaska and held a series of subcommittee hearings there in connection with my official duties. I have talked with all kinds and conditions of Alaskans, young and old. I have talked with businessmen, with fishermen, with farmers. I have talked with their wives. I want my colleagues to know something about the kind of Americans whose admission to the full equality of first-class citizenship we are discussing today.

For it is clear that the character of the American people is what has made and makes America. These people, originally of diverse origin, from countries of varying customs, often of differing languages, of various religious faiths, impelled by the desire for greater freedom and greater opportunity, but united here by the common principles under which our Republic was conceived, and inculcated with its ideals and purposes—these are what constitute America.

Our America is not merely a geographic area. Our country is not merely a vast extent of shoreland with its bays and sounds and inlets, with its expanse of prairie and of great mountain ranges. Our country is not merely its great for-

ests, its lands and mines with their subsoil treasure, fortunate as we were and are in its generous and God-given abundance. Our country is not merely its forests and farms and the rural communities in between. Our Nation is not its populous cities, our centers of industry, commerce, and culture. It is the people who came here and stayed here, who worked and built in time of peace, and worked and fought in time of war, who have made our land. They constitute America.

What sort of people are the Americans of Alaska, whose territory we acquired by purchase 88 years ago?

Alaskans embody a continuation of America's oldest and finest tradition. This tradition in its practice is the westward march of the pioneer. From the Old World, across the wide, uncharted waters of the stormy Atlantic they came. They settled along the Atlantic seaboard. It was here and by the settlers in that fringe of colonies that our Nation was given birth. But ever the quest for greater freedom and greater opportunity beckoned many of these newcomers and later arrivals westward. And so the more hardy and the more adventurous penetrated the forests and passed beyond the Appalachians. They moved into the fertile valley of the Mississippi and its tributaries. They crossed the prairie in covered wagons. They surmounted the barrier of the Rockies, of the Sierras, and of the coast range, and of desert lands in between. They reached and settled the Pacific coast. It was in the final decade of the last century that the Bureau of the Census informed us that the frontier had ceased to be.

But there was still another frontier, of which the Bureau of the Census had taken no heed. It was to Alaska that an extension of the pioneer tradition and practice led Americans. They went there for the very same reasons and purpose that had induced preceding waves of pioneers and settlers to move westward. Of the more than 200,000 Americans now in Alaska, six-sevenths came there—or are the descendants of those who came there—for the same motive that in earlier decades had brought Americans westward. They came from every State of the Union—North, South, East, and West. They represent the last of the pioneer saga. They struggled with and overcame the Alaskan wilderness. Undaunted by the physical hardships they encountered, they surmounted all natural obstacles. They have established, despite the great handicaps imposed upon them by their territorial status, a typically American, robust, growing society. They have maintained, and continue to maintain, their rugged, self-reliant pioneer qualities. Their children have been born there, and their children's children.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, for 12 years previous to his Senate election our colleague as Representative of the Second Washington Congressional District, the district closest to Alaska, probably is as familiar with Alaskans as any Member of Congress. He has been there often. Said he:

It is my belief that no finer people live on this earth than those residing in Alaska. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 3, p. 2996.)

Let us move from Washington into the Deep South and go back 30 years and listen to former Representative John Rankin, of Mississippi, for 30 years a Member of Congress, who visited Alaska in 1924. This is what he declared on the floor of Congress the following winter:

When I went into Alaska I thought we would find very rough, uncivilized people, but I must say that I never found a more highly developed civilization in all my rounds than we found in the Territory of Alaska. Strong men, courageous, intelligent, honest, and struggling there in that ungentle climate for a livelihood. Noble women, with their children around them, trying to make homes in Alaska. They say that the timid never start to Alaska and that the weak die on the way and I am inclined to believe that is true. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 28, 1925.)

Let us go back into the Northwest, and listen to what the late and beloved Senator Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming, had to say 3 years ago:

In November of last year, Mr. President, I had the privilege of visiting Alaska. I visited Nome, Fairbanks, Seward, Ketchikan, Whittier, and Anchorage. What kind of people did I find there? I found just as intelligent a citizenship as there is in any State of the Union. * * * I visited the very finest of country clubs at Fairbanks. I found in Alaska practically every type of business that we have in the United States. I can see practically no reason why those people are not just as fully qualified to be citizens of the United States as is the present Presiding Officer or as is the junior Senator from Wyoming. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 2, p. 1518.)

Let us now turn to the testimony of a distinguished Senator from a border State, and I quote the testimony of Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, made on the floor of the Senate on March 11, 1954:

When I was in Alaska last summer with Senators BUTLER, MURRAY, ANDERSON, BARRETT, and JACKSON, at times I had the curious sensation of being in a bustling 20th century civilization and at the same time having been returned to the storied West of our frontier days. * * *

Let me state frankly, that at one time I had doubt as to the advisability of admitting Alaska as a State of this Union. Those doubts were based upon a lack of knowledge on my part regarding Alaska. * * *

In the first instance, let me report, that in Alaska I found a dedicated people. A people facing many difficulties, the kind of difficulties which are always confronted in a frontier land, yet determined to overcome them. And overcomng them one by one.

I found a people truly patriotic and devoted to American ideas and ideals and principles. Of course, this was bound to be the case. After all, Alaska is inhabited by Americans. It is true there are many Alaskans who are the children or the grandchildren of those who went north in the gold-rush days and whose families have remained ever since. That fact is important. It demonstrates that in Alaska are to be found the things that attract a community of homemakers. That generation should succeed generation in calling Alaska home is surely proof that the country has the opportunities and the attractions to attract and to keep a stable population. Some Alaskans are of original American stock. They are the Indians, the Aleuts, and Eskimos whose ancestors came to Alaska in time immemorial. This is good American stock. The patriotism of these people who are termed the "natives" of Alaska was amply demonstrated during World War II. Their sons served with devotion along with all other American boys during the war.

However, the principal population increases in Alaska during the last several years have come about because of the migration from the States to the Territory of people from all over our country. Ex-GI's, those looking for new business opportunities, those who wanted to participate in the carving out of a frontier land—all these, and others, have joined the northward rush. They come from every State in the Union. They are Alaskans now. The Alaska community is a solidly American community. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 3, pp. 3086–3087.)

Let us go back again into the deep South and quote the opinion of a Representative from Louisiana, Henry D. Larcade, Jr., whose first-hand acquaintance with Alaska and Alaskans began 10 years ago. When he returned from a visit there as a member of the House Committee on Territories, he said:

I am firmly of the opinion that Alaska should be admitted to the Union. In all save the political status, Alaska is as much a part of the United States as any one of the 48 States. From the time of its acquisition from Russia in 1867, Alaska has been settled by American pioneers. These settlers brought with them the social and business mores of the States and continental Territories from which they had come. Their concepts were traditionally American, and long before Congress provided a code of laws in 1900, or for a delegate to Congress in 1906, a group of citizens from Sitka assembled unofficially to elect a delegate to Congress and petitioned for representation in the Congress.

These concepts have been reflected in the legislation Alaska has enacted in the years since, when Congress made provisions for an elected legislature. In many instances, Alaska has enacted laws which, for progressiveness and social policy rank favorably with the leading States, and sometimes has led them in point of time. The women of Alaska were granted the right of suffrage a good 6 years before the adoption of the 19th amendment to the Constitution. Alaska was the first of the States and Territories to enact laws setting an 8-hour day, a comprehensive workmen's compensation act and social-security measures devoid of the implication of charity or dole. * * *

* * * I was impressed with * * * the character of the people, and the stability of the people who made up the citizenship of the various towns. * * *

They are highly educated and progressive citizens, and they are very eager to have self-government. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 206 and H. R. 1808, Apr. 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, and 24, of 1947. Pp. 35 and 37.)

And now back from the southern border to the northern, I take pleasure in quoting briefly from the tribute paid to Alaskans by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Montana, JAMES E. MURRAY:

I say that no people anywhere within my experience are more competent to manage their local government than are Alaskans.

I could multiply this testimony almost indefinitely. It adds up impressively to the conclusion that by the admission of Alaska to statehood we will admit as full citizens the very type of Americans who have made the America that we love and believe in. By making Alaskans first-class citizens we will be adding the very ingredient which at times we feel may have diminished in our body politic: youth, courage, strength, independence of thought, devotion to basic principles, in short, a rugged Americanism—these are the qualities that Alaskans will bring with them into the Union.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, frequent references to Puerto Rico have been made in House debates on statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska during my 9 years of congressional service. Because it has been argued more than once that enabling the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska to organize themselves as member States of the Union would set a precedent which Puerto Rico might want to follow, I beg leave to make some pertinent observations at this point in the debate.

It is not my position to take sides. The Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico has no vote in this body. The issue will be decided by the voting Members. But I think it proper and timely that the points of view held on this question by the people of Puerto Rico should be brought to attention.

It is only natural that the Puerto Ricans have devoted much thought to their political status. The possibility of membership in the Union, understandably has entered their thinking.

In order to understand the Puerto Rican mind in this respect, it need be recalled that in 1508, 15 years after Columbus discovered the island, the first settlement in Puerto Rico was started by Juan Ponce de Leon. This was long before his trip westward, which was to result in the discovery of the great State of Florida.

From the day that Ponce de Leon commenced the settlement of the present city of San Juan, the island was part of the Kingdom of Castile, later the Kingdom of Spain. The Spanish Constitution and laws were the constitution and the laws of Puerto Rico. The language and culture of Spain were those of Puerto Rico. Identically, the laws, language, and culture of England were those of the original 13 English colonies. During nearly four centuries ensuing, the forefathers of the present Puerto Rican people streamed from Spain to the island. By the end of the 19th century, a million Puerto Ricans were in that province of the Spanish Kingdom. Separation then resulted from the Spanish-American War. Under the Treaty of Paris in 1899, sovereignty over Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines was transferred to the United States.

This treaty differed fundamentally from all previous treaties under which the United States had acquired territory. Under the earlier treaties, newly acquired territories became a part of, and were constitutionally incorporated into, the United States. People from the original States came to occupy the new additions to the national domain. As with the Northwestern Territory, the new parts were regarded as potential States. Contrariwise, the Treaty of Paris did not provide for the Philippines to become part of the United States. Nor did it provide for Puerto Rico, already settled by a people of Spanish descent and culture to become integrated into the United States. The Supreme Court, in the leading insular cases, decided there was a clear distinction between Territories acquired previous to the Treaty of Paris and Territories acquired under the Treaty of Paris. Under this treaty, the latter Territories were subject to the sovereignty of the United States, but did not form a part of the United States. Their destiny was left uncertain.

The first Organic Act for Puerto Rico, adopted by Congress in 1900, created as a body politic "the people of Puerto Rico." The inhabitants were declared citizens of Puerto Rico. A Government was created for the people of Puerto Rico. Similar legislation was later adopted for the Philippines. In 1917, the citizens of Puerto Rico were made United States citizens. However, in a Supreme Court decision in 1922, Chief Justice Taft declared that the fact that the citizens of Puerto Rico had been vested with United States citizenship by collective naturalization did not change the status of the island. It remained as the Treaty of Paris had placed it, subject to the sovereignty of, but not constitutionally a part of, the United States. In 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was organized by the people of Puerto Rico under a constitution of their own adoption, within the terms of compact embodied in a law enacted by the Congress in 1950, and accepted by a referendum of the people of Puerto Rico.

In a decision rendered only last month in the case of Granville-Smith against Granville-Smith, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the difference between unincorporated and incorporated territories. Hawaii and Alaska are incorporated Territories. The Court gives as examples of unincorporated territories, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and pre-Commonwealth Puerto Rico. The decision thus makes clear that Puerto Rico, now a Commonwealth, is no longer in the category of a mere unincorporated territory, nor is it incorporated territory.

I quote from the opinion:

> Territorial government in the continental United States was customarily viewed as a transition step to statehood, and statehood in fact resulted. The Spanish-American War opened a new chapter. Beginning with the Treaty of Paris, the United States acquired by conquest, treaty, or purchase outlying territories for which statehood was not contemplated. The position of these territories in our national scheme gave rise to lively political controversy. Answers to some of the constitutional issues that arose were unfolded in a series of decisions best formulated, perhaps, in opinions by Mr. Chief Justice White and Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Still quoting:

> A vital distinction was made between "incorporated" and "unincorporated" territories. The first category had the potentialities of statehood like unto continental territories. The United States Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, fully applied to an incorporated territory.

The Court states further:

> The second category described possessions of the United States not thought of as future States. To these only some essentials, withal undefined, of the Constitution extended.

Mr. Chairman, not only is there a vital constitutional distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories, but the historical development of the former has been completely different from that of the latter. Except for Hawaii and Alaska, all incorporated territories have become member States. Should Alaska and Hawaii now be granted statehood, the United States would have no more incorporated territories.

On the other hand, there is no precedent for unincorporated territories ever gaining statehood. The Philippines became independent. Filipinos were never citizens of the United States. Puerto Rico is a Commonwealth. Puerto Ricans are United States citizens since 1917.

There is no constitutional prohibition against Congress admitting an unincorporated Territory into the Union. There is even the precedent of an independent republic having been admitted into the Union as a State—Texas. There is also the precedent of an independent republic being constitutionally integrated into the United States as an incorporated Territory—Hawaii. But the fact remains that Territories acquired by the United States which were not incorporated into the United States have never been considered destined for statehood.

There are only two precedents as to the possible evolution of unincorporated Territories. The Philippine Islands, whose inhabitants, I repeat, were never citizens of the United States, evolved into independence. The unincorporated Territory of Puerto Rico, whose inhabitants were declared citizens of the United States in 1917, became a Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth is a new concept in the United States political system. It is the concept of a free, associated body politic. Such is the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The compact under which it was formed creates the association. The association of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to the United States is a relationship of mutual agreement which permits the Commonwealth and its citizens to enjoy full self-government while they remain associated to the United States political and economic Federal system and while they continue to be citizens of the United States. Federal laws apply in Puerto Rico as in continental United States, except tax laws. United States citizens of mainland birth who are residents of Puerto Rico are also citizens of the Commonwealth. Commonwealth citizens, although citizens of the United States, do not participate in national elections or legislation as do the citizens of the several States.

This creative thought, tailored to the historical, economic, political, and cultural circumstances of Puerto Rico, has

been possible because Puerto Rico was an unincorporated Territory; no constitutional limitations would prevent Congress from acceding to it. They would if Puerto Rico were incorporated.

The question is asked at times, Will Puerto Rico ever want to exchange its present Commonwealth status for that of a State of the Union? I have no crystal ball. I do not think anyone knows the answer. But it is safe to say that Puerto Rico's present economic and cultural circumstances preclude any serious consideration of the proposal.

Contiguity is not, to my mind, an important consideration. Contiguity is a relative term. Does water unite or separate us? If it separates us, how wide must the body of water be in order to so separate effectively? Long Island is not contiguous to New York. A mountain range is more forbidding to cross than an expanse of water.

Other considerations are much more important than contiguity. Obviously, the trend in Puerto Rico is neither toward statehood in the Union nor separation from the United States. It is for perfecting the new concept of commonwealth. I am proud that the idea of commonwealth is a real contribution we have made in the development of the American federative system. It is a new dimension in the United States political system. The people of Puerto Rico unfalteringly support the Commonwealth. In the elections of 1952, after the Commonwealth had been in existence for 4 months, three political parties went to the polls in Puerto Rico: the Popular Party fully supported the Commonwealth status; an Independence Party, dissatisfied and critical of the Commonwealth status, advocated separation; the Statehood Party, dissatisfied and critical of the Commonwealth status, advocated statehood in the Union. The results speak for themselves. The Governor and Resident Commissioner nominated by the Popular Party were elected by about 430,000 votes; the candidates of the Independence Party polled 124,000 votes; the candidates for the Statehood Party polled 84,000 votes.

It is safe to conclude that, as the Commonwealth concept develops and proves itself with the passing of time, all thought of reverting to the dilemma as between statehood and independence will fade more and more. One of the great virtues of the Commonwealth concept is that, being based on the principle of compact, it is subject to modification by mutual agreement. It lends itself, therefore, to adjustment as the events and circumstances may demand.

Because of its constitutional status stemming from the Treaty of Paris and because of its economic, demographic, and cultural circumstances, Puerto Rico evolved from an unincorporated territory to a Commonwealth. The Commonwealth is a new and dynamic status. It has to be perfected.

This does not mean that we move toward separation. We have made our position unmistakable that we do not wish to separate. We have declared in our Constitution that our United States citizenship is a determining factor of our lives. We are pioneering along new paths of political freedom and solidarity with the free world. I consider that the United States Congress is entitled to highest recognition for its statesmanship in having enabled the people of Puerto Rico to organize as a Commonwealth and to enjoy the blessings of freedom in the bosom of the United States political system.

There can be no charge of colonialism, when the people of Puerto Rico of their own free will have chosen their present status and relationship with the United States.

The proposition of statehood for the incorporated Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, whose people feel that the time has now come when they should be admitted as sovereign States, is entirely different constitutionally, historically, culturally, demographically, and economically from that which Puerto Rico brought here.

As I said in the beginning, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico cannot side in this debate. I know Congress will decide the issue of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska in the way the Congress of the United States has always treated such questions, on the basis of the highest concepts of justice, inspired by the great principles that have made this Union of States the greatest and foremost of all nations.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation, and I would like to speak a word about the charge that Hawaii is dominated by Communists. I listened to the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], and I looked carefully at his display that he had on the bulletin board, and I would suggest if someone were to cull any one of the New York newspapers for 1 week, that they could probably get as horrible a display of headlines about Communists in and around New York as he had on the bulletin board by which, as I got his remarks, he was trying to show, proved that Hawaii was dominated by Communists. I think, as a matter of fact, someone brought out in the debate that the FBI reports showed that there were 22,000 Communists in the State of New York, known Communists, versus 36 in the Territory of Hawaii. On a population basis, the percentage of Communists, then, in the State of New York is much greater than in the Territory of Hawaii. That does not prove to me that the people of New York are incapable of self-government. That does not prove to me that the State of New York and the people of that State should be expelled from the Union. Neither did Mr. PILLION's demonstration prove anything about the Territory of Hawaii except that they probably have fewer Communists per capita than have most States in the United States.

I think the issue is strictly one of emotionalism and, if I may be pardoned the expression, one that has very little merit on the face of it, and one that should receive very little consideration from this House.

I have had the privilege of being in Hawaii only once. That was on the occasion of the funeral of the late Delegate, Joseph R. Farrington. It was not the most auspicious occasion to visit the Territory, but during the week we were there I certainly was very favorably impressed with the people I met and with the people who attended the funeral, with the great regard that they had for the late Delegate. And by showing that regard, they showed the high regard they had for the principles of democracy and for the institutions of the United States of which they hope to become a part.

I am glad, too, that Alaska is included in this bill, because I think Alaska is ready for statehood. I have listened to the arguments for the past 2 days, and I am convinced, on the basis of precedent, that Alaska is worthy of being admitted to the Union. As a matter of fact, the principal argument that has been made against both Territories is the fact of the representation that would be accorded to them in the other body which would be out of proportion on the basis of population with that of other States.

I might point out that there are States in the Union now that have a smaller population that Hawaii. I am not so sure but that there are one or two of them who have a lesser population than Alaska. So, if that is a valid argument, if that is the basis for the exclusion of these two Territories, perhaps we ought to introduce legislation to take certain States out of the Union.

As a matter of fact, that is not a valid basis, because when the Constitutional Convention assembled that argument was one of the bitterest arguments and one which split the delegates, because as everyone knows, some of the delegates envisioned a single chamber with Members selected on the basis of population. Some of the other former colonies had the idea that we should have a single chamber with an equal number from each State. A compromise was worked out which has been very satisfactory for the most part from that time until now. That was that this House should have Members elected on the basis of population and that in the other body with almost coequal power except for the origination of certain bills in the House, the membership should be selected on the basis of two from each State. That was a fair way to do it and it will be fair in the case of these two Territories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes, and I do that for the purpose of summing up very briefly some of the arguments that have been made. I think it should be remembered that the Gallup polls taken in the last several years have shown that the people of the United States are for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska by about 70 percent.

The debate here today has been honest and sincere and hard, just as it was in the days when they were trying to admit California and Nebraska and Mississippi. Honest, sincere men then made the same arguments that today have been made against Hawaii and Alaska, that those Territories ought not to come

in as States. They did come in, and of course time has proved those men wrong.

May I point out also that the governors of 11 Western States in their conference at Albuquerque in 1953 went on record unanimously for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. The President of the United States and former President Truman also favor it. The last three congressional committees that have been to Hawaii have come back recommending statehood for Hawaii. Both political parties time and time again have placed this plank in their platforms.

The bill before us is not a perfect bill. Under the rule under which we are working it is not even possible to change a comma or a couple of semicolons that ought to be changed in the bill. The Rules Committee reported out a rule that would not permit that. For the information of my colleagues, there are more than 50 committee amendments to this bill. I do not believe they should be considered en bloc. I do not know how long the House wants to stay here, for the Members have been here more than 7 hours debating this bill in an earnest and sincere manner. I do want some time upon these committee amendments. Under the rules of the House 5 minutes can be had on each side on each amendment, the fifty-some-odd amendments might well take considerable time. I suggest that the Members are getting a little tired. I am not part of the leadership, but there is another day coming. If the Members want to stay here until midnight, I am quite capable of doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my very able colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, if you will look at the inscription on one of the Government buildings downtown you will find the statement, "The past is prologue, the future is epilogue." The problems we are facing in this bill today mark this day as the day of destiny for the future of our country.

I can say to you with all sincerity that had the Founding Fathers not been willing to compromise, had they not been willing to admit that there were differences that had to be resolved among the Thirteen Original Colonies, there never would have been a United States of America.

When King George made his treaty he did not make it with the United States of America, he made it with 13 independent colonies that had won their independence in the War for Independence because they decided that men should be free. For the first time in the history of the world a nation came into existence on the theory that the people that belong to this Nation were all entitled to the same rights and privileges. From the 7th day of December 1787, when the State of Delaware signed the Constitution and ratified it as the first one of 48 States, down until today, that has been the policy that has guided the destiny of this country.

Had the philosophy of some of the opponents of the Thirteen Original Colonies attempting to become a union of States been in effect we would not have had a country.

Upon the great issue of equal representation in the United States Senate, Pennsylvania is called the Keystone State not because of its position halfway up the coastline, but because there were 6 of those Colonies that did not believe that they should have equal representation, and 6 of them that did.

It was the vote of the Representatives who came from the then Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that made it possible that in the body which sits on the opposite side of this Capitol, the United States Senate, each State, large or small, should have equal representation. We have followed uniformly that same policy in the growth of our country. Whenever a new State was admitted to the sisterhood of States and as each 1 of those 35 came up and became a part of these United States of America, they became entitled to the same rights and privileges of every other State. As each one of the States have been admitted, they have become entitled to two representatives in the United States Senate. I heard someone say that they came from one of the States and wanted to know whether or not they would lose their seat in the Congress, if these two new States of Hawaii and Alaska were admitted. My answer to you is, that, that depends entirely on what you, the House of Representatives, want to do the next time the problem comes up before the Congress as to how many Members shall sit in the United States House of Representatives. We are the only legislative body which has the right, under our Constitution, to determine the number of Members which will constitute this body. If some of these States decide that they do not have enough representation, all they have to do is to amend the law and give us more Members in Congress.

I was very much interested with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] and the terrible harangue which he made with regard to the Communist group. But did it ever dawn upon you that he entirely missed the important point involved as he pointed here this morning to that newspaper and said, "Seven Communists convicted." The significance to me and I hope to you is that the American public and you, the Members of Congress, should be just this—that the people in Hawaii are American throughout. They took the act which was known as the Smith Act, which declares it to be a crime to commit acts of subversion against these United States of America, and there under the system which grew up in this great country of ours, took a jury of 12 people from the islands and what did those 12 people do? They listened to all of the testimony presented by the Government, they listened to all of the defense that was made by those who were in favor of saying that they were not Communists, and that they had not committed any acts of violence against this country, and then those 12 jurors, American citizens, just like each and everyone of you, found them guilty. And because they found those men guilty and did just what you or I, or any other good and loyal American, would have done to put behind bars the people who would commit acts of subversion, those who would defeat this bill point with scorn to the headlines in the paper and say, "Seven Communists convicted." I say to you that only in America is it possible for something like that to happen and to be given the perverted interpretation which was given by the gentleman from New York.

Wherever you go in the island of Oahu—Diamond Head, Pearl Harbor, Pali Pass Punch Bowl—you can see in the harbor the American flag flying above the sunken battleship *Arizona*. When the roll of the active ships of the United States Navy is called today, the battleship *Arizona*, named for the last State admitted to the Union, is still called. Why? Because there were aboard that vessel, 1,100 American boys. As long as there is a United States Navy and a list of the ships in the line is called, the battleship *Arizona* will remain.

I hold in my hand, and I recommend that each and every one of you get it and read it, a book entitled "Americans." It is the story of the 442d Combat Team. It is dedicated to the Niseis who have asked only for the right to be called Americans and not Japanese Americans.

It is interesting to me to read a part of chapter V in this book, and I would like to call it to the attention of the great delegation from the State of Texas, because they have been some of the most outspoken opponents of this bill. I recommend that all of you read this because there you will find that the 103d battalion of the 442d Regimental Combat Team received word after they had been retired to the rear lines for a well earned rest from 2 weeks of the fiercest combat that occurred in northern Italy and southern France, that a part of the Texas National Guard were cut off and all efforts to rescue them had failed. The 103d Battalion had been at the rest camp less than 1 day when they were asked whether or not they would volunteer to attempt to rescue the First Brigade of the 141st Infantry Regiment of the 36th Infantry Division, which was the Texas National Guard. This unit had been cut off for 4 days. There was no hope given for their recovery. The 103d Battalion of the 442d Combat Team volunteered to rescue the Texas National Guard and in the next 5 days suffered 50 percent total casualties, but they did what no other human was able to do; that is, rescue the lost battalion in World War II, a part of the National Guard of Texas. In reward for what happened, the great State of Texas made every member of the 442d Combat Team an honorary citizen of the great State of Texas.

Every argument that has been presented here by the opponents of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska I could say to you has been presented from time to time with regard to the other States.

Report of the committee to which was referred, on the sixth instant, the memorial of the Legislature of the Mississippi Territory, praying for admission

into the Union, as an independent State, December 29, 1815:

The committee to whom were referred, on the sixth instant, the memorial of the legislative council and House of Representatives of the Mississippi Territory, praying for the admission of said Territory into the Union, as a State; and, on the 14th instant, the petitions of sundry inhabitants east of Pearl River in the same territory, praying that provision may be made for taking a census of its citizens previous to such admission, respectfully submit the following report:

By the articles of agreement and cession between the United States and the State of Georgia, it is provided "that the Territory thus ceded (now Mississippi Territory) shall form a State, and be admitted as such into the Union, as soon as it shall contain 60,000 free inhabitants, or at an earlier period if Congress shall think it expedient, on the same conditions and restrictions, with the same privileges, and in the same manner, as is provided in the ordinance of Congress, of the 13th day of July 1787, for the Government of the Western Territory of the United States, which ordinance shall, in all its parts, extend to the territory contained in the present act of cession, that article only excepted which forbids slavery."

In relation to the simple question of admission, as presented by the memorialists, precedents are not wanting, either to encourage their application, or to grant their request. The State of Ohio was admitted before it possessed the number which the ordinance required, and Louisiana did not come in as to time or numbers, in virtue of a strict and insuperable claim. * * * and it is believed (of Mississippi) that its state of political minority and probation has been of longer duration than that of any of the adopted States.

* * * If, then, after 15 years of restraint, the people of this country should evince even an impatient desire for enlargement, it is but just to ascribe it to that sense of independence which is common to the Nation, and which should be rather encouraged than depressed. It is a policy worthy of a government, which is constituted and maintained by the public will, to foster, throughout the Union, those feelings which give energy to the national character, and to extend to every portion of it, those rights which conduce to the general good. Nor could a period more propitious to these ends be selected than the present, when all American citizens have new cause to approve of their principles, to confide in their institutions, and to be proud of their name.

So far, your committee have considered this subject, as though an immediate admission of the Territory were desired by all of its inhabitants; but they are not prepared to say that such is the fact. Whilst it is true that such admission has been repeatedly solicited, for a succession of years, it is also true that about 4 years ago a small minority of the representative branch of the Territorial Legislature protested against it; and that about a year thereafter, a considerable number of the people themselves petitioned that all proceedings in Congress, on the subject, might be postponed.

House Report No. 14 of the committee to which was referred, on the 9th instant, the memorial of the Legislature of the Mississippi Territory, praying for the admission of said Territory into the Union, as an independent State, December 23, 1816:

The committee, to whom was referred, on the 9th instant, the memorial of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives, of the Mississippi Territory, praying for the admission of said Territory into the Union, as an independent State, with its present limits, respectfully submit the following report:

The Mississippi Territory contains, according to a census lately taken under an act of the legislature, and furnished by the secretary, of said Territory, 75,512 souls; of whom 45,085 are free white persons; 366 free people of color; and 30,061 slaves. By the articles of agreement between the United States, and the State of Georgia, it is stipulated that this Territory shall be admitted into the Union, as a State, when it shall contain 60,000 free inhabitants, or at an earlier period, if Congress shall deem it expedient. Hence it appears, that its admission at this time depends, not upon the claim derived from the above-mentioned agreement with Georgia, but upon a liberal policy, on the part of the United States. It would seem to be superfluous in your committee to recommend, that considerations of a deficiency of numbers be waived in this case; seeing that the House of Representatives have passed three bills at different periods, for the admission of this Territory, when its population was much smaller than it is at this time.

But it becomes a question whether the object of the memorialists can be ultimately attained, or ought to be attained, in the way in which it is asked. It will be readily perceived that your committee allude to the objection to the extent of the Territory in question, which the memorialists pray may be embraced within the limits of a single State. Whether such a measure might, in any possible contingency, affect the general interest of the Union, it is possible that a difference of sentiment may exist. Your committee presume, that it is not required of them to discuss this question; as it is one on which every Member of the House will form an opinion for himself. They will, however, beg leave barely to remark, that they cannot believe a State of such unprecedented magnitude, as the one contemplated by the memorialists, can be desirable to any section of the United States. In relation to the interest of the Territory itself, it may be more within the province of your committee to give their opinion, with the facts upon which it is formed.

It is deemed unnecessary to calculate how many square miles, or how many millions of acres, the Mississippi Territory contains; as its size is sufficiently apparent from a mere glance at the map. But there are other circumstances of a local nature, which are not so obvious to the House, and which, therefore, the committee will proceed to state.

There are in this Territory, three principal settlements, which lie, as to their relative positions, somewhat in a triangular form: viz. one, immediately below the 35th degree of latitude, on the Tennessee River; another, immediately above the 31st degree, on the Mississippi; and the other, also immediately above the 31st, on the Moble. From the settlement on the Tennessee to that on the Mississippi, the distance is about 400 miles; all of which is a wildernes, excepting so far as it is settled by the Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians, by whom these immense regions are claimed. From the settlement on the Mississippi to that on the Mobile, the distance is nearly 300 miles. Here the Indian claim is extinguished; but the intermediate settlements, from Pearl River eastwardly, are insulative and of small extent. From the settlement on the Mobile to that on the Tennessee, the distance is about 300 miles also; and here, too, the Indian claims are now extinguished to the whole of this extensive and interesting tract of country; which will, no doubt, soon exhibit a flourishing settlement, extending from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico. Between the Tennessee and the Mississippi settlements and between the Mississippi and the Mobile settlements, there is not, and probably never will be, any commercial intercourse whatever; but between the Mobile and Tennessee settlements, such an intercourse cannot fail to take place when the intervening country shall be settled, and its fine navigable streams explored and improved."

Note: In other words, the area "between the Mississippi and Mobile settlements" in which "there is not, and probably never will be, any commercial intercourse whatever"; as it happens, gentlemen, today now includes what is the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Mississippi and with or without "any commercial intercourse whatever" it has sent to the Congress of the United States the very able gentleman, Congressman COLMER, from Pascagoula.

The whole Mississippi Territory formed into a single State, would not only be very inconvenient to a vast majority of those of its inhabitants whose duty or interest might call them to the seat of government; but would also prove, in the opinion of your committee, too extensive for its executive to suppress internal disorders in all parts, and repel external invasion at all points, with necessary promptness, energy, and effect.

But another objection to an entire admission of the Territory, arises from the want of a continuity of settlement, and a reciprocity of interest between its distant parts. The former of these defects might, perhaps, be merely inconvenient; but the latter could not fail to be a permanent source of real evil to the legislative councils of the country, and, of consequence, to the community at large. Your committee need not express their apprehensions in detail, as the House will readily conceive how naturally jealousies would arise, and collisions ensure, amongst the representatives of a people inhabiting different regions, having distinct local interests, and entertaining opposite views. There is much cause to fear, that in such a state of things, sectional feelings would prevail over principles of justice, and local policy over the general good.

ACCURACY OF PREDICTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE OREGON TERRITORY: TODAY OREGON, WASHINGTON, IDAHO, AND PARTS OF MONTANA AND WYOMING

Excerpt from statement of Congressman Kahn, of California, volume 223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 1545–1546, January 25, 1906:

Why, sir, when it was proposed to organize the Oregon country as a Territory of this Union there were grave and reverend Senators of the United States who arose at the other end of the Capitol and denounced the proposition in unmeasured terms. I will read for the edification of the House some sentiments which were uttered upon that question. Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, arose in the Senate, February 26, 1825, and soberly said:

"But is this Territory of Oregon ever to become a State, a member of this Union? Never. The Union is already too extensive and we must make 3 or 4 new States from the Territories already formed.

"The distance from the mouth of the Columbia to the mouth of the Missouri is 3,555 miles; from Washington to the mouth of the Missouri is 1,160 miles, making the whole distance from Washington to the mouth of the Columbia River 4,703 miles, but say 4,650 miles. The distance, therefore, that a Member of Congress of this State of Oregon would be obliged to travel in coming to the seat of government and returning home would be 9,300 miles. This, at the rate of $8 for every 20 miles, would make his traveling expenses amount to $3,720.

"Every Member of Congress ought to see his constituents once a year. This is already very difficult for those in the most remote parts of the Union. At the rate which the Members of Congress travel according to law—that is, 20 miles per day—it would require, to come to the seat of government from Oregon and return, 465 days; and if he should lie by for Sundays, say, 66, it would require 531 days. But if he should travel at the rate of 30 miles per day, it would require 306 days. Allow for Sundays, 44, it would amount to 350 days. This would allow the Member a fortnight to rest himself at Washington before he should commence his journey home. This rate of traveling would be a hard duty, as a greater part of the way is exceedingly bad, and a portion of it over rugged mountains, where Lewis and Clark found several feet of snow in the latter part of June. Yet a young, able-bodied Senator might travel from Oregon to Washington and back once a year; but he could do nothing else. It would be more expeditious, however, to come by water around Cape Horn, or to pass through Bering Strait, around the north coast of this continent to Baffins Bay, thence through Davis Strait to the Atlantic, and so on to Washington. It is true this passage is not yet discovered, except upon our maps, but it will be as soon as Oregon shall be a State."

Mr. Dayton, another distinguished Senator, said:

"I trust I may be pardoned here for reading an extract from a western paper of recent date (Louisville Journal), republished in the National Intelligencer, of this city. Here it is:

" 'What there is in the Territory of Oregon to tempt our national cupidity no one can tell. Of all the countries on the face of the earth it is one of the least favored of Heaven. It is a mere riddling of creation. It is almost as barren as the desert of Africa, and quite as unhealthy as the Campania of Italy. To leave the fertile and salubrious lands on this side of the Rocky Mountains and to go beyond their snowy summits a thousand miles, to be exiled from law and society, and to endeavor to extort food from the unwilling sand heaps which are there called earth, is the maddest enterprise that has ever deluded foolish man. We would not be subjected to the innumerable and indescribable tortures of a journey to Oregon for all the soil its savage hunters ever wandered over. The journey thither, from all accounts, is horrible enough, but it is paradisean when contrasted with the wasting miseries which beset the wretched emigrant when he has reached a point where he fancied his unutterable woes were to cease, but where he finds they are to be increased beyond all endurance. Of the last party of emigrants that left Missouri for Oregon, only eight died of starvation before reaching Fort Hall, which is halfway to the country that is reckoned inhabitable by those who are afflicted with the Oregon mania.

" 'All the writers and travelers agree in representing Oregon as a vast extent of mountains and valleys of sand, dotted over with green and cultivable spots. This is the representation given by Cox, Bonneville, Farnham, and Hinds. Now, that such a wretched territory should excite the hopes and cupidity of citizens of the United States, inducing them to leave comfortable homes for the heaps of sand, is, indeed, passing strange. Russia has her Siberia and England has her Botany Bay, and if the United States should ever use a country to which to banish its rogues and scoundrels, the utility of such a region as Oregon will be demonstrated.' "

I read the extract without adopting the sentiments as to the character of the country in the full extent, but this description in a paper of the West so widely circulated as the Louisville Journal is evident to my mind that public sentiment there in behalf of the settlement of Oregon is not so universal as some gentlemen have presented it. I desire here to disclaim any intention to burlesque the subject or feelings of Senators who seem to be extremely sensitive upon the point. With the permission, therefore, of the Senate I will call attention to another extract of a grave tone, and from a paper above all exception. I read from the Christian Advocate of the 7th of this month (February):

"The West has land enough yet to settle and improve at home. The population cannot be so crowded for half a century to come as to be willing to incur horrors of war to acquire wastelands on the other side of the globe. Indeed, when we take into view the inducements which must be offered to a people circumstanced as the habitants of the Western States and Territories are, in order to induce them to emigrate, and compare them with what Oregon Territory presents, we should be inclined to think the representation of their feelings as having been made on very insufficient grounds. We have some opportunity from our position to form a correct estimate of the soil, climate, productions, and facilities of the country from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, as we have had a large mission there for several years, distributed in small parties over the Territory, and from all we have learned we should prefer migrating to Botany Bay. With the exceptions of the lands on the Willamette and strips along a few of the smaller water courses, the whole is among the most irreclaimable barren wastes of which we have read, except the Desert of Sahara.

"Nor is this the worst of it. The climate is so unfriendly to human life that the native population has dwindled away under the ravages of its malaria to a degree which defies all history to furnish a parallel in so wide a range of country, and the scattered remnants of the wandering tribes of Indians who still remain exhibit a degree of decrepitude, loathsome disease, and moral degradation which is unknown among any other portion of the aborigines. So entirely sunken and subdued are these wretched people and so rapid has been their decay that they predict their own annihilation from the 'cold sickness,' as they have learned to call the ague, which is a prominent symptom of the terrible malady which annually visits them in all their wanderings."

Mr. Dayton, after arguing that the country was not worth contending for, that it was too remote from the seat of government, that the distance to the Capital around Cape Horn was 18,000 miles and across the continent 5,000 miles, concluded in this fashion:

"The power of steam has been suggested. Talk of steam communication—a railroad to the mouth of the Columbia. Why, look at the cost and bankrupt condition of railroads proceeding almost from your Capital, traveling your great thoroughfares. A railroad across 2,500 miles of prairie, of desert, and of mountains. The smoke of an engine through those terrible fissures of that great rocky ledge where the smoke of the volcano has rolled before. Who is to make this vast internal, or rather, external improvement? Whence is to come the power? Who to supply the means? The mines of Mexico and Peru disemboweled would scarcely pay a penny on the pound of the cost. Nothing short of the lamp of Aladdin would suffice for such an expenditure. The extravagance of the suggestion seems to me to outrun everything which we know of modern scheming. The South Sea bubble, the Dutchman's speculation in tulip roots, our own in town lots, and multicaulis are all commonplace plodding in comparison."

These are fair samples of some of the views entertained by distinguished statesmen in those days concerning the magnificent empire which has since been divided up into the Commonwealths of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming. In 1838 there were only 50 Americans in that great stretch of country, and where is the American today who does not feel proud of the advancement that has been made on that Northwest border of our common country.

OPPOSITION TO NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA BECAUSE CANADA, CUBA, MEXICO, AND CENTRAL AMERICA WOULD BE NEXT

During the debate in the Senate on April 19, 1888, on a bill proposing the admission of the Dakota Territory, Senator Call, of Florida,—volume 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3128—raised a question as to precedent, in these words:

Then, Mr. President, the considerations are manifest which should govern this question. First, the welfare and happiness and continued power and permanence of the States already created; second, the welfare and happiness and permanence of the new States to be created and admitted. From that standpoint how are we to view this question? Certainly it is not by making States because they are agricultural; not by making them large or small because of the character of industries which exist among them. There is no permanence in that. We must have some regard in the exercise of the powers of government to the equilibrium of forces which now and hereafter are to exist in this country. We have 65 million now; very soon there will be 100 million, and in the near future a far greater number of people.

It is not beyond the bounds of a reasonable statesmanship that Canada and Cuba, and Mexico, and perhaps Central America, may ask to be admitted into this Union of States. Shall we disregard the possibilities of such contingencies? Shall we create this Territory into small States like Rhode Island or Delaware, or even Massachusetts? Or shall we make them so large that the difference between this body and the other House in numbers will always exist, and that the number of persons in this body will bear some proportion toward a large and somewhat difficult body to manage as is the House of Representatives? Shall we preserve the idea of States so large that the Senators who represent them here will continue to be a conservative element in the Government, or shall we make the two bodies alike in all respects, throwing open the whole scheme of our Government to change, and to an essentially different character from that which it now possesses? Shall we create new States so as to concentrate the political power of the National Government in the Northwest, so as to sectionalize it, and again create sectional difficulties? Are we entirely sure that there may not be other questions besides the dead Negro of the past upon which sections of the Republic may not divide?

Mr. President, I take it that is the only question to be considered in the creation of new States. Admitting the sufficiency of population, admitting the identity and sympathy of feeling, admitting the devotion to republican institutions and to our form of government, what other question is there to be considered? I venture to say that can be done in only one way, and that is by enlarging the areas of the States now to be created and those to be created in the future. In my judgment there can be no rational argument presented against this view, there has been none presented. The suggestion of imperial States has no significance. You have in the House of Representatives the full representation of the people. You have in this body a representation

made equal in respect to the States, the political organization, the territory embraced within certain limits and designated by certain names as States. And the preservation of this equality of rights in this body is the great force of this Government, is its great and conservative force against sectionalism. That is the great point. Shall we give the States to be made in the Northwest territory such representation in the Senate as their increasing population will give them in the House of Representatives until they have ascendency over all other portions of the country, or shall we make them autonomies so large that they will bear their proper and just proportion of political strength and power, not as agricultural States, but as States differenced from the middle and the east and south by distance, by climate, by the absence of that direct and immediate intercourse which even railroads will not bring.

I venture to say, then, that politically and philosophically there is no ground on which to consider this question except to so arrange these States that one section shall not have the absolute or permanent preponderance over the others. The war has passed away and slavery has gone; and my distinguished friend from Ohio, for whom I have a high respect for his ability, and the Senator from Massachusetts, are laboring in vain and are deluded when they think there remains in the people of this country any remnant of feeling which can be excited by the recollections of the war. All that is gone, and gone forever; and in the Southern States there is more sympathy, more protection, more regard for the colored race and the colored voter than there is or ever can be anywhere else, and less of violence than there is among the white race in the North toward each other, and less of intimidation and corrupt influence than there is in the party contests of the Northern States.

NEW ENGLAND PREDICTIONS OF CONSEQUENCES TO FOLLOW STATEHOOD ADMISSION OF WESTERN TERRITORIES

During the debate on the Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico statehood bill, Mr. Beall, of Texas, refreshed the memories of some of his colleagues—volume 223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1517—in this language:

But gentlemen from the East say that these Territories are barren, desolate, and unproductive, for the most part, and can never separately become worthy to wear the crowns of statehood. New England has prophesied before. If the Government should do no more for New England than it has done for these Territories a great part of New England would become barren and unproductive waste.

In 1811, when Congress was considering the question of admitting some of the territory purchased from France by Mr. Jefferson as a State into the Union, Mr. Josiah Quincy said:

"If this bill passes it is virtually a dissolution of the Union. It will free the States from their moral obligations and, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, definitely to prepare for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must."

This first threat of secession was made by a Member from Massachusetts. And for what reason? Because Congress was preparing to admit into the Union some of the great West. Mr. Chairman, without the great West, which New England so despised, to feed and clothe her, New England would be hungry and shivering today and her cities would be silent in the stagnation of death. That great West has been the brawn and muscle, the heart, and brains of this Nation.

In peace it has made her prosperity the marvel of the world, and in war it preserved her from dissolution and death. Without the Lincoln of the West, the Grant of the West, the Sherman of the West, and the legions upon legions of soldiers from the West who marched to the music of the Union, the men who followed the strains of Dixie would have knocked at the gates of every city in the Eastern and Middle States and would have swept their armies off the field of battle.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL THAT TEXAS MAY BE FORCED TO DIVIDE INTO FIVE STATES IF ALASKA AND HAWAII ARE ADMITTED TO STATEHOOD

A Texas Congressman, who preceded by some 50 years the present Representatives from Texas, during the debate on the bill proposing to admit Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to statehood on January 24, 1906—volume 223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1518—said this:

If area alone were considered, Texas could be divided. You could divide her forests and her prairies, her mountains and her valleys; but there are some things about Texas you cannot divide. There is her Alamo—greater than the Thermopylae of old. The babes of Texas have been taught to lisp the names of Travis and Crockett and Bowie and the others who died there. The Alamo belongs alike to all, and no son of Texas would be so unworthy as to surrender his claim to it. There is Goliad and there is the field of San Jacinto. In dividing Texas could these battlefields be divided also and their glories parceled out to different States? There is the memory of Houston; of Austin; of Burleson; of Rusk; of Albert Sidney Johnston; of Roberts, the "Old Alcalde"; of Reagan the "Grand Old Man," who loved Texas and who was beloved by Texas; and a great host of other illustrious ones. Can such memories be weighed and measured and apportioned to different sections? The soldiers who went from Texas homes mingled in the tumult of every great battle of the war between the blue and the gray, and they sleep upon every field from Gettysburg to the gulf. Will anyone be found so base as to give up the memory of their deathless deeds?

No, Mr. Chairman, to give up any of these to one section would be to impoverish all others. They belong to Texas—to all of Texas, and not a part of Texas. They were given to us by the fathers, and we must hand them down to our children. They belonged to Texas in her weakness; they must still be hers in her strength. They comforted and blessed her in her night of sorrow; they must adorn her in her day of triumph. [Prolonged applause.]

ARGUMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA CONGRESSMAN AGAINST ARIZONA-NEW MEXICO ADMISSION

In opposing the admission of the Arizona-New Mexico Territory to statehood, Congressman Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, said—volume 223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1505, January 24, 1906:

I am arguing that there is an undue number of Senators in the United States as compared with the Members of Congress at this end of the Capitol representing population, and that the whole system of Government as devised by the Fathers has been overturned by the introduction of these Senators from these small States. Mr. Speaker, I am arguing that Senators ought to represent population, and not rocks and sand. [Applause.]

EXTRACT FROM DEBATE ON ARIZONA-NEW MEXICO

The comments of Congressman Bede from Minnesota—volume 223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 1502–1503, January 24, 1906:

The treatment of the East toward that part of the United States west of the Mississippi is a mistaken one. They speak of us as the "wooly West." When easterners want to whip us into line and get something done here, they call up the great name of Theodore Roosevelt, but when they want to defeat something that he wishes to bring about, they call him the "bronco statesman." They heap contumely on him merely because he once lived in Dakota. * * * Oh, they say they fear Senators from the West. I do not. But they say, "You haven't folks enough out there." * * *

We used to hear it said that New England was not fit to live in; yet we have made that a great country. Even Governor Bradford, in his notes on the early settlement of that country, intimates that the Pilgrim Fathers themselves would not have landed in New England if they had not been seasick. [Great laughter.]

We have made a great country of New England, and we love every State of it; I would not strike down one of her Representatives in this House or the other; but we love the West, too. We have heard it said that Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas were the Great American Desert; but that idea has been wiped out and they are now garden spots. As a boy I heard it asserted that you could never run a railroad through Minnesota with the thermometer 30° below zero, because the water would freeze in the boiler and the locomotive would go dead. [Laughter.] We have now a great State there and other great States have been made in the West, and I believe in a fair representation for this great country west of the Mississippi River.

Senator Nelson, of Minnesota, on "Weak, Sickly States," New Mexico-Arizona statehood, February 27, 1906, page 3048, volume 225, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whenever Senators deem it necessary to disorganize these Territories or pass any legislation, as the Senator suggested, we will be ready to meet that question. But the question today is whether these two Territories should not be united into one State. In their makeup and their characteristics, in their natural resources and their population, ought they not to be one State instead of two weak, sickly States, with a scattering and feeble population?

New Mexico has today, if you eliminate the Indian population, hardly 200,000 white people; and if you eliminate the Mexicans from that number there are, perhaps, about 100,000 Americans there. Arizona today has a population, after all these years of Territorial existence, if you eliminate the Indians out of it, of only about 100,000 white people, or about enough for half of the ratio of a Representative in Congress.

Taking the 2 Territories—the one, New Mexico, nearly 60 years of age, and Arizona—the 2 together have a white population in round numbers of only about 300,000 people.

After all these years, if all that country, with all that immense domain, can only make such a showing, why in the world should we segregate them and make them into separate Commonwealths simply because of the vast territorial area?

Senator Hopkins, of Ohio, on the New Mexico-Arizona statehood February 27, 1906, page 3046, volume 225, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Suppose the State of Delaware, to which Arizona has been compared, were a Territory, is there a man west of the Allegheny Mountains who represents a State in this Senate that for a moment would consent to permit this small area to become a sovereign State in the Union? We all know that had she not been one of the Original Thirteen States, and had it not been necessary in order to secure our Federal Union to give her the

rights and privileges in the Senate that New York and Virginia were to have, she never would have been granted that privilege.

Here, after more than 100 years of our constitutional Government, when our population has reached more than 80 million, and when States that helped to form the Federal Union which had only a few thousand population then have increased to millions, it is proposed to permit a section of our country from the arid region, with thousands upon thousands of acres of barren rocks and of land absolutely unproductive of anything that will sustain animal life, all the rights and privileges of one of the Original Thirteen States.

REBUTTAL TO ASSERTION THAT POPULATION RATIO SHOULD BE A TEST

In the debate on the Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico statehood bill, Mr. Beall, of Texas—volume 223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 1516 and 1517, January 24, 1906—said:

Has each of these Territories a sufficient population to justify statehood? Let us examine this proposition in the light of rules that have been applied in the past. Congress has heretofore adopted two rules to govern the admission of Territories into statehood, so far as population is concerned. The ordinance of 1787 fixed the conditions upon which States might be carved out of the Northwest Territory, which Virginia and others had so generously surrendered. After this ordinance had provided for the future division of this Territory into not less than 3 and not more than 5 States, and had fixed the boundary of 3 of them, namely, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, it contained this provision:

"And whenever any of the said States shall have 60,000 free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and State government: *Provided,* The constitution and government so to be formed shall be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the Confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000."

This ordinance was afterwards extended so as to apply to the territory south of the Ohio River and later to Oregon. Under its authority Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Oregon were admitted. Under this ordinance it was conceded that when a Territory attained a population of 60,000 free people it had a right to demand immediate admission. Tennessee was the first to apply for admission under authority of this ordinance. She proceeded, without any enabling act from Congress authorizing it, to hold a convention in which she framed a constitution, and then she chose a legislature and elected her Senators and Member of Congress. She notified Congress of her action and advised that upon a certain day her Territorial government established by Congress would cease and she would take her place as a State. She took her own census and notified Congress that she had 54,000 whites and 6,000 free Negroes. George Washington transmitted this constitution to Congress with the following message:

"Gentleman of the Senate and House of Representatives: By an act of Congress passed on the 26th of May 1790, it was declared that the inhabitants of the Territory of the United States south of the river Ohio should enjoy all the privileges, benefits, and advantages set forth in the ordinance of Congress for the government of the Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio; and that the government of said Territory south of the Ohio should be similar to that which was then exercised in the Territory northwest of the Ohio, except so far as was otherwise provided in the conditions expressed in an act of Congress passed the 2d of April 1790, 'An act to accept a cession of the claims of the State of North Carolina to a certain district of western Territory.'

"Among the privileges, benefits, and advantages thus secured to the inhabitants of the territory south of the river Ohio appear to be the right of forming a permanent constitution and State government, and of admission as a State by the delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever when it should have therein 60,000 free inhabitants: *Provided,* The constitution and government so to be formed should be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in the articles of the said ordinance.

"As proofs of the several requisites to entitle the territory south of the river Ohio to be admitted as a State into the Union, Governor Blount has transmitted the return of the enumeration of its inhabitants and a printed copy of the constitution and form of government on which they have agreed, which, with letters accompanying the same, are herewith laid before Congress." (United States, April 8, 1796. G. Washington.)

Tennessee did not come as a supplicant begging for admission. She came demanding it as a right, because she had the requisite 60,000 of population.

But under this ordinance a population of 60,000 was not essential to admission into statehood. It provided: "And, so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the Confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000."

Under the authority of this last proviso Ohio was admitted in 1802 with a population of 45,000 and Illinois in 1818 with a population of 55,000.

It will thus be seen that the ordinance of 1787 provided not that there must be 60,000 people for a State, but that there must be a State for 60,000 people, leaving Congress free to create a State for a territory having less than that number of people if it was deemed advisable to do so.

Now, what was the other rule that Congress has prescribed upon this subject? By the treaty of 1803 the Territory of Louisiana was purchased by Mr. Jefferson, and out of this a number of States have been carved. In this treaty the following language occurs:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."

In 1819 a treaty was made with Spain under which Florida was ceded to the United States. This treaty contained the following:

"The inhabitants of the territories which His Catholic Majesty cedes to the United States by this treaty shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States as soon as may be consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution and admitted to the enjoyment of all the privileges, rights, and immunities of the citizens of the United States."

In 1848 the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, under which a great area, including New Mexico and Arizona, was ceded to the United States, was made, and this treaty contains the following:

"The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republican conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution."

I have quoted the provisions of these several treaties to show that in each of them it was contemplated that the territory secured should at the earliest practicable moment be carved into States. The language in each was a covenant and promise that this would be done. In one it was stipulated that the people should be "admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States," and substantially the same language was used in the other treaties.

Arkansas was the first of this territory to seek admittance as a State, and it was necessary for Congress to interpret the meaning of the phrase, "according to the principles of the Federal Constitution." After protracted discussion it was agreed that it meant that when a people in an area called a Territory reached the point in population where this population was equal to the number of people required for a Congressional district in a State, then that they should be admitted as a State.

Under the ordinance of 1787, while a Territory had a right to demand admission as a State when its population reached 60,000, yet such Territory could be properly admitted by Congress when it had a much smaller population, and likewise Congress interpreted the provisions in these treaties to mean that while a Territory could demand admission into the Union as a matter of right when its population was equal to the unit of representation in Congress, yet Congress could admit such Territory when its population was far below the point named. The instances of such admission when the population was far below the unit of representation prevailing at such time are numerous. Florida when admitted had a population of 54,000, when the basis of representation was 70,000; Oregon came in with 52,000 people, when the unit was 93,000. Nevada was admitted in 1864 by the Republican Party for partisan purposes, with a population of only 6,800 at the preceding census, when the unit of representation was 127,000; and in 1866 both Houses of Congress passed a bill admitting Colorado when her population was less than 30,000, when the basis of representation was 127,000. The next year Nebraska was admitted when her population was only 60,000.

Much has been said that there is no promise of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The following extract from the debate on the admission of the State of Dakota should resolve that question:

THE ADMISSION OF STATES

(Extract from S. Rept. No. 15, 49th Cong., 1st sess., dated January 11, 1886, from the Committee on Territories to accompany S. 967, providing for the admission of the State of Dakota into the Union)

The policy of the United States from the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and even before, has been to encourage the settlement of the public lands lying outside the boundaries of the States, and to organize the communities thus formed into States as soon as the requisite population was found

within a suitable area. Territorial governments were always regarded as formative and temporary, to be superseded by State governments as soon as the necessary conditions existed. The vast domain acquired by cession from Virginia, by the treaty with Louisiana, and by conquest from Mexico, has been carved into States, which have been admitted to the Union as fast as sufficient population was found therein.

In the case of *Dred Scott* v. *Sandford* (19 How. 446), the Court (Chief Justice Taney delivering the opinion) said upon this subject:

"There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish and maintain colonies bordering on the United States, or at a distance to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given, and if a new State is admitted it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State, and the citizens of the State, and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a Territory to be acquired and held permanently in that character.

* * * * *

"We do not mean, however, to question the power of Congress in this respect. The power to expand the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given; and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government, it has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory, not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population and situation entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion."

The table of approximate population of the United States prepared by the Library of Congress is inserted here for the information of the Members:

Approximate percentage of the total population of the United States possessed by each of the 48 States upon entry into the Union

State	Date of admission to the Union	Population, nearest decennial census		Total population of the United States, nearest decennial census		Each State's percentage of the total population upon entry
		Year	Population	Year	Population	
Alabama	Dec. 14, 1819	1820	127,901	1820	9,638,453	1.3269
Arizona	Feb. 14, 1912	1910	204,354	1910	91,972,266	.2221
Arkansas	June 15, 1836	1840	97,574	1840	17,069,453	.5716
California	Sept. 9, 1850	1850	92,597	1850	23,191,876	.3992
Colorado	Aug. 1, 1876	1880	194,327	1880	50,155,783	.3874
Connecticut	Jan. 9, 1788	1790	237,946	1790	3,929,214	6.0558
Delaware	Dec. 7, 1787	1790	59,096	1790	3,929,214	1.5040
Florida	Mar. 3, 1845	1850	87,445	1850	23,191,876	.3770
Georgia	Jan. 2, 1788	1790	82,548	1790	3,929,214	2.1008
Idaho	July 3, 1890	1890	88,548	1890	62,947,714	.1406
Illinois	Dec. 3, 1818	1820	55,211	1820	9,638,453	.5728
Indiana	Dec. 11, 1816	1820	147,178	1820	9,638,453	1.5269
Iowa	Dec. 28, 1846	1850	192,214	1850	23,191,876	.8287
Kansas	Jan. 29, 1861	1860	107,206	1860	31,443,321	.3409
Kentucky	June 1, 1792	1790	73,677	1790	3,929,214	1.8751
Louisiana	Apr. 30, 1812	1810	76,556	1810	7,239,881	1.0574
Maine	Mar. 15, 1820	1820	298,335	1820	9,638,453	3.0952
Maryland	Apr. 28, 1788	1790	319,728	1790	3,929,214	8.1371
Massachusetts	Feb. 6, 1788	1790	378,787	1790	3,929,214	9.6402
Michigan	Jan. 26, 1837	1840	212,267	1840	17,069,453	1.2435
Minnesota	May 11, 1858	1860	172,023	1860	31,443,321	.5470
Mississippi	Dec. 10, 1817	1820	75,448	1820	9,638,453	.7827
Missouri	Aug. 10, 1821	1820	66,586	1820	9,638,453	.6908
Montana	Nov. 8, 1889	1890	142,924	1890	62,947,714	.2270
Nebraska	Mar. 1, 1867	1870	122,993	1870	39,818,449	.3088
Nevada	Oct. 31, 1864	[1] 1870	42,491	1870	39,818,449	.1067
New Hampshire	June 21, 1788	1790	141,885	1790	3,929,214	3.6110
New Jersey	Dec. 18, 1787	1790	184,139	1790	3,929,214	4.6864
New Mexico	Jan. 6, 1912	1910	327,301	1910	91,972,266	.3558
New York	July 26, 1788	1790	340,120	1790	3,929,214	8.6561
North Carolina	Nov. 21, 1789	1790	393,751	1790	3,929,214	10.0211
North Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	1890	190,983	1890	62,947,714	.3033
Ohio	Mar. 1, 1803	[2] 1810	230,760	1810	7,239,881	3.1873
Oklahoma	Nov. 16, 1907	1910	1,657,155	1910	91,972,266	1.8017
Oregon	Feb. 14, 1859	1860	52,465	1860	31,443,321	.1668
Pennsylvania	Dec. 12, 1787	1790	434,373	1790	3,929,214	11.0549
Rhode Island	May 29, 1790	1790	68,825	1790	3,929,214	1.7516
South Carolina	May 23, 1788	1790	249,073	1790	3,929,214	6.3390
South Dakota	Nov. 2, 1889	1890	348,600	1890	62,947,714	.5537
Tennessee	June 1, 1796	1800	105,602	1800	5,308,483	1.9893
Texas	Dec. 29, 1845	1850	212,592	1850	23,191,876	.9166
Utah	Jan. 4, 1896	1900	276,749	1900	75,994,575	.3641
Vermont	Mar. 4, 1791	1790	85,425	1790	3,929,214	2.1740
Virginia	June 25, 1788	1790	[3] 747,610	1790	3,929,214	19.0269
Washington	Nov. 11, 1889	1890	357,232	1890	62,947,714	.5675
West Virginia	June 19, 1863	1860	376,688	1860	31,443,321	1.1979
Wisconsin	May 29, 1848	1850	305,391	1850	23,191,876	1.3168
Wyoming	July 10, 1890	1890	62,555	1890	62,947,714	.0993
Alaska		1950	128,643	1950	150,697,361	.0853
Hawaii		1950	499,794	1950	150,697,361	.3316

[1] The census of 1870 provides more meaningful statistics for the State of Nevada even though the date of entry into the Union is nearer 1860. The population of Nevada Territory when organized in 1861 was 6,857. The total for the Nation in 1860 was 31,443,321.

[2] The census of 1810 provides more meaningful statistics for the State of Ohio even though the date of entry into the Union is nearer 1800. The population of Territory Northwest of River Ohio in 1800 was 45,365. The total for the Nation in 1800 was 5,308,483.

[3] The figure 747,610 is made up of 691,737 for Virginia itself plus 55,873 for what is now West Virginia, since the 2 are listed separately in the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953, p. 15, for the census of 1790.

Sources: Bloom, Sol. The Story of the Constitution. Washington, United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, 1937. pp. 87–88. U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953. pp. 15–17.

Estimated population, Thirteen Colonies

	1774	1783
Massachusetts	360,000	350,000
New Hampshire	80,000	82,200
Connecticut	200,000	206,000
Rhode Island	50,000	50,400
New York	180,000	200,000
New Jersey	130,000	130,000
Pennsylvania	300,000	320,000
Delaware	40,000	35,000
Maryland	220,000	220,700
Virginia	560,000	400,000
North Carolina	260,000	200,000
South Carolina	180,000	170,000
Georgia	30,000	25,000
Total	2,590,000	2,389,300

We have heard the claim made today that California is now the second largest State of the Union and the boast that the day is not far distant when their population will exceed the 15 million mark, yet I call your attention to the fact that one of the opponents of statehood for California said that the State of California could never maintain a population of 100,000 people or contribute anything to the welfare of this great country of ours.

It has always been the philosophy of those who have opposed the admission of new States to the Union to try to limit what in the other States are enjoying. The great challenge to the House of Representatives today is to say to the people of Hawaii and Alaska, that have met every test ever acquired of any of the other 35 new States that we have asked more of them than of any other Territory. However, since they have met every requirement and passed every test they are entitled to and should be admitted to statehood to become the States of Hawaii and Alaska.

I should like to dwell for just a few minutes on the great Territory of Alaska. Alaska is actually the sleeping giant of America, but it is hampered and held down by the red tape and control of various bureaus in Washington that have charge of it. If the Washington bureaus continue the land surveys at the present rate it will be more than 15,000 years before the Territory of Alaska surveys will be completed.

Alaska has more timber in the Tongas National Forest than we have in the entire United States. It is an area which is leaping and trying to break the bureaucratic chains that bind it here in Washington and become a part of the sisterhood of States of this great Union.

There is at the present time a rumor going around to the effect that Public Land Order 82 is about to be revoked. If Public Land Order 82 is revoked it will turn loose in a new State of Alaska the opportunity for the greatest exploration the entire Territory of Alaska has ever seen.

At the time of its original purchase it was called Seward's Icebox, Seward's Folly, and every other possible name that could hold it up to ridicule, but it has become the great treasure chest of America.

Those people who have talked about the rapid growth of population in Alaska have said that the great majority of the people up there now are members of the Military Establishment. I might ask the

question of Members of the House: Do you think we are not going to defend Alaska as a State? The answer is: Yes, we are going to continue the defense of Alaska; and we are also going to continue the defense of Hawaii because they are a part of these United States.

We fought a Revolutionary War because the King of England wanted us, the Thirteen Original Colonies, to submit to his will without any representation whatsoever. We as a Nation have held forth to the world the theory, that in America, things like that could not happen. The great challenge that exists to the Members of this House today is to say to the world which is watching us, that we believe in what we have said as far as the other 48 States are concerned and that we will continue to give incorporated Territories the status of statehood, that we will give statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. They will contribute more to this country as States than any of the other 35 Territories. They will be equal as other States have been; and once granted equality of statehood they will then grow and prosper and become a part of the United States of America.

If the members of this committee will have the interest of their country at heart, if they really have the interest of the future of what we have been handed as a heritage by our parents to hand down to our posterity, they will mark this day as a day of destiny. When you are asked by those in your district, by those in your family, "How did you vote when the question was presented to you as a Member of Congress to extend to other Americans the same rights and privileges that you have to other Americans?" you will be able to say, with pride, "I stood up and I gave to other Americans the same rights and privileges which I have." If you will do that, I am satisfied that the bill will be enacted, and will become the law and Alaska and Hawaii will become the 49th and 50th States, and you will be able to point with pride in future years, that you had an active part in making these United States of America a bigger, better, and more prosperous country than the world has ever known it to be.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except the committee amendments printed in the reported bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are, I believe, 56 committee amendments. Some of them I do want to discuss in some detail. I just hope that considering them en bloc will not preclude discussion of them. If it does I shall have to object to taking them up at this time en bloc.

Mr. ENGLE. There are some 55 or 56 amendments, all of them subject to discussion, which would involve this committee in something like 520 minutes of additional discussion. The amendments are in the bill and have been for 7 hours of general debate. No one has raised any question about them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, is it possible under the rules of the House to do this by unanimous consent or may one object, thereby stopping consideration of these amendments en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. One objection would stop consideration of the amendments en bloc.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I withhold it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The only reason I have is to ask the gentleman, Is he opposed to the committee amendments?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Some of the amendments ought to be discussed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman opposed to them?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will discuss that when I come to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this a filibuster?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I renew my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments, beginning on page 3, line 13 down to and including page 9, line 16, be considered en bloc, these amendments being perfecting amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "a."

Page 8, line 21, strike the word "apropriations" and insert in lieu thereof the word "appropriations."

Page 9, line 16, following the word "consideration.", add the following new sentence: "The Congress shall within 60 legislative days after receipt thereof approve or disapprove said constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 20, strike out the word "before" and insert in lieu thereof the word "after."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 20, add the following new section:

"If the Congress shall fail to approve or disapprove the constitution within the 60 legislative days provided for in the second paragraph of this section, the constitution shall be deemed to be approved, and it shall be the duty of the President to certify such fact to the Governor of said Territory, who shall thereupon proceed in like manner as though the constitution had been expressly approved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 10, strike out the numeral "4" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "104."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments beginning on page 12, line 22, to page 25, line 13, be considered en bloc.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wanted to discuss the amendment on page 15.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request to except the amendment on page 15 which the gentleman from Nebraska wishes to discuss, but renew my unanimous consent request with respect to the pro forma and perfecting amendments otherwise included from page 12, line 22, to page 25, line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 22, strike out the numeral "1" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "101."

Page 19, line 24, strike out the words "out 'Hawaii' from" and insert in lieu thereof "out 'Hawaii and' from."

Page 20, line 10, strike out "(5) and (6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4) and (5)."

Page 21, line 9, following the citation, insert the words "as amended."

Page 25, line 5, following the designation "Sec. 116" insert the designation "(a)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 1, strike out "of the House of Representatives shall not" and insert "shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13) nor shall such temporary increase."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. Chairman, I do this not to stall this amendment but to give some reassurance to those who were worried about the number that might be in the House of Representatives from Hawaii. The committee wisely provided that if Hawaii comes in as a new State it shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives. Now, several Members were concerned about losing their seats in the House of Representatives, and it is quite plain, I think, with the adoption of this amendment, that the condition as to the membership in the House remains with the House. Any change can be made by Congress. I have no objection to the amendment. I wanted at this time to sort of reassure some of those folks who felt that, if we bring in two more Members, they will

lose their seats. This is not necessarily so. I will also say that if a rule had been reported so that we could have amended this bill— and I hope it will be amended over in the other body—that I had intended to offer an amendment to provide for one Representative, and I believe it would have been adopted. I hope it is done in the other body. Again, the rule does not permit amendments.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. What the gentleman is telling the House is that the Membership Act of 1911 and the Apportionment Act of 1941 will still remain in force?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. Only Congress can change that act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, following line 14, insert the following:

"(b) Effective on the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

"(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words 'island possession or island territory,' the words, 'island State' and a comma;

"(2) section 605 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words 'island possession or island territory', the words 'island State' and a comma; and

"(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words 'island possession or island territory,' the words 'island State' and a comma."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 30, line 2, strike out "the" and insert in lieu thereof "a."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 19, after "alienation", strike out the semicolon and the words "and that" and insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall recognize, deny, enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any claim against the United States, and any such claim shall be governed by the laws of the United States applicable thereto; and nothing in this act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that any law applicable thereto authorizes, establishes, recognizes, or confirms the validity or invalidity of any such claim, and the determination of the applicability or effect of any such claim shall be unaffected by anything in this act: *And provided further*, That."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 32, line 8, strike out the numeral "5" and insert the numeral "205."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 35, strike out all of line 21 through line 7 on page 36 and the word "Government" on line 8.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 36, line 16, after the word "amended.", insert "Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the rights of the United States under the provisions of the act of February 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 100; 16 U. S. C. 631), as amended, and the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 325; 16 U. S. C. 772), as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments from line 21, page 36, to and including the amendment on line 10, page 42, be considered en bloc, they being perfecting amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 36, strike out all of lines 21 through line 2 on page 37.

On page 37, line 3, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)."

On page 37, line 9, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)."

On page 38, line 20, strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)."

On page 39, line 22, strike out "(k)" and insert "(j)."

On page 40, line 11, strike out "For the purposes of this subsection the mineral character of lands granted to the State of Alaska shall be determined at the time patent issues and the patent shall be conclusive evidence thereof."

On page 49, line 15, strike out "(l)" and insert "(k)."

On page 40, line 25, strike out "(m)" and insert "(l)."

On page 41, line 2, after "State," insert "or its governmental subdivisions."

On page 41, line 7, strike out "(n)" and insert "(m)."

On page 41, line 23, strike out "(o)" and insert "(n)."

On page 42, line 10, strike out "(p)" and insert "(o)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, lines 18 to 21, strike out "a certified copy of the same shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Alaska through the President of the United States to the Congress for approval or disapproval as hereinafter provided," and insert the following: "a statement of the votes cast thereon, and a certified copy of said constitution, shall be immediately submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Alaska to the President of the United States. The President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for approval or disapproval as hereinafter provided."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition on this amendment.

I do this to reassure my colleagues that the question of a constitution for the new State of Alaska is in the hands of Congress, because, on page 44, lines 3 and 4, it says:

The Congress shall within 60 legislative days after receipt thereof approve or disapprove said constitution.

This makes it an important part of the bill, because the Congress will be given an opportunity to have a look at the constitution that they may adopt in Alaska and thereby allay some of the fears of individuals who feel that something will be put in the constitution adopted that might be contrary to some of our philosophy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And Congress will vote the constitution up or down without authority to amend either one of the constitutions that might be sent up?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Congress will have a chance to approve or disapprove the constitution.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by amendments? Congress will have the right to amend the constitutions that are sent up to us?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Congress will have the right to approve or disapprove.

Mr. GROSS. To amend or just to approve or disapprove?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. To approve or disapprove.

Mr. GROSS. Without the right to amend?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. I think that is under the same conditions adopted for all new States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 3, insert:

"(c) The Congress shall within 60 legislative days after receipt thereof approve or disapprove said constitution."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 5, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

Page 44, line 9, strike out "section 307" and insert "section 207."

Page 44, line 18, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Page 45, line 1, insert the following:

"(f) If the Congress shall fail to approve or disapprove the constitution within said 60 legislative days, the constitution shall be deemed to be approved, and it shall be the duty of the President to certify such fact to the Governor of said Territory, who shall thereupon proceed in like manner as though the constitution had been expressly approved."

Page 45, line 7, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)."

Page 45, line 8, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Page 45, line 15, strike out "subsections (c) and (d)" and insert "subsections (c), (d), and (f)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, line 17, strike out "of the House of Representatives shall not" and insert "shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the

act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13), nor shall such temporary increase."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, here again I want to point out to my colleagues that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives need not be changed because Alaska comes in as a new State. I say this for the benefit of those of you who have been apprehensive that you might lose your seats through a change in apportionment. It provides that those changes will not be made so as to change the permanent membership as prescribed in the act of August 8, 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 1, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 210. (a) The President of the United States is hereby authorized to establish, by Executive order or proclamation issued prior to admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, one or more special national defense withdrawals within the exterior boundaries of Alaska, which withdrawal or withdrawals may thereafter be terminated in whole or in part by the President.

"(b) The authority of the President to establish special national defense withdrawals as provided in the foregoing subsection shall be confined to not to exceed 40 percent of the areas of Alaska situated to the north and west of the following line: Beginning at the point where the Yukon River crosses the international boundary between Alaska and Canada; thence downstream along a line parallel to, and 1 mile from, the right bank of the Yukon River, to the point of intersection of the Yukon River with the meridian of longitude 158° west of Greenwich; thence north to the parallel of latitude 65° north; thence westward along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 169° west of Greenwich.

"(c) There is hereby reserved to the United States, effective upon the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, exclusive jurisdiction over all special defense withdrawals established under this section, and the United States shall have sole legislative, judicial, and executive power within such withdrawals. The exclusive jurisdiction so reserved shall extend to all lands within the exterior boundaries of each such withdrawal, shall remain in effect with respect to any particular tract or parcel of land only so long as such tract or parcel remains withdrawn, and the laws of the State of Alaska shall not apply during the period of withdrawal thereof.

"(d) During the continuance in effect of such special defense withdrawal or withdrawals as may be established under authority of this act, or until the Congress otherwise provides, within such withdrawals—

"(1) there shall apply all laws of general application to areas under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, those provisions of tile 18, United States Code, that are applicable within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 7 of said title;

"(2) there shall apply all laws of general application to areas reserved for defense purposes of the United States;

"(3) there shall apply, to the extent not inconsistent with the laws made applicable by the foregoing provisions of this section, all laws in force within the Territory of Alaska immediately prior to the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, whether enacted by the Congress or by the legislature of the Territory;

"(4) all functions vested in the United States Commissioners by the laws herein made applicable shall continue to be performed by such Commissioners;

"(5) all functions vested, by the laws herein made applicable, in any municipal corporation, school district, or other local political subdivision, shall continue to be performed by such corporation, district, or other subdivision; and

"(6) all other functions vested, by the laws herein made applicable, in the government of the Territory of Alaska, or in any officer or agency thereof, shall be performed by such persons or agencies and in such manner as the President shall from time to time, by Executive order, direct or authorize: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed as limiting the exclusive jurisdiction reserved to the United States by subsection (c) of this section or the authority of the Congress to implement such exclusive jurisdiction by appropriate legislation, or as limiting the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Alaska, or as continuing in effect the laws relating to the legislature of the Territory of Alaska, or as limiting any authority otherwise vested in the Congress or the President, or as denying to persons now or hereafter residing within the area described in subsection (b) of this section the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I think this is the most important point in our admitting Alaska as a State. The question of where we should draw a line, as to whether we should set aside 10 percent, 20 percent, or 40 percent or more of Alaska as a military reservation, was one discussed pro and con in the Committee.

I received a letter from President Eisenhower in which he indicated that while he was somewhat concerned about any conditions of admitting Alaska to the family of States, he does say in his letter addressed to me, and in a similar one addressed to Senator JACKSON, that Secretary McKay had made certain proposals as to the line, and that if Congress approved this particular line he would give it his earnest consideration. I think that is as near as he could come to saying he would support the bill.

This new McKay line we had hoped to put into the bill, if the Rules Committee had not seen fit to report out a rule which would prevent such action, would have taken out about 287,000 square miles, I think about 44 percent of the Territory of Alaska, and set it aside in a military reservation. That is asked for by the military and by the President of the United States.

It is my hope that we can pass this bill, that we do not recommit it, but send it on to the other body, and we can hope that the other body will see fit to put in the line as suggested, and that the legislation may move forward.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Would the gentleman agree with my understanding that this is not a partition line, that this is merely a line north and west of which the President can make national defense withdrawals?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. The people in the area are citizens of the United States and can vote just as citizens in the other area do.

Mr. BARTLETT. On both sides of the line they are citizens of the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. It merely makes it possible for the President to declare a military reservation. The line has been drawn. We had hoped in the committee it would have been possible to present it to the House.

But I beg the House not to recommit this bill but send it over to the other body, and we will get this line in somewhere, and then we can proceed to have a vote on the two States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the representation in this House would not be changed by the adoption of this bill; that the 435 Members would be exactly the same, and yet Hawaii would have 2 seats and Alaska 1, and that that would not upset anybody's seat at all?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; we adopted an amendment here that would not make a permanent change. Some future Congress could, of course, make changes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I agree to all that, but 435 seats have to be differently distributed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Congress will decide that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes; but some States will certainly lose a seat by this arrangement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We may have 437 Members in the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You said it did not add to the 435 seats by the terms of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It does not affect anyone's seat, that is what I said—it will not necessarily affect any seat in Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What does it do?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It might add 2 or 3 more that Congress could accept. That decision rests with Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments subsequent to the one just adopted be considered en bloc, they being pro forma and perfecting amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, referring to page 63, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether this language proposed is to the effect that all sums unexpended over a 1-year period or a 5-year period may be expended at some future time, that is, the sum of $48 million?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend my unanimous consent request to include those amendments subsequent to the amendment just adopted down to and including the amendment on page 64, line 8, which excludes the

amendment to which the gentleman from Iowa refers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's request, if he will answer the question.

Mr. ENGLE. I do not regard this particular amendment as a pro forma amendment and to that extent my unanimous consent request previously made was not a correct statement, therefore, I amend it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 53, line 5, strike out "210" and insert "211."

Page 55, line 5, after the period insert a new sentence as follows: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to lands within such special national defense withdrawal or withdrawals as may be established under authority of section 210 of this act until such lands cease to be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction reserved to the United States by that section."

Page 55, line 11, strike out "211" and insert "212."

Page 57, line 18, strike out "212" and insert "213."

Page 58, line 17, strike out "213" and insert "214."

Page 59, line 13, strike out "214" and insert "215."

Page 60, line 4, strike out "215" and insert "216."

Page 60, line 18, strike out "216" and insert "217."

Page 61, line 5, strike out "217" and insert "218."

Page 61, line 21, strike out "218" and insert "219."

Page 61, line 23, strike out "219" and insert "220."

Page 62, line 4, strike out "220" and insert "221."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 17, insert a new sentence as follows: "Any portions of the sums mentioned in the preceding sentence that are not appropriated for, or obligated during, the particular fiscal year for which their appropriation is authorized by such sentence are hereby authorized to be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to seek information. I simply want to ask the chairman if this means that the sum of $48 million here authorized for appropriation can be carried over and spent in any succeeding year?

Mr. ENGLE. That is how I read the language. I yield to my friend the Delegate from Alaska, for any elaboration of it that he desires to make.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think that about states the case. I would say to the gentleman that although I did not offer the amendment, I approved of it. I think it would carry out the intent of the committee in respect to the aids for roads in Alaska.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that we are providing too much money for this specific purpose?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, sir, I do not. I approved exactly what the committee did in that respect.

Mr. ENGLE. The language does not make any appropriation. It simply authorizes an appropriation. It may be carried over if it is not expended.

Mr. GROSS. Then it does mean that money appropriated for these purposes can be carried over into future years?

Mr. ENGLE. That is as I understand it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The committee discussed this very, very carefully. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee a question about the bill and the procedure. We are on the last amendment. A motion to recommit will come from this side. I have notified my colleagues to vote against the motion for recommittal and vote for the bill. I hope the gentleman will also make that clear as far as his position is concerned.

Mr. ENGLE. I certainly concur in that. We will never get this bill to the Senate by recommitting it. I hope this House will vote down the motion to recommit and vote the bill favorably to the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 8, insert "Any portion of the sums mentioned in the preceding sentence are not appropriated for, or obligated during, the particular fiscal year for which their appropriation is authorized by such sentence are hereby authorized to be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 64, line 23, strike out "221" and insert "222."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and pursuant to House Resolution 223 he reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PILLION. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PILLION moves to recommit the bill H. R. 2535 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 170, answered "present" 3, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—218

Abbitt	Fountain	Mills
Abernethy	Frazier	Morano
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Murray, Tenn.
Alger	Gamble	Natcher
Allen, Ill.	Gary	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Norrell
	Gavin	O'Hara, Minn.
Andresen, August H.	George	O'Neill
	Grant	Ostertag
Andrews	Gregory	Patman
Arends	Gross	Philbin
Ashmore	Gwinn	Phillips
Auchincloss	Haley	Pilcher
Barden	Halleck	Pillion
Bass, Tenn.	Hand	Poage
Bates	Harden	Poff
Baumhart	Hardy	Polk
Beamer	Harris	Preston
Becker	Harrison, Nebr.	Priest
Belcher	Harrison, Va.	Radwan
Bell	Harvey	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Hébert	Ray
Bentley	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Betts	Herlong	Richards
Blitch	Hess	Riley
Bonner	Hiestand	Rivers
Bosch	Hill	Roberts
Boykin	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, La.	Hoeven	Rogers, Fla.
Brooks, Tex.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rutherford
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Sadlak
Brownson	Hosmer	Scherer
Broyhill	Huddleston	Scrivner
Budge	Hull	Scudder
Burleson	Hyde	Seely-Brown
Bush	Ikard	Selden
Cannon	Jackson	Short
Carlyle	James	Sikes
Carrigg	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Chase	Johansen	Smith, Miss.
Chelf	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Wis.	Taber
Clevenger	Jonas	Taylor
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Thomas
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Thompson, La.
Coudert	Kean	Thompson, Mich.
Cramer	Keating	
Curtis, Mass.	Kee	Thomson, Wyo.
Davis, Ga.	Kilburn	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Trimble
Davis, Wis.	Kilgore	Tuck
Deane	King, Pa.	Van Pelt
Delaney	Krueger	Van Zandt
Dempsey	Landrum	Vinson
Derounian	Lanham	Vursell
Devereux	Lankford	Wainwright
Dies	Latham	Watts
Dodd	Lipscomb	Weaver
Donohue	Long	Wharton
Donovan	Lovre	Whitten
Dorn, N. Y.	McGregor	Wigglesworth
Dorn, S. C.	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Dowdy	McVey	Williams, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Macdonald	Willis
Evins	Mahon	Wilson, Ind.
Fascell	Martin	Winstead
Fenton	Mason	Withrow
Fino	Matthews	Wolcott
Fisher	Meader	Wolverton
Flynt	Miller, Md.	Younger
Forrester	Miller, N. Y.	

NAYS—170

Addonizio	Ford	Murray, Ill.
Albert	Friedel	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso	Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Gentry	O'Konski
Aspinall	Gordon	Osmers
Ayres	Granahan	Patterson
Bailey	Gray	Pelly
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Baldwin	Griffiths	Pfost
Barrett	Gubser	Powell
Bass, N. H.	Hagen	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	Prouty
Berry	Hays, Ohio	Quigley
Boggs	Hayworth	Rabaut
Bolling	Hinshaw	Reuss
Bow	Holifield	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bowler	Holmes	Rhodes, Pa.
Boyle	Holtzman	Robsion, Ky.
Bray	Horan	Rodino
Buchanan	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Burdick	Karsten	Rooney
Burnside	Kearney	Roosevelt
Byrd	Kearns	St. George
Byrne, Pa.	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Kelly, N. Y.	Schenck
Carnahan	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Celler	Kirwan	Scott
Chenoweth	Klein	Sheehan
Christopher	Kluczynski	Shelley
Chudoff	Knutson	Sheppard
Church	Lane	Simpson, Ill.
Clark	LeCompte	Sisk
Coon	Lesinski	Spence
Corbett	McCarthy	Springer
Cretella	McCormack	Staggers
Crumpacker	McDonough	Sullivan
Cunningham	McDowell	Talle
Curtis, Mo.	McIntire	Teague, Calif.
Davidson	Machrowicz	Thompson, N. J.
Dawson, Ill.	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson, Utah	Mack, Wash.	Tollefson
Denton	Madden	Tumulty
Diggs	Magnuson	Udall
Dingell	Mailliard	Vanik
Dixon	Marshall	Velde
Dollinger	Merrow	Vorys
Dolliver	Metcalf	Widnall
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Engle	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. J.
Feighan	Minshall	Wilson, Calif.
Fernandez	Mollohan	Wright
Fine	Morgan	Yates
Fjare	Moss	Zablocki
Fogarty	Moulder	Zelenko
Forand	Multer	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Cole	Dague	Edmondson

NOT VOTING—43

Adair	Flood	Passman
Avery	Green, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill.
Boland	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Frances, P.	Hope	Riehlman
	Judd	Shuford
Bolton, Oliver, P.	Keogh	Sieminski
	Knox	Siler
Canfield	Laird	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	McConnell	Steed
Dondero	McCulloch	Utt
Durham	Morrison	Walter
Eberharter	Mumma	Westland
Elliott	Nelson	Wickersham
Fallon	Norblad	Young

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Edmondson against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Cole for, with Mr. Norblad against.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Elliott against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Avery for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Boland against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Heselton for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Steed against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. SHUFORD. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. JUDD. I voted "yea." If he were present he would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. NORBLAD. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with the legislation just disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MACK of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 241, Rept. No. 581) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit tomorrow during general debate on the Defense Appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION FOR THE DAIRY FARMER

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would extend the school milk program for another year and the accelerated brucellosis eradication program for another 2 years, increasing the amount available under the school milk program by $25 million.

The language of my bill is identical to sections 4 and 5 of H. R. 12, the agriculture bill which passed the House on May 5. The need for these sections is widely recognized. They have the support of the administration. They were included in H. R. 12 without any dissent in the Committee on Agriculture. As far as I know, there is no controversy over them.

Unfortunately, they are included in a bill which has no chance of enactment. It is necessary, therefore, that separate legislation be introduced and considered by the Committee on Agriculture and this House if we are to put them into effect.

The major objective in having the House consider H. R. 12 has now been accomplished. Every Member has had the opportunity to record his position on rigid price supports. Now, it is time to get on with agriculture legislation that has a chance of enactment and which everyone is generally agreed should be enacted.

I urge the Committee on Agriculture to act speedily upon this legislation.

THE SMALL AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, May 5, during the debate on the farm bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] referred to certain alleged views of the Undersecretary of Agriculture on the subject of the small American farmer. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I could find the source of these allegations. He declined to yield. I got the floor a few minutes later and asked the gentleman from Ohio if he would supply for the RECORD the source of these alleged views of Mr. Morse inasmuch as they did not coincide with the views I know Mr. Morse holds. In the revised remarks of the gentleman from Ohio appearing in the RECORD of May 5, "according to the newspapers" is the source set forth. This, of course, is too general to be helpful. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Ohio would supply the specific article or articles which he had in mind.

I am inserting into the RECORD some material which sets forth Mr. Morse's true views on the subject of the low-income farmer. Mr. Morse has just been appointed to head the direct program of assistance for low-income farm people of this administration. I believe that from the data I am inserting in the RECORD setting forth Mr. Morse's back-

ground and some of his views it can be readily seen that there could not be a more sympathetic and understanding man to head up this particular program. Furthermore, it clearly shows how completely in error Mr. HAYS' impression of Mr. Morse's views in regard to the small farmer are.

Press release from the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., April 28, 1955:

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today designated Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse as the major USDA official responsible for the direction and coordination of the Department's work in developing a program to provide more effective assistance for low-income farm people.

Proposals were developed for this purpose by Secretary Benson. They are based on a study undertaken by the Department of Agriculture and the National Agricultural Advisory Commission and were transmitted to the Congress on April 27 by the President.

A committee within the USDA is now being established to help guide this work. Representation will be from such agencies as the Agricultural Research Service, Extension Service, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers' Home Administration, Commodity Stabilization Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and Office of Information. The Farm Credit Administration is naming an official to the committee. An interdepartmental committee is also proposed to help direct the program.

Mr. Morse grew up on a small farm near Carthage, Mo., in an area with many low-income farms. For more than 26 years he worked actively with low-income farmers and has been responsible for efforts that have been effective in helping improve their welfare. This assistance included work in some 20 States following World War I and during the depression years.

Opportunities for rural development through more effective planning and work by local leadership have long been advocated by Mr. Morse. He was called upon to originate a rural community development program for Tupelo, in northeast Mississippi. The success of this plan stimulated many other such developments and attracted national recognition. Mr. Morse later directed the development of plans for the Asheville, N. C., and Beckley, W. Va., areas. He also has worked with numerous other areas, groups, and organizations in similar efforts to improve the incomes and general welfare especially of lower-income farm areas.

Feature article appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sunday, May 1:

T. D. MORSE SEEKS HIGHER INCOME FOR THE SMALL FARMER

(By Ed O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Rimming the walnut-paneled office of Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse are 27 framed pictures of different types of typically American farming, from a dairy herd in New England to an irrigated citrus ranch in Arizona.

A farmer calling on Morse, who lived in St. Louis for 26 years before coming here at the start of the Eisenhower administration, probably would be struck by one thing. None of the photographs shows what Morse calls pretty farming.

"You don't see any white fences or fancy estates," he says. "This is practical farming, the kind that accounts for this country's great production of food and fiber."

Morse is a highly practical man. He had to be, as president and later as board chairman of the Doane Agricultural Service, Inc., of St. Louis, a large farm management and consultant organization.

He also has a strongly idealistic bent. One picture shows a kind of farmer who is sometimes overlooked in favor of those who are more prosperous, better organized, and more articulate. This scene portrays a small, struggling farm in the hill country, with four discouraged cows grazing in a stony field beside a rickety farmhouse.

"That could be down in the Ozarks in Missouri or Arkansas," Morse explains. "There are about 1,500,000 families living on low-income farms like that one. Those people are pretty much of a forgotten segment of rural life."

All the hubbub about flexible versus rigid farm price supports, he continues, has little to do with the plight of the low-income farmers. By and large, they don't produce enough to get the benefit of supports. On the other hand, they are often hurt by supports, because the price of the feed grains they have to buy is pushed higher.

Morse worked more than a year on a special Agriculture Department study of low-income farmers and how to help them. This week the study bore fruit, in a special message to Congress from President Eisenhower, suggesting a 15-point program aimed at raising incomes, loosening credit, improving vocational training, and creating jobs. The Ozarks' region and parts of southern Illinois were among low-income areas spotted.

One meaningful achievement already on the books, Morse declares, is the extension of social-security coverage to farm families "after 19 years of denial." This is especially important, he says, to small farmers, who generally have little opportunity to accumulate savings toward their old age.

As Agriculture Secretary Benson's right-hand man, Morse has been in on the ground floor of these and other parts of the Eisenhower administration's farm program, from the early drafting stage to the present battle to retain flexible price supports.

A mild, somewhat retiring man himself, Morse characterizes that program as "positive, dynamic, and aggressive." It is based, he contends, on "freedom for farmers, expanding production, increasing consumption, competitive prices that build markets, efficiency, quality products, salesmanship, and sound governmental programs and actions."

The Truman-Brannan approach, in Morse's view, was "negative and defeatist, involving a philosophy of scarcity, price fixing, regulations, controls, undue reliance on the Government, failure to hold and develop markets, and unwillingness to meet competition."

Morse's argument for the Eisenhower program runs like this: Under the Truman administration, farmers were caught in a price-cost squeeze that knocked the parity ratio from 113 to 94 in 2 years. In the 27 months of the Eisenhower administration, the decline has been largely checked. Now the ratio is 86.

All of this decline occurred while the basic commodities had high, rigid supports, which are still in effect, Morse contends. But the products with no price supports or only moderate ones have been moving into consumption with no big build-up of surpluses for any extended period.

The flexible supports which generated so much controversy in Congress last year are scheduled to go into effect with this year's harvests. Then will come the real test—provided rigid supports are not restored in the meantime by the Democratic Congress.

"We're concerned that Congress is even considering going back to flat 90 percent supports," says Morse, "in view of the pile-up of surplus commodities."

At present the Government has $8,500,000,000 invested in farm surpluses. The Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles price supports, has total borrowing authority of $10 billion. Now Morse, who is president of CCC, is wondering if that will be enough.

The answer, he believes, is flexible or lower supports, geared to supply, plus an aggressive sales policy.

Despite the drop in farm prices in past years, Morse cites figures to support his feeling that farmers are much better off than critics of the administration are asserting.

He is cheered, for instance, by a recent upswing in farmland values, particularly in the Midwest. He points out too that farm debt is not rising and that per capita income of farm people went up last year.

Then, taking a long look ahead through his rimless eyeglasses, farm-born True Morse says, "We don't see any further squeeze on our farmers. We expect to build back to more profitable farming."

Excerpts from a speech delivered by True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, to the Georgia Poultry Festival, Gainesville, Ga., Saturday, May 16, 1953:

Family farms are the solid backbone of your State and of the Nation. We are vitally concerned that they be strengthened as they continue to stand as a bulwark against all that is aimed at weakening and destroying our American way of life.

The small farms and those of low incomes, such as many in this area, need the special attention of all of us. In the development of the poultry industry and its related activities you have a fine demonstration of how incomes of underemployed farmers can be greatly expanded.

It has been my privilege in past years to take the lead in rural development programs. This was pioneering work in areas of small farms with low incomes. It was done in States like Mississippi, North Carolina, and West Virginia, in communities where the average farm size was as low as 40 acres. It has perhaps been some of my most constructive work, because of the economic and social importance of farm families.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

HATE, INC.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have recently received in the mail a copy of the April issue of a pamphlet called Headlines. The subject matter of this issue is entitled "Cowards in the United States Congress." The pamphlet is a scurrilous and viciously untrue attack on leading national Jewish organizations and the House Un-American Activities Committee for issuing its report on neo-Fascist and hate groups.

The pamphlet is a contempt of the Congress, and it is not surprising that the author is Joseph P. Kamp who has been twice cited for contempt by Congress and who has served time in jail for contempt. Kamp has long been one of the Nation's leading hatemongers. As far back as the midthirties, he won the

commendation of the Nazis for his pro-Fascist sympathies. Such great Americans as President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren have been the targets of his vilification and his abuse.

It is a fortunate coincidence that almost at the very time that Members of Congress were receiving the latest product of Kamp's poisonous pen that the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in a series by Jack Steele entitled "Hate, Inc." were setting the record straight on just who Mr. Kamp is. In the last installment of this splendid series he reviews organized bigotry in the United States and the un-American activities of Joseph P. Kamp.

Permit me to read Mr. Steele's article as follows:

THE FIFTH COLUMNISTS OF HATE AND PREJUDICE

(By Jack Steele)

New rightwing and isolationist groups now springing to life are providing a happy hunting ground for peddlers of prejudice.

Bigots of varying kind and degree are trying to infiltrate and take over these organizations set up to give voice to ultra-conservative or neonationalist sentiments.

Such groups are legitimate enough and have an unchallengeable role to play in the formation of American public opinion, just as do those of the non-Communist left.

But haters hope to use these groups for their own ends—either as covers for trouble-making or as paths to the pocketbooks of wealthy and unsuspecting angels.

In efforts to infiltrate rightwing groups, the forces of bigotry have adopted the fifth-column tactics of the Communists.

They readily take over and preach the doctrines of the particular group they want to penetrate. Often they cover their operations with an aura of intrigue and conspiracy.

Some operators try to conceal or explain away their own unsavory pasts. Others hide their prejudices behind euphemisms designed to fool the unwary and confuse their critics.

These tactics make such infiltration hard to tag, as these recent case histories will indicate·

JOSEPH P. KAMP

He has been one of the Nation's most prolific pamphleteers. He turns out brochures loaded with distortions and appeals to fear and prejudice. Then he sells batches of them to businessmen and others to distribute "where they will do the most good."

Who supplies the money to keep Joe Kamp going? He won't say.

He went to jail for 4 months for contempt rather than disclose the sources of his revenue to a House Campaign Expenditures Committee in 1944. He was convicted on similar charges in 1950, but won a retrial and acquittal.

Kamp, who refers to anti-Semitism as a "dirty little Communist swear word," vehemently denies that he is anti-Semitic.

But dislike of Jews crept into much of his literature. That was the case with anti-Eisenhower propaganda he turned out before the 1952 convention.

He devoted two 16-page issues of his publication, Headlines, to candidate Eisenhower. The first was headed "Who's Promoting and What's Behind 'We Want Ike'?" and the second, "More About What's Behind Ike."

Kamp's answer was obvious—Communists and Jews.

These editions were widely distributed to supporters of the late Senator Robert A. Taft (Republican, Ohio). Senator Taft repudiated them and the Volunteers for Taft denounced them as "scurrilous, un-American, and defamatory."

But hate sheets copied freely from them.

More recently Kamp has cashed in on Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S fame. He formed a front called the Committee for McCarthyism and put out a "miniature library" of pamphlets on Senator MCCARTHY.

He also took it upon himself last year to answer the "McCarthy Balance Sheet"—a series of articles by Scripps-Howard reporter Frederick Woltman, who won a Pulitzer prize for exposing Communists. Kamp's pamphlet was entitled: "The Red-Addled Brain Behind the Scripps-Howard Smear of Senator MCCARTHY."

Hatemongers Conde McGinley, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Gerald Winrod praised and quoted from it. Mr. Smith wrote: "We are indebted to the brilliant commentator Joseph P. Kamp for a very special article on Frederick Woltman who was called out of Roy Howard's journalistic brothel to do a job on the great MCCARTHY."

Kamp's most recent pamphlets have attacked tax-exempt foundations—and suggested boycotts of the products of companies which finance them.

ALLAN A. ZOLL

He is another pamphleteer and promoter whose most successful venture was the National Council for American Education. This outfit, with a name easily confused with the respected American Council on Education, fomented a wave of troubles in the public schools.

Here's how it worked.

Mr. Zoll's Council put out pamphlets which served as blueprints for exposing school administrators, teachers, and textbooks as being Red-tinged and for attacking so-called educational frills.

These were sold to taxpayer groups interested in cutting school costs and to patriotic groups aroused by Mr. Zoll's extravagant Red charges. Use of the pamphlets touched off a rash of battles in public-school systems across the Nation.

The New York World Telegram and Sun first disclosed that Mr. Zoll was behind all this and told who he was.

Mr. Zoll in 1937 founded and became national commander of the American Patriots, Inc. Attorney General Francis Biddle in 1940 listed it as Fascist. Mr. Zoll called this a New Deal smear, but the now-defunct group is still carried on the Attorney General's list for the Eisenhower administration's security program.

In 1939 Mr. Zoll appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee and opposed confirmation of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter on grounds that he was a Jew. Yet Mr. Zoll claims he hates anti-Semitism.

He also organized the picketing of radio station WMCA in New York when it took Father Charles E. Coughlin off the air. He was indicted on charges of taking a bribe to call off the pickets, but the case was dismissed without being brought to trial.

Mr. Zoll has been inactive since he married the elderly widow of an oil millionaire late in 1953. She sued for divorce last December.

Mr. Zoll is now back in his New York haunts—presumably ready for a new venture.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The U. N. is one of the major targets of blatant bigots. Gerald L. K. Smith and his fellow hatemongers rarely miss a chance to charge that the U. N. is part of a Jewish-Communist plot to destroy the sovereignty of the United States.

Neoisolationists who are forming new groups patterned after the old America First Committee likewise center their attacks on the U. N.—without, of course, combining them with appeals to prejudice and bigotry.

But these parallel attacks on the U. N. and one-worldism can and do create a good deal of confusion.

Take the case of W. Henry MacFarland, Jr.

Mr. MacFarland now runs the American Flag Committee from his home in Philadelphia.

Attacks on the U. N. issued under its imprint have been widely circulated in the last few years, and widely reprinted by hate sheets.

But many people who have read and perhaps been influenced by the publications of the American Flag Committee know little about Mr. MacFarland's background.

A onetime admirer and supporter of Gerald Smith, Mr. MacFarland once ran from the same address in Philadelphia an outfit called the Nationalist Action League.

The Attorney General cited the Nationalist Action League as Fascist on April 27, 1949, and its name still appears on the Justice Department's list.

A few weeks after it was so listed, Mr. MacFarland sought to unite the Nationalist Action League with a group of supporters of hatemonger, Conde McGinley. For a short time, Mr. McGinley's Common Sense was the official organ of the league.

The House Un-American Activities Committee charged in its report in December on hate groups that Mr. MacFarland had also been active in the National Renaissance Party, a group branded by the committee as neo-Fascist.

Mr. MacFarland's union with Mr. McGinley did not last long. Soon after it broke up he formed the American Flag Committee as a vehicle for his attacks on the U. N.

Mr. MacFarland now assures his supporters that the American Flag Committee is an avowed enemy of fascism.

In one of his publications he offered this explanation of attacks on his own background:

"Neither the (American Flag) committee nor its chairman has ever been cited as Fascist by the United States Attorney General, nor by any other Federal or congressional body."

Technically, Mr. MacFarland is correct.

The Attorney General cites only organizations, and not the individuals who run them, on his list, which is used as the basis for the Government's loyalty-security program.

And the American Flag Committee has never been cited by anyone.

This is a good point for me to read, Bert Andrew's article entitled "Smear Artist at Work—Joseph Kamp, Cited by Nazis, Splatters Mud at Eisenhower," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 12, 1952, as follows:

Political campaigns are never conducted on a sweetness and light plane, but evidence is already at hand which indicates that some pamphleteers are preparing to dive to a new low in the 1952 contest.

One piece of such evidence is a 16-page pamphlet called Headlines and What's Behind Them, published by Joseph P. Kamp, at 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Mr. Kamp is against General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Republican Presidential nomination.

It's hard to tell who he is for, although he does speak approvingly of Senator Robert A. Taft and General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

WORDS DISTORTED

He opposes General Eisenhower with some of the most vicious and distorted language ever used in a campaign document. He apparently writes in the belief that the Eisenhower campaign leaders won't fight back, but he is wrong, for the New York headquarters of the Eisenhower backers has already sent copies of a memorandum to branch offices, saying in part:

"The pamphlet is a high-level smear job that is being circulated throughout the country. It is full of distortions, slanted interpretations and errors. The purpose of this note is to give you a few highlights from

the career of the pamphlet's author, Joseph P. Kamp."

The memorandum then discusses Mr. Kamp's past.

It tells of his work in the midthirties as executive editor of the Awakener, which it calls "a periodical so apparently sympathetic to the Fascist cause that it won high commendation on two different occasions from World Service, the Nazi propaganda paper published in Erfurt, Germany."

It recalls that he was a member of the committee which gave a testimonial dinner for Maj. Gen. George Van Horn Mosely, retired, in 1938 when General Moseley was so far to the right that he was almost all by himself.

It points out that Mr. Kamp served 4 months for contempt of Congress for refusing to turn over to the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures a list of contributors to the Constitutional Education League. He was cited a second time for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the House committee investigating lobbying practices. He was convicted, the conviction was set aside on a technicality, and on a retrial he was acquitted.

SCATTER GUN USED

The Kamp pamphlet attempts to smear Eisenhower as being everything from a Democrat to an internationalist, a Communist bedfellow, a backer of Communists and fellow travelers.

Some of the headlines give the general idea:

"Reds, New Dealers Use Ike in Plot To Hold Power."

"Red Rag First Newspaper To Ballyhoo for Ike."

"Ike's First Sponsor Acted for Powerful Secret Subversive Group."

"Eisenhower Joins Reds in Stand Against Loyalty Oath for Teachers."

"Ike Coddled Communists While President of Columbia University."

"Red-Lover Backs Ike."

Those are just samples.

But perhaps the lowest depth of all is reached with the headline:

"Moscow Thinks Ike Can Get the Votes."

That headline is followed by the following paragraph:

"This is the message that was delivered to Columbia University the other day when Warren Moscow, 'New York Times' political writer, declared that Truman could beat Taft in New York but that General Eisenhower could carry the State against either."

RIGHTEOUS WORDS

On one page an oddity appears—an indignant attack on any one who uses smear tactics. It reads:

"Taft and MacArthur supporters may expect the mud-guns to go to work on them as the convention nears. While all decent Americans deplore the raising of religious and minority issues in a campaign which should be conducted on the plane of honest debate, General Ike has too many poison-pen experts in his entourage to keep such filth out of the campaign.

"These despicable smear artists have been so successful in destroying their patriotic opposition so many times in the past that in their present role as Eisenhower supporters they can be expected to use their lying tactics again and again."

Then Mr. Kamp dips his pen and writes:

"The opponents of General Ike can meet such opposition only by telling the truth over and over again."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS REGARDING HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD explanations of two bills which I introduced on May 5, 1955. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of including this material in the RECORD will be a total of $367.

The first of these explanations relates to H. R. 6040, the Customs Simplification Act of 1955. The Committee on Ways and Means is scheduled to begin public hearings on this legislation on May 23, 1955. The cost of printing this analysis is $180.

The second explanation relates to H. R. 6059, the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955. The Committee on Ways and Means is scheduled to begin public hearings on this legislation on May 16, 1955. The cost of printing this explanation is $187.

I deem it desirable that these explanations be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the information contained in them may be available to the Members of Congress and to the public.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 240) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The oath of office was then administered to Mr. MCCORMACK (Speaker pro tempore) by the Speaker.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, we commemorate Rumanian Independence Day which has long been celebrated by Rumanian patriots in all parts of the world as a day of national unity.

The Rumanian nation, history tells us, was constructed by the descendants of the Roman colonists many centuries ago. Down through history Rumania has stood as one of the strong and sturdy ramparts of European freedom and the noble cause of Christianity. As a consequence of her geographical position as well as her strong loyalty to the cause of an advanced civilization Rumania has often been the scene of war and martyrdom.

Today this historic nation of some 20 millions of people suffers under the heavy yoke of Russian-Communist imperialism. While it is true that the Rumanians have known the cruel whip of Moscow in past generations, the Communist whip now in the hands of the Kremlin masters is more cruel, brutal, and inhuman than any before lashed over the backs of the Rumanian people. The well-known resistance of the Rumanians to both the Czarist and Communist Russian types of imperialism has made their task of keeping alive the spark of freedom and the national heritage far more difficult. It is a truism that the Russians hand out their recognized punishment in direct proportion to the degree of resistance to Russification offered by the population of any of the captive non-Russian nations. All freedom-loving Americans, therefore, on this, the traditional Rumanian Independence Day, pay tribute to those loyal and sturdy patriots who stand fast in their faith for the future of Rumania and all mankind.

It is proper that on this day we should recall that on March 6, 1945, an infamous executioner of Communist crimes, Andrei Vyshinsky, with the overwhelming help of the Red army, installed a Russian puppet government in Bucharest. At the very moment the master criminal, Vyshinsky, was proclaiming that "in Rumania, I am Yalta," 19 Rumanian divisions, comprising over 335,000 men, were fighting shoulder to shoulder with the allies. This first act of treachery was followed by the signing of a so-called peace treaty for Rumania in February 1947.

While we pay tribute to Rumanian Independence Day, it is timely that we turn our attention to the diplomatic conference now going on in Vienna, Austria, looking forward to the signing of a peace treaty for Austria which would grant her well-deserved independence. For 10 long years the United States has taken the initiative to bring about a peace treaty for Austria. For 10 long years the Russians have used every conceivable excuse and evasion to prevent such a treaty from coming into effect. Now it seems the Russians are attempting to use the just aspirations of the Austrians for national independence as a propaganda weapon to prevent the free Western World from finally achieving European unity for a common defense. The Kremlin claims, however, that they are sincere in their desire to give Austria its independence, that they are sincere in their claims that peaceful coexistence between the free world and the totalitarian empire of Moscow is feasible. There are those who say that the Russians might be sincere in their claims. There are those of us who have made a careful study of the record of Communist tyranny who, of necessity, demand that the Russians show good faith on a reasonable scale before any serious thought be given to their claims of peaceful coexistence and a desire to lessen world tension.

I believe, however, that the conference of diplomats now taking place in Vienna provides the Russians with an unusual opportunity to demonstrate whether or not they have any good faith. That opportunity is provided by article 21 of the

Rumanian Peace Treaty of 1947 which provided the legal basis for the Soviet Union to maintain armed forces in Romania for the purpose of maintaining lines of communication between Moscow and the Red army of occupation in Austria. It is important to note in this connection that the present lines of communication through Rumanian territory into Austria varies in distance between 845 and 910 miles, whereas the most direct route from Moscow to Vienna is only 395 miles long and moreover, the facilities already established on that direct route are much superior to those lines established through Rumania. It is clear that it would be far less expensive and in every sense more efficient for the Kremlin to maintain direct lines of communication with its diplomatic mission in Vienna after the Austrian Peace Treaty comes into force and effect. If the Russians use the direct line of communication between Moscow and Vienna, it would no longer be necessary for them to keep Red troops quartered in Rumania unless the Kremlin either fears that the stooge government it set up will not be able to keep the Rumanian people under control, or the Kremlin is planning a war against the West in the immediate future. These are the only two possible reasons which could account for the Russians continuing their occupation of Rumania. The Russians can prove any good intentions they may possess by a complete withdrawal of all military and economic cadres from Rumania and Hungary at the same time they are withdrawing their troops from Austria.

All of us sincerely hope that the masters of the Kremlin have seen the folly of their ways and are now willing to join with us in all steps leading to peace and justice throughout the world, but we must not allow our high hopes for mankind to lead us up any blind alleys with the masters of the Kremlin.

It has been called to my attention that the Russian master planners have instituted a new program of mass deportations from Bessarabia, that territory taken from Rumania and now referred to as the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic. This program of mass deportations is, of course, being carried out under one of the new banners of Soviet patriotism created by the new czar, Khrushchev. While making appeals in the Russian-controlled newspapers and radios for workers to pioneer in vast areas of the empire and at the same time holding out what appear to be rich financial rewards for those who cooperate with the Kremlin, the mass transfer of population is, nevertheless, carried out on an involuntary basis.

This Congress was officially informed of mass deportations of this type affecting the Crimean Tatars, the Chechin-Inguish, and the Kalmuck nations by the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress. Testimony was taken by that committee from a Russian colonel who was directly in charge of an operation transferring the entire Chechin-Inguish nation to the Tundra regions of Siberia in the course of 24 hours. The Russian colonel made it clear that this mass deportation was carried out for the purpose of destroying a non-Russian nation because of its opposition to the plans of Moscow. In the case of Bessarabia, the masters of Moscow have become more clever and deceptive, but have in no way altered their formula of treatment for nations which oppose their desire for world domination. While Khrushchev may call for pioneers to settle and develop vast regions of the U. S. S. R., the fact remains that this is nothing but a cover for the brutal transfer of an entire population to geographical areas of the Russian Empire where it is impossible for them to eke out an existence and where the likelihood remains that they will perish in the course of several years.

On February 10, 1955, under special order which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1437, I took occasion to call public attention to the tremendous crisis which had developed in the agricultural life of the Soviet Union. At that time, I also called attention to the Khrushchev plan for moving huge segments of the non-Russian population of the empire into barren and unproductive regions of the U. S. S. R. for the purpose of eliminating resistance elements. Here is an excerpt from my address of that date:

More recently Khrushchev has been the advocate of a new population transfer within the U. S. S. R. He calls it the pioneer-resettlement program. Some Russian propagandists have even likened this program to the efforts of the American pioneers. The essence of his plan is to move millions of people from their native lands to the interior reaches of the U. S. S. R.—there to reclaim millions of acres of land for food production. Naturally these people are not going to go there voluntarily because they are not fooled by the propaganda of Khrushchev. This has resulted in another wave of forced deportations from the non-Russian nations of the Communist empire. All those who resist the decaying process of communism are rounded up as volunteers, for the new pioneer movement. This is the latest device created by Khrushchev to break the spirit of resistance within the empire and at the same time to hide the facts concerning it from the civilized world. How many millions of people will be purged by this scheme is anyone's guess. But of one thing we may be sure, this silent but thorough purge would not be underway if there were not great internal troubles confronting the Communists.

In my opinion the good people of Bessarabia are now being subjected to this brutal treatment by Khrushchev.

Against this background, I have here before me a translation of an article which appeared in Sovietskaya Moldavia, a Moscow publication in Bessarabia which appeared a few days ago. I would like to read it because it bears upon the clever scheme of Khrushchev to camouflage the extermination of whole nations with clever propaganda terms which even the Nazis lacked the evil cunning to create:

The General Directorate for the transfer of residence and planned recruitment of workers, of the Council of Ministers of the S. S. Republic of Moldavia, organizers of the planed transfer (of workers) from regions of the S. S. Republic of Moldavia to the kolkhozes in the regions of Astrakhan and Rostov (R. S. F. S. R.) and of the region of Pavlodar of the R. S. S. of Kazakhstan.

Citizens who will enlist voluntarily for this transfer will enjoy free traveling facilities to the locality of residence, including all personal belongings up to 2 tons for each family

The State will grant, at the same time, a bonus of 500 to 800 rubles to the heads of family and 150 to 300 rubles to other members of the family. On their new residences, the settlers will enjoy exemption of agricultural taxation as well as of state deliveries of farm products for a period of 2 years. They will receive foodstuffs as additional relief.

The settlers are offered long-term credits for the construction of dwellings (with a 10-year amortization) and for the purchase of livestock (with a 3-year amortization) as well as other facilities.

The transfer is in force in the districts of Ataky, Belzy, Bendery, Bravitchy, Britchansk, Grodiansk Drokiew, Iedinetz, Zgouritz, Kalavach, Korpensk, Kichenev, Notovak, Kotionpansk, Nisporiensk, Oknitza, Resink, Soroky, Strachensk, Souslensk, Tyrnow.

All informations can be obtained from the executive committees of the districts and from the delegates in charge of transfers and planned recruiting of workers.

On this, the traditional anniversary of Rumanian independence, I call upon President Eisenhower to issue an official protest against the new program of mass deportations which the Kremlin has announced for the good and patriotic people of Bessarabia. The conscience of mankind demands that we take official notice of and raise our voices in protest against what the Russians are about to do to the people of Bessarabia.

Let us all hope and pray that the day is not far distant when the Rumanian people will be able to celebrate their historic day of independence, free of Russian domination and once again a sovereign nation within the family of nations.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON LEGAL SERVICES AND PROCEDURES

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1955, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government submitted its report on legal services and procedure to the Congress. Three days later its chairman, Mr. Hoover, issued the report of the task force which was concerned with this problem.

As a Member of Congress and as a lawyer, I believe that the issues involved are of the utmost gravity and should be carefully considered by the Congress, the legal profession, and the citizenry at large. Therefore, I am introducing the two bills which were developed by the task force to implement the suggestions made in its report. I have included an amendment of my own in the bill to improve legal procedures in the executive branch of the Government through the enactment of an administrative code

which I believe merits serious consideration. This amendment provides that the sections dealing with hearings and judicial review of administrative decisions shall apply to certain proceedings which may result in the dismissal of officers or employees of the Federal Government.

The New York Herald Tribune said editorially on April 12, 1955, that the Hoover Commission report on legal services and procedure faces up to one of the knottiest problems created by the vast expansion of Government in recent years. This is administrative law—a body of regulations which have virtually the force of law which are drawn up and enforced by executive agencies. The problem with which the Commission deals involves the 50 agencies of the Federal executive department which have come into being as the powers of the Government to regulate our economic and political life have grown, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The New York Times in an editorial on April 14, 1955, said:

For the most part these Boards and Commissions not only investigate alleged violations of the laws with which they are concerned—and of their own rules and regulations—but they have the power to pass judgment on those they believe to be transgressors. As the Hoover Commission points out, they often act "as judge, jury, defense and prosecuting attorney" in the same case—as if a police department had the power to try and to sentence those they arrest.

The New York Times added that—

The proposals of the Hoover Commission may be faulty in details—and the details are multitudinous—but the administrative court idea raises an issue of deep import to the American people, and at a time when the executive arm of the Government increasingly elbows its way into our private and business affairs. It deserves the widest possible discussion—and prompt action, if no serious objections can be found.

The Hoover Commission itself is divided on some of the recommendations of the task force which considered this difficult subject. Half of the members, including Mr. Hoover, did not vote for a series of proposed amendments to the Administrative Procedure Act, but believed they should be included in the report because of the importance of the issues and the eminence of the task force. However, the major recommendation of the task force in this field, the creation of a new administrative court, won the support of all but 2 of the 12 members of the Commission. I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the separate statements by the members of the Commission which appear in the report submitted to the Congress. These are included here. The Commission had the services of a task force, consultants, and assistants of the most distinguished order. The consultants included Robert H. Jackson, former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and Arthur T. Vanderbilt, chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Short statements on each of the task force members, its consultants, and assistants have been included here, as well as some of the newspaper articles dealing with the report which appeared in various newspapers throughout the Nation.

Dr. Lillian Wald Kay, assistant director of research, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, recently made available to me a roundup of editorial opinion on the legal services and procedure report. This also is included here.

IV. SEPARATE STATEMENTS BY COMMISSIONERS

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOOVER AND COMMISSIONERS BROWNELL, FLEMMING, HOLLISTER, KENNEDY, AND MITCHELL [1]

This report on legal services and procedure contains 52 recommendations. We fully support recommendations Nos. 1 to 28, inclusive, and Nos. 49 to 52, inclusive.

Recommendations Nos. 29 to 48, inclusive, deal mostly with proposed amendments to the Administrative Procedure Act. We did not vote for these recommendations because of their possible consequences and possible increase in the expenditures of the Government.

However, we felt that in view of the searching investigation and the eminence at the bar of the members of the task force who proposed the changes upon which recommendations Nos. 29 to 48, inclusive, are largely based, these should be furnished to the Congress but without Commission action upon them.

HERBERT J. BROWNELL, Jr.
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING.
SOLOMON C. HOLLISTER.
HERBERT HOOVER.
JOSEPH P. KENNEDY.
SIDNEY A. MITCHELL.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER BROWN

The nature of some of the recommendations in this report on legal services and procedure makes it necessary for me to reserve the right to disagree with them in my capacity as a Member of the 84th Congress.

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Commissioner.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER FARLEY

With some reservations, I voted in favor of adopting the recommendations in chapter III on administrative procedure, so that by Commission action these recommendations would be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration. I am aware that these recommendations are extremely technical and it is difficult for a layman to conceive of the practical problems which might be created by them. For this reason they will require careful analysis and study by the Congress.

Among others, I do not agree with recommendation No. 36 because it makes it possible for any one wishing to interfere with or delay proper administrative investigation to go to the courts at its inception and hold off the investigation by claiming that the agency is exceeding its constitutional or statutory power. With subsequent appeals, this would make it possible for those who would benefit from such action to forestall for a long period agency investigations and the performance of the regulatory duties imposed upon the agencies by the Congress.

I do not agree with recommendation No. 37 as it raises the serious problem of whether agency heads can consult with their expert and technical advisers in deciding cases if the latter have had any part in the investigation or prosecution of the cases. This may require establishing costly duplicate staffs whose work would be confined solely to furnishing the agency members with technical guidance for the purpose of making decisions.

I do not agree with recommendation No. 48. This is much broader than recommendation No. 36, since it applies to all agency proceedings at any stage and is not limited only to investigations.

With respect to recommendation No. 51, creating an Administrative Court, I agree that the Tax Court could properly be transferred from the executive branch to the judicial branch. However, with respect to the suggested trade and labor sections of the Administrative Court, I have reservation as to the advisability of withdrawing certain regulatory functions from the agencies concerned, and transferring them to such a court.

JAMES A. FARLEY,
Commissioner.

DISSENT AND SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER CHET HOLIFIELD

My objections to the Commission's report on legal services and procedure are noted below under specific subject headings. Generally, I believe the report is too legalistic in its approach to problems of Government organization and management. The recommendations would vest in the Office of Attorney General duties and prerogatives which I consider unnecessary and unwise, and would recast the administrative process in the image of the courts.

It is difficult for one who is not a lawyer to evaluate the impact of each and every recommendation in the report regarding changes in administrative procedure. Considered individually, some have merit. Taken together, they may have consequences that are drastic and costly and impractical from the standpoint of efficient Government administration.

In agreeing that chapter III (legal procedure) should be included in the report submitted to the Congress, I am concerned with those recommendations which would insure fair treatment of citizens dealing with their Government and protection of their legal rights. I do not believe that these objectives require a basic alteration of the administrative process.

A further careful exploration of this subject by the Congress is indicated.

Authority for legal staffs

It might be well for the Congress to review the employment of legal staffs by executive agencies to determine whether there is overstaffing or improper classification of legal personnel. However, the argument in support of recommendation No. 1 is that some agencies lack statutory authority to employ legal staffs seems misplaced.

Either there is a presumption of validity based upon the general authority of an agency to employ personnel and upon recurring appropriations for legal as well as other staffs, or else the salaries should have been disallowed by the Comptroller General.

Laws dating back to the creation of the Department of Justice in 1870 bar other departments or agencies from hiring and compensating lawyers except where their employment is specifically authorized by law, and even then the Attorney General must certify that the services could not be performed by his Department (secs. 189, 357, 361, 363, 365, and 367 of the Revised Statutes, codified as 5 U. S. C. 49, 306, 307, 309, 312, 314, and 316, respectively).

From time to time the Attorney General and the Comptroller General have applied these statutes and decided that Government agencies could not employ or pay lawyers (18 Op. A G. 135; 19 Op. A. G. 328; 4 Comp. Gen. 386; 5 Comp. Gen. 382, 517; 28 Ct. of Claims 483).

Indeed, by virtue of this statutory authority, the Attorney General once extended his sway across the ocean to prevent the Navy from hiring a lawyer to maintain a damage suit in a foreign court against a British steamer which collided with Capt.

[1] Commissioners Flemming and Kennedy were absent from the Commission meeting at which recommendations Nos. 29 to 48 were approved, and thus did not vote.

Alfred T. Mahan's vessel in the harbor of Antwerp (21 Op. A. G. 195).

As late as 1952 the Comptroller General reviewed and applied these statutes to prevent employment of counsel by the Department of Navy in certain attempted litigation (32 Comp. Gen. 118).

What would be gained by congressional amendment of various agency statutes merely to include "attorney" or "counsel" in the sections of those statutes which authorize employment of personnel? More to the point are the size and functions of legal staffs, and these are subject to review and limitation by the Congress in yearly appropriation acts.

The report implies, but does not specifically state as a recommendation, that no agency requiring less than 10 legal positions be authorized to hire its own lawyers but that its legal work be performed by the Department of Justice. The contention is that lawyers in small agencies lack the desired professional caliber and independence and that economies could be effected by eliminating their positions. I cannot agree.

If the Department of Justice were to undertake the performance of these legal services for other agencies, it would have to add various small legal units, highly specialized in agency programs and required to give them full time and attention.

Either these lawyers would be constantly running back and forth between the Department of Justice and the agency that needs them, or they would be detailed on a full-time basis—the very situation the report seeks to avoid.

The difficulties would be compounded by the fact that legal staffs in some departments or agencies are located in field offices as well as in Washington.

Department of Justice lawyers performing legal services for other departments or agencies would be involved in the administration of programs for which their own department head is not responsible. Thus problems of dual supervision of these attorneys would arise.

Of course a statutory ban on employment of legal staffs would not prevent agencies from hiring examiners or specialists with legal training but not classified as attorneys. In such cases there would be duplicate legal staffs in the Department of Justice and in the agencies, where single staffs prevailed before.

Coordination of legal services

It seems gratuitous to say (recommendation No. 2) that the Department of Justice should be recognized as the chief law office of the Government and that it should conduct all litigation before the courts except as Congress authorizes. This is substantially the situation today.

Traditionally and by statute the Attorney General is the chief legal adviser to the President and may be called upon to give advisory opinions to the heads of departments.

The courts have long recognized this statutory provision of the Attorney General and his authority and duty to institute and conduct litigation (*United States* v. *San Jacinto Tin Co.* (125 U. S. 273, 279); *Walling* v. *Crane* (64 F. Supp. 88, 90); *U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 27)).

It is true that in certain cases Congress has empowered departments or agencies to conduct their own litigation. The tax force has not made a comparative analysis of the results of separate agency litigation. It is difficult to say, therefore, whether Congress should be asked to remove the exceptions by statutory amendments.

There may be a few instances of substantial duplication of legal staffs; for example, lawyers of the Department of Justice and of the Treasury Department both are engaged in tax litigation. However, the special status and jurisdiction of the tax courts are here involved and should be considered as a separate problem.

I would suppose that in most litigation, whether carried on by the Department of Justice or by agencies individually, there is a close degree of cooperation. Because of the specialized nature of agency litigation, the Department of Justice, in most cases would depend upon, or be associated with, agency legal personnel in the preparation, if not the presentation, of suits.

Aside from litigation, the emphasis in the report on "positive coordination through the Department of Justice" seems to contemplate for the Attorney General more than an advisory role. If so, the Attorney General would be placed in the position of interfering with specific agency programs or with the performance of legal personnel responsible to their agency heads. Such interference has been considered improper by holders of the Attorney General's office (17 Op. A. G. 332; 38 Op. A. G. 182).

Recommendations of this sort assume that legal services are a homogeneous activity which can be segregated from department or agency functions and supervised or directed by an outside legal authority (the Attorney General). Thus the report states: "The lack of effective coordination of legal staffs has created a fragmentation of legal services within the executive branch."

Legal services are "fragmented" because numerous agencies, bureaus, or divisions require legal services in the administration of manifold governmental programs. To assume that the Attorney General could give direct or immediate attention to the legal features of these programs is wholly unrealistic. In years past, when Government was simple and small, this concept may have had some validity, but today it is hardly applicable.

Part of the trouble with the argument, it seems to me, lies in the assumption that the business of Government lawyers is mainly with the courts. Litigation and adversary proceedings are a relatively minor part of the legal work of the Government. Agency lawyers devote a large portion of their time to legislative work and to the rules and regulations that flow from legislation. Frequently they must participate in the presentation of their agency programs to the Congress and in assisting congressional committees in developing technical legislative bills concerning their particular agencies.

It is neither fitting for the Attorney General to attempt to supervise such work nor possible for his office to acquire the fund of knowledge concerning legislative detail which is held by legal staffs of Government departments or agencies.

Resolution of legal conflicts

Recommendation No. 3 proposes an arrangement whereby the Attorney General would attempt to resolve conflicting department or agency legal opinions or interpretations of statutes. To the extent that these are matters of law arising in the administration of department programs, the Attorney General already has authority of great force and effect. Vesting additional authority in the Attorney General by statute would create a number of complications:

(1) The Attorney General might be placed in the untenable positions of deciding conflicts between his Department and other departments or agencies.

(2) He might be faced with the problem of overriding the decision of an independent agency not completely subject to executive direction or of a Government corporation in which the Congress has vested the authority of suing or being sued in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) He might come in conflict with the Comptroller General who has statutory authority to make certain decisions which are binding upon the departments and agencies (see 33 Op. A. G. 265; 38 Op. A. G. 181).

(4) Where conflicting statutes authorize different agency programs, he might acquire the role of deciding, in effect, which of conflicting national policies should prevail. Thus he would become the arbiter of congressional intent in certain situations rather than the Congress itself or the courts.

(5) Generally speaking, he might be confronted with matters which require judicial determination, an area in which the Attorney General traditionally has refrained from giving advice.

(6) In most cases he could not prevent a court test of litigation because private parties would be involved, another area in which the Attorney General traditionally has refrained from giving advice.

(7) In matters which finally reached the courts despite the Attorney General's objections, he would be called upon to prosecute or defend the case on which he had already rendered an opinion.

It is true that initiation of the recommended procedure for resolving conflicts is voluntary; yet if resorted to, the agencies would be bound by the Attorney General's decision. It seems to me that this arrangement would make agencies less inclined than they are now to seek the Attorney General's legal assistance in controversial matters.

Attorney General Black's advice back in 1857 (9 Op. A. G. 36) still is a good maxim: "The duty of the Attorney General is to advise, not to decide."

Integration of legal staffs

The proposal in recommendation No. 4 that each department or agency legal staff be "integrated" under an Assistant Secretary for Legal Affairs or a General Counsel raises the question of the relationship between the general counsel and the department or agency head.

Although the report disavows any intent to interfere with existing line and staff organization of departments or agencies, it suggests that Government attorneys have responsibilities which transcend those of department or agency heads, that these attorneys should have a certain "degree of independence from administrative control," and should act as a restraining influence on administrators.

From the standpoint of efficient agency performance, emphasis on the authority and importance of the legal staff and general counsel is not an unmixed blessing. Administrative personnel frequently complain that their programs are slowed down or involved in needless red tape because the general counsel insists on routing all papers through his office and in writing rules or orders in complicated legal jargon.

Veterans' Administration guardianship service

I do not agree with the contention that the need for the Veterans' Administration guardianship service is now obviated.

The fact that a State has adopted the Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act does not mean that the Veterans' Administration Administrator no longer has to perform certain legal services to insure the proper use and disposition of Government funds. State laws specifically recognize the continuing responsibilities of the Administrator.

The possibility of reducing the number of Veterans' Administration legal personnel engaged in performing these services is, of course, a different matter.

Separation of legal management and litigation functions

Separation of legal management and litigation functions of the Department of Justice (recommendation No. 6) would seem to impose an artificial division of labor in functional units of the department or else would result in an arbitrary allocation of units to one or another area. Consequently the creation of two new offices of Assistant Deputy Attorney General to coordinate in each area,

proposed in the report, would appear anomalous.

As outlined by the task force, the Internal Security Division, for example, would be under the cognizance of the new Assistant Deputy Attorney General for Litigation. This division administers laws relating to the internal security of the United States, including such functions as the registration of foreign agents and subversive organizations. The litigation features of this activity appear to be relatively minor.

On the other hand the task force proposed that the Office of Alien Property be under the cognizance of the new Assistant Attorney General for Legal Administration. As is well known, the litigation features of the Alien Property Office have assumed major proportions.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, which would be under cognizance of the same Deputy Attorney General, also has important litigation aspects.

Whether or not the Attorney General requires the services of two additional deputies, it seems unnecessary to recommend a division of labor that might be unworkable.

Legal career service

Although I favor a career system for Government legal personnel, I see no good reason to vest personnel recruitment and administration within the Department of Justice (recommendation No. 11). This would make the Department of Justice the only agency besides the Civil Service Commission responsible for personnel administration outside its own establishment.

Many of the legal positions required in the Government involve detailed, often routinized, examination of documents, claims, applications, etc., and other duties which are far removed from the office of general and associated counsel. To assume responsibility for filling such legal positions would make the Department of Justice in some respects a civil-service agency, a function remote from its major purpose.

If, on the other hand, the Department of Justice concerned itself only with "attorneys," there would be a division of personnel functions in the legal field between the Department and the Civil Service Commission.

According to recommendations Nos. 11 and 12, the legal career service is to be administered by a proposed new Office of Legal Services and Procedure established in the Department of Justice. In the contemplation of the task force this new office was to be established "for the dual purposes of administering the legal career service and assisting agencies in the improvement of administrative procedures."

The proposed office is a watered-down version of the recommendation made by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in 1941 that there be established by statute an independent Office of Administrative Procedure (S. Doc 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess., p. 123).

The establishment of such an office within the Department of Justice to assist and advise agencies in standardizing certain legal forms and procedures could be useful. A legal career service should be established and administered by the Civil Service Commission, possibly with the help of a reconstituted Board of Legal Examiners.

It seems unnecessary to go beyond the making of a strong recommendation for a legal career service to spell out (recommendations Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16) the details of probationary periods, veterans' preference, performance ratings, etc. These should be handled as part of the general career service with minor modifications where necessary for legal personnel.

Representation before agencies

Considerable attention is given in the report to canons of conduct and qualifications for persons appearing before Federal agencies. These matters seem more of interest to the legal profession than to a Commission concerned with Government organization.

There seems to be great concern, for example, that nonlawyers may appear before Government agencies on matters which are considered to be within the lawyers' domain. It might be well to point out, in turn, that many lawyers in Washington appear before agencies on matters which do not require the services of a lawyer.

While better standards of conduct always are to be desired, it is not the function of our Commission to bolster a segment of the legal profession engaged in Washington agency representation to the detriment of other persons engaged in the myriad activities involving contact with the Federal Government.

This should not be taken as a reflection on the motives of the eminent lawyers and judges who comprised the task force and provided the basic studies for the Commission's report. Their outlook necessarily is that of the legal profession. Our viewpoint in the Commission must be a broader one.

Administrative procedure

In chapter III the Commission report proposes fundamental revisions of administrative procedure, including the transfer of certain quasi-judicial functions to a specially constituted administrative court.

Some of the recommendations are too generalized to offer useful guides to legislative or administrative action. Others affect the organization of the judicial branch and therefore are beyond the Commission's purview.

Certain recommendations, standing alone, have merit. These are aimed at preventing abuses in the administrative process and in affording individuals a greater measure of protection against arbitrary Government action. There are too many instances of such abuse to allow an attitude of complacency and indifference to the possibilities of improvement in administrative procedure.

At the same time we must not lose sight of the fact that the various regulatory agencies and commissions were created to carry out certain broad public policies established by the Congress. In so doing, they perform functions which are both legislative and judicial by nature. The very existence of these administrative bodies means that neither the Congress nor the courts could undertake by themselves to make all the rules and decisions implicit in Government regulatory action in modern industrial society.

The drift of the Commission recommendations is to "judicialize" procedures in the administrative agencies as much as possible and to go even further by breaking off some judicial-type functions and placing them in an administrative court. To the extent that the proposed changes in administrative procedure seek a basic shift of administrative power to the courts or offer loopholes for thwarting agency action in carrying out congressional policies, I must record my objections.

Furthermore, I am opposed to the establishment of an Administrative Court which would include Trade and Labor Sections as well as a Tax Section. There may be good grounds for making the Tax Court a part of the judiciary, although this would involve additional organizational problems relative to the Court of Claims and the district courts. However, I see no point in constituting the Tax Court as a Section of the Administrative Court. The functions of the Tax Court are sufficiently specialized to warrant separate treatment.

The proposed transfer to an administrative court of certain quasi-judicial functions affecting trade and labor matters raises a host of organizational problems involving both the judicial and executive branches of the Government.

What functions would be transferred and what would remain with the administrative agencies? How would the statutory responsibilities of the agency heads be affected? Can some adjudicatory functions be conveniently separated from others and from a given complex of regulatory functions without jeopardizing the execution of congressional policies? What internal agency reorganizations would be required?

What status and functions would the administrative court have relative to the established district and circuit courts? This is a particularly important question since it is not known whether the Commission intends the administrative court to have original or appellate jurisdiction. Is it not true that a large number of judges would be required to pass upon the complex subject matters to come before the proposed new court? Would they enjoy lifetime appointments as do other Federal judges despite their part in administering public policies which must inevitably reflect changing attitudes of the electorate?

These and many other vexing problems are not resolved in the Commission's recommendation.

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Commissioner.

APPENDIX A

This Commission has had the services of a task force, consultants, and assistants of the most distinguished order. They were:

CHAIRMAN

James Marsh Douglas, St. Louis, Mo.: Lawyer; formerly chief justice Supreme Court of Missouri; chairman, Judicial Conference of Missouri; chairman, Appellate Judicial Commission of Missouri; lecturer, medical jurisprudence, Washington University Medical School; chairman of the board of Washington University.

MEMBERS

Herbert Watson Clark, San Francisco, Calif.: Lawyer; formerly special assistant to United States Attorney General; chairman, Committee of Bar Examiners, State of California; member, American Law Institute.

Cody Fowler, Tampa, Fla.: Lawyer; formerly president, American Bar Association; member American Law Institute; American Judicature Society.

Albert J. Harno, Urbana, Ill.: Lawyer; formerly president, Association American Law Schools; president, National Conference Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; now dean, College of Law, University of Illinois; chairman, board of directors, American Judicature Society.

James McCauley Landis, New York, N. Y.: Lawyer; formerly with United States Department of Labor; member, Federal Trade Commission; Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission; dean, Harvard Law School; Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; member, Commission on Uniform State Laws, Massachusetts; consultant to Advisory Commission, Council of National Defense, and to War Department.

Carl McFarland, Missoula, Mont.: Lawyer; formerly assistant to Attorney General of the United States; member of various commissions and committees concerned with legal procedures; now president, Montana State University.

Ross L. Malone, Jr., Roswell, N. Mex.: Lawyer; formerly city attorney, Roswell, N. Mex.; Deputy Attorney General of United States; trustee, Southwestern Legal Foundation.

David F. Maxwell, Philadelphia, Pa.: Lawyer; member, Pennsylvania and American Bar Associations (chairman, house of delegates, 1952–53).

Harold R. Medina, New York, N. Y.: Judge; judge, United States District Court, Southern District of New York; now judge of the Court of Appeals for Second Circuit.

David W. Peck, New York, N. Y.: Judge; presiding justice, Appellate Division, First Department, Supreme Court of New York.

Reginal Heber Smith, Boston, Mass.: Lawyer; member and vice president, National Legal Aid Association; assistant editor of the Journal of the American Bar Association, and director, survey of legal profession in America for American Bar Association.

E. Blythe Stason, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Lawyer; formerly Michigan Commissioner in National Conference on Uniform State Laws; member, Michigan Constitution Revision Study Committee; now dean, Michigan University Law School.

Elbert Parr Tuttle, Atlanta, Ga.: Judge; formerly General Counsel for the Treasury Department; now judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit; trustee, Cornell University and Atlanta University.

Edward Ledwidge Wright, Little Rock, Ark.: Lawyer; served on National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; American Law Institute; American Judicature Society; trustee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; International Association of Insurance Counsel.

CONSULTANTS

Robert H. Jackson, Washington, D. C.: Judge; after 20 years of private practice, appointed General Counsel, Bureau of Internal Revenue; became successively Assistant Attorney General, Solicitor General, and Attorney General of the United States; appointed Associate Justice of United States Supreme Court in 1941; named chief of counsel for the United States to conduct prosecution of trials of European Axis war criminals (deceased, October 9, 1954).

George Roberts, New York, N. Y.: Lawyer; formerly special counsel to Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and member of Secretary of War's Advisory Board.

Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Newark, N. J.: Judge; formerly dean of New York University Law School; judge, circuit court, New Jersey; now chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

STAFF DIRECTOR

Whitney R. Harris, Chicago, Ill.: Lawyer; formerly professor of administrative law, Southern Methodist University; chairman, Texas State Bar Administrative Law Committee; member of council, section of administrative law, American Bar Association; Chief, Legal Advice Branch, Military Government for Germany; member, California, Texas, and American Bar Associations; now executive director of American Bar Association.

RESEARCH DIRECTOR

Courts Oulahan, Cleveland, Ohio: Lawyer; member, Federal Communications Commission Bar, American, Federal, and D. C. Bar Associations.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 12, 1955]

GOVERNMENT AND THE LAW

The Hoover Commission report on legal services and procedure faces up to one of the knottiest problems created by the vast expansion of Government in recent years. This is administrative law—a body of regulations which have virtually the force of law and which are drawn up and enforced by executive agencies.

The Hoover Commission itself is divided on some of the recommendations of the task force which considered this difficult subject. Half of the members, including Mr. Hoover, the Chairman, did not vote for a series of proposed amendments to the Administrative Procedure Act, but believed they should be included in the report because of the importance of the issues and the eminence of the task force. However, the major recommendation of the task force in this field, the creation of a new administrative court, won the support of all but 2 of the 12 members of the commission.

The general principle behind the task-force proposals is the fundamental one of separation of powers. The agencies often draft regulations (a legislative function), prosecute offenders (an executive task), as well as determine guilt and impose penalties, which is a judicial process. The commission suggests that wherever practicable the judicial operations be separated from the other phases of administrative work, by turning some of them over to the regular courts and by establishing an administrative court which will deal with tax matters, questions of trade regulation, and the adjudication of cases involving unfair labor practices.

At present the subjects which would come within the jurisdiction of the administrative court are divided among a number of agencies, including the Tax Court and the National Labor Relations Board. To define the powers of the new court would require major changes in many laws; it may be challenged on the ground that judicial functions now are exercised by specialists, familiar with their respective complex fields, and that a court of broader scope might slow down and hinder the regulatory and administrative labors of the various agencies. But the recommendation for the court includes specialized sections, and the agencies are already slow in reaching quasi-judicial decisions.

The project of an administrative court is worth the most careful consideration of Congress. It may not solve all of the problems posed by the growth of administrative law. It does promise to keep that law in closer touch with the fundamental principles of the Constitution and of American jurisprudence.

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1955]

ADMINISTRATIVE COURTS

The report of the Hoover Commission on the legal and judicial activities of Federal administrative agencies raises an issue that goes to the roots of our Constitution and form of government. It also offers a challenging program by which the issue may be met. The report is based on a searching investigation by a distinguished task force, learned in the law, under the chairmanship of James Marsh Douglas, formerly chief justices of the Missouri Supreme Court.

The problem with which the Commission deals involves the 50 agencies of the Federal executive department which have come into being as the powers of the Government to regulate our economic and political life have grown, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the National Labor Relations Board.

For the most part these Boards and Commissions not only investigate alleged violations of the laws with which they are concerned—and of their own rules and regulations—but they have power to pass judgment on those they believe to be transgressors. As the Hoover Commission points out, they often act "as judge, jury, defense, and prosecuting attorney" in the same case—as if a police department had the power to try and to sentence those they arrest.

A good deal of flexibility was probably justified in the early life of these agencies as rules and their interpretations gradually emerged from the everyday business of carrying out broad congressional directives. But it has become increasingly clear that those who decide such cases are subject to understandable pressure to justify the orders and rulings of their own employees—a pressure which runs counter to the public interest. In fact, the Commission is convinced that the public now needs greater protection against abuses of power and arbitrary bureaucratic action. Moreover, the increasing exercise of judicial powers by executive agencies violates the principle of the separation of powers on which this Government is based.

By far the most important proposal in the Commission's exhaustive and detailed report—endorsed by 9 out of its 12 members including Attorney General Brownell—urges the establishment by Congress of 3 new courts to hear and decide cases arising from orders of the various administrative agencies in the fields respectively of taxation, trade, and labor relations. The essence of this proposal is the complete independence of these courts from supervision or control by the Executive branch of the Government. No longer would those who pass judgment in such cases be beholden to the agencies involved, any more than is the judge who sits in any existing Federal court.

It seems strange, however, that the Commission failed to propose a court to take over the judicial functions now being performed by the Immigration Service. When aliens are held for alleged violations of the immigration laws hearings are conducted by employees of the Service and appeals from their decision go before a board appointed by, and responsible to the Attorney General, in whose department the Service operates.

The proposals of the Hoover Commission may be faulty in details—and the details are multitudinous—but the administrative court idea raises an issue of deep import to the American people and at a time when the Executive arm of the Government increasingly elbows its way into our private and business affairs. It deserves the widest possible discussion—and prompt action, if no serious objections can be found.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 11, 1955]

IN THE LEGAL MAZE

Many of the new Hoover Commission recommendations for improving the Government's scattered and often confusing legal services are logical and clear.

The legal—and legalistic—ways of doing things here in Washington are frequently out of hand and overlapping, and need a close and careful look by Congress. A chart of Government legal procedure looks more like Rube Goldberg than Blackstone.

The biggest change recommended is an administrative court to handle tax matters, trade regulation cases, and unfair labor practices. These now are handled by boards, commissions, and executive departments.

In a similar field, the report suggests replacing hearing examiners with hearing commissioners completely independent from the agencies whose cases they consider.

And the Commission urges an over-all independent Federal legal career service, intelligently recruited, well trained and supervised, and adequately paid.

The report contains several fuzzy recommendations.

One (No. 47), limiting agency publicity, could be interpreted as a muzzle on Federal agencies as well as a real barrier to the people's right to know.

At its best, it might safeguard a citizen from governmental name-calling, but it also could cover important cases with impenetrable secrecy.

Another possible sleeper is the recommendation (No. 29) that Federal agencies give up jurisdiction to State agencies "which meet reasonable standards of regulation."

In most cases, there never would have been any Federal regulation in the first place unless State bodies had been inadequate.

The final decision, of course, is up to Congress. Excellent as most Hoover Commission reports have been, there is no reason to swallow them whole.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 12, 1955]

THE BADGE, THE HAT, AND THE ROBE

When a detective goes on a case and the evidence he turns up convinces him that the man he is investigating is guilty, the detective will be certain to let the prosecutor know what he thinks.

But the prosecutor, if he is a fair one, will not take just the detective's opinion. He will want to look at all the evidence. If he thinks there are grounds to believe that the accused is guilty, the prosecutor may be expected to present vigorously the evidence against the man and it is likely that the detective will appear as a witness.

But the judge—or the jury—must also be convinced of the man's guilt or he will go free.

All of these steps are safeguards in the law or the Constitution to protect a suspected person from arbitrary arrest and preconceived prejudgment. It is not hard to imagine how injustice could flourish if the detective were firmly convinced of the man's guilt and the detective, the prosecutor, and the judge were all the very same man.

Yet that situation exists right now in many of the Government agencies empowered to regulate business and commerce. The Federal Trade Commission, for instance, puts on a detective's badge to investigate charges against a company of unfair competition; then it puts on the prosecutor's hat and issues a complaint and holds hearings; finally it dons the judge's robes and if the five-man Commission decides the company is guilty it can order it to cease those practices.

The company, of course, has the right of appeal to a Federal court of appeals, but in many cases it is a long and costly process and burdensome to the accused, to the agency, and to the courts.

The Hoover Commission now has proposed that Congress remove from some 50 Government agencies the right to judgment on evidence the agencies themselves have gathered. The Commission's advice is for Congress to create a Federal Administrative Court to handle the judicial powers the agencies now possess. "There can be no effective protection of private rights unless there is a complete separation of the prosecuting functions from the functions of decision."

It would be difficult to dispute that view. But whether the creation of more specialized courts is the best answer will certainly be questioned in Congress; presumably either of the litigants may appeal the decision of the proposed court to higher ones and it is not at all certain that the crowded dockets will be relieved of tax, labor, and trade disputes as the Hoover Commission suggests the result of its proposal will be.

There may be other and better ways than the Hoover Commission proposes to reduce the powers of bureaucracies. Congress, for all we know, may some day decide that some of these agencies should never have been created and that none of them should have been granted such broad powers.

But what is certain is that there is great danger where any man or any agency has power to wear the badge, the hat, and the robe.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE
FOR THE HOOVER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1955.

I am sending you our 2-week roundup of editorial opinion on the legal services and procedure report. Most of the favorable opinion (6 papers with a circulation of 3,506,174) was with respect to the administrative court. The six papers were:

PAPER, DATE, AND CIRCULATION

Dallas (Tex.) News, April 12, 183,583.
Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, April 12, 433,624.
Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger, April 12, 192,699.
New York Daily News, April 17, 2,251,430.
New York Herald Tribune, April 12, 328,892.
Rochester (N. Y.) Times Union, April 12, 115,946.

As for the informational and reserved editorials, the New York Times was in that category only because they felt an immigration section should be included. The Chicago, Dallas, and New York Wall Street Journals (total circulation 213,701) recognized the need for separating the judicial function from executive agencies. However, they are not convinced that the administrative court is the best solution.

"There may be other and better ways than the Hoover Commission proposes to reduce the powers of bureaucracies. Congress, for all we know, may some day decide that some of these agencies should never have been created and that none of them should have been granted such broad powers."

Since the time of the 2-week roundup we have received a few more editorials. I have not yet been able to review them all. However, this is a summary of the larger papers:

Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer (circulation 194,369): Favorable with respect to the administrative court.

Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator (circulation 94,375): Favorable.

San Diego (Calif.) Union (circulation 65,219): Generally favorable.

Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram (circulation 114,857): Generally favorable.

When we have the more complete 6-week roundup, we will send you a copy. Please let me know if you require any other information.

Sincerely yours,
LILLIAN WALD KAY,
Assistant Director of Research.

APRIL 25, 1955.

In the first 2 weeks after the Commission's report on legal services we reviewed 21 editorials.

Of these, 9 (total circulation 3,930,821) were favorable; 12 (total circulation 2,217,878) were reserved or informational.

It will be noticed that most of the positive comments single out the administrative court. This recommendation received some comment in all the editorials.

Sample quotes are attached.

LILLIAN WALD KAY,
Assistant Director of Research, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

SAMPLE QUOTES

Favorable

Baltimore (Md.) Sun (circulation 178,676): "But the Government in its new role of manager wants (like all managers) as little outside interference as possible with its exercise of discretionary authority. The old-fashioned private tycoon hated Government in business; the new-fashioned Government expert resists interference from any other branch of Government. He especially doesn't want interference from the courts. What, he asks (sometimes scornfully), can a judge know about the precise, technical field where he operates? He is an expert and, by definition, no judge can be such an expert."

Indianapolis (Ind.) Star (circulation 196,362):

"It will be recognized that these recommendations hit at some of the means by which bureaucratic Government harasses business, industry, and citizens as individuals.

"* * * The report contains potential dynamite. It lays open the proesses by which bureaucracy operates."

Favorable with respect to the administrative court

Dallas (Tex.) News (circulation 183,583):

"It is unlikely that the recommendation will be translated into law without a fight. Federal agencies that have become little laws unto themselves will not be persuaded to give up sovereignty. But for the general good it is to be hoped that this reform is accomplished.

"* * * But it is a sound point in Government that the final disposition of what are essentially law cases ought to be left to a court of law."

Detroit (Mich.) Free Press (circulation 433,624):

"Such infringements of the executive upon the judicial powers can be dangerous; if they are allowed to become too common or too extensive, the individual citizen's constitutional rights would be in jeopardy.

"The Hoover Commission, by looking at this question, has struck upon a serious problem. It is not one which the Commission or anyone else is going to solve easily or quickly, but it is a good thing to have public attention centered upon it."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD in three instances and to include in one a statement in support of a resolution to establish a foreign service academy.

Mr. PRICE, to revise and extend his remarks made in committee and to include a statistical table.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, his remarks on the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill; and include certain tables and extraneous matter; also to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MADDEN and to include a resolution.

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. LESINSKI in two instances.

Mr. LONG.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter in connection with remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIDSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances.

Mr. DIXON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR to revise and extend remarks he made in Committee of the

Whole and to include extraneous matter therewith.

Mr. BURNSIDE.

Mr. BYRD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for the balance of the day, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 265. An act to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 614. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 748. An act to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 824. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands erroneously conveyed to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1007. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

783. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmittting a report on contracts negotiated under section 302 (c) (10) during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

784. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "To amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3399. A bill to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5224. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5875. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3786. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 573). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3813. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 574). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4754. A bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); without amendment (Rept. No. 575). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President; without amendment (Rept. No. 578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4791. A bill to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees; with an amendment (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6057. A bill to further extend the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories; to provide for the continuation of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 241. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 6042, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan; without amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser; without amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 163. An act for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos); without amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry; without amendment (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup; without amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou; without amendment (Rept. No. 562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha; without amendment (Rept. No. 563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 17. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou; without amendment (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Eufemia Bencich; without amendment (Rept. No. 568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg; with an amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6138. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by providing for increased consumption of milk under the school-lunch program and acceleration of the brucellosis-eradication program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6139. A bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States-flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6140. A bill to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 6141. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide for a stronger national transportation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 6142. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide for a stronger national transportation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 6144. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 6145. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6146. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that the Federal Government shall pay a portion of the costs of certain works of improvement constructed for purposes of water conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 6147. A bill to declare that beneficial consumptive uses of the waters of western streams shall be superior to their use for navigation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 6148. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that the Federal Government shall pay a portion of the costs of certain works of improvement constructed for purposes of water conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6149. A bill to provide for the demolition and removal of temporary buildings erected in the District of Columbia since the beginning of World War I, and for the substitution therefor of permanent-type facilities constructed under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 6150. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6151. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed veterinarians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 6152. A bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 6153. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 6154. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6155. A bill to provide pension for certain veterans of World War I and for their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 6156. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide current insured status for certain additional individuals who served as employees of the State of Wisconsin and to whom social-security coverage was retroactively extended in 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 6157. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthdox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Memorial of the State of Illinois, 69th General Assembly, senate resolution, expressing adherence to the policy set forth by the Civil Aeronautics Board in its conclusion that there should be two separate and competing United States flag air routes across the Pacific, one through the California gateway to the Orient via the central Pacific and the other through the Seattle gateway via Alaska and the short Great Circle course to the Orient; and opposing any application for duplication of service on the Great Circle course; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the State of Illinois, 69th General Assembly, house resolution 66, urging the President to confirm and approve the findings of the Tariff Commission in the bicycle action, which action is now awaiting the President's final decision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital at Chelsea, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial of the Oklahoma house concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the Senate concurring therein, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation to provide a 90 percent of parity price-support program for basic agricultural commodities; commending certain members of the Agricultural Committee, National House of Representatives for reporting favorably on said pending legislation; directing that copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation and to certain other Members of Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 6158. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carlo de Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 6159. A bill for the relief of Hans Elis Hillers Tromholt, Mrs. Edna Emma Tromholt, and Elsa Maria Tromholt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

247. By Mr. CRETELLA: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meriden to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

248. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 191 residents of the State of Washington to help bring up mentally and morally sound children and to conquer the juvenile delinquency now in our midst by exercising the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

249. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mr. G. L. Porter and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., requesting that the Senate and House of Representatives repeal the recently enacted law raising the pay of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

250. By the SPEAKER: Petition of secretary, Seneca County Men's Republican Club, Seneca Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

251. By the SPEAKER: Petition of commander, Kirk-Casey Post, No. 366, American Legion, Seneca Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Customs Simplification Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of H. R. 6040, the Customs Simplification Act of 1955, there follows an explanation of this legislation for the information of the Members of Congress and the public. The Committee on Ways and Means has announced public hearings to be held on H. R. 6040 beginning Monday, May 23.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6040, THE CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1955

The President, in his message of January 10, 1955, on the foreign economic policy of the United States, stated that the uncertainties and confusion arising from the complex system of valuation on imported articles caused unwarranted delays in the determination of customs duties and he urged the Congress to give favorable consideration to legislation for remedying this situation. Furthermore, he asked for continuing efforts to improve the procedures for customs administration. The proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1955 is designed to carry out, in part, these recommendations of the President. The Treasury Department is continuing its study and will in the future submit additional legislative proposals in line with the President's recommendations.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND EFFECTIVE DATE

This section contains a short title and provides that the act shall be effective on and after the 30th day following the date of enactment.

SECTION 2. VALUE

The present section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 402) tells how appraisers shall determine the value of imported merchandise for the purpose of assessing duties. Briefly, it provides that the "foreign value" or the "export value" shall be used, whichever is higher, but that if neither of these can be ascertained, then the "United States value," and if that also is unascertainable, then the "cost of production." In a few special cases, the rate of duty is to be based upon the "American selling price." Decisions of the appraiser are reviewable in the Customs Court. The statute then goes on to define the foreign value as the market value or price at the time of exportation to the United States "at which such or similar merchandise is freely offered for sale for home consumption to all purchasers * * * in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade * * *." Costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the merchandise ready for shipment which are not included in such value or price are to be added thereto. The export value is the price at which the merchandise is freely offered for sale to all purchasers in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade for exportation to the United States, with the same charges added. The United States value is the freely offered price in the United States which is available to all purchasers, in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, with allowance for duty and other expenses, a commission not exceeding 6 percent, if any has been paid, and allowance for profit not to exceed 8 percent. The cost of production is defined as the sum of four items: (1) Cost of materials and fabrication or manipulation; (2) the usual general expenses, not less than 10 percent of (1); (3) the cost of containers and coverings and other incidental costs and charges; and (4) an addition for profit, not less than 8 percent of (1) and (2). The American selling price of an article manufactured or produced in the United States is the price at which the article is freely offered for sale for domestic consumption to all purchases.

The amendments proposed by the bill would effect the following changes in the law as above stated:

1. Eliminate the use of foreign value and make the export value the preferred method of valuation if it can be ascertained.

2. In determining United States value, the actual commissions, profits, and other deductions are to be used, not arbitrarily limited amounts.

3. In determining United States value of new lines in which there is no previously established trade, the earliest actual sales of the merchandise undergoing appraisement or similar merchandise may be considered if made before the expiration of 90 days after importation.

4. In the case of constructed value (previously called cost of production) the actual addition for general expenses, profit, etc., are to be used, not prescribed percentages which may exceed the actual figures.

5. The appraiser may use actual sales instead of offers, where both exist, in determining export value or United States value.

6. A definition of "freely sold or offered for sale" is provided for the first time. It will permit determination of an "export value," "United States value," or "American selling price" on the basis of sales or offers to wholesalers which are unrestricted, except for restrictions which are imposed or required by law, which limit the resale price or sales territory, or which do not affect the value of the merchandise to the purchaser. It will also permit the use of sales to exclusive agents and other restricted sales where such limitations do not affect the price. The present statute has been interpreted to make a "foreign value," "export value," "United States value," or "American selling price" unusable when the only offers made are subject to restrictions of the kinds stated. Furthermore, under the present law the price, in order to qualify, must be available to all purchasers, including retailers and consumers.

7. The proposed bill goes on to provide definitions for the words "ordinary course of trade," "purchasers at wholesale," and "such or similar merchandise."

8. It also defines "usual wholesale quantities" in such a manner as to mean the quantities in which the greatest aggregate quantity of the merchandise is sold, whereas under the present law the usual wholesale quantity is the quantity in which the largest number of individual transactions occur.

9. Certain references to the customs appraisers, and to appeals to reappraisement in the Customs Court, which were duplicative of other provisions, are eliminated for conciseness. No change in the functions of appraisers or court is effected.

The bill also provides that in considering any tariff adjustments by executive action, such as trade-agreement reductions under section 350 of the Tariff Act, the Tariff Commission and each officer of the executive department shall take full account of any reduction in tariff protection resulting or likely to result from these changes in valuation standards.

SECTION 3. CONVERSION OF CURRENCY

Under present law conversion of foreign currency values for customs purposes is made at the gold coin parity proclaimed quarterly by the Treasury Department, unless that parity varies by more than 5 percent from the buying rate for the currency in the New York market as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. If there is no proclaimed rate for the currency in question, or if the proclaimed rate does vary by more than 5 percent from the certified rate, then customs collectors are required to convert foreign currencies at the daily rate certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The result is that in most cases the daily certified rates are used. Consequently, each collector is required to check the daily rate for each day's importations since those rates, certified to 6 to 8 decimal places, are subject to frequent, often daily minor variations.

The amendment of section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 31, sec. 372) proposed by section 3 of the bill would retain the quarterly proclamation of gold coin parity. It would also continue in effect the requirement that the Federal Reserve bank certified rate be used if that rate varies by more than 5 percent from the gold coin parity. The amendment would then authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide by regulations for the use of the rate first certified for the quarter as long as the rate certified for the day of exportation did not vary by more than 5 percent therefrom. This would permit one customs officer to determine if the daily certified rates varied by more than 5 percent from the first effective certified rates or from the proclaimed gold coin parity and to notify all customs collectors of any such variations. In the absence of such notification each customs collector would continue to use the same certified rate throughout the quarter.

This will simplify currency conversion procedures without major alteration in the existing statutory framework.

SECTION 4. OBSOLETE PROVISIONS OF THE CUSTOMS LAWS

Section 4 is devoted to the repeal of a number of obsolete provisions of the Tariff Act. The reasons that the provisions repealed are obsolete, inoperative, or unnecessary, are set forth below.

Sections 12, 13, 14, and 15 of title 19, United States Code (subsecs. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of section 4 (a) of the bill), provide for appointment by the Secretary of the Treasury of a limited number of special agents for the purposes of checking the accounts of collectors and other customs officers for the prevention and detection of frauds upon the revenue, and for the better guarding against frauds upon the revenue, authorize appointment of special agents to reside in foreign territory. The title "special agent" is no longer used in the customs service (see U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 5, sec. 281b (c)). The customs agents who, among other functions, perform the functions formerly exercised by the special agents now are appointed and serve under the operation of the Classification Act like other customs employees.

Sections 16, 17, and 18 of title 19, United States Code (subsecs. 5, 6, and 7) are survivals of the act of July 27, 1866 (ch. 284, secs. 4, 5, and 8, 14 Stat. 303), to reorganize the office of the customs appraiser at New York. Section 16, prescribing qualifications and a special oath for examiners at New York only, is superfluous since placement standards for the position are fixed in accordance with the Classification Act by the Civil Service Commission, and the oath requirement is

met by the provisions of section 1757, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 5, sec. 16), applicable to all Federal officers. Section 17, prohibiting employees in the office of the appraiser at New York from engaging or being employed in any commercial activity is discriminatory against this group of employees. Its repeal would leave such employees subject to the same restrictions on outside employment as other like employees. Section 18, relating to the duties applicable to the appraiser and assistant appraiser at New York, was originally enacted as a saving clause when a special statute was enacted to reorganize the office of the customs appraiser at New York (act of July 27, 1866, supra), but it now serves no useful purpose since all duties of appraisers are prescribed by section 500, Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1500).

Sections 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27 (subsecs. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) of title 19, United States Code, prescribe special oaths of office for the officers enumerated therein and designate persons who may administer such oaths. These provisions are unnecessary, since a form of oath for all Government officers is prescribed by R. S. 1557, supra. The number of copies of oaths of office to be required and their disposition can readily be prescribed by regulation; and since an employee may not receive his salary until the oath of office is taken, there seems to be no purpose in prescribing a penalty for failure to take the oath. As to the designation of persons to administer the oaths, sections 16a of title 5, United States Code, gives authority to persons designated in writing by the head of an executive department to administer the oath of office. The above sections are therefore unnecessary and obsolete.

In addition, section 26 of title 19 is obsolete (as is also sec. 379, infra, for similar reasons) in that it relates to special examiners of drugs, medicines, and chemicals, officers who are no longer appointed. The Food and Drug Administration now performs the functions formerly exercised by the special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals (see U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 21, sec. 381). For these reasons, these sections should be repealed.

Section 28 of title 19, United States Code (subsec. 14), providing that the headquarters of the customs district in Florida shall be at Tampa, is unnecessary and serves no practical purpose. It is the only statutory provision expressly designating the situs of the headquarters of a customs district, and there are 45 such districts. Section 1 of the act of August 1, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 2), vests authority in the President to, among other things, change from time to time the location of the headquarters customs-collection district. By Executive Order 10289 of September 17, 1951, the President designated and empowered the Secretary of the Treasury to perform this function.

Section 40 of title 19, United States Code (subsec. 15), prescribes the duties of the surveyor of customs. The title of surveyor of customs has been discontinued, except at the port of New York, and the duties there performed are those which are usually handled at any seaport by the officer in charge of the activities performed for the collector outside of the customhouse. The act of July 5, 1932 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 5a), abolished the offices of surveyor of customs at all other ports and their duties were transferred to career employees under the collector. Many of the functions prescribed by section 40 for the surveyor at New York have been obsolete for years and are no longer performed by that officer. This section should be repealed as obsolete.

Section 53 of title 19, United States Code (subsec. 16), which provides for the apportionment of compensation according to the time served, is believed to be obsolete in view of the act of June 30, 1945 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 5, sec. 944), which established the basic workweek, pay periods, and pay computation methods for all full-time officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government.

Sections 54 and 57 of title 19 (subsecs. 17 and 20), which relate to the furnishing of blank forms, books, stationery, blank manifests for sale, etc., are obsolete. Section 54 is superseded by provisions of the act of June 30, 1949 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 40, sec. 481), with respect to procurement of supplies by the General Services Administration. Section 57 is obsolete because in lieu of payment of compensation out of commissions and fees, collectors of customs are now on a fixed salary basis under the plan of reorganization of the customs service authorized by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 434).

Section 55 of title 19 (subsec. 18) provides that collectors of customs, and comptrollers and surveyors performing the functions of collectors, shall render quarterly accounts to the Secretary of the Treasury of fines collected, moneys received as rents, etc. These functions are presently being performed under authority of other statutes, and this section is unnecessary.

Section 56 of title 19 (subsec. 19), which relates to additional hours of service at public stores in New York, was made obsolete by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 5, secs. 901–954), which provides for the establishment of a basic administrative workweek and for overtime compensation at prescribed rates.

Section 59 of title 19 (subsec. 21) prescribes requirements, related to section 57, supra, which date back to the time when the compensation of customs officers was primarily the proceeds of the specific fees fixed by law. Many of the functions for which fees were fixed are no longer performed. While it is believed that a table of the rates of fees demandable by law should be posted in a conspicuous place in each customhouse, convenient for public inspection, and a receipt should be given for all fees paid, this is rather a matter for handling under existing regulatory authority without statutory prescription of impracticable and inflexible requirements.

Section 61 of title 19 (subsec. 22) is inoperative and obsolete. Revised Statute 2580, from which it was derived, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint inspectors at San Antonio, Eagle Pass, and other places in Texas, at an annual salary of $2,500, to report to the Secretary of the Treasury semiannually on goods exported to Mexico. Regular customs offices are now established at necessary ports, stations, and places along the Texas-Mexican border whose officers inspect and supervise imports, as well as exports, to the extent required.

Section 62 of title 19 (subsec. 23), which was intended as a means of maintaining discipline among customs officers, authorizes suspension from duty for neglect or minor delinquency. The procedures which have been and will be followed in regard to the conduct of customs officers and employees are those prescribed in section 863, title 5, United States Code, and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission.

Section 67 of title 19 (subsec. 24), which provides for a report to each session of the Congress by the Secretary on customhouse business, is inoperative and unnecessary. The Secretary submits an annual report to the Congress in accordance with sections 262, 264, and 265, title 5, United States Code, substantially superseding the requirements of this more limited provision of the customs laws.

Section 379 of title 19 (subsec. 25) provides a method for preventing importation of adulterated drugs, etc. (see sec. 26, supra), at ports where there is no special examiner of drugs. As indicated in commenting on section 26, supra, special examiners of drugs are no longer appointed and the provisions of this section are inoperative, functions with relation to spurious or adulterated foods, drugs or cosmetics now being handled by the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under United States Code, 1952 edition, title 21, section 321, et seq. The section is obsolete and inoperative and should be repealed.

Section 390 of title 19 (subsec. 26), which provides for the adoption of a hydrometer for use in ascertaining the proof of liquors, is unnecessary. The hydrometer in use by Customs is the same as that which is approved for use of the Internal Revenue Service under section 5212 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The standards for spirits are the same as those applicable to spirits of domestic manufacture under paragraph 811 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 811).

Section 494 of title 19 (subsec. 27), which provides for the seizure of merchandize as security for fines imposed under the provisions of section 12 of the act of June 22, 1874, 18 Statutes 188, an ancestor provision of section 591 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1591), now superseded in turn by section 542 of title 18 of the code, is absolete and unnecessary. The 1874 provisions relating to unlawful importation have been repealed and this particular provision thereof is no longer operative.

Section 526 of title 19 (subsec. 28) provides that the cost of prosecution in cases where seizure, condemnation, and sale of merchandise takes place within the United States and the value is less than $250, shall be paid from the part of the forfeiture which accrues to the United States. This section is obsolete since the subject matter is now covered by section 613 (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1613 (1)).

Section 541 of title 19 (subsec. 29) authorizes the collector of each customs district to provide and use small open row- and sailboats, which shall be necessary in boarding vessels and for other purposes. Coast Guard crafts are used by customs officials for boarding purposes and section 541 is therefore obsolete.

Section 542 of title 19 (subsec. 30) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use elsewhere as the exigencies of the service require, the motorboat provided for Corpus Christi, Tex. No motorboat is now provided or needed for Corpus Christi and there has been none for many years. The provision is obsolete.

Section 549 of title 31 of the code (subsec. 31) directs the comptrollers of customs and surveyors, registers of land offices, and the superintendents of mints to examine the books and accounts of their depositaries, collectors, and treasurers and to make a report to the Secretary of the Treasury. The functions referred to are performed by the Comptroller General under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 23 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 31, secs. 41–58)), and therefore section 549 is now obsolete.

Section 579 of title 19 (subsec. 32) provides that in a suit on bond for the recovery of duties the court shall grant judgment unless the defendant makes an oath that an error was committed in the liquidation of the duties demanded. This section has been superseded by the protest provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1514).

Section 711 (7) of title 31 (subsec. 33) authorizes a permanent appropriation for the repayment to importers of the excess of deposits for unascertained customs duties, or duties or other moneys paid under protest. This section has been superseded by a permanent indefinite appropriation covering all refunds of customs collections or receipts authorized by law (see act of June 30, 1949, ch. 286, 63 Stat. 360).

Subsection 34 of section 4 (a) of the draft bill will repeal that part of the act of September 30, 1890 (c. 1126, 26 Stat. 511 (formerly codified as U. S. C. title 19, sec. 30)), which provides that such clerks and inspectors as the Secretary may designate shall be authorized to administer oaths of office. This section is related to sections 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27, of title 19, which also are proposed to be repealed, supra. The section is obsolete and should be repealed.

Section 4 (b) of the bill seeks to amend subsection (f) of section 500 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1500 (f)), which provides for the designation of an acting appraiser at ports where there is no appraiser and requires that such acting appraiser take the oath provided in section 21, title 19, supra. It is proposed to repeal the requirement that the acting appraiser take the special oath provided in said section 500 (f) since the provision for that oath is being repealed by subsection 8 of section 4 (a) of this bill. The oath prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 5, sec. 16) will be sufficient.

Section 4 (c) of the bill proposes to amend section 583 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1583). Section 583 provides that the customs or Coast Guard officer's certification regarding the inspection of the manifest required by that section shall be made on "the back of" the original manifest. The manifest forms now in use have the space for such certification on the front. The procedural detail as to place of certification on a manifest is a minor one that should be left to administrative regulation and it is proposed to delete the language "the back of" in that section.

The 10th of May: Rumania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. Three great events of its history are celebrated at that date.

The Rumanian people, after more than a thousand years of battles and sacrifices, have succeeded in forging their national unity and in gaining their freedom and independence. Since then—gathered around their King—they have been celebrating their national holiday, May 10, which stands for independence and unity. Today, Rumanians at home cannot celebrate any of their traditional holidays.

During their long history the Rumanians have always stood up against invaders and they have battled against hordes of barbarians pouring into Europe from the East. They have also fought against the forces of the Ottoman Empire.

Some 500 years ago the Turks succeeded in overcoming by their superior numbers the defenders of freedom. The same thing happened a few years ago when the dark forces of communism swallowed up the people of Rumania.

However, the will of the Rumanian nation was not broken. In recognition of the people's drive for freedom, the Rumanian principalities received a special status—as autonomous States—in which the Turks could not interfere. Mircea the Elder, Vlad the Impaler, Stephen the Great, Michael the Brave, John the Fierce are names of brave Rumanian rulers who have fought in the past for independence and unity.

On May 10, 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Signaringen, was proclaimed in Bucharest Prince of Rumania and so founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was the successful outcome of the nation's long struggle to acquire the right of electing as its sovereign a member of one of the Western nonneighboring reigning families in order to put an end to the strifes and rivalries among native candidates to the throne. This ardent wish, though it had been officially expressed as far back as 1857 by the Moldavian and Vallachian Assemblies—known as the Ad-hoc Divans, which convened as a result of the Paris Treaty of 1856, was nevertheless opposed by both the Russian and Austrian Empires, which were equally alarmed by the growth in power and prestige of the young bordering nation, which they both secretly hoped to absorb some day. Thanks to the unrelentless efforts and thanks to the wise steps taken by Rumanian patriots, and, also, to the constant diplomatic assistance of Napoleon III, all political obstacles were gradually removed, and that which was to be the prosperous and glorious reign of Charles I could be inaugurated on May 10, 1866.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the turmoil of the Russian-Turkish War, the principality of Rumania, until then nominally a vassal of the Sultan, proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds which still linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian Army, as an ally of Russia, played a noteworthy part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 confirmed Rumania's independence and conferred Europe's official recognition, a bright page in the country's dreary history, though marred unfortunately by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Czar Alexander II and his government from the ally who had helped them obtain the victory over the Turks.

Another 4 years elapsed since the Rumanian people had proclaimed their independence and a further step was taken as they decided to raise their country to the rank of a kingdom. On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned, by the will of his people, King of Rumania. A prosperous era, which lasted over six decades, opened on that day for the nation. Its apex was attained when national unity within the historical boundaries was reached after World War I. The socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the southeast of Europe.

During all those years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as their national holiday, the anniversary of glorious events in their history, in which the achievements of the monarchy and of the people were interwoven. This date remains the symbol of the Rumanian permanency and perseverance through woes and hardships in order to reach the ultimate end of freedom and well-being.

The consciousness of the Rumanian people, concerning their unity and independence, is the result of centuries of sacrifices. Today this consciousness remains intact. It cannot be destroyed by either brutality, lies, or oppression.

Soviet Russia, through the intermediary of the Communist regime which it helped install by force, has attempted to tear out of the Rumanian history the sacred days of this nation. Today the Rumanian people are forbidden to celebrate their national holiday. Today, in Rumania, any demonstration of independence is banned. Rumanians no longer can sing their national anthem, nor can they raise the flag of their Independence Day.

However stark the present situation in Rumania may be, this nation which in the past has achieved independence rallying all its forces and courage and enthusiasm around the King, is once more closing ranks around King Michael I, who has remained a symbol of independence and unity.

The ruthless foreign rule which now oppresses the Rumanian nation has not been able to uproot the people's attachment to the traditional celebration of the 10th of May. In order to try and alter at least its significance, celebrations were shifted from the 10th to the 9th of May, the anniversary of a Soviet victory. Although flags are now hoisted on May 9, Rumanians in their captive homeland celebrate nonetheless in their hearts the following day, awaiting with faith and courage the dawn of new times when freedom shall be restored to them.

The Rumanian people have kept their courage and faith. They know that freedom cannot be destroyed. The Rumanian nation looks up with hope toward the free world.

We can assure the Rumanian people that their suffering is known to us and that we are sensitive to the trust they have bestowed upon us, the American people.

The United States will continue to help the progress of the people's freedom and the independence of states in the world, certain that the Rumanian people will enjoy once again their national freedom and independence.

Senior Class of the Sunset High School, Sunset, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the fundamental requirements for a continued strong and enlightened America is that

more and more of our young people become better acquainted with our democratic principles of government. One way that this could be accomplished would be for every high school student to be allowed to visit the Nation's Capital to view the inspiring sights created by the leaders of this great land; to see the representatives of the people sitting in session to formulate laws for the betterment of our Republic.

One such group is visiting Washington today, Mr. Speaker, it being the senior class of the Sunset High School of Sunset, La., in my district. I feel that I must congratulate the people of Sunset, and especially my old friend, Mr. Ferdie Duos, principal of the school, and the teachers for having undertaken this tour for the students. Mrs. Floyd Domengeaux and Miss Elva Bernard are the type teachers we should strive to retain in our schools in order to continue education which maintains the high ideals of America. The names of the students on this tour, who are seniors of the Sunset High School, represent names of future leaders of our country. They are: Barbara Beaugh, Beatrice Bellmin, Norris Bourgeois, Calvin Bourque, Betty Cazaudebat, Cecilia Cormier, Joyce Courvelle, Ravis Courvelle, Florine Credeur, Earline Dalfrey, Janelle Guilbeaux, Jimmy Guilbeaux, Kathleen Guilbeaux, Nolan Guilbeaux, Dell Horaist, Nell Horaist, J. E. Leger, Eva Dell Meche, Jason Meche, Bobbie Miller, Harold Miller, Agnes Olivier, Alfred Richard, Gayle Richard, Nettie Richard, Shirley Richard, Lincoln Savoie, Lou Wilda Sibille, Nolan Stelly, Sally Thomas, and Ethel Tweedel.

Resolution Urging That Fort Leonard Wood Be Designated a Permanent Military Installation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring to the attention of the proper authorities a serious problem in my district, I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, a copy of the Missouri House of Representatives Resolution 123 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resolution follows:

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood has served as the training area for thousands of members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood is strategically located in the heart of Missouri's rugged hill country and is climatically situated so that military personnel can be trained under all weather conditions and over a varied terrain which is recognized as one of the best training areas in the United States; and

Whereas the United States has spent great sums of money on Fort Leonard Wood and has one of the greatest concentrations of earth-moving equipment in the world at Fort Wood for the training of Army engineers; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood has been designated and is now operating as a temporary installation; and

Whereas Fort Leonard is of great value to the Nation and to Missouri and the closing of Fort Wood would be harmful to the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this house earnestly urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated a permanent military installation and operated as a permanent military training center; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk send copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from Missouri.

Adopted May 3, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated a permanent Army installation. Fort Leonard Wood is one of the best equipped Army camps in the United States, yet for the want of a permanent designation this installation is operating on a costly short-time basis.

It is neither fair to the soldier nor to the State of Missouri to be constantly threatened with the disbandment of this Army installation. The soldier is adversely affected by lack of off-base housing and countless other facilities which would be provided if there was the security of permanence at this installation. The State of Missouri loses because of the reluctance in developing the area due to the temporary status of the fort. Fort Leonard Wood is one of the best in the Nation and needs development of the surrounding area which would immediately follow if provided with the proper business climate which a declaration of permanency would provide.

Creation of a United States Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, from a military viewpoint, the United States has won all of its wars. It has not been so successful, however, in its efforts to protect the rights and advance the interests of our Nation through diplomatic negotiations. Some of our defeats in diplomacy have been tragic preludes or postludes to our Nation's great sacrifices in blood and fortune on the altars of freedom and justice.

Because of the utter destructiveness of modern nuclear weapons, winning a war may never again mean a real victory for either side—if it ever has meant true victory. Global warfare, if it ever occurs again, may mean global suicide. More than ever before it has become necessary that this Nation win through diplomacy rather than try to win through war. Maintenance of peace has become necessary for the preservation of civilization.

Why has the United States in the past sometimes won a war and lost the peace? What is the significance of our military victories and diplomatic losses in relation to the future?

Our victories in warfare have been due largely to our foresight in making suitable provisions for selecting and training men for military leadership. Our shortcomings in diplomacy have been due largely to our failure to make similar provisions for selecting and training men for our Foreign Service. The increasing need for maintenance of peaceful relationships with other nations has now made necessary the strengthening of all our forces engaged in diplomatic negotiations.

On April 11 of this year Soviet Russia suddenly offered to restore Austria's freedom on the condition that that country must remain neutral and permit no foreign bases on its soil. Soviet propaganda agencies are hinting at a similar offer to Germany—holding before the nationality-conscious German people the luring vision of a neutral, united Germany. Soviet Russia has thus taken the diplomatic initiative away from the West, and has strengthened neutralists not only in Germany but throughout the free world. It goes without saying that the importance to the United States of the rearmament of Western Germany is incalculable. Yet Soviet Russia has forced us to negotiate at her bidding concerning Austria, and may later force us to negotiate concerning Germany.

The current tensions in international relations in general and recent developments respecting Germany in particular point up the continuing need for the advancement of the interests of freedom throughout the world. Prominent political scientists have predicted that serious international tensions will continue for many years to come. The United States must select and train its best qualified young men to work for the easement of these tensions and for the preservation of our freedom and the promotion of our national welfare through diplomacy.

I am therefore introducing a bill proposing "that in order to promote greater understanding and goodwill throughout the world and to provide for a trained force for the Foreign Service of the United States, ambassadors, ministers, and other officers, there is hereby established an academy to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy."

Applicants accepted for training in the Academy would be required to pass entrance examinations testing their general knowledge and their intellectual capacities and aptitude for the Foreign Service. They would be selected in a manner insuring nationwide representation in the Academy.

The course of study would be designed to assure that graduates would have the ability effectively to represent the interests of the United States abroad, and would have an understanding of the foreign peoples with whom they would live and work.

In general the Academy would provide an educational system for the Foreign Service comparable to that which the Congress has established for officers of the armed services. I have pointed out circumstances which show that selection and training of officers for our Foreign Service has become of paramount importance. Let us create a Foreign

Service Academy now while there is hope for the extension of international understanding, peace, and freedom throughout the world.

Rock Creek Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, every great city lays claim to some exclusive distinction. The city of Washington of course boasts of the National Capital and all that goes with it.

But Washington possesses something else besides the home of the Government of the land of the free, something else the equal of which is known to no other city in the world. There is not a city that would refuse to trade the greatest distinction it has for the equivalent of Rock Creek Park, thousands of acres of nature at her best, stretching through the length of the city and into Maryland, area available to the people for their recreation and enjoyment. Its picnic areas, its recreation areas, its riding trails, and its abundance of bird life in the very heart of the city is something that a great city could have only because men who dared to look ahead provided the asset when it could become a public possession at other than inflated costs. Hundreds of millions of dollars would replace what is Rock Creek Park today if it were to be lost.

We, in Congress, can take pride in the fact that our predecessors provided this great park. As recently as 1930, and some are still here remember the undertaking, Congress provided for the extension of Rock Creek Park for miles into Maryland. The Capper-Cramton Act of that year was evidence that Congress not only stood ready to protect this great national and community prize but sensed a growing need for its enlargement to accommodate growing populations.

But the things which Congress thought it was providing for in the creation of Rock Creek Park and its extension, are being challenged in no uncertain way. If the planners and builders of roads and express highways can have their way, Rock Creek Park is to become the location of a great six-lane highway throughout its entire length. Already the encroachment is under way, with planning agencies giving a little way here and a little way there to the highway people who love to build roads where right-of-way is free.

Local residents in Maryland have waged a 2-year fight against abandonment of Rock Creek Park to expressways. They have thought the laws governing the park, laws passed by Congress, were adequate. Challenges are riding in the courts at the present time, but in spite of them the Maryland Roads Commission continues to cut its right of way through the park, build overpasses, and so forth.

I have introduced a joint resolution in the House which is completely similar to one introduced in the Senate and upon which the Senate Interior Affairs Committee has conducted hearings. This resolution proposes to preserve Rock Creek Park to its dedicated purposes. I hope the appropriate committee of the House will give the subject early consideration to the end that we may act with expedition and in coordination with the Senate on the subject.

I know I speak the mind of many Members of the House when I say that we ought to go all out in preserving Rock Creek Park. Those predecessors who created it are entitled to whatever action is necessary to save it.

In connection with Rock Creek Day on Sunday, May 15, I am sure that Members and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in the following article entitled "Everybody's Invited to a Fine Park," by Irston R. Barnes, president, Audubon Society of the District of Columbia:

EVERYBODY'S INVITED TO A FINE PARK

(By Irston R. Barnes, president, Audubon Society of the District of Columbia)

Rock Creek Day is Sunday, May 15. The Rock Creek Day committee, a group of community leaders who value outdoor recreation in all its forms, invites all who appreciate Rock Creek Park to spend a part of the day engaging in a favorite pastime in the park.

The invitations are being accepted by Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, hiking clubs, equitation enthusiasts, nature societies, and a host of other groups. And each group, planning its chosen outdoor recreation, is inviting any interested members of the public to join in.

The plan for Rock Creek Day was initiated by the Potomac Valley Conservation and Recreation Council, an information clearing house for citizens' associations, recreation clubs, nature societies, and conservation groups. The council was formed as a result of many individuals and organizations writing to this columnist and endorsing various articles devoted to the importance of preserving the C. & O. Canal, Rock Creek Park, Glover-Archbold Park, the Dyke Marsh, and other park and natural areas.

It is appropriate that we pause in the hurried round of daily living to contemplate, not simply as individuals but as members of the Washington community, what our National Capital would be like if our parks and woodlands were allowed to be eroded further by neglect or ill-advised highway building. I wish that those who loved and enjoyed the Rock Creek Valley of 100, or even 50, years ago had carried their thinking beyond the mere reservation of the park to assure its retention as they knew it.

Rock Creek, in the not distant past, was a lusty, clear, flowing stream which filled its banks and covered the great boulders that now stand amid its shrunken and discolored waters. There is simple testimony to its wild beauty.

President John Quincy Adams had a retreat in the valley where he sought refreshment from the pressures of politics in this romantic glen, listening to the singing of a thousand birds. John Burroughs, when he resided in Washington, found Rock Creek as wild and savage, and apparently as remote from civilization, as anything one meets with in the mountain sources of the Hudson or the Delaware. And Viscount Bryce, then British Ambassador, thought Rock Creek made Washington unique: "What city in the world is there where a man * * * can within a quarter of an hour and on his own feet get in a beautiful rocky glen such as you would find in the woods of Maine or Scotland—a winding rocky glen with a broad stream foaming over its stony bed; and wild leafy woods looking down on each side."

Such was Rock Creek not many years ago, as pictured in the sober, unexaggerated testimony of responsible witnesses. What would it not be worth if we could have kept Rock Creek as these men knew it.

And how Theodore Roosevelt, if he could return today, would berate those between his day and ours who have already appropriated most of the park below Porter Street for motor roads. As a practicing apostle of physical fitness and the rugged life, he has described his joy, when he was President, in going on rough cross-country walks, perhaps down Rock Creek, which was then as wild as a stream in the White Mountains.

Louis J. Halle, author of Spring in Washington, writing in the Atlantic Naturalist, gave his evaluation of Rock Creek today in these words:

"In the midst of a city whose piles of brick and concrete and whose stretches of macadam represent the temporal devices of mankind, an area like Rock Creek represents the elements of eternity. Exposure to these elements is essential if men are to keep their contact with ultimate reality, and an area like Rock Creek Park ought consequently to be regarded as an indispensable feature of our National Capital. It is there to nourish the vision that justifies the Nation."

So as we prepare to participate in Rock Creek Day, we are joining a notable company of the great men of other days who have found in the natural majesty of Washington's setting that re-creation of body, mind, and spirit which they needed to fit them for the trials of their days.

The 100th Anniversary of Louisiana's State Board of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the past 100 years have been memorable ones for Louisiana in the field of health. All of us—all the American people—are, in a very real sense, reaping the benefits of the advanced thinking and courageous pioneering which emanated from Louisiana on March 15, 1855. For on that date the first State board of health in this country was authorized.

The story of the development of public health administration in Louisiana from its beginning is a fascinating one, shot through with the threads of our national history—civil war, reconstruction, and the emergence of modern America as a scientific leader. A mere fragmentary historical note will serve to pay incomplete tribute to the "giants that walked the land" in those pioneer days.

Since the early struggles of Louisiana are largely to be read in the flow of events which shaped the growth of the city of New Orleans, it is to its history we must turn. Its strategic location at the foot of the Mississippi River and as a great port of entry gave rise to one of the

major events in United States history—the Louisiana Purchase.

In the shaping of its own destiny, the location of New Orleans greatly favoring the recurrence of those "malignant, pestilential, and infectious diseases" which ravaged its population down to the 20th century, was most important. And as the growing trade brought to the city and State a constantly increasing and fluctuating population, the question of disease and adequate provisions for treatment and control were the major health problems which faced the new State.

From 1793 to 1901 New Orleans is reported to have lost 41,348 inhabitants from yellow fever alone. Lack of scientific knowledge regarding the cause of this dread scourge down to the 20th century was one reason for its relentless recurrence. It was the disastrous yellow-fever epidemics of 1853 and 1854 in Louisiana which prompted a small band of pioneers to set up a bold experiment—to establish a board of health which would be responsible for the protection of the entire State. This was only 5 years after the publication of one of the most remarkable documents in the history of public health—the Shattuck report of the Massachusetts Sanitary Commission. This document recommended many public health duties which should be undertaken by the State, but which for those days, were practically revolutionary. Many of its wise recommendations, especially those pertaining to quarantine measures, were incorporated in Louisiana's public health act 336 of 1855.

Quarantine was not the only duty of the Board. Its broader duties are stated in section 6 of the act which provides:

The Board of Health shall have power to remove, or cause to be removed, any substance which they may deem detrimental to the health of the city of New Orleans, and the Commissioners of Streets shall execute their orders, whenever not in conflict with the ordinances of the city or the laws of the State; to pass and enforce sanitary ordinances for the city, provided the same are approved by the council and published as city ordinances; and impose additional duties to officers appointed under this act; to issue warrants to any constable, police officer, or sheriff in the State, to apprehend and remove such person or persons as cannot be otherwise subjected to the provisions of this act, or who shall have violated the same, and whenever it shall be necessary to do so, to issue their warrants to the sheriff of the city or parish where any vessel may be, having violated the provisions of this act, commanding him to remove said vessel at the quarantine grounds, and arrest the officers thereof.

Nearly 20 years were to elapse before other States followed suit and established State boards of health. In 1869 Massachusetts established what historians usually credit the first permanent State board of health. It must be remembered that Louisiana was vitally involved in the turmoil of the Civil War and Reconstruction periods, so that for a very brief period during the 1860's, records for the Louisiana State Board of Health are incompleted. There is, however, a recent article which carefully documents the continuity and permanency of the health board established in 1855. According to this article, published in the October, 1951 issue of the American Journal of Public Health, "at no time from 1855 on was the State of Louisiana without a law requiring the establishment of a State board of health, nor was the State without such a board of health for any appreciable period that might be considered as a gap in its continuity. The year 1898, which has sometimes been given as the date when the Louisiana State Board of Health was established, is really the date when a more comprehensive act was passed to include all the provisions for public health recommended by most of the previous boards in the 42-year period beginning with the tenure of the first State health officer, Dr. A. Forster Axson.

From 1898 on, the Louisiana State Board of Health has continued to build on the foundation laid in 1855. The 20th century brought an avalanche of new scientific knowledge to the field of public health. It provided also a great impetus to the Louisiana State Board of Health, to take advantage of the newly discovered ways of preventing disease and improving health.

The concepts of public health as we know them today have their roots, therefore, in the act of 1855, establishing State governmental responsibility for the health protection of Louisiana citizens. The success of this principle has demonstrated that State and local planning is the only foundation on which we can build toward our national health goals. Progress at the national level depends on action by the people in individual communities throughout the Nation; on their initiative, and the urgency of their demand for better health. In this light, it is not an exaggeration to pay tribute to the "giants that walked the land" in Louisiana in 1855.

Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of H. R. 6059, the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955, there follows an explanation of this legislation for the information of the Members of Congress and the public. The Committee on Ways and Means has announced public hearings to be held on H. R. 6059 beginning on Monday, May 16.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6059, THE PHILIPPINE TRADE AGREEMENT REVISION ACT OF 1955

EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATION OF 1946 TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES

Preamble

The preamble is revised to delete the reference to the war against Japan and to emphasize the need to strengthen the economy of the Philippines.

Article I

Recommendation: Replace the schedules for the disappearance of tariff preferences for Philippine articles imported into the United States and for United States articles imported into the Philippines by new schedules which are more liberal to the Philippines, as set forth below:

Percentages of customs duties applied

Calendar year	By the United States to imports from the Philippines		By the Philippines to imports from the United States	
	1946 agreement as extended	Revised agreement	1946 agreement as extended	Revised agreement
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1956	15	5	15	25
1957	20	5	20	25
1958	25	5	25	25
1959	30	10	30	50
1960	35	10	35	50
1961	40	10	40	50
1962	45	20	45	75
1963	50	20	50	75
1964	55	20	55	75
1965	60	40	60	90
1966	65	40	65	90
1967	70	40	70	90
1968	75	60	75	90
1969	80	60	80	90
1970	85	60	85	90
1971	90	80	90	90
1972	95	80	95	90
1973	100	80	100	90
1974	100	100	100	100

The Philippines undertakes to eliminate the present 17-percent tax on sales of foreign exchange and to replace this tax with a temporary special import levy, exempt from the preferences applicable to United States articles, which levy will be progressively reduced at the rate of 10 percent per year, beginning in the calendar year 1957. Provisions are included for the suspension of this schedule of reduction in the event Philippine revenues in any calendar year from tariffs on United States goods and from the temporary special import levy on United States goods fall below the proceeds of the foreign-exchange tax on payments for United States goods in the calendar year 1955.

Discussion: Modification of the tariff relations of the two countries so as to give the greatest possible impetus to the lagging Philippine economy was the most urgent objective of the Philippines in requesting revision of the 1946 agreement. The Philippine Economic Mission stated that free entry for American goods entering the Philippines had prevented the development of Philippine industry and had deprived the Philippine Government of revenues vitally needed for the economic development of the country. It argued that although the reciprocal preferences were intended to be equally advantageous to both countries, the Philippines for the first few years after the war had been unable to make much use of their privilege in the American market because of the havoc which the war had caused to their productive facilities, whereas American goods, and especially nonessentials, had poured into the Philippines during the first 5 years of independence. To correct this state of affairs the mission proposed a selective free-trade arrangement whereby free entry on all United States imports from the Philippines would continue through 1970 and rapidly disappear between that date and the expiration of the agreement, while free entry into the Philippines would continue to be extended through 1970 to selected American articles which were essential to Philippine needs and the remainder of American articles (constituting roughly two-thirds of the total) would become immediately subject to full Philippine duties. Revision of article I on any such

basis was rejected by the United States delegation on several grounds, including the difficulty of separating American exports to the Philippines into two categories, one to be greatly benefited and the other to be greatly penalized. It was made clear that any change in this part of the agreement would have to be on a general basis. The preference schedules that were finally agreed to, as set forth above, represented the result of gradually working the Filipinos away from the extreme demands with which they began.

It is the general opinion of the United States negotiators that unless substantial satisfaction, such as the recommended modification, is given to the Philippines on the question of tariff preferences, and particularly on Philippine preferences in the United States, there is a real possibility that the Philippine Government will decide to give notice of termination of the 1946 agreement.

In return for these tariff modifications the United States delegation insisted on and obtained the undertaking described above with respect to elimination of the 17 percent exchange tax. Much of the sacrifice that will be entailed from 1957 to 1966 in meeting the higher rates of the Philippine tariff, under the reduction of preferences recommended, will be compensated by the decline in the temporary special import tax that will replace the exchange tax. A further advantage of this provision is that the exchange tax on invisibles will disappear as soon as the revision is adopted, a fact which should be generally encouraging to the establishment of new American investments in the Philippines as well as a material gain for existing investments. The disappearance of the exchange tax will at the same time remove a discrimination against American shipping which has been subject to this tax while competing air carriers have been exempt from it.

Article II

Recommendations: Amend paragraph 1 to delete any reference to rice (item C of schedule) and to remove the present absolute quotas on cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons (items D to G, inclusive, of schedule). Insert a statement that the present absolute quotas on Philippine raw and refined sugars shall be without prejudice to any increases which the United States Congress might allocate to the Philippines in the future. Amend paragraph 2 to provide for a new and slower schedule for the progressive decrease of the duty-free quotas on cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons. For the sake of clarity divide the schedule in the 1946 agreement into two schedules to show separately the items subject to absolute quotas and those subject to tariff quotas. Delete paragraphs 3 and 4 which specify how the allocation in the Philippines of United States quotas on Philippine products is to be made.

Discussion: The recommendation for removal of the absolute quotas on cigars, tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons is based on the following reasons: That these quotas being applicable only to the Philippines are discriminatory; that they are unnecessary for the purpose of protecting domestic industry since the United States retains the right under article III to impose quotas where there is injury or threat to a domestic industry; that the quotas on Philippine cigars and scrap tobacco are so much greater than the amounts on these articles presently exported to the United States that they are practically meaningless; and that the quota on coconut oil for the same reason is likewise without any restrictive effect on Filipino exporters and without any protective effect for American producers. A further argument, advanced by the Filipinos, was that the Philippines had been unable, because of the time required to rehabilitate their export industries, to take much advantage of the quotas in the early years following independence. Rice has been deleted from the quota list altogether for the reason that the Philippines has been and for some time will probably continue to be an importer rather than an exporter of rice, and that if it should ever have a surplus rice production available for export, neighboring countries, notably Japan, offer a natural market for this product. No change was recommended with respect to the quota on cordage (item B of the 1946 schedule). The sugar quota was not modified, and the United States delegation repeatedly emphasized during the negotiation that this quota was not a limitation so far as the Philippines was concerned, but rather a privilege to share in a premium market for sugar where the Philippines would probably be unable to sell at all in free and open competition with other foreign countries.

The quantities specified in the 1946 schedule for cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons (items D to G), although recommended for elimination as absolute quotas, were recommended for retention as the bases for calculating the duty-free tariff quotas on these articles. The progressive diminution of these duty-free quotas was slackened so that the products subject thereto might receive a benefit comparable to the slower application of United States customs duties to Philippine articles as recommended under article I, and the rates for the disappearance of the United States tariff preferences will be seen to be the same as the rates for the disappearance of the United States tariff quotas.

The Filipinos were insistent upon the elimination of the provisions specifying how United States quotas were to be allocated among the several producers in the Philippines. They felt that these provisions were an infringement of Philippine rights, and they considered also that the continued maintenance of the original quotas tended to arrest development in the respective industries by discriminating against new producers. The United States delegation reached the conclusion that these allocations had served their original purpose which was to facilitate the recovery of firms whose businesses had been destroyed by the war. It found that the American interests in these several industries were not so great as to warrant such special protection, particularly since they enjoyed general protection under other provisions of the agreement. No objection whatever to the elimination of these allocation provisions has come to the attention of the United States delegation.

Article III

Recommendations: Make reciprocal provision for the establishment of quantitative restrictions on imports to protect domestic industries from injurious competition and to safeguard monetary reserves.

Discussion: Article III of the 1946 agreement permits the United States to impose quantitative restrictions on imports from the Philippines for the protection of domestic industry, but it says nothing about the establishment of import quotas by the Philippines, either for protective or for any other reasons. Whereas the United States has found no occasion to utilize its power under this article, the Philippines has imposed numerous quantitative import restrictions, some amounting to absolute prohibitions on the importation of products of the United States. The introduction of the new reciprocal provisions should therefore give American trade a measure of protection which it has not had under the existing agreement. The article attempts to define the size of quotas which may be imposed for protective purposes and to insure the admission of at least token quantities of any commodity to protect regular channels of trade. It defines also in general terms the circumstances under which quotas may be imposed for balance of payments reasons. There is a consultation provision which should discourage arbitrary or precipitate action. This article is considered by the United States delegation as an important improvement in the agreement from the standpoint of the United States. Had there been such a provision in the original agreement, the Philippines would not have been free to adopt drastic limitations on imports of American tobacco for the purpose of protecting domestic industry.

Article IV

Recommendation: Delete paragraph 3 prohibiting the imposition of an export tax by either country upon products which it exports to the other.

Discussion: In its urgent need to raise additional revenues the Philippine Government wishes to be free to impose export taxes if it sees fit. Since the United States does not attempt to put a prohibition on the use of export taxes on other countries with which it does business, no justification is seen for retaining the prohibition in the Philippine agreement. The United States delegation has, however, pointed out the danger to the Philippines from an abuse of this power.

Article V

Recommendation:

1. Delete the entire article on currency and exchange as it appears in the 1946 agreement.

2. Insert in this place a new article V whereby the Philippines undertakes to enact legislation to complement that which was passed in the last session of the United States Congress to facilitate the reciprocal entry of traders.

Discussion: From the outset of the negotiations the Philippine Economic Mission laid stress on the need to eliminate the provision of the 1946 agreement whereby the Philippines had to get the agreement of the President of the United States to change the value of its currency or to impose controls on the transfer of funds to the United States. It maintained that this was an infringement of the right of the Philippines as a sovereign nation, and insisted on complete elimination of the article. The United States delegation endeavored to substitute for the old article reciprocal provisions with respect to exchange restrictions comparable to those used in recent treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation to which the United States is a party, but the Philippine Mission claimed that as a member in good standing of the International Monetary Fund, the Philippines was already making all of the commitments in this field which it was willing to make. The sentiment of American business, as ascertained in the public hearings which were held and in the briefs which were submitted to the United States delegation, indicated a general willingness to see this article deleted and no strong objection thereto from any business quarter.

The new article V with respect to treaty merchant status was inserted at the request of the United States delegation to make sure that the Philippines would carry through on their side the legislation necessary to permit the two countries to enter into an agreement to facilitate the entry of traders from each country into the other. The absence of such an agreement, and indeed of any agreement with respect to immigration, is a source of genuine anxiety to Americans in the Philippines today. Action taken prior to signature of the agreement by the Republic of the Philippines with respect to proposed article V will be reflected in modification of that article, as permitted under section 203 of the proposed authorizing legislation for the revised trade agreement. Thus, if the necessary legislative and executive actions are taken by the Philippine Congress, provisions on entry of traders could, if desired, be incorporated into the

revised trade agreement as article V, or, if a separate agreement on this subject is desired, the proposed new article could be deleted.

Article VI

Recommendation: Article VI in the original agreement related to immigration, and its provisions have now expired. This subject is treated in article V of the recommended revision. Article VII of the 1946 agreement, concerning parity rights, therefore, becomes article VI in the revised agreement. The recommended modifications of the parity article would delete the obsolete provisions, including part of paragraph 1 and all of paragraph 2, mutualize the rights provided in paragraph 1 with respect to the exploitation of natural resources and the operation of public utilities, and specify the reservations which the United States must make to protect existing Federal legislation and the constitutions and laws of the States, which reservations would also be mutualized.

Discussion: The Philippines has long resented the parity provisions of the 1946 agreement as an infringement of their sovereign rights, since no corresponding rights were granted in the agreement to Filipinos in the United States. The Philippine Economic Mission requested the complete termination of these provisions unless a satisfactory mutualizing formula could be found, and during the negotiations it was clear that the mission would have preferred the former. The United States delegation declined to consider termination of parity, which was regarded by American business as perhaps the most important benefit which the United States gained through the agreement. To mutualize the provisions, the reservations had to be spelled out in detail, and this has resulted in some rather complicated language. The purpose of the revision is to protect American rights already acquired under the 1946 agreement, and to continue parity rights for the duration of the agreement to the extent that the United States and the individual States of the United States are prepared to grant similar rights to Filipinos. So strongly did the Philippine mission feel about the necessity to mutualize this provision in every respect that had completely mutualizing language not been found, it is doubtful whether the parity article could have been retained.

Article VII

Recommendation: Insert here a new article providing for reciprocal nondiscrimination by either party against the citizens or enterprises of the other with respect to engaging in business activities, subject to the reservation of the constitutions and laws of the States of the United States and the mutualization of these reservations.

Discussion: The 1946 agreement contained no clear statement of rights of Americans to engage in business enterprises in the Philippines other than those referred to in the parity article, but there was a penalty provision (par. 4 of art. X), unilateral and regarded by the Philippines as harsh, whereby the President of the United States could suspend the agreement in whole or in part if the Philippines discriminated in any way against Americans or American companies. The recommendation in the final act provides for reciprocal national treatment with respect to engaging in business activities, subject to the necessary reservation of the constitutions and laws of the several States, which reservation is also mutalized. The rights of Americans already engaged in business in the Philippines are protected.

Article VIII

Recommendation: The substance of old article VIII is transferred to article IX and a new article is inserted here containing security exceptions for which there was no provision in the 1946 agreement.

Discussion: The new article contains the usual type of security exceptions included in international agreements to which the United States is a party.

Article IX

Recommendation: This article as revised contains the amended substance of article VIII of the original text. The last clause of paragraph 1 of old article VIII is deleted as obsolete. All of paragraph 2 after the first sentence relates to the allocation of quotas and is deleted in view of the recommendation under article II that all provisions for the allocation of quotas be eliminated. All of paragraph 3 is deleted as now obsolete since the work of the Philippine War Damage Commission is completed and the Commission is no longer in existence. There remain only the general provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 with respect to implementation by the two parties of the provisions of the agreement.

Article X

Recommendation: The subject of old article IX (consultation) has been transferred to article X and amended to provide for a consultation not later than July 1, 1971, on joint problems which may arise as a result or in anticipation of the termination of the agreement.

Discussion: The added language is to ensure that at a reasonable length of time before the expiration of the agreement the two parties meet to consider what the situation will be after expiration. The important problems for American investment in the Philippines which will arise in connection with expiration of the agreement should not be left to last-minute consideration.

Article XI

Recommendation: The amended substance of article X of the existing agreement, with respect to termination, is transferred to article XI. Paragraphs 1 and 3 are deleted as obsolete. Paragraph 4 is deleted inasmuch as its purpose, which was to provide for nondiscriminatory treatment of American citizens and firms, has been put into positive reciprocal undertakings in the new article VII. Only paragraph 2 remains of the article. Add a new paragraph providing for entry into force of the revising agreement.

Discussion: Paragraph 4 of article X, because of its unilateral and penalizing character, was offensive to Philippine national pride and regarded by Filipinos as unjust. The Acting Secretary of Foreign Affairs referred to this provision in 1954 as intolerable. American business firms in the Philippines have felt that the provision gave them no positive security since it contained no assurance by the Philippine Government that the latter would in fact not discriminate against them, and the American Chamber of Commerce in Manila informed the United States delegation of its members' wish that this article be clarified. The meaning of "discriminating" was not defined, and while the United States Government understood this term to mean national treatment for Americans in most circumstances, there were indications that the Government of the Philippines did not view it as necessarily requiring more than most-favored-nation treatment. The usefulness of the provision in the hands of the President of the United States in the event of Philippine discrimination was problematical, since it obviously would not be invoked except under great provocation, and the provision had in fact never been invoked.

The positive undertaking of the Philippine Government as contained in article VII of the recommended revision assures Americans in the Philippines of national treatment with respect to engaging in business activities and is a marked improvement over paragraph 4 of article X in the existing agreement. The portion of old article X that is retained in the revision, former paragraph 2, contains all of the termination provisions that are regarded as necessary. The new paragraph provides that the revising agreement shall enter into force on January 1, 1956.

Protocol

Recommendation: Add to the definitions of "United States article" and "Philippine article" as contained in paragraph 1 (e) and (f) a statement that such articles do not lose their status as such by reason of being imported from a country other than the Philippines or the United States or from an insular possession of the United States or by way of or via such a country or insular possession.

Discussion: The Philippine Government has been treating items manufactured in the United States and imported from Guam and from third countries as not entitled to the tariff preferences accorded United States articles under the 1946 agreement.

General

Certain stylistic changes and changes in references or citations where appropriate are also included in the proposed revising agreement.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for the week of May 9, 1955, which recalls the ending of the European war 10 years ago:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Do you remember your thoughts on that miraculous day 10 years ago when the word came flashing through that the war in Europe had ended? Were you among those who breathed a prayer of thanks to Almighty God, and felt utopia had arrived? Or were your thoughts—happy in the victory but tinged still with fear—turned rather to the Pacific?

It is hard now to recapture the feeling of that moment when we learned of Nazi Germany's surrender. It was one of the great climactic moments of life.

It was also a moment for dreams—dreams of reunited families, of renewed ties, of doing together many things long delayed. It was a time, too, for dreams of a perfect world.

The term "postwar world" was a phrase which meant to each of us the achievement of every goal, the realization of every dream, the accomplishment of a durable peace in which people everywhere would be free and content.

Of course, no such perfect world has come into being. Life still has many heartbreaks and private tragedies; life still has the ever-present threat of war—of a more horrible kind of war than we had even imagined possible just 10 years ago.

The United Nations, to which we were going to assign the responsibility for keeping the peace and making it into that dreamed-of reality, has rather stumbled along and muddled along. East and West are divided, armed camps nervously watching one another in deepest suspicion and mistrust.

No, the dream we dreamed 10 years ago has not materialized. The human race lived

through the kind of ordeal in that war which should have cleansed the soul of mankind—but, alas, we have retained our contrary and oh-so-human characteristics. We have failed to live up to dreams we fashioned for ourselves. We wanted to wish our way to world peace.

But let us look, too, at the other side of the coin. Ten years ago we won the right to try to establish a basis for enduring world peace. We brought liberation to vast areas of the earth—liberation from dictatorship and tyranny and oppression. True, there are still vast areas which are not free.

But we are free to keep working for their freedom. And we shall never be deterred from that goal. For in its achievement lies, finally, the realization of all of our own dreams of that perfect world we thought 10 years ago was then just a matter of days, or weeks, or months—at most just a few years—away.

Do you remember?

The Heritage of Schiller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the 150th anniversary of the death of Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller, great German poet and author of some of the world's greatest literature, including the immortal story of William Tell:

THE HERITAGE OF SCHILLER

The burden of my message on the 150th anniversary of the death of Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller is that in this genius we have a deeply German poet with a universal ideal. The ideal, nurtured in the German milieu of his time, was a savage love of liberty. No nation has ever been without its quota of tyranny, bigotry, and stupidity, not even the most enlightened at the peak of its enlightenment. This perfection is as rare of achievement in nations as it is in individuals. And tyranny was the target at which this brilliant poet leveled the wit, the insight, and the skill of his articulateness. He cut the tyrant and tyranny to pieces with language that spoke from the influences of German culture and that expressed qualities inside the soul of the German people. In days like these, heavy with the bitter remembrance of recent evil, this fundamental trait in the people of Germany is worthy of emphasis.

For it is as impossible to think of Schiller without thinking of Germany, as it is to think of Shakespeare without thinking of England. Or Homer without thinking of the ancient Greeks. Or Racine without thinking of France. Or Walt Whitman without thinking of America. If I had to say what do I think is Schiller's greatest service to the German people I would say it is his representation to the German people themselves, and his representation to the world of the noblest characteristics in the German character. He did it through his poetry and through his dramas. It is what I call the noblest trait which is embodied in the word "liberty." And it is his accent on liberty which, in my judgment, gives his lifework a universal ideal. For liberty has, since the beginning of man, been the goal for which man strove most mightily.

It is, of course, an interesting speculation—but only a speculation—to judge how the thinking of Schiller, getting its roots from the climate of the Germany of his time, influenced those Germans who, coming to this country, have enshrined themselves in American history. Or was it not Schiller per se, but the atmosphere that was German and influenced Schiller, which also influenced those Germans who, emigrating to America, did so much to make America great? Either way, it seems to me, the evidence should help us to dampen the fires of postwar acrimony in our own time, and build up in us that "malice toward none, and charity for all" which is the better side of civilized behavior.

Schiller is hardly a name too well known in America. But that cannot alter the fact that what he wrote not only fertilized freedom of thought everywhere, but may, indirectly, have produced profound results for the forward march of the forces of freedom. Until Schiller made of the story of William Tell, for example, the great legend that it has become it was only a fragment of the forgotten history of the Swiss and the Austrians. Today wherever almost any language is spoken the epic of William Tell is the story, on the highest dramatic plane, of man's intrepid struggle to be free. It is a part, in fact, of the universal literature of mankind. We, and no other people, except his own, can claim Schiller, for he is a German of the Germans. But I venture to guess that God—who, we have been told, moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform—had in mind the freedom not only of Germany, but of all mankind when He gave us this universal genius as His gift. In that sense Schiller, who died 150 years ago, lives forever and for all of us.

Centennial of Organized Public Health in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the public-health program of the United States has saved thousands of lives and has made happier and healthier living for millions. I am proud that my home State of Louisiana has been a pioneer in this great program. This year marks the centennial anniversary of organized public health in Louisiana, and this significant event is being commemorated in connection with the annual meeting of the southern branch of the American Public Health Association with which the Louisiana Public Health Association is affiliated. Public-health workers from 16 Southern States, the District of Columbia, and Latin America are gathered in New Orleans today for sessions continuing 4 days.

While there is some difference of opinion concerning the first official State board of health in this country, the evidence is that the first Louisiana State board of health was established in 1855 and this has become an accepted fact.

I am glad of the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues, the long and important part Louisiana has had in this wonderful work.

West Virginia's Daughter of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in these busy days, it is not perhaps amiss to think at least briefly about some of the finer, and, as we might say, sweeter things of life. During the past weekend, the thoughts of each of us turned again to remember that person who, in almost every life, represents the epitome of affection and loyalty and love, and, in remembering our mothers, it was quite natural that we would also honor our wives and sisters and sweethearts, because a man never gets so far down nor so high up in the world that some woman does not love and comfort and usually sustain him.

The faith and loyalty of woman, even to the point of blindness to our faults—beginning with our mother's love for us, including that of our sisters, and not ending with our wives—because daughters and granddaughters also enter into this delightful conspiracy—is wonderful to those of us who enjoy it. The classic oath of loyalty so familiar to us all was made, not by a man but by a woman—and then about her mother-in-law.

It was Walt Whitman who said, "A man is a great thing upon the earth, and through eternity—but every jot of the greatness of man is unfolded out of woman." Woodrow Wilson stated the same thing in a different way when he said, "No man ever amounted to a snap of the finger who was not constantly surrounded by a bevy of admiring females." So, it is most appropriate that, at this time of the year, we should pause to pay special respect to those of the fairer sex who are Members of this House. Much could be said about the services so capably performed by the gentle ladies who serve with us, and even then it would be impossible to find words to adequately express our esteem and admiration for their quiet dignity and charm, but I should like to speak briefly of the lady Member of my own delegation, Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE. You will understand my inestimable pride when I inform you, Mr. Speaker, that on Saturday evening, May 7, the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia held its annual son and daughter banquet honoring West Virginia's outstanding son and daughter of the year 1955, and Mrs. KEE was selected as our State's most distinguished daughter. She was presented with a beautiful plaque by a former Member of this House, the Honorable Jennings Randolph, and she also received a great number of letters and telegrams from friends. Because these messages are expressive of the confidence and the high respect reposed in this great woman by all who know and love her, I am inserting some of these in the RECORD. All who were present rejoiced that one so richly deserving had gained this signal honor. It was a trib-

ute to her record of eminent service, and a fitting reward for her steadfast devotion to her people. It was recognition of her fervent desire to help mankind. I and my fellow Members of this House join in saying that we are happy for the high privilege of serving with West Virginia's daughter of daughters, our sister, and our true friend.

MAY 7, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C.:

I am happy to know that the West Virginia State Society of Washington, D. C., has chosen Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE as the outstanding daughter of the year 1955 for the State of West Virginia.

This honor could not have been more worthily bestowed, as Mrs. KEE is outstanding in ability, character, and a fervent desire to serve mankind. Please convey to her my warmest congratulations and best wishes.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States.

MAY 6, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C.:

ELIZABETH KEE's colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee wish to join the West Virginia State Society in paying tribute to a fine Congresswoman and a grand person. We appreciate the contribution which she is making to our committee's work. West Virginia must be proud of her illustrious daughter.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, United States House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1955.*

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C.:

I have learned with pleasure that you have designated the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE as West Virginia's outstanding daughter for 1955. We who work with her each day and know her well realize how richly she deserves this recognition. She has won the affection and respect of her colleagues in the Congress for her gifted and devoted service to her State and Nation. My warm congratulations to you and to her on this happy occasion.

GRACIE PFOST,
Member of Congress, from Idaho.

MAY 7, 1955.

The Honorable ELIZABETH KEE,
Care of Mr. Joe Weeda, President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations and my very best wishes on this glorious occasion. The West Virginia Society has shown excellent judgment in selecting you as their daughter of the year. Your friendship is precious to all who know you and this fine tribute is righly deserved.

VERA BUCHANAN,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1955.*

Hon. ELIZABETH KEE,
Member of Congress,
Care of Mr. Joe Weeda, President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

West Virginia is no prouder of you tonight than all of us in the House who consider it an honor and pleasure to serve with you. Congratulations.

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Third District, Missouri.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 6, 1955.*

Hon. JOSEPH WEEDA:

Mrs. Kilgore and I deeply regret it will be impossible for us to attend the West Virginia Society's son and daughter banquet due to the fact that we will be out of town. Please extend our heartiest congratulations to Mrs. KEE and Mr. Reuther upon their receipt of this well-deserved honor. The State of West Virginia can well be proud of these outstanding citizens.

Senator H. M. KILGORE.

MAY 4, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

Regret very much unable to be present for affair honoring Mrs. KEE and Mr. Reuther. Please extend to Mrs. KEE my sincerest congratulations for being chosen daughter of the year. It is a deserved honor. Her hometown of Bluefield is extremely proud of Mrs. KEE as West Virginia's first and only Congresswoman. Best wishes to all for a successful dinner.

A. S. BARKSDALE, Jr.,
Editor, Sunset News, Bluefield, W. Va.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1955.*

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

The West Virginia Society is honoring the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, Member of Congress from West Virginia, as the outstanding woman of the year. I fully expected to attend this dinner to join with others in paying respect to this very distinguished woman, who, in my judgment, is worthy of any honor that might be conferred upon her. However, circumstances beyond my control prevent me from doing so. Her services in the Congress and her dignified record reflect the high intelligence of the electorate from the district she represents.

West Virginia should be proud of ELIZABETH KEE and I wish to join with the officers and members of your society in extending felicitations to her. I express the fervent hope that she will continue to be blessed with good health to the end that we may indefinitely enjoy the fruits of her labors in the United States Congress.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
Vice President, United Mine Workers of America.

We salute the rule of life by which ELIZABETH KEE lives, so aptly expressed by the poet:

"How far away is the temple of fame?"
Said a youth at the dawn of the day.
He toiled and dreamed of a deathless name,
And the hours went by, and the evening came
Leaving him feeble, and old, and lame
To plod on his cheerless way.

"How far away is the temple of good?"
Said a youth at the dawn of the day.
And he strove in the spirit of brotherhood,
To help and succor as best he could,
The poor and unfortunate multitude,
In their hard and dreary way.
He was careless alike of praise and blame,
But after his work was done,
An angel of glory from heaven came,
And wrote on high his immortal name,
To proclaim this truth that the temple of fame,
And the temple of good are one.

For this is the lesson that history
Has taught since the world began;
That those whose memories never die,
But shine like stars in the human sky,
And brighter grow as the years go by,
Are the men who live for man.

Appropriations for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my pleasure to read our colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS, of California's, weekly newsletter. This letter is written for the Congressman's own constituents, but it has facts and figures of importance to all our people.

The last letter is of especial interest to all of us who have been told of late by certain groups that the United States has been, and is being, niggardly in its contributions to the United Nations. Nothing could be further from the truth. If the United Nations does not succeed, its lack of success can never be attributed to a lack of American money.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

I RISE TO REMARK

(By Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS, of California)

Last week I wrote a little about a current pressure campaign, being carried on by some good-hearted ladies of this country, to prevent any reductions in the appropriations for the United Nations, and its subsidiaries. I was sitting here at my Corona, wondering what to write about this week, and on my desk, right in front of me, is a slip of paper with an old Latin proverb on it: "It is easy to be generous with other people's property."

Do you suppose it is only a coincidence that this should turn up this morning? If anyone is worrying that good old Uncle Sam, the softest touch in all history, is not giving enough to the United Nations (which statement has nothing to do with the merits of the U. N. or its work) let me condense and recite our support, over the years:

The U. N. itself has received, from all members, $343,601,172; of which the United States contributed $144,238,394. Our percentage has decreased slightly, from 39.89 percent in 1946 to 33.33 percent this year.

UNESCO has received (in addition to the above, of course) $65,063,651, of which the United States of America contributed $27,191,299. In this organization, our share started at 44.03 percent in 1948 and is now 33.33 percent, as in U. N. itself.

We have contributed $21,178,928 to the World Health Organization, of a total of $50,372,225. Our percentage dropped from 38.77 percent in 1949 to a present 33.33 percent.

The FAO, about which I wrote last week, and which I want earnestly to keep from the domination of those influential members of the U. N., who have never taken a direct interest in its work and have not, up to now, supported it directly, has received a total of $49,020,000, of which the United States of America has contributed $14,905,467. Our percentage has risen, in this organization, from 25 percent in 1946 to 30 percent for the current year.

The ILO (International Labor Organization) has received $50,899,433 and of this the United States of America has given $21,339,691. The United States of America contribution increased from 17.53 percent in 1946, to 25 percent in 1955.

We contribute 25 percent of the money but the British managed to slip in that extra "u."

The International Civil Aviation Organization has had $24,129,192, of which we gave $6,941,464. Our share has increased from 11.95 percent in 1946 to 32.6 percent for 1955.

The International Telecommunications Union has received $11,399,692, and we gave $1,248,701 of that. Our share for 1955 is only 8.96 percent and this has changed very little since 1950, in which year we gave 8.04 percent.

Of course, we ought to do something about the weather, so the World Meteorological Organization has had $1,038,152, in 4 years, of which we gave $169,867. We are giving 11.45 percent this year, which is about par for that course, as we gave 12.67 percent in 1952.

I point with pride to the last of the regular organizations, the Universal Postal Union. It has received $2,689,031 and of this we gave $118,912. Those postal boys are pretty good bargainers, as any Congressman can tell you, and we are contributing this year 4.36 percent to this fund. The largest percentage was 4.63 percent in 1946.

All the above adds up to $598,212,548, of which the United States has given $228,332,723, which is not bad for a nation whose dollar has been cut in half, and which already has a per capita debt greater than any of the other contributors to the same funds. But don't go away. There are still more.

We will now take up contributions to voluntary and special programs. I only have the figures, for these programs, to include 1953. There should be 2 additional years, to have them comparable with the ones already given. The first is UNTA, the U. N. expanded program of technical assistance, about which I wrote last week, and which is now duplicating, in part, three other programs. This received, in 3 years only, $51,610,380, of which we gave $31,578,833.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) which, for 2 years, was called U. N. Relief for Palestine Refugees, received, in 5 years, $156,437,753, of which we gave $109,450,000.

The U. N. International Children's Fund (UNICEF) has had $163,471,042 in 7 years, not including the 2 recent years, for which I do not have figures, and of this the United States of America apparently gave $54,620,834.

The U. N. Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) received $86,289,023 between 1950 and 1953, of which the United States of America gave $50,750,000.

The U. N. High Commissioner for Refugee Emergency Fund had $847,908, but I am unable to give the United States of America's share, because we did not begin to appropriate directly until 1954. We took the money from other appropriations.

The International Refugee Organization was in existence from 1947 to 1950, inclusive, or under the U. N. during that time, and received $412,691,915, of which we are shown to have paid $166,091,457.

All in all, I do not think Uncle Sam has been penurious, so the good ladies can stop worrying, and I'll end this letter with another quotation, this one from La Rochefoucauld: "What is called generosity is usually only the vanity of giving; we enjoy the vanity more than the thing given," or perhaps, more simply, just "The gift without the giver is bare."

Rumania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, 78 years ago on May 10 the Nation of Rumania threw off the yoke of Turkish subjugation and proclaimed its independence. The people cherished their freedom, and during the First World War took their place at the side of the democracies in the struggle against the Central Powers. Unhappily, the chain of events of the Second World War forced a new tyranny upon the Rumanian people, the tyranny of Soviet communism.

Under their Communist overlords, the people of Rumania today are in a state of enslavement. Only "reliable" Communists are permitted to leave the country and travel, even within the country, is severely restricted. Books have been purged, and the press, the movies, and the schools are forced to become channels of Communist propaganda. Religious freedom is denied, and hundreds of priests have been thrown into prisons or concentration camps because they opposed the atheistic regime.

The ordeal of the Rumanian people under the ruthless foreign occupation of Soviet communism, their economic exploitation, and their deprivation of elemental human rights and liberties are now a matter of record. On the other hand, through Soviet political and military pressure, Rumania has been transformed, against the will of its people, into a satellite base for the aggressive schemes of Moscow.

The Soviet Union will not permit the open celebration of the 10th of May in Rumania because this day stands for the liberty and justice which the Communist conspiracy is intent upon destroying. Nevertheless, loyal Rumanians will never reconcile themselves to the loss of the liberty which their forefathers died to obtain. To them, May 10 will be a time of solemn dedication to the rebirth of freedom. On this day they have the assurances of the American people that their plight is not forgotten, and our prayers that freedom will be theirs once again.

A Tribute to Thomas Murdock Brooks and Floyd Jackson Boling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 29, at a banquet in Siler City, N. C., I had the honor and the privilege of presenting portraits of two of my beloved friends to Chatham Hospital and to all of the people of Chatham County. These two friends made great and grand contributions to the building of modern hospital facilities in that progressive community and county. Such institutions are frequently referred to as Hill-Burton Hospitals. Actually, Mr. Speaker, while the Federal contribution was substantial and important, the hospital probably never would have been built but for the generosity of Tom Brooks and the untiring efforts of Jack Boling. Both of them gave freely of their time, talents, and fortunes. The building of this hospital proves just what can be accomplished if governments and people cooperate in trying to build better communities in which our citizens are to live. In presenting the portraits, which are wonderful works of art, I paid a brief tribute to Tom Brooks and Jack Boling, and here is what I said on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, last week I was in the ancient city of Rome, and I stood on the spot where the great Caesar was mortally wounded. I recalled the eloquent oration delivered by Mark Anthony over the body of his dead friend. In that speech, Mark Anthony said:

"The evil that men do lives after them—
The good is oft interred with their bones."

I have never been willing to agree with the sentiment expressed by that great orator. It occurs to me that exactly the opposite is true. This statement by Anthony, as he stood over the body of the mighty Caesar, has lived through the years, but, actually, the good that men do lives after them.

So it shall be with the two illustrious citizens to whom we, at this moment, pay homage. The good that they have done shall live after them.

Impulses of sincere affection and friendship inspire us as we meet here at this hour. We are not here to beautify the character, nor to exalt the lives of these beloved men, but rather, we are here to commune with the magnificent spirit which has guided and directed them through all the years of their lives.

Thomas Murdock Brooks and Floyd Jackson Boling have made great and grand contributions to the health, the welfare, and the happiness of the people of this community. By their lives, their labors, and the brilliant splendor of their mental exertions and dynamic and untiring efforts, they have endeared themselves to all the people among whom they have lived and labored. They have built lasting monuments in the hearts of the people of Chatham County. During every moment of their lives they have believed in the majesty of love—in the dignity of man—in the traditions and institutions of our country—and in the omnipotence of a good and gracious God.

I shall not violate the proprieties of this occasion by attempting to recapitulate, nor to review, their many magnificent achievements, but I shall attempt only to express the deep gratitude of this whole community to Tom Brooks and Jack Boling for the lives they have lived and the priceless contributions they have made to the great sum of human happiness, and to the alleviation of human suffering.

By their lives and their labors, Tom Brooks and Jack Boling have made thoroughfares of friendship in all of the highways and byways of Chatham County. Both of them in their hearts disdain and despise the "trappings of pride." Both of them are modest men. A nobility of purpose has inspired them, and prompted them to serve well the cause of humanity. They have enriched the world, and have helped to make it a better place in which to live.

Turning away from a multitude of things that distract and disturb us in the toiling hours of our daily work, we meet tonight in a beautiful spirit of friendship. We abandon for a while the vocations and avocations of both public and private life, and come here to honor these distinguished men.

THE GOOD THAT THEY HAVE DONE SHALL LIVE AFTER THEM

Their time, talents, and fortunes shall not have been given in vain. They shall enjoy the richest compensations of life. In magnanimous fashion they have given generously, and they shall reap abundantly the rewards they so richly deserve.

When I left Washington a few short hours ago, and looked from the plane window down upon that beautiful city—the Capital of our great country—the greatest Nation that ever thrived in all the tides of time—I contemplated for a moment the youth of our Nation, its vicissitudes and struggles, and I thought of its greatness. What has made this young Nation of ours so great and powerful? Surely it is not its lofty peaks and lovely lakes and beautiful countryside, nor its flourishing fields and factories—nor its soldiers, ships, and planes, and military might and power. The real greatness of America is in the moral fiber and fabric of a free and unfettered people who have cherished the altars of freedom throughout the years.

"Not gold but only men can make
A nation great and strong.
Men who for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.

"Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly.
They build a nation's pillars deep.
They lift them to the sky."

Tom Brooks and Jack Boling have helped to build their Nation's pillars deep, and they may take just pride in their achievements. For 14 long years Jack Boling has been the beacon light and the guiding star in this community's efforts to establish and maintain the great institution of mercy which now adorns that lovely hillside out yonder. He has given freely of his valuable time, business ingenuity, and administrative ability, and as president of Chatham Hospital he has served with great devotion through all the years.

Tom Brooks, from an humble beginning, has become a great benefactor. He put his very life and labor, and a large part of a fortune, into the building of the magnificent structure—a home for the sick and the suffering, where all of the sciences and skills of modern medicine can be provided. All the people of this county owe to Tom Brooks and Jack Boling an everlasting debt of gratitude. Their lives have been a blessing and a benediction. We hope that Heaven will light their pathways, and the Lord of Mercy will bless and keep them.

The modern hospital facilities they have helped to provide, to maintain, and to operate, are unsurpassed by those in any other community in this great Commonwealth. To you, Tom and Jack, may I say that our hearts are filled with gratitude. We cherish your friendship, and salute you as two great Americans.

The lovely daughter of the retiring president, Jack Boling, will now unveil these works of art, and on behalf of the sponsors, I have the honor and the privilege of presenting these beautiful portraits to Chatham Hospital, to the people of Chatham County, and to generations yet unborn. They shall be hung in appropriate places on the walls of that great institution which they helped to build, in recognition and in remembrance of their grand and glorious efforts, and the contributions they have made. To them may I say again, may the Lord bless and keep you.

Mr. Speaker, the portraits of the great benefactors, Thomas Murdock Brooks and Floyd Jackson Boling, were painted by Miss Mabel Pugh, director of the art department of Peace College, in Raleigh, N. C. Miss Pugh is an artist of exceptional ability, and has been listed in Who's Who in American Art as well as Who's Who in the Southeast. Incidentally, she is the same artist who painted the portrait of the present chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, which was presented to the committee, as a great surprise to me, on February 10.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout history Rumania has been a crossroad between East and West. Partly for this reason, up to the latter half of the 19th century Rumania remained divided among her neighbors for nearly 400 years and the Rumanians had to endure alien rule. During those centuries Rumania was part of the Ottoman Empire and it was ruled by the callous and corrupt agents of the sultans.

History often repeats painful experience, perhaps even more painful in view of modern aspirations. Today the Soviet Union, through its puppet government in Rumania, has followed a course of systematic enslavement of the Rumanian people. It has exercised economic abuse by its exploitation of the Rumanian economy. The economic programs applied by the Soviet Union have had a disastrous effect on Rumanian national stability. For if Rumania were able to deal with the outside world as an independent nation, it would have a much more favorable balance of trade and the Rumanian people would now be enjoying a more nearly decent standard of living.

It was on May 10, 1877, that the liberty-loving Rumanians were able to proclaim their independence. And in 1878 with the Treaty of Berlin, Rumania received recognition of their independence by other nations.

Thousands of Rumanians have been welcomed to this country and they have settled here as hardworking and loyal citizens. They have made a distinct contribution to the American way of life, and have contributed their portion in building and defending it.

But today, for more than a decade, Rumania itself has been sealed off from the free world, and some 16 million Rumanians live in what is practically a vast prison camp. There they are denied all forms of freedom and have been ordered to follow the Communist line. Democracy as we know it here has been banned, and tyrannous dictatorship is the order of the day.

We Americans whose forefathers have come from countries dominated by the Soviet dictatorship are continuing to strive to bring about the liberation of those oppressed peoples.

In my House Concurrent Resolution 120, introduced last week, May 3, I called for the condemnation of the violations committed by the Soviet Government. The resolution declares that measures should be taken to inform the peoples of the world of such violations. It states, and I quote:

That all men should be publicly informed that the United States never acquiesced in, and overwhelmingly reprobates such distortion of the purpose of the agreements, which has resulted in the subjugation of free peoples in many lands, in the domination of a totalitarian despotism over whole nations.

The resolution asks that these broken promises by Soviet Communist leaders should be openly condemned before the eyes of the world.

It is my hope that all of us who are interested in freedom for all nations will be united in order that we may have an effective policy in this matter. Just as the spirit of freedom can never be destroyed, so the Rumanian people will never lose hope for freedom.

Rumania's National Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, is the most significant date in the history of the Rumanian nation. It is unique, in that it marks three distinct milestones on the Rumanian path to independence and nationhood. First, on May 10, 1866, Prince Carol, who was to become King Carol I, the first King of modern Rumania, arrived in the country from Germany. Then, on May 10, 1877, Rumania proclaimed its independence from Turkey. Having done so, Rumania fought for that independence with determination and skill. Her efforts were instrumental in bringing victory in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 to Russia, and in the Treaty of Berlin in 1878 her independence was recognized. Finally, May 10 is celebrated as the anniversary of the unification of all Rumanian Provinces.

We wish that it were possible to salute this anniversary with a spirit of joyfulness. However, for the past 10 years, during one of the most fateful decades in all human history, the Rumanian people have not been masters in their own house. Instead a Communist dictatorship, staffed by the puppets of Moscow, and maintaining a full apparatus of terror, purports to act in the name of the Rumanian people.

This shabby illusion deceives no one. For all their secret police, their spies, for all their suppression of thought and religion, the Communists have not crushed the spirit of the Rumanian nation. This has been evidenced by the solidarity of Rumanian farmers against the Government's policy of forced collectivization of agriculture. Today, Rumanian farmers have been reduced virtually to serfdom, but their spirit remains unimpaired. Rumanian intellectuals have faced prison and concentration camp rather than manufacture Communist art and literature to order.

It is incumbent on the United States to encourage this spirit of resistance, to continue its task of marshaling the resources of world opinion against final acquiescence in Russia's fait accompli. If we do so, we have reason to hope that Rumania may greet some not-too-distant May 10 in the spirit which it deserves.

The Anniversary of Rumanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 the people of Rumania have been accustomed to celebrate their national holiday, an anniversary that includes a commemoration not only of their national independence but of their national unity as well. Rumanians all over the world cherish this day, but in the homeland the celebration cannot even be held, for today Rumanian independence is a figment of Communist propaganda, and Rumanian unity is the unity of the enslaved.

The Russian armies marched into Rumania in 1944 in their victorious campaigns against the Germans, and in 1945 the Russians, through the late Andrei Vishinsky, forced the Rumanian Government to accept Communist control. From that day to this Rumania has been in the grip of tyranny.

This tyranny proclaims that it works to benefit the Rumanian people. It exemplifies its beneficence by looting Rumania of its natural resources, particularly its oil, persecuting religion, refusing to permit emigration of people desiring to leave the country, forcing collectivization of agriculture on an unwilling peasantry, and suppressing all manifestations of a dissenting attitude in political and cultural affairs.

The Rumanian people want no such hypocritical benefactor. They know the Soviet tyranny for what it is, a regime of ruthless exploitation, maintained by terror, against the heartfelt desires of the people. They have manifested their opposition to that regime with the most remarkable courage and tenacity. Their resistance has rightfully earned them the admiration of all men who value freedom.

Within the last 2 years we have had several manifestations of that courage and tenacity. First, there was the instance of Mr. Georgescu, an American businessman of Rumanian birth. His sons were still in Rumania, and the Communist approached him with a request to spy for them, threatening death to his sons if he did not. Mr. Georgescu withstood this most cruel pressure, and in the end his sons were happily reunited with their family in this country. Then there was the seizure of the Rumanian legation in Bern, Switzerland, by a small group of inspired refugees, who chose to take this manner of demonstrating Rumanian contempt for the regime that claims to represent them. Diplomatic usage required action against them by the Swiss Government, but the lesson of their desperate act was not lost on the world.

On this May 10 Rumanians look to the United States to champion their cause. Unable to speak for themselves, they ask that our voice continue to be lifted in behalf of all oppressed peoples in the councils of nations. It is most important that this be done, for Moscow would like nothing better than to lull the conscience of the world into permanent acceptance of satellite slavery.

If we act in accordance with our historic principles, we will continue to be regarded as the champion of human liberty, and we may witness the dawn of a new day of freedom in Rumania, and in other nations now groaning under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

Correspondence With Walter P. Reuther Relative to Remarks by Secretary of Commerce Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1955, Walter Reuther, president of the UAW–CIO, wrote to me, and probably other Congressmen, complaining about certain remarks of Secretary of Commerce Weeks. He accused Mr. Weeks of "reckless and irresponsible behavior," "distorting the truth and attempting to divide and disunite our people." Mr. Reuther said such action "deserves Presidential and congressional attention."

I certainly agree with Mr. Reuther that if the actions and remarks of Mr. Weeks warrant the grave charges Mr. Reuther has levied against them, such attention is deserved.

I am inserting at this point Mr. Reuther's letter and the enclosures to which the letter refers:

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I enclose a letter and pamphlet which I have forwarded to Mr. Sinclair Weeks. I respectfully urge that you take note of the reckless and irresponsible behavior and statements to which I refer on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.

Such distortion of the truth on the part of a Cabinet Member in an attempt to divide and disunite our people deserves Presidential and congressional attention.

I think you will agree, as I suggest to Mr. Weeks in my letter to him, as Americans we should stand together to protect and respect our right to differ but our differences should be based on facts, not fancy; on knowledge, not prejudice.

WALTER P. REUTHER.

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your remarks on automation in a recent speech in New York are a startling and shocking demonstration of reckless irresponsibility on the part of a Cabinet officer.

In your references to "scaremongers" who are trying to frighten automobile workers with the "bogeyman of automation," you spoke either in ignorance of the facts or with willful distortion of the facts, as other reckless propagandists, with less stature than your position gives you, have done before.

As a Cabinet officer, it is your responsibility to get the facts and, having got them, to state them accurately and truthfully. It is also the responsibility of a public official of your rank to devote his energies to pulling the people of our country together on the basis of a sound, constructive program of united action to meet and overcome the economic, social and political problems that confront Americans and the free people of the world generally. The objective results of your uninformed or untruthful remarks on attitudes toward automation are to divide our people into warring economic groups.

While you did not mention the UAW–CIO or any of its officers by name, it is obvious you were referring to us because the distortions you uttered coincide exactly with the false propaganda which has emanated from other sources.

The truth about our position on automation was and is available to you from government as well as from union sources.

Let me quote to you certain passages from an introduction which I wrote to a recent UAW–CIO publication on automation:

"Automation must be met sanely and constructively so that the miracle of mass production—and the ever greater economic abundance made possible by automation—can find expression in the lives of people through improved economic security and a fuller share of happiness and human dignity.

"Sensibly, rationally, scientifically we intend to harness this radical new force in our lives, using its potential to produce an era in which well-being, justice and peace will be the universal possession of all mankind.

"Historically, the problems of mankind have been set in conflict between people, groups and nations each engaged in a struggle to divide up economic scarcity. We have had a world divided between the "haves" and the "have-nots"—those who were fed and those who were starving. Now, science and technology have at last given us the tools of economic abundance, and we are confronted no longer with the need to struggle to divide up scarcity.

"Economic abundance is now within our grasp if we but have the good sense to use our resources and technology, fully and effectively, within a framework of economic policies that are morally right and socially responsible.

"The UAW–CIO and its 1½ million members welcome automation, technological progress, and the promise of the peacetime use of the atom. We offer our cooperation to men and women of good will in all walks of life in a common search for policies and programs within the structure of our free society that will insure that greater technological progress will result in greater human progress.

"We in the UAW–CIO believe that we can solve the problems of UAW–CIO members as wage earners only as we work with other people in our free society in the common effort to find answers to the problems of all the people in our country—and ultimately in the world, for only as we learn to work with people everywhere in finding answers to the problems of the world community can we find answers to our own. As citizens of the atomic age, we have the tools of abundance at our disposal. We are confident that the free people of America, in cooperation with free men everywhere, will demonstrate the good sense and courage to use the tools of abundance for constructive and moral purposes."

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of the publication from which these quotations are taken.

I would also like to refer you to the transcript of both my prepared statement and my oral testimony before the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives on February 25 and also my prepared statement and my oral testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on February 10, where I elaborated in greater detail on the position of our organization on this

subject. I am sure a transcript is available to you. One would think that a Cabinet officer would avail himself of the information compiled by congressional hearings before speaking on matters covered by those hearings. In fact, it would seem obvious that an official with the rank of Cabinet member would find it incumbent upon himself to check all possible sources of information and find out what is going on in particular areas of American life before making public pronouncements that carry the weight and authority of that high office.

The difference, Mr. Secretary, between you, like other critics who have misrepresented our position, and us in the UAW-CIO, is that you are trying to run away from problems attendant upon automation, trying to sweep them out of sight under the rug, while we are stepping up to our responsibilities by exploring all the problems and possibilities and, within our abilities, taking positive action to assure the maximum social good.

It is our considered judgment that you owe to the UAW-CIO and to the American people a public apology for your intemperate and untruthful statements.

Let us as Americans stand together in fully protecting and respecting the right to differ. Let us act responsibly and base our differences upon facts, not fancy; upon knowledge, not prejudice.

Sincerely,

WALTER P. REUTHER.

Upon receipt of this communication from Mr. Reuther, I wrote to him on March 25, 1955, as follows:

Mr. WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, UAW-CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. REUTHER: Thank you for your letter of March 18, 1955, enclosing a copy of your letter to Secretary Weeks in which you take exception to the remarks Secretary Weeks makes in a recent speech in New York. I have asked the Secretary to send me a copy of that speech.

I think the UAW-CIO and yourself personally have taken a fair position on the serious problem of automation. I thought your testimony before our Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which I read carefully, was fair and objective. I do not regard yours, or the position of the UAW-CIO on this matter, as that of scaremongers, nor do I regard the problem of automation a bogeyman. I think you are justified in objecting to the use of such language in reference to the position of the UAW-CIO and yourself.

I do believe, however, that the problem of automation is not a new one. It is a new term but it refers to a problem over 100 years old. I have been a great admirer of the way most of the American labor leaders have approached this problem in contrast to the way in which European labor leaders have approached it, both in the past and in the present. I wonder if you have had occasion to read a recent (1953) pamphlet entitled: "European Impressions of the American Worker," by Robert W. Smuts. This is one of a series of studies being conducted at Columbia University Graduate School of Business under the heading "Human Resource Studies." I was quite impressed with this 58-page document and hidden between the lines there is much thought on the problem of automation.

I am glad that you feel that it is important not to attempt to divide and disunite our people and that we should stand together to protect our right to differ—based upon facts not fancy; on knowledge, not prejudice, because I have felt that some of your public speeches and some of the statements of the PAC-CIO were subject to just this kind of criticism. I think this has been particularly true in your treatment of the recent Internal Revenue Code of 1954. I would call to your mind some correspondence we had about such matters as depreciation and stock dividend credits. Certainly calling a major piece of legislation like this a "rich man's tax bill" is attempting to divide our people; it is based upon fancy not fact; on prejudice not on knowledge. This does not mean that there is not ample room for honest men to disagree on the details in this piece of legislation. Certainly there is, but let's stand together as Americans to respect and protect our right to differ, granting to each other the motive which I feel we all share of trying to do our best to solve the human problems of the day in the best interests of our people and our posterity.

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

I wrote to Secretary Weeks on March 26, 1955, to get a complete transcript of the speech he delivered on March 5, 1955, to which Mr. Reuther took exception. On April 1, 1955, I received a copy of the speech from Mr. Weeks. This is it in its entirety:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE SINCLAIR WEEKS AT DINNER OF THE PILGRIMS OF THE UNITED STATES, HONORING THE RIGHT HONORABLE ROBERT GORDON MENZIES, C. H., Q. C., PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 5, 1955

It is a great pleasure to join with you in welcoming your distinguished guest, the Right Honorable Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia.

I am delighted to have this opportunity of addressing your society, which since 1903 has been strengthening the bonds of friendship between the United Kingdom and the United States. Together with your sister organization in the British Isles, you have fostered a better appreciation, on both sides of the Atlantic, of our common heritage in such fundamentals as language, literature, law, and democratic government.

You have facilitated a two-way exchange of ideas and cultural achievements which has brought better understanding between the two oldest English-speaking peoples of the community of nations. With better understanding has come unity of purpose, strengthening our common devotion to freedom and our determination to help each other preserve it.

I congratulate the Pilgrims of Great Britain and the Pilgrims of the United States on this great accomplishment.

It is highly appropriate that from time to time you entertain the representatives of other English-speaking nations.

When such a representative is from the Commonwealth of Australia, which in war and peace has made contributions to international freedom and progress out of all proportion to its population and wealth, we do honor to ourselves in honoring him.

Australia is a country that always steps up and meets its responsibilities. It is doing so again today. It has realized the danger to the free world of Communist aggression in Asia and is doing something about it. It has established diplomatic missions in southeast Asia. It is giving aid to those countries through active participation in the Colombo plan whose very establishment owes much to Australian initiative.

The recent meeting at Bangkok of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization reminds us of our joint interest in the Far East. There the foreign ministers of Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, and the representative of France, forged closer ties of defense.

In particular they recognized the insidious threat of Communist subversion and infiltration to the peace and security of the area. Henceforth, the eight governments will carry on continuing consultation and mutual assistance, each drawing upon the experience of the others in dealing with this danger.

No less important in preserving the integrity and authority of the freely-constituted governments in southeast Asia are their economic strength and the social well-being of their citizens. At Bangkok the member states inaugurated steps to increase economic cooperation, and to promote economic progress.

Of course, the Bangkok meeting is merely the latest of many successful steps free governments have taken in the past few years to deter aggression and preserve peace. I need not recite for this audience the long list of our accomplishments in mutual help and firm solidarity. You and I know that today free nations are collectively stronger than at any time in recent years.

Perhaps the utter futility of modern warfare may become more evident as time goes on. In any event, and whatever happens, the United States and Australia not only will, but must, continue to stand shoulder to shoulder.

With so much in common, we should and do enjoy most satisfactory business relations with Australia. When it comes to investing capital abroad, businessmen naturally look for a welcome on the mat, and American businessmen have always found it in Australia.

About 475 United States firms have established, acquired interest in, or otherwise participated in the development of a wide variety of Australian manufacturing industries. About 175 of these investments are in corporations classified as subsidiaries or affiliates of the American firm. The others operate under various arrangements such as licensing.

Many American companies have constructed plants in Australia today. Among these are included names which are known to you all: Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, California-Texas Oil, Ford, Chrysler, General Motors, General Electric, Goodyear Tire & Rubber, International-Harvester, Johns-Manville, Swift Co.

United States direct investments in Australia totaled $328 million at the end of 1953, as compared with $161 million at the end of 1949. In other words, such investments have more than doubled in a 4-year period.

In connection with the investment of American capital in Australia, it is interesting to recall the words of Acting Prime Minister Sir Arthur Fadden at the opening of the new Philip Morris plant in Melbourne in January of this year, when he referred to Australia's policy of welcoming foreign capital from abroad in these words:

"The policy of the present Commonwealth Government therefore is to welcome overseas capital to Australia, particularly if it is intended for permanent investment and if it is likely to contribute to the desirable development of Australian resources."

Trade between our two countries is equally important. Wool, over the years, has been one of the leading items of trade. As a lifelong resident of New England, I have, of course, been brought up to think of Australia as an important supplier of wool for our textile industries. In this connection, I am pleased to have participated in the revamping of our wool policy last year, so as to make it more equitable both to foreign suppliers and to our own domestic wool growers.

Currently, imports from Australia are showing greater diversification. For example, the figures indicate a striking increase in the import of metals from 2 percent of total imports in 1937 to 33 percent in 1953.

As Australia develops and increases its population, it can be expected to become an increasingly important market for a diversified line of American goods.

These mutually profitable business relationships between the United States and

countries such as Australia are a model for the world. They are the economic counterpart of that mutual cooperation between the English-speaking peoples of the world which your organization has fostered for these many years.

The importance of this common interest cannot be overstressed. With it goes the interchange of not only goods but of our people and our cultures. What better way is there to develop lasting friendship and peace between nations for the common good of all.

I believe that a bright economic future is in store for Australia and the United States if we do those things which promote economic growth.

There are many steps we can take to attain long range prosperity. One of them is to encourage the advancement of technology. Scientific progress in agriculture, mining and manufacturing is giving this generation the greatest material blessings in all history, security from destruction by aggressors and the assurance of a much better future for ourselves and children.

The industrial revolution's machinery released man from muscular slavery and is supplying him with a wealth of new goods and new jobs. Today the dawning age of truly automatic machines—which we describe by the word automation—is providing man with mechanical senses of feeling, hearing and sight—in some cases even with electronic "brains."

The result of this fresh surge in productivity is a higher standard of living for everyone. New technological progress is the greatest creator of more and better paid jobs.

Yet some doubting Thomases have arisen in both countries who seem afraid to take full advantage of the new technology with its new self-regulating machinery, automatic memories and other labor-saving innovations.

Some apprehension stems from lack of knowledge; some from misleading propaganda.

Recently a new rash of opposition to and fear of new technological progress has been voiced in some circles in the United States. Here unscrupulous demagogs and economic illiterates are trying to scare people into the belief that automation is a vicious Frankenstein devouring their jobs. I am certain that this is the most stupid and the most cruel misguidance that can be given to the free workers of the free world.

Such dread of progress, however, is not new. History is filled with examples of those who erroneously thought new machines would wipe out their livelihood.

An ignorant mob invaded Hargreave's home and smashed his spinning jennies. Quill penmen rose in anger against the introduction of the printing press. Paris workers rioted against the sewing machine. English hand-knitters used sledge hammers to smash Cartright's power loom. The teamsters of Pennsylvania wrecked the first oil pipelines.

Suppose these panic-stricken deluded people had been able to stop progress? Millions of new jobs never would have been created. Untold numbers of new products never would have been manufactured for the pleasure and well-being of mankind.

Karl Marx, whose false doctrines have brought limitless misery to his dupes, bitterly condemned the machine as the soul of capitalist exploitation. Let's not permit his modern echoes to get away with similar deceptions. Let's confront wild charges about technological unemployment with facts which refute falsehoods.

As Secretary of Commerce it is my duty to study the economy and to foster measures to improve it. Here are some statistics on economic expansion in America which prove without question that machines make more and better jobs. From 1939 to 1953 the population of the United States increased 22 percent. But employment in manufacturing increased 70 percent. The machine created new industries and made new jobs.

A breakdown in figures is quite revealing. In this period jobs in electrical machinery rose from 393,000 to 1,200,000—a jump of around 200 percent. In 1910 there were 444,000 employed teamsters, draymen, and carriage drivers. In 1950 there were 1,919,000 employed motor-vehicle drivers and delivery and route men.

Some scaremongers at the moment are attempting in particular to frighten automobile workers with the bogeyman of automation. But the record shows that this industry, a pacemaker in technological advancement, employed 937,000 workers in 1953 as against only 466,000 in 1939.

Economists estimate that every job in auto manufacturing stimulates five additional jobs in occupations connected with motoring, such as mines supplying metals, farms furnishing raw materials for plastics, highway construction, motels, filling stations, and other roadside enterprises.

The late Philip Murray, the American labor leader, said, when addressing the CIO as its president in 1951, "I do not know of a single, solitary instance where a great technological gain has taken place in the United States of America that it has actually thrown people out of work. I do not know of it, I am not aware of it, because the industrial revolution that has taken place in the United States in the past 25 years has brought into the employment field an additional 20 million people."

Automation is the modern term for what has been known as labor-saving machinery. The Socialist—the irresponsible demagog—hurls the words "labor-saving machinery" in the face of inventors, scientists, managers with the accusing connotation that it must be designed to throw people out of jobs.

As a matter of fact, labor-saving machinery means exactly what it says—it saves labor. The backbreaking jobs on the farm, in the home, in the steel mills, and elsewhere in industry have, for the most part, yielded to pleasant, agreeable work on the farm, in the home, and in clean, well heated, well ventilated mills and factories producing products which but for this same labor-saving machinery the people could never have or even dream of.

Example after example can be cited to show that instead of being the destroyer of jobs, the new industrial robots are the best friends of workers, managers, and consumers.

In short, can anyone who thinks about these things believe that we have reached the end of the road of progress?

Can anyone believe that further and greater technological progress and development in the field of labor-saving machinery will fail to make jobs and advance the welfare of all the people? Of course not. My conviction, supported by every bit of available evidence, makes me sure that the road ahead is still wide open for almost unlimited further progress.

In conclusion, let me reaffirm my trust in the partnership of Australia and the United States. We have in common a colonial background from which have grown two proud, independent nations, united by fond memories and ties of warm friendship among ourselves and the United Kingdom. Nothing can sever that bond.

We cherish similar ideals and spiritual values. Thrice as Allies we have mingled the blood of our sons in battle. Our mutual desire is for good will among all the peoples of this earth. But in any grave emergency in the Pacific or elsewhere the United States and Australia not only will, but must, stand resolutely side by side.

We will not shrink in fear from encouraging further industrialization and technological progress because we know that on the expanding economic strength of the free world is based mankind's best assurance of freedom and deepest hope of a just and lasting peace.

On April 18, 1955, after carefully reading Mr. Weeks' speech, I wrote to Mr. Reuther again, as follows:

Mr. WALTER REUTHER,
President, UAW–CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. REUTHER: On March 25, 1955, I replied to your letter to me (and other Congressmen) of March 18, 1955, in which you took exception to remarks made by Secretary Weeks in a speech he made in New York City, March 5, 1955, at a banquet honoring Prime Minister Menzies, of Australia. I said in my letter I would obtain a copy of Mr. Weeks' speech so I could better judge the complaints you make against it.

Having read the speech, I am somewhat amazed at your letter of March 18, 1955. Having, as I stated, read your views on automation as presented before our Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I cannot for the life of me see how you determined that Secretary Weeks was referring to your position on automation when he was referring to "scaremongers," using the "bogeyman of automation," even though he said "in particular to frighten the automobile workers," unless you had made speeches which presented a different approach than the one you took before our committee. My own assumption would be that you have retained a consistent position on the subject of automation.

I feel certain that Secretary Weeks agrees with you that automation, though essentially a good thing, does present immediate problems that require thought in their solution. We may all disagree as to the extent of these problems, and certainly as to the methods which are best suited to meet them.

Reverting back to your statement, which I so fundamentally agreed with, that it is important not to attempt to divide and disunite our people, I have found one of the most-used techniques to accomplish this undesirable end, today, is the claim of being insulted when, indeed, no insult was intended. I am certain Mr. Weeks intended no insult, and if he did, it falls flat on its face in light of the fair and objective presentation you made to our committee.

Because this matter was brought to the attention of all the Congressmen, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of Mr. Weeks' speech, your letter to Mr. Weeks, and the forwarding letter to me, plus my correspondence with you. If you care to make an answer to my letters, I shall be happy to include your answer along with the rest of the material.

THOS. B. CURTIS.

I am sorry that Mr. Reuther has not availed himself of my offer to reply to my letters. The matter has received some congressional attention, at my hands, as Mr. Reuther suggested. It now lies with Mr. Reuther to come forward and explain the basis of his grave charges against the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks. Certainly, Mr. Weeks was not dreaming up "scaremongers" who "at the moment are attempting in particular to frighten automobile workers with the bogeyman of automation" inasmuch as the pamphlet put out by UAW-CIO education department entitled "Automation" to which Mr. Reuther refers and quotes from in his longer letter, on page 8 quotes a person who might well be described as a scaremonger—without

identifying him anymore than Mr. Weeks did except to refer to him as an "expert" instead of a "scaremonger." The following is a direct quotation from the pamphlet:

> The experts disagree on what the future holds. (One says automation is only "a new chapter in the continuing story of man's organization and mechanization of the forces of nature.")
>
> Another says that automation "will produce an unemployment situation, in comparison with which * * * the depression of the thirties will seem a pleasant joke."

Now, I do not think one can quarrel too much with Mr. Weeks for referring to this person, whoever he may be, as a "scaremonger" even if he is also an "expert." Personally, I do not like to use words which might be passed off as epithets even when they seem to be properly descriptive. I would prefer to have people judge for themselves from the person's own words and actions. Nonetheless, to call the Secretary of Commerce "reckless and irresponsible and distorting the truth," and so forth, because of it, seems to be in itself reckless and irresponsible and distorting the truth.

Mining Claims on National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for several years past the Committee on Agriculture has been working diligently on a problem of great concern in the field of natural resources—the problem of harmonizing the search for and development of the minerals and mining values in our national forests with the other values such as timber production, grazing, watershed protection, recreation, and wildlife development—which are also of great importance. Our efforts to solve this complicated and knotty problem were spurred on by the fact that over the years in the neighborhood of 100,000 mining claims have been filed in the national forests and without some change in the law these claims may continue into perpetuity tying up valuable timber resources and denying access to the areas covered by the claim for other public or conservation purposes.

Many of these claims are valid, having been filed by mining prospectors in a legitimate effort to discover and develop valuable minerals. Many of them, on the other hand, are clearly claims which have been filed for some other purpose than mining, usually with the objective of obtaining presumptive title in the surface of the land for some personal or commercial use entirely unassociated with mineral development.

Our study of this problem as a committee began as early as 1950 and resulted in the introduction by me in the 82d Congress on May 27, 1952, of H. R. 7023, the first comprehensive bill on this subject.

Following the introduction of that bill the committee continued its study of this problem assiduously. Conferences and meetings were held with officials of the Forest Service, with the mining industry, the lumber industry, with representatives of conservation and wildlife groups, and with other elements having a direct interest in this matter.

Our bill was revised and improved several times as the result of this work and in the 83d Congress an improved version of the bill was introduced by Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE, the then chairman of the committee.

This bill was still further improved during the 83d Congress and early in the 84th Congress improved and amended versions were introduced both by Mr. HOPE (H. R. 110) and by me (H. R. 3414).

In the meantime, organizations outside the Congress, notably the American Forestry Association, had followed the leadership of this committee and were making their own efforts to work out a bill which would present an acceptable solution to this difficult problem.

Within the past few weeks, I am happy to report, these efforts have met with apparent success and there has been worked out a bill which apparently will take care of the major part of the problem involved. It is reported to be acceptable to the mining industry, to those primarily interested in conservation, and to officials of the Government responsible for the administration of the mining laws, the national forests, and the public lands. In the hope that this bill is the solution toward which we have been working for the past 5 years, I have been happy to introduce it although the bill (H. R. 3414) will be referred to another committee—the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of our able colleague, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of California.

I would be happy, of course, if the Committee on Agriculture might carry through to a conclusion the work it has been engaged in for these several years, but since the bill has been broadened in its scope to include not only the national forests but also the public lands which are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and since it actually amends the mining laws, the jurisdiction of the committee headed by the gentleman from California is clear and I will be most happy to further in any way I can the progress of the bill before that committee.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD an article which will be printed in the forthcoming May edition of American Forests, the publication of the American Forestry Association, describing in some detail this measure to which I have referred:

FIRST STEP TOWARD CORRECTING ABUSES OF THE MINING LAWS

The board of directors of the American Forestry Association on April 15 passed a resolution urging all groups and individuals to join with them in strongly supporting proposals now pending in Congress that, once enacted, will enable the Agriculture and Interior Departments to wash out the bulk of invalid or fraudulent mining claims on public lands in from 6 months to a year.

Purpose of identical bills introduced in both the House and Senate last month is to revise the mining laws to permit multiple use on the surface of mining claims, both in national forests and other public lands, and to eliminate the incentive to locate mining claims for purposes other than actual mining and related activities.

The proposed measures were introduced as the result of cooperative action by the mining industry and the Interior and Agriculture Departments. The campaign originated in the American Forestry Association when it called on representatives of the three groups last February to sit down around a table and map out a solution to a problem that has been vexing both the industry and the public alike.

Today the proposals which have the support of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, the mining industry, and a growing number of conservation groups including the American Forestry Association, would:

1. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act. (This provision is similar to the Regan bill in the 82d and 83d Congs., which had the endorsement of the Forest Service.)

2. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent:

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources (except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws), and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

3. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a quiet-title action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area. This procedure calls for adequate notice to mining claimants in the area involved, and a local hearing to determine any rights to surface resources that may be asserted by claim holders. If a mining claimant fails to assert rights to surface resources, or if the rights he asserts are not upheld, or if he voluntarily waives such rights, the claim would thereafter have the same status as claims hereafter located, with the Government having the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage and to manage other surface resources in accordance with sound principles of good management.

In this manner an area in which a timber sale, for example, is contemplated could be subjected to a conclusive determination of surface rights within as short a period as 6 to 12 months.

Identical bills embodying these proposals were introduced last month in the House by Mr. DAWSON, of Utah (H. R. 5561); Mr. FJARE, of Montana (H. R. 5563); Mr. YOUNG, of Nevada (H. R. 5572); Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Oregon (H. R. 5577); Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina (H. R. 5595); and Mr. HOPE, of Kansas (H. R. 5742). As American Forests went to press, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, chairman of

the House subcommittee on mining, and perhaps still others were preparing similar bills.

In the upper House, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, joined by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming; BENNETT and WATKINS, of Utah; and AIKEN, of Vermont, introduced the same measure (S. 1713).

It is particularly significant to conservationists that those who have worked closely in the past with AFA and other groups in the effort to remedy mining law abuses—men like Representative HAROLD COOLEY, who introduced the first surface mining bill (H. R. 7023) in the 82d Congress, and Representative CLIFFORD HOPE and Senator GEORGE AIKEN, who fathered bills in the 83d Congress for corrective mining legislation, have joined in on this proposal.

These proposals represent the answer of the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the mining industry to the growing chorus of demands by the public to correct the already widespread and growing abuses of the mining laws that have been impeding sound land management. Public demands for corrective measures reached a new high last year with announcement by the Forest Service that only 2 percent of the 84,000 unpatented mining claims on national forests were producing commercial quantities of ore and that in too many cases they were being used for purposes other than mining. These 84,000 claims, the Forest Service said, cover more than 2 million acres and support over 8 billion feet of merchantable timber worth over $100 million.

Of the 37,000 claims which have actually gone to patent, only about 15 percent have produced ore in commercial quantities. These facts demonstrate, the Forest Service said, that the mining laws are being used to obtain claim or title to valuable timber, summer home sites, or access to preferred hunting or fishing grounds—activities far removed from commercial mining operations. Moreover, with the advent of the current uranium rush, the number of unpatented claims has more than doubled in recent months.

To launch a program to clear up the irregular claims situation as called for in AFA's program for American Forestry adopted last year, Lowell Besley, executive director-forester, in January contacted representatives of the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the American Mining Congress and proposed a conference to work out the problem under the auspices of the AFA.

The response to this proposal was favorable. Aided by an assist from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the groups concerned were brought together February 10 at the Washington office of the American Forestry Association. Purpose of the conference was to evolve a workable solution that would eliminate questionable claims while fully protecting the legitimate interests of both the public and the mining industry.

Working under the chairmanship of DeWitt Nelson, vice president of AFA and director of California's Department of Natural Resources, it quickly became apparent that industry representatives were primarily interested in leaving the present patent system undisturbed. (At present, approximately 200 claims go to patent every year.)

"Above all things, your prospector knows and is decidedly aware of one fact," one industry spokesman said. "That is if he works hard and develops his claims he can obtain a patent. To remove that incentive or to otherwise interfere with the patent system would, in our judgment, have an adverse effect not only on mining exploration and development but on the economy of the country at a time when more and more minerals are of vital importance."

While the industry took a dim view of previous suggestions that a miner, in patenting his claim, should purchase his timber rights, it did concede it was in full sympathy with a revised system that would enable Government representatives to wash out invalid claims in a short time. The industry spokesmen also reiterated that they were against use of claims for any purpose other than legitimate mining operations, and favored giving the Government the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage on all claims hereafter located up to the time of patent. The claimant, at the same time, would be permitted to use such timber as is needed for carrying on mining activities but would be barred from removing the timber or other surface resources for other purposes.

While the Agriculture Department representatives believe that claimants should pay for timber on claims at the time of going to patent, spokesmen said that the proposals advanced by the industry as regards handling of claims was a constructive proposition and one that would materially aid in the management of public lands. At the present time, the Forest Service, for instance, cannot remove timber from claims, and in some cases claimants are actually impeding management of land—including rights-of-way—to timber and forage on holdings adjacent to their claims.

The so-called in rem or quiet-title action under which the Government could resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims was also cited as a constructive move by Agriculture spokesmen. As proposed at the conference, the new system would enable the Government to wash out invalid claims in selected areas in 6 months or a year—a development that would be a decided improvement on the laborious search-and-sue method now in effect. At the same time, it would enable the Government to determine surface rights to resources without disturbing miners' rights to the minerals in the prepatent stage.

Under Chairman Nelson's guidance, the conference arrived at a meeting of minds, and a three-man committee comprised of representatives from the two Departments and the mining industry was named to draft a bill based on the findings and conclusions of the conference.

Both Chairman Nelson and Mr. Besley praised the constructive attitude of the conference. Mr. Besley commented, "From the standpoint of those of us long interested in clearing up the mining-claim abuses on the national forests and other forest lands, this proposed legislation represents a compromise only with respect to the 'all or nothing' school of thought. We can wholeheartedly approve of everything it is designed to accomplish. It is definitely a tremendous step in the right direction. Forest Service officials estimate it will clear up 75 percent or more of the mining claim troubles on the national forests. Some think it may go even further. None of us can know for sure until we have given it a fair trial over a period of years."

The position of the mining industry has been that it does not condone the use of mining claims on public lands for other than mining purposes. Its position is and has been that it should have the continued opportunity to locate mining claims, to mine any minerals found, and to make a profit if it is fortunate enough to discover and develop commercial deposits. It seeks security of its investment through a full title to mining claims when all the requirements for patent have been met. It does not seek to prevent the use of the surface of unpatented claims for other desirable uses so long as those do not materially interfere with mining operations and related activities. This position has widespread support from public-minded citizens who recognize the need for continued development of the mineral resources needed for our economy and our national security.

From the outset, the board of directors of the AFA has made it clear that it had no intention or desire to interfere with legitimate mining operations but was solely interested in helping to clear up abuses on the part of people who were using the framework provided by the mining laws for purposes other than mining. In the opinion of the board, these abuses will be brought under control if the present proposals are enacted into law.

Sick Leave in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned, as I know many Members of the House of Representatives have been concerned about the press reports on the report of the Comptroller General regarding sick leave abuses in the postal service.

I have given this report very careful study and feel that in fairness to our 500,000 loyal and conscientious postal employees this unfortunate impression should be corrected.

It is apparent to me that many press accounts of the contents of this report contain slanted emphasis—unintentional, I am sure—which reflects on both the work productivity and the integrity of our postal employees. My remarks are directed at this slanted emphasis, which does not at all represent the tone of the Comptroller General's report.

In truth and in fact, this report heavily scores the management of the Post Office Department from top to bottom. The keynote appears in the line beginning on page 7 of the report:

> The failure by officials at the top management level to effectively administer and control sick leave has resulted, principally from a departmental policy, which, in the past, condoned the liberal interpretation placed on existing regulations or perhaps ignored a practice which was common knowledge.

The report goes on and cites chapter and verse in support of its statement that departmental officials had been made aware of the unsatisfactory sick leave practices. Here are some other excerpts from the report:

> The Department issued a directive in May 1953 * * * relative to abuses of sick leave, but corrective action has not been taken to strengthen sick-leave policies, procedures, and reporting.

This is on the first page of the report. A few lines later the reports goes on:

> Inadequate supervision of this vast number [500,000] of employees could result in considerable monetary losses as a result of man-hours lost on the job.

Elsewhere it is said that—

> Responsible approving supervisors and officials in post offices have disregarded policies concerning the control and administration of sick leave * * *; that improper approval of sick leave results from the policy of the Department in delegating to immediate supervisors * * * authority to grant sick leave without providing adequate review and control; and that although depart-

mental officials have assigned the responsibility for approving sick leave to the lowest level of supervision, they have not established procedures for a systematic review.

It should be pointed out that the discussion of abuse in paragraph No. 9 on page 2 of the Comptroller General's report will be corrected by the pending postal pay legislation. This legislation, as agreed to in conference and in the House, contains a new "biweekly pay period system" for the postal field service which will prevent the practice complained of in this paragraph. This legislation I seriously doubt will be vetoed by the President, for he would be definitely acting contrary to all responsibilities of his office just to placate the Postmaster General.

It should further be pointed out that in the past the Department has been very reluctant to appoint supervisors when the postmasters of post offices have requested same. The Department itself is primarily to blame for the action of the employees as to sick leave.

The very first recommendation of the Comptroller General is "that the Department reappraise the authority granted to immediate supervisors and strengthen the procedures relating to documenting and reporting of sick leave to those responsible at higher levels."

With further reference to the part played by the postal employee, the Comptroller General's report points out that organizations of postal employees are aware of the situation and have taken action, so far as would be appropriate for them to act, to cooperate with the Department in preventing abuse of sick leave. For example, one of the exhibits with the report is an excerpt from the M. H. News, a publication of Branch 29 of the National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers in Cleveland, Ohio, dated December 5, 1954. The M. H. News quoted its national office as asking employees to cooperate with the Department in this matter, and said:

> You are subject to removal and heavy penalties. * * * We are asking you to cooperate with the local office and the Department to cut down on this abuse of sick leave. * * * Sick leave is the best insurance you can have. * * * Try to keep your record clean.* * * Watch your sick leave.

I think this should help set the record straight, as it should be in justice to our postal employees. I am presenting this material with the belief that will be helpful to those who must have received a distorted picture of this situation, as I can well understand from the press accounts that I have read.

"Dear Lady"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the health of a nation is contingent upon the morals of its youth. The morals of its youth is often reflected in the songs they sing. Therefore, it is heartening to note, that statistically, the clean, wholesome country and western song is now characterized as "pure Americana."

The Nation has recognized Ralph S. Peer—Peer International, New York City—as foremost contributor to this field; and now takes cognizance of his latest publication, "Dear Lady," a popular song with religious overtones, designed to combat suggestive and off-color ballads.

The colleges and universities of the Nation which have fostered "Dear Lady" in hopes of starting a new trend, welcome his leadership in furthering their cause.

Legion, and documentary, are the letters of approbation from leading educators, radio and television executives, and disk jockies of the country.

Grateful indeed, are the above mentioned, to RCA president Frank M. Folsom and Joseph R. Carlton, for the cooperation of RCA Victor.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Louisiana State Board of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it has now been proved and generally accepted that the first State board of health was established in Louisiana in 1855. Public-health workers from 16 Southern States, the District of Columbia, and Latin America are gathering today in New Orleans to commemorate this centennial. They will be in session through the 13th.

Every so often it is good that we should pause in the press of our day-to-day activities and look to our past. This is such a time for Louisiana on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its State department of health.

Forged out of trial and struggle, this department today is conceded to be one of the most important divisions of Louisiana State government. But in 1855 the idea of State responsibility for the health of its citizens was a new and challenging one. No other State in the Union had recognized this responsibility. Indeed, the board of health in its early years met with the opposition of many shortsighted and faint-hearted men in Louisiana. But they could not impede the wheels of progress once they were set in motion.

It was the scourage of yellow fever that prompted the enactment in 1855 of the act "to establish quarantine for the protection of the State," extending along the entire Gulf of Mexico shore of Louisiana. Combining with the city board of health of New Orleans, it fought the spread of yellow fever. Incidentally, this pattern of State-local cooperation in matters affecting the public health has become one of the keystones in our democratic form of government. This joint cooperative enterprise lasted until 1898 when the present organization of the State board was set up in the constitution of that date. Up until that time the function of the board was primarily, but not solely, the establishment and maintenance of quarantines. In the words of the first State health officer, Dr. A. Forster Axson:

> Quarantine forms only a part of what the law contemplated as a system of health measures.

The evolution of public health in Louisiana, from its beginning in 1855, has provided precedent and inspiration for every other State in the Union. The present machinery for health action-in-partnership was mirrored in the prophetic vision of those early trailblazers. Today, every State in the Union has a State health organization which, with the local and Federal organizations, constitutes the modern public health team.

We have not arrived at our present stage of development without some tragedy. It was many years, for example before the scourge of yellow fever was finally brought under control. It took another epidemic in 1897 at Franklin, La., to provide the groundwork for present Federal, State, and local cooperation in promoting public health. At that time, the Federal Government sent 2 medical officers and 2 pharmacists to Franklin to work with the State and local officials to prevent the spread of the epidemic.

Thus, the past 10 years have been notable ones for Louisiana, as well as for the entire Nation in the field of public health. Let us all hope that the next century will be filled with even greater accomplishments, even more momentous triumphs. We have largely conquered the contagious diseases, such as yellow fever, but we have new problems threatening the health of our people. Longer lives, made possible by the conquest of communicable diseases, bring with them the chronic diseases of old age. It is in this area that we must look for future accomplishments. It is in this area that I feel certain the next 100 years will bring even greater triumphs. It is with pride that I salute the Louisiana Department of Health on its 100th birthday.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record. It follows:

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan (83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
1	Jan. 6	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy:	
3	Jan. 21	On passage. (Passed, 329 to 36)	Yea.
		H. J. 358, to discharge indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation:	
4	Jan. 27	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 27)	Yea.
5	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
6	Feb. 3	do	Present.
7	do	do	Present.
8	Feb. 4	do	Present.
9	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 3300, authorizing the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under direction of the Secretary of the Army, to divert water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway:	
10	do	On amendment designed to prevent additional diversion of water until survey of lake levels had been completed by Corps of Engineers and submitted to Congress. (Rejected, 177 to 202.)	Yea.
11	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 150 to 234.)	Yea.
12	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Absent.
13	do	do	Absent.
14	Feb. 17	do	Absent.
		H. R. 4646, providing for the exchange of certain public and private lands in order to prevent Federal lands acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations:	
15	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 226 to 161.)	NV.
16	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 400, to provide funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
17	Feb. 25	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	NV.
18	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Mar. 2	do	Present.
		H. J. Res. 355, relating to supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico:	
21	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 156 to 250.)	Nay.
22	do	Quorum call	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	Mar. 4	do	Present.
		H. R. 8067, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for fiscal 1955:	
25	Mar. 5	On an amendment to increase funds for subsidies to air carriers from $23,000,000 to $40,000,000. (Adopted, 265 to 105.)	Yea.
26	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 10	do	Present.
		H. R. 8224, reducing and extending certain excise taxes:	
28	do	On motion to recommit, with instructions to remove taxes on admissions of 50 cents or less. (Rejected, 200 to 213.)	Nay.
29	do	On passage. (Passed, 411 to 3.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 15	do	Present.
32	do	do	Present.
33	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8300, revising the internal revenue laws:	
34	Mar. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase personal exemptions and eliminate section dealing with double taxation of dividends. (Rejected, 204 to 210.)	Nay.
35	do	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 80.)	Yea.
36	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	Mar. 23	do	Present.
39	Mar. 24	do	Present.
40	Mar. 29	do	Present.
		H. R. 8224, reducing and extending certain excise taxes:	
41	Mar. 30	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 395 to 1.)	Yea.
42	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8583, appropriating funds for various independent offices for fiscal 1955:	
43	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to adopt language preventing FNMA from liquidating mortgages. (Rejected, 180 to 214.)	Nay.
44	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
45	Apr. 2	do	Present.
	do	H. R. 7839, aiding in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities:	
46	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide 35,000 public housing units each year for 4 years. (Rejected, 176 to 211.)	Nay.
47	do	On passage. (Passed, 352 to 46.)	Yea.
48	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
49	Apr. 7	do	Present.
50	Apr. 8	do	Present.
		H. R. 8649, authorizing the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of wiretap information secured in national security investigations:	
51	do	On amendment requiring a court order in order to make wiretap evidence admissible. (Passed, 221 to 166.)	Nay.
52	do	On passage. (Passed, 379 to 10.)	Yea.
53	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	Apr. 14	do	Present.
55	Apr. 27	do	Present.
		H. R. 7397, amending the Public Health Grant-in-Aid Act by consolidating and simplifying the several public health grant-in-aid programs for assisting States and local communities in providing necessary public health services:	
56	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
57	Apr. 29	do	Present.
		H. R. 8873, appropriating funds for the Defense Department for fiscal 1955:	
58	do	On passage. (Passed, 077 to 0)	Yea.
59	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
60	do	do	Present.
61	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2150, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in the United States territory:	
62	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 157 to 242.)	Nay.
63	do	On passage. (Passed, 241 to 158.)	Yea.
64	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 2556, amending United States Code relative to extradition of certain fugutives from United States to countries occupied by United States jointly with 1 or more powers:	
66	do	On motion that enacting clause be stricken out (that the bill be killed). (Adopted, 228 to 68.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan (83d Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
67	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 533, citing Bernhard Deutch for contempt of House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
68	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 346 to 0)	Yea.
		H. R. 9040, authorizing cooperative research in education:	
69	May 12	On passage. (Passed, 296 to 55.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 532, providing for consideration of H. R. 7434, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education:	
70	do	On resolution. (Adopted, 194 to 140)	Yea.
71	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7434, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education:	
72	do	On passage. (Passed, 179 to 157.)	Yea.
73	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7601, providing for a White House Conference on Education:	
74	do	On passage. (Passed, 269 to 69.)	Yea.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9242, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska communications system:	
76	do	On passage. (Passed, 346 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 568, providing for the consideration of H. R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code:	
77	June 1	On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 76)	Yea.
		H. R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increasing the benefits payable thereunder, preserving the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits:	
78	do	On passage. (Passed, 355 to 8.)	Yea.
79	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 580, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7494, extending the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year:	
80	June 11	On adoption. (Adopted, 273 to 63.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7494, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, for 1 year:	
81	do	On passage. (Passed, 281 to 53.)	Yea.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9517, appropriating funds for the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal 1955:	
83	June 15	On amendment fixing the Federal payment to the District of Columbia at $20 million instead of $16 million. (Passed, 186 to 168.)	Nay.
84	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8729, extending for 2 years the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.	
85	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit bond purchasing authority to periods when no cash is available. (Rejected, 80 to 250.)	Nay.
86	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 583, providing for disagreement to a Senate amendment to the Housing bill providing for public housing and agreeing to conference requested by Senate:	
87	do	On passage. (Passed, 360 to 19.)	Yea.
88	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		S. Con. Res. 91, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement:	
89	June 29	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 0.)	Yea.
90	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9678, promoting the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations (mutual security bill):	
91	do	On amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that no funds should be used for governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia. (Passed, 389 to 0.).	Yea.
92	do	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 126.)	Yea.
93	do	Quorum call	Present.
94	July 1	do	Present.
95	July 2	do	Present.
		H. R. 9680, providing for continued price support for agricultural products, augmenting the marketing and disposal of such products, and providing for greater stability in the products of agriculture:	
96	do	On amendment to provide flexibility in price supports from 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 1955 crops of basic commodities. (Passed, 288 to 170.).	Yea.
		H. R. 9640, amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds and otherwise improve the provisions of that act:	
97	July 8	On passage. (Passed, 347 to 0.)	Yea.
	do	H. R. 9709, a bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program:	
98	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to impose Federal standards upon State programs. (Rejected, 110 to 241.)	Nay.
99	do	On passage. (Passed, 309 to 36.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9580, revising and extending the laws relating to espionage and sabotage:	
100	do	On passage. (Passed, 324 to 0.)	Yea.
101	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 623, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8356, the health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill:	
102	July 13	On passage. (Passed, 274 to 88.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8356, the health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill:	
103	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 238 to 134.)	Nay.
104	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 627, reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations:	
105	do	On passage. (Passed, 381 to 0.)	Yea.
106	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7839, the Housing Act of 1954:	
107	do	On recommittal motion designed to provide 140,000 new units of public housing over a 4-year period in lieu of the 35,000 new units for fiscal year 1955. (Rejected, 156 to 234.)	Nay.
108	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 358 to 30.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9888, extending the time for initiating training under the Korean GI bill of rights to 3 years instead of the present 2 years after date of induction:	
109	July 21	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9020, granting increases in compensation and pension to veterans of all wars and their dependents:	
110	do	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9245, providing postal rate increases and postal pay increases:	
111	do	On motion to suspend rules and pass with an amendment. (Rejected, 228 to 171. A ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of the rules.)	Yea.
112	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 664, citing Bolza Baxter for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
113	July 23	On passage. (Passed, 376 to 0.)	Yea.
114	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9757, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended:	
115	July 24	On amendment relating to atomic patents. (Passed, 203 to 159.)	Yea.
116	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9757, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended:	
117	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 165 to 222)	Nay.
118	do	On passage. (Passed, 231 to 154.)	Yea.
119	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 10051, the mutual security appropriation bill for fiscal 1955:	
120	July 2	On passage. (Passed, 266 to 128.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8300, a bill to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States:	

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan (83d Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
121	July 2	On motion to recommit with instructions for House conferees to agree to Senate amendment which deleted section providing credit against the income tax of an individual of a percentage of the dividends received from certain domestic corporations. (Rejected, 169 to 227.)	Nay.
122	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 316 to 77.)	Yea.
123	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 626, providing for the consideration H. R. 236, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
124	...do....	On passage. (Rejected, 188 to 195.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9756, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation:	
125	July 29	On passage. (Passed, 317 to 57.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 265, providing for sine die adjournment of the 2d sess. of the 83d Cong. on July 31:	
126	...do....	On passage. (Rejected, 183 to 193.)	Yea.
127	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 30	...do	Present.
		H. R. 7840, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act:	
129	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 360 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9666, amending sec. 1001, par. 412, of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to hardboard:	
130	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 235 to 109.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 266, providing for sine die adjournment of the 2d sess. of the 83d Cong. on July 31:	
131	...do....	On passage. (Adopted, 179 to 167.)	Yea
		H. R. 8384, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon:	
132	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 144.)	Yea.
133	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
134	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 16, amending the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or its committees:	
135	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 293 to 55.)	Yea.
136	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9245, establishing a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification and providing a 7-percent pay increase for postal employees:	
137	...do....	On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 590, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 9245. (Passed, 348 to 29.)	Nay.
138	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 352 to 29.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 687, providing for consideration of S. 2033, relating to the labeling of foreign-produced trout sold in the United States:	
139	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 209 to 159.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9678, promoting the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations:	
140	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 97 to 266.)	Nay.
141	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
142	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 305 to 2.)	Yea.
143	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
144	...do....	On motion to instruct conferees to accept Senate amendments. (Adopted, 208 to 100.)	Nay.
		H. R. 10051, making appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year 1955:	
145	Aug. 19	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 188 to 77.)	Yea.
146	...do....	On motion ordering previous question on amendment providing $55 million and providing 80 percent of the foreign currency generated shall be used to strengthen and improve the civilian economy of Spain. (Adopted, 186 to 76.)	Yea.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
147	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 265 to 2.)	Yea.
		H. R. 2236, providing for regulation of certain public transportation in the Washington metropolitan area:	
148	Aug. 20	On recommittal of conference report with instructions to eliminate establishment of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulatory Commission. (Rejected, 95 to 164.)	NV.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, is a day which the people of Rumania and also of Rumanian descent living in the United States highly revere and commemorate. May 10, 1866, May 10, 1877, and May 10, 1881, stand out as milestones in the centuries of struggles of Rumania for independence and self-government.

On May 10, 1866, Prince Carol was chosen for the throne of Rumania and a constitution of liberal principles was adopted. For the first time in almost two centuries began a breathing spell for Rumania's development.

On the eve of the war between Russia and Turkey on May 10, 1877, Rumania signed a convention with Russia which established further progress toward Rumania's freedom and self-rule.

On May 10, 1881, Rumania was recognized as a sovereign kingdom and proceeded to develop and expand its ancient culture without interference from her powerful neighbors to the north, east, and south. The history of Rumania's fight during the First World War on the side of France, England, and America brought about freedom and unity of all Rumanians. The recent history of the Soviet and Communist infiltration and aggression in Rumania is well known by all who are familiar with Communist aggression. The same communistic blueprint was used to place Rumania under Soviet tyranny as was inflicted upon other captive nations now under the heel of the Kremlin.

Last Sunday, May 8, I addressed a mass meeting at Detroit, Mich., of Rumanians and friends of Rumania which was held in commemoration of the day, May 10, which stands out as a day of celebration in Rumania's history.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the assemblage gathered in Detroit in joint commemoration of Rumania's Independence Day:

RESOLUTION OF THE RUMANIAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND RUMANIAN-AMERICANS OF MICHIGAN—JOINT COMMEMORATION OF MAY 10, RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, SUNDAY, MAY 8, 1955, DETROIT, MICH.

Whereas the declaration on liberated Europe of the Yalta agreement, to which the United States is one of the three signatory powers, provides that the peoples liberated from domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of former Axis satellite states of Europe are to be assisted to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement further provides that the establishment of order in Europe and rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice; that this provision is a principle of the Atlantic Charter, namely, the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those people who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations; and

Whereas the three Governments, namely, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are pledged that they will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe where, in their judgment, conditions require—

(a) To establish conditions of internal peace;

(b) To carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed peoples;

(c) To form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the populations and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsible to the will of the people;

(d) To facilitate where necessary the holdings of such elections; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement, on the part of the Government of the United States was, in good faith, a determination to build, in cooperation with other peaceloving people, a world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and general well-being of all mankind; and

Whereas because of devious and underhanded methods employed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to avoid the fulfillment of their stated obligations under the terms of the Yalta agreement, in effect has enabled the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to foist upon the peoples liberated from Nazi Germany a government other than one of their own choice, and thereby have secured for the peoples concerned only a change of masters; and

Whereas this Nation has a sacred obligation to right the wrongs committed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Be it

Resolved, That we Americans of Rumanian origin first and foremost reaffirm our unswerving loyalty without reservation to the Government of the United States of America; that we are determined at any cost to maintain our American form of democracy; that we are opposed to all forms of subversive ideologies; that we desire to alleviate in every way legally possible the sufferings of our Rumanian brethren; that we desire to assist our Government in every peaceful way to attain the restoration of the freedom not only of our Rumanian brethren, but of all enslaved peoples everywhere, from a tyrannical and Godless communistic regime; and be it further

Resolved, That we Americans of Rumanian origin urge our subjugated Rumanian brethren to remain steadfast in their devotion to democratic ideals, institutions, and processes and to await with faith and hope the day of their liberation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, the United States delegate to the United Nations, the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the two United States Senators from Michigan, and to all Representatives from Michigan whose districts include citizens of Rumanian origin.

A Free, Independent Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, it is fitting that we commemorate the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791—a document which adopted many of the concepts of freedom which were put forward only a few years earlier by the new United States of America. It was, of course, natural that the Polish patriots of 1791 should derive a degree of inspiration from the United States in this regard, since freedom-loving Poles had played an important role in our own American fight for freedom and liberty.

In Westmoreland County of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, we have today many fine citizens—outstanding citizens—of Polish descent who are completely steeped in the principles of freedom and who are bitterly unhappy over the continued denial of freedom to their friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain. Our laws and red tape intended to make it so difficult if not impossible for escapees from Communist terror behind the Iron Curtain to get into the United States rankle with these Americans because of their implication that Polish people who want to come here are some kind of security risks. No such implication is justified. It is because the Poles love freedom so deeply that they try to escape from the Iron Curtain and come here. People so imbued with a love of freedom make outstanding citizens of a free country.

Despite the most intensive kind of "Russification" attempts in Poland by the Communist rulers trying so hard to turn Poland into a Russian colony, the natural leanings of the Polish people are to the West, to freedom and to independence. The "Russification" will fail, just as previous attempts to destroy the Polish national character have always failed.

We must never cease our efforts, Mr. Speaker, to work for the freedom of the Polish people and of all peoples now prisoner behind the barbed wire and machinegun emplacements of the Iron Curtain.

On Poland's great national holiday—free Poland's holiday, that is, since of course the Russians would not permit Poland today to celebrate its past traditions of freedom—we should reiterate the conviction of the free world that Communist tyranny must be ended over the minds of men, and over their lives as well.

We pray that there may be a new birth of freedom in Poland soon.

The Anniversary of Rumanian Independence and Union Is Celebrated in the Hearts of the Brave Rumanian People Now Living in Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the anniversary day of Rumanian independence and national unity. The Moscow-controlled regime in Bucharest has abolished this celebration according to the Soviet plan of denationalization of Rumania. But in this free country it is for us a moral obligation to remember those who fight and suffer for human liberty, because such heroic sacrifices lie at the very source of our own history as a free nation.

History reveals that the Rumanian people, descendants of the Roman colonists of Dacia—the ancient name of the land inhabited by the Rumanians—formed a strong Latin and Christian outpost at the eastern confines of Europe. The country, numbering now twenty-odd millions, has preserved its national integrity throughout centuries of vicissitudes. A deeply rooted nationalism and Christian faith are once more today the inspiration which welds the Rumanian people together in an unyielding resistance to communism.

After a period between the 17th and 19th centuries, when the Ottoman Empire had the suzerainty over the Rumanian lands and Russia brutally sought their annexation under the pretext of protecting them, the Rumanians succeeded in regaining their liberty following the Crimean War in 1856. They were given political autonomy under the guaranty of the European powers. It was to put a barrier to Russian expansion which 100 years ago represented a threat similar to the one plaguing Europe today, that the ancient position of Rumania as the guardian of the southeast gates of Europe, was restored as the most effective step against Moscow's imperialistic drive toward the heart of Europe. In 1878 the Berlin Congress recognized the full independence of Rumania which had been proclaimed by the Rumanians on May 10, 1877, and which they achieved in blood by defeating the Turks on the battlefield.

But today Rumania is no longer a free and independent country. In 1945, after an ultimatum delivered by Andrei Vishinski 2 weeks following the Yalta declaration, Rumania was subjugated by the Soviet Union, and a puppet government under Groza was imposed on the Rumanian nation. It is the ardent hope of every liberty-loving American that the time is not far away when the great injustice done to Rumania will be corrected, and from her status as an enslaved country she will soon be restored to the ranks of the free nations. This is the sincere wish of America on this day of national commemoration and mourning of the Rumanian nation.

America's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week I had the privilege and pleasure of attending the reception and luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria in New York honoring the American mother of the year, Mrs. Lavina Christensen Fugal, of Pleasant Grove, Utah.

I also attended a special Mother's Day service in Scarsdale, N. Y., where Mrs. Fugal was the honored member of the congregation.

On both of these occasions I was deeply impressed with the spirituality and the fine dedication of the members of the American Mothers, Inc., which organization is responsible for the selection of the mother of the year. The objectives of the mothers' committee are to develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual fiber of the American home, and

to give to the observance of Mother's Day a more spiritual significance outlining the important role of the mother in the home, the community, the Nation and the world. Annually each State selects a mother of the year for the State, and from among this total number, the American national mother is chosen.

Mothers attended the Friday function from every State in the Nation, from the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. The assembled State mothers of the year entered the room, each carrying a lighted candle, to the softly played tune Lead Kindly Light.

It was a stirring and inspiring sight. One felt that mothers indeed epitomized the light in the encircling gloom and shadows of today's world. The mothers who spoke stressed without exception the power of prayer in the home, its deep-rooted significance, and important influence throughout the Nation, the need for a Bible in every home, the blessing of food, and family prayer.

This House, too, has a religious service every Thursday morning. We all feel more and more poignantly the need for prayer and for divine guidance in solving today's problems.

Congressmen can help to further this fine movement in their own States by endorsing and encouraging its work. Commendation should be given to the national body of the American Mothers, Inc., who work tirelessly and without recompense of any kind in their effort to improve the homes of America and to bring about the solution to the problems of Juvenile delinquency and enact some Congressmen will realize the seriousness of juvenile delinquency and enact some kind of legislation that will help to fortify the homes of America.

This is a land of much industrial accomplishment and much time is spent on economics. There is a finer part to play, greater far than that of economics. It is the support, endorsement, and encouragement of spirituality in our homes, the foundation on which our Nation is built.

This great spiritual strengthening and developing of the moral fiber of our home, which is the work of the American Mothers, Inc., deserves the support and commendation of this body.

Mrs. Hobby Charged With Culpability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has stirred up a witches brew of uncertainty and confusion. Unfortunately Dr. Scheele, a good doctor, is cast in a bad role as her front. Mrs. Hobby has now suspended further distribution of the antipolio vaccine. She proclaims, however, that the vaccine is safe. Suppose the investigation reveals that the vaccine, as manufactured, is unsafe? Where does this leave the anxious parents of the 5 million children already inoculated? Why did not Mrs. Hobby insist upon proper inspection before and not after she gave the green light?

Why did the President recently assure the Nation that all was well? He is not without responsibility for the actions of his agent, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. This lady is indeed very culpable.

A Bill To Amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer today for the consideration of the House a bill designed to completely revise the so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

When President Eisenhower signed this law 2 years ago, he pointed out that its purpose was to welcome to our shores and give asylum to over 200,000 victims of Nazi and Communist oppression. These political refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain were to be permitted to come to the American haven during a 3-year period ending in 1956.

President Eisenhower said pridefully in August 1953:

It—

This law—

demonstrates again America's concern for the homeless, the persecuted, and the less fortunate of other lands.

This is "a great humanitarian act."

Nothing could have been further from the truth. This law is an immoral deception and a fraud. It is unworkable and unworthy. It belies the promise and frustrates the hope which our beloved country holds out to the world. It is a deceptive fake which decency demands we rectify.

Today, with virtually one-half of the statutes term having passed, some 563 refugees have been able to clear the mountainous hurdles and traps set for them before reaching these shores. You ask, "What hurdles?" "What traps?" Let us set them forth for you.

Suppose you wanted to sponsor the relocation of a refugee family in this country. What would the procedure entail? You would not be confronted with red tape alone, you would run smack into legal barbed wire.

First, you would have to execute a binding agreement with the government personally guaranteeing that the alien and his family will not become public charges. Please produce supporting affidavits as to your own employment and income, your bank credit and a copy of your last income tax return.

Second, supply proof that your alien has a job waiting for him; a particular job with a named employer and at a stated wage. This job must not displace any other jobholder. Have these facts certified by the local United States Employment Service and then by the Department of Labor in Washington. And, be sure to see to it that the job is held open for him until the refugee gets here—8 months from now—if at all.

Third, produce information that you have provided housing for him—give street address, description of accommodations, and the name and address of the landlord.

Getting tired? All right, mail all these documents to the Refugee Relief Administration at the Department of State in Washington, but, do not sit back with a sigh of relief. Your refugee is having his own heartaches on the other side of the ocean.

First, he must get the O. K. from some government to emigrate, along with a guaranty from that government that they will readmit him, if at any time and under any circumstances his residence in the United States is terminated.

Second, the alien applicant must prove that for the last 2 years he has been politically and ideologically pure of heart. He must get security clearance. This is far from easy, but it is his job.

Cabell Phillips, writing for Harper's Magazine, April issue, after an exhaustive study, characterized this as a "phony refugee law" which stands on our books as a national disgrace.

The present law is not alone a vicious fraud, its very administration compounds the deception.

In offering this bill, I join forces with a great humanitarian Senator, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who has made the extirpation of this calculated piece of legislative hypocrisy and administrative chicanery one of the prime objectives of his distinguished career.

Our bill provides the following major changes in the refugee relief law:

First. Place the administration of the refugee-relief program in a new office of Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, with the present Administrator having this responsibility taken from him.

Second. Provide for sponsorship and assurances for refugees by recognized welfare agencies.

Third. Increase the number of visas available by 15,000.

Fourth. Extend the termination date of the act to December 31, 1960.

Fifth. The definition of the word "refugee" is broadened.

Sixth. The 2-year documented history provision of the present act is repealed; while the more than adequate security requirements of this act and of the basic immigration law remain in force.

Seventh. Certificates of readmission to country of departure would no longer be needed.

Eighth. The term "ethnic" is stricken from the act.

Ninth. The maximum age for orphans eligible to be admitted under section 5 of the act is raised from 10 to 14.

Tenth. The provision for adjustment of status of aliens presently residing in the United States is broadened and liberalized.

Eleventh. The visa priority system, having proved unworkable and meaningless in practice, is repealed.

Mr. Speaker, an honest, yes, and Americanized refugee relief act can mean much to us all. This country is loved by those of us who are fortunate enough to have been born here. It will be cherished and enriched, as it was in the past, no less by those who pray daily to enter it as the land of their choice.

Let us now so act as to give meaning to those immortal words which grace the symbol of our ideology, the Statue of Liberty, which proclaims to the world:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Let us unlock the golden door.

Huge Cost of Federal Government Paperwork Should Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission has done a tremendous job for the people of the United States in investigating every phase of Government expenditure to ferret out the waste, extravagance, and duplication which has cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars each year, and which can now be saved thereby increasing the efficiency of the Government without loss of services to the public.

I do not place a blanket endorsement on all of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission because each such recommendation must receive a thorough study and review by the Government Operations Committee of which I am a member, and only after such study can a final decision be reached on the merits of the recommendation.

However, there is no question that previous recommendations of the Hoover Commission which have been put into operation have already resulted in a tremendous reduction in the cost of Government.

One of the latest reports of the Hoover Commission covers the problem of internal paperwork management in the 14 Government agencies which employ about 95 percent of all Federal employees.

The total cost of paperwork in the Government for 1 year, according to the report, has reached the staggering figure of $4 billion, a figure that shows the cost of paperwork alone in the Government approximating the entire budget for total operating costs of the Government prior to 1933.

As an example of some of the savings that can be made in paperwork management, the Hoover Commission has estimated that $255 million can be saved by more efficient operation of Government correspondence, reports, recordkeeping and mail handling.

In the fieldt of reports, it cost the Government as much as $700 million a year simply to prepare and collect information contained in reports, and the cost for a single report has reached $1 million. The Hoover Commission has further found that some reports have been issued long after they could serve any useful purpose, and that better than $50 million could be saved annually through careful management of Government reports.

More than $1 billion of the total paperwork cost in Government is charged to letterwriting alone, and a considerable reduction can also be achieved in this field.

The following is a comprehensive review which recently appeared in the Tax Digest of the Hoover Commission report on Federal Government paperwork with some of the recommendations for specific action to cut down this enormous expense which is consuming the taxpayers' dollars at an alarming rate:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PAPERWORK $4 BILLION COST A YEAR

(A digest by research department, Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report)

The Federal Government creates and handles some 25 billion pieces of paper each year (exclusive of the tons used in printing technical manuals, pamphlets, periodicals, etc.).

To do this, it employs 750,000 full-time employees.

The total cost of this paperwork is $4 billion a year. This figure aproximates the entire Federal budget prior to 1933.

The annual output of paperwork includes: More than a billion individual letters; 127,000 reports for use by Federal agencies; the addition of 9 billion documents to the Government's permanent records.

The Federal budget includes: $180 million for office space for paperwork employees, plus $40 million for records' storage space; $36 million for the rental of tabulating machines; $1 billion for letterwriting.

This report covers the problems of internal paperwork management in the 14 agencies which employ about 95 percent of Federal employees. A second report will cover the paperwork required of the general public by the Government.

The possibilities for more economical and efficient handling of the necessary paperwork are illustrated by the accomplishments with respect to records management, traceable to the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission, which were:

1. The creation of a records-management bureau in the Office of General Services;

2. The enactment of a Federal records-management law;

3. The establishment of an adequate records-management program in each department or agency.

In June 1949 the Congress established the General Services Administration (GSA). In 1950 it passed the Federal Records Act, giving GSA responsibility for the promotion of a program to improve the management of Government records. This act also required each agency head to establish a program for economical and efficient management of his agency's records.

The GSA has been responsible for important accomplishment in this field. It has reported these savings for the fiscal year 1953:

Records disposal	$11,500,000
Lower cost storage	8,227,000
Filing and paperwork	14,443,000
Total	34,170,000

The first Hoover Commission estimate of savings possible in this area for the fiscal year 1953 was $32 million.

The task force of the Hoover Commission covered a wider segment of the paperwork problem—taking up where the first Hoover Commission left off.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the Commission led to three major recommendations. These are described in brief below:

Recommendation 1

That the President establish a government-wide paperwork-management program by executive order and direct his top officials to give it their support.

That the General Services Administration be given the responsibility for general supervision of paperwork management in the executive branch, with a view to simplifying and improving the quality of documents, eliminating nonessential copies, reducing the volume and cost of paperwork, and standardizing procedures and practices.

That paperwork management staff functions now existing in the National Archives and Records Service be consolidated into the organization established in the GSA to implement this recommendation.

Bases for recommendation 1 are:

First. "The enormous volume of paperwork imposed upon top Federal executives interferes with their basic responsibilities * * * makes these positions far more difficult than those of the top officers of large corporations." The Commission thought the handling of the personnel side of paperwork could, at best, be "characterized as haphazard and shortsighted." Encouraging results were found to be an exception. "On the whole, agency heads and their principal subordinates have not given proper attention to potential economies in this $4-billion activity."

Second. While the General Services Administration has developed successful methods for improving the management of records, other phases of paperwork management leave much to be desired.

Many of the billion letters written each year (at a cost of $1 billion) "deserve their reputation for long words, long sentences, and long paragraphs, further obscured by legal terms, abstract nouns, passive verbs, and dangling clauses * * *."

The task force suggested that 1 style manual (instead of the 55 it found) would result in monetary savings and produce a letter of higher quality, which would be more acceptable to the public.

The Government spends about $700 million to collect information and prepare 127,000 different reports. The Commission found that "agency management is often uninformed of the kind, quantity, purpose, and cost of the information collected. Many reports do not appear to be well conceived as tools for management control, nor is the data properly integrated and maintained for this purpose. Some agencies could not supply relative elemental information about their activities.

Directives and instructions cost in excess of $100 million a year. The Commission found that few systems are effectively coordinated. There are 2- to 3-year lapses between revisions and unwarranted delays in clearing and promulgating instructions. In some agencies, subordinate echelons rewrite and expand instructions received from above. Not only is this practice costly, but confusion as to the original meaning is increased each time the original is paraphrased and interpreted. Thus, the energy, time, and money spent on the establishment and maintenance of the system is wasted, and those who attempt to adhere to it are frustrated and confused.

The Federal Government was a pioneer in the development of large-scale, high-speed computers, but it "has taken a back seat in

their use * * *." Budgetary procedures are the most important reason for this—a machine must be bought from a single year's budget. "It would pay some agencies, which have been processing data separately, to buy and operate a machine jointly." Personnel poses a similar problem, as highly skilled technicians are costly if each agency hires its own. Coordinated effort is advantageous.

Quality control accounts for at least 10 percent of the total paperwork cost ($400 million). In one unit of a military agency the review of finished letters takes 15 percent of the unit's total appropriation. "Even 100-percent inspection does not insure 100-percent accuracy because the drudgery * * * causes inspection errors."

Personnel policy provides another obstacle. Although it has attempted to develop standards for 3 years, the Civil Service Commission has tended to delay action until more agencies establish paperwork management programs. Agencies "* * * either scatter responsibilities for various segments * * * among relatively untrained, low-ranking employees as a part-time activity, or push the responsibility off on to some higher ranking employee too busy to give serious attention to it."

The Government keeps 26 percent of all records permanently. Records kept permanently by private industry average closer to 4 percent.

This all adds up to the cardinal fact that: While the Federal Government has made important strides, its records management program is still lacking in centralized direction and managerial drive.

Recommendation 2

The Commission suggests that some top official in each agency be assigned the responsibility of simplifying forms, eliminating nonessential copies, and determining the number and character of reports with a view to reducing and eliminating the nonessential reports. This official should cooperate with the General Services Administration in determining methods and systems.

Bases for recommendation 2 include:

The possibilities of intra-agency improvements are illustrated by some of the practices commended by the Hoover Commission:

The Internal Revenue Service, working with the General Services Administration, saved $157,200 in its Baltimore office in 1 year by streamlining its correspondence operation. Applied to all 64 district offices, this would result in a saving of $5,500,000 by the Internal Revenue Service alone.

On 1 project, covering 1 functional area, the Department of the Navy consolidated 3,161 forms into 752. Overall, it eliminated 21,000 forms in a year with identifiable savings of $3 million.

The Commodity Stabilization Service (Department of Agriculture) reduced its report requirements from 1,400 to 600. This made possible a 43-percent reduction in the number of employees working on reports in the field offices.

The Army Finance Corps audits only 10 percent of its pay cards and expects to cut its present low error rate in half. The overseas error rate dropped from 7 percent to 4½ percent in the last half of 1953.

These important, but as yet somewhat isolated, examples indicate what can be saved in time and money if this problem is given the emphasis is deserves.

Recommendation 3

Enactment of legislation authorizing necessary changes in forms 941 and 941A (Employers Quarterly Federal Tax Return), as recommended by the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration.

Basis for recommendation 3 is that these forms now require 184 million lines of information from employers each year, and also they duplicate data sent to other Federal agencies. "The saving to the Federal Government would be considerable, and the saving to the business world is estimated at $22 million annually."

POSSIBILE SAVINGS

It is possible to do the necessary paperwork more economically and more efficiently. Improved records management alone saved more than $34 million in fiscal 1953. If the recommendations of this report are implemented a further annual saving of $255 million is possible. This means more than a 6-percent reduction in the cost to the taxpayer.

The Task Force on Paperwork Management has estimated the current cost and possible savings on the seven major categories of paperwork.

Paperwork activity	Task force estimates	
	Current cost	Possible saving
Correspondence	$1,000,000,000	$75,000,000
Forms	867,000,000	50,000,000
Reports	700,000,000	50,000,000
Directives and instructions	100,000,000	----------
Record keeping	650,000,000	50,000,000
Mail handling	104,000,000	30,000,000
Supervisory and miscellaneous	579,000,000	----------
Total	4,000,000,000	255,000,000

Trinity Project in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, among many specious arguments now being leveled against the upper Colorado River storage project is one to the effect that atomic energy will replace the hydroelectric energy this project would develop.

In answer to those arguments I am submitting herewith excerpts from testimony of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. engineers dealing with hydro versus atomic power. The testimony was taken during House Interior Committee hearings on the Trinity project in California.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY ON THE TRINITY PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Utah, Mr. DAWSON.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Gerdes, on page 2 of your statement we find the words that by 1956 postwar additions in new hydro and steam power capacity of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will amount to nearly 3 million kilowatts, increasing the total system to 4.4 million, and your 11-year postwar construction program will represent an investment of $1.6 billion.

In addition to that investment I understand that you have plans beyond 1956 for the construction of steam plants and also hydro developments, have you not?

Mr. GERDES. Yes; we have plans for construction of additional powerplants, both steam and hydro. In our area the powerload is increased rapidly each year, and we have to keep building ahead to take care of those demands.

Mr. DAWSON. And that involves a good many millions of dollars, as you estimated?

Mr. GERDES. I could state it this way: Last year my company spent, if I recall the figure correctly, approximately $170 million. That includes distribution lines and transmission lines as well as generating facilities. It also includes some gas facilities. It is a very large sum of money we are speaking of.

Mr. DAWSON. Now, in view of the fact that some of those who would oppose future reclamation projects involving hydro development are claiming that the atomic age is upon us and is about to blossom forth, do you figure you are taking any chance with that kind of investment in hydro and steam plants?

Mr. GERDES. We are planning to build hydro plants and we are planning to build steam plants. We do not feel we are taking any risk in building them because of the development of atomic energy. As a matter of fact, we are participating with four other companies in a study of the development of atomic energy. We have recently made an offer to the Atomic Energy Commission which would involve the construction of a sizeable plant. We do not regard the development of atomic energy as a threat to our existing development of the plants that we intend to build.

Mr. DAWSON. That would include both hydro and steam?

Mr. GERDES. That includes both hydro and steam. On anything that we know today, atomic energy, at least in our area, is not competitive with the conventional plants. I am speaking as of this day. It may be that within a few years—and I would not predict how many—it may become competitive.

Mr. DAWSON. As of this day you do figure you are safe in projecting your future plans far enough ahead that you are willing to go ahead now and construct steam and hydro plants?

Mr. GERDES. In the first place we have to go ahead with our plans in order to meet prospective loads; and in the next place we think we are safe. Atomic energy, so far as electric power is concerned, is only another source of fuel to generate steam. If and when it becomes competitive—that is, when atomic energy can produce electric energy at a cost equal to or less than the conventional plants—it will just be another source of fuel. As a matter of fact, every year that we build a plant, that plant is more efficient than the one we built previously due to progress of the art.

Mr. DAWSON. But it would not render your hydroplants obsolete?

Mr. GERDES. It would not; no. The older plants are relegated to a point where you use them less. You use your most efficient plants at the base of the load curve. In other words, the most efficient plant is run 24 hours a day, or as much time as you can run it, and the less efficient, older plants are run to met the load peaks.

H. R. 4627 and S. 923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have been requested by Mrs. Earl Wagoner, who is legislative representative of the West Virginia Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to inform my colleagues of a petition I have received from the West Virginia Womans' Christian Temperance Union supporting H. R. 4627 and S. 923. The petitions in

support of these bills have been signed by more than 330 citizens of West Virginia.

Antitrust Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and also chairman of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I insert the following statement I made at the opening of the hearings on emerging antitrust and monopoly problems:

Our Antitrust Subcommittee in opening the first hearings of a substantial character to be held by the House in the last 3 years on emerging antitrust and monopoly problems, plans to probe deeply into the operation and enforcement of the antitrust laws at this time. Many questions come to the fore. Have our antitrust laws been adequate? If adequate, have they been effectively used to track down violations and violators? If they have not been adequate, in what way can they be made adequate? We hope this inquiry will provide the answers.

During the 65-year period since the Sherman Act was enacted in 1890 there have been several notable investigations. The Industrial Commission in 1898, the Pujo Committee before World War I, the Temporary National Economic Committee before World War II, and in more recent years the Senate Judiciary and the Senate and House Small Business Committees in addition to our own committee on the Study of the Growth of Monopoly Power during the 81st and 82d Congresses—all conducted extensive inquiries and made recommendations which resulted in major additions to the Sherman Act as, for example, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act. Just recently the House passed two more bills bearing my name. One of these bills increases the fine for an antitrust violation tenfold. The other authorizes Government suit for damages and establishes a uniform statute of limitations in private antitrust actions.

It is our hope and plan that these hearings will carry on the tradition thus notably set and will further broaden and strengthen our system of free competitive enterprise.

All of these inquiries began by listening to recurrent waves of criticism that the antitrust laws should be weakened or abolished. But in each case it was found upon thorough examination of the facts that the principles embodied in our antitrust laws were the pillars upon which our entire competitive business and economic structure rested. All of them resulted in recommendations and legislative, administrative, and judicial activities strengthening the antitrust laws and their enforcement.

Today our country is again going through a wave of mergers. During the last 2 years, in fact, nearly as many mergers have taken place as during the entire decade from 1938 to 1948. In fact one has to go back to the period from 1928 to 1931 to find industrial empire building going on at a comparably hectic pace.

This spate of mergers must give us pause. It is worthy of note and rather strange that not too infrequently whenever antitrust cases are lost by large entities, their executives and attorneys step up the clamor that our antitrust laws are confusing, and contradictory and stand in the way of progress. The financial editors of some big city papers and some not too disinterested trade journals echo the cry. Presently there seems to be in the air a concerted effort to make a vigorous assault upon our antitrust fabric. I've been amused to see history in this regard repeating itself—or would be amused if it were not for the tragic fact that during World War II the world received a triple-plated education in the principle that abandonment of free competitive enterprise handed nations lock, stock, and barrel into the clutches of fascism and communism.

Megalolatry—the cult that whatever is bigger is better—has too many ardent devotees.

I am amazed that some American pundits and publicists should blithely join the cult. We observe that the American Government broke up big cartels in Germany and Japan and this effort in no small measure has contributed to the degree of prosperity enjoyed by these countries. They are swinging over to the principles of free competitive enterprise. Germany, Italy, France, Britain, and Sweden have given extensive study to our antitrust laws. Some have adopted anticartel legislation, notably Sweden, Germany, and the Benelux countries. Others are considering similar legislation. What is needed here in the United States is not an attack on but a strengthening of our laws designed to foster free, efficient, independent competitive enterprise.

In order to document at this time the political and economic implications of concentrations of economic power, our committee plans in these hearings to survey the entire field, getting advice from political, industrial, agricultural, and labor experts concerning the new types of problems they find themselves compelled to handle because of the new forces now transmuting the economy.

Inasmuch as the principles underlying our antitrust legislation are the living, flexible fundamental, without which neither economic nor political freedom can exist or flourish, what adjustments, if any, are now advisable? A new defense industry bigger than any other will for a considerable time to come form an integral part of the economy. How can free competitive enterprise best coexist with the H-bomb, new vaccines, the wonder drugs, electronics, univacs, automation, supermarkets, bank consolidations, giant multiproduct conglomerates, and discount houses? What are the remedial measures, if any, that most deserve intensive examination?

We hope, as a result of these hearings, to know the areas to which we can most productively devote our limited time and money so as to make the most effective contribution now possible toward dovetailing the legal framework of our antitrust legislation to the requirements of an ever-changing, dynamic economy.

Those of us who believe in the maximum practicable diffusion of economic and political power and decision-making are determined that, so far as lies in our power, our system of free competitive enterprise shall continue to demonstrate its maximum possibilities for the enlargement of human productivity and individual freedom.

We are in fearful competition with a totalitarianism where decisions are centralized in concentrations of economic and industrial power coextensive with the state in that competition we cannot, we shall not, we dare not come out second best.

A year or so ago I wrote a book, one chapter of which is headed:

"Oh, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant."
—Shakespeare: Measure for Measure.

It is my purpose to make this the guide for our committee.

County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the National Farmers Union's Washington Newsletter of May 6, 1955 contains an article which gives a completely erroneous impression of the changes that have been made in county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the reasons for those changes. A careful reading of the statement which follows will clearly reveal the false picture which is presented:

The restriction on consecutive terms of office for community committeemen has been removed by an amendment to the Secretary's regulations governing ASC county and community committeemen. This completes the reversal of the Secretary's attempt last year to prohibit the election of experienced PMA community and county committeemen. A last-minute amendment to the sliding-scale price support bill last summer by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, prevented the Secretary's new election rules from applying to county committeemen, but experienced community committeemen fell under the ban. This latest ruling erases the penalty placed on experience, but not until after a completely new slate of community committeemen had been selected under the temporary operation of the regulation that has now been eliminated. Moreover, a small, select nominating committee set up by the regulations still will choose nominees for both county and community committees. Some critics are saying that Benson put the regulation into effect just long enough to eliminate Democrats from the committees, and now that as many Republicans as possible have been put on the committee he has changed the rules so they can stay on.

In States where community committees are elected at meetings, nominations are made directly by farmers at the meeting. Where election is by mail, nominees are chosen by a community election board and through petitions signed by 10 or more farmers. Community election boards consist of three farmers living in the community. They are named each year by the county election board, of which the county extension agent is chairman, and on which the SCS, FHA, and each general farm organization operating in the county are represented. Nominees for the county ASC committee are chosen directly by delegates at a county convention, the delegates being the community committee chairmen elected by the farmers.

In view of the election process described above, it is absurd to suggest that the purpose of imposition and removal of the limit of three consecutive terms of office for community committeemen was to replace Democrats with Republicans. Membership on these committees now, as always, tends to reflect the political sentiments of the community each serves. Many committees are and have always been nonpartisan, with repre-

sentatives from both major political parties serving on the same committee.

The limit on consecutive terms of office for community and county committeemen was adopted partly to answer criticism by farmers and others that there was a tendency for committeemen to perpetuate themselves in office, and partly to revitalize the committee system by assuring that fresh viewpoints would from time to time be brought to bear on local farm problems. It was eliminated after legislative action prevented application of the principle to county committeemen. Since the limit could not be applied to county committeemen who are a much more important part of the committee system, it was subsequently removed by administrative action for community committeemen. Removal of the limitation on community committeemen was not made effective at the time the legislation was passed because community committee election had already been completed in a number of States.

Thus it will be seen that the reasons for changes in the election procedure of these committeemen was not political but rather to improve the membership of the committee and the service which they can render to the areas they represent.

Aaron Frank: Distinguished Citizen and Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I this morning learned of the passing of a great public servant, a teacher, a brilliant lawyer, and a distinguished citizen of the State of New York. Prof. Aaron Frank died in his sleep on May 10, 1955. His passing will be noted with sorrow by the political and the legal fraternities as well as the philanthropic community in the city of New York.

Aaron Frank served with distinction as deputy police commissioner for many years. He was respected and honored for his brilliance, his integrity, and his kindly understanding by everyone of the thousands of policemen who were members of the Department. His legal attainments were widely recognized and respected, both in the field of teaching and the practice of law. He was professor of law at the New York Law School, who endeared himself to all of his pupils through the years. His ability as a lawyer's lawyer was recognized by the bar as well as the bench. He was active in the field of philanthropy and served as chairman of the metropolitan New York advisory board of the antidefamation league of B'nai B'rith.

Above all, he was indeed as reported in the New York Times this morning, both "soft spoken and kindly," with a "reputation for fairness and compassion."

I know that I speak for literally thousands of grieving citizens in the city of New York when I extend heartfelt condolences to his wife, Mrs. Estelle Frank, his son, Julian, his daughter, Barbara, and his father, Philip.

In This Atomic Age National Defense Requires Conservation of Scientific Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, we are all vitally interested in building and maintaining a strong national defense which will afford the United States the defensive strength to meet any conceivable emergency and, in the event of attack, to defend and repel the invader.

Such a program must, to be effective, embrace within its structure all the elements necessary for such defense. And there must be no weak link in the chain of our defensive strength if it is to stand the test should this ever be necessary.

We now have plans under consideration to bring our manpower to a maximum strength for defense purposes, and there is no doubt that a satisfactory plan to utilize the manpower strength of the Nation will become effective.

We also appropriate huge sums for all branches of our armed services to keep the weapons of war in constant readiness and to replace obsolete equipment.

However, a review of our existing defense policy brings to light one phase which could be that dangerous weak link in our overall national defense policy. This is the present lack of an effective policy to recognize the importance of a maximum effort in the field of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

When we realize the full extent to which we must depend upon our scientists and technological experts, not only to develop and operate atomic weapons of war, but equally important, to provide the antidote to neutralize the effectiveness of such weapons in enemy hands so that we may be assured of national survival in the event of conflict; then we can begin to fully appreciate the paramount importance of utilizing the talents and abilities of Americans already trained in these fields as well as our young men and women who exhibit outstanding ability in scientific research and technological development.

The American Chemical Society has made an exhaustive study of this problem as related to a sound long-range plan for defense and the needs for development and production of items which make our manpower a stronger combative force. As a result of this study, the Society has issued a statement of policy which contains recommendations to be considered in any proposed manpower program.

These recommendations are worthy of the thoughtful appraisal of all Members of Congress, and I am inserting them herewith for consideration:

When Congress passed legislation to provide for the military strength of our country it declared that "in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy" (sec. 1 (c) of Public Law 51, 82d Cong.).

The obligation and privilege of serving one's country in time of need has appealed to the patriotism of millions, yes, billions of people in literally hundreds of different countries. The United States has no monopoly on this feature. It is in the desire to assure a fair and just system of selection that the United States differs sharply from many other nations, and it is particularly important, in the interests of freedom and democracy, that every effort to provide such a system be made. Congress realized this when in the same law (sec. 1 (e)) it declared that "adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

These statements were incorporated into Public Law 51 on June 19, 1951, when the United States was playing a leading role in the Korean action. Since then there has been a gradual change in the world situation and in the part played by the United States. The so-called cold war which followed has developed into what more accurately may be called a technological war. Recent authentic information from Russia indicates that her leaders fear our technological superiority more than anything else. In view of the Russians' greater numerical strength, technological superiority offers the best hope of assuring our national security. It is logical that the degree to which national security can be assured is in direct proportion to our margin of superiority.

While the Soviet Union is conscious of the role of technology as the basis for both military and economic power, it is also conscious of its accomplishments in this area, accomplishments that have eliminated our superiority in certain fields, and left the margin uncomfortably narrow in others.

This being true, it is even more certain now than in 1951 "that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

Therefore, in the interest of immediate as well as long-range needs of our Nation, it is the opinion of the board of directors of the American Chemical Society that every step should be taken:

1. To assure maximum and uninterrupted growth of scientific and technological developments by promoting a strong educational system at all levels which will produce an adequate flow of specialized personnel of outstanding qualifications.

2. To assure optimum utilization of specialized personnel through a system whereby both military and civilian needs will be fulfilled. This objective will require expert civilian and military judgment to determine where each person can contribute most to the national interest.

These broad objectives are not being met today. Because they are not being met, it is the opinion of the board of directors of the American Chemical Society that those in Government having responsibility for the

administration of the manpower program should seek:

1. Modification of Public Law 51 (Universal Military Training and Service Act) and its administration, including a change in title, in order to guarantee the selectivity features of the law.

2. Legislation to establish a National Manpower Board in the Office of the President composed of both civilian and military personnel whose duty it shall be to determine policy and implement the administration of matters relating to specialized personnel. This legislation shall also provide for proper organization at State and local levels to ensure adequate recognition of individual abilities and local situations which provide realistic proper utilization of each reservist.

3. Legislation to provide an immediately callable reserve, under the control of the military, of such a size that it can be well organized, highly trained, and quickly mobilized to provide an effective striking force in the event of aggression, and also

4. Legislation to provide a selectively callable reserve, whose members shall not be recalled to the military except on a selection basis under the direction of the National Manpower Board.

Bill Introduced To Erect a Memorial to the Memory of Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is not that we pay homage today to genius. Albert Einstein was that and more—much more. We pay homage to this gentle man, to this man of heart, conscience, and mind. He sought the answer that all of us, in an infinite variety of ways, seek—the underlying unity of the universe.

We weep that he is gone from us, and it is right that we do so. We rejoice that in him and through him we have witnessed the magnificence that human beings can reach, and it is right that we do so.

Albert Einstein was a shy man, at ease only with his music and the children who came his way. Yet he was a man unafraid. He did not keep silent when demagogs and self-seekers sought to shackle us into conformity and strip us of our natural heritage of restless, searching, intellectual curiosity. He feared, more than any one single thing, the mind imprisoned. There were many who for this reason called him foolish and soft and there were others who called him dangerous.

He lent his illustrious name to many causes because—and of this I am sure—he knew there are many ills, many woes, many injustices man-made which man can undo. Poverty, disease, prejudice, hatreds—these are common foes. And Albert Einstein, man of genius, of scientific achievement unmatched in this century, looked upon the people and loved them, all peoples, all creeds, all races.

I remember once receiving a letter. The envelope was the kind that you buy for a penny in a corner store. The address on the envelope was written in a small, almost childish hand. And inside was a letter, handwritten, in the same hand, on a penny sheet of stationery, requesting help on a private immigration case, and the signature, humbly and unpretentiously, was "Albert Einstein."

This was some 10 years ago, and the memory of this simple little letter stays with me, for it was a mark of the man's humility and greatness.

When I spoke with him, as I had the honor to do on a number of occasions, I was again struck by the simplicity of this man who had opened vistas of science that even today are remaking the world. Today we stand at the crossroads between fear and hope. There will be a meeting "at the summit" of four world leaders who, together, could unlock the doors to peace. The dread destruction unleashed by the Einstein formula may yet be the Einstein formula to release the world from the scourge of war. For the dread of this destruction has pushed the world toward the imperative of making peace.

Because of this and because of much more which is inexpressible in the human heart, I have offered a resolution to erect a memorial to the memory of Albert Einstein. The resolution I have introduced reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That authority is hereby granted to any organization which may be organized for this purpose, to erect within 5 years from the date of approval of this resolution, a memorial testifying to the humanity and majestic scientific achievements of Albert Einstein, in the city of Washington on such grounds as may be designated by the Fine Arts Commission, subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library. The model of the memorial so to be erected shall be first approved by the said Commission and by the Joint Committee on the Library, the same to be presented to the people of the United States without cost to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That the cost of custodian maintenance of the edifice contemplated by this act will be borne perpetually by the organization undertaking its original construction.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

His Grace, Bishop Valerian D. Trifa, of the Rumanian Orthodox Episcopate of America, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with deep humility, We pray for the Members of this body, representing the people of the United States of America.

Grant them, O Lord, the wisdom, the understanding, the ability, and the power to govern this beloved country of ours, and to guide the world according to Thy will.

Almighty God, Creator of all things, who hast made America trustee of priceless human liberty and dignity, look down from Heaven upon Thy servants now present before Thee, and bless them, that they may remember in their discussions and decisions Rumania and all the oppressed nations who are still longing for a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and that they may give hope and help to all those who are living in hunger, need, discouragement, doubt, or fear.

And we pray, our Lord, for the peace of the whole world, for the welfare of mankind, and for the union of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 9, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States;

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; and

H. R. 4909. An act relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; and

H. R. 4909. An act relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Membership Corporations Law of the State of New York.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from this afternoon until Tuesday of next week.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following a brief executive session, there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John T. Williams, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PESIDENT. The President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUDIT REPORT ON ISLAND TRADING COMPANY OF MICRONESIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Island Trading Company of Micronesia, a Corporate Instrumentality of the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, Department of the Interior, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MAINTENANCE OF ROSTER OF CERTAIN RETIRED JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESCISSION OF ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF BENITO QUINTANA SEARA

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order relative to the rescission of adjustment of status granted Benito Quintana Seara (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 24

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to study the problems involved in civil defense

"Whereas recent scientific developments have so altered previous civil-defense plan-

ning that it has now become apparent that an effective national civil defense program can only be achieved by the Federal Government's acceptance of responsibility for both defining and financing such a program; and

"Whereas the previous position of the Federal Government that civil defense is primarily a responsibility of the several States controverts the Federal Constitution which clearly assigns the responsibility for the common defense to the National Government; and

"Whereas it has been clearly demonstrated during the past 4½ years that with the several States dependent upon each other for civil-defense support, many States are neither financially able nor inclined to go along with the current Federal program which demands matching-fund participation to the degree necessary to provide adequate fallback support for their sister States; and

"Whereas California's neighboring State of Nevada has recognized its inability to provide adequate support for the people of California in the event of an enemy attack and its legislature has adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to make adequate provisions for such an event by establishing Federal supply reserves east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to study the problems involved in the new concept of civil defense resulting from the greater destructive powers of presently developed weapons and make adequate plans to realistically provide an effective national civil defense program to the extent necessary; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to take appropriate steps to alleviate certain burdensome conditions imposed on the State in connection with the extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to public employees therein

"Whereas there are some 580 local public agencies now extending the benefits of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program to their employees, through contracts with the State, and by the State on their behalf with the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the 1954 amendments to the Federal Social Security Act, which permits the extension of such coverage to employees in positions covered by retirement systems, will affect an estimated additional 400,000 public employees in approximately 3,500 separate local agencies in the State; and

"Whereas the Federal law makes the extension of such coverage to such employees dependent upon action by the State, in giving notice to the separate groups of employees, and in supervising or conducting a referendum by secret written ballot within each such group; and

"Whereas the Federal law, or the administrative interpretation thereof, requires that as to each separate group of such employees the Governor of the State must personally certify to the fulfillment of all such conditions, without permitting the delegation of such function; and

"Whereas the provisions of the Federal law require that the State assume all obligations of an employer with respect to all public employees in the State to whom such coverage is made applicable; and

"Whereas, a private employer is allowed 1 month following the close of a reporting period within which to file his report and remittance to avoid penalty, while the State must within the same period, allow the local agencies in the State having such coverage time to prepare their returns and transmit them to the State, after which the State in the remaining portion of said 1-month period, must in conformity with Federal regulations compile and consolidate the reports and returns of each separate public agency and transmit the same to the appropriate Federal agency together with remittance to cover, thus having an effective filing period, if delinquent penalties are to be avoided, which is less than that accorded private employers; and

"Whereas the Federal law which prohibits the Federal Government in the absence of fraud from assessing a private employer for delinquent contributions after 3 years is held not to apply to the obligations of the State, thus subjecting the State acting on behalf of numerous local agencies, to contingent liability for unreported and unpaid contributions without limit as to retroactive effect; and

"Whereas such provisions of law and of administrative regulations and interpretations are discriminatory and impose undue hardship on the State and public agencies and impede the efficient administration of the provisions of the Federal act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to take appropriate steps to alleviate the conditions referred to herein; and specifically:

"(a) To permit the responsibility for certifying the adequacy and results of any and all referendums required under the act to be delegated by the Governor.

"(b) To permit the State a reporting period without penalty of at least 45 days after the close of the reporting period.

"(c) To provide a statute of limitation that will afford this State the same relief from retroactive contributions that is now enjoyed by private employers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to operation of Federal dams

"Whereas a great amount of unappropriated water which is not subject to disposal under existing contracts with water users is spilled over Friant Dam during flood seasons, and is wasting into the seat; and

"Whereas water is desperately needed throughout the service area of this dam for the purpose of replenishing the underground water supplies; and

"Whereas the charge at which water is made available under existing contracts makes it financially impossible to use that water for replenishment purposes; and

"Whereas it would be in the best interests of the United States in the operation of its water conservation facilities and the repayment thereof to dispose of such floodwaters at whatever price is obtainable; and

"Whereas it is essential to the welfare of this State that inexpensive water be made available to replenish the underground water supplies in order to protect the underground basins from destruction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, to take such steps as may be necessary to make available, pursuant to State law, for underground replenishment floodwaters from Friant Dam which are not subject to existing contracts, and that such water be made available at the lowest possible cost; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Secretary of the Army."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 24

"Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas; and

"Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

"Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water, and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

"Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

"Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation, pollution control and soil conservation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions are necessary to assure continuance of surveys and planning and assure cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water, by the three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United

States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body March 31, 1955.

"ROBERT H. JENNISON,
"Speaker of the House.
"FRANK GARRETT,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend its air parcel post rates

"Whereas numerous Hawaiian export businesses depend exclusively upon air transportation to the mainland for their perishable products; and

"Whereas air parcel post rates are unduly burdensome to these businesses because the present air parcel post charges on a package weighing 9 ounces is the same as the charge for one that weighs a full pound; likewise a package weighing 1 pound 1 ounce has the same charge as one that weighs 2 pounds; similarly a package weighing 2 pounds one ounce is charged the same as one weighing 3 pounds, etc.; and

"Whereas such shipments which exceed the even pound or pounds by only a small fraction now pay highly excessive rates: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to amend the existing laws fixing the rates for air parcel post so that the charges for airmail parcel post will be at a flat rate of 5 cents per ounce for all parcels.

"SEC. 2. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 6th day of May A. D. 1955,

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to enable the construction of irrigation projects to serve Hawaiian homes lands

"Whereas the Hawaii Irrigation Authority, created by Act 245 of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, proposes to construct irrigation projects designed to serve, in whole or in part, Hawaiian homes lands; and

"Whereas the construction of such projects would greatly benefit the homesteaders who occupy or will occupy such lands, and also the economy of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas to enable the construction of such projects the Hawaiian Homes Commission must be authorized to grant licenses to the Hawaii Irrigation Authority for pipelines, and the like, across Hawaiian homes lands and to develop water appurtenant to Hawaiian homes lands, to provide reservoir and well sites upon Hawaiian homes lands, and to undertake the payment of assessments against community pastures served by such projects and in certain circumstances the payment of construction costs of projects requested by the Hawaiian Homes Commission: Now, therefore—

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to enact legislation granting authority to the Hawaiian Homes Commission to do the above things, and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to amend section 220, Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920

"'Be it enacted, etc.—

"'SECTION 1. That section 220, Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, be further amended by adding a new paragraph thereto, to read as follows:

"'"To enable the construction of irrigation projects which will serve Hawaiian homelands, either exclusively or in conjunction with other lands served by such projects, the commission is authorized, with the approval of the Governor, to grant to the Hawaii Irrigation Authority, or to any other agency of the government of the Territory or the United States undertaking the construction and operation of such irrigation projects, for such term of years as is required for amortization of the costs of such projects, licenses for rights-of-way for pipelines, tunnels, ditches, flumes, and other water-conveying facilities, reservoirs, and other storage facilities, and for the development and use of water appurtenant to Hawaiian homelands; to exchange available lands for public lands, as provided in section 204 (4) of this act, for sites for reservoirs and subsurface water-development wells and shafts; to request any such irrigation agency to organize irrigation projects for Hawaiian homelands and to transfer irrigation facilities constructed by the commission to any such irrigation agency; to agree to pay the tolls and assessments made against community pastures for irrigation water supplied to such pastures; and to agree to pay the costs of construction of projects constructed for Hawaiian homelands at the request of the commission, in the event the assessments paid by the homesteaders upon lands are not sufficient to pay such costs. Such payments shall be made from and be a charge against the Hawaiian home-operating fund."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of May A. D. 1955.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by amending section 77 thereof, and by adding thereto a new section 77A, relating to a postauditor

"Whereas the Hawaiian Organic Act creates an audit department within the executive branch of the Territorial government, with the powers and duties of performing both preaudit and postaudit functions; and

"Whereas modern principles of public administration dictate that the important function of postauditing should not be performed by a member of the executive branch, but rather that such function should be performed by an official serving outside the executive branch and as an independent check thereon; and

"Whereas this principle was recognized by the drafters of the proposed constitution for the State of Hawaii and provision was therein made for the appointment of the postauditor by the legislature: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by amending section 77 thereof and adding a new section 77A thereto, to read substantially as follows:

"'SEC. 77. Comptroller and deputy comptroller: That there shall be a comptroller and deputy comptroller, who shall have the powers and duties conferred upon and required of the auditor-general and deputy auditor-general, respectively, by Act 39 of the Session laws, as amended by this act, subject to modification by the legislature. In said act "officer" shall be substituted for "minister" where used without other designation.

"'SEC. 77A. Postauditor: That there shall be a postauditor who shall be appointed by a majority vote of each house of the legislature in joint session, who shall serve for a period of 8 years and thereafter until a successor shall have been duly appointed. He shall have such powers and duties relating to the postaudit of Territorial and county accounts and appropriations as may be prescribed by law. The legislature, by a two-thirds vote of the members in joint session, may remove the postauditor at any time for cause.'

"SEC. 2. In enacting the legislation requested by section 1 of this joint resolution, the Congress is further respectfully requested to make it effective upon the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii of legislation prescribing the duties of postauditor and redefining the duties of the comptroller.

"SEC. 3. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of May A. D. 1955.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to permit entry into the United States of wives and minor children of citizens of the Republic of the Philippines who entered the United States prior to 1946 and have established permanent residence therein

"Whereas there are thousands of Filipino citizens who entered the United States as laborers prior to 1946 and are now permanent residents therein whose wives and minor children are now living in the Philippine Islands; and

"Whereas such Filipino citizens have contributed much to the economic development of, and are distinct assets to, the Territory of Hawaii, as well as the United States of America; and

"Whereas it would be to the public benefit and weal to have the families of such Filipino citizens reunited so that they may fully participate in the growth and develop-

ment of the respective communities in which they may establish themselves: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to permit entry into the United States of the wives and minor children, as nonquota immigrants, of citizens of the Republic of the Philippines who legally entered the United States prior to July 2, 1946, and have established permanent residence therein.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of May A. D. 1955.

"FARRANT L. TURNER,
"Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 62

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to increase the apportionment of Federal funds for wildlife restoration in Hawaii

"Whereas the need for public hunting areas in Hawaii is essential; and

"Whereas in the past 4 years the number of public hunting areas has risen to 14 covering some 240,000 acres on 5 different islands; and

"Whereas the income of the fish and game division is insufficient to develop these areas properly; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has more public hunting areas than at least 10 States but receives less than one-half of the smallest of Federal-aid funds apportioned to any one State; and

"Whereas the public hunting areas offer a recreational and economic asset to the Territory;

Whereas it is declared the policy of the legislature to do those things which will increase the proper use of the natural resources of the Territory and thereby substantially contribute to the welfare of the people and to the economy of these islands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby requested to pass H. R. 5790 entitled, 'An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act,' which will raise Hawaii's apportionment of Federal aid to wildlife funds from $25,000 annually to $50,000 annually; be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

The petition of Ernest E. Kranz, of Monrovia, Calif., relating to his contract with the United States relating to the control of smog; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the Constitution League, Tacoma, Wash., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mary K. Braun, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by an assembly of Americans of Sudetic-German descent, New York, N. Y., relating to the Yalta agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea

"Whereas it is proposed to close the Chelsea Naval Hospital; and

"Whereas the facilities at the Chelsea Naval Hospital have been invaluable to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents for over 100 years; and

"Whereas the closing of the hospital would be detrimental to many of the retired naval personnel and would also deprive the dependents of such men and others in active service of a privilege granted to them by Congress; and

"Whereas the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital at this time would be an uneconomic action: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Federal Government take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, May 2, 1955, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

By Mr. BUSH:

A resolution of the general assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Joint Resolution 83

"Resolution memorializing Congress in regard to legislation concerning tax-exempt property owned by the Federal Government

"Whereas the increasing acquisition of various types of property, both real and personal, by the Federal Agencies has removed billions of dollars of property from the tax rolls of the States, towns, and counties throughout the United States; and

"Whereas this trend, because of the gigantic loss of tax revenues involved, has threatened the integrity and independence of local governments and should be halted at once; and

"Whereas many procurement contracts negotiated by the various armed services with private contractors contain provisions under which the Government, upon making any partial payment, takes title to parts, materials, inventories, work in progress and tools, acquired or produced by the contractor for the performance of the contract, thus making it possible for both the Government and the contractor to claim that such property becomes tax free: Therefore be it

"Resolved by this assembly, That the general assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon a bill submitted by United States Senator PRESCOTT BUSH of Connecticut which recognizes that equitable treatment of the States and of local governments requires Federal payment of taxes or grants-in-lieu of taxes on federally acquired and owned property; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Senators and Representatives in Congress from her State.

"MILDRED P. ALLEN,
"Secretary of state."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolution extending to Patrick B. McGinnis and the officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. commendation for and encouragement in their efforts to develop the services of the railroad for the betterment of this area

"Whereas the present management of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. has been in office just more than 1 year; and

"Whereas its president, Patrick B. McGinnis, has spent considerable time in our State propounding his plans for the improvement of service and equipment on this most important lifeline of transportation; and

"Whereas the said Patrick B. McGinnis has tangibly demonstrated his real interest in the State of Rhode Island by entering into negotiations for the development of a 2,500 acre industrial development in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of this general assembly, heartily in accord with the efforts displayed by the officials of this railroad, and particularly by its president, Patrick B. McGinnis, now commend that spirit of endeavor and development, wishing to said Patrick B. McGinnis every encouragement and success in his continued efforts for the betterment of the economic, social, industrial, and other phases of our life here in Rhode Island and throughout this entire area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to transmit to the several Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the Interstate Commerce Commission duly certified copies of this resolution."

By Mr. BRIDGES:

A concurrent resolution of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Court of New Hampshire urges the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 5255, entitled "A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the construction of the New Hampshire Marine Memorial as the first memorial in the United States in honor of men and women who lost their lives at sea in all wars, which is to be erected at Hampton Beach, N. H., now pending in the United States House of Representatives, as introduced by Representative CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of New Hampshire in the Congress, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

"Passed, April 12, 1955.

"Attest:

"ENOCH D. FULLER,
"Secretary of State."

THE DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Denver Chamber of Commerce, Denver, Colo., and a resolution which the board of directors of the chamber passed on April 14, 1955, relating to the sugar industry.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Denver, Colo., April 19, 1955.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: The enclosed resolution is to support your position in regard to an immediate increase in the quota which the domestic sugar industry may market and the changing of the Sugar Act of 1948 so that the domestic industry may share in all future increases in sugar consumption in the United States. Specifically, it is in support of your action on S. 1635.

The agriculture and livestock committee of the Denver Chamber of Commerce compliments you on the affirmative action which you have taken in this matter and the speed with which you have moved to obtain for the domestic sugar industry an equitable share in the domestic market.

Specific information which the Denver Chamber of Commerce developed in their study of the subject, and which may be of interest to you, is quoted below. It points out the value of the sugar industry to the economy of the Denver market area.

"The Western Beet Sugar Producers, Inc., supplied the following information concerning the Denver market area. The value of sugar produced in our market area is estimated at $90 million per year, with the peak payments made to farmers equaling $65,717,651. Company payrolls of the processors amount to $18,702,437 and direct company purchases in the market area amount to $10,221,038. Above and beyond these figures, it should be remembered that sugar beet byproducts, principally tops, pulp, and molasses, have a multimillion dollar annual volume and are the mainstay of our western livestock feeding industry. In many factory communities, the sugar-beet industry alone is responsible for as much as 35 percent of all railroad freight. Its annual freight payments are estimated to exceed $12 million. The industry fosters and is largely responsible for the sale of several million dollars worth of mineral and chemical fertilizers each year. Very important is the fact that the industry uses a pound of coal for each pound of sugar produced and therefore is 1 of the 2 largest purchasers of coal from the Rocky Mountain mines. Last, the influence of this industry on the purchase of such items as farm machinery, petroleum products, etc., and the economic stability for which the industry is responsible in agricultural regions is a valuable factor."

It is our hope that this action will tend to strengthen your position.

We remain,

Most respectfully,

CALVIN K. SNYDER,
Manager.

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural and industrial life of the Rocky Mountain and High Plains States; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of this agricultural area in which Denver has a keen economic interest: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic industry; and that the Congress be and hereby is petitioned to restore to the domestic industry its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to bring about the reforms requested above, we heartily endorse Senate bill S. 1635 introduced on April 1, 1955, by 49 Senators; and that the secretary of the Denver Chamber of Commerce is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Colorado; and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by board of directors of the Denver Chamber of Commerce April 14, 1955.

W. K. KOCH,
President.

GEORGE COCHRIAN,
Secretary.

FLOOD CONTROL LEVEES AT SALINA, KANS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Leland M. Srack, city manager of Salina, Kans., together with a resolution adopted by the mayor and governing body of that city, urging early action on the proposed flood-control levees and program for that city.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution No. 1558

Resolution pertaining to proposed flood-protection works for the city of Salina, with participation by the United States of America

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has duly adopted Public Law 566, the same being expressive of proposed public works; and

Whereas said document includes and approves flood-protection works for the city of Salina, Kans.; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has instituted a program for a study of river and stream bank stabilization as part of its system of flood control, which program is particularly favored by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Salina, Kans.; and

Whereas before such approved plan can be implemented it will be necessary for the Congress of the United States of America to provide for such implementation by appropriations of money; and

Whereas the city of Salina has heretofore duly expressed and does now wish to reaffirm by resolution its intention to provide funds for the acquisition of right-of-way providing for changes in highways, the construction of bridges, and all other costs that might accrue to it under the proposed plan; and

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the City of Salina, Kans., deems it in the public interest that said flood-protection works be constructed and said flood-protection plan be carried out in all details; and so, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Salina, Kans., That it earnestly solicits the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate sufficient funds and moneys and make the same available to the Corps of Engineers of the United States of America in order that such agency may draft plans and specifications and perform all work necessary and incidental thereto for the construction of such works; and so that the city of Salina, Kans., may be advised therefrom the nature and extent of its duties in order to facilitate the implementation of such plan. That the city clerk of the city of Salina, Kans., be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, the Honorable WINT SMITH, the Director of the Budget, and Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, of the Corps of Engineers, aforesaid.

A. W. HAWKES,
Acting Mayor.

Attest:
[SEAL]

H. E. PETERSON,
City Clerk.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREST SERVICE—RESOLUTION

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the conservation committee of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, urging increased appropriations for the Forest Service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MICHIGAN ACADEMY OF
SCIENCE, ARTS AND LETTERS,
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich., April 4, 1955.

Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA,
Senator from the State of Michigan,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: On March 26, 1955, the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters unanimously approved the following resolution submitted to it by its conservation committee:

"It is recommended by the committee on conservation of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters that the Congress of the United States provide adequate funds to the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture for the development of recreational facilities and for wildlife management on the national forests."

As you are probably aware, the appropriations to the Forest Service have been woefully inadequate to provide for the proper development of the forests to meet the recreational and wildlife needs of the people.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE M. MCEWEN,
Secretary.

RECOGNITION OF GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Harry S. Panos, secretary of Milwaukee Chapter No. 43,

of the Order of Ahepa, a letter urgently recommending the official recognition of the Greek Orthodox Church for the purpose of identifying the religious affiliation of United States servicemen.

I have extremely high regard for the Order of Ahepa, which, down through the years, has rendered notable service to our own country and to the continual strengthening of our friendly relations with our ally, Greece.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Panos' significant message be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDER OF AHEPA,
MILWAUKEE CHAPTER, NO. 43,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 6, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have been instructed by the members of Milwaukee Chapter No. 43, Order of Ahepa, to write to you and urge that you give your support to bill S. 3872 (83d Cong.), officially recognizing the Greek Orthodox Church and authorizing the services to mark the dog tags of servicemen with the initials GO, indicating their religion as being Greek Orthodox. We believe that it is only just that the Greek Orthodox Church be given the same recognition that other faiths have. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY S. PANOS,
Secretary.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND COMPULSORY RESERVE — RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Regional Baptist Student Movement at their annual meeting on May 1, 1955, in Minneapolis, expressing their opposition to the proposal concerning universal military training and the compulsory Reserve.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA BAPTIST STUDENT MOVEMENT,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 4, 1955.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At the annual meeting of the Regional Baptist Student Movement, held May 1, 1955, in Minneapolis, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

"*Resolved,* That the Baptist Student Movement of Minnesota-North Dakota region shall stand opposed to the proposal concerning universal military training and the compulsory Reserve now before Congress on the basis that—

"1. Such a program would require placing young men in the morally degrading atmosphere of weekly military indoctrination for almost a decade of their lives.

"2. It would require minds, men, and money which could otherwise be used in building institutions of peace, including international disarmament.

"3. The approval of such a program will eventually lead to the formation of a militaristic state, which history proves abolishes the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the church."

The Baptist Student Movement represents 1,000 Baptist students in the following Minnesota colleges: University of Minnesota, Macalester, Hamline University, Carleton College, Mankato State Teachers College, St. Cloud State Teachers College, Winona State Teachers College, University of Minnesota (Duluth branch).

We urge you to consider this action as you vote on the President's plan for universal military training and the compulsory Reserve (H. R. 2967 and H. R. 3005).

Sincerely yours,
JO ELLYN PHILLIPS,
Secretary.

REGULATION OF NATURAL GAS PRICES—RESOLUTION OF THE SPRINGFIELD (MINN.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Springfield, Minn., on April 15, 1955, endorsing the mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills, relating to the regulation of natural-gas prices.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution endorsing the mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemptions bills

Resolved by the City Council of the city of Springfield, That we endorse the formation of a mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills purporting to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission the matter of regulation of natural-gas prices. Further, that we endorse participation by the mayor of the city of Springfield in such committee program; be it further

Resolved, That the League of Minnesota Municipalities be requested to immediately contact Minnesota communities, including those expecting future service of natural gas, to undertake active opposition to the foregoing legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to transmit forthwith copies of this resolution to Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of Philadelphia, Pa.; Clarence Ludwig, secretary of the League of Minnesota Municipalities; Charles Rhyne, general counsel of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers; and to each Member of the House and Senate in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed April 15, 1955.

B. J. ENGELEN, *Mayor.*

Attest:

P. H. SOLYNTJES,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF WEST ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by the City Council of West St. Paul, Minn., on April 26, 1955, opposing legislation which would eliminate regulation of companies carrying natural gas to Minnesota by gas pipeline companies.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the common council of the city of West St. Paul has been advised that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States will hold meetings for the presentation of arguments, pro and con, on the merits of those bills already introduced in the House of Representatives directed toward certain proposed amendments in the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which bills are designed to amend the said Natural Gas Act to provide for the exemption from the jurisdiction of Federal regulation and control, of the so-called independent producers in the natural gas field in connection with the transmission of gas in interstate commerce by interstate pipeline carriers, said bills being designated as H. R. 4675, H. R. 4560, H. R. 3703, H. R. 3902, H. R. 3941, H. R. 3940, H. R. 4168, and H. R. 4427; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota has no native sources of fuel and must rely upon fuels transported considerable distance into this area, making it inherently an area of high fuel prices; and

Whereas the citizens of West St. Paul, Minn., are served, in the supply of natural gas for home and industrial use, by the Northern States Power Co., which purchases its supply of gas from that certain interstate pipeline carrier, the Northern Natural Gas Co.; and

Whereas the city of West St. Paul has been served with natural gas for many years, and the use of natural gas for industrial and home consumption continuously is growing; and

Whereas the common council of the city of West St. Paul is convinced that the passage of the legislation hereinbefore referred to, and the exemption of this segment of the industry, hereinbefore referred to, from Federal regulation and control can only lead, in the ultimate, to a higher cost of natural gas for industrial and home use to the local citizens and corporations resident in the city of West St. Paul: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the common council of the city of West St. Paul, Minn., speaking in behalf of the citizens of this municipality, That said governing body hereby expresses opposition to any proposed legislation in Congress seeking to exempt such independent producers from regulation and control by the Federal Government, said regulation to be imposed through the Federal Power Commission, and said Commission's regulation and control of interstate pipeline carriers carrying said natural gas in interstate commerce, the said bills having been specifically designated herein above; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to dispatch copies of this resolution to the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to the Honorable Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, and to Hon. Congressman O'HARA.

Approved April 26, 1955.

JOHN V. SPERL,
Mayor.

Attest:

E. ZEHNDER,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of South St. Paul, Minn., on April 25, 1955, opposing proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act of 1938

which would exempt so-called independent producers in the natural-gas field from Federal regulation and control in connection with the transmission of gas in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the mayor and the City Council of the City of South St. Paul have been advised that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States will hold meetings for the presentation of arguments, pro and con, on the merits of those bills already introduced in the House of Representatives directed toward certain proposed amendments in the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which bills are designed to amend the said Natural Gas Act to provide for the exemption, from the jurisdiction of Federal regulation and control, of the so-called independent producers in the natural-gas field in connection with the transmission of gas in interstate commerce by interstate pipeline carriers, said bills being designated as H. R. 4675, 4560, 3703, 3902, 3941, 3940, 4168, and 4427; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota has no native sources of fuel and must rely upon fuels transported considerable distance into this area, making it inherently an area of high fuel prices; and

Whereas the citizens of South St. Paul, Minn., are served in the supply of natural gas for home and industrial use by the Northern States Power Co., which purchases its supply of gas from that certain interstate pipeline carrier, the Northern Natural Gas Co.; and

Whereas the city of South St. Paul has thus been served with natural gas for many years, and the use of natural gas for industrial and home consumption has grown to a point where the amount of natural gas used in this community is in the amount of over 402 million cubic feet per annum, exclusive of the packing industries; and

Whereas the mayor and City Council of the City of South St. Paul are advised that the passage of the legislation hereinbefore referred to, and the exemption of this segment of the industry, hereinbefore referred to, from the Federal regulation and control can only lead, in the ultimate, to a higher cost of natural gas for industrial and home use to the local citizens and corporations resident in the city of South St. Paul: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and City Council of the City of South St. Paul, Minn., speaking in behalf of the citizens of this municipality, That said governing body hereby expresses opposition to any proposed legislation in Congress seeking to exempt such independent producers from regulation and control by the Federal Government, said regulation to be imposed through the Federal Power Commission, and said Commission's regulation and control of interstate pipeline carriers carrying said natural gas in interstate commerce, the said bills having been specifically designated herein above; and be it further

Resolved, That the city attorney of South St. Paul is hereby directed to dispatch copies of this resolution to the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to the honorable Senators of the State of Minnesota, and to each of the honorable Representatives of the State of Minnesota.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF WINDOM, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Windom, Minn., opposing legislation which would eliminate regulation of companies carrying natural gas to Minnesota by the gas pipeline companies.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution respecting Federal control of gas pipelines

Whereas the City Council of the City of Windom, Minn., is advised that there is pending Federal legislation exempting gas line companies from Federal regulation; and

Whereas the city council believes that such legislation, if enacted, would be detrimental to the interest of the city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Windom, Minn., as follows: to-wit:

1. That it is opposed to such legislation as would eliminate regulation of companies carrying natural gas to Minnesota by the gas pipeline companies.

2. That it is recommended that our Representatives in Congress vote against such legislation.

3. That copies hereof be sent to the Senator and Representative from Minnesota which represents our city and to Eric G. Hoyer, mayor of the city of Minneapolis.

Passed April 18, 1955.

OSCAR A. OLSON,
Mayor.

Attest:

BESSIE L. MORGAN,
City Clerk.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted on April 28, 1955, by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission with regard to the proposed Federal water pollution control legislation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas at a meeting of the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission at the State Board of Health Building, University Campus, Minneapolis, Minn., April 28, 1955, pending Federal water pollution control legislation (S. 890) was considered and the following conclusions were reached:

1. The proposed bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act provides delegation to the Federal Government of enforcement to a degree inconsistent with the constitutional rights and responsibilities of the States;

2. The present satisfactory progress in water pollution abatement and control would not be improved and might be retarded by delegation of additional enforcement authority to the Federal Government;

3. While the present Water Pollution Control Act could be improved by revision, such revision should be made only after consultation with state and interstate water pollution control agencies, which consultation was not provided prior to introduction of S. 890: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That while the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission recognizes the desirability of Federal activity in the field of water pollution control, particularly in the areas of research, training, and the coordination of problems of interstate nature, the Commission opposes the proposed legislation S. 890 and the companion House bill, and urges extension of the present law, Public Law 845, pending consultation with state and interstate agencies.

HELLS CANYON DAM—RESOLUTION OF CARPENTERS LOCAL, NO. 1644, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by Carpenters' Local, No. 1644, of Minneapolis, Minn., on April 22, 1955, in support of the federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL UNION, No. 1644,
U. B. OF C. AND J. OF A.,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 30, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The following resolution was adopted by Carpenters' Local, No. 1644, on April 22, 1955, in support of the federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon:

"Whereas the platform of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America is for the public ownership of all of our natural resources; and

"Whereas our hydroelectric developments, flood control, and irrigation are derived mainly from the natural resources of this country; and

"Whereas the full development of our natural resources for the greatest benefit of all citizens can be done best through direct Government control: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the contemplated development of Hells Canyon as proposed by Senate bill No. 1333 and House bill No. 4719 be adopted immediately and remain always under the direct control of the Government; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That all our natural resources be kept in public ownership and developed by the public for the best interests of all citizens at all times."

Respectfully submitted by Carpenters Local, No. 1644, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Respectfully yours,

F. J. HEIMAN,
Recording Secretary.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of St. Paul, Minn., on April 21, 1955, recommending passage of Senate bill 1566, proposing payments to State and local governments on Federal real property.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Paul, Minn., That it hereby heartily approves and recommends for passage by the

Honorable, the Senate of the United States of America, that certain legislation incorporated in S. 1566, a bill introduced by the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, of the State of Minnesota, and other coauthors, namely the Honorable Senator KUCHEL, of California, and the Honorable Senator GOLDWATER, from Arizona, which bill would provide for payment to State and local governments:

1. Regular ad valorem taxes on properties owned by the Federal Government but leased to private users or sold to them under conditional sales contracts.

2. Annual payments determined by each Federal property-owning agency on the basis of an application from the affected State or local government and in conformity with Governmentwide standards and procedure for properties in each class. This would be the most common type of payment under the bill.

3. Transition payments on a declining basis over a 10-year period.

4. Special payments in unusual situations where a taxing jurisdiction can demonstrate that Federal activities are imposing a local hardship for which other aid is available from the Federal Government.

5. Special assessment for local improvements, substantially the same as for private property; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the honorable United States Senators from Minnesota; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the Members of the House delegation of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Approved April 21, 1955.

JOSEPH E. DILLON,
Mayor.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS—CHANGE OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE LAW—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, two resolutions adopted by the Ellingson-Brenden Post, No. 376, of the American Legion at their regular meeting on March 21, 1955 at Rothsay, Minn., opposing the closing of any Veterans' Administration hospitals, and also opposing any change in the veterans' preference law of the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Hoover Commission in its report issued recently has recommended the closing of 19 Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the United States, 2 in particular, which are located at Fargo, N. Dak., and Minor, N. Dak.; and

Whereas the closing of these hospitals, especially the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Fargo and Minot would create a great and unnecessary hardship on the veterans served by these institutions, not only in denying them hospitalization in a veterans' hospital near their respective homes, but also in increasing the waiting lists of other veterans' hospitals by overburdening their now inadequate facilities by the demands for hospitalization of the veterans in the areas served by the Fargo and Minot Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the veteran population is steadily increasing which demands increased Veterans' Administration hospitals facilities to adequately meet the needs for treatment of veterans who honorably served their country in time of war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Ellingson-Brenden Post, No. 376, Rothsay, Minn., at a regular duly convened meeting on the 21st day of March 1955, That this post hereby urges the Senators from the State of Minnesota, and the Representative from the Ninth Congressional District, State of Minnesota, to put forth every effort and employ every means at their disposal to prevent the closing of these Veterans' Administration hospitals, particularly the hospital located at Fargo, N. Dak., and Minot, N. Dak.; and to prevent the unjust discrimination against the veterans in the area served by these hospitals, particularly the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Fargo, N. Dak., and Minot, N. Dak., which will result if these Veterans' Administration hospitals are closed; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Hon. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and the Honorable COYA KNUTSON, Representative of the Ninth Congressional District, State of Minnesota, to apprize these officials of the attitude of this organization in this regard and to hereby request each of them to inform this organization as seen with respect to the proposed closing of these Veterans' Administration hospitals, particularly those at Fargo, N. Dak., and Minot, N. Dak.

ROBERT B. COWIE, Jr.,
1st Vice Commander.

Attest:

ELDRING SHEPERD,
Adjutant.

Whereas it has come to the attention of this veterans' organization that there is contemplated and proposed, changes in the Veterans' Preference Laws of the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas the proposed changes would seriously affect the rights of veterans who honorably served their country and also those who not only served their country honorably, but are suffering service-connected disabilities because of such service and who are the widows of veterans who paid the supreme sacrifice, by limiting the preference these veterans and widows now have in retaining and obtaining employment with State agencies in the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas the proponents of the change in such veterans' preference laws attempt to justify the change by claiming that it would provide State governmental agencies with high caliber persons for State employment; and

Whereas such claims are absolutely unfounded and the veterans and widows selected for positions and employment with the State of Minnesota have always been of the highest caliber and ability and suited for the employment for which they were engaged and their services and sacrifices for their country in time of war has increased their devotion to their Government, State and Federal, and that by such sacrifices more fully understand the importance of its purposes and functions to secure our democratic way of life; and

Whereas these veterans and their widows by their service and their sacrifices for their country in time of war have earned the right to preference in employment in the Government for which they fought, suffered disabilities, and in some cases paid the supreme sacrifice; and further because as stated in the original Veterans' Preference Law that "training and experience and service of the Government and loyalty and sacrifice for Government are qualifications of merit which cannot be readily discovered by examination:" Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Ellingson-Brenden Post, No. 376, at a regular meeting duly convened at Rothsay, Minn., on the 21st day of March 1955, That this post hereby expresses its unequivocal opposition to any change in the Veterans' Preference Law of the State of Minnesota and hereby direct that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the State senator and representative of the district wherein this Post is located to apprize them of the attitude of this organization in that regard; Be it further

Resolved, That said senator and representative each be and hereby is requested to inform this organization as soon as convenient by letter addressed to the commander of this Post of his position with respect to the proposed change in the Veterans' Preference Law in the State of Minnesota.

ROBERT B. COWIE, Jr.,
First vice commander.

Attest:

——— ———,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1580. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 348).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 35. Resolution providing for a study of merchant-marine training and education in the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 349).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED COMMUNITIES AT OAK RIDGE, TENN., AND RICHLAND, WASH."—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 96, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 96), submitted by Mr. ANDERSON on May 3, 1955, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 7,000 copies of the committee print of the said joint committee during the 84th Congress entitled "Disposal of Government-Owned Communities at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash.," dated April 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

GRATUITY TO FAY DOUGLAS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Fay Douglas. It is computed according to the rule. The payment is to be made from the contingent fund of the Senate. The deceased employee

served the Government in one capacity or another for 20 years. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) to pay a gratuity to Fay Douglas, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fay Douglas, widow of John L. Douglas, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1921. A bill for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children; and

S. 1922. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Santos Matias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1923. A bill to require safety devices on the doors of refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1924. A bill to establish a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks by Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize and empower the President to provide for prompt, fair, and effective distribution and use of poliomyelitis vaccine for the purpose of preventing abuses and safeguarding the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1926. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1927. A bill to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers; and

S. 1928. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Regina M. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1930. A bill for the relief of Florentine Kintzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1931. A bill to further prevent the spread of contagious diseases in animals including diseases such as rabies which afflict certain domestic animals other than livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1932. A bill making an appropriation for the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system by the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1933. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elpedio Dosado, Aurelia (wife), and Deanna, Elpedio Jr., and Ambrosia (their children);

S. 1934. A bill for the relief of Stavros Constantinos Zevas; and

S. 1935. A bill for the relief of Gunhard Oravas and Virve Oravas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1936. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tien Hsin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 1937. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1938. A bill for the relief of Hildegard L. McNabb; and

S. 1939. A bill for the relief of Victorine (Vicky) Shalam, John Shalam, and Claude Shalam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gurli Thovtrup-Larsen Putnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1941. A bill to provide for the burial near the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery of the participants in the famous flag raising at Iwo Jima; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1942. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the southeastern United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1943. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

S. 1944. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen on the Fort Laramie division of the North Platte reclamation project; and

S. 1945. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen on the Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1946. A bill to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians; and

S. 1947. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, who occupy inadequate quarters, to do so on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1948. A bill to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain of the publicly owned lands of the United States to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped Institute for Human Engineering, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1949. A bill to prohibit the payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States who remain outside the United States after having been indicted for certain offenses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1950. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chu Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for Mr. MURRAY, himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1951. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1952. A bill for the relief of the University of Louisville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 1953. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1954. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1955. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1956. A bill granting certain grazing, fishing, and hunting rights to the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1957. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Houston; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1958. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 1959. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a 6.89-acre tract of land out of a 199.959-acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Houston, Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution directing the Surgeon General of the United States Public

Health Service to exercise for a limited period of time, certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SAFETY DEVICES ON DOORS OF REFRIGERATORS SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require safety devices on the doors of refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce.

The summer months are again upon us, the season of the year when there are so many tragic accidents in which young boys and girls playing in old iceboxes, refrigerators and freezers shut themselves in and are suffocated.

Less than a month ago a local newspaper carried a picture and story labeled "Death in an Icebox." Two small boys were found dead in an abandoned icebox in a city in California. The youngsters had suffocated after being trapped in the box. They apparently had crawled in while playing and the door slammed shut on them. There was no way to open the door from the inside.

There have been four such deaths recorded in 1955. There have been 99 icebox deaths recorded since 1948. Ages range from 2 to 12 years. The average age of these children is 5 years, with boys outnumbering girls 3 to 1. The greatest number of deaths was recorded in 1953 with 29 deaths.

There are more than 50 million iceboxes, refrigerators, freezers and other such airtight cabinets in use today. They are being discarded at the rate of approximately 2 to 3 million a year according to the National Safety Council. Once discarded, these refrigerators and other airtight containers make inviting places for games by small children. It is now estimated that the number of discards will continually increase over the next few years.

The number of these icebox deaths is not large, but just one death in an abandoned icebox is one too many. Moreover, abandoned iceboxes are not the only hazards. At least one child suffocated in a new freezer left on the porch.

In recent years there has been a vigorous campaign in the cities, towns, and States to combat these tragic accidents. They have worked through publicity campaigns, city ordinances, and State laws making it illegal to abandon refrigerators and iceboxes. This work being done on State and local levels is very commendable, but it is not complete throughout the Nation. These death traps in the form of discarded and unused refrigerators will continue to plague and tempt our youngsters as long as these appliances are put into commerce without a safety device to allow the doors to be dislodged or opened from the inside.

During the 83d Congress my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and I introduced bills which would have required latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce. Senator SPARKMAN has reintroduced a similar bill again this session. The hearings on the icebox bills last session produced Senate Resolution 272 urging the States and municipalities to take steps by legislation or ordinance to prevent discarding refrigerating units.

The resolution has served its purpose, I am sure, but I believe we must go one step farther and fight this menace at the Federal level. I understand that considerable progress has been made in engineering a device which would make it possible for refrigerators to be opened from the inside.

The bill I am introducing today has several changes of a clarifying nature. Under this bill it would be unlawful for any person to introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any refrigerator, of a capacity of 1½ cubic feet or more, unless the door of such refrigerator is equipped with a device which enables the door to be opened easily from inside.

There must be cooperation at every level to combat this hazard to the lives of our small children.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1923) to require safety devices on the doors of refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any refrigerator, of a capacity of 1½ cubic feet or more, unless the door of such a refrigerator is equipped with a device which enables the door to be opened easily from inside.

SEC. 2. Any person who violates the provisions of the first section of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, (1) the term "interstate commerce" includes commerce between one State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, and another State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, and (2) the term "refrigerator" means any cabinet, box, or receptacle which is cooled by mechanical means, or by the use of ice, and is designed for the purpose of preserving food.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective 6 months after the date of its enactment.

COMMISSION ON THE CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE OF RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the establishment of a commission to be appointed by the President to study and recommend to Congress a policy dealing with land, water, forests, and related natural resources of the United States.

Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, is today introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

Our lands, our waters, our forests, and our natural resources are the basic resources upon which depend the continued growth, development, and economic prosperity of our Nation.

It is essential that we protect and preserve these resources in order that we may assure continued prosperity and provide for the increasing demand for products of the soil, to take care of a rapidly increasing population.

Water and soil are our most valuable natural resources. In the State of Kansas our citizens have always been subject to intermittent floods and droughts and have experienced severe hardships from both.

It has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all sources of water supply in cooperation with a sound soil-conservation program.

Presently, the Federal Government has many programs dealing with these problems, but I believe it is important that we effectuate a policy of cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and the various subdivisions of government for a greatly expanded cooperative program.

The Commission proposed under this resolution would be appointed by the President and composed of 1 member each from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Department of Army, 3 members representing the States, 3 members representing local subdivisions of the Government, and 3 members representing the public at large.

They would be directed to study and investigate the present conditions of the renewable natural resources of the United States, the probable future demands on such resources and formulate a practical program for carrying out these recommendations.

Under the bill introduced by me the Commission would submit a report to the President for transmittal to Congress, including proposals for legislative enactment and administrative action, as, in its judgment, are necessary to carry out its recommendations on or before March 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1924) to establish a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the land, waters, forests, and related natural resources of the United States constitute an

essential basis for the national security and the physical, social, and economic welfare of the American people; that the conservation, orderly development, and sustained use of the renewable natural resources of the United States is the joint responsibility of the Federal Government, the States, the various subdivisions of government, and the people thereof; and that this policy shall be effectuated through cooperation of the Federal Government, the States and their various subdivisions, the owners and users of these resources, and private groups and organizations serving as a medium for public participation.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of studying and recommending means of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Renewable Natural Resources (hereinafter referred to as the Commission).

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

SEC. 3. The Commission shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the President as follows: 1 member each from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army; 3 members representing the States; 3 members representing local subdivisions of government; and 3 members representing the public at large. All members of the Commission shall be qualified by expert knowledge of or experience with the problems and management of the lands, waters, forests, and related renewable natural resources of the United States. One member of the Commission shall be designated by the President as Chairman and another as Vice Chairman.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the present condition of the renewable natural resources of the United States, the probable future demands upon such resources, and shall formulate a program for the practical carrying out of the policy established in section 1.

(b) The Commission shall submit a report to the President for transmittal to the Congress, including proposals for such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations, on or before March 1, 1956, and shall submit its final report not later than June 30, 1956, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The Commission may, from time to time, submit such interim reports as it deems desirable or as the President may request.

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member, to any member who is receiving other compensation from the Federal Government, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or by the vice chairman when acting as chairman.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OVER SALES BY INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. It is a companion bill to S. 1248 which I introduced on last February 28.

The purpose and effect of the bill is to exempt from Federal regulation the producers of less than 2 billion cubic feet of natural gas a year. While it would leave subject to Federal regulation the interstate sales of producers who sell over 90 percent of the gas sold to interstate pipelines, it would remove from the necessity of Federal regulation over 96 percent of the producers—the true little fellows. It has the same purpose, although it is not the same in form, as H. R. 4924 introduced by Representative HESELTON, of Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with an explanatory statement of mine, including statistical tables, a legal memorandum, and the excellent statement of Assistant Corporation Counsel James H. Lee, of Detroit, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on April 26, 1955, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and other data will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1926) to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1926

A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "or to any transportation or sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce which occurs at or prior to the completion of production or gathering during any calendar year by any person if (1) during the preceding calendar year the total sales of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce by such person, alone or in the aggregate with affiliated producers and gatherers, did not exceed 2 billion cubic feet computed at fourteen and sixty-five hundredths pounds per square inch absolute at 60° Fahrenheit, and (2) such person is not a natural-gas company by reason of other transportation or sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce and is not affiliated with a natural-gas company."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) For the purposes of this act, a person shall be deemed to be affiliated with a producer or gatherer if such person directly or indirectly controls, is controlled by or is under common control with such producer or gatherer by reason of voting stock interest, common officers, directors, or stockholders, voting trusts, or by any other direct or indirect means."

The explanatory statement and other data presented by Mr. DOUGLAS are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

When we were considering the Kerr bill (S. 1498) in the 81st Congress, I supported an amendment to the Natural Gas Act which would have exempted from Federal regulation the small producers of natural gas. Had that amendment been accepted by the Senate and concurred in by the House, about 96 percent of the natural-gas producers who now find themselves subject to Federal regulation, would not be in that classification. In order that a similar proposal may be considered by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, along with other proposals to amend the Natural Gas Act, I have submitted this bill, exempting those who sell less than 2 billion feet a year.

The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, at my request, has furnished me certain information bearing upon this matter. So that this data may be available to all concerned, I include in this statement several tables which I have prepared from the data furnished by the Federal Power Commission. These tables disclose the sources of the gas supply of the interstate pipeline companies, the number of so-called independent producers, the volume of gas they sell, and the States in which they make their sales in interstate commerce to the natural-gas pipeline companies. The tables also list the large producers whose sales in interstate commerce for resale were in excess of 35 million M c. f. in the year 1953.

The tables are as follows:

TABLE I.—*Source of gas supply of natural gas companies reporting to Federal Power Commission*

SOUTHWEST AREA (STATES OF ARKANSAS, KANSAS, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, NEW MEXICO, OKLAHOMA, AND TEXAS)

	1947		1948		1949		1952		1953		Percent increase, 1953 over 1947
	Thousand cubic feet	Percent	Thousand cubic feet	Percent	Thousand cubic feet	Percent	Thousand cubic feet	Percent	Thousand cubic feet	Percent	
Produced by pipeline companies	426,493,204	26.01	472,443,523	22.77	457,878,795	19.58	648,890,602	14.23	505,165,225	10.08	18.45
Produced by affiliates	200,529,811	12.23	241,558,569	11.64	215,278,661	9.20	300,396,841	6.58	448,447,850	8.95	123.63
Subtotal	627,023,015	38.24	714,002,092	34.41	673,157,456	28.78	949,287,443	20.81	953,613,075	19.03	52.09
Purchased from other producers	1,012,504,187	61.76	1,361,178,867	65.59	1,664,668,860	71.22	3,610,971,833	79.19	4,055,962,575	80.97	300.59
Total	1,639,527,202	100.00	2,075,180,959	100.00	2,337,826,316	100.00	4,560,259,276	100.00	5,009,575,650	100.00	205.55
Produced by pipeline companies	256,460,180	60.98	221,770,745	56.09	215,247,583	56.11	224,190,598	49.35	211,220,774	51.12	(17.00)
Produced by affiliates	8,050,649	1.91	7,303,117	1.85	4,354,065	1.14	2,975,998	.65	2,654,841	.65	(67.02)
Subtotal	264,510,829	62.89	229,073,862	57.94	219,601,648	57.25	227,166,596	50.00	213,875,615	51.77	(19.14)
Purchased from other producers	156,078,900	37.11	166,293,193	42.06	164,014,822	42.75	227,133,298	50.00	199,276,658	48.23	27.68
Total	420,589,729	100.00	395,367,055	100.00	383,616,470	100.00	454,299,894	100.00	413,152,273	100.00	(1.77)
TOTAL UNITED STATES (EXCLUDING PACIFIC COAST)											
Produced by pipeline companies	682,953,384	33.15	694,214,268	28.10	673,126,378	24.73	873,081,200	17.41	716,385,999	13.21	4.90
Produced by affiliates	208,580,460	10.13	248,861,686	10.07	219,632,726	8.07	303,372,839	6.05	451,102,691	8.32	116.27
Subtotal	891,533,844	43.28	943,075,954	38.17	892,759,104	32.80	1,176,454,039	23.46	1,167,488,690	21.53	30.95
Purchased from other producers	1,168,583,087	56.72	1,527,472,060	61.83	1,828,683,682	67.20	3,838,105,131	76.54	4,255,239,233	78.47	264.14
Total	2,060,116,931	100.00	2,470,548,014	100.00	2,721,442,786	100.00	5,014,559,170	100.00	5,422,727,923	100.00	163.22

NOTE.—Data for years 1950 and 1951 not available.

Source: Federal Power Commission studies.

TABLE II.—*Sales of natural gas by independent producers to natural gas companies reporting to the Federal Power Commission, year 1953*

Size interval (thousand cubic feet of natural gas)	Producers			Sales (thousand cubic feet)			Average sales volume per producer (thousand cubic feet)
	Number in interval	Cumulative		Volume in interval	Cumulative		
		Number	Percent		Volume	Percent	
Over 100 million	7	7	.16	1,308,598,166	1,308,598,166	30.79	186,942,595
50 million to 100 million	14	21	.48	928,903,489	2,237,501,655	52.66	66,350,249
25 million to 50 million	18	39	.89	671,694,706	2,909,196,361	68.47	37,316,373
10 million to 25 million	23	62	1.42	353,847,849	3,263,044,210	76.79	15,384,689
5 million to 10 million	52	114	2.61	367,630,122	3,630,674,332	85.45	7,069,810
2 million to 5 million	60	174	3.99	224,893,282	3,855,567,614	90.74	3,748,221
1 million to 2 million	53	227	5.20	70,603,553	3,926,171,167	92.40	1,332,143
500,000 to 1 million	147	374	8.57	139,733,341	4,065,904,508	95.69	950,566
100,000 to 500,000	255	629	14.41	94,103,641	4,160,008,149	97.90	369,034
Under 100,000	3,736	4,365	100.00	89,061,787	4,249,069,936	100.00	23,839
Total	4,365			4,249,069,936			

Source: Federal Power Commission study.

TABLE III.—*Sales of natural gas made by independent producers in 1953 to natural gas pipeline companies classified by States and regions*

	Number of producers	Sales (M c. f.)			Number of producers	Sales (M c. f.)	
		Volume	Percent			Volume	Percent
Southwest:				Appalachian:			
Arkansas	27	9,218,861	0.22	Kentucky	251	24,185,503	0.57
Kansas	228	314,286,074	7.40	Maryland	14	1,024,685	(1)
Louisiana	254	823,307,844	19.38	New York	12	354,269	(1)
Mississippi	22	135,144,650	3.18	Ohio	54	585,990	(1)
New Mexico	271	209,280,096	4.92	Pennsylvania	993	47,578,834	1.12
Oklahoma	229	243,052,826	5.72	Virginia	2	12,932,405	.30
Texas	829	2,310,370,374	54.37	West Virginia	1,424	57,824,919	1.36
Total	1,860	4,044,660,725	95.19	Total	2,750	144,486,605	3.40
Rocky Mountain:				Other States	62	6,506,692	.15
Colorado	17	1,796,049	(1)	Grand total	[2] 4,790	4,249,069,936	100.00
Montana	80	6,054,801	.14				
Utah	2	2,974,670	(1)				
Wyoming	19	42,590,394	1.00				
Total	118	53,415,914	1.26				

[1] Less than 0.1 percent.

[2] Includes 435 duplications of producers who operate in more than 1 State, principally in the Southwest and Rocky Mountain regions.

Source: Federal Power Commission study.

TABLE IV.—*Independent producers whose sales of natural gas in 1953 to natural gas pipeline companies exceeded 35 million thousand cubic feet*

No.	Name of producer	Sales (thousand cubic feet)	Percent of total sales	Cumulative	No.	Name of producer	Sales (thousand cubic feet)	Percent of total sales	Cumulative
1	Phillips Petroleum Co	457,445,147	10.77	10.77	18	Continental Oil Co	52,868,918	1.24	51.39
2	Stanolind Oil & Gas Co.[1]	202,562,446	4.77	15.54	19	Southwest Gas Producing Co	50,798,484	1.20	52.59
3	Humble Oil & Refining Co.[2]	175,975,859	4.14	19.68	20	Panoma Corp	48,606,770	1.14	53.73
4	Magnolia Petroleum Co.[3]	157,553,211	3.71	23.39	21	La Gloria Corp	48,016,833	1.13	54.86
5	Shell Oil Co	156,356,923	3.68	27.07	22	Pure Oil Co	48,002,992	1.13	55.99
6	Chicago Corp	155,561,811	3.66	30.73	22	Ohio Oil Co	47,761,245	1.12	57.11
7	Gulf Oil Corp. and subsidiary [4]	138,437,426	3.26	33.99	24	Abercrombie, J. S., Co	46,947,330	1.11	58.22
8	Atlantic Refining Co	95,201,494	2.24	36.23	25	Tide Water Associated Oil Co	45,380,214	1.07	59.29
9	Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp	81,394,405	1.92	38.15	26	Sinclair Oil & Gas Co	43,449,336	1.02	60.31
10	Skelly Oil Co	74,650,656	1.76	39.91	27	American Gas Production Co.[5]	43,283,875	1.02	61.33
11	Sun Oil Co	69,020,225	1.62	41.53	28	Southern Production Co	42,116,644	.99	62.32
12	The Texas Co	67,405,381	1.58	43.11	29	Western Natural Gas Co	39,228,299	.92	63.24
13	Carthage Corp. plant	66,589,144	1.57	44.68		Subtotal, 29 producers	2,687,152,424	63.24	
14	Republic Natural Gas Co	63,245,423	1.49	46.17		All others	1,561,917,512	36.76	100.00
15	Superior Oil Co	62,533,698	1.47	47.64					
16	Sunray Oil Corp	53,734,890	1.26	48.90		Total	4,249,069,936	100.00	
17	Union Oil Co. of California	53,023,345	1.25	50.15					

[1] Subsidiary Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).
[2] Subsidiary Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey).
[3] Subsidiary Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.
[4] Gulf Refining Co.
[5] Subsidiary Cities Service Oil Co.

Source: Federal Power Commission study.

NOTE.—The volumes reported for most of the producers include some gas sold jointly with other producers including those listed above.

BIG, NONTRANSPORTING PRODUCERS ARE MAJOR SOURCE OF NATURAL GAS

The first table shows the sources of the gas supply of natural gas companies reporting to the Federal Power Commission for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949; also for 1952 and 1953. In 1947 pipeline companies took into their systems 2,060,116,931 thousand cubic feet. Of this volume 43.28 percent was produced by the pipeline companies and their producing affiliates, the balance being purchased from nontransporting producers.

By 1953 the proportion produced by the pipeline companies and their affiliates had declined to 21.53 percent, although this segment of the producing industry increased its total production 30.95 percent between 1947 and 1953. Purchases from nontransporting producers increased in the same period to 4,255,239,233 thousand cubic feet or an increase of 264.14 percent. These facts demonstrate that most of the Nation's gas reserves are in the hands of the nontransporting producers, and the pipeline companies must secure an increasing portion of their supply from such producers.

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY-FOUR BIGGEST PRODUCERS SELL 90 PERCENT OF NATURAL GAS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

The second table shows a breakdown of the sales by producers to pipeline companies by size intervals, the number of producers in each size interval, the sales volumes, and the percentages which such sales volumes bear to the total volume sold. From this data which the Federal Power Commission supplied to me, it appears that 174 producers whose sales exceeded 2 million thousand cubic feet per year, sold 90.74 percent of the total volume of gas purchased by pipeline companies in 1953.

It is equally startling to find that 3,736 producers together only sold 2.1 percent of the total. The sales of these 3,736 producers were all under 100,000 thousand cubic feet annually, and on the average amounted to 23,839 thousand cubic feet. If such volume were priced at 10 cents per thousand cubic feet, which was approximately the average revenue received by producers in 1953, it would mean an annual average income of only $2,384.

LION'S SHARE OF NATURAL GAS RESERVES ARE IN SOUTHWEST STATES

The next table which I have inserted in the RECORD clearly reveals the concentration of the Nation's gas reserves in the Southwest. It will be noted from this table that producers in the seven States of the Southwest—Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas—sold in 1953 95.19 percent of the gas purchased by pipeline companies from nontransporting or so-called independent producers. In 1953 the Rocky Mountain region furnished only 1.26 percent of the total supply and the Appalachian area 3.4 percent.

The table shows about 1,860 producers in the 7-State area, but as the footnote to the table indicates, there are 435 duplications in the Southwest and Rocky Mountain regions. Thus, the number of producers in the Southwest, including duplicates, would be in the neighborhood of 1,500 or less.

BIG OIL COMPANIES ARE AMONG BIGGEST NATURAL GAS PRODUCERS

The fourth table reveals the great concentration of natural gas production and the ownership of the Nation's gas reserves among the "who's who" of the oil industry. This list of producers whose annual sales for 1953 were in excess of 35 million thousand cubic feet is quite revealing. As would be expected, Phillips Petroleum Co. heads the list. Three Standard Oil companies follow—Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., Humble Oil & Refining Co., and Magnolia Petroleum Co. Then comes Shell. These five companies together sell 27.07 percent of the total volume of gas sold by nontransporting producers to the interstate pipeline companies. The 29 producers, most of whom are large oil companies, sold 63.24 percent of the total gas purchased by the pipeline companies from nontransporting producers in the year 1953. All the other producers together—4,336 of them—sold 36.76 percent of the gas.

REGULATION OF SALES OF SMALL PRODUCERS NOT NECESSARY FOR PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS

In the background information on natural-gas legislation which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 28 I made it clear that I did not believe it necessary to subject these little producers to Federal regulation in order to protect the consumer from gouging by the 100 larger producers who sell more than 85 percent of the natural gas to the interstate markets.

I have long recognized that regulation imposes burdens not only on the regulated but also on the agencies which are charged with the duty of administering the law. I do not wish to see the Federal Power Commission bogged down in an administrative morass. I have no desire to see the individuals, partnerships, and small corporations whose total contribution to the Nation's interstate gas supply is so very small volumewise subjected to expense and effort in complying with a regulatory act and prescribed rules and regulations when it is apparent that the public interest does not truly require such regulation. Such producers do not control large enough supplies of natural gas to affect materially the interstate movements or price levels of such gas.

I have therefore concluded that it would be in the public interest to exclude from Federal regulation under the Natural Gas Act those producers whose sales in interstate commerce for resale do not exceed on an annual basis 2 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

While some may contend that the Federal Power Commission might itself have adopted administratively some such approach—beginning and ending its regulation with the 175 or so largest nontransporting producers—I understand this may be an arguable point under the law as written. This bill would, therefore, adopt such a workable approach as a matter of law.

REASONABLE CLASSIFICATION IS ACCEPTED LEGISLATIVE PRINCIPLE

The proposal to make a distinction as between those subject to regulation and those which are not subject on the basis of size is neither revolutionary nor illegal. In connection with the similar proposal in the 81st Congress when the Kerr bill was under consideration, the question of the constitutionality of such proposal was given consideration by the Bureau of Law of the Federal Power Commission. The Commission's report on the proposal to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which report apparently was submitted at the request of Senator JOHNSON of Texas, includes a legal memorandum of the Bureau of Law of the Commission, approved by the General Counsel. This points out that classification upon the basis of size for regulatory purposes has been previously utilized and has received judicial sanction. I include at this point the text of that legal memorandum:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMISSION

JUNE 3, 1949.

Re Constitutionality of proposed exemption of producers.

This memorandum is prepared in response to an assignment from the general counsel. It discusses the question of whether the proposed exemption from the jurisdiction of the Commission of sales of natural gas in interstate commerce at the conclusion of production and gathering where such sales, individually or in the aggregate with affiliated producers, do not exceed 2 billion cubic feet during the calendar year, would be constitutional as involving a permissible classification of natural-gas companies.

Such an exemption, in my opinion, would be constitutional since it is based upon a reasonable classification of regulated and nonregulated companies for legitimate regulatory purposes. While it is estimated that the provision would exempt 97 percent of the 2,300 producers in the country who made sales to interstate pipelines in 1947 and 530 of the 600 producers in the 7 Southwestern

States, the remaining 70 producers in the Southwestern States who would not be exempt sold 83.96 percent of the gas sold to interstate pipelines in the year 1947. Those producers, therefore, would be exempt whom it is not important to regulate.

Such reasonable classification and exemption based thereon has been repeatedly upheld by the United States Supreme Court. In *Wilson* v. *New* (243 U. S. 332), a similar classification and exemption was upheld. The rule was stated in the majority opinion on page 354 as follows:

"The want of equality is based upon two considerations. The one is the exemption of certain short line and electric railroads. We dismiss it because it has been adversely disposed of by many previous decisions. The second rests upon the charge that unlawful inequality results because the statute deals not with all, but only with the wages of employees engaged in the movement of trains. But such employees were those concerning whom the dispute as to wages existed growing out of which the threat of interruption of interstate commerce arose, a consideration which establishes an adequate basis for the statutory classification."

Similarly in the case of *Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 80), the Supreme Court said on page 93:

"The classification which results in exempting railroads less than 100 miles in length from the necessity of making reports of per diem accruals separately to each of the numerous car owners throughout the country is attacked as arbitrary and unreasonable. We think it is neither. It is of a kind frequently made and frequently upheld by this court. *St. Louis & I. M. Ry. Co.* v. *Arkansas* (240 U. S. 518, 520); *Wilson* v. *New* (243 U. S. 332, 354), and authorities cited. Moreover, the car equipment of the country is substantially in the hands of the trunk lines, that owned by the short lines being almost a negligible proportion of the whole. And this fact affords some additional ground for the classification."

To the same effect, in the case of *Dow* v. *Beidelman* (125 U. S. 680), the United States Supreme Court said, on page 691:

"The legislature, in the exercise of its power of regulating fares and freights, may classify the railroads according to the amount of the business which they have done or appear likely to do. Whether the classification shall be according to the amount of passengers and freight carried, or of gross or net earnings, during a previous year, or according to the simpler and more constant test of the length of the line of the railroad, is a matter within the discretion of the legislature. If the same rule is applied to all railroads of the same class, there is no violation of the constitutional provision securing to all the equal protection of the laws."

See also *New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company* v. *New York* (165 U. S. 628 (1897)); *Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company* v. *Conley* (230 U. S. 513 (1913)); *Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.* v. *Grosjean* (301 U. S. 412 (1937)), and *Carmichael* v. *Southern Coal & Coke Co.* (301 U. S. 495 (1937)).

For other authorities see dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Stone concurred, in *Louisville Gas & Electric Co.* v. *Coleman* (277 U. S. 32), at pages 42 to 44, and dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Cardozo in *Stewart Dry Goods Co.* v. *Lewis* (294 U. S. 550), at page 579, both of which gave broad application to the doctrine.

LOUIS W. MCKERNAN,
Chief, Division of Interpretation and Research, Bureau of Law.

Approved:

BRADFORD ROSS,
General Counsel.

CI——379

REGULATION DOES NOT STIFLE GROWTH OR PROSPERITY

It has been contended that such a classification would discourage small producers from increasing their sales in interstate commerce, and would encourage large producers to reduce their sales, and thus curtail the flow of gas in interstate commerce. This argument, of course, implies that producers who make sales in excess of 2 million thousand cubic feet annually and are thus subject to Federal regulation would be treated unfairly by the regulatory agency. I cannot give such argument any credence. It is a well-known fact that those corporations which have been subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission for the past 16 years have prospered and expanded tremendously. My proposal to exempt small producers from Federal regulation is based solely on the ground that their regulation is not essential for the protection of the public interest and is designed to relieve them from the burden of unnecessary regulation, and likewise to relieve the taxpayers of the financial burden of nonessential regulation.

I am still firmly convinced of the necessity in the public interest of defeating the legislative drive to exempt the interstate sales of the big, nontransporting producers of natural gas. If the little fellows who are being used to run interference for them are exempted, it may therefore serve both the desirable objectives I have mentioned, and to remove the unnecessary aspects of regulation which the big producers have used as a public relations asset for their own legislative drive.

EXCELLENT SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REGULATING BIG PRODUCERS' SALES AND EXEMPTING SMALL PRODUCERS' SALES IN JAMES H. LEE STATEMENT

I would like to bring to the attention of all Members of Congress the incisive and comprehensive statement of Assistant Corporation Counsel James H. Lee, of Detroit, to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on April 26, 1955. Appearing on behalf of Mayor Cobo, of Detroit, and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, Mr. Lee has ably outlined the reasons why the interstate sales of big nontransporting producers of natural gas should not be exempted from Federal regulation, why the sales of small producers could well be exempted, as proposed in the bill I am introducing today, and why the phantom costs allowed to pipelines by the Panhandle case decision and by the Harris bill, H. R. 4560—but which would be outlawed by my bill, S. 1248—may bring gigantic increases in consumers' gas bills.

The text of Mr. Lee's statement is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF JAMES H. LEE, ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL, PUBLIC UTILITIES, DETROIT, MICH., ON BEHALF OF MAYOR ALBERT F. COBO, OF DETROIT, CORPORATION COUNSEL PAUL T. DWYER, OF DETROIT, THE COMMON COUNCIL OF DETROIT, AND THE 943 MUNICIPALITIES WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS, BEFORE THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, OPPOSING THE HARRIS (H. R. 4560) AND SIMILAR BILLS

APRIL 26, 1955.

"My name is James H. Lee. I am assistant corporation counsel of the city of Detroit, Mich., in charge of public-utility matters and appear here on behalf of the Honorable Albert F. Cobo, mayor of Detroit, Mich., the corporation counsel, Paul T. Dwyer, and the common council of my city. I also am chairman of the committee on electric, gas, and telephone rates of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (NIMLO). City attorney, Henry B. Curtis, of New Orleans, president of NIMLO, has authorized me to present the position of that organization to this committee.

"The reasons we oppose the Harris bill (H. R. 4560), and all the similar bills now before this committee, may be summarized as follows:

"1. The Harris bill in effect takes an estimated $200 million to $800 million per year out of the pockets of approximately 60 million consumers and funnels these millions chiefly into the coffers of approximately 100 big oil and gas companies. This would be a congressional giveaway—not of public funds but of these consumers' money. Oil and gas companies are not here pleading need, or lack of profits, under the existing provisions of the Natural Gas Act. They are rich and growing richer, in part due to their congressionally granted 27½-percent depletion-tax exemption. The additional 'exemption' or 'windfall' proposed by the Harris bill at consumer expense is inequitable, unjust, and not in the public interest.

"2. The business of selling natural gas in interstate commerce is affected with a public interest which requires the regulation now provided by the Natural Gas Act. Such gas is unique in that it can only be transported economically through a pipeline. Natural-gas consumers are 'captive' customers, dependent entirely upon Federal producer price regulations for protection against price gouging. The producer, transporter, distributor, and ultimate customer are linked together and the freedom of action, or choice of several suppliers, found in the buying and selling of commodities and goods in the open market is not found in the sale of natural gas in the field, at the city gate or at the consumer's meter.

"3. Natural gas consumers are helpless to protect themselves against price exploitation by the giant oil and gas companies who dominate the natural gas market—too few control too much of the market for it to be competitive—and the Supreme Court of the United States has found that the 'primary' purpose of the Natural Gas Act (which the Harris bill would effectively scuttle) is 'to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural gas companies.' When properly interpreted and administered, this act has provided 'just and reasonable' rates and Congress should not now allow such 'exploitation.'

"4. If the Harris bill is adopted, prices will be raised to exorbitant levels by use of escalator clauses, most-favored-nation clauses, spiral clauses, and unjust and unreasonable field price formulas. And no effective power to protect the public interest will exist.

"5. The Harris bill recreates the very evils—the 'exploitation' of consumers—which the present act is intended to eliminate, as it allows big oil and gas companies who so dominate the field as to have monopoly powers, to extort unreasonable and exorbitant prices for an essential public service by revoking the power under the Natural Gas Act to require 'just and reasonable' prices.

"6. Under the Natural Gas Act the industry has prospered greatly, is now gigantic in size, serving millions of consumers in several hundred cities. The effect of natural gas on the national economy is tremendous. The unique characteristics of the business, the scarcity and monopoly of supply, along with monopoly of transportation and absolute dependence of consumers upon one source, cause the natural gas industry to be affected with a compelling public interest which Federal regulation must protect or no protection exists. The 'few pennies' for producers argument advanced by proponents of the Harris bill is unsound, illogical, and contrary to every basic principle of regulation of business affected with a public interest under our system of free enterprise.

"7. The Natural Gas Act was passed to close, and did, in fact, close the constitutional regulatory gap which denied the States the right to regulate sales of natural gas when made in interstate commerce. No one can dispute that such sales will continue to be interstate sales. And it is unchallengeable that such sales can only be regulated under the Federal Constitution by the Federal Government. Should the Harris bill be passed, no regulation of such sales will exist, this "gap" will be reopened and a "twilight" zone recreated wherein consumers will be at the mercy of unregulated producers with runaway, uncheckable prices certain to result.

"8. Emasculation of the Natural Gas Act as provided by the Harris bill thus means no effective protection at all for natural-gas consumers as the States are constitutionally prohibited from protecting consumers on interstate sales prices and intrastate controls are impractical, ineffective, and futile as the States must force onto consumers without question every producer price increase no matter how exorbitant and unreasonable it may be.

"9. Due to the lack of producer competition in the field, there is a monopoly sellers' market, competition is only between buyers; not sellers with buyers outbidding each other for this scarce and much needed product. As illustrative of what the elimination of the "just and reasonable" rate requirement of the Natural Gas Act by the Harris bill means, one need only consider the tremendous increase in producer prices which has occurred in recent years while the Federal Power Commission has stood idly by, under its self-denial of jurisdiction which the Phillips decision reversed. The producers price to pipelines has increased an average of 84 percent since 1947 with some recent contracts jumping from 200 to 300 percent in the past 2 years (about 5 cents in 1947–49, 9 cents in 1953, and recently 20 cents in Louisiana). As another example, 1 pipeline under the field-price formula espoused by the Harris bill has written up the value of its natural-gas reserves 15,000 percent.

"10. The Natural Gas Act's provisions requiring the Federal Power Commission to fix 'just and reasonable' rates is fair to both producer and consumer and should not be eliminated so as to permit producers and gatherers to charge unjust and unreasonable prices.

"11. Consumers relying upon the congressional promise contained in the Natural Gas Act of 1938 of 'just and reasonable' rates have spent millions for gas-burning equipment, thus supporting the nationwide expansion of the natural-gas industry in recent years. Now that consumers have acted in reliance upon this congressional promise, it would be highly inequitable for the Congress to withdraw that promise by adopting the Harris bill, thus causing millions of dollars of producer rate increases to descend upon them. If the consumer protections are scuttled by the Congress, no effective regulation will exist and producer price increases—already totaling millions—will 'automatically' go into effect.

"I now would like to present the official NIMLO resolution and report, and our detailed statement supporting the above summary. This is in effect our brief in chief on behalf of consumers. The producers, pipelines and distributors have all been heard at great length for many days, with their statements in the main supporting the Harris bill. Herein I present our side of this controversy and our answers to the chief arguments advanced by them for the Harris bill.

"NIMLO'S OFFICIAL RESOLUTION AND REPORT

"The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (NIMLO) has a membership of over 900 cities located in each of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and in the Territories of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. NIMLO is supported entirely by tax funds of its member cities. Last September in San Francisco NIMLO adopted a resolution providing as follows:

" 'Whereas the primary purpose of the Congress in adopting the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was to protect consumers from exploitation by suppliers of natural gas, while at the same time assuring the supplies of a fair and reasonable price for their products;

" 'Whereas the means whereby the Congress accomplished this purpose was to confer jurisdiction upon the FPC to fix reasonable rates for sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale to consumers;

" 'Whereas NIMLO has since the adoption of this act taken the clear and consistent position that this purpose of the Congress should be carried out and that the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission thus conferred should remain unimpaired: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved*, That NIMLO hereby reaffirms its prior position and opposes the enactment of Federal legislation which would weaken or impair the jurisdiction and functioning of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act as now written; and be it further

" '*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy which is now considering natural resources.'

"This resolution was based upon a report which stated:

" 'This subject was the only one upon which there was controversy at the open hearing conducted by your committee. Your committee was urged to recommend no action upon this subject until a newly created Cabinet Committee has completed a study of natural resources and reported, with NIMLO appointing a committee thereafter to recommend a position for this organization. We were also urged to recommend that NIMLO adhere to and reaffirm the prior position consistently taken by NIMLO since adoption of the Natural Gas Act in 1938 that this act should be carried out as originally written.

" 'It was suggested that two States, Kansas and Oklahoma, prescribe minimum prices for intrastate sales of natural gas at the wellhead whereas the FPC only passes upon the reasonableness of maximum prices of sales in interstate commerce for resale and that some conflict in Federal and State jurisdiction exists in reaffirming NIMLO's prior position taken not only by resolution but in the brief amicus curiae filed in the United States Supreme Court in the recently decided Phillips case. Your committee fails to find such conflict and notes that such conflict was urged upon the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case and found to be nonexistent. In fact, your committee is impressed with the fact that since the States are constitutionally unable to control the reasonableness of sales in interstate commerce no conflict with FPC jurisdiction can arise. And no producing State fixes maximum prices for natural gas for the protection of consumers. They fix only minimum prices to protect producers.

" 'Upon checking with NIMLO's staff, your committee was informed that while a copy was mailed to each one of NIMLO's 881 member municipalities of the brief amicus curiae filed in the Phillips case, not 1 member wrote in protest against or in disagreement with the position taken therein, i. e., the position urged in the foregoing resolution.

" 'Under these circumstances, your committee finds no reason whatever to depart from the prior position of NIMLO on this matter. The proponents of a change of position frankly informed your committee that legislation to remove FPC jurisdiction to pass upon the reasonableness of rates charged by Phillips Petroleum Co. for sales in interstate commerce is certain to be introduced in Congress in January. NIMLO has not wavered down through the years in opposing such legislation and no valid reason was advanced to your committee why NIMLO should change its position now. We were urged to recommend a change in NIMLO's position to one of "no position" and that we cannot do when no valid reasons were presented for such action.

" 'Your committee was also informed that unless the Natural Gas Act is amended so as to nullify the decision in the Phillips case, the suppliers of natural gas would not sell their gas in interstate commerce, thus depriving thousands of users of this commodity and making the price higher because pipelines will not operate at full capacity. This argument in the nature of a threat by oil companies to deny themselves profitable interstate markets is one to which your committee cannot give credence. The FPC requires reserves to be dedicated for the use of each pipeline before the line can be constructed. The millions in cities who have changed over to the use of natural gas should not thus suddenly find their supply cut off due to this Supreme Court decision against Phillips Petroleum Co.

" 'In NIMLO's brief amicus curiae it was pointed out that some 40 million consumers are now dependent upon natural gas. Nearly every large city—and many of the smaller cities—now have pipelines bringing this valuable commodity to them. Your committee is impressed by the argument urged upon it that we as city attorneys represent not oil companies but the consumers who reside in our cities. To here adopt the position of Phillips Petroleum Co. and depart from our representation of the consumers who pay us to represent their interests seems wholly inconsistent. We who represent consumers cannot be in the position of urging higher prices for consumers of natural gas. In the Phillips case the Supreme Court noted that a scuttling of FPC jurisdiction meant an increase in price for these consumers—an increase estimated from authoritative sources in NIMLO's amicus curiae brief there at $200 million per year. Action to support such a result your committee cannot recommend.

" 'Consistent with our position as a representative of the consumers who reside within municipal corporate limits, your committee therefore, recommends that NIMLO reaffirm its position in this matter.'

"The NIMLO resolution was adopted in democratic fashion after a lengthy debate at which both sides of this important question were fully presented. I have attached to my statement a copy of the transcript of this very comprehensive debate. Each side was allowed to present its views but the vote in favor of the resolution was almost unanimous. Approximately 500 municipal attorneys from all over the Nation participated in this vote.

"Based upon my more than 40 years of public service as a municipal attorney—for the past 15 representing consumers in utility matters—I have set forth in the remainder of this statement my analysis of the issues presented by the Harris bill and my answers to the arguments advanced for that proposed legislation.

"I. CITIES FAVORED PASSAGE OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT OF 1938 AND URGE THAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST DICTATES ITS RETENTION AS NOW WRITTEN

"This is not the first appearance or comment of cities on this matter. Member cities representing consumers of gas residing within their corporate limits were among the sponsors of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 when it was adopted.[1] Further, cities have ap-

[1] Hearings before Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 75th Cong., 1st sess. on H. R. 4008, March 24–25, 1937, pp. 46, 58, 59.

peared through their legal representatives in practically every case before the Federal Power Commission involving increases in consumer rates. Their position has uniformly been that natural-gas companies are entitled to their cost of operation plus a reasonable rate of return under the act's provision for 'just and reasonable' rates.

"In fact, the case of *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *State of Wisconsin, City of Detroit, et al.* (347 U. S. 672), was instituted by the city of Detroit before the FPC in a motion filed October 11, 1946, in the case of *Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co.* (67 P. U. R. (NS) 427).

"Likewise, all legislative attempts to amend the Natural Gas Act have been vigorously opposed by cities.[2]

"In short, cities take the position that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 should stand as written, and that it should not be amended in any respect.

"As so aptly stated by the courts: 'The primary aim of this legislation was to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies.' *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, (320 U. S. 591, 610).

"Only in its present form can this aim of the act be attained and should the present attempts to emasculate the act by freeing producers from regulation prevail, it will result, in effect, in no regulation at all. Such a result would be a major disaster for consumers.

"II. CONGRESS INTENDED TO REGULATE SALES MADE BY PRODUCERS WHEN THEY CLOSED THE 'GAP' OF STATE INCAPACITY TO REGULATE SALES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

"1. Legislative history proves intent

"Should Congress enact the Harris bill, H. R. 4560, then the intent of the previous Congress will be overridden and the hiatus existing between non-State regulation of sales made in interstate commerce and the lack of effective Federal control over such sales will be reopened.

"Under the doctrines of *Missouri* v. *Kansas Natural Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 298). and *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam & Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83), the States are constitutionally unable to protect consumers by regulating any sales in interstate commerce. Either Congress retains the present Federal protection or none will exist. Consumers must and do depend entirely upon the Congress not to leave them without this protection.

"It was '* * *' to fill the gap in regulation that now exists by reason of the lack of authority of the State commissions' that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was passed. (See H. Rept. 709, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3.)

"This fact was recognized by the Supreme Court not only in the recent case of *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *State of Wisconsin*, et al. (347 U. S. 672), but in the much earlier case of *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682, 690), wherein the Court said:

" 'In denying the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction to regulate the production or gathering of natural gas, it was not the purpose of the Congress to free companies such as petitioner from effective public control. The purpose of the restriction was, rather, to preserve to the States powers of regulation in areas in which the States are constitutionally competent to act. * * *'

"Since the States may not constitutionally regulate sales in interstate commerce for resale, it is clear that the purpose of Congress in adopting the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was to confer jurisdiction upon FPC over any such sales transactions. As the congressional report also said:

" 'The basic purpose of the present legislation is to occupy this field in which the Supreme Court has held that the States may not act.' (H. Rept. 709, S. Rept. 1162, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3.)

"As in the briefs and arguments in both the *Interstate* and *Phillips* cases, statements made by the then FPC Solicitor General, Dozier A. DeVane, have been put into the record of this hearing. His remarks, however, referred to an earlier bill (H. R. 11662, 74th Cong.) in which jurisdiction was provided only over 'transportation in high-pressure mains in interstate commerce,' sales during production and gathering were not covered. The bill which Congress actually enacted into law, however, was H. R. 6586 of the 75th Congress. This bill, which became the Natural Gas Act of 1938, covered all transportation and all sales for resale in interstate commerce—a very different bill.

"Significantly, no one testified on H. R. 6586 as did Mr. DeVane on H. R. 11662 of the earlier Congress. Nor could they have done so because of the broader jurisdiction in the later bill. And Senator Wheeler, who was in charge of the bill adopted by the Congress, in the Senate, made it crystal clear in his explanation thereof that producers selling in interstate commerce 'would have to sell it (gas) at the price fixed by the Commission' (81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9314).

"Further, any possible ambiguity was removed and any contrary inference overridden at a later date by Senator Wheeler, chairman of the committee in charge of the bill (H. R. 6586) when he expressed the view (83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2422) that 'the courts have held that sales for resale, or so-called wholesale sales in interstate commerce, are not subject to State regulations.'

" 'Neither the sending nor receiving State may regulate the wholesale rates. The consumption of natural gas in the State is secured for the most part through interstate transmission, and the cost thereof is a very material element in determining the price the local consumers must pay for their gas.' "

"And at page 2424, the Senator said:

" 'Federal jurisdiction plus the jurisdiction of the several States should be so utilized and coordinated as to produce effective regulation and the termination of existing abuses to the end that there should be no unregulated twilight zone. Otherwise our system fails in a very crucial situation.'

"In the debates on the bill, Senator Connally asked Senator Wheeler (81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9314):

" 'If a man should produce gas in my State and ship it in interstate commerce, then he would have to sell it at the price fixed by the Commission?'

"Senator Wheeler replied:

" 'Exactly; at the wholesale price fixed by the Commission.'

"Indeed, one of the statements of Senator Wheeler relied upon by Mr. David T. Searls in support of his argument before this committee for nonregulation of producers in actuality strongly disproves his thesis.

"At page 13 of Mr. Searls' statement he quotes:

" 'Mr. WHEELER. It does not attempt to regulate the producers of natural gas or the distributors of natural gas; only those who sell it wholesale in interstate commerce.'

"This statement is precisely in keeping with the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case. The producer's manner, methods, etc., of production and gathering are not regulated. But as soon as the producer makes his wholesale sale for resale in interstate commerce, that price is regulated. No language could have clearer meaning.

"The Supreme Court likewise recognized this when it stated in the Interstate case:

" 'Unreasonable charges exacted at this stage of the interstate movement become perpetuated in large part in fixed items of cost which must be covered by rates charged subsequent purchasers of gas, including the ultimate consumer. It was to avoid such situations that the Natural Gas Act was passed.' (*Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682, 692–693).)

"The final pronouncement of the Supreme Court on this matter was handed down in a per curiam opinion as recently as April 12, 1955. The Court stated:

" 'In these cases Oklahoma has attempted to fix a minimum price to be paid for natural gas, after its production and gathering has ended, by a company which transports the gas for resale in interstate commerce. We held in *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 672), that such a sale and transportation cannot be regulated by a State but are subject to the exclusive regulation of the Federal Power Commission. The Phillips case therefore controls this one.' *Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America* v. *Corporation Commission of Oklahoma et al* (23 L. W. 3250).

"From the foregoing, there can be no doubt as to the intent of Congress. Should this Congress override that intent, pass the Harris bill, and reinstitute the 'twilight zone'[3] referred to by Senator Wheeler, supra, then it will indeed be legislating away the only protection presently afforded the consumer and scuttling the only means by which exploitation can be controlled.[4]

"And it is immaterial whether the sale be at the wellhead or in the well or 50 or 1,000 miles from the well as it is the sale in interstate commerce for resale, regardless of where it takes place, that the statute reaches.

"2. The Federal Power Commission's lack of uniformity of opinion is insufficient to prove producers should not be regulated

"Senator O'MAHONEY adequately summed up the position in which the Federal Power Commission has placed itself by its vacillations through the years when he stated at 96 CONGRESSIONAL RCCORD 4171:

" 'The Federal Power Commission has wobbled all over the face of the earth with respect to this problem.'

"However, even with this 'wobbling,' it has never categorically stated that it did not have jurisdiction over these producers sales. A quick summation of FPC history proves this:

"The first case in point is the *Columbian Fuel Corp.* case, (2 FPC 200 (1940)). There the FPC stated that it was not the intent of Congress to regulate companies whose only sales of natural gas in interstate commerce are made as an incident to, and immediately upon completion of such persons' production and gathering of said natural gas, if these persons are not otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. It further stated, however, that if experience revealed that through affiliation, field agreement or dominant position in a field, an unreasonable price might be maintained, the Commission will decide whether it can assume jurisdiction (p. 203).

"Immediately after this case, *Peoples Natural Gas Co., et al.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (127 F. (2d) 153 (App. D. C. 1942)) arose. Peoples relied on the *Columbian* case and asserted that FPC lacked jurisdiction. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ignored Columbian and stated:

" 'We cannot disregard the plain language of the act because the Commission—at one time interpreted it narrowly.'

---

[2] Moore-Rizley bills, S. 734 and H. R. 4051, 80th Cong., 1st sess.; Kerr bill, S. 1498, 81st Cong., 1st sess.; Lyle bill, H. R. 3285, 82d Cong., 1st sess.

[3] See testimony of Mr. Don Emery, general counsel for Phillips Petroleum Co. on Moore-Rizley bill in support of a twilight zone. Hearings on H. R. 4051, note 3 at pp. 67–74.

[4] Cf. Minton, J., "Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural gas companies was the primary aim of the Natural Gas Act." *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *State of Wisconsin, et al.* (347 U. S. 672, 685).

"The Commission then began to regulate natural gas sales of the Interstate Natural Gas Co. in the field to three interstate pipeline companies, one of which was affiliated with Interstate.

"On April 10, 1947, the FPC submitted a report to the committee holding hearings on the Rizley bill. It felt that the outcome of the pending Interstate Natural Gas Co. case should be awaited (hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess. on H. R. 2185, H. R. 2235, H. R. 2212, H. R. 2569, and H. R. 2956, p. 10).

"The Supreme Court then held Interstate subject to regulation by the FPC, *Interstate Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682).

"Next, FPC Order No. 139 was issued on August 7, 1947, Commissioner Draper dissenting, which in effect repudiated the Interstate decision, supra. It construed section 1 (b) as including arm's-length sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers made during the course or upon completion of processing and gathering.

"The FPC likewise appeared in April of 1949 before this House committee opposing the Lyle-Harris bills, H. R. 79 and 1758, on the grounds that they would deprive the Commission of its jurisdiction.

"The majority (Commissioners Buchanan, Draper, and Olds; Commissioners Smith and Wimberly submitting a minority report) took a like position before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Kerr bill, S. 1498, 80th Congress, 1st session (p. 500).

"Then, on July 11, 1950, the FPC issued Order No. 154 which rescinded Order No. 139, stating it was inconsistent with the requirements of the Natural Gas Act.

"Finally, the Phillips decision by the FPC in 1951 restored the Commission to its 1940 position which position the courts have adequately demonstrated is grossly erroneous.

"From the foregoing, it is crystal clear that the FPC was never certain about its jurisdiction. It seemed to differ as its membership changed. However, it never definitely stated that it did not have jurisdiction, per se. Even Order No. 139 never went that far. The Commission merely declined to exercise the jurisdiction that was delegated to it by Congress. Now that the FPC is at long last about to embark on this program of producer-pipeline rate regulation the Congress should not remove the only means of insuring that a just and reasonable rate in keeping with the mandate of the Natural Gas Act, is charged consumers.

"III. LACK OF PRODUCER COMPETITION RESULTS IN A MONOPOLY MARKET SINCE COMPETITION IS ONLY BETWEEN BUYERS, NOT SELLERS

"There has been much testimony given at this hearing on the number of gas producers so as to imply that intense competition exists in the field among these producers. Nothing could be further from the truth. In Wisconsin one producer—Phillips Petroleum Co.—supplies all of the gas sold in that market. And elsewhere the competition which exists is competition between buyers—the very reverse of the true competitive situation that protects consumers by competition between sellers. According to data furnished by the FPC in the 81st Congress, 70 producers sold in 1947 84 percent of all of the gas sold in the Southwest to interstate pipelines.[5] Of this 51 percent was sold to 12 companies. And FPC has inserted in the record of this hearing (p. 1404) a statement that 42 producers sold 70 percent of all gas purchased by pipeline companies in 1953. And 19 companies own 43 percent of the total reserves in the United States. Whether there are 2,300 producers, 4,000 producers, or, according to the industry's latest figure, 8,000, is indeed of little consequence since the small producers own so little of the existing gas reserves.

"According to the 1952 statistics of the Texas comptroller[6] more than 80 percent of the gas production in the Texas Panhandle area, more than 65 percent of the production in the west Texas area, and 69 percent of the production in the east Texas area came from 15 large producers in each area. Thirty-five large companies were responsible for about three-fourths of the combined production of 2,158 billion cubic feet of gas from these 3 great producing areas.

"Furthermore, 50 percent of Panhandle area production was carried out by 4 pipeline companies, and 50 percent by 8 companies in the west Texas and east Texas areas.

"Even more compelling figures were published in the Wall Street Journal of November 2, 1954. Therein it was shown that two companies, the Phillips Petroleum Co. and Humble Oil, lead all other producers in estimated reserves of natural gas. Humble, which is a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, estimated its reserves at 16 trillion cubic feet. This fantastic amount of gas is topped only by the gas reserves of the Phillips Petroleum Co., whose holdings exceed 18 trillion cubic feet. Thus 2 companies control 34 trillion cubic feet, or one-sixth of the total natural gas reserves of the entire industry in the United States.

"Each 5 cents per thousand cubic feet added to field prices increases the value of their combined reserves by $1,700,000,000. Is it any wonder they oppose regulation? If the Harris bill causes an increase of 15 cents per thousand cubic feet, these 2 companies alone stand to profit by $5,100,000,000.

"The great Hugoton field in Kansas and Oklahoma is dominated by 6 pipelines companies and 16 independent producers who control 75 percent of the acreage. Phillips Petroleum, Stanolind Oil and Gas (Standard Oil of Indiana), Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co., Republic Natural Gas Co., Cities Service, Northern Natural Gas Co., Skelly Oil Co., Magnolia Petroleum Co., and Peerless Oil and Gas own two-thirds of the total natural gas acreage.

"The producers of gas are in the driver's seat. Chairman Kuykendall himself stated at these hearings that we have a 'seller's market.' It is common knowledge that there has been a fabulous increase in the use of natural gas since 1946. This has resulted in increased demand and, of course, in increased reliance upon the producer to furnish that gas. Thus, the producers dictate terms and prices to the pipeline companies. Average field prices have increased 100 percent since 1946. This has been done not only by direct bargaining, but by use of escalator clauses, most-favored-nations clauses and the like. By these means, the producer even assures himself of a price increase when another producer or pipeline obtains one.

"Therefore, the small producer can be of no consequence upon prices that these giants set. Further, the purchasers of gas cannot be protected from exorbitant prices by any free play of seller competition since there is none.

"The producer operates in a monopoly market. A small percentage of the industry controls more than the lion's share of a valuable commodity which is in great demand. The price of sales in interstate commerce, for resale, whether at the wellhead, in the well, or far from the well is, therefore, of prime importance. It must be regulated or chaos will result. The Harris bill seeks to restore the very 'consumer exploitation' which the Supreme Court of the United States has said the Natural Gas Act prevents.[7] What chance does a small consumer have competing against giant oil companies? Either Congress retains the present act's protection of 'just and reasonable rates' or the consumer really has no chance.

"Parenthetically, for the reasons stated above, I do not believe that all producers need be regulated. I stated to the Federal Power Commission in docket No. R–142 that I do not believe it is either desirable or necessary for the Commission to undertake the task of investigating and determining reasonable rates for each of the small producers. It is believed that with minor exceptions, effective regulation in the public interest can be secured through concentration of the regulatory effort on the approximately 100 big companies who dominate this field. Therefore, I believe it appropriate for the Federal Power Commission to classify the independent producers and gatherers by size and to relieve the small producers from as many obligations and requirements as it is possible under the act to do so. Such exemption of the small producers would not affect the domination of the big oil and gas companies in this field and it is these large companies who require full regulation in the public interest.

"*1. Consumers have been made dependent upon these producers under a congressional promise of just and reasonable rates*

"The testimony already presented at this hearing shows the tremendous growth of the natural gas industry under the Natural Gas Act of 1938. A few cities were served in 1938 but now hundreds of cities and nearly all major cities have natural gas as pipelines cover the Nation. Just since World War II there has been a terrific increase in the sale of natural gas. In city after city teams of men have converted consumer's existing gas stoves, hot-water heaters, and other utilities to the use of natural gas.

"The gas companies have obtained thousands of new consumers by extolling the virtues of this clean, efficient, and cheap fuel. These people have now become dependent upon this fuel to have a warm meal, a warm house, or adequate hot water. Their investment in these facilities outweighs the investment of the gas companies themselves. Gas is now the only product that can be utilized by this equipment. The user or local distribution company cannot change products or be supplied by another seller if the particular company upon which he is dependent increases the price. These pipelines cannot be moved like a garden hose. They are wedded to the source of supply and must buy gas from the pipeline which serves them and pay the price exacted by these producers. Unless FPC has jurisdiction to control the fairness of that price, no control exists.

"It is highly inequitable to have led these millions of consumers into spending hundreds of dollars for natural gas burning equipment upon a representation of just and reasonable rates and now to scuttle that guaranty and subject consumers to unlimited exploitation at the hands of producers. A consumer cannot turn to another fuel without suffering the great loss of this gas burning equipment investment. In many instances houses are built to burn only gas. A home owner must continue to use it regardless of price. The claim made by some that consumers will have freedom to choose between fuels is therefore completely, in these instances, wrong.

"Producers are not here telling you they are not making money. No. They admit,

[5] Hearing on S. 1498, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 495.

[6] Brief of Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, FPC Docket R. 137 (re Escalation clauses), p. 35, appendix A.

[7] *Phillips Petroleum Company* v. *Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 672, 685).

as they must, that they are making millions in tax-exempt money due to their 27½ percent depletion allowance. And they have a guaranty of a just and reasonable rate of return under the act as now written. But they want more than that. These producers want to make more and more money at the expense of consumers, now that consumers are stuck with expensive gas heating equipment—bought under a congressional promise of just and reasonable rates. Here the producers ask you to nullify your promise to consumers and the Harris bill is their vehicle to do exactly that.

"2. If producer-pipeline prices are unregulated the Natural Gas Act of 1938 is voided, rates will skyrocket, and consumer protection will die

"The regulation of the price of gas as it enters the interstate stream is obviously the most important price in the movement from field to burner tip. Should that price be raised, then like a rock tossed into a pool, the ripple caused thereby arrives finally at the consumer's door. Increases are eventually passed on to the consumer. On that there can be no dispute.

"There has been much testimony to date that there is a relationship between field price and the prices paid by the ultimate consumer. As shown by Mr. J. French Robinson, president of Consolidated Natural Gas Co. a 1-cent increase per thousand cubic feet results in a $4 million yearly increase to his company's customers, and in a $2,700,000 yearly increase to his customers according to the testimony in these hearings of Mr. John F. Merriam, president of Northern Natural Gas Co.

"Pennies Mean Millions

"There has been much talk at these hearings by proponents of the Harris bill that any price increase for gas in the field are really only pennies, and that these pennies are so insignificant that it makes no difference whether there are producer increases or not. As will be shown later these few pennies for producers will in actuality be 20 billion to 80 billion or $200 million to $800 million annually. That is a lot of pennies.

"This few pennies argument flies in the face of all the rate regulatory philosophy of our free-enterprise system. It is a well imbedded principle of that system that the purpose of any price regulation is to protect the person who cannot protect himself against monopoly, exploitation, or price gouging. Otherwise, there would be no need for regulation whatsoever.

"Streetcar concerns, telephone companies, bus companies, electric companies—all deal in a few pennies. But, when all these pennies are totaled the result is billions of dollars. The real question is not whether a small price increase will cost consumers pennies or dollars—the question is, why should consumers be forced, by means of a price increase, to contribute money to a large gas company which operates in a business affected with the public interest when this price increase is not needed? As already stated, these big oil and gas companies are making millions now—they do not and cannot contend they need a few more consumer pennies to meet losses or even to insure a reasonable profit. Whether it be 1 cent or $1 which is paid, the principle remains the same. Such a windfall is unwarranted for those controlling scarce natural gas supplies.

"Should legislation be premised upon this few-pennies principle, then the ultimate consumer is in dire trouble. Under the few-pennies doctrine, the Michigan Bell Telephone Co. sought a rate increase of $22,229,000 per annum, insisting such increase was only 3 cents per customer per day. Streetcars in Detroit under the same theory might charge a cash fare of 25 cents since that is only a 25-percent increase and really amounts to only 5 pennies—further illustrations are unnecessary.

"The danger and sophistry involved in this argument is adequately seen from these examples. In the final analysis, should this few pennies or de minimis argument prevail, then all regulation should be abolished because if a consumer is forced to pay a price, which though not actually deserved, is only a few pennies and, therefore, of little consequence, then the entire rate regulatory structure topples.

"It is for this reason that cities have vigorously championed the Natural Gas Act and will continue to do so.

"There is a further consideration here, however. As testified to at great length, many concerns have reached the situation where their sales of natural gas for industrial use have already reached the level of competitive fuels for most industrial uses and also for space-heating purposes. Further increases in gas rates cannot be added to these latter classifications without the loss of some portion of the existing business and the destruction of the opportunity for further expansion of natural-gas markets. Thus, future increases in gas costs to distributing companies will make it necessary to add such increases to the residential cooking and water-heating customers' rates, which classes of business are principally competitive with electricity. If, for example, such classification constitutes 30 percent of the distributing utilities annual gas sales volume, an increase in the city gate rate of only 5 cents per thousand cubic feet would mean an increase of approximately 17 cents per thousand cubic feet in the rates for the residential cooking and water-heating customer. Also, if there is a loss of industrial and other business, the distribution company's load factor will decline and the remaining customers must shoulder a greater portion of the fixed charges which in the utility business constitutes the principal cost of doing business.

"To say that the producer price does not need regulation since it is insignificant in the ultimate price paid by consumers is certainly grossly erroneous. This Harris bill is not a poor man's bill in aid of needy oil and gas companies. It is a bill whereby the rich seek to get richer at the poor consumer's expense.

"IV. 60,000,000 CONSUMERS WILL BE PLACED AT THE MERCY OF THE BIG OIL AND GAS COMPANIES—THE MONOPOLISTIC PRODUCERS—WHO CAN RAISE PRICES $200,000,000 TO $800,000,000 ANNUALLY OR HIGHER

"The Harris bill removes prices to be paid producers from effective regulation. In effect that bill condones the raising of prices to unlimited levels. If the FPC is not allowed to effectively regulate the price to be charged by these producers on wholesale interstate sales to the pipelines, the consumers are absolutely without protection against price gouging because the States are constitutionally prohibited from acting in this area.

"As shown by the record to date, there was 8.7 trillion cubic feet of natural gas (8.7 billion Mcf) consumed in 1954. Contract prices since 1949 have more than doubled for gas sold wholesale in interstate commerce at the point of initial sale in interstate commerce, i. e., the wellhead, in the well, or 50 miles from the well. In many instances producers have already received 3 to 5 price increases. And due chiefly to such increases, $106 million in yearly rate increases were granted in 1954 by FPC. And $286 million in additional increases were pending before FPC at the end of that fiscal year.[8] If there is any free competition which will stop field prices from their rapid rise in recent years it has not been in evidence so far. And as FPC Chairman Kuykendall testified at these hearings, all pending rate increases due to producer price increases will "automatically" go into effect if the Harris bill is adopted. In other words, the Congress will be legislating into effect these vast rate increases—those now pending and all future producer increases—if it adopts the Harris bill. It is not amiss to assume that because of the monopoly in production control, and lack of competition between sellers in the field, prices will rise 2 cents to 5 cents per Mcf annually. And these prices, of course, will be paid by the ultimate consumer. Over the estimated 20-year life of the existing reserves, even these modest increases would amount to from $4.5 billion to $17.6 billion.

"And a 2 cents to 5 cents per thousand cubic feet increase is generally considered too low. Mr. Thomas D. Bailey, a pctroleum engineering consultant, in a letter submitted to the Federal Power Commission in Docket No. R–142 suggested that natural gas to become competitive with other fuels will rise to 25 cents per thousand cubic feet at the wellhead. This would result in a 15-cent increase in average field price and would result in an annual price increase of about $800 million based upon present consumption trends.[9] And current industry talk indicates an expectation of an eventual 25 cents per thousand cubic feet field price if the Harris bill passes. This $800 million estimated annual rise may eventually be far too conservative.

"The clause in the Harris bill (new subsection (b) of section 5 of the act) which purportedly covers FPC jurisdiction over new contracts would not only be ineffective in regulating rates but raises serious constitutional problems. Suffice it to say for now that if FPC is to consider whether or not any new contract prices are the 'reasonable market value,' rather than 'just and reasonable' as under the present act, then it will merely be ascertaining whether the price paid is that which the market will bear. Further, under all principles of rate regulation and constitutional due process, should the FPC deny a pipeline company the recovery of a price which it is actually paying to a producer and which is a bona fide item of its cost of service, there is no doubt that it would be reversed by the courts as engaging in confiscatory practices. Therefore, there is no effective regulation whatsoever in the Harris bill.

"Attached hereto is a detailed analysis of the Harris bill discussing its other defects.

"1. Escalator clauses, spiral clauses, most favored nation clauses, and renegotiation clauses coupled with use of a 'reasonable market price' or 'field price' will result in exorbitant rates for consumers

"Much has been said at this hearing concerning escalator clauses, spiral clauses, favored nation clauses and renegotiation clauses. Mr. Robinson's statement, referred to above, defines such clauses and outlines the basic reasons why they are unjust and unreasonable. Other witnesses have likewise leveled such unanswerable attacks on such clauses and I will not repeat their arguments here. The interrelationship of such clauses to the use of the so-called reasonable market price or field price provisions of the Harris bill, in lieu of the present cost method and the just and reasonable criterion of regulation contained in the present act warrants deep consideration and your careful scrutiny.

[8] 34th annual report of FPC, p. 108.

[9] The FPC in testimony on the Kerr bill, S. 1498, 81st Cong., 1st sess., at p. 16, table 10 and p. 283 estimated that in 1949–50 a 5 cents per thousand cubic feet increase in field prices would be $200 million per year. The rapid rise of field prices and use of natural gas since has far outstripped the expectations at that time.

"(a) Field Price and Its Relation to a Pipeline Company's Own Produced Gas

"Under the recent FPC Opinion No. 269, *In the Matter of Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company*, the FPC departed from the basic principles of 15 years of rate regulation and, among other things, changed its court sanctioned policy of allowing a company to recover in rates only the actual cost of gas plus a reasonable rate of return on gas which it either purchases from its own producing company or which it produces itself and allowed a so-called weighted average price as a field price for the gas.

"The best way to describe the result is that Panhandle was permitted to write up the cost of its own produced gas. Some indication of the extent of this writeup is shown in the annual report of Panhandle Eastern for the year 1953. In that report Panhandle pointed out that it owned 3.5 trillion cubic feet of gas which cost approximately $3 million. In that same report Panhandle said that it believed the commodity value of its gas should be at least 13 cents per thousand cubic feet or about $450 million.

"The result of the order in FPC Opinion 269, supra, is that the rate payers in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri must pay, by Panhandle's own figures, some $450 million for the gas which cost $3 million.

"Even this huge figure is not a real measure of the cost of this FPC decision to the public, for Panhandle now apparently thinks that they will be able to increase the price to even more than a $450 million windfall for the gas which was bought and paid for by the gas consumers.

"I base this statement upon the fact that Panhandle said it would dedicate some of its gas reserves to the use of the gas consumers who so greatly need additional supplies, if the Federal Power Commission gave it the field price for its gas. Shortly after the decision was announced by the Commission, that pipeline company filed an application with the Commission to expand its facilities, but recently it withdrew its request for about 60 percent of its proposed expansion with its own gas. Apparently that company now believes it can get even more for its gas if this bill is passed, and it is withholding the gas from market in an effort to force this committee and the Congress of the United States to further increase its profits.

"The staff of the FPC vigorously opposed this principle of the field price of gas and in its brief to the FPC the staff said that such a decision would cost the people of the country billions of dollars. This figure seems tremendous, but I assure you that it is not exaggerated. The FPC staff is expert in this field and knows the facts support its assertion.

"I have cited just a single example in which one pipeline company under this Harris bill would be able to write up the value of its own gas reserves by more than 15,000 percent. That example should illustrate to you just what you Members of the Congress are asked to take from consumers and hand to gas companies by adopting this bill.

"FPC Opinion 269 is presently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by the city of Detroit, Mich., and others. Congress should not legislatively condone this giveaway of consumers' money to Panhandle by passing the Harris Act.

"A graphic example of the results of this decision upon rate payers was placed in this very record at page 1403A by the FPC. Therein it is shown that the difference in price between the actual cost of gas to six pipeline companies and the use of a fictitious field price amounts to about $20 million. This $20 million will be given as a windfall to these six companies presently seeking increases, since, of course, they do not actually pay this money—the FPC merely allows this field price as though it were being paid. The result is exorbitant profits to the pipeline companies. Is this 'protection of the ultimate consumer from exploitation' in keeping with the act? To state the proposition is to answer it.

"If the Harris bill is passed, 'reasonable market price' is to be used for determining the value of pipeline-produced gas and also for new contract prices between pipelines and producers. This term would seem to mean 'field price.' There is a serious question with respect to the meaning of this term, since different methods of ascertaining field price are used.

"If a weighted-average field price is used, then contracts in a field between producers and pipeline companies wherein various prices are listed would be averaged and a figure obtained. This is the method used by the FPC in the Panhandle case in setting the field price presently under attack in the court of appeals.

"Also, a prevailing field price might be used under the Harris bill, and that, of course, would merely be the highest price obtainable in the field, or that price which the market will bear.

"There are also other methods of obtaining a field price, but irrespective of which one is used, they result in a price which is completely out of line with the costs incurred plus a reasonable profit, and certainly do not result in a price which is just and reasonable to the ultimate consumer in keeping with the present provisions of the Natural Gas Act. No field price can come within the confines of the Natural Gas Act as being just and reasonable.

"An illustration of the inherent dangers and built-in inflation in the Harris bill is helpful. Suppose the present so-called reasonable market price or field price is 10 cents per thousand cubic feet in a certain field. A pipeline purchases a new supply of gas in this field from an independent producer. Since there is no FPC regulation, it must pay 12 cents per thousand cubic feet to the producer because prices are constantly increasing for new gas. This, in the parlance of the industry, "triggers" all escalation clauses of existing contracts in that field and any producers receiving less than 12 cents per thousand cubic feet will now likewise receive the 12 cents per thousand-cubic-foot price. This, of course, raises the reasonable market price or field price from 10 cents per thousand cubic feet to 12 cents per thousand cubic feet or somewhere in between, taking into account the fact that there are some contracts with no escalation provisions. Pipeline companies which have their own produced gas in this field will be able then to seek a rate increase from FPC because of the increase in this reasonable market price or field price. Under the Harris bill they would be entitled to receive this price, even though they are not actually paying that price, and even though it is many times the amount it actually costs to produce their own gas. Every time someone buys at an increased price in the field, the entire field is triggered which results in increased purchase prices and the reasonable market price or field price thus advances accordingly.

"Further, when any contract, subsequent to this triggering effect, is made, no producer would even discuss anything less than 12 cents per thousand cubic feet and undoubtedly would seek at least 15 cents as a basic price. If 15 cents is the price which is finally paid, all the contracts will trigger again and the field price will be raised to around 15 cents. The potentialities of this procedure are frightening to contemplate. As the purchase price rises—existing contract prices escalate to meet it; as existing contracts escalate, the asking price for purchased gas rises—ad infinitum. Indeed, the consumer will find himself on a treadmill wherein he either must leap to another fuel or pay the exorbitant prices forecast and lose his investment in gas heating equipment.

"(b) Field Price and New Contracts Between Pipelines and Producers

"The Harris bill purports to give some protection to the consumer by allowing FPC to pass upon the reasonableness of the price set forth in new contracts by considering whether it conforms to a reasonable market price. Aside from the constitutional aspect of due process in disallowing a valid cost, there is no criterion set down by which the FPC can ascertain this price. The cycle of increased contracts and triggered contracts discussed previously with regard to pipeline produced gas also applies to any new contracts for gas. When the pipeline company tenders a contract at this price for FPC approval, what basis is FPC to use to arrive at the "reasonable market value"? It really will be the so-called field price, i. e., the average price which is being obtained in the field on current transactions. It is arrived at, of course, by use of triggered escalations which have no relation either to the value of the gas to the producer or its worth on the market. It is more properly labeled the unjust and unreasonable price as compared with the just and reasonable standard laid down by the act.

"The ultimate consumer will merely be paying the highest price that the market will bear and prices which the producers have forced up beyond all reason. This certainly was not intended by the Natural Gas Act and Members of the Congress should insure that only a just and reasonable price will be paid by consumers. This is easily accomplished by allowing the act to stand as it is at present.

"V. STATE COMMISSIONS CAN NEITHER PRACTICALLY NOR CONSTITUTIONALLY AID IN KEEPING PRODUCER PRICES JUST AND REASONABLE

"There have been discussions at this hearing with respect to State commissions and their role in the rate regulation picture. Also, some statements have been made regarding their capacity of insuring that only just and reasonable rates are charged consumers. However, such talk is wishful thinking when regulation of price increases for gas sold in interstate commerce by producers is discussed. The constitutional prohibition which prevents States from regulating prices charged in such sales have already been discussed herein.

"When the producer increases his price for gas to the pipeline this results in an increase in price by the pipeline to the ultimate distributing company. This latter company is generally under control of a State commission regulatory body. If this company is being charged more for the gas it purchases from its pipeline supplier (because of an increased price by the producer) then it either must absorb this increase itself or seek relief from the State commission by means of a rate increase. Since the distributing company is a public utility, it is entitled to recover its costs plus a fair return upon its investment in facilities dedicated to the public service (*Bluefield Water Works and Improvement Co.* v. *Public Service Commission* (262 U. S. 679).) This is a basic rate regulation principle. Thus, no State commission could deny a distributing company a rate increase based upon a bona fide price increase which it was paying for purchased gas from the pipeline. If it did deny the increase, the courts would never allow such regulation to stand. Thus, the State commission would be bound to grant a rate increase to the distributor and it is at this point that the consumer begins paying for the increase in producer prices. As already shown, supra, the consumer would generally pay at least an amount equal to the increase at the point of sale in interstate commerce for resale and maybe even more,

depending on system loads, industrial sales, and other factors.

"Further, the FPC cannot have any power over these retail sales since this is an intrastate operation. Therefore, no faith can be put in the premise that State Commissions can keep down producer price increases. They can neither constitutionally nor practically attain such an objective. The only possible way to do it is by FPC jurisdiction over producers' sales since Federal Power alone under our Constitution can be used in regulating such sales. The Harris bill will, of course, remove the effectiveness of this jurisdiction and leave consumers to producer exploitation by assuring the producers that they may increase prices for this essential public service to whatever level the market will bear.

"Recently, it was my privilege to participate in a conference with the President of the United States at which representatives of consumers presented oral and written statements of their reasons for opposing the Harris bill. I have attached to my statement a copy of the written statement there presented as some of the basic facts showing how beneficial the Natural Gas Act has been to both consumers and producers are not repeated in my statement to this committee.

"CONCLUSIONS

"For the foregoing reasons, the Harris bill is clearly not in the public interest. It allows oil and gas companies to gouge the ultimate consumer by charging exorbitant prices through elimination of present legislative power to require producers and gatherers to charge just and reasonable rates.

"The provisions of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as now written are in the public interest and should be allowed to stand."

(Supplementary statements and appendix omitted.)

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF RABIES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill the enactment of which will enable the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the Public Health Service and the Wildlife Service in the control and eradication of rabies.

I have been informed by Dr. Ralph L. West, secretary and executive officer of the Minnesota Livestock Sanitary Board and chairman of the Committee on Legislation for the United States Livestock Sanitary Association, that the national association has been on record for several years in favoring an amendment to the present law which would enable the Department of Agriculture to extend its research activities and its cooperation with other agencies in this field.

Dr. West explains the need in the following paragraph from a letter which I received from him on May 9:

The principal reason for this change would be that dogs are the principal reservoir of rabies infection and spread this disease to other domestic animals and man. The rabies situation is becoming more acute in some areas in this country, including Minnesota, because of its appearance a few years ago in wildlife. In Minnesota, skunks are now infected to a large extent, while in other areas, foxes are the principal species of wild animals where the disease is found. During the year, rabies has also been diagnosed in bats in some areas in the United States, and it is not now known to what extent the disease appears in this species.

I agree with the conclusion reached by professional men in the field of livestock disease control that legislation along the lines suggested is "a first step in effective control of this very serious disease of human beings, as well as domestic animals."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1931) to further prevent the spread of contagious diseases in animals including diseases such as rabies which afflict certain domestic animals other than livestock, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

OPERATION OF EMERGENCY HURRICANE WARNING SYSTEM BY THE WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill making an appropriation for the operation of an emergency hurrricane warning system by the Weather Bureau.

All of us will long remember the havoc wrought by Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel last fall. My colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], has introduced a bill calling for a survey by the Army engineers to determine the feasibility of public works to lessen hurricane damage to the Northeastern Coastal States. This bill has my full support, but I feel that we should explore every possible means of assisting our people who may be menaced by future hurricanes.

I understand that during the hurricanes last fall the weather stations in New England did not have all hurricane warning devices. The State of Connecticut devised its own warning and evacuation system which was jointly operated by the State civil defense office and the State police. This proved to be an effective emergency measure, but it should not be expected to take the place of complete hurricane warnings by the Weather Bureau.

The bill I am introducing is identical with H. R. 5260 which was introduced in the House by Representative JIM PATTERSON, of Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks he made on the House floor in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the remarks of Representative PATTERSON, of Connecticut, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1932) making an appropriation for the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system by the Weather Bureau, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The remarks of Representative PATTERSON are as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am asking the Senators, Governors, and Congressmen of the 18 coastal States to join me in a concerted drive to obtain the necessary funds to cut down the loss of life and property damages from hurricanes.

Today I have introduced in Congress an independent appropriation bill asking for $5 million providing for an emergency hurricane warning system based upon a special study prepared by meteorologists specializing in hurricane phenomena.

Few people realize that the property damages of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel last fall amounted to $1 billion and killed over 150 persons in the devastation wrought along the North Atlantic seaboard.

Meteorological experts tell us that these last three big storms were not freakish sea storms straying inland off their regular paths. The scientists say that distinct changes in the worldwide upperwind patterns is creating a new cycle driving inland the great sea storms and may afflict heavy damages on the New England coast again this season and for years to come.

The United States Weather Bureau, operating under a drastically cut budget, is doing the best it can to detect the movement of hurricanes and issue warnings. In fact, the Weather Bureau has done a great job with limited mechanical equipment operated by overworked staff personnel. During the last big storm, weather forecasters worked continuously 18 hours without relief. But there is a limit of human endurance. Budget cuts forced the closing of weather stations at Eastport, Maine; Bangor, Maine; Cape May, N. J.; Ocean City, Md. The Eastport station had been in operation since 1891. Also, forced reductions in the Bureau's working force resulted in only limited operation at offices at New Haven, Conn.; Bridgeport, Conn.; and eight other weather stations.

I recently appealed to President Eisenhower to act favorably on the recommendations of the Interagency Hurricane Research Conference for a more effective hurricane research and warning program. This was a long-range program.

The President advised me that he shared my concern for adequate someguards against hurricane disasters, and said "you may be assured that thorough consideration will be given to such additional research activities as may be proposed."

I am now proposing a short-range emergency hurricane warning program to be financed by a special appropriation of $5 million. I am appealing to 36 Senators, 18 governors, and 177 Congressmen to join me in the drive to secure necessary Federal funds to enable the Weather Bureau to set up a really effective hurricane warning system to save human life and property.

It is impossible to accurately determine in advance what the projected hurricane task program will accomplish in dollars and cents; but experts estimate that potential savings of 25 percent damages to property and 90 percent savings in human life will result if advance warnings from 7 to 21 hours can be widely disseminated via newspaper, radio, and TV-news bulletins.

I am today introducing in Congress an independent appropriation bill of $5 million based upon a carefully prepared scientific study formulating an intensified hurricane surveillance system to protect the lives and property of 2 million American citizens living in the immediate vicinity of newly menaced coastal zones. And I wish to add that there is no fat in this proposed budget—specific requirements are cut to the very bone, but sufficient to provide an efficiently functioning emergency hurricane task force.

The enactment of this bill will provide the following:

First. The projected program will provide 4 upper-air observations daily instead of the present 2.

Second. Additional upper-air observations in "blind" areas where no observations are now taken.

Third. Provision for extra rawinsondes during progress of hurricanes.

Fourth. Emergency teletypewriter circuits and emergency private telephone liaison lines.

Fifth. Survey teams before, during, and after hurricanes to evaluate damage.

Sixth. Provision for full night and day hurricane staffs at each of six forecast centers. This means five additional forecasters at: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Seventh. Keeping open 24 hours a day the following 12 Weather Bureau offices which are now open only part of the day: New Haven, Conn.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Atlantic City, N. J.; Wilmington, N. C.; Daytona Beach, Fla.; Fort Meyer, Fla.; Appalachicola, Fla.; Pensacola, Fla.; Port Arthur, Tex.; Beaumont, Tex.; Bock Island, R. I.; Concord, N. H.

Eighth. Reopening of weather observation posts at the following places: Eastport, Maine; Bangor, Maine; Cape May, N. J.; and Ocean City, Md.

Ninth. Extra observations from ships at sea.

Tenth. Hurricane warning services flying squads at regional offices at New York and Fort Worth.

Eleventh. Radar observers at non-Weather Bureau radar stations.

Twelfth. The establishment of warning service for high tides, waves, and high water.

Thirteenth. Establishment of ocean-weather ship stations half way between Norfolk and Bermuda. This was taken away 2 years ago in the economy wave and was originally a part of the original 10-station North Atlantic ship program.

Fourteenth. Hurricane Information Program. This program is required to inform the public as to all important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, and protective measures that can be taken during the approach and during the hurricane passing to save property and lives.

Fifteenth. Establishment of special Weather Bureau broadcasts for emergency transmission of storm warning information. This may require obtaining special radio frequency from the Federal Communications Commission.

The following objectives of the projected program are as follows:

First. It will enable the United States Weather Bureau to give the location, intensity, and movement of all hurricanes with substantially more accuracy than has been possible in the past.

Second. It will undoubtedly reduce the loss of life and property in the coming years for all coastal States.

Third. It will enable the warnings to be given out further in advance and more expeditiously and efficiently.

Fourth. It will enable the Weather Bureau to more accurately describe the weather conditions in and around the hurricanes.

Fifth. It will stimulate necessary precaution on the part of all citizens and thereby reducing the loss of life and property on the onslaught of anticipated hurricanes. For example: more accurate timing as to when the wind will reach a certain speed and water a certain height.

Sixth. It will reduce public apprehension and fear in areas near the paths of expected hurricanes.

May I emphasize that unless we get additional funds for a concentrated attack on the main technical weather problems that exist today, we are likely to spend 20 years in finding out the best methods to carry out hurricane protection services. What is needed is a crash program to provide means to issue hurricane warning 6 to 12 hours earlier than now possible.

I know that the people of Connecticut, as well as residents of other coastal areas hit by hurricanes want their elected Representatives to take all steps possible to give them the maximum protection from further hurricanes, and it is for this reason I am trying to enlist the active support of the Senators, governors, and Congressmen of the 18 coastal States to join shoulder-to-shoulder with me in a drive to get the essential Federal funds to set up a truly effective hurricane-warning system. Even an additional 6-hour warning may mean the difference between life and death to many people in our States.

An added bonus on the funds expended for a more intensified weather-forecasting system will greatly benefit agriculture, transportation, and other major interests throughout the country.

Last, but not least, the foremost meterologists agree that the prediction of climatic fluctuations in hurricanes is necessarily linked with solving the central problem—the general circulation of the atmosphere—of vital importance in exploring the menace of atomic fallout. The scientists say they are woefully lacking in charted data concerning the jet winds—these are the upper atmosphere winds traveling at the terrific velocity of 200 to 450 miles per hour; these are the "rawins" that carry atomic debris, and presently under study by atomic scientists and meteorological specialists.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the armed services.

Each of these bills is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department explaining the purposes of the bill.

I ask that the letters of transmittal be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the listing of Bills Introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1946. A bill to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1946 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide for the continuance of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, except for those who enter on active duty after June 30, 1955, who are obligated for service under section 4 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and who do not volunteer for a minimum of 1 year's active service beyond that for which they are obligated under the act cited above.

This special pay is designed primarily to provide an incentive to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who choose the uniformed services as a career by lessening the disparity between the earnings of doctors in the uniformed services and the earnings of their counterparts in civilian life. In addition this special pay will aid in compensating for the expenses of reestablishing practice upon release from active duty in the case of those older professional personnel who are required to serve in the Armed Forces under the authority to draft medical, dental, and allied specialists under the provisions of section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the act of September 9, 1950, as amended (doctor draft law).

As indicated above, this proposed legislation makes a distinction with respect to doctors who enter on active duty after June 30, 1955, between those who are vulnerable for military service under the regular draft and those who are vulnerable solely under the Doctor Draft Act. It is believed that young doctors who enter on active duty after June 30, 1955, who would be required to serve for 2 years in the Armed Forces under the regular draft on the same basis as all other young males in the United States—even if they were not doctors and even if there were no Doctor Draft Act—should not be entitled to the benefits of special pay unless they volunteer for a period of active duty at least 1 year greater than the period all young males are required to serve. Conversely, it is believed that the older doctors who are not required to serve in the Armed Forces under the regular draft and who, solely on the basis of their profession, have been singled out for military service by the Doctor Draft Act from among all other older males in the United States, should be entitled to the benefits of special pay.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that enactment of this proposal would cost approximately $1,600,000 in fiscal year 1956, providing the special authority to draft doctors and dentists under the act of September 9, 1950, is extended. If this special authority to draft doctors and dentists is not extended, the cost in fiscal year 1956 would be approximately $800,000. Net savings, however, over the funds now contained in the fiscal year 1956 budget would be $2,625,000 if the act of September 9, 1950, is extended in accord with this legislation or $3,425,000 if that act is not extended as there is currently contained in the 1956 budget approximately $4,200,000 for this special pay.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1947. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, who occupy inadequate quarters to do so on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1947 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of legislation "to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents who occupy inadequate quarters to do so on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it is in accord with the program of the President. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, and their dependents who occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis to do so without loss of basic allowance for quarters. It should be noted that the President in a special message to the Congress relating to personnel turnover in the military services (H. Doc. No. 69, 84th Cong.) urged the enactment of legislation of this type.

The head of the Department concerned would be given the authority under regulations to determine whether particular units of family housing are inadequate as public quarters. It is contemplated that in making the determination that housing facilities are inadequate he would use as a criterion the minimum standards established for permanent family quarters construction programs. The housing facilities would be designated inadequate due to inadequacy of acceptable livability, size, construction, utilities, or necessary facilities for family housing. A determination by the head of the department concerned that housing facilities under his jurisdiction are inadequate would be final and conclusive.

The head of the Department concerned would be authorized to lease inadequate housing to personnel of his department upon such terms and conditions as, in his judgment, will be in the best interest of the United States. The facilities leased, however, would not be required to have been constructed with funds appropriated specifically for rental housing.

The act of July 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 316; 37 U. S. C. 111a), would be repealed by this proposal. That act authorizes members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and their dependents to occupy, on a rental basis, housing facilities other than those designated as public quarters. Members occupying rental housing do not lose their basic allowance for quarters. On the other hand, members do lose their basic allowance for quarters when occupying housing designated as public quarters. In addition, the Comptroller General has ruled (25 Comp. Gen. 798) that housing constructed with appropriated funds directly or indirectly made available for quarters or housing for members of the services concerned, however inadequate, must be considered as public quarters.

Under this ruling of the Comptroller General, there are, in many localities, both inadequate housing which must be treated as public quarters, and comparable housing facilities under the jurisdiction of the services concerned which were constructed with funds specifically appropriated for low-cost defense housing units. Service personnel who occupy these latter units do so on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters. The result in these cases, therefore, is that comparable housing facilities cost one member a greater amount than that paid by another member of the same rank or rating. Inequitable situations such as these create very undesirable morale problems. This proposal is designed to alleviate these conditions by authorizing the rental of inadequate housing constructed or converted with funds appropriated for public quarters on much the same basis as housing constructed with funds specifically appropriated for rental housing.

In order to prevent the indefinite use of inadequate housing, a specific provision is contained in section 4 of this proposal requiring the demolition, within 4 years, of all housing found inadequate under section 2 unless (1) it is altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, (2) it is urgently needed because of a shortage of housing located within a reasonable proximity and available at suitable rentals, or (3) is inadequate by reason of size alone.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that enactment of this proposal would result in an increase in cost to the Department of Defense of $40,251,000. However, it is estimated that receipts from rentals will amount to approximately $25 million, resulting in a net cost to the Government of approximately $15 million. While such $40,251,000 was not included within the proposed operating budget for fiscal year 1956, funds for this and certain other items are included in the budget for later transmission, contingent upon authorizing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States who remain outside the United States after having been indicted for certain offenses. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum, prepared for me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1949) to prohibit the payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States who remain outside the United States after having been indicted for certain offenses, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The memorandum presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

The attached bill would amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1954 (Public Law 769, 83d Cong.), so as to prohibit the payment of annuities or retired pay, based upon service of officers or employees, or members of the Armed Forces, of the United States, who are heretofore or hereafter indicted for offenses related to their Government service, and who remain outside the United States for a period in excess of 1 year with knowledge that an indictment is pending against them.

The bill would apply to cases where the indictment was returned prior to the date of its enactment; but for the purpose of computing the 1-year period, periods elapsing prior to such date would be disregarded. Periods elapsing prior to the time the person indicted receives notice of the indictment would likewise be disregarded.

Persons whose annuities are denied under the bill will be given refunds of any contributions which they have made toward such annuities, together with interest thereon.

PROPOSED FEDERAL FAMILY SUPPORT ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders.

This bill relates to runaway fathers, who abandon their wives and children in order to avoid taking care of their families and to avoid being brought back to their home States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1955) to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain States and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has introduced a similar bill, but my bill goes much further than that of the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much further does the Senator's bill go?

Mr. LANGER. It provides for certain punishments.

Mr. CAPEHART. I congratulate the Senator for introducing this bill. I think it is a fine thing. As he has stated, 2 or 3 months ago I introduced a bill to accomplish the same purpose. I hope the Senator is introducing a better bill than I introduced, and I hope he will help us get either his bill or my bill through the Congress, because I think such legislation is badly needed.

TEMPORARY CONTROL OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide temporary controls for the Salk vaccine.

I think it provides for a simplified type of controls and one that is definitely in the public interest.

What the joint resolution does is this:

It states that there is an emergency health problem of temporary nature resulting from the shortage of the vaccine.

The joint resolution then directs the Surgeon General to establish such priorities as necessary to insure that the available supply will be distributed first to the most susceptible age group, based on existing medical knowledge, and thereafter to other age groups in descending order of their susceptibility.

The joint resolution calls upon the Surgeon General to establish a price per unit for the vaccine, exclusive of the cost of administering, which will be fair to the manufacturers and sellers of such vaccine.

The joint resolution then provides that the State health departments shall establish programs for the distribution,

sale, and use of the vaccine, and the Surgeon General shall allocate each State its share. The vaccine contracted for by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is excepted from this joint resolution.

The resolution, if enacted into law, will expire May 31, 1956, or earlier if prior to that time the Surgeon General publicly announces that the emergency and shortage no longer exist.

Mr. President, I do not necessarily say that this system is the perfect one, but it is based upon numerous conversations that I have had with doctors in my own State of Tennessee and here in Washington.

The doctors with whom I have discussed this problem say that there is need for some such authorization on their part, if they are to see that the vaccine goes to the age group most susceptible to the disease.

If we, as a government, want it to go to that group, then we are placing an impossible burden on the doctors if we simply put the vaccine on the open market in short supply and leave it all up to them as individuals.

Mr. President, put yourself in the place of a doctor. One of your patients comes in and says he would like his 15-year-old boy to have a shot of the Salk vaccine. You say: "Oh, no. I have got the vaccine but I am saving it for someone between the ages of 5 to 9." The patient asks: "Well, might my 15-year-old son get polio?" All you can answer is yes—and if you refuse to give the shot, without some such authorization as contained in this bill, and the child gets polio then the patient might very well have a suit against you. At any rate, you can be pretty sure, as a doctor, that you will not have that patient any more.

Some such authorization as I have provided for in this joint resolution—which, incidentally, is similar in purpose to a bill introduced by Representative JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, in the House—is needed for no other purpose than to give the doctors a chance to do what the great majority of fairminded doctors would like to do.

Furthermore, Mr. President, by giving the Surgeon General the authority to fix the fair price, we will prevent profiteering in the drug during its scarce supply. One would have to be very naive indeed to think that there would be no profiteering, if it is just dropped on the market by manufacturers among drug brokerage houses and various traders during a time of great shortage and the understandable urge of every parent to get that vaccine for his own children.

One would be naive indeed also to think that under those conditions the vaccine would somehow—by some miracle—get to the most susceptible age groups during such a period.

And the best thing about such a program as I have outlined is that it is a control system which cannot forever be with us. It has within it the terms of its own expiration. During the shortage there is general agreement that some such controls are necessary. Immediately upon the expiration of the shortage there will be no need whatsoever for controls—and they will expire under terms of this joint resolution itself.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) directing the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to exercise for a limited period of time certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress finds that the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis affords, at this time, the only effective means for preventing that disease, that the demand for the Salk vaccine far exceeds the supply, and that this temporary shortage in the supply of the vaccine has given rise to an emergency health problem which, being national in its scope and nature, requires the exercise for a limited time, as provided in this resolution, of certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of such vaccine.

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Surgeon General")—

(1) shall establish such priorities as he determines necessary to insure that the available supply of the Salk vaccine shall be distributed first to the most susceptible age group (based on existing medical knowledge) and thereafter to other age groups in descending order of their susceptibility to such disease, and such priorities, to the extent deemed appropriate by the Surgeon General, may be established on a regional basis; and

(2) shall establish a price per unit for the Salk vaccine (exclusive of the cost of administering such vaccine) which is fair and equitable to the sellers of such vaccine.

(b) The Surgeon General, on the basis of priorities established under subsection (a), shall allocate to each State its share of the available supply of the Salk vaccine.

(c) The health department of each State shall establish a program, approved by the Surgeon General, governing the distribution, sale, and use, in accordance with this resolution and the requirements established under authority thereof, of the Salk vaccine allocated to such State.

SEC. 3. (a) No Salk vaccine shall be sold at a price other than the price established in accordance with section 2 (a) (2).

(b) No Salk vaccine shall be sold in a manner, or upon terms or conditions, in conflict with the applicable program established by the health department of a State pursuant to section 2 (c).

SEC. 4. The supply of Salk vaccine which has been purchased or contracted to be purchased by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis shall not be subject to the provisions of this resolution so long as such supply of vaccine is owned and distributed by such National Foundation.

SEC. 5. The Surgeon General shall issue such regulations and orders as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act (including regulations and orders with respect to the sale and distribution of the Salk vaccine in any State prior to the establishment and approval of a program in such State pursuant to section 2 (c)).

SEC. 6. Whoever willfully does any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by the provisions of this resolution or of any regulation or orders issued under this resolution shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 7. As used in this resolution—

(1) The term "health department" means the department, agency, or authority of a State having jurisdiction over public health matters; and

(2) The term "State" includes, in addition to each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any Territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 8. This resolution shall cease to be in effect at the close of May 31, 1956, except that if, prior to that time, the Surgeon General finds, and makes a public announcement, that the emergency which necessitated the enactment of this resolution no longer exists, that this resolution shall cease to be in effect at the close of the day upon which such public announcement is made.

INVESTIGATION OF POLICY OF ADMITTING BONDED LABORERS FROM CANADA INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 98), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of (1) the present policy and practice of the United States with respect to permitting bonded laborers from Canada to enter and work in the United States, (2) the number of such bonded laborers currently present in the United States, and (3) the extent, if any, to which the presence of such bonded laborers in the United States affects the opportunities for employment and wage rates of United States citizens engaged in the performance of services which are the same or similar to those performed by such bonded laborers. The committees shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

CREDITING OF CERTAIN SERVICE TOWARD RETIREMENT OF RESERVE PERSONNEL—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 801) to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of Reserve personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 631) to amend certain provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, relating to educational exchange and other cultural programs under such act, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT, RELATING TO LOANS TO CERTAIN FARMERS AND STOCKMEN — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on May 9, 1955, I introduced the bill (S. 1912) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make direct loans and to insure loans made by private lenders to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing indebtedness in certain areas, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be added to the list of cosponsors of the bill, the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Address entitled "The Wilderness of Aldo Leopold," delivered by him and published in the winter issue of the Living Wilderness.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address on American foreign policy delivered by him before the Peoria, Ill., Association of Commerce at its annual dinner meeting, at Peoria, Ill., on May 10, 1955.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Address entitled "The Rights of the Individual and the United States Security Program," delivered by him before the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith in New York City on April 30, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by Senator GREEN at the Polish American Congress rally in New York city, on May 8, 1955.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Address delivered by Senator JOHNSON of Texas before the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address delivered by Senator Knowland before 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Address delivered by Senator MARTIN of Iowa, before Republican Women Volunteers, at Chicago, Ill., on April 20, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement by him on Rumanian Independence Day.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Exchange of correspondence between certain Senators and Secretary of Defense Wilson concerning the essentiality of the jeweled-watch industry.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 19, 1955, at 9 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

Benjamin M. Tashiro, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 4 years, vice Philip L. Rice, elevated.

Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, to fill a new position.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY GEN. DAVID SARNOFF FOR CONDUCTING WORLDWIDE POLITICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday there was released to the public a document which could have a far-reaching effect upon the course of our lives. It consists of a memorandum prepared for President Eisenhower by Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America. The document is a blueprint for conducting a worldwide political offensive against communism.

This memorandum is particularly impressive because it addresses itself to the most important issue of our time—the conduct of the "cold war." There have been few efforts to treat this problem in the comprehensive manner proposed by General Sarnoff.

The conduct of the "cold war" on a coordinated basis is an issue which has been too long neglected. As General Sarnoff notes, we have engaged in "cold-war" activities, but on a piecemeal basis and on an inadequate scale.

We have made far-reaching preparations for "hot war," even hot war on a worldwide scale. But the "cold war" which is with us now—and may prove ultimately to be decisive in shaping the course of humanity—has been treated on a hit-or-miss basis.

Yet there is a very clear conclusion we can all draw. There are only two alternatives to winning the cold war—hot war or slavery.

It is my understanding that General Sarnoff's memorandum is under study at the very highest levels of our Government. I hope that it will receive the deep and thorough consideration it deserves—that it will stimulate thinking, and place this country upon a realistic basis.

General Sarnoff belongs to that great group of Americans who are always on call when their Government needs them. He has always been willing to set aside his personal affairs, however important, when his services can advance his country's welfare.

His corporation is a key element in our defense structure. He has served as adviser to Presidents. His industrial leadership has been a major factor in making our peacetime living easier through the science of electronics. But when the final accounting is made, this memorandum may well be his greatest achievement. It is a monumental work, deserving the attention of all those who seek to preserve the security of the United States.

This document should be available to every Member of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR A POLITICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST WORLD COMMUNISM

(Introduction)

Our best and surest way to prevent a hot war is to win the cold war. Individual Democratic leaders have long been aware of this truth, but it has not yet been fully grasped by the free world.

Because the label is of recent coinage, many people assume that the cold war is a new phenomenon. Actually it has been underway ever since the Bolsheviks, entrenched in Russia and disposing of its resources, launched the Third or Communist International.

World communism has been making war on our civilization for more than three decades. And the term "war" is not used here in a merely rhetorical sense. It has been a war with campaigns and battles, strategy and tactics, conquests and retreats. Even the postwar years, it should be noted, have seen Red retreats—in Greece, Iran, Berlin, for instance—as well as victories; but such retreats have occurred only when the West acted awarely and boldly.

I. HOW THE COMMUNISTS WAGE COLD WAR

There have been intervals of truce in the cold war but not of true peace. Periods of seeming Communist moderation have been used as a cover for frantic buildups and deployments for the next big push. There has not been a single year when the Kremlin did not, with single-minded concentration, make the most of its opportunities by methods short of general war.

Not a single country today under Communist rule was conquered by outright military assault. Russia itself fell to the Bolsheviks through a political coup, after other parties had overthrown the old regime. The east European satellites were placed behind the Iron Curtain by cunning diplomacy and brute extortion. China was joined to the Soviet sphere by "rear operations" performed from inside.

It is useful to break down Moscow's political-psychological techniques for easier observation. But it should be remembered that they are all inextricably intermeshed, that they are stepped up or soft-pedaled as required, that they are supplemented with physical force and the menace of such force according to circumstances. The listing that follows is therefore overlapping.

1. Propaganda

The massive use of all media of communications by the Soviet Government, its puppet governments, local Communist parties, and by ostensibly independent groups under Moscow control or influence, is vast but impossible to measure.

In 1948 Soviet broadcasting to foreign targets totaled 528 hours per week. By 1954 this figure was increased to 1,675 hours. In addition, the Soviet news agency Tass broadcasts 121 hours daily to the foreign press. By comparison, the Voice of America broadcasts only 716 hours a week.

It is estimated that over 1,000 Soviet transmitters are engaged in jamming our signals. The Kremlin spends more for jamming it than we spend on all operations of the Voice of America. The Soviet and satellite expenditures in all types of foreign

propaganda cannot be accurately gaged—nearly everything Communists do has a propaganda content—but these costs run into billions of dollars annually.

Printed matter in tremendous quantities pours out of the U. S. S. R. into the non-Soviet world. Several large publishing houses in Moscow and elsewhere do nothing else but feed this flood. Besides, the Kremlin operates a chain of large publishing enterprises on foreign soil. Their Red tide of books, pamphlets, reports, posters, etc., inundates the world.

In nearly every non-Soviet country and region there are newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations, either overtly under pro-Communist control or in "liberal" disguises. These speak in local tongues—but the voice is Moscow's. In addition, thousands of Kremlin-oriented individual writers, commentators, editors, and trained propagandists are smuggled into strategic non-Communist spots to plug the current Moscow lines.

All available forums, from the United Nations to cultural and sports gatherings, are exploited to advance the battle for men's minds.

Special emphasis is given in Communist plans to what is called the propaganda of acts—strikes, riots, demonstrations, mass meetings in support of Soviet objectives or in protest against local policies distasteful to the Soviets, and contrived events of every kind.

Soviet films are rated high in the Communist propaganda plans. Pure entertainment in films, of course, is almost nonexistent. The result is that any and all pictures made in the Soviet sphere, however disguised as art, contain a message which contributes to their cumulative effort to brainwash the non-Soviet world.

2. Infiltration and subversion

Through Communists, fellow travelers, and and assorted sympathizers, there is a systematic colonization of governments, labor unions, educational and scientific institutions, and social organizations. The goal is to weaken the infiltrated bodies or to use their leverage to influence public opinion and official policy in the Kremlin's direction; to undermine traditions and subvert loyalties which block the road to Communist thinking.

In the infiltration of government agencies, espionage is by no means the chief purpose. Far more important to the Soviets is the subtle pressure an infiltree can bring to bear upon the shaping of national policy and the influencing of national moods. The theft of secret documents is routine. The subversion of a government's self-interest, the sowing of disunity, the careful sabotage of policies unfavorable to Soviet interests—these require and receive more polished methods.

3. Fifth columns and false fronts

Communist Parties, whether legal or proscribed, are the primary fifth column. They function under direct instructions from Moscow headquarters, usually under leaders assigned from outside.

But this is the beginning, not the end, of the apparatus of power reaching into every corner of the free world. Innumerable committees, congresses, leagues are set up—outwardly devoted to legitimate and even noble causes like peace, race equality, antifascism, but actually controlled and manipulated by Communists for strictly Communist objectives.

These false-front outfits are spawned continually, discarded when their purpose has been served. In the United States, where this technique has been widely practiced, they have run into scores. Every new situation produces its organizational instrument. At times a front started for one purpose is shifted overnight to its opposite: Thus fronts for keeping America out of the war during the life of the Moscow-Berlin Pact were converted into fronts for putting America into the war after the Germans attacked Soviet Russia.

Besides creating these fifth-column devices, the Communists also are expert at "capturing" organizations started by others. By joining some existing society or committee, acting as a disciplined minority bound by caucus decisions, a dozen persons have frequently succeeded in taking effective control of organizations with thousands of members.

4. Sabotage and terror

The use of these weapons in time of war is familiar, but its systematic use in peacetime is the great Communist innovation. In all free countries the main targets of infiltration are defense industries, communications, transport and police systems—all of which offer ample opportunity for mischief affecting a nation's security. Strikes at strategic points and strategic times, as well as overt physical sabotage, can slow up a country's preparations for defense or actual war-making capacity.

In regions where it is useful and feasible, the Communists do not disdain raw terror: Incendiarism, kidnaping, assassination. A special research section of the MVD (Soviet secret police) is devoted to developing murder weapons, poisons, and the like.

5. Civil strife

Internal discontents and economic crises are stimulated and then systematically exploited to produce inner disunity, chaos, and actual civil insurrection. Guerrilla forces under professional military leaders are frequently reinforced by "volunteers" from outside.

Para-military formations, underground organizations of every variety in line with local conditions and opportunities, are standard techniques. Genuine grievances are channeled and exploited through local "nationalist" or "anticolonial" and "anti-imperialist" movements, either started by the Communists or infiltrated and captured.

6. Preparation of cadres

In Soviet Russia and now in its colonial states there are schools and universities of revolution. Students, drawn from all countries, are taught the theory and practice of political warfare, sabotage, guerrilla operations, propaganda methods.

Virtually all heads of Red Satellite states and insurrectionary movements in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are products of such institutions. Tito, dictator of Yugoslavia; Ho Chi Minh, number one Communist of Indochina; Rakosi, the top leader in Red Hungary; Bierut, President of Red Poland; Liu Shao-Chi, Vice President of Communist China, and General Liu Po-Cheng, one of the foremost military leaders of Red China. The same is true of many leaders of Communist parties in non-Soviet countries.

The job of preparing cadres to implement the cold war and to provide generalship for civil conflicts and other revolutionary actions has been going on since the 1920's. Even during the last war, while the Kremlin ostensibly was on terms of friendship with its allies, the training of leaders for revolutions in the Allied countries was not slackened.

7. Preparation of reserves

The Communist high command does not depend only on the faithful Communists. It attaches great value to its peripheral "reserves"—groups of sympathizers or innocent collaborators willing to travel along the Communist road part of the distance. These are mobilized and brainwashed through the false-front organizations, United and Peoples Fronts, the spread (as required) of pacifist or neutralist sentiment, doctrines of class struggle, belief in the inevitable collapse of capitalism and free societies.

In advanced countries like the United States, Britain, France, some segments of the so-called "intelligentsia" have proved especially vulnerable to Communist indoctrination. Not only their self-doubts and frustrations but their most generous idealistic instincts have been canalized and perverted to promote victory for the Soviets in the cold war.

The turnover in these reserves is, of course, high. Fellow travelers by the thousands are likely to become disillusioned with every new Soviet policy zagzag. But expert manipulation of public opinion serves to retrieve such losses.

8. Treacherous diplomacy

In its cold-war operations the Kremlin enjoys the advantage of working on two levels, as a conventional state dealing with other states, and as a conspiratorial movement embracing the whole globe. In its guise of "just another government" the Politburo can make promises and engagements which world communism is under orders to violate.

Soviet diplomacy takes full advantage of the moral code and political naiveté of some free countries, and especially of their eagerness for peace, sometimes peace at any price. It uses the threat of war as a species of blackmail, and is past master at playing off one country against another. It appeals to the profit motives of competitive economies, and in general exploits what it refers to as the "inner contradictions" of the free world.

It can make the most of amorphous slogans like "peaceful coexistence"—a phrase coined by Lenin, repeatedly used by Stalin and candidly defined in Communist literature as a "tactic" or "stratagem" to gain time, deploy forces, undermine enemy vigilance.

In the arena of foreign relations the Kremlin can blow hot or cold, inflame our fears or our hopes to any required temperature, and use trickery to induce its enemies to drop their guard. Its announcements of policy, negotiations, and talk of negotiations, tourists to Red areas, artistic and cultural missions abroad—everything is grist for the cold war mills.

The Communist high command recognizes no restraints, no rules of fair play, no codes of civilized behavior. It regards its great historical mission as a mandate which cancels out traditional values in the relations between man and man or country and country. In pursuance of that commitment it considers any cost in life and substance to be justified. A system of power which has not hesitated to liquidate millions of its own citizens cannot be expected to hesitate to wipe out lives anywhere else.

Moscow has brought one-third of the human race under its iron control by means of a hot war—by shrewd diplomacy, deception, propaganda, the blackmail of threats, fifth-column subversion, guerrilla forces and, where expedient, localized shooting wars. These political and psychological methods—the cold war—have paid off, at smaller risk and infinitely lower cost than a hot war would entail.

Accordingly they are being applied without stint to the conquest of the rest of mankind. For world communism, with its high command in the Kremlin in Moscow, the cold war is not a temporary or holding operation, nor a prelude to a hot war. It is the main bout, the decisive offensive, conducted on an unlimited scale, with total victory as its goal.

In a decision of the United States Supreme Court (vol. 339, May 8, 1950) an opinion written by the late Justice Robert H. Jackson stated the case against communism in language that is clear and penetrating. He said:

"The goal of the Communist Party is to seize powers of government by and for a minority rather than to acquire power through the vote of a free electorate. * * *

"* * * It purposes forcibly to recast our whole social and political structure after the Muscovite model of police-state dictatorship. It rejects the entire religious and cultural heritage of western civilization, as well as the American economic and political systems. This Communist movement is a belated counterrevolution to the American revolution, designed to undo the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights, and overturn our system of free, representative self-government.

"Goals so extreme and offensive to American tradition and aspiration obviously could not be attained or approached through order or with tranquility. If, by their better organization and discipline, they were successful, more candid Communists admit that it would be to an accompaniment of violence, but at the same time they disclaim responsibility by blaming the violence upon those who engage in resistance or reprisal. It matters little by whom the first blow would be struck; no one can doubt that an era of violence and oppression, confiscations, and liquidations would be concurrent with a regime of communism.

"Such goals set up a cleavage among us too fundamental to be composed by democratic processes. Our constitutional scheme of elections will not settle issues between large groups when the price of losing is to suffer extinction. When dissensions cut too deeply, men will fight, even hopelessly, before they will submit. And this is the kind of struggle projected by the Communist Party and inherent in its program.

* * * * *

"Violent and undemocratic means are the calculated and indispensable methods to attain the Communist Party's goal. * * * In not one of the countries it now dominates was the Communist Party chosen by a free or contestable election; in not one can it be evicted by any election. The international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'etat, terrorism, and assassination. Not only has it overpowered its critics and opponents, it has usually liquidated them."

II. WE DARE NOT LOSE THE COLD WAR

If we ignore these facts, or do not counteract them effectively in good time, we shall lose the cold war by default. For the United States and other free nations, defeat of this sort would be as catastrophic and as final as defeat in a shooting war. Whether we freeze to death or burn to death, our civilization would be equally finished.

Were the Communists willing to settle for a permanently divided world, each half pledged not to interfere with the other, they could readily arrange it. But they are not interested in a stalemate. In the nature of their ideology and world-wide apparatus of action, they must continue to drive relentlessly toward their ultimate objective. They are irrevocably dedicated to winning the cold war. They prefer to attain world dominion by non-military means because:

(a) They consider themselves masters of cold war techniques pitted against those whom they regard as amateurs; their chances of victory seem to them incomparably greater than in a conventional military showdown.

(b) Political warfare does not directly endanger their own territories, industry, manpower and above all, their mechanism of dictatorial power.

(c) Clear-cut victory in the cold war would give them access to our technology and resources, our great cities and treasures, intact and ready for exploitation; whereas a military victory would give them only the ruins of nuclear devastation.

Now as in the past, they proceed in the conviction that they can gain world hegemony by methods that, in the phrase of Leon Trotsky, constitute "neither war nor peace." For Moscow, the real alternative to a nuclear showdown is not "peace" but political-psychological warfare of a magnitude to weaken, demoralize, chip away and ultimately take over what remains of the free world.

III. TO PREVENT A HOT WAR, WE MUST WIN THE COLD WAR

Political psychological offensives are not new. They have frequently been employed in wartime, to supplement ordinary military action. We used them ourselves in both world wars. Their purpose has been to soften up the enemy's will to resist, to win friends and allies in hostile areas, to drive wedges between belligerent governments and their citizenry.

The democracies are familiar with war-making in the normal military sense and hence do not hesitate to make huge investments and sacrifices in its name. They do not shrink from the prospect of casualties. All of that seems "natural." But they are startled by proposals for effort and risk of such dimensions in the life-and-death struggle with nonmilitary means.

Under these circumstances it has become incumbent upon our leadership to make the country aware that nonmilitary or cold war is also terribly "real"—that the penalty for losing it will be enslavement.

Hot war is always a possibility. It may come through force of circumstances even if no one wants it. Limited, localized wars are also a continuing threat. Nothing in this memorandum should be construed as a substitute for inadequate military vitality. On the contrary, superior physical force in being is the indispensable guarantee for effective nonmilitary procedures.

We must maintain our lead, and accelerate the tempo of progress, in the race for ascendancy in nuclear weapons, guided missiles, air power, early warning systems, electronic know-how, chemical, and bacteriological methods of warfare. We must maintain adequate and well balanced forces for the ground, sea, and air. These conventional military forces must be ready and capable of deterring or meeting an outbreak of peripheral or small-scale wars this side of a general showdown. They will be indispensable in a general war, if one should be fought without nuclear weapons. We must stockpile and protect the sources of vital strategic materials.

But short of a blunder that ignites the third world war which nobody wants, the immediate danger is the debilitating, costly tense war of nerves that is part of the cold war. Because there is no immediate sense of overwhelming menace, no thunder of falling bombs, and daily casualty figures, we are apt to think of this period as peace. But it is nothing of the sort.

The primary threat today is political and psychological. That is the active front on which we are losing and on which, unless we reverse the trend, we shall be defeated. Its effects are spelled out in civil wars in parts of Asia, legal Communist Parties of colossal size in some European countries, nationalist movements under Communist auspices, neutralism, and rabid anti-Americanism in many parts of the world—in pressures, that is to say, of every dimension and intensity short of a global shooting war.

Unless we meet this cumulative Communist threat with all the brains and weapons we can mobilize for the purpose, the United States at some point in the future will face the terrifying implications of cold war defeat. It will be cornered, isolated, subjected to the kind of paralyzing fears that have already weakened the fiber of some technically free nations. We will have bypassed a nuclear war—but at the price of our freedom and independence. I repeat: we can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

Our counterstrategy

Logically we have no true alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. We have only a choice between fighting the cold war with maximum concentration of energy, or waiting supinely until we are overwhelmed. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

We must meet the cold war challenge in our own household and in the rest of the world, and carry the contest behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We must seek out and exploit the weak spots in the enemy's armor, just as the Kremlin has been doing to us these thirty-odd years. We must make our truth as effective and more productive than Moscow's lie.

Our political strategy and tactics should be in terms of a major enterprise, on a scale for victory, with all the inherent risks and costs. We cannot fight this fight with our left hand, on the margin of our energies. We have to bring to its resources, personnel, and determination to match the enemy's. This is a case where, as in a military conflict, insufficient force may be as fatal as none at all.

If obliged to make tactical retreats, moreover, we must not bemuse ourselves that they are enduring solutions. To do so would be to disarm ourselves and open ourselves to new and bigger blows. This is a principle of particular importance during intervals when negotiations with Moscow or Peking are being discussed or are in progress.

The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clearheaded determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and by private groups—to win the contest.

Our countermeasures and methods must be novel, unconventional, daring and flexible. They must, moreover, be released from the inhibitions of peacetime, since it is peace only in outer forms.

Almost against our will, in point of fact, we have launched more and more cold war activities. But they have been piecemeal, on an inadequate scale and often without the all-important continuity of action. Worst of all, they have not been geared for total victory, being treated as extras, as harassment operations while hoping against hope that there will be no outbreak of war or that there will be a miraculous outbreak of genuine peace.

Our current posture shares the weakness inherent in all defensive strategy. The hope of a real compromise is a dangerous self-delusion. It assumes that Soviet Russia is a conventional country interested in stabilizing the world, when in fact it is the powerhouse of a dynamic world movement which thrives on instability and chaos.

Our duty and our best chance for salvation, in the final analysis, is to prosecute the cold war—to the point of victory. To survive in freedom we must win.

The enemy is vulnerable

The free world, under the impact of Moscow's cold war victories, has tended to fix attention on Soviet strengths while overlooking or discounting Soviet weaknesses.

The Communists expertly exploit all our internal tensions, injustices and discontents. Yet within the Soviet empire the tensions are incomparably greater, the injustices and discontents more vast. Our opportunity, which we have failed to use so far, is to exploit these in order to undermine the Kremlin, exacerbate its domestic problems, weaken its sense of destiny.

The nature of a malady can be deduced from the medicine applied. In its fourth decade of absolute power, the Soviet regime is obliged to devote a major portion of its

energies, manpower and resources to keep its own subjects and captive countries under control, through ever larger doses of terror. There we have the proof that the Communists have failed to "sell" their system to their victims.

Even a ruthless police state does not maintain gigantic secret-police forces, special internal security armies, colossal networks of forced-labor colonies just for the fun of it. These are measures of self-defense against actual or potential internal oppositions. After all discounts are made for wishful thinking and error, ample evidence remains that in the Soviet sphere the West has millions of allies, tens of millions of potential allies.

Whether the potential can be turned into actuality, whether the will to resist can be kept alive and inflamed to explosive intensity, depend in the first place on the policies of the non-Soviet world. Our potential fifth columns are greater by millions than the enemy's. But they have yet to be given cohesion, direction, and the inner motive power of hope and expectation of victory.

No one knows whether, let alone when, the internal Soviet stresses can reach a climax in insurrectionary breaks. It would be frivolous to count on such a climax. But we have everything to gain by promoting a spirit of mutiny, to keep the Kremlin off balance, to deepen existing rifts, to sharpen economic and empire problems for them.

For the purposes of our cold war strategy it suffices that the potential for uprisings exists. Soviet economic conditions are bad, particularly in the domain of food production. Nations which used to be exporters of bread (Hungary, Poland, Russia itself) now lack bread for themselves. As Secretary of Agriculture Benson said recently: "Failure of the Soviet system to provide for the basic needs of its own people could be one of the most important historical facts of our time."

The Soviet peasants, still the overwhelming majority of the Kremlin-held populations, are everywhere bitter and restive. The Politburo knows that it cannot count implicitly upon the loyalty and allegiance of its subjects. At the same time it has failed utterly to assimilate the captive countries, so that it has no allies but only sullen colonial puppets.

In the last war the U. S. S. R. fought on two fronts—against the foreign invaders and against its own people. There is reason to believe that Hitler's psychological blunders, in insulting and alienating the Russian peoples, helped save the Stalin regime from destruction by its own subjects. In the present cold war, too, the U. S. S. R. must maintain its fight against the Soviet citizenry, and at the same time deal with seething dissidence in the subjected countries.

The basic conditions for successful cold war counterstrategy thus exist.

Guidelines for political offensive

Our guiding objectives in an all-out political offensive are fairly obvious. They must include the following:

1. To keep alive throughout the Soviet empire the spirit of resistance and the hope of eventual freedom and sovereignty. If we allow that hope to expire, the Kremlin will have perpetuated its dominion over its victims.

2. To break the awful sense of isolation in which the internal enemies of the Kremlin live—by making them aware that, like the revolutionists in Tsarist times, they have devoted friends and powerful allies beyond their frontiers.

3. To sharpen by every device we can develop the fear of their own people that is already chronic in the Kremlin. The less certain the Soviets are of the allegiance of their people, the more they will hesitate to provoke adventures involving the risks of a major showdown.

4. To provide moral and material aid, including trained leadership, to oppositions, undergrounds, resistance movements in satellite nations and China and Russia proper.

5. To make maximum use of the fugitives from the Soviet sphere, millions in the aggregate, now living in free parts of the world.

6. To appeal to the simple personal yearnings of those under the Communist yoke: release from police terror, ownership of small farms and homes, free trade unions to defend their rights at the job, the right to worship as they please, the right to change residence and to travel, and so forth.

7. To shatter the "wave of the future" aura around communism, displacing the assumption that "communism is inevitable" with a deepening certainty that "the end of communism is inevitable."

8. To inspire millions in the free countries with a feeling of moral dedication to the enlargement of the area of freedom, based on repugnance to slave labor, coerced atheism, purges, and the rest of the Soviet horrors.

This inventory of objectives is necessarily sketchy and incomplete. But it indicates the indispensable direction of the cold war effort.

IV. THE MESSAGE OF FREEDOM

We must be quite certain of our destination before we can begin to figure out means of transportation. There is little point in discussing the how of it until a firm decision for an allout political-psychological counteroffensive is reached.

In hot war you need a weapon and means of delivering it to the target. The same is true in cold war. The weapon is the message; after it has been worked out we can develop the facilities for delivering it to the world at large and to the Communist-captive nations in particular.

The essence of that message (and its formulation is the critical first step) is that America has decided, irrevocably, to win the cold war; that its ultimate aim is, in concert with all peoples, to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-based communism.

Once that decision is made, some of the means for implementing it will become self-evident; others will be explored and developed under the impetus of the clearcut goal. Agreement on the problem must come before agreement on the solution.

"To be effective," as one student of the problem has put it, "our decision must be as sharp-edged and uncompromising as the Kremlin's; it must be spelled out as unequivocally as the Communists have done in the works of Lenin and Stalin and the official programs of the Comintern and Cominform."

Adjustment of our thinking in accord with such a decision to win the cold war demands clarity on at least the following points:

1. The struggle by means short of general war is not a preliminary bout, but the decisive contest, in which the loser may not have a second chance.

2. It must, therefore, be carried on with the same focused effort, the same resolute spirit, the same willingness to accept costs and casualties that a hot war would involve.

3. In order to establish credence and inspire confidence, our conduct must be consistent. Our philosophy of freedom must embrace the whole of mankind; it must not stop short at the frontiers of the Soviet sphere. Only this can give our side a moral grandeur, a revolutionary elan, a crusading spirit not only equal to but superior to the other side's.

4. We must learn to regard the Soviet countries as enemy-occupied territory, with the lifting of the occupation as the overall purpose of freedom-loving men everywhere. This applies not only to areas captured since the war, but includes Russia itself. Any other policy would turn what should be an anti-Communist alliance into an anti-Russian alliance, forcing the Russians (as Hitler forced them during the war) to rally around the regime they hate.

5. The fact that the challenge is global must be kept clearly in view. Red guerrillas in Burma, Communists in France or the United States, the Huks in the Philippines, Red agents in Central America—these are as much the enemy as the Kremlin itself.

6. We must realize that world communism is not a tool in the hands of Russia—Russia is a tool in the hands of world communism. Repeatedly, Moscow has sacrificed national interests in deference to world-revolutionary needs. This provides opportunities for appeals to Russian patriotism.

7. Though the Soviets want a nuclear war no more than we do, they accept the risk of it in pushing their political offensive. We, too, cannot avoid risks. (It might become necessary, Mr. Dulles said recently, "to forego peace in order to secure the blessings of liberty.") The greatest risk of all, for us, is to do less than is needed to win the Cold War. At worst that would mean defeat by default; and at best, a situation so menacing to the survival of freedom that a hot war may become inevitable.

Our present lead in the possession of nuclear weapons and the ability to use them may be matched by the Communists in the next few years. This is the view expressed by competent statesmen, scientists and military experts. If and when nuclear parity is reached, the enemy's fanatics (and there may be a powerful madman—a Hitler—among them) might be tempted to use them against us by throwing a sneak punch. Since our policy is not to throw the first nuclear punch but only to retaliate if it is thrown against us, we may find as more horror weapons are unfolded, that to yield to the enemy the initiative of the first offensive punch, is tantamount to national suicide. All this further emphasizes the vital need for winning the cold war and preventing a hot war.

V. TOWARD COLD WAR VICTORY

1. Organization

An organizational framework for fighting the cold war already exists. It needs to be adjusted and strengthened in line with the expanded scale and intensity of operations.

A Strategy Board for Political Defense, the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side, is suggested. It should function directly under the President, with Cabinet status for its head. Top representatives of the State Department, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the United States Information Agency, should sit on this board. Liaison on a continuous basis should be maintained with all other agencies which can play a role in the overall effort.

There will be various operations which the board would undertake in its own name, with its own facilities. But its primary function should not be operational. It should be to plan, initiate, finance, advise, coordinate and check on operations by other groups and agencies, whether already in existence of created by the board for specific undertakings.

One cannot, however, be too specific at this point about the organizational forms. John Foster Dulles wrote in 1948:

"We need an organization to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is working and winning its victories. * * * We ought to have an organization dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense just as the present Secretary of Defense heads up the organization of military defense. The new department of nonmilitary defense should have an adequate personnel and ample funds."

2. Financing

On the matter of funds, likewise, one cannot at this stage offer specific estimates.

But let us recall that appropriations over the past 4 years for our military defense averaged approximately $45 billion annually. In contrast, it is significant to note that for the fiscal year 1955 the total appropriation for the United States Information Agency was $79 million, of which $17 million is available for the world-wide activities of the Voice of America.

As a working hypothesis it is suggested that a specific and more realistic ratio between military and nonmilitary appropriations be worked out: say an amount equivalent to 5 or 7½ percent of Military Defense appropriations to be granted to the Strategy Board for Political Defense—this, of course, without reducing the military budget and not counting foreign military aid and point 4 types of expenditure.

I am convinced that if the American people and their Congress are made fully aware of the menace we face, of the urgent need for meeting it, and the possibility of doing so by means short of war, they will respond willingly as they have always done in times of national crisis. They will realize that no investment to win the cold war is exorbitant when measured against the stakes involved, and against the costs of the bombing war we seek to head off.

3. Implementing the counteroffensive

We must go from defense to attack in meeting the political, ideological, subversive challenge. The implementation of the attack would devolve upon specialists and technicians. In gearing to fight a hot war, we call in military strategists and tacticians. Likewise, we must have specialists to fight a cold war.

This implies in the first place the mobilization of hard, knowledgeable anti-Communists who understand the issues and for whom it is not merely a job but a dedication. The specialist in communications is important; but the message to be communicated is even more important.

The main weakness of our efforts to date to talk to the masses—and even more so to the elite groups (Army, intelligentsia, etc.)—in the Soviet camp is that we have not always been consistent in what we had to say to them. Our message has been vague and subject to change without notice. As long as we regard Communist rule as permanent, we can have no strong psychological bridges to those who are under its yoke. The only free-world goal that is relevant to them is one that envisages their eventual emancipation.

With the formulation of a message, we will at last have something to say that interests them, not only us, and can devote ourselves to perfecting the means of delivering the message.

Before essaying a breakdown of cold war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now under way needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking. The expanded offensive with nonmilitary weapons must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it.

No outline such as follows can be more than indicative. Operations are necessarily related to current developments and opportunities opened up by events.

In all categories the arena of action is the whole globe. Our cold-war targets are not only behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, but in every nation, the United States included. In the battle for the minds of men we must reach the Soviet peoples, our allies, and the uncommitted peoples.

The agencies involved will be both official and private. The objectives must aim to achieve dramatic victories as swiftly as possible, as a token of the changed state of affairs. While the Kremlin has suffered some setbacks and defeats, its record in the cold war has been strikingly one of success piled on success. This trend must be reversed to hearten our friends, dismay the enemy, and confirm the fact that Communist power is a transient and declining phenomenon.

4. Propaganda

If the weapon is our message, one of its basic elements is propaganda. It is the most familiar element, but we should not underestimate its inherent difficulties. Hot war is destructive: the killing of people, the annihilation of material things. Cold war must be constructive: it must build views, attitudes, loyalties, hopes, ideals, and readiness for sacrifice. In the final checkup it calls for greater skills to affect minds than to destroy bodies.

Propaganda, for maximum effect, must not be an end in itself. It is a preparation for action. Words that are not backed up by deeds, that do not generate deeds, lose their impact. The test is whether they build the morale of friends and undermine the morale of foes.

No means of communication should be ignored: the spoken word and the written word, radio and television, films, balloons and missiles to distribute leaflets, secret printing and mimeographing presses on Soviet-controlled soil, scrawls on walls to give isolated friends a sense of community.

5. Communist targets

The Communist sphere must be ringed with both fixed and mobile broadcasting facilities, of a massiveness to overcome jamming. The Voice of America will acquire larger audiences and more concentrated impact under the new approach. Its name, it is suggested, should be expanded to Voice of America—for Freedom and Peace. This slogan added to the name will, through constant repetition, impress the truth upon receptive ears.

Besides the official voice, we have other voices, such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberation. There are other popular democratic voices that should make themselves heard: those of our free labor movement, American war veterans, the churches, youth and women's organizations.

Already there is a minor flow of printed matter across the Iron Curtain, especially aimed at the Red occupation forces. The volume and effectiveness of this effort can be enormously enlarged. Magazines and newspapers which outwardly look like standard Communist matter, but actually are filled with anti-Communist propaganda, have brought results.

A greater hunger for spiritual comfort, for religion is reported from Soviet Russia and its satellites. Programs of a spiritual and religious character are indicated. They should preach faith in the Divine, abhorrence of Communist godlessness, resistance to atheism. But in addition they can offer practical advice to the spiritually stranded—for instance, how to observe religious occasions where there are no ordained ministers or priests to officiate.

The enslaved peoples do not have to be sold the idea of freedom; they are already sold on it. The propaganda should wherever possible get down to specifics. It should expose the weaknesses, failures, follies, hypocrisies, and internal tensions of the Red masters; provide proof of the existence of friends and allies both at home and abroad; offer guidance on types of resistance open even to the individual. It should appeal to universal emotions, to love of family, of country, of God, of humanity.

6. Free-world targets

The fighting front is everywhere. The program of the United States Information Agency should be reappraised with a view to improvement and expansion. "The Voice of America—for Freedom and Peace" has tasks to perform in many nations of the free world second in importance only to those in the unfree world.

Merely to point up the inadequacy of our present effort, consider Finland—a country on the very edge of the Red empire and under the most concentrated Soviet propaganda barrage. Soviet broadcasts beamed to Finland total over 43 hours weekly. A television station is now being built in Soviet Estonia which will be directed to a million potential viewers in nearby Finland. To maintain their morale under this pressure, the Finnish people, still overwhelmingly pro-West and pro-American, have desperate need of our encouragement. Yet the Voice of America in 1953 was compelled to discontinue its daily half-hour broadcast to Finland to save $50,000 annually.

We need in every country newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations, consciously and effectively supporting our side. Those that exist should be aided materially to increase their range and vitality; others should be started with our help. The strongest individual anti-Communist voices must be provided with better facilities for making themselves heard in their own countries.

Mobile film units are already penetrating backward areas. The operation should be enlarged, its message and appeal perfected. In addition, mobile big-screen television units in black-and-white and in color can carry our message. Their very novelty will guarantee large and attentive audiences. Vast regions in Asia and elsewhere, where illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radios bars the spoken word, could thus be reached. To quote the Chinese saying: "One picture is worth 10,000 words."

The so-called backward parts of the world, particularly Asia, are under the most concentrated Communist psychological attacks. Of necessity the counteroffensive must take this into account, and develop special techniques for reaching both the masses and the elite of those areas.

7. Radio receivers and phonographs

Mass production of cheap and light-weight receivers tuned to pick up American signals are now feasible. They should be made available by the million at cost or gratis, as expedient, to listeners in critical areas and behind the Iron Curtain.

There are millions of persons in the world who do not have electric power receptacles, electron tubes, batteries, or any of the electrical and mechanical marvels which the free world has and takes for granted. A simple, hand-operated phonograph device costing no more than a loaf of bread, could be produced in quantities and supplied gratis to millions of persons living behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and in other critical areas.

An unbreakable and intelligible record, made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of Coca-Cola, could carry our messages to these people. Such records could be dropped from the sky like leaflets and the messages they carried could not be jammed.

8. Use of facilities in friendly countries

Nearly all European and many Asian countries possess broadcasting facilities. We should seek to enlist their use to supplement and intensify American broadcasting on a worldwide scale.

In some cases this could be negotiated on a quid pro quo basis where we are providing military or economic aid; in other cases we may have to buy the necessary time for transmitting our message. Our friendly allies, such as Great Britain, have vast short-wave facilities of world-wide scope and range and have the same reasons as we have for seeking to win the cold war. We need their help in this field. We are fully justified in asking for such help and ought to receive it.

Propaganda is a large concept. In a sense it includes and exploits all other activities.

Its successful use calls for imagination, ingenuity, continual technical research and, of course, effective coordination with all other operations that bear on the problems of the cold war.

9. Passive resistance

Pending the critical periods when active resistance in one or another Soviet country is possible and desirable, full encouragement and support must be given to passive resistance. This refers to the things the individual can do, with minimum risk, to create doubt and confusion in the ranks of the dictatorship, to gum up the machinery of dictatorship government.

The worker in the mine and factory, the farmer, the soldier in the barracks, the office worker are able to do little things that in their millionfold totality will affect the national economy and the self-confidence of the rulers. It is the method that comes naturally to captive peoples, especially in countries with a long historical experience in opposing tyrants.

Our opportunity is to give the process purposeful direction. In this concept the individual opponent of the regime becomes a "resistance group of one." He receives, by radio and other channels, specific suggestions and instructions. The tiny drops of resistance will not be haphazard, but calculated to achieve planned results.

Special action programs of the type that do not require large organization—or at most units of two or three—would be worked out and transmitted. Our sympathizers in the Soviet orbit would feel themselves part of an invisible but huge army of crusaders. Symbols of protest would appear on a million walls. The rulers' morale would be deliberately sapped by a multitude of actions too small, too widespread, to be really dealt with.

The special value of passive resistance, aside from its direct effects, is that it nurtures the necessary feeling of power and readiness for risk and sacrifice that will be invaluable when the passive stage is transformed into more open opposition.

10. Organized resistance

Pockets of guerilla forces remain in Poland, Hungary, the Baltic states, China, Albania, and other areas. There is always the danger of activating them prematurely. But their existence must be taken into the calculations and, in concert with exiles who know the facts, they must be kept supplied with information, slogans, and new leadership where needed and prudent.

Many of these resistance groups are so isolated that they do not know of each other's existence. The simple realization that they are not alone but part of a scattered network will be invaluable; methods for establishing liaison, for conveying directions, can be developed.

11. Insurrections

The uprising in East Germany, the strikes and riots in Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, the dramatic mutinies inside the concentration camps of Vorkuta in the Soviet Arctic, are examples of revolutionary actions that failed. But they attest that insurrection is possible.

We must seek out the weakest links in the Kremlin's chain of power. The country adjudged ripe for a breakaway should receive concentrated study and planning. A successful uprising in Albania, for instance, would be a body blow to Soviet prestige and a fateful stimulus to resistance elsewhere. (That little country is geographically isolated, ruled by a handful of puppets; able leadership is available in the Albanian emigration.)

Eastern Germany is among the weakest links. Its revolt would ignite neighboring Czechoslovakia and Poland. The time to prepare for such actions is now—whether the time to carry them out be in the near or distant future. Meanwhile we must not allow the Soviet propaganda to make unification appear as the Communists' gift to the Germans. It is a natural asset that belongs to West Germany and her allies.

12. Collaboration with emigres and escapees

Tens of thousands of self-exiled fugitives from Communist oppression emerge eager to plunge into movements for the freeing of their homelands. When they fail to find outlets for their zeal, disillusionment and defeatism set in.

Maximum exploitation of this manpower and moral passion is indicated. They must be drawn into specific, well-organized, well-financed anti-Communist organizations and activities; utilized for propaganda and other operations; enabled, in some cases, to return to their native lands as "sleeper" leaders for future crises.

Officers' corps of emigres can be formed: Perhaps groups of only a score to a hundred, but available for emergency and opportunity occasions. The existence of such nuclei of military power—a fact that will be widely known—should help generate hope and faith among their countrymen back home.

13. Planned defection

Escapees have come, and will continue to come, spontaneously, now in trickles, other times in rivers. Beyond that the need is to stimulate defection on a selective basis. Individual prospects in Soviet missions and legations, in Red cultural and sports delegations, can be carefully contacted and developed. Types of individuals needed to man cold war undertakings will be invited to escape, assured of important work. Special approaches can be worked out to encourage defection of border guards, Army officers, secret-police personnel disgusted by their bloody chores, scientists, important writers, etc.

Escapees today are often disheartened by their initial experience. They are taken into custody by some foreign Intelligence Service, pumped for information, and sometimes then left to shift for themselves. Their honest patriotism is offended by the need to cooperate with foreigners before they are psychologically ready for it.

It is suggested that emigre commissions be set up, composed of trusted nationals of the various countries. The fugitive would first be received by the commission of his own countrymen. Only when found desirable and prepared for the step, would he be brought into contact with American or British agencies.

14. Training of cadres

The immediate and prospective activities of the cold war offensive will require ever larger contingents of specialized personnel for the many tasks; to provide leadership for resistance operations; to engage in propaganda, subversion, infiltration of the enemy; even to carry on administrative and civic work after the collapse of Communist regimes in various countries, in order to stave off chaos.

Already, limited as our political efforts are, there is a shortage of competent personnel. Meanwhile thousands of younger men and women among the emigres are being lost to factories, farms, menial jobs. This amounts to squandering of potentially important human resources.

We need a network of schools and universities devoted to training cadres for the cold war. The objective is not education in a generic sense, but specific preparation for the intellectual, technical, intelligence, and similar requirements of the ideological-psychological war.

This training, of course, should not be limited to people from the Soviet areas. A sort of West Point of politial warfare—analogous to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow—might be established. Staffed by the ablest specialists obtainable, it would seek out likely young people willing to make the struggle against communism their main or sole career.

The present exchange of persons program is clearly valuable. Hundreds of foreign students go back home with a better and friendlier understanding of America. But beyond that it is possible and necessary to educate invited young people from abroad, carefully selected, along lines of more direct and specialized value to the cold war effort.

In a sense these shock troops of democracy would be like the professional revolutionaries on the Communist side. They would be equipped to operate openly or as secret infiltrees wherever the enemy's assaults need to be neutralized. Trained anti-Communists from Asian areas, dedicated and knowledgeable, would be available for countries under Red pressure, as today in southeast Asia; Latin Americans, Europeans, would serve similar functions in their respective regions.

Thus from a largely amateur enterprise our counteroffensive would gradually be transformed into a professional undertaking.

15. Campaigns by special groups

An American trade union in the clothing field played a major role in preventing Communist victory in the Italian elections in 1948. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (in which both the A. F. of L. and the CIO are active) is conducting important psychological drives in many countries and offsetting the mischief worked by the Moscow-controlled labor international.

Speaking as workers to workers, trade unionists have a legitimate approach to the laboring masses in the Soviet sphere. They have a special justification for exposing and publicizing forced labor, onerous laboring conditions and laws, phony totalitarian trade unions.

In many countries—France and Italy, for instance—there are competing Communist-controlled and democratic unions. Free labor of all countries can throw its moral and material support to the anti-Communist federations. It can take the lead in breaking Moscow's grip on influential segments of world labor.

Corresponding political campaigns should be mounted on a telling scale by other nonofficial, popular groups: Farmers' organizations and peasant unions would concentrate on the evils of Red collectivization, great church groups on the immoral and atheistic aspects of Communist theory and practice; youth organizations on the perversion of youth under communism, etc.

The scope of such focused group and class appeals is enormous. Some of them are being made already, but without the coordination of effort and continuity of impact that is called for.

What a specialized group can achieve has been demonstrated by the Society of Free Jurists in West Berlin, which indicts and condemns in absentia persons guilty of Communist crimes. Its work is sowing the fear of retribution in East Germany. Radio Free Europe has made successful forays of the same order—identifying brutal officials, exposing Red agents, etc. But the surface has only been scratched in this type of psychological pressure.

VI. DIPLOMACY IS A WEAPON

The Kremlin treats foreign affairs as a primary arena of ideological and psychological effort. It makes moves on the diplomatic chessboard for their propaganda impact to rally its friends in the outside world, to win over a particular element in some country, to embarrass its opponents. In the measure that democratic diplomacy fails to do likewise, it is defaulting in a vital area of the cold war. Let us bear in mind:

1. Day to day conduct of foreign affairs is pertinent to the struggle for men's minds. The rigid observance of protocol, in dealing

with an enemy who recognizes none of the traditional rules, can be self-defeating. We must make proposals, demands, exposés, publications of official documents, etc., that are carefully calculated to show up the true motives of the Kremlin, to put a crimp in Moscow political campaigns, to mobilize world opinion against Soviet crimes and duplicities.

For 10 years we have made 1-shot protests against Soviet election frauds in satellite countries, against violations of treaties and agreements, against shocking crimes in the areas of human rights as defined by the U. N. Charter. The archives are packed with these documents. These should be followed up through consistent publicity, renewed protests, etc.

Even when nothing practical can be immediately accomplished, the facts of slave labor, genocide, aggressions, violations of Yalta, Potsdam, and other agreements must be kept continually before the world. Diplomacy must champion the victims of Red totalitarianism without letup. At every opportunity the spokesmen of free nations should address themselves to the people in the Soviet empire over the heads of their masters; to the people of free countries in terms of universal principles of morality and decency.

2. The measures of reciprocity should be strictly applied to Soviet diplomats, trade, and other representatives. These should enjoy no more privileges, immunities, access to information than is accorded to free-world representatives in Communist lands. Even socially they should be made aware of their status as symbols of a barbarous plexus of power. The desire to belong, to be respectable, is by no means alien to Red officialdom.

3. Economic leverages, too, must be applied. Trade can be turned into a powerful political weapon. The stakes are too high to permit business-as-usual concepts to outweigh the imperatives of the cold war. Where acute distress develops in a Communist country, our readiness to help must be brought to the attention of the people as well as their bosses. If and when food and other relief is offered, it must be under conditions consistent with our objectives—to help the victims, not their rulers.

4. In virtually all countries outside the Communist sphere there are large or small organizations devoted to combating communism, at home or abroad or both. There is little or no contact among such groups—no common currency of basic ideas and slogans, no exchange of experience. Without at this stage attempting to set up a worldwide anti-Communist coalition, or Freedom International, we should at least facilitate closer liaison and mutual support among anti-Soviet groupings already in existence.

VII. SUMMARY

No claim is implied that the foregoing outline is complete, or that all of it can or ought to be launched at once. The program here suggested should not be judged on the basis of this or that specific proposal but on the overall concept and its underlying philosophy. As a practical matter, methods flow from correct policies, the availability of funds and trained manpower, the existence of leadership and organization prepared to take advantage of unfolding events.

Summarized, my observations and conclusions are:

1. We are in the midst of a cold war which the Communists are prosecuting vigorously on all fronts in an unswerving determination to win.

2. We dare not lose this cold war, because defeat may be as fatal as would defeat in a hot war. We can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

3. Our best and surest way to head off a hot war is to win the cold war which is already in full blast all over the world. But for the reasons mentioned, such as insufficient funds and inadequate tools, our efforts in this decisive field are strikingly little compared with the enemy's and are wholly inadequate to achieve victory. We must meet the political-psychological challenge of world communism fully and on a scale geared to winning the struggle.

4. We should organize our efforts to win the cold war on a basis comparable to our organization for winning a hot war which we seek to prevent. To this end it is recommended that a Strategy Board of Political Defense (or some other suitable name) be set up to function as the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the military side. Top representatives of the State and Defense Departments, CIA, and USIA, should be members of this Board. Its activities must be effectively coordinated with all departments and agencies of our Government concerned with this effort. This new Strategy Board should function directly under the President and its head should have Cabinet status.

5. Our decision to win the cold war should be communicated to the entire world as a fixed goal of American policy. This will not rule out conventional relations on the governmental level, where the Kremlin, too, functions despite its clear commitment to world revolution.

6. The American public should be made promptly and fully aware of the nature of the present cold war, the importance of our winning it, the costs and sacrifices that this may entail. The significance and urgency of the problem should be conveyed to the American people, through discussion over radio, TV, and in the press.

7. The idea of our determination to win the cold war must be presented for what it actually is: A project that can be carried through successfully and thereby prevent a general war that could force a devastating nuclear showdown. Once grasped, this prospect would help to offset the fears and frustrations generated in the public mind by constant emphasis on the horrors of atomic war. The alternative presented, is understandable and hopeful. Instead of concentrating on the perils of defeat, we can dwell on the prospects for victory.

8. Key leaders in Congress should be drawn into the philosophy and purposes of the cold war counteroffensive from the outset. No program of the scope suggested here can be undertaken and executed without adequate funds that only Congress can appropriate. In addition to legislative support the Congress can aid immeasurably by stimulating united, patriotic effort as complete and nonpartisan as in a hot war.

9. To wrest from the Communists the advantages they gain through constant use in their propaganda of the appealing word peace—while casting us in the role of warmongers—it is recommended that the present name of the Voice of America be extended to the Voice of America—for Freedom and Peace.

10. Our diplomacy should be used as a weapon against world communism and our message to their captive peoples should contain the hope for their eventual freedom. Our message of truth should tell the world the truth about Communist objectives, methods, and practices as well as the truth about ourselves.

IMPORTANCE OF AID TO ASIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to place two newspaper items in the RECORD, but before doing so, I should like to make some preliminary remarks.

In March I made an address in the Senate on the subject of the underdeveloped countries of the world, with special emphasis on the countries of southeast Asia. I pointed out that although we can look upon our accomplishments in Europe with considerable satisfaction—in the underdeveloped areas of the world there is as yet no equal progress. These are the areas which have become the key objective of the Communist advance—if this vast area of the world were to disappear behind the Iron Curtain, the survival of the United States, even of western civilization itself, would be seriously jeopardized.

I went on to point out that in planning our mutual assistance programs, concerning which the Committee on Foreign Relations is now conducting hearings, and in formulating our attitudes toward these great areas of the world, "we must strive to convince the free peoples of Asia that we will work together as partners with them, and that our dealings with them are on the basis of mutual respect and mutual need."

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is now considering the Mutual Security Program for fiscal 1956. The committee has heard testimony from Secretary of State Dulles, Governor Harold Stassen, Admiral Radford, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Struve Hensel, and this morning the committee heard Mr. Sebald, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, and Mr. Moyer, who is in charge of the nonmilitary aspects of the operation in that area. All these witnesses stressed the importance of the word "Mutual" in our assistance program. As Admiral Radford put it, "We cannot be secure without our allies and they cannot be secure without us."

The testimony of these leaders also stressed the interdependence of the economic and military aspects of the program.

I think it is very important, Mr. President, that we recognize this interdependence, especially in the light of the suggestions from some quarters that the economic-aid portion of the program should be either reduced of eliminated.

I am mentioning this now because, although the subject will be brought up on the floor later, we cannot stress it too much as we proceed with our hearings.

In our present consideration of the mutual-security program we should be constantly aware of the broad picture of events which have been taking place in Asia in recent weeks. Our continued concern over situations in the Formosa area and in southern Viet-Nam are only a part of that picture. Important developments are and have been taking place at Bandung in Indonesia, at Baguio in the Philippines, at Simla in India, and at Bangkok in Thailand, where the cultural committee representatives of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organizations have just completed a planning session. In these conferences, the initiative has been increasingly Asian. As at Bandung, most of the participating countries have been demonstrating at these meetings an increasing awareness of the threat of Communist colonialism and a growing willingness to prevent it.

A recent editorial in the New York Times discusses this increased awareness and initiative in free Asia in the light of

proposed United States economic aid, and specifically the requested $200 million regional fund:

The idea behind a regional appropriation in our economic aid is sound. Some things, of course, can be done and have been done in bilateral agreements. These need not be jeopardized by a look at an entire area without too much concentration upon political boundaries. In some cases progress has to cross those boundaries, and joint effort is imperative.

Mr. President, on May 6, a very interesting article entitled "Central Facts on Asian Aid," written by Roscoe Drummond, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Drummond points out most effectively the importance of the nations of east Asia. He says:

Here, with the overhanging shadow of Communist threat either through overt aggression or through subversion, are 15 Asian nations seeking to realize their future through democratic means. These nations are Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, South Vietnam, Indonesia, the Philippines, Nationalist China, Korea, and Japan. These 15 prodemocratic countries want to maintain their independence from communism. To do so they must be stronger militarily and stronger economically.

Mr. Drummond concludes, rightfully I think, by saying that:

FOA Administrator Harold Stassen is not overstating it when he says that this great arc of freedom around the center of Communist power in Asia is where the future of democracy may be decided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the New York Times editorial of May 9, to which I have already referred, and the article by Mr. Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 6.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1955]

INTEGRATION IN ASIA

On both sides of the Pacific there is a fresh amount of working and planning for a closer integration of the free Asian countries. At present some of these are neighbors only in the geographical sense. There is a need to bring them closer together in other aspects.

In Bangkok the cultural committee representatives of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization have just concluded a 4-day session in which they discussed plans for closer cultural, informational, and educational ties among the various countries. In Washington there has been further elaboration of the objectives of the proposed appropriation of $200 million as a "regional fund" for assistance to free Asia. In both cases it is recognized that many things can be done better by cooperation than through isolated efforts.

The idea of closer cultural ties among some of the Asian states is not new, and the need for them has been recognized. This whole program was dramatically set forth in the Baguio Conference of May 1950, long before the treaty organization had even begun to take shape. There is a wide range of possibilities here and few of those opportunities have as yet been even explored. An exchange of information, and with it an exchange of skills, among the Asian neighbors can be a strong force for progress and for peace. The treaty powers are certainly working in the right direction in this field.

Similarly, the idea behind a regional appropriation in our economic aid is sound. Some things, of course, can be done and have been done in bilateral agreements. These need not be jeopardized by a look at an entire area without too much concentration upon political boundaries. In some cases progress has to cross those boundaries, and joint effort is imperative.

A good example is development of transportation on the Mekong River. This river is a major highway for four countries—Viet-Nam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. All can benefit by any gains that are made. There is a need not merely for transportation on the river itself but for additional feeder streams—both land and water—into it. Similarly, there can be commodity exchanges—metals for food, for example—in several cases, and some of these might involve even more than the two countries most immediately concerned.

The development of fisheries has always been an international and often a multilateral problem. This development can be furthered in a wide area of agreement in which good can accrue to all.

It will be tragic, indeed, if there is any move in Washington to curtail an operation that shows such imaginative promise. It can be the right economic complement to the cultural developments that are foreseen in the Bangkok meeting. Mind and body can and ought to move together toward happier days.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1955]

CENTRAL FACTS ON ASIAN AID

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The two most significant facts which emerge from the administration's $3,530 million mutual-security program, now before Congress, are these:

1. No economic aid of any kind is being requested for any of the Marshall plan countries in western Europe.

2. Fully 68 percent of all nonmilitary funds is going to the countries of free Asia and the Far East—as compared with 11 percent in 1952.

These facts demonstrate:

That American economic aid was soundly conceived from the beginning, that it accomplished its purposes as in the Marshall plan countries and, having accomplished its purpose, was wisely discontinued.

That the far greater percentage of economic aid is now being directed where it is most needed; namely, to the great arc of freedom around the center of Communist power in Asia.

Here, within the overhanging shadow of Communist threat either through overt aggression or through subversion, are 15 Asian nations seeking to realize their future through democratic means. These nations are Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, South Viet-Nam, Indonesia, the Philippines, Nationalist China, Korea, and Japan.

What sets these nations apart is that among them there is not a single Soviet satellite, not a single totalitarian government, not one of them which is not alert to the lure and the dangers of Communist subversion.

These nations comprise a land area larger than the United States and Alaska combined. Here live 770 million human beings—a population about 5 times that of the United States and almost equal to the number of people in both the Soviet Union and Communist China.

This arc of free Asia is especially important to the free world. Ten of its fifteen nations were colonies of other nations before World War II. Their political independence came as the fulfillment of the dream of many generations; more people gained independence during the postwar period than during any similar time span of history.

The leaders of free Asia recognize that the reports of economic advance in Communist China disregarded the human cost which Communist dictatorship imposes upon its people, but they are determined that their own economic deficiencies can and shall be overcome—economic limitations, in part, imposed by the Western colonial powers.

These 15 prodemocratic countries want to maintain their independence from communism. To do so they must be stronger militarily and stronger economically.

Their military strength and their economic strength are both valuable to the United States and the free world. Few things could be more fateful than to allow communism to extend its control over the vast resources and the vast population of this area. Our safety is related to their safety and our economy is closely tied to their economy. The free world buys 33 percent of its manganese from India. At least 39 percent of our natural rubber and 22 percent of our tin come from Indonesia. From the Philippines come 69 percent of our abaca fiber, 52 percent of the copra and coconut oil, 32 percent of our chromite.

These countries on the very rim of Communist power are ready to sacrifice, as we are, for the defense of their freedom. They are not asking something for nothing. Consider the fact that Korea and Formosa are spending from 55 to 70 percent of their own budgets on defense. Pakistan spends 23 percent of its total budget on defense. Thailand more than doubled its defense expenditures from 1950 to 1954. India, though a member of no military group, allocated in the past fiscal year $436 million of its total annual budget of $2,846 million for defense services.

I think it true to say that if we were not appropriating $3,530 million for the mutual security program for 1955–56, we would be forced to appropriate an additional three times that amount for our own military budget.

FOA Administrator Harold Stassen is not overstating it when he says that this great arc of freedom around the center of Communist power in Asia is where the future of democracy may be decided.

CANADIAN STOCK SWINDLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as senior Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been engaged for some time in looking into one aspect of our relations with our good neighbor, Canada—the best neighbor, I am glad to say, any nation has in the world.

That phase is the unfortunate matter of stock frauds perpetrated by stock racketeers, that is, securities swindlers across the border. This is by no means a problem unique to Canada, because, very obviously, we ourselves have had more than our share of swindles perpetrated on this side of the international boundary by objectionable individuals of American nationality.

I am hopeful, however, that remedial action can be taken, so that the public interest can be protected both here and in Canada. The hour is, however, late to lock the barn door, so to speak. A great many horses have already been stolen.

I send to the desk a brief statement and attachments describing the background of this stock-fraud situation. I ask unanimous consent that they be

printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and attached documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING THE PROBLEM OF CANADIAN STOCK FRAUDS

"Let the buyer beware."

This ancient maxim is more sound today in terms of precaution in investment in securities, and particularly in obscure securities, than at most previous times.

Investment in penny uranium issues and the like, anywhere, can be a particularly risky venture.

Of course, a vast new industry of atomic energy is opening up. Spectacular individual successes have indeed been achieved by certain companies and persons. Inevitably, as the word gets around, there is a "get rich quick" psychology which develops.

Newspapers, magazines, radio and television are full of dramatic stories concerning the latest developments in miracle metals. Inevitably, the public appetite for investments is whetted by news of new discoveries, new processes, new industries, new profits.

But the pubic must be cautious; it must be wary; it must investigate before it invests.

This is the sound advice of all responsible authorities in this country and Canada. It is the advice of the United States Securities Exchange Commission, of State securities exchange officers, of attorneys general, and other law-enforcement officers. It is the advice of the New York Stock Exchange and other exchanges.

The need for caution is well founded.

In recent years, there has been a particular rash of phony stock promotions from north of the border. Responsible public and private leaders in Canada deplore the activities of the stock racketeers. These swindlers besmirch the good name of Canada and of Canadian investments, even though the phony share-pushers represent only a small fringe group and a mere fraction in terms of the volume of bona fide Canadian securities.

CANADA'S LEGITIMATE INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Canada is, of course, universally recognized as a great new frontier. There is tremendous economic opportunity there in extractive as well as in other industries. Canada has welcomed American investment, and American investors have welcomed the opportunity there.

We ourselves, in our own national history, benefited greatly from foreign capital. English capital, for example, and capital from other Western European countries, was tremendously instrumental in the opening of the great American West. Thus, foreign capital, as such, can be a tremendous boon to a country.

But a small number of swindlers in Canada, some of them emigre American crooks, have been misusing these circumstances and exploiting the gullibility of the public.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE WORK

My personal interest in this problem stems, of course, from my service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As its senior Republican member, I am deeply interested in the closest and most harmonious relations with Canada. I don't want those relations to be harmed in the slightest by this or any other nuisance problem.

Back on July 11, 1952, a Supplementary Extradition Convention with Canada became effective. It had been reported out, of course, from our Senate Foreign Relations Committee and subsequently ratified.

Previous to that convention, no effective means was available whereby an operator in Canada, who employed fraudulent practices in the sale of securities to American investors, could have been brought to this country to stand trial. As a consequence, a flood of illicit stock sales in America had been unleashed by a fringe group of operators, principally located at that time in Toronto.

Following the Convention's ratification, on March 5, 1953, the United States Securities Exchange Commission adopted regulation D under the Securities Act of 1933. For the first time, it extended to Canadian securities the conditional exemption from registration under the act for offerings of securities in amounts not exceeding $300,000, which previously had applied only to domestic securities. That action by the Commission had been made possible not only the extradition agreement, but also by a determined effort on the part of Canadian officials and responsible business leaders to cooperate with Government agencies in this country in curbing fraudulent operators.

I will not at the present time attempt to elaborate on the subsequent history of actions in Canada and in the United States including important regulatory actions by the Ontario Securities Commission, because it is my purpose at a later date to comment on this subject in detail.

Suffice it to say for the moment that subsequently the decision in a test case under the extradition convention proved adverse, unfortunately, to our hopes for extradition action.

Nonetheless, the recent past has not been without promise. Observers have, for example, welcomed the formation of the new Quebec Securities Commission. I am hopeful that it can proceed expeditiously and effectively against the swindlers who had moved their headquarters activity from Toronto to Montreal.

BANKING COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Now, I should like to point out that the basic jurisdiction for securities matters is, of course, that of the Senate Banking Committee.

Accordingly, I have been in close touch with the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is much interested in this phase, and with his staff. Likewise, I have been in contact with my able colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who, back in 1952, served on both the Banking Subcommittee on the Extradition Convention, and as chairman on the Foreign Relations Subcommittee which reported out the Convention. Senator SPARKMAN, I am glad to say, has advised that he particularly welcomes my exploration of this problem anew.

And I have been in touch too, with my worthy friend, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] who formerly served as chairman of the Senate Banking Committee and who serves as do my other above named associates on the Foreign Relations Committee as well.

It is my purpose to continue in cooperation with these and other Senators and sources to compile evidence on this subject and thereafter to submit it in formal presentation to the Senate Banking Committee. I do so as an individual Senator, on my own initiative.

I have, of course, been pleased to advise the Chairman of our own Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the esteemed senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] with regard to my plans and intentions. And he has indicated that the committee stands ready, of course, at any time to receive such material as I desire to submit to it.

I now feel that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is however so heavily engaged in its vital overall duties relating to world relations, particularly the mutual aid bill for the next fiscal year, that unless new circumstances otherwise justify, it is the Senate Banking Committee which should carry on this review as a part of its look-see into the overall securities problem.

Meanwhile, I have been in contact with many sources, with the United States Post Office Department, (regarding mail fraud aspects of this situation), with the SEC, with the Attorney General of the State of New York, the Honorable Jacob M. Javits, with the Canadian Embassy, the State Department and with other officials.

EXCERPTS FROM VICTIMS' LETTERS

But now what of the meaning of this issue in terms of damaged human hopes and lives? I should like to quote now from some of the messages which I have received from victimized investors. They are but a handful of the great numbers of sad messages which have flooded into my office.

From Louisville, Ky.:

"I was happy to read in our daily newspaper, the Louisville Times, about you investigating the Canadian stock swindle.

"Because I happen to be one who Mr. --------, of Montreal, called many times, urging me to buy * * * and assuring me it was sure to be a very profitable investment.

"I finally bought 400 shares. You no doubt know what happened. I told Mr. ------ I was a widow past middle age and could not afford to lose even a dollar.

"He said he would be responsible for my investment which, of course, he wasn't. He refused to send me quotations after the stock was listed. I got a letter written in general to all their investors that they had retired from the securities business.

"So I trust you and your committee will be successful in curbing such fraudulent swindling."

From Charlotte, N. C.:

"Noting the article by Sylvia Porter that you are handling matters pertaining to Canadian oil stock, it seems that I am stuck in this game. I wrote to -------- about the sale of my stock 200 shares, and sent him (at his request), the papers I held. He sent these back as not being the proper papers. For 2 years after the deal I got monthly reports of the great progress they were making, but never heard from him anymore. I hope you have success in arriving at the facts in such dealings."

From Minneapolis, Minn.:

"Re the attached article which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune today on the Canadian stock swindle.

"Miss Porter is most certainly correct in everything she says in this article, but if anything is too mild. This gigantic fraud is powerfully pursued and extremely widespread.

"I am also attaching three different sales pitches I received in today's mail alone on worthless stocks. Also I had two boiler-room calls for two of these deals yesterday.

"These fast operators all seem to follow the same pattern."

From Morton, Ill.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I happen to be one of the unfortunate persons that have been swindled in a small way in the Canadian oil frauds. I still have some correspondence and stocks sent to me and will be glad to help in any way I can."

From Tilton, N. H.:

"We bought 1,000 of * * * for the sum of $500, and 1,000 of * * * some months later, at $650 for that lot. We were given prospectus, and so forth, and also received what purported to be market papers of one sort and another giving bid and asked prices of these stocks; only one could not sell them for love nor money. This Mr. * * * would telephone us frantically and breathlessly to get in now, and so forth. Then I'd say suddenly he flew the coop and just before we heard of it my wife suggested I try to telephone him and we discovered the telephone disconnnected, and so forth.

"We think this whole thing has been bad and while we were gullible, the fact is he put on quite a show."

From Scotch Plains, N. J.:

"I am one of the stupid fools who was taken in by these boiler factories.

"After some high pressure selling over the telephone I bought 1,000 shares of a mining stock at 74 cents per share which has since proved to be worthless."

From Fort Wayne, Ind.:

"You can put me down on the sucker list. I did invest a small amount in Canadian stock."

NO INDIVIDUAL STOCK APPRAISAL POSSIBLE

I may say that some of the people who have written to me have asked me to try to appraise individual securities. They have asked, too, whether I can give them any information on certain companies and individuals.

I have, however, advised them that neither I nor, to my knowledge, my colleagues are in a position in any way whatsoever to even attempt to evaluate any specific securities, any companies, or any individuals.

There are so considerable a number of these companies which have been hatched by the swindlers, and the swindlers have used so many front names, that it would be impossible—certainly for any one man—to attempt at the present time any specific descriptive listing without a most complete, careful and extensive prior survey.

In evaluating offerings, care should be exercised, moreover, in this respect. The fact that a uranium or other company—here or in Canada—may be obscure, the fact that it is small in capital does not, of course, denote that it may not be a bona fide company, legitimately engaged, let us say, in exploration for minerals.

There have been many companies formed from the smallest beginnings by honest, competent, experienced individuals—Americans or Canadians—who are interested in putting almost every dollar of capital into actual exploration, rather than siphoning it off for extravagant high-pressure promotion purposes and for selfish, personal pocketing. And numerous small bona fide companies have prospered greatly.

Of course, discovering and mining raw materials for nuclear power requires considerable investment. The United States Government and in particular its Atomic Energy Commission knows that United States investors will have to contribute great sums of risk capital for legitimate atomic industries. But every dollar poured into a rathole for the enrichment of a swindler is one dollar that cannot be put into a legitimate business venture.

OFFICIALS SHOULD FULLY EXPOSE THE SITUATION

No one can read the sort of victims' letters which I have reprinted above without feeling that Government officials should leave no stone unturned within their available authority and prerogatives to try to protect the investor.

We cannot, of course, do for the investor what he refuses to do for himself. If he wants to be reckless and to risk losing his money, that is his prerogative.

At the same time, I feel that every agency of the United States Government should exert itself in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the law to do everything it can within its official power.

In particular, I feel that officials in both the legislative and executive branches should use all available opportunity through the great media of public information to expose the shoddy moose-pasture salesmen, whether they be Americans, Canadians, or of any other nationality.

I feel frankly, and I believe fairly, that the record of the past leaves much to be desired, insofar as some American officials having relatively sat back and not adequately informed the investing public of the dangers of some of these Canadian investments.

STOCK EXCHANGE HAS COOPERATED

Turning to responsible private sources, on the other hand, I want to say that, insofar as the New York Stock Exchange is, for example, concerned, it has given me complete cooperation in my efforts to date.

It has welcomed with open arms, so to speak, the fullest light of public exposure on this issue. Mr. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, in contact at my request with counsel of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has assured me the most complete teamwork. I am sure that Mr. Funston's position is completely reflected by exchange member firms and by all other responsible leaders in American finance and in financial circles across the border. Articles in the Exchange magazine in particular have helped expose frauds of diverse nature and have been most salutary.

MATERIALS APPENDED

I have appended now various materials (somewhat abridged for purposes of brevity) which illustrate this overall problem. These include:

A. The text of an article entitled "I Sell Phony Stock to American Chumps," which had been published in the Saturday Evening Post, and which was later reprinted in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the Extradition Convention.

B. Excerpts from two powerful columns by the nationally-syndicated financial writer, Sylvia Porter, who has devoted a great deal of constructive attention to this problem.

C. Excerpts of an article by Jack Steele, of Scripps-Howard Service, and published in the Washington Daily News and other newspapers throughout our country yesterday.

D. The text of an article appearing today in the New York Herald Tribune by Max Forester, the first of an important series on this general matter.

E. And for a background of the problem as viewed earlier from an official standpoint, the text of an address by SEC Commissioner Clarence H. Adams. (Data in this 1953 address, I am pleased to say, has been brought up to date by material transmitted to me by Commissioner Adams.)

[From the Saturday Evening Post of January 12, 1952]

I SELL PHONY STOCK TO AMERICAN CHUMPS

(By Marcus Verner, as told to Earle Beattie)

(This is the astonishingly candid confession of a confidence man who operates his sucker game just inside Canadian law. And, in spite of his warning, he says, you may fall for his line tonight when you take that intriguing telephone call.)

There are about 9,000 men and women in the United States who would like to lay hands on me, rough hands, with a rope and a handy branch nearby; or maybe an old-fashioned tar barrel with a flock of feathers would satisfy their urge to get justice from my hide. United States Federal police, too, would like to put the heavy hand on me, if they could just escort me across the United States-Canadian border from my base of operations here in Toronto, Ontario, because likely they have several secret indictments against me on charges of fraud.

You see, for the past 15 years I've sold guillible Americans $1,500,000 worth of Canadian mining and oil "securities," and about $1,400,000 of it wasn't worth the gold ink we used to print the gilt edge. That $100,000 worth which made money for a few supremely lucky ones was purely accidental. I never meant to sell anything but "moose pasture"—phony stock—to get-rich-quick Yanks, who are the easiest marks in the world because they believe in Santa Claus. Of course, my pals and I also sell to other Canadians, but the big market for mooches is south of the border, where we drag in some $30 million a year.

I push this useless stock by mail, telegraph, and long-distance phone to a cross section of Americans, including, in the past, several judges, many bank managers, scores of lawyers, and one police lieutenant in Los Angeles. These "mooches," or "accounts," as we call them, live in all 48 States and Alaska, and often, to raise the money, they exhaust their savings, sell their cars, and mortgage their homes. A storekeeper in Atlanta I clipped recently borrowed money from a loan company, thinking he was going to make a fast profit on a two-bit stock; he's probably in debt now for the next 4 years. One of my salesmen pals loaded 4,500 shares of a lead-and-silver-mine stock, worth $1,250, on a man in Bend, Oreg., who wrote that he knew gold would be found because he had a vision from God depicting a rich V-shaped pocket of gold. It was not even a gold prospect. This mooch invested his entire savings. Others lost far more. A Minnesota farmer threw in $1,000 in cash, mortgaged his farm for $2,500, sold implements and livestock for another $1,000, and then sold a chunk of his land for a final $750. We sold him the gold shares at 40 cents; they weren't worth a penny. Literally thousands of American families have had their nest eggs plundered in this way, undoing years of patient saving and leaving them poverty stricken.

The newspapers and honest brokers call me and my pals on Bay Street—Toronto's equivalent to Wall Street—border bandits, stockateers, buccaneers, share pushers, hoodlums, and other unflattering names. We call ourselves stockees. There are about 200 of us still active in the business, working out of some 50 boiler rooms—that's the term used by laymen and writers to describe our high-pressure offices, but we call them joints or houses; it's a house when you're in it, and a joint when you're outside. Some very sodden, very callous guys operate around these stock joints, ranging from the millionaire manipulators at the top to the little alcoholic lush on the small-sales end, and we use every known method to peddle our moose-pasture shares; lying literature, fake names, fronts, greed pandering, psychological bullying and ordinary high-pressure salesmanship.

Don't confuse us with the honest brokers, who are in the vast majority, selling good Canadian stocks.

Last summer we hit our lowest ebb in years because the Ontario government tightened up its regulations and the market was slow, until September, even for good stocks. But for us the heat has been on in more ways than summer and we're soft-pedaling for a while. Last March the Canadian post office banned mail service to 27 broker-dealers, underwriters, and their employees, but the ban was lifted a few months later, after an outcry about dictatorial methods. And, despite what some newspapers say, the Ontario Securities Commission has been steadily driving the bad brokers off Bay Street. In the past 2 years 30 brokers have blown their tickets—lost their licenses—some have surrendered their licenses voluntarily and about 60 others have given up. Another 50 have been hauled into court. The Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington has also made it warm for us by getting the United States Post Office Department to ban mail deliveries to and from the stockees through fraud orders and cease-and-desist orders, but we've managed to get around that by changing firm names and addresses. Then this past summer and fall the Ontario Legislature's crime committee turned the spotlight on phony-stock operations with a new rash of headlines that didn't do our business any good. But the biggest scare of all is extradition. Canadian and United States authorities agreed in October to amend the

Canadian-United States Extradition Treaty so that we stockees could be taken across the border to stand trial. However, we hear the deal is still pretty vague, with plenty of loopholes and red tape, so wealthy stockees can fight it out first through the Canadian courts. This heat is nothing new to us, however, and we're just waiting now for a new gimmick to get back in the boiler rooms full blast.

People say, "Why aren't the stock crooks arrested for peddling moose pasture?" It isn't hard to find us. We operate right out in the open, in offices on Bay, Adelaide, Queen, Simcoe, King, and Richmond in downtown Toronto, and we're registered with the Ontario Commission. The answer is that it's hard to catch us in the act. We obey half the regulations, but we become outlaws on the other half—mostly the phone calls to mooches, when we make extravagant claims for the stock. The commission can't check easily on phone calls and, even when they do nab us and take our licenses away, we dodge in behind a front. That is, we get some salesman with a clean record to set up as a broker, and we work through him. Most of the big men are now using fronts, and as one front falls they set up another.

We can defraud people of their life's savings, but there was nothing in the Canadian criminal code to put us behind bars until it was amended last fall. Those stockees who went to jail were trading without a license, and that was their crime, not the stock they were selling.

As for the stock we handle, who can say whether it's moose pasture or not? All broker-dealers handle issues with big risks in them, and the commission doesn't attempt to pass on the merits of a property—not at least until complaints have poured in. They can't. If they did, they might have condemned Quemont, a copper-company long shot in the Noranda area that went from 18 cents to $18 in a year. Even Imperial Oil drilled 133 dry holes in western Canada over 30 years until they struck oil at Leduc, Alberta. Our moose pastures are often located near rich producers, and have a chance, too—about 1 in 10,000—and as long as natural resources are exploited by risk capital in a kind of gigantic lottery that makes the Irish Sweepstakes look like penny ante, the public can be invited to take a chance. But honest brokers give the buyer a true picture of the chance he's taking and don't high-pressure him; we tell a pack of lies about the property being a "sure thing" and trick him into buying fast. We know how hopeless the property is, but the commission can never be sure; they don't want to rule out all long chances, for fear of killing off all ventures.

Another thing I want to put straight right now is that my heart doesn't bleed for the mooch who buys this moose pasture. Why? Maybe I'm warped beyond hope, but I feel the same way as my stockee pals do about the stupid mark—we never call him a sucker; it makes us uneasy—who's trying to get money for nothing, big money. He's a chump who would gyp me if he could, and when I feed him the pitch—sales talk—on the phone, I can hear the greed quivering down the line. I can sell the same guy over and over again, even after he has lost money, like the little mooch in Seattle who told me he couldn't buy my stock until he had consulted a certain party. The party was a spiritualist who advised him not to buy. But a week later, when I phoned, it was all right with the spirit, and he sent me $800 in the mail. I kept using that spirit for three reloads—additional sales—on the Seattle man.

As for the poor widows we hear so much about, they don't deserve to get clipped, but most of the stockees I've worked with avoid them like the plague. It isn't just scruples, it's a saying in the joints that "nobody but a schnook takes off case money." Case money is money that might bring trouble. Widows' money is that way, and we don't like beefs. It takes only one good beef to blow your ticket, and we figure the value of a salesman's license at $1 million, even though it costs the salesman only $25 to take it out. No; the greed and stupidity of the average mooch make him fair prey in my book. If Americans are warned off from buying moose pasture by reading this article, then it's incidental. Personally, I believe the Yankee mark will fall for my pitch 5 minutes after he has put down this Post article, if I call him by phone from Toronto. I believe marks are that dumb.

[From the New York Post of April 21, 1955]

CANADA STOCK PROBE DUE

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now preparing a top-level investigation into Canadian stock swindlers—into the stock frauds which are rolling down from Montreal, Quebec, and other Canadian cities today at an increasingly horrifying rate and which are defrauding countless Americans out of millions of dollars every month.

Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, and a key member of the committee, is spearheading the probe, this reporter learned.

Julius Cahn, counsel for the committee, is already "exploring" the areas for investigation, was in New York a few days ago getting information from key financiers.

Are Canadian stock frauds widespread? Are little Americans all over our land being swindled out of their savings by ruthless "stockateers?" Is there need for action?

The answer to each question is a thumping "Yes."

Among the worst of the financial abuses existing today are the fraudulent promotions of Canadian oil and uranium stocks. The idea of making a "killing" in this type of stock has tremendous pull in this era. The suckers who think they alone are smart enough to turn a penny stock into a bonanza are legion.

The upsurge in stock prices to all-time peaks has sharpened the public's appetite for speculation, has made the little fellow an even easier target for a glib promoter.

Of course, there are lots of sound Canadian stocks, worthwhile speculations and investments. But there are lots of crooks operating too. Frequently, these form companies which have little more than a mailing address behind them. They print stock certificates, turn out lurid sales literature—and then the rackets begin.

From "boiler rooms" in Canadian cities flow torrents of tipsheets and telegrams to Americans on sucker lists. Hot prospects get long-distance phone calls from smooth-talking salesmen. In each instance the spiel is "put up a couple of hundred dollars on this 'sure' thing and make a fortune."

An informed estimate is Americans have been defrauded out of $3.5 billion by these swindlers just in the last decade—and the belief is the rackets are now flourishing more than ever.

"Rat-hole salesmen," is the blunt way Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, denounces them.

"Plain crooks," is the even blunter description of former New York State Attorney General Goldstein.

"Appalling" and "gruesome" are the adjectives applied by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, the world's largest stock house.

And none of this is exaggeration.

The whole thing is a miserable mess—made more miserable by the delicate issue of United States-Canadian political relationships.

Our Securities and Exchange Commission—our Government's sole financial policing agency—has been shockingly ineffectual in controlling the rackets. The SEC is now completing a confidential study of the situation but the odds are the study will remain confidential, will gather dust in the files, and the SEC will do nothing.

A few months ago the Province of Ontario canceled an agreement it has with the SEC to control the frauds and cooperation between the two countries is, to say the least, less than adequate.

If the Senate committee really digs into this, it'll find evidence that will make world-wide headlines. Just the publicity a probe would give to the 10,000-to-1 odds against the speculator in these stocks would be a valuable warning to potential suckers.

Go to it, Senators. Whatever you do will be a service to us.

[From the Portland Oregonian of May 2, 1955]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—WILEY PREPARES PROBE OF GET-RICH-QUICK MAIL

(By Sylvia Porter)

WASHINGTON.—To the hundreds of thousands in the United States who have received letters postmarked in Canada and containing tips to buy "penny" Canadian oil or uranium or gold stocks for a quick, certain profit: Send whatever details you have to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington. The Wisconsin Senator is preparing a full-dress probe into the mounting wave of stock frauds rolling down from Canada; as a potential sucker or one who already has been victimized by a Canadian stockateer, you have valuable information. In WILEY's words: "The most serious limitation on the public's protection is the unwillingness of most victims to admit to authorities that they have been swindled." To the Securities and Exchange Commission: You, the Government's sole financial policing agency, are about to receive a "no fooling" demand from the committee to get into action. Your record leaves much to be desired. WILEY is not just talking when he says: "Instead of making reports to gather dust in the files, the SEC should have used to the fullests its powers to protect the public."

To the State Department:

The Senators will urge you to "intensify your efforts to secure greater cooperation from Canadian authorities for joint action to control fraud." Much can be done—and you know it.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT COULD HELP

To the Post Office Department:

The committee also wants you to apply your powers more effectively. Although you have intercepted some mail at the border going to known swindlers, stamped the letters "fraudulent' 'and returned them to the senders, you could expand your activities. Instruct post offices to refuse money orders addressed to suspect firms; advise all post offices on the border to be more on guard.

To the New York Stock Exchange: WILEY gratefully accepts your pledge of fullest cooperation in this drive against stock frauds. In a sense, this investigation will be unique, for it will mark the first time Washington and Wall Street have been on the same side of a probe. And this is a milestone for the stock exchange, too, for this time, instead of being investigated, it will be helping in the investigation.

Since mid-April key staff members of the Foreign Relations Committee have been exploring the extent of Canadian stock swindles.

Now WILEY has learned enough to tell me. "The Canadian stock racketeer represents one of the most disgraceful chapters in the

history of confidence-game swindles—particularly so in an era when the idea is that the public be protected rather than the public be damned."

OTHER SENATORS GIVE ASSISTANCE

So the decision has been made to push the investigation.

An informal task force of Senators who are members of both the Foreign Relations and the Senate Banking Committees is being formed to decide the direction, speed, and management of the probe. In the force working with WILEY are two Democrats, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and one Republican, HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana.

WILEY is set to needle the agencies which can achieve something without additional legislation. The SEC is a target because it has been so ineffectual; the Post Office is in a major position to help; the State Department could do much if it had the courage to act.

A most significant development is the agreement between the Senators and the New York Stock Exchange to work together. The stock exchange has been deeply concerned about the Canadian frauds for a long time.

Of course, there are many worthwhile Canadian stocks, and most Canadian promoters and brokers are honest. But the crooks smear the reputations of all. The crooks must be controlled—and this is notice to them that the heat is about to go on.

And this is warning to you, too. Be on guard against the penny peddlers from Canada, ignore their get-rich-quick tips. And, if you already have been approached or victimized, speak up now; help protect the suckers to come.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 10, 1955]

URANIUM HOLDINGS IN A MOOSE PASTURE—CANADIAN "STOCKATEERS" GROW FAT PLUCKING UNITED STATES SUCKERS

(By Jack Steele)

Do you have a few dollars to invest in a Canadian moose pasture?

Perhaps you've read about someone making a cool million on a uranium strike in Canada. Or maybe it was in stock in an oil well or gold mine north of the border.

If so, you are perfect bait for what G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, calls Operation Sucker.

All you need now is to get a phone call from Montreal or Toronto from a smooth-talking promoter who offers you the chance of a lifetime.

Or to receive a brochure through the mail from one of these cities urging you to get in on the ground floor by buying stock in fly-by-night Uranium, Ltd.

VICTIMS GALORE

If you fall for this confidence game, at least there is one consolation—you'll have lots of company.

Thousands of Americans have been taken in by Operation Sucker in the last few years.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has been studying the situation for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Information he has collected indicates that these promoters may be milking American investors for as much as $50 million a year.

And he has received letters from scores of suckers who identify themselves as widows or aged pensioners.

NATIONAL DISGRACE

Senator WILEY calls the whole business a national disgrace.

He is turning over his files to the Senate Banking Committee, which is expected to investigate the Canadian stockateers later this year.

This investigation may show what is behind the racket. For instance:

Many companies consist only of so-called "boiler factories"—shabby rooms partitioned off into phone booths from which stock promoters make their "pitches."

The only capital behind them is a few dollars put up by the promoters to print "gilt edged" stock certificates.

A few promoters—to keep out of trouble with none-too-strict provincial officials—actually own a few acres of wasteland in the Canadian wilds. Hence the "moose pasture" label for their ventures.

SEC IS POWERLESS

The Securities and Exchange Commission, and the post office and State officials have tried to crack down on the "stockateers." But they can't do much as long as Canada permits them to operate with relative impunity.

The Senate thought it had solved the problem by ratifying a new treaty with Canada in 1953. It was to clear the way for phony stock promoters to be extradited to the United States and prosecuted for fraud.

But in the first test case brought under the treaty, a Montreal judge refused last December to extradite two such promoters.

Senator WILEY's files contain many letters which begin: "I admit I was a sucker" or "I am one of those who was taken in by those boiler factories."

They also include a brochure sent out by one Canadian promoter only a few weeks ago claiming that one uranium company's second drill hole was highly radioactive.

"The word is already starting to leak out," the brochure added. "Clients are advised to increase their holdings immediately this flash message is received. Telephone me in Toronto collect."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1955]

PHONY STOCK PROMOTERS—SHARP SALESMEN PUSH PENNY SHARES

(By Max Forester)

Spurred by the biggest boom ever in securities markets of both Canada and the United States, stock pushers are bilking Americans for millions of dollars. With old-time sales pitches, plus new elusive practices, sharp salesmen are cashing in on a flood of "penny" uranium stocks to the alarm of officials on both sides of the border. These officials, because of a legal snarl, seem powerless to stave off an impending international scandal.

In the midst of this deluge of cheap stocks, the system of controls worked out by officials in the United States and Canada to deal with sales in the United States of Canadian penny issues has virtually collapsed.

In the resulting confusion, sharp promoters both in the United States and Canada are:

1. Selling worthless stock certificates.
2. Sharing in exorbitant commissions.
3. Financing corporations with extraordinary and quasi-legal gimmicks.
4. Indulging in promotional techniques that, by comparison, make the bucket-shop operators of the late 1920's look like saints.

The sales of the vast majority of corporate stocks are proceeding under strict legal supervision with adherence to ethical practices.

But there is no restraint on the pushers of cheap securities in Toronto, Montreal, and Manitoba.

In the United States, also, some promoters and brokers are employing excessive promotional tactics in peddling the stock of exploratory uranium ventures.

Only the barest threads remain of the system of controls established in 1953 by the Securities and Exchange Commission. These made Canadian-based sellers of penny issues comply with SEC regulations regardless of whether they were dealing in securities of Canadian or United States origin.

Canadian authorities are refusing to enforce United States laws on their side of the border.

Even our own regulations appear to be inadequate in the light of practices used increasingly in promoting smaller stock issues for uranium exploration, development and production.

The fact is that stockateers are flourishing, both in Canada and the United States—flourishing to an extent to arouse such observers as G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas.

The main elements of the situation are these:

1. The regulatory breach created last November 17, when Ontario's Securities Commissioner O. E. Lennox declared he would no longer insist that the Province's brokers comply with SEC's rules, is still wide open. As a result, promoters in both Toronto and Montreal are stepping up their phone calls and mail solicitation to gullible investors in the United States.

Mr. Lennox's backdown was announced after he complained, probably not without justification, that since the SEC had made its regulation D procedures applicable to United States nationals located in Toronto, these operators were circumventing the Toronto commission's authority. One reason they did so was that Toronto rules were stricter than the SEC's.

2. Emboldened promoters in Montreal and those who moved there from Toronto to escape Mr. Lennox's rough regulations are flooding the United States with questionable issues.

3. Because of mounting criticism of promotional techniques used in floating United States uranium issues, the SEC has decided to tackle the domestic penny issues first, before trying to reestablish some reciprocal regulations with Canadian officials.

WARNS ON FRAUDS

4. On April 21, after New York's Attorney General Jacob K. Javits had sent a strongly worded memorandum to Governor Harriman and the heads of both houses of the legislature declaring that fraudulent-securities sales "are increasing at an alarming rate," an amendment to the Martin Act was passed, detailing a list of practices by promoters and securities dealers subject to prosecution as misdemeanors.

5. In Washington, the Fulbright committee is expected soon to turn to the question of domestic mining issues in a resumption of its hearings. In addition, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, is gathering data on the Canadian stock-promotion problem for presentation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The pitches are many and varied. Salesmen are offering "ground floor" purchases of securities. They make brash comparisons of new penny issues with other seasoned stocks that show market price rises of 1,000 percent or more. They make claims of "discoveries," and of "producing mines" and "oil wells," which upon investigation have often proved fraudulent.

There are even more obvious tactics being used increasingly in Montreal and Toronto and, to the same degree, in the United States. Officials say that only the cooperation of an alert public can successfully fight the pitchmen.

More difficult to deal with, because they work within the law, are the "insiders" who are devising cute methods of capitalizing their companies and distributing their stocks for their own enrichment.

Corporate officials have every right to participate as insiders in the financing of their companies so they can retain an active interest or control, but it is the manner of

their participation that frequently is objectionable.

It is becoming a rule for insiders to set aside increasingly big parts of initial stock issues for themselves.

For instance, a typical Canadian applicant for SEC registration of a uranium stock offering, recently proposed a setup under which the company would receive just over 50 percent of the entire amount to be raised from the initial offering.

Of $600,000 which would be raised, the company would get only $380,000 after sale by the firm's president of 350,000 shares at 1 mill a share to the New York underwriters; the sale of an additional 150,000 shares to the United States attorneys at the same price, and after paying underwriting commissions of $150,000 and underwriters' expenses of $70,000. This becomes a glamorous piece of business for the underwriters and the insiders.

Moreover, under terms of the registration, the underwriters and attorneys would be able to sell their stock at any time whatever, depending presumably on the most favorable market price.

FEW READ SMALL PRINT

All such information, incidentally, is in the registration statements, but unfortunately customers and stock purchasers of penny shares all to frequently do not trouble to read it.

The setting aside of stock for insiders is further embellished by the issuance of options and warrants to corporate officials and noncorporate participants. It is, to say the least, one of the costliest forms of raising money ever devised.

Such practices, the potential buyer of stocks should know, can leave the corporation with insufficient funds for normal development, and they dilute the stock purchased by the investing public.

In New York State, a newly strengthened law—the amendment to the Martin Act—is expected to help route out cases of stock fraud in this area. But regulation with more teeth is said to be needed urgently at national and international levels.

Observers like Mr. Funston and others in Wall Street are urging a quick end to the international legal impasse.

In a booming economy, which receives its impetus in part from investments in the development of natural resources, a major blow to investor confidence could have disastrous results, the Wall Streeters say.

The largest case on record here, as revealed in an injunction secured by former Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein against Gaspe Oil Ventures, Ltd., and Quebec Oil Development, Ltd., both of Montreal, was said to have bilked United States citizens of $5 million.

Attorney General Javits says he wouldn't dare estimate a full total of losses suffered by gullible investors.

But, he says, no one wants the losses to get any bigger.

COOPERATION WITH STATE SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS

(Address by Clarence H. Adams, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the SEC Liaison Committee Forum, National Association of Securities Administrators, Miami Beach, Fla., December 10, 1953)

CANADIAN PROBLEMS: REGULATION D AND THE REGISTRATION OF CANADIAN BROKER-DEALERS

Over the past 15 years or so, the Commission has been gravely concerned over the activities of a group of Canadian stock promoters who were selling securities to residents of the United States in open and willful defiance of our laws. In all fairness, I should like to note that the great majority, if not all, of such promotions originated in Toronto and the Province of Ontario and were conducted by a numerically small group which in no way was representative of the vast number of persons engaged in the securities business in Canada. Nevertheless, the activities of this group resulted in extremely large dollar amount losses to United States investors.

Let me take a few minutes to review briefly the background of the Canadian situation as it became known, the measures that were taken to counteract it, the recent developments in the relationship between the two countries in the field of securities regulation, and their significance.

As you know, prior to early 1953 no attempt was made on the part of the issuers, the promoters, or the distributors of the highly speculative Canadian securities to comply with the requirement for registration. Neither were the underwriters bothering to comply with the requirement that persons conducting a securities business in this country register as brokers and dealers. To further aggravate the situation, we discovered, in many cases where an investigation was conducted, that gross misrepresentations were being made in connection with the offering and sale of these securities. In our view, the activities of this fringe group of operators, who had chosen to do business in this country but considered themselves as somehow immune from the requirements of United States law, was characterized in large measure by plain and unvarnished fraud. The real problem, as we saw it, was not one relating to compliance with the difficult registration laws of another jurisdiction, but rather revolved about fraudulent conduct such as was interdicted by the laws of both Canada and the United States and which was proscribed by the common moral precepts of both nations.

The Commission and, I think you will agree, the various State securities commissions were virtually powerless to cope with the problem in any realistic manner, in large measure, I believe, because of the absence of effective cooperation from Canadian regulatory and enforcement officials. You in the States issued many cease and desist orders. In many cases, the Post Office Department issued fictitious and fraud orders, on information supplied by the Commission, which permitted the interception of mail addressed to the subjects. But ways to circumvent and thwart the effect of the postal orders were devised. The violators were quick to learn that our postal employees were only authorized to stop mail sent to the specific person named in the order at the address stated therein. It was not long before persons subject to postal fictitious and fraud orders were supplying investors with return envelopes which did not contain their names, but rather were addressed to "Accounts Department" or "Statistical Department" or to different suite numbers or to different street addresses. As a result of these subterfuges, the postal authorities in many cases had to issue order after order covering the same person and promotion. The Commission was equally powerless to stop this illegal traffic in securities across the border by means of its power to obtain injunctions. And, for all practical purposes, the statutory right of an investor to sue to recover losses in the purchase of Canadian securities which had been fraudulently represented was illusory, to say the least.

In some of the more flagrant cases of fraud, indictments, many of which were secret, were obtained. But in all except one or two cases, the defendants remained secure beyond the border and out of reach of our process, the Canadian courts having determined in an early case that our Federal indictment did not fall within the purview of the then existing extradition treaty.

As far back as 1941 the Commission had recognized this weakness in our enforcement structure and had initiated efforts to secure a new treaty with Canada which would permit the extradition of persons indicted on charges of having committed fraud in connection with securities transactions. However, because of various objections which were raised in Canada—largely, I think, because of artificially created misconceptions as to our laws, our aims, and our objectives, which clouded the issues beyond all recognition—it was not until last year that an amended extradition treaty covering securities frauds was signed by the Governments of the United States and Canada, after ratification by our Senate and the Canadian Parliament. The treaty amendment became effective July 11, 1952. Although we at the Commission labored long and hard for the adoption of this amendment, I would like to state that this major step could not have been accomplished except with the sponsorship and active cooperation of responsible officials and business leaders in Canada.

The treaty amendment is an exceedingly simple document. It does no more than make extraditable the sort of conduct that could be prosecuted in this country under the fraud provisions of the Securities Act and Mail Fraud Statute, and in Canada under various provisions of the Criminal Code including their own mail fraud law.

In the light of this development, the Commission was in a position to give favorable consideration to long-standing demands on the part of Canadians that their offerings of securities in this country in amounts not exceeding $300,000 should be entitled to the same exemption from registration as applied to domestic securities. After numerous conferences with Canadian officials and broker-dealer associations, the Commission, on March 6, 1953, adopted regulation D under the Securities Act of 1933.

In brief, regulation D grants to Canadian issuers the conditional exemption from registration they had long sought. I would like to note that rule 507 of the regulation requires the issuer, each of its officers and directors, and each underwriter of securities offered for sale in this country pursuant to the conditional exemption, to file a written irrevocable consent and power of attorney which authorized the commencement of any civil actions or suits arising out of any offering made or purporting to be made under the regulation or any purchase or sale of any security in connection therewith, by the service of process upon the Commission. By the terms of this consent, the Commission is authorized to receive service of all papers in such litigation and, in turn, is required to forward copies to the appropriate persons by registered mail. Rule 507, we think, gives full effect to the civil liability provisions of the Securities Act. In this connection, I should like to note that the Commission, on April 22, 1953, adopted a more general rule which requires the filing of written consents to service of process by nonresident brokers and dealers and nonresident general partners and managing agents of brokers and dealers, for purposes of civil suits or other actions arising out of the conduct of a broker-dealer business in this country and founded upon any one or more of the several specified laws administered by the Commission.

To date, 24 filings pursuant to regulation D have been made by or on behalf of Canadian issuers. Fifteen filings have been cleared after careful examination by the Commission's staff, and the offerings have commenced. One filing is in the process of being cleared, and one was withdrawn by the issuer before any action was taken. Seven filings are currently pending, primarily because additional information has been requested by the staff of the Commission.

Of the 24 filings to date under regulation D, there has been none relating to other than extractive industries. In this connection, 18 have been mining ventures, the remainder oil and gas. Generally the companies have been recently organized with a large percentage of the authorized shares

being issued to promoters in exchange for properties which cost them little or nothing. The offerings usually consist of the maximum amount of $300,000 permitted by the regulation and, with one exception, are offered on a best efforts basis by underwriters or through officers, directors, and employees of the issuer. The underwriting commission is in the neighborhood of 25 percent plus a significant amount for additional selling expenses with stock options from either the issuer or promoter for little or no consideration.

Concerning offerings qualified under the securities laws of thhe Province of Ontario in which there were underwriters, no options were granted except in one instance, and in that case the options were canceled at the request of the Canadian authorities. It is interesting to note in this connection that of the seven issues underwritten by Americans, all but one provided for options. Since the offerings usually are for the maximum permitted by the regulations, a problem arises in accounting for the proceeds. In most mining cases, for example, it is apparent that lesser financing would meet forseeable needs of exploration that would decide whether any further work was warranted. As you may surmise, limited exploratory work is often sufficient to discourage further work on a mining property. The reason for the seemingly excessive amount of the offerings in many cases is not fully apparent. One thought that occurs to me which may bear looking into is that the size of the offering may be due to insistence by the underwriter for the full amount permissible under regulation D. While we cannot control the amount of offerings under the regulation, we are faced with the problem of getting proper disclosure with respect to the use of proceeds.

A substantial number of the mining filings dealt with uranium properties which have replaced the gold mines of yesteryear in sales appeal. All were in the exploratory stage with no known bodies of commercial ore. The variety of problems peculiar to mining issues that arise are numerous. It is not unusual to have a mining venture portrayed in a more favorable light than the facts justify. In one such case the ore structure was described as being almost a mile long and several hundred feet in width. It was implied that tests of ore values by owners of neighboring properties into which the ore structure extended were applicable to the issuer's ore. These tests were reported as showing values of from $200 to $800 per ton of crude ore which, if accurate and applicable, would indeed be indicative of a mountain of wealth. Needless to say, we pointed out the fallacy of relying on the neighbor's test of values and according to our procedure called for supporting data in substantiation of any ore claims.

We have seen other offering circulars where much emphasis is placed on the properties of others with no information being given as to what significance, if any, these properties have on the issuer. Often these properties are miles away. Furthermore, in many cases great emphasis is placed on the fact that the property is owned by a well-known mining company without any indication that it is not the company's principal and well-known property, but is a mere prospect with no known ore bodies.

Problems incident to the filings by oil and gas companies generally relate to inadequate disclosure concerning their oil and gas reserves and the market value of the securities to be offered. One case will serve to illustrate the point. In the course of our examination of the filing, there appeared to be a discrepancy between the reported oil reserves and the amount of depletion taken in the financial statements included in the offering circular. After a discussion with the company's Canadian accountants, it was determined that the figure for the oil reserves should be 73,000 barrels rather than the 700,000 barrels used as the basis for depletion, resulting in an operating deficit for the period in place of the profit originally shown. This position was taken by the Canadian accountants despite the protests of management who insisted that depletion should be calculated upon the initial estimates of oil reserves even though such estimates were clearly out of proportion to actual oil production. In the same case, the offering circular was revised to show on the facing page that the offering price was in excess of the recent price range of the stock on the Calgary Stock Exchange.

All sales literature used in connection with the offerings is required to be filed with the notification. Copies of the literature first received were replete with false and extravagant claims and catch phrases such as "ground floor opportunities," "join with us now before the cream is taken off of the top of the bottle." As a result of our processing of the material and requesting issuers to remove inaccurate and misleading statements, there has been a noticeable improvement in the quality of sales literature used.

We feel that the adoption of the amendment to the extradition treaty and the promulgation of regulation D were significant steps toward the eventual elimination of illicit securities traffic across the border. The treaty amendment presents an opportunity for truly effective action since it permits rendition in cases where fraud within the meaning of our Securities Act and Mail Fraud Statute and the Canadian Criminal Code, which I think cover the conduct engaged in by securities swindlers, is charged. Furthermore, it has had a considerable deterrent effect. Regulation D is adapted to the circumstances of small Canadian enterprises and will facilitate venture capital financing by such companies. At the same time, it insures that the investor will be furnished with such basic information as will indicate to him the essential characteristics of the enterprise in which he is being asked to invest his funds.

We, of course, do not conceive the treaty and regulation D, standing alone, to be a panacea. If our investors are to be given maximum protection, and if honest business in both countries is to reap the benefits of the achievements that have been made, the treaty and regulation D must be implemented by active cooperation on the part of Canadian and United States securities regulators. This cannot be a one-way street. There must be cooperation on both sides of the border for a common cause. I think that such cooperation exists in fact today.

During the past year or so, the Ontario Securities Commission, under the able administration of its chairman, O. E. Lennox, has weeded out and canceled the registration of a large number of repeated offenders. The number of broker-dealer registrants has been reduced from 212 to approximately 145. Similar action has been taken by the Broker-Dealers' Association of Ontario.

On March 26, 1953, the Ontario Securities Commission adopted a statement of policy that "any registrants who violate the United States securities laws are not only prejudicing the position of others, but are placing their own registration in jeopardy." It recognized the adoption of the regulation D exemption for Canadian securities and states that "it is not considered to be in the public interest, nor in the interests of those directly concerned, to permit an offering of securities to be made from Ontario in violation of the United States securities laws while the practical merits of regulation D are being tested. The statement constituted "a special warning to security issuers who have shown a tendency to ignore policies which are generally accepted by organized groups."

On the same date, the Broker-Dealers' Association of Ontario issued a notice to members suggesting that those of its members who engage in the securities business in the United States should register as broker-dealers with the SEC. The notice specified that "provided the members of the association who make application without unreasonable delay are registered with the SEC, any violation by members of United States Federal security laws through the sale of securities directly from Ontario into the United States shall constitute 'unethical conduct' pursuant to the regulations made under the Broker-Dealers Act, 1947."

We think it highly significant and gratifying that the Ontario Commission and the Broker-Dealers' Association have canceled or suspended several registrations on the basis of information supplied by us which indicated a violation of our statutes and noncompliance with their respective notices.

As a result of the foregoing, numerous Canadian firms have filed with us applications for broker-dealer registration. These registrations themselves add to investor protection, for they tend to facilitate the commission's surveillance of the activities of the firms in question. The filings have required extensive examination by the commission's staff of any facts, particularly evidence of fraudulent practices in the sale of securities in this country, which should dictate the denial of registration to a particular applicant as necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

Of the 54 such applications filed since the first of the year, 32 have become effective. One registration has since been withdrawn. With respect to 17 of these applications, proceedings have been instituted by the commission for the purpose of determining whether registration should be denied; and in 4 of these cases, the applications were subsequently withdrawn. One other application was withdrawn after denial proceedings had been authorized by the commission but before the order had been issued. The remaining three applications are still being processed by the commission's staff.

It seems appropriate to state here that proceedings on the question of denial of registration have been ordered in cases where it was felt that fraud or fraudulent practices could be established by competent evidence. This action, of course, does not reflect any prejudgment of the issues by the commission. Hearings for the purpose of taking evidence have been scheduled. The respective applicants will be afforded full opportunity to be heard, to be represented by counsel of their own choosing, to present evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, and otherwise to defend their right to registration.

I can report to you that, as a result of these developments, including particularly the splendid cooperation of Mr. Lennox and his associates on the Ontario Securities Commission, there has been a virtual cessation of illegal and fraudulent stock promotions from Toronto. It is clear too that there has been an equalization of the regulatory process as between domestic broker-dealer firms and those which operate from across the border, with a corresponding contribution to the objective of investor protection under the securities laws. And there has been afforded to small Canadian issuers the opportunity to offer their securities for sale in this country under virtually the same conditions as apply to domestic securities, thereby facilitating venture capital financing by Canadian enterprises, and, at the same time, affording to American investors a measure of protection which has long been denied to them.

MEETING OF INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to a very important gathering which will take place from May 15 to 21,

in Tokyo, Japan. I refer to the Tokyo Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce. It is expected that more than 1,000 businessmen from 40 or more countries, as well as representatives of 50 international organizations, will attend the sessions.

As senior Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, it is my pleasure to convey warmest personal greetings to the businessmen who will gather there from the far corners of the world. We hope their discussions will be fruitful, and that out of this congress, as out of previous such gatherings, will come a further stimulus to the expansion of world trade and the strengthening of the system of private enterprise everywhere.

His Excellency, Ichiro Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan, will welcome the delegates, including the 100 delegates of our own country, headed by chairman of the United States council, Warren Lee Pierson.

It is through meetings such as this that the indispensable economic pillar of free-world foreign relations is strengthened. Here is wishing the very best of success for the Tokyo congress of the international chamber.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR WILLIAMS, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the great State of Michigan, designating May 10, 1955, as Rumanian Independence Day, to commemorate Rumanian independence from Turkey, achieved on May 10, 1881. The eminent Governor of Michigan urges all Americans to aid persons newly arrived in the United States, to the end that not only the oppressed Rumanian immigrantts be helped to a measure of security, but that all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain may have a measure of encouragement to sustain their desire for freedom.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing.

For the people of Rumania, whose country since 1944 has been under Soviet domination, the 10th day of May has a threefold significance. On that day in 1866, Prince Carol, later to become King Carol I, arrived in Rumania and the intention to create a Rumanian kingdom was proclaimed. On the same day in 1877, the Rumanian principality proclaimed its independence from the suzerainty of Turkey, and on May 10, 1881, the principality of Rumania was proclaimed a kingdom.

In 1948, Rumania's Communist oppressors, determined to suppress all patriotic demonstrations, declared that May 10, which had for many years been celebrated as Rumanian Independence Day, should be replaced as a holiday by May 9, the day of Russia's final victory over Germany.

As Rumanians throughout the world, ignoring this substitute observance, continue to celebrate their traditional day of independence, it is most fitting that all of us in Michigan join with our fellow citizens of Rumanian descent in celebrating their motherland's great holiday.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 10, 1955, as Rumanian Independence Day in Michigan, and urge that on that day, and the days that follow, all our people, whatever their racial heritage, support the program of the Rumanian-American National Committee designed to aid persons newly arrived in the United States to find employment and establish homes, and the drive for funds with which to further expansion of the Voice of America, which brings hope and encouragement not only to the people of Rumania but to all the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 14th day of April 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

[SEAL] G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in 1950 the National Security Resources Board, at that time under the able chairmanship of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], drew up plans for the establishment of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. This program has been jointly administered by the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce. The plan provides for the voluntary allocation by the airlines of commercial airliners for a reserve fleet for military use in the event of a national emergency. To date some 317 four-engine aircraft having a market value in excess of $400 million, together with crews, now stand in readiness for military use in case of an emergency. The cost to the Government and to the taxpayer for this reserve fleet has been exactly nothing. It is one of the outstanding examples of industry's ability and willingness to offer its facilities and personnel for the defense of the Nation. The CRAF program has always had my personal endorsement.

I am sure—and I feel confident that other Senators share my concern—that everything within our power should be done to provide the maximum amount of airlift that would be required in the event of a national emergency. The problem which all of us have is to find how this may best be accomplished without upsetting the civilian economy.

Recently there has come to my attention a proposal of the Navy Department which apparently has as its intent increasing the current commercial airlifts, thus making it potentially available in the event of an emergency. I commend the Navy for their interest in a problem which we must all try to solve.

The Navy's proposal, as I understand it, would be to lease Navy-owned transport-type aircraft to commercial operators for the limited purpose of transporting commercial air cargo within the United States. The lease rentals would be established so that over a 5-year period the Government would recoup its capital investment in the equipment and the lease terms would require that the aircraft either be maintained by the operator commensurate with Navy standards or that the Navy be reimbursed for the necessary maintenance work it would perform. Such a plan, the Navy believes, would stimulate increases in the volume of commercial air freight, thus providing an incentive to the commercial carriers to buy more all-cargo type equipment, thus again increasing the potential airlift available in the event of a national emergency.

Again, I commend the Navy for its interest in the problem, but in all fairness I feel obliged to tell my colleagues that in my judgment this is a very complex subject, and one which must be looked at most carefully.

For example, the Navy's proposal, if it is to accomplish its purpose, must be bottomed on the premise that there is presently a substantial shortage of commercial air freight lift. I am informed that no such shortage of lift presently exists. To the contrary, I am told that the present unused capacity on the commercial airlines would enable them to carry twice the amount of air freight they are presently carrying. This then raises the following question in my mind: Is it likely that commercial operators will wish to lease airplanes for all-cargo operations and fly them around the country empty or half-empty? I doubt whether the commercial operators would do this unless there were some understanding that the Government would underwrite cost. I certainly am not prepared to recommend to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee that the Government should subsidize the commercial air-freight business, particularly when it appears that the desired aim is being reached, without any costs to the Government, through the CRAF program. I may add that this subsidy danger is not merely a fanciful fear. The air transport business is a very cyclical one, and that is particularly true of those segments of it, such as air cargo, which are the least well established. At the present time air transportation is enjoying a considerable degree of prosperity, but there is certainly no guarantee that it will continue. I am sure some of my colleagues remember that while the rest of the country was booming in 1946–47–48, the airlines were in a period of tremendous economic adversity. I certainly hope nothing like this will happen to this industry again, but Congress cannot appropriate funds without recognizing such a possibility and the financial difficulties which it would bring to an over-expanded air-cargo operation.

Another point which I should like to make is that I do not see how the Navy could rightly participate in such a venture at this time. It is my understanding that under existing statutes the only basis on which the Navy could make airplanes available to commercial operators would be a finding by the Navy Department that such aircraft were surplus to the Navy's needs, yet our Committee on Appropriations has received a number of requests since World War II from the Navy Department for additional transport aircraft, and will be taking delivery of more of such planes in 1956.

Moreover, if the Navy Department's proposal were adopted we have no way of knowing how many of its airplanes might

ultimately find their way into the commercial airline fleet. Is the Navy Department's proposal another merchant marine of the air suggestion? If so, I remind my colleagues that this question was considered at length by the Congress and by the Government agencies only a few short years ago, and the Congress did not see fit to place its seal of approval on such a program. If my memory serves me correctly, every Government agency, including the Navy Department, was in agreement that such a program was undesirable. Certainly, such a program is contrary to the aims of the present Republican administration on at least two counts: First, it would represent Government being in competition with private enterprise; and second, it would open the door to wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

I raise these questions on the floor not because I am opposed to any plan which would have the ultimate effect of increasing the airlift available to the Military Establishment in the event of an emergency; to the contrary, I know we do not have enough such lift available today and I will endorse any reasonable proposal to increase such lift. The problem is, if I may quote from the Hoover Commission report to the Congress of March 1955—

> To build a military air transport service capable of meeting all air transport needs in wartime would involve enormous sums. The capital costs of new transport aircraft are about the same for military or civil use. Moreover, the great economy of the civil air fleet and their trained personnel lies in productive peacetime use while serving as an immediately available reserve for emergencies.

Here is an idea which comes quickly to my mind as a possible answer.

If it is correct as the Navy Department asserts that the Military Establishment has a need for greater numbers of air cargo airplanes and for modern airplanes in the commercial air fleet to be available to the military in the event of emergency; and if it is correct, as the Navy Department asserts, that the military has a substantial number of transport type airplanes, which for a variety of reasons are not now being used to the fullest extent possible; and finally, if the commercial carriers have need for additional commercial airlift of all types now, but assert that they have to wait from 12 to 36 months for delivery of any aircraft which they order because of the priority which military production carries over commercial production, it would seem logical to try to arrive at some adjustment of the military priority on the production line so that the commercial carriers could purchase new airplanes without the long lead time wait. If such aircraft were then assigned to the CRAF program and subject to recall on short notice in the event of an emergency, it would appear that the problem of both parties could be solved.

As I have said, this proposal comes quickly to mind, and I am sure that this suggestion, like the Navy Department's basic proposal, should not be entered upon without a very careful investigation. We are all agreed upon the desirability of the objective, but we must be most careful that the means leading to meet the objective do not involve wasteful expenditures of Government funds and do not impair programs which have proven successful such as the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business to be transacted? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED ATOMIC ENERGY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TURKEY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Friday, May 6, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy received a proposed agreement for cooperation between the United States and Turkey in the field of peacetime use of atomic energy. Under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement must remain before the joint committee for 30 days.

So that Members of Congress and the public may be apprised of the terms of the proposed agreement, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the proposed agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

PREAMBLE

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas there is well advanced the design and development of several types of research reactors (as defined in article X of this agreement); and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Turkish Republic desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, represented by the United States Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), desires to assist the Government of the Turkish Republic in such a program;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Subject to the limitations of article V, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

A. Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

B. He..lth and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

C. The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

ARTICLE II

A. The Commission will lease to the Government of the Turkish Republic uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the opeartion of research reactors which the Government of the Turkish Republic, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of the Turkish Republic uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conconditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of the Turkish Republic may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of the Turkish Republic shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of the Turkish Republic to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission into the custody of the Government of the Turkish Republic shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, unless the Commission shall specify that a greater quantity of such material may be transferred under this agreement to the Government of the Turkish Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction.

C. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commisison and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

D. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be on such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VI and VII.

ARTICLE III

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the Turkish Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Turkey. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE IV

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Turkey may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the

other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article I, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to, and perform services for, the Government of the Turkish Republic and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of the Turkish Republic to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to: (A) Limitations in article V; (B) applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Turkish Republic.

ARTICLE V

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of the Turkish Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE VI

A. The Government of the Turkish Republic agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 leased from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

B. The Government of the Turkish Republic agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States of America under this agreement by the Government of the Turkish Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of the Turkish Republic decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

C. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement the Government of the Turkish Republic agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of the Turkish Republic will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

ARTICLE VII. GUARANTIES PRESCRIBED BY THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The Government of the Turkish Republic guarantees that—

A. Safeguards provided in article VI shall be maintained.

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Turkish Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Turkish Republic except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE VIII

This agreement shall enter into force on ------(a calendar date) and remain in force until-------- (a date 10 years later), inclusively, and shall be subject to renewal as may be mutually agreed.

At the expiration of this agreement or any extension thereof the Government of the Turkish Republic shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel material leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of the Turkish Republic, and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

ARTICLE IX

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Turkey.

ARTICLE X

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

B. "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus, and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

C. "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

D. The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at ——— in duplicate this ——— day of ———, 1955.

For the Government of the United States of America:

GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs.

MAY 3, 1955.

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

MAY 3, 1955.

For the Government of the Turkish Republic:

MELIH ESENBEL,
Deputy Secretary General of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

MAY 3, 1955.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter dated May 6, 1955, sent by W. F. Libby, Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; a copy of a letter, dated May 3, 1955, from Acting Chairman Libby to President Eisenhower; and a copy of a letter, dated May 3, 1955, from President Eisenhower to Mr. Libby.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter (1) proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Turkish Republic; (2) letter dated May 3, 1955, from the Commission to the President recommending his approval of the proposed agreement; (3) letter dated May 3, 1955, from the President to the Commission approving the proposed agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

As we informed the President in our letter of May 3, "the proposed agreement calls for cooperation with respect to the design, construction and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. Under the agreement Turkey, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Turkey. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Turkey up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235." This amount of special nuclear material is not important from the military point of view and the limitation expressed will restrict the Turkish Government in determining the type of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor. We understand that as an initial step, Turkey is interested in a water-boiler research reactor similar to that located at North Carolina State College in Raleigh, N. C. This type reactor is, of course, only one of several types of unclassified research reactors which could be constructed under the agreement.

Article VI of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Turkey with respect to safeguarding the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission, and article VII contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act.

The State Department and the Commission are presently holding discussions with representatives of several other countries for agreements for cooperation under section 123. In general, the form and substance of the proposed agreement with Turkey is being followed in these negotiations. The Commission recognizes, of course, that subsequent agreements restricted to unclassified research reactors may differ in some minor details but it is intended that the major provisions, particularly those which relate to the exchange of information and the leasing of special nuclear material, will be similar to those in the proposed agreement with Turkey.

It is the judgment of the Commission that the proposed agreement is a significant and important implementation of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the Turkish Republic and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution after the proposed agreement has been placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in accordance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Turkey, in accordance with the policy which you have established. The Government of the Turkish Republic has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act and which are recorded in the proposed agreement.

The proposed agreement calls for cooperation with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Under the agreement Turkey, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Turkey. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Turkey up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235.

The agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation between the United States and Turkey will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly the production of power from atomic energy in Turkey.

Respectfully yours,
W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 3, 1955.

The Honorable WILLARD F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman,
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LIBBY: Under date of May 3, 1955, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Turkish Republic and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of the Turkish Republic desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to Turkey special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby (1) approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Turkish Republic concerning the civil uses of atomic energy; (2) determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and (3) authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State after the proposed agreement has been submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the United States Congress and a period of 30 days has elapsed while Congress is in session.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Turkey, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly the production of power in Turkey.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in a short time, and with all due expedition, the Subcommittee on International Agreements of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold hearings on the proposed agreement.

COMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, last Friday it was my pleasure, as a member of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, to visit and inspect that installation at New London, Conn.

I should like to note the deep satisfaction and sense of pride which that visit afforded me and my colleagues from the House of Representatives.

Prior to the annual meeting of the board we had occasion to review the corps of cadets and to inspect the physical facilities of the Academy.

During the day we interviewed several of the cadets and had special interviews with the cadet battalion officers.

I should like to say at this time that I was most favorably impressed wih the character and the caliber of the young men at the Coast Guard Academy as well as the high sense of duty reflected by the staff and faculty and the corps of cadets.

I should like also to commend publicly Vice Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, commandant of the Coast Guard; Rear Adm. Raymond J. Mauerman, superintendent of the Academy; the officers and men of the permanent party at the installation; and the corps of cadets.

It is my conviction that the United States Coast Guard Academy is continuing to perform its mission in the highest traditions of the United States Coast Guard.

WATER RESOURCE AND POWER DEVELOPMENT POLICIES OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the water resource and power development policies of the Eisenhower administration have been predicated on an idea which they euphemistically refer to as partnership. Ordinarily, this term implies a somewhat equal division of benefits between the participants. Yet, as time goes on, it becomes more obvious that the Eisenhower administration's partnership program means less and less for the American people, and more and more for private utility companies.

So far as our Nation's power consumers are concerned, the administration's partnership scheme is the label for an empty package. Fortunately, enlightened elements of the press are helping to alert the public to the dangers of the program. The spotlight of publicity is being focused on the inadequate partnership and on the special interests who shape its development through the present administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a portion of a broadcast by Mr. Edward P. Morgan over American Broadcasting Co. on May 5, 1955, and 2 editorials, 1 from the Sacramento Bee, of April 30, 1955, and another from the East Oregonian of April 26, 1955, all of which deal with the adverse effects of the administration's partnership on the public's power resources.

There being no objection, the portion of a broadcast by Mr. Edward P. Morgan and the two editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN'S BROADCAST, MAY 5, 1955,
AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

What may develop into a major investigation of the Eisenhower administration's electric power policies will open next Tuesday in Washington. The House Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources, headed by Representative CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, will inquire into certain power activites of the Department of the Interior.

Interior Secretary McKay's staff, this reporter learns, has already registered a sharply sensitive reaction in advance of the public hearings. On April 21, McKay's administrative assistant secretary, D. Otis Beasley, issued an interoffice memo listing strict good conduct requirements for employees in any contacts with committee investigators. The inquiry's staff director, Arthur Perlman, contends this was an attempt to gag sources within the Department and deny full access to data and documents.

One supposedly key batch of documents, according to a responsible source, has not yet been found, or at least produced.

Tuesday's hearings will center on the question of how and why the Department of the Interior eliminated regulations requiring private utilities, in certain instances, to handle Federal power over their lines.

Under the law, certain public agencies such as municipalities and REA cooperatives have preference rights on power produced at a Federal dam. A problem is how to get the power to them. The Government has built transmission lines, but when it tried to get private utilities to carry this power via the unused capacities of their lines, there was resistance. Then the Government discovered a weapon. In the West particularly, powerlines travel hardly any distance before they cross public lands. Before it would grant a permit to cross these lands, the Gov-

ernment simply required the power companies to agree to carry this preference electricity to municipalities and elsewhere up to the private lines' unused capacity, at a fair rate. The power companies tied up this regulation for 3 years by fighting it in the courts, but in November 1952, the Supreme Court upheld the Government. Less than 2 years later, on August 11, 1954, Secretary McKay's Department nullified the whole procedure, however, by simply amending the regulations and deleting the requirements which the Supreme Court action had validated.

In announcing Tuesday's investigation, Chairman DAWSON of the House Government Operations Committee, charged that the changes were designed to "cripple the public power program throughout the West by preventing the Government from delivering low-cost power." DAWSON, Democrat of Illinois, created the Chudoff subcommittee.

DAWSON stated that the subcommittee had already determined that the new regulations were submitted by attorneys of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co.—P. G. & E.—and other private utilities and were adopted verbatim by the Interior Department.

Day before yesterday in Sacramento, Calif., a former official of the Interior Department, Engineer Ralph Tudor, made a speech at a sectional meeting of the American Society of Civil Engineers. According to the Daily Sacramento Bee, Tudor said the Federal Government should not attempt to develop the power phases of the proposed Trinity River project in California if it can make more profit by selling the "falling water" to private industry. P. G. & E. is in the thick of the fight to get Trinity River power rights. It was Ralph Tudor, while he was with Interior, who signed the amendment nullifying the requirements which the House subcommittee is about to investigate—an amendment whose language, the subcommittee maintains, was suggested by P. G. & E.

[From the Sacramento Bee of April 30, 1955]

TRINITY DEAL WOULD BE GOOD FOR PGE, NOT US

The so-called partnership on the Trinity River, whereby the Federal Government would build the dam, tunnels, etc., and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the powerhouse, would be a dandy deal for the utility but hardly for the people of the United States.

This was brought out amply at the hearings recently held in Washington, D. C., before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

In the first place the dam and necessary tunnels would be built with low interest rate Government money. This would be a windfall for the company's stockholders amounting to millions of dollars over what comparable works would cost were they built by the utility with borrowed money or from the sale of stock.

But even with this highly favorable arrangement—favorable to the company, that is—the price offered by the PGE for the falling water would be substantially short of what the Government would require to amortize its investment.

The utility offered $3,500,000 a year. To return to the Federal Treasury its actual cost, Federal reclamation experts estimate, the figure would have to be $4,150,000 annually.

Over the 50-year payoff period, this would represent a loss to the Government of more than $32 million.

Moreover, the reclamation witnesses completely punctured the company's claim that the misnamed partnership would return an additional $36 million to the Government from power production.

As a matter of fact, the cost of enlarging the tunnels under the PGE proposal would be $42 million.

On this phase of the deal alone the Government would stand to lose another $6 million.

It is not desirable that the low cost Government credit be extended to the privately owned utility for the latter's profit even if the Treasury would break even.

But it becomes totally preposterous in the face of testimony that the Government actually would lose, out of pocket, millions of dollars on the so-called partnership arrangement.

Even more important is the need for Government generated power from Trinity to operate the Government's pumps to lift the water into the San Luis Reservoir to irrigate lands in the San Joaquin Valley.

If the Government surrendered the power-generating rights on the Trinity it would have to buy the power from a privately owned utility to operate the San Luis pumps.

And what would the rate be? The PGE proposal includes no specific offer on this. But it would be high enough for the company to make an additional profit. Of that the public may be sure.

And so the Government, and that is the people, stands to lose at both ends of the line.

[From the Pendleton East Oregonian of April 26, 1955]

A SHOWDOWN ON PARTNERSHIP

Representative SAM COON'S bill that provides for partnership construction of John Day Dam undoubtedly will bring us to a showdown in the Northwest on the Eisenhower administration's partnership program.

The Federal Government, according to Representative COON'S explanation, would build and own John Day Dam. Three private utilities (Pacific Power & Light, Portland General Electric and Washington Water Power) have offered to put up $273 million of the total estimated cost of $310 million. The bill permits other local agencies, such as PUD's, REA's and municipal systems to participate.

In return for their investments in John Day the utilities would get its power output for at least 50 years. The Federal Government's investment of some $37 million would cover such nonreimbursable benefits as navigation and flood control.

Several newspapers, in their discussions of the Coon legislation, have said, in effect, "We are not enthusiastic about the partnership proposal for regional development of water resources, but—." They then ask the question, "If not in this way, how will the region get the hydroelectric power it must have to continue its present rate of expansion?"

Representative COON'S bill will demand an answer to that question.

It seems entirely reasonable to us that the Federal Government's investment in dams in the Columbia basin should be protected by the Government building John Day, one of the key structures in the chain. John Day generators will have an installed capacity of 1,105,000 kilowatts, much of their output made possible because of upstream dams built by the Federal Government.

The Eisenhower administration proposes to spend in excess of $1 billion in the upper Colorado power-irrigation development project. Yet, we are told that the Federal Government cannot put up the necessary funds to finish a job it has started on the Columbia River, a key and integral part of which is John Day Dam.

A sound case can be made for construction of dams in the Northwest by the Federal Government strictly from a financial standpoint. The dams Uncle Sam has built are returning principal and interest ahead of schedule. Yet, the Bureau of the Budget has said that Federal appropriations for the power producing feature of additional dams in the Northwest are an expense that cannot be justified.

We must recognize this attitude as a formidable roadblock. And we must recognize, too, a point that the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune recently made. It is that some Senators and Representatives from Northwest States have been saying so emphatically in Washington that Uncle Sam hasn't money for hydroelectric projects in the Northwest that they have left the region without a case to present to legislators from other sections of the country.

In view of this situation we can well understand the anxiety of the private utilities. Portland General Electric is now dependent upon the Federal Bonneville system for about 75 percent of its power supply, and Pacific Power & Light about 50 percent. These companies must assure themselves of additional power, and in large blocs, in the immediate future.

The preference and priority clause in the Bonneville Act protects public agencies in the matter of future power supply from dams under construction. Only additional dams will assure the private utilities of the power their customers will need.

We believe there is a reasonable way out for those who "don't like the partnership, but—," and for those who want Uncle Sam to do the job but recognize that as of now, he won't. It is through a regional corporation. Legislation that would create a regional corporation is in process. There are many questions about its ingredients. The men who are writing the bill haven't closed the door and said, "this is final," in respect to any of the ingredients.

One of the most controversial is that which gives preference on power to the public agencies. If that were removed we believe the private utilities would find little about the regional corporation plan objectionable. If the regional corporation plan worked as we envision it we can see no reason for retaining the preference clause. The clause was written to operate in a time of power scarcity. We doubt there would be a scarcity under the regional corporation plan.

The private utilities must have power. The region must have power. It must be available at a cost that will make the region competitive with other regions in the eyes of industry. The regional corporation plan would assure that. The partnership plan would not.

So far there is no point of objection to the regional corporation plan that cannot be overcome. It would supply low cost power in abundance. And that's what everyone in the region supposedly desires. Let us get our teeth into a plan that will do the job with the least amount of controversy. The regional corporation plan answers that demand.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Resolution 94, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to make an announcement. Several Senators desire to say a few words concerning the anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration, after which it is our plan to proceed with the unfinished business, Senate Resolution 94, to be followed by consideration

of Order No. 241, Senate Resolution 92, providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights.

Then it is our plan to take up for consideration a minor resolution, Order No. 279, Senate Joint Resolution 51, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif. I understand there is no objection to that resolution. When the Senate completes action on that measure, it will take up the conference report on the postal-pay bill.

Mr. President, I now desire to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is the anniversary of an event which had more profound effects upon the economic and social history of our Nation than almost any other single act. It was just 20 years ago today that the late President Roosevelt issued his Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration.

A whole generation has grown to manhood since that historic day. The conditions and the circumstances of the times are enshrouded in the mists of the past to many Americans.

It is difficult now to conceive of the tremendous economic and social forces which created the necessity for REA. But in those days nightfall left the rural sections of our Nation blanketed in darkness. Millions of Americans relied solely upon flickering kerosene lamps and battery flashlights for all activities after the sun went down.

The farmer worked from sun to sun and his labor was hard. There were no electric pumps, no running water, no dependable refrigeration except for the favored few.

The farmer's wife scrubbed the family clothes in the old zinc washtub and, if the wrinkles and creases were to be removed, the rite was performed with an implement of labor appropriately named the "sadiron."

Aside from manpower and animal power, a great majority of America's farmers and ranchers relied for outside sources of energy upon the winds and upon uncertain, sputtering gasoline engines. The amount of work that went into America's food and fiber was high; productivity per man-hour was low.

The Nation itself was in the throes of depression. Millions were unemployed and farm prices were hitting alltime lows. Our land was blanketed by a feeling of hopelessness that reached into every home, every farm, and every ranch.

Under determined leadership, a bold attack was made upon the evil forces that beset America. In 1935, one of the boldest strokes was President Roosevelt's order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this order be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the executive order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935 (Public Resolution 11, 74th Cong.), I hereby establish an agency within the Government to be known as the "Rural Electrification Administration," the head thereof to be known as the Administrator.

I hereby prescribe the following duties and functions of the said Rural Electrification Administration to be exercised and performed by the Administrator thereof to be hereafter appointed:

To initiate, formulate, administer, and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy in rural areas.

In the performance of such duties and functions, expenditures are hereby authorized for necessary supplies and equipment; law books and books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; travel expenses, including the expense of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Administrator; rental at the seat of Government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding; and incidental expenses; and I hereby authorize the Administrator to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services and, with the consent of the State, such State and local officers and employees, and appoint, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, such officers and employees, as may be necessary, prescribe their duties and responsibilities and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix their compensation: *Provided*, That insofar as practicable, the persons employed under the authority of this executive order shall be selected from those receiving relief.

To the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this Executive order the administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase or by the power of eminent domain, any real property or any interest therein and improve, develop, grant, sell, lease (with or without the privilege of purchasing), or otherwise dispose of any such property or interest therein.

For the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration there is hereby allocated to the Administration from the appropriation made by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 the sum of $75,000. Allocations will be made hereafter for authorized projects.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1935.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was a modest beginning but a courageous beginning. The next step was the appointment of the first REA administrator, Morris Llewellyn Cooke, a great, social-minded engineer who had been interested in the problems of low-cost power for rural electrification

The President's appointment paved the way for the greatest of Mr. Cooke's opportunities. He recognized the herculean task of bringing the blessings of electricity to America's farm families.

It was a job of gigantic proportions. The 1935 census showed that only 1 out of every 10 of America's farms was receiving modern, dependable electric service. Today more than 9 out of every 10 farms are the beneficiaries of this 20th century blessing.

Mr. Cooke had assumed that the funds granted under the Executive order would be used by the private power companies to build lines into rural areas. He was to suffer bitter disappointment.

He called a conference of power company executives to offer them the funds and cooperation of his new agency. The conferences ended in assurances of consideration but not in action. The power companies insisted that their existing facilities should meet the demand.

Had the project been dropped at that point, our farms would still be in the dark ages. But American agriculture had waited too many years for this opportunity. They were not to be set back. REA and the farmers sought another means of using the Federal funds that were available.

In the Tennessee Valley area, cooperatives were organized by TVA. In Wisconsin, a farmer organized his neighbors into a cooperative and submitted a loan request.

That farmer was one of the great pioneers. His name was George A. Lewis—a real American who died last week after a lifetime of service to his country.

He worked with REA for many years, helping his neighbors all over America to organize cooperatives to help themselves in this great partnership effort between the people's government and the people themselves.

The pattern of organization was established. REA began making great strides. But obviously the task was too great for an emergency agency.

On May 20, 1936, the Rural Electrification Act was passed—the Norris-Rayburn Act, sponsored by the distinguished American who is now the Speaker of the House and by the late great Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris. It is difficult today to realize that the infant REA was fought at every step. Rural electrification has become so much a part of our entire lives that many have forgotten the early struggles.

There were many who seriously believed that farmers and ranchers either did not want or did not need or could not pay for modern electric service.

There were many who insisted that the Government should do nothing about this problem—that it should be left to the power companies that had never betrayed the slightest interest in the plight of the farmer.

There were others who simply scoffed at the idea that farmers could organize and successfully operate electric enterprises.

There were still others who predicted that farm organizations would go bankrupt in a few years and that the Government would be fortunate to collect 10 cents on the dollar.

Without exception, these proved to be false prophets.

Today in my own State of Texas there are 97 REA borrowers to which over $201 million has been advanced for construction. Another $25 million has been allocated for future construction.

When all of the loan money has been used—and the whole record shows that it will be repaid—there will be more than

139,000 miles of electric line connecting more than 349,000 consumers in Texas alone. This is progress of which we can all be proud.

In the foundation year of REA, less than 3 out of every 100 farms in my native Texas were electrified. Now the figure is close to 9 out of every 10.

Mr. President, the story of REA is the story of the dignity of man. Our rural population has been brought out of the dark ages and the whole country has prospered.

We have fewer farmers today, but they are producing more food and fiber. This would not be possible if we had not substituted electric power for muscle power and mule power.

The progress of the past two decades has been little short of amazing. But when the final chapter is written, I believe that history will record rural electrification as one of the greatest achievements of this country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to identify myself with the very impressive statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

In my judgment, the rural electrification program in the United States has done more to promote the welfare and well-being, as well as the comfort and culture, of American rural life than has any other agency established during the past 20 years. In other words, this great agency has made a larger contribution to more people, and to more people who needed a large contribution, than has any other Federal agency established during the past two decades.

I am pleased to add my commendation of the REA to that made by the distinguished Senator from Texas in his excellent statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD statements by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I am happy to join in commemorating REA's 20th anniversary. The job that has been done through loans made available by the Congress has been of untold value not only to rural people but to all of our citizens.

The Congress has made available in the last 20 years a little over $3.1 billion in loan authorizations for the extension of electric service to our farm citizens. The REA in turn has loaned nearly $3 billion of these funds to about 1,000 borrowers. The farm groups to whom this money was loaned have done a tremendous job in getting service to their people. Nine States have had funds in excess of $100 million and loans have been made in 45 of the 48 States and in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. We can all be proud that, for the most part, Congresses of the last 20 years have been sympathetic and helpful in this outstanding program.

In my own State of Missouri, more than $212 million has been loaned to bring electric service to 257,000 rural consumers. Only in the great State of Texas has REA loaned more money. In 1935 when the rural electrification program began, only about 10 percent of our Nation's farms had any electricity. Today about 93 or 94 percent of the farmers throughout our Nation receive central station service. In my own State of Missouri, less than 18,000 farms out of 280,000, or between 6 and 7 percent, had electric service. Today, about 93 percent of our farm families in Missouri enjoy the labor-saving benefits of electricity. This is a remarkable record over a 20-year period. REA is to be congratulated on this achievement. The loan funds have been used carefully and wisely.

I think the picture as described for Missouri is generally true of the Nation as a whole. In my judgment, loan authorizations will continue to be as vitally necessary as they have been in recent years. There is still a big job to be done and new capital is needed and must be provided to do it. I, for one, pledge my support to the continuation of this tremendously worthwhile program.

Three billion dollars is a lot of money but this is one program that hasn't cost the Federal Government a cent. It has substantially improved the standard of living in the country, it has made the farm an attractive place to live, and it has contributed immeasurably to the welfare of our boys and girls in schools.

In the rural-telephone program since its inception, the Congress has authorized a little over one-fourth of a billion dollars for the extension and improvement of telephone service in rural areas. Of the total amount authorized, REA has, through March of this year, made total loan allocations of about $219 million. Good telephone service is just as essential—perhaps even more urgently needed—for farm people than it is in urban centers. I am a little disappointed that out of $85 million available for telephone loans during the current fiscal year, only $42 million had been loaned at the end of April. That means that $43 million is still available which could be loaned during this fiscal year with only 2 months to go. I earnestly hope this does not indicate that the Administrator of the REA program is not in accord with the telephone-lending program. The Congress has recognized the need of good telephone service and has made funds available for that purpose. They should be used. The lending of telephone funds should prove just as beneficial to our farm people as the lending of funds for the extension of electric service.

Because I am convinced that these programs are good for our Government and good for our people, I have given them my wholehearted support and cooperation since their inception. Because I have seen at first hand the tremendous benefits they have brought to the farm and rural families in my own State and to our State agricultural productivity, I believe they merit the continued support of all of us who are devoted to the welfare of our people and the progress of our Nation.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

It is fitting that Members of Congress should pay tribute to the rural electric cooperatives on this, the 20th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

During these 20 years light has been brought to the lives of most of the farmers in this country. Burdens of the housewife on the farm have been lightened, living conditions have improved, the farmer's work has been lightened and his productivity increased. A whole new market for electrical appliances of all kinds and description has been created.

The coming of electricity has revolutionized farm living.

Through their rural electric cooperatives farmers of this country have done for themselves what the private power companies refused to do.

They have built lines into sparsely settled areas.

They have given complete coverage and adequate service to their members. They have reduced the cost per kilowatts.

It has been a hard fight—every step of the way. The power companies individually and in concert have fought this development.

They have built "spite" lines. They have come to the Halls of Congress to strangle the program through a concerted drive against adequate appropriations.

Fortunately, a majority of the Congress has supported REA. Some of its best supporters are on the floor of the Senate today. I am proud to be among their ranks.

The fight will go on—we will continue to win.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

It is a real source of personal satisfaction to me to take this opportunity of paying my warmest personal tribute to the splendid job that the Rural Electrification Administration has performed throughout this country and our Territories, as it now celebrates its 20th anniversary. To me this is a very auspicious occasion, for the emergence of the REA on the world scene marks one of the most significant achievements since our Government was established.

I believe that the best way of indicating the outstanding achievements of the REA program is to refer to my own great State of Florida and observe what this program has meant to our rural residents. Before the REA was established, we had 72,857 farms, only 5,700, or 7.8 percent, of which received what is known as central-station or high-line electric service. I believe Senators will agree with me that a rural electrification percentage of less than 8 percent is indeed a very low figure.

At the present time in the State of Florida there has been an increase in rural electrification since REA was established of from less than 8 percent to over 85 percent today. I believe this outstanding record speaks for itself.

As we look at the record of this outstanding Rural Electrification Administration program throughout the United States, we find that the achievements, State by State, and nationally, have matched or exceeded the tremendous progress in my own State.

Prior to the creation of REA there were 6,812,350 farms in the United States. Of this large number of farms, only 743,954, or 10.9 percent, had central-station electric service. In other words, Mr. President, less than 11 percent of our farms were electrified in 1935.

Today, according to the latest compilation, 4,965,962 farms, or 92.3 percent, are now receiving central-station electric service. The REA advises that, according to its recent preliminary estimates, this figure has jumped to 94 percent. We may say accordingly that there has been an increase in rural electrification since REA was established of from less than 11 percent in 1934 to 94 percent today.

We all know what rural electrification has done to remove much of the drudgery of farm work, drudgery that was formerly considered a necessary part of farm life. As a result, living in rural America today is comfortable and convenient, and no longer is there such wide disparity between the countryside and the city, which formerly was the

only place where electricity and all its conveniences were available. In addition, bringing electricity to the American farm has contributed immeasurably in helping farmers to increase production at a time when fewer workers are available to do the necessary job.

No tribute to the REA would be complete without noting the endless devotion and persistence of the pioneer back home and in the Halls of Congress who worked so long and laboriously to make its success possible. On this 20th anniversary we should all pause and pay tribute to these valiant champions who labored for many years, under great handicaps, and often many disappointments, until the present REA's success was finally attained.

I am sure we can all agree that the outstanding record of achievement of the REA program merits the respect and confidence of the American people.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

REA on its 20th birthday reminds me of young men and women who have reached a like age. As the orator at their graduation usually says, they have reached the age of commencement. That is, while they have already proved themselves, their most productive and fruitful years lie ahead.

So it is with REA. I am pleased that the Republican Party, officially at least, has taken REA to its bosom, just as it has officially embraced the principles of social security pioneered by the New Deal. This official endorsement, however, does not excuse the attacks which have been made upon REA by persons and groups closely identified with the administration, of which the recommendations by the Hoover Commission are among the most recent and most vicious. Just as the young graduate faces peril in a troubled world so does the REA, upon entering its 21st year, find around it powerful interests which would destroy it, or at least curtail sharply the wonderful benefits it provides the people.

Twenty years ago only 1 farm out of 9 was electrified. Today 19 out of 20 are electrified, and systems financed by REA supply a majority of that power. But let not that impressive record blind us to the wonderful opportunities for service that can still be provided by REA. Let me illustrate by pointing out what can be done in my State of Montana:

Only 9 percent of Montana's waterpower has been developed. Ninety waterpower sites are undeveloped. The 18 developed sites Federal Power Commission, and 72 of them are undeveloped. The 18 developed sites provide a total of 603,910 kilowatts. Development of the other 72 would increase this power more than tenfold. One of the most needed dams in my State is the long-delayed Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River, which would convert useless and dangerous floodwaters into hydroelectric power, store water for irrigation, and provide other benefits.

And so I suggest that we commemorate the birthday of REA not by merely applauding its part in electrifying more than 90 percent of the Nation's farms, but by looking ahead to the job still to be done in States like Montana where more than 90 percent of the waterpower is undeveloped. REA can and should have a leading role in meeting this challenge. Let us meet that challenge, here in Congress, and help develop our God-given resources for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished majority leader and other colleagues today in observing the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives when this program was inaugurated. Little did those responsible for the program realize the full significance of the contribution to our national economy which was made by Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935.

Its importance can be partially appreciated when we recall that at that time electric service was available to only 10 percent of the farms in the United States; whereas, today 93 percent of the farms in the United States enjoy the direct and indirect benefits of electric power.

Commenced as a corollary of the WPA program and with funds allocated from its appropriations, very few grants were made. The public, particularly the rural population, quickly responded to the opportunity it afforded to them. As a consequence $3 billion have been loaned to 1,000 rural enterprises—mostly cooperatives—through which 4 million consumers are being served.

The REA program has been of even more significant value to the farmers of my State. As of the date of its commencement only 1 percent—3,000—of the farms of Arkansas were electrified. Today approximately 85 percent—154,000—of them have electric service. Not all of these, however, are being furnished such service by cooperatives. In fact, the private power companies, stimulated by the competition of REA, have greatly extended their facilities to rural areas, and as a result furnish electric service to 64,000 of the 154,000 farms now electrified in my State. Ninety thousand farms are being supplied with service through 21 cooperatives from $94 million in loans from REA.

It is a tribute to the program that these loans are being repaid not only promptly but in many instances ahead of schedule. Of the total loans made, $375 million in principal has been repaid, of which $80 million represents payments made ahead of schedule.

Delinquencies are very small. Only 13 borrowers, with total loans of $250,000, are in arrears in payment on principal and interest. These, I am sure, will soon meet their obligation.

Mr. President, of all the programs inaugurated during the depression years of the thirties, none have been more successful or of greater value to our people and the general economy than has the Rural Electrification Administration. I am glad, as a Member of the Congress, to have had the privilege of supporting it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished majority leader and my other colleagues in paying tribute to the Rural Electrification Administration. It is one of the truly great accomplishments of the Democratic administration in the mid-thirties.

The people of Arkansas, perhaps as much as those of any other State in the Union, know from experience the benefits which can be derived through rural electrification. In 1935, when our Nation was floundering in the depths of the depression, there was not only economic gloom throughout the State, but there was a real, rather than a figurative gloom, in 97 out of 100 farm homes in the State. Twenty years of light and progress under the REA program have brightened the lives of the rural people in Arkansas.

Many of us who have become accustomed to modern living standards cannot appreciate what the rural electrification program has meant to the rural communities of this Nation. I know, however, that the farmers who have had electricity brought to their homes know the value of the REA program. Electricity has, I believe, revolutionized life on the farm to such an extent that it is almost impossible to comprehend the far-reaching effects of the program. We know, of course, that modern farm homes have all sorts of electrical equipment which has been made possible through electricity. REA has not meant merely that farms could be properly lighted, but it has meant that farmers could live in homes with modern conveniences such as the deep freeze, air conditioners, radio, and television, in addition to having the labor-saving devices which have so greatly increased the productivity of our farms. Think of what a difference it makes to a farmer merely to have an electric pump instead of having to rely on the old hand pump or unreliable gas pump.

This revolution in farm life has had far-reaching effects throughout the national economy. I understand that studies have been made which indicate that for every dollar which has been spent in building the REA distribution system $8 is spent for equipment by the farmers whose homes are electrified. This has meant business for retail and wholesale appliance distributors. It has meant employment and profits in the manufacturing industries and for the transportation companies. It has meant that the producers of the raw materials have likewise shared in the expanding economic prosperity which has resulted from the REA program.

I wish to say a word about my own State of Arkansas which has, I believe, done an outstanding job in the development of the REA program. Twenty years ago only 3 percent of the farms in my State had electricity, compared with the national average of 10 percent. The Arkansas cooperatives have made steady progress. At the present time almost 9 out of 10 homes in the State are electrified, and we are very close to the national average.

Arkansas has been fortunate to have some outstanding leaders in the field of rural electrification. The Honorable Clyde T. Ellis, who preceded me as Representative from the Third District of Arkansas in the House of Representatives, was the sponsor of the original REA enabling act which was adopted by the State legislature of Arkansas in 1937. As a Member of Congress and as executive secretary of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Clyde Ellis has given strong and effective leadership to the rural electric cooperatives. I know that most Senators are familiar with the great leadership of Clyde Ellis in this field.

Another Arkansan, the late Thomas B. Fitzhugh, was also a nationally known pioneer in behalf of REA. Thomas Fitzhugh frequently testified before committees of Congress and for a time

served as general counsel of the NRECA. He continued his active interest in the program until his death early this year.

I am proud also of the fine job which has been done by the Arkansas State cooperatives, as well as by the REA cooperative managers and directors throughout Arkansas.

I suppose that on birthdays it is appropriate to take stock of one's accomplishments in the past, but I also believe that we should recognize that the rural electrification program in this Nation is far from complete. As the rural consumers of electricity increase the number of appliances and labor saving devices which use electricity, there are increased demands upon the REA distribution system. Loads on the REA lines are growing at a fantastic rate. They are doubling every 4 or 5 years. This will mean that additional capital will be needed for modernization and expansion of the distribution systems. Heavier lines and heavier transformers and equipment must be installed to carry the growing load. New and economical sources of power must be developed to provide the energy for the program. At the same time we must realize that there are still an estimated 3 million persons living on farms in this country which do not have electricity.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the record an editorial written by Clyde T. Ellis for the May issue of the publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALLELUJAH, REA

(By Clyde T. Ellis)

Let all, who will, rejoice. REA's 20th birthday is at hand.

Franklin Roosevelt had a knack for putting himself in the other fellow's place, particularly in the little fellow's place. But when he issued Executive Order No. 7037 on May 11, 1935, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration, not even he could have realized the full impact of his deed.

For he probably had never heard a young daughter ask, "Mommy, why can't we here on the farm live like the folks in town, with electricity and all?"

He probably had never witnessed a family's tears as a young son, his few duds in a pasteboard box, left home for some faraway city "because the boys in town laugh at me for living on the farm with its Chic Sales and other backward ways."

But Roosevelt had seen farm women bending hard over the corrugated washboards. He had seen their dimly lighted homes along the highways at night, and he knew that for about a year farmers in the Tennessee Valley, with the help of TVA, had been organizing large-scale electric cooperatives.

We know F. D. R. was conscious of all this, for he later said as much when he dedicated the Lamar Electric Membership Corp., at Barnesville, Ga., in 1938.

So the country was overripe for rural electrification when the order was signed. And it was as American as apple pie that the new REA idea, the REA self-help idea, should then sweep rural America like a prairie fire.

Quickly the power companies sensed what was happening. They set to work to not only prove to all public officials that the idea wouldn't work, but to cream-skim the areas with their own lines and otherwise see that it couldn't work. What the big power companies never understood, and don't yet, is that in a free democracy the people, being human, will have many things that don't pay off by power company standards.

By a year after the executive order—that is, by 1936—it was obvious that the initial REA, operating as a subdivision of a relief agency, was still inadequate. Farmers were meeting everywhere, clamoring for information on how to get started. Congressmen were besieged by requests. The demands far exceeded the possibilities of any relief setup. A dynamic action agency with broader power was necessary.

CONGRESS TAKES A HAND

It was only natural in our democracy that Congress should step in. It was only natural, too, that the statesman Senator from Nebraska, George Norris, should lead the way. He had been battling for a decade to develop the Nation's water resources and make low-cost electricity available wholesale to public agencies, cooperatives, and private companies. He had at long last won his battle to establish a Tennessee Valley Authority. Now he set his head and heart on an REA.

It is significant that Norris as a Republican in a democratically controlled Congress sponsored such a popular measure in the Senate, while a leading Democrat, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, sponsored it in the House. But the great depression was on. Many feared that our capitalistic system itself was trembling, and Democrats and Republicans alike not only joined in this effort but joined also in writing into the bill language designed to keep politics out of its administration. Finally on May 20, 1936, the Norris-Rayburn bill was signed into law as the REA Act.

The REA idea has worked so well that nothing else in the field of Government lending or Government-sponsored self-help in all the history of the world can be compared with it. More than $2½ billion have been loaned to farmer-owned and controlled electric systems, invested by them, and are being repaid on schedule or in advance, with interest and without loss.

Government, by borrowing and lending to the farmers, simply enables them to help themselves. Government comes out ahead financially, and so do the farmers.

Four and one-half million rural homes, churches, schools, and other establishments are thus being self-served. Some 13 million farm people are lifting themselves from darkness into light.

More than a million miles of lines and poles and transformers have been built with the $2½ billion. In the process, whole new industries are set in motion and old ones expanded. Over $10 billion more have been spent by the farmers for electric lamps, irons, washing machines, refrigerators, freezers, automatic water systems, television sets, and other appliances and equipment.

Think of the man-hours of labor that are going into the production of all this. Think of all the additional income taxes and State and local taxes that are being paid. And it's a continuing process.

Farmers not only enjoy the conveniences made possible by electricity; they also increase their efficiency of operation. They put better food on the market at lower cost. Electricity has become the extra farmhand, in and out of the house—"Willie Wirehand" they call him.

Not only is he the cheapest farmhand known, but he performs many tasks that are beyond human labor; refrigeration, television, air conditioning (it's coming), and sprinkler irrigation (it's coming, too).

And these rapidly growing uses mean that we have to keep building the rural-electric systems—the wires, poles, transformers, substations, etc.—larger, and that we will have to continue borrowing from REA to do this, while, of course, at the same time paying off our old loans. This we call vertical growth.

Furthermore, we must still help bring service to nearly one-half million farm homes and rural establishments still in the dark. The plight of these unserved farm folk is a disgrace to the United States. No special effort, aside from what we have tried and proved, is being made by Government to reach them.

PROGRAM MUST STILL FIGHT TO LIVE

Despite the rural-electric program's phenomenal achievement—or because of it—the power companies are accelerating their efforts to kill it off. For instance, the recent Hoover Commission report, dictated by the Wall Street power-company investor crowd, asks Congress to abolish REA in its present form and require the program to go to the private money market for further funds. Admittedly, the interest rate would be doubled, and all funds would be denied for projects opposed by the power companies.

Stories are leaking out of the Department of Agriculture that REA may soon be merged (and probably submerged) with other lending agencies under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1953—which NRECA opposed. We hope the stories are in error, for that, too, would help kill the program.

Many rural-electric systems are being dragged into court by power companies determined to prevent the farmers from serving themselves efficiently. Even as I am writing this, the United States Court of Appeals has today (April 28) kicked 10 power companies operating in Arkansas, Missouri, and Kansas out of court in a case against our program, but only after they have damaged us to the tune of several million dollars over a 4-year period.

More than 70 power companies are mixed up in another lawsuit against a local electric co-op in South Carolina and NRECA in an effort to kill off the rural electric systems' "Willie Wiredhand" symbol.

New Federal wholesale power policies, long advocated by the power companies, are already crippling the rural-electrification program in some areas, threatening it in others, and not giving it the boost it needs in still others—in the Southwest, Northwest, Missouri Basin, Southeast, and the Northeast.

Even our hopes for participating in the atomic-power program have been frustrated over the past 2 years by the power-company drive to monopolize this new field.

STILL WE CELEBRATE

Indeed, it has been said that no one seems to be for the rural-electrification program any more except the people. And therein lies our real hope, for the REA idea is bigger, and stronger, than all its opposition combined.

The REA idea has fired the imagination of the ordinary man, wherever he is. Even the leaders of commerce and industry who oppose us know deep down under their propagandized prejudices that the REA program is providing a much needed shot in the arm to the free-enterprise system.

Because of REA every American lives better, and for it every farm lass and lad, father and mother give thanks.

Persons who attack the REA movement with any hope of changing its course simply have no comprehension of its magnitude or momentum. It is like trying to change the course of a Mississippi River flood—and one can get mighty wet in the process.

Yes, despite all the resistance and diversions, the rural-electrification program of the United States deserves a full year of celebration from the 20th anniversary of its creation by Executive order on May 11, 1935, to the 20th anniversary of its enactment into law on May 20, 1936.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on this anniversary day we can all be proud of the part that Congress has contributed to

the success of the REA program. While more than 90 percent of the farms of the Nation are enjoying the benefits of electric service, we must remember that the REA program is by no means completed. As our farm people use more and more kilowatt hours, it is necessary to make system improvements, to "heavy-up" the lines, find additional sources of power supply, and do other things any progressive business does to keep its service record in good shape. The electrifying of rural America was brought about through a partnership arrangement—a partnership between the Federal Government and the local people. The partnership constituted a real, dynamic force—the Federal Government working with local people to secure for themselves one of the necessities of life. May I say I am not speaking of the kind of phony partnership whereby resources of our country are turned over to vested interests for exploitation.

The Congress has been and still is carrying out its part in the partnership arrangement. The record of cooperation between the Congress and REA has always been good. In the very beginning, when President Roosevelt recommended legislation, after he had created REA by executive order, the Congress cooperated fully in passing the act to enable rural people to get electric service. The legislation passed in 1936 has been of untold benefit to the whole Nation, as well as to the farmer and his family. It provided for loans to be made for the extension of electric service in rural areas. The original act provided for a maximum repayment period of 25 years. It also provided that the loans should bear interest at a rate equal to the average rates of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof.

The interest rate turned out to be about 2¾ percent. Under the act, any funds appropriated by the Congress could have been loaned to the private power companies if they had been willing to undertake the job. They declined to do it, saying, in effect, that the farmer's market for electricity was unprofitable and, in many cases, undesirable. At that time only 1 farm in 10 had electric service. After the turndown by the private power companies, the people in local communities formed their cooperative associations to get the much-needed service, and, in partnership with their Federal Government, they got it.

As time went on, changing conditions indicated a need for some changes in the act. Again, a friendly Congress came into the picture with the passage of the Pace-Russell Act. The Pace-Russell Act accomplished three purposes. It amended the act to, first, extend the amortization period to 35 years, second, fix the interest rate at 2 percent, and third, make REA a permanent agency. These changes were necessary in order to reach sparsely populated areas and low-income groups. Here again is an example of the partnership arrangement. The Congress, through committee hearings and debate in both Houses, had made it known that the Congress wanted electric service extended to rural people on an area coverage basis. The only way this could be done was through the extension of the amortization period and the lowering of interest rates.

All through the years the Congress has met its responsibility in the partnership, by making loan funds available in sufficient quantities to do the job rapidly. It has done the same thing so far as administrative funds for the agency are concerned. Even though we had 4 years of war, when no major construction could be undertaken, the Congress has authorized for rural electrification loan funds in excess of $3 billion. Through March 31 of this year, the REA has approved loans of $2,973,000,000 to over 1,000 borrowers. We, in Congress, can be justly proud of our part in this record.

In 1949, Congress recognized the need of our farmers and rural people for telephone service and passed the bill which I introduced in the Senate and Representative POAGE of Texas introduced in the House to amend the act to provide for the making of loans for the extension of telephone service to rural areas. The terms and conditions under which telephone loans are made, insofar as the amortization period and the interest rate are concerned, are exactly the same as in the electrification program. This is just another example of the partnership arrangement.

The Congress has authorized a total of $267,736,000 for loan funds in the telephone program since its beginning in November of 1949. Although REA has available for telephone loans this fiscal year about $85 million, it appears that not more than $55 million will be loaned. Telephone service is badly needed all over the Nation, and I sincerely hope that this year's slow rate of loans is not indicative of the attitude of the agency.

The Congress is being called on now to further amend the REA Act by eliminating the State allotment formula, which is outmoded and no longer useful as the rural areas more nearly reach 100 percent electrification. I hope here that the Congress will again show its faith in the great program and will carry out its part in the partnership arrangement by passing this much needed legislation.

When I look back over the last 20 years and find that in our Nation the rural electrification program has progressed from the point where 1 out of 10 farms had electric service to a point where 9 out of 10 farms have it, with 4 years out for a major war, it seems to me that this is truly a remarkable record of achievement. This kind of progress could only have been made through a sound partnership between the Federal Government and its rural citizens. The partnership has paid manifold dividends in providing higher standards of living for our rural people, in helping to diversify our agriculture, conserve and rebuild our soil, and build the strength and prosperity of our Nation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], since he asked me to yield first. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am indeed grateful to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, for offering me an opportunity to say a few words regarding the fine REA program. I wish to emphasize the part the present administration has played in support of the program. The Republican administration has strongly supported it, and its goal is to reach unserved farms so that they have the benefits of both electricity and telephones.

The administration has set records for speed in handling loans. In fact, the backlog of the number of persons seeking such service is the lowest it has been since World War II. For the last fiscal year and the year before, electric loans totaled more than $350 million. That amount was higher than the amount of loans for the 2 preceding years, and paved the way for 364,000 new consumers.

The telephone loans for the last fiscal year and the year before totaled $155 million, nearly twice the previous 2 years' total, and nearly two-thirds of all the loans made since the program was begun in 1949.

I am sure President Eisenhower will maintain these programs on a level as high or even higher than he has during the past several years.

The funds available for loans this year are, as I understand, approximately $250 million for electricity and $87 million for telephones.

So the work of the REA is being advanced, supported, and promoted by an administration whose policy it is to be liberal in all matters of human rights and conservative insofar as our economy is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have the floor. Has the Senator from Ohio completed his remarks?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I have.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have promised to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. Thereafter, I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without saying a word of commendation of one of the finest of our agencies, the Rural Electrification Administration, which was established 20 years ago. I think it most appropriate that both the majority leader and a number of other Senators have called attention to this 20th anniversary of the REA.

Personally, I know of no program that has done more to improve farm life and make farm life more livable for the farmer's wife than electricity on the farm.

I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives when the REA was created by Executive order. Since that time, a number of us have had the opportunity, either as Members of the House of Representatives or as Members of the Senate, of voting for the appropriation of funds for the REA.

I do not know of any program which has been of greater value to the people of the Nation than has the REA program. The REA has demonstrated that it has the ability to operate a very fine and successful program.

We in Kansas have been very fortunate in that we have a splendid State committee, composed of representatives of the private power companies and the REA cooperatives. The committee meets every month, and discusses the related problems, and works them out most ably.

The State of Kansas has a remarkable record in connection with the operations of the REA; and the other States might well emulate the performance of Kansas in respect to mutuality of operations between the State agencies and the REA.

This record is due in great part to the outstanding leadership of the REA officers and employees in Kansas; I wish to pay tribute to these men and women who have played such a vital part in its development.

During my term of service as Governor of Kansas it was my privilege to become very familiar with the operations of the REA. Certainly it has demonstrated very great ability in working out some of the most complex problems.

We are very fortunate, indeed, to have as Administrator of the REA Mr. Ancher Nelsen, a man of wide experience and great ability. I am proud of his leadership and of the splendid work done by the other leaders of the REA whom I have had the opportunity of knowing personally.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention has just been called to a statement by Mr. Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator, which was published in today's Washington Daily News. The heading is "REA Has Just Begun." He makes the interesting comment that we are looking back 20 years, and asks, "Why not look ahead 20 years and try to envision the possibilities?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimus consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REA HAS JUST BEGUN

(By Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator)

The benefits of REA to the farmer have only begun.

Without electricity, farmers would be completely unable to meet the demands made upon them. The modern farm, with its pressure water system, its electrical dairying and poultry-raising equipment, its hay driers, feed grinders, its workshop to keep machinery in repair, would almost stop functioning if it were not for the power that flows over REA lines.

But we have as yet taken only a few steps into the atomic age—we cannot conceive of the possibilities there for obtaining electric power in greater quantities, at lower cost, than was ever dreamed possible.

In my mind there is no question but what the next 20 years holds greater promise for American farmers than the past 20 years has fulfilled.

Today, the 20th anniversary of REA, is a good time for us to bring to the attention of the whole country the vital importance of this program in our economy.

Without electric power, farmers could not feed our country.

Our farm young people today are to a great extent preparing themselves to remain on the farm, rather than looking forward to the time when they can get away to live in the cities. I don't think anyone questions that it is electric power which is changing their point of view.

And while this 20th anniversary of REA finds more than 90 percent of our farms with the blessings of electricity, we have still a further obligation. That is to explore the possibilities of new and greater ways of putting this power to work for us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to join in the commemoration of the 20th birthday of the rural-electrification program. I know this program has meant much to New York State, as well as the rest of the country.

In New York State, in 1934, only 32.7 percent of the farms were receiving central-station electric service; but in 1954, 94.5 percent of our farms were receiving such service. In the country as a whole, in 1934 only 10.9 percent of our farms had central service, but by 1954, the national percentage had been increased to 92.3.

Rural electric cooperatives have been largely responsible for this tremendous increase, because they have been formed in many areas which the blessings of electric power had never reached. Many farms had not received such service because the shortsighted power companies claimed they could not make enough profit in serving farms. The rural cooperatives demonstrated the falsity of this notion in farm areas all over the country, and the commercial power companies were quick to follow the example provided by REA.

The REA was very important in providing competition with the regular companies, and this stimulated them to serve certain areas before the people in the areas organized cooperatives to provide themselves with electric service. This is largely what happened in New York State. We have only 6 rural electric cooperatives, which serve less than 15,000 electric consumers. But the most important benefit which our State derived from the REA program was as a stimulus to the private companies, who knew that if they did not serve the rural areas, the people there would organize their own systems. This threat stimulated the profit companies to action.

Before the Rural Electrification became a fact, in some cases these companies "skimmed off the cream" by serving only the farmers near the roads and in more densely settled areas. By this process of taking most of the better customers, and leaving the remote areas unserved, the private companies frequently prevented and delayed the coming of electricity to many farm homes. In some cases, private power firms would consent to serve a customer only if the individual paid for the line to connect to the company's facilities, and then deeded the line to the company.

Despite all this opposition the REA program has been one of the most successful plans our Government has ever adopted. It is a plan for a people's government to help the people work together to serve themselves. The electric cooperatives borrow money from the Government, and repay the money, with interest, over a period of years. The rural electric cooperatives have developed the farm areas of our country to a level which they would not likely have reached without REA.

The rural electrics have helped to build up the rural economy so greatly that it would now be much more difficult for that segment of our economy to falter and set off a depression such as the one we suffered in the 1930's.

When REA funds are loaned to a cooperative and are invested locally, they result in much greater expenditures by other segments of the community. It has been estimated that for every dollar invested in rural electric facilities, private individuals invest $5. They spend this amount for electrical appliances, wiring, plumbing, etc. The funds spent in the local community result in increased spending in all parts of that community, and the goods they buy affect the economy of the Nation as a whole.

The rural electrification program is by no means completed. The farmers' need for electricity grows more rapidly than that of other segments of our economy. The use of electricity by Rural Electric cooperatives is doubling about every 5 years, while the use of electricity by other groups doubles only once in nearly 10 years. To carry this greatly increasing amount of electricity to the farms, the rural electric cooperatives need to improve their lines, so that they will carry greater amounts of electricity. In order to increase their lines, the rural cooperatives need to borrow more money from the Rural Electrification Administration. All the money they borrow is being repaid over a 35-year period, with interest.

One of the most important influences which the rural electric program has on our economy is the great need of rural electric consumers for appliances. Their increased use of appliances will provide jobs for millions of Americans. This is particularly true because farm families have a vast backlog of needs for the products of our mass production industries.

If the farm dwellings cannot obtain adequate electric power to operate their various appliances and equipment, then they will not be able to use such equipment. As a result, our factories will produce less farm equipment, and our workers will have less employment. I think this illustration should demonstrate to all the importance of rural electrification not only to the farmer, but also to the city worker and to our economy as a whole.

Rural electrification has reduced the cost of farm production and has reduced farm drudgery. If farmers still used prewar methods, food prices would be higher in city markets. Electrically powered irrigation systems and farm machinery have greatly increased the output of our Nation's farmlands. With all predictions pointing to an astounding population growth for our Nation in the years ahead, this increased production

through electrification is vitally important to our country.

Rural electrification and public power are important because they provide a yardstick of what electricity should cost. The electric industry is by nature monopolistic. Not more than one electric line can serve a particular customer. He has to take electricity from the line which serves his area. The only way we can get competition into the electric industry is with public systems, such as the rural-electric cooperatives, which provide service at cost, plus a reasonable amortization. They can, and have, provided an example which has encouraged the private companies to charge lower rates.

The Rural Electrification Administration program has kept out of the Northeast so that we have only a very poor electric rate yardstick. Three of the States in our area have no rural electric cooperatives. This is largely because restrictive State legislation prevented their formation. I am advised that Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island have no rural electric cooperatives. Other States having rural electric co-ops have so few serving only a small number of consumers that they have been unable to provide any effective yardstick.

The development of the full power potential of Niagara Falls with public body preference is necessary to strengthen rural electrification in New England and give us a yardstick. The key to low-cost power for residential and industrial use is low wholesale rates. The rural electric cooperatives in our area have been unable to obtain low-cost power. One of the reasons for this is is that the Federal Government has failed to develop hydroelectric power at any of the many possible development sites which we have in the Northeast. Much of our hydroelectric potentials like Niagara has been undeveloped. What the commercial companies have developed has been largely incomplete development producing high-cost power.

One alternative to Federal development of the Niagara is development by New York State with full preference for public bodies including cooperatives and municipalities. I, along with 16 other Senators, was happy to introduce a bill providing for such development. This bill would provide safeguards of the public interest, guaranteeing that public power from the Niagara will be used for the benefit of all the people—to bring down power rates throughout the State and the area and to make this low-cost power, one of the largest blocks of undeveloped hydroelectric power on the North American Continent, available in the first instance to public bodies and rural electric cooperatives. These conditions, or safeguards, are the heart of this bill, and they insure that the sense and meaning of national public power policy evolved over the past 50 years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, will be applied in New York State to protect and strengthen rural electric cooperatives and municipal systems.

Abundant low-cost power is essential to hold industry in the Northeast. It is our best deterrent to runaway industry and we have failed to properly use it. Since 1946, in Massachusetts alone, some 70 textile mills have closed their doors, usually for migration to other parts of the country, or for disposition of their plants to mills in other sections. This dislocation is taking place not only in Massachusetts, but all over New England and the Northeast. It has occurred not only in textiles, but in shoes, electric goods, and other industries. I have given the figures for New England, but the figures for New York are proportionately high, in relation to the charges for power levied in other parts of the country.

The November 1952 report of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry said that the higher power costs and the relatively small development of hydroelectric power were among the factors causing the decline of the textile industry in New England industrial establishments.

I have long supported rural electrification, and I sincerely hope that the rural electric cooperatives will continue and increase their good work in the coming years as they have during the past 20.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central electric generating system went into service in this country, up to 1935, was literally a dark age for American farm families. In 1935 fewer than 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electric service. In Mississippi, it was less than 1 percent. It was estimated at the time that only 2,800 farms in our State were receiving electric service.

The total amount of electrification loans approved for Mississippi up to and including December 31, 1954, was $88,399,862 to 27 REA borrowers in Mississippi. This money will go to build a total of 50,936 miles of REA lines for an estimated 225,146 consumers, including 163,227 farms.

I remember when the proposal for the REA was first discussed among the people of my State. As a relatively well-informed person at that time, I thought it was more of a fancy, or dream, than a possible reality. That shows how much mistaken we can be. It shows the possibilities of the electrical age. The figures I have just quoted show that in my State alone, more than 225,146 customers on 163,227 farms are actually being served, by reason of the change brought about within the brief span of 20 years.

A total of 187,613 farms in Mississippi had electricity as of June 30, 1954, or 74.6 percent of all the farms in Mississippi—as compared with 2,800 farms with electricity in 1935, which was nine-tenths of 1 percent.

Also interesting to note is the great increase that has been made in the use of electricity by each farmer who receives REA service. For example, in December 1941, the average monthly use was only 40 kilowatt-hours. For December 1954, 13 years later, the average monthly consumption was 143 kilowatt-hours. This reflects the increased use of electrical equipment both on the farm and in the home and the more comfortable life for all of us who live in the country. This electricity is used on the farm for lights, refrigerators, radio and television, water pumps, saws, mowers, milking machinery, air conditioners, and hundreds of other uses.

I was fortunate in that I was raised on a farm. The refrigerators, electric irons, washing machines, electric sweepers, electric freezers, radio and television sets, and other appliances in the home, as well as the electric water pumps which make available all the facilities of modern plumbing within the home, and power appliances which take care of most of the chores on the farm, make possible a wonderful new way of life on the farm. They not only make possible a new way of life, but a new way of making a living, a new economy. I believe that the small industrial unit is one of the great bulwarks of our economy, and I hope it will continue to be such for a long time.

All these things give me the feeling that I would rather have my name connected with the origin of this fine service than with any other single piece of legislation that I know of in the past 20 years.

In the beginning we thought these things were impracticable, if not impossible. Now we realize what can be done; and we look ahead to the next 20 years, or the next 50 years, with confidence in the possibilities.

In 1949 the Congress gave the Rural Electrification Administration a new job—the supervision of a rural telephone program. In 1950, in Mississippi there were only 16,436 farms with telephones—or only 6.5 percent of the farms. As of December 31, 1954, the amount of loan funds authorized for telephone improvements and extensions in Mississippi was a total of $1,973,000—to be used to build 1,096 miles of rural telephone lines to serve 3,771 new subscribers, and to improve present service for 1,327 rural subscribers.

The electric and telephone programs have the same basic features. Both are lending programs wherein the borrower is required to repay the loan within the time agreed. Mississippi has a proud record in this respect. Up to December 31, 1954, the REA borrowers in Mississippi had repaid $11,987,513 on principal, and in addition had repaid $5,747,809 of interest. There are no borrowers in Mississippi who are delinquent.

These programs are sound. They afford our rural people a better way of life and they strengthen our economy.

Another factor in the success of this program, which has not been mentioned, as I recall is the very high quality of men to be found serving as REA managers in the various States. I have found those in my State to be not only men of ability, but men devoted to a cause, men with a desire for service. They take great pride in their work, and feel a personal responsibility to their customers.

Generally speaking, we in Mississippi have had a very fortunate relationship with our private utilities. Their attitude generally is that of working toward the ultimate aim of serving the people. Of course, there are conflicts in certain areas, but I believe that, on the whole, our relations have been good in Mississippi.

A word should be said about those who serve as members of the boards of directors of the REA's. They serve without compensation. They receive reimbursement for actual expenses, but they are not paid a salary. They furnish guidance, direction, and sound business judgment in the operation of the REA's. That is another reason why the record of the REA's, from the standpoint of meeting their financial obligations, is so good throughout the Nation. Virtually all the REA obligations throughout the Nation are current. I know that that is the situation in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in consonance with the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], it is necessary for public-power agencies, in looking ahead, as has been said by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], to search for new sources of power.

The demand for electric power is growing throughout the country. Now and in the foreseeable future cooperatives will need great new sources of power, for the load demand on electric systems serving farm areas is doubling every 4 or 5 years. In comparison, the load demand of commercial power companies is doubling in about 7 to 10 years. Cooperatives must begin now to secure new energy sources to meet this huge demand.

In some areas, where there is no hydro power potential, the REA co-ops face a rather bleak outlook, unless Congress takes forthright action with respect to atomic energy. In some areas the cost of power is very high. In such areas we should provide the opportunity for public power agencies to participate in atomic energy development. Atomic powerplants should be developed in sizes which cooperatives can use to generate the new blocks of power they need.

The Atomic Energy Commission should be developing large economical "yardstick" atomic powerplants from which power-shortage areas could buy new power at reasonable rates under the preference provisions of the Atomic Energy Act passed last year. This is particularly true of several high cost power areas. However, the cooperatives are not now getting the assistance from their Government they need to participate in this great new source of power. They cannot, alone, pioneer the generation of power from atomic energy. They do not have huge sums of money for research facilities; therefore they must depend upon the Government to pioneer in this field for them. Unless the co-op systems do get into the atomic power field in its early stages, they may find this new type of power generation completely controlled by large private utility groups through superior operating knowledge, technical know-how, private patents, and exclusive franchises.

The AEC has done little to help farm electric systems enter the field of atomic power generation. Under the present administration, REA has failed to employ the technical consultants who could help cooperatives enter the atomic power generation field. This failure is not due to lack of funds, because Congress appropriated funds for this purpose last year. The Senate committee report instructed that these funds might be used by REA to give "appropriate attention to the possibility of the utilization of atomic energy for electric power generation in rural areas." When the Congress approved these funds for this purpose it meant them to be used. But to the best of my knowledge they have not been so used.

What is the holdup, Mr. President? Why this procrastination? Surely our farm families deserve to share the benefits of this great new source of energy developed at the expense of all the people. It is not right they should be denied the opportunity to share. But if they are to participate in this great new boon, the Government must take steps to point the way and make possible the entry of rural electric cooperatives into the field of electric power generated by the atom.

I have joined the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], in the introduction of a bill which would point the way to a worthwhile development of atomic energy and to making that new source of power available to all the people.

By a determined fight last year on the amendments to the atomic enegry bill, notable victories for the public interest were won. However, extensive review of the atomic energy law is required in order to permit the cooperatives and public power agencies and small private utilities to participate in this vast development.

It is my hope that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, in the near future will start a review and study of the Atomic Energy Act which was enacted last year. I believe the public interest requires it.

I wish to join in congratulating the distinguished majority leader for leading the Senate in this tribute today on the 20th anniversary of the birth of REA. I know of no other group which has contributed more to the national growth and to the happiness and welfare of the American people than the hundreds of rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in recognizing the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration on this the 20th anniversary of the program.

Twenty years ago only 1 farm in 10 enjoyed the benefits of electricity. REA, through loans to the individual locally owned electric cooperatives, and the excellent work and management of those cooperatives by the local owners and officers, today provide electricity to approximately 9 out of every 10 of our rural people.

In Texas today approximately 90 percent of all farms are securing electricity, as compared with 2.3 percent before REA was born. There were only 11,466 farms served by electricity in Texas 20 years ago. Today more than 292,000 farms are enjoying the benefits of electricity supplied by locally owned corporations under the REA program. In Texas the REA has loaned $223 million to 97 cooperatives which have over 300,000 consumers and have constructed over 100,000 miles of line. Texas leads the Nation in the number of farms served by electricity and in total miles of rural electric lines.

In pointing with understandable pride to these statistics it might be well to look at the repayment record of the Texas cooperatives. They have repaid $31 million in principal, $4 million of which has been in advance of the due date. Seventeen and one-half million dollars of interest has been paid the Federal Government and there are practically no delinquencies on loan and interest payments.

Although the Federal Government through the REA and its loans to the cooperatives plays a most important role in the development of this program, the facilities of the cooperatives are owned by the persons whose homes and farms are benefited by the supply of electricity. Those of us who have lived in rural areas can appreciate the meaning of this more than perhaps others who have always lived in metropolitan areas. I happen to be a member of the Sam Houston Electric Cooperative, Inc., which serves my ranch and home in Texas, and I know whereof I speak.

Farmers and other residents of rural areas are an independent group—frugal in nature and with an ability to manage their businesses so as to secure from them the most at the least possible cost. Ownership of the rural electric facilities by these individual groups has led to a vigorous program with a reasonable cost to the owner-consumer.

The REA program is one of the great advances and accomplishments of our times. It stands now as an eloquent testimonial to the good that can be accomplished through genuine cooperation between the people and their Government, when the Government truly serves the people and does not attempt to reduce them to servitude. This valuable working alliance must not be tampered with and it must not be handicapped by actions or attitudes here in Washington.

There are still approximately one-half million rural families and rural establishments in the Nation that are not receiving electric service. With this responsibility remaining to be fulfilled, the rural residents of the Nation—the men and women who have made REA a success by their own work, their own management, their own dollars—expect and rightfully deserve an REA program which will attack with unrelenting vigor all the many complex problems involved in extending and maintaining electric service to the Nation's farm and ranch population.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

DREAM OF A GENERATION

Twenty years ago today the dream of a generation became a reality. On May 11, 1935, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Executive order that set into motion the

Rural Electrification Administration program.

President Roosevelt, acting courageously in the best American tradition, brought breath and substance to the concept of REA in the depths of the dark thirties. In those days the rural people of this country did not know what it was to have an electric lamp, an electric stove or a telephone. In the cold winter months the rural people of this country went into hibernation for all practical purposes. Almost all productive work came to a halt with the coming of cold days, long nights and rainy weather. The rural people worked and lived in a shell, isolated from the necessities and conveniences that our town people had come to take for granted.

For many years farmers had dreamed of having telephones and electric power. Until the REA was put into operation, these desires and needs were nothing but a dream.

The needs were clear. The rural families needed telephones to call the doctor when there was sickness in the family. They needed telephones to call the schools to make sure their children arrived safely in bad weather. They needed telephones to transact day-to-day business with merchants in town. They needed electric power to assist the housewife with her daily chores. They needed electric power to pump their water, to run their milking machines, to make irrigation systems practical and to perform hundreds of other jobs.

Thousands of miles of telephone and power lines connected rural families with the outside world. The farmer became a businessman who could do business every day in the year. The elements no longer forced him to hibernate and put aside his work and wait for warm weather again. Rural electrification made the difference between a bare existence and prosperous living.

In pausing to take a look over 20 years of the REA program, we should remember that this business of rural electrification is no one-way street. Each time a farmer buys a new electrical appliance or installs a new piece of power machinery it means another sale for the merchant in town. It means another sale for the manufacturer. It means another job for the factory worker. All along the line, it means more productivity for everybody concerned.

Today there are many people who would have us think that REA has finished its job Nothing could be more removed from the truth. In fact, the progress of REA is just beginning. In the 20 years of the program that ends today, we are just beginning to find out what electric power is able to do on the farm. Consequently, each day there is more and more demand for electrical devices and machinery in the everyday work on the farm.

Rural electrification has done unbelievable things for the American way of life. I am sure that the accomplishments of rural electrification in the next 20 years will be even more unbelievable than those in the 20 years ending today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to join in commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. I know that the organization of the Rural Electrification Administration was one of the most important events in bringing the benefits of modern living to Minnesota, as well as the rest of the Nation.

Before the REA was organized in 1934, only 10.9 percent of our Nation's farms received central station electric service. In June of 1954, 92.3 percent of farms in the United States were receiving central station electric service. In my own State of Minnesota the change since REA is even greater. Today 96.3 percent of the farms of Minnesota are electrified, but in 1934 only 6.8 percent received dependable electric service.

In Minnesota, farmers who did not have electricity at all, or who were not receiving adequate electric service joined together to organize 54 rural electric cooperatives. Most of the farms of Minnesota receive their electricity from rural electric cooperatives. In December of 1953 there were 187,258 consumers connected to rural electric lines in Minnesota.

It is with no hesitation that I remind Senators that many of these consumers might not today have electricity were it not for the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. President, this fact was emphasized by the remarks of the majority leader, when he pointed out the failure in the early days of the Rural Electrification Administration of the private power companies to take advantage of the loan provisions which were available under that legislation for the purpose of extending rural electric service into farm areas.

Many of the power companies claimed that farmers could not afford electric service, but the REA proved they were wrong.

Among the strongest supporters of REA are the farm women who have known what it was to be without electricity, and who could not now do without it. Since electricity has come to the farm home it has all the advantages of a city residence, along with the many other advantages of rural living.

One rural electric wife has written:

I had never really loved farm life until electricity came, now I shall always be a strong booster for REA.

Many a farm wife has told about the influence of REA on her home life. They have told long stories of toil and labor, a large part of which today is eliminated by the use of electricity. I would like Senators to hear some of the comments of a farm wife who had this experience:

I wonder how many of you know how to draw water with a bucket and rope and two hands. Before we installed our deep well pump, I learned another way and it might be well to pass it along to you. When I broke my arm about 4 years ago, I learned to draw it with 1 hand and 1 foot. Oh, yes; I had to, because I was at home with my 3 boys and they were thirsty and under 6 years of age. We had no telephone, and I knew my husband would not be home until evening. So I guess that proves the old saying, "Necessity is the mother of invention." Now, since the installation of our water system, my work has been lightened beyond description.

No more dragging in that zinc washtub for baths on Saturday night. I know it's supposed to be a joke, but it's also the truth. And, of course, the whole family always had a bath in the same water, just adding a little to keep it warm, and leaving the dirtiest until the last.

I don't think I could ever draw enough water again with a bucket and rope; but, how well I remember the two pails I always took to the well, and how I would hardly get back and get a job started until they were empty again.

However, drawing water for the family wash was always too much for me, so my husband had to get up about 30 minutes earlier on washday to get the water I would need. Then we would carry it to the basement to a wood stove to heat. Now our water is in the kitchen and bath as well as the basement. And all the effort required on my part for any amount of water is just a turn of the faucet. I never really thought about the time this has saved me because I was more concerned about my back.

However, someone was; and tests show that before electrical equipment and weekly laundry, that she washed 116 pounds of wet clothes and carried 730 pounds of water to do the job. But with electricity, laundry day is no more a drudgery. The electric washer plus the electric water heater make it about a 2-hour task.

The life of the farm woman of today is much improved over what it was previously. Today most farm wives do not have to wash clothes on a washboard. They have an electric washing machine, and maybe they have an electric dryer. Today many farm families do not have to worry about the food they produce spoiling before they can use it. They have electric refrigerators and more and more have deep freezers.

Today with the increased use of modern appliances, the farm wife has more time to spend with her family, and because electricity is their "wired hand" her family has more free time to spend at home.

And electricity is not used only in the farm home; it has been extensively used to increase farm produce. As everyone knows, increased productivity on the farm means that farm products can be sold to the consumer at lower prices. If the farmers still had to use prewar methods to produce the food they do today, then food prices would be even higher in the city markets.

In the United States today farming takes more power than any other industry except transportation. Previously, the farmer had to obtain this power from the wind, or farm animals, falling water, gasoline motors, and the human back. With electricity on the farm it can be used to cut wood; to cut ensilage and lift it into the silo; to sort and scrub potatoes; to dry corn, hay, and tobacco; to spray; to convey and grade peaches and apples; to milk cows and cool the milk; to shell corn; to hatch eggs and keep the baby chicks warm; to ventilate chicken houses; to run pig brooders; to burn stumps out of the field; to heat hotbeds for growing seedlings and for many other farm chores which barely begin the list of jobs electricity can perform on the farm.

There are many instances in which electricity on the farm has increased yields. One farmer startled his neighbors by starting to pick corn several weeks in advance of the customary date. Other farmers did not pick their corn because the moisture content was too high for safe storage, but he used an electrically driven corn dryer to bring it down to a safe level and had 3,200 bushels of corn in his bin by the time his neighbors were starting to pick theirs. The time he saved meant that his land was clear to plow before the ground froze, that he had no loss due to fall rains and freezes, and he had a minimum loss of grain in the field and in storage.

What is even more amazing, his power bill for drying the corn was only $25. There are similar examples of how pig

output has been increased by operators who breed sows to get their young in January and bring them to maturity with electric pig brooder and infrared lamp; of increased egg production by turning on lights automatically in the chicken houses at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning; of increasing the net income of a farm by $250 a month through installation of an automatic water system.

There are many other examples of how electricity on the farm has brought increased production and made lower food prices possible.

Rural electrification has also been a very important factor in keeping our young people on the farm. It has been said that the coming of rural electrification to the farm has slowed rural migration from a run to a walk. The youth of this age are unwilling to remain "hewers of wood and drawers of water." They want and they deserve the benefits of modern living. The modernization of the farmhouse through electricity is essential if future generations are to be willing to stay on the land to feed the growing population of America and the world.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that the REA has not only been a wise investment in terms of American agriculture and in bringing about increased production, but it has been one of the greatest benefits to American industry.

The production of electrical appliances and of the many, many facilities which are necessary for the operations of rural electric cooperatives have added millions of dollars to our national economy. Every town and city in America has benefited because of a wise and prudent policy on the part of the Federal Government. Best of all, this policy has paid dividends to the Government.

The farmers of the United States are ahead on the repayment of their farm loans.

Let the American people know that REA has not been a grant or a gift by Government to a selected group in the community. It has been an institution characterized by wise management, sound business practice, and by the extension of credit at reasonable rates of interest over a long period of time.

This kind of investment by the Government has produced untold wealth. It represents the highest standard or the best example of close cooperation between the Government and the people, to the mutual advantage of both.

I have heard some comments today in reference to the continuation of the rural-electrification program and its expansion. So that the record may be complete, let me state these facts.

In fiscal 1954 the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, requested $145 million for REA loan funds. Congress appropriated $240,500,000. In fiscal 1955 the Bureau of the Budget, an office of the President, requested $130 million. Congress appropriated $210 million.

Congress has clearly understood the importance of rural electrification. Congress, both as to rural electric power and rural telephones, has led the way.

I am particularly pleased to say that on each and every vote for augmenting and increasing appropriations for rural electrification and rural telephones it has been my privilege to vote in the affirmative, in support of those measures.

I want the record to be clear that an attempt was made to reduce the funds which would be available. Thank goodness, Congress overruled that unwise policy decision. Thank goodness, Congress has had faith and confidence in the rural-electrification program and in the ability of farmers to manage their own rural-electric cooperatives, and has extended the helping hand of Government to strong arms in rural America. This has paid off for the Nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in the 80th Congress there was considerable discussion about the REA, and that although the appropriation finally was increased to $400 million, nevertheless the actual amount appropriated was reduced, with the result that in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, where REA lines had been laid out, even though the situation was later brought to the attention of Congress, and was ultimately changed, the program was retarded for 1 whole year in those three States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is entirely correct. As he knows, there was at that time some comment to the effect that the construction of generating facilities was to be curtailed, and as the Senator points out, funds for the administrative functions which were necessary for the program were severely limited, and therefore the rural regions suffered for a period of time by reason of the improper development of the program.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator from Minnesota believe that steamplants are essential to the firming up of power for REA?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. Furthermore, I concur in the statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that the use of atomic energy for rural electric cooperatives and for the creation of electrical energy in rural areas is absolutely essential.

It is to be hoped that in high cost power States, such as, for example, as Minnesota and North Dakota, there will be atomic energy plants which can fill in along with steam plants for the purpose of providing adequate sources of electrical energy.

Mr. LANGER. In Minnesota, especially, a splendid development of REA has been accomplished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct; and we are very proud of it.

Mr. LANGER. Although the development in North Dakota and South Dakota, and, as a matter of fact, most of the Middle Northwest, has not been so great, we have caught up pretty well with some of the other States, such as Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the celebration of the 20th anniversary of REA is a noteworthy event. I am proud of the great record of progress it has written in bringing the farm families of America forward into the 20th century.

Before the birth of REA 20 years ago only some 10 percent of the farm homes of America could get central station electricity. Now—just 20 years later—that ratio has risen until more than 90 percent enjoy the benefits of electric power.

It works for the farmer in his production of poultry, dairy products, livestock, and in all sorts of jobs around the farm. The great conveniences of modern living today belong to the farm wife. Her work is made easier by all the modern appliances that once only those who lived in big cities could have.

The ever-increasing demands for electric power demonstrate how well the farmer realized the advantages of electrification, and each year the farm load grows greater. In Oklahoma alone our REA lines serve 138,000 farm families. Demand is moving ahead rapidly in extending the service to more than 4,400,000 rural customers throughout the Nation.

Of the nearly $3 billion in loans made to about 1,100 rural co-ops, only about $307,000 in loan repayments are delinquent more than 30 days. This is a remarkable record, hardly matched anywhere in Government lending activities. But in addition, these same REA's have paid ahead of time on their obligations by $60 million.

In addition to this remarkable repayment record, the REA's have created a vast amount of new business which could not have existed had these rural lines not been constructed.

Each of the more than 4 million farm homes served has become a buyer for new appliances, tools, stoves, deep freezes, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and the like. It is reliably estimated that for every dollar the Government has spent in loans to build REA lines, the farmer has spent $4 to enjoy the benefits of his new electric service.

Estimating the total loans at some $3 billion since 1935, this would make the total business generated for the appliance dealer, the hardware man, the implement dealer, and others who merchandise electrical goods, exceed $12 billion. And still the need grows as farmers constantly devise new uses for electricity.

One of the big problems in completing the network of rural electric lines has been the problem of power supply. Under REA, thousands of new electric customers had to be served in areas where none previously existed. The pattern of the city utility transmission lines, which had been developed to serve urban load centers, simply was not suitable in many cases to carry the heavy load required by the addition of thousands of farm users.

The same power supply problem that faced the agency 20 years ago still faces it today. This goes both for the generation of power and for the transmission of it to the load centers of the rural electrification co-ops.

This was obvious from the start. In fact, in his second annual report to the Congress, the Administrator treated this

subject extensively and laid down a policy which has generally been adhered to by the agency and accepted by the Congress throughout the years.

I quote from that report:

> REA authorizes new generating plants sparingly, and only where there is no power available, or where the utilities have refused to supply at all, or refused to supply at a price within the limits of feasibility.

I think this was a sensible approach to the power supply problem at that time, and I think it is one which is still sensible. Without the authority to make generating and transmission loans, rural America would never have been electrified.

Some power companies would have refused to sell power at all, or if they did agree to sell it, the cost would have been so unreasonable that feasibility could never have been established.

By December 1937, REA had made allotments for 19 generating plants scattered throughout the country. As early as 1937 generating plants had proved their value to the program. Even then, they had supplied a deficiency in power sources in some areas. In other areas as soon as the authorization of the generating plant had been made, certain utilities came forward with rate quotations which they had previously withheld. In some cases, the authorization of generating plants brought forth the offer of substantial reductions in wholesale rates which had previously been quoted. Remember, this was back in 1937, in the beginning of the program. That same pattern has followed through the years.

In Minnesota and Wisconsin, for example, the first federated cooperatives were formed after long and tedious negotiations had failed to secure satisfactory wholesale rates. When the Wisconsin federation was ready to begin actual construction, the power company offered to sell wholesale energy at a low rate to the projects in the federation on a year contract. The Wisconsin Power Cooperative was too far along with its plans to abandon its project. Thus came into being the Dairyland Power Cooperative, serving today 25 distribution cooperatives in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois. Dairyland has received loans totalling a little more than $60 million. This is the largest generating and transmission cooperative that REA has financed.

By the middle of November, 1937, REA had loaned about $2¾ million for generating plants. REA learned early that one of the major elements in extending widespread electric service at low cost was reasonable rates for wholesale power. The cost of power in those early days of the program was, and still is today, one of the most important factors in the successful operation of a rural electrification cooperative or power district. The cost of power is the largest single item of operating cost, except for interest and amortization payments. If the power is purchased, as most of it is, and the only available wholesale rate is a few mills too high, then REA has no alternative but to lend money for generation and transmission facilities.

In order to have some small degree of protection against exorbitant rate increases for wholesale power, or against poor service on the line, the generating and transmission co-op loans have been worth tremendous amounts to REA. Every State has seen outstanding results because an independent power supply can be obtained through REA loans if the utility rates are unreasonable or the service unsatisfactory.

In Oklahoma, during the early days of REA, our rate was as high as 12 mills for wholesale power. Gradually with the help of the Southwestern Power Administration, making available power generated at hydroelectric flood-control dams, and with the power from the Western Farmers Co-Op, using a $14 million generating and transmission plant, the rate has gone down to 5 and 6 mills. The preservation of an independent source of supply has saved the farm users millions in keeping rates low. These plants do not take away any of the load that existed before REA. They supply only a fraction of the load built by Government loans to these REA co-ops. Last year the power generated by REA's totaled only about 5 percent of its power needs, and only a slightly higher amount was available from public-power sources.

We need to protect these vital sources of power supply from the constant attacks made against them. Already the successful operation, through integration, of hydroelectric power generated by Southwestern Power Administration with the firm power of Western Farmers Electric is threatened by hostile action because a continuing fund to buy and sell electric power has been denied. By action of the Congress in 1951, this fund was killed, and contracts for the planned operation of these sources of wholesale power were ordered terminated last year. Activation of the original plan for integration would save the farmers in Oklahoma a minimum of some $750,000 a year, and would result in a saving on their present rates.

In eastern and central Oklahoma, the farmers have found a satisfactory power supply in KAMO, a straight transmission co-op, reaching into Arkansas and even into Missouri with new lines designed to serve the rural-load centers. The power deserts which existed were eliminated by this line. It, too, gets much of its power from Southwestern Power Administration, but due to pressure from utility opposition, the quantity is gradually being reduced, so that the farmers are not getting a sufficient amount to supply their needs.

By fiscal 1940, REA had loaned $6,716,000 for generation and transmission and by the end of fiscal 1945 the figure was $50,923,000. By 1950, it totaled a little over $377 million. At the end of fiscal 1953, it was 507¾ million dollars. Since the end of fiscal 1953, the Agency has loaned about $36 million through March of this year for additional generating and transmission facilities. Such loans are needed for two basic reasons:

First. They are needed in areas where power supply is pitifully short and the situation growing more desperate as REA cooperative loads grow. They are growing rapidly. As a matter of fact, the load on an average REA cooperative doubles about every 4 or 5 years.

Second. Unless REA makes generating and transmission loans, wholesale power rates will go up to a point where costs of power will be prohibitive.

The average annual loans for generating and transmission from May 1935 through fiscal 1940 was only a little over $1 million. From fiscal 1941 through fiscal 1953, the average was $38½ million. I think it may be significant that only one new federated cooperative loan has been made in the last 2 years. Other loans are badly needed, but have not been made. I hope the Administrator is not opposed to generating and transmission loans, although the annual average for the last 2 years is only $18 million. The farmers of America have saved millions of dollars in wholesale power costs because of the right REA has to make generating and transmission loans. This right must be preserved and it must be exercised so that power supply will be adequate and at reasonable rates.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the distinguished majority leader began the presentation of the benefits of the Rural Electrification Administration, I was impressed with his calling to our memories the drudgery which was inflicted upon our rural people when they had no electricity on their farms.

I recalled this vividly, Mr. President, because in my State only 27 percent of the farms had electricity before the Rural Electrification Administration came into existence. Today, 20 years later, and largely as a result of that great agency, more than 98 percent of the farm homes in the Pacific Northwest have electricity.

I have visited in many of those homes. I have seen what electricity has meant, particularly in lightening the drudgery and toil which formerly had been inflicted upon the farm wives of the Pacific Northwest region.

Mrs. Neuberger's family are farm people. I have heard my mother-in-law speak many times about what it was like for the women on the farm to live without electricity. They had to wash farm clothes—and I might add parenthetically that farm clothes get very dirty—over a corrugated washboard. They had no mechanical refrigeration, and the food they cooked often spoiled. They had to do their cooking with wood, and the women chopped the kindling when the men were in the fields performing their chores. They carried kerosene lanterns from room to room in winter, and they had to get up by kerosene lamp when the children were sick.

A few weeks ago in Oregon we held hearings on the Hells Canyon bill. At those hearings testimony was given by Mrs. May Grant, who is president of the Benton-Lincoln County Rural Electric Co-Op Association. She told how she had to spend a large part of the day trimming the wicks of kerosene lamps in the era before there was electricity on the farms.

I was impressed by the earnestness of that Oregon farm woman as she looked

back on that period of time. And then her face lighted up and she told what it had meant, in terms of a higher standard of living for her and her family, when the REA lines had brought to them electricity.

Mr. President, the REA did not come into existence accidentally. Unlike Topsy, it did not just grow. It came into existence very largely, Mr. President, through the efforts and the vision and the foresight of a great man who served in this body, and the good that he did will live forever. It has lived long after him, and it will go on living through the pages of our history. His name was George William Norris, and he was a Senator from the State of Nebraska. He was the man who fathered the REA. He introduced the bill in the Senate to make the REA a permanent Government organization, a part of the great governing body of the United States. The REA is his monument. Wherever there is electricity on our farms which did not exist and did not throw a light before the establishment of REA, that electricity is his monument.

George William Norris was a very great American. He began life as a conservative Republican. He told very many times how he was a conservative Republican when a young Member of the House of Representatives. But he was not a man who was inimical to change. Like the great poet Lowell:

New occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth.

In his later years, as he developed, he came to be a political independent, although most of the times he supported the Presidential nominees of the Democratic Party, men like Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. President, George W. Norris was closely associated with Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the President who worked with Senator Norris to create the Rural Electrification Administration. I should like to read what Franklin Roosevelt said of George Norris. This is what Mr. Roosevelt said of that great Senator:

We should remember that the ultimate analysis of history asks the answer to questions which are not concerned so much with what you and I, in these modern days, call ballyhoo, or headlines, as they are with much simpler fundamentals. History asks, "Did the man have integrity?" "Did the man have unselfishness?" "Did the man have courage?" "Did the man have consistency?" And if the individual under the scrutiny of the historic microscope measured up to an affirmative answer to these questions, then history has set him down as great indeed in the pages of all the years to come.

There are few statesmen in America today who so definitely and clearly measure up to an affirmative answer to the four questions as did the senior Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris. In his rare case, history has already written the verdict.

Mr. President, that is what Franklin D. Roosevelt said about George Norris.

In 1940, a significant poll among 53 leading Washington newspaper correspondents was sponsored by Life magazine. They were asked to rank Members of the United States Senate according to four basic qualities. These were integrity, influence, intelligence, and industry. First of all the 96 Senators in this salient rating was one of the oldest Members of that body—George Norris. He scored 297.5 points. Second was William E. Borah of Idaho, with 287 points.

I mention this poll for a number of reasons. To begin with, who could better know the merits and abilities of the Senators than the newspaper reporters who covered their activities each day? Second, although Senator Norris was near the end of his unusual career, he still scored high enough in the four categories selected by Life to excel all other Senators. And when the magazine listed each Senator's major interest, this was what its editors put down for Norris: "Public electric power."

If Senator Norris' interest in this respect were to be further subdivided, I would add that his greatest desire in the satisfactory settlement of the power issue was that ample hydroelectricity be brought to the farmers of the Nation.

Fundamentally—

He once said—

I felt the farmer would become a better and more satisfactory consumer of electricity than the individual in the town and city. His needs were greater. In the farm home there were all the various applications of electricity that the city dweller made, and there were also so many additional requirements.

In the annals of our majestic country, the names of great men are associated forever with noble causes. We think of Jefferson in connection with the Declaration of Independence. Madison brings to mind our Federal Constitution. Lincoln symbolizes the holding together of the Union and the ending of human slavery. Theodore Roosevelt stands for the busting of the trusts and Woodrow Wilson for the New Freedom and the League of Nations. Franklin D. Roosevelt means to us the voice which rallied and cheered the land at the depths of the great industrial depression.

Yes; and George Norris makes us think of water flowing ceaselessly through concrete and steel chutes to spin whirring turbines. And we think, too, of transmission wires threading through the rural countryside, bringing the unseen genie of electricity to do the bidding of the farmer and his family.

After the Rural Electrification Administration had been established, Senator Norris declared:

In time, REA bids fair to become greater in its effect upon agricultural life than the Department of Agriculture itself.

I know that Senator Norris treasured until his death the silver plaque which the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association presented to him in St. Louis 10 years ago. No man of Norris' character could read these words describing himself upon such a plaque and not be moved to gratitude and humility:

For independence of partisan politics, for the fight for political and economic freedom for all human beings, for the suppression of monopoly and special privilege, for honesty and efficiency in Government, for elimination of racial and religious prejudices and for economic security and freedom from want for all.

Mr. President, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has decided to erect a new building here in Washington, D. C., where is located its national headquarters. I think it would be entirely fitting if the building were to be dedicated and named after the great Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris, who was the father of the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural-electric movement in the Nation.

Mr. President, before concluding my remarks, I wish to comment very briefly on some comments which were made earlier today, in pointing out that the present national administration supports the REA.

I think all of us are aware of the fact that the present national administration has advocated a so-called partnership policy on the great rivers of the Pacific Northwest, where lurks 42 percent of the potential hydroelectric power still left in the Nation. One feature of that partnership policy is the elimination of the public-power preference clause.

Mr. President, the public-power preference clause came into existence in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. It was championed by George Norris, Charles L. McNary, William E. Borah, and many other great progressive Republicans. The only thing which protects the power supply of our rural electric cooperatives in the Pacific Northwest, is the public-power preference clause. Unless that preference clause is continued and unless it endures, our farmers' rural electric cooperatives cannot be assured of a continuing power supply from the great dams on the Columbia River. Yet, Mr. President, if the partnership policy of the present national administration is adopted, there will be no preference clause governing the distribution of electric power from such great sites as Hells Canyon, John Day, and others.

So, Mr. President, although no one can presume to speak for the dead, I daresay that if George W. Norris, the father of rural electrification, were alive today, he would join with the present rural electric cooperatives in opposing the partnership power policy.

Mr. President, before I close, I wish to say that when we pay this tribute to the REA, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of its establishment, it is fitting, indeed, that we pay tribute and give praise to the father of the REA, George W. Norris. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very moving editorial written by Mr. R. L. Duffus, associate editor of the New York Times, which appeared in that eminent American newspaper, in tribute to Senator Norris, on September 4, 1944, shortly after his death.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR NORRIS

George Norris was one of the last of the elder statesmen. Probably no Senator in his time left a deeper impress on a changing America. He stood like a rock dividing the liberal and conservative streams of thought in this Nation, diverting much of it into the channels through which he wished it to flow.

That was always to the left, always toward what he felt was the side of the common man and against what he felt was entrenched privilege. He was uncompromising and incorruptible. The possible dangers that lurked in a socialized society he ignored. In his last days, accepting the honorary chairmanship of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, he stood further to the left than he had ever before ventured.

The end of his life was saddened by his defeat for the Senate in 1942. He regarded it as a "repudiation of 40 years of service" by "the people I love." But most of the reforms for which he fought so stoutly were already incorporated in our political system, and his place in history as one of the great American progressive leaders was assured. It was 28 years ago that Senator Norris really stood in the shadow. He voted against the first war with Germany when this country had determined to defend its rights, and he was thrust by Woodrow Wilson into that "little groups of willful men." But Hitler's rise to power brought Senator Norris to the most complete reversal of his career. This time, despite his hatred of war inspired by the misfortunes of his family in the struggle between the States, he urged war to the hilt against both Germany and Japan.

His career was colored by the bitter experiences of an impoverished youth. It was inevitable that he should fight for the poor and oppressed. Elected to Congress as a partisan Republican, he became by slow stages a party maverick, an insurgent, an independent, and finally an ardent supporter of President Roosevelt. It was he who led the revolt in the House against the iron rule of Speaker Cannon. The list of constructive legislation he fathered is extensive and impressive. He was the author of the 20th amendment, which outlaws "lame-duck" or hold-over sessions of Congress. He brought the single house legislature to Nebraska. He was responsible for the vast power enterprise of the TVA, and it was with infinite satisfaction that he saw similar authorities established in other sections of the country. No man could ask a more monolithic monument than Norris Dam.

But his character was his noblest monument. Grave and gentle in individual relations, he was hard as granite toward the things he hated. Above all, he hated corruption and sought to crush it. Wrong-headed he could be. Wrong-hearted he never was. His influence will remain as the shining examplar of the utterly sincere and honest man in politics.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished Majority Leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and my other colleagues in rejoicing over the achievements of the rural electrification movement in the United States in the past 20 years. The record of these achievements shines as brightly throughout the land as the farm lights do in my own State of Montana on a clear night.

There are many things I would like to say about this great program, about its achievements, about the thousands of fine men and women who have toiled to make it succeed. But I think a record should speak for itself, and I should like to insert into the RECORD some of the figures showing how really great these achievements have been, achievements by farm people in cooperation with a great agency of Government.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing the electric loan funds allocated and advanced by REA each year, from 1935 through 1954.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*REA electric loan funds allocated (obligated) and advanced by fiscal year, 1935–54 (not including telephone loan funds)*

Fiscal year	Obligated	Advanced
1935–36	$13, 903, 412	$823, 262
1937	45, 032, 805	11, 041, 574
1938	26, 933, 787	48, 175, 974
1939	133, 158, 334	62, 297, 014
1940	41, 736, 000	98, 949, 463
1941	100, 054, 672	75, 107, 855
1942	91, 152, 724	58, 220, 868
1943	6, 700, 978	14, 536, 572
1944	31, 930, 124	18, 478, 088
1945	25, 731, 055	39, 736, 068
1946	289, 372, 488	87, 253, 106
1947	254, 521, 172	190, 085, 857
1948	313, 023, 099	246, 235, 957
1949	448, 859, 597	321, 286, 868
1950	375, 151, 456	286, 658, 652
1951	221, 733, 800	268, 130, 658
1952	165, 425, 811	227, 574, 029
1953	137, 379, 160	207, 633, 936
1954	155, 923, 014	181, 528, 532

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the table shows that funds actually advanced to the systems rose from a total of $823,262 in 1935–36, to a peak of $321 million, in 1949. For the fiscal year 1956, the administration is planning to lend $185 million to continue this program.

Loans do not tell the story, however, because what the Congress and rural people have been interested in is getting the job done. In the course of 20 years, REA borrowers have energized over 1,387,441 miles of line, through June 30, 1954. This is enough line to reach around the earth at the equator over 55 times.

These lines have brought modern electric service to approximately 4½ million farm families and other rural establishments—schools, businesses, and churches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing the development of rural areas, in terms of miles of line and number of consumers served. The table indicates that more than 4,367,000 consumers were served, as of June 20, 1954, and that over 100 thousand more have been added since then.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Millions of connected consumers and miles of line energized by REA borrowers as of June 30 each year, 1936–54* [1]

Year	Miles of line energized (cumulative)	Consumers connected (cumulative)
1936	400	693
1937	8, 000	19, 611
1938	41, 736	104, 528
1939	115, 230	268, 000
1940	232, 978	549, 604
1941	307, 769	779, 561
1942	369, 129	981, 193
1943	381, 747	1, 041, 821
1944	397, 861	1, 152, 031
1945	424, 072	1, 287, 347
1946	474, 831	1, 549, 057
1947	546, 781	1, 843, 351
1948	666, 156	2, 263, 869
1949	839, 685	2, 778, 180
1950	1, 018, 336	3, 251, 787
1951	1, 134, 498	3, 547, 323
1952	1, 210, 473	3, 769, 426
1953	1, 271, 443	3, 951, 940
1954	1, 387, 441	4, 367, 045

[1] Source: REA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, loans and miles of line and consumers connected are the means to an end, the end of bringing abundant, low cost electric power to rural people. The rural electric cooperatives have a national song which begins:

We have set transmission towers on their march across the land. Soon to bring electric power's strength to every farm's command. We have shown what happens, when the farmer takes a hand.

The result of the farmer taking a hand in partnership with democratic government has been a peaceful revolution in rural life. In fiscal 1954 the rural electric systems pumped 15 billion kilowatt hours of power over their lines to supply a need that was completely unmet 20 years earlier. Electric energy is bringing to the farm the blessings described in a recent General Electric advertisement. In this advertisement GE stated that a modern, well-equipped home enjoyed the benefit, in terms of electric power consumed, of the equivalent of the labor of 32 able-bodied men working 8-hour days every day of the year. I ask Senators to picture in their own minds a comparison between a farm home 20 years ago and one today, assuming the ability to enjoy the labor of 32 men working about the home compared to a home where that 32 man-day equivalent was missing. In recent years we have heard complaints about high wages and the inability of some women to hire the work of one able-bodied household servant. If this is ground for complaint, consider the rural housewife shorn of the work of 32 man-hour days each day. When we consider this, it will explain why rural people rise up in arms when public officials or private power companies threaten their supply of wired hands about the home and farm.

From the pessimism of false prophets of the early years, we come down through the years with the growth of farm use of power leaping at a phenomenal rate. Over the years the demands on the rural electric systems have risen on the average 20 percent per year. This means that the demands are doubling every 4 or 5 years. There does not appear to be any foreseeable end to the steady growth in demand for power on our farms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the growth in in-put of energy into the rural-electric systems in recent years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—*Estimated input of kilowatt-hours of energy of REA borrowers by calendar year, 1943–63* [1]

Year	Input in kilowatt-hours (billions)	Percentage increase over preceding year
1936	[2]	
1937	[2]	
1938	[2]	
1939	[2]	
1940	[2]	
1941	[2]	
1942	[2]	
1943	1. 920	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Estimated input of kilowatt-hours of energy of REA borrowers by calendar year, 1943–63* [1]—Continued

Year	Input in kilowatt-hours (billions)	Percentage increase over preceding year
1944	2.188	14.0
1945	2.417	10.5
1946	2.817	16.5
1947	3.812	35.3
1948	5.232	37.3
1949	6.782	29.6
1950	8.308	23.0
1951	10.241	23.3
1952	11.991	17.1
1953	13.890	15.8
1954	[1] 15.480	[3] 11.5
1955	16.810	9.6
1956	18.150	8.0
1957	19.480	7.3
1958	20.820	6.9
1959	22.160	6.4
1960	23.490	6.0
1961	24.830	5.7
1962	26.170	5.4
1963	27.500	5.0

[1] Actual input through 1953; estimated for 1954–63. "Input" excludes power produced for resale to non-REA borrowers. Source: REA.

[2] Data for years 1936–42 not available on comparable basis. Gross input for earlier years destroys comparability because data on energy generated for resale to non-REA borrowers is not available.

[3] In the 5-year period 1949–53, inclusive, energy input more than doubled (1953 was 105 percent of 1949).

Mr. MANSFIELD. I remind my colleagues that this job was not done by the rural people alone; it was done in collaboration with a great agency of the Congress, the Rural Electrification Administration. Without a dynamic, driving agency this program would never have achieved its present status. I, for one, am disturbed over the tendency to steadily slash at the administrative funds appropriated for the electric-loan program of REA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the total man-years of assistance available to REA over the years, and the total available for the electric program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Man-years of REA administrative manpower employed by fiscal year, 1936–56*

Year	Man-years employed [1]		
	Electrification program	Telephone program	Total
1936	206	----------	206
1937	390	----------	390
1938	460	----------	460
1939	684	----------	684
1940	785	----------	785
1941	950	----------	950
1942	1,094	----------	1,094
1943	790	----------	790
1944	646	----------	646
1945	723	----------	723
1946	987	----------	987
1947	1,117	----------	1,117
1948	929	----------	929
1949	1,076	----------	1,076
1950	1,152	49	1,201
1951	1,131	190	1,321
1952	969	214	1,283
1953	811	320	1,131
1954	628	392	1,020
1955	[2] 566	[2] 440	[2] 1,006
1956	[3] 562	[3] 485	[3] 1,047

[1] Includes legal staff employed by REA prior to 1942.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Based on Bureau of the Budget request.
Source: REA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These figures show that the manpower available to service the loans of the rural electric systems is lower than it has been since 1938. There is a great deal of loose talk and propaganda about protecting the farmer's morals from too much assistance. I think if the Congress and the administrative agencies do their job in extending to farmers the same services they extend to other groups in the economy, the farmer will take care of his own morals. It is disturbing to me to hear the constant beat of propaganda from self-appointed theologians who make a living out of politics about protecting the farmers' morals. I am not disturbed about the farmer or his morals, and neither do I think anyone else is concerned whose own morality is beyond question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I, too, am happy to join the distinguished majority leader and other Senators in saluting the REA on its 20th anniversary

This great organization has done an outstanding job in the pioneering of rural electrification.

For years before the establishment of REA, a familiar refrain was that rural electrification was uneconomic, construction costs were too high, and it simply could not be done. Yet in 20 years, the farms of the Nation receiving electric service have risen from 1 in 10 to 9 in 10.

The job was done because of the vision and foresight of our national leaders, and because of their confidence in the rural people of America, along with the pioneering zeal of the employees of the Agency.

Let us take a look at some of the things pioneered by REA in rural electrification. REA developed new rural-line construction plans and specifications. When REA started, rural electrification was on a piece-meal basis.

With very few exceptions, construction practices had followed urban practice. The construction methods of electric distribution lines were not suited to the needs of farm electrification. Besides, that type of construction was costly to the point that rural electrification was impossible unless more economical costs could be developed.

During those days, in collaboration with manufacturers and consulting engineers, REA conducted research into the characteristics and uses of the great variety of materials that went into rural-line construction.

Field engineers were assigned to the field and worked out of their homes in order to speed up construction.

REA established standardization of construction practices, and also of materials used in construction. First was the adoption of a simple design suited to rural conditions. Such a design was found in the now common vertical construction, with the elimination of the crossarm. That design had been known to the industry for some years, but it had never been used on a broad scale until REA came into the picture.

Another important change was the steadily increasing length of the span between poles.

When REA was created, a span of 200 to 225 feet was normal. Standard specifications for REA projects were drawn up calling for longer spans, and thus fewer poles per mile.

In cooperation with manufacturers, new type transformers were developed. Savings of unnecessary costs included specifications for lighter class poles.

Overall, the pioneering done by REA resulted in cutting construction costs heavily, as against what they had been originally.

As the REA borrowers went into operation, many other innovations were introduced into the industry. One of these was having the member read his own meter, thereupon reporting the figures directly on a postcard to the office.

Meter-reading costs were thus cut drastically. This practice alone has saved many thousands of dollars for the rural consumers over the past 20 years.

In many areas where it was difficult to establish feasibility because of economic conditions, high cost of power, or various other reasons, self-help projects were pioneered by REA. The farmer members contributed such labor as helping set poles, securing right-of-way, clearing, and so forth. It was pioneering in the development of a real, genuine partnership, a partnership those of us who believe in REA also believe will continue and prosper.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the REA. I think perhaps the best tribute I can pay to it is to say that I use REA services on my farm, and every month I send a check in payment of them. The REA has performed an important function in an excellent manner. It is a fine organization. I have been a Member of the Senate for approximately 11 years, and I have consistently and continually supported the REA, and will continue to do so.

I congratulate the REA on the fine work it has done in the past 20 years. I say this not only as a citizen, a taxpayer, and a legislator, but also as a user of REA services.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration, better known as REA, today celebrates its 20th birthday. Twenty years ago today, on May 11, 1935, President Roosevelt initiated the REA program by Executive order. The objective of this program was to bring light and electricity to rural homes. This wonderful objective has been achieved beyond the fondest hopes of its originators.

In 1935, only 1 of every 10 rural homes in the United States had electricity. Today, more than 9 out of 10 rural homes enjoy the blessings of electricity. In my State of South Carolina less than 3 rural homes in every 100 had electric power in 1935. Today 88 out of every 100 have it.

Nationally, REA serves more than 4 million consumers, and in my home State of South Carolina it serves more than 80,000 rural homes. Essentially, REA is a Government lending program whereby loans are made chiefly to rural cooperatives for the building and maintenance of rural electric systems. Since 1939, more than $3 billion has been loaned to borrowers. The total number of these borrowers exceeds more than a thousand, and to date there have been

only two foreclosures, costing the Government only about $40,000. Three hundred and seventy-six million dollars of the principal loans has been repaid, along with $192 million in interest. Truly, this program has been amazingly successful. But the real measure of its success is not to be found in statistics. Rather it is to be found in the benefits that have come to the homes of the millions of REA consumers.

Since the enactment of the REA program, many burdens have been lifted from the shoulders of our farm and rural families. Today these people have electric lights to replace kerosene lamps in their homes and schools; they have electric power to replace muscle power in so much of their work; and, yes—I am proud to say—a great many of our rural homes now enjoy the luxuries and conveniences of radio, television, washing machines, refrigerators, food freezers, and many of the other modern appliances.

I know of no single piece of Federal legislation that has been enacted within the past 100 years which has done as much as the REA program to benefit so vital a segment of our economy and our farm population. I hope the day is not far away when every rural home in America will have electricity and telephone service. I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for initiating today the many tributes which have been paid to the REA program by my fellow colleagues and myself on its 20th anniversary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

THE BIRTHDAY OF REA

I am proud to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Rural Electrification Administration on this, their 20th anniversary. In my State of Nebraska, we have made one of the most enviable records of any State under the REA program.

In 1935, only 9,544 farms in Nebraska were connected with electric lines. Today, we have 103,000 electrified farms and 96.4 percent of all farms in the State of Nebraska receive electricity. We have borrowed $117 million under the REA, and I am happy to say our districts are all in sound financial condition and our loan repayments are actually ahead of schedule.

I can attest to the fact that the entire Nebraska delegation has long supported the REA. I became a strong advocate of this program when I came to the House of Representatives in 1938 and have worked closely with REA development since that time. While Nebraska started rather slowly in this great undertaking, the REA development has grown by leaps and bounds during the past decade and I feel that the maximum possible electrification will soon be reached in Nebraska.

I am certainly mindful of the many benefits afforded by this fine program. The lives of farmers and farm wives have been enhanced by electricity. Much of the farm labor is now performed, with the use of a variety of electric appliances, far easier than I knew farming as a young man. In addition, the many businesses allied with farming, such as the sale of farm machinery and appliances, have greatly benefited from REA development. A new and important result of farm electrification is the widespread use of pump irrigation on many farms in Nebraska. I was happy to author legislation which will make easier the matter of farm development of pump irrigation and I feel that this method of putting water on the soil has seen only a beginning in the State of Nebraska. It is my purpose to remain closely in touch with REA board members and managers in the State of Nebraska, as well as with individual farmers. We are able, through close cooperation, to maintain a degree of progress which will bring the full benefit of electrification to a maximum number of farms. In this program, the entire State of Nebraska is richly rewarded.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, today we are celebrating the 20th birthday of one of the greatest programs we in the Senate have the privilege to support. This REA program has made an essential service available to the farmer, a service which for years was denied to them. REA developed a fine Federal-local partnership of the people with their Government. This is much different from the Eisenhower-McKay partnership for the enrichment of the private power companies. The Eisenhower partnership is typified in my part of the country by the Dixon-Yates deal.

We in Tennessee feel we are in a State which has benefitted greatly by this program. Before the advent of REA 3.6 percent of the farmers in Tennessee had central station electric service. It was not that the farmers in Tennessee did not want this service, but it just was not available to them except in a few cases at a cost they could not afford to pay. But this tremendous problem did not dismay Franklin D. Roosevelt. He did not tell the farmer to be patient and wait until the private power companies were able to construct profitable rural lines. Instead, he decided the Federal Government could and should help, and by executive order he established REA. Later the Congress enacted a law establishing REA as a permanent agency of the Federal Government. I say permanent with some reservations, because if the Eisenhower-Hoover-Benson team has its way, this fine program will be destroyed by slow starvation through higher interest rates, higher cost power, or, in some areas, a scarcity of power. I tell you, Mr. President, we Democrats will fight this to the limit of our strength.

REA got the job done. Remember, only 3.5 percent of the farms in Tennessee had electricity before REA. Now 95.4 percent have received central station electric service. Also, the farmers in Tennessee are making extensive use of this service. They are among the highest farm users in the Nation, with an average usage of 282 kilowatt-hours per month per farm, as compared with 226 kilowatt-hours per month per farm in the Nation as a whole. Of course, this use is due in a great part to the low-cost power made available by the other great partner of the people, the TVA. Together the farmer and REA and TVA are getting the job done in this large area of the country.

This great REA program was not successful without tremendous effort on the part of the farmer. He went down the dirt roads and collected the memberships and the right-of-way easements. He held community meetings and told his neighbors about the opportunity offered them. He helped to get his co-op formally organized and incorporated.

But this program could not have grown so rapidly without the aid of the Federal agency, REA. The old REA, the people's REA, gave them help at every turn. They provided field representatives to explain and promote the program, they provided engineering and management assistance when required, they developed new ways of constructing rural lines to bring the costs down, and they got the loans. But in this administration the brake has been put on. If a co-op wants assistance in management, engineering, or auditing it is usually told to go out and purchase such services. If a group of cooperatives feels that it needs an additional source of power, it is told to go out and try to make arrangements with the private power companies, and only as a last resort will REA make a loan to enable the farmer to achieve sufficient power at lower cost. REA seems to have lost its fine spirit of the past. It no longer is carrying the ball in leading the way in the field of rural electrification.

We Democrats in the Senate want REA to go ahead in these fields and provide the services that the rural electric systems should have. This program is self-supporting and is no burden to the taxpayer, but it will become a burden if the co-ops are denied the necessary services and they get into financial trouble. Then, I guess, they would blame it on the Democrats. The full responsibility for the administration of this program rests on the present administration. We Democrats got this program started and got it on its feet. It is up to the present administration to see that it continues to grow and that all its needs are met. We Democrats in the Senate will provide the administration the necessary funds to do this.

Today I am proud to join in wishing this fine program many years of continued success on its 20th anniversary. I stand ready to do my part to protect this program from the attempts of the Eisenhower-Hoover-Benson team to destroy it. I stand ready, as a Member of the Senate, to approve the necessary funds to provide for the continuous expansion of this program, which means so much to the farmer. I oppose turning this program over to the Wall Street bankers as the Hoover Commission report suggests, and which the administration has not taken a stand against. Also, we do not want the cooperatives to be put at the mercy of the private power companies on their power supply problems, but we want the REA Administrator to make the necessary generation and transmission loans to meet their power needs as they occur. We do not want a cooperative to have to agree to integration or other conditions before it can get a generation and transmission loan. But we want this loan to be made if it is needed, and to be made the way the local cooperatives want it. We do not want policy to be dictated from on top. We want the wishes of the people to be met.

This is a program formed by the people, and we do not want it to become top-heavy with bureaucratic interference in Washington. We Democrats in the Senate must strive unceasingly to see that the necessary funds and services are available to allow this fine program to grow as it has grown in the past 20 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am happy to join in this celebration of REA's 20th anniversary. We all recognize what a grand job it has done in bringing much-needed electric service to rural people in America. There is, however, one thing that we should all recognize and that is, that the job is not, by any means, completed. The job of bringing adequate electric service and keeping it at a high standard, is a continuing job. I want to talk for a few minutes about the future of REA, as I see it.

The electric industry is a growing industry. As has been pointed out, REA loads double about every 4 or 5 years. This means that heavier lines have to be put in, additional substations have to be installed, new sources of power supply have to be obtained. The history of the utility industry shows that new capital has to be put in at regular intervals. Where new capital has not been obtained, the service deteriorates, it becomes obsolete and dissatisfaction arises among the consumers.

Probably the most serious problem that will face the REA co-ops in the future, will be the low-down, covert attacks made on them through such vehicles as the Hoover Commission report, the National Tax Equality League, the power trust, and the banking fraternity. If the Hoover Commission recommendation should be accepted, then we are probably celebrating here today about the last birthday REA will have. The next ceremony will be the funeral. These attacks all come in the guise of getting the Government out of business. They are nothing more than thinly-disguised attempts to kill the Federal power program. There is no question that the REA co-ops are going to need in the future, the same sympathetic understanding and help from their Congress which they have received in the past.

At the rate of growth of REA borrowers, power supply has come to be one of the most critical problems facing the cooperatives. Some systems have been able to obtain adequate power from nearby sources, but, as consumption increases, many of these sources of supply are becoming inadequate. For example, energy requirements were 20 percent greater in 1952 than 1951, and in 1953 and 1954 the story was the same. In the Northeastern States, high power costs still prevail and will until, and unless, Niagara and St. Lawrence developments are completed. In many sections, dependable power supply is difficult to obtain because of inadequate transmission and generating facilities.

In other sections, the cooperatives are entering into wheeling arrangements and are doing everything humanly possible to obtain needed additional power. To my mind, one of the most important future problems of REA will be that of helping its borrowers obtain an adequate and reliable power supply. This will take money. In my own State of Illinois, I am informed that the cooperatives will need, during the next fiscal year, somewhere between twenty-five and thirty million dollars for generation and transmission facilities, if they are to maintain their service at its present high standard. And under the limitations of the present allotment formula, it may be impossible to secure such a loan without further appropriations.

The REA cooperatives in the future will need sympathetic help on various management problems, including the working out of wholesale power contracts, interchange agreements, and help of a technical nature in other fields. The Federal Government has a real stake in this program. The Congress, in the past, has always been sympathetic with the needs of rural people for electric service. The Congress, I hope, will continue in the future to look with favor on the REA program.

The REA had approved electric loans totaling nearly $3 billion by the end of March of this year. If this program, which in the final anlaysis is a partnership program between the Federal Government and its local citizens, is to remain strong and healthy, additional funds needed in the next 10 years may well equal what has been loaned in the last 20 years. New capital will always be needed. Having modern electric service on the farm is a large measure of insurance against any national emergency. The last war proved that, even though less than 40 percent of the farms were electrified at the time of Pearl Harbor.

I am proud to have been a Member of the Senate during a period when so much was done by the Congress to help bring this much-needed service to our people. In the future years, as the needs of the cooperatives grow, I shall continue to support this program with all my strength.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this being the 20th anniversary of the REA, I wish to pay tribute at this time to the legislative leaders in the enactment of the legislation which created the REA Administration. They conceived the idea and appropriated the funds.

The REA movement was vitalized by the organization of a national organization to carry out the intent and provisions of that congressional act. At that time I was an active farmer in the southern part of Minnesota, in Dakota County. I was president of the Dakota County Farm Bureau at that time. As an organization of farmers, we worked not only to create the support which resulted in the enactment of the legislation by encouraging Members of Congress to vote favorably for the bill, but we also worked for the development of the first association in that county.

There has been nothing that has brought as much comfort, safety, and convenience to rural homes as the provisions of the REA Act. If anyone has worked about a farmyard in the long winter months, or has come home from the fields with possibly 4 or 5, or even 9 head of horses, he knows the work involved in endeavoring to put those horses away with the aid of an old kerosene lantern. Then followed perhaps 2 hours of work in the dairy barn with the aid of an old kerosene lantern.

Sometimes, as the farmer came out of the dairy barn and looked toward his dwelling, he saw the flicker of a flame in the kitchen, which indicated a fire. He would rush to the home and find that the curtain, blowing in the open window and across the Aladdin lamp, had been ignited by the heat of the Aladdin lamp, and that the wall of the house was on fire.

I recite that picture so that we may have before us the hazards in the home of a farmer with small children playing about the home and the ever-present danger that the lamp would be pulled off the table or that it would be pulled of the dresser and ignite the home; or that a lantern would be knocked over and start a fire which might well destroy all of the farmer's possessions both in the home and in the barns. Those hazards existed in every farm home. Those were the hazards that were ever present in the barns.

Today we see the farm home equipped with a complete system of electric lighting. Wherever we turn we see bright lights and we see complete lighting and complete safety in every barn. It is a convenience, indeed, to be able to start the milker with the throwing of a simple switch. It is a far cry from having to start a gasoline engine, which usually refused to start.

The farmer in the old days could not possibly have a modern home, because he did not have the means and the convenience of being able to maintain a water-pressure system. Therefore, we saw farm youth after farm youth telling their parents, "I will leave here just as soon as I am free." That was said by many boys and girls in the old days. They said they would go where they could live in modern homes.

We saw it happen in many farm communities across the land.

It was with great pride and determination that we farmers in the southern section of Dakota County in Minnesota worked toward the development of associations which brought electricity to our homes.

If anyone says that President Eisenhower is unmindful of the great convenience of electricity and unmindful of all that has been achieved through REA associations, he has never visited with President Eisenhower. President Eisenhower was raised in a simple home. He is a man of work. He has worked around the farmyard. He knows what electricity means to the farmer.

I can say without equivocation in heart, mind, or voice, that President Eisenhower would not turn a finger to jeopardize REA.

The present administrator, Ancher Nelsen, is a man whom I knew before I was either in State or Federal service. He was then a farmer in Hutchinson, Minn. I first came in contact with him when he was invited by the State Legislature of Minnesota to testify on the question of farm legislation pending before the Legislature of Minnesota. This young man, Ancher Nelsen, the present director of REA, testified before the

Agricultural Committee of the Minnesota State Senate. At the time he was an operating farmer in Hutchinson and was serving in the State senate. REA means everything to Ancher Nelsen, because it brought convenience and comfort to the home community in which he resided and to the whole farming area around Hutchinson, Minn.

Therefore, I say again without equivocation in my voice or in my heart that Ancher Nelsen would never so much as even turn a finger to do other than to improve REA and to assure greater service through the organization of REAs. He would do everything in his power to help the producers and homeowners throughout this land in their reliance on REA, whether it be in Minnesota, Wisconsin, or in the Deep South, or in any other area of the United States. He is dedicated to improve rural living conditions.

On this 20th anniversary of REA, I want it clearly understood that I would never permit an administration in which I have any voice or influence to do anything that might jeopardize the great organization of REA. I would fight with whatever political ability I possess to make certain that nothing would be done legislatively which would injure REA.

My record in voting for appropriations for REA has been as good as that of any other Member of the Senate. I did vote against certain amendments, and on the basis of that vote perhaps someone might erroneously say that I voted against REA. However, I never voted for any legislative measure which specifically affected or denied funds for the REA. I say that without any fear of challenge or contradiction.

Therefore I say this evening, on the 20th anniversary of REA, that never at any time has a legislative act brought so much to the rural areas of the Nation as has been brought by REA. Never has any legislative act brought so much comfort and convenience and safety as it has.

We have only scratched the surface on what we are going to use in the way of electricity on our farms. When I threw the switch to give electricity to our homestead, I thought that if I used 6 or 7 dollars' worth of electricity it would be the maximum amount that I would have to pay. I operate my farm with hired help. We maintain the home and the other farm properties. The last electric bill I paid was for very nearly $50.

It is the cheapest source of help and the cheapest source of power and the cheapest convenience we have in the entire farm community.

I shall do everything I can in this session and for so long as I am privileged to serve in the Senate to make certain that in every home of the land electricity shall be furnished whenever it is desired.

It is with great pleasure that I am privileged to say these few words in memory of the men who not only conceived the idea of the REA but also helped to enact the legislation which created and brought it into being, because they did much so that many could have conveniences and pleasures in rural homes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a great deal has been said about hindsight in dealing with the problem of Yalta and other international conferences of the past. Today we are faced with some similar problems, and I shall take a little time to speak on them.

The times are rife with agitation for international conferences all the way from Sir Winston Churchill's call for talks with the Soviet empire "at the summit" to Chou En-lai's offer to negotiate Asian problems with our government. We are now confronted with three occasions on which our representatives will be sitting down with spokesmen for Soviet Russia and Red China—all with the avowed purpose of abating the tensions produced by the cold war.

Each day various individuals through the press, radio, and television, present us with fresh arguments for talking with the potential enemies of our country and the West. The agitation rises to a shrill pitch when, as for example, Red China apparently opens the door to discussions.

There is an urgency about this clamor for negotiation—with or without reason, hope, or purpose—that creates a kind of hysteria in the public mind in this country and abroad. It is the fear that if we do not reach a cease-fire agreement with Chou En-lai bombs may be bursting over Manhattan, Chicago, and Seattle. Such a public mood militates against calm appraisals of our responsibilities and perils by the President, the Senate, and the Department of State.

I do not object to international conferences as such, although the plain lessons of the West's experience since Prime Minister Chamberlain made his pilgrimage to Munich instruct us that the West has gained little and suffered much from its encounters with cunning, single-minded, 20th-century dictatorships. However, we cannot ignore any instrumentality which may produce peace with honor.

The Soviet Union, for example, has presented us with the necessity of negotiating an Austrian state treaty. The administration naturally believes that it could not reject Chou En-lai's tender without exploring his intentions and good faith. The demand by Sir Winston, and now Sir Anthony Eden, for general talks with Soviet leaders—a demand dictated at least in part by the political exigencies of the Conservatives under the prod of the Laborites—has become so insistent, and finds so many echoes in this country, that we must, no doubt, meet "at the summit" in due course.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what I believe is an uncontroverted fact, namely, that it is not the fact that statesmen confer that has brought harm and disaster to the Western World, but it is what the statesmen do at international conferences, their blunders, their unwise concessions, their sacrifices of principle for expediency, that have injured the free people.

No one can deny, for example, that Mr. Chamberlain's placatory spirit at Munich, his reliance on the promises of Hitler, helped produce a war that ravaged Europe.

Furthermore, the great wartime conferences at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam afforded legal cover for the conquests of Soviet Communist despotism.

What I contend is that our negotiators, when they meet the representatives of the East and West, should chart their courses with reason, caution, and prudence. First, they should consider, first and foremost, the interests, immediate and long-term, of our own Nation. Next, they should not confuse principle with detail. Principles cannot be bargained, details may be. Thirdly, they should not allow themselves to be hurried. The Soviet Union's diplomats notoriously procrastinate at conferences. We, too, should practice patience and choose the time for our own ventures—our time, not theirs. Our representatives must assume that the spokesmen for world communism have only one object before their eyes, namely, the advancement of world communism. And finally, our people, in their thinking, should keep always in mind this proposition: While it is better to talk than to fight, we must be ready to fight if necessary, if the talk is to be a success.

It is a piece of good fortune that we have before us at this juncture in the cold war an object lesson of how not to negotiate with world communism. I refer to the Yalta papers, which illuminate, despite their incompletion, the tragic nature of the free world's retreat before Moscow's assertiveness.

The United States and the West suffered an incalcuable defeat at Yalta, as they did at Teheran and Postdam—a defeat which opened the door to the rise of Communist imperialism throughout Eurasia from the Baltic to the Gulf of Tonkin. I do not say that Stalin might not have conquered and subdued the European satellites and that China might not have fallen to communism without Yalta. I do say emphatically that Yalta expedited and accelerated those conquests and, moreover, in the case of Communist expansion in Europe the Yalta agreements furnished dubious grounds upon which they could be based.

It is now 10 years since Prime Minister Churchill, in the full tide of his powers, and the mortally ill President Roosevelt met with shrewd and determined Joseph Stalin on terms of equality at Yalta on Soviet soil. It is only a matter of weeks since the Yalta papers have been opened to public view. During that 10-year period the record of the Yalta Conference, whereat these three statesman played with the destiny of mankind as if they had a sort of world proprietorship, was suppressed.

I wish to assure Senators that I have been unable to understand the storm of disapproval that accompanied the belated baring of the Yalta story. I may perhaps have a partial view of the matter because I confess to having had a part in bringing the papers to light. It would be an act of political cowardice did I not assume at least partial responsibility for bringing this about.

I have long insisted that the American people were entitled to know what happened at this pregnant conference. I would have wished that the Yalta papers were published years ago, not only for the instruction of the people, who have a right to know, but also for the guidance of our statesmen on what to avoid in similar circumstances.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in the last Congress, I urged the committee, which acquiesced, to vote the funds necessary for this publication. It is an interesting sidelight that at that time none of my Democratic colleagues objected.

This Republic was founded on the theory that the citizen is sovereign. A condition precedent to the successful functioning of the Republic is intelligent, aroused public opinion. Our decisions are arrived at by discussions, debate, division and final synthesis. It is by this means of synthesis that we arrive at a program of action. How can we expect intelligent public opinion to aid and create an intelligent foreign policy if our people are prevented from knowing the facts? We do not live in a totalitarian country where the rulers make all decisions without the advice and consent of the governed.

We live in the free United States in the middle of the 20th century, where a vigorous press, radio, and television have the duty of keeping the American public informed. Our executive branch and our Congress have the duty and obligation of providing the press with the information they need to perform this function. Those of my colleagues who object to this procedure are denying the first principle of our society.

Is it the view of those who objected to publication of the Yalta proceedings that the American people who gave the lives of their sons, brothers, and fathers in the war against Hitler's Germany and Japan were not entitled to know what their leaders did at Yalta? I note with some amusement that a large part of the clamor comes from the so-called Democratic liberals—the creators of New Deals and Fair Deals—who are forever voicing their interest and concern in the masses. These are the so-called champions of the democratic processes who are in perpetual jitters over alleged dictatorial tendencies in thought and speech. These are the very men who now, 10 years after the fact, have the effrontery to attempt to deny the American people their just rights—the privilege of knowing exactly what has been done in their name and in their so-called interest.

The other principal objection comes from that grand master of British politics, Sir Winston Churchill, who, after a long and distinguished career, has at length laid down his scepter of power. Mr. Churchill, to whom I pay the highest tribute as the most distinguished man in Western public life during the first half of this century, is a journalist of equal distinction. In his 5-volume autobiography wherein he paints his own portrait for history, Mr. Churchill gave his own version of what happened at Yalta. Could it be that his reason for taking exception to the publication of the Yalta proceedings was that he did not wish his own findings blurred or controverted?

It is my considered opinion that men who play a role on the stage of human history must be prepared to accept the prying, the exploration and finally, the verdict of history. Of the three conferees at Yalta, two have since gone to the beyond. Only Mr. Churchill survives. If in the course of these remarks some unkind things may be said of the late President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister Churchill, they are not said in a spirit of personal acrimony. They are said only because saying them is a part of the process of evaluating the conference, and the respective roles these three men have played in the final commitments made. I do not think my colleagues will be so tender about any remarks I might make with respect to Stalin.

In the 10 fateful years which have followed Yalta, any number of speeches have been made on the mistakes of the conference. These have been met with apologies and denials as to what really happened at the conference, and with every form of obfuscation and confusion.

A great deal of this would have been eliminated had the records been published at the close of the war. We should have been talking about these things, and it might have been possible to come to some agreement as to the lessons of Yalta. For, while it is true that nothing can be done to change the agreements made there—they are fait accompli—we could, with some intelligence, and some good will between the political parties, have long ago learned and profited from the serious mistakes which were made at the conference.

I shall spend a few minutes considering the most grievous of these mistakes, but before I outline them I wish to put myself on record. The charge is constantly being made that we now see the mistakes of Yalta from hindsight—that there was no warning, and that the mistakes were such as reasonable men might have made. I do not agree with this view, and I personally am not a respondent to this charge, because in speeches as early as 1943 I raised the question of Russia's objectives and warned that we must not surrender our war ideals.

In other words, some persons are now saying that the ones who are criticizing Yalta are using hindsight. That is "the bunk." There were some men in the Congress who warned of what was going on.

Speaking directly on the subject of our dealings with Russian leader Stalin in 1943, I said in a newspaper interview for the Boston Herald of September 12, 1943:

> It is time to use more spine and less servility on this subject (of dealings with the Soviets). Joseph Stalin needs to be dealt with toughly, frankly * * * and with self-interest plainly in mind.

Mr. President, I submit that if President Roosevelt and other of our top diplomats who were dealing with the Russians had followed this advice, some of the tragic results of later conferences would not have occurred.

I shall have occasion later to quote from a speech made immediately after Teheran, voicing my suspicions of Russia's motives at that early date. Nor was I alone in this view. It was common gossip that the beautiful ideas expressed in the Atlantic Charter were being scuttled within 6 months after they were enunciated. It comes now with bad grace from those who howled us down as "Red-baiters" in 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947, to insist that the mistakes of Yalta are seen now only from hindsight.

Some of us realized as early as Teheran that the Russian dictatorship was carrying on two wars simultaneously—a military war against Fascist Germany and a diplomatic war against its allies. The purpose of the diplomatic war which Russia carried on against the United States and England was to enhance its own power and, above all, to end the war sitting astride the prostrate body of Central Europe, the Near East, and the Far East. From 1943 on, Russia was concerned with the shape of the world after the defeat of Germany. Russian leaders were determined that at the end of the war they should be in the dominant political, military, and economic position in these three great areas of the world. Our diplomats—our intelligence services—should have recognized this, and individuals in those services did. The President of the United States on many occasions was so advised. But he blithely disregarded all warning. Instead of taking the necessary measures in each diplomatic maneuver to protect our clear-cut interest, he too frequently surrendered when he met the cunning and force of the Communist dictatorship. At no time did Mr. Roosevelt maintain American interests with high and firm consistency.

In 1944, immediately after Teheran, in a speech in the Senate of the United States, I questioned the nature of the political commitments made at the meeting, especially those with respect to the future of Poland.

Because I am not speaking from hindsight, but from foresight, I quote from the speech I delivered in the Senate on January 14, 1944, when I said:

> Americans want to know whether the national life and independence of any people in Europe—or western Europe—whether in the Baltic region, the Balkans or Western Europe have been endangered by American commitments or the failure to make strong American representations. Americans want to know how Poland, which was the only full ally England and France had at the beginning of the war and which has been so horribly ravaged, is to be rewarded for its loyalty and supreme sacrifices.

Mr. President, that was January 14, 1944—more than a full year before the Yalta conference. That is not hindsight that is foresight. The record is clear—we did fail the free people of

Western Europe, the Baltics, and the Balkans, Poland, and other free peoples. I knew, as every informed man in public life should have known, that Russia had no intention of permitting a free Poland.

Mr. President, I could tell of conferences which I had with the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and with the Secretary of State, at that time, both individually and accompanied, at least on one or two occasions, by the late Senator from Nebraska, Kenneth Wherry. The memorandums of those conferences are in my office. Some of the statements made at those conferences were shocking to me and to the then Senator from Nebraska.

Even at that early date Russian duplicity in connection with Poland was clear. Only a strong stand by us—which we failed to make—could have saved her from the fate which finally overtook that gallant little country.

In the speeches made in the Senate I raised the question of what secret commitments had been made; and if so, what they were and what the general tenure of the discussions was at Teheran. I was assured by Mr. Connally, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that while he could not answer specifically the questions at that time because he had not been informed by the administration, even though he was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the answers to these questions would be given immediately after the cessation of hostilities in the form of a complete publication of the proceedings at Teheran.

Mr. friend Mr. Connally is no longer in the United States Senate, and I cannot ask him at this time to meet his promise. More than 10 years have now elapsed and the proceedings at Teheran are still unpublished. I will use every effort at my command to urge the publication of the Teheran proceedings, even though I believe they are not complete.

Mr. President, when I stood up and raised some of those questions, which was foresight and not hindsight, I was accused of rocking the boat. While most of those who led our country at that time were blind as to what was going on, I stood up, and the record of the Senate and the record of committees is clear with reference to what I said and did. So, Mr. President, I am sick and tired of hearing about only hindsight. Because on previous occasions I stood on the floor of the Senate and spoke out on the problems of that period.

I was 1 of 6 Senators who spoke and voted against the enactment of the Neutrality Act. I have been told by some of the leaders of other nations, who are respected and who are authorities that the Neutrality Act did more than any other single thing to give Adolph Hitler and Mussolini the green light and to bring on World War II. The act was recommended by the administration and passed by an almost unanimous vote in the House and the Senate. Thank God, I was one who stood up and voted against it in the year 1937. So I have no apologies to make. I merely wish to comment that when gentlemen stand up and in a complacent and placid way talk about hindsight, it is the bunk.

The recent publication of the Yalta papers reveals more about the general climate of the conference than it reveals about new and startling details. We have, in the past 10 years, managed to piece together many of the unfortunate decisions taken at Yalta. The autobiography of Mr. Churchill, the Hopkins papers, the Forrestal diaries, the Stettinius journals, together with Russia's insistent demands for every ounce of flesh bartered away at Yalta, have long acquainted us with the nature of this diplomatic catastrophe. But, as I have said, the actual publication reveals some very interesting sidelights.

In the first place, the three men, Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, met at dinners and luncheons where at least one revolting toast was drunk, too revolting and disturbing to our relations with a friendly power to repeat here.

As I read that background, I am shocked and startled. I shall not endanger our relations with other friendly nations by repeating on the floor of the Senate the toasts which are recorded as having been made by some of the gentlemen who attended that meeting, because they are too horrible and revolting and would upset our relations with other nations.

One of the officials of the State Department at that time, the present Governor of New York, who is a potential candidate for President of the United States, has refused access to his papers. I do not know why Mr. Harriman has refused access to them, but I know that he has done so. Not only was that reported to me by representatives of the State Department, but it was also printed on the front pages of the newspapers at the time. Averell Harriman, Governor of the great State of New York, and a key figure at the time of the Yalta Conference, refuses access to his papers for the purpose of completing the data on Yalta.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I am pleased that the Senator from New Hampshire is making this statement. As he knows, ever since the Yalta papers were published, the statement has been made by leading Democratic politicians that they were published for political purposes.

I am certain that any reasonable person would say that if the facts which have been revealed by the portions of the Yalta papers which have been published had been made known before the last election, Mr. Harriman would not be the Governor of New York today.

Commenting further on what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying, I recall very well that while I was a Member of the other body, I spoke in the same vein about Poland, and Czechoslovakia, as the Senator from New Hampshire is speaking on the floor of the Senate today, and about the deals which were made to sell those people down the river.

Poland is 97 percent a Catholic country. The people of Poland had absolutely nothing to say about their being placed under Communist domination. They did not want the Communists to control and operate their government. They had no part in that decision.

It is because alleged American statesmen made deals at Yalta, at Potsdam, and at Tehran that we find the enslavement of the great people of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and a third of Germany, and all the people on the mainland of China. This has happened because of the rotten deals which were made at those conferences.

I commend the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for having raised his voice in the Senate at the time of these horrible deals.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his remarks.

No official transcript of the meeting was kept. Everything was done with great casualness, and considerable accent was placed on food and drink. The Conference had all the ease of a pleasure convention rather than an austere meeting dealing with the future of civilization. Representing as they did the three great powers which, it was clear, would be the victors, the three heads of state treated the entire Yalta Conference as a personal confab in which they would decide the future of the world.

When the editors of the State Department were confronted with the problem of collecting the Yalta Conference papers, they found many at Hyde Park among the private papers of Mr. Roosevelt. Other parts of the Conference could only be reconstructed because of the refusal of Averell Harriman, of New York, and the Stettinius estate to make available papers which they regarded as their personal property.

Mr. President, I wish to say, too, that I am shocked to know that the estate of Mr. Stettinius, formerly Secretary of State, has also refused access to the Stettinius papers. Stettinius was Secretary of State during a part of that period.

It would have been just as improper for me, when I had concluded my service as chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to have taken all the records of that committee to Concord, N. H., and to have stored them in my barn there, as it was for Mr. Stettinius, and the other persons concerned, to take the records of the State Department of that time. It seems to have been a habit with them to do that.

After all, when Mr. Roosevelt was President, he was President of the United States; when Mr. Stettinius was Secretary of State, he was Secretary of State of the United States. The very important documents which concern the destiny of this country and of all mankind should remain the property of the United States of America.

As a United States Senator, I object strenuously to allowing Averell Harriman, Governor of New York, to deny to the United States of America access to his papers during the period when he served as an official of the Government and was a factor in the making of policies which have affected the destinies of mankind.

Similarly, I feel very strongly that those who made such a decision on behalf of the Stettinius estate—and I do not know who they were—were wrong.

I cannot refrain from saying so, and saying so very strongly.

As I have said, the conference at Yalta was one of the great conferences of history; yet no official transcript was made of its proceedings.

When the Committee on Appropriations hears a request for $3,000, the committee has an official reporter who makes an official record of the proceedings. But the Yalta conference was a conference at which Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin sat down to determine the future of the world, to bargain away people, and to bargain away nations, but they did not keep an official record of the proceedings. It is almost unthinkable, Mr. President, to realize that that was done. What if Congress were to conduct its business in a similar fashion today?

I quote now from the March 17, 1955, issue of the New York Times, in which the steps in the collection of these papers are outlined:

SCOPE OF COVERAGE

The editors have aimed to present in this volume as definitive and comprehensive a coverage of the Malta and Yalta conferences as could be made at the present time. To achieve this purpose it was necessary to obtain much documentation that was never in the files of the Department of State, notably presidential and military papers.

A few papers pertinent to the Malta and Yalta conferences have been obtained by the Department of State from the White House beginning as early as 1946. By 1950 all White House papers prepared by or for President Roosevelt had been sent to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N. Y. In order to facilitate the collection of source material for the present volume, the Department of State in 1953 asked for the cooperation of the Roosevelt Library. The director of this library with the approval of the Archivist of the United States, set up a special project to identify and microfilm for the editors of this volume all documents pertinent to these two conferences from the Roosevelt and Hopkins papers in the custody of the library.

Since the files of the Department of State contained very few papers on the military staff discussions at Malta and Yalta, the Department of State also obtained the assistance of the Department of Defense in locating and releasing documents from the military records of these conferences. This type of material consists of papers documenting the official advice or position of the War and Navy Departments on politico-military subjects discussed at the international level, as presented by the civilian leaders of those departments and by the American Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff, together with instructions and interpretations of such subjects given to those departments by the President. In addition, a few other papers originating with or transmitted by military authorities have been included where appropriate to clarify references or to set forth information pertinent to the conferences which was given to the President or to his principal advisers. In the selection of military papers the emphasis has been placed upon those relating to subjects with significant implications for the foreign relations of the United States.

This volume therefore includes the relevant and significant papers on the Malta and Yalta Conferences from the files of the Department of State, the Department of Defense and the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, including some papers obtained from the White House earlier. It is believed that these records give an accurate account of the basic policy of the United States in relation to the issues before these conferences. Though this account is definitive as to these records, the conference documents as a whole are not so complete as might be desired, since records of some of the conference discussions do not exist, and since there may be papers of significance among private collections which have not been made available.

The editors have sought access to the private papers of individuals who attended the conferences. Certain of these persons have contributed useful comments and suggestions, and some have written valuable memoirs which have been carefully checked for information leads. A few collections of papers have not been made available, including those of Mr. James F. Byrnes, who attended the conference as special assistant to President Roosevelt; Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador to the Soviet Union at that time; and, more particularly, the conference papers of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who was present as Secretary of State. It may be doubted however, that any of these would change significantly the basic record of United States policy here presented.

Here we have one of the great conferences of history with no official transcript. I do not think that ever have such fateful decisions been arrived at in such offhanded fashion. No agenda was prepared for the Conference. When the Conference was first proposed Mr. Roosevelt asked for accommodations for 35 advisers, experts, and colleagues. When the Conference was in full swing he had 350. I do not know what results would have been obtained had the number been 1,000, or even 35, as originally planned. This gives some idea of the preparation—or rather the lack of preparation for this all-important meeting.

It took 6 months from July 1944 to February 1945 for Roosevelt to bring the Conference about. Stalin refused to meet anywhere except within the borders of the Soviet Union. He was immovable. After numerous other suggestions, Roosevelt and Churchill finally agreed to Yalta. This was probably the first mistake—the first small surrender—which was later to result in large surrenders. I mention it only because it helps recapture the general climate of the situation and to show that from the beginning Stalin was studied, determined, and resolute. He got his way in small things, and later on in very, very large things.

But to return to the main theme of our discussion, what are the lessons we should learn from Yalta? I have already outlined the first and perhaps the most important mistake, namely, the failure to realize that we were engaged in a diplomatic war, that Russia's objective was the domination of large areas of the world, and that this domination would threaten Anglo-American security. Had Mr. Roosevelt realized that this was essentially the begining of the war of nerves, he could not have so lightly thrown away both the moral and strategic position of the United States. The apologists have an explanation for the mistakes which cost the very security of the American people. They tell us that there was no reason to mistrust Russia, that she was our ally, and that our hindsight is better than was our foresight.

The statement about hindsight is the bunk. Immediately after the United States recognized and established diplomatic relations with Russia in 1933, the ink was not dry upon the paper on which the Russians signed before they began to violate the provisions of the agreement of recognition. Yet there were persons in high office in the United States who said, "We must not rock the boat; we must trust our allies."

I cannot accept this explanation at par. Americans had always been mistrustful of the Communist imperium. The Bolsheviks had ruled Russia with an iron hand from 1917 to 1942 when they became our ally in the war—a period of 25 years. We had withheld recognition until 1932.

We had ample opportunity to observe Russian attempts at subversion, revolution, and conquest. Russian double-dealings were known to every chancellery in the world. For example, as early as 1935, William Bullitt, then our able Ambassador to Russia, wrote a memorandum to the State Department which is even now in the files of the Department. I quote from that memorandum:

To think of the Soviet Union as a possible ally of the United States in case of war with Japan is to allow the wish to be father to the thought. The Soviet Union would certainly attempt to avoid becoming an ally until Japan had been thoroughly defeated and would then merely use the opportunity to acquire Manchuria and sovietize China.

That statement was made by Bill Bullitt in the early days of our renewed relations with Russia. He was our Ambassador, appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, years before the advent of the problems we now face.

Soviet intentions and objectives were no secret. Soviet leaders in their own writings were outspoken in their contempt and bitterness toward the United States. Evidences of their undeviating determination for world conquest were many. We knew that the Communists morally, spiritually, and religiously had contempt for western morals—inseparable from the Judeo-Christian concept. We knew that Russian Bolshevik leaders had for a quarter of a century heaped contempt on Western democratic principles. It may have been necessary to accept Russia as an ally in the defeat of Fascist Germany. It was not necessary to accede to every political and strategic move which would leave Russia in a stronger position in the postwar world, and leaving us in a correspondingly weaker position.

Ten months before the Yalta Conference the obvious rumblings of Russian postwar intentions so disturbed me that I delivered a speech in the Senate on May 23, 1944. This was not hindsight, Mr. President. This was foresight.

The speech was entitled, "What Are Our Peace Aims?" In my judgment at that time, we were drifting, without a firm, realistic postwar foreign policy. Because I thought this subject so important, I opened the speech as follows:

Mr. President, because the matter which I am presenting is so urgent, from this point on, I shall address myself directly to the President of the United States.

President Roosevelt, the American people are not going to be content with a military victory only. We, as a people are utterly in sympathy with your own sentiments which you expressed in a radio talk on May 27, 1941, wherein you said—

We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in their own way—freedom from want, and freedom from terrorism.

Mr. President, I regret to say that those lofty sentiments, voiced by Mr. Roosevelt, seemed to have been ignored as our leaders faced the determined Soviet negotiators at wartime conferences.

Disillusion with Russia and the Communist ideology is not new—not something that came along after the war's end. Let me quote again from the speech I made on the floor of the Senate. Remember the date of the speech was May 23, 1944:

Certainly the American people have not gone into this war with the purpose of turning over Europe to the control of any nation or group of nations, much less to substitute the terrors of one dictatorship for another. It is not and has not been our intention to divide, actually or in effect, the war-torn European nations into special spheres of influence or to reduce this or that nation of Europe under the control of any nation no matter how benevolently inclined such a nation might profess to be. In your silence on the prospects of establishing peaceful relations among free nations of Europe, let me remind you that only through a genuinely international organization which is all inclusive, wherein "all nations, great or small, victorious or vanquished," may have equal opportunity to collaborate, can the highest purposes of the American people be realized. We have no desire to be a party to the establishing of any postwar organizations which are determined and dominated by 1, 2, 3, or 4 nations.

Much less have we entered into our present military alliances in order that our own American ideals and principles shall be conditioned, if not altogether dictated, by either a prime minister or a dictator, or both. With great dismay we have observed the unilateral attacks upon the Atlantic Charter, the bold denials of this and that principle, the reservations and exceptions heaped one on the other.

Mr. Stalin, immediately following the Moscow Conference, launched upon a series of independent acts, every one of which was a violation of the principle of collaboration upon which we had agreed. First came the mutual assistance pact with the Czechoslovak Government in exile, then the Kharkov trials, then, in rapid succession the entry of Russian troops into Poland without any statement that they came as liberators and not as conquerers; Pravda's rebuff of Mr. Willkie; the rejection of our good offices in settling the Polish dispute; the Pravda report of a separate peace negotiation between Britain and Germany; the unprovoked attack on the Vatican; the change in the Russian Constitution which established 16 constituent countries including the Baltic States; the recognition of the Badoglio regime and the demand for units of the Italian Fleet; with every act straining the relations between the Big 4.

In quoting that speech I do not pretend to have prophetic powers of vision separate and distinct from most other Americans. These were views widely held by many thoughtful and instructed Americans, and certainly they were known in the Senate on both sides of the aisle. There were not many Senators here at that time who did not have grave suspicions about the Russians' ambitions and who were not concerned that our war aims and ideals would not be achieved. Yet at Yalta these forebodings were completely ignored.

Further on in my speech of May 1944 I called attention to what apparently was the abandonment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. I read from that speech, and my remarks were directed to the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. I said:

You yourself have declared a Communist dictatorship to be the epitome of ruthlessness. Yet since Tehran all these things have changed. President Roosevelt, the American people have a great admiration for any people who resist any and every aggressor, and our great and powerful ally, Russia, has superbly defended her soil and her very life. But again let me remind you that the American people have not changed their minds concerning dictatorship. Great as is their admiration for the military prowess and stoical determination of the Russian people, they still prefer above all else the American way of life, and they openly disavow communism or Communist nationalism.

Mr. President, that was not hindsight. That was foresight. I believe, Mr. President, that had President Roosevelt paid heed to those remarks we would not have an Iron Curtain surrounding so much of Europe today, nor would China be completely cut off by a Bamboo Curtain.

Mr. President, another thing interests me today. Back in those days many people—I happened to be one Republican in the United States Senate who did so, and there were others, too—approached these problems from an international point of view. I was condemned by persons in this country who classed themselves as isolationists, among them Members of my own party, and some in the opposing party. Today many of the Members of Congress who proudly stood on the floor and said they believed in facing these vital international problems are now condemned by others who then shared their point of view and who are now among the most ardent isolationists we have in this country. There has been a change of heart. Some of the newspapers which, editorially, in those days faced these problems courageously today are hiding under the table. They have gone under the bed. They are burying their heads in the sand. They do not want to meet the issues. They do not want to think unkind things. They do not want to face any of those problems. It is a sad commentary on the changed attitude of some of the newspapers of the United States that they have suddenly gone blind in dealing with some of the great international problems of today which so vitally affect our Nation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire think the agreements entered into at Yalta were of sufficient importance to be classed as treaties rather than executive agreements?

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly do; yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator recall who were in the Senate at the time those agreements were entered into?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I do.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, the Senator from New Hampshire was a Member of the Senate at that time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator have any idea whether the Senate would have ratified a treaty of that kind had it been brought to the floor of the Senate and discussed by the representatives of the American people?

Mr. BRIDGES. If that agreement had been brought to the Senate and discussed, I do not think it would have been ratified. Of course, in spite of the warnings of the senior Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators, we were never told what went on, but the information leaked out little by little afterwards. There was never a report made in a forthright manner to the Senate. If such a proposal had been put before the Senate in a formal way, I doubt that it would have been ratified.

Mr. WATKINS. As to the question whether or not such an understanding could be classed as an executive agreement, I call attention to the fact that the agreement involved disposition of people and boundary lines of whole nations. An agreement involving such matters ordinarily would be considered to be a treaty rather than an executive agreement which would be necessary in carrying on a war.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Utah is correct. There are many things of which he can be proud, and I should like at this time to compliment him on one of them. As years go on, we can see what happens. We can review the Italian peace treaty, which gave a part of the Italian Navy to the Communists. The peace treaty provided that Italy should pay reparations to Communist nations, which we in turn had to pay. The Senator from Utah, as well as other Senators, joined the Senator from New Hampshire in opposing such a treaty. We were condemned and ridiculed and harassed for our stand, but we were right. The next thing we knew we were appropriating money so that ships could be built for the Italian Navy to replace the ones we had given to Communist nations.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sure the Senator will recall that during the troops-to-Europe debate, the Senator and I offered to a pending resolution an amendment, which was adopted, asking the United States to renounce the military limitations of the Italian Peace Treaty on the ground that it was necessary for Italy to defend itself against the Communists. That proposal carried by a vote of 60 to 20.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. At the present time no one is insisting on any of the military limitations placed on Italy.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The Senator from New Hampshire remembers those facts well, but he is glad they have been called to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I also wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was one of the leaders in the opposition to the Italian Peace Treaty. At that time I was only a freshman Senator, having been in the Senate only 2 or 3 months. I recall very well the feeling of disgust I had when I considered that so little was being done by that nation for its own defense, although the Communists were separated from it by only a borderline, whereas the United States, more than 3,000 miles away, was appropriating and spending many millions of dollars for the defense of that nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that when President Roosevelt made his report on Yalta, he told the joint session of Congress to which he was making the report that there were no secret commitments?

Mr. BRIDGES. I remember very well sitting in the House of Representatives, at the joint session, and hearing Franklin D. Roosevelt's voice ring out when he said, "I want to assure the people of America that at Yalta there have been no secret deals, no secret agreements," and so forth. His statement is to be found in the RECORD, where it can be checked by anyone; and I recall that statement as well as does the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that President Roosevelt made that statement in an unusually loud voice, and looked up from the paper he was reading?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

I also recall hearing Franklin D. Roosevelt say, in the last speech I heard him make, that the Far East had not been discussed in that conference.

Mr. President, I did not understand such statements; but I have quoted from the official record, as it has been written; and all of us who heard those statements made can remember them personally.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, those statements appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where he who runs may read.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to quote further from the speech I made then. What I said at that time was not hindsight; on the contrary, it was foresight. I said:

> We know that (President Roosevelt) risking our whole future and the future of the postwar world on the good will of Mr. Stalin * * * will never be accepted by the American people as their only safeguard against war and the threat of war.

In other words, at that time I said to the President of the United States that we should not base the security of our Nation and its safeguards on the word of one man, Josef Stalin.

I asked:

> What are our peace aims, Mr. President, and do they bode good or ill?

I am still quoting from my speech, Mr. President; and this is foresight, not hindsight:

> Are they a patchwork of unprecedented necessities which will merely postpone the final issue of war itself to the not-too-far-distant future. Why do you not take us, your own people, into your confidence, Mr. President? Is it because you wish to overwhelm us with joy when you suddenly pull a patchwork peace settlement out of your hat or is it because the monster which you have helped to breed has broken its leash and is now at large?

Mr. President, that also is foresight, not hindsight.

When we criticize such things as those to which I have referred some persons today say, "That is just hindsight." Mr. President, there is no foundation for such a statement. At that time some Members of the Congress told the President of their misgivings and concern.

Mr. President, was what I said in that speech hindsight? I think not. The fears expressed in that speech eventually were realized. The monster of Communist imperialism is at large, and today still threatens the peace of the free world. The monster of Communist imperialism will not be stopped today, any more than it was stopped at Yalta, by appeasement, compromise, or weakness.

Mr. President, if any leader in the Nation is today so stupid as to believe that by appeasing communism or compromising with communism or showing weakness in opposition to communism, we can be safe, I can only express my sorrow and regret for such an attitude.

I am willing to have this speech read 10 years from now, just as today I am reading some speeches which were made 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, or 18 years ago. I stood on my record then, and I stand on it today. I was correct then, and I will be found to be correct today.

Mr. President, we cannot close our eyes to what is going on. We cannot close our eyes to the realities of life. I can remember when I stood in this Chamber and submitted a resolution calling for the stopping of the shipment of scrap iron, steel, and aviation gasoline to Japan. I can remember that the administration sent its representatives before the old Committee on Military Affairs, where they testified that to stop those shipments would be an hostile act against a great, friendly country; and the administration forces succeeded in defeating the resolution. I remember that ridicule was heaped upon me in that connection. But, Mr. President, I was correct. I was not the only one who spoke at that time in opposition to the shipment of such materials to Japan. That was foresight, not hindsight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sorry that I missed a part of the Senator's speech. Perhaps he has already covered what I have in mind.

Is the Senator from New Hampshire aware that at the time when the Congress of the United States was not being advised as to the Yalta Conference, and when, in fact, a false official report relative to what occurred at Yalta was being made to a joint session of the Congress, less than a month before the Yalta Conference was held, instructions had been given by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, that all documents—of every type and character, and of the highest classification—that this Government had should, even before they reached the hands of the President of the United States, pass through the hands of Alger Hiss?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not mentioned that during the course of my speech, but I certainly remember it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me to do so, I should like to read from page 91 of the Yalta papers, which were released only a short time ago. I read from them as follows:

> At the Secretary's staff meeting of January 10—

And I may say, parenthetically, that the Yalta Conference was held from February 4 to February 11, 1945; and this memorandum is dated January 10, 1945—

> the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15.

Does not the Senator from New Hampshire feel that that was a rather significant development, when the Members of Congress were not informed, when, in fact, it took 10 years for us even to get the Yalta papers released, and when it was not until after a great deal of agitation in both the House of Representatives and the Senate that a copy of the Yalta agreement was even furnished the Members of Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from California, and his point is well made.

Mr. President, I do not claim to have been the only Member of the Senate who at that time had grave misgivings about our dealings with our Soviet allies. That position was taken at that time by a number of the Members of this body. Perhaps I was more outspoken than some. But I do say that there were only a few Members who had the courage to stand up and speak of their doubts and the doubts of the American people. I recall, Mr. President, the abuse that some of us took for questioning the course of our wartime policy. I remember that certain Senators said we were trying to "rock the boat," that we were trying to do things which would "reflect upon our allies," and we were trying to "needle," and so forth. Those were some of the very famous phrases which were used in this body at that time. Of course, Mr. President, those statements were not true. We were told that we would disrupt the war effort, betray our soldiers

and sailors fighting with allies around the world, and force the abandonment of a united front against Hitler.

Those charges were "bunk," Mr. President, just as the charges of "hindsight" are today. I, for one, can show with facts the warnings that were available to the administration leaders before they sat down with the Communist leaders at Yalta.

In speeches made before the Senate on January 14, 1944, May 23, 1944, and September 21, 1944, I clearly pointed out what, in my judgment, were the errors in our wartime dealings with the Communists. All those speeches were made long before Yalta, Mr. President. The record was clear then, just as it is today. If our leaders had paid some heed to the warnings which were voiced in the Senate at that time, the great tragedy of Yalta might have been avoided.

The second defense for the dreadful mistakes at Yalta and the surrender of basic American principles and moral leadership is the so-called doctrine of military expediency. We are told that Mr. Roosevelt made these concessions in both the Far East, where he surrendered a policy of some 50 years—integrity, and namely the freedom of China—and in Europe where he agreed to a position in Germany which was untenable and unnecessary because he desired Russian participation in the war against Japan.

Giving Mr. Roosevelt the benefit of every doubt, and conceding that the participation of Russia was desirable, it must have been equally clear that victory could have been accomplished without Russia. The backbone of Japanese resistance was broken by that time. The Philippines had been recovered. The military possibilities of the atomic bomb were to be known to us within only a few months. In the face of all these facts, Roosevelt had all the cards, and should have known that he had all the cards. In addition, he should have known that Russia could not stay out of the war with Japan if she wanted a strong position in the Far East. For decades, Russia had considered Japan her most deadly enemy and used every strategem at her command to worsen our relations with Japan so that we would eventually defeat her ancient enemy.

If Soviet Russia had really been a faithful, devoted ally, as we had proven ourselves to be with our program of lend-lease, the unlimited supplies we shipped to Russia and the landing of our vast armies in France, there would have been no question of her entry; no need to bribe her.

The condition that Russia should join the Allies in the war against Japan as soon as Germany was vanquished was a condition that prudent men would have insisted upon at the beginning of the conflict, when we first advanced lend-lease to Russia. This promise and agreement should have been required by Mr. Hull at the first Moscow conference, and certainly by Mr. Roosevelt at Teheran.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator recall that Japan had attempted, through Russia, to get word to our Allies that she wanted peace and was ready to surrender, and that that word was not passed on by Russia to the other nations?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct. That fact has since become known. Japan had made several attempts, through Russia, to indicate that she was ready to surrender. Today some of our people who are left-wingers and even some of those who profess to be middle-of-the-road, seem to forget that all the time we were fighting side by side with Russia against Germany, her enemy, and while we were carrying on war against Japan in the Pacific, Russia was furnishing war material to Japan with which to fight us. Of course the Senator from Utah is absolutely correct in what he says. Russia did withhold that information when, on at least 3 occasions, an attempt was made to negotiate a peace.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, Russia kept that information from us in order that she might get into the war against Japan.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Undoubtedly if word had come to us, the war would have been finished before she had an opportunity to get into it.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. So she was withholding the information apparently in an effort to get in on the settlement, and reap some rewards.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. President, rather loose statements have indicated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had advised Mr. Roosevelt that the participation of Russia was necessary in the war on Japan. There is no record that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the brilliant strategist in the Asiatic theater, was specifically consulted at Yalta as to the necessity of Russian participation. Certainly a responsible and prudent negotiator would have wanted some consultation with him and some idea of his assessment of the position. But Mr. Roosevelt did not invite General MacArthur. He had other people there. He had Alger Hiss there. He did not have MacArthur. He did not have Eisenhower. He did not have some of the great leaders who were winning the war, but he had Alger Hiss.

In any decision involving the final settlement of the situation in the Far East, the advice of MacArthur should have been solicited. Not only was he the commander of our forces who, from the first day of the attack on Pearl Harbor, set about to lead our troops to final victory, but he was an outstanding authority in the Far East. He had lived in the Philippines for a number of years, and knew the configuration of the problems of the Asiatic Continent as no other American did. But Mr. Roosevelt saw no need for asking his advice or views. Certainly MacArthur's judgment as to what it would take to defeat Japan, what help the Russians could provide, and whether the diplomatic price was worth paying should have been of inestimable value.

That the Joint Chiefs of Staff had advised before the Yalta Conference that the participation of Russia was desirable, there can be little doubt. In war, any ally who can give aid is desirable. The real question here is not the desirability of Russian aid, but the price of that aid. The question of price is one which the President was finally to decide. In this case, the price was so high that it practically negated our war efforts, lost us China, and gave us a hollow victory. How the President could have paid that price without asking the advice of the one man who knew the most about it is a piece of imprudence for which the American people are still paying a very high price.

The price that Roosevelt paid was not only a price of military strategy. More important, it meant the loss of our moral position. He should have known that moral surrender never pays. The American people had gone into war for moral purposes, and in their 3 years of savage struggle in the Asiatic theater alone, had already paid a huge price. If that price was to be larger, I am sure that they were willing. The result was that the price was paid by the American people without the accomplishment of any of our war objectives. This is a moral burden which the name and fame of Franklin Delano Roosevelt must bear. At a time when moral courage was imperative, he and others gave in to expediency and surrendered to Russian totalitarianism. History will not forget that surrender, regardless of the apologetics of the New Deal campaign speechmakers.

Even forgetting for a moment the moral issues, the fateful decisions made at Yalta with such carefree abandon cost the American people untold blood and treasure in these 10 intervening years. We have fought a war in Korea; we have taxed ourselves heavily; we have spent billions on our Armed Forces to protect ourselves from Russian aggression.

Mr. President, I have traveled over the United States. When one goes to the crossroads of America, he finds that the heart of America is troubled. Our security is endangered. The vast continent of Asia is facing on our own Pacific shores is in the hands of a brutal and ruthless opponent. We fought a war over that continent, but nothing was resolved. All because in a moment of weakness and moral irresolution a surrender was made which placed the Communist imperium in the position to challenge us in the Far East.

We have dwelt here with the concessions made to Stalin with respect to the Far East. Concessions made in Europe were equally fatal. The division of Germany was agreed upon, which put Russia in a strategic position in central Europe. Once that was done, no intelligent man could long doubt the fate of central Europe.

I cannot understand how we could divide Germany and place Berlin in the position of having no corridor of access. I cannot understand how we could do what we did to Austria.

As for Poland, Churchill with a wave of his hand dismissed the question of Poland by saying he did not much care for the Poles, as if he were choosing company for a fashionable tea rather

than determining the fate of a nation and a people.

Mr. Churchill was a great man, but that was not one of his great moments.

It was not one of the great moments of the British Empire, either. It was all a part of the cynicism of Yalta. Great Britain went to war when Poland was invaded. Yet the very fate of Poland was settled at Yalta. The world will long pay for that cynicism. We allowed Russia to accomplish objectives beyond Hitler's wildest dreams. At Yalta a new imperium was born, stretching from the Atlantic to the Yellow Sea.

This was the price Roosevelt paid at Yalta without consulting the Senate, the commanders in the field, or the American people. Probably never in human history were such fateful decisions made without preparation, long consultation, and arriving at some evaluation of public opinion.

History is a vast storehouse of human experience and from it man may learn the mistakes of the past, though not always promptly, and delay is often the cause of great tragedy. I hope that we can learn from the lessons of Yalta. I hope we can learn that appeasement and moral surrender cannot work out in the grand design of human history. If we can learn these lessons, America will soon recover the moral grandeur which up to the near past was the hallmark of our Nation in the parade of history.

Many Senators will remember the fateful day in 1941 when we voted to extend the Selective Service Act. When we walked out of the door, we were confronted by a group of women wearing black clothes and black hoods. They called themselves Mothers of America. When those of us who had voted for an extension of the Selective Service Act walked past those women, they spat on us. That is how people are treated when they make decisions on some of the great issues of the time.

History has a way of creeping up on us. It is only by learning and following the lessons of history that we can to some extent make better decisions in the future. That is one reason why I wanted the Yalta papers published. That is one reason why I want the papers of the Teheran and other conferences published.

I have no quarrel with Averell Harriman, the Governor of the great Empire State of New York. However, I cannot understand how he, a prominent official in our country, can deny to the United States Government access to records which the Government needs to build up its record of official papers. His denial of access denies to the Government papers which are official papers of the United States Government. If they are not so classified as Government papers they should be.

I cannot understand how Stettinius could have followed a similar course, or how anyone else who has had a part in such conferences can do so. I cannot understand how anyone can deny access by our Government to such papers which are necessary in order to build an accurate and true picture of those historic events.

Mr. President, let us not fool ourselves. Today we are passing through the same kind of period through which we passed back in those days many years ago. Many present Members of the Senate will be Senators for years to come. I hope that 10 or 12 or 15 or 18 years from today Senators will be able to stand on the floor of the Senate and look the President of the Senate in the eye and look the American people in the eye and say that in this critical period they did not bury their heads in the sand and did not close their eyes to what was going on about them.

If we take a courageous and intelligent approach to these problems and do our best to give the American people all the information they need to enable them to understand the issues and the significance of the issues, we shall have made a great contribution to the welfare of our country.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

THE YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for his fine statement. He is to be congratulated for his speech on Yalta. It is said that hindsight is always a better historian than foresight. However, the foresight of the Senator from New Hampshire was clear, and he knew what he was talking about years ago before the Yalta Agreement was entered into or was being considered. We must not make the mistake of excusing every blunder in the name of fairness. That is the historic road to compounding diplomatic errors and perpetuating injustice.

There is at least one inescapable conclusion from the Yalta meeting. President Roosevelt may have had noble purposes in mind. But the record shows a cynical disregard for idealism and morality which is shocking even in retrospect. Mr. Roosevelt knew the desperate plight of the people of Poland. Yet he was at least as much concerned with the Polish vote at home as he was with the fate of the Polish people.

Mr. Roosevelt went to Yalta with the knowledge that 6 million men, women, and children of the Jewish faith had been ruthlessly slaughtered by Hitler. Yet he found it possible to suggest lightly that he sometimes wished he could turn over his Americans of Jewish origin to Ibn Saud. It was a very bad joke, and no one could laugh at it.

This attitude runs all through the Yalta talks. Our President behaved at Yalta as if the strength of America were due to Roosevelt. He forgot the truth that Roosevelt's strength was due to America.

I do not wish to dwell too long on this phase of the negotiations. History has frozen the decisions into accomplished facts. But we ought to learn some lessons from these tragic meetings.

One thing we should have learned is the lesson of bipartisanship in foreign policy. With the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, I believe in a bipartisan American foreign policy. On the troubled issues of world affairs, both parties should speak together. Domestic problems are always open, but politics should end at the water's edge.

The Yalta story proves that we have not yet achieved the basic requirement for a true bipartisan foreign policy.

Apparently we still regard foreign policy as a partisan issue, even when we agree on its purposes. I am convinced that our diplomats must take representatives of both political parties to every major world conference—public or private. I see no valid reason why this cannot be done. The British took Clement Attlee to Potsdam when their elections were coming along. He knew the score from the beginning.

If even one Republican was at Yalta, he must have crawled in under the barbed wire fence. I do not know of any Republican who was at the Yalta Conference.

The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the ranking minority member of the committee should go to every international conference. If they did, we would have fewer sensational revelations, but we might be further ahead on national unity.

We Republicans have been talking about the Yalta meeting for a long time. Very little has been disclosed in the published documents on the Yalta Conference that came really as a surprise to us. Nevertheless, much of it did come as a bombshell to the entire world. I am sure that no American who had been conversant with the agreements at Yalta would have voted for any Senator or any Representative who had voted to approve any agreements which contained provisions for the betrayal of the millions of people who were betrayed at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran.

It is easy to indulge in charges and countercharges, but we cannot ignore some of the facts.

The greatest single shock is the revelation that the President did not report faithfully to the American people. On March 1, 1945, President Roosevelt appeared before a joint session of Congress. He declared that he was making a personal report to the people of the country on the results of the Yalta Conference.

In the course of his address, the President said:

> Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe—and not with the Pacific war.

The questions being raised about the conference were directed at the Pacific war.

We know now that one of the most important items of business at Yalta concerned the entrance of Russia into the war with Japan. At Yalta, decisions were made on questions concerning China, Manchuria, Korea, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands.

Chiang Kai-shek, our ally, knew nothing of the arrangements being made for China. Without consulting Chiang, our President agreed to a set of Chinese conditions which were frankly outrageous. They are outrageous now. They were just as outrageous in 1945. Let me list them:

First. We agreed to preserve the Soviet People's Republic in Outer Mongolia.

Second. We promised to turn over the southern part of Sakhalin, as well as all the adjacent islands, to the Soviet Union.

Third. We agreed to internationalize the commercial port of Dairen and to recognize the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port.

Fourth. We recognized the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in Manchuria, although China supposedly retained its full sovereignty.

Fifth. We turned over the Kurile Islands to the Soviet Union.

What did the Soviet Union agree to do? They said they were willing to conclude a pact of friendship and alliance with China. They agreed to fight Japan. They did little fighting and less "allying."

Two of the major purposes of this secret agreement were obvious. It stopped Congress from debating this amazing sellout of China. It prevented the Chinese from calling upon the conscience of the world.

I do not have to tell the Senate what would have happened in Congress if we had known all of the terms of this secret agreement. Certainly the recognition of the "Preeminent interests of the Soviet Union" in Manchuria would have been fiercely challenged by Democrats as well as Republicans. We were inviting the Russians to make claims which no one could anticipate.

Our Government has always fought for the open-door policy in China. We were closing the door with this agreement.

Mr. President, ever since I can remember, in my lifetime, ever since I attended Sunday School as a small boy, Americans have been interested in China. As a Christian Nation we have been interested in the Chinese people, as we have been interested in other peoples throughout the world. It is not American policy, nor is it statesmanlike, to forget people who need friends.

I have emphasized the Chinese sellout at Yalta because it is the key to everything that has happened since 1945 in the Far East. The Korean war—the Indochinese revolt—and the present crisis are the legacy of Yalta.

The worst of it appears to be the fact that it was all unnecessary. Russian help was not required to defeat Japan. We know that now. There are conflicting reports as to whether we knew it in 1945.

The record shows that Stalin had agreed, as far back as 1943, to enter the war against Japan. Two years later we gave him more than he had ever expected, in order to get him to do what long before he had promised to do.

The clue to this weird business is easy to find. President Roosevelt told Stalin at Yalta that China's internal troubles were due more to Chiang Kai-shek's party than to the so-called Communists. The whole record of our dealings with Chiang Kai-shek underscores this basic attitude.

Where does this leave us? First, we did not need to give Russia anything to get her help against Japan.

Second, what we gave was unwarranted and unprincipled.

Third, we had no right to pledge territory and rights which did not belong to us without consulting the people to whom they did belong.

And, last, we must have been regarded by the Russians as small children playing an incredibly infantile diplomatic chess game.

Ninety-seven percent of the people of Poland are Catholics. Do Senators think they want communism?

Our Chinese agreements were bad. The decisions on Germany and Poland were worse. At Yalta, our President agreed to divide Germany into three zones. He postponed the questions of reparations and future political decisions. There never was any clear understanding of our ultimate goals for Germany.

For Poland, the Yalta agreement promised a new Government, including leaders from Poland itself and from the Polish Government in exile.

Free elections were to be held. New boundary lines were to be established. We gave away Polish freedom and the Polish people without a second thought. Churchill tried to get a solution which would leave Poland as a free and independent state. But the only thing that bothered our President was the possible effect upon the Polish vote in the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt said to Mr. Stalin:

> There are six or seven million Poles in the United States. It would make it easier for me at home if the Soviet Government would give something to Poland.

Mr. Stalin replied to Mr. Roosevelt:

> What will the Russians say?

He insisted that he could not return to Moscow without the Polish territory he wanted. He got what he wanted. We got what we usually get—nothing.

Stalin promised free elections, but refused to permit international supervision of those elections.

He prevented the establishment of a coalition government during the period prior to elections. We let him get away with it. This was a sellout of the Polish people, as brazen as the sellout of Chiang Kai-shek.

What happened is history. Two years after Yalta, the Polish Provisional Government, a Communist front, held elections. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, head of the Polish Peasant Party, was forced to flee from Poland for safety. The free elections were a sham. Poland today is under the absolute rule of the Red army. We let Stalin set up a new Communist state without batting an eyelash.

The Polish experience was enough to discourage the people of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. If the Western powers could run out on the country for whom they had originally entered the war, what hope was there for them?

It is shocking to us now because we can see the whole story. Stripped to its essentials, the Yalta Conference reads like a meeting of men who made no pretense of concern for any democratic process. This could have been a meeting of European rulers back in the 17th century. They had advisers whose advice they ignored whenever they chose. Our President executed agreements without any consultations with other elected officials of the American Republic.

I do not think we are bound by these executive agreements. The Constitution of the United States requires the ratification of all treaties by the Senate. In my judgment, our country should repudiate every one of the agreements which the United States regards as unconscionable.

I think it is unconscionable for any President of the United States to parcel out nations, to move boundary lines, to enter into secret deals affecting the lives and destiny of millions of people. I think it is unconscionable for any President to arrogate to himself, without authority from any source, the right to commit our country to arrangements which he is unwilling to reveal.

There are those who apologize for Yalta by the ready use of such phrases as "the practical realities." They say that we must judge Yalta in the context of things as they stood in 1945—not as we see them now.

I submit that by any standard—by the most practical standard open to American leaders—the decisions reached at Yalta were an ignominious surrender of American interests. We were involved in World War II by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. That attack grew out of our determination to prevent Japan from seizing and occupying China. At Yalta, we vested the future of China in the Soviet Union. We killed the open-door policy, which was the one firm foundation of all our dealings with the Far East for 50 years.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was quoted widely in the newspapers recently. He was reported as saying that our preoccupation with the defense of Formosa was obscuring our concern with Japan and Vietnam. He regarded these areas as equally important.

I say that our troubles in the Far East, with Formosa, with Vietnam, with Korea, with Japan, all stem directly back to Yalta.

It was not on a battlefield—it was not at an election booth—that we lost China. It was at Yalta. And from that defeat there arose the monstrous Communist army that drove Chiang Kai-shek out of his homeland into Formosa.

From that defeat, there arose the power which revolted against the French in Indochina, split the land in two, and almost exploded into another world war last year. It was from Yalta that the arbitrary, artificial, and unjustifiable division of Korea into North and South stemmed. We know what this meant in American lives.

I do not claim for any human being the powers of divine omniscence. It did not take such wisdom to realize what was happening at Yalta. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had the opportunity between them to stand firmly for justice, morality, and the conscience of the free world. They missed the boat. They abdicated.

That was the tragedy of Yalta. We are its heirs; and the blood, sweat, and tears of this generation are written in the ink of Yalta.

Let us resolve that we will not repeat these errors endlessly into the future.

Mr. President, I have been trying to say these things for a long time. Unfortunately, as a new Member of this body, I am not altogether conversant with the procedure of the Senate, and, of course, I do not choose to speak too often. But I have a deep feeling and an abiding faith that what was done at Yalta was wrong. I have sat here listening to some of the older Members of this body, and I have wanted to speak my piece. I have wanted to say something about it. I have been a Member of the Congress for 14 years. I am new in the Senate, and I am not familiar with all its rules. I have been trying to learn, and I have listened attentively. But, Mr. President, the agreement made at Yalta was wrong, and I do not propose that my people in Ohio shall feel that I am sitting here and taking without protest the talk about hindsight. I am very proud of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for telling us of the work of the membership in both Houses during the years gone by in protesting and objecting to the kind of sellout which was made at Yalta.

I think that, even though some of us are new Members of the Senate, we certainly have a right to speak out. All Senators are on the same basis, even though some may have been elected by a small majority. I know that in the great State of Ohio I was not elected by a landslide.

Last Saturday when I met Mr. Harriman, the Governor of New York, I shook hands with him and said, "Hello, Landslide Harriman. This is Landslide BENDER."

Governor Harriman could not have won by the great "landslide" by which he was elected if the people of New York had known all about Yalta last November. I think I can guarantee that, because I know the people of New York are intelligent, capable, and qualified.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Ohio means, does he not, that if the public had known at that time that the candidate for Governor of New York, Averell Harriman, had refused the United States Government access to his papers on Yalta and knowledge of his part in the proceedings at Yalta, they would not have had sufficient confidence in him to have elected him Governor of New York?

Mr. BENDER. The Senator from New Hampshire is absolutely correct. That is the point I am trying to make. He certainly would not have been elected by such a landslide if the people of New York had known all the facts.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The people of the United States know the facts. Does the Senator from Ohio think that this will have any bearing on the desire of the Governor of New York to be President?

Mr. BENDER. I answer my friend, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, by saying that I believe the people of New York, by this time, have learned their lesson.

I am certain that, so far as the Nation is concerned, the people are thinking about only one man, and that man is the present occupant of the White House. In whatever poll is taken, and wherever it is taken—whether it be the Gallup poll or any other—the lowest vote the President receives is a majority of 68 percent.

The people of the United States are not thinking about Mr. Harriman. Neither are they thinking about Mr. Stevenson. They are thinking about the greatest man who has occupied the great office in the White House in our time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. By his statement, the Senator from Ohio does not mean to imply, does he, that the Governor of New York, Mr. Harriman, is not running as fast as he can for President?

Mr. BENDER. I am certain that Mr. Harriman is running. I am sure he has the Presidency in mind. I heard a speech he made recently. I think he never spoke better. That is not saying very much, but I never heard him speak better than he spoke that night.

I know Mr. Harriman has in mind running for the Presidency at the next election; but, I say to my friends, he will run for exercise; and anyone else who runs against President Eisenhower next year will be running for exercise.

I am certain that most Senators on the Democratic side who are wise—and they are good friends of mine, and I love them—appreciate that fact.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator from Ohio think that Mr. Harriman, who is a multimillionaire and a Wall Streeter, would appeal to some of the liberals of the Democratic Party?

Mr. BENDER. I think he has an appeal to Mr. De Sapio, the head of Tammany Hall; and possibly he might appeal to some of the other liberals in the Democratic Party. But certainly so far as the liberals in the Democratic Party in Ohio are concerned, they have never heard of Mr. Harriman.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from Ohio think, Mr. Harriman might appeal to the Jeffersonian Democrats?

Mr. BENDER. I happen to know a great many Jeffersonian Democrats. Practically all of my relatives live in Virginia, and they are all part of HARRY BYRD'S organization. Of course, they were there before I was; and so far as they are concerned, they do not know that Harriman exists.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator from Ohio name one candidate who is appearing on the opposite horizon who might embrace Jeffersonian principles—just one candidate?

Mr. BENDER. I do not know of a single potential candidate who is actually in the running or who has been considered by Dr. Gallup who would be considered adequate by the Jeffersonian Democrats.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire knew that he was holding the floor, but he did not realize that the distinguished Senator from Ohio intended to speak for more than a few minutes in order to propound a question.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In view of the fact that the Senator from Ohio has not been able to name a candidate from the opposite horizon who embraces Jeffersonian principles, might the Senator from Ohio be able to suggest who is picking the candidates on the opposite horizon?

Mr. BENDER. I have no idea about Democratic politics. I have all I can do to think about Republican politics.

So far as I am concerned, my interest is in only one man on our side as a candidate because of the superb job he has done, because of his good work, because of his excellent performance.

The Republican Party has many persons who are qualified to be President. There are many able members of our party. But I say that a man who does a good job certainly is entitled to a second term. I am aware of the fact that at the moment President Eisenhower has not said whether he will or will not be a candidate. But, under the circumstances, I believe he is the best possible man who could be named for the Presidency.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Ohio suggest, then, that Jeffersonian doctrines have disappeared from the halls of decision in the opposite party?

Mr. BENDER. Certainly so far as those who favor the Democratic Party are concerned, I have not heard any Jeffersonian doctrines expounded by any leading member of the Democratic Party, who has authority in the party. As a matter of fact, the most recent statement I read was that those in authority in that party were trying to read some of the Jeffersonian Democrats out of the party; they do not even want the Jeffersonian Democrats to attend the convention in Chicago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from Ohio agree that there is only one finer tune in the country than that with reference to Jeffersonian principles, and that is the Lincolnian tune; and that it is time we do all we can to assist those in the opposite party who espouse Jeffersonian principles to regain control from those who have discarded the principles of Jefferson?

Mr. BENDER. I wish to say that our great President has said he is a liberal, so far as human rights are concerned,

and a conservative so far as the economy is concerned.

I started in politics when I was 14 years old, as a follower of Theodore Roosevelt. In Ohio, during my lifetime, I have tried very humbly to serve as a legislator for 25 years in various capacities. I like to have in the Republican Party the kind of man we have in President Eisenhower. I like the kind of man who is forthright, honest, sincere, and devoted to keeping his word with the American people. I think President Eisenhower has done a noble job. For that reason, on every occasion, on the slightest provocation, as an exponent of the principles of President Eisenhower, I support his program as strongly as I possibly can; and I have, in the main, supported him on almost every occasion.

Once in a while it has been necessary for me to disagree with him, because I am elected to represent the people of Ohio. But I rarely find occasion to disagree with our great President. I think that, in the main, the people of the United States generally share my views of this great man.

In closing, I apologize to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and to the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for speaking at such great length. I learned to admire the Senator from New Hampshire long before I became a Member of the Senate. He has rendered valiant and valuable service today in telling the American people about the horrible plight of the people of occupied countries, and frequently at other times in exposing the deplorable conditions which prevail there.

We should never miss an opportunity to tell the facts and to tell the truth, because, as Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and the distinguished Senator from Ohio for the splendid remarks they have made this afternoon. I wholeheartedly agree with the statements of both distinguished Senators that the sellout of Poland and the other countries presently behind the Iron Curtain is one of the great tragedies of this day and age.

It seems to me, Mr. President, it ought to be pointed out that the Prime Minister of Great Britain stated that it was with great reluctance that he was compelled to accede to the wishes of the other powers, particularly in view of the fact that Great Britain entered World War II because of the invasion of Poland. So it seems to me the time has come when we ought to evaluate the events which took place at Yalta, certainly in view of the fact that our then Chief Executive made the statement on the floor of the House, which was quoted a few minutes ago, that no secret agreements were made at Yalta. Now we know that, instead of calling upon the people who were best able to give him advice, such as General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, now the great President of the United States, and many other distinguished leaders of our country, he took Alger Hiss as one of his chief advisers.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is entitled to great credit for bringing all these facts to the attention of the people of the United States.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his remarks this afternoon. I think it is most apropos that the facts be made concerning the conference at Yalta and the use of Government documents by former Government officials, whether they be Presidents or whether they be officers in a lesser capacity in the executive branch, as private papers rather than as public documents, which they are, which belong to all the people of the country.

There has been much discussion of the so-called release of the Yalta papers. Most of the information in the Yalta papers was leaked out to private publications long before the release of their full text. So, in all fairness to the public, the full text of the papers should be released.

I commend the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his remarks today, particularly since there is much discussion at the present time to the possibility that there will be in the near future a meeting of heads of government to discuss future plans for a peaceful world.

I sincerely hope that mistakes which have been made in past conferences will be heeded, not only by heads of government, but by the persons who do the planning. I think it will be found that in most such conferences much of the damage has been done not by the heads of states so much as by the persons who have planned for the various conferences.

I am sure the American people will insist that all discussions, or all decisions which are made at future conferences, shall be made public, and that there shall be no more secret deals, particularly when they relate to the lives and freedoms of other people.

If the Senator will bear with me, I should also like to pay a compliment to the outstanding junior Senator from the State of Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who I am confident the good people of his fair State will return to the Senate for a full 6-year term. He is a credit to his State and a man of great ability.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in closing, I should like to thank the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] for his forthright statement and very able contribution to the discussion. I wish also to say that I appreciate very much the contributions made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and other Senators who have participated in the debate.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENIOR CLASS OF THE WALTERBORO HIGH SCHOOL, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to state that we have with us in the Senate gallery this afternoon the senior class of the Walterboro High School, which is one of the leading high schools in South Carolina. It is a great pleasure to have them here. There are present, in charge of the class, Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Mobley, Mr. Roger W. Sturm, and Mrs. Odessa Bryan. I should like to have the senior class of the Walterboro High School stand.

[The visitors rose from their places in the gallery and were greeted by the Senate with applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. The quorum call can be started, which will enable the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is in committee, to be present on the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the request is made with the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 92, Calendar No. 241, and then resume the consideration of Senate Resolution 94, with the understanding that at the conclusion of action by the Senate on these two resolutions, and also the conference report on the postal pay bill, the Senator from Wisconsin will have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate, Senate Resolution 92 which will be read by title.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) providing funds for an examination and review of the Administration of the Patent Office, and of the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights, was read and the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

The resolution had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of May 1, 1955.

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me state, briefly, that the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks was established after the legislative reorganization bill was passed by the Congress.

At the present time, the Commissioner of Patents and his principal examiner are abroad, at Bern, Switzerland, where they are engaged in a conference with the representatives of certain other nations with respect to the worldwide use of patents. The matter is of great importance to the United States, its people, and its industries, because I believe it will be recognized by all that the inventive genius of the United States and its people has been the principal cause of the creation of a great many jobs throughout the history of our country. It is true that sometimes workers are displaced; but, on the whole, new industries are created by patents.

We have received complaints in regard to great delays in the handling of patent applications in the Patent Office. Sometimes it is alleged that patent applications are not acted upon for even a year or more. That situation has resulted in an unfortunate development, in that citizens of foreign nations have become acquainted with the details of some of the patent applications, and have filed applications of their own in foreign countries, where they have received patents. It would take a long time—and longer than need be taken, I believe—to describe the entire situation.

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous in its recommendation to the Senate and to the Committee on Rules and Administration that the resolution be adopted.

I may say that if the world should be so fortunate as to have developments on the international scene result in relieving the tension which now exists, and if military expenditures should be decreased, it will be of great importance that steps be taken to do what can be done to increase domestic expenditures in productive enterprises. But if that is to be done properly, there must be a thoroughgoing review of the patent laws, and the review must be made by the committee upon which jurisdiction of that matter has been conferred. The committee is not a special one; it is a standing subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Inasmuch as the resolution was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Subcommittee and by the full Judiciary Committee, and also by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I hope the resolution will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ELLENDER I am sure the Senator from Wyoming recalls that when he was a member of the Appropriations Committee, the chief cause of this backlog was the lack of money recommended by the Appropriations Committee, so as to provide the Patent Office with the necessary funds to enable it to catch up with its work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the able Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of that fact, what good will come from the expenditure of $50,000 in order to find out what we already know?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that one of the good things which will come from it will be that we shall develop the facts, which may persuade the Appropriations Committee to take steps which will help.

The Senator from Louisiana knows as well as I do that the Appropriations Committee does not have time to go into legislative matters; and the standing legislative committee in charge of patents, copyrights, and trade-marks must be equipped with a sufficient staff to be able to do this work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has anything come to the attention of the Senator or the committee to indicate that a revision of the patent laws themselves would be in order?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. There have been complaints of all kinds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know what those complaints are? Would it not be possible to introduce bills now in order to correct the evils about which complaint is being made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Sometimes poor legislation——

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the difficulty could be thrashed out by the standing committee, rather than by the creation of a new staff, the employment of extra help and the spending of $50,000 of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of the great difficulties about some legislation is that bills are introduced without the proper study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It will set forth in full the case which was made before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the report (No. 239) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 92) providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

The expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary for the inquiries proposed under this resolution will be limited to $50,000.

The amendment offered by the committee strikes out a proviso setting the effective date for beginning the resolution's operations at May 1, 1955, inasmuch as the same provision occurs elsewhere in the resolution's text.

A letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, explaining in detail the proposals of the resolution, and attaching a budget, is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
April 25, 1955.

Re Senate Resolution 92.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: There is now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolution 92, which provides for an appropriation in the sum of $50,000 for the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly organized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the administration of the Patent Office and the laws relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights, with the view in mind of improving the administration of the Patent Office and to propose such amendments to title 35, as may be deemed advisable under the circumstances after a proper investigation.

Various patent law associations, and those connected with the patent business, have passed resolutions on various phases of the patent law which seem to require thorough study. For example, a statement of the New York Patent Law Association states, in part, as follows:

"The patent system is of vital importance to the country. It has been estimated that 75 percent of the jobs in this country today are due to inventions made within the last 50 years; for example: automobiles, airplanes, radio, television, moving pictures, automatic telephones, home appliances, synthetic rubber, plastics, electronics, business machines, aspirin, wonder drugs, cellophane, nylon, rayon, Army tanks, guided missiles, proximity fuse, and atomic energy. A large fraction of the income of the Federal Government is based on business which exists only as a result of inventions. The outcome of any future war will depend largely on new inventions. And the patent system is the most important stimulus to the making of inventions. When the Government is spending billions of dollars each year for defense, is it not absurd to starve the Patent Office? A single invention may directly save the Government more in a single year than the entire cost of the Patent Office for many years."

There have been complaints over quite some period of time from inventors to the effect that there is too long a delay in the granting of patents after application therefor has been made. The American Society

of Inventors, in a communication in this regard, states, in part, as follows:

"A recent issue of the Official Gazette shows that there are over 200,000 applications awaiting action by the Patent Office, that the average delay in action upon an application is over a year, and that some cases have been awaiting action for more than 18 months. This condition is due to an inadequate staff which in turn is due to pennywise economies. As you know, the last Congress, instead of increasing the Patent Office appropriation which was then urgently required for the same reasons that exist today, actually reduced the appropriation so that today the examiner would have to pass upon almost twice as many cases in the same time interval as 5 years ago to keep their work current.

"The difficulties confronting independent inventors today are greater than ever before. If these conditions continue to exist, they are going to stifle the creative thinking of our loyal Americans whose efforts are honest in trying to help our country. This delay curtails the incentive of those with new ideas in development work and instead of promoting this type of work, it is a real handicap.

"It is quite evident that Congress has not been fully informed about conditions in the Patent Office or it would not allow them to exist. We, as members of a national, nonprofit organization of inventors, urge that immediate consideration be given to this problem."

Information has come to the committee that either through the matter of delay in the issuance of patents, or for some other reason, there have been leaks in relation to inventions that have caused a great deal of confusion in patent processing which has, in turn, delayed further the issuance of patents. There is a necessity of protecting an inventor from disclosure of his idea and this subject is necessarily one for study by the committee.

The committee proposes to make an examination of the manner in which new inventions for purposes of defense are handled in the Defense Department and other departments concerning their methods and procedures which stem from governmental activities. Also, it is intended to study the system relating to the rights of the Government and the individual when such individual is the creator of an invention and works for the Government or perfects his creation on Government time.

It is proposed to make a study of the relationship between the United States and other governments of the world. It is understood that at the present time the Commissioner of Patents and other officials of the United States Patent Office are now in consultation with other governments in Bern, Switzerland, in respect to patents. A study of the present patent law is necessary in order to keep abreast of possible treaty arrangements.

Title 35 of the United States Code, dealing with patents and the Patent Office, was codified in 1952 and it is the opinion of the committee that since that codification a review of existing patent law is necessary to bring the laws relating to patents and trade-marks up to date. In years past, patents dealt primarily with mechanical subjects but in recent years there has been a tremendous growth of complex patents, particularly relating to chemicals, so that a study of existing law is indicated to keep pace with this growth.

There also has been criticism relating to new improvements on existing machines as to the adequacy of the now existing law in relation thereto.

In the past two Congresses there have been introduced bills relating to inventors' awards in order that inventors would be encouraged to proceed with inventions in the public interest and in the public defense. No action has been taken on this type of legislation and the committe believes that a thoroughgoing investigation as to the merits of such a proposal is in order.

Some criticism has been leveled as to the existing law in relation to when a patent attaches. It has been stated that even though an inventor has filed his application for a patent, his patent may not be granted because some other person may come in and show that he had the idea a number of years before the patent application was filed. It is believed that an investigation to determine whether or not there can be some method under which the rights to a patent may attach in order to avoid confusion and unnecessary delay in the processing of patents is necessary.

There have been a number of resolutions submitted to the committee which indicate that the budget for the Patent Office is not sufficient in order to administer the patent program adequately. In 1952 there were 60,386 applications for patents filed and in 1954 there were 75,271 such applications. In 1952 there were 720 examiners and in 1954 that number had been reduced to 654, and as of February 19, 1955, the number had been reduced to 610. It would appear to the committee that the continuous rise of applications for patents, coupled with the reduction in force of examiners, is a matter of major concern. The appropriation for fiscal 1955 was $11.5 million and the appropriation asked by the Budget Bureau for fiscal 1956 is only $500,000 more, or $12 million. According to the statement of the New York Patent Law Association the Patent Office appropriation should be at least $15 million for fiscal 1956. With a 25-percent increase in patent applications filed from 1952 to 1954, an increase of at least 25 percent in the appropriation is required to provide even restricted services rendered in 1952, not considering rising costs since then.

The committee believes that the operation of the Patent Office in the interest of national defense and in the interest of the public welfare is of major importance and that an investigation into the various items set forth is most necessary to the welfare of this country.

On behalf of the committee I urge the approval of the attached proposed budget, since these funds will enable the committee to make its contribution toward the goal herein set forth.

With kindest regards, I am

Most sincerely yours,

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

Proposed budget of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-Marks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary for the period of May 1, 1955, to Jan. 31, 1956, inclusive

Position	Number	Base salary	Gross salary	Monthly salary	Total for period of budget
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$7,320	$11,646.00	$970.50	$8,734.50
Associate counsel	1	7,320	11,646.00	970.50	8,734.50
Investigators	2	5,280	8,907.12	742.26	13,360.68
Administrative and clerical: Clerical assistants	2	3,360	5,908.12	492.34	8,862.12
Total	6				39,691.80
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage)					1,000.00
Contingent fund					3,308.20
Total					10,308.20
Funds requested					50,000.00

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in my feeble effort to try to save a little money for the taxpayers——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I yielded the floor temporarily in order that an explanation might be made. I have an appointment at 5 o'clock. I should like to know about how long the Senator intends to take at this time. I hold the floor now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall require not more than 10 to 15 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not more than 10 minutes? I yield for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I tried to point out in the early part of this session, expenditures for special investigations have been increasing by leaps and bounds. The last time such a resolution was before us I introduced into the RECORD data showing just how far we have gone. For example, last year, we spent $1,900,000 on special investigations. That amount was exclusive of the $95,000 which is regularly made available to each standing committee under the Reorganization Act. If the Judiciary Committee is allowed the amount it now seeks in order to conduct an investigation, the Judiciary Committee will have at its disposal for this year alone $920,672, plus the $95,000 which is allotted to that committee for its regular work.

If this amount is allowed, if the $50,000 asked by the same committee for another subcommittee, to investigate civil rights, is allowed, and if the $75,000 now being requested by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is allowed, it will mean that up to this time we shall have made available, for the purpose of conducting special Senate investigations, $2,283,819.79 for this year alone. The Committee on the Judiciary has for expenditure almost half of that total sum.

I do not see how committee members can find the time to do so much subcommittee work. It is my belief that most of this work is done by clerks or profes-

sional job hunters who sell a bill of goods to some Senator in the hope of getting a job. I have said that on many occasions, and I believe it to be true.

I know the futility of my standing before the Senate and trying to save this $50,000 or $100,000. It is a small amount, but it ought to be saved. It is my hope that this resolution, as well as the one to follow it, will be defeated. It is true that the amount involved is small, but if we add it to other amounts, the total is a large sum.

In addition to the expenditures referred to which include clerk hire and incidentals, subcommittees hold hearings and make reports; thousands of copies of such hearings and reports are printed and sent throughout the country at public expense. I should say that the cost of such reports amounts to probably a third of the total appropriation. Many of such reports are sent out under the franks of Senators or of the committees, at great expense to the Government.

It is my hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will take note of the resolutions before it, providing for these many investigations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator know that in my previous service in the Senate, when I was chairman of several subcommittees, it was always my practice to have documents and reports sold by the Government Printing Office, and that whenever such a report was made on a subject which seemed to be of public interest, I made the announcement on the floor of the Senate, with the result that returns were received by the Treasury from the printing and distribution of such documents. That is what I would do now.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator did that with respect to the investigations conducted by the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trade-Marks, but that action related only to a part of the total number of reports. I am sure that a substantial number of such reports were sent out free.

It is my hope that something may be done about these expenditures. As I have stated, we are increasing the amount, year by year. Every year the sums grow larger. Thus far this year—and it is only May—we have increased the amount by almost $400,000, as compared with expenditures last year for special investigations. My hope is that the Senate will take note of this condition and halt such expenditures.

Senators complain about the great amount of work they have to do, and how they are burdened. The proposal before us is a demonstration of how some of them seek work; much of which I consider useless. In my judgment a great deal of the work could be done by the professional staff members who are employed by the standing committees, without the necessity for hiring news staffs at great expense. As I have often pointed out, each committee is entitled to employ 4 professional workers and 6 clerical workers. Many committees have been successful in having resolutions adopted by the Senate by which they obtained more professional workers than the law generally provides for. If we add all the appropriations together, it will be found that the Judiciary Committee is spending in excess of $1 million over and above what it could regularly spend under the law. I hope the Senate will take note of this situation and put a stop to such expenditures.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I wish to comment that the $50,000 asked for by the subcommittee will be entirely inadequate. In my opinion, it should be at least $100,000.

This is one of the most important jobs that is to be done by the Judiciary Committee at this session of Congress. I can produce records to show that when a man applies for a patent, the procedure requires 3 years before he can obtain action on his application for a patent. It is not 1 year, but 3 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator believe——

Mr. LANGER. I am not yielding to the Senator at this time. The result is that large corporations, like General Electric, have their employees sign a contract containing a provision that any invention they may develop during their employment shall belong to the corporation.

That is not all. The distinguished Senator says he wants someone on the staff to work out the proper legislation. Who on the staff knows anything about patent law? No one. It is a speciality all by itself. The average lawyer who is appointed to the Federal bench knows nothing about patent law.

As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I discovered that many times after patent cases had been argued before a Federal judge, the judge would take months and even years before giving his decision. One of the great jobs of the subcommittee is to make a thorough investigation of whether Congress should set up a patent court so that there will not be these interminable delays, during which patents are stolen from citizens by foreign countries.

The situation is very serious. It should have been attended to many years ago. I regret that during the time I was chairman of the committee we were unable to get action on this matter, although I tried time and time again to do so.

I am satisfied that if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will bear with the committee he will find that for every dollar the committee will expend the people of America will receive many more dollars in return.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 94.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. 94) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I shall be as brief as I can, recognizing that in the time allotted I cannot adequately explain the resolution in its entirety in terms of the field which the resolution seeks and proposes to cover.

The subcommittee concerned is a standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I did not seek the chairmanship of the subcommittee. Having been assigned the chairmanship, I have the feeling that there is a job to be done and that it should be done.

I can best express the general purview of what the subcommittee intends to do by following the notes I have undertaken to make on the subject.

We are asking for only $50,000. We have a very small staff. We are starting very late in the year. The subcommittee is to deal with a general examination of the Bill of Rights and proposed legislation affecting it, to determine the appropriateness of its present-day application, with particular attention to matters concerned with due process, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, as well as the functions of administrative agencies whose responsibilities particularly affect such rights.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. That field, I may say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana, is necessarily all-embracing so far as it relates to the Constitution and to the first ten amendments to the Constitution. The subcommittee does not intend to row with muffled oars toward concealed objectives. We have heard from many sources that the Bill of Rights is being eroded and that individual rights are being invaded. Therefore, we would like to conduct an open examination into the various fields embraced within that subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator expect to cure the evils to which he refers by merely holding hearings?

Mr. HENNINGS. The hearings, I should think, will ultimately result in bringing before the country very distinguished men who would testify concerning the various fields in which they believe the Bill of Rights may be in danger of being eroded in some way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do we not have laws on the statute books, as well as the Constitution itself, to protect the rights of our people?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. If some rights are not being protected, why do not the individuals concerned resort to the courts? What good will it do to hold hearings and simply stir up dust, so to speak?

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator from Louisiana suggest that it may be dangerous to stir up the Bill of Rights?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not suggest anything of the sort. The Bill of Rights has endured for more than 100 years. It exists for the protection of the rights of our people. If anyone's rights have been violated, it strikes me that the individual can be protected by recourse to the courts. Merely holding hearings will not cure any evils that may exist.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to constitutional rights, the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956 (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for the consideration of a conference report?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield further, but I should like to inquire how long the Senator expects to speak.

Mr. PASTORE. It should not take me more than 5 minutes. Originally I had planned to take much longer, but I shall insert my remarks in the RECORD in the form of a statement and then make a very short and concise report to the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 9, 1955, pp. 5846–5861, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have prepared an explanation of the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PASTORE

It occurs to me that perhaps some on both sides of this highly complex issue are overlooking the fact that matters of this kind often are not completely and finally resolved to the full satisfaction of everyone with one fell swoop. Frequently, the goal cannot be reached with a single stride, but must be approached step by step.

Legislation is not always perfect and it is never permanent. It can be changed to correct inequities, reflect improvements and allow for progress. History is replete with supporting examples of this. If this were not true, there would be little progress in industry, in science, in the arts or in government. We would become a stagnant nation and disintegrate because of decay.

As I understand the situation, neither side is completely satisfied with the conference agreement, nor does either side have any substantial reason to be completely dissatisfied. On the one hand, the Post Office Department would acquire the position classification program it so greatly desires, but it is a little unhappy with some of the pay features. On the other hand, the employees would receive an immediate pay raise, but they are a little unhappy with various and sundry other features. Finally, there are those in Congress—and I am one—who entertain sincere concern regarding the Department's classification program. However, the fact that neither side obtained every thing it desired, may be of itself an indication that this bill is not so bad after all. It may be an indication that the bill has the proper checks and balances to work in a rather acceptable manner after all.

The Classification Act—applicable to a million or more Federal employees outside the postal service—was not perfect when it was first enacted in 1923. There are few who would maintain that it is perfect today, even after more than 30 years of operation and in spite of being amended by Congress on more than a dozen occasions. But, all agree that progress has been made under it; that employee morale has been raised because of it; and, that the principle of equal pay for equal work has been observed. I am confident no one would wish us to return to the chaotic method of pay-fixing for our other Federal employees which existed before the Classification Act was first enacted. I suspect rather strongly that we may be viewing history repeating itself in regard to the postal pay bill now before us.

This great Nation of ours under God—in earnest search for honorable and lasting peace—has beseeched other nations to resolve their differences around the conference table. The problems of nations are vastly more complex and their differences much greater than any involved in the issue before us here today. Surely, if there be any hope at all of settling differences between nations by such a method, there should be no question of success when that same method is used to settle small differences, by any yardstick of comparison, among ourselves. That, so it seems to me, is exactly the situation in which we find ourselves on this issue.

Candidly and with great sincerity, I must disagree with those who predict that the President will veto this bill.

I disagree with them for two reasons: First, I respect the President, and I accept his word that he will study this bill before reaching any decision whether to veto or approve it. Secondly, I believe firmly, that if the bill is presented to the President properly he will agree to its enactment.

To the end that he may better understand the bill that will soon be in his hands I wish to point out the following:

1. The bill passed by the Senate provided for a straight 10 percent increase for all postal employees. It did not contain the position classification program strongly desired by the Post Office Department.

2. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the House, working closely with the Post Office Department, reported out a bill that provided a 6-percent immediate increase and contained the Post Office Department's position classification program.

3. When the House committee bill reached the floor, three amendments were adopted. Two of the amendments—so I am informed—were acceptable to and approved by the Post Office Department. The third amendment added a few dollars here and there in some of the lower grades and reduced some of the future—not present but future increases—in several of the top grades.

Thus, the conferees had on the one hand the Senate bill providing a flat 10-percent increase (without the Post Office Department's classification program) that would have added over $200 million to the payroll cost of the Post Office Department, and on the other hand, the House bill providing a 6 percent increase and the Post Office Department's position classification program, which would add $164 million to the payroll cost of the Department.

4. In conference the Senate conferees accepted completely the Post Office Department's position classification program contained in the House bill. This was done in the spirit of compromise; it was done in order to give the Post Office Department a program that the Postmaster General has stated repeatedly is essential to the efficient operation of the postal service; and, it was done in the interest of obtaining speedy enactment of a pay raise for our postal employees.

When it came to the basic increase itself, agreement was not so easily reached. To repeat—the House bill called for a 6-percent increase as against a 10-percent increase in the Senate bill. One would assume that a reasonable compromise might have been 8 percent—the midway point between the two extremes—but here again, the Senate conferees yielded ground in an effort to come out with a bill that would be reasonably acceptable to all concerned. The House conferees agreed to an increase of 1 percent and the Senate conferees accepted a reduction of 3 percent, thus arriving at the 7 percent called for in the bill before us. This agreement resulted in adding $9 million to the payroll cost of the House bill. In other words, the cost of the conference bill for pay increases and classification of positions amounts to a total of $173 million, or an average increase of 8.59 percent. I am cognizant that many people are under the impression that the bill agreed to in conference amounts to an average of 8.8 percent, as has been widely publicized. This 8.8 percent figure includes a number of items not

attributable to pay increases. For example, it includes an item of $3,600,000 for reimbursement of travel expenses. This item and others of a similar nature, amounting to a total of $6 million annually, are no more attributable to salary increases and position classification than would be the cost of building a new post office. With these items eliminated—as they properly should be—the cost of the conference agreement is 8.59 percent. This is less than 1 percent above the figure quoted as being acceptable to the administration.

There was good reason and sound logic for agreeing upon the 7-percent basic increase. Let me explain what was accomplished by changing the increase in the House bill from 6 to 7 percent. This small increase of 1 percent evened out the increases of the lower paid employees in most categories. The exact figures under the 6-percent House bill and the 7-percent conference agreement are as follows:

Group	Employees	Increase	
		6 percent plus reclassification	7 percent plus reclassification
Clerks, 3d class	10,224	9.00	9.00
Special-delivery messengers	5,602	7.70	7.80
Rural carriers	35,597	6.20	7.30
Clerks, 1st and 2d class	196,853	8.30	8.70
City carrier	130,741	8.50	8.70
Postal Transportation Service	39,763	7.50	8.20
Postmasters:			
4th class	17,189	8.62	8.71
1st class	6,861	7.73	8.62
2d class	3,558	6.81	8.88
Other (except postmasters 3d class)	48,643	8.10	8.50
Subtotal	495,031	8.1	8.5
Postmasters, 3d class	13,229	21.38	21.38
Total	508,260	8.2	8.59

The American people support us in our attempt to secure an adequate pay increase for postal employees, and in recent weeks there have been many editorials appearing throughout the United States, urging the enactment of postal pay legislation into law. I am inserting a number of these fine editorials into the RECORD.

The conference agreement is a good bill. It is acceptable to our postal employees. It was approved in the House by a vote of 328 to 66. It will be approved here today without serious opposition. It should be acceptable to the Post Office Department. I hope the President in his wisdom will approve it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some editorials which appeared in various newspapers. They deal with the bill now under consideration.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal of May 5, 1955]

THE GAP'S TOO SMALL FOR A VETO

Considering the circumstances under which the postal pay increase legislation came before Congress this session, the rate of raise which the conference committee has agreed upon should be regarded as reasonable. Presumably, therefore, both the House and Senate will shortly accept the conference report.

Although neither the House nor Senate bill provides for an increase in postal rates, this unfortunate omission is not sufficient justification for a Presidential veto, as it was last year. For this year the Members of Congress have voted themselves a pay increase that makes the postal employees' raise appear picayune. Moreover, there is pending legislation that is intended to increase the salaries of all Federal civilian personnel by a percentage at least equal to that accorded the postal workers. The Senate has already approved its bill granting a 10-percent increase—identical with the increased rate it voted the postal employees—and the House is expected to sanction a slightly lower general increase. Finally, members of the Armed Forces have lately received a pay boost.

Against this background, Mr. Eisenhower now has no legitimate reason for vetoing the postal pay increase if the House and Senate accept the conference report unaltered. For it tops 7.6, the figure the President was reportedly ready to accept, by only an additional 1.2 percent. Such a small gap does not warrant another denial of a long overdue increase in postal workers' compensation.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 5, 1955]

THEY NEED A RAISE

President Eisenhower has not yet committed himself as to whether he will sign or veto the bill providing an average 8.8 percent pay raise for about 500,000 postal workers. At his press conference yesterday he said that he will study the measure carefully before making his decision.

That is as it should be. A pay raise for half a million Government employees represents a very large sum of money. This does not obscure the fact that postal workers are badly in need of an increase.

The President is not unsympathetic to the plight of the mail carriers. He has said, however, that he considers a 7.6-percent increase all that ought to be granted at this time.

The Senate thinks otherwise; it approved a 10 percent raise. The House approved 8.3 percent. A conference committee has compromised at 8.8 percent. That appears reasonable, considering that postal workers have not had a general raise since 1951. We hope the President will feel that the compromise figure is low enough to warrant his signing the bill.

[From the New York Daily News of April 22, 1955]

NO PO RAISE THIS YEAR?

All the evidence shows, and virtually all of us are agreed, that the Nation's 500,000 post office employees deserve a pay raise and should have had one last year.

Yet, because Congress and the President can't agree on whether the boost should be 7.6 percent or 8.2 percent, this act of simple justice to the postal workers is in danger of being put off for another year.

Our word for the prospect is "stinking." What's yours?

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of April 22, 1955]

POSTAL PAY VETO?

By a vote of 224 to 189, not large enough to override a presidential veto, the House has approved an 8.2 percent boost for some half million postal employees. The Senate last month voted a 10 percent boost. A compromise seems in the cards.

President Eisenhower last year refused to sign a 7 percent increase on the ground that it was not accompanied by a revenue-raising hike in postal rates.

The postal workers deserve a raise in pay. The ratio of cost of living to their pay raises over the past years proves that. And the President in a measure invalidates his position of last year when he now implies that he will veto any raise over 7.6 percent.

Finally, the fact that the measure is not accompanied by a raise in postal rates is not a sound objection. As the Times-Star has said before, postal rates and pay for postal employees are no more connected than the pay of sailors is to the price of battleships.

[From the Providence Journal of April 23, 1955]

NOT THE RIGHT OCCASION FOR A VETO

Mr. Eisenhower will have to dig very deep if he is to come up with a convincing reason for vetoing a postal pay increase bill because the House voted six-tenths of 1 percent more than he has indicated he would approve.

A year ago he denied the postal workers a raise for the legitimate reason that Congress provided no funds to pay it. But this year the responsibility rests with him to make sure that these faithful public servants get their proper share of the pay boosts that economic circumstances have persuaded him to recommend for other civilian employees. These circumstances have already compelled the Government to provide increases for its military personnel and, more conspicuously, for the Members of Congress themselves.

Where the conference committee will finally fix the percentage point remains to be revealed. It must stand somewhere between the House's 8.2 percent pay increase and the Senate's 10 percent. But obviously there is no reason to expect that either branch will drop back to Mr. Eisenhower's 7.6 maximum.

And considering that the administration in the next fiscal year plans to spend upward of $60 billion, with at least 3.5 percent of total expenditures allotted to alien peoples, it can hardly afford to haggle over perhaps a dozen million extra dollars that Congress may decide to give the postal workers beyond the amount the President prefers to ratify.

In the circumstances, if the conference committee sticks to the House's 8.2 percent, Mr. Eisenhower should not compel the legislators to attempt to override a veto. Such Presidential action would be politically unwise and economically dubious.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 23, 1955]

POSTAL PAY PROGRESS

The politics-buffeted postal pay raise bill has run its course in the House and emerged at an 8.2 percent increase, as against the 10 percent boost voted earlier by the Senate. The hike for the 500,000 post office employes under the first plan would cost the Treasury about $171 million, and under the latter $200 million.

The House vote was along party lines, with Republicans warning even the 8.2 percent figure, being more than the 7.6 recommended by President Eisenhower, would face White House veto. The Democrats, who put through a 50-percent boost in congressional salaries, were eager both to salve the carriers for that action and to place the President in an embarrassing veto squeeze.

The measure now goes to Senate-House conference, with the prospect any compromise arrived at will top Ike's recommendations and thus pose the dilemma of vetoing in the interests of budget balance, or of signing in the interests of fairness to postal employees.

It is unfortunate but not surprising the issue has been debated and bruited primarily from political considerations. The plight of the carriers merits better treatment than that. It is to be hoped the President so views the matter, and signs whatever compromise emerges.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the conference report deals with nothing

more than a 7-percent basic increase in salary for all postal workers, plus a reclassification provision which was passed by the House of Representatives.

Originally, the Senate passed S. 1, which provides for a 10-percent increase across-the-board. On the other hand, the House passed a bill providing for a 6 percent increase, with reclassification, which was amended by the so-called Morse amendment. In conference the conferees on the part of the Senate accepted in its entirety the reclassification features as passed by the House of Representatives.

In view of the charges and counter charges and admonitions which have been made with reference to whether or not the bill would be acceptable to the White House or subject to a veto, the conferees on the part of the Senate yielded as far as they could possibly yield by accepting a conference compromise which reduced the 10-percent figure passed by the Senate down to 7 percent. In other words, we allowed the 6 percent of the House to come up to 7 percent and the Senate's 10 percent to go down to 7 percent. We feel that to be a reasonable and fair compromise. I believe the bill ought to be acceptable to the White House.

Newspapers have published the statement that this is an 8.8 percent average increase. It is not that at all. It is an average increase of 8.59 percent. The reason it does go up to 8.8 percent is that certain travel allowances have been made, but they should not be considered a part of the pay plan.

Mr. President, I wish to make this further brief observation:

The difference between what has been said the President will sign and what this bill represents is less than 1-percent increase. To 325,000 of 495,000 postal workers the difference amounts to only 90 cents a week. I cannot believe that the President of the United States will veto a bill which involves 495,000 employees in the postal service, when 325,000 would receive an increase of only 90 cents a week.

Mr. President, I hope the report will be accepted by an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that every Senator who was a member of the conference committee signed the report?

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, please let me read to the Senate the following self-explanatory telegram relative to the postal pay bill which was received today.

Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Six undersigned postal employee organizations, representing 60 percent of nonsupervisory employees in the postal field service, respectfully urge you to support conference report on S. 1, postal pay and reclassification bill. Adjustments made by Senate and House conferees retain reclassification features sought by Post Office Department; they did, however, increase pay for those in lower levels. These increases actually make bill more equitable. We urge you to support conference report, and assure you conference agreement will meet with overwhelming approval of majority of employees affected by bill.

Thanking you for your consideration, we are

SAMUEL E. KLEIN,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.
PAUL M. CASTIGLIONI,
Legislative Representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees.
HAROLD MCAVOY,
President, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers.
ROSS A. MESSER,
Legislative Representative, National Association of Post Office and General Service Maintenance Employees.
W. M. THOMAS,
President, National Postal Transport Association.
WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senate has before it a conference report which was signed by all the members of the Senate conference committee. I wish to say, very frankly, that on March 25 I offered an amendment to the bill then pending in the Senate providing for an increase of 7.6 percent in pay for the postal workers. It amounted to an increase of 6 percent on the base pay and 1.6 percent for various changes in the Reclassification Act. The Senate, by a vote of 52 to 41, rejected the amendment.

On the question of final passage, the bill was approved in the Senate by a vote of 72 to 21.

Frankly, Mr. President, I had hoped we would pass a 7.6-percent bill. The reason why I say that is because I have confidence that the President of the United States would have signed such a bill.

On March 25 I stated on the floor of the Senate:

I wish to say very sincerely that I would have liked very much to support the bill providing for a 10-percent increase, but above and beyond that, I want very much to secure a pay raise for the postal workers of this Nation.

I am fearful that this afternoon we have marched up the hill and are going to march down again. I sincerely hope the conference report will be adopted in order to get the bill before the President of the United States. We have dilly-dallied long enough in taking care of the postal workers. I tried to get a bill through last August, but it was vetoed. The President agreed to go as far as a 6-percent increase on base pay.

The conference report distorts the relationship between the city carriers and the rural carriers.

Presently the rural carriers' pay is based on a 45-mile route and the pay is $4,070, which is comparable to the present salary of a city carrier.

Under the conference report, the city carrier would receive $4,430, while the rural carrier, for the same service he rendered previously would receive $4,280. In other words, the city carrier would receive an increase in this bill of $360, while the rural carrier would get an increase of $210.

In the bill I presented to the Senate for action at the time we passed the postal pay legislation, I had this matter corrected in order that both the city carrier and the rural carrier would receive the same increase. I shall not further delay the action of the Senate. As I have stated before, I feel a pay increase for our postal and other classified workers is long overdue and although I shall vote against this measure, I urge approval here today to expedite the legislative process.

Let us adopt this conference report, and if the bill is vetoed, I shall vote to sustain the veto. But immediately, if the veto is sustained, I shall offer a bill providing for an increase of 7.6 percent, with a retroactive clause making it effective March 1, 1955, on the base pay increase. It is up to the Senate, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Tuesday, May 10, 1955, entitled "Political Pay Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL PAY BILL

Postmaster General Summerfield is justified in his vehement opposition to the postal pay bill which the House approved yesterday. The size of the pay increase is not the governing consideration. The fact that the bill is political in origin and discriminatory in effect is what makes it unacceptable.

President Eisenhower asked for a pay increase for postal workers of approximately 7.6 percent. Congress boosted the increase to 8.8 percent. If there were no other considerations this would not be a significant difference—certainly not enough to justify a veto even though postal workers have been given larger average increases than classified employees. But the bill as passed would remove some of the incentive for better work because of discriminations against the most responsible officials. It would seriously distort the pay patterns for the different grades that every organization finds necessary for employee morale. As Mr. Summerfield said, it would be utterly impossible to administer with fairness and would invite widespread dissatisfaction and serious morale problems.

It is a vicious thing to play partisan politics with Federal pay bills. If such practices continue a great many Federal employees will suffer in the long run. Only those with the strongest political organization will benefit in the short run. By organizing politically they put Federal employees directly into the partisan squabbles they are supposed to avoid. These are the evils of the bill the House passed yesterday and which the Senate is apparently determined to pass on Wednesday.

The President, therefore, has no reasonable alternative but to veto it in the hope that Congress will come to its senses and pass another bill without the partisan flavor.

The postal workers were denied an increase last year because of the same kind of politics. They ought not to be made to suffer another delay because of congressional jockeying for political favors.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter dated May 8, 1955, from the Postmaster General to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, House of Representatives, pointing out why, if the bill in its present form should be passed and sent to the President, the Postmaster General would feel it necessary to recommend a veto.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1955.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: Because of the far-reaching impact of this legislation upon the postal service, I welcome your request for my reaction to the postal pay conference report now before the House.

We are now in this situation: Both the administration and the Congress are eager to provide fair compensation and an equitable salary and incentive structure for all the half-million employees of the Post Office Department; yet, the legislation now before the House to serve this common purpose, instead of helping all postal workers, would fail to correct many serious inequities which we have sought to correct and, in addition, would create many new ones.

The facts are unmistakable. Approval of the postal legislation in its present form would discriminate against thousands of postal employees. I know the Congress does not desire this.

The legislation would create serious pay distortions; it would raise the pay of some by as much as 9 percent, while leaving at only 7 percent the increase of many employed at like duties. Thereby it would invite widespread dissatisfaction and serious morale problems.

It would raise havoc in the relationships of city carriers with rural carriers; these relationships in turn would be distorted in respect to the road clerks of the Postal Transportation Service; additional distortions would work to the disadvantage of special delivery messengers; the legislation would arbitrarily reduce the amount of increase available for supervisors, assistant postmasters, and postmasters.

Moreover, the legislation would throw salaries of many tens of thousands of postal employees far out of line with the pay of corresponding workers in America's private enterprise, and, within the postal establishment itself, it would destroy the basic concept of equal pay for equal work.

All of these things I am confident the Congress does not desire.

There is another fundamental I must mention. This legislation is now so drawn as to make it utterly impossible for any Postmaster General to administer it with fairness. Many employees, by force of this law, would necessarily be unjustly treated. This, again, I know the Congress does not want.

And there are other serious implications. Since 1945 most postal employees have had more than a 90 percent increase in salary. In the same period living costs went up 48 percent. Since the last postal pay increase, living costs went up only 3 percent; this fact was one of the important considerations in determining our initial recommendation for a 6.5 percent pay increase. Yet, the pending legislation would now impose pay increases not only out of line with the living cost increases of the past 4 years but also, in large measure, out of line with private industry wage scales. For example, senior letter carriers and clerks, now receiving an average of up to $2.10 an hour, would receive under this legislation up to $2.27 an hour. The revised scales would be well above the salaries paid by private empoyers for work of comparabe responsibility. This comparison, of course, does not apply to supervisory employees whose salaries remain well below their counterparts in private industry.

I shall not catalog many additional deficiencies in this legislation. What I have already stated clearly demonstrates that its approval in its present form would be, for thousands of postal workers unfair and discriminatory and, for the postal establishment as a whole, would create a multitude of unsolvable administrative problems, and impose excessive costs which would vex us all for years to come. I hope, therefore, that in its zeal to join the administration in benefiting the Postal Service, the Congress will not adopt legislation which would in fact work against the best interest of the Postal Service.

It is inherent in what I have said that should the Congress forward this legislation in its present form to the President for signature, I could not in good conscience, in consideration of the welfare of the postal employees and the Postal Establishment, recommend its approval.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement with regard to the conference report. I shall support the conference report because it is a fair report. It gives to the postal workers a pay increase, although in an amount less than what I think they deserve; but a pay increase which has been long overdue.

In years gone by we have heard in the Senate, from both parties, when proposed legislation in Democratic and Republican administrations has been before us, that if we did not do such and such in regard to a measure, it would be vetoed. However, in my 10 years in the Senate I have never heard the threat of a veto used as a bludgeon upon the legislative branch of the Government to the extent to which it has been used in connection with the pay bill.

The pay bill for postal workers has been voted for by large numbers of Republicans as well as Democrats. It is about time that Congress decides who passes legislation.

The President, under the Constitution, has the right to veto proposed legislation if he wishes to do so; but, as one Member of the Senate, I resent the tactics which have been used by the President and the Postmaster General in regard to this measure. The Postmaster General has demonstrated, time and time again, that he has no respect for the legislative branch of the Government. Apparently he believes we are chore boys, and that either he is going to have his way, or else legislation which protects the economic interests of the postal employees will not be placed upon the books. I am for taking the issue to the administration and to the country.

We have before the Senate a pay bill, small indeed in the amount to which the postal employees are entitled. Congress, upon the recommendation of the President, voted itself a 50-percent increase in pay at this session. The bill before the Senate provides for an increase in pay of a little more than 8 percent for postal workers, and we are threatened by the Postmaster General, the administration's spokesman before Congress, that if Congress votes the postal employees the pay increase to which they are entitled, we shall be confronted with a veto.

Let the President veto the bill. Then let us take the issue to the country. After the President vetoes the bill, if he vetoes it, in view of the large number of Republican and Democratic votes for the bill, the people of the country will be interested in knowing who really represents them in the legislative process in Congress.

I think it is time to call a halt to the threatening practices of the administration upon the legislative branch. It is time for Congress to declare its independence of this kind of coercion. It is time to make clear to Mr. Summerfield that he is not running a big business establishment, in which people merely "yes" him or else get fired.

The man who should be fired in connection with this matter ought to be the Postmaster General himself.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is absent on official business. If he were presenting and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is absent by leave of the Senate to perform official duties on behalf of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. If present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HENNINGS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are absent by leave of the Senate to conduct hearings for the Senate Interior Committee in the State of Nevada.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business on behalf of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business in the State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bush	Holland	Pastore
Butler	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cotton	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kerr	Stennis
Dirksen	Kilgore	Symington
Douglas	Kuchel	Thurmond
Duff	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ervin	Long	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Young

NAYS—11

Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Knowland	Schoeppel
Carlson	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Curtis	Potter	

NOT VOTING—19

Bible	Jenner	Murray
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kennedy	Scott
Clements	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Malone	Sparkman
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

So the report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced the Speaker pro tempore had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 11, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 noon on Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF CALENDAR ON FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Friday to call bills unobjected to on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 240, Senate Resolution 33.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 33) for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 33) for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were, on page 1, line 4, after the word "to", to insert "(1)"; and in line 6, after the word "Government", to insert "and (2) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to postal rates, procedures, employee relations, and research and development with the view to greater operating economy and efficiency."

The additional amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*" and insert: "That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to full and complete studies and investigations with respect to (a) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government, and (b) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to postal rates, procedures, employee relations and research and development with a view to greater operating economy and efficiency, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution for the investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department."

INVITATION TO HOLD 1960 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES AT SQUAW VALLEY, CALIF.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order 279, Senate Joint Resolution 51.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy. He has permitted a number of his colleagues to vote on a yea-and-nay vote, and has been very courteous to the leadership.

Mr. McCARTHY. I might say I think I sacrificed most of the audience.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has the best audience that has been in attendance this afternoon.

QUEMOY AND THE MATSUS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the world's attention is riveted on several

small islands lying off the China coast. The Communist nations eagerly anticipate another victory there. The neutralist nations see an opportunity to test the theory of coexistence—to demonstrate that the Communist appetite is satiable. The anti-Communist nations in Asia hope prayerfully for another Marne.

Three months ago it was unthinkable that Quemoy and the Matsus would be sacrificed. Today it is not only thinkable but a likely prospect. As the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has pointed out, every available clue indicates a decision by the administration to surrender Quemoy and Matsus. The question, apparently, is not whether communism will consume those islands, but when it will consume them.

The only hope lies in a popular protest. The disaster can still be prevented if the American people, through Congress, plainly inform the administration that they will tolerate no more retreats, no more appeasement, no more surrender.

Granted, there has to date been no arresting evidence of public outrage over the impending surrender. And with a few exceptions—like the wise and courageous speech by the Senator from Indiana, and the frequent protests of our dauntless minority leader—Congress has assumed the supine posture so familiar during the Roosevelt days, and is busying itself signing pledges to follow the leader. Nonetheless I believe that the American people are determined to prevent another Communist victory, and that they would make their views known if they, in turn, knew the significance of possession of the off-shore islands.

The country and, I fear, Congress suffers seriously from misinformation about the value of Quemoy and the Matsus to the free world.

Democrat leaders—especially the left-wing branch of the Democratic Party—the country over, are making the argument that Quemoy and the Matsus have no military value; specifically that possession of them is not necessary to the defense of Formosa. The administration is encouraging this view, although, since they were taking exactly the opposite position only several months ago, a little more time must elapse before administration leaders can preach the worthlessness of the islands as confidently as the Democrats do.

The truth of the matter is that Quemoy and the Matsus have immense military value: They are vital to the defense of Formosa.

In that connection, I should like to read from the testimony of a great American general, General Van Fleet, when he appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary on January 21, 1955. The question was asked:

General, is Quemoy important to the United States?

General Van Fleet replied:

Senator, I would say it is vitally important.

Mr. President, here are the facts. There is nothing in them of a security nature—nothing the Communists do not know, nothing the Nationalists do not know, nothing the administration does not know. The only ones that can benefit by this information are the American people and the free world.

Fact No. 1: Quemoy Island lies a scant few thousand yards from the Communist port of Amoy. Amoy is the natural point of embarkation for Communist troops attempting an invasion of Formosa. It is, all military experts agree, the logical place from which to launch an invasion fleet across the Formosa Straits. At this moment, however, the guns of Quemoy are trained on Amoy Harbor. Heavy artillery is prepared to rake the area. So long as Quemoy remains in Nationalist hands, no invasion fleet can gather there.

Fact No. 2: The Matsu Islands lie about 3 miles off the Chinese port of Foochow. Foochow is an important Communist arsenal, and has the only significant navy yard on that part of the China coast. The navy yard was originally built by the Republic of China. Although the Japanese removed much of its heavy equipment during the Second World War, the Communists have since rebuilt the yard. It is now equipped to construct hundreds of armored junks. It is this type of craft the Chinese Reds are counting on to transport their armies to Formosa. At the moment, however, the harbor and navy yard cannot be used, for the heavy guns of Matsu can rain destruction on ships bringing to Foochow the materials used in constructing the junks. So long as Matsu remains in the hands of the Nationalists, construction of a Communist invasion fleet is substantially blocked.

Fact No. 3: Quemoy and the Matsu group stand athwart Communist shipping routes along the entire China coast opposite Formosa. From Canton, in the south, to Shanghai, in the north, coastal communication by sea is extremely difficult for the Communists so long as Quemoy and the Matsus remain in Nationalist hands.

Fact No. 4: At the present time the nearest Communist airfield to Formosa is situated 200 miles from the China coastline. The Communists must use inland airfields because the terrain along that part of the China coast is extremely broken. Thus Communist aircraft now face a 350-mile run from their bases to Formosa—not a prohibitive distance, it is true, but one that makes massive fighter support of bombing attacks difficult. Quemoy, however, has three airfields, and has room for more. If Quemoy were to fall, the Communist air run to Formosa would be cut down by over one-half.

Fact No. 5: If Formosa should be attacked while Quemoy is in Nationalist hands, Nationalist aircraft could strike back from a base 150 miles closer to the target than should they have to fly from Formosa itself. Quemoy is an aircraft carrier permanently anchored several thousand yards off the enemy coast, and one, to boot, Mr. President, that cannot be sunk.

These facts are well-known to the administration, and by suggesting that Quemoy and the Matsus have no value, the administration is consciously misleading the country. The Democrats, for all I know, may preach out of ignorance; but not so the administration.

No, I should not be a bit surprised if, tomorrow, some administration agent denies these facts or attempts to explain them away by the double talk for which the court pundits have shown such remarkable talent. But if denials or explanations are forthcoming, then I ask that these things be explained to the American people: Why did the administration decide 2 years ago that Quemoy and the Matsus had to be defended at all costs? Why, in 1953, did the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously agree that possession of Quemoy and the Matsus was essential to the defense of Formosa? Why did the administration then demand that Chiang Kai-shek garrison and fortify those islands? And, after Chiang Kai-shek has fortified the islands at our behest, and has increased their garrisons from a few hundred men to 12,000 troops on Matsu, and 50,000 troops on Quemoy, why is the administration now encouraging the country to believe that Quemoy and the Matsus are not so important after all?

Mr. President, I secured the floor earlier this afternoon. I yielded so that other Senators could leave and so that a vote could be taken. I doubt very much that I would be justified in holding the remaining Senators here any longer. I have carefully prepared remarks on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that they appear in the RECORD, the same as though given on the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I use the word "encouraging" advisedly because the administration has not yet flatly denied the value of the islands. The administration is, rather, promoting the idea by innuendo and implication. The Democrats trumpet the idea with apodictical certainty; the press, radio and TV commentators are feverishly attempting to sell it to the country. The administration is confident that by just hinting at the worthlessness of the isles, the idea will catch hold.

The myth that Quemoy and the Matsus are of no military value is one aspect of a two-pronged administration strategy for preparing the country for surrender of the islands. The balance of the plan calls for a deal with the Communists by which it will appear that we have gained something in return for what we are giving away. One possibility is that in return for giving the Communists Quemoy and the Matsus we will get their agreement to a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. Or, perhaps, we might wrench from them a pledge not to attack Formosa. Of course, any such agreement by the Communists is not worth the paper it is written on. But the administration believes it is a way of saving face with the American people and with our anti-Communist allies in Asia—and, above all, a way of pleasing our neutralist friends in Europe.

The occasion for making such a deal was suggested by the Communist Premier at the Bandung Conference. Chou

En-lai offered to enter into "direct negotiations" with the United States about the Formosa situation.

Now, there were two reasons why the United States should immediately have spurned that offer. First, Chou appended to it a clear warning that any such conference would have to give the Communists what they wanted. Red China, he said, would never relinquish its so-called "right" to "liberate" Formosa, Quemoy, and the Matsus.

Second, the term "direct negotiations" clearly implied that the representatives of the Republic of China would be excluded from such a conference. We could agree to that condition only by perpetrating the most blatant double-cross of modern times. Trading off the territory of a proven friend, behind her back, would not only be scaling the heights of international amorality and cynicism; it would, in this case, be repudiating a solemn promise scarcely 6 weeks after it had been proffered. In March, on his last visit to Taipei, Secretary of State Dulles had given, in the name of America, a public pledge to the Chiang regime and to the entire anti-Communist world. "The United States," he had said, "will not enter into any negotiations dealing with the territories or rights of the Republic of China except in cooperation with the Republic of China."

But the administration wanted to make a deal. It was therefore determined not to let the opportunity presented by Chou En-lai slip away—however formidable the obstacles seemed to be. The arguments that prevented honorable men from giving Chou's proposal a second thought could be handled by the practitioners of double-think and double-talk who pitch tent at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

As for Chou's intransigence on the point of Red China's "right" to "liberate" Formosa, the administration thought this did not necessarily preclude the sort of deal it wished to make. Chou's tough talk was, perhaps, resort to an old diplomatic technique; he might well be demanding more at the preliminary stages than he would settle for at the conference—in hopes of persuading the world, later on, that Communists are reasonable folk, ever willing to compromise.

What Red China is really adamant about, the administration reasoned, is retaining and bettering its military position vis-a-vis Formosa. The Communists might therefore be persuaded to buy a cease-fire agreement, coupled with the transfer to them of Quemoy and the Matsus. This solution would be attractive to the Communists for three reasons. First, they could claim a great victory in acquiring Quemoy and the Matsus without a fight. Second, by signing a cease-fire agreement, they could present a front of sweet moderation to the world, citing it as evidence of their peaceful intentions and their willingness to compromise. Third, they would have improved the military possibilities of launching a successful attack on Formosa.

This last item, enhancing the Communists' military position was not, of course, desirable; but neither was it—in the administration view—too high a price to pay for retaining the good will of the European neutralists.

Moreover, the administration believed—and it believes today—that the deal can be sold to the American people. It is confident that such an agreement like the Korean armistice can be made to look like a victory for us—or at least, not a defeat. The White House publicists will hail the end of an explosive crisis and the bringing of peace and stability to the Formosa area. A cease-fire may even be interpreted as a renunciation of Communist claims to Formosa. As for Quemoy and the Matsus, the idea will by then have taken hold that the offshore islands were never of any military value anyway.

Thus, the sort of settlement Chou's conference would probably bring forth did not perturb the administration.

The matter of proceeding without the Nationalists, however, presented a stickier problem. For we were unequivocally committed to include them in any conference "dealing with the territory and rights of the Republic of China." It took about a week for the double-think, double-talk artists to maneuver the administration out of that commitment.

The first signs, however, were encouraging. Our Under Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., promptly advised the Communists—and the world at large—that we would talk with Red China only on the condition that Nationalist representatives would be present at the conference. Mr. Hoover reportedly issued his statement after an hour's phone conversation with President Eisenhower. He was apparently successful in persuading the President that however dearly the administration wanted to make a deal, it could not repudiate a solemn promise to Chiang Kai-shek. That was on a Saturday.

By Monday the wind had shifted. Senator GEORGE, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, took issue with Mr. Hoover. Our pledge notwithstanding, Senator GEORGE stated, it would be unwise to insist on Chiang's presence at the conference. Now, this might have represented just the opinion of one Senator—a member of the opposition party at that. But, in the circumstances, his statement implied a great deal more. For Senator GEORGE—the high priest of bipartisanship—had, only 2 weeks before, promised to follow the President, willy-nilly, whichever way he might lead in the Formosa crisis. The implication, then, was that the distinguished Senator from Georgia was following, not disagreeing, with the President. Had Senator GEORGE been forewarned that the administration had changed its mind?

On Tuesday the answer came. And, incredibly, the man who gave the answer was the very man who had given our original pledge to Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Dulles announced that we would, after all, be willing to negotiate with the Communists about the Formosan situation without the participation of Free China. Whether the President had been advised of the policy reversal, it is hard to say. One gets the impression that the President is sometimes not informed of his decisions until after they have been made.

By next morning, at any rate, the President had been brought up to date. And his pitiless advisers had given him the job of explaining the new policy to the press.

"Had there been a reversal of our policy in regard to having Chiang present during the negotiations?" a reporter asked. Oh, no, said the President—nothing like that. There was perhaps an "insufficient elaboration" of our position in Mr. Hoover's statement—perhaps we should have said we would not negotiate without the Nationalists on any questions that would "affect the Nationalists." But the conference with Chou En-lai, the President explained, would not necessarily "affect the Nationalists."

The masters of double-think and double-talk never had a better pupil, nor the pupil a better day. A conference dealing with Nationalist territory—Quemoy and the Matsus—would not "affect" the Nationalists? A cease-fire agreement to which the Nationalists would have to be a party would not "affect" the Nationalists? Incredible. Why could not the President have stated simply, that we had changed our minds—and let it go at that?

The truth, of course, is that we have reversed our policy—we have gone back on our word. We have done this in order to facilitate the transfer of Quemoy and the Matsus to Red China. For Nationalist participation in the conference is hardly compatible with administration plans. If territorial concessions are to be the business of a cease-fire conference, then the administration is quite right in thinking that Chiang Kai-shek would be in the way. Chiang, for 30 years now, has followed an unswerving course of refusing to yield voluntarily 1 inch of territory or 1 human being to Communist domination. A record which, I regret to say, the United States can only envy.

We have reversed our policy, and what we must now do is reverse the reversal. I know that repeated policy switches are embarrassing, but the White House advisers can be counted on to find words that prove things were always thus. But however it is done, it must be done. We cannot sit down with the representatives of an enemy power and talk about giving away the territory of our friends without permitting our friends to take part in the conversations. No nation can do that and keep its self-respect.

Moreover, we cannot jeopardize free Asia's military position by ceding Quemoy and the Matsus. For reasons of both defense and offense, the offshore islands play a vital role in free world strategy. Quemoy and Matsu are Formosa's first line of defense. Formosa, in turn, is a vital link in our defensive chain in the western Pacific. If Formosa should fall, the enemy would sit astride the middle of our line leaving our left and right flanks fatally exposed. Japan and the Philippines would be vulnerable; our mainland positions—Korea in the north and Viet-Nam, Thailand, and Malaya in the south—would, for all practical purposes, have fallen behind the Iron Curtain. Once our western Pacific

line has been pierced, the Communists can afford to set their sights on Hawaii and California.

Quemoy and the Matsus are equally vital to a free world offensive in the Far East—if ever there is to be one. Both as jumping-off points for invasion troops and as bases for providing air cover, the offshore islands are invaluable to an attempt by Free China to recapture the mainland. If these bases are surrendered, Formosa—whether or not it is actually attacked—will be neutralized militarily; and eventually the stout-hearted Nationalists will despair of ever liberating their homeland. The return of China to the Chinese people must be our ultimate goal in the Far East. Final victory over world communism is unthinkable so long as China, and thus Asia, is controlled by the enemy.

If the administration cannot be moved by considerations of national honor—if it cannot be persuaded that we owe loyalty to our friends—then let our leaders be reminded of their duties to the American people. For through its far-eastern policies, the administration is not only betraying an ally: it is betraying millions of Americans who in 1952 voted for the Eisenhower ticket because of promises of firmness toward our enemies and loyalty to our allies.

In 1952 the American people cast a resounding vote against international treachery. They welcomed the pledge contained in the Republican platform to repudiate the infamous Yalta agreement. They demanded we put an end to the Roosevelt-Truman policy of selling out our allies in return for Communist promises to behave. They insisted that we should never again barter with the territory, the wealth, the lives, the freedom, of gallant friends. At Yalta we bargained away huge portions of China behind the back of the Chinese Government. For 6 months we did not even inform Chiang Kai-shek that part of his country had been traded to the Soviet Union. Performances such as these the American people vowed not to repeat.

Moreover, the country was promised a policy of liberation, not coexistence. I do not think many voters understood candidate Eisenhower to be saying in the fall of 1952 that support of a Chiang attempt to liberate the mainland would be support of an "aggressive war"—as the President put it in a press conference a few weeks ago.

The administration is well aware of its mandate. Memories of 1952 are not so dim as to require lectures on the subject by Members of Congress. The administration, moreover, fully understands what its mandate requires in the current Far Eastern crisis. The proof of this is that the administration, originally—following its own lights—made the right decisions about Formosa. As I have said, the administration decided in 1953 to defend Quemoy and the Matsus at all costs because of their great military value. And it was the administration position, until only last week, that no conversations would be held with the Peiping regime without the participation of Free China. Then, why the reversals? Why has the administration not stuck by its guns and kept faith with the American people?

Part of the answer is that the administration is subject to formidable pressures—from foreign governments, from the left wings of the opposition party, from court advisers who have bought or wheedled or been born to a seat in the inner circle. But have our elected officials no stamina, no courage, no minds of their own? Why is it, when American policy deviates from British policy, the British policy invariably prevails? Why is it, when Republican views clash with Democrat views, the Democrat views eventully win out? Why is it, when the brothers confer, the seat of government moves to State College, Pa.? Other administrations have encountered similar pressures; but other administrations have managed, withal, to wield the national power. In our day, the pressures invariably prove stronger than the will to resist. This Government's principal malady is ambivalence, pliancy, and irresolution at the summit.

The crisis in the Far East cries for bold leadership by the President of the United States. The President must answer that call. He must declare that Quemoy and the Matsus will be held at all costs because they belong, by right, to an ally, and because they are important to the free world's defense. He must therefore plainly inform Red China that it may have Quemoy and the Matsus the day it has defeated the United States of America. This would not, mind you, be a war policy; for the Communists would not dare attack in the teeth of such a warning.

As for negotiating with the Communists, the President must advise Chou En-lai that the United States has not the slightest interest in discussing further concessions by the free world. He must tell Chou that if he wants to talk, we will talk about the release of 481 American prisoners of war; we will talk about Red China getting out of Korea; we will talk about the Communists getting out of Indochina; we will talk about returning China to the Chinese people.

The way of Presidential leadership is not always easy; it is sometimes a lonely road from which the warmest friends fall away, where the only companions are conscience and courage and will. But at the end of the road waits history ready to tender its thanks and congratulations.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMENCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the death rate in Louisiana is 80 percent less today than it was 100 years ago. It is 50 percent less than it was a half century ago. Statistics show that eight times as many lives are being saved today through public health measures and better living standards than by the treatment of diseases after people become ill. As the years progress, public health will save the Nation more and more of its human resources and material wealth.

This month, the Louisiana State Board of Health, the oldest State board of health in the United States, commemorates its 100th anniversary. To celebrate the occasion, the southern branch of the American Public Health Association and the Louisiana Public Health Association are holding a joint meeting in New Orleans this week. This gathering is truly a centennial of organized public health in America; and, because of this, I feel it is fitting for the Senate to take a few minutes in this legislative day to pay an anniversary tribute to the Louisiana State Board of Health, forerunner of America's great health movement.

The theme of the 23d annual meeting of the southern branch of the American Public Health Association, which embraces public workers from 16 Southern States, is "Public Health Pioneering—A Southern Heritage." This convention is in session in New Orleans, La., and the convention will last from May 11 to May 13. Its program is replete with statements by outstanding representatives of the medical profession, and their subjects embrace every phase of a modern health program. This program is designed by the committee in charge to bring out and highlight the many basic innovations in the organization of public health administration that have been developed in the southern branch area.

The Louisiana State Board of Health was established by an act of the Louisiana State Legislature on March 15, 1855, and actually organized on June 13, 1855. At that time, the State of Louisiana and the city of New Orleans were suffering devasting epidemics—the most dreaded of which was yellow fever.

Many public health laws were enacted to increase the scope of the board's functions, between the years 1855 and 1898. In the latter year, it was given the authority to draft and adopt a sanitary code; provisions were made for the establishment of parish and municipal boards of health; and, generally, the basis for the board's present wide range of functions, including 61 public health units, was set up.

Today, the broader duties of the board include quarantine functions and the enforcement of many other regulations designed to increase the human life span.

I am certain that I bespeak the unanimous feeling of all the Members of this body in conveying my warmest regards to all members of the American Public Health Association on the 100th anniversary of the commencement of such services in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I consider it a privilege to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], in paying tribute to the Louisiana State Board of Health on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

Louisiana is proud to have been in the vanguard of the States in furnishing this splendid facility for the improvement of the health, and in direct proportion, the happiness of our people. As a former member of the Louisiana Legislature, and as a Member of the United States Senate for over 18 years, I too am proud of the small part that I have played in actively supporting and

encouraging an expanded and an aggressive public-health service, both on a State and a National level.

Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague in extending my sincere greetings to the members of the American Public Health Association, who are assembled now in the city of New Orleans, La., to fittingly commemorate this memorable occasion—the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the first State board of health in the United States.

THE REA AND PUBLIC POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, when many of my colleagues were making statements regarding the great REA program, I agreed to postpone a brief statement of mine until the Senate had transacted the necessary business on the conference report on the postal pay bill.

Mr. President, my record of support of of the REA is perfectly clear during my 10 years as a Member of the Senate. The REA is one of the great cooperative programs between farmers in the United States and a government which has understood the importance of promoting the general welfare.

In paying my respects to the great economic contribution the REA has made to the welfare of the Nation, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a statement in connection with our atomic energy program, which recently was made to me by a high official. He pointed out that research indicated that by the year 2000, the people of America will need 20 times the kilowatt hours of power that presently are generated in the United States. Mr. President, that is a startling statement, but I am satisfied it is one which can be substantiated, in fact, by means of good analytical research. However, it points out to the Congress a great responsibility which I most respectfully say we are not living up to in our own decade, at least to the degree that we should.

Mr. President, if a healthy economy in the year 2000, which is not very far ahead, will require 20 times the kilowatt hours of electric power now being generated in the United States, we had better follow a course of action immediately which will guarantee that the power will be available to American people living in that era. That means that we cannot justify a shortsighted, false-economy program which sacrifices the maximum potential of any great project that is capable of being developed in our country.

The REA and the tens of thousands of farmers who comprise the REA movement know how important it is to their economic welfare, and to the economic welfare of the people as a whole, that cheap power made available to the farmers of the country.

In some of the speeches this afternoon—and I notice in some of the propaganda of private utility advocates on the REA issue—we have the statistic given us that an exceedingly large percentage of the farms of America are already electrified. It does not follow that, because electric lines go into those farms, they are adequately electrified. What was an adequate supply of power to a farm on an REA line 10 years ago is no longer an adequate supply of power on tens of thousands of American farms. Why? Because during the past 10 years the use of electricity in performing farm work has so increased that we find REA after REA across the country unable to furnish the amount of electric power which the customers need. Their lines need to be firmed up. They need to develop heavier transmission lines. They need more power than they are capable of transmitting to the farms over their present systems.

So there are thousands of REA's which need an enlarged REA program. What I am pointing out is that the job has not been completed. Now we must bring additional facilities to these REA's in order to give to the farmers the quantity of power which is necessary to operate the modern labor-saving devices and the electrical equipment now available to the farmers of the country. I wish to stress that fact, particularly in respect to the recommendations of the Hoover task force, which has recently handed down its recommendations in regard to the REA's.

A year ago, when I stood on the floor of the Senate and opposed appropriations for that task force, I warned the Senate what to expect from it, because it was typical of so many of the appointments of the President of the United States. It was rigged. The President placed on that task force men not in sympathy with the REA movement, as their background and history will show. So we have exactly the kind of report that those of us who had taken the time to study the background of the personnel the President was appointing had every right to expect.

Now we find that the business spokesmen for this administration, the private utility spokesmen for this administration who have taken over the Department of the Interior and turned it into a department of private utilities, are now trying to sell the American public a bill of goods. They are trying to convince the people that the Government should withdraw from the REA program and turn over the program to so-called private business, which is in fact private monopoly.

Objections are being raised to the low-interest rates which have been made available to the REA's through this Government program. But let the American people never forget that the farms of America never would have been electrified if we had had to wait for private utilities to do the job. The private utilities would not stretch their transmission lines into the remote rural areas of the country. They would not electrify the farms because they could not make the profits they wanted to make from that kind of business venture. So what we see in this instance is a good example of what we are seeing in so many instances in regard to turning over a great many heritages of the American people to big business interests under the Eisenhower administration.

We now get the big business scheme, because REA has proved to be a great success. REA has taken power into the remote areas; and by putting power into the remote areas it has caused population to follow. The remote areas of 10 or 15 years ago now have become thickly populated areas. They have become what would be a rich source of income for private utilities if they could squeeze the REA's out. So we find big business spokesmen, who comprise so large a percentage of so many of the task forces of the Hoover Commission, propagandizing public opinion with the proposal that the utilities ought to take over the program; that the banks, and not the Government, ought to be making the loans—at what interest rates? Not at the low-interest rates the Government has been providing, but at the high rates which the bankers would charge. That is why I have been heard to say, and why I repeat today, that one of the chief characteristics of the Eisenhower administration is that it will go down in history as a tribute-collecting administration for the financiers of America, taking advantage of the people of low income. I am unalterably opposed to that program.

The REA's have made a great contribution to agricultural life in this country, and they have made a great contribution to the businessmen of America, because the REA's have increased the purchasing power of the farmers in the rural areas of America. That has redounded to the economic benefit of the small-business men and the small towns in the rural areas of America.

What we ought to be doing in this Congress is strengthening the REA program, not weakening it, as the chief spokesmen of the Eisenhower administration are proposing in connection with this program. We ought to set at rest the fears of the farmers of America in REA cooperatives today by making clear to them that we are going to continue the main policies of the Federal Government with respect to REA, at low interest rates.

What is the record of repayment of REA? It has been a wonderful record. It has been a record of economic success. In a great many instances the REA's have paid back their loans ahead of schedule. In view of the fact that, by the year 2000, we shall need 20 times the number of kilowatt hours we are now generating in the United States, Congress, in this session, ought to strengthen, and not weaken, the REA program. We ought to apply that principle to other great projects of power development, which this administration will scuttle if we let them get away with it.

In a moment I shall introduce for the RECORD a long list of resolutions passed by REA's and other farm groups in support of a high dam at Hells Canyon. I wish to point out that the high dam at Hells Canyon will be of great importance to the REA in my section of the country, because it will stand there as a great guardian and protector of REA interests. It will supply to that area of the country a great quantity of electric power which will be available for transmission over REA lines, and will make it possible to supply farmers in the Pacific

Northwest with the additional power which they so sorely need.

Recently there has been handed down a report by an examiner of the Federal Power Commission on Hells Canyon. Many months ago we predicted the nature of the report, because, again, we are dealing with a rigged commission. We know what the Federal Power Commission is going to recommend in regard to Hells Canyon, just as we knew what Examiner Costello was going to recommend, because the President of the United States appointed as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission a man who he knew was opposed to Hells Canyon. He took him out of Governor Langlie's office. Governor Langlie, of Washington, is one of the greatest opponents of the people's interests in a high dam at Hells Canyon. The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission was selected for a quasi-judicial position, and the President of the United States must himself be charged with knowledge that the Chairman was opposed to a high dam.

What has been the line of the Republican spokesmen on the Hells Canyon Dam issue? I am a good enough lawyer to know that when I have an affidavit of prejudice available to me, and the judge of a case has already prejudged the issues—and I am satisfied that he has—I file my affidavit of prejudice.

In the circumstances it is perfectly clear what the Federal Power Commission is up to. Therefore, it is important that Congress protect the American people from the prejudices of the Federal Power Commission.

One of the interesting things about the report of Examiner Costello—and I recommend a reading of the report by my colleagues in the Senate—is that he admits in the report that the most efficient and effective program and the soundest program would be the building of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why did not Mr. Costello make such a recommendation?

Mr. MORSE. Because he engaged in gratuitous advice to the country—and who is he to pass this kind of judgment and try to make it binding?—that he did not believe, in view of past performance, that Congress would make an appropriation for that purpose.

Imagine, Mr. President, an examiner of the Federal Power Commission taking the position of recommending against a high dam at Hells Canyon—after he agrees that it is the most efficient and most effective and soundest procedure for the development of that reach of the Snake River—because he does not believe Congress will appropriate the money to do the work in the most efficient and most economical way it can be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has Mr. Costello been elected either to the Senate or to the House of Representatives?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator well knows he has not. However, that does not seem to make any difference to this superlegislature which President Eisenhower has developed in his commissions in order to carry out what the Republican administration is trying to do, namely, take away from the American people their heritage. I have said before, and I repeat, it is grand larceny by law. That is what the administration is up to. It is about to participate, if we let it get away with it, in one of the greatest political steals in history, if we let it scuttle the high dam at Hells Canyon, especially after one of its examiners admits that from an engineering standpoint, from an economic standpoint, and from the standpoint of maximum development of electric potential a high dam, not a low dam, should be built there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not the function of Congress to decide what Congress will do, not the function of an examiner attached to a regulatory agency?

Mr. MORSE. It is not only the function of Congress, but it is also the duty of Congress to do so. In this particular instance I believe the Congress should resent the effrontery of Mr. Costello. I believe he has insulted the Congress of the United States by saying, "Although this is the way I think it ought to be done, I do not believe you men will do it that way. Therefore I recommend the less desirable, less feasible, and less economic method of doing it."

It is a shocking report. Nevertheless, we should have expected it. Senators should have expected such a report if they followed the Hells Canyon hearings—as I did—and noted the arbitrary rulings he made time and time again and the highly capricious and unsound nature of the hearings.

I have brought this subject into the discussion of the REA because the REA's across the country have a great interest in the development of a high dam at Hells Canyon, and they have an interest in seeing to it that we do not waste 50 percent—mark that figure, Mr. President—of the electric-power potential of the Snake River in this reach of the river. Mr. President, that procedure cannot be justified in terms of future generations of Americans.

Now we have the issue clearly drawn, so far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned. I put it to the President again: "Mr. President, when are you going to read the facts? When are you going to take the time to read the facts with regard to Hells Canyon? You cannot justify scuttling the Hells Canyon Dam, in view of the finding of your examiner. You cannot justify approving the gratuitous political action the examiner takes in his report when he says he recommends that the dam be built by the Idaho Power Co. because he does not believe Congress will appropriate money for the preferable high dam."

If Congress does not appropriate the money, whose fault is it? In my judgment, the leadership in this matter rests squarely on the shoulders of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Dwight D. Eisenhower ought to make clear to the American people that he at least has an understanding of this problem. No public pronouncements he has made show that he has any comprehension of the problem of the maximum development of power in the Pacific Northwest. He still seems to be deluded by the notion that all that needs to be done is to turn it all over to private monopolies and that in that way the interests of the American people will be protected. The fact is that if we turn it over to the private monopolies we will sacrifice 50 percent of the electric power potential of the Snake River in this reach of the river, and we will deny to future generations of Americans the development of the greatest remaining multiple-purpose dam site on the American Continent.

We cannot justify such a course of action. Congress cannot justify such a course of action when it has before it the statistics which I furnished earlier in my remarks. The statistics show that by the year 2000 we will need in this country 20 times the kilowatt-hours of power now being generated in the United States. When it is evident that we will need that amount of power, it is shocking that we have a President of the United States who is seemingly going along with a giveaway to private utilities of so much of the people's heritage in the maximum electric power potential of the people's rivers.

These rivers do not belong to Dwight D. Eisenhower. They do not belong to the Federal Power Commission. They do not belong to the Idaho Power Co. They belong to American citizens who are living today and to generations of American citizens yet to be born. We must see to it that these natural resources are left in full to future generations of Americans.

I know what is happening on this issue in the communities of America, as the people come to understand more clearly the facts of the issue. They are leaving President Eisenhower by the droves on this issue, because they are beginning to recognize what the Eisenhower program means so far as conserving the natural resources of this country for future generations of Americans is concerned.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a series of resolutions from various States. They were adopted by various associations, including farm groups and others, and urge the building of the high dam at Hells Canyon.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPE FITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA FAVORING PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION OF HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, senior Senator from Oregon, with the cosponsorship of 29 other distinguished Senators, a bill known as S. 1333, to authorize the Federal Government to construct, operate, and maintain a public multipurpose dam, to be known as Hells Canyon Dam, on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon; and

Whereas the Idaho Power Co. now has pending before the Federal Power Commission a request for authority for private construction of three low-head private electric power dams on the Snake River at or near the site proposed for the public construction of the multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam, and such private construction would practically prevent the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam; and

Whereas public construction of the multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam promises immense and widespread benefits for industry, agriculture, and individuals in the Pacific Northwest, and the enrichment of our entire Nation, by providing a large supply of low-cost electric power, by aiding flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, and river transportation, and by furnishing new recreational facilities; and

Whereas the Federal Government, through its appropriate administrative agency, the Department of the Interior, is alone capable of developing the greatest remaining multiple dam site in the country for the realization of all the beneficial purposes that are envisioned; and

Whereas in contrast, the private construction of three smaller dams by the Idaho Power Co. at Hells Canyon would virtually deprive the American people of the vast benefits to be derived from the public construction of multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam, and would mean immediate gain for one private power company at the sacrifice of opportunities for the future growth and development of private enterprise on a much broader scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada go on record as favoring the immediate enactment of Senate bill 1333 for the public construction of Hells Canyon Dam, as essential for the full development of the rich natural resources of the Snake River Valley, which without such construction would be impossible, and as a public undertaking that properly belongs to all American citizens acting in concert through their Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Association is firmly and basically opposed to any grant of authority to the Idaho Power Co., or other privately owned utility, to construct electric power dams at or near Hells Canyon on the Snake River; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, senior Senator from Montana and chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Douglas McKay, and to the Federal Power Commission, in order that they may be advised of the position taken by this United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing & Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

MARTIN P. DURKIN,
General President.

Attest:

EDWARD J. HILLOCK,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF OHIO STATE COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

Whereas there has been introduced in the United States Senate, a bill, Senate bill 1333; and

Whereas an identical bill H. R. 4719 has been introduced in House of Representatives; and

Whereas these two bills were introduced for the purpose of having built a big multipurpose dam at Hell's Canyon; and

Whereas the Secretary of Interior McKay has proposed turning the damsite over to private interest; and

Whereas the McKay proposal will permit private utility to erect a series of low dams for the purpose of producing electricity; and

Whereas if these low dams are built, all chances for full possibilities of the site for navigation, recreation, irrigation, and flood control will be lost; and

Whereas all parts of the Nation will suffer, because these low dams will not permit the full growth of the West; and

Whereas the recent growth of the West can be traced to the building of the Grand Coulee Dam, the Bonneville Dam, and other big multipurpose dams; and

Whereas if local utilities are permitted to erect these low dams, they will only build for their present needs, and the rivers will never be utilized to their fullest extent, because irrigation, recreation and flood control are not as profitable as the production of electricity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio State Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, composed of 125 local unions, and representing 33,000 members, fully endorse and recommend the enactment into law, Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719; and be it further

Resolved, A copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon and to all Senators signators to Senate bill 1333, and to the Congressmen who presented H. R. 4719; and be it further

Resolved, The Ohio State Council of Carpenters send copies to Senators BRICKER and BENDER, of Ohio, and to the Congressmen of Ohio, asking their support and assistance for passage of these bills; and be it further

Resolved, That all district councils and local unions in Ohio be sent copies of this resolution with a request that the resolution be endorsed, and also a request that their members write personal letters to their Senators and Congressmen, asking them to vote for the above bills.

WM. H. REED,
Secretary-Treasurer.

LOCAL UNION NO. 2949,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Roseburg, Oreg., April 28, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Lumber and Sawmill Workers Local No. 2949, A. F. of L., of Roseburg, Oreg., with a membership of 1,549 members wishes to inform you of a resolution passed by them backing Senate bill 1333 in regard to Hell's Canyon Dam.

We urge that you support this very important bill.

Very truly yours,

TED PRUSIA,
Business Agent.

TENNESSEE VALLEY
PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
Chattanooga, Tenn., April 29, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We thought you might be interested in a resolution that was adopted by the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association at its annual convention in Memphis, Tenn., on April 26, 1955.

We people in the Tennessee Valley feel very keenly that Hell's Canyon is a focal fighting point in the public power fight. We will be very glad to be of any assistance that we can and hope you will call on us.

Sincerely yours,

KEN G. WHITAKER,
Information Committee.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NINTH ANNUAL MEETING, TENNESSEE VALLEY PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, MEMPHIS, TENN., APRIL 26, 1955

HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries requires construction of the Hells Canyon Dam for flood control, power generation, and river regulation; and

Whereas the Hells Canyon issue, like the Muscle Shoals struggle of 30 years ago, involves the right of the people to develop their rivers for the greatest good of the general public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse Federal construction of the Hells Canyon Dam.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, UNION NO. 190, KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

To the Oregon Senators, Congressmen and Congresswoman, Representing the State of Oregon, Washington, D. C., Greetings:

Whereas Senate bill 1333 recently submitted to the United States Senate and H. R. 4719 introduced in the House, provides for a Federally Constructed Dam at Hell's Canyon on the Snake River; and

Whereas this Carpenters Local Union No. 190 feels that it is to the best interests of all the peoples of these United States that such project remain as an asset of the United States Government; and

Whereas we also feel that the economy of our State and the whole Northwest area that could be served by such Federal Financed High Dam would materially benefit in other ways than Hydro-Electric Power alone, through Flood Controls, Irrigation and Recreation, all of which are very valuable assets to the district; and

Whereas we feel that the cost of construction by the Federal Government is reimbursable from the sale of Power and for which the power consumers of the area must ultimately pay, whether constructed by the Government or by Private interests; and

Whereas these facts being evident that regardless of the first cost of this project, we the people, are the most vitally interested persons in this matter and will in the end pay all bills connected therewith without hopes of future ownership, in the case of private ownership, but with the certainty of public ownership if constructed by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the members of Carpenters Local Union No. 190 do urge upon the Oregon Senators and Congressmen and Congresswoman to use their best influence in the passage of these two bills, Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719, to insure to the great Northwest the future it deserves; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Oregon delegation at Washington, D. C. and copies be sent to M. A. Hutcheson, General President of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America and to George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor urging their support of this measure, also that copies be sent to the next regular conventions of the Oregon State Federation of Labor, the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council and to the Oregon State Council of Carpenters for their consideration and adoption.

Fraternally submitted.

C. P. MCCOLGIN,
President.
C. D. LONG, *Secretary.*

Approved by local union No. 190, April 20, 1955.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas we believe in the comprehensive development of all of our river resources: Therefore be it

Resolved by Ohop Grange, No. 812, of Pierce County, State of Washington, That we favor the building of the high dam by the Federal Government and urge the passage of Senate bill 1333.

M. KJELSTAD,
Secretary.

EATONVILLE, WASH.

WILLAMETTE VALLEY
DISTRICT COUNCIL,
LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
Eugene, Oreg., April 28, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The 12,000 members of this district council wish me to convey to you our appreciation of your past effort in regard to the building of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

It is our hope that Senate bill 1333 will eventually receive a sufficient number of votes for passage, for we believe that unless a high, multipurpose dam is built at Hells Canyon, the people of this Nation will lose a natural resource that can never be regained.

With best wishes for the passage of Senate bill 1333 and to you personally, I am,

Yours very truly,

ELDON KRAAL,
Executive Secretary.

HILLSBORO GRANGE No. 73,
Hillsboro, Oreg., April 9, 1955.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 and a companion bill in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, having been introduced for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a high dam at the Hells Canyon site on Snake River; and

Whereas a high Hells Canyon Dam is part of the intervent development of the Columbia River system for power, irrigation, navigation, recreation, etc.; and

Whereas the Army engineers and reclamation service engineer reports state that a high Hells Canyon Dam is both feasible and self-liquidating; and

Whereas the Northwest region is in need of more electric power for home use and the developing of industry; and

Whereas the defense of the United States depends on the power from these great dams in case of emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Hillsboro Grange, No. 73, in regular session this 9th day of April 1955, go on record as approving the principles embodied in Senate bill 1333, and a companion bill in the House of Representatives, and ask our Senators and Representatives to use their influence in the passage of these bills; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to Representative Honorable GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, the Oregon State Grange, and the Hells Canyon Association.

W. J. VANDEHEY, *Master.*
ERMA L. WHITAKER, *Secretary.*

NYSSA, OREG., *March 31, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Malheur Democratic Club of Nyssa, Oreg., has passed a resolution urging our congressional representatives to support Senate bill 1333 for the construction by the Government of the high dam in Hells Canyon.

Sincerely,

MALHEUR DEMOCRATIC CLUB No. 1.
By NORA W. VEST, *Secretary.*

LIST OF RESOLUTIONS IN FAVOR OF THE HIGH FEDERAL DAM AT HELLS CANYON, AND S. 1333

1. Local Union No. 2949, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Roseburg, Oreg.
2. Local Union No. 1784, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Chicago, Ill.
3. Local Union No. 891, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Hot Springs, Ark.
4. Local Union No. 2588, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Bates, Oreg.
5. Willamette Valley District Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers, AFL, Eugene, Oreg.
6. Mohawk Valley District Council of Carpenters, Little Falls, N. Y.
7. Local Union No. 1818, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Clarksville, Tenn.
8. Local Union No. 50, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Knoxville, Tenn.
9. Local Union No. 2274, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Johnstown, Pa.
10. Local Union No. 1683, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, El Dorado, Ark.
11. Local Union No. 627, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Jacksonville, Fla.
12. Local Union No. 1885, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Austin, Tex.
13. Local Union No. 1437, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Compton, Calif.
14. Local Union No. 1462, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Bristol, Pa.
15. Local Union No. 317, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Aberdeen, Wash.
16. Lumber and Sawmill Workers, AFL, Local Union No. 2812, Missoula, Mont.
17. Local Union No. 764, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Shreveport, La.
18. Lumber and Sawmill Workers, AFL, Local Union No. 1845, Snoqualmie, Wash.
19. Local Union No. 819, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, West Palm Beach, Fla.
20. Local Union No. 329, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Oklahoma City, Okla.
21. Local Union No. 722, Millwright and Machine Erectors, AFL, Orem, Utah.
22. Local Union No. 1644, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Minneapolis, Minn.
23. Local Union No. 1773, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Mandan, N. Dak.
24. Local Union No. 81, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Wesleyville, Pa.
25. Local Union No. 1447, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Vero Beach, Fla.
26. Local Union No. 1296, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, San Diego, Calif.
27. Local Union No. 200, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Columbus, Ohio.
28. Local Union No. 2512, Shipyard Carpenters, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.
29. Local Union No. 125, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Utica, N. Y.
30. Shingle Weavers Union, AFL, Local Union No. 2576, Gray's Harbor, Wash.
31. Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebr.

This list includes one public power district, and 30 labor union locals in the following states: Oregon, Illinois, Arkansas, New York, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Florida, Texas, California, Washington, Montana, Oklahoma, Minnesota, North Dakota, Massachusetts, Nebraska.

LIST OF RESOLUTIONS IN FAVOR OF THE HIGH FEDERAL HELLS CANYON DAM AND S. 1333 TO AUTHORIZE ITS CONSTRUCTION

1. Siletz Valley Grange, Oregon.
2. Crab Creek Grange No. 933, Oregon.
3. Willakenzie Grange No. 498, Eugene, Oreg.
4. Roy Grange No. 702, Oregon.
5. Klickitat Pomona Grange No. 5, Washington.
6. Westland Grange No. 827, Hermiston, Oreg.
7. Aloha Grange No. 773, Oregon.
8. Steuben County Rural Electric Membership Association, REA, Angola, Ind.
9. Local Union No. 256, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Savannah, Ga.
10. Local Union No. 213, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Houston, Tex.
11. Local Union No. 98, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Spokane, Wash.
12. Local Union No. 1289, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Seattle, Wash.
13. Local Union No. 1852, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Jacksonville, Ill.
14. Local Union No. 1822, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Fort Worth, Tex.
15. Tri-State Carpenters and Joiners District Council of Chattanooga, Tenn., and vicinity.
16. Local Union No. 756, Carpenters and Joiners District Council of Bellingham, Wash.
17. Millwright and Machinery Erectors, Local No. 1113, San Bernardino, Calif.
18. Local Union No. 665, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Amarillo, Tex.
19. Local Union No. 1332, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Grand Coulee, Wash.
20. Local Union No. 1428, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Midland, Tex.
21. Local Union No. 601, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Henderson, Ky.
22. Kentuckiana District Council of Furniture and Woodworkers, Owensboro, Ky.
23. Local Union No. 501, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, San Diego, Calif.
24. Local Union No. 1331, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Hyannis, Mass.
25. Local Union No. 1176, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Fargo, N. Dak.
26. Local Union No. 110, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, St. Joseph, Mo.
27. Local Union No. 1872, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Willows, Calif.
28. Local Union No. 985, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Gary, Ind.
29. Local Union No. 583, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Portland, Oreg.
30. Local Union No. 131, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Seattle, Wash.
31. Local Union No. 2078, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Encinitas, Calif.
32. Local Union No. 80, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Chicago, Ill.
33. Local Union No. 1350, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Seymour, Ind.
34. Local Union No. 803, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Metropolis, Ill.
35. Local Union No. 986, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, McAlester, Okla.
36. Local Union No. 1795, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Farmington, Mo.

37. Local Union No. 210, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Stamford, Conn.

Seven granges, 1 REA co-op, and 29 local labor unions, from Oregon, Washington, Indiana, Georgia, Texas, Illinois, Tennessee, California, Kentucky, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Connecticut.

THE LOUISVILLE AND NASHVILLE RAILROAD STRIKE AND THE SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY STRIKE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the South has been hard-hit by two strikes which have been in progress for a number of weeks—one involving the L. & N. Railroad and its associated lines, the N. C. & St. L., the Clinchfield, and others; and the second involving the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company.

I am very happy that today the striking nonoperating railroad brotherhoods went back to work. Differences between the railroads and the brotherhoods were referred to arbitration.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have just seen a newsticker report quoting the President's statement with reference to the strikes, in which he expresses gratification. The statement reads:

Eisenhower expressed gratification over the end of the long Louisville & Nashville Railroad strike, and called the agreement to arbitrate the dispute a great boon to the South. He also expressed hope that there will be a quick end to the strike against the Southern Bell Telephone system.

As for the general principle of arbitration, the President said in reply to a question, that he did not think it would be profitable for him to launch upon a discussion of that matter. He did say he would welcome a settlement of the telephone dispute through arbitration, or by any other means.

The other strike—the telephone strike—is still in progress. This strike involves some 50,000 members of the Communications Workers of America, the Nation's largest telephone union. It began on March 14. Prior to that time the company and the union had been in negotiations ever since July of last year, and the contract under which they were working terminated in September.

Although there are a number of unresolved points between the two parties, the big point in dispute is a no-strike clause which the employer, Southern Bell, demanded early in the negotiations.

Labor's right to strike is well established in the United States. However, in a business in the nature of a public utility—and the telephone company is a public utility—the public interest may be such as to justify a no-strike clause in labor contracts.

The union reluctantly agreed—thereby giving up voluntarily one of labor's principal weapons. I think they deserve commendation for doing so.

However, the union asked for provisions in the contract by which disputes could be settled by arbitration. Having agreed not to strike during the duration of the contract, they asked then that this method be set up for the settlement of disputes.

The company refused to include arbitration in the no-strike clause—and it was at this point that the negotiations broke down and the current strike began.

I think that the two parties to this dispute—which, as I say, is seriously affecting a nine-State area, and which involves a public utility in which the public interest is paramount—ought to agree to arbitration of the present dispute, as the railroads and brotherhoods have done.

Accordingly, on Monday of this week I sent identical telegrams to Mr. Fred J. Turner, president, Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., and to Mr. Joe Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, urging that they arbitrate their differences.

This, Mr. President, is the text of my telegram:

The telephone strike, involving some 50,000 workers and seriously affecting my State and other Southern States, is now in its ninth week. It is my understanding that the major point in dispute is a no-strike clause. I urge both parties to this dispute to agree to a resumption of work, submitting all unresolved items of the proposed contract to impartial arbitration, the arbitrators to be made up of a panel selected from a slate named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and findings to be binding on both parties. I feel that the public interest requires early settlement of this strike.

In each of the telegrams I informed the addressee that an identical telegram was being sent to the other party to the dispute.

On that same afternoon I received a return wire from Mr. Beirne, president of the union, which reads as follow:

Re your wire of today regarding the telephone strike in the nine southeastern States and your suggestion that the matter be submitted to impartial arbitration. You are correct that the no-strike clause is the major item in dispute. However, there are some 16 additional items which remain to be resolved. Prior to the actual beginning of the strike, CWA made a proposal to the company to arbitrate these unsettled issues. When the three-governor subcommittee of the Southern Governors' Conference requested of both parties whether or not they were willing to submit the remaining issues in dispute to arbitration, CWA agreed. The company refused. We have continually stated publicly and to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service that we are willing to submit these issues to arbitration. Therefore, to you we unequivocally state that we would be willing to submit the unresolved issues to impartial arbitration and that the arbitrators to be made up of a panel selected from a slate named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and that their findings be binding on both parties. Your interest in this matter is deeply appreciated. The union too, feels that it would be in the public interest that an early settlement of this strike be consummated. We hope the company will agree to your proposal.

This telegram, which I have read for the RECORD, Mr. President, is signed by J. A. Beirne, President, CWA, CIO.

I regret that I cannot tell the Senate at this time what the attitude of the company is to my proposal. I hope to hear soon from the company and when I do I shall advise the Senate of their answer.

It is my firm hope that they, too, will agree. This strike has gone on long enough, and further delay can only inflame an already bad situation.

Tempers on both sides are becoming frayed. Many persons are out of work. They are good people. I cannot see that any good purpose will be served by continuing the strike longer. I hope that, following the example in the strike between the nonoperating brotherhoods and the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, the telephone strike may be submitted to arbitration, with the parties agreeing to abide by the decision of the arbitrator. That seems to me to be a fair proposal, and I hope it will be accepted by both the union and the management.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret that I was not on the floor when the Senator from Tennessee made a statement with regard to the telephone strike which has been raging for some time in several Southern States, of which Louisiana is one. I should like the Senator from Tennessee to know that I, too, believe the strike has continued too long and should be settled.

The union has offered to arbitrate the outstanding issues. I do not believe arbitration would be entirely necessary, if the company were willing to sit down and enter into good-faith negotiations in a serious effort to terminate the strike. I sincerely hope the company will negotiate with the union and endeavor to settle the differences, or else that the parties will agree to arbitrate the dispute. The strike is causing great public inconvenience and undoubtedly is causing undue hardship to those who are members of the union and to others who are concerned.

I believe the union would like to settle the strike, and I believe also that there is a desire on the part of the company to bargain in good faith. If so, the strike could be settled very shortly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his observations and his viewpoint.

As I stated to the Senate a little while ago, I sent telegrams to Mr. Beirne, the head of the union, and to Mr. Turner, the head of the telephone company, for the reason that I had received notice that the parties involved in the railroad strike, which has caused so much trouble and loss in the South, had finally agreed to arbitrate their differences. Arbitrators have been appointed, and the parties have agreed to abide by the findings of the arbitrators.

It seems to me that the telephone strike, which began about the same time, and is vitally affecting the southern area, has, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, continued long enough, with the result that tempers are on edge and some disturbances and difficulties have occurred, and that it should be settled in the same way as the railroad strike. Thus both disputes could be settled.

I made this suggestion to Mr. Beirne and Mr. Turner in my telegrams.

I have received from Mr. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, a telegram saying that the union was ready to agree to arbitrate

and to abide by the decision. I have received a telegram from the company saying that they would write their views a little later. When I receive the letter from the company, I will place it in the RECORD.

We who come from the sections which are affected by the strikes realize the damage they are causing to the economy of the South and to the services of the companies, and we hope they will be settled promptly.

Mr. LONG. I am frank to say to the Senator from Tennessee that the telephone strike should have been settled by this time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The union contends that the strike could have been settled at the Governors' Conference, but that it was not possible to get the telephone company to agree. But I hope that now, at long last, they will agree.

Mr. President, I now desire to address the Senate on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The Senator has the floor, and may proceed.

POOR HEALTH CONDITIONS AMONG CHILDREN ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during last year and this year, as a member of the subcommittee to investigate problems of juvenile delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has taken great interest in the matter of juvenile delinquency among the Indian children on the various reservations in the United States. I joined with the Senator from North Dakota in holding hearings in his State. He has given much time and study to the problems of Indian children, not only in North Dakota, but also on the reservations in other States. He deserves the high commendation and thanks of the Senate for the interest he has taken in the Indian children.

The Indians have been too little thought of and greatly neglected by the Federal Government and by many persons in authority in the United States.

Week before last the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, in furtherance of his study and his interest in the Indian children, was designated to act as chairman of a subcommittee and to hold hearings for 3 days in Arizona and California in connection with juvenile delinquency among the Indian children.

I have received from the Senator from North Dakota a report addressed to me as chairman of the subcommittee on juvenile delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think the subject is of such importance that we should not wait until after the interim report on Indian problems has been prepared to bring it to the attention of the public and the Senate.

With appreciation for the excellent work which has been done by the Senator from North Dakota, and in the hope that some immediate action may be taken by Congress in connection with some of the matters brought out in the special report, I read the report to the Senate, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE BY THE SENATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DIFFICULTIES IN RECONSTRUCTING THE INDIAN HOSPITAL IN SELLS, ARIZ., WHICH WAS DESTROYED BY FIRE IN 1947—REPORT TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Commissioner of Indian Affairs Glenn L. Emmons, in his statement to the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee at its hearings in Phoenix on April 28, 1955, pointed out that the poor health conditions that prevail in so many Indian communities is one of the deep-rooted factors that contributed to the problem of juvenile delinquency. A recent survey indicated that of 260 children, 25 percent died before they reached the age of 1 year; 40 percent died before they reached the age of 6; and 52 percent died before they reached the age of 18, making an average of 17 years' life expectancy in comparison to a life expectancy of 69 years for the general public throughout the United States.

That is a distressing and shocking condition among our Indian children. I continue to read:

Dr. Salisbury, director of the State health department for the State of Arizona, pointed out that infant deaths during the first year of life for the Indian population throughout the State are 132 per 1,000 live births, whereas the rate for the State of Arizona as a whole is approximately 40 per 1,000 live births. He further pointed out that pneumonia and tuberculosis were the two most prevalent diseases among the Indian people. Dr. Salisbury further stated that the health conditions among the Papago Indians in southern Arizona are as serious as on any Indian reservation in the United States.

The seriousness of the health conditions among the Papago Indians has been accentuated by the destruction of the Indian hospital at Sells, Ariz., in 1947. Although requests have been made to restore the hospital, the position was taken that there is a hospital at San Xavier and also one at Tucson, Ariz., which would be available to service the Papago Indians. However, because of the difficulty in transporting patients who are to be taken from the Papago Reservation to San Xavier, Tucson, or even Phoenix, many of the Indian people on the Papago Reservation have been unable to receive any medication whatsoever. The distances from Sells, the center of the Papago Reservation, to San Xavier is 75 miles; to Tucson, 62 miles; and to Phoenix, 125 miles. The total population of the Papago Indians is about 8,200 persons living on 3 reservations and they live in 73 widely scattered villages. The entire area covers 2,855,000 acres. Although there are a few Papago families whose sources of income are cattle sales and skilled and semiskilled trades and who thereby enjoy a fair income, the much larger group of Papago families maintain a very precarious livelihood from subsistence farming, small cattle holdings, and seasonal off-the-reservation labor. Most of this group consists of uneducated, non-English-speaking people whose incomes range from a bare subsistence level downward.

Because of their inability to use the hospitals at Tucson, San Xavier, and Phoenix, the Papago Indians have continuously urged the erection of a new Indian hospital at Sells, Ariz. Recently, Dr. Fee from the Budget Bureau Office in Washington visited the Papago Reservation pertaining to an Indian hospital. Quoting from the testimony of Mr. Mark Manuel, the chairman of the Tribal Council, at page 492 it states: "He (Dr. Fee) asked us about a hospital in Sells. He pointed out that there are two places where they want to build a hospital, one in Tucson, which he was very much in favor of building out there, and I told him that it was all right, but I would like very much to have it built in Sells, because this is the center of the reservation, and also the villages surrounding the district, this is the headquarters of the Papago Council.

"So I pointed out this, and I point this out to you, that there is a hospital at San Xavier, and also one in Tucson, there is a county hospital there, which some of our Papago people go to. I also point out this, that our hospital in Sells was destroyed by fire in 1947, and ever since we have tried to ask for a hospital to be built in Sells, because of the difficulty in transporting patients who are to be taken from here to San Xavier, or to Tucson, or even to Phoenix."

It was further pointed out that the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs had been collaborating in attempting to get an appropriation for the hospital at Sells. However, it has been learned that it will not be included in the 1956 budget because they were unable to complete the study at the Bureau of the Budget level. The amount of money needed for the hospital is estimated at $2 million. It is also estimated that it would take a year and probably longer before the hospital can be completed after construction begins, which means that in the meantime the Papago Indians who need hospitalization and medication will keep suffering for the next 3 or 4 years, as they have suffered since 1947, without the services of an Indian hospital at Sells, Ariz. It is unbelievable in this day of wonder drugs and modern hospital and medication facilities that the Indian people should suffer the terrifically high death rate that they do, especially among the infants, which is not only the concern of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee but the concern of every Senator and every Congressman in the United States. The Congress has the power to appropriate $2 million for the restoration of the Indian hospital at Sells, Ariz., for the use of the Papago Indians and not wait until 1957, or 1958, or 1959, or 1960 and thereby deprive these people whose death rate is one of the highest in the Nation of the proper hospital and medical facilities that, as citizens of the United States, they are entitled to.

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator.

I wish personally to join with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in urging that Congress appropriate $2 million for the construction of the hospital. I think it is high time that in some manner at least we showed our intentions of giving a little better justice and a little better treatment to the Indians, who are the wards of the United States Government. I can think of no better way of showing that intention and desire than by enabling Indian children, who have been dying in such large numbers at such an early age, to have better medical and hospital facilities made available to them.

I commend the report to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and I hope the Senate will join in supporting an amendment to the appropriation bill to make the building of the hospital possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to call to the attention of the Senate, and I would hope to the attention of

the Department of State and the President, a story which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, and also one which appeared in the New York Times, and I am sure in all the other daily newspapers of the country.

The story in the Washington Post and Times Herald has the headline "United States, France Reach Unity on Vietnam."

The headline in the New York Times has the headline "Paris May Accept United States View on Diem."

Mr. President, one of the stories, the story in the New York Times, is written by Thomas F. Brady. The story in the Washington Post and Times Herald is by Kingsbury Smith, with the dateline Paris, Wednesday, May 11. What is the substance of these stories?

I should like to read from the article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, an International News Service release, which reads as follows:

The United States and France reached a tentative understanding on Vietnam today based on French willingness to support the government of Premier Ngo Dinh Diem in exchange for American agreement on temporary retention of Bao Dai as emperor.

An unquestionable source said a gentleman's agreement has been reached at a meeting between United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and French Premier Edgar Faure, also attended by Sir Harold Caccia of Britain and other three-power spokesmen.

The meeting was marked by a startlingly blunt exchange between Dulles and Faure which included expressed willingness on the part of each to pull out of Vietnam entirely and leave the other to carry on.

I digress a moment from the article, Mr. President, to call to the attention of the Senate the next two paragraphs:

Dulles said Vietnam was not sufficiently important to justify serious discord between France and the United States.

Dulles added that it might be better to abandon Vietnam than continue to pursue antagonistic policies.

Commenting on Faure's reported offer to withdraw and leave the United States to "carry on as best it could," Dulles declared:

"The United States also offers to terminate its interest in the situation to allow the French to carry out their policies as best they can."

Dulles said if the French withdrew the United States would continue to support the anti-Communist Nationalist Government in Vietnam as long as that government has a chance of survival.

Dulles and Faure agreed to meet again Wednesday evening.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1955]

PARIS MAY ACCEPT UNITED STATES VIEW ON DIEM—DULLES SAID TO GAIN FAURE'S SUPPORT FOR VIETNAM CHIEF

(By Thomas F. Brady)

PARIS, Wednesday, May 11.—France appeared ready early this morning to accept the United States view that Premier Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam should be supported pending elections.

At a three-power talk French Premier Edgar Faure told Secretary of State Dulles he was "ready to be converted" to the United States view. Sir Harold Cacci participated in the discussion.

M. Faure said the decision was very difficult for him personally and unsound politically, but that under certain conditions his government would promise full and continued support of Mr. Diem. One of these conditions was an enlargement of the present South Vietnamese Government headed by Mr. Diem.

[Premier Diem reorganized his government Tuesday into a strongly nationalist cabinet. One of its main aims will be to hold early elections.]

The three-power discussion, which lasted until after midnight, ended on a hopeful note. M. Faure said he would draw up a memorandum embodying the views expressed to be used as the basis for further discussions tomorrow night.

The convergence of views came after a sparring match in which Mr. Dulles and M. Faure had each suggested that his Government abandon its interests in Indochina so that the other Government might carry out its policies as best it could.

Mr. Dulles said Vietnam, "important as it is, is not sufficiently important to become a source of serious friction between the United States and France. It would be better, he continued, to abandon Vietnam altogether than to have the 2 countries pursue antagonistic policies.

The Secretary of State admitted Mr. Diem had pursued an increasingly anti-French policy but asked if the French would nevertheless support the Saigon Premier pending elections. The United States, he said, would use its influence to make Mr. Diem adopt a more moderate policy.

M. Faure replied that if 1 country gave up its interests in Vietnam it would really be abandoning both countries. Therefore, he said, "we should reach common view."

He urged that Bao Dai, the Chief of State of South Vietnam, who is now in France, should have a part in the enlarged government to give it legitimacy.

Sir Harold said that reports to Britain indicated that, "whether we like it or not, Diem is in a strong position." This indicated a change in the British view, which had previously paralleled the French view that Mr. Diem should be ousted.

Mr. Dulles agreed with the points made by M. Faure and said he sympathized with the idea of using Bao Dai to give legitimacy to the Diem Government, but that Bao Dai must play a passive role.

VIETNAM WIDENS CABINET

(By Tillman Durdin)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, Wednesday, May 11.—Premier Ngo Dinh Diem announced last night the reorganization of his Government into a strongly Nationalist Cabinet. It is dedicated to oppose both communism and colonialism.

One of its main aims will be to hold early elections for a National Assembly that would decide a permanent system of government for South Vietnam.

Mr. Diem changed all but four of the chief participants in his previous Government and thus named virtually a new Cabinet.

His action raised two key questions: (1) Whether his reformed ministry will be repudiated by Chief of State Bao Dai, and (2) whether such a repudiation would result in nonrecognition by foreign powers.

Government circles expectantly awaited the reaction of Bao Dai, to whom the new list of Ministers has been communicated with no request for the Chief of State's approval. Bao Dai, who recently sought to unseat Mr. Diem by calling him to France, is now on a visit to Paris from his chateau on the French Riviera.

It was felt here that a rebuff by Bao Dai would sharply affect the attitude of the French Government, which looks with disfavor on Premier Diem and would like to see him replaced. Government quarters felt more confident of the reaction of the United States, although it was realized a rejection by Bao Dai would raise a difficult question for Washington.

PREMIER TO BE FIRM

One of Mr. Diem's chief aides said last night that a refusal of Bao Dai to approve the Premier's government would not shake Mr. Diem's determination to keep his Ministry in office. He stated such a move by Bao Dai would result in a final break between him and the Premier and a repudiation of Bao Dai as chief of state.

Mr. Diem and many of his backers hold that Bao Dai should relinquish all his powers to the Premier and refrain from any intervention in Veitnamese affairs until a National Assembly can decide whether the present chief of state is to have a place in a future republican or monarchial system.

In a statement announcing his new cabinet list, Premier Diem said the ideal of his government was democracy, liberty, and "an independence that will tolerate compromise neither with reaction nor with communism." Alluding to the talks between United States, French, and British officials on Vietnamese affairs in Paris, Mr. Diem added, "My government demands that our problems not be discussed without us."

As Minister of Foreign Affairs in his revised government, Mr. Diem named Vu Van Mau, a professor of law and court judge, to replace Dr. Tran Van Do, who was named in the last days of the Geneva Conference to defend the Saigon Government's views. Dr. Do offered his resignation to the Premier sometime ago.

To the important Ministry of the Interior, the Premier shifted Bui Van Thinh, a jurist from the Ministry of Justice. Mr. Thinh has been acting concurrently as Minister of the Interior for 2 months.

Mr. Diem retained his post as Minister of National Defense to mark his solidarity with the Army and his determination to complete the pacification of the country. As his deputy in the Ministry he kept Tran Trung Dung, a former Hanoi newspaper editor and municipal councilor.

In the Ministry of Justice was put Nguyfn Van Si, first president of the appeal court of Saigon, Tran Chanh Thanh, once a non-Communist Nationalist with the Viet Minh Communists, was made Minister of Information replacing Pham Xuan Thai, a Cao Dai leader.

Tran Huu Phuong, who has been Minister of Finance for some time was made head of a Ministry of Finance and Economics. Tran Van Meo, prominent engineer was made Minister of Public Works.

As Minister of Agrarian Reform and Landed Property, Mr. Diem named Nguyen Van Thoi, an engineer and at present director general of the Surveying Service. Nguyen Duong Don was retained in his post as Minister of National Education and Youth.

Vu Quoc Thong was appointed head of a combined Ministry of Health and Social Action. He is a professor of law. Huynh Huu Nghia was made Minister of Labor, and Nguyen Cong Vien, an engineer, was designated as Minister of Agriculture.

Nguyen Huu Chau was appointed Minister-Delegate of the Presidency. He is a lawyer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us analyze what these two articles seem to mean, because both carry the same substance or story. The Secretary of State of the United States of America

has journeyed to the NATO meeting in France to discuss with our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the effective defense of Western Europe. This is the annual meeting, and one to which our Secretary, of course, must go, and in which he has great responsibilities. But there happens to be a major civil war which has been raging in Saigon, in South Vietnam, or in free Vietnam.

I have said on the floor of the Senate before that from time to time within the past month our Government's policy has been unclear, dubious, and at times vacillating, in reference to free Vietnam. I repeat that charge, and I further state that our Ambassador Extraordinary to Vietnam, the President's personal emissary, Gen. Lawton Collins, is reported to have brought back recommendations to this Government that we might let the Government of free Vietnam go by the board unless there was a coalition with forces that were undesirable to the freedom of that country.

It is incredible to me that we would waiver in this critical hour. It was incredible to me that we would have a report coming back to our State Department which indicated, by its terms, that the Government of Premier Diem could no longer control free Vietnam.

I say here today that at the very time the report of General Collins was in the hands of the State Department, reportedly recommending we might very well let things drift unless there was a coalition government, Premier Diem took affirmative action, and is now in complete control of free Vietnam.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the Senator from Minnesota is a very careful gentleman. Is he certain that General Collins recommended we should compel Premier Diem to form a coalition government with the river pirates?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure whether it was with the river pirates, but I am informed a recommendation was made of a coalition; and it is further reported that our support for the free government of Vietnam waivered for a period of about 2 weeks. That is prologue, that is past, and since then our Government has reaffirmed support of the government of Premier Diem. Our Government reaffirmed it prior to Secretary Dulles' visit to Paris.

Mr. President, I say that again the Secretary of State has done a disservice to the cause of freedom in Vietnam.

Let me read the statement:

> Dulles said Vietnam was not sufficiently important to justify serious discord between France and the United States.

Mr. President, it is about time the United States spoke out on some of these issues. The France have "bobbled" the job in free Vietnam or South Vietnam. The French colonial and foreign offices have not been able to make their policies effective in that part of the world. The French have insisted upon support of Emperor Bao Dai, who is in disrepute, and who is, for all practical purposes, being read out of his country. Emperor Bao Dai is now vacationing on the Riviera, while his people are suffering and going through trial and tribulation.

The Premier of free Vietnam or South Vietnam and his government have said they are going to create an independent state.

Mr. President, what was the report I read a few days ago in our press? It was that the United States was recommending a constitutional monarchy for South Vietnam. It is said that such a recommendation was made by the United States of America, a nation which declared its independence, and threw off the yoke of George III; a nation which believed in the republican form of government; a nation which does not believe in constitutional monarchy. It is incredible that we would have the audacity or, let me say, the stupidity, in this instance, to propose the establishment of a constitutional monarchy, when the leaders of that country are presently proclaiming a republic.

Mr. President, I realize that the relationships with the French are difficult. One of the morning newspapers carried a lead column about the long and great difficulty which has been experienced with the French by the prior administration and by this administration. I sympathize with any Secretary of State who has to deal with the French Foreign Office when it comes to French colonialism. But, Mr. President, French colonialism in Vietnam is dead; and if the French do not know it, we should tell them so.

We have put $1,300,000,000 of the American taxpayers money into free Vietnam, the past 2 years; and under the foreign-aid program it is proposed that we send hundreds of millions of dollars more to free Vietnam. That item is carried in the foreign-aid bill which now is before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, in light of the action of the Congress, the Secretary of State is not at liberty to say that we will abandon free Vietnam. The Secretary of State is not at liberty—or, may I say, is even less at liberty—to bargain with the French on the basis of the abandonment of free Vietnam.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

> Dulles added that it might be better to abandon Vietnam than to continue to pursue antagonistic policies.

The people of free Vietnam need to know that if there must be a choice between the French foreign office and the people of free Vietnam, the people of Vietnam have our support.

Already we have had to bear intolerable burdens of colonialism. We are going to lose everything in southeast and south Asia, if we do not make up our minds where we stand.

Interestingly enough, the French foreign office does not seem to feel too strongly about this matter, because Premier Faure is reported as offering to withdraw and to leave the United States to carry on the best it can. So apparently the French foreign office feels it is no longer successful in its efforts, and the French foreign office or the French Government has offered to withdraw.

Surely, Mr. President, this is no time for our great Republic to indicate any weakness or any indecision. I say this most reluctantly, because I am deeply concerned about this area of the world. I have talked with people from free Vietnam and with representatives of free Vietnam. I say most reluctantly that such newspaper stories stir up strife, civil war, revolution, and political trouble. Something must be done to clarify the record.

I hope our President will do as he did before, namely, speak out and say that we support unequivocally and unqualifiedly the only alternative we have in South Vietnam or free Vietnam, namely, the government of Ngo Dinh Diem. Furthermore, that government is calling for elections, and is organized, and a new cabinet has been established; and it will not make a bit of difference what Bao Dai wants. He is not in control. Bao Dai, the so-called Emperor of Vietnam, is in France, on the Riviera, whereas the people of free Vietnam are in the streets, fighting for their liberty.

Mr. President, the Premier of South Vietnam has shown his capacity to govern; and it does little good for France, the United States, our Secretary of State, or the French Foreign Minister, to be saying that Emperor Bao Dai should tentatively be given a position as chief of state or the leader of the people whom he no longer represents.

I say that the vacillation, indecision, and political bargaining which apparently have been going on, are beneath the dignity of the Government of the United States. We need not bargain with the French, Mr. President. There is absolutely no need of it. Furthermore, if our Secretary of State is indicating that we should abandon free Vietnam, then I wish to have the Foreign Operations Administration proposal, now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, amended. To do so will save the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

We are in this matter up to our necks; and when one is deep in a problem—as deep in as we are now—it is no time to pull out.

Much is said about the morale of people; and in the case of the people of Formosa, we are deeply concerned with those matters. Mr. President, what more could be done to destroy the morale of young men who tonight are giving their lives in the outskirts of Saigon, the capital of free Vietnam, than to have the Secretary of State of the greatest country on the face of the earth indicate that their country and its safety are not worth disagreements between ourselves and the French over a policy relating to free Vietnam.

We are not required always to agree. However, we are required to do what is right, when there seems to be a critical situation confronting the world, and particularly when people are fighting for their liberty.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that if we abandon free Vietnam, we shall have abandoned all of southeast Asia. Half of Vietnam already is gone. It is very possible that free Vietnam may not

be able to be saved, even with our help, but surely we ought not add to the difficulty.

I am of the opinion that if we really make a firm decision, if we really determine what we are going to do, if we really give that government the support it needs, it can survive, and can preserve that area as a free part of the world.

I warn the American people that to lose free Vietnam or South Vietnam will be to lose a strategic area of the world. Indonesia will be next on the list. While our Secretary of State has been away, Indonesia has signed a treaty with Red China. Indonesia has 88 million people. If free Vietnam falls, or if the Communist elements take over, then, Mr. President, every country in the corridor of southeast Asia will be in more difficulty, and we shall not be able to stop it.

Mr. President, I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent months there has been underway a very active campaign to induce State legislatures which have been in session to memorialize the Congress in favor of the Bricker amendment, or some variations of it and its effort toward restricting the treat-making provisions of the Constitution.

It is, of course, perfectly proper for those who support the Bricker amendment to do so, although personally I am convinced that members of the State legislatures are already heavily burdened with State problems and are seldom in a position to give any sustained attention to the intricacies of foreign affairs.

I have seen some of the materials which are distributed to members of the State legislatures, and I notice that they avoid the fine points of constitutional and international law, and rely primarily upon the general charge of national incompetence. The burden of their argument is that the State legislators ought to be concerned because our country is on the brink of very serious injury unless we are saved from the mistakes of the present President and future Presidents, the present Senate, and future Senates.

My purpose in rising is not to go into the merits of the argument. The Senate is well aware of my opposition to the Bricker amendment. I only want to bring to the attention of the Senate that I am proud of the fact that on March 26 the Senate Judiciary Committee in the Minnesota Legislature killed the Bricker amendment memorial. Many other State legislatures are doing the same, despite the efforts that are being made to get them to support the so-called Bricker amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY—RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other statements to be made by Senators, I plan shortly to move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday, in accordance with the order previously entered.

First, I should like to have the RECORD show that it is the intention of the leadership on Friday to call the calendar of bills to which there is no objection. Such permission has already been granted by the Senate.

When the call of the calendar is concluded, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Order No. 217, S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. That bill has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

If consideration of that bill is concluded in time on Friday, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Order No. 218, H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Act of 1938.

When the Senate concludes its business on Friday, it is my tentative plan to move that the Senate recess or adjourn until Monday or Tuesday. First, I shall have to determine whether any appropriation bills will be ready for consideration on Monday. If not, and after consultation with the minority leader, it may be that I shall move that the Senate recess or adjourn until Tuesday.

So far as the Senate is concerned, there has been a somewhat light legislative program this week in the hope that Members could be available to conduct their committee work. I understand that hearings are about to conclude on one or two appropriation bills. Substantial progress has been made on the mutual security bill, and hearings are now proceeding in connection with the housing bill.

I understand the roads bill will be reported tomorrow. Perhaps we shall be able to take it up some time early next week.

I wish to serve notice on the Senate that while the attendance of Senators has not been necessary, except on one or two days this week, we are now well into the month of May, and the fiscal year will end on June 30, and we shall have before us appropriation bills, the roads bill, the housing bill, and the wage bill, all of which the Senate must consider. I wish to put Senators on notice that some of these bills will come out of committees within the next few days, and if Senators have any engagements requiring their absence from the floor, I hope they can fulfill them speedily, because we shall have a rather crowded schedule as we approach adjournment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to concur in the statement of the majority leader that there is need for all of us to give serious thought and attention to the bills which are to be enacted. The Appropriations Committee met yesterday forenoon, and was in session all yesterday afternoon. This morning the committee met to consider the public works appropriations. It met this afternoon, again, on military appropriations. We worked last evening until half past 5 o'clock, and we worked this afternoon up until the quorum call came when the conference report on the postal-pay bill was being considered.

We intend to work tomorrow forenoon and tomorrow afternoon, and, likewise, every single day for the next several weeks, in order to report the appropriation bills.

One has no conception, unless he is serving on the Appropriations Committee, of the amount of time necessary to go through the numerous and detailed questions involved in the Interior Department appropriation bill, to say nothing about military appropriation bills. In the case of military appropriations we really have a burden on our hands.

I am happy that there will be no session of the Senate tomorrow, because then the members of the Appropriations Committee can devote their entire time to the problems awaiting their consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the acting minority leader. Every Member of the Senate is aware of the intelligence, capacity and conscientious devotion to duty on the part of the Senator from Minnesota. We are somewhat ahead of the schedule of previous years so far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned. The work has been thorough and efficient. I think one of the reasons why it has been unnecessary for the Senate to hold night sessions and long sessions every day is because the weaknesses in bills have been taken care of in the committee itself.

I observed that the Interior Department appropriation bill took only 2 or 3 hours to pass the Senate, because every question that could have been asked about it had already been asked in the committee. The same is true of the Treasury-Post Office bill and of the Agricultural Department appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the work that has been done by the committes and of the cooperation we have received not only from the minority leadership, which is always cooperative, but from all the minority Members. I hope that with continued understanding and cooperation we can do everything we should do and still meet the adjournment date of July 30.

Mr. President, I now move that in accordance with the order previously entered the Senate stand in recess until next Friday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Friday, May 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1957, vice Ralph H. Demmler, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Edward A. Conger, retired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico for a term of 4 years, vice Donald A. Draughon, term expired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. Nixon, of Idaho, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont., in place of Edward C. Ellsworth, Jr., resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be lieutenant colonel, USAF (Medical)

Malcolm H. Sawyer, O358789.

To be majors, USAF (Medical)

Samuel E. Andrew, AO2260993.
Thomas A. Collins, AO468868.
Henry E. C. Everett, AO1735723.
Theodore C. Marrs, AO2261128.

To be major, USAF (Dental)

Kenneth D. Rudd, AO1765996.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Latimer H. Booth, AO2213807.
Charles L. Cox, Jr.
Victor M. Ohta, AO2238753.
Harry P. Raymond, Jr.
Jack H. Robbins, AO2261001.
Carl Screws, Jr., AO1878440.
Frank J. Spada, AO1906330.
William P. Tinkler, AO2238752.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

William H. Calvert, Jr., AO965287.
Francis J. Samaha, AO1906579.
Lee F. Straub, O965206.
John J. Tarsitano, AO959114.

To be captain, USAF (Veterinary)

Leslie J. Seigneur, AO1906639.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical

Dwight M. Akers, AO3000217.
William B. Barnes, AO2060762
Billy J. Bauman, AO2261386.
Gordon Bendersky, AO3042011.
Robert J. Boese, AO3000303.
Wilbert G. Dalzell
Thomas L. Evans
Richard A. Feezel, AO2260997.
Lawrence O. Gahagan
Leon Goldman
Kenneth G. Gould, Jr., AO3000591.
William L. Hinds, AO3000290.
Hal C. Holland, AO3042158.
Donald E. Howland, AO3401995.
William T. Kemmerer, AO3000282.
Roman J. Kownacki
Boyd H. Metcalf
Edwin R. Roberts, Jr.
Bealer T. Rogers, Jr.
Richard J. Salina, AO3001809.
Edward A. Sheldon
James R. Smith, O956664.
Roy A. Springer
Coleman Taylor
Arthur L. Walker
Richard C. Wolff, AO871617.
Thomas E. Zion

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Norman C. Gadbois, AO2067981.
Gaylord L. Hall, AO775017.
Bruce E. Stansbury, O2263827.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Veterinary)

James E. Cook, AO2261765.
Roland L. Hanson, AO1756235.
Charles V. Lang, AO667823.
Elmer L. Lashua, AO2261155.
Erby L. Massie, AO2213651.
John D. Mosely, AO2238705.
Hilding M. Strandberg, AO937885.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Michael D. Guerin, Jr., AO2216987.
John L. Hartman, Jr., AO2217399.
Loren J. Keeffe, AO2213783.
Donald V. Roach, AO2215251.
Charles H. Steinmetz, AO2261346.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Edward D. Henry, AO2262060.
Frank R. Parsons, Jr., AO2221314.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

William W. Gobrecht, AO940937.
William E. McCarthy, AO1903917.
George L. Wenrich, AO664101.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 101 (c) and 102 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and Public Law 37, 83d Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Belle E. Dorsey, AN2242345.
Doris J. Fritts, AN2214266.
Patricia A. Grim, AN1912734.
Marian B. James, AN1906239.
Ruth C. Miedwig, AN796958.
Veda G. Parton, AN2244500.
Doris M. J. Pelchat, AN753642.
Miriam D. Rolwing, AN2214261.
Margaret H. Ross, AN2241618.
Doris L. Savage, AN2242581.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Women Medical Specialist)

Junie M. Coursey, AM2239933.

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Francis James Adams
Edwin McCoy Anderson, Jr.
William Lee Anderson
Marlin Richard Baker
Gregory Inman Barras
Thomas James Bell
John Jennings Beoddy
George Robert Blitch
Carl John Bossert
William Herbert Bottoms, Jr.
Philippe Ovide Bouchard
Gerald Chadwick Brown
Al Buie
William David Burroughs
William Miles Carrington
Cyrus Curtis Cassells, Jr.
Carl Homer Cathey, Jr.
Francis Raymond Chura
John Meade Cohan
Dennis James Cosca
James McKenney Cutchin IV
John Colford Daly, Jr.
Dempsie Augustus Davis, Jr.
Joseph Henry Davis, Jr.
Reginald Roderick Davis
Marshall William Dickson, Jr.
Frank Lofton Donald, Jr.
Kenneth Lee Donaldson
Felix Dorough
Alan Miller Edwards
Charles Vincent Ewing
Judson Charles Faurer
Leland Dwight Floyd
Charles Logan Flynn
John Thomas Gamble
Daniel Boone Geran
Jerry McClelland Gilpin
Donald Anthony Giza
Norb Ray Glidden
William James Goodwin, Jr.
Francis Martin Greene, Jr.
Bud Thomas Hall
John Thomas Hamilton
Haywood Shepherd Hansell III
John Scott Hardy
William Whitmarsh Harris, Jr.
Preston Standlee Harvill, Jr.
Jerome Douglas Hawkins
Lawrence Chandler Herdman
Milton Joseph Herman, Jr.
James Fritz Heye
William Joseph Hock III
Russell Barry Hodges
Henry Allen Hollensbe
Peter Hampton Hornbarger
John Farwell Hotchkiss, Jr.
James Evan Howard
Delbert Harold Jacobs
James Benson Johnson
Raymond Alexander Karam
John Herbert Karnes
James Frank Keegan
George Robert Kennebeck, Jr.
Henry Albaum Klung, Jr.
Fred Gerard Knieriem
John Stanton Lapham
Donald Keith Law
Walter Franklin LeCates, Jr.
John Kanelos Leventis
Herbert Selig Lichtenberg
Roy Henry Lynn, Jr.
Charles Homer Martin, Jr.
Paul Lawrence Martin, Jr.
Richard William Masson
Richard Dennis McCarthy
Walter Clifton McCrillis
John Sheridan McDonald
Albert Durfee McJoynt
Robert Dean McKelvey
Ronald William McNiven
William Daniel McWilliams III
Robert Anthony Meisenheimer
Lawrence Gilbert Michalove
Robert George Millard
George Lennox Monahan, Jr.
Ronald Stewart Murray
Roland Leif Nordlie
Lewis Cortez Olive, Jr.
Albert Franklin Oppel
Donald Herod Peterson
Robert Frank Pheiff
Fred Bradford Phillips
Thomas James Phillips II
John Leonard Pickitt
Frederick Edward Pirkey
John Thomas Poirier
Richard Hayes Prater
Leslie Delbert Pruitt
Carl Alan Rankin
Richard Adrian Regnier
Leland Stanford Riggs, Jr.
Charles Walton Roades
William Edward Roth
Ronald Eldredge Rule
Edwin Francis Rumsey
Alexander Kratz Rupp
Robert Louis Russell
Gerald John Samos
James Edward Seay
John Robert Sechrist
Richard Vernon Secord
Alfred Edwin Sheldon, Jr.
Robert Miller Sherman, Jr.
Thomas Eugene Sims

Earl Vinton Singer, Jr.
Duane Wenzel Smetana
Verne Golson Staffen
Charles Gary Stoeckel
Reed Lewis Stone
George Alfred Straus
Robert Kirbo Strickland
Donald James Sutton
Gerald Duane Tebben
Robert Thornquist
Roy Thorvald Thorsen
Clarence Lee Trentman
Thomas Allan Turner
Theodore Eugene Vitori
Wilfred George Volkstadt
Brien Dale Ward
Richard Gustav Wargowsky
Morris Thompson, Warner, Jr.
Thomas Gerald Weaver
Ronald Edwin Weissenborn
Thomas Crossley Wilkinson
Kenneth Vincent Wilson
Lloyd Thomas Wolfe
Alfred Merrill Worden
Robert Oakley Wray
Brewer Hamilton Young, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Loren Raymond Alfred
Arthur Buckland Allen
William Alison Anders
John Joseph Anderson
William Ellis Arnold, Jr.
William Joseph Barlow
Robert Owen Bartlett
Robert Barry Barton
Philip Arthur Bayly
Frank Edward Bendrick
Charles Robert Benton
Nathaniel Bernt
Richard Allen Bianckino
Robert Henry Binish
Frederick Michaels Bowles
Richard Hadley Brower
Robert Ward Burton
Paul Christofer Cacavas
John Charles Cardosi
William McDowell Carruthers
Edwin Karl Chapman
LaVerne Allen Chastaine
Anthony Joseph Chiota
Joseph Elmer Clarkson
Fred William Colbern
George Wilmarth Conner
William Rutgers Conway
Robert Keith Coulter
John Everett Cowell
Eugene Ashmore Crosby
David Bowdoin Crouch
John Tally Cunningham III
Gerald Tillman Dantzler
Dwight Fairly Denton
Gerald Donald Dickey
James Henry Dickinson
Thomas James Drake
Kent Richard Drummond
James Ralph Dunbar
Richard Clark Dutnell
Pintard Magruder Dyer III
Edward James Eassa
Daniel Ebert
James Wright Ellstrom
James David Everett
William Gordon Fairey
William Wallace Farnsworth
George George Fetterer
Melvyn Fisher
Edward Eugene Fowle
George Frederick Francis
Roy Bell Freeman, Jr.
Claude Taylor Fuqua III
John Ezra Gauldin III
Philip Francis Gehring, Jr.
Gerald Alva Gerdon
Joseph Louis Gimbrone
James Adonis Goodwin
Robert Wesley Graue
Charles Maurice Gray
Lucius Perry Gregg, Jr.
Carl Henry Haines
Richard Earl Hamilton
Gordon Bruce Hamley
David Milton Hammett
Robert Arthur Hammond
William Thomas Harbour
Myron David Harnly
William Lavern Harrison
Monroe Wilson Hatch, Jr.
Sanda B. Helms, Jr.
Russell Duane Hensley, Jr.
Robert Jackson Higgs
Richard Weills Hilland
Robert Allen Hlawek
Kenneth Leroy Holden
Leslie Royal Holland, Jr.
Brooks Thomas Huey
George Fletcher Hunter
John Wendell Jamison, Jr.
John Roux Johnson
Norbert Raymond Kaus
Charles Edward Kenney
Edmund Herman Keranen
Richard John Kiefer
John Forster Kindel
Richard Michael Kittler
David Marshall Koonce
David Anthony Korzep
Leroy Albert Lamb, Jr.
Harold Alwood Levin
Alan Pomeroy Lewis
John H. Linebarger
Donald James Loosley
Howard Eugene Lovely
Edward Low
Ray James Lunnen, Jr.
Raymond Gregory Lyden
William Carl Martin
Richard Kirkman Mattox
Wayne Otto Mattson
Donald Monroe May
Samuel Lee McClure
Richard Ellsworth McCowan
Robert Hopkins McDaniel, Jr.
Francis Joseph McLaughlin
James Kirby McPherson
Robert Lewis McVey
Raymond Richard Medeiros
Albert Kenneth Millay
Thomas Hamilton Miller
Jimmie Ray Mitchell
David Herman Monnich
Thomas Dewey Moore, Jr.
Richard Ashley Moran
Kenneth Holmes Moses
Michael George Mudzo
James Winbert Anthony Mulholland
Gerald Lupton Nay, Jr.
Harold William Nelson, Jr.
Francis Gregory Neubeck
Marcy Lester Newell
Thomas Edward O'Brien
Patrick Joseph O'Connor
Peter William Odgers
Calvin Eugene Ohme
Robert Michael O'Lear
Harold Clark Pabst, Jr.
Norman Kenyon Palladino
William Eugene Parsons
John Richard Perkins
Carl Brynolf Peterson
Wilbur Dean Peterson
Robert Joseph Ponti
Robert Theodore Poppe
James Francis Powers, Jr.
John Michael Raster
James Stewart Ray
Steve Anthony Recicar
Emil George Riedel, Jr.
Robert Harvey Ringer
Donald Louis Rissi
James Julian Roche
Allen Higgins Rodes
Donald Frank Rohr
Morton Jay Rubenstein
Arthur Jensen Ruberg
John Charles Ruth
Edward Francis St. George, Jr.
David Upton Schade
Harold Charles Schlicht
Earnest Hugh Seborg
Charles Hilarian Senn
Henry Muir Serex
Wayne Kimball Shanahan
Tad Eugene Sizemore
Irvin Matthew Small
Richard Sherwood Smith
John Franklin Snyder
Wilson Harvey Spangler, Jr.
Thomas Lester State
Eldon Dwight Steele
Jerry Doyle Stephens
James Histaspias Stewart
Alvin Briggs Storey II
Edward Clayton Straub
Theodore Robert Strickland
Robert Bradley Stuart
John Ripley Sullivan
Clarence Sandor Summers, Jr.
James Laurence Thompson, Jr.
William Joseph Todd
David Leon Trapp
Paul Michael Ulshafer
Ernst Volgenau
Walter Elisha Ware, Jr.
William Warford Welch
James Francis Wiesner
Fred Anthony Wilhelm
Arthur Peter Winfrey III
Albert Cornelius Winters, Jr.
Sidney Joseph Woodcock
John Watterson Wynne
William Richard Young
Donald Louis Zuckerman

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Howard V. Bangsberg, AO2223061.
David V. Bannerman, AO2236053.
Donald H. Bridgman, AO2222878.
James L. Brown, AO1858981.
David R. Cruz, AO2223254.
Edward R. Cummins, AO2219476.
Henry F. Ebertshauser, Jr., AO2223080.
James P. Farrell, AO2223211.
Lucian A. Ferguson, AO2223081.
Paul F. Giguere, AO2234095.
Robert D. Haley, AO2222942.
Donald G. Hendricks, AO2217229.
Frank F. E. Hense, Jr., AO2223273.
Joseph Howley, AO943940.
James R. Huffman, AO2223141.
Alan D. Hutchinson, AO2223499.
William C. Kidd, AO2223145.
John C. Machun, AO2223403.
Lurie J. Morris, AO2223589.
Edwin L. Phillips, AO2219628.
Donald L. Schmidt, AO2222974.
Harlan E. Suits, AO2240219.
Gene F. Williams, AO2230846.

To be second lieutenants

John K. Giles, AO2244649.
Robert E. Guthland, AO2251151.
Charles O. Hopingardner, AO3005382.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 19, 1960.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 2, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years.

John T. Williams, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, at the noon hour of this new day, we are turning our thoughts toward Thee in thanksgiving, for Thou art daily blessing us so abundantly.

We humbly confess that we are frequently baffled and perplexed and even frightened when we think of the tremendous amount of physical power and energy which now belongs to our modern world.

Grant that the spirit of man may not become haughty and reckless and supercilious but may it be endowed with adequate moral and spiritual controls.

Wilt Thou give unto man more of the spirit of self-discipline and self-mastery, helping him to keep in subjection all thoughts which have in them any feelings of revenge and any implications and intentions of evil toward others.

Show us how we may direct and channel all these God-given powers and energies toward the great beneficent goals and purposes and for the welfare of humanity and the glory of Thy great and holy name.

Hear us for the sake of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SALK POLIO VACCINE: WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the whole country is concerned by the situation which has developed with regard to the Salk polio vaccine. That situation might be improved if we understood better who is responsible for what in this matter.

The job of the Public Health Service with regard to the Salk vaccine—its only responsibility, the only thing it is fitted to do by training and experience—is to make sure that every batch of Salk vaccine which is sent out is pure and safe and potent. The final decision on whether each batch of vaccine is safe has to be made by one man, Surgeon General Scheele. It is a decision which, for our children's sake, should be made by a man who is allowed to concentrate on the job he knows without being harassed day and night by the administration, the Congress, and others to answer questions which have nothing to do with the Public Health Service.

If we are concerned, and we all are, about the problem of black marketing, of how to assure that those children who need the vaccine most will get it first, of misuse or maldistribution of the vaccine, let us ask the right people about them. Let us ask Secretary Hobby to come up with the answers to those questions. Let us get the advice of those experts in Commerce, Treasury, and the Food and Drug Administration who have vast knowledge and experience of distribution and distribution controls, but for our children's sake let us let the Surgeon General do his vital job without being subjected to constant heckling about matters beyond his competence. Let us insist that the others of our Government who have a responsibility stop ducking out and start doing their jobs.

Why is it, for example, that after more than 2 years when no one was permitted to speak for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare except Madam Secretary Hobby, now when there is a really tough problem the Surgeon General is shoved out in front and Madam Secretary disappears into the background?

Why is it that the one person in Government who actually directs a program through which 4 million children a year receive immunizations—smallpox, diphtheria, and so forth—has either not been called on or not permitted to speak on immunization against polio? I refer, of course, to Dr. Martha Eliot, director of the maternal and child health program of the Children's Bureau.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may meet this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RESTORING THE CUT PROPOSED IN THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out to the House that at the proper time I propose to introduce an amendment to the naval appropriation bill for the purpose of restoring the cut in the Marine Corps. I say that now for this reason: The press and the various news media have been stressing the fact that amendments will be introduced for the purpose of restoring the cuts in the Army. That amendment, of course, I shall introduce at the proper time. But nothing has been said of the fact, and many Members of the House have inquired of me concerning whether I propose to introduce an amendment to restore the cut in the Marine Corps.

In view of the fact that the overall expression of strategy by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the administration is to build up the effectiveness of a force in being and an elite corps of striking power, I want to assure the Members that at the proper time I propose to introduce an amendment to restore the cut in the United States Marine Corps.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and insert extraneous material.

CONFUSION IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, about 1 month ago the famous Francis report on the Salk vaccine was announced to this Nation and to the world. It had a Hollywood premier effect on the people of this country. It seemed to give the impression to all the mothers of the children who were to be inoculated with this vaccine that it was 100 percent effective, which is not the fact. The fact is that it will prevent polio up to within 80 percent and 90 percent of those inoculated.

Also, it gave to the public of this country the impression that we had enough of it on hand at that time to inoculate all those who needed it. The confusion that has developed over the manufacture and distribution and the safety of this vaccine by those in control here in Washington is causing great concern throughout the Nation. If the authorities in Washington who have control over this vaccine do not see fit to appear willingly before the appropriate committees of the Congress, it seems to me that those committees should take proper action and see to it that something is done to straighten this mess out, and do it quickly.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "warehouseman", insert "or other dealer."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "also" and insert "regularly engaged."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "warehouseman" and insert "seller."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "warehouseman's" and insert "seller's."

Page 2, line 8, after "goods.", insert "To be entitled to relief under this section a buyer must assert as an affirmative defense and establish by a preponderance of the evidence the facts necessary to entitle him to such relief."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas explain the amendments? I know they are not out of harmony with the original purpose of the bill, but I think we should have a brief explanation.

Mr. POAGE. The first amendment simply adds the words "or other dealer." The bill originally related to warehousemen who are engaged in the business of buying and selling. The Senate added "or other dealer." I cannot see that there is any objection to that.

The last amendment provides simply that there shall be added the words "to be entitled to relief under this section a buyer must assert as an affirmative defense and establish by a preponderance of the evidence the facts necessary to entitle him to such relief."

It has been the position of the House committee that that was already in the bill, and that is substantiated by the opinion of the Department of Agriculture on the Senate amendments, in which the Solicitor says:

> The last sentence is included because a question was raised during the debate. We believe, however, that this adds nothing new to the bill but would simply reaffirm what the bill already requires.

So as I see it, we have merely spelled it out in a little more detail.

Mr. HOPE. The amendments are merely clarifying?

Mr. POAGE. Merely clarifying; yes.

Mr. HOPE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 241 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. One of the basic principles of parliamentary procedure is that general legislation should not be written in an appropriation bill.

House Resolution 241 would grant a rule, waiving points of order against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as the report on this bill indicates the Committee on Appropriations made a very thorough study of the military budget which was submitted to Congress by the President on January 17. Hearings were conducted for about 3 months by the 15-man Department of Defense Subcommittee and 4 weeks of hearings were held by the entire subcommittee on the overall requirements of the Department of Defense. During these hearings the Secretary of Defense, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Commandant of the Marines were heard on this subject.

The Appropriations Committee in H. R. 6042 recommends that $31,488,206,000 be appropriated by the Congress for the expenditures of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956. This amount is $744,609,000 less than was asked for in the budget estimates for 1956. However, it is $2,688,135,514 more than was appropriated in 1955. Evidence shows that the Joint Chiefs of Staff concur with reluctance.

The Committee on Rules waived points or order against the bill to take care of the situation such as arises on page 4 of the bill in the section which is entitled "Reserve Tools and Facilities." This section would permit the purchase of specialized long-lead-time tools for mobilization reserve purposes. Certain language in the appropriation paragraph dealing with transfers between appropriations and clearing such transfers with the Bureau of the Budget would technically be subject to points of order. However, this is a very necessary item in the bill and the provision should not be jeopardized.

Also, it is understood that the amounts in the bill for reserve construction will sometime during fiscal year 1956 exceed monetary authorizations. A bill authorizing additional construction passed the House on April 27, and is now pending in the Senate. Under the rules, any amount in the bill in excess of the remaining available authority would be subject to a point of order. However, it is my understanding that there is no controversy on this matter.

The principal reason for the rule, however, is that there are rescissions in the bill totaling $1,649,000,000 which under the Rules of the House are subject to points of order.

On page 12 of the bill, line 3 reads "the amount available in the Army stock fund is hereby reduced by $700 million, such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act." This represents a rescission in the amount that had been previously made available to the Department.

On page 23, line 2 of the bill, another rescission is made whereby the Navy stock fund is reduced $429 million; the Marine Corps stock fund is reduced $25 million, and the Navy industrial fund is reduced $40 million.

On page 29, line 23 of the bill another rescission is made whereby the amount available in the Air Force stock fund is reduced by $300 million, and on page 30, line 2, the amount available in the Air Force industrial fund is reduced by $155 million.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other sections in this bill which made this waiver of points of order desirable. Most of these sections are administrative in nature and in the interest of greater economy and efficiency. I hope that the House membership will adopt the rule and that the bill itself will receive the serious and careful consideration of this body. We all know that the defense budget is vitally important in safeguarding the United States against all enemies. It is a fact that the great Committee on Appropriations has attempted to give us the program that the country needs. There are undoubtedly differences of opinion as to just what percentages of the total expenditures should be spent on specific items, but despite this understandable situation we all agree on the fundamental principle that the defenses of our country must be maintained at the highest possible level. I hope that the rule will pass and that the debate will then commence on this all-important bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as always, the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] has explained the rule and the provisions of the bill itself. As the gentleman mentioned, we have waived points of order on this bill. The Members, by referring to the report, pages 54 and 55, can see the reason why we have waived points of order. There is considerable legislation on this appropriation bill. The amount of this bill is $31,400,000,000, and we of the Committee on Rules, while we gave an open rule, did not determine the time of debate. That is left to the Committee on Appropriations.

It is my hope that the Committee on Appropriations will agree on at least 4 hours, because so much money is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 227) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the so-called Reserve manpower bill. The rule provides for 4 hours of general debate. It is an open rule with full opportunity for amendments.

With reference to the bill itself, I think there has been a very widespread misapprehension as to what this bill actually is or what it does. It has been confused with the discussions we have had here over the years in regard to universal military training. It is regarded in many quarters as a UMT bill, which it is not at all. I hope when we go into the consideration of this bill the House will understand that, because I know all of you, like myself, have received a great deal of correspondence in opposition to the bill from people who apparently were not advised or who were ill-advised and did not know what the bill contained.

I just wanted to take this opportunity to state to you what the bill does and what it contains. We heard it very fully up in the Rules Committee because of the widespread opposition that many of us had received on the ground that it was a UMT bill.

Here is what this bill does, it provides for a reserve force; it provides for 6 months' training. I think it should be understood from the beginning that there is not one iota of compulsion in this bill on any person who is subject to the draft. Let us understand that clearly.

Here is what it does: A boy who is subject to the draft between the ages of 17 and 19 if he elects, and only if he so elects, may volunteer for the Reserves. If he volunteers he is then obligated to a 6 months' training period. When he completes his 6 months' training period he can go on back to school, he can complete his education, he is relieved from further training except of course in the event of a national emergency, in which case all Reserves would be called. He is relieved from any further training and his only obligation then is to attend certain drills. He can either attend drills in the place that is most convenient for him or he can go to camp for 2 weeks in each year and remain in the Reserves for the remaining 7½ years. He would have been in the Reserves for 6 years if he had taken 2 years' training under the draft law.

It does not change the law as to the length of time the man remains in the Reserves. The only change is that he is given this opportunity to volunteer and take 6 months of training instead of being drafted for 2 years' service.

The advantage of it to the individual is that by taking this voluntary 6 months' training and going into the Reserves he could go into training at the beginning of his vacation, which would be 3 months, and it would mean that he would only lose 3 months out of his college training.

But he does not have to do any of it. Just let it be clearly understood. Instead he would be subject to the draft and subject to service. He does not have to do anything; he does not have to go into the program at all if he does not want to. The only obligation upon him is that if he voluntarily accepts the program then he has to comply with its requirements.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Am I to understand that this bill provides for 6 months' training but that the training period can be broken up 3 months this summer and 3 months later?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, the boy must take 6 months' continuous training. The reason is perfectly obvious. We have got to have this Reserve and we have got to have some trained people in it. We all know about that. I think the committee has done a mighty fine job on this bill because the boy can get through in 6 months of active service instead of 2 years. But to split it up into one period of 90 days this year and another period of 90 days next year is going a little too far; he would not get concerted intensive training during his whole program.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. There is some propaganda going about that this is a form of universal compulsory service. We know, however, that that is a misguided opinion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I stated in the beginning—perhaps the gentleman was not here—that this bill had absolutely no connection whatsoever with universal military training. The boy, if he wishes, goes into this program voluntarily rather than take a chance with the draft.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot conceive any closer step to universal military training. All one would have to do in this bill is to change the word "may" to "shall," and you would have it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish the gentleman, who is a very careful Member of this House and studies legislation very carefully, I wish he would study this bill. I had misapprehensions about it myself in the beginning until I sat down one evening, studied it, read it, and analyzed it. If the gentleman will do that I think he will see my viewpoint.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Can the Pentagon call a man with this 6 months' training any time they get ready, or does there have to be a national emergency?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They cannot call him out if he complies with his contract. Understand, again, he can forget this bill was ever enacted, and they cannot do anything to him about it unless he voluntarily comes in and says, "I want to take the 6 months' training rather than take my chances on the draft." If he does volunteer, then he submits himself to certain obligations. He has to attend drills, or he has to take 2 weeks' training every year.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have received letters from young men who state they could not accept a permanent job for 8 years if they took that course of training.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They are wrong.

Mr. VINSON. To answer the gentleman from South Carolina, after he comes in the Reserves he cannot be called unless the President declares an emergency, or unless the Congress declares an emergency.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Is the Reserve requirement the same for the boy who has voluntarily enlisted for the 6 months as those for the boy who has been drafted for a period of 2 years?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There is no difference in the obligation of the reservist under this bill and under existing law. The boy who voluntarily accepts this program of only 6 months' training must carry out the training provisions of this bill throughout the period of service in the Reserves. He could either attend a drill periodically or he would take 1 month's training during the year.

Mr. VINSON. The obligation to perform Reserve training is identically the same for the 6 months as for the draftee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. After the 6 months' period, the gentleman refers to periodic drill periods of 30 days a year. What are the periodic drill periods—of what duration?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Those drills are 48 drills a year.

Mr. VINSON. I did not understand the question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The question is, What are the drill periods he must take when he goes back into the Reserve after the 6 months' training?

Mr. VINSON. They are required to take 48 drills a year. If he does not take the 48 drills then, he is required to take 2 weeks of training when they are called together in the summertime. If he does not take that, he is required to take a 30-day training. As the gentleman from Virginia stated, there is not a single line of compulsion in this bill, there is no UMT, there is no effort to get the camel's nose under the tent. This is to build up a virile, effective Reserve which ultimately will save the Government money because it costs $5,000 a year to maintain a man in the active force. If he is in the Reserve it will only cost $1,000. The whole purpose will be ultimately to reduce the armed strength.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. The thing that bothers me about this is the man who has already served his 2 years. Today the man who serves his 2 years, though he is still in the Reserve, has no obligation to go to drills or he does not go to drills now, he does not go to summer camp.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He still has the obligation. The obligation is not changed.

Mr. KEAN. But he does not go now.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There are 600,000 who do go. The trouble is some of them do not. This will provide the procedure for the carrying out of the obligation.

Mr. KEAN. This would require a man to attend drills or else go to camp if he has had 2 years?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The obligation is still there. It is not changed one bit.

Mr. KEAN. But today most of them do not.

Mr. VINSON. The cost of those that go today, in the very next bill that is coming up, is over $700 million. That is how much the present program is costing. They do go; they do participate, and they will participate in the future under this bill just like they are doing today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I can ask the gentleman from Georgia a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is the Military Establishment now saying that they can train a combat-ready soldier in 6 months?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, he never gets trained as perfectly as they would like to have him, but nevertheless 6 months is far better than no training at all.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, why 2 years under Selective Service?

Mr. VINSON. Because he is on active duty. It is active duty.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but we have been told in the past that it requires 2 years to train a combat-ready soldier.

Mr. VINSON. Well, we have never told that that I know of. Two years is active service. I am very much impressed with what the gentleman from Virginia said to the learned gentleman from Iowa, for there is no more diligent Member of the House than the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. But I trust that between now and the time we will call up this bill you will examine every phase of this bill, examine the report, and I am satisfied you will reach the same conclusion that the gentleman from Virginia did when we first submitted the bill to him. There were some reservations in the minds of a great many Members, but after you analyze it and see what we are trying to do, I am satisfied that your conscience will tell you that that is the proper procedure.

Mr. GROSS. On the contrary, I am satisfied that my conscience will not be changed a bit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia has explained the rule, but, if I may, I want to make a few observations in regard to the training bill itself. First of all, I want to congratulate the Democratic leadership in not rushing this measure through the House. I might say here that I think the rule will be adopted today. It is my understanding that this bill itself will not come up until next Tuesday. That will give the membership the opportunity of studying the hearings. Extensive hearings were had before the Committee on Armed Services.

Now, as one who has always opposed universal military training, I am frank to confess that this bill has many complications and that it has many features which still bother me. But, nevertheless, when the President of the United States comes out for it, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff and all the high military favor it, when my good friends on the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman, Mr. VINSON, and I believe the great majority of that committee favor it, that has been the chief reason why I am endorsing this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that the ranking minority member of the committee is in favor of this bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is my best judgment that he will support this bill, but that is for him to say.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Like my colleague from Illinois, I, too, in the past, over many, many years, have violently opposed the enactment of any universal military or compulsory military training bill, so-called. But, in this bill, after lengthy hearings before our committee and time spent and the action of the subcommittee, I am convinced in my own mind that we are on the right track to see if we cannot get an effective reserve without compulsory training in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I get the gentleman's remarks, he thinks that the military will not later on use this as a foundation to give us UMT.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that that has entered my mind, and I hope that that is not true, although I have thought about it the same as the gentleman. I hope that this is not a forerunner for universal military training.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In reaching that conclusion, has the gentleman in mind our experience with the military unification bill that we passed in 1947–48, requiring the armed services to unify their efforts in purchasing matters of that kind; on which we are now holding hearings in the room of the Committee on Ways and Means? It has beeen demonstrated that they have paid no attention whatsoever to the legislation passed by Congress. Has the gentleman kept that in mind?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am aware of that, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan.

In addition to that, the reason I am for this measure is that this is strictly on a volunteer basis, whereas, UMT had a compulsory feature. Under existing law, as we know, they can draft our young men, if they wish to use the provisions of the existing law. But this is strictly a volunteer measure.

In addition to that, I would say this is a compromise. It is a compromise we might say in the military themselves, because they feel that a UMT law could not be enacted. So they have come to Congress with a compromise.

I was hoping, after we had passed the incentive-military-pay-raise bill that that would be sufficient to persuade them to remain in the service by reenlisting. I remember the words spoken by my good friend from Georgia in regard to that. I was hoping we would have additional

reenlistments and additional volunteers. Perhaps there has not been sufficient time.

I am not unmindful of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is not going to be the aggressor in any way. If someone does commit an act of aggression against our country, I feel that our chief salvation rests in immediate retaliation.

Also I am aware that should some 6 or 8 men in the Kremlin decide to commit an act of aggression against this country, that many big bombers would get through and cause devastation to many of our cities. As most of the Members know, our fighter planes cannot go up into the air as much as 35,000 or 40,000 feet to bring down these bombers. They cannot fly that high. It means that some of these bombers are going to get through.

What does that mean? It means that a city like Chicago, for instance, might find itself with 300,000 or 400,000 people injured or killed. They might find their hospitals completely destroyed. There would be no law and order. The local protective agencies, the police, could not take care of the situation. Hundreds of thousands of people would be rushing out of the city to get into the country. What I have in mind is that when such a catastrophe occurs, these young men, who would not be trained sufficiently in modern war tactics to be able to be used for purposes of retaliation, could be used within the reserve, to go into such cities or such areas and stop the plundering and the looting and so forth. I think that is one of the purposes, one of the main purposes of having such a reserve; not to send the boys over there for purposes of retaliation, under conditions of modern warfare, because they would not be trained for that, but to send them into these areas which would be in partial ruin as a result of, perhaps, an atomic-bomb attack.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me what foreign countries levy upon their manpower for 7½ years in the Reserves?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I cannot answer that question. I am frank to confess I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me whether in his opinion this legislation will discriminate against the National Guard? What effect will it have upon the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The National Guard representatives sat through all the hearings and were satisfied with it when the hearings were over. If it discriminates against them, they certainly do not believe it.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman say the National Guard will find very much potential manpower available to it if the men go in for 6 months under this proposal and discharge their obligation then by going into the Reserves?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The National Guard will actually get 50 percent of the first increment of 100,000 men trained under the 6-months program. They will get one-half of the first 100,000.

Mr. GROSS. On what basis?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. On the basis of dividing. Actually, on the basis of 100,000, there will be 99,000 trained for the Army, and half of the 99,000 will be given to the National Guard and the other half to the Army Reserves. One thousand will be given to the Marine Corps.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by "given to the National Guard"?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They will be assigned to it.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is not voluntary?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They can enlist in the Guard and take the 6 months' training and go right back in the Guard.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman said this was a voluntary proposition.

The gentleman from Illinois and I both have agricultural districts. Does not the gentleman think this discriminates against the youths on the farm. If they live 30 or 40 miles from a Reserve training center where they must go once a week? Does not the gentleman think that would discriminate against the youths on the farms?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say that would enter into it. If they live 40 miles from a training center it would be more difficult for them to take the training than for someone living near the training center.

Mr. GROSS. Who is going to bear the expense of traveling the 80 miles round trip?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say the gentleman has a good point there.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to call attention to one point in the bill. If there is not a drill place in convenient proximity to the reservist, provision is made for him to take a certain amount of correspondence courses, and there are other means by which that inconvenience is alleviated.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], in the first place, please remember that that farm boy does not have to take the 6 months' training. If he wants to take his chances with the draft, and the ratio they are now being drafted is 1 out of 9, if he is qualified mentally and physically he can just take his chances with the draft and stay away from that 6 months' business.

Mr. GROSS. There could not be more 100 percent discrimination than that, could there?

Mr. ARENDS. He can just take the draft, that is all. We have the draft law. He can just take that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did the Rules Committee ask anything about the draft? Does this do away for the next couple of years with the draft law we passed?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Did the gentleman say, Did the Rules Committee consider doing away with the draft law?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did that matter come up before the committee?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not think so.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. May I answer the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The purpose of the draft is to maintain a standing army. There is no intention of doing away with the draft.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is true. The 6 months is merely a training period. The draft provides for training and service. The draft is largely service.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Assuming without conceding that there is no compulsion in this measure, is the gentleman convinced that this will not be an opening wedge to compulsion, to universal military training?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I hope not, but I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. A great deal has been made of the choice the reservists will be given on this. As a matter of fact, they are only given a choice between the Army and the Army. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. So that he cannot serve in any other branch of the service.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. This adds an additional choice. This gives him a choice, where the other way he has no choice.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, he still has very little choice as to going into the Army. This way he is tied up here for 7 years.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The other way he has no choice. Under existing law, he has a choice, whether he wants to go in under existing law or for 6 months and then go in the Reserves. This gives him a choice which the other did not give him.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Why is it the Navy and the Air Force have no use, if I understand correctly, for this Reserve proposition?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In regard to that, may I say I have heard the same thing that the gentlewoman mentions, but I have no definite statement from the Air Force or the Navy saying that they were opposed to this measure.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the gentlewoman kindly repeat her question? I believe I may be able to enlighten her.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The question I asked was, Why was the Air Force and the Navy, as I understand it, opposed

or certainly uninterested in this Reserve plan?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I might say to the gentlewoman from New York the Air Force and the Navy were not opposed to this plan. They do not contemplate using it at the present time, but they were in favor of having it in the law so, in the event it became necessary, they could use it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. They do believe that they could use it, in other words?

Mr. DEVEREUX. There is a possibility in the future they might have to use it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I might say further in that connection, to the gentlewoman who just made the inquiry, that there is a provision in the bill to recognize the program of the Air Force for long-term enlistments, which the Navy requires also. They are vitally concerned that that long-term voluntary enlistment be authorized under the law. They are in favor of this bill.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is still a different proposition from what they would be getting under the reserve bill.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. We have just extended the Selective Service Act for a period of 3 or 4 years. Does this have a termination date and will its status be different should the Selective Service Act not be extended after that period of time?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is terminable. It ends in 4 years. That is a very important question and a very important thing to know—that this terminates at the end of 4 years.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. Is there a limitation to the number of young men who may join the Reserves?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The figure is 250,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is 250,000 in 1 year.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is 250,000 per year. There is a floor of 100,000 and a ceiling of 250,000.

Mr. McVEY. How do they determine which young men will be accepted?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. This is strictly on a volunteer basis.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is on a first come, first served basis.

Mr. McVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, you have always been against universal military training.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And so has our whip, the very distinguished gentleman from your State. Now what influence, if any, does the fact that we have a Republican President have to do with the change of mind?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Under the other——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If any, I said—if any.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. During the time when I was chairman of the Committee on Rules, I think I had considerable to do with holding up universal military training. I held that bill up in the Committee on Rules because it was strictly compulsory. This is on a voluntary basis. They could force anyone in under the original UMT Act. Under this, they have the right and the choice to go in. Under existing law, they do not have a choice. This is a strictly volunteer proposition and it would put them under no compulsion. This is volunteer and they have a choice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the fact that we could not compel or induce the military to go along with us on the expenditure of dollars, what reason have you to believe they will go along with us on the drafting of young men?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say that I have confidence in them. I think most of us must rely on their judgment. It is easy to sit back and just say, "No, no, I am against—." But maybe it would be well for some of us to bring forth their plan of security. Maybe it would be well for someone here during the debate, who is opposed to this, to bring their plan forward and say how they would plan for the security of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would give you my plan and say that we should get out of some of these foreign entanglements.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I must yield to the other gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order. We ought to have a quorum. I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I withhold it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] emphatically that I am opposed to compulsory military training, yesterday, today, and tomorrow. I would be, even if the Speaker or the gentleman from Michigan were President. But I do not call this bill universal military training. I have told my boys, "Go ahead and take your chance with the draft, or if you prefer, go in for 6 or 7 months. That is your business."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you say that this legislation will stay this way; that it will not be amended?

Mr. ARENDS. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course not.

Mr. ARENDS. They may be asking, but I will still be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A little bit more; relax and enjoy it. That is the attitude.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think probably this is a good time for me to yield the floor.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Aspinall	Dondero	Norblad
Avery	Durham	Preston
Barrett	Eberharter	Prouty
Bass, N. H.	Fallon	Reed, Ill.
Baumhart	Gamble	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher, Okla.	Green, Oreg.	Riehlman
Boland, Mass.	Herlong	Simpson, Pa.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Heselton	Smith, Miss.
	Holifield	Steed
Buckley	Jackson	Vursell
Canfield	King, Calif.	Walter
Celler	McDowell	Westland
Chatham	Mollohan	Wolverton
Coudert	Morano	Young
Dingell	Nelson	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 166, noes 12.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that there is no question which has disturbed me more than the one which we will take up next Tuesday. I have to fly out to Missouri, but I will be back Monday. No one can tell you I am for this bill, or what my position is. I will be here next Tuesday and make my position unmistakably clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some arrangement as to the time with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and I suggest, if I may, that we agree to equally divide the time and proceed for the time being, and I ask unanimous consent that it be so ordered.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6042, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, following the tumult of yesterday, we come to this present quiet moment for the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the forthcoming fiscal year.

Just prior to the quorum call there was considerable discussion, which was not without some heat, on whether or not the manpower bill which is scheduled for consideration next week, was actually compulsory or voluntary. We will make that determination next week. The pending appropriation bill for $31,488,000,000 is strictly compulsory. It is strictly not voluntary. We are going to have to pay that bill. The money will be eventually withdrawn from the Treasury. There are no voluntary aspects.

So today we come to that day of the year when we consider that gigantic request—and I use that word advisedly—for the Department of Defense, for defense spending. This is the day and this is the bill, H. R. 6042. Generally it provides for a military establishment of considerably in excess of 1 million civilians. It provides for military manpower, men and women in uniform, of something slightly less than 3 million men and women for the forthcoming fiscal year. It provides for a reduction in military manpower from last December 30 to June 30, 1956, of about 300,000 men.

If I might utter a personal word, I began working on these military bills 15 years ago, serving on one of the subcommittees on military appropriations. At that time we had two. Since then we have effected unification, and we consider the whole military budget in one bill.

Frankly, $31,488,000,000 is somewhat incomprehensible, as everyone knows.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. In the last Congress we voted about $28.8 billion did we not?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The bill this year increases the amount by $2,688,000,000. We are going upward in appropriations this year as compared with last year.

Mr. SHORT. We have upped it. You have got how much unexpended balance?

Mr. MAHON. If we pass this bill, we will have available to the Department of Defense on July 1, 1955, approximately $74 billion.

Mr. SHORT. $74 billion, and that is more than any wise man could spend in any session of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. It is more than could be spent without some waste and mismanagement, but the spending program of the Department of Defense is about $34 billion or $35 billion for the forthcoming fiscal year; that is the estimate.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the splendid statement the gentleman from Texas is making, because he always knows what he is talking about, but I think the Members of the House should keep in mind that we are trying to avoid the mountains and the valleys, the feasts and the famines, and level off at about 2,850,000—a little under 3 million in all our armed services and an annual expenditure of $35 billion, which is wise management.

Mr. MAHON. That is an estimate of the Department of Defense.

I am complimented that the gentleman from Missouri, my good friend, the able senior member of the House Armed Services Committee on the minority side, would attest to my knowledge of this bill. The truth is the military budget is so big the President does not fully comprehend it, the Secretary of Defense does not fully comprehend it, the members of the committee do not fully comprehend it, the staff while possessing many good qualities does not have all the facts in so vast a program at their fingertips. Here are 5,000 pages of hearings which contain many significant facts about our Armed Forces.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is the amount recommended by the committee in excess of the request made by the Defense Department?

Mr. MAHON. The amount recommended by the committee is approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars below the President's budget, but some of those reductions do not actually represent savings; some of them represent mere bookkeeping. However, I refer the gentleman to the report for that information.

Now I should like to look at the overall picture and speak without interruptions for a few moments, if I may.

These tremendous requests that come to us have come to us for a reason, and the stamp of approval of the Appropriations Committee, the 50 members of the committee and the 15 members of the subcommittee, has not been lightly given, as these hearings will attest.

The Soviets have the capability of launching a series of attacks upon the United States which would destroy much property and take the lives of millions of our citizens. The threat to our security is not static; it is a growing threat. Since World War II the Soviets have produced the B–29 type bomber, our World War II model, the B–47 type medium jet bomber, and more recently the B–52 type heavy intercontinental type jet bomber. The medium- and heavy-type jet bombers were flown over Moscow on May Day a year ago. The Soviets do not have these jet bomber types in quantity or in quantity production. The long-range air fleet of the Reds is at the moment by no means comparable to our own from the standpoint of quantity and perfection. However, the fact that there is in existence such a capability which is growing with every passing month and which could be aimed at the United States gives us ample cause to be on the alert and keep up our guard. The Red air force continues to grow in ways that pose a threat to the United States. The atomic bomb in their possession came much more quickly than we had expected. We are flatly told by Defense officials who ought to know the facts that the Soviets are now working on an intercontinental ballistic missile. The intercontinental ballistic missile is such a frequent subject of conversation among our defense people it has been tagged the ICBM. These four little letters are about the most ominous ones on the military horizon at the moment. During the next few years we are going to hear more about them.

The Chief of the Air Force had this to say:

> A development highlight is the Communist guided-missile program. It should be no surprise to us that they are putting vast resources into missiles.

We are putting a billion dollars in guided-missile procurement in this bill.

> We know they have many topnotch German scientists. Many of these men were outstanding missile experts and had long experience in the Nazi missile program.
>
> We know they are at work on an intercontinental ballistic missile commonly called the ICBM, and having sufficient range to destroy targets in the United States.
>
> Ballistic missiles with intercontinental ranges present a defense problem more difficult than any other faced in the history.

They will fly at speeds above 10,000 miles an hour. The ICBM can be launched from widely dispersed, isolated, well-hidden firing sites. These would be difficult to find and destroy.

We had a little experience with them in World War II.

The most effective counter to this development is a long-range missile of our own. Let me assure you that we are placing a very high priority on this project.

The country which makes the first significant breakthrough in this field, and there are a number of difficulties before this will become a reality—it is going to be a matter of years—but the country that has in its possession a stockpile of intercontinental ballistic missiles is going to be in a vastly better position than the country that does not have the weapon.

As I say, I do not mean to indicate that this missile is already in the stockpile of this country or of any other country. It is like a lot of other missiles that have not been thoroughly and completely perfected. We are spending a quarter of a billion dollars on further research in missiles. If the big war eventually comes but does not come in the next few years, the missile will have a tremendous part in the contest.

There is nothing especially new or spectacular in the defense program unless the increased emphasis on the ICBM and guided missiles should be so considered.

We are all worried about the situation; but we are not frightened or alarmed and we are not panicky. We have the worry of some degree of insecurity and we have the staggering burden of heavy defense spending. It makes sense to try to put the picture in proper focus. In a military way we are growing vastly stronger. Soviet Russia is vastly improving her striking power. It can be argued that time is or is not on our side in this weapons race. I do not know whom time serves but he who runs can read the cost figures of our military program because they loom very large indeed. Moreover nobody has suggested that there is a likelihood of a reduction within the next few years. On the contrary, there have been many suggestions of increased costs. Indeed the military bill before us today is $2½ billion above what the bill was last year.

I think the picture as viewed from many angles is pretty bad. The President must think so. He has reemphasized the futility of war as a means of settling international problems and has indicated that he may participate in a high level conference. For the present there seems to be no choice other than to continue to build bigger and more deadly weapons. But I doubt if this sort of thing can go on forever, even though the Secretary of Defense has said that we had now reached a leveling off period in our defense program and must continue defense preparations for the indefinite future at approximately the present high rate.

There are some of us in the Congress who listen for months each year to our military officials justify or attempt to justify our defense program. I have an increasing respect for these people. They are not in favor of war; they believe in peace; they have no aggressive designs against any nations; they are not trying to lead this country into war. To them the object of our defense program is to deter aggression and promote peace. It is a wholesome situation in that respect. Of course, our object is to be strong enough to take care of ourselves and achieve ultimate victory if our peace efforts fail and war comes.

Preparedness is a matter of degree. There is no absolute security to be found anywhere. The military budget presented to us in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations is about as good as could be expected at this time. Admiral Radford, Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, emphasized his opinion that the program as outlined in the President's budget is reasonably adequate. He stated unequivocally that the program had his unqualified endorsement and support.

No one can safely make any guaranties to the American people in military matters, but the following statement made to the committee by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs on April 19, seems to represent the prevailing view in the Pentagon—page 792, Department of Defense hearings:

Admiral RADFORD. * * *. We have today the strongest military forces we have ever maintained in peacetime, and from a purely military standpoint I feel that we are ready to take care of those foreseeable actions which might come short of a general emergency, and we are very well prepared to take care of the initial stages of a general emergency.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to rubber stamp the Defense Department or assume the role of yes man. I do not approve of all the elements in the present program, and I think in some areas there is much room for criticism.

Here is as good a place as any to point out a colossal failure of the Department of Defense is in the field of procurement. A little waste and mismanagement around the fringes is bad, but mismanagement in the field of procurement when most of our defense dollars are spent is in the area where losses to the taxpayer are greatest. During the past several years 50 percent or more of the defense dollar has gone into the procurement of military goods, airplanes, electronics items—the products of industry generally.

Now you cannot save money on pay of the men in uniform. The fact is we have recently passed a pay-raise bill. You can save some money in the field of maintenance and operations, food and clothing and such items, but if you are going to save big money in the military program you have got to save it in the field of procurement because that is where the big money goes. The Department over the protest of men like General Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army, and General Shepherd, Commandant of the Marine Corps, is attempting to save some money by cutting military manpower. That misses the point.

A real, two-fisted campaign to save money by getting better bargains from industry in defense buying has not been launched. It is long overdue. If we are going to have to carry on indefinitely a gigantic program of military procurement we have got to do a better program of getting a dollar in value for every dollar spent. Loose procurement practices were bad during the Korean war, but we were in the midst of a crash program, a global war was threatening, and some mismanagement was understandable, but not desirable, and the same situation existed during World War II. But we are now far removed from the crash aspects of the defense buildup, and there is no adequate excuse for bad bargaining with industry—big or little industry.

The profits of industry engaged in defense business have been soaring as though they were jet propelled. They have in some instances reached supersonic speeds. The taxpayer is being taken for a merry ride. The Secretary of Defense is a genius in the field of business and management, but if he has knocked any heads together in industry in an effort to get defense costs down to reasonable levels through better contracting I have not heard about it. He of all people is best equipped to do this job, but he has not done it. In fact he goes to great pains to point out that he has nothing directly to do with defense contracts.

Let us take a look at the record.

From the standpoint of money value, only 15 percent of defense contracts are let on a competitive basis. Putting it another way, in money value 85 percent of defense contracts are let on a negotiated basis—some type of cost-plus basis. There is the rub. There is the problem that has not been solved. That is where the taxpayer is losing his shirt, and industry is reaping an unreasonably high enrichment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly.

Mr. GROSS. Is the common catalog in use?

Mr. MAHON. We continue to move toward better identification, cataloging, and inventorying of our items of defense.

Mr. GROSS. But in the matter of procurement, is unification actually working?

Mr. MAHON. It is working to some degree. Of course, it is not working perfectly. But I think it is better to proceed as we are in an effort to achieve unification than to go back to the old system which undoubtedly was much more wasteful than the present system.

Mr. GROSS. Then the common catalog is not in common use?

Mr. MAHON. Not fully; no.

I quote the following from a recent issue of a major magazine:

Stock prices, overall, are nearly 2½ times the level of June 1949, and 60 percent above September 1953. The $1,000 of an investor in 1949 is $2,460 now on a paper-value basis, using SEC averages.

Now these overall values have to do with industry, generally, not specifically to industries involved in the defense program. Of course, we want a healthy

condition in industry. Now I resume the quotation as follows:

There have been rather spectacular gains in some industries.

To give you an idea of what's already happened: In aircraft, the $100 invested in 1949 now is $612 on an average of paper value.

If you are looking for justification for the indictment which I make in the field of procurement, you get some of it right there.

In the three years from July, 1950 to July, 1953 the Department of Defense entered into contracts with industry in the sum of approximately $100 billion.

This was taken from a report formerly issued by the Department listing the value of contracts granted to the 100 biggest companies. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense discontinued that practice in June of 1953 and we do not get those figures now. It would be interesting to see what has happened since that time, but admittedly defense contracts are giving industry and the country generally, a terrific shot in the arm and at the taxpayers' expense.

If a man takes his money and goes out and takes a gamble and loses or wins, that is one thing, but in these negotiated defense contracts it is another thing. The risk is in effect removed by negotiation.

Some industries such as the aircraft industry are almost 100 percent dependent upon this procurement by the military for their very existence. Consequently, the profits are agreed to and underwritten or guaranteed in effect by the Government. Other major industries may make only 20 or 25 percent of their sales to the Government. Nevertheless, it is obvious that procurement for military purposes is a major factor in the support of big and little business. It is also quite obvious that doing business with the Government becomes a means of guaranteeing a good profit. Some examples will serve to demonstrate what a good thing, from a strictly business management standpoint, it is to be doing business with Uncle Sam.

Take a certain airplane company that does about 100 percent of its business with the Government. This company had sales of about $1 billion in 1954, and made a profit, a guaranteed profit that is, of about 3.7 percent on those sales. This profit was about 45 percent of reported net worth. The 1954 sales of this firm were 227 percent greater than they were in 1950 and over 7,000 percent greater than they were in 1946. Net profits after taxes were 242 percent greater in 1954 than in 1950. Net worth increased only 79 percent from 1950 to 1954 and only 200 percent from 1946 to 1954.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, stock prices per share for this company increased from a high of $14 in 1950 to about $81 in 1954 or by about 478 percent. More recently the stocks went even higher but have since settled back to around $70 per share. Earnings per share of stock were $8.38 in 1954 compared with $3.34 in 1950 and a net loss in 1946. This company has an existing backlog of over $2 billion, and good prospects for more.

Another airplane company doing between 80 and 90 percent of its business with the Government also had sales in 1954 of nearly $1 billion and made a—guaranteed, mind you—profit of 3.9 percent on those sales. This profit was about 37 percent of net worth compared with less than 10 percent in 1950 and 4 percent in 1946. From 1950 to 1954 sales increased about 604 percent, net profit increased about 403 percent and net worth only about 33 percent. The price of stocks, however, followed sales and profits rather than net worth and increased from a high in 1950 of $24 to a high in 1954 of $141 or 487 percent. Earnings per share on stocks were $14.70 in 1954, $3.01 in 1950, and 91 cents in 1946.

Leaving the airplane industry and taking as an example, a company that deals in electronics, airplane engines, and similar items, and whose sales are reported to be about 25 percent to the Government, we find here also that business is very profitable. Sales of this company were almost one and three-fourths billion in 1954. Net profit was not quite as good in 1954 as it was in 1950, but it was 5.2 percent which was still better than in the airplane companies given before. However, percent of profit to net worth was not as good as in the airplane companies, being reported as 11.8 percent in 1954, 17.6 percent in 1950, and 3 percent in 1946. The reason for this is that this company owns more of the production facilities being used than is the case with airplane companies.

From 1950 to 1954, sales of the company increased 60 percent, net profits increased 8.6 percent, and net worth increased 62 percent. From 1946 to 1954, sales increased 338 percent, net profits 860 percent, and net worth 146 percent.

Stock prices over this period of time went from a high of $39 per share in 1946, to $36 per share in 1950, and $80 per share in 1954. This was an increase of 122 percent over 1950, and 105 percent over 1946. Earnings per share on this stock went from $0.51 in 1946 to $5.36 in 1950, and $5.06 in 1954.

There are numerous examples of this type with variations in profits and net worth that could be used just as effectively to demonstrate that doing business with Uncle Sam is a very good thing. This is not the time to recite voluminous details. However, before leaving this subject I do want to mention one other company that appears to be doing well, if statistics mean anything. This company does a large part of its business with the Government in several fields and seems to be growing rapidly.

Recently this company had a stock split, issuing two for one. Consequently prices have had to be adjusted to reflect the effect of that split. This stock hit a recent high of $80 per share which was an increase of over 416 percent from the low in 1953 and 242 over the high for 1953.

It is not my purpose to make these companies look bad. We want to see big and little business do well. The point is some of them who have Government contracts are doing too well and at the taxpayer's expense. The high priced talents of big business are getting the advantage when they sit down at the table with Government representatives. A few timid civilians and harrassed lieutenant colonels are not equal to the task of meeting big business on even terms. We need heavier artillery on the Government side, and we have not had it.

Here is a significant fact which highlights the weakness of the defense contracts system. By reason of bad contracting, by and large, the Government under the Renegotiations Act, recovered from World War II contractors the colossal sum of $10 billion.

Profits should not be related to sales when the goods being sold are produced in facilities and with tools owned by the purchaser, the taxpayer. Why should the taxpayer pay a profit of say 3.5 percent on sales of $1 billion as he had been doing on sales of a much lesser amount when the company making the profit has not made material additions to its investment to make possible the $1 billion rate of production but has rather just undertaken to manage Government-owned production facilities.

If you do not think these firms doing business with Uncle Sam have a very good thing, with profits guaranteed, take a look at the prices being paid various companies for the same identical items. For example, on similar fixed-price contracts we find one company producing a certain fire-control system at a unit price of $37,000 and another company producing the same thing at a unit price of $40,972. Another similar example is a radar set costing $12,297 from one company and $10,422 from another. Yet all are making a good profit on sales to the Government for these items. There are hundreds of similar examples. In fact to find a similar price is the unusual thing.

I want to say that on this issue of better bargains in defense buying the gloves are off. We are determined to get more in value for the defense dollar expended. In the interest of the taxpayer some way must be found to break through the barrier. We have broken the sound barrier successfully, but we have not broken the iron curtain of excessively high profits on defense contracts.

The Committee on Appropriations has launched a new investigation of the defense contracts problem. We hope our efforts will be productive.

In complaining about deficiencies in the field of defense contracts I do not want to leave the impression that the Department of Defense has made no progress in effecting needed economies in many areas. The hearings are replete with examples of economies. One of the most notable economies is represented by the so-called new policy in aircraft procurement known as the program of "Fly before you buy."

I want to make it clear that we have some very able people in the Department of Defense. They are achieving considerable success in many fields. I do not want to shake the confidence of

the Congress or the country in our civilian or military leaders. I have great respect for them. I do not mean to be stepping on anybody's toes. I am just trying to make a contribution toward needed savings in Government contracts with industry for defense items.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has been my understanding that over a period of years we have had special expert staffs assisting in the Appropriations Committee. These staffs, I suppose, are still being maintained to see whether or not the intent of the committee or Congress is carried out with reference to these contracts.

Mr. MAHON. We do have staffs working but nobody can run the legislative branch of government but the legislative people, and nobody can run the executive branch of government but the executives. We can put all the prohibitions in legislative enactments that we want and make arguments, but do not think we can get real efficiency without the aid of the men running the thing whether it be in Congress or in the Pentagon.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I believe my distinguished chairman has made one of the most significant and important statements I have ever heard him make, and I have heard him make many that I think are important and significant. I trust, however, that my distinguished friend has not implied to the House that by placing stars on the shoulders of those lieutenant colonels he will in that way give them enough authority to handle their own at the conference table negotiations on prices.

Mr. MAHON. I think when we try to put stars on the shoulders of the military or additional stars in the flag of our country, as we did yesterday, we must be careful how we proceed. The top men in the Defense Department should participate more actively in the areas where the money is being spent. One such official participation in a contract running into hundreds of millions of dollars is worth a lot more to the people of this Nation than three speeches made on Armed Services Day or at some hearing. That is where the energies and the genius of these men are needed most.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I wish, of course, to agree with the complimentary remarks made by the gentleman from Florida with reference to my chairman's principal address. As he knows, I go along with him on everything he says until we get to the manpower bill. We will come to that later. Just now I want to mention that the gentleman from Texas told us the size of this budget and that it would be on a plateau of this size for years to come.

I have in my hand here a news item from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Friday, May 6, this year, in which Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson indicated that future annual defense appropriations may have to be $3½ billion more than the amount Congress is expected to provide for the year starting July 1. So that even confirms the gentleman and what we are looking at today and what the Defense Secretary who brought up this subject looks for in the immediate future.

Mr. MAHON. I will say that if the stocks of companies doing business with the Government continue to skyrocket in the next few years as they have in the last few years it may take more than an additional $3 billion. If we can cut this down to the right basis we can bring defense costs down some. Now I would like to take a few minutes to hit several of the highlights of this bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Texas realize that at least $2 billion of that figure which was mentioned will fall into one appropriation item for the Department of the Army, namely procurement and production. For the last 2 years the Army has been living off of previously appropriated funds which were made available during the Korean war. For the first time in 2 years, in fiscal 1957, there will need to be new money for procurement and production in the Army.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to join with other colleagues of this subcommittee in commending the gentleman for the very forthright and forceful statement he has made and the pinpointing that has been made of some of the places where apparently there has been lots of money spent, perhaps without getting a dollar's worth in return. I am highly pleased that an investigation of procurement policies and practices as requested by our subcommittee is to be made. I believe in the value of such investigations. Later, in my own time I will cover the basis for our request. At this point I would like to bring out that one of the greatest weaknesses that developed in our hearings was not only along the line that the gentleman has told us but it was quite apparent that a number of the witnesses from the military, fine military people who were before our subcommittee to justify these requests for appropriations, were wholly lacking of any knowledge of the monetary aspects of these contracts. Much of the information which the gentleman has used had to be supplied later, you might say, of the chairman of the subcommitee and the subcommittee itself. In my experience in the Congress I have never seen as many witnesses who were justifying millions of dollars of expenditures who had less knowledge of the bases on which the money was requested than was presented in these hearings. Now let me say these same witnesses are fine people and wonderful fighting men.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Mississippi took a very active, aggressive, and effective part in the hearings in trying to get down to rockbottom on this highly important matter and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Following up what the gentleman from Michigan has said about the $3 billion, he mentioned $2 billion in one Army item. I think there is about three-quarters of a billion dollars in a Navy item. So that actually the plateau is there and to keep the plateau at the same price we would have to pay $3 billion a year more.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. If given adequate backing with personnel and money, does not the gentleman think that the command-management school recently set up at Fort Belvoir can do in peace and war, by the efficient use of the defense dollar, what hitherto staff and command schools have done for this country in combat?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman makes a very significant statement. A lot of good can come of this.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. How about the new management school at Fort Belvoir?

Mr. MAHON. I think before we are going to get down to rock bottom on defense contracts, we have to take men from business who will put the same vigor into contracting for the Government that they put into similar aspects of this program, and I think the civilian rather than the man in uniform will do a better job in the contracting field. But better management skills among the men in uniform is, as the gentleman points out, highly essential too.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is it a fair statement to say that up to now we have not really had any Armed Forces management school to give the men in uniform the brass to stand up to industry? They have had an inferiority complex; have they not?

Mr. MAHON. I think the school is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I have made reference to the guided-missile program. In the reserve program there is $803 million for all the services. The amount for research development is this year about the same as it was last year, $1.3 billion. Continental defense in this budget is about $3 billion, considerably more than last year. Other members of the committee—and there are 15 members on the subcommittee—are in a position to go into more detail. I do not want to monopolize the time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As the gentleman from Texas has mentioned, continental defense is another part of the program where there will be a requirement for greater funds, because that is increasing rather rapidly.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Texas very properly is belaboring this question of defense contracts, and I agree, very properly, as he says, that we get into the Government service men from business who will see that the Government is met across the conference table properly. But, certainly out of an abundance of caution, if for no other reason, the gentleman wants to be sure that at all times we do not want General Motors men on both sides of the table or men of any other company.

Mr. MAHON. This is a big budget. No member of the committee knows all there is to know about it. We have worked hard for about 4 months. We have worked on military budgets in previous years. We did the best we could. We do not think the bill is perfect, but we think by and large we are moving in the right direction, and we submit it to you in the hope that you can generally concur in our findings and support us in the programs which we have endorsed.

For the RECORD I would like to conclude my remarks by inserting at this point the names of the members of the Department of Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations who have worked for the better part of the last 4 months on a morning-and-afternoon basis in an effort to appropriately scrutinize the defense budget and present this bill to the House of Representatives. The faithful service of these members may never be known to their constituents, but I would like for this issue of the RECORD to contain their names. I have been privileged to serve on the Democratic side with the following members, and I list their names in the order of seniority: Mr. SHEPPARD of California, Mr. SIKES of Florida, Mr. NORRELL of Arkansas, Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. RILEY of South Carolina, Mr. DEANE of North Carolina, Mr. FLOOD of Pennsylvania. The members on the Republican side who have been equally faithful in the discharge of their duties, and in the order of their seniority, are as follows: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts, Mr. SCRIVNER of Kansas, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, Mr. OSTERTAG of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

The general hearings were attended by all members of the 15-man subcommittee. The subpanels are as follows: Army: Messrs. SIKES, RILEY, FLOOD, FORD, and MILLER; Navy: Messrs. SHEPPARD, NORRELL, ANDREWS, WIGGLESWORTH, and OSTERTAG; Air Force: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, DEANE, SCRIVNER, and DAVIS.

The members of the committee staff who have contributed the most to the pending bill are as follows: Corhal Orescan, Paul Wilson, Sam Crosby, and Earl Silsby. Ralph Preston, while not a senior member of the staff, was of much value to the committee throughout the hearings.

Mr. CANNON, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, frequently attended the hearings. Mr. TABER, the ranking minority member and former chairman, did likewise, and both participated in the final draft of the bill, giving the subcommittee guidance from time to time. I am seeking in a modest way to give credit where credit is due.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this bill carries appropriations in the amount of $31,488,000,000.

Expenditure in the field under consideration amounts to 55 percent of our entire Federal expenditure.

There has been a lot of work in connection with this bill, beginning on January 19, which is reflected in some 5,100 pages of hearings and a 61-page committee report.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the majority members of the committee for their unfailing consideration, particularly to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and to the members of the Navy panel with whom I labored for many weeks, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

I also extend my thanks to the members of our executive secretary and clerical staff who have given their usual expert advice and been most helpful. The committee and Congress are indebted to them for their contribution.

Mr. Chairman, under present world conditions, with the ever-present threat of Communist world domination, we must maintain a powerful America, powerful in the military sense, powerful in the economic sense. Lack of power in either respect could be fatal.

A powerful America carries with it the best assurance against a global war and the best assurance of victory in the event of war.

We are fortunate in having in the White House a President and Commander in Chief with vast and successful experience in the military field who is dedicated to world peace.

Under his leadership we are building tremendous offensive and defensive power. Any potential enemy must know that it is foolhardy to attack us.

The force goals supported by this bill are designed to provide military power capable of dealing with the initial steps of any war, global or otherwise; military power affording an ample base for rapid buildup if and when necessary; military power which can play its part in a powerful, balanced, allied force of the free world; military power which we can afford to carry over the years for the long pull without undermining our economic power.

FORCE GOALS

What are the force goals recommended?

Briefly, they will give us Armed Forces numbering 2,859,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1956 as compared with 2,961,000 as of the end of the fiscal year 1955, a reduction of about 3 percent in total numbers; a reduction of about 1.5 percent in operating forces.

The force goals recommended will give us an overall Armed Force about double the pre-Korean figure of 1,460,000.

They will give us Reserve forces of 1,010,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1956, as compared with 857,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1955; an increase of 153,000 during the same period that the Regular forces are to decrease 102,000.

In addition, of course, there are probably 4 million people in civilian life of military age with military experience, some 2 million having had that experience in the Korean war.

The proposed Army of 1,027,000 persons and the proposed Navy of 664,000 persons will each be somewhat less than double the pre-Korean strength.

The proposed Marine Corps of 193,000 persons will be about 2½ times pre-Korean strength.

The proposed Air Force of 975,000 persons will be about 2¼ times pre-Korean strength.

The continental air defense is to proceed at maximum speed consistent with technical developments and training.

Military planes in both the Air Force and Navy will increase substantially to somewhat over 35,000 in number as compared with the pre-Korean figure of about 20,000.

Ships in the active fleet will number 1,001, compared with the pre-Korean figure of 646.

The new construction program calls for a fifth Forrestal carrier, characterized by Admiral Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, as "the strongest offensive weapon in the Navy, required, regardless of other capabilities, for the direct support of amphibious operations and for the defense of forces after landing.

The new force goals also provide for the construction of 34 new ships, and 1,228 new landing craft, and for the conversion of 24 vessels at a cost of $1,317,000,000, about $300 million more than provided for the current year.

Provision is also made for further modernization of our weapons, for increased stockpiles and industrial mobilization, and for essential research and development.

Let me quote briefly from the testimony of Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

We are better prepared to meet an emergency—

He says—

than we have ever been during my service in the Armed Forces. We have a flexible combination of land, sea, and air forces, with a wide variety of weapons and capabilities, including nuclear, which, in my opinion, is fully adequate for the security of the United States. We have strategic air forces, and carrier task forces which are unmatched by any other nation. We have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending upon what the target requires. We have Army and Marine Corps ground forces consisting of well over a million men.

The program recommended has been under development for the past 2 years.

It is submitted, according to the President, only after "careful and prayerful consideration."

Secretary Wilson states that there has been a searching review of our military policies and programs extending over many months by the military departments, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the Secretary of Defense, by the National Security Council, and by the President.

The new force goals are submitted in the light of overall world conditions. There have been many gains in the world as well as some losses.

They are submitted in the light of the increased strength of our allies, of the estimated strength of the Communist forces, of the better utilization of manpower, of the enormous increase in firepower.

I might say parenthetically that the record indicates that firepower in respect to a division has increased since World War II by something like 85 percent. It is further estimated that one air group today could drop greater destructive power than all the bombs put together, which were dropped on Great Britain during that war.

The recommendations are submitted in the light of the redeployment from the Far East of five divisions and of all other available information.

The figures submitted are those of the President with his vast and successful military experience.

They are endorsed without qualification by Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with his brilliant naval career of some 40 years.

They are endorsed by the National Security Council, by the Secretary of Defense, by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and the Air Force.

The forces envisaged in this long-range program of the Department of Defense—

Says Secretary Wilson—

constitute by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time. With the incorporation into our Military Establishment of the new weapons that we have developed, they constitute a force of tremendous striking power.

The United States forces we plan to maintain—

Says Admiral Radford—

are the most powerful individually by service and collectively as a team that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. These forces are fully adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and they constitute an ample base which will permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary.

The figures, Mr. Chairman, are submitted on the understanding that in the event that an unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, the Department of Defense can and will communicate immediately with the Congress.

They are submitted also in a bill under section 616, of which the President of the United States, whenever he deems it to be necessary in the interest of national defense, may waive the so-called Antideficiency Act and proceed to spend the money available as rapidly as he thinks necessary.

I have no hesitation, Mr. Chairman, in supporting the force goals which have been recommended, force goals which have been overwhelmingly approved by the committee in charge of this bill.

DOLLARS AND CENTS

To provide this military power, as has been pointed out, appropriations are provided for in the amount of $31,488,000,000. That is about $2,688,000,000 more than was carried in the current fiscal year, the increase being due largely to the substantial expansion in the Air Force. It is $13,300,000,000 less than the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1953.

The expenditure contemplated—and that is the important thing from the standpoint of the budget—amounts to $33.3 billion, about the same figure as for the current fiscal year, and about $10.3 billion less than in the fiscal year 1953.

If you look at the unexpended balances for the overall picture, you will find a steady decrease from about $62.2 billion in fiscal 1953 to $41.4 billion as of the end of fiscal 1956.

Similarly, the unobligated balances show a decrease from $15.7 billion in fiscal 1954 to 6.5 billion as of the end of the fiscal year 1956.

If we add the unexpended balance to the new appropriation figure, you will find that there will be available for expenditure in fiscal 1956 about $74.6 billion as compared with about 80.3 billion in the current fiscal year and 91.2 billion in the fiscal year 1954.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee has made reductions in the budget requests, aggregating $744,609,000. This is a cut of about 2⅓ percent, only a part of which will be reflected in decreased expenditure.

It should be noted, however, that the Department itself, in the field of expenditure contemplates an overall reduction of something like $1,750,000,000 below the budget estimates, as a result of a 5 percent saving during the course of the year in operating expenditure.

It should also be noted that the committee has effected rescissions in various stock and industrial funds amounting to about $1,649,000,000.

When the President sent his budget to the Congress he recommended the transfer of $800,000,000 previously made available for procurement and production of the Army, for transfer against other needs in fiscal 1956. A majority of the commitee, as you will note from page 20 of the committee report, determined that that transfer should not be made at this time. I personally was not and am not in accord with that decision, but I have no patricular objection to it for the time being, as there are still to be presented requests for additional appropriations for military construction, and for the Reserve bill, if enacted into law, which will greatly exceed in total the $800 million in question.

The matter is, of course, subject to reconsideration, and I am sure it will receive the further consideration that it merits at the proper time.

EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to efficiency and economy.

In the past, as the Members of the House know, I have been a frequent critic of the armed services.

I have criticized them for lack of proper organization, for lack of proper business methods, for lack of proper control of vast funds entrusted to them, for gross waste and extravagance.

The situation 3 years ago, in some respects, was almost unbelievable.

Without going into detail the Members will recall the testimony of Secretary Wilson a year ago when he said:

Management of the huge inventories of equipment and supplies has been a particularly troublesome problem for years.

The lack of adequate financial control in this area had been particularly costly.

Although the Navy has employed a financial property accounting system for years, the Army and Air Force have not.

You will also recall the testimony at the same time of former Deputy Under Secretary of the Army Pearson when he said:

No one knows the value of Army inventories.

The Army has had no means of regularly ascertaining the value of its inventory assets.

It does not possess even the most rudimentary records with which to measure progress and defend programs.

The Air Force was apparently in a somewhat similar position.

Of course it is impossible for the Department of Defense or for the Congress to function efficiently without current inventory figures and resulting usage figures.

I am happy to report to the House and to the country, as I did a year ago, that in my opinion great progress has been made in the right direction since January 1953.

There is still a long way to go, as those in charge are the first to admit.

But the record contains many pages indicating results accomplished which should be of great interest to the Congress and to the country.

See hearings on Department of Defense, pages 820–823; on Army, pages 125–138; on Navy scattered through hearings; on Air Force, pages 77–78, 491–493, 1520–1539.

Last year the record showed, among other things:

First. Reorganization or clarification of organizational lines and responsibilities under the Reorganization Act.

Second. Elimination of the Munitions Board, Research and Development Board, Armed Forces Medical Policy Council, and the Management Committee.

Third. Elimination of 208 boards, committees and subcommittees under various OSD agencies employing full-time staffs, plus 2,265 part-time workers.

Fourth. Review and improvement of administrative structures of the three armed services.

Fifth. Reduction in civilian personnel during the first 11 months by 150,357 persons.

Sixth. Reduction in military personnel as the result of the review of some 5,000 tables of organization, disclosing

160,000 noncombat spaces, 91,000 of which were transferred to active duty, 69,000 of which were eliminated.

Seventh. Realinement of equipment and construction of base programs with personnel and training progress.

Eighth. Increased use of stock funds and industrial funds.

Ninth. Operation Clean Sweep to expedite disposal of surplus property.

Tenth. Initial steps toward financial property accounting by the Army and the Air Force contemplating eventual dollar inventory reports every month within 30 days after the conclusion of the month for several hundred categories of items, worldwide.

This year the record indicates, among other things:

First. Reorganization largely perfected.

Second. Significant progress toward financial property accounting.

Third. Continued reduction in civilian personnel, the total now being almost one-quarter of a million since January, 1953.

Fourth. Continuing increase in the ratio of operating personnel to overall military personnel from 53 percent as of June 30, 1952 to 63 percent June 30, 1956.

Fifth. Elimination of duplication of effort as between the three armed services.

Sixth. Significant savings in the area of management, maintenance, distribution and disposal of real property, based on the first complete inventory ever to be made as of January 1, 1954, showing a total in terms of original cost of $19.1 billions.

Seventh. Enormous potential savings in the field of procurement and production by the adoption of a policy strongly against premature commitment to volume production.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD pages 820–823 of the Department of Defense hearings:

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES — STEPS TAKEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN CALENDAR YEAR 1954 TO ELIMINATE WASTE, ACHIEVE GREATER ECONOMY, AND IMPROVE EFFICIENCY

The drive for greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the business of the Defense Establishment was continued with increasing effectiveness during calendar year 1954. Many of the measures which were mentioned last year in terms of future accomplishment produced their desired results in 1954. From top to botom of the Defense Department, efforts to establish new and higher standards of economy and efficiency have been accepted by all elements of the organization. We are nearing the point of diminishing returns so far as future large reductions in expenditures resulting from more effective determination of requirements is concerned. In other areas, however, much still remains to be done even though there has been encouraging progress to date in achieving greater economy and improved efficiency in operations.

The reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953, was substantially completed in that year. During 1954, the new organization was shaken down and certain refinements effected. The functions and methods of operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been clarified to provide a more direct line of authority from the Secretary of Defense to unified commands, to assure that the service Secretaries are consulted and kept fully advised by their respective Chiefs of Staff on matters coming before the JCS, and to provide the opportunity for the proper integration of the views and special skills of the staff agencies of the Department of Defense and the participation of competent civilian scientists, engineers, and other professional personnel in defense planning.

Another significant refinement in organization has been the realinement of the staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) to improve the planning, operation, and management of the military-assistance programs for which the Department of Defense is directly responsible. This arrangement should considerably improve the management of the military-assistance programs and greatly facilitate their integration with the regular military programs of the Department of Defense, as provided in section 110 of Public Law 778, while at the same time avoiding duplication of staff effort.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Development) during 1954 continued to streamline his staff and achieved a significant reduction in personnel, both full time and consultants. Suitable working relationships between his staff and the staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Applications Engineering) have been established so as to avoid duplication of efforts in those areas of mutual interest to the two Assistant Secretaries. Under this arrangement, a number of joint groups have been established to review programs in the fields of aircraft, electronics, guided missiles, and ordnance.

Although each Assistant Secretary of Defense has been assigned a major functional area of responsibility, the Office of the Secretary of Defense is organized with the objective of functioning as a single unit. In this respect, the informal day-to-day relationships among the respective Assistant Secretaries, the Secretaries of the military departments, and their staffs are more important than the formal arrangements spelled out in the organization charts. No piece of paper setting forth functions and responsibilities can substitute for a real will to work together. It is this concept of a Defense Department "team" which best reflects the philosophy of our present organization.

In line with the recommendations of the Flanders subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee and of the Department of Defense Advisory Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures, the Congress enacted Public Law 562 in August 1954, which authorized two additional Assistant Secretaries for each of the three military departments. This legislation has made possible the reorganization of the offices of the service Secretaries along the lines of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, thereby rounding out the concept of an overall Defense Department team. Each military department now has, in addition to a Secretary and Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary responsible for financial management, a second responsible for manpower, personnel and reserve activities, and a third responsible for procurement and supply. The responsibilities of the fourth Assistant Secretary vary in each department, depending upon the areas of special importance in each department. In the Army, he is charged with civil-military affairs, including the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. In the Navy, he acts as the statutory Assistant Secretary for Air, while in the Air Force he is the Assistant Secretary responsible for research and development. With this strenghening of their staffs, the departmental Secretaries are now in a position to carry out their proper functions as the operational managers of the Department of Defense.

In the Department of the Army, a Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics has been appointed to take charge of the seven technical services of the Army and a new Continental Army Command authorized to coordinate the activities of the six continental armies and the Military District of Washington. These organizational adjustments should contribute to more efficient and economical management in the Army.

The extension of financial property accounting in all three military departments, which was authorized in the National Security Act amendments of 1949, was given considerable emphasis in the working group reports of the Advisory Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures. Significant progress was made in this area.

The Navy has had financial property accounting since 1908 and current efforts in that Department are aimed primarily at further refinements. The value of Navy property under inventory control as of June 30, 1954, was about $53.5 billion, including ships, aircraft, buildings, equipment in use and stocks.

This principle, however, has only recently been introduced into the Army and Air Force. The Army has now virtually completed the installation phase of its program at depots worldwide and at larger stations in the continental United States. As of September 30, 1954, the Army had brought almost $18 billion of its bulk inventories under financial property accounting. Extension of the system to small stations and to inventories in arsenals and Army manufacturing plants, other than those included under industrial funds, is now under study.

The Air Force has brought under financial property accounting all inventories at base level worldwide, inventories in continental United States depots, and inventories of clothing, aviation fuel and medical-dental supplies in the Air Force stock fund. Including aircraft and other equipment in use, the Air Force, as of November 30, 1954, had under financial property accounting a total of $25.2 billion. In addition, $1.8 billion of Air Force inventories are presently held in Army depots. By April 1955, the Air Force expects to bring inventories in overseas depots under this system and by July 1, 1956, virtually all other inventories such as Air Force property in the hands of contractors, stocks in transit and materiel on order.

The scope and coverage of stocks funds have also been significantly broadened in all three services. These funds now include $9.8 billion in inventories. The Army expects to bring the remaining major category of consumable-type items—engineer parts—into the stock fund by July 1, 1955, and by the same date extend the stock fund operation to overseas depots and to select stations in continental United States. The Navy is studying the feasibility of including in its stock fund approximately $3.8 billion of consumable type technical materiel and parts. The Marine Corps has steadily expanded the coverage of its stock fund operations. The Air Force has been moving more slowly, but is testing a procedure for utilizing station stock funds for local purchase items and is developing procedures for financing a commissary division of the stock fund to control subsistence at the base level. A tangible evidence of the effectiveness of stock fund operations is the fact that the Congress has been able to rescind $1.1 billion in cash generated by stock funds during the past 2 fiscal years, and it is proposed to offset part of the fiscal year 1956 budget requirements by the transfer of $700 million from the Army stock fund.

The extension of financial property accounting has materially improved the supply operations of all three services by relating requirements and purchases to inventories,

spotlighting overages and excessive movement of inventory, etc. The expansion in the use of stock funds has led to improved supply discipline by establishing a buyer-seller relationship between the stock fund and the using organization and has brought a better balance between procurement and consumption of supplies.

Continued progress was made in extending the use of industrial funds to finance the cost of operating industrial- or commercial-type activities. This type of accounting makes it easier for the responsible officials in the military departments to evaluate the performance of these activities. It permits coordination of operating and fiscal responsibilities under a single management. The buyer-seller relationship between an activity and its military purchasers or customers is encouraged and this creates pressure for economy. It also makes practicable common use of available facilities and inventories and reduces or eliminates overlapping or duplication of services and facilities.

The Navy, which has the longest and most varied experience with industrial fund operations, brought 8 more shipyards and the Naval Gun Factory under industrial funds during 1954, bringing the total number of Navy activities under this type of operation to 36. All major Navy shipyards are now operating under industrial funds. The Army extended industrial fund financing to 6 more arsenals and the maintenance divisions of 3 quartermaster depots. Most of the Army's ordnance arsenals and chemical plants are now operating under industrial funds. The Air Force placed seven printing plants under industrial fund operation on July 1, 1954, and by July 1, 1955, expects to extend this type of financing to all laundry and dry-cleaning plants.

Utilization of personnel, both military and civilian, by the three military departments continues to show marked improvement. With respect to military personnel, the proportion of total strength in the operating forces continues to increase. On June 30, 1952, about 53 percent of total military personnel were in the operating forces. By June 30, 1956, this figure is expected to reach 63 percent. For the most part, this improvement is being achieved by a multitude of small savings in the use of military personnel in supporting activities.

The utilization of civilian personnel in the employ of the Department of Defense has also continued to improve during 1954, making possible a further reduction of 70,000 during that year. Since January 31, 1953, civilian employment has been reduced by almost one-quarter of a million persons, dropping from 1,426,391 on January 31, 1953, to 1,179,813 on December 31, 1954.

One of the most wasteful practices in the procurement area in recent years has been the premature commitment to volume production of new items of equipment not yet fully developed or tested. While there was some justification for this practice during the early years of the defense buildup following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, there is, generally, no justification for it now. The Defense Department is making a concerted effort to avoid such situations by carefully scrutinizing all new major items of equipment before they are committed to volume production. For example, procurement of the ONTOS (antitank) vehicle was temporarily deferred pending successful test of developmental modification to assure that the vehicle was fully ready for production. Volume production of a number of electronic items has been similarly postponed pending full test and evaluation. Both the Air Force and the Navy now follow the policy of low initial rates of production to provide the time required for thorough operational testing of new aircraft models.

Elimination of duplication of effort among the three services has also received special attention in 1954, particularly in the research and development area. For example, separate proposals by the Army and the Marine Corps to develop a high-performance observation aircraft have been combined into one development project which will meet the need of both services. The Air Force has now been given the responsibility for the development of airplane crash, fire, and rescue vehicles for all three departments. The other services have stopped all major development of such vehicles. Another example was the consolidation of two separate Army and Navy development projects for range-instrumentation radars into one project to provide a radar suitable for all three departments. These actions will yield additional benefits in the form of lower unit production costs and the simplification of logistics support.

Progress in achieving greater economy and efficiency has also been made in the military public-works area. Recommendations of the working group on construction activities, headed by Mr. E. M. Voorhees, of the Advisory Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures, have been approved for implementation, and are expected to strengthen the procedures for planning and executing the construction activities of the Department of Defense.

Basic to the proper utilization of real property controlled by the Department of Defense is a complete and meaningful inventory. The first such inventory, taken on a uniform basis, was completed in the fall of 1954. This inventory disclosed that as of January 1, 1954, the Department of Defense had under its control $19.1 billion of land and buildings, valued at their original cost to the Government. A complete uniform inventory is also needed to assure that no new facilities are constructed or acquired where facilities suitable for the purpose already exist in the Department of Defense, and to assure timely disposition of property no longer needed by the services either for their current or mobilization requirements.

Uniform standards and criteria for new construction, designed to insure proper quality of construction at the most favorable cost, are being established by the Defense Department. During the past year, standards have been issued for permanent-type barracks, permanent-type bachelor quarters, permanent-type hospitals, air-conditioning for hospitals, and family housing provided for by Public Law 765. Similar standards have been prepared and soon will be issued covering other types of permanent construction.

Excellent progress is also being made in reducing the cost of facility maintenance through improvements in the operations of utilities, development of better methods of fire prevention, etc.

During 1954 the Department of Defense conducted a thorough review of all of its real property holdings with the result that land and structures, which originally cost $73 million, were transferred to the General Services Administration for disposition. In addition, the Army sold directly to private industry 2 large chemical works for almost $21 million, reserving for the Government the right to purchase the total output of these plants in the event of emergency. Ten million square feet of warehouse space no longer needed by the Army was transferred to the Air Force, thereby reducing Air Force construction requirements by about $60 million. The cost of leased space was reduced by several million dollars through the transfer of certain military activities from leased to Government-owned space.

In the field of supply and logistics, numerous improvements were made during 1954 in the determination of requirements, in the management of inventories, in the maintenance of equipment, and in the movement of men and materiel. Greater uniformity in the presentation of demand-supply data by the services has been established to facilitate top management review of requirements. Excess stocks are being redistributed or disposed of to free needed warehouse space. Storage and materiel handling techniques found successful in private industry are being applied in the day-to-day operations of the military-supply systems. New maintenance techniques are being developed and applied to reduce the unit maintenance costs. Transportation costs are being reduced by better packaging and loading techniques and more economical routing of shipments.

The above constitute only a few of the highlights of our efforts to eliminate waste, achieve greater economy and improve efficiency in the management of the Defense Establishment. A more detailed account of the accomplishments in this area may be found in the following three sections prepared by the military departments.

As the statement indicates, the points referred to are a few of the highlights. A more detailed account is to be found in the sections prepared by the three departments.

The Army reports steps in the right direction in a great many fields—in the field of organization; of the budget; of management; of administration; of personnel; of training; of transportation; of procurement and production; of facilities; of disposal, distribution, and maintenance.

Details may be found on pages 125–138 of the hearings on the Department of the Army.

The Navy also records many steps in the same direction, details of which appear in numerous places in the hearings on the Department of the Navy.

The Air Force also reports many steps in the same direction, some of which are particularly striking. Among other things, the record indicates that while the total military force will increase as between 1952 and 1957 from 973,500 to 975,000, or about 1,500, operating forces in the same period will increase from 451,900 to 595,100, or a total of 143,200, a result accomplished largely by reduction in support and administrative areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD pages 77–78 of the hearings on the Department of the Air Force:

AIR FORCE HEARINGS, PAGES 77–78

The Air Force, since June 30, 1952, has made extensive changes in the distribution of its military manpower resources in order to accommodate its expanding force structure. The table below indicates the magnitude of the changes achieved since end fiscal year 1952 and those which must be effected if the Air Force is to attain 137 wings within 975,000 military personnel.

Distribution of military personnel since end of fiscal year 1952

Fiscal year	Wings	Operating forces	Total military	Cumulative increase in operating forces	Cumulative increase in military personnel
1952	95	451,900	973,500		
1953	106	486,300	977,600	+34,400	+4,100
1954	115	501,300	947,900	+49,400	−25,600
1955	121	552,500	970,000	+100,600	−3,500
1956	131	588,300	975,000	+136,400	+1,500
1957	137	595,100	975,000	+143,200	+1,500

At end fiscal year 1952 the Air Force had 95 wings and 451,900 military personnel in

the operating forces out of a total military strength of 973,500.

At the conclusion of the following year, 1953, the Air Force had 106 wings and 486,300 military personnel in the operating forces. Total military strength, after 3 months of action to reduce the intake and expedite the release of personnel to meet lower personnel objectives, stood at 977,600.

By the end of fiscal year 1954 the Air Force had increased the number of wings to 115 and the number of military personnel allotted to the operating forces to 501,300. Total military strength, however, dropped to 947,900. Thus the operating forces had increased 49,400 over 1952 while total military strength dropped 25,600. The number of personnel allotted to the remainder of the Air Force, in spite of increased requirements, was reduced by the 75,000 necessary to accomplish this.

The Air Force plans to increase the number of wings to 121 and the military strength of the operating forces to 552,500 by the end of fiscal year 1955. Compared to the end, fiscal year 1952 position, the operating forces will increase by 100,600 while the total military strength decreases 3,500. The number allotted to our supporting structure, in the face of increased requirements, will be reduced further for a cumulative total of 104,100.

By the end of fiscal year 1956, the Air Force will have increased the number of wings to 131 and the military strength of the operating forces to 588,300. Total military strength will be 975,000. Compared to the end fiscal year 1952 position, the operating forces will have increased by 136,400 while the total military strength is increased by 1,500. The number allotted to our supporting structure, will again, in spite of increasing requirements, be reduced even more by a total of 134,900 since fiscal year 1953.

For end fiscal year 1957 with the number of wings increased to 137 and the military strength of the operating forces to 595,100, total military strength will remain at 975,000. Compared to the end fiscal year 1952 position, the operating forces will increase by 143,200 while the total military strength increased 1,500. The number of military personnel allotted to our supporting structure will have been reduced a total of 141,700 from the end fiscal year 1952 position.

The Air Force portion of the 160,000 spaces reported by the Department of Defense was approximately 74,500. They represent reductions made to one category of Air Force requirements, during the period July 1, 1952–October 31, 1953, to accommodate the requirements of another category. As evidenced in the above chart, the resources made available through the reductions effected, largely in the support and administrative areas, were reprogramed into the operating forces. In no sense did the Air Force construe these spaces to be surplus. Rather, they were and are viewed as part of the continuing shift in emphasis from the noncombat to the higher priority combat forces. The Air Force recognizes that so long as it must expand its combat forces within fixed military personnel resources it must allot to those forces an even greater portion of the available resources.

Since October 31, 1953, the Air Force has achieved additional reductions. During the period November 1, 1953–June 30, 1954, the Air Force made actual reductions of approximately 52,500 military and 14,600 civilian personnel from the current authorizations. These reductions, largely in support and administrative areas, were channeled into the combat forces. Reductions in spaces, over and above those required to man additional combat units in fiscal year 1954, were used to offset requirements generated by combat unit activations in fiscal year 1955 and to partially offset the deficits foreseeable for fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

In addition to the examples cited by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, the following are typical of the steps taken by the Air Force to effect manpower savings to provide the resources required for the operating forces:

1. Since the motor vehicle fleet represented a dollar inventory second only to aircraft, a revised program for maintenance was initiated. The goal of the program was to increase maintenance economy and to establish shops with modern equipment, resulting in savings of material, dollars, and manpower. Tests were established at selected locations on the latest commercial methods and equipment. The results of these tests identified areas where savings could be achieved. Conversion from tactical to commercial type vehicles is being carried out to the fullest extent practicable. Further savings have been realized by an exchange of motor vehicles and parts between the Army and Air Force. The revisions in required motor vehicle maintenance and a reduction in the number of authorized vehicles resulted in an immediate reduction of 4,283 personnel spaces in the motor vehicle area. As of June 30, 1954, the total reduction had reached 8,566 spaces.

2. Action was taken to reduce civilian requirements by bringing employment in line with existing missions and workloads. In August 1953, the Air Force concluded, as a result of a survey of two Air Materiel Command depots, and the confirmation of the experience of an industrial engineering project in Sacramento, that there could be a reduction in the number of civilians employed by the Air Materiel Command. This conclusion was based on a combination of several factors, the most important being the end of hostilities in Korea. Therefore, a phased reduction of 14,000 spaces was made in that command.

3. The major air commands were requested in 1954 to conduct a self-analysis of their own and subordinate headquarters to determine where further reductions in manning could be effected. Through this self-analysis and voluntary reductions, reorganizations were accomplished, functions eliminated, and spaces made available for reprograming. Over 10,000 spaces, civilian and military, were made available for reprograming through these voluntary reductions.

4. As a result of a study of authorized personnel in relation to assigned, the Alaskan Air Command was reduced by 1,726 spaces.

5. The Air Research and Development Command was reduced by 1,374 personnel authorizations. These reductions were the result of a study of the Air Research and Development Command requirements in support areas and the consolidation of the Human Resources Research Center and the Human Factors Operations Laboratories into one Air Force personnel and training research laboratory.

Those who took over the Department of Defense a little over two years ago took over a tremendous job from the standpoint of efficient and economic administration. There is still a long way to go but we are moving in the right direction toward eliminating the impossible conditions previously prevailing.

Many billions of dollars have been saved for the people of America in the process. Those billions made possible, in large measure, the tax reduction of a year ago in the amount of $7.4 billions—the largest tax reduction in any single year in the history of the Nation.

The people of the country owe a debt of gratitude to Secretary Wilson and to his associates for the progress they are making toward efficiency and economy, and toward greater defense for less money.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In connection with his reduction in force, I wonder if any of that reduction in force has been brought about because of dismissal of incompetent officers as has been reflected in newspaper accounts describing purchases which have been made in excess of the needs of the Armed Services?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think the hearings deal specifically with the instances the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have in my hand the Daily News, which is published in the District, and I quote the following:

> House investigators recall Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas for further questioning about Navy's hoard of 886,000 pounds of hamburger.

Now, 886,000 pounds of hamburger with 759,000 people would not last over 3 days.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that the committee has not had opportunity to go into the details of the charges referred to, but we have received responses from the Department of Defense which indicate that various figures included in the charges were not at all accurate, that some of them related to the past and not to the present and that as of the present certain items reported on appeared to be in very good shape.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad to know the committee is bringing about some economies and I go along with the gentleman 100 percent on that; but when you read in the paper where the Secretary of the Navy conceded, and I do not think that was challenged, that there was a 60-year supply of canned hamburger, despite the fact the gentleman says the Navy could eat it all up in 3 days if the men were put on a hamburger diet, I think there is evidence, if that charge is true, and I take it that there is at least some semblance of truth in it.

I want to find out what is being done to discipline officers who buy not only hamburger or catsup, or anything else, if they are buying in excess of needs and storing it away. I want to know what steps we are taking to bring about a stop order on that. I intend to direct a letter to the Secretary of the Navy particularly and to others when the occasion arises to try to get some answers to these questions. Every since I have been in Congress, and long before, I have read these accounts, but never at any time have I ever heard of any officer being disciplined because of that. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not he knows of any officer being disciplined because of such activities?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that these alleged shortcomings have only been recently reported. I do not know what if any basis there may be for them. I do not

know what, if any, action the Department may find it desirable to take in the matter, after the charges have been explored.

I may state, however, that I hold in my hand a letter from the Assistant Comptroller, Director of Budget, and reports of the Navy Department, dated May 9, from which it would appear, if his version is correct, as far as canned hamburger is concerned, instead of having enough on hand for 719 months' supply as was charged, there was on hand as of March 31, 1955, over and above special program reserve requirements, a 5 months' supply.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That letter is dated May 9?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May 9, 1955.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The hearing was held yesterday in which he conceded that those facts were not correct; that there was a 60-year supply on hand, and they have not done anything about it. I hope the gentleman's committee will look into this and try to cut out the things that we do not need. I want to appropriate every cent we do need, but I do not want to appropriate one dime for anything we do not need.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sure the committee shares the gentleman's sentiments in the latter respect.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not know about the details that the gentleman from Missouri has mentioned, but I think this particular incident helps to bear out something that became quite obvious to those of us who sat in on these hearings; that the people in the Department of Defense have been kept so busy trying to dig up the facts for some people who, for various motives, keep sniping away at the Department of Defense and the people in it on this score, that they really have not had a chance to devote themselves to dramatizing and educating the American people on some of the real economies that have been accomplished in the past 2 or 3 years.

I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts did bring out some of those things. As I say, I do not know the particular facts in this connection, but we could say, for example, in the field of civilian defense, where we are trying to stockpile some of the medical supplies and put them in warehouses for use during an emergency, some investigater, probably, within the next few weeks will make headlines in all the newspapers by saying we have a 100-year supply of adhesive tape stored away somewhere.

Surely it is a 100-year supply for current use when we have no catastrophe. So with this hamburger. That may be 60 years' use, whatever it may be, when we are not using canned hamburger, but instead using a fresh supply issued to the troops every day. I venture to say if disaster hit this country or if we go into all-out mobilization, that quantity of hamburger, whatever it might be at the present time, would come in mighty handy in handling an emergency situation at that time.

The difficulty is, as we found out in our hearings, that too often these people have answered "yes" or "no" to meet these newspaper headlines. When we attempted to give them an opportunity to answer, they just were not prepared to submit to the committee and the American people the answers that do exist with respect to this thing. I recall that my colleague from Kansas made the remark—I do not think it is in the hearings, but he made it a couple of times—that he got awfully tired of trying to testify for these people, because he knew the facts were there but these folks were not just giving us the answers.

I submit that a good point was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] in calling attention to some of the affirmative things that have been accomplished in this field.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether he thinks progress has been made in the implementation of the Uniform Cataloguing Act passed about 3 years ago.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would answer the gentleman in the affirmative. Of course, the job is not complete yet, but I think substantial progress is being made all along the line.

Mr. HARVEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that while this particular bill carries an appropriation of only $31 billion——

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Thirty-one billion four hundred and eighty-eight million dollars.

Mr. HARVEY. That there is authorized for expenditure about $74 billion during the fiscal year 1956?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The overall sum available for expenditure for fiscal 1956 and subsequent years including the $31.4 billion carried in this bill is $74.6 billion.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, there is approximately $43 billion in prior appropriations that remain unspent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Forty-three and one-tenth billion dollars; that is correct.

Mr. HARVEY. Can the gentleman give me any breakdown of this sum to indicate approximately what percentage will be spent in the area of procurement of supplies of all kinds?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think about 46 percent of the total estimated expenditure of the Department is presently going for procurement.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It seems to me it is only fair to point out with respect to these scare headlines that while I am sure nobody on our committee or anybody in the House wishes to encourage over-purchasing or lax spending of money, the membership should realize when anyone says figures do not lie, that they can be confusing, especially if we do not understand the background.

For example, when we talk about so many years' supply of something, when the Army, the Navy or the Air Force is on a reduced basis, it is not a proper yardstick to apply when we are thinking of a mobilization base for possible all-out war.

Our committee heard just the other day, for instance, that between 1940 and 1941 the cost of ordnance for the United States Army went up from $30 million in 1940 to $3 billion in 1941. The testimony also showed that there was a 66,000 percent increase in the value of ordnance procurement in a period of 3 years; that the Army strength increased 40 times in a period of 3 years.

When these officers are laying in supplies for an eventual all-out emergency, they may make mistakes and we know they do. And we think if they are bad mistakes they should be disciplined, perhaps. But it is not fair to say, when they speak of so many years' supply, based on, say, a few million men, compared with what they may be asked to prepare for in a sudden all-out mobilization, that there is overpurchasing. I think that point ought to be considered whenever these scare headlines are read.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that in the letter to which I referred dealing with the subject of canned hamburger, it is indicated that as of March 31, 1955, there was on hand 687,924 pounds. Of that total 533,874 pounds was the minimum inventory required to meet a military emergency on very short notice, such as the gentleman suggests. That left a balance of 154,050 pounds which, on the basis of 32.431 pounds per month, the average for the last 6 months, provided a stock on hand over and above the special program requirement of 5 months.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman to explain to me how the Department of Defense can spend $400,000 on public information? Just how is that money spent? Is that the way they got the information for this pamphlet the National Republican Committee put out containing military secrets? Just how do they spend it?

Mr. TABER. A reduction was made from over $1 million a couple of years ago.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not care if it is a reduction from a thousand million, but just how do they spend $400,000?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Generally speaking, a certain amount is spent at the level of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Considerably more is divided among the three branches of the armed services.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It says here that it is all at the level of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman who has made the inquiry will just sit down and read the hearings, and he does not have to read all 5,000 pages, for it

has been fairly well discussed, he will find there has been a rather substantial reduction in public information expenditures over the past 2 years. He will find that the Army, Navy, and Air Force operate several thousand installations. In the major installations they have public information officers. The gentleman has seen them on his trips around. Perhaps they have too many, but we have cut them down some this year, and if we find there are still too many we will cut them down some more next year. But that is the purpose of the entire thing, as the gentleman can see here on page 15 of the report.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I mean the Office of the Secretary of Defense himself. Just for his office it is $400,000. How can they at the office of the Secretary of Defense spend $400,000 in giving the public information?

Mr. SCRIVNER. In times past, even back beyond 2 years ago, the Office of the Secretary of Defense spent about a million dollars a year for public information.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That still does not justify why he spends $400,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No. We have cut it down, and we cut it down again $100,000.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Forty thousand might be adequate. That would write enough speeches for someone.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let the gentleman sit down and figure how many public information officers this pays. This $400,000 is not all confined to the Pentagon Building, if the gentleman wishes to know.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. There is some 2 or 3 million in the overall, and it is broken down to $400,000 in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. OSTERTAG. If the gentleman will yield, I refer the gentleman from Tennessee to page 635 of the hearings, on which there is a complete breakdown, a detailed breakdown of the justification as presented by the Office of Public Information. There it tells the number of employees, and the personal service is of course the largest item; but there are other matters such as travel, and transportation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not think we need that much money to advertise any department of the Federal Government. I just do not see any justification for spending that much money advertising what one of your departments is doing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the comments of our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and our ranking minority member the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], wherein they have discussed the policy and to a degree the composition of the appropriation bill, which is presently before you for consideration. I would like at this time to pay my compliments to the gentlemen with whom I am honored to serve on the Navy subcommittee, to wit, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. OSTERTAG for the fine cooperative attitude they have shown throughout the entire hearings and in the marking up of the bill. Also, I want to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to Paul Wilson, the executive secretary of our subcommittee, who has done so much to relieve me of much of the detail burden. I am very grateful to you, my friend, for the way you have responded.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Navy portion of the budget which the preceding gentlemen have referred to, we started out with a 1956 budget of $8,946,000,000. We were about two-thirds of the way through our hearings, when we received an amendment. That amendment was necessary because of the passage by the Congress of the recent military-pay bill plus the fact that the President had authorized an additional 10,000 personnel, of which 7,000 was Navy and 3,000 for the Marine Corps. That totaled composition, dollarwise, that is, including the amount that we had, created a figure for the consideration of your committee of $9,180,157,000. Your Navy subcommittee, after very careful review of the requirements, as they had been presented to us by the Navy, reduced the figure which I previously referred to by $108,323,000. That is what I see fit to advise you is savings—a reduction. Further than that, we rescinded $25 million from the Marine Corps stock fund, $429 million from the Navy stock fund, $40 million from the Navy industrial fund, and $8,572,000 on contract authorities, making a total of rescissions of $502,572,000.

As chairman of the Navy subcommittee, I make no claim of a saving or of particular astuteness on the part of the members of your committee in this matter by calling your attention to these figures although, of course, I thing any of us will admit when funds are rescinded out of any funds such as I have referred to, it, of course, precludes the expenditure of those funds; but if you take the actual cuts your committee made of $108,323,000 plus the rescissions of $502,572,000 you would have a total of $610,895,000.

The $108,323,000 of reductions were made in the following categories. These are, of course, explained at some length in the report. Under the title "Military personnel, Navy," you will find reductions in military transport rates, and other travel and transportation costs. We reduced the request by $4,480,100. Under the category of "Military personnel, Marine Corps," you have military transport rates, subsistence, travel, and transportation costs; we reduced those $1,953,000.

Under the title "Marine Corps Troops and Facilities," in cataloging and general operational savings in training and station operation areas, we cut $3,250,000.

Under "Aircraft and Facilities," in the field of Military Sea Transport rates, civilian employment, aviation gas prices, and overhead costs at joint air stations of Air Force and Navy Reserves, we made a reduction in those categories of $4,868,000.

Under "Ships and Facilities," in the areas of rates of the Military Sea Transport Service, fuel costs and deutschemarks financing, we made a reduction of $7,015,000.

Under the next title "Procurement of Ordnance and Ammunition," while we approved the program we applied an estimated $75 million unobligated carryover, not contemplated in the 1956 budget, thus cutting the new request some $75 million.

Under "Ordnance and Facilities," in respect to Military Sea Transport rates, expenses in regard to the York, Pa., plant, and the level of operation of facilities and maintenance of old equipment, a cut of $5,611,000.

Under "Medical Care," due to overstatement of patient load in hospitals, we made a slight reduction of $900,000.

The next item is "Civil Engineering." In the areas of Military Sea Transport rates, purchase of passenger cars and buses, plus a general cut against certain items on the basis that they ought to come down along with the size of the fleet, we made a reduction of $2,430,300.

Under the next item "Military construction, Naval Reserve Forces," due to a repricing of the program, we made a reduction of $415,600.

Under the item, "Servicewide supply and finance," in connection with cataloging and supply distribution system, we made a reduction of $2,400,000.

That in total was the action that your subcommittee handling Naval appropriations is presenting for your consideration today, and it constitutes a total of $108,323,000.

I would like to touch upon a subject to which Mr. MAHON referred, and that is the method in which contracts are presently being handled or have been handled, not only in the present status but for some period of time. There is no question but what in the field of procurement your military procurement officials have to deal in fields where they have to enter into negotiated contract procedure. They have not been in that field long enough to determine actual requirements to definitive purposes. However, when it comes to the construction field today, because of the competitive status in that field, there is no legitimate excuse for any military procurement officer or any policy-making officer, from the Secretary on down, to do business other than by competitive contract. Any man who tells me he is a modern businessman and pursues such a course in the field of procurement is not worthy of the position he occupies, and I do not care whether he is a Democrat or a Republican.

I think it is high time that this Congress became a little more adamant in this regard and insist that it be done through proper legislative procedure. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations is limited in the legislation it can report, but I am specifically calling attention to the proper legislative committee of the House that I think it is high time that they had those in policy-making positions take

into consideration what is for the best interests of the taxpayers and revert, if you please, to negotiated, bond-provided and protected contract procedure. If they can do that it will save plenty of money.

An adequate Military and Naval Establishment is a necessity, even though it costs us billions of dollars. It is for this reason we propose the appropriation. However, the only thing that can justify this initiative in an ideological age is our commitment to preserve our form of government and way of living.

In January I came into close first-hand contact with moral rearmament at their assembly in Washington. We received the delegates here in the House of Representatives. Later I went to California and saw the international task force under the leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman in operation. What I saw there was the effectiveness of an ideological initiative that could be an answer to the dilemma between armed conflict and a default to communism.

It is possible that the work of MRA and those that help it may permit us all within the span of our lifetime to live in peace. They are providing the inner strength in people that can withstand the evil pressures of our time. They are doing a great job bringing people together, which is a splendid achievement.

Mr. Ole Kraft, of Denmark, recently Chairman of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, speaking in Washington, in January, said:

> Moral Rearmament has the answer to the burning needs of today. There cannot be found in the world a stronger unifying force. It is a miracle that decades ago Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of MRA, foresaw what has since become our most urgent need, and now can offer us a trained and disciplined international force with a quarter century's experience in ideological combat.

In these days of world crisis in the cold war we have available a world force that can bring an answer on a world scale, if we have the courage and commitment to apply it. President Eisenhower said in his inaugural address:

> Whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.

Leaders of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Europe, and the Americas will meet for a world assembly for moral rearmament at Mackinac Island, Mich., May 26 to June 5, to plan an unprecedented mission to many of the pivotal areas around the world. They will take with them the new musical, the Vanishing Island, as a weapon for changing the thinking of an age. All of you have received an invitation to the assembly, and I hope that it may be possible for a considerable delegation from both parties to attend over each long weekend. The journey is 3 hours by plane. Here is an answer that is worth seeing.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say at the outset I am not sniping at anybody; I am certainly not sniping at the military forces. I think this matter to which I refer should be cleared up, and I think further that to avoid the possibility of any harm being done, the Quartermaster Corps or the Air Corps should come forth with an explanation on this matter not later than tomorrow morning; it should be furnished even this afternoon.

I refer to a bid-letting under the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot and the result of an announced invitation for bids QM–36–030–55–648. The depot requested bids to be opened on April 22 at Philadelphia for 3,824,060 yards of Air Force cotton twill cloth.

The three lowest bidders were the Windsor Co., 450,000 yards; the Burlington Industries—I will not give the exact figures; J. P. Stevens & Co. All three of these concerns are well known in the field of this industry, although I am personally not very familiar with one bidder, the Windsor Co., I do know the Burlington Industries, and J. P. Stevens & Co., strange as it may seem, the unsuccessful bidder is from somewhere in Connecticut, and I am not acquainted with it except by reputation. One of the successful bidders is quite a reputable concern with a tremendous mill in my own congressional district, but those people do not want business handled in this manner. I think all three of these concerns would testify that each of them is a reputable concern, perfectly capable of carrying out any contract it might enter into.

On May 6, 1955, the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot rejected a bid of the Windsor Co. and awarded contracts for the entire 3,824,060 yards to Burlington Industries and J. P. Stevens & Co. at a total cost of $2,215,332.58.

Had the Windsor Co. bid been accepted the Government would have saved $43,200. The Windsor Co. is located at Windsor, Conn., Mr. John E. Luddy, the head of that company, is a man of means, so I am informed, well regarded in business circles. I am informed that for many years he has been a regular dealer in textile fabrics, that he has had a number of Government contracts, all of which were performed perfectly.

By postal card dated May 6, the Quartermaster Depot informed the Windsor Co. that after consideration it was concluded that the Windsor Co. bid would not be accepted, and hence no award could be made.

Now, not a single one of these companies has appealed to me. I do not represent them and, so far as I know, they do not know that I am talking here. But I have had some matters brought to my attention in the past that I could never quite get my finger on or get any results other than high-sounding language that meant nothing.

I think this is specific enough. The date is recent, in fact May 6, and the quartermaster general of the Air Force should come forth with a detailed explanation as to why $43,200 of the taxpayers' money was thrown around so lightly. So I would like to have this put in the RECORD so that all may see it. I am not given to scratching at people unnecessarily, but in all fairness to them while this appropriation bill is being considered there should be a full, clean-cut explanation of this matter and that should appear in the debate on this bill. If I am wrong I shall be profuse in my apology and do my best to clear it up. If I am right, I am not so sure but what I may have a few more words to say about it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I might say in respect to the gentleman's query that this covers an issue that I would be personally reluctant to make any commitment on because this should be addressed to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the subcommittee. But knowing the gentleman from Texas as I have known him in the past I feel satisfied the gentleman will find he will exercise an interest in it undoubtedly and see that the proper channels respond.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina that his inquiry should be directed to the Quartermaster Procurement Office because the Quartermaster makes or rejects the bid. I do not know anything about the merits of the matter. I am trying to keep the record clear, that is all.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say that I am not going to contact the Quartermaster General's department any more. I have never had much luck.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have not asked the gentleman to do that. He said the Air Force ought to make an explanation. The Air Force is not the procuring agency; the Quartermaster Corps is the procuring agency. The Quartermaster rejects or accepts bids, not the Air Force.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the gentleman is correct in that I probably misused the term "Air Force" and to that extent I will withdraw it, amend and apologize for what I said. The statement I make is that this is the time, this is the day, and the matter is under consideration, for this to be cleared up.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARDEN. If it is all right, they can clarify it in 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the Committee on Appropriations has requested, and it is in the process of being carried out, an investigation of the whole procurement policies and practices of the military establishment. That inquiry came because in our hearings we were able to point out things of a similar nature, where, certainly, the indications were we were wasting a lot of money.

For instance, in the hearings requests were made for a given number of a certain type of plane. The fact developed that the same company had been manufacturing these planes for 2 years, the same plane. It developed that $150,000 more for each of the new units under the new contracts for the same plane made by the same company was included. I asked what efforts were made to try to hold the company down to the current type of plane. They said that

they had to bring the file in from Wright Field. We waited 2 weeks. Then they said they were sorry, they had been sure they were trying to hold them down, that they were right, but on investigation they would have to tell me they had not had the contract up with the company, they were just playing it safe because they thought they might have to pay $150,000 more for the planes from the same company.

There are 4 or 5 illustrations of a similar nature where millions and hundreds of millions of dollars are involved. In one instance in this bill there are millions of dollars—listen to this—for a new kind of weapon—procurement, not research—weapons for which drawings have not been drawn, the use of which is dependent upon a discovery by the Atomic Energy Commission which has not been discovered. That certainly will be handed to this investigating committee.

Mr. BARDEN. I just think this is the proper place to air these things, and rather than just bat this story around, I want to know what the facts are. If they had good reason for turning it down, they should have told this man so. But, the difference in the bid, let me call to your attention, is such that certainly anyone interested in economy in the Government would have made some search about, because the Windsor Co.'s bid for 49.7 cents per yard and the J. P. Stevens bid was 59.3. Both of these firms I am told enjoy fine business reputations and I am sure they would both like to fill that if they should be low bidder. There would be no question about the award.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I believe, at least from what I have heard, that that is a matter that comes under the Army Quartermaster procurement program. General Hastings is the head of the Quartermaster Corps. If the gentleman will turn over the material, which is pertinent, to me, I will make an effort to get an answer from the Quartermaster General in the time limit which the gentleman has suggested, namely, in the next 24 hours.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman understands I am not trying to be ugly about it, but I would not want my statement to remain in the RECORD for all time if it is erroneous, and I do not think it is, because it comes to me from very, very reputable sources. So, if they have an explanation, I think tomorrow's RECORD is a good place for it, or this afternoon would be even better.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will give me the information so that I can pinpoint the problem, I will be delighted to try to find out from General Hastings of the Quartermaster Corps and get the reply that is necessary for the RECORD.

Mr. BARDEN. I shall do that within the next few minutes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. The gentleman stated that his committee did not have the authority to legislate with reference to requiring competitive bids in the procurement of services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is my personal opinion of the functions of our committee. We have a right to limit an appropriation, but we have no right under the rules of the House to legislate on an appropriation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I just discovered here that if we are going to spend $78 billion next year on defense, it will mean that $66 billion of the taxpayers' money is going to be spent through negotiation. Now, for 6½ years I served as a postmaster in another branch of the Federal Government. I remember that I had to secure bids for 32 cents worth of laundry weekly at my post office. Now, I cannot see the feasibility of spending $66 billion of the Government's money in that way. If it were on secret weapons, something that we should not publish plans for, or something that the public should not know about, then there could be some excuse for it. But, I have heard these people come into the well of the House and talk about free enterprise, letting everybody have an opportunity to compete. Why, it is absolutely a disgraceful situation for the Congress of the United States to appropriate $30 billion and hand it to some man and say, "Go out and spend it with your friends in any amount you want to, and then we can renegotiate." I will never vote for a bill where 85 percent of the overall budget to operate the entire Government or half of the entire budget of the Government is spent on negotiations. It just does not make sense. If we do not have people in America who can supply the plans and give to the proper engineering people enough information to bid on it competitively, then we need some more personnel somewhere.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I might say this to the gentleman——

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I am not criticizing the gentleman's committee. I want you to know that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be all right if you did. That is the gentleman's privilege. But, let me say that there are some aspects in this military budget that I would be extremely reluctant to go into the competitive bid field with.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I eliminated those.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, there is another field, a great percentage—let us say hypothetically 60 percent—that could well be in the negotiated field, because we do not have enough personnel in the Department to write up adequate specifications.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Absolutely so.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure that my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] would want me to point out that I think his figures are inaccurate in that this bill calls for approximately $31.5 billion. It is estimated that the actual expenditures by all of the Armed Forces for fiscal 1956 will be around $34 billion, of which some $15 billion is for major procurement. Of that we estimate possibly $10 billion, most of which is for aircraft, will come in the category of negotiation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I was quoting a figure given by a minority member of the committee of next year's expenditures.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. My question does not have to do with negotiated contracts directly, but I inquire as to the extent to which the committee asks the people from the Department of Defense about their policy in rejecting low bids and then opening up the whole procedure and all the information that the low bidder had given, to new bids or to negotiation, where the low bidder in too many cases, it seems to me, does not receive the contract.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is one of the things the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] was talking about. It is the result of a practice of long years of development, and quite frankly we have not been too happy about it. That is one of the reasons why, between now and this time next year, our own committee, without depending on any other subcommittee, will have a thorough and complete investigation so that we will know exactly what these procedures are. If they are bad, we shall do everything we can to eliminate them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall submit examples that I have which the committee possibly may consider.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The committee could use them, because we shall turn them over to our investigating staff who are working on this problem and who will be working on it for the next 7 or 8 months. They will be examples that they can use.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to answer a question?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is there an appropriation provided in this bill for an atomic propulsion unit for an aircraft carrier?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If there were, I would not tell the gentleman publicly.

Mr. YATES. The Secretary of the Navy, according to the hearings that I have been reading, indicates that they have asked for one.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I still stand on my answer, that if there were, I would not tell the gentleman in public. I shall be glad to discuss it with the gentleman privately.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very small number of Members of the House here today, aside from members of the Committee on Appropriations. I take it as an indirect compliment and a vote of

confidence in the Subcommittee for Military Appropriations and the job that they do each year.

The report which the committee has prepared and presented to the House on this military appropriation bill, if Members will take the time to study it, gives fairly full and complete information. As a matter of fact, I feel that in some instances it gives too much information. I have often wondered how much it would help us if Communist Russia would follow a procedure such as ours. How much simpler our job would be, especially if during the discussion, if there is any such discussion of their military budget, the press gallery in Moscow would be opened up to United States reporters, just as our press gallery is open today to Tass reporters who may care to be present.

There was almost complete unanimity in the committee on President Eisenhower's military budget and program. The President's letter to Secretary Wilson, which is to be found in the hearings on the Department of Defense at pages 4 and 5, states the President's views quite fully, and I shall emphasize only 2 paragraphs of that letter. These are the President's words as contained in that letter:

> Our first objective must therefore be to maintain the capability to deter an enemy from attack and to blunt that attack if it comes—by a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness.

I might say right there, before I go further, that this budget does provide just exactly that kind of strength the President has talked about, namely, that effective retaliatory power. One of the major items of increase in the Air Force budget this year is for continental defense because we are spending more, almost double what we did last year for that activity. The indications now are that next year we may be called upon to add twice as much as we have been called upon to appropriate this year.

Continuing the President's letter:

> These two tasks logically demand priority in all planning.

They have been given priority both in the military planning and in this military budget, and these tasks are primarily for the Air Force to carry out.

Continuing:

> Thus we will assure that our industrial capacity can continue throughout a war to produce the gigantic amounts of equipment and supplies required.
>
> We can never be defeated so long as our relative superiority in productive capacity is sustained.

That, too, is one of the major programs and one of the major underpinnings of this military budget. We have provided for productive capacity.

The chairman of the military appropriations subcommittee [Mr. MAHON] has worked quite diligently, as have the other 14 members. He has always been courteous to every Member. Of course, we would be lacking just a little bit in human shortcomings if there had not been during the hearings 1 or 2, maybe 3 times, but surely not more than that, when there may have been a little political byplay, but it is always a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Texas, and the results of these hearings show how diligently that job has been done.

Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the senior Republican, has been equally diligent and courteous. Through all the years that all of us have worked together, our relationships have become quite close. I feel quite sure that without any hesitation the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] would say about me as I say about him, that for him I have a very firm, fine feeling of friendship.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas, since I mentioned him.

Mr. MAHON. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

I omitted from my original remarks today any complimentary references to any member of the committee. I sometimes think that our colleagues and the general public feel that we may feel too kindly toward each other when we come to present a bill——

Mr. SCRIVNER. They have not heard some of the colloquies that take place in the committee.

Mr. MAHON. No; they have not heard some of those colloquies, and some of them represent some pretty sharp differences of opinion.

I may say, however, that for a man to serve on the Appropriations Committee he should have a passion for anonymity. Most of the hearings of necessity must be closed. No member of the committee, none of the 15 who worked on this bill, would ever be given credit for the many hours and weeks and months we have spent on it. It is not possible for the general public, our constituents back home, to know that. It is good that we can work together in fellowship, all of us working for the interests of the taxpayer, by and large nonpolitically, trying to get a better job done by the departments under all administrations and under all circumstances.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. I know of the good work of all of the members of the committee. I wish there were some way whereby they could receive proper recognition for their long hours of public service. The consciousness of having given our best energies in the service of the country we love is no doubt the reward we most desire.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the compliment. Of course, as I said, the unanimity was just almost complete—not entirely. I thought personally that there were some other reductions that could be made, but the Subcommittee on the Air Force and the Military Appropriations Subcommittee felt otherwise. One item that I felt was not fully or satisfactorily justified was a proposed commercial airlift of engines and top-priority parts from the United States to overseas. No one could possibly predict how much this is going to cost in the coming years. They cannot tell us how many millions of dollars we are going to be called upon to spend on just this one program alone. You will note the first request was made for this year. Well, they said they were going to begin it, but during the hearings, it developed that they already had started it. So it is almost an accomplished fact, as so many things are that happen in the military—we hear about them after they are started, and not before. But the committee, after hearing the report did finally reduce this to $30 million.

Even though we do find some fault with them, the Air Force is to be highly commended on the economies it has effected. The fact is that it has accomplished much more than was planned in the way of wing forces with fewer personnel by making better and better use of its manpower.

I was rather interested in some of the remarks the gentleman from Texas made, and I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the hearings disclosed countless cases of good economy. It shows there has been a good review made through the renegotiation clause of outstanding contracts most, if not all of which, had their inception at or shortly after June 25, 195[illegible], when the Korean war started—and under a former administration. As a matter of fact, as a result, the Department of Defense in the last few months, particularly in renegotiation, has brought about such savings and such prospective savings as is shown on pages 46 and 47 of the report that we were able to make a reduction of $200 million. That being true then, of course, some of these things cannot be quite as bad as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has painted them, but I will agree with him, there is room for a great deal more improvement in some of the procurement practices. There is a great deal of room for added economy in all of the military service. Of course, as you read the paper, you will see that the stock of the aircraft building companies has gone up quite sharply. If you will take the figures you will see that the jump came with the building up of our Air Force at the outset of the Korean war—and that is where the major portion of the increases took place. There again, I will recall, the present administration came into power in January 1953, and although I do not have the exact identity of some of the companies he was talking about, I think I know some of them. If my memory does not fail me, the heads and top men of some of these companies which are now supposed to be making such high profits are men who occupied top places in the previous administration. I never knew and I never believed, and I am sure the gentleman from Texas does not believe, that it is a crime to make a profit in this capitalistic representative republic in which we live. It has been profit in private enterprise that has made this Nation grow great and that has given us the productivity that made it possible for us to win the most gigantic and most destructive war in all history. I would agree with him that if there is anything illegal or anything wrong, then we ought to find it out and no matter who it is, any

persons guilty of wrongdoing should be punished. We may derive a great deal of consolation out of much that took place during the hearings. There is no time to review it all, but General Twining told us emphatically, without any hesitation whatsoever, that we have the biggest and best Air Force in all the world. We are going to keep it that way.

Some people may be disturbed and may have their thinking slightly bent by reading articles in magazines. For instance, an article in March 1955 Air Force, a magazine of American air power. That is not a Government publication. In it there is quite a striking article by Michael Gladych. I turned the article over to the Air Force intelligence and asked them to tell me how much of it was fact and how much of it was fiction. Of course I would be doing a thing that I would condemn other people for doing if I would take this and point out where he was wrong and therefore make public the facts. I would be aiding the enemy, which I will not do. I will simply state that the Air Force intelligence points out that there are no less than 10 major errors in this article.

I talked a moment ago about our Air Force being the biggest. It is. Our strategic air command can deliver a conventional or an A-bomb or H-bomb to practically any target it chooses in any part of the world. While the day of pushbutton warfare is quite a way off, we are making progress in our guided missile program, in both short- and long-range missiles. As you all know, the Matador units are already stationed in Europe, more are being trained for deployment, and still more are being trained for ready deployment, so that our striking power, our ability to hit targets wherever located is growing.

As has been suggested in the President's letter—we are placing emphasis on continental defense. You have heard about the radar and DEW line, and numerous interceptor flight bases. This reflects the major portion of the increase in the appropriations for the Air Force this year. As I said before, the prospects are that in coming years, next year and the year after, there will still be more money requested and required for continental air defense.

I am not an alarmist. I told you last year, and I say it again, that I have not lost and I do not intend to lose one single solitary moment of sleep worrying about any Russian attack on this country. Oh, an attack is possible. They have some planes, if they were determined to go on a one-way desperation mission, that could bomb this country, but in my view it is highly improbable. They know exactly how terrific would be the retaliatory blows which they would receive if they were to start an attack, and they would not have time to make more than one, and the losses which their nation would sustain would be so great it would take them generations to recover.

This budget provides for over 2,000 new modern craft to be used by 131 wings, which is 10 more than we have at the present time, with various operations in hundreds of installations throughout the world. The Air Force will be actively operating over 20,000 planes in the Air Force. The goal of 137 wings will be reached on or before July 1, 1957.

There has been some talk about procurement of aircraft. During the past 2 years there has been a radical change in the aircraft procurement program. Had such changes not been made after the new Chief of Staff was appointed, our Air Force would now be equipped to a great degree with new but obsolescent planes, and the peak plane production would have long since passed, and plane production plants throughout the country would be closing down due to limited production schedules. Contracts for obsolescent planes were canceled and new contracts were made for new and more modern planes and more deadly planes with the money which had previously been made available.

The Air Force has adopted a program of "fly before you buy," meaning that instead of placing orders for a large number of planes where research and development and production were all telescoped into one program, now the research and development progress through the prototype stage, then when a plane appears to have the desired characteristics, or at least approaches it, then a few planes, 15 or 20 or 30, are ordered, and then they are thoroughly flight tested. The bugs are discovered and worked out before large numbers are ordered. This is practical commonsense and results in a great deal of economy, better and more modern planes.

Despite what the Congress and especially what our committee has said, despite our admonition to remedy the situation, there are still far too many changes of station taking place in all of the services every year. Not only is this costly to the taxpayer, but also, it is one of the big reasons why men with families leave the service. Oh, they tell us, they are going to cut down the frequency of the changes, but as yet they have not done a very good job, and to aid them, to help them a little we have reduced the appropriation for transportation and travel.

Speaking of leaving the service, let me point out one fact and shatter a myth of long standing. We have been told time and time again, especially by the Air Force and the other services, that one reason they were losing men from the services was that the men instead of reenlisting went to take jobs in private industry in lines along which they had been trained in the service.

However, that is not the fact, for the very records of the Air Force themselves show that of those who leave the Air Force instead of reenlisting, only about 10 percent leave to earn a livelihood in the type of work for which they have been trained in the Air Force. That is not my statement, that is the Air Force statement, and you will find it on page 32 of the Air Force hearings.

In the case of the Air National Guard the committee has granted the full amount of the request. The Air National Guard has been a success and has proven itself to be a real, vital, and valuable part of our national defense. This year, the committee, as in the past, determined their action by the one slogan: We will keep our guard up.

There is one other controversial issue in the budget and that, of course, relates to the fifth carrier for the Navy. My view was and still is as expressed on the floor here a few days ago when legislation authorizing the fifth carrier was before us, that the atomic submarine has changed many of the old traditional ideas of naval tactics. We are at a revolutionary stage of Navy tactics. With the coming of atomic power we ought to stop, look, and listen. We have furnished money for four of these big carriers, but not one has yet been out to sea, and none has been tested under all sorts of conditions. I said then, I believe now, let us build them, let us try them, but let also look and see what the possibility is of powering them with atomic power.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I share some of the gentleman's views about the fifth supercarrier. I wonder if the gentleman could give us any idea of the amount that will be spent or committed on this sort of carrier which is appropriated for during the period before we know what a supercarrier will do?

I had hoped it would stay in the designing and engineering stage rather than be built until we could find out something about what they will really do.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In this bill $200 million approximately is provided for this new carrier. Generally, you find that the first year there is a very small amount of the appropriation actually expended; a little more is expended in the second year. The third and fourth years are the big years of expenditure, tapering off a little in the fifth year. It would probably be well to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] about that, since he is chairman of the Navy subcommittee.

How long would it take to spend the money now appropriated, or how long before the keel would be laid; would it be about a year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just about a year for the laying of the keel.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So it will still be in the designing and engineering stage and the planning and fabricating of parts and things like that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is hardly correct on the matter of design because of the fact you have a design laid down and the pattern of construction decided upon. I do not think it would be that long.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In other words, already having provided for the four Forrestal-type carriers previously, most of the designing and engineering work is out of the way except for modifications and changes?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true they had to re-lay the keel of the *Forrestal?*

Mr. SCRIVNER. They ran into some construction difficulties on the first one.

Mr. VORYS. Can either gentleman tell us how long it will be before we have one of the four supercarriers at sea

so that we will know what they will do in addition to not being able to go through the Panama Canal before we go ahead?

Mr. SCRIVNER. There again I must refer the gentleman to the gentleman from California who has an intimate knowledge of these matters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first *Forrestal* should join the fleet next summer, including the shakedowns and all that. It will be in complete operation by that time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Does the gentleman mean the summer of 1955 or 1956?

Mr. SHEPPARD. 1956.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As I said a while ago, I have expressed my views in reference to this on the floor. As a matter of fact, I do not believe I am disclosing any very carefully guarded secret when I say that I proposed to delete $200 million for this ship but the committee saw fit to vote that down. That decision has been made as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, despite the doubts about some phases of this bill which I have expressed, together with other less important items, I feel on the whole it is a good bill and deserves the support of the House of Representatives. The total of $31.5 billion is a lot of money. The prospects are that as long as Russia remains a menace to the world we will be faced with about that same requirement for many years to come. It is not a pleasant picture. Someone mentioned the fact this is a lot of money, and has asked how much is it? I used this illustration last year and I will use it again this year.

If you will take a package of crisp $1,000 bills, a thousand of them will make a million dollars and they will make a stack 8 inches high.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Anfuso	Engle	Miller, Nebr.
Arends	Fallon	Morano
Avery	Fogarty	Morrison
Barden	Forrester	Norblad
Barrett	Granahan	Norrell
Boland	Gray	Pilcher
Bolton,	Green, Pa.	Powell
Oliver P.	Griffiths	Preston
Boykin	Halleck	Rabaut
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill.
Burdick	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Horan	Smith, Miss.
Chase	Jackson	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Jensen	Thomson, Wyo.
Chiperfield	Kelley, Pa.	Walter
Christopher	Kilburn	Westland
Coudert	Klein	Wharton
Davis, Tenn.	Knutson	Wickersham
Dempsey	Lesinski	Williams, N. J.
Dingell	McCulloch	Wolverton
Durham	Mason	Young
Eberharter	Metcalf	Zelenko

The Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 360 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, for some reason best known to himself the gentleman from Tennessee made a point of no quorum. I had just said that despite the doubts about some phases of this bill which I have expressed, along with some other less important items, I felt that on the whole this is a good bill and deserves your support.

I had stated that the total sum herein appropriated, $31½ billion, is a lot of dough, but that the prospects are that as long as Russia remains a menace to the world we will be faced with about the same requirements for many years yet to come. It is not a pleasant picture.

I had just started to explain how much a million dollars was: Namely, that if you took a thousand $1,000 bills it would make a million dollars, a stack about 8 inches high. To make a billion dollars you would have to have a thousand bundles like that. Those bundles would make a stack 8,000 inches, 666 feet high, which is 111 feet higher than the Washington Monument. In order to carry out the appropriation we are here authorizing you would have to have 31½ stacks that big.

Mr. Chairman, these dollars for defense could do much if we could but spend them for constructive, helpful programs instead of potential destruction. Costly as our defense is, our freedom, our existence, is worth the cost, worth it because here in this great representative Republic we have all of those desirable things that Russia promises others but has never yet delivered.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Army Appropriations.

Mr. SIKES. Does the gentleman from California wish me to yield to him?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would yield to me before he gets started on his speech.

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset I speak as a member of the Small Business Committee and with the approval of the chairman of the committee. I call attention to section 611 which deals with the hope that small business in America may have its fair share of these defense contracts, and I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to two specific instances in which the Defense Department advertised for bids to small business and in asking for the bids failed to include any drawings or specifications, resulting in the bids being directed to the original prime provider, and as a result eliminating the small-business man and his ability to conform to the bids. I believe this is a very bad practice in procurement, and I hope the committee in the investigation which I notice on page 7 of the report it is going to hold, will look into this practice and do everything possible—and I talk now for the record—to provide against the continuance of such practices. I will be glad to give the committee the specific instances to which I refer.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to commend my distinguished friend from California for his interest in small business. I certainly concur that the intent of the Congress and the law should be carried out and that everything possible should be done within reason and within the law to see that small business does have a fair chance to compete for contracts for the military services. The gentleman from California has made a very fine record for himself here and I commend him for the diligent attention to his duties that he has shown.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and may I say that he has rendered most distinguished service on this committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Florida is going to make a first-class presentation of the Army budget and since he is my chairman on the Army panel I do not want to interrupt his affirmative statements. As the gentleman knows, at the proper time I propose to introduce certain amendments to restore the cut in the Army personnel. Also I propose to introduce the necessary amendments to restore the cut in Navy personnel, Navy ships, and in Marine personnel. Since it is getting late in the day and we are not clear at this point whether or not we will be able to finish general debate today—maybe we will and maybe we will not—if I have time in general debate, of course, I will develop the subject, but just out of an abundance of caution and so that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow may show the proposed figures in my amendments, I am grateful to the gentleman from Florida for permitting me to read them at this time.

The amendments that I will introduce for the Army will be as follows:

Military personnel, $144,574,000; Army maintenance and operation, $109 million, or a total increase for the Army of $249,574,000. That will provide an end strength as of June 30, 1956, the same as the end strength as of June 30, 1955, of 1,114,000.

For the Navy military personnel an increase of $55 million, general expenses, $2,700,000, which is an increase for the Navy of $57,700,000. In addition, there will be proposed an increase in Navy ships and facilities of $23,144,000 which will restore the active fleet ships from 1,001 to 1,066, which is the number estimated as of this June 30, 1955. For the Navy as well a Medical Corps addition of $1,100,000.

For the Marine Corps military personnel, $57,229,500, Marine Corps procurement, $6,250,000, Marine Corps fa-

cilities, $15 million, a total Marine Corps increase of $78,479,500.

The total proposed dollar increase for all branches, personnel, facilities, maintenance, and operation, to be $409,993,500.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if the subcommittee made any inquiry as to the number of negotiated contracts made by the Defense Department, percentagewise and dollarwise?

Mr. SIKES. I see my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], is on his feet. I believe that he wishes to respond since it is in line with his earlier statement to the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, from the standpoint of dollars, in excess of 85 percent of defense contracts are let on a negotiated basis, some kind of cost-plus-fixed-fee or other basis. In other words, about 15 percent of the defense money is expended on competitive-bid contracts. Now, it is true that it is pretty difficult to build a new airplane or some of these defense items by competitive bidding because there are not enough companies qualified to do the job, but I think we pointed out earlier in the afternoon that the greatest area for spending in the past and today is in this field of negotiated contracts. We have been losing our shirt, I might say to the majority leader, in my judgment, in that field over a period of years. I understated the figure in general debate in saying we recovered through renegotiation $10 billion after World War II. It was in excess of $11 billion. That is evidence of poor negotiation and poor contracts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My next question is, What effect has that high percentage of negotiated contracts had upon the ability of small and independent businesses of our country to get contracts from the Defense Department? Can the gentleman express any opinion on that?

Mr. SIKES. Unquestionably, in my opinion, it would increase the difficulty that small business has in getting contracts. I think the record is clear enough on that. It is a most unfortunate situation which certainly militates against the little businessman.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In other words, 85 percent of this budget, then, is spent in the same manner that the President made the contract for the Dixon-Yates deal.

Mr. SIKES. Eighty-five percent of the procurement and production money in the budget.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my very great appreciation to and commendation of the gentlemen who have served with me on the Army panel of the defense subcommittee. I do not believe I have ever served with a finer, more conscientious, or abler group of men than the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER]. They know their subject intimately, they have worked long hours, and they have done an admirably fine piece of work in helping to develop the best Army structure that we could under the budget before us. I want to take a moment also to express my appreciation to Earl Silsby, the clerk of our committee, for this is his first responsibility with a major assignment. He has worked tirelessly. He has done excellent work. I believe he has great promise, and we were very glad indeed to have him with the subcommittee. Of course, I am appreciative of the courtesy and consideration shown to me by the full subcommittee and particularly by the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the vice-chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. Chairman, the committee by its action has accepted the reductions proposed by the Department of Defense in strength and budget figures for the Department of the Army for fiscal 1956.

This has not been an easy problem to solve. I personally must confess grave misgivings as to whether a cut at this time is proper. If you will refer to the hearings—and they are voluminous—you will find that it has been very difficult to assign actual responsibility for the cut in the size of the Army. There is serious question that those who are responsible for the cuts have complete trust in their own action. For instance, early in December, the Army was prepared to bring to the Congress a budget estimate that would have provided troop strength substantially similar to that of the current fiscal year 1955. Many months of preparation had gone into this.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the committee was unable to determine who was the individual who actually recommended the cuts?

Mr. SIKES. The testimony will show that the committee found it difficult to place the actual responsibility for the decision to make this cut.

After the Army budget staff had spent many months preparing a budget to bring to the Congress, there came on December 14 the sudden, and to the Army the shocking, announcement that a material reduction in strength and in funds would have to be accepted, presumably for budget reasons. This would have allowed an end strength for fiscal 1956 of 1,002,000 men.

Many sleepless hours were necessary for Army personnel to whip new budget figures into shape. Then in January there came an upward revision of 25,000 troops, again leaving the budget out of balance. Finally, in April, there came another revision permitting the Army to enter fiscal 1956 with some 60,000-odd more troops than had been justified before the committee. This again brought a requirement for budget juggling and a revised estimate.

Those are some of the difficulties the committee had to cope with in deciding what to do. This committee has held exhaustive hearings, and there is before you in the printed hearings the entire story, other than the off-the-record security presentations.

On the surface, it could be presumed that the plans now presented to Congress are for a peacetime budget in a world whose declining tensions permit an army of reduced strength or a budget which places greater dependence upon the military strength of our allies than has been possible heretofore. You will have to judge the propriety of those assumptions. I found no one among our witnesses who was willing to testify that world conditions today permit a general relaxation in defense preparations. Obviously, there is a trend toward peace at this moment; and if that trend continues, we are not going to get hurt under this budget. If we should not continue to enjoy peace, we will be back in the peaks-and-valleys system of crash-and-costly programs. But—and I want to be fair about this—to a lesser extent than at the outset of previous wars.

Actually, most of the reasons that were assigned for the justification of Army cuts just will not hold water. These included buildup in allied forces which does not exist. They included the early availability of German forces which is 2 to 4 years in the future. They included the buildup in Ready Reserves under the new Reserve program. Congress had not even voted on that. Also, they include implications of far greater airlift potential, greater mobility and firepower for our own troops.

There has been improvement in the position of our troops in these fields, but there also is a significant improvement in the mobility and the firepower and the supply system among Communist forces and among Communist satellites. And there is no reason to believe—get this—there is no reason to believe that there are developments for American forces either in equipment or weapons which Communist forces do not also have. Finally, let us not forget that Russia has announced a 12-percent boost in defense expenditures for the coming year.

General Ridgway testified that modern weapons and modern conditions of atomic warfare would require more rather than fewer men. He testified also that the Army's capabilities will be reduced in 1956 under this budget. In other words, the Army will not be in as effective position under the fiscal year 1956 budget to assist in the defense of the free world as it has been previously.

I am not an alarmist—I simply want to nudge us into an awareness of the fact that we are not out of the woods. There is still much danger. We in the committee do not want to recommend

the spending of any more money than is absolutely necessary. If world conditions will permit us to assume that these budget figures are adequate for our requirements, Congress should support them. In addition, if there is any way that we can cut the figures presented to us and do a conscientious job, we should cut them. However, Congress also as befitting the body whose constitutional responsibility it is to determine the size of the Armed Forces and the amount of money that is to be made available to the Armed Forces should determine clearly whether this is an adequate budget for the defense of the country. This is the thing we now are trying to do.

After careful deliberation, our committee is supporting the budget figure that was presented to us, even though there are misgivings on the part of some of us about the wisdom of our course. To support that position our committee has made recommendations which are calculated to improve the strength of the Army while maintaining the budget structure recommended by the Department of Defense.

We emphasize the fact that one primary consideration rests upon our ability to expand rapidly from the present position of the Army. We are in better position than we have been in for a long time in that regard. Then we have made it plain that this committee is willing to expand our forces at the drop of a hat should occasion require it.

The figures that we have approved and that we bring to you today will permit the Army to enter the fiscal year 1956 with 1,112,200 officers and men, and to end the fiscal year with 1,025,000 officers and men.

The appropriation request for the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1956 totals $7,573,980,000. Including all supplemental requests the committee has recommended appropriations totaling $7,329,818,000, a reduction of $244,162,000 below the budget estimates and $289,248,986 under the current year appropriation. The major items of expense are military personnel and maintenance and operation. Of course, the committee realizes that pay and allowances is a fixed item which is primarily arithmetic in nature and which is not subject to adjustment by the committee other than through changes in military strength. Military personnel costs for the current year are $3,679,095,000. This is a reduction of $9,505,000 below the revised budget estimate of $3,688,600,000 and is $471,384,000 under the amount provided for fiscal year 1955.

The greater part of those reductions are in the deutschemark equivalent funds, money that is to be made available as a contribution by the German Federal Republic to help defray the cost of maintaining our troops in that nation.

The major items of expense are military personnel and maintenance and operations. Of course, the committee realizes that pay and allowances is a fixed item which is primarily arithmetical in nature and which is not subject to adjustment by the committee other than through changes in military strength. Military personnel costs for the current year are $3,679,095,000.

The reduction recommended, $9,505,000, is contained in the activity "Movements, permanent change of station" and is made on the basis that the Army can and must make decided improvements in the field of travel and transportation. The committee has repeatedly for several years expressed its concern and directed emphasis to the need for stabilization of assignments and a review of its policies with regard to packing, crating, and shipping of household goods. The recent report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has been noted and its comments with respect to these matters reemphasize the strong feeling of the committee that definite policy decisions must be made to get the matter under control.

While I am on the subject of military personnel, let me point to one problem affecting ROTC graduates. Due to reduced manpower ceilings, the Department of Defense has modified its policy of commissioning ROTC graduates. Under the figures presented to Congress there simply was neither the money nor the spaces to permit all the ROTC graduates to be called into active service. The Committee feels that the Government has a contract with these young men and that they have not only the obligation to serve, but should have the opportunity after completing 4 years of ROTC to serve as commissioned officers. Therefore, the committee has directed that sufficient funds be diverted to make this possible.

Also under military personnel activities, the committee calls particular attention to the Army's new policy for unit rotation of military personnel known as Operation Gyroscope. Under this plan whole units up to division strength will, upon completion of training in the continental United States, periodically relieve and replace similar units overseas. This plan permits the assignment of Regular Army personnel in units of their own choice and shipment of troops and their families simultaneously. It is anticipated that the program will do much to increase enlistment and reenlistment rates and an improved morale with resultant effect of the combat efficiency of the units concerned.

For maintenance and operations, which includes all training facilities, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $2,831,019,000, a decrease of $234,112,000 below the 1956 revised estimates of $3,065,131,000 and an increase of $35,296,014 over the amount provided for fiscal year 1955. This increase between 1955 and 1956 is not an actual one because during 1955 the Army was drawing down stock levels. In other words, living in part off the shelf on items accumulated during and since the end of the Korean war. During fiscal 1956 the Army will go on a current consumption basis.

The Maintenance and Operations appropriation contains most of the funds for the current operating expenses of the Army other than those pay and allowance items contained under Military Personnel. The major portion deals with the logistical programs, namely: Supplies and Minor Equipment, Procurement Operations, Supply Distribution and Maintenance, Armywide Services, Logistics, Medical Care, Industrial Mobilization, Installation Services, and also funds for the evaluation system, training, support of the Army's administrative base and certain joint activities with other services.

Within the committee recommendations are several adjustments in the appropriation, including additional funds totaling $10,251,000 to be applied against reductions of $244,363,000, as set out below.

The committee has been advised of additional requirements which have arisen in connection with the training program, and if provided for in fiscal year 1956 will be of material assistance in fulfilling the training mission of the Army. The committee recommends inclusion of these items in the bill in the amount of $7,100,000 for such projects within the appropriation as are set out below:

Army language school (project 2224)	$1,200,000
(Increased load directed by National Security Council since presentation of estimates to Congress.)	
Directed exercises (project 2251)	2,000,000
(Change in concept since presentation of estimates to Congress to pay rental allowance to land owners of areas needed for maneuver purposes.)	
Troop tests (project 2253)	1,000,000
(To allow for an essential and orderly expansion of testing activities in the field of electronic warfare, aviation, and meteorology, and battlefield surveillance.)	
Training aids (project 2261)	2,900,000
(For additional radar target simulators, certain marksmanship targets, atomic bomb simulators for use in maneuvers.)	
Total	7,100,000

This money quite frankly is for training under conditions which simulate atomic warfare. The committee considers that it is extremely important that new training procedures and practices, which will be necessary in the event of atomic war, be emphasized more than they have ever been before. It was brought out to the committee that if this is done on what appears to be an adequate basis, more money for training is necessary. The committee feels it will be a serious mistake not to provide that additional money. The amount is small in comparison with the important lessons in tactics and maneuvers to be learned.

It is the sense of the committee that the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass., and the Army-Navy Hospital in Hot Springs, Ark., should remain open and continue to be operated and therefore recommends that additional funds in the amount of $1,700,000 be applied for this purpose as follows: $600,000 to program 3300—Medical care,

and the balance to programs 3800 and 3900—Installation support funds.

An amount of $1,000 is recommended for addition to the $8,000 appropriation requested by the Inter-American Defense Board. Testimony indicated that rising costs have made it increasingly difficult for the Board to operate in the manner desirable. In light of the emphasis on cooperation with the other nations in this hemisphere it is felt that every effort should be made to increase the level of activity above that possible under the current appropriation.

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, procurement and production is one of the big items of appropriation in the Army budget. This, of course, provides the funds for procurement of military equipment and ammunition and for the production of facilities which will be required to meet military requirements in the event of war.

No new funds are requested this fiscal year, it being the second consecutive year that requirements can be financed from previously appropriated funds supplemented by reimbursements. The estimated status of funds in the current appropriation, as contained in the printed Budget, is set out in the following tabulation:

[In millions]

Fiscal year 1956:	
Funds available from prior year	$3,489
Recovery of prior-year obligations	150
Reimbursements from other accounts	519
Subtotal	4,158
Obligations to be incurred	2,500
Funds available in subsequent year	1,658
Offered for transfer to other appppropriations	800
Balance recommended as working capital beginning fiscal year 1957	858

The committee does not concur in the proposed transfer of $800 million to other appropriations, but recommends that this amount be left within the appropriation, and directs that these funds shall not be spent on the program presented in the fiscal 1956 Budget. In the event of emergency the money would be available for such use as necessary and as directed by the committee otherwise it will be applied against requirements for fiscal year 1957.

Testimony before the committee by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics on March 28, 1955, in connection with this appropriation, was given due consideration in making the above recommendation. Excerpts from his remarks are as follows:

If war comes, we plan to fight with allies. Our prospective allies cannot furnish all the materiel that will be needed to support the troops we count upon them to put in the field. The data shown in the charts refer solely to the requirements and capabilities of the United States Army.

* * * * *

The fact is that the reserve stocks and production base of the United States Army are, as I have shown the committee, not designed to provide the full 100 percent computed requirements of the United States Army itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida, our distinguished colleague, on the splendid statement he is making.

I want to congratulate all members of this committee for the information which they have brought us this afternoon. I have been particularly intrigued with the idea of how much we could save in procurement if we could get more into the field of competitive bidding. I know the gentleman will recall the debate that we had on price supports the other day for agriculture. As I recall, we spent $300 million up to 1954 on price supports for agriculture. Does the gentleman think we might save that much money in 1 year if we could get the Defense Department more into the field of competitive bidding when they come to their procurement program?

Mr. SIKES. Let me say to my friend who has shown a remarkable interest in farm families and their welfare, that I think it is entirely possible, if circumstances would permit all Department of Defense procurement contracts to be put on a strictly competitive-bid basis, that there might be sufficient saving to pay all of the costs of the farm parity price program. It would be a great thing indeed if we could divert more and more money from defense purposes to peacetime pursuits.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman very much. I also thank him for the comment he made about our ROTC program. I have had that problem called to my attention and I think the gentleman has pinpointed that.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. As the distinguished gentleman from Florida knows, on our committee where we had the housing facility authorization, we insisted that the military do all of its construction by competitive bidding. The construction program of the military is competitive bidding. That is for the facilities, as the gentleman well knows. I think it would be very helpful if somewhere down the line your great committee could instill into the military wherever possible this idea of competitive bidding. A lot of these highly sensitive instruments cannot be obtained by competitive bidding. We realize that. Therefore, we cannot save a great percentage there, but there are areas where there can be savings. I think the gentleman with his usual diligence would render great service to the country if, somewhere down the line, he could help us get competitive bidding where it might be realized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think I would agree wholeheartedly with the desirability of having competitive bidding in the procurement program, but if the gentleman will look at the bill and will retrace history, he will see there is a provision there which, in effect, tells the Department of Defense that we should not have competitive bidding, because there is a desire to help economic distressed areas. Therefore, we have a set-aside program in order to aid and assist those areas which have a surplus of labor and whose economic conditions are not as good as other areas of the country. So, in effect, the Congress, in the defense program to a degree has told the Department of Defense in these kinds of orders specifically you should not have competitive bidding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. That is a small percentage of the country. I never subscribed to that thing which the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has referred to. I do not think it should have been done. In my section of the country we were gutted in the textile business, but that is neither here nor there. But there are fields where we should not criticize the military, because they cannot operate that way. I am sure there are certain areas where they cannot have it.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman knows, there are a number of Members in this body and in the other body who have been forceful in their presentation in behalf of the so-called set-aside program in noncompetitive bidding to just do that thing.

Mr. RIVERS. We cannot criticize the military for not having competitive bidding, because there are areas over which they have no control, and I do not think we should get up here and just criticize them across the board.

Mr. SIKES. I want to express my appreciation to both gentlemen for their contributions.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. As the gentleman knows, West Virginia has great unemployment and the gentleman knows of the interest I have in trying to relieve the situation.

I have been talking to the general in charge of ordnance procurement and he said: "We pay very little attention to set asides"—I am using his words, a direct quote from the general. "We pay very little attention to set asides. We pay little, if any, attention to unemployed areas."

In West Virginia we have a double pattern and need for keeping our industries going, but he said this: "We have to pay close attention to big business because big business has very good research facilities, so for that reason we pay very little attention to small business."

That is a quote from the general in charge of our ordnance procurement for the United States Government over in the Pentagon. So for all intents and purposes very little attention is paid to small business, very little attention is paid to set asides both for unemployment and also for things of that nature.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Is it not also a fact there are other matters that have to be taken into consideration in the defense picture? The production base often has to be maintained, and although the quantity of a particular item that may be needed at a given moment might be supplied from one of the low-cost areas, yet in the event of sudden mobilization it might be necessary to have more than one source of supply, and for that reason some of these lines had to be kept going even though they operate at a higher cost. It occurs to me that while this is not in the items under this bill as a policy announced by this Congress, for instance, that in shipbuilding a bid that is not 5 percent lower is not considered a low bid, we have put a good many restrictions in it and in fairness to the service this is not just simply the problem of selling for our dollar.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I just want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the company that provides more optical goods than any other company in the United States just closed its plants this last week, practically closed them except for a few little things. Another point I want to make is that in one area about 80 percent of the optical goods have been produced, and one atomic bomb could knock it out.

That is the type of thing I am calling to the gentleman's committee. We must do something to help small business and keep it going, for we must depend upon it in time of war.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's line of thought, but I am particularly interested in section 63 which I believe was referred to as the Sikes amendment. Will the gentleman attempt to discuss that during the course of his remarks?

Mr. SIKES. I shall be very glad to discuss that but would prefer to defer it for a few moments until I reach it in the bill. Then I will be glad to discuss it.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and wish to congratulate the gentleman on the fine statement he has made, but at this point for the record I want to call the attention of this Committee to a particular situation that exists in regard to the Port of New York Authority and the Air Force. It is a burning issue. Some people might call it extreme and others could say that the practice should extend to all facilities in private industry. The situation goes like this: In a contract entered into between the Air Force and the Port of New York Authority it is stipulated, as I understand it, that when the Armed Forces abandon a certain Port Authority installation not only does the Port Authority get free of cost the improvements to property, such as air-conditioning systems and a railroad spur, but Uncle Sam, it seems, agrees to pay the Port Authority half the cost of the increased value of the facility. It reads like a wonderful gift. Applied to private industry, this means free installation by Uncle Sam of improvements plus one-half the value of the improvement. I hope to hear the committee's side of the story. I sent the committee a letter on this. To date, no answer.

Mr. SIKES. The distinguished gentleman certainly is entitled to a complete answer on the question he has raised, and I am glad to see him bring it to our attention at this time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for standing there and acting as chairman and permitting the Members to interrogate him so they may get the facts. It is a service to the Members that you are standing there and doing this.

Like the gentleman from West Virginia and some of the other Members here, and as the members of the Appropriations Committee, particularly the Armed Services Subcommittee, know, I have been beating them over the head for a long time on the question of distressed economic areas and the failure of the procurement people in all branches of the Armed Forces.

Mr. SIKES. May I interrupt to say that I do not know of any person who has been more diligent in his efforts in that important field of service than has my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. That is very kind of the gentleman. It was because of my insistence with the committee and because of the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee that on page 13 of the report on this bill is language dealing expressly with it. On page 47 of the bill itself there is a proviso, following the semicolon in line 16 to the period in line 19, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocation.

Had there not been a waiver of points of order on this bill, I was going to raise a point of order at the proper time in the reading of the bill to have that proviso stricken from the bill on the theory or on my suggestion that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill. However, since points of order have been waived I cannot raise that point of order. I was prevented from raising the question before the executive session of the Appropriations Committee in the consideration of the bill when the committee reported the bill to the floor because points of order of that nature cannot be raised in the Appropriations Committee. But the Appropriations Committee went as far as the law would permit it to go. Under no circumstances am I satisfied.

I represent the No. 1 distressed economic area of the Nation, the hard coalfields of Pennsylvania. Last night I attended a chamber of commerce dinner in my city and the report was made that there are 25,000 men out of work in my district. In many of the districts that you gentlemen come from if you had one town with 500 men out of work you would be thinking it was a disaster, yet in this 1 area alone, in this 1 valley, there are 25,000 men out of work.

Under the law—and heaven knows I hold no brief for the procurement people in the armed services—complete 100 percent bidding on these procurement contracts would not be practical. There are many reasons why it would not be. I think the chairman and the Member speaking, especially the chairman of the full Military Committee, the gentleman from Texas, meant we should apply the rule of reason to prevent these things from being done. I think I agree.

Now I refer my colleagues in committee and the House to the language on page 13 which under existing law is about as far as we can go in support of the distressed economic areas at this time.

Mr. SIKES. Now, if I may proceed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out for Research and Development, an amount of $333 million, the full budget request for fiscal 1956, is recommended by the committee. This is a decrease of $12 million below the figure for the current fiscal year. It has been testified that this sum of money is designed to continue activities at approximately the same level of effort as that pursued during the last 2 years and is adequate to carry on the program.

The recommended appropriation for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice is $265,000, an increase of $115,000 over the budget estimate of $150,000 and $165,000 greater than that appropriated for the current fiscal year. This increase is for the purpose of furnishing .22 and .30 caliber ammunition to rifle-club members in the 12 to 18 age group. Prior to this year supplies have been furnished from surplus stocks of World War II ammunition which was transferred to the Board. However, this surplus supply has been exhausted and testimony indicated the $50,000 increase within the budget estimate would not furnish all the ammunition needed for these junior members. It is estimated that the $115,000 allowed by the committee will enable the Board to furnish the necessary ammunition for the ensuing fiscal year. The committee is very much aware of the lack of knowledge and understanding of firearms by the youth of this country today and looks with favor on this worthwhile program among the junior groups.

The Army stock fund has again generated excess cash as a result of the Army's living off its "shelf stock" and cutting inventories down to peacetime levels. The committee recommends that the amount available in the Army stock fund be reduced by $700 million and that it be covered into the Treasury in the same manner as previous rescissions from this fund.

Mr. Chairman, there are many important points in this bill I would like

to discuss, but obviously I cannot take the time at this late hour to do it. I shall extend my remarks to include other items on the Army bill and I hope the membership will have an opportunity to study them before tomorrow.

Let me say that the committee took a number of steps designed to improve the efficiency of the Reserves. We know there is still much unrest and uncertainty among the Reserves whether on extended active duty or on inactive duty. It is of great concern to this committee that no really workable Reserve program has been brought forward in all the years since World War II. The committee has seriously wondered on many occasions whether there is real interest in and appreciation for the Reserves among many of the professional soldiers who dominate the thinking in the Pentagon. The committee recalls with concern that at the time of the Korean war it was the individual reservist who had already given many years of his life to military service in World War II who was immediately recalled and thrown into the fighting in Korea. Testimony shows that in the event of war tomorrow, much of the same sort of thing would happen. This is not a happy situation. Reserves are pushed around in little ways—denied promotions, denied even the right to participate in study courses after the age of 45. Heretofore they have been denied the right for weekend drills. Our committee assumed that a quirk in the law was at fault, but found that there simply had been no implementation of regulations to permit weekend training of Reserves. This I am glad to say is being corrected. There are many items of this type that could and should be corrected by the Pentagon. The committee notes that the strength goals for Reserve personnel always have been much higher than the actual goals achieved. However, in an effort to be helpful to the reservists, it is providing the money requested for the current year and hopes that a sufficiently realistic program will be advanced to make the goals attainable.

The recent reports of the Hoover Commission have attracted new attention to Army policies on medical care, transportation and purchase of supplies. The first of these—the report on medical care—was published sufficiently early for the findings of the Commission to be discussed during our regular hearings. I respectfully call the attention of this committee to the testimony of Maj. Gen. George Armstrong, Surgeon General, and an outstanding person, in our published hearings. The reports on transportation and purchase were not published until after our hearings had been completed. However, in order to be as fully informed as possible, this subcommittee held additional hearings, the results of which are available in page proof at the majority and minority desks. I have no desire to excuse the Army for lax practices, but I am convinced that much of the sensational information which came out of the Hoover Commission findings failed to give a true picture of what is taking place or that it can even be substantiated through careful examination. For those areas where the committee feels that the Army has been dilatory, as in the field of transportation, we have made cuts. Perhaps I should point out, however, that criticism was directed particularly toward costs in the field of transportation of household goods and automobiles. In that connection, military authorities have simply followed the law as laid down by Congress permitting these practices. I do think regulations could and should have been issued by the Army to prevent abuses in this field.

Now, some mention has been made of section 639 of the bill, and I am going to ask to be given enough time to comment briefly on it. I will read section 639, on page 50, which says:

SEC. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

Now I request that you turn to page 14 of our report and study what we say there. I read it to you:

Section 639: Attention of the committee has on a number of occasions been directed toward plans within the Department of Defense for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes that there may be circumstances which make a contract operation more desirable than continuations of work by civilian personnel within the Department. In some instances, this, however, represents a radical departure from established custom and it is conceivable that contract operations could, if carried to extremes result in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within the departments with the dispersal of tools and facilities and result in an actually greater cost to the Government over a period of years. Particularly would this be true in the event of a sudden emergency which would require rapid expansion of "on-base" activities. The committee has no desire to hamper legitimate transferal of Government activities to private business where it can properly be shown that this is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by contract without danger to national security. In view, however, of the Government's great investment in its own shops and facilities and the know-how of its civilian personnel and because of this committee's responsibility in the matter of appropriations it is felt that a justification of transfers before the appropriate committees of Congress is proper before the transfers take place.

What does that mean? It simply means this committee believes that some committee of Congress—it could be the Committee on Armed Services, or the Committee on Government Operations, or the Committee on Appropriations; it does not matter—at least 1 committee in the House and 1 committee in the Senate should be made acquainted with the reason or justification for changes in operating procedures before they are made. We have a responsibility to the people. We have a responsibility for orderly operations of fiscal affairs in the Armed Forces. Members have talked much today about waste and inefficiency in the services. We have a responsibility to help prevent waste and inefficiency. A closer knowledge of major changes in operating procedures would be helpful to Congress. The procedure I have outlined would not require much time for the Congress or great effort by the Department of Defense. I do not think there could be any valid objection.

I have no desire to hamper the operations of private business or to stop private business from taking over any function of government which it can perform legitimately at a cost no greater than that which the Government now has to pay for that service. I have no desire to obstruct improvements in operating procedures in the services. But I do want Congress to know what is going on and for that I have no apologies.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida for his marvelous presentation today. I am particularly interested in section 639. I am wondering how it affects the ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard, which happens to be in my district. That is an institution that is close to 100 years old. There are 87 people employed in making rope for the Navy. Actually, 40 percent of the rope used by the Navy is made at this particular shop.

As I understand it, a directive has been issued that this particular part of the yard is to close on August 1. This is not only a rope-manufacturing shop, but it is a research laboratory for testing purposes to develop a stronger fiber. During the war they did develop a stronger fiber so that rope today is 4 times more powerful, has 4 times more strength than it had, say, 10 years ago.

With regard to the ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard—and, incidentally, the ropewalk was authorized by a special act of Congress establishing it close to 100 years ago. In the opinion of the gentleman, would section 639 prevent that directive from coming into effect?

Mr. SIKES. In my opinion, no part of the money contained in the fiscal 1956 budget could be used to take that operation out of existence until such action had been justified before an appropriate committee of the Congress.

Mr. O'NEILL. I think the money the ropewalk operates on is a revolving fund. The Navy has spent so much money for rope. The money is there to spend for the rope, regardless of whether it is manufactured or not.

I would like to spell into the RECORD, if I could, whether or not either the gentleman or the chairman of the committee could say whether or not the adoption of section 639 would defeat the directive. That is my purpose.

Mr. SIKES. Having no personal knowledge of the operation involved, I hesitate to express an opinion. However from what the gentleman has said I consider there is strong likelihood that justification before an appropriate committee of the Congress would be necessary.

Mr. O'NEILL. Two years ago before the Harden committee this matter was

discussed and investigated at length, but that committee never did come out with a report on the matter.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend. May I say it always is a pleasure to me to yield to my friend from South Carolina, with whom I served for a number of years on the great Committee on Armed Services. I know that he represents his district most ably, and has for many years.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

I congratulate the gentleman on that provision. There are times when I do not like to see legislation on an appropriation bill, but this is a time when it comes in pretty handy.

Mr. Chairman, we are losing know-how in the Norfolk yard where they developed the paint that private industry never could develop, and which it would cost $100 million to develop. We are going to lose the paint manufacturing at Norfolk. We are going to lose the clock repair at Norfolk, where they have tools that nobody in private industry can have. We are losing know-how in the Philadelphia Navy Yard and in the Boston Navy Yard, where this crazy program is carried out. If we do not stop these threats to destroy this manufacturing process we will put men out of work who have been there for years and we will destroy equipment. Goodness knows what it will cost. It will set our 11 legislatively created navy yards back 100 years at the minimum.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on that fine provision in the appropriation bill. I must confess it is one time I do favor that part of your legislative program.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I want to concur in what the gentleman from South Carolina has said.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. With reference to the comments of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] on section 639 on page 50 of the bill, we went into that in addition to the other full hearings we held on the Report of the Hoover Commission. May I say that I have voted for the Hoover Commission reports that have come to this floor in prior sessions of Congress, but now the Hoover Commission is sending more reports up here than the President of the United States is sending up. They are coming too fast, they are going too far, and they want to do too much. Under the circumstances, the rule of reason, as provided in the language of this committee report, is far more intelligently handling these subjects of interference with contract performance by civilians in the Army than it has been handled by the Hoover Commission. The gentleman from Florida has handled it very well.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one or two more comments only; I have already taken far too much time.

In concluding my discussions on the Army budget, I want to warn again, as I have in the past, against reliance upon push-button warfare, against reliance upon air power to win wars overnight. War is still a team effort requiring coordinated planning and operation by Army, Navy, and Air. Surely the memories of Korea are fresh enough to remind us of that. Surely the presence of great land armies of Communist forces poised ready to move in all quarters of the world dispels any thought to the contrary. No war has yet been fought in which the land forces were not the decisive element in military power. They alone have the unique ability to close with and destroy forces of enemy power and to occupy his territory. Organized resistance ceases only at that moment.

It should be of concern to us that land forces are designed to apply power directly against military power with minimum damage to civilian populations and economies.

Modern weapons are changing the tactics of war, but the principles of war are immutable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what time has been consumed in general debate by the minority and the majority sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There has been a total consumption of 3 hours and 22 minutes, of which the gentleman from Texas has used 2 hours and 8 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts 1 hour and 14 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be some fixing of the time. I have committed myself to yield 3 additional 20-minute periods so we need an additional hour on this side. I wonder what the situation is on the minority side?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe if the time is fixed not to exceed 3 hours, that will allow the gentleman from Texas his hour and allow the minority to make up for the 52 minutes that we are behind up to now.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue not to exceed 3 hours and that the time be divided in keeping with the situation which has just been set forth in our discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In order to make the situation clear, does the Chair understand that the time will be allotted 1 hour to the gentleman from Texas and 2 hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and insert appropriate material therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar, which would be called on Monday next, may be postponed until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency and any subcommittee thereof may sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations and any subcommittee thereof may sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in that connection I desire to say it is the plan of the leadership to adjourn over until Monday next, if the armed services appropriation bill is completed tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the special order granted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit tomorrow during general debate on the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today, which is third on the list. In view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD at that point where the special order would have been called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

SHORE EROSION

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, so many inquiries were directed to this office on the subject of our critical shore-erosion program, that I presented to the Congress a report on the problem. It is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1955, on pages 1510–1511. I explained that the northeast coast of the United States had been subjected to a series of great storms starting in 1929; that they are increasing in frequency, and that it has now been determined that we on Long Island are in the hurricane pattern. I introduced two bills to attempt to alleviate our situation.

It is now time to make a progress report. It is not encouraging. The answers to the delays fall into three classifications: (a) lack of general public support and understanding, (b) lack of general political support and understanding, (c) partisan politics.

Support for erosion control comes almost exclusively from shorefront property owners. However, even the shorefront property owners are unaware or refuse to recognize the existing legal limitations. The framework within which I must operate comprises:

First. A United States statute—Public Law 727 of the 79th Congress—prohibiting any Federal money for erosion aid in front of private property, yet the United States Army engineers are the recognized agency to conduct a comprehensive survey.

Second. New York State constitutional provisions—article 1, section 7 and article 8, section 1—raise grave questions as to whether an inclusive State program could be undertaken without new State legislation.

Third. Limitations of chapter 535 of the laws—New York—of 1945 as to maintenance and extent.

At the risk of being repetitious, the most difficult thing to get across to the public is limitation one, referred to above. The Federal Government is simply not allowed to spend money for beach erosion in front of private property. Until that law is changed, the Federal Government is out of the picture. This is doubly ridiculous, as I pointed out, because the Army Engineers must pass on all comprehensive projects of this nature, which are proposed by a county or by the State.

Many erosion proponents refuse to accept the solution of town, county, State, and Federal teamwork, based on an overall plan for Long Island. There are at least three bills including mine pending before Congress to overcome the law prohibiting the use of Federal funds for erosion control in front of private property. Yet, even preliminary hearings by the Public Works Committee are not in the immediate offing.

Immediately after the hurricanes Carol and Edna, I held a series of conferences with the officials of the Weather Bureau. They agreed to institute a new hurricane warning service. I learned that one of my colleagues from the State of Connecticut, Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON, planned to introduce a measure providing additional funds for the operation of this service. Yet at the present time, there appears to be no wild rush of enthusiasm to pass his very much needed legislation. This phase of our shocking negligence is best reported in an editorial in the New York Times of May 9, 1955:

HURRICANE WARNING

Last summer's hurricanes killed 200 people and caused about $800 million damage to property as they tore into the coasts and back country of our northeastern States. They also confirmed the grim presumption that this part of the country is now definitely in the hurricane zone. Disaster experts, however, estimate that 90 percent of the loss of lives and possibly as much as 25 percent of the property damage from hurricanes could be prevented if the Weather Bureau were able to give more precise and timely warnings broadcast over all our communications media and based on much more knowledge than it has about the air currents far aloft and out to sea.

In view of all this the public has a right to expect an immediate and substantial increase in the Bureau's facilities and personnel. Shocking as it will be to those unfamiliar with the Federal budget now before Congress, nothing of the sort is in sight for the next fiscal year (July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956). In a letter published on this page a well-known meteorologist raises a timely alert as to this dangerous situation. His letter, however, suffers from understatement.

If the appropriations called for in the budget are not increased the Weather Bureau will not, in practical effect, get a cent more for research and its general weather reporting services next year than this. The Bureau itself states in its budget justification that "research in 1956 is planned at about the same level as for 1955," and there will actually be one less staff member assigned to this work.

The overall budget for next year, it is true, is $3 million more than last ($27,850,000) plus a special $5 million extra for equipment to be spent over the next 4 years. But the $3 million is to cover the expenses of taking over observation activities which the Air Force previously carried on and the $5 million—except for new radar installations—is largely to replace old equipment. No more stations are provided for and no strengthening of the present inadequate and underpaid but expert staff. (The Bureau has lost 1,000 employees since 1949 and the average annual pay of those who remain is $4,864.)

The very least that should be done by Congress is to pass the Patterson bill (H. R. 5260), which provides an additional $5 million above the budget allowances for the Weather Bureau—to be used exclusively in the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system. But Congress might well look into the adequacy of the Weather Bureau's budget all along the line. As far as hurricanes are concerned additional expenditures now may well be covered, and many times over, by savings to the public in the long run.

Added to these difficulties is the interjection of partisan politics. A political committee under the label "Suffolk County Democratic Erosion Control Committee," made a report to the Governor of the State of New York, containing a number of good suggestions. But eternal shame will forever be theirs for injecting party politics into this field. But this goes even further. I have brought this entire problem to the attention of the New York State Commissioner of Public Works, recently appointed by Governor Harriman, asking for a joint meeting with the United

States Army engineers. This was refused. Why?

This office has accumulated a large file on the subject of beach erosion as well as a great deal of firsthand information in dealing with the problem. This office has access not only to the New York district engineer's files but also to those of the Federal Beach Erosion Board, which has done comprehensive work all over the United States. Yet no request for information from either the political committee or from Governor Harriman's appointee has ever been received. In fact, the existence of a political action committee in the erosion field was learned by a copy of their report being mailed to me by a colleague. Politics of any kind has no bearing and should not play a part in the field of beach erosion. There may be differences as to method and procedure, but we should debate all questions on the basis of merit and not politics.

At this writing, we are waiting for the commissioner of public works of the State of New York to accept the Federal survey contract. When this is signed by the State of New York, the Federal survey will begin by the New York district engineers. Upon its completion, it will still be necessary to resolve, on a teamwork basis, the method of approach. The sands are running by and the hurricane season approaches. Nothing is being done. Consequently, I suggest that a three-way conference between the county, State, and Federal Government are not out of order.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today—May 11—is a landmark in the economic and social development of my home State of Illinois and of the United States.

Today is the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration—the agency which has helped more than 4 million rural consumers lift themselves from the dark ages of the kerosene lamp into the modern era of electric farming.

It was May 11, 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration.

That executive order was the start, and the next year the Congress passed legislation establishing the REA on a firm basis for 10 years. The legislation has been extended until now REA is a permanent agency inside the Department of Agriculture.

What has been the result of these 20 years of REA?

In 1935 fewer than 11 farms in every hundred in America had electric power and light. Today, two decades later, more than 92 out of every hundred farms electrified.

The REA has been directly responsible for the extension of electricity to more than half of these farms. More than half of the electrified farms are served today by the 1,300,000 miles of powerline built with REA financing.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen with my own eyes, as I am sure that many in this House have done, the amazing transformation of the face of rural America in these two tremendous decades.

Twenty years ago when I went to speak in the towns and villages of the counties that are now in my district, there was many a village hall, many a church building, still lighted with kerosene lamps.

The people who came to the meetings came from farmhouses lighted with kerosene lights and candles. And many of these communities were less than 50 miles, less than 25 miles even, from a major city, which had had electricity for decades.

The farm people of my district, and the farm people of America, were denied their full participation in the conveniences and marvels of modern life. They could go to the city and see the lights burning; they could visit a factory and see electricity running machines. But they had no electricity themselves.

There are few farms in my home State today that still are forced to dwell in darkness. In 1935 only 12 percent of all farms in Illinois had electricity, today more than 96 percent are electrified.

For this they can thank the REA—both for its direct assistance and for the powerful stimulus it created to privately-owned utilities, which finally began to extend their lines where never before had they seen what they called a profitable market.

It is good for us to think, sometimes, in simple human terms. The measure of the REA's contribution goes beyond a mere tabulation of the total consumers served and the miles of power lines built with REA loans.

Let us think of the women of the farms, who have been released from some of the drudgery of their lives. At one giant step they entered the full privileges of modern life. They are free, at last, of the backbreaking toil that killed their grandmother prematurely.

They, like their previously more fortunate city sisters, can buy electrical appliances to help them in their work. They have electrically driven water systems instead of the dug well and the old oaken bucket. They have refrigerators, electric ranges, garbage disposals, and dishwashing machines. They have vacuum cleaners and pop-up toasters. They, like their previously more fortunate city sisters, can get relaxation and entertainment, a more varied life, from radio and television.

Let us think of the men of the farms who toiled before with outmoded tools and labored with only their own horsepower to do the heavy tasks that farmers have always known.

They have electrically powered milking machines, automatic livestock watering equipment, pig and chicken brooders, hay dryers, hoists, and feed mixers. Coolers and barn ventilators help dairymen produce more and better milk.

The farmer and his sons have help, at last, with the production of the foods and fibers that clothe and feed our whole vast country—and while their tasks have been made easier, their production has been vastly increased. There is a saving in farm labor—a decrease in the once endless tasks of hauling wood and coal and water—and a great spurt in output. Back in 1900, in the pre-electricity days, the average farmworker could produce enough for himself and seven others—and there was relatively little change by 1935 except in the contribution of the tractor. Today, thanks to power equipment and electricity, the average farmworker produces enough for himself and 14 others. The average output per hour of farm labor has almost doubled since just before World War II—in the past 15 years of the REA.

The REA record in the financial field is one of which the borrowing electric systems have reason to be proud.

Up to the beginning of this year, REA had approved nearly $3 billion in electric loans to more than 1,000 rural electric systems. These borrowers had made about $193 million in interest payments and repaid about $376 million in principal retirement.

A cushion against future interest and principal payments had been created by the return of nearly $79 million ahead of schedule. Only about $307,000 in loan payments was overdue more than 30 days. In other words, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of payments were delinquent—a record, across the years, that I doubt can be matched in any area in the history of American banking.

The power systems which made this enviable record are all locally owned and managed.

Not one of these systems was built by Uncle Sam. All of them are the product of grassroots initiative and hard work and good management at the local level.

For the most part they are privately owned business enterprises, including 983 cooperatives and 25 commercial companies. A smaller number—73—are systems operated by public power districts or other public bodies—but all of them are local.

The function of the REA was to finance the building of these systems, to advance the money as it was needed. But before any loans for electrification were made, local groups had to develop feasible plans and rally adequate community support to assure repayment of loans. The REA is not a handout agency; it lends a helping hand, after the plans are made and after the REA administrators are persuaded that the plans are practical.

With this broad community base to build on, REA power systems have grown far beyond the most optimistic early projections. Many of them are now among the leading business enterprises in the areas they serve. They have sizable payrolls and they make a substantial contribution to the prosperity of the general local economy.

An extraordinary factor contributing to their success has been the steady increase in farm power consumption. As recently as 1949 the average farm consumer served by REA-financed lines used 134 kilowatt-hours of power per month.

In 1954, just 5 years later, the average consumer used 226 kilowatt-hours per month.

My own State of Illinois has paralleled this experience. Illinois farms connected with REA systems used 262 kilowatt-hours per month in 1954—well above the national average and 57 percent above the 1949 average for Illinois alone.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this remarkable enterprise would be branded by some as "creeping socialism," but it has meant developing prosperity and a richer, fuller life for millions of hard-working Americans.

Let us think, for a little, about what REA has meant to the people in cities. There is the danger, occasionally, that in emphasizing the services of REA systems to the farm people we may inadvertently slight their important contribution to urban people.

Electric power means bigger income for the farmer, and this means that he has more to spend on the products and services of city dwellers. Farm power helps pay the doctor and hospital bills, farm power buys new furniture; electric power finances the education of the farmers' children.

Who is it who keeps the assembly lines spinning in the automobile factories of Detroit, the appliance and clothing factories running in cities all over the country? A major part is played by the Nation's 7 million farmers, who have the purchasing power, at last, to take their place as a significant segment of the consuming economy. Electric power on the farm means profits for the producers of appliances, it means more work and fatter pay envelopes for employees in the manufacturing, retailing, and service industries. Farm power means more business for the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker.

Take the wiring contractor and the electric appliance dealer, for example, to see the direct benefits of REA to people in the cities.

It is estimated, perhaps conservatively, that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities, rural families spend $3 to $4 in farmstead wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

On the basis of the nearly $2.5 billion of REA loans invested in power systems, this means between $7.5 billion and $10 billion has been spent with urban enterprises or in the stores on Main Street where the farmers shop. A more accurate estimate might be between $12 billion and $15 billion.

In my home State of Illinois alone, about $81 million in REA loan funds has been advanced for investment in rural power systems. A projection suggests that this has resulted, conservatively, in between $243 million and $334 million in new business for Illinois town and city enterprises.

The rural electrification program contributes in still another way to the common welfare of town and country people. REA-financed electric systems pay taxes to the support of their communities and the Nation. Many electric cooperatives are now among the biggest taxpayers in their communities.

That is only part of it. Their employees pay taxes on their incomes, like everyone else. Rural power systems, by raising the income of farmers and adding to the value of farm property, make an important contribution to tax revenues needed both for national defense and for schools, roads, and other essentials of Government.

There is no way to measure this contribution statistically with any exactness. But the amount in additional Federal income taxes paid by farmers is certainly substantial. It is more than enough to offset claims that the rural-electrification program has been a drain on the National Treasury.

The excellent repayment record of REA borrowers, the additional taxes they have paid, the tremendous benefits that the REA has spread across the Nation, make the rural-electrification program one of the remarkable achievements of our times.

I would like to touch, at this time, on a matter which is familiar to many of us but which should not be passed over without specific recognition.

The father of the rural-electrification program, in a very real sense, is the Speaker of this House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

It was the Speaker, who already had served his people well for more than two decades, who joined with the late Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, to sponsor the basic legislation upon which the REA program has been built.

It was the Rayburn-Norris law which gave a firm grant of authority from the Congress to the movement that spread from farm to farm, from cooperating group to cooperating group, until finally the blessings of electric light and power were available to the vast majority of American families on the farm.

I am sorry, in a way, that the Speaker is not with us today in this body. I would be glad to pay my tribute to him directly.

There is great pleasure to be gained, however, from the fact that he is sharing in what might be called a grassroots celebration of his personal contribution to REA.

The Speaker today is in Atlanta, Ga., where he is addressing a meeting in which 41 REA cooperatives of the State of Georgia are commemorating this anniversary.

This is fitting and proper, because the vision of the REA was born in Georgia. The late President Roosevelt told in a speech in 1938 how, when he was visiting the Little White House in Warm Springs, he meditated on the darkness of the farm homes, the laborious toil of the farm people, and reached a determination that something should be done to bring the farmers of all the land into the full privileges of our modern era.

The people of Georgia have not forgotten this, nor have they forgotten what the Speaker helped them do when he sponsored the basic REA legislation.

They invited him to join them in their celebration—in the celebration of the fact that in 20 short years the number of electrified farms in their State has climbed from 6,956 to 240,733—from 2.8 percent to 92.7 percent.

When he speaks to them today, they will be the symbol for all the farmers of the land, to whom REA has meant a new outlook and a fresh chance for a better life.

It is not often, in history, that a man is given the chance to meet with the people after two decades and realizes: "This good thing that has been done, I had a part in creating." The Speaker has this opportunity today, and I am sure that his heart is full and his spirit proud, and that he will know our best wishes and felicitations are with him.

There is a fashion, nowadays, when we reflect on the great social and economic contributions of the New Deal era, to pretend that everybody was always in favor of these programs, that everybody always believed, for example, in the REA.

We know that it is not true. There were denunciations of the Executive order of Franklin D. Rooseveut in 1935, and there was resistance to and attempted sabotage of the basic Rayburn-Norris law of 1936. All through the years there have been raiding parties and piratical expeditions against REA appropriations, against the scope of REA operations. There was long delay and resistance to the extension of REA authority to lend money for rural telephone systems.

The people are sometimes told, in the heat of political campaigns, that the party and the leadership that accomplished good things for the Nation were guilty of "20 years of treason," that they were soft toward foreign enemies, that they changed things too fast and ought to slow down the pace.

Well, take a look at the REA program. Is this program which transformed the face of rural America the result of 20 years of treason? Did we move too fast? Did the New Deal of Roosevelt and the Fair Deal of Harry S. Truman, which created and upheld the REA, do something when they made it possible for farmers to have electricity and telephones?

Mr. Speaker, we have had a recent report from an official commission which says in effect that there is something shameful and un-American in the way electricity has been spread across the prairies and farmlands.

Let us change the lending system, says this report, let us change the way the REA has operated. Make it charge more interest, force it to make things more difficult for the rural co-ops.

The things that were done by REA were wrong, or at least the way in which we did these things were wrong, we are told. We have been guilty, it is charged, of subsidizing the spread of electricity to the farmers.

There in the stark, heartless language of the report we have a denial of the suggestion that everybody, just everybody, believes in the REA.

Everybody does not believe in the REA. The majority members of the Hoover Commission complain that the program has been financially inadequate and that subsidies have been improperly granted.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who is a member of the Hoover Commission, filed a separate statement of views that commands respect because of the logic of its reply to the Hoover Commission majority.

The Hoover Commission majority, declared the gentleman from California, simply wants to wipe out Federal aids to many programs that "concern intimately the affairs and well-being of millions of Americans and the health and strength of the national economy."

"The Congress has authorized subsidies of many kinds to develop the Nation and to keep it strong," Mr. HOLIFIELD pointed out, but the Commission majority "made no systematic survey on the whole subject." It wants to weaken and restrict exactly those subsidies "which bring widespread benefits to the whole population."

Let us nail this down to the subject of REA. "Everybody," it is alleged, respects and admires the work the REA has done. But the Hoover Commission majority bluntly suggests that REA be reorganized, that it be denied advances from the Federal Government, that it be forced to finance itself from private sources.

Does anyone believe that under this philosophy the REA would have accomplished what it has done in these past 20 years?

We would not be bothered with a celebration of electricity on the farms, we would not have had a 20th anniversary to celebrate, if the dogmas of the Hoover Commission had dominated legislation for the past two decades. We would not have had any great social and economic accomplishment to commemorate.

The Federal Government set up a program. The Congress passed a law authorizing the program, and the objective was to make electricity available to the farmers. The program has worked.

Now there is more to be done. There are farmers who still are without electricity; they have a right to share in advantages available to other Americans. The REA systems need to expand their capacity and facilities, to meet the rising demand for power.

The REA co-ops deserve a full chance to participate in the development of electricity from atomic generation. There are telephone lines and telephone systems to build in the rural areas.

Yet a Commission majority comes and says, "Oh, yes, electricity and telephones are no doubt a fine thing, but you have been guilty of subsidies, and you must stop these subsidies to preserve the American way of life."

I say that the American way of life is to use the General Government wisely to do those things for the people which the people cannot do for themselves without the Government's help.

I say that the farm women from whose backs the burdens of toil have been lifted, the farmers who can earn more and produce more and still enjoy more leisure, know a lot more about the American way of life, and share in it more richly, than if they had been fed dogmas instead of being given a chance by the REA.

The people who want to hamper and harass the REA today are the people who never believed in it—and the answer to their gloom and doom is what REA has done in two proud decades.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I desire to join the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and other colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the great record of service of the Rural Electrification Administration. It is my conviction that in its far-reaching consequences to the happiness and welfare of the people of this country, and especially those of the rural areas, it is one of the greatest programs ever initiated in the history of this country.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, who participated in bringing about this legislation for the rural areas of this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to compliment my friend on the speech that he is making today. In addition to thanking the members of the REA for their efficient administration, I think the real thanks can go to the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who initiated it, and our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, who sponsored it, and for the Democratic Party, because this legislation was put through by the Democratic Party against the greatest opposition possible from the other party, and we might just as well have the record clear. The people who are the beneficiaries of this are indebted to the Democratic Party under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. PRICE. I agree, of course, with the fine remarks of the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. MOULDER. I, too, want to join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in the remarks he has made commemorating this day in respect to the rural electrification program, and while speaking on this subject I hope the gentleman will yield me sufficient time to call the attention of the Members of the House to the recent attitude of the present administration in connection with the Southwest Power Administration.

The REA in effect or in theory or in principle is a partnership with the people who are receiving the rural electrification service.

Partnerships between the Government and its citizens are not new. Democratic government, in its purest sense, is a partnership with its people.

Partnerships to be successful must be mutually advantageous to the partners. Each partner must have something to offer that the other partner wants. The partnership must be in the public interest and sound in public policy. When partnerships involve electric power, they must be sound also in economics and engineering—that is, the generating plants and power lines must work satisfactorily, and a dollar's worth of goods and services must be produced or saved for each dollar spent.

Certain rural electric cooperatives in Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma entered into a partnership arrangement with their Federal Government to provide a market for surplus hydro power from Government flood-control dams, and to provide power for 325,000 farm homes in these States. The job was too big for individual electric distribution cooperatives, so they join together to form federated cooperatives known as generation and transmission cooperatives. Five of these generation and transmission cooperatives negotiated partnership contracts with Southwestern Power Administration—SPA—an agency of the Department of the Interior. These contracts provided that the generation and transmission cooperatives would secure loans from REA to build steam powerplants and complete electrical systems, including lines to go out to the farm communities and larger lines connecting to the Government's hydro plants to supplement the Government's hydro power. The Government approved their plans, designs, and contracts and inspected the work during construction of their systems under the partnership arrangement. The contracts provided that SPA would operate most of the lines built by the generation and transmission cooperatives, purchase all the power from their steam plants, combine it with its hydro power, and sell back to the generation and transmission cooperatives all the power they needed for themselves.

Here was a partnership arrangement at the local level between the Government and its farm people. Would it pass the test of soundness? Did each partner have something to offer the other partner? He did. SPA needed electricity from the generation and transmission cooperatives' steam plants; it needed power lines to reach out to the preference customers, who are nonprofit cooperatives, municipally owned systems, and Government installations. Since SPA had only enough water in its reservoirs to run its power generators about 30 percent of the time, it could sell only about half of the power it had. With the generation and transmission cooperatives as partners, SPA could sell all its power when combined with the steam plants which can run all the time. The generation and transmission cooperatives were a real helpful partner to SPA. The generation and transmission cooperatives needed SPA. With SPA they could run their plants all the time. This combination would reduce cost for each kilowatt-hour or unit of power, because the same cost would be divided by more kilowatt-hours. Let us compare this partnership to a train—it costs more per car to run a train of 20 freight cars than it does to run a train of 100 cars. The cost per car would be about five times as great for the short train as for the long one. Likewise, it costs more to run steam-generating plants only part of the time than it does to operate them full-time. The same principle holds true for the transmission lines and substations. Under SPA contracts the facilities would haul power up to their capacity, and the cost to everyone, including the farmer, would be the lowest possible under any method of operation.

Everyone benefited from the partnership, and cost to the taxpayer in taxes was nothing, since power was sold at

rates sufficient to pay all the costs. Congressional appropriations were not required, because a revolving account, called a continuing fund, created from SPA's power revenues, was set up to meet the month-to-month expenses. The economics of the partnership were sound.

The facilities were built according to standards of the Government and sound engineering and have been working perfectly.

Operation of this partnership would raise the standards of living and tax-paying ability of 325,000 farm families; it would bring cheaper power to business and industry; it would make more work for our laborers; it would raise the economic potential of a great segment of our Nation. The partnership is in the public interest and is sound public policy.

Something happened. Today this partnership arrangement is not at work. The generation and transmission cooperatives are facing bankruptcy; SPA is seeking rate increases to meet its costs. Government experts are frantically trying to force the generation and transmission cooperatives into a new partnership arrangement with private utility companies. Farmers are suspicious of the power companies. Past relations have not been good. Partnerships do not have much promise of success where there is lack of faith in each other.

Furthermore, the generation and transmission cooperatives do not have much the private utility companies can use advantageously. These companies do not need power from the generation and transmission cooperatives' steam plants because they already have large steam plants of their own. However, some of these companies can use generation and transmission cooperatives' lines.

The generation and transmission cooperatives have a preference right to buy SPA's hydro power; the private companies do not. Most of these private companies can use SPA's hydro power. Can the generation and transmission cooperatives trade their preference right to the private companies for a solution to their present predicament? The answer rests on how cheaply they can obtain SPA's hydro power and on how much they can mark up the price to the private companies.

Would such a partnership between the generation and transmission cooperatives and the private companies stand up under the tests? Do each of the proposed partners have something the other needs and wants? The answer is "No." Is this proposed partnership economical? Its financial success depends upon low rates to SPA, high rates to the private companies, and a wide margin between these prices for the generation and transmission cooperatives to pass on to the companies in exchange for low rates for themselves. Such a financial arrangement is not sound economically for the Government. The Government has loaned about $380 million to develop the federated power systems and their member cooperatives. Is it sound fiscal policy to jeopardize this Government investment? Is it sound policy to urge and encourage a partnership arrangement that has little basis for success? Is it sound policy to try to bring about a wedding of unwilling participants? The answers is "No."

What is the solution? The answer is to go back to the original partnership. All facilities have been built and are operating. No appropriations will be necessary if the continuing fund is restored. The farmers want the fund restored. They do not want the partnership plan now being promoted. It is up to this Congress to decide either in favor of the people or in favor of private interests.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in this matter because I have given the question a great deal of study. My understanding is that under the partnership status the users were able to buy power for a little over 5 mills.

Mr. MOULDER. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now they are charging them over 11 mills?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. This could be handled by a small appropriation on the part of Congress of $400,000 which would enable the partnership to be revived and carried on.

Mr. MOULDER. That is exactly right.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not a further fact that this money, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri, would not be an appropriation out of the Treasury of anything except funds that have been paid into the Treasury as the result of the sales of electricty by the Southwest Power Administration?

Mr. MOULDER. That is correct and would not cost the taxpayer a penny.

Mr. ALBERT. It would not cost the taxpayers a dime. It is simply a bookkeeping transaction. If the Congress would authorize the use of part of these funds it would restore the situation. I want to add that I should like to compliment the gentleman on a very fine statement he has made on a subject that is certainly of utmost importance to the economy of all the States of the Union.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our distinguished colleague from Illinois for calling the anniversary of this great event to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago most of my farm neighbors were without the tools and conveniences so important to farming and farm life today. Only a very few had electric power. The rest were doing their chores by lantern light, almost in darkness. When they went from the house to the barn to do their chores, they had become accustomed to feeling for the path in the darkness.

Many farm wives did the family washing on the old washboard. The life of a woman on a farm was one of long hours of hard work. She could visit her sister in the city and see her using the new appliances made possible by electricity. But when she returned home she had to get out the washboard to do the washing and the old flatiron that had to be heated on the wood stove for ironing.

When she cooked or baked she reached for the big bowl and spoon, prominent in every farm kitchen. When she did her mending in the evening, she did it by lamp light. She had to turn up the wick. Then it smoked up the glass chimney and the light dimmed again.

Preserving food meant many long hours of preparation for canning—hours of hauling wood, pumping water, and standing over the hot stove to be sure each important step was properly attended to.

The farm radio was run by batteries that had to be charged periodically.

The iron pump handle familiar in the farmyard and farm home was worn smooth by the many hands that had pumped it each day.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard for us today to fully understand how the signing of Executive Order 7037 by a great President on May 11, 1935, revolutionized the rural life of America.

Some of my farm neighbors were concerned 20 years ago that this new development was a luxury that we could not afford. Some were afraid that the Government would spend itself into bankruptcy by trying to bring electric power to the farm.

We all know the remarkable record of repayment that has been made by REA cooperatives in spite of the fact that many of the original lines had to be rebuilt in order to carry many times the load anticipated at that time.

The revolution on the farm left its mark on the rest of the economy. What a great boon rural electrification has been and continues to be for business and industry. It has opened almost limitless markets for machinery and appliances that are no longer considered luxuries but are necessary to everyday work.

Then, as now, there were those who talked about interfering with free enterprise and regimenting the farmer and his family. The same arguments continue about development of our resources, about private versus public power, in this great chamber.

Certainly the leaders of private industry failed to recognize a great potential market that existed in the rural America of 20 years ago. The Rural Electrification Administration simply helped the people do those things which by single efforts alone they were unable to do and an entire nation has benefited.

It would be well for us to acknowledge the effect of this great cooperative effort between the people and their Government. It should be an example to us and a constant reminder that there are still opportunities for people to work with and through their own Government to do together the jobs we cannot do alone. The strength of our country rests in the strength and moral fiber of its people. Programs like REA revitalize anew the faith, and hope, and industry of a great people.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I want to join with the gentleman from Illinois in applauding the achievements and accomplishments made by the national rural-electrification program. I hope that the same enthusiasm and support that it has had in the past will be continued and that we can keep it operating without impairment.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime supporter of the work of the Rural Electrification Administration, it is a matter of gratification to myself and the people of my district to congratulate it on 20 years of notable service to the farmers and rural communities of the Nation.

No legislation affecting farmers in my memory has had such successful results. No legislation concerning our farms and farm families has proved so overwhelmingly popular. And I doubt seriously that the people of the United States have ever made a much better investment than in REA.

When REA began in 1935 there were fewer than three-quarters of a million farms in America served by central station electric power. Today there are nearly 5 million.

In 1935 scarcely 11 percent of farm homes were electrified. Today the figure stands at nearly 93 percent. This is an achievement of the greatest magnitude. It has made the labor of the farmer and his family go much further in that it has added to man's power, the power of electricity. It has brought increased incomes to farms and better lives for farm families. In increasing the economic and social stability of the American farm, the REA has accomplished a tremendous service.

Not all of the gain in electrified farms has been due to REA, of course. Today about half the electrified farms in the Nation are served by REA borrowers. We sometimes forget, however, how the work of the REA has stimulated private companies in this field and opened up new paths of service to them.

Financially, this program has been an outstanding success. Loans now total approximately $3 billion. There are now 1,075 electric borrowers and of these 977 are cooperatives; some of them are small private companies and others small municipalities.

All of this money will eventually be paid back to the Federal Treasury. So far, borrowers have returned approximately $377 million in principal, and they have paid nearly $193 million in interest.

It is interesting to note that REA has been forced to foreclose on only 2 mortgages of electric borrowers in the 20 years of its existence. In one case, a plant was destroyed by a storm before it could get into operation. In the other, a small cooperative found that its territory had been bought up by a private company before it could get in operation. Yet, in that case, the Government got all its money back.

I doubt that many business enterprises of such size could match that record.

REA's work has done more than electrify farms and promote the happiness and well-being of farm families. It has created an enormous and continuing demand for all manner of electrical appliances and farm equipment operated by electricity, thus building an enormous market for manufactured goods which previously just did not exist.

So, on this anniversary I take pleasure in behalf of thousands of my constituents in Mississippi who have directly benefited from the REA program in saluting the REA, a good and faithful servant.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the splendid statement he has made and for the tribute he has made to the great REA and his outline of what it has meant to our country. I think it is especially fitting that today on the 20th anniversary of the REA our beloved Speaker is addressing the Georgia Electric Membership Corp. in Atlanta. That is an organization that embraces most of the REA's in Georgia. Mr. RAYBURN is to address that great gathering. I want to pay tribute to Mr. RAYBURN for his interest and for the fact that he gave so much of his time and energy to promoting the REA.

In that connection may I say that on May 9 I introduced into the RECORD a story published by the Atlanta Journal dealing with Mr. RAYBURN'S coming to Atlanta and outlining what the REA had meant to the State of Georgia. This story is as follows:

REA JOLTS AWAY FARM DRUDGERY

(By Elmo Hester)

Two decades of improved farming and better rural living for Georgians are being celebrated this week.

Changes in the State's rural areas have been swift since the Rural Electrification Administration was established 20 years ago this Wednesday.

Central station electric current—a new source of power for farmers—now is at their fingertips, available 24 hours a day on 92.7 percent of the State's farms.

Coming of the high lines to rural areas has made possible new sources of farm and rural income. With better living standards have come more conveniences for rural comfort. Farm living now may be just as attractive as life in any city.

Industries and businesses have sprung up in rural areas. They employ many farm dwellers, sometimes indirectly displaced by electricity and mechanization of farm production. The industries also supply markets for other new farm enterprises.

Electricity has become, on many farms, the top—and tireless—hired hand.

HARD WORK

Twenty years ago only 2.8 percent of Georgia's farms were electrified. Life on the farm meant hand pumping and carrying of water, chopping wood for the cookstove, bending over a washboard and poor lighting for reading and farm chores after nightfall.

Many farm chores were done by hand. Shelling corn, milking cows and drawing water for livestock took many hours of work.

The vision President Roosevelt had at the Little White House at Warm Springs now is nearing reality. His Executive order of May 11, 1935, set up REA for the purpose of elevating the standard of living of rural America.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 gave REA permanent status and authorized a 10-year electrification loan program. It was extended indefinitely in 1944. Rural telephone loans were authorized by Congress in 1949 to give rural people adequate telephone service.

Electricity truly has brought the fruits of the industrial revolution to 4 million farm families of the Nation over the past 20 years. It has resulted in an agricultural revolution which still is under way.

The 1955 farm picture is far brighter—laborwise and lightwise—than in 1935.

Farm families served by rural electric lines can have pushbutton lights, running water, refrigerators, water heaters, clothes driers, air conditioning units (even for the baby pigs in the farrowing houses), and other modern conveniences.

Electricity has more than paid its own way on the farm. Electrical servants have taken over much of the hard work of livestock and crop production while boosting output and cutting costs.

Without electricity in rural Georgia, the diversification of the State's agriculture of the past quarter centery would have been impossible. The $150 million commercial broiler and egg industries, celebrating their 20th anniversaries this month, still would be in infancy. Expansion of dairying into new areas and efficiency gains in hog production would have added far less to farm income without labor-saving electric power.

POWER TO PRODUCE

Electrically generated cool temperatures in coolers preserve egg quality in the summer's heat. Farmers may now do their own egg grading and packing. Lights, too, help maintain production. Automatic feeders and watering systems in broiler houses take much of the labor out of broiler production.

Dairymen are producing better milk and more of it in Georgia with the help of milking machines, cooling systems which protect quality, and barn ventilators. Grain and hay driers have come along to give the farmers new freedom from weather hazards.

Feed can be handled with electrically driven conveyors. Electricity makes possible feed grinding and mixing using feed crops produced at home. Processing of hybrid seed corn and other quality seeds now may be done on the farm—with electric motored machinery.

Irrigation, using current from REA-financed lines, also is increasing.

Electric pumps geared to deep wells can supply the source of water which otherwise may be lacking for irrigation on some farms.

With wider use of electricity in agricultural production, such farm industries as hatcheries, poultry byproducts plants, sausage factories, and feed-mixing plants have come to rural areas. This is particularly true in the north Georgia broiler belt.

But nonagricultural businesses also are moving to the country with electricity. De luxe motels, drive-in theaters, restaurants, and other businesses no longer are restricted to towns or cities.

Power lines now reach virtually every rural community of the State. But the need for expansion still is present. But this expansion must be vertical and not so much horizontal.

Greater power use per farm, which often means that power-line capacity must be increased by a heaving-up process, will reduce the cost per kilowatt-hour of current consumed. Often transformers must be changed and more transmission lines built.

BIG STRIDES

Cooperatives serving Georgia farms already have made tremendous strides in this direction. Average monthly kilowatt-hour consumption on REA-financed power lines in Georgia increased from 104 per farm in 1940 to 161 in 1952, to 195 in 1953, to 212 during 1954.

But here's the picture in the eight northeast Georgia broiler counties served by the Jackson Electric Membership Corp., with headquarters at Jefferson:

Per consumer use of electricity was 37.3 kilowatt-hours in 1940, 81.2 in 1948, and 209.6 last year. During the same period the consumer cost per kilowatt-hour dropped from 6.7 to 3.9 to 2.7 cents each in the respective years.

Georgia's first REA loan was approved in August of 1935. A year later the Georgia Power & Light Co., of St. Petersburg, Fla., energized the first REA-financed lines.

The State now has 43 REA-financed rural power systems which serve about 79.4 percent of the State's electrified farms. On January 1, 1955, these REA-financed cooperative systems were serving 240,733 farms and other rural consumers along 60,121 miles of lines.

Total electrification loans approved for Georgia borrowers on January 1 was $98,999,907. When construction authorized by these loans is completed, the new facilities will bring electric service, including lines now energized, to about 258,000 consumers.

Georgia's 92.7 percent of its farms electrified compares with a national figure of 92.3 percent. During 1954 Georgia passed the national average for the first time. Twenty years ago the national figure was 10.9 percent—nearly 4 times as large as Georgia's 2.8 percent.

BRINGS IN INDUSTRY

Families living on REA-financed lines aren't the only ones who have benefited. the rural-electrification program has brought more business to rural communities.

REA borrower experience shows that for every dollar invested in new rural power facilities, farm families themselves have to spend $3 to $4 for wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances in order to made use of the current. That means between $245 million and $325 million in Georgia business resulting from the $81,500,000 in REA funds advanced to borrowers for investment in rural-power systems.

Georgia co-ops plan to spend, during the next 5 fiscal years, $25,279,000 to add to power distribution, system improvement, generation, transmission, and consumer facilities. Of this, nearly $7 million will be spent during the fiscal year 1956 beginning July 1.

They plan to seek loans of approximately $30 million, but all the funds won't be used during that period.

Some of the cooperatives already are returning to their members patronage dividends based on the amount of current used. For the Colquitt County Electric Co. at Moultrie, this has reached almost a million dollars over the past 4 years.

LOWER RATES

Others are reducing rates. Some of the co-ops offer trained engineering or home economist electrification adviser assistance in planning more efficient use of electricity on the farms.

At the beginning of 1955, Georgia borrowers had paid $8,193,441 in interest and repaid $15,935,335 in principal on their REA loans. This includes a current balance of $2,715,335 in payments made ahead of schedule. No payments were in arrears from Georgia borrowers at the end of last year.

Last year the Georgia co-ops spent $6,640,000 to add 6,904 new customers along 1,601 miles of line.

Electricity's junior partner to more convenient farm living is the rural-telephone program.

Five years ago there were 18,619 Georgia farms with telephones—or 9.4 percent. By April 1, REA had allocated a net total of $2,157,000 for loans to 14 commercial companies and 3 cooperative associations in the State. These loans will enable the borrowers to serve 10,728 new subscribers and to provide improved service to 9,680 present subscribers, using 4,894 pole miles of line.

Private utility companies operating in Georgia also have expanded their rural programs during the past two decades. But complete figures of growth on farms served by private power and telephone companies are not available.

Drudgery hasn't vanished from the Georgia farm and rural home. But current from rural electric lines are shocking back-breaking tasks into the background.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his very fine statement regarding the REA, and I want to pay my tribute to the Rural Electrification Administration. It has a clean and efficient record of dedicated service to our rural people. And, I want to pay my compliments to our own rural cooperatives in my native State of Missouri. Their accomplishments about parallel the marvelous accomplishments of REA throughout the Nation. In fact, before REA came to Missouri, less than 10 percent of our farms had electricity. Now we have almost the exact reverse. Less than 10 percent are now without electricity, and that would not have been possible except through the encouragement of the REA.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman for this time and compliment him on the splendid statement he is making on behalf of REA. I want to associate myself with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. LANHAM], in saying that our State of Georgia is honored today to be the host to the distinguished Speaker of this body, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who, as the gentleman told you a moment ago, is there speaking to the more than 40 electrical cooperatives in convention at Atlanta, Ga. I believe I have heard more criticism about the alleged New Deal and the Democratic Party than I have about any other single factor of our Government since I have been interested in government. In some of that criticism I joined; in other parts of it I have frowned upon it. I believe we can all submit that mistakes were made by the so-called New Deal and by the leadership. It was inevitable that we would make mistakes when we had the responsibility of leadership. But, I want to say to you that it shall be to the everlasting credit of those in responsible leadership during the period of the so-called New Deal and those in responsible leadership in the Democratic Party that the Rural Electrification Administration was created, for if there was bungling and if there was waste anywhere in the Government of the United States by any party in the experimental stages, all of that waste has been repaid thousands of times over by the economic prosperty created out of rural electrification.

I again compliment those who had the foresight to bring rural electrification into realization through legislation. If I may have about a minute more, I would say that my district in Georgia is typical of the rural district of America where the people have benefited from it. We have in a small northeast Georgia district five rural cooperatives who borrowed collectively more than $11 million and have built and maintained more than 7,000 miles of line and serve more than 35,000 rural customers. What have they done about this money that they borrowed? More than $1.5 million of it has been repaid on the principal. In addition, almost $1 million has been paid in interest, and to date those cooperatives are $360,000 ahead of schedule in payment on the principal alone. That, if you will take a pattern across the country, is characteristic of what the great rural electric cooperative leadership and management is doing.

I again thank the gentleman from Illinois for this time and compliment him on the splendid statement he has made.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who are congratulating our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] on taking this time to bring to the attention of the Congress and the country the fact that the Rural Electrification Administration is celebrating its 20th birthday today. The REA was set up because the private power companies were dragging their feet on rural electrification. They wanted to serve those areas where the population was dense and where profits were very lush. They did not want to run their lines out into the back country so that the farm people of America could have the same kind of convenience that the housewives and the people in the urban areas had. As a consequence, under the authorship of the great Speaker of this House, the Rural Electrification Administration was set up 20 years ago today. That it has done a good job, there can be no question whatever. Today 95 percent of all the United States farms are electrified and 54 percent—note this—54 percent of this number have been financed by REA loans.

The REA has been loaned from the Federal Government over the last 20 years something like $3 billion. That was to about 1,100 customers. One

thousand of these are cooperatives. Seventy-five are public distributors. Twenty-five are private power companies. Over $375 million in principal has been repaid, plus the interest on $192 million more.

More than $78 million has been paid back ahead of schedule, and only $252,000 is in arrears more than 30 days.

Some of the REA's first borrowers already have paid out in full. In short, this has been a good business venture for America, as well as a great service to the rural people of our country.

I am especially glad that the gentleman has taken this time because I am sure that not everyone realizes that probably now more than at any time in the past 20 years we are having a more concerted assault upon the REA program and upon public power generally—more than at any time in our history.

On the front page of the Star newspaper today, Members can see an article about the power partnership program of this administration. We expect to get a report very soon from the Hoover Commission on which my friend and colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has already commented. The purpose of that report is to wreck the Rural Electrification Administration. The power partnership program would turn over to the private power monopoly the great powerhouses on these federally built dams and Federal structures.

Whenever we lose that power, we lose the low-cost power principle, and whenever we lose low-cost power we lose the preference to which the REA's are entitled, which has helped them to survive and to secure the power that has made their growth possible.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as we celebrate the 20th anniversary of the REA, we get ourselves ready for a fight to defiend the low-cost power principle, and the preference to public agencies, public users, the REA's and the REA itself.

Again I want to congratulate my friend from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] for taking this time, and compliment him on it and thank him for being so kind as to yield to me at this time.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for reminding us that today is the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. This action of our Government is one of the greatest legislative acts of this generation. It has revolutionized rural living for the farmers of America. It has brought the comforts and conveniences of electricity to rural homes, and we are able thereby to keep more of our young people on the farms where they are needed.

I am saddened to learn that there are those in America who would weaken this great force for good in America by hamstringing its source of power. It behooves us to watch the ramparts well in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the gentleman from Illinois in his salute to REA and the transformation which REA has made possible in the farm life of America.

Oklahoma, like other States benefiting from rural electrification, is well aware of the great contribution of REA to the economic progress of the Nation. Every member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress is constantly reminded by his constituents of the importance of this great program, and of the need for continued support of REA by our Government.

The acceptance which the program has won is demonstrated convincingly by the fact that both national parties, in their 1952 platforms, pledged their full support of REA.

Only the Democratic Party, however, continues to fight hard to keep faith with that platform commitment, which was truly a commitment to the future support of a fair deal for the American farmer.

The true friend of the American farmer is also a friend of REA. Those who seek to undercut and undermine this worthwhile program are certainly not friends of the farmer.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I desire to congratulate my friend from Illinois, who has been a great friend of the rural people and a great friend of the Rural Electrification Administration, which has done so much for them.

May I also say that probably no State in the Union has benefited more from the Rural Electrification Administration than has my own State of Mississippi. In 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established, only nine-tenths of 1 percent of the farms in my State were served with electric power. Now, however, from 26 REA-financed rural-power systems the percentage served reaches 85.5 percent. While we may not have as fully electrified our farms as some other States, the fact is that we had a much longer way to go, and have made excellent progress in that regard.

At the beginning of 1955 these REA-financed systems in my State were serving 214,785 farms, and other rural consumers over 50,190 miles of line.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I should like to join in the remarks of my most able colleague from Illinois on this observance of the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Although I am from an urban area rather than a rural area, I feel that in the past two decades the Rural Electrification Administration has contributed greatly to the expansion of the prosperity of the urban areas as well as the rural areas, because with the electrification of the rural areas a great new market for all of the consumer electrical appliance products was opened.

I again compliment my colleague from Illinois on his fine remarks on this 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his effort in this observance of the 20th birthday of this wonderful movement. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and would like to associate myself with the sentiments he has expressed in connection with this important anniversary. I do not know of any one accomplishment of the Democratic Party which has brought so many blessings to the rural people of America as the REA. Early in my law practice, I had the honor and privilege of serving as the attorney for the Talladega Electric Cooperative, Inc., and worked with rural people helping to set up their loan and to get their lines installed to bring electricity to several counties in my district. The present president of the Alabama State organization is Mr. Maury McWilliams, of Prattville, Ala., which is in my district. He is also a member of the board of directors of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. So I have been closely tied in with this movement and I have been in a position to observe the wonderful benefits and blessings that have been brought to our rural people through the REA. Again I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his effort in this respect.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the commendations that have been paid to our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] in calling attention to the fact that this is not only the 20th birthday of the REA, but, as has been so earnestly pointed out, it heralds, after 20 years of complete success, the beginning of an attack upon the REA that calls forth the best efforts and interests that all of us have in seeing that this landmark of rural—yea, American progress—is preserved, and that the people continue to have the benefits of the people's program, the REA.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may have permission to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the rural areas of my State and district have benefitted tremendously from the electric power that has been furnished by the REA. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for granting me the

time to join with him and my other colleagues here this afternoon in saluting the REA on its 20th anniversary.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Illinois in securing this time and so graciously yielding to the other admirers, who happen to be present, of REA—and I know that there are many who are absent who would be here to say a good word if they knew of this time being used for this purpose. While my district in California is an urban district, and I believe a distance of possibly 100 or more miles would intervene between any rural cooperatives and the edges of my district, I have always felt it a privilege to support the great REA program in America because I believe that bringing the advantages of electricity to the farm people is inextricably linked to the welfare of those who make the electric machinery and the equipment which is used on the farms. Therefore, labor in the cities profits from the greater use of electricity on the farms. I would say this as a member of the Hoover Commission, and my colleagues who read my dissenting report on the lending agency recommendations of the Hoover Commission, know full well where I stand on the subject of REA. I would say we are facing now a renewed attack from the great private power monopolies in the Nation on the rural electric cooperatives and all other forms of pubiic power. We see that in an attempt to destroy the preference clause and in an attempt to raise the interest rates for rural electric cooperative financing and the charging of additional expense to rural electrical cooperatives that would make it harder for them to bring their services to the people. The task force on power and water resources of the Hoover Commission has just finished its study and has referred the results to the members of the Commission. I am under confidence at this time not to report specifically the provisions of this task force study. It has been accumulated by the expenditure of over $325,000 of public funds and, in my opinion, it should be made known as quickly as possible to all the American people. I think they should have the right to know how their money was expended and what the recommendations of this task force was which expended that money.

I want to say that if the philosophy carried out in the recommendations of the Task Force Study, as I have had the limited time to study it myself—if they were carried out by the Congress of the United States, we would turn back the clock at least 30 years to the days when there was no such thing as rural electric cooperatives, when there was no such thing as public power in the sense we see it today. Those recommendations, if carried out—and I have no feeling in my mind that they will be carried out, because in my opinion the policies set up by the Congress of the United States, by the representatives of the people, will have a great deal more permanence in this Nation than the appointed task force members and their study.

We who believe in the REA will have to stand ready to gird for the fight that is approaching. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the 20th anniversary of the REA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, although my district in the city of San Francisco contains no rural electrification projects nor REA cooperatives, I am deeply interested in the wonderful work that the agency has done throughout the country. In the 20 years since REA was organized under President Roosevelt's administration as a part of his New Deal it has really meant a new deal for the American farmer and his family. Bringing electricity and telephone service to the remotest sections of America has meant more than just bringing the twentieth century to what used to be the backwoods and making life more liveable for farm families. That social benefit more than justifies whatever small cost to the taxpayer may not yet have been repaid to the Treasury. However, the modernization of farm homes and the remaking of the farmer's way of life has brought a tremendous economic boon to the entire country through the opening of a great new market for consumer goods. Industry has profited. Laborers in every city in the country have profited. In fact, there is no segment of our economy which has not benefited.

While there is no way to estimate accurately exactly how much the opening of these great rural markets have meant in increasing our gross national income and raising the general standard of living, it is safe to say that this one factor, made possible only through REA, has much to do with the present high level of prosperity throughout the Nation. Further, none of this great expansion would have been possible without the low-cost public power distributed through the REA cooperative systems. In the areas served by REA systems, where private power has historically refused to venture and still will not venture until a high-profit margin is assured through public-power initiative, millions of people would still be going to bed by kerosene lamplight and washing their clothes by hand if it were not for the REA. And the whole country would be the poorer.

Until cheap electric power has been brought to every inhabited section of this country we cannot afford to let selfish interests weaken its powers. Even then the job will not be finished since we must continue to oppose every effort to destroy the program by those who would take over the systems in the name of free enterprise, and when they have gained control, would systematically squeeze their farm customers dry through exorbitant rates. If I am here that long I will do everything I can to see to it that REA is kept in business at least another 20 years to insure that no farm home is kept without electric power at a price it can afford to pay.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electric Administration which had its beginning 20 years ago is an outstanding example of a partnership between the people and the Government to provide service and facilities which would otherwise be impossible.

For many, many years the farmers of our country were the forgotten people of the Nation. They were denied the opportunities that were available to those who lived in larger communities and towns—they were denied the opportunity to have electric power service. Private power was afraid to tackle the problem of electric transmission lines and they said it was not economically feasible to run long power lines needed to carry electricity to farms in rural sections.

But this picture was changed 20 years ago by the beginning of REA which was signed into law by the late President Roosevelt. Up until that time only 11 percent of the farm homes in our entire country were served by electric power lines. Today, after 20 years of operation, the Rural Electrification Administration has brought electricity to approximately 95 percent of the farm homes in the land.

This tremendous expansion in such a short period of time is almost unbelievable. Think of the great change that has come to the rural homes of America. Farm groups with the help of REA loans have built over 1½ million miles of lines in addition to 20,000 miles of transmission lines. This was the job that private power was afraid to tackle but which our Nation's farmers tackled—with faith in themselves and the future—so that light and power could be brought to rural America.

REA has been a good investment for our Goverment. Almost $3 billion has been loaned to co-ops and they are paying back these loans faster than they fall due.

REA has created customers for industry. About 1 million rural people using REA power have bought billions of dollars worth of electrical equipment and wiring. Estimates are that farmers spend about $825 million a year for farm equipment, and perhaps more than that sum for electrical appliances for their farm homes. Think of what an impact on industry these purchases make. Think of the thousands and thousands of electric freezers, television sets, milking machines, radios, washing machines, chicken brooders our farm people are buying every day. REA has indeed created customers for business. A great new market has opened up which did not exist until farmers had electric power and needed electric appliances and equipment.

REA's electric loan program has accomplished what we might call a miracle. But even so its job is not finished. There are still farms without electricity, and there is still a great job to be done for those farms that are served by REA lines. It is a job for REA, the farmers, and their co-ops together. There are

increasing demands for more and more electric energy for better living and more efficient farm production. Our farmers need and want more electric equipment and it will take more electric energy to serve these heavy demands. REA's task then is not finished or completed by any means. It is just beginning.

At the very moment when we are reviewing the accomplishments of REA and the great successful program it has been, the Rural Electrification Administration is facing a great threat to its continuation. The Hoover Commission's task force on lending agencies has prepared a report which recommends that the REA be abolished and that in its place a Federal corporation be set up and called the Rural Electrification Corporation. It recommends that Congress provide no more loans or administrative funds for either electrification or telephone purposes.

These recommendations and others made by the task force would immediately put the REA co-ops at the mercy of the private power lobby which tried during the past 2 years to kill the REA program by starving it for loan funds. Under such an arrangement, interest rates to be paid by the co-ops would be from twice to three times as high as the present rate. In addition, higher rates for electric service and telephone service are specifically called for. The Hoover plan would stretch out the yardstick which co-ops have been setting in rural rates and service for the entire utility industry, and it would result in rising rates and service for the entire utility industry.

The result of these recommendations, if adopted by the full Commission and the Congress, would be utterly disastrous to the rural electric system.

I would like to point out that the task force report has been prepared by the power company accounting firm of Price, Waterhouse—the firm which audits the books of Purcell Smith's power trust lobby. It is a deliberate attempt to do away with the REA program and bring an end to competition in the electric business. If we allow these recommendations to become effective, the REA cooperative-electrification program of REA as we know it would be strangled as an effective source of competition with the private utilities.

I believe in REA. I take pride in the things that our farm people have accomplished through this great agency of our Government. I think the REA program is one of the most valuable programs our Government has ever undertaken. I will do all in my power to see that it is continued so that the next 20 years—like the past 20—will be another period of great expansion and progress for the rural electric systems and the farm people they serve.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], for the excellent statement he has made on the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Executive order by President Roosevelt, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. I know of no agency which has tended more to ease the burden of farming, to bring comfort to rural homelife and to make farming more efficient.

When this order was signed, only 11.7 percent of all the farms in the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana had electricity. Today, 97 percent of these farms are electrified. There are four REA-financed electric systems with headquarters in the Eighth District of Indiana. These are: Clark County Rural Electric Membership Corp., Sellersburg, Ind.; Dubois Rural Electric Cooperative, Jasper, Ind.; Harrison County Rural Electric Membership Corp., Corydon, Ind.; and Southern Indiana Rural Electric Cooperative, Tell City, Ind.

The Eureka Telephone Co. in the Eighth District was the first REA-financed rural telephone system in the State of Indiana. This system has been completely modernized with up-to-date dial service and with one central exchange which is supplied by the new Albany Telephone Co.

The Eighth Congressional District borrowers from REA have proved excellent financial risks. They have repaid $1,244,994 of the principal. None has ever defaulted on an obligation, and the sum of $111,954 was repaid in advance. In addition, they have paid $624,662 in interest on their 2-percent loans. Most of these cooperatives hold capital assets such as Government bonds to insure the payment of debts on time.

The Clark County Rural Electric Membership Corp. awards a 1-week trip to Washington to the 4–H Club student in its district having the highest all-around grade in scholarship and achievement in 4–H work. There is local rivalry among the some 1,700 students to secure this award, and it is a great pleasure to have the winner visit my office each year. One of the boys is in Washington this week and I attended the ceremony when Vice President NIXON presented him with an award for this honor.

The REA simply gave the farmers the opportunity to help themselves. For years they lived in darkness and without the benefit of modern electric appliances. This program is not a gift. The Government has loaned the money to the farmers and collected it with a large profit in interest. It simply gave the farmers the opportunity to help themselves, and was indicative of the period when there was courage and foresight in all branches of our National Government, and a desire to correct wrongs so the people could help themselves. The Rural Electrification Administration is a great memorial to the spirit and foresightedness of that period in our national history.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to the great national and local organization of Rural Electric Cooperatives which spreads throughout 45 States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Since I come from a State where we talk in terms of streams and tributaries, I would like particularly to talk in terms of what REA has meant to one tributary of that great national system—the State of Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, the REA accomplishments in my State have been truly miraculous. Back in 1934, before REA was born, only 29 percent of Idaho farmers had high line central station electric service. Today, some 20 short years later, over 97 percent of the farmers in my State have such service.

In other words, there has been an increase of 68 percent. I believe you will agree with me that not only Idaho but all America can be proud of such progress.

REA has approved over $15 million in electrification loans to Idaho. All 10 borrowers are cooperatives. The loans have made possible the construction of over 6,000 miles of lines to bring electricity to almost 17,000 families. If we consider five an average family, this means that some 80,000 Idahoans enjoy the blessings of electricity because of the REA program.

Such accomplishment is no accident. It is the product of the pioneering vision of a few leaders and dreamers. These unsung heroes were determined that their children, as well as unborn generations to come, should not live in kerosene darkness. No words of praise can duplicate the endless sacrifices and stubborn persistence which brought a new way of living and a new kind of prosperity to rural America.

This bold new way of helping people to help themselves was, as we all well know, sponsored and given its successful start by a man who will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was turned into workable, practical law under the leadership of that remarkable Nebraskan, Senator George W. Norris, and our distinguished and beloved Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN]. Rural America is immeasurably richer and happier because of the rare courage and wise statesmanship of these men. We pay deep and respectful tribute to them here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am frankly disturbed by the so-called Hoover proposals to supplant the REA with a private corporation which would charge high bankers' rates of interest for loans to farmers for rural electrification projects. What could be the motivation for such a proposal? REA is no handout. It is one of the soundest managed programs in the entire American economy—public or private. Throughout the United States, with a few exceptions, these REA cooperatives are not only paying their interest and principal on the barrelhead when due, but often paying ahead of time.

It seems to me there is something wrong with our national thinking when we consider REA loans as part of our national debt. These loans are not only sound, and repaid with interest, but they enrich the local communities.

For every dollar that REA lends to cooperatives, more than $4 are spent locally by members for appliances and equipment. This equipment comes from all over America. Its production makes jobs for men and women everywhere, and wealth for the Nation.

It is obvious that the enemies of REA are determined to kill it outright—or, if

that fails, to smother it to death. The smothering process takes many forms. Sometimes it takes the form of blocking the erection of REA generating plants, which keep rates down to a point where farmers can afford to pay for the service. Other times it is putting REA on a starvation budget by cutting it to the bone, and submitting the budget as a true estimate of REA's needs. Opponents of the program are driving out of REA organizations the splendid public servants whose determination and technical knowledge have made its success possible. Others who might contribute to the success of the program are being discouraged from going into it.

To those who are trying to sabotage the REA, I should like to say—the people of rural America have stated in the plainest terms that they want REA—and REA is here to stay. The program has many, many friends in the Congress. We will be constantly on guard to see that it is not scuttled or slowly smothered to death. We will make sure that it receives the full and complete congressional support it so richly deserves.

The REA program is a program for the average farmer. At the same time it brings great benefits to the towns and cities which surround the rural area served. It builds solidly from the average man—the average family—up. That is the philosophy of the Democratic Party—the party which brought REA into being. That is the philosophy which will make America truly strong.

Until every farmer in America—until every farmer in Idaho—until every rural resident in America—until every rural resident in Idaho—who can reasonably be reached, has the great blessing of REA electricity, the job is not done. It seems to me we should not only take time here today to praise the great men and women who have made possible the magnificent accomplishments of REA, but those of us who are now in the fight should pledge ourselves to see that the job is finished.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of commemoration of the advent of rural electrification program, I join here with my colleagues in tribute to this act of the Congress and to those who courageously fought for its passage. Undoubtedly it shall always be the hallmark of our great Nation's determination to transform confusion and fear to the realities of progress—progress that was at the same time industrial, agricultural and, most important of all, human.

Birthdays and anniversaries are usually times for fond recollection and serious self-searching. It is the time when a man, or collectively men as a nation, scrutinize the past in the mixed emotional condition of happiness and sadness, gladness for what has been done well and regret for what could have been done more perfectly; but always with thanksgiving for blessings received and a firm resolve of faith for the future. It is this pause that we take now on the 20th anniversary of the birth of rural electrification.

The material progress that was made possible by this act is sometimes more readily discernible and laudably acclaimed by its proponents—as for its opponents suffice it to say it had many audible ones—but that is only the fallacy of measurement of which we are oftentimes guilty. There is the yardstick that is not calibrated by the number of farmhouses that have been transformed from the grey shadows of flickering oil lamps to the flood of incandescent light, or the backbreaking farm tasks that are now performed at the switch of a button; but by the elevated standards of spiritual and intellectual enlightenment that have erased the vast gulf that separated country-folks from city-folks. It is this standard that must be applied if we are to ever know the true significance of our material progress—for when our material advancement fails to reflect a corresponding elevation in our spiritual understanding then we must question the true worth of our technical genius as the ultimate goal of national ambition.

How does the program of rural electrification measure up when we apply the nonmaterial yardstick? One need only scan the list of the agriculture and mining schools that have sprung up to bring higher learning to our methods planting, growing, and harvesting of crops. These advance techniques of food production are wholly dependent upon the ready accessibility of power—electric power. This growth and material advancement immediately reflected itself in a higher standard of living for the farmer and his family who were now able to avail themselves of a fair share of the industrial abundance that they were helping to make possible. Yes, 20th-century civilization arrived at our Nation's farmlands the day Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Norris-Rayburn bill on May 20, 1936. Truly the courageous efforts of these dedicated men shall find a lasting testimonial in the REA.

But, as often is the case, the good is oft interred with the bones; for all that can be said by some today is "Sellout at Yalta," "Traitors to the American free-enterprise system," "Socialist visionaries," and the like; of which there is an adept loud-mouth group of self-seeking interests who fashion themselves the sole heirs of America and our way of life. REA is a living repudiation of their delimited thesis and a lasting memorial to the men and the party that brought it into being.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining my colleagues today in commemorating the 20th anniversary of the signing of an Executive order by President Franklin D. Roosevelt creating the Rural Electrification Administration.

Just a year after the order the Congress passed the Rayburn-Norris Act authorizing REA in basic legislation and I wish to pay tribute to our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who is the father of the Rural Electrification Administration which is a permanent establishment of our Government.

The benefits which have come to the rural areas from rural electrification are numerous. More than 92 out of every 100 farms have been electrified. Men who formerly had to work with old-fashioned equipment have such modern improvements as feed mixers, milking machines, and automatic watering equipment for their livestock. The womenfolk on our farms have also been relieved of much drudgery through the use of electrical equipment. This program which has transformed the face of rural America has also been beneficial to the industrial areas of our Nation as these areas have prospered from the business which has resulted from the electrification of so many of our farms in this great country.

I am happy to have the opportunity to join in the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it seems highly appropriate today on the 20th anniversary of the conception of the Rural Electrification Administration, to look back over the accomplishments of this program inaugurated by the Democratic administration by Executive order in 1935. The rural electrification program points up very vividly, I believe, the type of positive constructive planning from which this country has benefitted, and it points up the type of leadership which still is guiding the Congress, for the legislation which made REA a permanent part of our Nation's prosperity was authorized by our Speaker and Democratic leader in the House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

In the Second Congressional District of Texas, 4 REA cooperatives furnish electric power to 10 out of 11 counties. These organizations are: the Deep East Texas, Jasper-Newton, Sam Houston, and Rusk County cooperatives. There are more than 24,000 members of these cooperatives, being serviced from more than 6,500 miles of energized line. Since 1947, REA power consumption on Texas farms has more than doubled.

It was not unusual, not so many years ago, to drive up through the Second District a little after dark and not see a light for miles other than your own headlights on your car. Folks were dead tired by nightfall. They had done most of their farm work by hand and sitting around by a kerosene lamp was not much inducement to stay up. A few battery radios had been bought, but those batteries were pretty expensive.

Tonight you can ride through this same countryside and see the concrete evidence of the benefits of those 6,500 miles of transmission line. More than 90 percent of the farms now have electric power. And the farmers have electrical aides—water pumps, milking machines and coolers, feed grinders, to mention a few—to help them in their work and their families have the advantage of electric washing machines, irons, and other household appliances which make life more enjoyable.

A new industry is growing up in these farming counties in east Texas; that is the poultry raising business. I do not believe the enterprising farmers, feed dealers, and processors who have pioneered this industry, would have had the opportunity to step in and find this substitute to replace King Cotton in east Texas if electric power were not available.

There is another important sign of prosperity in east Texas that rural electricity has helped make possible. That

is the opportunity for many retail stores to open up in our towns and county seats and sell electric appliances to the REA farmer-consumer. Without electricity in this area, a salesman would be out of luck if he were handling electric washing machines, brooders for baby chickens, or radios and television sets.

These merchants form part of the foundation for our towns. They deposit their funds in local banks; buy homes built by local workmen, with material furnished by local lumberyards and hardware stores; and their families patronize the local groceries and help support the local schools.

The chain reaction to the introduction of electricity into the rural areas of the Second Congressional District is still going on.

I believe we must remember, however, as we are commemorating the 20th anniversary of the beginning of the REA program, that rural electricity did not just happen, either in the beginning, nor is it just happening now. It took a lot of hard work to get the program started; and it takes a lot of hard work to keep it going efficiently and economically.

Every cooperative has a group of directors who are chosen by the co-op members to supervise the organization. These directors are folks interested in their community and neighbors enough to give a great deal of their time to their cooperative and its business without being paid anything.

We should remember these leaders of our rural areas who are carrying out the program begun by President Roosevelt in 1935 and enacted into permanent legislation through the efforts of our Speaker. Let us pay special tribute to these men who are unselfishly giving of their time and resources so that the rural areas can continue to develop and our farmers can continue to enjoy better living conditions made possible by electric power.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add here the names of the directors of electric cooperatives which serve the Second Congressional District:

Deep East Texas Electric Co-op: O. L. Burnham; W. B. Warner; C. G. Minton; R. N. Stripling; B. M. Chandler; Jesse Johnson; C. L. Knight; T. A. Hargis; W. D. Burrows; D. N. Beasley, manager.

Jasper-Newton Electric Co-op: H. J. Adams; R. B. O'Bannion; S. F. Hughes; M. H. Durdin; R. K. Mott; R. L. Hext; T. A. Barker; Jim Ray; E. E. Rogers; Troy Mitchell, manager.

Sam Houston Electric Co-op: C. S. Wainwright; Oscar L. Munson; L. S. Stanford; J. T. Aden; P. C. Kirkham; A. E. Cessna; T. O. Sutton; W. T. Gardner; H. T. Barrington; M. T. Potts, manager.

Rusk County Electric Co-op: W. C. Rainbolt; V. B. Mays; Joel Fletcher; Sylvan Harris; Wayne Dennard; Bennie Chapman; E. R. Poole.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying my personal tribute to the Rural Electrification Administration on its 20th anniversary. Although I represent an urban district—a crowded area in the great city of Chicago, I recognize that the cities and the rural areas are integral and unified segments of the same body. We recognize the role that each part of our country plays in our entire economy. The foods we consume in the city are the products of the countryside. In a machine age, the finished products we manufacture in the city are essential for such rural production. This is especially true of the REA program.

We now know that there are over 400 uses of electricity on the farm. This means the purchase and maintenance of all kinds and types of appliances and electric facilities that are manufactured in our large cities. Therefore, in paying tribute to the great REA organization and in helping to keep it financially and technically sound and free from all politics as the Congress intended, we are actually taking steps to provide for a continuing prosperity which is as essential to the rural areas as it is to our urban cities.

As we examine the REA program, the one thing that impresses me is the genuine Federal partnership with the local people. It is not a giveaway program. For the facts plainly disclose that the REA cooperatives are paying their loans back almost without exception, with interest when due, and in many cases before payment is due.

So the loans that the Federal Government has made to those local citizens in the rural areas are a sound financial proposition. In addition, REA makes for extremely good business. For every dollar that the REA loans to these REA cooperatives, the local people spend around $4 additional for various types of electric appliances and facilities. This means much business locally, regionally and nationally, as these manufactured products they use are made in all parts of the country.

Another thing that impresses me as I consider the splendid accomplishments of the REA program in its 20 long years of highly successful operation is what has happened to the countryside. As a result of the availability of electric power at low rates that the people can afford to pay, these rural areas have been literally transformed into a new way of living. Backbreaking drudgery has been largely eliminated by electric machinery, and satisfactory income and modern living is now possible for the farm folks and other residents of rural America.

To the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, our distinguished Speaker, I wish to pay my respects for the outstanding leadership he exerted in making possible the passage of the first REA legislation in this body, as well as his continuing leadership of this splendid program thereafter.

For my own part, I propose to continue to support the excellent REA program in the future as I have in the past, for REA is democracy in action, democracy at its best.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] for his effort today directed toward recognition of the great value of the REA program, and I wish also to join with the others who today will tell of this great cooperative achievement as we review its 20 years of operation.

We have just recently received from the administration a message proposing a program of assistance to the small farmer. I would not want to cloud this discussion today by any appearance of partisanship and I mention this proposal only to draw attention to the REA program. I can think of no program which will do as much for the small farmer as this REA program has done and I think it stands as a great landmark in the field of helping the farmer to help himself. For those who love the soil and the close touch with nature, no calling offers rewards to compare with farming. No pursuit is of greater service to the general community, yet in years gone by we saw comforts and conveniences added for city dwellers that seemed forever denied to the rural areas. It seemed quite possible and quite feasible to bring electric power to the closely packed city, but it was contended that the sparse rural areas would not support area power coverage. Only a small fringe of farms along a main road or close to a city had electric power and the rest were consigned to the semidarkness of the coal-oil lamp or a home generator. They were consigned also to the extra labor of pumping, lifting, washing, stock watering, and the old theme of "how are you gonna keep 'em down on the farm" had a real and penetrating meaning.

However, there were men of faith and hope and purpose who contended that rural areas could be served by electric power and in a time when the postulates of the administration were the programs of the administration, we had a Chief Executive who dared to start such a program by Executive order. The Congress took up the program and over the years of its life, the Congress has given full support to the dream of an electrified America, given support even when it seemed to wane in other areas of the Government. Just last year, the Congress insisted in increasing the loan funds of the Rural Electrification Administration just to be sure that the program would go forward.

Ample testimony will be rendered today to show the feasibility and the practicality of the dream of rural-electric power. In spite of the learned contention that it could not work, we have seen the percentage of electrified farms climb steadily upward until it now approaches saturation. We have seen farm groups organize and plan and build together to bring power to their farms. We have seen a great example of the achievement possible when opportunity exists and when necessary help is available. We have seen a demonstration that small cooperatives cannot only repay the funds they have borrowed, but repay them in advance and still provide power on their system at a price low enough that they have to struggle to keep their lines heavy enough and their supplies adequate.

As we stand and look back down the road and as we review these achievements, we should not forget that many handicaps had to be met and many problems overcome to write this record of achievement. The REA program has had its enemies all the way and they have been well organized. There have

been many attempts to raid their territory to skim off the best parts; many attempts to deny them access to power at reasonable rates and the concurrent opposition to their proposals to build their own interconnected generating plants. The way has not been easy, but the achievements now stand as an eternal record to the courage and determination of the leaders in this field.

Just the other day, I received some statistics and general information about the REA program in Colorado from the Colorado State Association of REA Cooperatives. I should like to read this summary report, for it tells in simple terms the achievement of Colorado people working for themselves.

There are 22 rural electric cooperatives in the State of Colorado.

They serve some 64,000 farms, ranches, homes and businesses.

They sold to their owner-member-customers over $8½ million worth of electric power in 1954; an increase from the year before of more than $1½ million. Those member-customer-owners are doubling electrical consumption every 3 to 5 years.

They handled over one-quarter billion kilowatt-hours. That is probably more than were used in Pueblo—Colorado's second largest city—during the same year.

Part of them get their wholesale power from the Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado-Big Thompson project, and in 1954 paid the Bureau $1½ million for power—helping repay the cost of that project rapidly. Eventually sale of Colorado-Big Thompson power will repay about 90 percent of the cost of that project—and with 3 percent interest to the Government.

They paid taxes to the county treasurers of Colorado—$428,846.92 in 1954.

They employ 568 persons, and their 1954 payroll was over $2 million.

They have paid back to the Government $7,067,053 in principal and interest to the end of 1954—on loans made to build the 29,000 miles of electric line now in use by them. They have paid back more than $1½ million not yet due.

They will spend $33 million more to take electricity to the few unserved Coloradoans, to heavy up their existing lines to take care of the greater demands for power and to add to their power supply, within the next 2 years.

They have brought more than 100 new industries into Colorado by having electric power available in the rural areas where those particular industries needed power.

They have brought about increasing diversification of farming, for central station electricity is a necessity for modern dairying, cattle feeding, and other forms of agriculture.

The rural electric cooperatives of Colorado are owned and managed by the rural people they serve.

I should like to close these comments with this thought. We hear much about what Government should do and what Government should not do. We hear on all sides platitudes and postulates and nostrums until we nearly smother in words—words about balanced budgets, individual enterprise, subsidies, and socialism. It seems to me that a close look at a program like the REA program cuts a fine clear path through all this calculated confusion.

Private enterprise, up through the roaring twenties was more concerned in building great utility empires and great corporational structures than it was in building lines to serve sparse areas. The money wasted and lost in this orgy would have gone a long way—more than likely the whole way—to electrify rural America, yet from places of importance came only platitudes and postulates. Thus it was that an agonizing reappraisal was made and men of courage and vision found a new spirit of enterprise—the enterprise of small people who needed not subsidy but merely long-term loans at reasonable interest—and the REA program was begun. Out of this joining, on the practical level, of individual enterprise, group cooperation and the resources of the general community came a real solution to a real problem. By joint effort and by a determination to do the job, the member cooperatives, the Rural Electrification Administration and the great leaders in this field have brought electric power to almost 100 percent of the farms in America, and on a better than 100 percent repayment basis. I think these are passing grades in any league.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this 11th day of May, 1955, marks the 20th anniversary of the signing and issuance of the Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration, a milestone in our national progress which is perhaps the most important of all the physical advancements we have thus far made. Its inauguration freed our farmers, the slaves of the soil, expanded our industry, created countless jobs, wealth and health, and reduced electric power and light rates, thus making the circle of usefulness of electricity ever wider and enjoyable by vastly larger numbers of people in the cities and in rural communities. This great experiment, premised upon boldness and social outlook, has proved a blessing to millions of our fellow citizens and has become a pattern for the rest of the world.

There is no language, no eloquence, to describe the Rural Electrification Administration plan and the success so far attained staggers the imagination. Despite the horrible predictions at the time, and the constant opposition of the enemies of progress, the idea grew beyond expectations of its fondest and most enthusiastic friends. Rural Electrification Administration is no longer an experiment; it is here to stay, it is permanent, positive, and productive. What has been thus far accomplished is but a beginning. Because it is in the past it is prologue to what will come in the future. I am proud of my connection with the Roosevelt administration which conceived and promoted the idea, and proud indeed of the part I played in supporting the Rural Electrification Administration legislatively, morally, and enthusiastically upon the very outset and to this very day. I am conscience and duty bound in the face of proof and facts to support its continuance and expansion.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, we should be deeply conscious that even while we celebrate this 20th anniversary of the REA, the opponents of REA are determined to undermine and sabotage this institution that has served the rural people of Pennsylvania and the Nation so well.

The philosophy of what might be called Dixon-Yatesism is pervasive in the top echelons of the executive branch of Government. In one case they propose a direct Dixon-Yates contract to hem in the TVA, out in Hells Canyon on the Snake River they propose to give away one of the last big-dam resources of the Nation. In California there is danger that the Trinity River project will be lost to a private utility.

The major attack on the REA itself comes from a majority of the members of the Hoover Commission. We should, and no doubt can, beat back the direct proposal that the REA be "reorganized" out of existence. But it is well for us to remember that the enemies never quit, that we must be constantly alert to keep the REA strong and vital for its future services.

These services have been distinguished in the past. They have been measurable. They are services in which we can take pride. We must make sure that two decades from now, another session of this House can celebrate another anniversary day with equal pride in 20 additional years of social and economic progress.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today the tremendous benefits of electricity were to a very great extent denied to the farm families of America. Except for a fortunate few the farmers of America, their wives and their families, had to labor with time-consuming toil to draw the water required by themselves and their stock, milk their cows by hand and perform myriad other tasks without the aid of electric power.

And when day was done, the only illumination by which he and his wife might read or perform household chores, and his children might prepare their school work was candlelight or the flame oil lamps. Indeed, in an era when electricity had been for generations utilized to lighten the burden of town and city dwellers, American farmers were restricted from the benefits of this power as effectively as though they had been living in the 18th century.

Today, in our own generation, we have seen the farmers of this great Nation come to share in the benefits of electricity. Tonight, when the sun descends on the farmhouses throughout the length and breadth of this land, when the shadows of darkness appear, the lights—electric lights—will come on in some 12 million farm homes.

No longer is the farmer of America dispossessed of this most valuable necessity to 20th century living. No longer does the farmer live in a literal age of darkness after the sun goes down.

Most of us here on this floor recall personally when our farm homes were in a large measure unlighted. Many of you here today had the opportunity of voting for the legislation that made possible the

Rural Electrification Administration and, through this agency, the blessings of electricity for rural America. I wish that my term of service in the House had begun soon enough for me to have had a part in voting for the legislation that gave statutory authority to the Rural Electrification Administration.

I do take pride in having voted for its extension and expansion until today it includes some 90 percent of America's farm families.

We all know that the late President Roosevelt created the REA by Executive order just 20 years ago today. However, I want to pay tribute to that sterling statesman who fathered the legislation which gave statutory authority to this agency and made it a permanent part of American government and American life.

I refer, of course, to our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

In those early days the principle of rural electrification did not have the acceptance that it has earned today. It was opposed by powerful lobbies, and fought by many forces that underestimated the initiative and enterprise of American farmers who had for so long been deprived of this useful servant so universally enjoyed by their urban cousins.

SAM RAYBURN had faith in the farmers of America and in their ability, given a little help and support, to bring about the electrification of their farms.

Our great Speaker initiated this REA legislation and guided it through this House when he was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has fathered much legislation that has improved the lot of the rank and file of our citizens, but I am sure he must be particularly gratified to have been the father of the Rural Electrification Administration which has done so much to lighten the burdens of the millions of Americans who till the farms of this Nation.

The success of the REA is a dynamic demonstration of the wise vision of SAM RAYBURN. In his own deep wisdom, SAM RAYBURN knew that, once given the means with which to act, the farmers of America would demonstrate their initiative and enterprise to extend electricity to their farms and strike from themselves the fetters of toil that electricity made unnecessary.

In a large measure SAM RAYBURN stands today as the emancipator of the men and women and boys and girls who live and work on the farms and ranches of our great land.

And each time a farm boy turns on a light to banish darkness from his room, a farm wife switches on a washing machine to do her laundry, or a homemaker reaches in her freezer locker for vegetables or meat, or a farmer speeds his dairy work with a milking machine, they enjoy the living reality that SAM RAYBURN envisioned when he drafted the act creating the Rural Electrification Administration almost 20 years ago.

Today we salute the REA and the farmers of America. Today I want to salute SAM RAYBURN, the man who made this anniversary possible.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and others in commemorating and celebrating the 20th birthday of rural electrification in America.

On May 11, 1935, Franklin Roosevelt, then President of the United States, signed an Executive order, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. At that time less than 10 percent of the farmers in America had the benefit of electricity. Today, more than 92 percent of our farms are electrified.

In my own State, before the Rural Electrification program began, less than 4 percent of the State's rural population had electric service. By January 1, 1955, nearly 97 percent of rural North Carolina was electrified. In the short period of 20 years, more than 1,000 rural electric cooperatives and power districts have been formed. The benefits of electricity are now being enjoyed by more than 4 million farms which were without electric lights or power prior to 1935. As an indication of what this program means to others in my home State, during the year 1955, North Carolina's rural families will buy 13,260 home freezers, 10,296 electric ranges, 8,736 water systems, 13,752 TV sets, 9,828 washers, and many other appliances—foregoing figures based on actual surveys of 33,848 rural families.

This program has brought a revolution in farm living in America. The story of rural electrification is a story of the kind of progress which has made America great. It exemplifies the democratic spirit of a determined and courageous people for a deeper, a more abundant and a more meaningful way of life.

The rural people of America, and all of America for that matter, owe a debt of gratitude to a former distinguished Member of the United States Senate from Nebraska, the Honorable George Norris and the present distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. These two outstanding men showed great vision in sponsoring legislation which has brought to almost every rural home in America the benefits of electricity. They supported their vision by action and after a hard fought and oftentimes bitter debate, Congress made the Rural Electrification Administration a permanent Federal agency.

I wish I had time to describe what this program has meant to the approximately 156,000 farm families being served by rural cooperatives in North Carolina. Recently I had occasion to hear Mr. J. A. Ward, president of the Tarheel Electric Membership Association in North Carolina, describe one family in North Carolina, the Lee family, and the benefits which that family is receiving from electricity supplied by a rural electrification cooperative. Mr. Ward did some research to find out how much time and labor running water alone was saving the Lees each year.

Using the United States Department of Agriculture averages for the amount of water consumed by farm people and farm animals, when plenty of water is available, and applying these averages to the Lee family and their livestock, this is what he found out:

Each day the Lee farm uses approximately 894 gallons of water. That is 321,840 gallons of water per year. In his remarks, he asked us to assume for a moment that the Lees would use that much water even if they had to pump and carry it by hand, and to assume also that a person would carry two gallons at a time. The Lees' house and also their out-buildings, he said, are located about 100 feet from their two wells. To satisfy their water requirements, Mr. Lee would walk 3,237 miles per year just carrying the water—the equivalent of walking from Murphy to Mateo, the westernmost point to the easternmost point of North Carolina, six times. According to Mr. Ward's computations, if Mr. Lee walked 3 miles per hour 24 hours a day—and that would be pretty good walking—he would walk 45 days a year carrying water alone. Maybe the Lees would not use that much water if they had to carry it, but if they were to use less, something would have to suffer.

The Lees are also dairy farmers and, as Mr. Ward pointed out, milk is 87 percent water. They also sell poultry products and eggs are approximately 76 percent water. Consequently, if the livestock drank less water, production would go down and so would farm income. If the Lees used less water in their home, which they might do if they had to carry it, their health standard would go down and the amount of Mrs. Lee's work would go up. In emphasizing what electricity means to that home for the one purpose which Mr. Ward described, it is interesting to note the cost to the Lees for all of the water they use as a result of electricity. It costs them the total sum of $4.80 per year. This is an example of what just one of the many uses of electricity can mean to a farm family.

The rural electrification program is one of the great accomplishments of the 20th century. Just 20 years ago the tremendous benefits which electricity has brought to the farms of America were only the hopes, the aspirations, and the dreams of far-sighted statesmen like Senator Norris and Speaker RAYBURN.

Let us continue to dream and to have faith. Out of these dreams and our faith, coupled with our ability and our willingness to use our material resources for the well-being of mankind will come the dawn of an even better day and a greater America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker. I have prepared the following and wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

A SALUTE TO REA ON ITS TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT CREATES REA

One of the momentous acts of our great and distinguished former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration in Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935. Now, neatly ensconced in a bound volume of Executive orders of 20 years ago, it turns out to be one of the greatest achievements of his distinguished administration.

It is of historic interest to note that this Executive order was issued during the dark depression days of 1935, not under a regular act of Congress, but pursuant to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, which was approved on April 8, 1935, under Public Resolution No. 11 of the 74th Congress. Note how closely the creation of the REA by Executive order followed the passage of the Emergency Relief Act, namely by 1 month and 3 days.

Here are the momentous words of President Roosevelt in that now famous Executive order:

"I hereby establish an agency within the Government to be known as the Rural Electrification Administration, the head thereof to be known as the Administrator."

In the following pithy language of this Executive order President Roosevelt gave the REA broad power to really do a job whether it was the generation, transmission, or the distribution of that electric energy:

"I hereby prescribe the following duties and functions of the said Rural Electrification Administration to be exercised and performed by the Administrator * * *.

"To initiate, formulate, administer, and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy in rural areas."

What a contrast this is with the so-called partnership policies today which shy away completely from having the Government aid in establishing standards and providing assistance that permits the people back home to really do a job.

Likewise, it is of historic interest to note that this famous order was basically concerned with providing jobs for the vast army of unemployed at that time, as the following language of the Executive order discloses in providing first preference for those on relief:

"*Provided*, That insofar as practicable, the persons employed under the outlines of this Executive order should be selected from those receiving relief."

As a closing note to this historic Executive order which has done so much to start rural America on its way to equality with the comforts and the opportunities and the good life of our city neighbors, a pitiful sum was made available to launch this now famous program on its way, for the Executive order only allocated $75,000 for administrative expenses:

"For the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration there is hereby allotted to the administration from the appropriation made by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 the sum of $75,000. Allocations will be made hereafter for authorized projects."

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is fitting that we now pause and pay the highest personal tribute to this great American, this distinguished statesman, who by this famous Executive Order 7037, made REA possible.

THE INSPIRING LEADERSHIP OF SPEAKER SAMUEL RAYBURN

Mr. Speaker, after paying this well-earned historic tribute to our former great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, let us recognize the obvious fact that it is one thing for the President to draft an Executive order, and it is quite another for the Congress to pass legislation which will make such temporary actions possible.

It is, therefore, proper that we now turn to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and pay to him the just tribute that he personally and historically has so well earned in the establishment of this national vital organization, the REA.

After the President created the REA by Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935, the long, difficult job remained of providing suitable legislation in Congress. Those of you who are personally familiar with this congressional area know the difficulties under which such legislation was created. Far from being an easy task, it challenged the finest leadership of the late, distinguished Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, and our present Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. It is a long story. Abbreviated time only permits us to condense into a few short conclusions.

Nevertheless, under the distinguished leadership of our Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, on May 20, 1936, a temporary emergency relief program sponsored by REA was made into a permanent, independent agency of the Government known as the Rural Electrification Administration. It was Speaker RAYBURN'S vigorous leadership that made possible the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, long after the dust has settled on many temporary activities of Congress which caused much shouting and tumult at the time, your splendid leadership in helping to create a permanent REA will be remembered as long as people live in America. I proposed that the Members of this body pay a rising tribute to you on this memorable occasion.

WHAT THE REA HAS DONE

Mr. Speaker, volumes and volumes of statistics have been compiled upon the accomplishments of REA. I am afraid if I presented them to this body only in part, that after I had proceeded for only a few moments all of us would have rural electrification statistics indigestion. So I propose to give you only the highlights—a few things that show what a tremendous program the REA is and how vast and significant are those accomplishments.

Take, first of all, the basic question of how much has REA really accomplished in electrifying rural America. Mr. Speaker, let us recall that back in 1934, before the REA was established, less than 11 percent of all the farms in the United States had central station electric service. Keep that figure in mind—11 percent in 1934.

And what is the picture today? Mr. Speaker, I am happy to tell you that this tiny figure of 11 percent has now climbed to 94 percent. Let me repeat that figure—94 percent.

I believe everyone will agree that an increase in rural electrification from less than 11 percent to 94 percent is a tremendous accomplishment. How was this remarkable accomplishment made possible? Very simply. The people received the genuine aid of your Federal Government through a real partnership, not a phony one. They were given the necessary technical and financial aid to help them do the job, and largely through independent private corporations of their own choosing. As a result, the costs were brought down to a price that people could afford to pay.

In the olden days, retail rates of 10, 12, and 15 cents and more a kilowatt-hour were not uncommon. And what do the REA users pay for their electricity today? Mr. Speaker, you will be interested in knowing, that in 1954, the average rates paid by REA consumers of electricity was around 3 cents a kilowatt hour. This is getting electricity down to a price that the common folks use it in large quantities.

As a result, the amount of energy purchased by the REA consumers increased, from some 402 million kilowatt-hours in 1940, to over 14 billion kilowatt-hours today.

Just look how the membership of this splendid organization of private REA borrowers has grown. Back in 1935 they had some 6,000 miles of lines which served about 26,000 persons. Now, they have over 1,365,000 miles of line serving over 4,250,000. At an average of 5 to the farmer consumer, this means that some 20 million persons in rural America are receiving the blessings of this marvelous program.

Our time is short, Mr. Speaker, and I merely want to close with these salient remarks. The REA has become a vital part of the bones and sinews of rural America, which means all of America. It is doing a magnificient job. We, in Congress, who are its friends, are determined that this splendid job shall continue, and we will not tolerate any political interference with its administration which seeks to curb the forward march of rural electrification in America under the brilliant banner of the REA cooperatives.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of real pleasure and personal satisfaction for me to arise on the floor of the House and pay tribute to the marvelous Rural Eelectrification Administration on its 20th anniversary. Truly, the program of this Federal agency is such a remarkable one that we should not let this day pass without recalling the origin and development of this outstanding Administration, together with the leaders and members of the local REA cooperatives who really did the job.

As we look back at the origin of the Rural Electrification Administration program, it is amazing to see how it ever survived. For it began in the dark days of the depression as a work-relief program, and ended up as one of the finest technical accomplishments in the Federal Government.

In the State of Louisiana the REA program is a great local institution. I know about it first hand and can tell you that this is one program that is really popular with our people.

It is easy to see why the REA program is so well-liked in Louisiana. All you have to do is to look at the record of accomplishment. It is hard to believe that back in 1934 when the REA was born only 1.7 percent of our 170,216 farmers, or 2,826, had central station high-line service. In other words, less than 2 percent of our farms had central station electric service. I believe that is about as close as you can get to the bottom and still have some rural electrification. Yet Louisiana was exactly in that status in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride for me to give you the rural electrification picture in my State of Louisiana today. The puny percentage of 1.7 percent has grown to 92.5 percent today. In other words, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, 114,917 Louisiana farms now receive central station electric service. This is an increase of 112,091 farms that have been electrified since 1934. Use any standards you desire and I believe you will agree this is truly a remarkable accomplishment.

This tremendous increase in rural electrification did not come about accidentally. The road was long, the disappointments were many, and the battle was continuous. A whole generation of pioneers was needed to carry on this valiant struggle. The private utilities had attempted to do the job at a price the farmers could afford to pay, but had not succeeded. So the rural folks themselves undertook the arduous task of banding together and forming their own local REA cooperatives in order to perform this essential task.

At the same time, their efforts would have been futile if we did not have in Congress men with vision and leadership like our present distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and his late colleague in the Senate, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska. Let us pay the highest tribute to these distinguished citizens who worked so hard and continuously to make a successful REA program possible.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for very public-minded Member

of this body when I state the REA program is a tribute to America and is the kind of local program that is settling a pattern nationally and locally for the democracies of the world to follow. I am glad to have played a part in that program and will continue to support the REA as long as it serves these vital needs of our people.

A TRIBUTE TO REA ON ITS 20TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, May 11 marks the 20th birthday of REA. It was on this date in 1935 that the REA was created by an Executive order. The Rural Electrification Administration became an established Federal agency by an act of Congress on May 20, 1936.

I wish to pay tribute to the REA program which not only has brought light and power to rural America but it has also aided in removing some of the drudgery from farm work. Before the REA program some of this drudgery was considered an almost inevitable part of rural living.

Twenty years ago less than 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electricity. Today more than 92 percent of American farms are receiving electric service. In a large measure—and I mean in a large measure—the tremendous increase in the percentage of electrified farms in the United States must be directly credited to the REA program.

Incidentally, although this is its primary purpose, I wish to point out that REA has done more than help farmers and farm housewives. The development and expansion of the REA program has also contributed greatly to business and industrial prosperity, including the employment of thousands of workers in industry. Twenty years ago not many farmers were buying electrical appliances such as milk machines, hay dryers, water pumps, feed mixers, hoists, pig and chicken brooders, electric power tools, flatirons, refrigerators, electric washing machines, and other electric household appliances.

As the REA program expanded its services in rural America, farmers bought these items from main street merchants in hundreds of communities. They would not have bought these products if the REA program had not come into existence. The main street merchants bought these commodities from manufacturers and thereby kept the wheels of industry turning with steady employment for thousands of industrial workers in our metropolitan centers.

I believe that it can be conservatively estimated that between the REA cooperatives and their 4 million consumers the program created a market of from $10 billion to $12 billion in the last 20 years. Thus, REA—in addition to helping farmers—has also helped main street merchants, manufacturers, and industrial workers.

There are many more things which should be added to the credit side of the REA economic ledger, but time does not permit a complete enumeration of these accomplishments. Without going into great detail, I wish to stress the fact that REA was of invaluable benefit in the production of food and fiber for the members of our armed services and civilians in World War II. In addition to meeting the requirements of our Nation, American farmers produced vast amounts of food for our allies during and after World War II. The harnessed horsepower of America's electrified farms made this possible despite a critical shortage of farm manpower. REA has served the Nation well in war and peace. It will continue to serve us even better in the years ahead.

Cold statistics, I realize, will not adequately tell the full story of REA accomplishments since 1935. Nevertheless, I will cite some significant REA figures. Up to January 1, 1955, REA had approved electric loans totalling $2,946,000,000 to 1,075 borrowers. When facilities financed by these loans are completed, the REA borrowers will provide electric service to more than 4,400,000 rural consumers over about 1,400,000 miles of power lines.

REA borrowers—and this is a point I wish to emphasize—have made a splendid repayment record on these loans up to the present time. At the start of the year, REA borrowers had paid about $193 million in interest on their loans. I think it is significant to observe that REA borrowers have paid nearly $79 million ahead of schedule as a cushion against future interest and principal payments. Only $307,000—yes, that is correct—only $307,000 in loan payments were delinquent more than 30 days.

This record deserves our highest commendation. I doubt very much if any other group of borrowers from the Federal Government has a better repayment record than REA borrowers. Farmers and the cooperative electric systems they operate have demonstrated beyond question that they are good credit risks.

The success of the electric power loan program led Congress in 1949 to assign to REA the task of launching and directing a similar program for the improvement and expansion of rural telephone service. From the start of the telephone loan program to the beginning of 1955, REA approved a total of more than $208 million to 163 telephone cooperatives and 146 telephone companies.

With an eye on the future, a recent survey conducted by REA shows that electric borrowers plan to construct about $202 million worth of facilities during the 1956 fiscal year. They also plan to connect new consumers at the rate of about 125,000 a year through 1960. To take care of increased power demands of consumers, the electric borrowers plan to spend about one-fourth of their future loans to improve and heavy up their distribution systems.

In paying tribute to the REA accomplishments since the program was launched in 1935, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not comment on the program's development in my own district. There are 10 REA-financed rural power systems serving the 11 counties in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin. All of these are farmer-owned electric cooperatives, and at one time—when I operated a farm—I had the honor and privilege of being a member of the Jackson County REA Cooperative.

Along with the Nation's other REA cooperatives, the borrowers in my district have an excellent record of providing good electric service and repaying the money they borrowed from the Government to build their systems. At the present time, these 10 REA co-ops serve 33,605 consumers—most of them farmers, and some rural industries. The co-ops operate 10,359 miles of powerlines.

Loans amounting to $17,700,513 had been approved as of January 1, 1955, to REA electric cooperatives serving the ninth district. Of this amount, $15,097,291 has already been advanced to the borrowers. This sum represents the amount of the cooperatives investment.

As of January 1, 1955, the systems in the Ninth District had paid $2,179,638 in interest and they have repaid $3,380,719 in principal on their Government loans. This includes $456,101 paid ahead of schedule as a credit cushion against future payments. None of the REA-financed cooperatives in the Ninth District are overdue on any loan repayment.

I believe it is of interest to note that the average monthly consumption per farm served by Ninth District REA co-ops in 1954 was 354 kilowatt-hours. This is considerably above the national average of 226 kilowatt-hours. It is also above the Wisconsin average of 314 kilowatt-hours monthly consumption in 1953. Since 1948 the average monthly consumption of REA co-op patrons has more than trebled in the Ninth District. In 1948 the average monthly consumption of REA patrons in the Ninth District was 168 kilowatt-hours as compared to 354 kilowatt-hours in 1954.

Before I close, I wish to say that Dairyland Power Cooperative—the largest farmer-owned electric cooperative in the world—furnishes the primary power to cooperatives in the Ninth District. It also has some of its generating facilities in our district.

The accomplishments of the REA program is more than a success story. REA-financed electric systems also contribute to the support of their communities by paying taxes. Many electric co-ops are among the biggest taxpayers in their communities. By increasing farm incomes and adding to the value of farm property, the rural power systems also make an important contribution to tax revenues available for the support of schools, roads, and other essential expenses of local government.

As I stated earlier, REA has served America well in war and peace. The past record of REA borrowers promises well for their future. I am confident that REA's past accomplishments is a full length mirror view of the movement's future development. That is why I am pleased to pay this tribute today to the REA's 20th birthday.

CONGRATULATIONS TO REA ON ITS TWENTIETH BIRTHDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks for the RECORD, I wish to join my colleagues today in extending my congratulations to the REA on its 20th birthday. It is, indeed, a pleasure for me to salute and commend the accomplishments of the REA, which has done much to make the lives of farmers and their families more enjoyable and comfortable.

The development and expansion of the rural electrification program has done more than lighten the burdens of the Nation's farmers and their wives. The REA program, by expanding electric services to millions of farmers, provided a market for electrical appliances that was untapped 20 years ago when only 10 percent of the farms in the United States were electrified. Today, more than 92 percent of America's farms are receiving electric service.

As the REA developed and expanded during the last 20 years, farmers and their electric cooperatives created a market that conservatively amounted to around $12 billion, which meant business for main street merchants, for factories and steady employment for tens of thousands of industrial workers.

One only has to look at the facts that 1,075 REA borrowers are serving more than 4 million consumers over 1,400,000 miles of power lines to appreciate what REA has meant to farmers and the country as a whole. It is fitting, then, that we commend the REA program today for its magnificent accomplishments.

I know that REA has meant much to my own State of Missouri. As of February 28, 1955, REA loans have been approved in the amount of $211,111,563 to 48 borrowers. A total of 256,783 consumers are served over 84,000 miles of power lines.

If the past 20 years are to be used as a guide, I am certain that the REA will continue to serve us as well in the future as it has in the past. It is a dynamic program serving peoples' needs—that is why it will continue to grow and bring even greater comforts to the people it serves, and at the same time it will strengthen the foundations of our free society.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have consistently opposed the so-called reciprocal trade program, were encouraged at the recent action of the House, when it came within 5 votes of defeating the gag rule forbidding any amendments by Members, and was equally close to recommitting the bill. It is obvious that the Congress is beginning to go beyond the attractive words and theories which always disguise this proposal; beginning to appreciate the real threat it poses to American labor and American industry.

Certainly workers and industry are alert to the danger. On February 18, 1955, I received the following telegram from Harry H. Cook, international president of the American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America:

TOLEDO, OHIO.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request you support recommittal action on H. R. 1, remembering that our industries are being destroyed and hundreds of thousands of American workers are presently out of jobs because of importation, and their families are in need of help, which should be our first consideration on the issue of foreign trade extension.

HARRY H. COOK.

I replied to him at once as follows:

HARRY H. COOK,
International President, American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America, Toledo, Ohio:

Retel shall favor motion to recommit H. R. 1, if that fails, prepared to vote against final passage.

MILLET HAND.

Prior to this, I had messages from a number of our local unions in the glass industry. A fair sample of these letters is that from local No. 132, at Vineland, who appealed to me as follows:

VINELAND, N. J., *January 24, 1955.*

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Second District of New Jersey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We of Local 132, AFGWU, are quite concerned over the cutbacks in the glass industry. These cutbacks are creating a shortage of work and our members are now and have been suffering because of the lack of work.

This condition we feel is mostly caused by the unfair competition of imports. While we agree that reciprocal trade should be carried out, we also agree that this trade should not be allowed to destroy the industry in this country.

With the world in such a state we must keep America strong so that we might protect ourselves in any emergency. This destruction of American industry and labor that is taking place at present at the hands of tariff laws is pitiful and should not be allowed to happen.

We are appealing to you to do all in your power to put some controls on the import program so that American industry will remain strong and thereby keep America strong.

There are several industries that have been hurt badly by these cheap imports and the glass industry is one of them. Our being glass workers makes this an important issue to us.

It is our understanding that GATT was brought into being on October 30, 1947. This organization more or less controls the tariff on imports but the Congress of the United States has never accepted this organization and has no control over it. It is also our desire that steps be taken to control the actions or curtail it so that the Congress of the United States has power over it.

Trusting that you will do all in your power to rectify the damage that has been done through the lax tariff program, and wishing you every success, we remain

Very truly yours,

JOHN BERNARDINI,
President.
JOHN W. REEVES,
Secretary, Local 132.

My reply, which pretty well sums up my position, was this:

FEBRUARY 7, 1955.

JOHN W. REEVES,
Secretary, Local Union No. 132,
Vineland, N. J.

DEAR MR. REEVES: I am glad to have the expression of your continued interest in the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, now pending as H. R. 1, which proposes to extend the President's authority to lower tariffs for the next 3 years.

I am in complete sympathy with the position of your union and many others concerning our tariff problems. I have consistently opposed, ever since I have been in Congress, giving the broad powers of the Reciprocal Trade Act to the Executive without proper restrictions, and have voted against the extension of this authority at every opportunity. I cannot bring myself to think that this is a reciprocal program, and even with the amendments which were introduced by Republicans in the 80th Congress concerning the peril point and escape clauses, I still feel that local industry is not sufficiently protected.

My own approach to the problem is indicated by the copy of a bill which I herewith enclose, and which I am sure you are familiar with. I have urged this legislation for some time. This would give to the Congress the ultimate veto power over a tariff agreement if Congress felt that it hurt local industry, and I think this is the minimum protection that we should have.

In its present form, I propose to work and vote against the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreement, and let me say that I am particularly aware of the bad effect that it will ultimately have on your industry and your union. You can count on my active support in your behalf.

Sincerely,

MILLET HAND.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ABDICATE

Under the Constitution, Congress has the responsibility to regulate trade with foreign nations, and should not abdicate it entirely. At least we should retain that measure of control which my bill, H. R. 2975, proposes. This bill gives us the power to protect, where needed, in this language:

H. R. 2975

A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the effective date of this act no executive agreement which contains any provision for reduction of tariff rates shall become effective until such agreements shall have been filed for a period of 90 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 90 days, the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall not thereafter be executed and shall for all purposes be void.

MANY INDUSTRIES HARMED

Mr. Speaker, of course it is not only glass in my county of Cumberland that is affected. One of the world's great manufacturers of china, Lenox, has a splendid modern plant in Atlantic County. With all mechanization possible, salaries and wages exceed 70 percent

of selling cost. Working under ideal conditions, these American workers receive an average wage of $1.76. How can they compete with foreign wage scales like these?

Country and date:	*Cents per hour*
England, October 1953	41
West Germany, March 1954	34
Italy, November 1953	30
Japan, March 1954	22

So the effect is apparent to the highly essential production of magnesite, in my home county of Cape May. The Northwest Magnesite Co., with an enormous investment there, wired me as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1955.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Further to letter January. Believe Ways and Means amendments to H. R. 1 inadequate to safeguard American industry, particularly essential industry. Hope you will seek open rule allowing needed amendments, particularly strengthened escape clause.

C. A. SARGENT,
Northwest Magnesite Co.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of similar pleas have come to me from all over New Jersey and other States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the theory of reciprocal trade, but it has not been reciprocal. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has pointed out:

Mr. Speaker, today the United States has the lowest tariff walls in our entire history—almost the lowest tariff walls in the world—with an average tariff rate of 5.1 percent. This is a lower average tariff rate than any one of our principal trade competitors, with the exception of Japan. Today we stand eighth from the bottom of all the nations of the world on tariff rates, while Great Britain, our chief competitor, stands fourth from the top with an average tariff rate of 25.6 percent, exactly 5 times as high as our average tariff rate. We have traveled a long way—a very long way—in the last 60 years, from the position of being one of the highest tariff countries in the world to that of being one of the lowest. Dare we lower our tariff rates still further?

MY POSITION FOR 10 YEARS

Nearly 10 years ago, I made a speech in the House, from which I quote two brief paragraphs:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in the exclusion of foreign products, and I recognize the necessity of cultivating foreign trade, but there are some specified industries which by their very nature require reasonable and adequate protection; and require, in my judgment, that that protection be guarded and provided by the elected representatives of the people in Congress, and not by the State Department, which, in its zeal to cultivate our foreign relations, often neglects our domestic welfare.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill to restore to Congress at least the right of veto of tariff treaties which are harmful. I think the bill is necessary, and I hope it will have the prompt attention of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House. It does not interfere with the international conference about to proceed, and it does not retard foreign trade. It merely restores to the Congress, where it rightfully belongs, ultimate authority over tariff questions, the protection of the American worker and American industry.

I am still of this opinion.

In conclusion, sir, if any of the Members wish to be debunked on the merits of this whole program, I recommend that they read The Revolution in World Trade, by Samuel Lubell.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support extension of this program unless Congress maintains its power to prevent destruction of large numbers of our workers and our industries.

SURPLUS FOODS PROGRAM IN ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district and throughout the southern half of Illinois, we have economically depressed communities which have been regularly receiving commodities through our Federal surplus foods program. Most of these areas, some of which have been classified as group IV critical areas, have been depressed by the permanent closing of coal mines as the result of the transition in the fuel market which has resulted in the loss of the demand for coal. This labor market has not been consumed by other industry, and as a result we have a very serious unemployment situation existing in downstate Illinois. This condition has been aggravated rather than alleviated, and it is now more necessary to have a surplus food distribution program than ever before.

I received information that the present State administration in Illinois had planned to terminate this surplus food distribution program. This information has been confirmed as a result of an investigation made by me. Upon contacting the United States Department of Agriculture, I was advised that the Illinois Public Aid Commission has indicated its desire to discontinue the distribution of surplus foods to these needy people. This, of course, would be a deplorable situation, inasmuch as our country now has over $8 billion worth of surplus foods and yet, through lack of initiative on the part of our State administration, we will have needy people and their children going hungry in this critically depressed area.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very much alarmed over the lack of interest and cooperation on the part of the State administration to utilize this available food supply for the benefit of needy persons and to administer the distribution thereof. Despite the fact that the United States Department of Agriculture advises it has adequate surplus commodities available and ready for shipment into this depressed area, upon request from the State agency, no action is being taken in behalf of these needy people by the State administration in Illinois. Because of my concern over the plight of these deserving persons, I sent a telegram to the Governor of Illinois urging immediate action by him so that this program would not be discontinued. Although this telegram was sent a week ago, and notwithstanding the urgency of this request, as yet I have not received a reply. Since I feel this is of the utmost concern to the people of my district and to the State of Illinois, I wish to have this telegram included in my remarks. The telegram is as follows:

MAY 4, 1955

Gov. WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Springfield, Ill.:

Investigation by me as to the probable discontinuance of distribution of surplus-food commodities in my district and other Illinois critical labor areas reveals Federal Government has adequate surplus commodities available and ready for shipment into this stricken area. Am further advised by the director of the food-distribution program, United States Department of Agriculture, that the Illinois Public Aid Commission has indicated its desire to discontinue this distribution. The United States Department of Agriculture cannot ship such food commodities to Illinois without request from the proper State agency. Inasmuch as group IV critical labor areas are in dire need of continuance of this assistance program, urgently request that you take immediate action to designate appropriate State agency to continue the administration of this surplus-commodity program in Illinois. Please wire collect advising action taken by you.

PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry that such an embarrassing situation has occurred in my native State but in view of the present situation existing there, it appears that the whole Federal program of surplus food distribution in the State of Illinois should be immediately reviewed.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I would like to join in the remarks of my able colleague upon the question of food distribution in the State of Illinois. At the present time a congressional committee is investigating the possible excess cost of surplus food distribution under the school-lunch program. This action of the Illinois Public Aid Commission and the failure on the part of the State administration, coupled with the present congressional subcommittee investigation, to my mind raises an implication which ought to move the administration and this Congress to review the entire food-distribution program in the State of Illinois.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I wish to thank the gentleman for his comment, and I think it is a very sound suggestion that we should have an investigation of the entire food-distribution program in my home State of Illinois.

ANTITRUST HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, commenced hearings on proposals involving the antitrust laws. I am inserting herewith the following:

First. Copy of my testimony presented to the Committee on the Judiciary on yesterday, May 10, 1955, including the part I have not read as well as that I have had the time to read today.

Second. Appendix A in parts 1 and 2, disclosing names of attorneys on Attorney General's committee representing concerns involved in antitrust charges.

Third. Copy of my letter to Attorney General of August 22, 1953, concerning appointment of his committee.

Fourth. Statement sent to Attorney General from antimonopoly group about antitrust policy and laws.

ANTITRUST PROBLEMS

(Statement of WRIGHT PATMAN, Member of Congress, before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, U. S. Congress)

Mr. Chairman, I am highly honored that this distinguished committee should wish to hear my views on the subject it is about to investigate. I am here with some hesitation, however. While your topic, antitrust laws, is one in which I have long been deeply interested, I fear that anything I may say will express either ideas with which you already agree—and for sounder reasons than I can give—or ideas which you have already considered and found wanting.

I have long been impressed with the scope of this committee, both as to the power it wields and the variety of vital matters on which it must be expert. But I was struck anew with these matters the other day when I learned that of the first 5,805 bills that were presented in the House during the present Congress 2,825 were referred to this committee.

The work of the Small Business Committee, I am happy to say, meshes very closely with the work of one of the several functions of this committee. I refer, of course, to your function of providing the Nation with adequate antitrust laws—the topic which you are considering today. In fact, small business and antitrust are actually two sides of the same coin. Whatever we can do to break down the barriers that hold back small business will lessen the monopoly problem, and anything this committee can do to lessen the monopoly problem will likewise make our political and economic climate more hospitable to small business.

I don't think, however, that there is any danger that either committee will supplant the other. I don't think we need have any fear that either committee will soon solve the antitrust problem so effectively that the other committee will be left without any work to do. On the contrary, the work ahead is, in my view, so vast that we shall be lucky if the efforts of both committees succeed in accomplishing any major portion of this work.

Twenty-five years ago, Mr. Chairman, when you and I were youngsters in the House, I feared the growing concentration of economic power because of the damage which such concentrated power does to the Nation's material well-being. Today, frankly, I fear such power more for the damage it does to our political freedoms.

I have read your recent statement in which you pointed out that the number of banks in the country has been rapidly decreasing over the years, despite the great growth in business and in the volume of financial transactions. You showed that in the past 35 years the number of commercial banks in the country has decreased by more than half. Whereas we had more than 30,000 commercial banks in 1921, we now have less than 15,000; and only 100 of these now have about half of all the bank deposits. This trend is not good.

I might also call attention, however, to the fact that the number of newspapers in the country has likewise been decreasing over the years. In 1910 there were about 2,600 daily newspapers and about 16,000 weekly newspapers in the country. Today there are less than 1,800 dailies and less than 10,000 weeklies.

In 1910, 689 American cities had competing daily newspapers; today there are only 87 such cities. Only 10 years ago, there were 76 chain operations. Today there are 95, controlling 45 percent of the newspaper circulations. Absentee owners operate 379 papers with 30 percent of the daily circulation.

I do not know the cause of this decline in newspapers. I am merely pointing out, with considerable regret, that a great many opportunities for independent and divergent expressions of views have disappeared from our country. We cannot say, I think, that the advent of radio and television has, in any real sense, provided a substitute for these opportunities for independent expression of views and for independent news reporting. It is distressing to think that when this Nation's communications are finally perfected in the technical sense, beyond anything past nations have ever dreamed of, we may become a nation of individuals who are as isolated from one another intellectually as any of the most politically and technically backward countries. It is a distressing prospect that one day we may all come to think uniformly as Wall Street wants us to, and that we may all express these thoughts in the idiom of Madison Avenue.

Now, if I may generalize for a few minutes more, I would like to describe the broad setting of the monopoly problem, as I see it. Then I have a few specific suggestions which I would like to offer for the committee's consideration.

FAILURE OF THE SHERMAN ACT

As to the past, it seems to me that the history of our antitrust legislation has been largely a repetition of locking the door after the horse is stolen. That is, we have consistently done too little too late. The essential problem has been, I think, the primacy given to property rights in our scheme of thinking. This primacy of property rights over public rights has resulted in some rather extreme conflicts within our body of antitrust laws. I am not speaking of the alleged conflicts we hear so much about from some quarters, which are the alleged conflicts between the laws which say you must not have a monopoly, and the laws which say you must not do the things which are certain to create a monopoly. Rather, I am speaking of the real conflicts, which are conflicts in degree as between what Congress and the courts have been willing to do to prevent a monopoly, and what they have been willing to do to break up a monopoly after a monopoly is already established.

We are all familiar, for example, with the wide differences in the way in which the courts treat a conspiratorial monopoly under the Sherman Act, and the way in which they treat an ownership monopoly under the Sherman Act. The courts quickly condemn almost any degree of control over the market which is effectuated by conspiracies among the rival owners, but they are unwilling to dissolve much greater degrees of control over the market when the control is exercised by a single corporate owner. Thus we have, in practice, the widest possible differences in standards which are intended for the same ultimate purpose.

Now comes the new Celler-Kefauver antimerger law which will, I should judge have a standard falling about midway between the extremes of ownership monopoly and conspiracy. While no case under this law has gone to court as yet, I cite the Attorney General's warnings that he will seek to enjoin, under this law, the proposed merger between Bethlehem and Youngstown. I hope that he will enjoin this merger. Yet, as we know, if the merger should be allowed to take place the resulting firm would still be second largest to United States Steel, which now has about 33 percent of the market. In contrast to what we might expect from the new antimerger law, we could hardly expect that under current interpretation of the Sherman Act United States Steel would be considered to have an illegal monopoly with 33 percent of the market.

Viewing our antitrust problem in its broad perspective, then, it seems plain that the critical feature of the problem lies here: what to do about monopoly controls over the market where these controls result from an already established concentration of corporate ownership? To date, progress in this area has been almost nil. The courts have simply been unwilling to compel dissolutions of corporate monopoly to the extent that private property rights would be substantially impaired. And the antitrust lawyers themselves have long been in the habit of urging painless antitrust. Almost invariably these lawyers end up assuring the courts that whatever decree they are proposing will in no way lessen the corporate owners' profits, and that no property values will suffer. All of this overlooks the essential point, which is: if the profitability of a monopoly situation is not to be impaired, then there is no reason for public objection to the monopoly situation in the first place.

One result of our failure to solve the antitrust problem in the area of ownership monopoly is a corresponding failure to solve what we used to know as a conspiracy problem in this same area. Where we have an industry which has become highly concentrated into three, four or even a half a dozen giant corporations, the result usually is a certain unanimity of policy as to prices, trade practices, expansion of production facilities, and so on. In short, the result usually is an unconversational understanding which is indistinguishable from the unanimity which results when separate owners enter into a conspiracy to control the market. And our courts are not able to cope with these unconversational understandings. Despite all the propaganda we have had in the last few years about so-called implied conspiracy, I think we may rest assured that the courts are not going to find any big corporations guilty of conspiracy without a great deal of evidence that can be explained in no other possible way but by conspiracy.

The net effect of all this is that we have a body of antitrust laws which are effective—to the extent that they are effective at all—only against the most deconcentrated and most competitive segments of business. In short, the antitrust laws are most effective where antitrust laws are needed least, and least effective where they are needed most.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PAINLESS ANTITRUST

Despite our poor progress in the past, however, I am not completely pessimistic about the prospects for a better diffusion of economic power. On the contrary, there are several bright spots in the picture which seem to offer better opportunities for progress in this field than we have had in the past

First, there is the fact that as a nation we have now reached a high level of productive wealth. As one Harvard professor has phrased the matter, we now have a lot of "fat" in our economic system. He has demonstrated this by pointing out that if we were a very poor nation every able-bodied person would be busily engaged trying to

produce enough beans and potatoes and other essential things to meet our minimum physical needs. Instead, a great deal of the Nation's productive effort is going, for example, into advertising—which is for the purpose of persuading people to buy things they don't even know they want. In fact, the Nation is spending about $7 billion a year on advertising, putting a great deal of productive effort into the manufacture of newspapers, magazines, and other vehicles for disseminating this advertising.

Yes; we can afford, and we are now enjoying, a great many luxuries and a great many things which are in the strict sense wasteful. In other words, we have reached a stage where we can afford and are affording a great many technical inefficiencies. New energy sources have been harnessed to take the place of human and animal labor, great advances in productive know-how have taken place, and we now have an economic system that can produce luxuries for everybody.

What does this mean to the antitrust problem? I think it means this: In past years public opinion has worshiped two economic idols. It has worshiped competition, but it has worshiped technical efficiency more. A few decades ago when two giant corporations wanted to merge, all they had to do to gain public acceptance of the merger was to announce that efficiency would be increased and cost savings would be made in their goods and services. This same worship of technical efficiency, moreover, has reinforced the courts' reluctance to disturb property rights. Any thought that the dissolution of a monopoly might lessen efficiency has frequently been sufficient in itself to frighten the courts away from any dissolution action.

Public opinion has, I think, been changing. The god of technical efficiency has been fading, with good cause. Our people have been and are becoming more and more aware that progress in technical efficiency has been outrunning efficiency in the distribution system. I do not mean, of course, efficiency in commercial distribution, for here, too, great technical progress has been made. I am talking about efficiency in our social organization—progress which Congress should make in determining the part which Government should properly play in the organization of the economic system.

The people are becoming more aware, too, that the economic stagnation we heard so much about in the early thirties was not a stagnation due to the disappearance of our land frontiers, but a stagnation due to industrial and financial monopoly. They have become and are becoming more aware that the real frontiers lie in the realm of science and in the application of scientific advancements to practical productive and distribution problems. Public opinion will demand in the future, I think, better social efficiency rather than that the last ounce of technical efficiency be obtained.

A particularly bright prospect for a better diffusion of industrial power lies in the opportunity which will be made by increased industrial growth. The present administration's economic theme song is, as we know, increased productive capacity. And increased productive capacity we must have. There may be disagreement, and there is sharp disagreement, about which policies will best bring about industrial expansion, but I will not go into these here. Certainly we all agree that we must have expansion in business capacity. In this respect we have a bear by the tail with this economic system of ours—it must either expand or collapse. So long as some families and some business groups receive shares of the current income above their immediate consumption needs, and above their needs for replacing worn-out business equipment, this income must go into an accretion of productive wealth if we are to have anything like full employment of our people. This is an awesome prospect in a way, but it is also a reassuring prospect. It means a continued increase in goods and services available to our people.

It is in the expansion of business capacity, I think, that we have the best and easiest opportunity for effective antitrust. It is here we have the opportunity for painless antitrust. If some way can be found to see that small business and new business groups have access to the Nation's savings, and to the productive know-how, then a deconcentration of monopoly industries will take place, and it will take place without disturbing any property rights.

Along with the general expansion of industry, there now appears an added prospect for a future deconcentration of some of the monopoly industries. This is the new automation. As yet we do not know a great deal about automation—how rapidly it will come, or what problems it will raise. I am chairman of a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee which is now looking into some of these questions. From what we do know, however, it appears that the new automation plants will tend to be smaller productive units than the present conventional plants. This seems to be in prospect both because of technical design and because of factors which will influence the location of these plants. Many conventional plants require great labor forces, and they have been located in and near the metropolitan areas where there are great labor pools. Since they were to be located near large markets, they were likewise designed on large scales, to produce for large markets. With the disappearance of labor as a factor in locating plants, many of the automation plants will probably be located at smaller markets, and designed specifically for the smaller markets. This will mean that there will be more plants, and it also means that there could be larger numbers of independent owners.

Finally, the commercial use of atomic energy will also add to the opportunities for a better diffusion of economic power. If we are correctly informed, electric power can be produced from atomic energy in smaller units than are now feasible, and such power can also be produced at places which do not now have power, or have only extremely high-cost power.

All of these bright prospects do not mean, however, that they will inevitably come to pass. The speed of the new industrial expansion will take place in reverse degree to which there is a monopolistic control over the resources for expansion. If there is one thing certain about a monopolistic industry it is this: it is a laggard when it comes to expansion. The automation plant will make possible more independent owners, but we have no reason to expect that there will be more independent owners. We have now many more conventional plants of a kind than we have corporate owners.

Atomic energy will make possible a great new volume of production, yes. If I have my power equivalents right, then I calculate that just a thimbleful of uranium will run an automobile for 100,000 miles, and the energy in the thimble will still not be used up. Imagine what this thimbleful of uranium would do if it were attached to the plow of some farmer whose plow is now being pulled by a mule.

But opportunities are one thing and making use of opportunities is another thing. From all appearances, atomic energy will be controlled by a few giant corporations which have vested interests in other power sources. And there is grave danger that the other commercial secrets of atomic energy will be locked up in a few giant corporations which have vested interests in present commercial processes.

HOW TO USE THE OPPORTUNITIES

What then is needed to see that a new business expansion takes place, and that these opportunities for painless antitrust are realized? Three things, I think, must be done.

1. Steps must be taken to see that small businesses and new businesses have reasonable access to the new discoveries and the new technologies.

2. Steps must be taken to see that small businesses and new businesses have an opportunity to use the people's savings in capital ventures, and on terms which are reasonably comparable to the terms on which big businesses use these savings.

3. Improvements must be made in the antitrust laws, and in the enforcement of these laws, so as to better protect small firms from the abuses of sheer size.

I realize, of course, that some of these steps may be outside the legislative responsibility of this committee, but I assume that your objective will be to formulate a comprehensive antitrust program, and not just doctor the laws piecemeal, and without any central purpose.

On the problem of access to new discoveries and know-how, I hope that your committee will study and reappraise the patent system to see if improvements can be made to better serve the public interest. Beyond this, I have little to suggest about patents except to call attention to a few summary facts:

1. Small business firms are finding the process of obtaining patents both lengthy and extremely costly.

2. In the case of legal disputes over patent rights, the question of who wins is all too frequently a question of which firm has the most money. Infringement suits are so costly that small firms frequently must lose by default.

3. In some industries a few top corporations are using interference proceedings to arrange divisions of the market and to arrange closed patent pools which exclude the smaller competitors.

4. Since the beginning of World War II the Government has given many billions of dollars to private firms for use on research and development. The Department of Defense is currently awarding between $1 billion and $1½ billion a year in research and development contracts. Almost all of this money has gone, and is going, to the big corporations. Moreover, the usual procedure is to allow the corporation to patent the products and processes it develops with this money, subject only to the condition that the Government not pay royalties on any of its purchases of products which involve the use of these patents.

WHO WILL USE THE PEOPLE'S SAVINGS?

On the question of steps which must be taken to see that small firms have better access to credit sources, my suggestions are more specific and definite. We need, and we need immediately, a Federal agency to make such credit available, either by direct loans or by some other means of increasing the capital flow to small business. Unless such steps are taken one thing is certain: such new industrial expansion as takes place will not even be a proportionate expansion between the big and small segments of business; it will be a disproportionately large expansion by the giant corporations, resulting in an even greater concentration of control over business than now. The expansion which is taking place right now is a disproportionately large expansion of the giant corporations. The reasons for this are clear.

The principal reason is that big business has easy access to long-term capital, and small business has very poor access to such capital. The simple fact is that the institutions that have control over the bulk of the country's savings are equipped and willing to make these savings available to big

business, but they are either unequipped or unwilling to make these savings available to small business. Here is the problem:

First, the centralized equity markets are not open to small business. It is simply too costly for a small or little-known corporation to float stocks.

Small business, in fact, depends largely upon the local commercial banks for its credit. These banks can usually supply short-term working capital. But they are in no position to supply any substantial amount of long-term capital; and such as they can supply cannot be lent for the terms needed. Savings in commercial banks are largely concentrated in 5 percent of the banks; the smaller banks have quite limited resources.

In the second place, commercial banks are primarily depositories for demand deposits. And even their savings deposits do not represent the kind of savings which can be committed for a long term of years.

Where, then, are the long-term savings accumulated? The pools of savings are in the big industrial corporations, in the investment trusts, and in the insurance companies. The volume of savings in these places has in recent years come to dwarf the savings in the old-fashioned investment banks.

Certainly, then, the savings held by the big industrial corporations are not available to small business. These corporations are merely acting as depositories for their stockholders' savings, so that the stockholders avoid paying personal income taxes as the income is received. The corporation may hold these savings in Government obligations, or, ultimately, invest them; but when it does, it invests them in its own expansion—or by purchasing and merging smaller businesses.

As for the investment trusts, these are by nature unequipped to make substantial investments in small business. Their idea is to have a stock portfolio consisting of a diversification of blue chips.

Finally, the insurance companies—these institutions seem able to make, and do make, a large volume of small loans, and even very small loans, in real-estate mortgages. Why they are not better sources of long-term credit for small business, I am not sure, but I think you will find these things to be true:

1. You will find that the insurance companies have heavy investments in many of the big industrial corporations. You would not expect that an insurance company would finance a new client which threatens to become a substantial competitor of a company in which it is already heavily invested.

2. You will frequently find that when a big industrial corporation makes a loan, it divides its loan among half a dozen or more insurance companies. I know of one instance where a big oil company divided its loan among nine insurance companies.

3. You will find many instances where the directors of an insurance company are on the boards of supposedly rival industrial corporations, and on the boards of corporations that stand as customer-suppliers.

4. The insurance companies appear in some instances to be pooling their industrial loans.

5. The insurance companies are in all practical respects exempt from the antitrust laws. Public Law 15, 79th Congress, provides this exemption wherever the company is under State regulation. You will find, I think, that the regulation provided by the States is, in most instances, no more than the faintest color of regulation.

I come now to legislative matters closer at hand. While opportunities for painless antitrust must be pushed, improvements must also be made in the more traditional forms of antitrust. This committee has, I think, an important job to do on this front. In fact, you have two jobs to do on this front. First, you have to defend the antitrust laws we now have, and which we have so slowly and painfully acquired, from the onslaughts of some people who have been putting on a drive to wreck these laws. And at the same time, you must, I think, proceed with the needed improvements of these laws.

THE LOBBY FOR WRECKING THE ANTITRUST LAWS

As for the lobby which is trying to wreck the antitrust laws, I have been observing its work for several years now, and I have noted that its main strategy has not changed. This drive started in midsummer of 1948, shortly after the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case. It has been going ever since. It has shifted tactics from time to time, to take advantage of new developments, and it has operated first in one forum and then another. It has on several occasions been able to arrange forums with official facades. The main line of its strategy is a divide-and-conquer technique, the formula for which is this: praise the Sherman Act, glorify the Sherman Act—and get rid of the Robinson-Patman Act.

You will find the strategy, the arguments, and the slogans of this lobby blueprinted in the report of Senator CAPEHART'S 60-man Advisory Council on Trade Practices in 1948; you will find these all repeated in a report titled "Effective Competition" which was arranged for the business advisory committee to the Secretary of Commerce in 1952, and you will find them again in the more recent report of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws.

Now, I think that it could be shown that this lobby has been singing the praises of the Sherman Act, not because it loves the Sherman Act, but because it loves the Robinson-Patman Act less. You will not have to look very far back to find that the same business groups that are behind this lobby have on several occasions organized similar drives against the Sherman Act. Many of your memories will go back to the circumstances of the early 1930's when many of these same groups were damning the Sherman Act as the thing which was preventing economic recovery. That campaign was so vigorous that it actually succeeded in having the Sherman Act set aside and the NRA set up in its place.

This is a lobby of very big business, and very big business only. It does not include any small business, nor for that matter, any medium-sized business. For example, I became intrigued with Professor Schwartz' statement to the effect that some of the recommendations which the Attorney General's committee has made for amending the Sherman Act with respect to patents would resolve the current litigation between Zenith and RCA et al. in RCA's favor. I then made inquiries as to how many of the lawyers on the Attorney General's committee are employed by RCA and how many are employed by Zenith. I have been told that no member of the committee is employed by Zenith, but that the following five members of the committee represent RCA and the other defendants in this pending litigation: Hammond E. Chaffetz, Edward R. Johnston, Whitney North Seymour, Jerrold G. Van Cise, and Laurence I. Wood.

Furthermore, we could take note of the fact that the Department of Justice also has a pending suit against RCA under the Sherman Act.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that this committee is the proper place for a consideration of the report of the Attorney General's committee. I should think the grievances committees and the courts where these lawyers are practicing in the pending litigation could more properly give consideration to this matter. As I count them, approximately one-half of the members of the Attorney General's committee are representing clients in pending antitrust proceedings—not past antitrust proceedings, Mr. Chairman, pending antitrust proceedings. These pending antitrust proceedings involve legal propositions concerning which suggestions have been made in the report of the Attorney General's committee for assisting their resolution. If all of the suggestions contained in this report were accepted, then the clients presently represented by approximately one-half of the members of the group making these suggestions would be the ones favored.

In view of the seriousness of this charge, I would not wish to leave this statement in the committee's record without support. Therefore, I shall append to my statement a list of the names of a number of members who have appeared in recent antitrust litigations. The list is in two parts. Part I shows the pending antitrust litigations in which members of the Attorney General's committee are appearing, along with the name of the member appearing in each litigation. Part II lists additional antitrust litigations in which members of the Attorney General's committee have appeared, along with the members' names. The lists are not necessarily complete. There may be additional names. (The lists referred to are designated appendix A.)

Now let me cite the matter of Edward F. Howrey, a member of the Attorney General's committee and present Chairman of the FTC.

Mr. Howrey appeared as an attorney of record in an important litigation which is now pending. In that litigation, as counsel for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., he challenged an order of the Federal Trade Commission respecting rubber tires and tubes, which order had been entered under the quantity limit proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act. In his appearance as counsel for the Firestone Co. in that proceeding, Mr. Howrey advocated that the Commission's order be declared invalid. As I have noted, the court has not today made final disposition of the proposition Mr. Howrey advocated. Although Mr. Howrey disqualified himself from further participation in this particular proceeding when he became a Federal Trade Commissioner, we now find him a member of the Attorney General's Committee, and in that capacity participating in a report which advocates repeal of the quantity limit proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act. If that advocacy should prevail, the Firestone Co. will be in a far better position than it would have been had Mr. Howrey secured acceptance in court of the propositions he advanced.

THE QUOTE CLUB

Mr. Chairman, if we are confronted here with a grave matter, it is also a matter which is not without some humorous aspects. I would commend for the Committee's entertainment the writings of what we might call the Quote Club. This club consists of William Simon, M. A. Adelman, Blackwell Smith, Breck McAllister, S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, and lastly, FTC Chairman Howrey. This club is unique. It is a tight, friendly little circle. One objective of its members is to eliminate from antitrust law enforcement the rule of law—the rule of certainty which they have chosen to designate the per se rule—and to replace it with a rule of uncertainty which they designate as a rule of reason. I have said that the club is unique. What I mean by that simply is this: they all quote one another as authorities for advancing the objectives of the club. For example, Oppenheim cites and quotes McAllister. Simon in turn quotes and cites Oppenheim. Oppenheim in turn cites and quotes Adelman and McAllister. Then we find Howrey citing and quoting Oppenheim, Adelman, and McAllister as authorities for his opinion and decision in the FTC Pillsbury case. Lastly, we find all members of the club, with the help of other members of the Attorney General's Committee, accepting Howrey's opinion in the FTC Pillsbury case

as the authority which should be followed by all enforcement agencies representing the public interest in the antitrust field.

Although the members of this club are thus ready to accept the writings of each other as final authority for a test on how the public interest should be protected, and how the antitrust laws should be interpreted, they advise against full acceptance and reliance upon interpretations of our antitrust laws by the Supreme Court of the United States, such as in the Morton Salt Co. case, the Cement Institute case, the Rigid Steel Conduit case, the Interstate Circuit case, the American Tobacco case, and the Hartford-Empire case.

WE NEED A NEW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Now as for the improvements which might be made in the antitrust laws, I have several to suggest. But I think the committee should bear in mind always the general framework in which the antitrust laws are enforced.

The Sherman Act is, of course, a political instrument. Enforcement of this law by the Department of Justice is subject to the control of whichever political party happens to be in power, and naturally there is a great lack of uniformity in attempts to enforce the act. In addition to that, anything is likely to happen to an antitrust case in the Federal courts—anything, that is, except that the court will issue a stern dissolution decree. You know the old saying that the antitrust lawyers win the opinions and lose the decrees.

The truth is, the Federal courts are really not equipped to handle most of the antitrust cases intelligently. The judges do not have the training and they do not have the staff help they need to handle these cases. Our courts are overworked and overcrowded, and the judges are called on to handle a bigger variety of technical subjects than is humanly possible for one man to become reasonably expert at. Furthermore, these judges know that the Sherman Act is honored more in the breach than in the observance, and this has an effect upon their willingness to issue stern decrees. In addition, the criminal penalties provided for under the Sherman Act are, I think, causing difficulty. These penalties are so picayunish, as related to a substantial corporation, that the judges gain a distorted sense of the seriousness of a monopoly offense, and are inclined to frame their decrees in civil suits accordingly. In any event, there is a great absence of uniformity in the application of the law.

All of this had become widely recognized by 1914, when the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act were passed. When these acts were passed it was hoped that there would be created in the FTC a body which would be both independent of political interference and expert in maintaining competition. The FTC too, has failed. The committee, of which I am chairman, made a thorough investigation of this Commission several years ago, and we found it inefficient and deficient in a number of respects, all of which are set out in our report. As of today, those deficiencies have been dwarfed by a deficiency of a new kind. The organization and the basic concept of the FTC has been changed. It is now another executive agency, subject to the same political direction as the Department of Justice. This has been brought about by the Hoover Commission reorganization plan. This plan has placed the staff and the administration of the FTC under the control of its Chairman, and it has, in turn, provided for the Chairman to serve at the President's pleasure. This means White House control, with 4 of the 5 Commissioners not knowing what is going on in the Commission.

I would not say that such an arrangement as this will at all times fail the public interest. But it is certainly true that the most powerful corporations—those for which we need the antitrust laws most—are the ones which exert the greatest political pressures when it comes to enforcing the antitrust laws. In any case, I question whether we need two political agencies in this field.

While the FTC itself has failed, I am not ready to concede that the idea behind FTC has failed. In fact, I am more convinced than ever that the objectives I have mentioned—independence and expertness—must be pursued. I think that we have simply not pushed far enough for these objectives. Therefore, I should like to see this committee consider setting up, within our judicial framework, an antimonopoly court. Such a court should have sufficient staff to handle intelligently these complex antitrust matters, and there should be similar inferior courts placed on a regional basis. It would be my further idea that these courts would hear all private litigations arising under the antimonopoly laws, and that they could bring cases in the public interest on their own motion. Furthermore, the members of these courts should be appointed for life. The decisions of the main antimonopoly court would be reviewable, of course, by the Supreme Court; but it would be my idea to limit such review, insofar as possible, to questions involving the constitutional safeguards, and try to avoid having the Supreme Court overturn decisions on economic fact and theory. The cost of these new antimonopoly courts could be met with the money which the FTC is now wasting or using to injure the public interest.

A second general principle which I would commend to this committee is that in framing antitrust laws you frame them, insofar as possible, with a view to gaining the purposes of the laws through private litigation. While the watchdog over the public interest may sleep, the rivals in conflicts of private interest never sleep. Furthermore, you will find, I think, that where a monopoly situation adversely affects the public interest, it will usually also adversely affect some specific private interest.

Now I realize, of course, that any general overhaul of the antitrust laws, and the creation of an effective enforcement mechanism will take some time and consideration. Pending the time when such needed steps can be taken, however, I might suggest to you several improvements in sections of the present laws which can be made immediately.

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES OF BIG BUSINESS

Beginning with the substantive sections of the Clayton Act:

Section 8 is badly out of date, as you will immediately recognize.

It forbids a person to serve on the board of directors of competing corporations. This language leaves more damage untouched than it touches, for most of the same reasons that the language of section 7 was inadequate prior to the 1950 amendment. This committee explored these reasons at that time. The language does not, for example, prevent foreclosure of markets and preemption of supplies through the integration of supplier and customer corporations. Yet the same integration, if brought about through merger, rather than by interlocking of directorships, might well do violence to the intent of the new antimerger law.

Similarly, the present language of section 8 does not prevent a bank, insurance, or other financial corporation from placing its directors on the boards of competing corporations, or on the boards of corporations which stand in customer-supplier relationships. In addition, there are other types of interlocking directorates which can be used to suppress competition, such as are shown in the Federal Trade Commission's 1950 report on this subject. I suggest the factual situations set out in that report for your attention.

All of the big corporations do not, of course, permit their directors to serve on the boards of other corporations. These have what are called working directors. On the other hand, there has grown up in this country a class of people who are professional board sitters. They may be directors of a dozen or even 20 or 30 big corporations. Some of these are perhaps harmless, and have their seats merely because they are scions of prominent families. On the other hand, there is another breed of professional board sitters which is actively engaged in industrial politics, unifying the policies of otherwise rival groups. No one can claim, I think, that a director who serves on the board of several big corporations can really devote much attention to internal affairs of these corporations. I would hate to think, moreover, that we have so few people with directorial and management talent in this country that opportunities for serving on the boards of the big corporations cannot pass beyond a small professional group.

Section 8 of the Clayton Act should be promptly amended to prohibit any person who is either a director or an executive of a corporation having assets of more than, say, $10 million, from being a director or an executive of any other corporation. I should think that a corporation of the $10 million size can well afford to pay for the full-time service of its directors, if these directors serve any legitimate and useful purpose.

THE ANTIMERGER LAW MUST BE IMPROVED

I come now to section 7 of the Clayton Act: The amendment which was made in this section in 1950 was well considered. Closing the loophole in the law as to mergers through acquisition of assets was certainly long overdue. Moreover, the intent of the new language forbidding mergers which substantially lessen competition, in place of the old language, which merely forbade competing corporations to merge, is entirely sound.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you also on your bill, H. R. 5948, to extend the new law to apply to banking corporations. This is also a progressive bill, and I hope it will be reported and passed promptly.

I feel that I must point out, however, that despite the much broader scope of competitive effects which the new Section 7 covers, the 1950 amendment contains a serious procedural defect. This procedural defect will, I fear, render the law largely ineffective, if and when the enforcement agencies set about to try to enforce the law. The point is that the law does not require corporations proposing to merge to obtain advance approval; nor does it require the corporations either to inform the enforcement agencies that the merger may take place, or that it has taken place.

From the standpoint of the companies involved, this may leave a cloud on the title of otherwise harmless mergers. Then from the public interest standpoint the defect is vital in two respects.

1. The long delays and the burdensome and unnecessary costs which are incurred by the roundabout way the enforcement agencies must try to gather enough information to determine whether or not a merger has taken place, and more especially, whether or not the merger is likely to have the adverse competitive effect named as the standard in the law.

2. The impossibility of separating the eggs after they have been scrambled.

On the matter of burdensome and inefficient administration, I can perhaps do no better than to read to the committee an extract from a letter from one of the FTC Commissioners, the Honorable James M. Mead, based on his firsthand experience with these administrative problems. The follow-

ing is from a letter which Mr. Mead wrote to Senator KEFAUVER:

"The present law also leaves much to be desired from purely administrative standpoint. There is, first of all, a clearly demonstrated need for more efficient and economical enforcement procedures than the present law makes possible. Under present law the Commission has in the first instance the burden of informing itself that a merger has taken place. Hence the Commission has a staff engaged in inspecting a variety of news and trade publications for information which the principals in these mergers could readily supply at no more expense than writing a letter. A large number of these news items suggest that there may possibly be some question of legality, and the Commission then has the further burden of collecting certain elementary facts about the companies involved, in order to determine whether a full investigation should be undertaken. For this purpose it is necessary to know, for example, what specific companies or assets are involved, what the companies' principal products are and what their approximate sales of these products are, whether there has been a customer-supplier relationship between the merged companies and whether competing companies are likely to be cut off from essential supplies, whether important patents are involved, etc. As a practical matter, we must depend upon the merged companies to supply such information, in response to our letters of inquiry. While no problem of false information has arisen under this procedure, it frequently happens that the corporations answer our questions only after long delays and with a degree of incompleteness which results in further inquiries and still further delays. These delays occur despite the fact that we rarely ask for information which is not readily available to the corporate managements. Indeed, it frequently appears that the items of information which we have been able to collect only after considerable difficulty and delay had already been assembled and considered by the corporate managements prior to their decision to merge. This problem of unnecessary expense and delay would be largely corrected by an advance approval requirement, since such a requirement would give firms wishing to merge an incentive for supplying us with the information by which we could make a decision, one way or the other."

The problem of unscrambling the eggs is, of course, a problem that money will not solve, and I anticipate that without a requirement that mergers be cleared with the enforcement agencies in advance, the purpose of the law will frequently be defeated. When one of the enforcement agencies ever sets about to dissolve a merger, years or even months after it has taken place, we will find that while the FTC or the court may be able to order a company to divest itself of its illegally gotten assets, there will be no authority for recreating an effective competitor. There is no authority to tell the corporation to whom it shall sell the illegal assets, for what purpose the assets will be used, or what management will be in control of the new corporation created by the divestiture of these assets. In this connection I might point out that much of the physical assets of corporations can be used as well for one type of business as another.

These are the defects of the antimerger law which must be corrected if it is to meet the intent which the distinguished chairman of this committee expressed on behalf of his bill.

FTC IS STUCK WITH ITS PILLSBURY DECISION

Moreover, some step obviously must be taken to put the original intent of the 1950 amendment back on its feet, at least insofar as Federal Trade Commission enforcement is concerned. However clear and intelligent the intent of the new language having to do with substantial lessening of competition was at the time this amendment passed, the Federal Trade Commission has now gotten itself stuck up with a tar baby. In its first decision under the new law, in the Pillsbury case, it attempted to read a new "rule of reason" into the law. And perhaps without appreciating the consequences, it read into the law a test of illegality which is so undefined and undefinable that the FTC can now never bring the trial of a case under this law to a conclusion, no matter what its wishes might now be in the matter. Specifically, the Commission chose as its new "rule of reason" a dictum to the effect it would take into account "all relevant economic factors" before determining whether or not a given merger will substantially lessen competition. The result is that the Pillsbury Co. is still introducing evidence on relevant economic factors, after 2½ years of trial, and it may still be introducing evidence on relevant economic factors 20 years from now.

Having gotten itself into this box, it does not appear likely that the present Commission will be willing to do a sudden about-face and yank the rug from under itself. On the other hand, if the FTC sets about to read the new "rule of reason" out of the law gradually, as the Supreme Court has succeeded to some extent in doing with its 1911 "rule of reason," then we may expect that it would take at least 25 years to whittle the rule down to manageable size. I would suggest, therefore, that the language of section 7 be amended in sufficient detail so that the Commission can save face in adopting the original intent of the 1950 amendment, on the assumption that the Commission may by now want to enforce the law.

I am not sure that the Commission does want to enforce the new antimerger law. You may have noted that some of the officials down there have been giving the impression that they are devoting great efforts to enforcing this law. I have a photostat, for example, of a press story on a speech delivered by the Commission's General Counsel on January 27, 1955, in which he is quoted as saying that the Commission is swamped with antimerger cases. This is from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 28, this year, as follows:

"MERGERS JAM FTC WORK, OFFICIAL SAYS

"The recent wave of mergers is complicating the work of an already overburdened Federal Trade Commission, according to Earl W. Kintner, FTC General Counsel.

"Addressing a luncheon session yesterday of the Washington chapter of the American Marketing Association in the Willard Hotel, Kintner pointed out that the FTC has about 600 persons to police the multi-billion-dollar industries of the Nation.

"He added that in recent years there has been much more effective liaison between the FTC and the Justice Department in antitrust cases.

"He also stated that the present merger wave is very different from that in the 1920's when much watered stock was pumped into consolidations."

In contrast to the misimpressions that may have gotten abroad, I am informed by my colleague, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, that a questionnaire which he recently sent to the FTC reveals that of this agency's total appropriation of $4,155,000 for the present fiscal year, it had spent through mid-February only $155,159 on antimerger investigations and trial work, including allocated sums and $30,658 used just studying what to do about mergers. In other words, FTC is spending about 6 percent of its appropriations on antimerger work. I am likewise informed that since Mr. Howrey reorganized the FTC on July 1, last year, he has had only four field investigations made, of all the hundreds of mergers which have taken place since that time, and he has brought not one case under the antimerger law.

To be on the safe side however, I think we ought to assume that the Federal Trade Commission may now wish to get off the hook and proceed with some enforcement of this law, and therefore I think some such face-saving arrangement as I have suggested ought to be made.

Finally, there is another force leading to mergers which no antimerger law in and of itself can correct. This committee might draft a very strong antimerger law and prohibit outright all important mergers, but no antimerger law alone could stop the present tendency for the owners of less substantial corporations to merge with bigger corporations, rather than to sell to new owners. The antimerger law thus does not discourage a pyramiding process which is undesirable, although the process may involve no single acquisition which would run afoul the law. I am referring, of course, to the more favorable treatment which the owners of a company receive under the tax law when they merge their company than when they sell their company.

What happens when the owners of a small corporation reach retirement age and have no immediate members of the family to carry on for them? They usually want to sell out and put their assets in a liquid and secure form. But, if they sell to another group of independent owners, younger people who would like to carry on the business, they are taxed on their capital gains; whereas if they merge and take their payment in the form of stock, they can accomplish their financial purposes without paying the capital gains tax.

I do not suggest that the capital gains tax ought to be repealed. However I do suggest that the tax law should be amended to tax capital gains on mergers, so as to equalize the incentive as between mergers and sales. Or it might be better still to place a graduated tax on all mergers.

DEALER COERCION IS UNDER STUDY

Now with reference to section 3:

Here we have a very bad sore spot. This is the section of law which is intended to prevent monopoly through exclusive dealing arrangements and tie-in sales. The law is aimed at the kind of thing which one of our subcommittees has been holding hearings on recently in the retail gasoline field. What is happening here is that independent people set themselves up in business to handle the gasoline of a particular oil company, thinking that they will be independent businessmen; but then they find out that the oil companies force them, by one coercive tactic or another, to buy and sell a particular line of auto tires, a particular line of batteries, and a particular line of auto accessories and other things. Some of these big oil companies do not distribute, handle or even sell the tires and accessories they force on their gasoline dealers, but they get a kickback or a rebate from the tire companies for everything these dealers sell. This is an extremely knotty problem and it involves other considerations, such as the terms on which the oil companies lease the gasoline stations to the operators. And the problem is quite acute in a number of other industries where it involves still other considerations. I am not going to make any suggestion for a solution to this problem at this time. My colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, and the other members of his subcommitttee, the Honorable TOM STEED and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, are devoting a great deal of intensive work and study to this problem, and I know that they will work out a better proposal than anything I could suggest at this time.

H. R. 11 AND H. R. 567 ARE MODEST BILLS

Now with reference to section 2:

As this committee knows, I have introduced two bills which would make some small improvement in this section of the law. These are H. R. 11 and H. R. 567. The principal bill, H. R. 11, is for the purpose of correcting in part, but not fully, the damage which was done to this section of the law when it was misinterpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case. I shall be glad to explain these bills and the need for them to the committee now or at a later time, but I would like to make a general statement at this time by way of introduction. As the distinguished chairman of this committee knows, I have on occasion proposed antitrust legislation which the distinguished chairman has considered to be rather drastic. I recall, for example, his remarks recently when we debated on the floor his bill for increasing the fine for violating the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000. When I offered an amendment to this bill to have the fine assessed on the basis of the corporation's assets, the distinguished chairman remarked that my amendment was Draconian and horrendous. I would like to assure the chairman and this committee that these two bills which I have before the committee are not Draconian or horrendous. They are extremely modest little bills. These bills do not restore to small business the protection which it had under the law prior to the decision to which I have referred. They restore this protection only in part, and they are needed to prevent this section of the law from being a complete nullity.

The truth of the matter is that these bills are tailored to the climate of the day. They ask no more protection for small business than I felt that almost everyone could readily agree to, including even the fair-minded members of big business. Forty-seven Members of the House joined me in endorsing H. R. 11 before it was introduced, and three Members have introduced identical bills. Similarly, 30 Members of the Senate are cosponsors with Senator KEFAUVER of an identical bill over on the Senate side. I hope that both of these bills, H. R. 11 and H. R. 567, can be reported and passed promptly, and I think that from letters I have seen from President Eisenhower to some of the small-business people that President Eisenhower would sign these bills.

WHY WE NEEDED THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Now I would like to tell the committee what we were trying to do back in 1935 and 1936, when we were drafting the amendments to section 2.

We were having literally thousands of complaints from small businessmen about price discriminations, and as you will remember small firms and some pretty big firms were going out of business by the thousands. Well, we made a lot of investigations and held hearings over a period of about 2 years. And we got the Federal Trade Commission to make investigations. They sent investigators out and collected all kinds of price data and interviewed people and made reports. We went into this thing thoroughly—from every possible angle. One thing was certainly clear: we had to have a law on price discrimination and we had to have a really good one.

Now when we started to draft a bill, we found we had two problems. We had the problem of small suppliers trying to compete with big suppliers; and we had the problem of small customers—wholesalers and retailers, and people like that—trying to compete with big customers, like the chain stores.

The problem of small suppliers trying to compete with big suppliers was not new. It was the thing that was made famous by the old Standard Oil Co., and several other big companies about that time. It was the same kind of problem which the 1914 section 2 of the Clayton Act was passed to control, except that we learned a lot of new angles about the problem.

The old Standard Oil Co. started out as a small company. About 1860 or 1865 it was only 1 of about 30 refining companies then located in the vicinity of Cleveland, Ohio. When the Standard Co. set out to grow, the first thing it did was to merge with several of its competitors. This gave Standard a big size advantage over all the other competitors. Then what did it do? It would go out into the territory of one of its competitors and cut the price just in that territory, until the competitor was driven out of business. Then Standard would raise the price in that territory and move on to the territory of another competitor. The bigger it got, and the more business it had in high-priced markets, the easier it was to drive out the rest of the competitors. This company got control of more than 90 percent of all the petroleum business in the country before it was finally subdivided by the Supreme Court in 1912.

Well, when we were investigating in 1935 and 1936, we found the same sort of thing still going on. Big suppliers were discriminating in their prices and putting smaller suppliers out of business. I will explain why this was when I finish telling you about the practical side of the problem.

Now, practically everybody, at that time, except some of the big companies, agreed that the kind of practice I have described was wrong. But a lot of people thought that the effects were bad only when a company discriminated to go below a competitor's price. We found out differently. The important thing is not just the price which a company receives for its product, it is also the volume of business it does at that price.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, those maps we were looking at a few years ago from the FTC report on the wholesale baking industry. There was one map, for example, of the Illinois-Indiana area. It showed the truck routes over which the big baking companies were shipping bread out of Chicago to the towns in this area; and it showed the price charged for bread in each town. When the price in Chicago was, say 10 cents, the price at some town 50 miles away would be 9 cents; then at a place another 25 miles away it would be 10 cents again; then at another town, perhaps 100 miles away, it would be 8 cents; and so on. In most towns the price was 10 cents, but in many places it was 9 cents, 8 cents, and in some places 7 cents.

The investigators found what was happening was this: the big Chicago baking companies were getting 10 cents wherever they could, which was in any town where there was no local competition. But when they came to a town where there was a local baker they would drop their price to meet whatever price the local baker charged. The result was that when these big companies started distributing out of Chicago a great many small baking companies went out business, and others were still going out of business. The point was that when a big bakery started sending trucks into a town and meeting the local baker's prices, the local baker lost a great percentage of his business. He had fixed costs, so when he lost business, his unit cost went up, and most likely he was soon in bankruptcy. Obviously, this is not a question of efficiency; it is a question of who is the biggest. Even if the local baker were greatly more efficient than the big baker—even if his unit cost for making and selling a loaf of bread were half that of the big baker, the effect would be the same. If the little baker reduced his price still further, to try to get back his volume, the big baker would meet that price, and he would not get his volume back. This is competition of size, not of efficiency. Efficiency would come into play only if, to meet the local baker's price, the big company had to reduce its price everywhere. Then the competition would be on equal terms.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION MAKES INEFFICIENCY

When we were investigating this practice we found the same thing going on in industry after industry. Big suppliers were discriminating in their prices, either to undercut the smaller companies or to meet the prices of the local companies. Sometimes the big companies would meet the price of local companies to put them out of business and sometimes to make them raise their prices. Where a big company found that a local competitor was selling below its national price, it would meet the price in that area, and if the local company did not show signs of going out of business, then the game of raising prices would start. The big company would lower the boom for a while and then raise it again. If the local company failed to raise its price promptly, then the boom would be lowered again. Before long, after a few ups and downs, the local company would catch on to the fact that it had better raise up to the big competitor's price. Since the big competitor is not going to permit local companies to have more than a certain share of the local market, the only profitable thing they can do is to raise their prices up to the big suppliers' price.

Thereafter the same proposition holds: no small supplier has any real independence to reduce his price. Discrimination makes it so easy for the big competitors to meet his price, and he knows they will meet his price, and hence he knows he can only lose money and not gain any volume of business by reducing his price. There are only 3 or 4 or perhaps 1 or 2 big suppliers in each industry which have any independence to reduce prices. This is the thing that keeps prices to consumers high: the centralized control over prices which is maintained by discrimination. This is soft competition.

Mr. Chairman, it is not much trouble to see, why the big corporations do not like the antidiscrimination law. These corporations are at the top of the heap and have an unfair advantage over all of the smaller competitors. Many of these giant corporations are fat and lazy, and they would not like to have to compete with smaller companies on the basis of efficiency. Many of them know that if they did have to compete on equal terms the smaller companies would run rings around them.

Most of the big corporations are inevitably inefficient. They have a large number of high-priced vice-presidents; they have huge advertising and political expenses; and, worst of all, they are snarled up in more bureaucratic red-tape than the worst Government bureau we ever had. Most of the managements don't know who their own people are, and most of the underlings have to spend their time making up elaborate reports and reading regulations to find out what authority they have to do what. All of this takes time and money that might be spent in productive work.

Now that is only one isde of the coin. When we were drafting the amendments to section 2, we also had the problem of small customers, such as wholesalers and retailers, trying to compete with big wholesalers and big retailers. We spent most of our time on this problem.

We found that suppliers were frequently giving competing customers radically different prices on the same item without any cost justification for making the price to one customer any different from the price charged another customer. It was in this field—the distribution field—that the greatest numbers of independent firms were going out of business. The manufacturing field had already become highly monopolized in the period from about 1890 or 1900 up to and through World War I. As you know,

it was during the 1920's and early thirties that thousands of independent merchants and small chains were driven out, and the distribution fields were rapidly becoming monopolized by a few giant chains.

PURPOSE OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAW

Now when we drafted subsection (a) of section 2, we drafted it to meet both the problem of competition among suppliers and the problem of competition among customers. In some situations a supplier's discriminations injure another supplier without any effect on the customers. In other situations, a supplier's discriminations injure competition among his customers without affecting his competitors.

In other situations a supplier's discriminations may injure both his competitors and his customers. Then, of course, there may be other situations where a supplier's discriminations injure neither competitors nor customers. If the customers are not in competition with one another, there is no injury there. And if the discriminations do not put a small competitor to a substantial disadvantage, there is no injury there.

Subsection (a), then, contains the general prohibition against price discrimination. We did not prohibit all price discriminations. And we did not prohibit discriminations which do only minor injuries. In other words, we did not want to trouble business about picayunish matters. But where the injury is substantial, the language is tight, and it was meant to be tight. I will quote the language as follows: "where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefits of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them."

On the other hand, we wrote into the bill a positive exemption for discriminations which are justified by differences in the supplier's costs. We did not want to be accused of interfering with efficiency anywhere in the economic system, and in fact we did not want to interfere with efficiency. We were not trying to make any advantage for small business, not even to offset the advantage which big business had enjoyed in the previous decades. We merely wanted to give small business an equal opportunity, or at least something approaching an equal opportunity.

At the same time, however, we put the burden of proving a cost justification on the company that makes the discrimination. The law does not just take the company's word that it has a cost justification. After a company has been proved to have made a discrimination and has been proved to have caused a substantial injury to competition, then the company may come forward and claim a cost justification, but it must prove its cost justification.

In the problem of small customers trying to compete with big customers, we found that there are other ways a supplier may discriminate among customers besides discriminating in price, but amounting to the same thing as discriminating in price. We found, moreover, that these roundabout discriminations were widely practiced, so we drafted a subsection of the bill to cover each type. We found, for example, that A. & P. had set up a dummy brokerage company which got a percentage rebate or kickback from the suppliers on all of A. & P.'s purchases. Therefore, we put subsection (c) in the bill, which forbids the supplier to pay the customer a commission or brokerage except for services actually rendered in connection with the sale or purchase of the goods in question. This section likewise forbids the customer to accept such a commission, and it specifically covers any agent or intermediary which is in fact acting for one of the opposite parties to the transaction. In other words, the law cannot be circumvented by setting up a dummy commission company.

We also found other situations where suppliers were paying the advertising bill for some customers and not paying the advertising bill for other customers. So we put subsection (d) in the bill, which forbids the supplier to pay for anything of benefit to one customer unless he makes such benefits available to all customers on proportionately equal terms.

At one time there was some thought of trying to incorporate this prohibition into subsection (a), or at least placing on it the same limitation as to where there is an injury to competition. We had a great deal of discussion about this, about whether the courts would recognize that advertising can divert business from one merchant to another, and what all it would take to prove to the courts that a particular advertising campaign had been the cause of one merchant's gaining business and another merchant's losing business, and so on. So the risk of creating a loophole in the whole law was grave. The result was that we concluded that if we put this prohibition into subsection 2 (a) we would risk creating a loophole by which the whole law could be evaded. This risk seemed more important than any reason we could find as to why a supplier should pay the customer's advertising bill at all, so we wrote the provision the way it is.

I mention this because great and ponderous legal tomes have been written about what a horrible thing we did here. I do not, however, see the matter today any differently than when the bill was drafted. If a supplier wants his customers to have money for advertising he can make available to them proportionately equal allowances, or he can simply reduce his prices and allow each merchant to decide how best to do his selling job.

I come now to subsection (e). This follows the same principle as subsection (d), and for the same reasons. It refers, however, to furnishing services or facilities. In other words, if the big baker comes around to the local merchant and says: "Yes, I know you have a local baking company here, but I can't come down to his price for you, because I might have to reduce my price to other customers; but I will lend you a couple of salesmen and paint your store and put some new counters in," then that corporation—we are talking about interstate commerce, you know—will have to make these services and facilities available on proportionately equal terms to its other customers.

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking in quite general terms about subsections (a), (c), (d) and (e) of the act. For the benefit of the lawyers who might want to go into these matters I have a more formal and detailed statement pertaining to these subsections which I will be glad to make available to you. I think your staff technicians will be interested in this, and perhaps the members of the committee too. (The supplemental statement referred to appears as Appendix B.)

OLD PROMISES TO SMALL BUSINESS

Thus far I have been speaking about those sections of the law which have held firm, and have been interpreted by the courts as they were meant to be interpreted. I would like to tell the committee now where the law has broken down, and how this has come about.

I have already mentioned that when we were investigating in 1935 and 1936, we found that the problem of competition among suppliers had not been solved. Big suppliers were discriminating either to meet the prices of small suppliers or to undercut the prices of small suppliers; and the small suppliers were being driven out of business. Why was this? What happened to the promises that had been made to small business in the campaign of 1912, and what had happened to the 1914 law that was intended to carry out these promises?

Certainly the promises had been made. The platform of the Democratic Party in that year promised legislation against price discrimination, and it also promised legislation against other monopoly practices. The legislation promised was for, and I am quoting: "The prevention of holding companies, of interlocking directorates, of stock-watering, of discriminations in price, and the control by any one corporation of so large a proportion of any industry as to make it a menace to competitive conditions." (Democratic platform of 1912.)

Woodrow Wilson made his campaign on these promises. He made a great number of small-business speeches.

Most of these things were done, or they were intended to be done in the Clayton and FTC laws. I would like to read you what President Wilson wrote after he signed these bills:

"With similar purpose and in a like temper the Congress has sought, in the Trade Commission bill and in the Clayton bill, to make men in a small way of business as free to succeed as men in a big way, and to kill monopoly in the seed. * * * It is our purpose to destroy monopoly and maintain competition as an only effectual instrument of business liberty." (Woodrow Wilson letter of Oct. 17, 1914, The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, vol. III, pp. 189–190.)

Certainly something had gone wrong with section 2 of the Clayton Act between 1914 and 1935. What had gone wrong? The fact is that section 2 of the Clayton bill contained a proviso which said that nothing contained in the law would prevent discriminations "made in good faith to meet competition."

What happened was that the courts interpreted this proviso to allow the suppliers to do about anything they pleased. The "good faith" phrase of the proviso was interpreted in the same way the Sherman Act had been interpreted with respect to attempting to monopolize. In short, the law on price discrimination which was passed because the Sherman Act had failed became no more than the Sherman Act. Lack of good faith could be proved only by proving an evil intent. Well, the new law provided some restraint, perhaps, against a big corporation's going on an open march to take over 90 percent or 100 percent of a whole industry. But for big corporations with a mere 10, 30, 50, or 80 percent of the market, it could rarely be proved that their discriminations were made with an intent to monopolize.

The courts could see no reason for inferring that a supplier might have some evil objective as to the distant future when the supplier had immediately at hand the wholesome objective of getting more business and more profits. The point of the law, which was to outlaw a particular method for getting more business and more profits, was lost sight of; all that counted was the corporation's intentions, its absence of any intent to monopolize. This deterioration in the law had become clear by the time of the depression following World War I. Congress did nothing about it, and the courts assumed, as they rightfully would, that they had interpreted the law the way Congress meant it to be interpreted. The law was largely a nullity.

PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN BILL

When we drafted the Robinson-Patman Act, it was the good-faith proviso, above all else, that we meant to correct. You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the legislative history supports me in this statement in copious degree.

We certainly intended to eliminate the nullifying effects of this good-faith proviso. But the question was how to do it.

The Federal Trade Commission made one good suggestion. It recommended in a report to Congress in 1934 [1] that this proviso, as well as another troublesome proviso of the old law, be left out of the bill entirely. They suggested that we could simply prohibit what they called unfair and unjust discriminations and omit the provisos. Without such provisos specifically in the statute, the FTC suggested it could, along with the courts, put judicial provisos into the law. Hence, this would allow the FTC and the courts to make judicial determinations in each case whether the circumstances justified violation of the general prohibitions of the law. That was supposedly what we had the FTC for—to be an expert at finding what injured competition and what improves competition.

Senator Robinson's bill adopted this suggestion, at least with reference to the good-faith proviso, just as FTC had made it. S. 3154 which was reported out by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, contained no reference to good faith, although the Senate later amended the bill in this particular.

In our bill, however, we tried to adopt the FTC's suggestion, not by having the bill silent on the matter, but by having it specifically state the procedure which FTC had suggested. So we qualified the general prohibition against price discrimination in subsection 2 (a) with a subsection, 2 (b).

Now we did several things in subsection 2 (b) and these things should not be confused.

First we provided a general procedure as to the burden of proof. We meant the law to be enforced, and we did not mean for the money which would be appropriated for its enforcement to be dissipated in the enforcement agencies' trying to prove everything under the sun. So we provided that the enforcement agencies could make out a prima facie case just by showing that a discrimination had been made and under such circumstances as would lead to the conclusion that injury to competition might result, and at that point the burden of rebutting that prima facie case would shift to the person who had made the discrimination. We saw no point but waste in having the FTC go ahead and prove that the discrimination had actually done an injury to competition, before the person making the discrimination would be obliged to come forward and show that he had some reason which would have a bearing on the question of how and if a cease and desist order should be issued. For example, it would be a waste of money, and it would slow down enforcement of the law in general, if the FTC had to prove that a corporation was making discriminations, and then prove that these discriminations actually had resulted in a substantial lessening of competition, only then to have the corporation pull out its books and show that the discriminations were justified by cost differences.

The second thing we did in subsection 2 (b) may be clear already. That is, we stated that the person against whom a prima facie case had been made out would have the burden of proof as to any of the affirmative justifications provided in the act. These affirmative justifications are all specifically stated in subsection 2 (a). They include the cost justification, the justification as to price changes made from time to time because of changes in the market for, or the marketability of, the goods in question, and other things.

The third thing we did in subsection 2 (b) was, as I have said, to adopt the procedure which FTC had recommended on the good faith matter, except we stated it specifically, and we stated specifically that a person against whom a prima facie case had been made out has a right to rebut that prima facie case by showing that his discrimination has been made in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor. We did not provide that such a showing would necessarily justify the discrimination and thus serve as a bar to a cease and desist order. We merely gave the person the right to put into the record the evidence that he met a competitor's price in good faith, and thus force FTC to take a closer look at the competitive situation before it issued an order, so that it would be sure that the order should issue and that it issued against the right people.

INTENT OF THE GOOD-FAITH PROVISO

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to show to the committee what this procedure means, or should have meant, after I have reminded the committee of the subsequent legislative steps on this bill. As you will recall, we had great trouble getting that language of subsection 2 (a) accepted by the House. It seems that half of the Members were thinking up and offering amendments to this subsection, and to other sections of the bill, too. But the House did accept the language as we had written it. The Senate passed a different version and the Senate bill differed from our bill on this point of good faith. There was a conference, and the conference committee accepted the House language on this point. Moreover, the manager of the House conferees brought back a report which explained the meaning of this language at great length and with great clarity and precision. After that report there should never have been any misunderstanding or dispute as to what the good-faith proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act means. I commend that report to the committee's attention. I should like to read two small excerpts, if I may, from the section dealing with the good-faith proviso. Referring to this proviso, the report reads: "This does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., 2d sess., June 15, 1936, p. 9416.)

In other words, this proviso was to mean just what the FTC had suggested. We would leave it up to the FTC and the courts to determine from the facts in each case whether the competition met was such as to justify the discrimination given.

Furthermore, this report went on to point out some of the circumstances which would not be condoned by the proviso:

"This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill" (op. cit.).

Then, Mr. Chairman, the report points out one of the factual circumstances which must be present when the good-faith defense might be found to justify a discrimination and thus serve as a bar to a cease and desist order. Now I hope that the committee will note these words, because in a few moments I will call attention to what the Supreme Court did with these words in its Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion. The report states:

"As in any case of self-defense, while the attack against which the defense is claimed may be shown in evidence, its competency as a bar depends also upon whether it was a legal or illegal attack" (op. cit., p. 9413).

Now what does this mean?

Let us suppose that I am walking along the street back home during a campaign and I meet my opponent and he attacks me in some unlawful way. Will I be justified in using an unlawful method to defend myself? Yes, of course, but this will depend upon all the circumstances. It will depend upon the nature of the attack, the methods of defense that are available to me, and the method I actually use. If my opponent were a big burley athlete, 7 feet tall, I might be justified in hitting him with a club, although he attacked me only with his fists. But I would not be justified in continuing to rain blows on him after he is knocked out. In any case, I have the burden of proving my justification in court later. I will have to prove that he attacked me first, and that he attacked me unlawfully. And I would have to prove that I did nothing more than was necessary under the circumstances to defend myself until such time as I could get the legal authorities to stop my opponent's unlawful attack.

Now let us suppose that I see my opponent coming along the street and he is unarmed, but I have a gun. He has not attacked me in any unlawful way, but I know that he has been trying to win over some of the voters who have supported me in past elections. So I pull out my gun and start shooting at him and I hit several innocent bystanders. Let us suppose further that my opponent takes cover behind a tree, and I then make myself comfortable and begin taking some leisurely pot shots at that tree. I know that as long as I keep my opponent pinned behind that tree he cannot be out winning over more of the voters. So I continue taking pot shots, and every now and again I hit an innocent bystander. I hit a lot of small children, particularly, who are not big enough to look out for themselves.

Then let us suppose that after a long while the police come around and try to put a stop to my activity, but I say to the police, "You cannot interfere with me, I have rights under the law; you will have to go back to the precinct station and make a determination whether I am acting in good faith; and unless you weigh the evidence and find that I am not acting in good faith, then you cannot interfere with me no matter how many innocent bystanders I shoot."

HOW THE LAW BROKE DOWN

Mr. Chairman, it might seem silly to ask if my conduct in this supposed situation would be justified, but you cannot avoid these conclusions:

First, if I had been before the Supreme Court in place of Standard Oil (Indiana) in 1951, the Court would have told me that I was perfectly justified in using my unlawful method in attacking my opponent, just so long as my opponent had used no unlawful method in attacking me, and I was using this method for the purpose of retaining the support of voters who had supported me in the past.

Second, if those policemen who tried to stop me from shooting a lot of innocent bystanders had been before the Supreme Court in place of the FTC in 1951, the Court would have told those policemen that I was right, that they could not interfere with me until they first made a finding whether I was acting in self-defense, and that I would be acting in self-defense if I used this otherwise unlawful method to attack an opponent who

[1] The recommendation referred to is contained in the final report of the Federal Trade Commission on chain-store investigations (S. Doc. No. 4, Dec. 13, 1934, 74th Cong., 1st sess.).

had not used any unlawful method, but who was lawfully trying to take the support of voters that I wanted to retain.

These are almost precisely the things the Supreme Court told the Standard Oil Co. and the FTC in the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision. Now what are the facts?

The discriminations were taking place in Detroit, Mich. Standard was selling at wholesale to certain of its retail dealers in Detroit, at a much lower price than it sold to its other retail dealers in Detroit. Standard had no cost justification for making the different prices. The favored dealers naturally were able to reduce their prices to consumers, and Standard intended that they would reduce their prices to consumers. As a consequence, the favored dealers were taking trade away from Standard's other retail dealers and putting these dealers out of business. These were the innocent bystanders. Why was Standard commercially shooting innocent bystanders? It was meeting the prices of the Red Indian Co.

Red Indian is a small Michigan refiner, making gasoline from Michigan crude. It sold what is frequently called an "off brand" gasoline; its gasoline is not nationally advertised. The price of its gasoline to consumers was normally several cents below Standard's price. Standard was the principal marketer of gasoline in the Midwest, and its market covered 14 States. Standard was not reducing its price in all of these States, it was reducing its price just in those neighborhoods of Detroit where there were stations selling Red Indian gasoline. There was no evidence that Red Indian discriminated in its price; on the contrary, Standard's attorneys told the Supreme Court that Red Indian had not been making unlawful prices.

Now what happened? How did the law get into such a snarl? Well, in the first place, the FTC had never followed the procedure we set out for them in subsection 2 (b). When the FTC brought cases under the Robinson-Patman Act, it never stopped with just making out a prima facie case and then letting the burden shift to the company to bring forward its evidence to rebut the prima facie case. The FTC had always gone on and proved the injury to competition or the tendency to monopoly. It did the same thing in the Standard (Indiana) case, so perhaps this helped to confuse the Court.

The FTC made its finding that Standard's discriminations were substantially injuring its retail dealers and issued a cease and desist order. It allowed Standard to introduce the evidence which Standard said would show that it had met prices in good faith, but it refused to make a finding on this question. FTC took the position that since it had already gone beyond the making of a prima facie case and proved the injury to competition, the question under the good-faith proviso was not relevant. Standard, on the other hand, claimed that its good-faith defense was not only relevant, but that if the question of good faith were answered in the affirmative this defense would be a final and complete bar to a cease-and-desist order.

The Supreme Court's ruling on this question we already know. The Court ruled with Standard. It told the policemen that they could not interfere with Standard's activities until they made a finding whether or not Standard's discriminations were made in good faith. And it told us all what good faith means. It told us that good faith means self-defense, and that this self-defense means that a supplier is justified in resorting to the unlawful method of pricing in defending itself against a competitor who has used no unlawful method of pricing, if the supplier's purpose is to retain a customer. Finally, the Court told us that this is what the good-faith proviso had meant under the 1914 law, and that Congress had, by the 1936 law, made no real change in the proviso. Why did the Court think such a topsy-turvy notion of self-defense as this is sound? Let the majority opinion speak:

"It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor. For example, if a large customer requests his seller to meet a temptingly lower price offered to him by one of his seller's competitors, the seller may well find it essential, as a matter of business survival, to meet that price rather than to lose the customer. It might be that this customer is the seller's only available market for the major portion of the seller's product, and that the loss of this customer would result in forcing a much higher unit cost and higher sales price upon the seller's other customers." (*Standard Oil (Indiana) Co. v. FTC* (340 U. S. 231).)

Thus my analogy holds. Since we may assume that I may need the votes of those supporters down in my District for reelection, then I am justified in attacking my opponent by a normally unlawful method, provided he has used no unlawful method to attack me, and the innocent bystanders I may shoot have no rights.

THE COURT CONFUSED VESTED INTERESTS WITH COMPETITION

Mr. Chairman, now comes the bitterest pill of all. Here is the Court declaring that a supplier has a vested right in the continuing patronage of the people who have bought from him, so much so that he is justified in using the method of pricing we condemned as an instrument of monopoly. Here is the Court telling the innocent bystanders we sought to protect from abuses of monopoly power that their rights are secondary to the rights of a supplier who may need to use his monopoly power to retain customers. And in the same breath, here is the Court finding support for its position by citing suggestions that the theory of the Robinson-Patman Act is inconsistent with the other antitrust laws, and citing the writings of propagandists who are constantly saying that the Robinson-Patman Act protects competitors instead of protecting competition.

Well, this I can say: When we passed the Robinson-Patman Act, we thought we were passing a law for competition and against monopoly; and I have not heretofore known of any theory of competition which holds that a supplier has a vested right in the continuing patronage of his customers, so much so that he can resort to a method of competition by which the small competitors will always lose out and the big competitors will always win.

How did the Supreme Court arrive at the construction of self-defense it reached in the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion? Its official sources were, for the most part, those I have cited to this committee—at least the Court found these things reconciled in its thinking. It also appears that the Court had been educating itself with some of the writings of the propagandists working for the lobby which is out to wreck the antitrust laws.

In fairness, it should be said that the Court also leaned heavily upon the opinion in the Staley case, written by the late Chief Justice Stone. The Court thought that it had held in part I of the Staley opinion that a supplier is never justified in making an unlawful price to meet an unlawful price; hence in the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion it concluded that the answer must be that a supplier is justified in making an unlawful price to meet a lawful price. Then followed the qualification which seemed to reconcile this construction with self-defense, the qualification being that this justification exists only where the unlawful method is used to retain a customer.

I think the Court misread part I of its Staley opinion. As I read that opinion, the Court rejected Staley's plea that it had acted in good faith in adopting its competitor's unlawful pricing system, for the obvious reason that this adoption was not made in self-defense against an unlawful attack, nor against an attack of any kind. Rather, the Court thought that Staley's purpose in adopting this pricing system was to join in an attack upon the consumer's pocketbook. It was known that several years before this case was brought the Department of Justice had charged Staley and its competitor with combining and conspiring to use this same pricing system, and that these companies had accepted an order forbidding them to continue such combination and conspiracy.

Mr. Chairman, I have said several harsh things about what has happened to the antitrust laws in the courts. By these things I have meant a critique of the antitrust laws, not a criticism of the courts. Our judges are honest men and probably wiser men than most of us in the House. Their biases are the biases common to our society. And if they are propagandized through the law journals, so are all of our minds molded by what we read. If I should now leave an impression that I think the courts have been primarily responsible for the failure of our antitrust laws, I would leave an erroneous impression. I do not think the primary responsibility for this failure lies with the courts; I think it lies with Congress.

Congress has written these laws, for the most part, in general and vague terms, and has left it up to the courts to give these terms meaning. If the courts have given these laws the wrong meaning, Congress has known about it, and has known what the practical effects have been. Our constituents write to us, or come to see us. They do not write or go to see the judges. Therefore, when Congress fails to act to correct a wrong interpretation of the law, the courts have every reason to think that their interpretations are right, and that Congress approves them.

THE PROBLEM IS UP TO CONGRESS

Our problem now is what to do about the error in the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision. I have offered two bills which I think will help to correct this error and which I think we can pass. I urgently invite the committee's attention to these bills. They are simple bills, and I can explain them very briefly.

H. R. 11 is to amend subsection 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act. The intent of the bill is to accept the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion up to the point where the effects of a discriminatory price reach a certain degree of seriousness, but to put a limit on the good-faith defense, so that it will not be a bar to a cease-and-desist order where the effects of the discrimination go beyond this degree of seriousness. This degree of seriousness is at the point where, in the language of the bill: "the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce."

The bill does nothing more than that. The protection which this language would give falls far short of the protection which the language of the prohibition in subsection 2 (a) would offer. The language there refers to discriminations: "Where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them."

In other words, H. R. 11 says that the supplier will be justified in shooting at his competitors who try to take his customers by lawful means, and in shooting a few

innocent bystanders, but if he reaches the point where he is about to make a substantial reduction in the population, then he will no longer be justified.

H. R. 567 is what we might call an anti-boobytrap bill. It is to require the supplier who offers quantity discounts or seasonal discounts to make known to all of his customers that these discounts exist and that they are available under the same conditions to all customers.

The reason for this bill is that some suppliers who offer quantity discounts or discounts during seasons of the year do not let all of the customers in on these discounts. The salesmen have the schedules in their briefcases, but they do not tell all of the customers; they may tell just certain customers. The merchant on one side of the street pays the prices shown on the price list. He is dealing with a big nationwide corporation. He knows that he cannot bargain with that corporation nor suggest what prices he will pay for its goods. He does not know that the merchant down the street is paying the prices shown on the discount schedule. He may not learn this even when he finally goes out of business. He is boobytrapped. H. R. 567 would tell suppliers who offer discounts to make a good-faith effort to see that all of their customers know that these discounts exist.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other place where the Robinson-Patman Act has broken down. This is in subsection 2 (f) of the act. This section has been completely nullified by the Supreme Court's decision in the Automatic Canteen case.

When we were investigating back in 1935–36, we found many instances where big buyers like A & P were coercing great numbers of small suppliers into giving them discriminatory discounts.

Subsection 2 (a) of the bill was aimed at suppliers. It prohibited an individual supplier from granting such discounts where the discounts were so substantial that they might have the effect of injuring competition as specified in the bill. But we felt that something ought also to be done about this situation where the big buyer was coercing the discriminations from a large number of suppliers. The reasons were two.

First of all, in many lines of commerce the merchants handle many different items from so many different suppliers, that one supplier's discriminations alone may not have the effect of any substantial injury to competition. On the other hand, the combined effect of these discriminations from all of these suppliers would have such an effect.

The second reason why we felt that subsection 2 (f) should be written is an administrative one. We saw no reason why the enforcement agencies should have to bring a large number of cases against many individual suppliers when the law ought to go directly to the root of the evil—that is, to the buyer who coerced these discriminations.

We thought that we had made such a provision in subsection 2 (f). But in the Automatic Canteen decision, the Supreme Court made a ruling which throws this section completely out of the window. It ruled, in effect, that a big buyer who coerces suppliers into giving it discriminations cannot be held accountable unless it can be proved that the buyer knew that the supplier's discriminations could not be justified by any of the justifications provided in the act. This means that in order to remain within the law, all that a big buyer has to do is to keep itself ignorant of what its suppliers' costs are. I have offered no bill to correct this problem. I call the committee's attention to the problem in the hope that it will find the proper solution.

H. R. 11 AND H. R. 567 SHOULD BE PASSED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the two bills before this committee, H. R. 11 and H. R. 567, go far enough, or that they would do what we really ought to do. It occurred to me that if we did what we ought to do, we would re-pass the Robinson-Patman Act. But frankly, I do not think we could pass the Robinson-Patman Act in this Congress. Consequently, I have introduced these two bills which I think we can pass and pass immediately. They will correct in part the damage done by the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision and restore some measure of protection to small business against big business abuse of power, although they will not give small business all of the protection it was intended to have by the Robinson-Patman Act.

Now we cannot wait until such time as we can pass a bill which gives small business full protection. We are confronted with an immediate and compelling practical problem. Subsection 2 (a) has for all practical purposes been rendered a nullity. The practical result is that thousands and hundreds of thousands of small businessmen all over this country are being injured, and they are being sorely injured. Many of them are being put out of business.

I hope that this committee will soon have an opportunity to read some of the testimony of small gasoline dealers who have been coming here and testifying before the committee headed by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT. These dealers have come from all parts of the United States, and they all have the same heartbreaking story to tell. They are being ruined. They are being ruined by price discriminations made in good faith to meet competition.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to conceive that in such a supposedly civilized country as ours there could be tolerated such persuasive and harsh injustices as this record shows. Here are these multi-billion-dollar oil companies on the one hand acting in good faith to ruin thousands upon thousands of small independent businessmen who go into the retail business with perhaps no more than $3 to $5 thousand of capital, plus the assets of high hopes and strong determinations. These little businessmen are not the castoffs of society, Mr. Chairman. They are intelligent, honest, hardworking citizens who want to be independent. There are 200,000 of these independent dealers in the country today, and one-third of them are going out of business every year. When the rate of failure among our citizens is this high, I do not believe that our citizens have failed, but that there is a failure in the laws which Congress has provided.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if this committee read the testimony of these gasoline dealers, it would not sleep tonight before it had reported out a bill to correct these injustices.

Cosponsors of H. R. 11: Hon. CARL ALBERT (Oklahoma), Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO (New Jersey), Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL (Colorado), Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY (West Virginia), Hon. RICHARD BOLLING (Missouri), Hon. OVERTON BROOKS (Louisiana), Hon. USHER L. BURDICK (North Dakota), Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD (West Virginia), Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS (Tennessee), Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL (Michigan), Hon. THOMAS J. DODD (Connecticut), Hon. CLYDE DOYLE (California), Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER (Pennsylvania), Hon. JOE L. EVINS (Tennessee), Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL (Maryland), Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ (Maryland), Hon. DON HAYWORTH (Michigan), Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD (California), Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON (Wisconsin), Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH (New York), Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY (Pennsylvania), Hon. CECIL R. KING (California), Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM (Georgia), Hon. JOHN LESINSKI (Michigan), Hon. GEORGE S. LONG (Louisiana), Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY (Minnesota), Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ (Michigan), Hon. DON MAGNUSON (Washington), Hon. LEE METCALF (Montana), Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER (California), Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN (Pennsylvania), Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR. (California), Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER (New York), Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN (Illinois), Hon. JAMES G. POLK (Ohio), Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR. (New York), Hon. MELVIN PRICE (Illinois), Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES (Pennsylvania), Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR. (New Jersey), Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS (Colorado), Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT (California), Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD (California), Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES (Florida), Hon. T. A. THOMPSON (Louisiana), Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY (Texas), Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS (Mississippi), Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI (Wisconsin).

Members of the House who have introduced bills identical with H. R. 11 in the 84th Congress:

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD (California), H. R. 2850.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS (New Jersey), H. R. 2690.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR. (Michigan), H. R. 2611.

APPENDIX A

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN'S STATEMENT ON ANTITRUST PROBLEMS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 10, 1955

PERSONNEL—ATTORNEY GENERAL'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY ANTITRUST LAWS

According to the membership list appearing in the report of March 31, 1955, the personnel of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust laws consisted of 61 members and 2 cochairmen. It is the purpose of this statement to segregate those members into a number of categories and subcategories. The first category is designated as part I. This includes a listing of the members of the committee who directly or through their law firms have appeared for alleged antitrust law violators in proceedings and investigations which are now pending. This part is further divided so as to list separately the lawyers who are engaging in practice regularly, those who are teaching law, and the members who are economists.

Part II contains a list of the members of the committee who directly or through their law firms have appeared as advocates for alleged violators of antitrust laws in proceedings and investigations in the past. This part is further divided so as to list separately the lawyers who are engaging in practice regularly, those who are teaching law, and the members who are economists.

Part I

Practicing Lawyers

H. Thomas Austern, Covington & Burling, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. Antitrust cases: du Pont Co., cellophane case; dupont Co., Chicago divestiture case (GM, United States Rubber); Watchmakers of Switzerland; Information Center (represented by firm); Michigan Tool Co. (criminal and civil).

Wendell Berge, Berge, Fox & Arent, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. Antitrust case: Joseph A. Krasnov.

Bruce Bromley, Cravath, Swaine & Moore, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. Antitrust cases: International Business Machines Corp., Lee Shubert.

Hammond E. Chaffetz, Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, 33 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. Antitrust cases: du Pont Co., Chicago, divestiture case (GM, United States Rubber); Darling & Co.; Employing Plasterers Association; National City Lines; *Zenith* v. *RCA et al.*

John W. Davis, Davis, Polk, Wardell, Sunderland & Kiendle, 15 Broad Street, New York,

N. Y. (although Mr. Davis is deceased he is listed because the firm continues in the active representation of defendants in pending cases). Antitrust case: Standard Oil Co. (N. J.)

George E. Frost, suite 838, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. Federal Trade Commission case: E. Edelmann & Co.

Edward F. Howrey, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C. Federal Trade Commission cases: Rubber Tire Industry; Quantity Limit Proceding, file 203–1; Investigation of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Edward R. Johnston, Johnston, Thompson, Raymond & Mayer, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. Antitrust cases: Butane Corp.; Fannin's Gas Co., National City Lines, *Zenith* v. *RCA et al.*

A. Stewart Kerr, Crawford, Sweeny & Dodd, 1601–1613 Dime Building, Detroit, Mich. Antitrust cases: Kelsey, Hayes Co.; Logan Co. (represented by firm); Michigan Tool Co. (criminal and civil).

Francis R. Kirkham, Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro, Standard Oil Building, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. Antitrust case: Standard Oil of California.

George P. Lamb, Kittelle & Lamb, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. Federal Trade Commission cases: Chain Institute, Inc. et al.; Pet Milk Co.

Mason A. Lewis, Lewis, Grant, Newton, Davis & Henry, 810 First National Bank Building, Denver, Colo. Antitrust case: General Mills (represented by firm).

Breck P. McAllister, Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Irvine, 2 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. Antitrust cases: Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); Watchmakers of Switzerland, Information Center (represented by firm).

Charles B. Rugg, Ropes, Gray, Best, Coolidge & Rugg, 50 Federal Street, Boston, Mass. Antitrust cases: Lawrence Fuel Oil Institute, Inc. (represented by firm); Lowell Fuel Oil Dealers (represented by firm).

Albert E. Sawyer, 56 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y. Federal Trade Commission case: Crown Zellerbach Corp. et al.

Herman F. Selvin, Loeb & Loeb, 610 Pacific Mutual Building, Los Angeles, Calif. Antitrust case: Twentieth-Century Fox (represented by firm).

Whitney North Seymour, Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Antitrust cases: International Boxing Club, *Zenith* v. *RCA* et al.

Morrison Shafroth, Grant, Shafroth & Toll, 730 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. Antitrust case: Union Carbide & Carbon (indictment and information).

William Simon, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. Federal Trade Commission case: Warren Petro Corp.

Blackwell Smith, Smith, Sargent, Doman, Hoffman & Grant, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Antitrust case: American News Co.

Jerrold G. Van Cise, Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl, 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. Antitrust cases: Pan-American World Airways (represented by firm), Procter & Gamble Co., Radio Corporation of America, Standard Oil Company (N. J.), *Zenith* v. *RCA* et al.

Curtis C. Williams, Jr., Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio. Federal Trade Commission case: Thompson Products, Inc.

Laurence I. Wood, counsel, apparatus sales division, General Electric Co., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., Antitrust case; *Zenith* v. *RCA* et al.

Law Professor

S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, cochairman.

(Pending investigation at the Federal Trade Commission relating to Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., for alleged violation of the Clayton Antitrust Act including the Robinson-Patman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act.)

Part II

NOTE.—Where name of firm and address are not shown see part I for that information.

Practicing Lawyers

Cyrus Anderson, assistant counsel, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa. Antitrust case: Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

H. Thomas Austern. Antitrust cases: American Can Co.; Bendix Aviation Corp.; Henry S. Morgan; A. B. Dick Co.; Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.; Phillips Screw Co.; The Sherwin-Williams Co. Federal Trade Commission cases: Van Kannel Revolving Door Co.; California Packing Corp., et al.; California Packing Corp., et al.; American Tobacco Co.; Agricultural Insecticide and Fungicide Association., et al.; Automatic Canteen Company of America; National Biscuit Co.; Independent Grocers Alliance Distributing Co., et al; E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., Inc., et al.; Association of Coupon Book Mfgrs., et al.; J. Richard Phillips, Jr. & Sons, Inc., et al.; American Chicle Co.; the Larsen Co.; Malleable Chain Manufacturers Institute, et al.; Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., et al.; Atlas Supply Co., et al.; H. J. Heniz Co., et al.

Cyrus Austin, Appell, Austin & Gay 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. Federal Trade Commission cases: Standard Oil Company (Indiana); Acme Asbestos Covering and Flooring Co., et al. (court proceeding only); Ruberoid Co.

Bruce Bromley. Antitrust cases: Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Bendix Aviation Corp., Electrical Apparatus Export Association (represented by firm), General Electric Co. (incandescent), General Railway Signal Co., Hartford Empire Co. (represented by firm), Henry S. Morgan (represented by firm), Univis Lens Co. (represented by firm), DeBeers Consolidated Mines, National Lead Co., United States Alkali Export Association, United States Gypsum Co. Federal Trade Commission cases: Paramount Famous Lasky Corp., West Coast Theaters, Inc., et al.

Hammond E. Chaffetz. Antitrust cases: American Optical Co. (represented by firm), Armour & Co., Chicago Mortgage Bankers Association, Yellow Cab Co., Swift & Co., Wilson & Co., Inc., Association of Limb Manufacturers of America. Federal Trade Commission Cases: Retail Coal Merchants Association, et al., Standard Oil Company (Indiana), National Tea Co., et al., B. F. Goodrich Co., Atlas Supply Co., et al., B. F. Goodrich Co.

Herbert W. Clark, Morrison, Rohfeld, Foerster & Clark, Crocker Building, San Francisco, Calif. Antitrust cases: Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. (represented by firm), National Association of Vertical Turbine Manufacturers (criminal), National Association of Vertical Turbine Manufacturers (criminal), Northern California Plumbing & Heating Wholesalers Association, Outdoor Advertising Association of America (represented by firm). Federal Trade Commission case: Cement Institute, et al.

John W. Davis. Antitrust cases: Henry S. Morgan; Brakelining Manufacturers' Association (three cases); Mortgage Conference of New York; New York Central Railway; Paramount Pictures, Inc.; DeBeers Consolidated Mines (civil). Federal Trade Commission cases: Butterick Co., et al.; Eastman Kodak Co., et al.; General Electric Co., et al.; Radio Corporation of America; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., et al.; Standard Brands, Inc., et al.; National Bisquit Co.; Allied Paper Mills, et al.; American Iron and Steel Institute, et al.; Atlas Supply Co., et al.

Charles Wesley Dunn, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Federal Trade Commission cases: Beech-Nut Packing Co.; Lautz Brother & Co.; Goodall Worsted Co.; Armand Co.; Armand Co., Inc., et al.; Penick & Ford, Ltd., et al.

Fred E. Fuller, Fuller, Harrington, Seney & Henry, Ohio Building, Toledo, Ohio. Antitrust cases: Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; Hartford Empire Co. Federal Trade Commission case: American Surgical Trade Association, et al.

Robert W. Graham, Bogle, Bogle & Gates, Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Antitrust cases: Alaska Steamship Co.; Chrysler Corp., parts wholesalers, northwest region; K & L Distributors, Inc. Federal Trade Commission cases: Carl Rubenstein, et al.; New England Fish Co., et al.; Washington Brewers Institute, et al.

Edward F. Howrey. Federal Trade Commission cases: Robinson Clay Product Co., et al.; American Refractories Institute, et al.; Automatic Canteen Company of America; Structural Clay Products, Inc., et al.; Structural Clay Products, Inc., et al.; Luden's, Inc.; F. B. Washburn Candy Corp.; Kimball's Candy Co.

Edward R. Johnston. Antitrust cases: Chicago Mortgage Bankers Association, National Association of Vertical Turbine Manufacturers (criminal) (represented by firm), Northern California Plumbing & Heating Wholesalers Association, Wallace & Tiernan, Inc. (criminal and civil), Central Supply Association, International Harvester Co., National Cheese Institute. Federal Trade Commission cases: United States Malisters Association, et al.; Young's Rubber Corp.; Metal Lath Manufacturers Association, et al.; American Surgical Trade Association, et al.

Francis R. Kirkham. Antitrust cases: Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., Cement Institute (represented by firm), Walter Kidde & Co. (represented by firm), Northern California Plumbing & Heating Wholesalers Association (civil), Northern California Plumbing & Heating Wholesalers Association(criminal).

George P. Lamb. Antitrust cases: Diamond Match Co.; Johnson & Johnson, Federal Trade Commission cases: Card Clothing Manufacturers' Association, et al.; American Veneer Package Association, et al.; Wire Rope & Strand Manufacturers Association, Inc., et al.; Tag Manufacturers Institute, et al.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., et al.; American Iron & Steel Institute, et al.; National Paper Trade Association of the United States, Inc., et al.; Vitrified China Association, Inc., et al.; Advertising Specialty National Association, et al.

Mason A. Lewis. Antitrust case: Cement Institute. Federal Trade Commission case: Ideal Cement Co., et al.

Breck P. McAllister. Antitrust cases: Eastman Kodak Co. (represented by firm); Electric Storage Battery Co. (represented by firm); Henry S. Morgan; Technicolor, Inc. (represented by firm); Diamond Match Co.; Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.; New York Great A. & P. Co.; Paramount Pictures, Inc.; Wallpaper Institute. Federal Trade Commission case: Cement Institute et al.

Parker McCollester (deceased). Federal Trade Commission cases: Corn Products Refining Co. et al.; Corn Products Refining Co. et al.; Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.

Gilbert H. Montague, 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. Federal Trade Commission cases: Shredded Wheat Co.; Bureau of Statistics of the Book Paper Manufacturers et al.; Cudahy Packing Co.; Cudahy Packing Co.; Mennen Co.; Philadelphia Wholesale Drug Co. et al.; Paramount Famous Lasky Corp.; Onedia Community, Ltd.; New York State Sheet Metal Roofing & Air Conditioning Contractors' Association et al.; General Electric Co. et al.; Metal Window Institute et al.; Biddle Purchasing Co. et al.; Joseph Dixon Crucible Co. et al.; Salt Producers Association et al.

Charles B. Rugg. Antitrust cases: Gamewell Co.; General Electric Co. (incandescent); Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.[1]

[1] This appearance was for the purpose of service of process on the defendant only since the case was tried in Boston. A New York law firm, however, handled the case throughout.

(represented by firm); Boston Fruit & Produce Exchange; H. P. Hood & Sons, Inc.; Library Binding Institute.

Albert E. Sawyer. Federal Trade Commission cases: Allied Paper Mills, et al.; Tag Manufacturers Institute, et al.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., et al.; American Biltrite Rubber Co., Inc.

Bernard G. Segal, Schnader, Harrison, Segal, & Lewis, 1719 Packard Building, Philadelphia, Pa. Antitrust cases: Baugh & Sons Co., Philadelphia Association of Linen Suppliers, Record Dealers' Association.

Herman F. Selvin. Antitrust case: Union Ice Co. (represented by firm).

Whitney North Seymour. Antitrust cases: American Can Co., Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., General Electric Co. (incandescent), General Electric Co. (fluorescent), Scophony Corp. of America (represented by firm), American Optical Co., Optical Wholesaler's National Association, Permuitt Co.

Morrison Shafroth. Antitrust case: Cement Institute.

William Simon. Federal Trade Commission cases: Building Material Dealers Alliance, et al.; Daniel A. Brennan, et al.; Salt Producers Association, et al.; Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) (court proceedings only); General Motors Corp., et al.

Jerrold G. Van Cise. Antitrust cases: Electrical Apparatus Export Association; Hartford Empire Co.; Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; Henry S. Morgan; New York Great A. & P. Tea Co.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc. (represented by firm); Times-Picayune Publishing Co. (submitted amici curiae brief in Supreme Court) (represented by firm).

Jerrold G. Van Cise. Antitrust cases: General Cable Corp.; Linde Air Products Co.; Metropolitan Leather & Findings Association, Inc.; Mortgage Conference of New York. Federal Trade Commission cases: Champion Spark Plug Co.; American Surgical Trade Association, et al.

Curtis C. Williams, Jr. Antitrust cases: Timken Roller Bearing Co. (represented by firm), Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. (represented by firm), General Electric Co., Republic Steel Corp., Rubber Manufacturers' Association.

Law Professors

Prof. Milton Handler, 445 Park Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. Antitrust cases: A. B. Dick Co.; involving an investigation of a member of the liquor industry.

Jack I. Levy, Sonnenchein, Berkson, Lautmann, Levinson & Morse, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. Antitrust cases: Uhlemann Optical Co., American Optical Co. Federal Trade Commission case: Independent Grocers Alliance Distribution Co., et al.

S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, cochairman (represented Burroughs Adding Machine Co. in connection with an investigation that was made of it under the antitrust laws).

Economists

Prof. Morris A. Adelman, economics department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. (He wrote articles defending the position A. & P. took in its defense in antitrust proceedings which articles were then distributed by A. & P.)

Prof. John Maurice Clark, 41 Wright St., Westport, Conn. (Was employed by the Cement Institute and in that connection assisted in preparing the economic defense in the Cement Institute case.)

Dean Ewald T. Grether, School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. (Was employed by the Cement Institute to testify in its defense in the Cement Institute case.)

Prof. Clare E. Griffin, School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (Was employed by the Cement Institute to testify in its defense in the Cement Institute case. He also was employed by the defendants to testify in their defense in the Rigid Steel Conduit case and the American Tobacco case.)

GENERAL COMMENTS CONCERNING THE LISTS WHICH APPEAR UNDER PARTS I AND II

From the foregoing it is shown that out of the approximately 45 practicing lawyers who were members of the Attorney General's committee approximately one-half of them directly or through their law firms have appeared in pending proceedings and investigations to defend alleged antitrust law violations.

Approximately two-thirds of all of the practicing lawyers who were included in the membership of the Attorney General's Committee have appeared directly or through their law firms as advocates for alleged violators of antitrust laws in proceedings and investigations in the past. Of the law professors who were members of the Committee one-third have appeared as advocates for alleged violators of antitrust laws in proceedings and investigations in the past. Almost one-half of all of the economists who are included in the membership of the Attorney General's Committee have appeared as advisors, or otherwise as advocates for the position they have advanced in defense of antitrust law violators. Almost all of the other economists who are members of the Attorney General's Committee dissented in some respect from the position of the report. When we deduct the law professors who have appeared for antitrust law violations then we find only a small number of the remainder actually subscribed to the position taken in the report. In fact two of those law professors wrote sharp dissents to the position taken in the report by the Attorney General's Committee. The Attorney General and his Cochairmen of the Committee refused to have those dissents published in full as a part of the report of the committee.

The foregoing information as set out in this appendix A is not complete. The additional data will be submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, as soon as it can be compiled.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1953.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is shocking to me, as it must be to all friends of a strong and effective antitrust law system in this country, to note your choice of the man to serve as cochairman of your Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws.

In view of this appointment, the so-called study would be a joke—except that this is no laughing matter. To the general public and most business firms, our antitrust laws are a most vital and serious matter. We cannot afford to have them dissected and emasculated in the name of "study" by one who has already prejudged and has long preached his personal views that such emasculation is necessary.

It becomes obvious that the good name of the Justice Department is being sought as a cloak to shield the evil intentions of those who would destroy many of the antitrust law gains that have been built up through the years.

For Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, as a private citizen, to hold the views he does is unfortunate—but that is his right. But for a man like him, with such predetermined and well-defined ideas on destroying antitrust safeguards, to be chosen to run a so-called impartial study is most terrible; it is indeed a major blunder that may prove costly to our entire economy. Big steel, big cement, big oil, big rubber, big national chains, and others like them may well rejoice in this choice. That they are pleased is evident in the views expressed by the business publications they read. Many are already reveling in anticipation of the new freedom they expect to gain in their business operations.

Surely you knew Professor Oppenheim's views when you appointed him; his writings outline them clearly. And your announcement of your committee to make the so-called study not only adopted Oppenheim's call for such a committee, it even copied many exact words and phrases he used and rephrased others. His call for the so-called study was included with an outline of the changes he wanted to make to our antitrust laws, particularly "gutting" the Robinson-Patman Act. So I am sure you do not claim ignorance of his views.

There may even be some who will question your own so-called unbiased attitude in regard to this so-called study. In your remarks at the time you announced the committee, you appear to have prejudged the Robinson-Patman Act by accepting the phony talk of hard versus soft competition.

Is the welfare of the American public to be sold out to big business interests? You know, that is not a far-fetched conclusion. It is well justified in view of what has been taking place. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not against any business because it is big. I am against the abuse of bigness in a way that injures competition and is harmful to the public interest. Big business has no right to ask for special privileges, secret rebates, and unearned discounts at the expense of their smaller competitors. I have no quarrel with any big business that seeks only equality of opportunity, which is all any little business is seeking or is entitled to receive.

As an author of the Robinson-Patman Act, I can well remember the days and days of hearings we held and the testimony that was uncovered. Business conditions prior to the passage of that act were deplorable. The deception, the pressures, the discriminations, and the chiseling that went on were terrible—and drove many firms out of business. It would have destroyed many more if the act had not been passed. I shudder to think of the future for the average American businessman—in fact, for our entire economy—if this type of situation is to be legalized by elimination of the safeguards established.

When your announcement was made—even before you told of your selection of Oppenheim—big business papers applauded the action, and reported that it was expected that there would be a major overhaul and revision of the antitrust laws that would be welcome to big business. One business paper, in its Washington letter, went further and gave the inside slant of what was being done, saying, "They hope the Robinson-Patman Act and other antitrust statutes will get a thorough working over before next year's congressional elections, and are losing no time in paving the way with heavy encouragement from Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., who's fostering a national committee to study the antitrust laws."

This indicates the view of the trained business press—trained in interpreting events of interest to their readers. Nor are they the only ones who seem to feel that there is in the making a new, soft attitude toward the freedom of big and unscrupulous businessmen to do as they please without fear of Government intervention. Many of the foes of the Robinson-Patman Act are untiring in their attacks on it and in their efforts to have it emasculated. These same foes suddenly are willing to wait for the recommendations of the committee. They are not waiting for a fair, factual report on what the situation is; instead, they anticiapte a report along the lines outlined by Professor Oppenheim in his writings. In view of all that has been taking place, they are most optimistic—even confident—of the outcome.

Are they justified in feeling this way? Well, here is what one big-business magazine

concluded in its review of the new situation. After discussing Oppenheim's recommendations for amending the Robinson-Patman Act, it says:

"None of these suggestions is doctrine yet, of course, and there's no foregone conclusion that the antitrust study committee will adopt all, or any, of them. All of the principals, Brownell, Barnes, and Oppenheim, have made clear that men from all sides of antitrust issues will serve on the committee.

"But Oppenheim is bound to play the most important individual role in the course of the 2-year study. And the final recommendations are more than likely to follow the general lines of his thinking."

Mr. Brownell, are your own friends inadvertently exposing the tactics now being adopted? Will several lawyers and economists who are not in favor of destroying the Robinson-Patman Act and the other antitrust laws be placed on the committee just to hide the true situation? Will they be used merely as a front? After all, your own announcement said there would be a small working committee designed to receive, classify, and pass upon the recommendations made by the larger advisory committee. They will carefully screen out any recommendations that will run counter to that proposed by Professor Oppenheim, won't they?

This new situation is especially discouraging, in view of the fact that the Federal Trade Commission has already apparently revised its standards and procedures along the lines of "soft" treatment to the big firms. I am sure you are familiar with their dismissal of cases against the big soap companies, big national chains, and others. It is almost as if they were cleaning house of important cases, now that they have a new Chairman. I had hoped that at least the Justice Department would remain faithful to the spirit and the purpose of our antitrust laws. I now fear that this hope is no longer justified.

About a year ago, Professor Oppenheim published his credo on the antitrust laws. Part of that credo has already been incorporated by you in the announcement of the committee you have setup. The big question is this, will the rest of the credo of Professor Oppenheim's appear before long in the report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws? That would certainly not indicate a fair, unbiased, factual study. I hope and pray that the people and the Congress will see through any sham that should be attempted, and will see instead the true picture of what lies behind such a report. The people need facts, not prejudged, legalistic maneuvers. I think there is still time for every effort to be made to give them the truth. I hope you will see the mistake you are making and will join with us in seeing they get the truth.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

STATEMENT ON OUR NATIONAL ANTITRUST POLICY AND LAWS PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTITRUST LAWS, DECEMBER 1953

(Submitted by National Association of Retail Grocers; National Association of Retail Druggists; National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc.; National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc.; United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association; National Food Brokers Association; National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc.; United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTITRUST LAWS,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The organizations subscribing hereto submit for consideration of the committee the following statement outlining their views in general terms with respect to the national antitrust policy and laws in the area of price and service discriminations, as suggested by the Attorney General.

The groups joining in this statement are particularly concerned over the attacks being made upon the policy and provisions of the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act, and therefore deem it necessary to state, as they see it, the need for maintaining and preserving this basic law in a strong and healthy condition.

I. THE NATIONAL ANTITRUST POLICY AND LAWS IN GENERAL

Constitutional freedom—equality of opportunity—of the people to engage in trade or business, is the essential concern of the national antitrust policy.

Equality of opportunity is the goal we seek to attain as a free society, whether it be in the economic, social, or political field. As a concept it gives reality to the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, under which we as a nation have progressed and advanced. Our Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal." This precious heritage of all free men depends for its continued existence on keeping open for all people the door of opportunity.

If we kill or damage this basic concept in trade and commerce, our freedoms and democracy itself cannot long survive. At this hour there are many advocates pleading for a weakening of the antitrust laws to enable a relatively few unthinking, big, and powerful units in our industry to practice discrimination without without fear of restraint and without regard to how much it destroys or damages the equality of others to compete.

On the other hand, we who subscribe to this presentation raise our voices in behalf of the people in every city, town, and township of the land who would be the victims of legalized unfair discrimination and whose right to equality of opportunity would thus be impaired or even destroyed.

In *Standard Sanitary Mfg. Co.* v. *U. S.* (226 U. S. 20, 49 (1912)), Mr. Justice McKenna stated in the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court:

"The Sherman law is a limitation of rights, rights which may be pushed to evil consequences and therefore restrained."

And, in *Ramsay Co.* v. *Bill Posters Ass'n.* (260 U. S. 501, 512 (1923)), Mr. Justice Reynolds stated for a unanimous Court:

"The fundamental purpose of the Sherman Act was to secure equality of opportunity and to protect the public against evils commonly incident to destruction of competition through monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade."

That this policy, common to our antitrust laws, was specifically affirmed by Congress in acting on the Patman bill is conclusively shown by the House report (No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess. 3) stating as follows:

"The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore, as far as possible, equality of opportunity in business by strengthening antitrust laws and by protecting trade and commerce against unfair trade practices and unlawful price discrimination.

* * * * *

"Your committee is of the opinion that the evidence is overwhelming that price discrimination practices exist to such an extent that the survival of independent merchants, manufacturers, and other businessmen is seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation is necessary."

Probably the most eloquent description of both the philosophy and need behind the Robinson-Patman Act was given on the floor of the House when Hatton W. Summers, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee stated in support of the measure:

"We cannot preserve a democracy in Government unless we preserve a democracy in opportunity."

There can be little wonder that the measure was approved in the Senate by a unanimous vote, passed the House with only 16 dissenting, and that the conference report which embodied the act was agreed to in both Houses without objection.

Today, as then, the act is supported by leaders of the Nation.

On October 16, 1952, Presidential Candidate Eisenhower stated his beliefs in a letter to small-business representatives, quoted in part as follows:

"I am opposed to all unnecessary Government restriction and regulation of private enterprise. I favor with equal vigor the maintenance and effective enforcement of the necessary basic safeguards to free American enterprise. These are provided in our antitrust laws and in those laws supporting fair competitive pricing practices. I shall oppose any legislation which will weaken them.

"American business cannot prosper and contribute in growing measure to our national well-being unless the opportunity to engage in business and to provide consumers with new and better products and services is vigilantly preserved.

"Our laws against unfair and destructive pricing practices as well as other practices leading to monopoly must be fearlessly, impartially, and energetically maintained and enforced.

"I am for such necessary rules of fair play because they preserve and strengthen free and fair competition, as opposed to monopolies which mean the end of competition."

With equal vigor, Presidential Candidate Stevenson, in a letter dated October 10, 1952, gave his endorsement to a strong Robinson-Patman Act in the following words:

"The citizens of America must be protected by a continuation of the free competitive systems which has helped make our Nation strong. In this connection, free does not include the right of some businesses to do whatever they please where the effect is to destroy others. It does include the right of all business to have equal opportunity to compete without fear of hindrance or hurt from monopoly forces."

No partisan issue was involved here.

These were not mere campaign promises given lightly in the heat of battle to be forgotten in the full glory of victory.

President Eisenhower lost little time after he assumed high office to dedicate his leadership to equality of opportunity for all.

Thus, in his address on the State of the Union, before the joint session of the House and Senate on February 2, 1953, he stated, in part:

"The grand labors of this leadership will involve:

* * * * *

"Dedication to the well-being of all our citizens and to the attainment of equality of opportunity for all, so that our Nation will ever act with the strength of unity in every task to which it is called."

Enjoyment of the right to equality of opportunity to compete in trade or business is protected by the antitrust laws. Although we are concerned with the Sherman Act of 1890, which generally prohibits contracts, combinations in the form of trusts or otherwise, and conspiracies in restraint of trade, and monopolies of trade or commerce, and also with the Clayton Act of 1914 which, "to strike the weed in the seed," supplemented the Sherman Act by specifically prohibiting abusive price discriminations, among other incipient restraints of trade and tendencies to monopoly, the particular concern of the undersigned is the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, which amended and strengthened the Clayton Act specific prohibition of such price discriminations. It is true, however, that the basic purpose of all antitrust laws is further to secure Americans in their right

to equality of opportunity to compete in said commerce by protecting them from coercive and subversive influences impeding full and free exercise of that right.

II. THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT IN PARTICULAR

The several provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act are indispensable to the protection of the opportunity of business rivals to obtain commodities of like grade and quality on equal terms. They deter continual and persistent price discrimination practices which unfairly favor one rival over the others. In particular, they aim to prevent a big nationwide operator which is so disposed to use its sheer economic and financial size and power to crush its local competitors by continually getting its supplies on discriminatory terms, and at the ultimate expense of farmers, labor, and the consumer.

That farmers, labor, and the consumer have a big stake in the Robinson-Patman Act was shown by what happened in the period 1920–29 when abusive price discriminations were widespread throughout the land. It was during this period that the prices paid to farmers declined considerably. As the pressures for discriminatory allowances were exerted more and more irresistibly by the largest corporate distributors on the processor, the processor necessarily had to make it up somewhere, and very often he was compelled, against his better judgment, to press for lower and lower prices paid to the farmer and for lower and lower wages paid to labor. And, as a result, the proceeds of the discrimination were pocketed by recipients thereof and that, far from benefiting the consumer, the consumer as well as farmers and labor paid the bill.

No one of the independents—large or small—no tire dealer, no grocer, no druggist, no gasoline dealer, or other such businessman can hope to succeed in his contest with a competitor which continuously gets the goods it sells at a substantially lower price not economically justifiable. What chance, what opportunity has he successfully to compete with a competitor which continually and unfairly buys the same goods as he, but 5 percent, 10 percent, 20 percent, etc., cheaper? What chance has a man of equal physical ability to win a 100-yard race against a man who always has a 15-yard handicap at the start? Or to win a prizefight with an opponent who has horseshoes concealed in his gloves?

By prohibiting unfair price advantages, the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, in our opinion, is the Magna Carta of free, independent business enterprise in America.

III. THE ATTACK UPON THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The attack on the Robinson-Patman Act aims to persuade Congress to open for sellers and buyers a large area of freedom to practice price discriminations. This aim is clothed in the beguiling proposition that sellers should be allowed to grant price discriminations where necessary "in good faith" to meet competition.

It is said that the Robinson-Patman Act makes competition soft because it provides a crutch for the inefficient.

The terms "soft" competition and "hard" competition are frequently used by those contending that there is a basic conflict between the Sherman Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. Actually these terms have little meaning and serve only to confuse the real issues.

If by "soft" competition is meant competition which is restrained by governmental action, then the Sherman Act, by prohibiting predatory competitive practices that give rise to restraints of trade, does itself promote "soft" competition. The Sherman Act, like the Robinson-Patman Act, imposes certain limitations which restrain competition, but this is done because without such necessary restraints the consequence would be the eventual destruction of free competition through the formation of monopolies and combinations.

The Robinson-Patman Act supplements the purpose of the Sherman Act by strengthening competition by depriving the small fringe of unscrupulous firms of the advantages of special deals, secret rebates, and other unjustified allowances.

The whole purpose of the act is to protect competition so that price discriminations will not create a small permanent class of buyers who by abusing their power contrive to gain an unnatural and overpowering advantage over their less favored competitors.

To permit this would certainly mean that those buyers starting the competitive contest with the leverage of unfair advantage would have an easy time of it.

The charge that the act is not in the public interest because it protects the inefficient has no foundation in fact.

This indictment cannot stand. It presupposes that those who are the recipients of systematic price discriminations are the efficient and that those who are the victims of this practice are the inefficient. Such a proposition falls of its own weight.

The extent of buying power and availability of large financial resources are not an accurate criteria of efficiency, but they are the standard by which price discriminations are secured and measured. The fountainhead of efficiency is competition based on equality of opportunity. The act is designed to preserve this necessary prerequisite to the competitive system.

As further aid to their efforts to get Congress to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to give them greater latitude to grant discriminations to meet their competition, the opponents of the act seek radical changes in national antitrust policy. It is proposed to restate national antitrust policy in terms of allegedly new concepts of competition academically christened effective competition or workable competition. In support of this proposal, it is argued that the Robinson-Patman Act is basically inconsistent with the main line of the antitrust laws—that it protects competitors whereas the Sherman Act protects competition. It is further argued that the Robinson-Patman Act, or at the very least its per se prohibitions, should be repealed and that price discriminations should be governed by a rule of reason including a right of sellers to grant price discriminations continuously and persistently to meet their competition. The dangers and disadvantages of such a proposition are clearly shown in the paragraphs that follow.

IV. OUR POSITION REGARDING PROPOSAL TO CONFER RIGHTS TO PRACTICE ABUSIVE PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS WITHOUT REGARD TO INJURIES CAUSED BY THEM

Prior to enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, the original Clayton Act of 1914—good-faith-meeting-of-competition proviso, insofar as it was interpreted and applied as an absolute defense, had the practical effect of nullifying the prohibition against price discriminations.

In the decade following World War I, Congress became acutely aware of the problem of price discriminations, particularly the mounting destruction of small businesses in the retail trade, with coercive buyers eliminating their independent rivals by the thousands. In 1928, Congress directed the Federal Trade Commission by Senate Resolution 224 (70th Cong., 1st sess.) to undertake a comprehensive study of coercive buying and to report the practices and its recommendation for additional legislation. Over a period of 6 years, the Commission submitted to Congress more than 30 factual reports pursuant to this resolution and a final report on this investigation on September 13, 1934 (S. Doc. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess.). Based on that investigation, the Commission was of the opinion that it had been the persistent policy of coercive buyers to seek out and demand special and unwarranted price concessions on the goods that they bought and that the suppliers who granted such price discriminations to these buyers had done so, by and large, in good faith to meet competition. As a solution to the problem, the Commission recommended that the good faith defense be eliminated altogether.

In enacting the Robinson-Patman Act amendment to the Clayton Act, however, Congress retained the good faith defense but left it to the Commission to determine as a matter of fact in each case whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given. That this was the intent of Congress in the Robinson-Patman Act is made perfectly clear by the statement of the chairman of the House Managers of the Conference Report on the Robinson-Patman Bill, explaining the section 2 (b) good faith proviso (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9418):

"It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given.

"This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill.

"If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product."

On January 8, 1951, however, the Supreme Court in a 5 to 3 decision ruled that the good faith meeting of competition is an absolute defense to a charge of violation of the prohibition against price discrimination. (*Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231).) In this case, the majority was of the opinion that the defense must be taken as absolute in the absence of more explicit requirements and more specific standards of comparison for fairly balancing injuries to competition against a justification for meeting competition.

Bills were introduced in the first session of the 83d Congress to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to make good faith meeting of competition an absolute defense to any charges of violation of the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In our opinion the majority opinion in the Standard of Indiana case evidenced a new found weakness in the Robinson-Patman Act. Moreover, in our opinion, the aforementioned bills would cement this weakness into the statute with the result of destroying one of the major basic safeguards to free American enterprise.

We oppose and we believe the American people are opposed to any such radical change in the national antitrust policy and law.

It is already known to us that the Standard Oil decision is being taken advantage of, and a veritable saturnalia of unfair price discrimination is in the making, equaling, if not exceeding, the disastrous practices of pre-1936. If independent business is to be saved, affirmative legislation is needed effectively to carry out the original intent of the Congress.

We strongly recommend preservation of the existing antitrust policy and the elimina-

tion of the aforementioned new found weakness in the Robinson-Patman Act by positive legislative enactment preserving commerce from substantial suppression of competition.

We repeat, the antitrust laws concern the constitutional freedom of all Americans to engage in trade or business; equality of opportunity gives reality to that freedom. The Robinson-Patman Act was enacted to restore, so far as possible, equality of opportunity in business. The Robinson-Patman Act should be strengthened and not weakened.

V. OTHER ATTACKS ON THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The price and service discriminations specifically prohibited as unfair trade practices in section 2 (c), (d), and (e) of the Robinson-Patman Act, are under attack as being "per se rules" to outlaw "accepted business practices not demonstrably resulting in harmful effects," and it is proposed that these discriminations be permitted wherever they may be held as being "reasonable." The aim of these attacks is clear, namely, to insure that there be at least one good loophole through which all discriminations may legally pass regardless of the disastrous effect upon competition—upon equality of opportunity to compete.

Per se prohibitions are not new in our jurisprudence. Murder, rape, robbery, mayhem, arson, etc., have always been specifically prohibited because it was in the interest of society to do so.

The history of antitrust legislation shows that Congress and the people have been trying assiduously to find those trade practices which were per se inimical to our free, competitive society. In 1887, Congress was goaded by popular demand to declare discriminatory freight rates per se an evil in competition, and Congress prohibited those discriminations absolutely. The history of the Clayton Act legislation shows Congress tried desperately then to pick out and define those practices which were per se evil. Because of the haste with which the Clayton Act was passed—with the upheaval of the First World War taking place—the effort was abandoned. But Congress and the people continued to believe that per se evil trade practices had to be spelled out. There is no doubt Congress and the people thought in 1936 that payment of brokerage to buyers was a subterfuge, a price discrimination, evil per se. The same thing was true of discriminatory advertising allowances and discriminatory allowances for services. So Congress spelled out in section 2 (c), 2 (d), and 2 (e) evil practices which all reasonable men agreed should be prohibited.

Businessmen want definiteness in law so that they know what they can do and what they cannot do. Has there been any change in our standards of morality since 1936 or in what is right and wrong? We think not. Those who would eliminate or emasculate these provisions must face the responsibility of advocating a return to indefiniteness in the law, chaos in voluntary compliance by businessmen and very likely collapse of administration and enforcement by Government.

The question resolves itself whether reasonable citizens, big and little, in trade and commerce, really want definite, specific, fair rules of the game. It is quite clear if we did not have fair rules in sports, such as football, the game would become a savage struggle on the gridiron. It is equally clear that if we do not have fair rules in trade and commerce, competition is by nature such that no little man, however industrious and efficient, could stay in business, and only the most powerful would survive.

There are those who criticize the Robinson-Patman Act by saying it is indefinite and that even lawyers do not know what it means. We say that the public, and particularly businessmen, know the evil practices which were sought to be prohibited by the act; and the courts have shown that they know the spirit and intent of the letter of the act. To illustrate, section 2 (c) has been litigated to the end and there can be no reasonable doubt in any lawyer's or layman's mind what it means; the courts have unanimously caught its spirit, approved its intent, and have answered all questions as to meaning and constitutionality again and again in their opinions.

In short, the Robinson-Patman Act furthers and fosters genuine competition in trade and business, not by restraining competition, not by protecting "competitors instead of competition," but by restraining the exercise of the right to compete, by prohibiting persons from persistently, continuously, and systematically engaging in coercive and subversive buying practices which lessen competition, tend to monopoly, and ultimately destroy competition altogether.

VI. ENFORCEMENT

With respect to improved enforcement, we urge the adoption of the recommendation which the Federal Trade Commission has repeatedly made to Congress, namely, that orders under the Clayton Act as amended, shall become final 60 days after service on the respondent unless court review is sought within that time. In case of review, the order should become final on its affirmation by the Circuit Court or the Supreme Court.

With respect to enforcement generally, however, it is also very important that Government agencies shall have the heart and will to enforce the law in the public interest, without fear or favor.

VII. CONCLUSION

The facts of the legislative history of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, its administration and enforcement, prove beyond any reasonable doubt that all of the provisions of that act are a consistent, integral part of, and have marked the greatest advance in the effectuation of the national antitrust policy and in the realization by the American people of their constitutional freedom to engage in trade or business.

Respectfully submitted.

National Association of Retail Druggists, George H. Frates; National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., W. W. Marsh; National Food Brokers Association, Watson Rogers; United States Wholesale Grocers Association, Inc., Harold O. Smith, Jr.; National Association of Retail Grocers, Marie Kiefer; National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., John W. Nerbinge, Jr.; United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, C. W. Kitchen; National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., C. M. McMullan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HILL and to include an address he made before the National Tool and Die Association.

Mr. HOPE.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. TUMULTY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, his remarks in the House today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. DEANE, his remarks during general debate and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a statement.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH).

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. LANDRUM).

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1. An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of March 1955, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress, to the Committee on Agriculture.

786. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Island Trading Company of Micronesia, a corporate instrumentality of the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, Department of the Interior, pursuant to the requirements in the Interior Department Appropriation Acts of 1953 and 1954 (66 Stat. 458 and 67 Stat. 273); to the Committee on Government Operations.

787. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Seaborn Bradley for the selling of firewood in the Smokemont Campground in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., for the period April 15 to October 31, 1955, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

788. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

789. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to modify the authority to lease for mining purposes allotted Indian lands owned by Indian heirs or devisees of allottees"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

790. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5462. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2851. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; with an amendment (Rept. No. 583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1762. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Woodward, Okla.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6043. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 6160. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to make certain emergency loans and to insure loans to farmers and stockmen in certain areas to refinance existing debts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 6161. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to redefine the term "refugee," to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6162. A bill to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the supreme court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6163. A bill to declare the policy of Congress with respect to renewable natural resources and establish a commission to recommend means of carrying out such policy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6164. A bill to authorize the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans made to finance mobile homes parks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6165. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Armed Forces Science Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6166. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 6167. A bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6169. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen on the Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6170. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen on the Fort Laramie division of the North Platte reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 6171. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6172. A bill to establish certain offices within the Department of Defense and define the functions thereof; to create a Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain automobile seat covers from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6174. A bill to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 6175. A bill to amend section 31 of the act of Congress approved July 5, 1946 (ch. 541, 60 Stat. 427; 15 U. S. C. 1113); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6176. A bill to increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects, to be administered by the Commissioner of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 6177. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6178. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 6179. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in respect of distributions in kind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6180. A bill to amend section 1231 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6181. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 6182. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 6183. A bill to provide for the selection and control of pages of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 242. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the differences in the costs of production of domestic linen fire hose and like or similar foreign linen fire hose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will guarantee price supports for basic agricultural products of at least 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to operation of Federal dams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the apportionment of Federal funds for wildlife restoration in Hawaii; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 6185. A bill for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6186. A bill for the relief of Theodore Elie Hadjithomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Myra Louise Dew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel H. Peter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6189. A bill for the relief of Henry Luxembourg, also known as Heinrich Luxemburg, alias Stelian Luizescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 6190. A bill for the relief of Ensign Charles A. Binswanger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 6191. A bill for the relief of Maria Sapien de Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6192. A bill for the relief of Noriko Shimizu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6193. A bill for the relief of Jules Maurice Lotode, Mary Lotode, and Jeanne Lotode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 6194. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Toomey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT (by request):

H. R. 6195. A bill to authorize sale of up to 250,000 cubic feet of helium to C. H. Propst for use in an airship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

252. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of Private John Sandora Post, No. 3561, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Philadelphia, Pa., opposing curtailment of veterans hospitalization and medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

253. By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming: Petition of Mr. H. F. Carter, Glenrock, Wyo., and 96 others, to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

254. Also, petition of Mrs. Violet E. Pierson, 111 Fourth Avenue, Newcastle, Wyo., and 21 others, to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

255. Also, petition of Mrs. R. I. Copley, 925 North Wood, Newcastle, Wyo., and 17 others, to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

256. Also, petition of Mrs. T. R. French, 824 West 14th Street, Casper, Wyo., and 84 others to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

257. Also, petition of Rev. H. E. Shultz, Newcastle, Wyo., and 38 others to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

258. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. O. Brown, Sundance, Wyo., and four others to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

259. Also, petition of Mr. Charles M. Redmond, Buffalo, Wyo., and 37 others to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

260. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Dittmar, 1620 West 18th Street, Cheyenne, Wyo., and 108 others to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foreign Service of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks about the Foreign Service and its role in our foreign affairs, in view of the amendment recently passed to the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

Although there are about 100,000 American civilians employed by our Government overseas, the Foreign Service is the only career service operating abroad. All the other Americans overseas are engaged in some kind of program activities, such as building bases, operating technical-assistance programs, and other relatively short-time activities. This fact, in itself, places the Foreign Service in a unique category. It is a profession of lifetime service abroad. As such, it requires people with training, integrity, and a sensitivity to human values and problems. Wherever they serve, the Foreign Service represents our people and our Government. They must possess those qualities that we as a people hold in the highest esteem and be able to impart them to peoples of different backgrounds. It was for that reason that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in 1946, laid emphasis upon a career concept. We expected that young men and women would enter the Service only after a rigorous examination and make it a lifetime pursuit.

I have been increasingly disturbed by the misrepresentations of life and work in the Foreign Service. Much of this misrepresentation has come from individuals who should know better or, at least, could have determined the facts rather easily. I am not defending those Foreign Service officers who may have departed from the high standards expected of them. The fact that there were some who did not measure up to expectations is no reason to condemn a whole group who are engaged in a vital activity for our Government. Contrary to popular belief, few of our Foreign Service officers find life glamorous. More frequently it is marked by hardships, personal sacrifice, and even dangers to their health and that of their families.

One requirement of a Foreign Service officer and, equally important, his family's adaptability to changed and changing environments. His "home" is never fixed. It changes every 2 or 3 years. He may move from Hungary to Indonesia to Brazil. Perhaps there is "romance" in this type of life. But there are more apt to be some hard problems. Take the simple matter of making daily food purchases. In a number of our posts abroad this constitutes almost a full-time operation. What about the education of the children? If they go to local schools, they must know the local language. If they are to receive an education in the English language, they must frequently be sent away to school. Certainly the content of education must be carefully considered. We do not want our children living behind the Iron Curtain to study Communist doctrine. I cite these two examples simply to show that a normal family life in the Foreign Service is difficult, if not impossible. The fact that individuals voluntarily enter the Foreign Service and stay in it is an indication that our Government does have devoted and loyal public servants abroad.

Many of the problems that beset the Foreign Service are inherent in the nature of work overseas. Legislation cannot correct that. But the Congress does have a responsibility to assure, in the words of Mr. Loy Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, of the Department of State, that the satisfaction of public service is not dimmed by undue personal financial worries.

This is particularly true when it is remembered that we not only want to recruit the best of American youth but, more important, keep him in the Service. Mr. Henderson put it this way:

> If it (the Foreign Service) is successfully to compete with private enterprise or with other governmental agencies for the highest types of American youth it must be in a position to assure those who enter it unparalleled opportunities for public service. A career in the Foreign Service by its very character entails certain sacrifices. There is no place in it for those who are looking for a soft life. Much can be done, nevertheless, to alleviate the hardships inherent in it.

At this point I want to pay tribute to Mr. Henderson. If there is one thing that the Foreign Service needs, it is an understanding and experienced administrator of its personnel. Mr. Henderson has more than 30 years of service over the world. Most recently he was our ambassador in India and then in Iran—both critical posts. He has filled every assignment with distinction. I know his colleagues in the Foreign Service and in the Department have the utmost confidence in his integrity and ability. Members of both parties in this body have expressed a similar confidence in him. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported to this House that it "is confident that he will administer wisely and effectively the provisions contained in the Foreign Service Act." That is my personal view too.

When this bill was before our committee, I was interested to learn that private American firms operating overseas branches gave more attention to inducements to retain employees overseas than in recruiting them for such service. I believe that the amendments that we recently passed to the Foreign Service Act will serve the same purpose. Those amendments do not increase the pay of the Foreign Service officers. But they do take account of the heavy extra costs that have to be met in serving abroad. They compensate in part for some of these expenses.

This new law is not, of course, the answer to all the problems of the Foreign Service. But it is a step in the right

direction. I hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will keep under review the operations of the Foreign Service with a view to its continued improvement.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the subject of American foreign policy, delivered by me at Peoria, Ill., last night before the Peoria Association of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE PEORIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE ANNUAL DINNER MEETING, PEORIA, ILL., MAY 10, 1955

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, I am pleased to be here with my friend and colleague, EVERETT DIRKSEN, who so ably represents Illinois in the Senate of the United States.

American foreign policy is the people's business. There is no American man, woman, or child who will not be affected directly or indirectly by the present and future aspects of our foreign policy.

Our basic foreign policy is and should be peace with honor. This is far different from a policy of peace at any price.

As an example of our ultimate objective, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where for a long period of our history neither that country nor ours has found it necessary to have a single fort or military establishment for the purpose of defending one country against the other along the entire international frontier of 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We certainly hope that in our lifetime or the lifetime of our children other nations not only in the Western Hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, might live together as good neighbors as we do with Canada.

If we are half as prudent as the men who gave us this Republic and who helped to win and develop the great West, we will continue to hope and pray for peace but we will keep our powder dry.

Today the White House announced that Secretary of State Dulles was authorized to make arrangements for a meeting of the heads of government of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

All Americans will join in a prayer and a hope that this proposed meeting will rise above the gatherings of Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Geneva which gave substantial victories to the Communist world. Those meetings all had a friendly press and a massive propaganda buildup. It was not until months and sometimes years later that the full price paid became known.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, to Yalta and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China, and to Geneva and its impact upon Vietnam.

The heads of the free governments will be accountable and responsible to their people and to their parliaments or congress.

To whom will Bulganin be accountable? To the presidium or to Khrushchev? If Bulganin is indeed himself "at the summit" today will he be there when the big four meet in June or July?

Are our Western allies prepared to stand against a condemnation to perpetual slavery behind the Iron Curtain of the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary? Or will we be outvoted 3 to 1?

Are we to insist on previous agreements being honored before we take the Soviet's word on a new scrap of paper?

Will plans for the Republic of Germany's part in a Western defense be scrapped to placate the Russian bear?

We might recall Kipling's the Truce of the Bear. While this was written concerning the imperial Russia of the Czar it is even more applicable to Soviet Russia today.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;
When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,
When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes;
When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear."

Will we insist on the Soviet Union withdrawing, as pledged, their troops from Rumania and Hungary when the Austrian treaty is signed? Their only excuse for being in those two countries was to keep open lines of communication to their troops in Austria. Or will this promise also be overlooked in order not to offend the Muscovites.

There is no reliable evidence to date that would warrant a prudent person in believing that the Soviet Union or international communism have changed their basic long term strategy for the destruction of human freedom. In discussing American foreign policy before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C. on April 22, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor said:

"The Communist enemy, regardless of any momentary change of tactics, regardless of any treaty the Kremlin may sign, is bent on conquering the entire world—the United States not excluded—and remolding it in the form of the totalitarian dictatorship and slave economy imposed on the people behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia, Rumania, outer Mongolia, and on the Chinese mainland. American labor never can be and never will be submissive or neutral toward such a total menace."

Certainly American businessmen and the public generally should be no less alert to the dangers of communism than is the American Federation of Labor as so ably and courageously expressed by the president of that great organization.

Our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support and what retards it we should oppose.

The age of colonialism in Asia is dead. The people in that part of the world want no part of it. Any American policy in that part of the world will suffer a handicap if it is tied directly or indirectly to European colonialism.

Nowhere in the long history of Russia under the Czars or under the commissars is there anything equal to the United States establishing the free and independent Philippine Republic nor for that matter is there anything equal to Great Britain setting up a free and independent India, Pakistan, and Burma.

To the contrary, during the same period the Soviet Union was destroying the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia though they had signed treaties of friendship and nonaggression with all 3 of those Baltic Republics.

We have many friends in Asia and we should call upon those nations with whom we have mutual defense pacts and agreements for their advice and continued assistance in dealing with problems arising in that area of the world. I refer particularly to the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China, the Republic of the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and Japan, all of which are independent Asian nations, and together with Australia and New Zealand, have demonstrtted on numerous occasions their friendship and willingness to stand up and be counted when the going gets tough.

Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam are 3 new countries that have gained their independence from colonial rule but now find themselves threatened by the nearness of a more dangerous type of colonialism which is communism.

In Vietnam, Premier Diem is faced with tremendous problems. He has had the support of this country in meeting the difficult problems confronting him.

It is up to the people of free Vietnam to make their own decision as to the type of government structure that will best suit them. If their choice is a republic and the cutting of ties with an absent ruler their decision should have the support of their Asian neighbors as well as the United States and our Western allies. If their choice should be for a constitutional monarchy without the present ruler they should likewise be supported. There must be no pressure of any kind to retain Emperor Bao Dai if the Vietnamese prefer some more acceptable alternative.

Americans must never lose sight of the fact that ours at the time and today is the authentic revolution. It not only freed us from colonial rule, but it developed a charter of liberty which established a constitutional form of government to serve us for all time to come.

Other nations have had their revolutions, but either immediately or in the not-distant future the people found they had supplanted one ruler for an even more despotic one.

We should be proud of our revolutionary past and help to encourage in the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain the revolutionary zeal for freedom which won us a nation.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership

is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen; 11 of these have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

How can our associates even consider compromising principle and honor to that extent? What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

How long is the United Nations going to pussyfoot on this question of American prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice? Of the 15 the Chinese Communists admit holding, 11 have been sentenced to terms of from 4 to 10 years.

These men were shot down in January of 1953. Last fall it was suggested in Government quarters that public discussion be held down until Mr. Hammarskjold had completed his mission to Peiping.

He came back in January and held a press conference in New York on January 14 in which he admitted that the prisoners had not been released nor did he have any firm commitment as to when they would be released.

It was suggested again in Government quarters that the American Congress and the American people be patient and that perhaps Chou En-Lai would release them prior to the Bandung Conference.

The Bandung Conference has now come and gone and the prisoners have not been released.

Are we to wait until these prisoners have been completely brain washed and then released to serve the Communist propaganda purposes as has been the case of some of the civilians?

It is time for Mr. Hammarskjold to make his report to the United Nations and to the people of America.

What is intended to be done about Communist failure to comply with the terms of the Korean armistice?

If the United Nations as an organization is paralyzed from taking action, then the Government of the United States has an obligation to men wearing the uniform of this country to take some effective steps in getting our men released.

Yet voices of appeasement, abroad and at home continue to urge the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

This despite the fact that Communist China was the aggressor in Korea where we suffered 140,000 casualties including 35,000 dead.

This despite the fact that Communist China has been and is now in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice agreement.

Have we forgotten the Biblical injunction in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Communist Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

There will never be peace in our time in any real sense until the people of Russia and China have thrown out their Communist masters and established justice in their political system, freed their economy from the dead hand of statism concentrated on armament production and, more important than all, reopened their churches so that the guidance of the Father of us all may replace the godless teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The crucifix is a more potent force than the clenched fist of communism.

When the people of Russia and China gain their freedom from the tyranny which temporarily rules them we should make it known that our friendship and our assistance will be available for the establishment of peace with honor in a truly free world of freemen.

We seek not one foot of their territory nor control over a solitary one of their people.

We only want for them the cherished freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; to have in the hands of a truly free people the right of self-determination on who shall constitute their government and the right to change it by the decision of 200 million people rather than a cabal of less than a dozen power-mad men in the Kremlin who threaten the peace of the world; and to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor and a rising standard of living.

We should look upon the people within the Iron Curtain as our friends and allies. Indeed, should their totalitarian masters embark upon further aggression the temporarily enslaved people may turn out to be among our stoutest allies.

Such a policy does not contemplate aggression on the part of the free world. But it does require that we never by word or deed give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of the 800 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Such a policy does contemplate the application of moral, economic, and diplomatic sanctions against the international Communist conspiracy against the free way of life. Human freedom is a God-given right beyond the power of dictatorships to permanently destroy.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa Straits.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I cannot help but believe that we have a better chance of maintaining the peace of the world by showing strength and firmness now than by vacillation or weakness.

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist nation' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This I believe: Under the divine guidance that made us and kept us a free nation this generation of Americans will not sacrifice principle for expedience; nor cringe in the face of brutal naked aggression and we will not barter friends and allies in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Africa or Asia, in a dishonorable appeasement at a Far Eastern Munich or a second Yalta.

Calumet-Sag Channel Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby submitting a statement made by me in connection with the hearings asking for an appropriation to improve the Calumet-Sag Channel in the Chicago-northwest Indiana area.

The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Hon. FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, of the Appropriations Committee, have been holding hearings on this important question for several days.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT TO THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBMITTED BY HON. RAY J. MADDEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, INDIANA

THE CALUMET-SAG NAVIGATION PROJECT, ILLINOIS AND INDIANA

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend your subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for holding hearings in behalf of the Calumet-Sag Channel project, which when completed will aid the industrial development of the Chicago area and the industrial region in northwest Indiana.

I also wish to commend the Chicago area congressional delegation who, through their chairman, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, is unanimously supporting the Calumet-Sag development.

In the last session of Congress, legislation was passed which inaugurated the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. This will be the beginning of the expansion of the Great Lakes waterway system from the Chicago area to the Mississippi River and on down to the Gulf of Mexico. United States Army engineers, through extended studies

during recent years on the development of the Calumet-Sag waterway have estimated that inland shipping can be increased about 20 times the present capacity through deepening and widening this natural water transportation highway. The Chicago congressional delegation has amply outlined the benefits of this water transportation improvement to the Chicago area as well as advantages to Midwestern shipping in general.

The Calumet-Sag Channel project will also bring about tremendous industrial expansion to the Calumet region in northwestern Indiana, of which I have the honor to represent in Congress. This development would bring about the influx of industries in the Chicago-Calumet area. Industrial expansion can go in but one direction as far as the Chicago area is concerned. The residential section on the north side of Chicago, the lake on the east dictates that industry must go south along the Indiana shores of Lake Michigan, if water transportation expansion is made available. If the Chicago-Calumet area will take advantage of the increased water transportation which would be brought about by reason of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the next 25 years would give northwest Indiana an industrial metropolitan area extending from the Indiana-Illinois State line along the shores of Lake Michigan for a distance of 50 miles.

The development of water transportation inland through the Mississippi Valley, New Orleans and through the Gulf of Mexico will give the Calumet area immediate shipping facilities to Mexico, South America, and other world seaports.

If this development is carried out to its logical goal, it will be the main cause to bring about employment for thousands of families in the northwestern Indiana area. It would lower the cost of sugar from Louisiana and the West Indies, coffee from South and Central Americas, iron ore from Venezeula and Cuba, to the Chicago-Calumet region and also the numerous products we receive from our southern neighbors. It would reduce the cost of shipping grain and for transshipping to vessels from central States to the ports of the world. It would reduce the cost and expedite the shipment of steel and steel products from the mills and factories of our area into the great Middle West and South, and to the rest of the world through the Gulf of Mexico. Scrap iron could be brought more cheaper to the steel mills in the Calumet and Chicago areas and transported from our mills to world markets. Industries in the Calumet region would benefit from lower shipping costs. More new industries would be attracted by the availability of more industrial sites along the southern shores of Lake Michigan.

The development of the Calumet-Sag Channel project would be merely a step forward in the modern 20th century campaign to provide employment for millions of young folks who will enter the labor market as time passes.

Another great reason for the necessity of this inland waterway development is the critical traffic situation which year by year becomes more critical in the Chicago-Calumet area. Water transportation out of this area to the South will eventually relieve our traffic problem to the extent of the construction of two large highway arteries in this congested area. An inland water highway from the Chicago-Calumet area would also prove to be a great asset and necessity in defense transportation in case of another world war. In addition to the facts that have already been presented by other witnesses before your committee, I submit that this modest appropriation of $4 million to improve the Calumet Sag transportation arteries is but a necessary preliminary start for the great program which must be inaugurated by the people of the Midwest to take advantage of the tremendous influx of industry in the Chicago-Calumet area which is annually expanding far beyond our transportation facilities.

When the Congress, during the last session, approved the St. Lawrence Seaway, it inaugurated a new era in transportation which will affect every major industrial area located on the shores of our Great Lakes. The various metropolitan areas which would benefit by reason of the St. Lawrence project must immediately take steps to keep pace with this modern improved transportation trend. The ultimate effect will create a multiplication of our transportation problems and the time to lay the foundation to solve these future needs is now.

Deepening of the Mystic River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Mystic River to accommodate the growing commerce that utilizes that river and to provide resources for our national defense requires an immediate appropriation of $4,500,000.

I include as a part of my remarks the statement made by me before the House Appropriations Committee at the hearing held yesterday in connection with the matter.

It reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, I am TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the subcommittee for permitting me this privilege of making a brief statement relative to the Mystic River project.

I want to first state that I am vitally interested in this project because of its great value to my district, to the Port of Boston, to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to our national defense.

The existing project, adopted in 1892 and supplemented by enactments in 1910, 1935, 1938, and 1950, provides for a channel 35 feet deep extending from the 35-foot channel of Boston Inner Harbor to the city playground at Charlestown, a channel 20 feet deep from the head of the 35-foot channel to a point 800 feet above the Malden Bridge with a turning basin above the bridge, a channel 6 feet deep from the Boston and Maine Railroad (western division) bridge to a point about 2,500 feet above Wellington Bridge, and thence 4 feet deep to Craddock Bridge.

All work on the existing project, with the exception of the 35-foot channel from Boston Harbor to the playgrounds at Charlestown, has been completed. The last work was done in 1938 when the section of the river between Island End River and the playground was dredged to 30 feet.

The dredging of the 35-foot channel, estimated to cost $4,500,000 is dependent upon the appropriation of funds as on May 17, 1950, Federal Law 516 authorized dredging the Mystic River from 30 feet to 35 feet at mean low water to within 100 feet of established United States bulkhead lines, generally from upper limit of 35 feet channel of Boston Harbor at Chelsea Bridge to the Charlestown playground and then narrowing to the downstream side of the Malden River. It was anticipated that this project would be completed simultaneously with the construction of the new Mystic River bridge, which was built at a high level with added expense to our taxpayers so that vessels could come and go freely. However, deepening of the channel has not been done and shipping has not been able to capitalize on the benefit of the new high level bridge. Presently the inadequate depth of the river limits the passage of tankers and many seagoing vessels to a few hours each day at high tide.

I am sure you gentlemen will agree with me that this project is of vital importance to the waterborne commerce of the Port of Boston and the economic welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At the present time this portion of Boston Harbor has the greatest potential for development, depending, of course, on a deeper approach waterway. Most of the deep-draft vessels which ply within the area of the project cannot now safely navigate at all stages of the tide, and must wait the higher stages This results in costly delays to all concerned.

Since 1950 every effort has been made to have Congress appropriate the necessary funds for the accomplishment of this project, but to date these efforts have been unsuccessful. President Eisenhower's budget for fiscal year 1956 calls for an estimate of $500,000 to start the project. As I stated before the dredging of the 35-foot channel is estimated to cost $4,500,000. I appreciate very much that the President is interested in getting this project started but I sincerely feel that the President's estimate of $500,000 is inadequate. I think a larger appropriation should be granted because this is a major channel of one of our country's primary ports, and it is my understanding that almost without exception, all such channels in other harbors have been dredged to 35 feet, and many have 40-foot channels. The present channel limits the passage of tankers and many seagoing ships to a few hours each day during high tides. Deepening of the channel would allow the passage of seagoing ships under the new bridge on a 24-hour basis. And reduction in the cost of "terminalling" must eventually be reflected in New England economics. As you know, long-range ship construction contemplates ever-larger ships of greater drafts. At present tankers are built which cannot be accommodated at the docks of a major oil company which has its piers on the Mystic River. This refinery and terminal is an important factor in providing aviation gasoline, motor fuels, heating oils, and residual fuels to Everett, other cities surrounding Boston, and a major part of Massachusetts. In wartime, as the only large refinery in New England, its supplies are even more important.

Some of the industries located in Everett which are very essential to the national economy and national defense and which would benefit by completion of this project are: Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Mystic Iron Co., Boston Edison Co., Esso Standard Oil Co., Monsanto Chemical Co., and General Electric Co.

In addition to Everett's industries, there are a large number of companies located on the Boston side of the Mystic River which would also benefit by the completion of this project. These include: Boston & Maine Railroad, Wiggins Terminal Co., United States Gypsum Co., Pocohontas Coal Co., and Revere Sugar (United Fruit Co.).

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that by providing a channel of sufficient depth we will have greater opportunity for industry to employ our people, and this means more Federal tax revenue. If the funds are not appropriated for this project serious damage to the industry of the district will result. I respectfully urge the committee to report favorably legislation for an adequate amount that will enable this great improvement to be started at the earliest possible date.

The Rights of the Individual, and the United States Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on April 30 I delivered an address before the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, at the organization's freedom forums, in New York City, on the subject the Rights of the Individual, and the United States Security Program. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNITED STATES SECURITY PROGRAM

(Address of Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS before the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith at the organization's freedom forum at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, April 30)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, 300 years ago 23 Jewish refugees from persecution landed from the bark *St. Charles* at New Amsterdam to seek freedom and opportunity. The 300th anniversary of that event is now being celebrated by the Jewish people of this country. In these 300 years many who shared the faith of these 23 refugees have since come to these shores.

Their gratitude for the freedom they found here has been demonstrated in the great contributions they have made to every phase of unparalleled American progress. In my opinion, however, the greatest contribution has been the Hebraic Bible and the Judeo-Christian heritage which grew out of it.

We should never forget that in the last analysis our American form of government is rooted in that same Judaic-Christian ideology.

Our Founding Fathers were strongly influenced by the noblest teachings in the Bible expressed in the great truth that man is a child of God and only in an atmosphere of liberty and freedom can he achieve the destiny a Divine Father has made possible.

In the address delivered at the American-Jewish tercentenary dinner last October, President Eisenhower said:

"Of all religious concepts, this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic.

"In this faith in human dignity is the major difference between our own concept of life and that of enemies of freedom. The chief among these enemies a decade or more ago were Nazi and Fascist forces, which destroyed so many of our fellow men.

"Today the Communist conspiracy is the principal influence which derides the truth of human worth and atheistic ruthlessness seeks to destroy the free institutions established on the foundation of that truth."

The order of the B'nai B'rith has stood in the forefront of our efforts to maintain this liberty. For more than 112 years this association has provided effective leadership in this continuous battle for democracy and the enlightened concept of Americanism.

We agree with you that "it has been an around-the-clock job to be carried on 365 days a year."

It is a job you have performed so well in so many fields of human activities. I am sure all enlightened Americans are aware of your great contributions.

In these times when our basic concepts of our way of life are being threatened by an international conspiracy that seeks world domination, your efforts and your cooperation are more sorely needed than at any time since the establishment of your order.

THREAT TO OUR SECURITY

The security of this country is being threatened by the most powerful enemy ever to confront us. This threat is posed primarily by the advocates of a political and economic system that is a direct opposite of our basic beliefs. It operates through a worldwide conspiracy which has already demonstrated strength in other countries and which reveals an ominous capacity to spread its poison through the system of democratic governments, leading to their downfall and the eventual enslavement of their people.

ATTORNEY GENERAL QUOTED

As the Attorney General has said, "The Communist conspiracy is a worldwide plot directed by scheming ruthless men who would bend the whole world to their selfish will. They cannot rest * * * until they have enslaved all the world. When repulsed in one area they try another. When one plot is exposed they hatch another. * * * They are willing to devote their lives to destroy in this country the very freedoms which allow them to speak and write and act."

I fully realize that loyal Americans cannot effectively support the Government's program to combat the effort to Communist infiltration unless they have an understanding of both the problem and the means by which we seek to meet it.

ATTACK ON SECURITY PROGRAM

Today we are in the midst of a widespread attack on our security program, which could be dismissed lightly if it were confined to those sympathetic to the Communist cause. We can expect attacks on any effective program we might devise.

But when this attack is made by well-intentioned people who abhor the principles of communism as earnestly as this administration does, then it becomes necessary to set the record straight.

I do not believe there is one among you who would not agree that a security program is a vital necessity if our Government is to survive.

No one denies the need for removing from the Government or refusing a Government position to members or potential members of a fifth column.

I believe all of us would agree that it is the duty of the Government to remove from its ranks those whose personal habits or activities make them sources of vital information to our enemies.

It would appear, therefore, that the criticism which has been leveled recently at the Government's security program is not directed toward the objectives of the program but toward the methods used to put them into execution.

Under pressure of the 80th Congress, which had before it a wealth of testimony regarding Communist methods of infiltration and subversion, there was established in 1947 a loyalty program for Federal employees.

That program was so loaded down with technicalities that it soon became apparent it could not prove effectual. It was necessary under this program to prove present disloyalty to the United States.

WEAKNESS OF 1947 PROGRAM

This means that, under that program, a man might be found completely loyal when a week or a month earlier he had been an admitted Communist. Again, loyalty being the principal test of whether or not he was a good security risk, the question as to whether he was a man of good judgment or was one who could not, because of his personal habits or for other reasons, be trusted with vital confidential matters, would not be given the consideration such matters deserved.

Consequently, even before Inauguration Day, President Eisenhower charged his new Attorney General with the task of drafting a new program which would provide for the removal of security risks from Government.

This included not only those of doubtful loyalty, but those who would be indiscreet under the influence of liquor or whose personal habits would render them liable to blackmail or pressure.

Other factors determining whether an employee shall be hired or shall continue in Government service include membership in Fascist or extreme rightwing organizations such as the Silver Shirts and the Ku Klux Klan.

No claim is made that every person discharged from Government employment under the Eisenhower security program is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. And there should not be a public conclusion that dismissal implies that they are Communists or even Communist sympathizers.

In establishing this security program, the administration did not neglect the traditional concepts of our democracy and the rights of individuals.

The administration realized fully that the security program must not be used to create friction between minority groups or to provide an opportunity for action based on prejudice.

We must particularly guard against the inference of prejudice in any security case, for if the breath of prejudice is ever so lightly blown on any facet of any security case, then not only is that case immeasurably weakened but the whole program is in danger of losing the faith and confidence of the people. In fact, democracy itself is weakened.

Let no one think for a moment that this administration is not fighting with all its strength the insidious attempt to make the word "Jew" synonymous with the word "Communist."

The Federal employee security program is based on the premise fundamental in our law that Government employment is a privilege and not a right. That principle is an implied part of every instrument of appointment.

Until 1912, any Federal employee could be summarily dismissed without cause or hearing.

Since that time certain procedural safeguards for the dismissal of employees have been provided by statute.

But the present Federal employee security program actually affords our Government worker more rights and opportunities for notice and hearing than has ever been known in our civil-service practice heretofore. This is something the critics of the program do not tell you about. It has been a sound program and has worked well.

There have been a few cases—and a very few out of the tens of thousands of cases processed in this program—which have received widespread publicity, but I think you will find in examining any one of these cases that if an error was committed it was administrative and not in the program itself.

Any program, it must be remembered, is manned by human beings and subject therefore to human frailty.

To reduce these possible human errors to the barest minimum the Federal employee-security program is and will continue to be under constant review by the Government and, as you know, proposals have already been submitted to the President which are designed to keep to an absolute minimum any errors in administration.

Every effort is made to protect the Federal employee's rights. He has a written statement of charges and an opportunity for a hearing, at which time he is given every chance to refute the charges.

He has at his disposal the advisory opinion of a security hearing board composed of men of high integrity and intelligence who are not employees in his own department or agency and thus under no pressure or fear of disciplinary action.

Finally, he has the right of appeal to the head of his department or agency who under this program has the sole responsibility for making a final determination.

Decisions are not based on irresponsible statements from snoopers or prejudiced individuals and wherever possible the employee does have the opportunity to face any person who has furnished derogatory information and to subject him to the most searching cross-examination.

Despite all the protections the security program provides for the Government employee, the Communists have centered their attacks on the refusal of the Government to disclose its confidential informants.

It is known from the prosecution of Smith Act cases and espionage cases that the Communists always raise this issue. They know that to require the disclosure of confidential information or informants would either make it impossible for the Government to get rid of security risks or would destroy the infiltration of the Communist Party by the FBI.

Nothing would serve the interests of both the extreme left and extreme right better than the weakening or destruction of the FBI's informant system. It is the great bulwark of protection against the fifth-column activities of both the right and the left.

The effectiveness of the program can be measured by the outcries of the Communists. It must be good, because they are screaming louder than ever.

When you remember that it took only one spy to turn over the most important secrets of the atom bomb, and when you realize that atomic weapons can be carried or brought into this country secretly and by stealth, you appreciate how thin is the thread upon which the security of the Nation rests. You realize how vital it is to provide the strongest possible tests to protect our country against the very real threat of espionage, sabotage, and subversion with which we are faced in this era of cold war.

It is for this reason that I believe it is so necessary for the public to have a real understanding of the Government's security program.

The Communist attack against the security program also centers upon the use of informants as witnesses.

Those critics of the security program who say the use of these witnesses is a novel practice and a sharp departure from the American tradition of law just don't know what they are talking about. Such testimony has been recognized by the courts throughout English common law and American constitutional history. The ancient informer suit has in a sense survived even to the present day, and is reflected in the fact that certain Federal statutes contain provisions for awarding informers a share of fines imposed. Judge Learned Hand's opinion upholding the first Smith Act conspiracy case, the celebrated Dennis case, tried before Judge Medina in 1949, contained this statement by Judge Hand:

"Courts have countenanced the use of informers from time immemorial; in cases of conspiracy or in other cases when the crime consists of preparing for another crime it is usually necessary to rely upon informers or accomplices because the criminals will almost certainly proceed covertly."

Now let us examine for a moment some of the former Government witnesses who have been subjected to the most severe attack. Most of the former Communists who have appeared as expert witnesses have at one time or another held party positions. Each of them has spent long years in the party being trained in the treacherous and deadly principles of Marxism-Leninism. Some of them were sent to Moscow to attend the Lenin school for specialized training. Some have served as official Communist Party instructors at training schools here in the United States.

Now, this you should know: All Government witnesses are subjected to the most intensive and careful interrogation in preparation for their testimony.

Government attorneys spend literally weeks with them reviewing their past activity and, most important, every effort is made to corroborate each item of testimony.

In each instance, their testimony has been subjected to extended cross-examination by able counsel. This cross-examination itself covers long periods, not only days but weeks, and the testimony has been weighed by numerous American juries and found to be credible.

I cannot emphasize too much the secrecy under which the Communists operate. The job of ferreting them out, of exposing them for what they are, and of prosecuting them successfully is made extremely difficult.

They resort to disguises, to the use of aliases, to secret meetings, and fictitious passports. They use codes to communicate in secret and have a security program of their own which is extremely harsh and strict.

As you know, the FBI has undercover agents in the Communist Party to report to the Government on Communist activities.

Incidentally, so the current story goes, the Communist leaders are so red-faced over FBI activities that they now open their meetings with this greeting: Welcome comrades and all FBI agents present.

Many of these persons who have infiltrated the Communist Party have spent and are spending long bitter years masquerading as Communists. The experiences of these patriotic citizens have in some measure been revealed through testimony.

They have suffered all types of personal indignities from fellow citizens because of their presumed Communist activities. One informant, for example, had to discontinue attending church because of the antagonism shown him because of what were believed to be his Communist activities.

In almost every instance these witnesses have been publicly acclaimed for the service they have performed.

Because of the tactics employed by the Communist Party in its effort to smear Government witnesses, a great deal of courage is required by a former Communist or confidential informant who testified against Communists.

Any person who is familiar with the workings and methods of the party is fully aware that if he ever testifies against Communists he will be branded in the Communist press as a stool pigeon and a spy.

He has heard the party officials on innumerable occasions refer to this country as a "Fascist dictatorship," to Government officials and prosecutors as "tools of the imperialist warmongers," to the FBI as the "Gestapo police," and to religion as the "opium of the people."

We cannot lose sight of the fact, however, that the Communists are continuing their fight against the use of informants.

Their attack on Government witnesses is devious but unrelenting.

One such witness, Harvey Matusow, has achieved considerable notoriety in the past few months. He now claims he lied in his testimony to the Government.

Yet, before being used as a witness, he underwent exactly the same procedure as I have described, and as of this day, despite his protestations, there is no evidence that Matusow lied regarding those matters in which he testified for the Government as a witness. In an action before the Subversive Activities Control Board to establish that a certain organization was a Communist-front organization, his testimony was amply corroborated by independent evidence.

In the case where he figured most prominently—the Jencks case—the Federal court upon a hearing of the matter was convinced that his testimony was the truth and in sentencing him for contempt made this statement: "It is my firm conviction moreover that this hearing was deliberately brought on for the purpose of attacking the judgment of this court, attacking the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department, in a carefully thought-out scheme to generally discredit by these means the testimony of undercover agents and former Communist Party members who give evidence against the Communist Party of the United States and its adherents."

As a member of the Internal Security Committee of the Senate, I participated in a hearing in Salt Lake City, Utah, which had for its purpose the investigation of any possible infiltration of Communists into the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union.

Harvey Matusow was a witness at that hearing.

His statement before that committee was to the effect that he knew Mr. Jencks, one of the high officials in the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union; that sometime previously he had met Mr. Jencks at a ranch in New Mexico, which the witness observed was owned by a person who was a Communist and where secret Communist meetings were held. He stated that a conference at this ranch was attended by Mr. Jencks and Matusow and others. The witness said Jencks told those present that strikes were to be ordered in the copper mines in the West, the effect of which would be to slow down the United States war effort in Korea.

I was impressed that Matusow was telling the truth. There was corroborative evidence in the record supporting his story. Mr. Jencks was given the opportunity to affirm or deny the Matusow testimony. He refused to do so, claiming protection of the fifth amendment. There was no indication that Matusow was not telling the truth. Later I read Matusow's book, False Witness. I also heard him testify recently before the Internal Security Committee of the Senate. There was no repudiation so far as I recall of his testimony that he met Jencks at the New Mexico ranch; that he had a conference with him and others; that a strike was called in the Kennecott open cut mine in Utah and other places in the West; that the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter organization was the union which represented the copper miners in this strike.

The only thing, as I recall, which was denied was the statement that Jencks had discussed a plan for calling a strike in the copper mines to slow down the war effort in Korea. So I feel that I can add my personal testimony to the statement made by the Federal district judge of Texas that Matusow's testimony in the Jencks' case, as well as in the hearing at Salt Lake City, was true.

Much has been made of the Matusow change of position. I submit in all fairness that, considering all the circumstances, the Government and the committee of the Senate were not negligent in these instances.

I am firmly convinced that his change of position, his denial of his previous testimony

came about as the result of inducements held out to Matusow which would be to his financial advantage. Just who brought about this change and the circumstances surrounding it are matters still under investigation.

I cannot tell you a surer way to do irreparable harm to our Communist prosecutions and to our security program as a whole than to be lulled into aiding the campaign of the Communists, their adherents, and the world assortment of leftwingers who fawn upon them. Never forget that the security program is designed to protect the Government—your Government, and that means you—against the boring-from-within tactics of the Communists and the extreme right elements. We must prevent them from infiltrating into the ranks of Government. You would not want these same kind of people in your own business.

And I would add that in cases where there is a reasonable doubt that the employee under investigation is a safe security risk, then that doubt should be resolved in favor of the Government and the people of the United States. That person would then be removed from the ranks. It will be in his own interest as well as all of the people in the United States. We cannot in these tragic and dangerous times gamble with the liberties and lives of the people of this country including the life of a citizen who may be determined to be a security risk.

I say particularly to this audience to avoid the whispered campaign of the pro-Communist and the pro-Fascist that the security program is directed against any certain minority or group. That is a typical Communist tactic, to throw dust in the eyes of its opponents and to obfuscate the issue by raising a false and collateral one. When you hear such whisperings, remember that of all the great powers in the world today it is the Soviet Union that is being charged in our newspapers with anti-Semitism and of all the countries from which Jews wish to emigrate to Israel it is the Soviet Union and its satellites which create the greatest and most rigid barrier.

In the book of Passover or Haggadah, which is read at the Seder services, your sages say, "In every age, each Jew should feel as if he himself was emancipated from Egypt." This is good counsel to all people at all times, for freedom can never be taken for granted. Ten years ago the Nazi threat was terminated through blood, sweat, and tears. Today freedom is threatened by the Soviet conspiracy and, as the Israelites of old struggled to be unshackled from the chains of slavery of a Pharaoh, so must all freedom-loving men today do everything they can to prevent the tentacles of communism from shackling each and every one of us to everlasting slavery. In the battle we are waging today we must strive with all our might to halt the inroads of tyranny and dictatorship. In the spirit of the Passover holiday we must resolve to sacrifice to make men free to protect the dignity of man, to enable all men to live in peace and security.

At the same time we must have faith and confidence in our ability as freemen to achieve the peace and security which we all seek. We must have full confidence in the ability of a democracy such as ours to solve its difficult problems and to meet, as it has before, the challenge to its continuance. B'nai B'rith is a vehicle which enables man to join in the battle for democracy being waged today. Your organization can and does provide the tools by which the sinews of this battle can be further strengthened and utilized. I take this opportunity, then, to congratulate you on your past achievements, to wish you success in your present deliberations, and to extend to you my sincerest hopes for all success in your future patriotic endeavors.

Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, Before Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] before the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 21, 1955

To me, as a Texan, there is a particular significance in addressing this great body on this historic anniversary.

It was just 119 years ago that a small group of Texans stormed the camp of Santa Anna at the junction of the San Jacinto River and Buffalo Bayou.

By ordinary standards, it was a desperate gamble. The Texans were outnumbered 2 to 1. They were torn and haggard from an unbroken string of defeats—San Antonio, Agua Dulce, Goliad, Refugio, and Victoria.

Santa Anna was in a position that he thought impregnable. His troops were flushed with an unbroken string of victories and had been strengthened by the addition of 400 battle-hardened soldiers under General Cos.

So confident was he that his afternoon siesta was well under way when the charge began. His slumbers were suddenly interrupted by 800 Texans who burst into the camp singing "Will You Come to the Bower" and shouting the immortal battle cry: "Remember the Alamo; remember Goliad."

Scarcely had Santa Anna blinked the sleep from his eyes when the battle was over. His entire force—consisting of 1,600 men—had been killed, captured, or wounded. The successful campaign of a tyrant had turned suddenly into a triumph for liberty.

Once again free men, united under a great leader, Sam Houston, had proved the superiority of the ideas under which we all live. The immediate result was freedom—freedom and independence for the Republic of Texas.

In my native State the memory of San Jacinto will always remain as fresh and as real as the eternal promise of spring. It will hold forth forever the Divine pledge of victory for those whose hearts are courageous and who march under the banner of liberty.

But in a large sense the meaning of San Jacinto is not confined within the borders of Texas. It is true that it led to independence and the Republic. But beyond the Republic—just across the waters of the Sabine River—was the United States of America, beckoning with the hand of brotherhood.

The Texans who fought at San Jacinto were Americans—led by one of the giants of American history. Sam Houston was a man who never faltered in his allegiance to the ideals of Valley Forge and Bunker Hill. He died as he had lived all his life—dedicated to the spirit of the Constitution.

It is for these reasons that I address you tonight with a heightened sense of the solemnity of this occasion.

I have never shared the feeling of those who look upon history with scorn. I have never agreed with the contention that the symbols of bygone days have no value in the present.

A people who ignore the past will never survive to meet the future. A people who are contemptuous of their ancestors can never inspire their posterity.

History demonstrates one fact conclusively. It is that every nation which has lost its sense of patriotism—its sense of historical continuity—has perished. Should we lose those values our country would be no exception.

For the tremendous work you have done in preserving the ideals of America, my congratulations. We are stronger because you—the Daughters of the American Revolution—have labored to keep before us the inspiring deeds of our great men.

Paging through your manual on the objectives of the DAR, I was greatly struck by one phrase in particular. It described the work of your historical department as "preservation of the deeds of the past, holding fast to ideals which make the present, and helping to build a future America."

I was struck by that phrase because it describes so perfectly the major task which should be before all Americans. The past has led to the present and, unless we understand both and act upon the understanding, there will be no future.

We are living in a time that is usually called the atomic age.

In reality the phrase is used loosely. Thus far the overwhelming mass of our knowledge of nuclear physics has been used solely for weapons of destruction. The atom is still a long way from active participation in our peacetime pursuits.

Nevertheless, it has become a key factor in our foreign relations and in our national defense.

The atom dominates our preparedness program. It is a compelling reality at every international conference. It dominates the thinking of our people beyond any other event of the 20th century.

One of the outstanding features of the "cold war" has been the atomic race between the East and the West. Our top experts assure us that we are ahead in that race—not only in the development of the atom but in the even more dreaded hydrogen weapons.

There is every reason to believe that those assurances are correct.

However, we confront another danger—one which I would like to discuss with you tonight. It is that we—the people of the United States— can become too emotionally dependent on atomic weapons and leave ourselves vulnerable on other fronts.

I am not raising this point in any spirit of contention. I am not arguing that our defense planners have missed some boat. I am not claiming that a wrong turn has been taken which will lead us down the road to disaster.

My sole objective is to bring before your organization—which has never faltered from its devotion to national defense—a point which has not had sufficient public discussion.

In the years that lie ahead, our Nation will devote a large—possibly an increasing—share of its national budget to atomic and hydrogen weapons. We cannot escape this grim necessity. It flows from the very nature of the modern world.

We will stockpile every type of nuclear weapon. We will develop every type of atomic carrier that can bring those weapons to a potential enemy. We will remain in a position of atomic readiness—on the alert to retaliate against aggression.

But it is possible to foresee a situation in which we could go to war without unleashing the atomic power that is at our command. It is possible to foresee a situation in which it would be against our interests to conduct hostilities on the atomic level.

Should that happen, the impact upon our people would be deeply disturbing. They would be unprepared for the realities and an unprepared people unite against an enemy only with difficulty.

The difficulty arises from a simple fact that is too often overlooked. It is that an atomic weapon is very much like a sledge hammer—a mighty poor instrument for swatting flies in a greenhouse.

It cannot be used to defend our troops when they are fighting at close quarters. It cannot be used effectively against an enemy whose methods of organization are primitive and who depends little upon massed centers of supply.

The strides in the development of atomic weapons have been enormous. Every stride has meant a solid building block in the wall of our security. But we would be sadly—tragically—mistaken if we thought that the atomic wall alone was enough.

There is no patented medicine that will assure our survival—not even if it bears an atomic label. Nothing could lead to our destruction more quickly than to delude ourselves into believing that there is a cheap, easy solution to our preparedness problem.

There are far too many instances in the history of the world where reliance upon one type of strength has led to no strength at all.

Before World War II, the French placed their reliance in the infantry and Maginot Line. Both quickly crumbled before the combined onslaught of the Nazi Panzer divisions and Stuka dive bombers.

The Nazis, in turn, had placed far too much reliance upon tactical air weapons. In the final showdown, they were incapable of defending Germany from the strategic bombing developed by the Allied Powers.

"Gadget thinking" in military matters has led to the destruction of many great nations. We must not make the same mistake.

We must realize that the ground forces still occupy a fundamental position in modern defense. We must realize that the Navy is still essential to modern warfare.

All of the services must be modernized and streamlined. But that does not mean that they should be weakened in the hope that some miracle weapon will compensate for the loss of strength.

We are, of course, fully justified in using atomic weapons where they will save American lives and shorten the fighting. But there are too many situations in which weapons of mass destruction will not achieve those goals.

There is also the frightening prospect that some day these weapons will become capable of worldwide devastation. They may become so powerful that they cannot be used under any circumstances.

On that day, atomic weapons could be another Maginot Line—costly but useless. The nation that had maintained defenses we now consider conventional would be triumphant. The nation that had placed its trust solely in atomic weapons would bow to an alien yoke.

This is not an appeal to abandon atomic weapons—far from it! We must push ahead with all possible research into that field as though our lives depended upon it—for indeed they do.

This is a plea for balance—for public understanding of the tasks that lie before us as Americans. Without that balance, we will not be truly strong as a nation.

We cannot build our defensive strength solely upon the atom any more than we can build our diplomatic strength solely upon the atom. I do not believe that our military leaders have any illusions upon that score. But there will be little strength of any kind unless our people as a whole are informed of the facts.

No nation can be any stronger than the will of its people. Since ours is a democratic form of Government, the will can exist only when it is informed.

We are entering a stage of this Congress where the questions I am discussing today will assume paramount importance.

The appropriation bills that determine the size of our Army, Navy, and Air Force are grinding through the committees. Manpower legislation cannot much longer be deferred. Money for our atomic programs will become a "must" by the end of this fiscal year—only a little more than 2 months away.

These are not routine questions. They involve two fundamental issues that are dear to the hearts of all Americans—the survival of our institutions and the defeat of communism.

I know of no organization more dedicated to those goals than the Daughters of the American Revolution. I know of no group which has followed its course more faithfully—refusing to be turned aside by any opposition, no matter how strong and no matter how vehement.

You are meeting in our Nation's Capital where some of the great decisions of our history are being made. Those decisions will determine the shape of our future—and whether we have a future.

Soon, you will be returning to your homes and your communities. You will be back among your friends and neighbors—among the people who look to you as individuals for leadership.

Your words will carry great weight because in a unique sense you are the custodians of the nation's great traditions.

I know your guidance will follow the spirit of the Founders of our Republic. I know you will walk in the footsteps of those great men who combined prudent deliberation with bold action; patriotic courage with grim determination.

Our country is threatened as it has not been since its foundation. The forces of communism are on the march. They have swallowed up already hundreds of millions of the world's people. They are reaching out greedily for more slaves.

The ultimate objective of the Communist assault on liberty is the United States. The Kremlin will not feel secure as long as our free institutions stand.

Our people have the will and the courage to safeguard our liberties from the Communist attack. They need only the unity that comes from informed guidance and frank discussion of the problems before us.

With that understanding, they will bear any burden, no matter how heavy, and freedom and the way of life for which our ancestors fought will triumph on this earth.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday, May 10, was Rumanian Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement commemorating this significant day in the history of these gallant people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER, COMMEMORATING RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, MAY 10, 1955

May 10 is a significant day in the history of the Rumanian people. On this day in 1866, the Rumanian dynasty under Charles, Prince of Hohensollern-Signaringen, had its glorious beginning. Also, on May 10, 1877, Rumania declared its independence from the Ottoman Empire and thenceforth flowered into one of the leading nations of Europe—the home of people who cherish liberty and independence and whose culture has added immeasurably to the heritage of western civilization.

Despite their strong will for freedom and long struggle against the forces of oppression, the Rumanian people this year again awoke on the anniversary of their independence to view their land in the grips of an oppressive, dictatorial force bent upon reducing them to spineless slaves. The Rumanian people and their millions of friends cannot foretell the day when their country will again take its rightful place among the free nations of the world. Yet, with faith in God and with knowledge of the Rumanian people's indomitable will, their courage and love of liberty, freedom-loving people everywhere are confident that this eventful day will come. The future remains the source of our hopes.

Meanwhile, these gallant people who love freedom, but are not free, keep the fine traditions of their country alive and the flame of Rumanian independence burning in their hearts. On this anniversary of independence, the American people reaffirm our past pledges of friendship and support and join in prayer that the day of liberation from the Communist yoke is not far off.

The Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Army has come in for some critical examination by the Members of this body, and it is a great pleasure to bring to your attention a new activity of the Army which merits close and sympathetic consideration. I am referring to the Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

It was my privilege, at the invitation of one of the students, Col. John C. Lackas, Assistant Comptroller for International Affairs, Office of the Comptroller of the Army, to spend an afternoon and evening participating in this farsighted and, at the same time, intensely practicable program. Fort Belvoir is, of course, the Army's Engineer Center and, under the able leadership of Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss and his chief of staff, Brig. Gen. Max S. Johnson, has maintained and enlarged the glorious tradition of the Corps of Engineers. Being the home of the Engineer School, the oldest service school in the United States Army, and the Engineer Research and Develop-

ment Laboratories, it is fitting that the Army's newest school be in such illustrious company.

Under the operational control of the commanding general of the Continental Army Command, Gen. John E. Dahlquist, with the invaluable assistance and technical guidance of Lt. Gen. Laurin L. Williams, comptroller of the Army, and the continuing support of Maj. Gen. John H. Stokes, Sr., commanding general of the military district of Washington, the Department of the Army has established this school for the intensive and advanced managerial training of senior officers from all of the various branches of the Army. I am happy to say that the Command Management School has recently become a permanent activity and will be a continuing source for the improvement of management skills of commanders. These capable and experienced officers, guided by a carefully selected staff and faculty headed by Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., commandant, contribute, and thereby enlarge, their knowledge and comprehension of the tremendous and complex nontactical management problems that must be met and solved if our Army is to maintain and increase its essential combat effectiveness. The enthusiasm and keen interest with which the class members and faculty attack the problems of expenditures, efficiency, coordination, and productivity described in their case studies bodes much good for the Army's future relations with this body. These are men who clearly understand their responsibilities as custodians of our Nation's resources as entrusted to them by the Congress for our defense.

Every 4 weeks a group of about 50 senior officers and key Army civilian officials, with a few from the Navy and Air Force, become students again for a period of 3 weeks. Included in the five classes which have completed this course of instruction were 2 major generals and 10 brigadier generals. Let me state emphatically that this is no snap course. The all-day sessions which are scheduled to 10 p. m. are days of intense application, making the final diploma a much valued and respected document. The materials considered, the problems analyzed are fundamentally pragmatic and concern the day-by-day, week-by-week, and budget-by-budget workings of the Army. The solutions arrived at are equally realistic and valid.

We, the Congress of the United States, are in effect the great board of directors of the United States Army; we make the allocations, we periodically examine its functioning, we check its balance sheets, but we cannot be the actual administrators. We now have a new ally, a new support, the Command Management School. Quietly working and spreading its influence throughout our Armed Forces, it will, I am convinced, justify the confidence expressed in it by Hon. Charles C. Finucane, the Under Secretary of the Army, who said of this school: "I think the Army has done a superb job, and this school is a tool that can be used to pass on the new techniques that have been developed to those who have actual operating responsibilities."

As a former enlisted man, I was very impressed with the work done and the interest generated by this group of officers. I enthusiastically commend the Command Management School to the Congress and suggest a personal visit while the course is in progress. You will find it, I am sure, a most refreshing and stimulating experience, and through this informal contact we may all gain a clearer perspective. The motto of this important addition to our arsenal of skills might well serve for us all: "From knowledge the power of decision."

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 8 our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who also is the senior Member of the Senate, delivered a most thoughtful address before the Polish-American Congress, at a rally held at Town Hall in New York City. His address dealt with some of the issues which should concern all of us here in the Senate—issues which are of special interest to Americans of Polish descent. The occasion of the rally was the observance of Polish Constitution Day.

The Senator's speech, which included extensive reference to the need for revising the Refugee Relief Act and the McCarran-Walter Act, deserves to be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that this fine address by our beloved colleague be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AT POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS RALLY, AT TOWN HALL, INC., NEW YORK CITY, ON MAY 8, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the Polish-American Congress:

I thank you heartily for the invitation to address you here on Polish Constitution Day. It is, of course, always a pleasure to meet with you of the American Polonia. Over the years, I have attended many gatherings organized by Polish-American organizations. The warmth of feeling and high level of discussion which have always characterized such meetings, have, each time renewedly been a fresh source of gratification to me.

Added to my pleasure today at being invited to speak at this rally in Town Hall is my realization of the importance of this occasion. Our purpose in meeting here now is to stage a demonstration which will remind everyone of the cause of Polish independence, and which will reawaken the conscience of all Americans to the suffering of the Polish people who are striving to maintain their national life in the face of ruthless Communist oppression. We are here to serve notice that we have had enough of empty words and hollow promises. We are here to state that we will not be satisfied with fantasies about a nonexistent policy of "liberation" fantasies which mock the hopes of the enslaved Poles for an end to the terrible reality of their oppression. We are here to demand action.

I am especially aware of the importance of our task now, because I was involved in the work of bringing independence to Poland almost 40 years ago. At that time I was working with a President of the United States who was not content just to issue statements about "liberation"—but who also worked with all his energies to accomplish what he felt to be his sacred duty, namely, to bring freedom to the Polish nation. Some of you may yourselves have participated in the work which went on then here in America on behalf of Polish independence: Others of you have heard about it from your fathers. You know that President Woodrow Wilson's idea about "self-determination" was not only a campaign promise. It was also a living principle which guided his policies and his actions. President Wilson dedicated his life to the idea that men have the right to choose their own national identity and form of government. He never allowed our country's allies to forget that Poles had been illegally deprived of that right. He fought tirelessly at the international conference tables to have that right restored. Polish independence was one of President Wilson's Fourteen Points. He made it a prerequisite of world peace.

I had the great privilege of seeing personally the results of President Wilson's efforts, when the President of Poland invited me to visit that country on the 10th anniversary of Polish independence. I stayed in Poland for several months, traveling through the country and meeting the people. Everywhere I went, from the official receptions in Warsaw and the Wawel Palace in Cracow, to the small villages and the countryside, I was impressed by a sense of unity and of progress. The same industry, the same devotion to democratic principles, the same selfless dedication to the common good, which I had observed here at home among Americans of Polish descent, I found clearly in evidence in Poland itself. Everywhere I went, I found a feeling of friendship and gratitude to America. To the people of Poland, America had become the country of Woodrow Wilson, the adopted land of their friends and relatives—the nation which had kept them in mind when they were enslaved.

You and I are thinking of Poles, again living under a foreign tyranny. Perhaps I should better say existing instead of living. We wish that those Poles were still comforted by the thought that America has not forgotten them, that America will not rest until they are free. But, I am afraid that there are moments in which they cannot help but wonder if this is so. Certainly the Soviets have not failed to inform them that the United States, the country which they had always thought was a haven for the oppressed, has now reduced by statute Americans of foreign birth to the rank of second-class citizens. Word must have reached reached them that many of their countrymen who managed to escape from communism are living in displaced persons' camps in Germany, because America refuses to admit them. They must wonder why the United States, which they know is rich, cannot let them hear more of the Voice of America broadcasts which might be comforting to them. They have heard blusterings about liberation, which seemed to call for new sacrifices on their part in the fight against communism, but did not mention one specific thing which we would do to bring the day of liberation nearer.

We Americans are aware of even more disquieting facts, and we are wondering what our administration's policies add up to in this critical period.

More than 4 years ago, the United Nations passed the Genocide Convention, an international law intended to protect the people of Poland and other enslaved nations from

the brutality of the Soviets. This law still remains unratified by the United States. Why? Because just a few weeks after the inauguration of President Eisenhower, his Secretary of State declared that the new administration would not press for the ratification of the convention.

We have also known for sometime that something has been terribly wrong about the way in which the present administration has been handling the refugee-relief program, which President Truman had launched in order to enable refugees from communism to come to the United States and here resume useful lives again. Everyone in our country, and perhaps all newspaper readers, radio listeners and TV viewers around the globe, should now be fully aware, following the explosive firing of Edward Corsi from the State Department, that the highly touted refugee program of this administration has been a dismal failure. The obvious reason is directly traceable to the lack of genuine sympathy on the part of this administration, and especially among the very personnel charged with putting the Refugee Relief Act into effect. We now know that the administration has actually sabotaged the relief program. There are about 50,000 Polish refugees living in Germany alone. Among them are many veterans and children of veterans of the Polish Armed Forces, who fought for us in Africa, Salerno, Monte Cassino and almost every other battlefield of World War II. They are living under very bad conditions, many suffering deprivation and disease. But, our administration has not only failed to come up with a program that would help our friends there, it has also actually frustrated the expressed wishes of the American people and their Congress by refusing to admit these refugees to America.

The question logically arises, since this heavy criticism is leveled at the Republican administration—What are responsible Democrats doing about the situation?

I am happy to answer that question by calling attention to the bill recently introduced by the senior Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN, to revise thoroughly the Refugee Relief Act. Cosponsors with him were Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; and Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Although he voted for the original refugee-relief bill because he believed in its expressed purposes, Senator LEHMAN warned at the time of passage that there would probably be a day of rude awakening. We have now seen that day. The act contains provisions robbing it of its truly humanitarian features and turns it into a prescription for delay, disappointment, and disillusionment. Unsympathetic, and downright obstructionist administration of the act under Scott McLeod, the Security Chief in the State Department, compounded the shortcomings of the faulty law. One of the first things the Lehman amendments would do is remove the program from the State Department Security Bureau, where it does not belong, and place it under a full-time administrator, who would be free from all other duties.

Of especial interest to you, also, should be the Lehman proposal to eliminate technical distinctions between so-called refugees and so-called escapees, and to establish only one category to include those who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and those refugees from the aftermath of World War II. In addition, the opprobrious term "ethnic" is struck from the act. Other improvements are in line with returning the program to its avowed humanitarian purposes.

But, although the refugee program is presently holding the attention of the public, we must not lose sight of our fundamental national immigration policy. Our policy today, of course, is unfortunately expressed on the statute books in the terms of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. How have the Republican leaders stood on that act? Here, again, we have examples of broken campaign promises.

During his 1952 campaign, candidate Eisenhower repeatedly attacked the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act and demanded that "a better law must be written." He also stated that "getting rid of second-class American citizenship * * * includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act." After his election, President Eisenhower renewed his general promises to the people and suggested to Congress some generally innocuous improvements in the law. But, I would be less than candid if I did not add that these suggestions were not backed with determination and enthusiasm of the sort he displayed in his fight over the tax program or other administration measures.

Again, in the light of the failures and broken promises of the Republican leaders, what have responsible Democrats done about this matter?

The answer is that we have proposed amendments to bring a spirit of humanity back into the law under the outstanding leadership of HERBERT LEHMAN. I am very happy to be a cosponsor, with him and 11 other colleagues in the United States Senate, of an omnibus bill to replace the harsh McCarran-Walter Act. We have called for early public hearings on this and other pending bills.

We would preserve, naturally, the technical improvements made by the McCarran Act over previous laws, and the 2 or 3 advances made—such as according husbands and wives equality before the law—but in a real sense we propose a new law, consistent with the finest traditions of the United States of America as a haven for the oppressed of the world, and consistent with our legitimate concerns for national security and economy, and consistent also with our very great responsibility as a world force for good, especially when evil is rampant.

Our bill conforms to recommendations of scores of religious and nonsectarian organizations interested in a sound immigration and citizenship policy. As a point of approach, we have chosen to call our bill "the Immigration and Citizenship Act" to stress this difference from the present Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Our bill recognizes that a regulated amount of immigration, with intelligent regard for legitimate selection, resettlement, and integration, is not a threat to American institutions, but is a decided benefit to us in every way. We are working hard to have early action taken on this measure.

Many of our fellow Americans are now deeply disturbed about the administration's Asian policy, a policy which seems to consist of talking about the liberation of China while so weakening our alliances that we may have difficulty in preventing the Communists from taking over additional territories. We, who have followed the administration's policies regarding Poland, have become hardened to the liberation talk, and know that as far as this administration is concerned, this is a word which has lost all meaning. But the policies which are weakening the moral and physical position of the United States are something we can never become hardened to.

Modern history has taught us that we can only deal with dictatorships if we are strong. It would seem that this lesson should have been impressed upon everyone by the catastrophic events of the 1930's and the war that followed. Evidently these tragic events were not dramatic enough to impress our present leaders. The administration has failed to carry on President Truman's policy of building up our military strength. It has cut our Air Force, reduced our Armed Forces, and instituted a program of economy in civil defense. It is difficult to estimate to what degree our own security has been imperiled by this program. One thing is certain—with each day the United States has failed to build up its strength, one day has been added to the period of suffering and terror in the lives of the people behind the Iron Curtain. For the Soviets will never give up the territories they rule until our strength leaves them no choice but to retreat.

What conclusion should we draw from the facts to which I have drawn your attention? Our immigration and citizenship policies are so much a part of our American life, determining how we live with each other in our communities, how we deal with other people abroad—and even how we appear to people in other parts of the world, that we can no longer continue to preach freedom and brotherly love on certain holidays, such as this Polish Constitution Day, unless we insist that our daily actions and our laws substantially carry out these sentiments. We would do well to take heed of the action taken by Polish patriots 164 years ago, when the Polish Diet adopted the great May constitution. At that time Poland was facing its certain partition at the hands of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. It was a period of crisis, yet the Poles chose that moment in their history to institute drastic internal reforms and strike a bold blow for democracy. They could have adopted a course of inaction, written a constitution filled with vague generalities. They could have listened to the voices of weak and fearful men. They did not do so then. We Americans, especially you of Polish descent, facing another critical period, will not do so now.

Address by Hon. Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, Before Republican Women Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an outstanding speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], which I think is worthy of general attention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR THOMAS E. MARTIN, OF IOWA, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN WOMEN VOLUNTEERS, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 20, 1935.

Thank you, Madam Chairman. It is a real privilege to come back to the Middle West and a great honor to be asked to speak to the Republican Women Volunteers of Chicagoland. I know of the excellent work this great group has done in the past. I know that a large measure of the credit for any political victory in any State must be accorded the hardworking and diligent women. That was true in my case last year. Their dedication to the Republican Party and the work and energy they contributed in our behalf cannot be over estimated. I also know that the Republican Women Volunteers of Chicago assume that same important position in the Illinois scheme of politics. I commend you most heartily on your past efforts and wish you all good luck and success in your coming ventures.

I must make my position clear immediately. I'm extremely happy to be here, but at the same time I'm sorry that your original speaker couldn't make it. STYLES BRIDGES has compiled a record second to none in the United States Senate. The record of leadership he has compiled fills the political slate. You could have chosen no more competent speaker nor any better Republican spokesman than STYLES BRIDGES. He was extremely sorry that the virus bug caught him at exactly the wrong time. When I last talked to him yesterday morning he was still determined to get out of bed and make this trip, but his doctor forbade it. His final words to me were "Tell them how sorry I am that illness cancelled my appearance. Give them my very best."

I am fully aware of the great Republican traditions and leaders that are represented here this noon. One of the most pleasant and inspiring byproducts of holding office as I do is the chance to meet and talk with people like yourselves—people that are tied inexorably together by the great principles of the Republican Party. Many of us have loved this party of our for many years. Like every other institution of modern times it has experienced its ups and downs. I know that you feel as I do—that despite the dire predictions of the impending crumbling of the Republican Party, made by partisan critics who whistle in political darkness, I sincerely believe that we are entering a period of great Republican ascendancy—and loyal Republicans like yourself will make it so.

As you know, we are today starting to draw the lines of the 1956 campaign. If we expect to win the political victory we need and deserve we must have a story to tell the American people. We must have a reasonable, accurate, compelling political "pitch" to make. We must give the American people a reason to vote Republican. We must tell them why.

As our political parties begin to shape up for the coming campaign and election, there is a crying need that once again we draw the lines of distinction between the Republican and Democrat Parties. The future of our country depends on our ability—on yours and mine—to draw that line of separation. We must ask ourselves and our neighbors—Where will the Democrats take us if they again assume the reins of government? What are the fundamental differences between their philosophy and ours? What does a Republican vote mean?

Search as you will, you cannot find this difference in the general aims of the two parties. Both stand for peace and prosperity. Both want to improve the welfare of the people at home and to safeguard their security and existence by adept and astute handling of international problems. This similarity in goals is not surprising. Both parties depend on attracting votes for their existence. These generalities are aimed at this broad target.

But political parties don't live on generalities. In the course of political action they make records. Through their devotion to certain causes and their support of individual issues and their opposition to others, they make their stand. They point the path they will travel to the generalized goals of peace and general welfare. That's the way you discover the real differences between parties. That story tells the tale. And that story also tells the why—the reason—the importance of a Republican vote.

One of the obvious differences between the two major parties of today lies in the field of allocation of governmental power. The Founding Fathers of our country were acutely aware of the dangers of government that concentrated most of its power at one source. They fought a Revolutionary War to escape the terrible and arbitrary power exercised over helpless subjects by kings, tyrants, dictators, and bureaucrats. Carefully and diligently they constructed a Constitution that established a government of laws, not of men. One hundred and sixty years of political developments in the most trying period of history's long pages have proven the wisdom of their philosophy. We have been a haven from the scourges of tyranny. We must continue to be so.

Perhaps the most significant contribution to the field of political science made by our country is the establishment of a Federal system—a government wherein the power is divided between the National and State government. The Constitution apportions certain powers to the National Government and reserves the residue of powers to the State and local levels.

My friends, the Republican Party still believes in the Federal system. We still believe that the National Government should do those things which the Nation requires and which cannot be done by States, localities, or individuals. We still do not believe the best interests of the most people can be solved by piling bureau upon bureau in Washington. We still do not believe that all knowledge and wisdom stems from Washington. We do not believe that Washington has a monopoly on all ideas, on all answers, on all intelligence. A man's I. Q. doesn't triple by crossing the Potomac. The Republican Party does not believe in centralizing all power in the Nation's Capital.

The brave men who wrote our Constitution 167 years ago knew that too much power concentrated in any one place holds great danger to human freedoms. But the Democrat Party of today seems to have forgotten that truth. Starting in 1933, a frightening trend began to appear in Washington. The National Government, like Topsy, "jes growed." It began to chip away in some of the fields previously reserved to the States. It began to glut itself on the diet of powers that had belonged to the States. That trend continued and blossomed for 20 years. The sphere of power of the National Government swelled and bloated, and the residue of State powers shrunk and diminished. It wasn't until the election in 1952 that the road blocks along the trail to centralization were built.

We Republicans have been in power in times of crisis. We realize that changing times demand changing methods of government. We met change as it came. But never did we consider any crisis so critical that we had to change our basic philosophy to meet it. Never did we match the exigency of the moment against our Constitution—and find our Constitution wanting.

My friends, make no mistake. Should we return the New Deal Democrat Party to power, we will return to the trail of centralization. The real Democrats of today—the Adlai Stevensons, Walter Reuthers, Hubert Humphreys—the Neubergers—yes, and the Douglases—these, and all the other ADA apostles—they scorn States' rights. They advocate an all-powerful centralized Federal Government. They advocate Government planning on a huge scale for all our people. They follow the theory that pursued to its logical end would mean our people would be dependent for their lives, their property, their enterprises, and their very freedoms on a bureaucratic government in Washington.

That's one reason why—that's one importance of a Republican ballot—a vote for the freedom of self-governing people and a vote against the downright slavery that accompanies an all powerful, centralized government.

That same pattern of increased power was demonstrated in the relationship that existed between the executive and legislative branches of government. Again, the basic structure of relationship between these two branches of government is spelled out in the United States Constitution. Again, the underlying philosophy has been disturbed and distorted by the attitudes of the last two Democrat Presidents.

I well remember the shock I received when I first became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1939. I watched aghast while a major portion of the legislation we were to consider was written in the executive branch of government. I was stunned to learn that so many of these important measures were written, not by individuals in Congress, but by members of the President's staff or advisers. All too often such proposed legislation received the rubber stamp of approval of the Democrat-controlled House and Senate. Sometimes I think the Congresses of the middle and late 1930's were the highest paid choruses in the world. They nodded approval and the executive's program became a reality.

This is not the way we Republicans believe. This usurpation of legislative authority by the executive was a trade-mark of Democrat administrations. But it is not ours. Our Republican President has never asked Congress to be sleepwalkers. Contrast the New Deal rubber-stamp procedure with the procedure followed in tax revision by the Republican administration and the Republican 83d Congress. I know because I served on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress. DAN REED as chairman of that great committee proved to be one of the greatest legislators of all time.

President Eisenhower received an exceptionally high percent of passage of his program. But his success was due to the quality of the program. The Members of the 83d Congress passed it because they knew it was best for the country. Under Republican leadership in the White House we are asked, consulted, and advised. But we are not told. I repeat, my friends, we are not told. The previous Democrat administrations took us on a long trip into the never, never land of executive domination of Congress and of the State governments. Now we are back from that jaunt into fantasy. And personally, I'm glad to be back home.

There is another basic difference between the two major political parties in the United States. This refers to the type of economic system under which we shall operate. The Democrat Party obviously believes that a centralized Federal Government holds no threat to the freedoms of the individual. It obviously believes also that the National Government should extend its sphere of influence and control into the fields of national economy. During the past 20 years we've watched a constantly growing trend to substituting a government-controlled economy for the free-enterprise, competitive system that gave this country the highest standard of living in the history of the world. You and I have watched that substitution being made—and I, for one, don't like it. I say to you, let's keep the first team in the game. A Republican vote next year means a pat on the back for the Republican leadership that made Paul Bunyan strides toward returning us to the philosophy on which we were founded.

The extent to which the Federal Government had entered the domain of private business would be far too cumbersome and time-consuming to annotate in this brief statement. But let me list a few instances to prove my point.

In 1953, the Department of Commerce sold the Government's Inland Waterways Corporation. This agency had lost more than $15 million of the taxpayers money. It owned 20 towboats and 273 barges on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. It is with us no more.

The last Congress set up a special Commission to handle the sale of the Federal Government's $555 million synthetic rubber industry to private industry. They are with us no more.

Congress passed and the President approved legislation giving the States rather than the Federal Government control over 85 million acres of submerged tidelands off the coast of the United States. This was a major defeat to Democrat advocates of centralized ownership and Federal control of land. The Federal control of tidelands is with us no more.

I might add, parenthetically, that this program was characterized as a great "giveaway" program by Democrat leftwingers. The latest estimate is that the Federal Government will receive $6 billion in revenue from the off-the-shore oil land. If this is a giveaway I'd like a little more of the same.

Under Republican leadership the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, one of the most unsavory of the Democrat agencies, was stripped of its lending powers. It is with us no more.

Congress suspended a $60 million plan for Federal development of the Coosa River in northeast Alabama. It never was with us, but only because we Republicans stopped it. A Republican Congress authorized private power companies to take over the work of constructing dams for hydroelectric power.

The Interior Department closed down a Federal Government plant making synthetic gas from coal in Louisiana, Mo. That saved the taxpayers $10,000 a day. This operation was turned over to private industry and it's no longer with us.

On and on the list goes. Back in my home State of Iowa we received the 24-carat treatment. The previous Democrat administrations took a long look at the farmers of the Nation and they decided that they, too, should take their place in line and become a part of this nationally planned economy. They tried to control and point his life. They tried to tell him what to plant, where to plant it, and how much of it to plant. They tried to tell him where to sell his products, at what time to bring them to market and at what price to sell them. They tried to smother him with the Brannan plan. With this Alice in Wonderland scheme they envisioned the fixing of the farmer's income through subsidies and complete income guaranties. The traditionally independent farmer was offered the traditional Democrat plan of government controlled economy. And he wouldn't buy it. He didn't want the pig or the poke.

My friends, the difference between the two parties in this field boils down to this: The Republican Party believes the economic strength of the Nation is based on the freedom of each individual to work and live as he chooses. We believe the Federal Government should be a partner with the States, the localities and the individuals. We believe Government should permit the people to stand on their own feet and walk around.

The Democratic Party believes the Federal Government should be a crutch upon which all other levels of government and the people themselves will lean. But crutches are used only by unfortunate people who are incapacitated. The Republican Party does not believe that the States, the localities, or the people themselves are crippled. We have too much confidence in them. We will not subscribe to the wedge-driving theory of Government entrance into private lives or private businesses. As far as we are concerned, the door to such Government entrance will never be opened.

There are many more differences that we might point up. For example, I believe there is a basic difference between the two parties on internal security. We Republicans know that the avowed aim of Communist leaders is to conquer the world. Time after time, in place after place, they have subscribed to the doctrine of world domination. We have watched country after country disappear behind the Iron Curtain. We know that the United States is the prize country. We know that our subjugation would be the signal cry for their complete success.

And we know also that countries can fall without a single shot nor an isolated battle. We know the importance of internal security. We know that the entrance of a Communist into a policymaking job in our State Department is not a red herring; it's a tragedy. We know these things, and we have done something about it. Between January 1953 and June 1954 some 2,400 security risks were weeded out of Federal employment. The Justice Department has deported 105 alien subversives and ordered the deportation of another 329 aliens with records of subversive activity or affiliation. Since we Republicans took over, 41 Communist leaders have been convicted and another 35 have been indicted under the Smith Act. We did not ignore the danger from within. We did not blithely turn our head when the snakelike head of communism appeared in our own Government. We did something about it. This, too, is a sharp contrast and difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

I could go on and on, reciting the constructive achievements that form the Republican record. We have reduced our appropriations and spending. We have reduced our taxes and at the same time acted to spur our business and economy into the greatest peacetime prosperity in history. We halted inflation and we stabilized the dollar. We needed price, wage, and rent controls. In short, my friends, we have done what the American people wanted us to do.

This is the record, the past—a past of which we are proud. What about the future? What's in store for us, the Republican Party? What is our challenge? What should we do?

Let me first interpose one word of warning. No Democrat horses will be spared in the 1956 campaign. Although I hesitate to make political forecasts I will stick my political neck out far enough to make this prediction. In the coming year and a half you will witness many surprising political attacks. You will see how badly the 1952 defeats hurt the Democratic Party—and how much they want to win the elections next year. They will pull every stop toward that end. They have already started.

President Eisenhower himself has not been immune to attack by the Democrats. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, termed the President "inept." Former Democrat National Chairman Stephen Mitchell accused the President last year of having made an "unholy alliance with Senator MCCARTHY for the purpose of the next election." Of course, this same Mr. Mitchell implied that the President was trying to steer some unethical profits into the pockets of his friend, Bobby Jones, through the Dixon-Yates contract. It is interesting to note that not a thread of proof of the charge was advanced when the blast was made—nor has any proof been offered since the charge to indicate that Ike has taken a page from Harry Truman's book to make deals with his friends. The proof is lacking because the charge is false. But that's the pattern of things to come. And then last month the absolute high in incredible criticism and the absolute low in political decency came when President Eisenhower was berated for going to church. One of the moot questions of political history is "How frantic and panicky can a political party get?" I think I know the answer now.

I might add in passing that these attacks come on the heels of the pious statement of Democrat leaders that they will support the President. If I may have a moment of your time to analyze these statements I would like to read these statements and then give you my translation. Following the lead of the New York Times political writer, Arthur Krock, who compiled a glossary of a few Democrat statements and annotated them with the real meaning, it would sound like this:

Democrat statement: "We will support the President when he is right and oppose him when he is wrong."

Translation: That means that the President is right whenever he agrees with the Democrats and he is wrong when he doesn't. Of course, the Democrats reserve the right to determine what the President is supposed to agree with.

Democrat statement: "We will not oppose just for opposition's sake."

Translation: That means that this is the smog-generator technique. It means that this is exactly what they will do but they will never admit they are doing it.

Democrat statement: "On certain matters we differ with the President, but only on details."

Translation: This means that on vitally important matters there will be only differences of opinion. Of course those insignificant differences include such things as the basic structure and allocation of national defense, the whole nature and administrative system of foreign economic aid, the fundamental grounds for the tax program, and, in fact, the entire domestic political philosophy of the President.

Democrat statement: "We only want fairness to the farmer and the consumer."

Translation: This fairness implies fixed, interoperating high subsidies for both the farmer and the consumer. It also means the cost will be covered by higher taxes and by increasing deficit financing.

In short, my friends, the general platitudes of the Democrat leaders about Presidential support as supplemented by their proposals and their opposition to administrative measures could be translated into one simple phrase: "Politics above all else."

It seems to me that a victory in any political contest comes as a result of combining three factors: a sound program, good candidates, and devoted workers. I have already referred to our program. I think without question it is a record of achievement. I know it can be sold to the American people because it is right.

It is very difficult to succinctly describe a program with many phases and various ramifications. But it is natural that the leader of the program, the man who was intricately concerned with its development should come the closest to putting on paper the philosophy behind the Republican Party. At a press conference on the 27th of January last year, President Dwight Eisenhower was asked to describe the Republican philosophy. May I quote you his answer.

"When it comes down to dealing with the relationships between the human in this country and his Government, the people of this administration believe in being what I think we would normally call liberal; and when we deal with the economic affairs of this country, we believe in being conservative."

This comes the closest to it. I have just finished an annual questionnaire that I conduct in Iowa. Each year since 1950 I have polled my district on the significant problems that face Congress. Until this year I had confined that poll to my own district. This year, for the first time, I polled the entire State since I now represent all Iowa. Although the answers to the 36 questions are far too time-consuming to analyze here, one conclusion is inescapable. The people of Iowa are impressed—they are impressed most favorably by the Republican Party and they are impressed most favorably by the Eisenhower administration. A good illustration is given in the 80-percent approval of President Eisenhower's foreign policy.

If I may be entirely personal for a moment, last fall I conducted a campaign over the whole State of Iowa. I went into almost every village and hamlet of Iowa. To each

person I met, in each meeting I addressed, in every press interview I had, I told the same story. "This is what we Republicans have done," I said. "I'm willing to stand or fall on that record." I staked my political future on that record because I believed it was right. The fact that I am, today, privileged to serve in the United States Senate is graphic proof of what Iowa thought of the Republican administration.

We have the program. We need outstanding candidates. I'm more than happy to be in Chicago for several reasons. One of the most compelling is that this is the home State of one of my closest friends. EVERETT DIRKSEN and I have been friends for a long time. I knew him as a real leader in the House of Representatives. I'm honored to be associated with him in the Senate, where again he is an outstanding leader. Further, Senator DIRKSEN had an effect on my political life that perhaps even he doesn't know. I watched with great interest his campaign in 1950. I knew that he had challenged one of the stalwarts of the Democratic Party. It took great courage to take on the Democratic majority leader of the Senate. I watched the way he conducted his campaign. I watched the energy and enthusiasm he showed. I witnessed the careful planning and the long months of hard work. I saw him hit the opposition hard and often. This was no casual campaign—no one speech a day, with many days off. This was the east-to-west and north-to-south fight that appealed to me.

I would not be so presumptous as to compare my victory in 1954 with Senator DIRKSEN's in 1950. But this similarity does exist. Each of us had a tought fight in unseating a well-established opponent.

That admiration for Senator DIRKSEN, the man, the statesman, and the campaigner, has not diminished during the years. During my service in the House of Representatives, in more instances than I can count, I asked him to come to my First Iowa District. He never failed. It was natural that when I was running over the whole State I should call on him again. And again he did not fail.

That same devotion to Republican causes that marked his 1950 campaign was put to national use last year. He was selected to fill one of the most important and one of the really vital spots in Republican Party circles. He was the national senatorial campaign director. I met him on both coasts, with several stops between. His work was evident everywhere. He was valuable beyond description.

One of the trade-marks of Senator DIRKSEN—and a real compliment, I believe—is that they ask for him to come back. When he addresses a meeting, they ask for a return engagement. The people of my own district—the people of the entire State of Iowa—say to me: Get Senator DIRKSEN back. And he does not fail.

My friends, now we are making the same request of you. Next year Senator DIRKSEN comes up for reelection. We want him back. I refuse to contemplate the loss we would suffer were he not reelected. His record, his qualifications, his leadership is not expendable. We want him back. And you will give him to us.

I have spoken at some length on the type of campaign that Senator DIRKSEN waged and the way I tried to emulate it. But it has one restriction. No matter how energetic the candidate is—no matter how many hours a day he works—no matter how many miles he travels, it is a physical impossibility for him to see every voter. We must depend on the spider web-like organization. I can promise you that EVERETT DIRKSEN will see as many people as humanly possible. But those people must see others. The web must grow in all directions.

I mentioned that a political victory is the result of three factors: a sound program, good candidates and devoted workers. The Republican Party has all three. Our program stands the test of inspection. Like a suit made of the finest goods, it wears well, it stands up. We can take it to the people of America with no hesitancy. We must build our campaign on it.

We have candidates that will carry our banner well. You know how I feel about Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN. I know you will return this great leader to the Senate.

I find it impossible to conclude this afternoon without referring to the greatest achievement of all—the thing that has been most impressive to the citizens of Iowa as well as those of 47 other States. The war in Korea has ended. Certainly this is a tribute to the President of the United States.

I have known President Eisenhower well throughout my entire service in Congress because I served on the Committee on Military Affairs of Congress from 1939 to 1947. I was the only civilian present when Ike was notified he was to be promoted to Brigadier General. I saw him assigned to London and destined to go to the top command of the Allied Forces. He earned that assignment by his thorough preparation and comprehension of the situation confronting us there and by his great devotion to duty. He had fortitude, courage, ability and determination. Drugstore quarterbacks who had never commanded a squad told him, "You can't cross the English Channel. You'll have to go through Spain and the Pyrenees Mountains. You can't cross the Channel. You'd better come up through the soft underbelly side of Europe. You can't cross the Channel." But Ike crossed the Channel and held the Normandy beachhead against the powerful German military forces.

When Ike became President, the Russians remembered all this and in my opinion, the end of the Korean war was not without significance. So also is our continued peace in the wartorn world of today.

Red China and Red Russia respect Ike's qualities and they have also observed closely America's unity in support of him today in facing our postwar problems. They know full well that in America we can disagree with him openly on some issues and yet support him vigorously. They also know that Ike is not a name-calling, face-making, fist-shaking, letter-writing piano player.

Let's stand united in support of our great President and move forward to continued peace, prosperity, and progress.

We have the program—we have the candidates—and we have devoted workers—people like yourselves. People who believe in the Republican philosophy and are willing to work for it. Let's each one of us here and now pledge ourselves to be a one-person committee for vigilance. There is no magic formula, no "open sesame" for political victory. It comes as a result of dedicated, energetic work. That is your job. Good luck to you all.

The Essentiality of the Jeweled Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence between nine Senators and Secretary of Defense Wilson concerning the essentiality of the jeweled-watch industry. Mr. Wilson's letter is in reply to a letter signed by Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, EDWARD MARTIN, MILTON R. YOUNG, CARL T. CURTIS, STYLES BRIDGES, WILLIAM LANGER, W. A. PURTELL, and ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A transcript of your press conference of last week indicates that an inquiry was made concerning the declassification of a report which purports to show that the jeweled-watch industry is not essential to the national defense and that in your reply you did not attach much importance to the report.

We are certain that since that time you have noticed the vitriolic attacks by newspapers and others on the President for his watch decision, most of which label the decision as one of political expediency. Inasmuch as both you and Assistant Secretary Pike have appeared before congressional committees to testify that the jeweled-watch industry is essential to our security, the release of this limited report, which has never been officially discredited, has resulted in great confusion.

We understand that at the same time the report was published, your Department issued a release covering part of Mr. Pike's testimony to the Senate committee, but the press release stated that this report supplemented Mr. Pike's testimony so that the report seemed to be a later or more important expression of the Department of Defense view.

The fact is, Mr. Secretary, that the report cannot be reconciled with Mr. Pike's testimony. The release should have stated that it was superseded by Mr. Pike's views, which indeed was the case. The continued effort of the authors of the report to preserve an appearance of validity for it cannot result in anything except prolonged confusion in the press and embarrassment to the people who have supported the decision.

The declassified report does not appear to take into account many of the facets of the problem. Some of the omissions which were brought out in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee are: (1) It does not mention at all the jewel-bearing problem and the importance of the jeweled-watch industry in that field, notwithstanding that the WPB report on the jewel-bearing problem in World War II says, in so many words, that the jeweled-watch industry saved the day with respect to crises in the supply of jewel bearings for both instruments and timepieces; (2) it does not mention the role of the jeweled-watch industry in research and development, which has been a critical one; (3) in some of the material still classified, the figures reveal that proper consideration was not given to the research and development—and in some cases actual production—of electromechanical fuses, magnetic-influence fuses, miniaturization of fuses for rockets, timers for unattended Arctic weather stations, certain essential components for all types of guided missiles, new types of mines and torpedoes, and special timing devices for gyroscopes in guided missile systems. (The report inexplicably omitted entirely any mention of the important role of the industry in the guided missile program, notwithstanding the fact that General Bradley and others clearly informed the authors of the report that an essential mechanism for one of the prominent missiles was made only by a

jeweled-watch company and that no suppliers outside the industry could make it because it contained a jeweled-watch movement; (4) it comes up with the conclusion that the Defense Department will need only 244,845 jeweled watches in the event of another war, notwithstanding that requirements were over 6 million in World War II, over 5 million in direct procurement, and the balance by requisition of imports.

If these are not the facts, we would like to know. But if they are, we believe it would be a service to the country and to the people who fought to preserve an essential industry if you would issue a prompt statement clarifying the situation.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES, WILLIAM LANGER, W. A. PURTELL, ROMAN L. HRUSKA, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, EDWARD MARTIN, MILTON R. YOUNG, CARL T. CURTIS.

APRIL 27, 1955.

GENTLEMEN: I am sending the original of my reply to your letter of March 30, 1955, to Senator SALTONSTALL simply because of his continued and early interest in the subject of the essentiality of the jeweled watch industry. A copy is being delivered at the same time to each Senator who signed the letter.

I wish to emphasize that the release of the declassified Department of Defense report on the essentiality of the jeweled watch industry on February 28, 1955, was a routine matter and did not in any sense change the position that the Department of Defense took with regard to the horological industry last summer.

The Department of Defense endorsed the tariff increase by letter on July 1, 1954, to the Director of the Budget, Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, a copy of which is attached. You will note this endorsement supported the essentiality of both the jeweled and nonjeweled watch industries. This letter, and the testimony of Mr. T. P. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), on June 30, 1954, before Preparedness Subcommittee No. 6, represents the authoritative statement of the Department of Defense on the essentiality of the horological industry.

The conclusions of the Department of Defense report of April 26, 1954, on the Essentiality of the Jeweled Watch Industry are apparently misunderstood and perhaps not clearly stated. In the course of the study it became apparent that the entire horological industry (the nonjeweled watch and clock producers as well as the jeweled watch manufacturers) was essential to the mobilization base. In order to express this conclusion forcefully, it now appears that the emphasis placed on not recommending special or preferential treatment to any one company of or segment of the horological industry, has been interpreted as not recognizing the essentiality of the jeweled watch industry. I regret this inference and trust that this clarifies any misunderstanding.

The mobilization requirements of the Department of Defense for jeweled watches are exceedingly low. This is the result of a sound policy to issue jeweled watches only in cases where there is an operational need for a jeweled watch. In addition, the Department of Defense, as a further means of economy, has encouraged the use of nonjeweled watches and will continue to encourage this practice. These are produced by the nonjeweled watch (or pin lever) manufacturing segment of the horological industry.

The Department of Defense does not expect jeweled watches to be the jeweled watch industry's only basis of essentiality. It expects the jeweled watch industry, together with the balance of the horological industry and other capable manufacturers, to the degree that they are able, to continue to design and produce very complex timing mechanisms, control devices, gyroscopes, and similar items which must be miniaturized and ruggedized if they are to be used in modern military equipment (items 1, 2, and 3 in paragraph 5 of your letter).

Certain additional information should be understood. The Department of Defense has supported the increase in tariff for watches only because this appeared to be an exceptional case and it did not appear to be at the expense of any other industry essential to the mobilization base. In general, the Department of Defense feels that the tariff policy covered by the extension of the Trade Agreements Act as represented by H. R. 1 is necessary for the greater good of the national and industrial economy, including the defense economy. No action or statement of the Department of Defense should be construed or quoted in any manner as opposition to the policy of extending the Trade Agreements Act.

I hope this reply is satisfactory and that it will clarify the Department of Defense policy as conveyed in the Department of Defense report, Mr. Pike's testimony as to the essentiality of the horological industry, and my own testimony on this subject in connection with the hearings on H. R. 1 before the House Ways and Means Committee.

At your suggestion, I am making public, through a press release, this exchange of correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

Attachment: Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Hon. EDWARD MARTIN, Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, Hon. W. A. PURTELL, Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1954.

Hon. ROWLAND R. HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: Reference is made to the letter dated June 1, 1954, from the Bureau of the Budget requesting the views of the Department of Defense on a proposed Presidential Proclamation entitled "Modification of Trade Agreement Concessions and Adjustment in Rates of Duty With Respect to Certain Watch Movements."

A majority of four Commissioners find that watches and watch movements are being imported into the United States in such quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry and recommend that the President increase the scale of duties by 50 percent. A minority of two Commissioners fail to find such injury and recommend no change in duty.

The Department of Defense is vitally concerned with the production capacity of the jeweled and non-jeweled watch industry to meet military mobilization requirements. This industry produces such products as jeweled watches and movements, mechanical time fuses, and other special timing devices which are essential to the conduct of successful military operations. In view of the findings of the Tariff Commission and because of the fact that the higher rates of duties should tend to arrest the decline in domestic production this Department favors the proposed Presidential Proclamation.

With respect to any evaluation of possible adverse impacts of the proposed increase in duties upon our international relations and trade, this Department defers to the opinion of other agencies having the primary responsibility in these matters.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS,
For the Assistant Secretary.

The Honorable Gracie Pfost Crusades for Dam at Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in a nationally circulated newspaper the following article on the activities of Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho. Those of us who entered the Congress with the energetic and attractive Mrs. PFOST, were made quickly aware of her persuasiveness and ability. Her district should be proud of her. The following news story does simple justice to our charming colleague, and I must say Uncle Sam wears his petticoats well:

PETTICOATS IN OUR GOVERNMENT—REPRESENTATIVE GRACIE PFOST TAGGED "HELL'S BELLE" AS SHE FIGHTS FOR DAM AT HELLS CANYON

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Public power's red-haired darling and defender is busy this month generating thousands of kilowatt-hours of her own.

Representative GRACIE PFOST (pronounced "Post") is using her private kilowatt-hours in the crusade for a great Federal dam at Hells Canyon on the Idaho-Oregon border.

Idaho's Democratic Congresswoman—sometimes referred to as "Hell's Belle"—is only 5 feet 2 inches tall and weighs 127 pounds. She is, truly, a bundle of energy—much of it dedicated to damming the Snake River.

"This river, winding through my State into Oregon, holds one of the keys to the development of the Northwest," Mrs. PFOST explains.

She was the first of four House Members to introduce a bill authorizing the United States Government to build a single multiple-purpose dam across the Snake. Private power wants to see the river harnessed, too—but it wants to do it by building three separate dams. Thereby hangs the hassle going on today.

Tireless Gracie has flown 6,000 miles to Idaho and Oregon and back in recent days with two congressional committees to listen to on-the-spot arguments of both sides—public and private.

Though born 49 years ago in a log cabin in the Arkansas Ozarks, Gracie typifies the State she now helps represent in Congress. When you see her handsome, healthy, freckled face you think of the sunshine on mountaintops, green forests, and clear, frolicking streams.

"At the age of 2, I was perched behind my mother on horseback," she says, "and by the time I was 5, I was following my brother up trees. And at 10 I was driving a team of horses down the road."

An admitted tomboy, Gracie was certainly not without femininity. She was married at 17 to John Walter Pfost, a master mechanic.

But that old tomboy streak is still there, especially at campaign time. She has found herself in a birling (log rolling) contest at a lumber camp and got a dunking in an icy stream. She's taken part in gold-panning contests and ridden a silver palomino, decked out in her cowgirl finery, in a round-up parade.

It was an obvious understatement when she remarked, "I thoroughly enjoy campaigning."

The road to the National Capital led from the county courthouse. In 1929 she was

deputy county clerk for Canyon County and she served later for 10 years as county treasurer. She tasted the national political pudding as delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1944. She ran first for Congress in 1950 and was defeated. Undaunted, Gracie tried again and won, beating the GOP incumbent. This is her second term.

Representative PFOST does think of other things sometimes besides Hells Canyon. She looks out for the lead, zinc, and gold-mining industries and keeps her eye on the farm situation. Recently she took a much-needed action that will benefit all House Members and persons who visit the House Chamber.

When visitors ask their Congressmen for cards of admission to the House gallery they will from now on find printed on the reverse side of the blue card rules of gallery etiquette.

"How were people to know that they were not allowed to take packages or cameras into the galleries or to take notes?" Gracie had wondered. "Now with the rules before them, they will not be embarrassed by a tap on the shoulder."

To GRACIE PFOST can go the credit for suggesting to the proper authorities that the rules be printed on the cards.

Mrs. PFOST is a businesswoman as well as a politician. She has owned and operated a real-estate business back home. But the real estate she's most interested in right now is a project she wants Uncle Sam to take over—the building of a great superdam at Hells Canyon. And she looks like a girl who will never say die.

Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include remarks I made before the 10th annual meeting of the National Tool & Die Manufacturers Association on May 10, 1955, in Washington, D. C.:

Mr. President, our country's industry and commerce has been brought to its present strength by a lot of small businesses growing into large businesses. The hope of every person or group upon entering business is to make their business grow and prosper. We in the Congress of the United States are trying to help keep these incentives alive. We are trying to keep the door of opportunity open and to foster the basic principle of the American way; namely, to continue an equal opportunity for all who are willing to risk their time and money in a business venture. Once we depart from this premise or permit ourselves to drift into a position where only a few may have business opportunities we shall have indeed lost our way.

Equal opportunity for all is the touchstone of our greatness, not only in the business world but in every single aspect of our national life.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to create the first peacetime small-business agency in our history. As you know, we were successful, and the Small Business Administration was created as an independent agency.

May I point out briefly that the Small Business Act of 1953 provided for 4 principal programs of assistance to small business.

1. To counsel with small firms on their financial problems and to assist them in obtaining needed credit, if private credit is not available on reasonable terms, to participate in loans by private lending institutions, or to make direct Government loans to the firms;

2. To make loans for rehabilitation of small businesses and homes damaged or destroyed by natural disasters, such as hurricane and floods;

3. To help small businesses obtain a fair share of Government contracts for supplies and services; and

4. To assist small firms in solving their management and production problems.

Without going into detail, I can assure you that the Small Business Administration has made great progress in each of the four main fields of its endeavors. It is not an easy task to set up an organization of such major importance as the Small Business Administration and have it running with the precision of a fine machine in the first very complicated year of its existence. It is somewhat like building a machine, plans need to be made and translated into blueprints. A staff of good workmen must be assembled to take those blueprints and start work on what will be in the end a fine finished product. This has been the course of the Small Business Administration. Its plans have been well laid and have been carried into effect with precision, aggressiveness, and a high degree of skill. Small-business men and small-business organizations throughout the United States have applauded the efforts of the Small Business Administration and are urging its continuance as a permanent agency of the Government.

We must recognize that there is opposition to any form of agency designed to assist small business in its dealings with the Government. Most of this opposition ignores the facts of small business operation. It ignores the fact that small business cannot maintain representatives in Washington, and dozens of other points throughout the United States, to take care of their interests. The opposition ignores the fact that when there is no other source of working capital or long-term capital available that it is right and proper for small business institutions to turn to their Government for aid and counsel in financing operations. To say this does not mean money loaned to small-business men through a Government lending agency is to be disbursed on an unsound or unrealistic basis. The money the Government lends to small and independent business must be disbursed with every expectation, both on the part of the borrower and the Government, that the money will be returned to the Treasury with a fair rate of interest.

The work of the Small Business Administration in the field of Government procurement is gradually and surely producing results. When you consider the ramifications of the purchases of its needs by the Government and the enormous but necessary sums of money required to pay for these purchases, the problem of the Small Business Administration is easily recognized. In its efforts to secure a fair share of the purchases of the Government for small business, the Small Business Administration must necessarily intrude into the affairs of other departments and agencies and particularly the Department of Defense. Those charged with the responsibility of purchasing supplies and equipment for the Government could not be expected to welcome this intrusion with enthusiasm. But in spite of these natural human feelings about having others, even Government agencies, interfering or intruding in our affairs, the Small Business Administration has been successful in securing a high degree of cooperation from every Government agency. This to me, and I am sure it will to you, bespeaks well of the character, ability and resourcefulness not only of SBA officials but the officials of all the departments and agencies with whom the SBA must deal in carrying out the mandate of the Congress.

In the field of management and production problems the Small Business Administration has found a welcome which is as surprising as it is gratifying. This is not to say that officials of SBA in charge of these programs know all the answers to management or production problems. But they do have access to sources of information which have been gathered together that supply many of the answers to problems troubling management and production of small-business men.

The response, as I have indicated, to the management aids and the recently launched production assistance programs has demonstrated the value of both programs. In some respects, as we have all learned in life, it is as important to know where to look for information as it is to have the information. The principal job is to get the information broadcast far and wide in order that all may have access to it. In the small-business field this is just exactly what the SBA is doing and doing successfully.

There is little doubt but that the Congress will continue the SBA, perhaps indefinitely, beyond its date of expiration of June 30, 1955. It has proven its worth in the short time of its existence. As the years roll on the SBA will become a major factor in keeping the door of equal opportunity open and strengthening the small-business institutions of our country in order that they too may grow and prosper.

As you well know the antitrust laws were designed by the Congress to do the very thing the word antitrust indicates. In other words back in the eighties and nineties the Congress decided that trusts as such were not good for American business or the American people, and so was born the first of a series of antitrust laws now on the statute books.

We have antitrust laws not only dealing with monopolies but with unfair trade practices of every type and description. Over the past 75 years we have come to accept the body of our antitrust laws as an integral part of the American business scene. However, there has always been a vast difference of opinion on the laws themselves, the application of the laws, the enforcement of the laws, and the judicial opinion which have confirmed certain aspects of the antitrust laws.

In view of the importance of the antitrust laws on our business life, it is desirable to stop occasionally and take a look at the laws themselves and the enforcement of the laws. I am sure it was with this in mind that Attorney General Brownell appointed, August 27, 1953, a national committee to study the antitrust laws. After 19 months of work the distinguished group of some sixty persons composed of lawyers, teachers, and Government officials reported to the Attorney General on March 31, 1955.

The report has provoked much discussion and considerable controversy. This is good because by free and open discussion and the expression of opinion from all walks of business and professional life, this report will come to occupy an important place in our continued struggle to improve and evaluate our opportunities.

Undoubtedly there will eventually be legislation based on the findings of this particular antitrust report. In speaking of the report it does not necessarily mean that I agree with every finding of the report. As a matter of fact, Assistant Attorney General Barnes, who is in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, recently testified at a Senate hearing, that neither he nor Attorney General Brownell agree with all of the findings of the report. That in itself bespeaks to my mind of the honesty of effort and the fair consideration which each recommendation of the report will receive at the hands of the administration.

There are many other aspects and ramifications of the SBA and its relationship to our economy that might be discussed, but time does not permit.

It is always nice to meet with your excellent organization of small-business operators, and Mrs. Hill and I have enjoyed this pleasant occasion.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] before the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, BEFORE THE 64TH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 21, 1955

In the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic world of freemen largely depends upon the Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact, and mutual-defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals, and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the Formosa resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

As a Republican I wish to pay tribute to Senator GEORGE, Senator JOHNSON, Congressman RICHARDS, and Speaker RAYBURN for their cooperation in helping to make such overwhelming majorities possible.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific and lay the groundwork for a conference which would have all the unfortunate results of a Munich, a Yalta, or a Geneva wherein the aggressor gains his objectives at the conference table.

Let us examine the record of the United Nations as an agency for effective collective security as envisioned by some or as a basis for a world government as contemplated by others.

World War II had not yet terminated in 1945 when the United Nations Conference was held in San Francisco. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age though those high in Government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately both during the San Francisco conference and in the 10 years that have followed a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their armed forces and place their reliance upon the police power of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed armed forces in the amount of 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000, and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Korean theater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of America supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

Our associates in the United Nations so tied us down that a stalemate was all that could be gained after 3 years of struggle in Korea.

We were denied the right of hot pursuit and the enemy was protected in his sanctuary across the Yalu.

With that example are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative.

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of superstate compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable when one considers the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life and his religious, economic, and intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from Old-World tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience as an independent nation, much of it unsatisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation.

With that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his natural rights.

A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that such an organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than 1 million have equal representation with those of over 300 million. The Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man.

Now, there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean war. This, together with the other Communist states, give that system of tyranny over 800 million people.

As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guaranties of freedom under our Constitution being modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions.

I am opposed to any form of world government wherein American freedom guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights is compromised or diluted in the slightest by comembership with Communist tyranny.

It is one thing for the American people by deliberate choice, after thorough debate, to amend our Constitution to meet changing conditions. To allow it to happen by default would be a betrayal of our responsibilities.

We must not permit court decisions of executive agreements to raise such to the status of treaties. Nor will we long preserve

our Constitution, drafted at Philadelphia under the chairmanship of George Washington, if we fail to challenge any effort to amend our Constitution by use of a loophole which may provide a treaty or executive agreement shortcut to what was intended to be a difficult process.

Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue. It is later than you think.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American peope and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

I am strongly opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory in Asia and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism? Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to Free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communists of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Germany, because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks, we broke the 1948 blockade of Berlin by the airlift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of the island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad which have indicated that we must placate communism when they get aggravated, for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is "No."

At Munich, Chamberlain and Daladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have "no further territorial demands in Europe."

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience, Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian State.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression. But the guarantee given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia, for by then they had lost their will to fight, largely because they had lost their faith in the western allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa Straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory and they are not today.

That these outposts have a military value, no man can deny, for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of Amoy and Foochow as long as the Free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to Free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and elsewhere where people understand the brutal and aggressive nature of communism.

I again want to emphasize that in my opinion the morale value of Quemoy and Matsu is as high for Free China as is that of Western Berlin for Free Germany.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as stepping stones toward Formosa and the Pescadores. What nonsense is this? When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-Lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts?

If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and they reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reinforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross-your-heart-and-hope-to-die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-faced violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

I wish to share with you two letters, one from Pilot and one from Bataan death-march veteran. (Letters read.)

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Commission on Renewable Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill defining governmental policy in the field of renewable natural resources and providing for the appointment of a commission by the President to be known as the Commission on Renewable Natural Resources.

The bill declares it to be the policy of Congress that the conservation, orderly development, and sustained use of the renewable natural resources of the United States, such as land, water, forests and related resources, is the joint responsibility of the Federal Government, the States, the various subdivisions of government within the States, and the people thereof.

Senator FRANK CARLSON is introducing a companion bill in the Senate today.

The principal purpose of the Commission is to study and to recommend means for carrying out the declared policy of the bill. In addition, it is directed to study and investigate the present condition of the renewable natural resources of the United States as well as probable future demands upon such resources.

The Commission will consist of 12 members appointed by the President of which there shall be 1 member each from the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Army; 3 members representing the States; 3 members representing local subdivisions of Government; and 3 members representing the public at large. The bill provides that all members of the Commission must have expert knowledge of or experience with problems and management of the land, water, forests, and related renewable natural resources of the United States.

The Commission is directed to submit a report to the President on or before March 1, 1956, and a final report not later than June 30, 1956. It is also authorized to submit interim reports as it deems desirable or as the President may request.

The Commission is given the usual powers of such commissions with respect to the hiring and compensation of employees, the holding of hearings, and the securing of information from agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The policy set out in the bill is based on the idea that our renewable natural resources are indivisible. We cannot separate land and water or the things that grow on land or in water—all of them bear a close relationship to each other. All of them and their relationship must be taken into consideration in determining natural resources policy. Likewise there are some phases of resource policy which come clearly within the scope of local and State government.

Other phases by reason of their effect upon the Nation as a whole must be handled as problems of the Federal Government. But all of them should and must be considered in determining national policy.

Tribute to Aldo Leopold by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, several months ago it was my pleasure to speak at the dedication of a memorial to Aldo Leopold. The memorial was in recognition of work Mr. Leopold did which led to the creation of a system of wilderness areas in the United States.

Mr. Leopold led an active life in the outdoors, and held a number of important posts in Government and as a private citizen. He was a man whose friendship I considered a privilege, a man who recognized the degrees and kinds of solitude to be found in a wilderness. More than that, he recognized the need for the preservation of such areas for those who will follow us.

Quite recently some people questioned whether one could be a friend of conservation, or of the wilderness area, and still support the huge irrigation and power project on the Colorado River.

For this reason, and in view of my long interest in preserving primitive areas, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks at the dedication of the Aldo Leopold memorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The text of the address has been printed in the winter issue of the Living Wilderness, a publication of the Wilderness Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C. The address was delivered in New Mexico overlooking the Gila wilderness area on September 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WILDERNESS OF ALDO LEOPOLD

(Address by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON)

Some years ago there came from the presses a rather thin volume entitled "A Sand County Almanac." It was written by Aldo Leopold and in it there are these words: "There are degrees and kinds of solitude." Today it is our privilege to pay tribute to Aldo Leopold and to realize that there are as well degrees and kinds of wilderness.

This Gila Wilderness is the type which he liked and which he sought to protect and preserve—a wilderness not crossed and recrossed by oiled roads and excellent means of transportation, but a great tract that was almost pathless forest where a man travelled best if he travelled on foot or in the saddle. Two years ago when the proposal of the Forest Service to modify the boundaries of the Gila Primitive Area was under consideration I spoke of my remembrance of many Forest Service officials who were on duty in New Mexico when I first arrived in this State to make it my home. This day is set aside for the erection of a plaque to the memory of Aldo Leopold and I, therefore, will disassociate him from the others and speak only of my great joy to have shared his friendship and his comradeship 35 years ago.

Aldo Leopold recognized the degrees and kinds of solitude that men can find to match their needs and moods. He became secretary of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, but he could not divorce himself from his love of nature and his desire to see set aside, even in a municipality, an area where people could breathe and could feel released from the restraints of society.

Back more than 30 years ago he sought the development of a Rio Grande Park in what had been a water-logged stretch of empty acres, and out of it with the passing of time there has emerged the Albuquerque Zoo, the Tingley baseball field, and a substantial area which will become more and more prized as Albuquerque continues to expand.

But it was the true wilderness which attracted him—the places where he could go and be alone, the spots in the White Mountains of Arizona or in the forests of New Mexico where a man could lose himself in his surroundings and be dropped back into complete comradeship with nature.

I talked to Aldo Leopold many times about the development of a wilderness area. There it would be possible to preserve scenic beauty and the natural accompaniments of the restricted country, the fish and the wildlife which had once owned these areas for themselves and now had become the hunted as man moved into these protected retreats.

It was such a place here in southwestern New Mexico, a hundred or more miles north of the Mexico border, where hazy blue silhouettes of the Mogollon Range mark the Gila wilderness, that Aldo studied the area, and in his report of October 1922 suggested this vast wilderness be named the Gila Wilderness Area or Gila National Hunting Ground.

Although most widely known for his eminence in technology of wildlife management, Aldo Leopold was a dominant influence in the movement not only to preserve the Gila wilderness, but also wilderness areas throughout the country.

Thirty years ago he enlisted me in the cause for preservation of wilderness areas in general. I shall never forget how he poured out his heart on the subject of primitive tracts which seemed likely to be destroyed with the development of the auto, the truck, and speedier methods of transportation.

What was his background?

Aldo Leopold was born at Burlington, Iowa, on January 11, 1886. There he developed an interest in ornithology and hunting. He attended Yale University where he received the bachelor of science degree from Scheffield Scientific School in 1908 and the master of forestry degree from the School of Forestry the following year.

From 1909 until he rose to chief of operations in the regional office at Albuquerque, he served with the United States Forest Service in Arizona and New Mexico. While there his interest in wildlife management developed and he became secretary of the Albuquerque and the New Mexico Game Protective Associations. His effort within these organizations to produce a rational system of game management and a nonpolitical administration of refuges attracted wide attention.

"It seems to me," wrote Theodore Roosevelt to Aldo in 1917, "that your association in New Mexico is setting an example to the whole country." It was in that year that Aldo was awarded the gold medal of the Permanent Wildlife Protective Fund of America.

In 1925 he left New Mexico and went to Madison, Wis., where he served for 2 years as associate director of the Forest Products Laboratory. Then he resigned from the Forest Service to conduct game surveys for the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute.

He was awarded the Outdoor Life medal for his first book, Report on a Game Survey of the North Central States, published in 1931.

A member of some 30 clubs, associations, and societies, Aldo served as president of the Ecological Society of America and of the Wildlife Society. He was a director of the National Audubon Society, and was vice president of the American Forestry Association, The Wilderness Society, and Friends of the Land. He also was an active member in the American Ornithologists Union. He served as associate editor of the Journal of Forestry and was also a member of the SAF Council.

He served on the Committee on Wildlife Restoration appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1934, as well as on many other conservation committees, and at the time of his death had been asked by Secretary of the Interior Krug to serve at the Inter-American Conference of Renewable Natural Resources.

Elected a Fellow of the Society of American Foresters in 1946, he had been professor of wildlife management at the University of Wisconsin since 1933.

Author of nearly 300 technical and popular articles, reviews, and his classic book, Game Management, Aldo Leopold was an internationally recognized authority on wildlife management as evidenced by his voluminous advisory and committee work and his membership in numerous conservation and scientific organizations.

But to us today as we meet here in his honor we can look at the great expanse of the Gila Wilderness, one of the few such areas in the United States virtually untouched by human hands, and honestly say this might not have been except for the initiative of Aldo Leopold. It was chiefly through his efforts that the Forest Service in 1924 established the first of its wilderness reservations, the Gila Wilderness Area or Primitive Area in New Mexico.

To what goals his love of nature would have carried him we have no way of knowing. Across the country his prestige had steadily grown. He was at the peak of his usefulness to the wildlife and the wilderness movements when those who had come to know and love him were shocked by news of his death. On April 21, 1948, he suffered a fatal heart attack after fighting a grass fire on a neighbor's property near his home at Baraboo, Wis.

There are other chapters in the history of the Gila Wilderness that had not been completed at his passing. After public hearings in August 1952, the area was permanently designated the "Gila Wilderness Area" and placed under a new and stricter regulation known as U-1.

Under the new regulation U-1, and upon recommendation of the Chief of the Forest Service, such areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as "Wilderness Areas" within which there shall be no roads or other provisions for motorized transportation, no commercial timber cutting, and no occupancy under special use permits for hotels, stores, resorts, summer homes, organization camps, hunting and fishing lodges, or similar uses. The only roads allowed will be roads of ingress and egress to any private property that might be in the area.

The work of Aldo Leopold has been done. We now become trustees of his inheritance. Those of us who may visit within the wilderness and who are able to rest and be restored in our peace of mind and body by the quiet that it will always possess have none the less an obligation to see that the work of one generation shall not be sacrificed by those that come after. We have an obligation to make sure that this area may remain untouched for generations and perhaps cen-

turies to come. We cannot take our burdens as trustees lightly if we are to keep faith with those who struggled so mightily to achieve these precious spots within the confines of a busy continent.

The erection of this memorial not only says to Aldo Leopold, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant;" it reminds each of us that our lives as well can contribute to the things that mean beauty for the eye and rest for the spirit. We, too, can preserve the wilderness. We, too, can find in it "degrees and kinds of solitude" that will mean for all who live in the southwest and for all who come to it to visit a communion with nature that will bring to each of us peace and joy and enduring pleasure.

Sarnoff Demands a Full Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, David Sarnoff has urged the Nation to wage all-out cold war against communism and be willing to accept the same costs and casualties as a hot war would involve.

The chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America charged that the Nation's political offensive against communism was inadequate. He warned that the cold war is not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest in which the loser may not have a second chance.

In a memorandum submitted to President Eisenhower last April 5 and made public on May 9, Mr. Sarnoff said the surest way to prevent a hot war was to win the cold war. The memorandum grew out of his discussion of the subject with the President on March 15.

Mr. Sarnoff urged the expenditure of up to $3 billion a year, or 7½ percent of the military defense budget, for political warfare.

I quote from just a part of General Sarnoff's inspiring statement:

It is well known that communism is challenging the freedom, initiative, and the individual dignity of all freedom-loving people. It is a threat to our very existence. We are attempting to combat this menace by means of a strong military. Until a satisfactory peace is evolved, we must continue to be militarily strong. But the battle for peace cannot be won by preparedness alone. We need a more flexible and imaginative program for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously drawn attention to the brilliant speech of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., on February 26, before the National Press Club, along the same lines. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and I have introduced bills to carry out these general purposes. Today, one of the Hearst newspapers, the New York Journal-American, published an editorial which I quote below and which I heartily endorse. The quality of Mr. Sarnoff's leadership would be invaluable as chairman of the strategy board he proposes. Once again, the President has been given an opportunity to inaugurate a program that will lead to peace by forceful deeds, instead of conflicting threats and empty gestures.

Mr. Sarnoff's statement:

Logically, we have no alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clear-headed determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and by private groups, to win the contest.

* * * * *

Short of a blunder that ignites the third world war which nobody wants, the immediate danger is the debilitating, costly, tense war of nerves that is part of the cold war. The primary threat today is political and psychological.

If we allow ourselves to be defeated in the cold struggle, we will have bypassed a nuclear war—but at the price of our freedom and independence. We can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

Existing organization for fighting and winning the cold war must be adjusted and strengthened in line with the expanded scale and intensity of operations. I propose a Strategy Board for Political Defense, the cold-war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side, functioning directly under the President, with Cabinet status for its head.

* * * * *

The specific activities cited as examples in the memorandum would be carried out not only by official agencies but by private groups, such as labor unions, veterans' organizations, churches, youth and women's groups. The Soviet-controlled countries, it showed, are extremely vulnerable to precisely the kind of psychological pressures the Communists are using against free nations.

[From the New York Journal American of May 11, 1955]

WE MUST WIN

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, board chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, has done this country a vigorous good service in proposing creation of a Government strategy board to coordinate efforts to win the cold war.

He has summed up his feeling on how vital it is to win in the following concentrated capsule of thought linking defeat in a cold war or a hot atomic war as twin disasters: "We can freeze to death as well as burn to death." The capsule could be the medicine for avoiding both.

The Hearst newspapers go all the way with General Sarnoff in his approach to the problem. In fact, his views are strikingly and happily similar to those advanced by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of our papers, in his speech last January 28 to the National Press Club in Washington.

Mr. Hearst emphasized the enormous importance of winning the battle of competitive coexistence, and urged the establishment of a national planning board to direct such efforts.

We have since come to think of such a board by the name of competitive coexistence council. We like the name because it is simple, it tells the story, and it can be condensed into the alphabetical symbol CCC.

There are some differences of detail and emphasis between General Sarnoff's proposal and Mr. Hearst's.

General Sarnoff suggests the head of the Board should have Cabinet status and should include representatives of the State and Defense Departments, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the United States Information Service. The Hearst proposal also would give high authority to the head of the Board but would include, besides Government representatives, the highest skilled and experienced civilian personnel that could be found.

Also, if we read General Sarnoff's views correctly, a great deal of stress is placed on massive psychological bombardment of ideas. To our thinking, the battle for competitive coexistence has entered a new phase that calls for quietly aggressive presentation of all the good things America has to offer and stands for.

By this we mean by word, by picture, by exhibit, by traveling delegations (Porgy and Bess, the New York Philharmonic, sports teams, for instance) to spread the story that this is indeed a land of plenty in industry, culture, sports—for are not these, after all, products of freedom?

But to General Sarnoff's objective, and the patriotic vigor of his interest, we offer a loud bravo.

And now we would like to make our latest contribution to this battle.

We propose General Sarnoff as Chairman of the Strategy Board.

The Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the postal pay bill has presented one of the most perplexing problems to this session of Congress thus far.

Knowing the administration's position, it seems to me that if I were to vote for a higher pay increase than the 7.6-percent contained in the House committee's bill, then logically I must be prepared to vote to override a veto. The logical test, then, seems to me to be whether or not the administration proposal was fair to postal employees by providing a rate of pay at least equal to that offered for similar work in private industry. This is particularly true in light of the fact that the post office is not self-sustaining, and that people in private industry, doing similar work, must pay the taxes to make possible the postal wages provided, at whatever rate.

As nearly as I can determine, from listening to all of the debate and giving it all the personal research that my time permitted, and from my recent personal experience with private industry in Wyoming, the administration proposal was not only fair but generous, in comparison with pay scales in private industry.

The most deliable comparative figures I was able to obtain covering Wyoming are for the Denver area, where the regional office of the Post Office Department serving Wyoming is located. From my personal knowledge, the Denver wage scale in private industry appears to be equal to or a bit better than that paid in the larger Wyoming communities; they are substantially higher than those prevailing in the smaller communities of my State.

As of December 1954 the average rate of pay for a janitor in the Denver area was approximately $222 per month. Under the administration proposal the minimum pay for a janitor would be $239 per month; and after 8 years automatic wage increases would bring this to $289 per month. Under the administration proposal an elevator operator would start at $256.66 per month, and with automatic wage increases after 8 years' service would be receiving $309.16 per month.

A material handler in the Denver area received an average of $269 per month; under the administration proposal a mail handler would receive a minimum of $277.50 per month, with increases to $332.50 per month after 8 years' service. A typist likewise would start at $277.50 and go up automatically to $332.50 per month. A truckdriver in the Denver area received an average of $295 per month. Under the administration proposal a truckdriver for the Post Office Department would start at $303 and go up automatically to $363 per month. An accounting clerk in the Denver area averaged $317, while under the administration proposal a Post Office Department accounting clerk would start at $323 and advance automatically to $385 per month at the end of 8 years.

City carriers similarly would start at $303 and advance to $363 per month, plus graduated rates of longevity pay to a maximum of $300 per year after 25 years' service. In addition, they would receive $100 per year for uniform allowance. This would represent an increase of 114 percent on the starting wage over what they received prior to 1945, and an increase of 108 percent on the maximum rate.

All of the Post Office pay figures cited above are guaranteed annual wages. Post Office Department employees have other benefits not ordinarily found in private industry. They have civil-service status, and retirement benefits. They have vacations of a minimum of 2 weeks and 3 days for beginners, up to 5 weeks and 1 day for employees with 15 years or more of service. Thirteen days of paid sick leave are granted each year, cumulative if not taken. Eight paid holidays are enjoyed each year, and nine in election years.

The rate of pay for post office carriers and clerks, provided in the administration bill, is from $1.75 to $2.24 per hour. A Congressman from a highly industrialized area in Michigan, where some of the highest wages prevail, stated that the maximum paid for similar work in his home community is $1.96 per hour. These people in private industry, he further pointed out, are subject to layoffs and do not enjoy the high degree of fringe benefits I have described.

In view of these facts and recommendations of other members of the committee, who have studied the problem seriously and sincerely over a long period of time, I could not justify voting to override a veto, and, therefore, could not justify voting for a higher rate of increase than the average of 7.6 percent, with reclassification as provided in the administration bill.

For a Deeper Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Delaware River Channel is a matter of vital concern to the State of New Jersey and should have the serious consideration of the Congress. An immediate appropriation of $25 million to commence the program is needed.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to point out that the demand that local interests contribute to the deepening of a navigable river, as proposed by the administration, is unique in our history. The navigable waters of the United States, as the Saturday Evening Post pointed out editorially recently, always have been, and still are, the responsibility of the Federal Government. It would seem frivolous of me to suggest that local interests share in the moneys collected in customs duties from rivers deepened partly at their expense, but the suggestion is no more illogical than the demand that the same local interests pay for a share of the improvements of our navigable streams.

If local interests must pay for an improvement in the Delaware River then must they pay for improvements all over the Nation? Must local interests pay a share of the numerous projects which have already been approved by the Congress and which are awaiting funds at this moment? If so, then each of us had better look into his own situation, for if my district must depart from tradition, then so must all other congressional districts at a future date. I am for a meritorious project and, at the same time, against an attempt of our Federal Government to abandon its responsibilities, a unique and dangerous precedent. May I say that we in New Jersey are not asking for anything new. We are asking only that the Federal Government perform its functions as it should, without departing from 175 years of tradition and history for the sake of a pennyweight on the scales upon which the political budget must be balanced.

I include as part of my remarks the statements by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of the State of New Jersey, and myself which we presented to the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 5, 1955.

The Saturday Evening Post editorial of April 30, 1955, entitled "Harbor Improvement Is One Federal Job That Has Paid Off" is included also.

The statements and editorial follow:

STATEMENT BY GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER ON THE DEEPENING OF THE DELAWARE CHANNEL

Congress has sanctioned the deepening of the Delaware channel project. We in the Delaware Valley consider it essential to the expanding economy of the area. The industrial development of the Delaware Valley is just beginning, and a channel capable of accommodating ocean-traveling ships fits naturally and indispensably into that development.

The plan for a channel 40 feet deep from Philadelphia Naval Base to the upstream end of Newbold Island and 35 feet from there to the Trenton Marine Terminal has been studied for years by the Army Corps of Engineers and other responsible agencies.

General Sturgis himself has said that the deeper channel would "unquestionably contribute to the general welfare of the region."

It is true that U. S. Steel would make good use of the deepened channel to bring ore-carriers to its docks. But it is illogical to say that only 1 company and no other would benefit from a 40-foot channel depth in the Delaware River.

The subsidy plan was probably devised as an economy measure, but its main effect is to slow down the pace of plans for a long-sought public improvement.

It should be remembered also that a concern like U. S. Steel already makes large payments to the Federal Government in terms of corporation and personal income taxes. Should such a firm—or any private enterprise, for that matter—be asked to meet even a part of the cost of benefits that might reasonably be regarded as a governmental responsibility?

To require private contributions for projects that have always been a Federal Government matter would establish dangerous precedents.

The benefits to be derived from opening the navigable section of the Delaware to deep-draft vessels, leads to the conclusion that the existing national policy of improving navigable waterways at the cost of the Federal Government should be adhered to and that it should bear the entire cost of the proposed project.

If a 40-foot Delaware channel is in the public interest, as it appears to be, it should be treated as a public improvement, built with public funds—not as part of a corporate investment.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, ON THE DEEPENING OF THE DELAWARE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955, 2 P. M., ROOM F 16, CAPITOL

Mr. Chairman, I come here today to support an adequate appropriation for the deepening of the Delaware River channel to Trenton, N. J. To one who represents the 4th congressional district, the shores of which are washed by the Delaware, the need for the deepening of this great estuary to the head of tidal influence at Trenton is crystal clear. A harbinger of the growth of the greater Trenton industrial area is to be seen in the choice by the United States Steel Corp. of its site for a tremendous operation. I refer to the great Fairless Steel Works near Morrisville, Pa., directly across the river from Trenton. Our area must accept the challenge that this growth presents, by providing a channel of sufficient depth to accommodate 40,000-ton-ore boats. Otherwise, a promise of progress may be rejected, and a threat of economic disruption and eventual stagnation result.

The choice of this area by United States Steel was acknowledged by numerous industries and business interests as an inducement

to move into the Delaware Valley. The fact is that the enthusiasm of industries which considered the banks of the river as a location has noticeably cooled since doubts have been cast on the fulfillment of the deepening project.

It might be well to note here the fact that the decision of United States Steel to locate in the area resulted, for one thing, in a tremendous Levittown housing development in Pennsylvania. Indications that plans are underway for a great Levittown on the New Jersey side of the river, in the district I represent, are encouraging. Such plans are, to no little extent, due to the expectation of additional industries locating along the banks of the Delaware. Discouragement of such plans by the failure of the area to provide accommodations for these industries would be unfortunate indeed.

In the district I represent there is more unanimity on this issue than on any other matter directly affecting the district. There is nothing I remember that even remotely resembles the kind of unanimity that has been demonstrated. The resolutions in favor of the Federal Government's fulfilling its responsibility for the deepening are too numerous to mention here. My offices have been virtually flooded with representations in behalf of the project. They include practically every governing body of the communities in the district. Public endorsement by both business and labor organizations have been very numerous. The newspapers of the district have editorialized and given press coverage which have served to educate and arouse the people of the area to the importance of the project. The degree of response to a questionnaire, recently distributed among my constituents, has been considerable. I was elated by the responses given to two questions dealing with the deepening issue.

One question read: "Do you favor the deepening of the Delaware River channel to Trenton?"

The answers: Yes, 630; no, 39.

Another question read: "Do you favor the administration's policy of requiring local contributions toward the cost of the channel, or do you believe the national economy and defense make the deepening project the sole responsibility of the Federal Government?"

The answers: Local contributions, 170; Federal responsibility, 434.

Clearly, the people of my district consider that in justice to them, this project should be undertaken as the sole responsibility of the Government as soon as possible. I would like, as their Representative in Congress, to impress upon you the urgency of this project if the well-being of my district is to be continued. It is, of course, most regrettable that some must suffer disadvantage and inconvenience. Every means of adjustment and compensation in individual cases must be considered. But progress requires that the greatest good for the greatest number be the prevailing criterion. Ours is an area where unemployment is a problem today, and where sustained full employment is a constant aim. Should this area not be given the opportunity this project affords, many jobs will never materialize. What a loss it would be for my district to be refused this golden opportunity to grow healthy economically. What a loss to the Nation that such new wealth should fail to be created.

Fortunately, the Congress has always recognized the impact that river and harbor improvements have had, not only on the economy of the areas immediately affected, but on the expansion and development of the entire Nation. The 83d Congress, consistent with this broad view in formulating policy on river dredging, authorized a 40-foot channel in the Delaware upstream from the Philadelphia Navy Yard. At that time the matter of cost-sharing was carefully reviewed, and the idea was rejected. It remained for the Bureau of the Budget to arrogate to itself the power to frustrate the will of the Congress. It is the right of the Congress to make clear that the violation of a well-established precedent shall not be undertaken in so cavalier a fashion. It is the duty of the Congress to see to it that the Delaware Valley is not thwarted in its pursuit of simple justice. It is an opportunity for the Congress to assist an area which can contribute immeasurably to the welfare of the entire Nation.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to point out to you that the demand that local interests contribute to the deepening of a navigable river is unique in our history. The navigable waters of the United States always have been, and still are, the responsibility of the Federal Government. It would seem frivolous of me to suggest that local interests share in the moneys collected in customs duties from rivers deepened partly at their expense, but the suggestion is no more illogical than the demand that the same local interests pay for a share of the improvements.

If local interests must pay for an improvement in the Delaware River, then must they pay for improvements all over the Nation? Must local interests pay a share of the numerous projects which have already been approved by the Congress and which are awaiting funds at this moment? If so, gentlemen, then each of us had better look into his own situation, for if my district must depart from tradition, then so must yours, at a future date. We are for a meritorious project and, at the same time, we are against an attempt of our Federal Government to abandon its responsibilities—a unique and dangerous precedent.

In conclusion, gentlemen, may I emphasize that we are not asking for anything new. We are asking that you insist that the Government perform its functions as it should—without departing from 175 years of tradition and history for the sake of a penny-weight on the scales upon which the political budget must be balanced.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955]

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT IS ONE FEDERAL JOB THAT HAS PAID OFF

The administration has declined to include in this year's budget an appropriation for a deep-water channel in the Delaware River above Philadelphia as far as Trenton, N. J., unless the project includes a stipulation that local interests must assume part of the cost.

The total sum involved in dredging the channel to 40 feet as far as Morrisville, Pa., and 35 feet from there to Trenton, is about $91 million. It is estimated that $18 million of this amount represents half the difference between a 35-foot channel and one that would permit large ocean-going ships to unload ore at dockside. Therefore, the Army engineers argue, this is a "local benefit" and should not be a charge on the Federal budget. Although the local interests are not specifically mentioned, various statements by administration spokesmen indicate that United States Steel Corp., whose huge new Fairless plant is located on the river just below Trenton, is meant.

In his press conference of January 19, the President supported this position, adding, if it was a new policy, he thought it should have been considered long ago.

Although the principle of local participation in large public improvements involving Federal expenditures is a sound one, harbor maintenance and improvement of navigable rivers and harbors have been an exclusively Federal concern since the foundation of the Republic.

It was precisely the question of foreign commerce and navigation—over which the original Confederation had no control—that led to the movement for the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In the end, the States renounced the right to collect import duties, ceding that source of revenue to the new Federal Government, which in turn was forbidden (art. I, sec. 9, par. 6) to discriminate among the ports of the several States.

Maintenance and improvement of harbors, under control of the War Department, have normally been carried out at Federal expense, insofar as deep-water channels are concerned. That would be no reason for continuing the policy, if it were wrong or financially burdensome, but the reverse is true. Adequate ports and channels are not a liability but a gilt-edged investment. In the case of harbors along the Delaware, the Federal Government, during the last 50 years, has collected over $14 for every dollar spent on development.

It is true that, for the moment, a 40-foot channel may be represented as a benefit to United States Steel, although other plants along the river would benefit too. But that argument could have been advanced at any time in the past 168 years against any of the industries that line the shores of our great ports. The record of American enterprise indicates that opportunities to locate on an improved waterway are seldom neglected. It is hardly fair to impose the cost of creating them on the first user.

The responsibility of the Federal Government, in any case, does not go beyond the cost of deepening and clearing channels. A productive harbor, obviously, is much more than just a waterway. Local interests provide and always have provided piers, rail connections, loading and unloading facilities, truck highways, police and all the other necessities that go into the complex of services that makes a port. Without them the huge Federal revenues from customs could never have been available.

Sympathy is due residents of the upper Delaware who view with alarm the inevitable transformation of riverbanks from charming residence and recreation areas into grim industrial and commercial areas. We are not debating the issue of whether this particular project is necessary. But, if the channel or any similar one is to be deepened, there would seem to be no valid reason to change the policy, buttressed by specific constitutional mention, which makes channel costs a Federal concern.

Postal Salary Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to express my hope that the conference report on the postal salary bill will soon become law. In urging early approval of this legislation by the Senate and the President, I speak on behalf of minimum economic relief for one of the few major employee groups in the Nation having had no basic salary increase since 1951. I speak for local postal inspectors having less in purchasing power now than they did 15 years ago. I speak for local letter carriers forced to borrow money in order

to feed, clothe, and house their families. I speak for mail sorters whose wives or children must go to work to help meet minimum family needs.

The proposed average increase of 8.8 percent for postal employees will do more than adjust postal salaries to take account of increased costs of living; it will help to raise the standards of post-office service. It will assist the Post Office Department in recruiting able employees hitherto receiving higher pay in other types of work. It will aid in reducing costly turnover among postal employees, by offering more opportunities for advancement within the postal service. It will improve the general morale and efficiency of persons having previously decided to devote their working lives to the collection and distribution of mail.

The conference report on the postal pay bill meets most of the major objections raised to last year's postal salary legislation which I also supported. The American people as well as the postal employees suffer from delay in the increase of postal pay. I hope that neither the people nor the employees will have to wait much longer.

Col. Commandant Michael de Kovats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today a great liberty-loving and heroic Hungarian soldier gave his life for the United States of America. This man was Michael de Kovats, of Hungary.

Wars for freedom generally rekindle dormant and slumbering emotions in many hearts. If the cause is a just and righteous cause, a popular and sacred cause, then it is bound to attract numerous adherents, even from the ranks of those who are not directly involved in the struggle.

The American Revolution was a popular and sacred cause, and the men who flocked to the defense of the colonists from many parts of the world and gladly gave their lives may be counted in the thousands. Among the most distinguished of such valiant and brave men was Michael de Kovats of Hungary.

Not enough is known of this remarkable man. It is generally believed that he was born in the year 1724. He had military service in his early life, and won his spurs in the service of Frederick the Great of Prussia. Then, early in our Revolutionary War, he arrived in this country. Here he met Pulaski. Later, upon Pulaski's recommendation, he was authorized by Washington to be the Colonel Commandant of the Pulaski Legion. In that capacity he led the charge against General Prevost at Charleston in May, 1779. There on May 11 he was mortally wounded and gave his life that our country might be born.

This very brief outline cannot do full justice to the memory of that brave and devoted servant of democracy and freedom. But we who are always grateful to those who gave their lives in our war of independence sincerely honor today the memory of that great soldier of freedom, Michael de Kovats.

All Americans are grateful to this great Hungarian and all Americans of Hungarian descent must take great pride in his heroism and patriotism.

Termination of Federal Administration on Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I commend to my colleagues' attention on a subject of great importance to a large segment of our Nation's people.

This statement was submitted to me by Mr. F. H. Sinclair, of Sheridan, Wyo., a member and committee chairman of the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians. This organization is composed of outstanding Americans who have been adopted by Indian tribes of North America. Membership extends even into this body and is represented on both sides of the political aisle.

I am most happy to submit the statement of this fine organization for the consideration of my colleagues and urge that it be studied fully.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it would be neglectful of me if I did not say a word about the distinguished Wyoming citizen who sent the statement to me. Mr. F. H. Sinclair of Sheridan is one of my State's best-known and best-loved men among Indians all over the Nation. He is completely sincere in his effort to aid Indians in their struggle for survival as a race and in their uphill fight against discrimination.

Howard Sinclair recently was named by Wyoming's Gov. Milward L. Simpson as chairman of a newly formed Indian Affairs Committee in my State. Mr. Sinclair's work among American Indians dates back many years, but his outstanding achievement in this field in recent years has culminated in an annual All American Indian Days spectacle at Sheridan. This year's will be the third annual event, during which authentic ceremonies and contests in dances, crafts, talents, and sports will be presented by members of more than 25 tribes.

All American Indian Days is an outgrowth of a program of human relations in which Mr. Sinclair took a leading part 4 or 5 years ago. This program which mushroomed spontaneously was aimed toward elimination of discriminatory practices, and was immensely successful. The net result—a practical demonstration of betterment of racial relations—brought international recognition to the Sheridan area in northern Wyoming and southern Montana.

I relate these facts, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the sincere approach to a very complex problem which has been adopted—successfully—by Mr. Sinclair. I believe this lends substance to the statement which follows:

STATEMENT OF TERMINATION OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS BY THE CONTINENTAL CONFEDERATION OF ADOPTED INDIANS

This national organization, the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians, consisting of regular members adopted into tribes of American Indians, and associate members concerned with Indian rights, has for its principal objective the promotion of the welfare and progress of American Indian citizens, and assistance to them in obtaining their full civil rights, is deeply concerned in the matter of the proposed termination of Federal administration of Indian affairs.

There is no need here to attempt to outline prevailing conditions now obtaining on the many Indian reservations in the United States, as these conditions have been made known by the testimony given before congressional committees and are known to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

After considerable study and consideration of these existing conditions, and apparent intent of the Federal Government to proceed with the termination of Federal trusteeship over Indian people, this confederation respectfully submits the following statements of its position and recommendations in this connection:

1. We favor ultimate termination of the administration of Indian affairs by the Federal Government, but suggest the transition period be over a period of not less than from 10 to 20 years.

2. We oppose the transfer of Federal responsibilities and services to Indians to the several States, until and unless said States agree to the transfer, and have set up qualified agencies to assume these responsibilities and supply these services as adequately as they are now supplied by the Federal Government; and further, that sufficient funds be appropriated by the Federal Government to be paid to the States to enable the States to undertake these responsibilities and provide these services until such termination program becomes a full reality.

3. We oppose termination of Federal administration over the affairs of any Indian tribe, without full consent of the members of said tribe, honestly obtained by ballot.

4. As exemption of Indian lands from taxation was part of the purchase price of lands ceded to the United States by Indian tribes, we opposed turning these lands over for taxation by the several States, without full consent of the tribes affected, and then not until the said State in which Indian lands lie, can provide the same services, in every respect, which are provided for other citizens of such State.

5. We oppose attempts to abrogate existing treaties between Indian tribes and the United States, by the use of persuasion, coercion, or by any other means, by any Federal department or agency.

6. We oppose any arbitrary law which attempts to define an Indian. We suggest a registration system be set up, whereby any person with any degree of Indian blood may register and declare himself to be an Indian if he chooses. Such registration need not constitute enrollment in a particular tribe.

7. We oppose the relocation policy which would transplant Indians in industrial areas, far from their homes, while at the same time large parts of the lands or resources within the reservations from which these Indian people are taken to be relocated, are leased to non-Indians. Land resources on reserva-

tions should be developed for Indian people. Indian tribes should have priority over non-Indians to purchase trust lands. Indian reservation lands should be maintained at present levels, if not increased, to be developed for Indians. Long term loans, at low interest rates, should be provided for the purchase of tribal herds of cattle, or the development of natural revenue producing resources for the benefit of Indians. Indian lands provide the last of the natural heritage of Indian people—their only homeland—and they should be retained for their benefit.

8. We suggest an educational financing plan such as the GI bill of rights for young Indian people, to finance them in schools and colleges where they may obtain professional educations. We also suggest more vocational training institutions and on the reservation schools, where practicable.

9. We suggest exploration of plans to inaugurate small industries on Indian reservations to provide employment, such as the small factory on the Turtle Mountain Reservation in North Dakota.

10. We suggest a thorough appraisal of all resources on every Indian reservation, preferably made by some independent and trained agency, rather than a Government bureau, so the true potential of each reservation be ascertained.

11. We recommend additional funds for law enforcement be appropriated, until this function is turned over to the States, and that the jurisdictional authority between State and Federal Governments be more clearly defined.

12. We recommend that appropriations for reimbursing State schools for the education of Indian students, under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, be increased and that more flexible means of processing these funds be devised.

13. We favor more authority and responsibility be given to superintendents of Indian reservations so that decisions can be made on the local level in accordance with local existing conditions, with a consequent reduction of personel in area offices and in Washington.

14. As Indians are American citizens, we oppose any ruling by a Government department preventing any tribe of Indians from employing legal counsel of their own choosing, without necessitating the sanction or approval of any governmental agency.

15. We oppose the enactment of any further legislation which would terminate Federal administration over the affairs of Indians, until claims by Indian tribes against the United States shall have been settled in full, or finally determined by the court of last resort.

16. It is our contention that more than economic factors are to be considered, and that the ethnic values should be considered and the efforts to break up tribal unity are not in keeping with the theory of the self-determination rights of minority peoples—and that the strong feeling of racial ties existing with Indians should be recognized; that understanding and sympathy toward Indian background, way of life, culture, and philosophy are essential; and the assimilation is a matter of evolution. Integration by practical progression should be the goal.

Committee on Termination: F. H. Sinclair, Chairman, Sheridan, Wyo.; John Batdorff, Manistee, Mich.; Joseph L. Boyle, Jim Thorpe, Pa.; Dr. Stanley Dougan, Palm Springs, Calif.; Theodore H. Haas, Washington, D. C.; Clyde H. Hendrix. Des Moines, Iowa; B. W. Jolly, Carnegie, Okla.; Mrs. Nicholas Merhab, Ada, Ohio; H. O. Waltmeyer, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Approved:

DANIEL FRANCIS CLANCY,
Continental Chief, the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians.

Sea Lamprey Control on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the House conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill for their foresight in agreeing to increase the appropriation for control of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes. The conference report on this bill, passed by the House yesterday, contains $350,000 for this purpose, the same amount appropriated in fiscal 1955. The bill, as it passed the House, contained $150,000 for this program.

The House reduction was made in anticipation of the ratification of the Great Lakes Treaty with Canada which provides for a joint effort in eradicating the sea lamprey from the Great Lakes. This treaty was ratified, in fact, by the Senate last week. However, the funds for the Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Interior bill will still be needed because it will take time to pass implementing legislation, organize the Commission called for in the treaty, and obtain funds for its activities. It is estimated that about 18 months will be required before the international sea lamprey program can be put in operation. Commissioners must be appointed, regulations and policies under which the Federal Government, the Government of Canada, the States, and provinces would operate must be established, and considerable planning is required before the joint program can begin.

In the meantime, it is absolutely essential the work already begun by our Fish and Wildlife Service be continued. Two million dollars have been spent on this project and a great deal has been accomplished. It would have been shortsighted to disrupt the continuity of this program.

It is important that the seriousness of this problem on the Great Lakes be understood.

We have a silent invader among us. By this I mean a vicious killer which is destroying the lake trout and other fishes on which commercial fishermen depend for a livelihood. These invaders sneak up on their prey, attach themselves to the side of the fish, grasp the flesh, inject juices which prevent blood and body fluids from coagulating, and suck the fish until the blood is removed and the fish dies. I am speaking of the sea lamprey—a salt-water invader by way of the Welland Canal.

These lampreys attain a length of about 15 inches, and in the 2 years they spend as parasites in the lakes they make about 87 attacks on fish and kill about 19 pounds for each individual. A hundred thousand lampreys destroy more than 1,867,000 pounds of lake trout during their lives.

The adult lamprey migrates up streams tributary to the Great Lakes and lays its eggs in the riffles, in much the same area as the trout. The young lampreys, after they hatch, remain in the mud at the bottom of the stream for about 5 years. There are five generations of young lampreys in the bottom mud at all times. As they mature they migrate to the lake to prey upon food fishes.

As a result of these depredations, the catch in Lake Ontario has dropped from in excess of 5 million pounds to approximately one-half million pounds, and in Lake Michigan from nearly 5 million pounds to practically nothing. The invaders are now in Lake Superior, which is the only one of the Great Lakes with an abundance of lake trout.

In 1946, when the downward trend in the fishery became readily apparent, the States and the Fish and Wildlife Service, with their available resources, undertook limited studies to determine what kind of attack should be made on the problem. Congress appropriated money in 1950 to undertake investigations that would be required in order to control the sea lamprey. These investigations included methods by which the lamprey could be used for food or other commercial purposes, and a study of its life history and relationship to other fishes in the lake in order to determine the weak link in its life history so that a more direct approach to control could be made. Electrical and mechanical devices were developed and tested on a large scale, so that sufficient work has been done to indicate that control of their abundance can be accomplished by means of these devices and the stocking of hatchery fish to rehabilitate the population.

Surveys have indicated that sea lampreys spawn in about 230 streams on the United States side of the Great Lakes and in a considerable number of streams on the Canadian side. Under the program already in progress, 71 streams are equipped with control devices. About 159 additional streams on Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron need to be equipped in order to eliminate the larval lampreys in all streams suitable for the spawning adults. Because the larval lampreys live in the streams for at least 5 years, and 5 generations are present, 5 years of such control measures will be required to effect a decrease in the population. In the meantime, experiments are being conducted with poisons and other techniques for the purpose of attempting to shorten that period.

The appropriation contained in the Interior bill, therefore, will permit research in this field to continue, will enable the staff to stay together, and will permit the continued operation of the control devices. Adult spawning of the eel in streams already under control can be prevented, and the length of time needed to accomplish control can be reduced.

We who are vitally concerned with the future of the fishing industry on the Great Lakes are encouarged by this action of Congress and are looking forward to the day when this program, and

the expanded international effort, will bring about the return of the lake trout and other commercial fish to the waters of the Great Lakes.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have asked why I supported the bill for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and why I did not go along with my colleagues from Nebraska on the vote. The reasons are as follows:

First. For 12 years I have been a member of the committee that has had long hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Second. We have heard more than 700 witnesses, and there has been more than 4,000 pages of testimony covering 57 subjects. Ninety percent of the testimony is favorable to statehood.

Third. The five Gallup polls conducted since 1941 all indicate a heavy percentage favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Fourth. The poll I conducted in the Fourth Congressional District this last month indicated that 75 percent felt Hawaii and Alaska should have statehood. I doubt it differs much in the other three congressional districts in the State.

Fifth. There have been 35 bills introduced on the question of statehood.

Sixth. There have been five complete investigations by congressional committees on Hawaii, the last committee headed by the late Senator Hugh Butler. The Senator himself strongly recommended statehood.

Seventh. The governors of the 11 Western States at their 1953 convention unanimously approved statehood for Hawaii.

Eighth. Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska has been advocated in the campaign platform of both political parties for many years.

Ninth. The President has recommended statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska if the so-called McKay line would be adopted. The McKay line sets aside about 40 percent of Alaska as a military reservation.

Both Territories, being incorporated, are entitled to statehood. It has been promised to them.

I am certain the question of statehood will be up again and many who have been opposed, if they study all the evidence, will see the justice of admitting Hawaii and Alaska as new States.

Fishers Island Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods.

I believe that this proposal can do much to alleviate the great damage, particularly to the eastern Connecticut shoreline, by hurricanes and severe Atlantic storms.

This proposal has already been discussed with the Corps of Army Engineers.

It appears to me to be a practical, efficient, and low-cost method of doing something soon about a grave problem.

This proposal originated with Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., who knows the area in question.

Unless the measures suggested in this bill, or something like them, are undertaken the Government is wasting money on the continual repair and maintenance on breakwaters along this part of our coastline.

I am hopeful that the appropriate committees will give this proposal the most serious consideration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Creator and gracious benefactor, in whom we live and move and have our being, inspire us to enter upon each new day with a greater reverence for life and a loftier appreciation of its priceless value and glorious purpose.

Show us how we may carry courageously all those burdens and responsibilities, which at times weigh so heavily upon us, changing them into inspirations and incentives for nobler living.

Grant that the impression and impact which we are consciously or unconsciously making upon the life of our fellow men may always be for good, enabling them to find new springs of joy and new currents of hope.

May we ever live as in Thy sight and for Thy glory and at last save us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow to file a privileged report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

GOVERNMENT SALE OF LIQUOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to give the District Alcoholic Beverage Control Board the exclusive right to sell whisky at retail in the District.

I have some figures compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress showing that last year there were 16 States operating whisky stores and that the total sales were $974,186,000. The profits were $171,260,000.

I also have a letter from the Library of Congress stating that last year in the District retail liquor stores sold approximately $75 million worth of whisky. These profits run roughly 20 percent of the total sales. If that be true, the District should realize around $20 million from the sale of whisky in the District. Under present laws the District is receiving $5,197,000 from licenses and excise taxes from those stores. So I see a great opportunity for the District to pick up between twelve and fifteen million dollars under this bill.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I am introducing today a bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill deals with the long- and short-haul provisions of the act.

I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Chairman Mitchell and the Commission's justification for this bill.

SAVE 3,500 LIVES YEARLY BY MODERNIZING INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our death-trap highways are giving and taking an awful beating.

They are the homefront battleline where human beings and motor vehicles are involved in a strange, involuntary war.

Not a day passes without casualties.

Boxcar trucks and high-speed buses and homes on wheels move in and out of the frantic flow, as drivers and pedestrians flirt with constant danger.

Automobile factories are pouring in reinforcements at a record-breaking pace—faster than overloaded highways can take care of them.

No one disputes the fact that we need more and better motor roads.

The only issue is: "How soon we can build them, and how we can pay for them."

We need different highways to serve different purposes—primary, secondary, urban, and interstate.

The States—and through them the communities, and the owners and operators of motor vehicles—are paying a large part of the current burden.

Since 1948, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has committed over half a billion dollars through bond issues and appropriations from the general highway fund for the development of an integrated highway network.

In spite of this great effort, the pressure mounts.

There are more and more cars.

They travel faster and faster on highways that fail to meet the needs of safety, convenience, and economic growth.

The automobiles and its problems are threatening to get out of hand.

We must make a mighty and constructive effort to build modern highways that will promote the free flow of traffic, while safeguarding the lives of drivers and pedestrians.

Interstate highways are the key, and thus become a matter of Federal concern: for safety and ease in travel, for economic development, and for national security.

Highway planners call it force of attraction, which is the economic stimulation of new industrial, commercial, and residential construction within 50 miles of limited access expressways.

This is imperative for older sections of the country, in order to relieve urban congestion, and to accelerate progress in the many communities that are not far from State lines.

How important this is to New England is the fact that the administration's bill is endorsed by the 6 governors of this area, 3 of whom are Republicans and 3 Democrats.

We believe that these States and their motor vehicle taxpayers are carrying more than their share of the load. Any expansion in their highway programs will require major assistance from the Federal Government.

For Massachusetts, the average annual outlay, under the administration bill, including Federal and State contributions, would be $101 million.

The accent would be on construction of interstate highways.

With the Federal Government contributing 81 million, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts providing over $2 million.

This program would take 10 years to complete, but it would be geared to carry traffic volumes 10 years hence.

In the meantime the State would have the responsibility, on an even matching basis, to build primary, secondary, and urban highways, to tie in with the interstate system.

A pay-as-you-go approach would seriously limit any State's ability to participate in a full-scale and adequate program to solve the steadily worsening highway problem.

The interstate portion of the plan must be financed almost entirely by the Federal Government, and to meet standards established by the Bureau of Public Roads, with maintenance and policing up to the States as part of their share in the cost.

I do not believe that increasing the present heavy taxes on gasoline, and on vehicles, is the best way to provide funds for this program.

The automobile is not simply for the convenience or the service of a minority.

We live in an automotive economy that affects the lives of every single inhabitant of the United States.

That being the case, a bond issue would appear to be the practical and equitable way to finance the highway expansion program, but, whatever formula is finally approved, should reflect the responsibility of all Americans for meeting a national problem.

In considering the issue before us, we must never lose sight of the fact that a first-class nation cannot run the risk of second-class roads.

GUILT BY INHERITANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Armed Services to make a thorough investigation of the case of Corp. Walter William Kulich, a member of the United States Army Reserve. I first called this case to the attention of my colleagues in the House on Monday, April 25, under special order.

I pointed out at that time that Corporal Kulich, a 22-year-old youth from Aberdeen, Wash., served 2 years in the United States Army and received an honorable certificate of separation on January 6, 1955, after which he immediately went into the Reserves. About a month later he received a letter from the Army advising him that it had on file allegations that his father was a member of the Communist Party and had attended Communist Party meetings. Corporal Kulich was given the two incredible alternatives of appearing before an Army field board in an attempt to disprove the charges against his father or quietly accepting an undesirable discharge.

Corporal Kulich subsequently was advised by an Army officer designated to assist him that it was up to him to prove his father's innocence of the charges and not up to the Army to prove his father's guilt; that the Army would not disclose to him the names of the witnesses who had supplied the information or the details of the charges; and that about all he could do at the hearing was to bring in witnesses who could testify to his father's good character and testify that his father was not a Communist. The boy knows of nothing on which the charges could be based, and has his father's word that they are not true.

The Army has informed me that it is conducting an investigation of the case. Since I first discussed the case here, the field board hearings originally scheduled for May 3 have been canceled by order of higher headquarters, but I still do not know whether or not the Army will resume its efforts to penalize this young man because of allegations against his father.

Regardless of the outcome of the proceedings against Corporal Kulich, I feel that this case should receive careful and complete investigation by a committee of the House of Representatives, because what has happened to this young man could well be happening to many other young men in our Armed Forces.

I think there is something wrong with a security system which could permit a case to start out the way this case has started out—and, of course, we still do not know how it is going to end.

One particular point I think the congressional investigation should explore is the desirability, the necessity and the constitutionality of imposing the unjust and unwarranted punishment of an undesirable discharge upon a man in Corporal Kulich's position. I seriously wonder whether it is not a violation of constitutional guaranties to draft a man into the service and then subject him to the lifetime handicap of an undesirable discharge because of something his father may have said or done or believed before the son was taken into the service.

Another question the committee should ask and answer to the satisfaction of the American people is whether it is necessary to have a security system which does not turn on the acts of the individual member of the armed services himself, but rather on the acts and associations of other members of his family. In a free America any use of a doctrine of guilt by association is bad enough; guilt by inheritance is even more intolerable.

Since I first called this case to the attention of the House, a number of my colleagues have told me of similar cases which have occurred in their own districts, involving both military personnel and civilian employees of the Government. I am convinced by what I have heard that a number of these cases should be investigated to the end that we may establish a security program which does not do violence to the basic principles of individual liberties and individual rights on which our Nation is founded.

POLIO VACCINE PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as a physician of many years' experience, I have been concerned about the many vitriolic attacks that have been made on the polio-vaccine program in the past few weeks. It seems to me, sir, that some of these attacks coming from the Democratic side of the House smack strongly of politics. It is unfortunate that anyone would seek political advantage in such a highly sensitive and technical area about a serum which we hope will protect millions of American children. These attacks have raised doubts in the mind of the American public as to the efficiency and competency of our public-health program.

In my opinion, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, has been doing an excellent job in handling this program. She is not a medical scientist. Neither are most of the Members of this House. It is only natural that she should follow the advice and counsel of her technical, scientific advisers. She is doing just that. She should be praised, not derided.

The Public Health Service has called in the finest scientific minds available for consultation on the serum problem. They have taken prompt action to make sure that every batch of polio vaccine is correct and will not bring any tragic results to the American children. Had they taken any other course of action, they would certainly be subject to severe criticism.

The production of polio vaccine is a highly technical and scientific process. It requires numerous complicated tests with mice, rabbits, monkeys, and other animals to insure the efficiency and accuracy of the vaccine. Many people have little knowledge of the subject, and, in speaking on such a question so highly technical and scientific, should remember that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." They should not, by all standards of decency, resort in attempting to get political mileage or propaganda at the expense of the health and welfare of the American families.

It is my hope that the days ahead will find fewer of my colleagues, who I am sure have little knowledge about the subject, criticizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Dr. Scheele, the efficient Director of Public Health, because they are seeking and following the counsel of the best minds available.

There will be other improvements in the polio serum—new discoveries and medicines will come in the future as in the past. They will be used to benefit mankind. The American people can feel content that there does exist a well-organized competent Health Department watching carefully over new products relating to their health. This Congress should praise and not condemn Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary, or Dr. Scheele, the able, efficient administrator of health matters.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and many other Members have paid high tribute to the REA, an organization which has, no doubt, meant as much or more than any other to the people in the rural sections of our country. I want to join with them in their praise of this outstanding program.

I fervently hope that the day will never come when this great program will be hampered, slowed down, or retarded in any way. We must continue to expand this great service, which does not cost the Government anything, but which is of such inestimable value not only to our rural areas but to our entire country as well.

When the Federal rural electrification program got under way on May 11, 1935, only 0.9 percent of all Mississippi farms and only 10.9 percent of all United States farms had electricity. Today 74.6 percent of Mississippi farms and 92.3 percent of all United States farms have this service.

Much of the progress recorded in Mississippi and the Nation can be traced directly to the REA program. In Mississippi 187,613 farms are connected to the high line; in the United States 4,965,962 REA borrowers serve about 85 percent of the farms getting service in Mississippi, and about 53 percent of those getting service in the United States.

Up to December 31, 1954, REA had approved a net total of $88,399,862 in electric loans to 27 borrowers in Mississippi, 26 of them farmer-owned cooperatives. Of this total, $71,455,957 had been advanced to the borrowers, and they had built 50,190 miles of line. These lines furnished electric power to 214,785 farms and other rural consumers.

Over 8,200 farms and other rural residents of Mississippi will get electric service for the first time as the result of loans approved by the REA in the State during calendar year 1954. Gross loans in the State in that period amounted to $4,900,000. The loan funds will be used to finance new construction and to make improvements in the electric systems to meet the increasing demand for power by Mississippi farmers and other rural people.

The record of Mississippi borrowers is generally good. The REA debt repayment summary, covering all transactions up to January 1, 1955, shows the borrowers have paid $5,747,809 in interest and repaid $11,987,513 of principal on their Government loans. This includes $2,735,617 on principal paid ahead of schedule which may be applied against future interest and principal installments.

Farmers in this State have increased their average monthly consumption of electricity from 85 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to 143 kilowatt-hours in 1954.

The first REA loan in Mississippi was approved in September 1935, and the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on February 15, 1936, by the Monroe County Electric Power Association of Amory.

Three REA-financed systems have headquarters in the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi. These are: Central Electric Power Association, Carthage; Southern Pine Electric Power Association, Taylorsville; and the East Mississippi Electric Power Association at Meridian. As of January 1, 1955, these three systems had received loans totaling $17,668,718 of which $14,925,943 had been advanced to the borrowers. The systems have 11,115 miles of line in operation serving a total of 40,676 farms and other rural establishments in the district.

In the REA rural telephone program a net total of $1,973,000 in REA loans had been approved to Mississippi borrowers as of April 1, 1955. These loans, approved to four commercial companies in the State, will make it possible for the borrowers to furnish modern telephone service to 3,771 new subscribers and provide improved service to 1,237 present rural subscribers. Funds actually advanced to the Mississippi telephone borrowers amount to $1,654,097. As of the first of January this year, the four companies had cut over eight exchanges to modern dial service. In addition to loans already approved, REA had on hand $1,023,000 in telephone loan applications from organizations in the State.

In 1950, there were 16,436 farms with telephones in Mississippi, representing 6.5 percent of the total. REA's telephone program was started that year.

I shall continue my support of this program in the hope that every rural home in our land may be reached and benefited by the wonderful service afforded by the rural electrification program.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Anfuso	Eberharter	Powell
Avery	Gamble	Preston
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gary	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Granahan	Riehlman
Burnside	Gray	Roberts
Canfield	Green, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Heselton	Short
Chatham	Hillings	Sieminski
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Morrison	Tumulty
Dawson, Ill.	Nelson	Vursell
Diggs	Norblad	Wickersham
Dingell	O'Brien, N. Y.	Young
	Pilcher	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today and to address the House on Tuesday for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6042, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that further general debate on the bill continue not to exceed 3 hours, 1 hour to be alloted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and 2 hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation at the outset to the chairman of our Army panel, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. He has been extremely fair and most constructive during the consideration of this bill in the past 3 months. Also, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] have been most helpful in the consideration of this legislation. We in the minority are grateful. I would be remiss if I failed to praise my competent and conscientious colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

I also feel it essential to say that, in my opinion, the Department of the Army for the past several years has been in good hands. The Secretary of the Army and his civilian associates have done a fine job in the management of that great Department. General Ridgway as Chief of Staff of the Army has been an outstanding leader of men and as a result, in my opinion, the Army is as strong as it has ever been in a peacetime era. Likewise, the Army budget officials, under General Lawton, have been most helpful and constructive in the manner in which they presented their budget justifications.

As was pointed out yesterday, the Army part of the budget as requested by the President totals $7,573,980,000 for the fiscal year 1956, which begins July 1, 1955. Our committee, after considerable consideration of this vast amount, decided that the figure for the fiscal year 1956 should be $7,329,818,000. This would appear to be a reduction of $244,-162,000 in new obligational authority. This figure is somewhat misleading. In reality there is a bookkeeping transaction which involves $224,626,000.

Our committee for the past 2 years, and again this year, has not gone along with the Bureau of the Budget recommendation in reference to the use of deutschemark equivalents. The Bureau of the Budget has repeatedly recommended that the Congress appropriate certain sums which were to be deposited with the Treasury so that the Treasury in turn could buy deutschemarks for the operation of our Army and other military services in Europe. Our committee has disapproved of that approach. In contrast we have given the military the authority to use the deutschemark equivalent without a comparable deposit of cash in the Federal Treasury.

In reality, therefore, the only reduction in the Army budget is $20,504,000, a rather small cutback in a budget which totals seven billion and some five hundred millions of dollars. I support the budget as recommended by this committee.

I think we ought to be cognizant of one point that is quite important. It would appear that the Army budget for fiscal year 1956 is slightly over $7 billion. That is true, as far as new obligational authority is concerned. The Army expenditure figure is more important. Army expenditures for last year, this year, and the forecast for next year are anywhere from $8.5 billion to $11 billion. When you compare Army expenditures to new obligational authority, this means that the Army for the last several years, and again for the coming year, will be living off of previously made available obligational authority. The expenditure figure is a more accurate reflection of what the Army is procuring and what the Army will procure in the future.

During the Korean war the Congress made available to the Army huge sums of money for procurement and production of heavy military equipment. This was necessary and desirable. With the termination of the Korean emergency the Army canceled certain contracts and did not let others. The net result is that a substantial amount of unused obligational authority was available to the Army. In fiscal years 1954–55 the Army has been using up this obligational authority for procurement of heavy military equipment.

It is forecast in the President's budget that at the end of fiscal 1956 there will be $1,658,000,0000 still available in this particular appropriation item. The President's budget proposed that the Congress rescind $800 million of this obligational authority and make it available to the Department of Defense for other purposes. The President's budget said that we ought to leave $858 million worth of this obligational authority available for fiscal 1957. It was the concensus of our committee that we should leave a total of $1,658,000,000 available to the Army in the production and procurement item for fiscal 1957. Therefore, on this item we have gone contrary to the President's budget recommendation. However, I should point out that in the committee report we have informed the Department of the Army officials that unless there is an emergency, which is not foreseen at the present time, that $1,658,000,000 for production and procurement should not be used during fiscal 1956, but should be reserved for fiscal 1957. I have confidence that the Department of the Army will respect our committee's recommendations. I repeat, however, that the present budget or obligational authority request is not a true reflection of the amount of hardware, military equipment that is being procured for the Army during fiscal 1955 and prospectively for fiscal 1956.

It may be well to point out at this point the unexpended balances which have been in existence and which have been forecast for the Department of the Army.

On June 30, 1954, the Department of the Army had unexpended $16.6 billion.

On June 30, 1955, 1 year later, it is forecast there will be an unexpended balance of $12 billion.

On June 30, 1956, it is estimated there will be an unexpended balance of $9.1 billion.

It might be in order to set forth for the record the unobligated balances which the Army has had and will have on various dates.

On June 30, 1954, the Army had unobligated 7.7 billion.

On June 30, 1955, it is forecast the Army will have unobligated 3.8 billion.

And a year hence, June 30, 1956, the unobligated balance forecast will be 1.7 billion.

I give you these figures to show that the unexpended balances for the Department of the Army for the last 3 years are going down. The unobligated balances are likewise being reduced. This is a creditable reflection on the management of the Department of the Army.

It has been stated in the papers on numerous occasions that because of atomic warfare techniques, the size of the Army must of necessity be increased. Various experts have stated that in this new type of warfare the size of ground forces must of necessity be expanded. I was most anxious to find out the answer to that as best I could during the hearings on this bill. I was particularly interested to find out whether the Army budget as presented for fiscal '56 was based on any strength change resulting from tests conducted on atomic warfare.

On page 107 of the Army hearings, I asked General Ridgway this question:

It is my recollection from the testimony that the Army is now in the process of making certain tests to determine whether that argument is sound or whether no changes are in order.

This referred to changes in ground forces, based on atomic warfare.

Then I continued:

I gather that the argument in favor of more rather than less has not been resolved; is that correct?

And General Ridgway replied as follows:

That is right, sir.

Later on, on the same page, I asked General Ridgway this question:

The net result being that none of that thinking is reflected in any of the figures which have been submitted for fiscal year 1956?

And General Ridgway answered:

That is correct, sir.
Either dollarwise or manpowerwise.
General RIDGEWAY. That is correct, sir.

It might well be that, at the conclusion of the various tests and exercises which are now going on, we may have to change the structure of our Army. It may well be that these tests and exercises will show we will have to expand the size of our Army, but as of now and as of the date that this budget was prepared, none of the thinking of the Army in that regard has been firmed up and consequently the problem is not reflected dollarwise or manpowerwise in this Army budget for fiscal '56.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I know the gentleman was a great help on this committee, and he has been most helpful during the consideration of this bill, but on page 107, in the very next sentence of General Ridgway's testimony which the gentleman read, there is also this:

Both are substantially smaller than our present counterparts, and we propose to reach our conclusions sometime this summer or early fall.

So, while what the gentleman said was true, the experiments are going on, and the fact is that it will be this summer or this fall that the conclusion will be reached.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the gentleman that we further explored this problem when the Army training people under General Adams were before us. It is in the record, I do not have the precise citation, that the Army will not conclude any of its exercises, nor will it make its final recommendation until January or possibly until after the first of the year 1956. That is on the record and is part of the hearings.

If you will refer to one other statement on page 108, you will see there that I asked General Ridgway this question:

Mr. FORD. Until we get the results of these field tests, which I presume are now being conducted by the Army, which you expect to finalize sometime in the fall of 1955, it is not fair to relate the arguments pro and con to the fiscal year 1956 budget?

I also quote General Ridgway's answer:

I think that is right, sir.

So, as far as this budget that we are now considering is concerned, it has no relationship to any field test or exercise the Army is now conducting in reference to future atomic warfare.

I would like to bring up at this point some of the problems which we today will have to face if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] offers one of his amendments. I understand he intends to offer an amendment to the Department of the Army budget which would call for an increase of $249,574,000. It is my further understanding that he is predicating this increase of approximately $250 million on an increase of about 89,000 in Army ground strength.

I think we ought to know that all through the hearings the Army repeatedly stated that it costs $5,500 to maintain a single soldier for a year. Three thousand two hundred dollars are required for the military pay part of this annual cost and $2,300 for what we call maintenance and operation, making a total of $5,500. If this figure is accurate, and that is the figure you can find in numerous places in the hearings, I think we ought to understand the mathematics of the gentleman's proposed amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated that he intends to make available to the Army 89,000 more men in the fiscal year 1956. If you will multiply 89,000 by $5,500, if my figuring is correct, the total amount is $489,500,000, rather than the figure of $249,574,000.

Also, if my mathematics are correct, dividing $5,500 into $249 million means that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania intends is to increase the size of the Army by 45,000-plus individuals in the year 1956 rather than the budget strength figure as proposed by General Ridgway.

There is one other matter that I think deserves consideration. It was stated in the newspapers earlier in the calendar year 1955 on numerous occasions that the Soviet military budget had been increased, I believe, by some 12 percent. I have in my hand a copy of the Washington Star for Sunday, February 13, 1955, and I ask you to look at the headlines. It reads: "Red Budget Is Deceptive—A 12-Percent Rise Is Not Necessarily So."

And let me point out, if I may, some of the statements which are made in the article to substantiate the headlines. The author of the article is Mr. Richard Fryklund, who writes:

The 12-percent increase in the Soviet military budget reported when the early figures became available, probably is only a change in bookkeeping.

He goes on to say, and I quote again:

The secret category, however, was significantly smaller; the unaccounted for expenditures had dropped 22 billion rubles, and the cuts came in the portion that was military in nature.

In other words, we do not know whether the Soviet has increased their military budget. At least, some analysts say that is not so. I have just illustrated that there are those who have studied Soviet military budgets in the past are convinced, as I read this article, that the Soviet military budget has not been increased for the current fiscal year.

There has been some comment from time to time in the press that General Ridgway had no opportunity to express his views to the President, the National Security Council, and others in authority. I refer to General Ridgway's views about the reduction of some 77,000 in the Army strength for fiscal 1956. This disturbed me. Consequently I was most anxious to find out whether General Ridgway's views were indicated to the proper authorities, including the President. On page 111 of the hearings you will find several questions by me trying to pinpoint whether or not General Ridgway's views were made known to proper authorities at the proper time. General Ridgway said:

My clear impression is, sir, that my views as Chief of Staff were known both before and after.

I had previously asked him whether his views had been known before the decision and whether his views had been known subsequent to the decision to make this reduction in the Department of the Army.

If I may, I would like to point out some things that may or may not in the mind of each of you justify the change in the size of the Army for fiscal 1956. It is a very serious decision for each Member to determine whether we should or should not decrease the size of the Army. During the long and comprehensive hearings I tried to approach the problem with an open mind and sought on every occasion to get the facts to justify or not justify the reduction in strength.

It seems to me we ought to realize these facts at the outset: As of July 1, 1955, it was originally forecast that the size of the Army would be 1,100,000. That figure has been revised so that the Army now has 2 more months in fiscal 1956 to get down to that figure. It was forecast in the President's budget for fiscal 1956 that the Army end strength for fiscal 1956 would be 1,025,000 plus 2,400 cadets at West Point. In other words, a year from now, if this budget is approved, the Army will have on July 1, 1956, 1,025,000 on active duty. Compare that, if you will, with the figure of 590,000 which the Army had on active duty as of a date just prior to the Korean war. In other words, the Army on June 30, 1956, will be almost twice as large as it was just prior to the Korean conflict.

There are 4 or 5 important facts that should be set forth so that all of us may honestly make up our own minds on what we should do on this important question. The proper utilization of manpower in the military is vital. Has the Army utilized its manpower effectively? The answer, frankly, is in the record. In the last year or so the Army has done a very commendable job in the effective use of its manpower. Certainly the situation has improved.

In 1952 a very competent and highly thought of committee of the other body prepared a report under the chairmanship of the now distinguished majority leader in that body. I have in my hands a copy of a report on the utilization of manpower by the Armed Forces. The chairman of the committee which issued the report on July 7, 1952, is the distinguished majority leader in the other body. This committee consisted of a

very outstanding group of Members, Senators from the States of Tennessee, Wyoming, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Oregon. It was a very competent group. I would like to read to you what they said in this report. What they said then about efficient military manpower utilization is applicable today. On page 2 the report says:

It has been demonstrated time and again throughout history that sheer numbers are no index of either efficiency or effectiveness.

Then this report also says on page 3:

In the field of manpower, however, our studies have produced a totally different result. Here we have found a high degree of waste—inexcusable waste—and an unconscionable amount of inefficiency. There is no reason why this waste cannot be removed to the benefit both of our defenses and our economic health.

Then it goes on to say, and this is quite interesting, on page 7:

The old Army game of using 5 men to do the work of 1 does not appear to have been discarded when the Air Force divorced the Army.

This was a good report and was very applicable and apropos in 1952. I am proud to say that I think our Army in the past 2 years has followed the advice in this report. I commend the authors of the report and the Army for taking advantage of their recommendations.

What has the Army done about efficient manpower use? The answer is on the record and it is a good record. If you will turn to page 240 of the hearings, you will find a series of questions by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] wanted information about the ratio of combat personnel to total personnel. If you will look at these figures, they are most enlightening. That table submitted by the Army shows that in 1953 the Army had 1,533,815 men on active duty. They had, out of that number, about one-third of their personnel in combat status, our total of 567,343. There noncombat personnel was as follows: 966,472. In other words, they had almost two men who were noncombat for every man that was in a combat status.

Now look at the improvement, and this is significant. In 1956, out of a total strength of 1,025,000, they will have in the combat forces 501,792. They expect to have in the noncombat forces of the Army 523,208. Just about even; almost 1 for 1. That is excellent progress. The Army has followed the suggestions of this distinguished group of men from the other body, and I commend them for it.

The actual change in 3 years is as follows: In noncombat forces the Army has gone from 966,472 to 523,208, a reduction of 443,000 plus. In the combat forces the reduction in 3 years has been 65,551. I remind you that the combat figure of 567,343 was at the height of the Korean war. Since the height of the Korean war we will have only gone down 65,551 in Army combat forces in a 3-year period. During that period the United States went from war to peace. Yes, the Army has done a good job, and I commend them for it. What they have done is cut away the fat and beefed up, in effect, their relationship of combat forces to total forces.

Let us turn to another problem that is set out on page 260 of the hearings. All during the hearings we heard repeated statements by responsible authorities in the Department of the Army that they were weeding out administrative and like jobs. If the Members will turn to page 260, they will see questions recorded there by me that I asked General Young, who is head of military personnel for the Army. I asked him to pinpoint some of these reductions. In the questions and answers on page 260 you will find that in the fiscal year 1954 and I think fiscal 1955 the Army in two areas reduced 36,000 noncombat jobs. That is a commendable record. After getting these questions and answers on the record, I asked General Young this:

During this period there has been no adverse reflection w[illegible]tever on the military or combat efficiency of the Army?

The question was asked because he had said they had reduced the need for 36,000 soldiers in the Army. General Young replied:

That is right. I might add that in these manpower surveys, and the study of tables of distribution, we have made considerable progress.

In another part of his testimony, General Young, in reference to a personnel problem, had some comments on reenlistment rates. This Congress in the last session passed legislation to increase reenlistment bonuses. The Congress thought if we could keep career people in the service, the Army would have a lesser training load, and consequently a more effective combat army. During the past several years, the Army was taking in anywhere from 400,000 to 600,000 raw recruits each year. And let me assure you that is expensive in dollars and manpower. It is an expensive luxury, because every time you take in four men as raw recruits, you have to assign, to train them, an average of one experienced soldier. If we can cut down this burdensome training load, we can cut our costs and get a more effective combat army. This reenlistment bonus is aimed at that objective. We have had surprising results in that regard.

On page 256 of the hearings we see this situation. I asked this question:

In other words, by the upsurge in your reenlistments, at least during fiscal year 1955, on the basis of those figures you will save $75 million approximately?

General YOUNG. That would be one way of expressing it. In addition, Mr. FORD, we feel our combat effectiveness has been greatly improved.

Let us turn to the testimony as shown on page 257. General Young is still the witness. He says:

That is right; yes, sir. You might almost put it this way, Mr. FORD, that because of this favorable trend—which we cannot say for sure will continue but we certainly hope it will—we possibly have achieved almost the equal of the strength of another division which we would not otherwise have accomplished.

By the simple process of paying career people more to stay in the service, in a 6-month period we had 25,000 more men stay on, which, according to General Young's testimony, is equivalent to another Army division.

Yes, I emphasize the Army has done a good job. They have cut down the fat, they have beefed up the relative position of the combat forces. We are now having a lesser training load, which means more soldiers can be in combat status.

There is another factor that ought to be considered here. What is the effect of new and better equipment? It does have a relationship to the size of your Army.

During the hearings, the chairman had before us probably one of the foremost authorities in the Department of Defense on the problem of Army planning. I refer to Major General Gavin, Assistant Chief of Staff for G–3. If you will turn to General Gavin's testimony on page 718, you will find what factors, equipmentwise, he considers to be important. The testimony indicates that in his opinion equipmentwise there are three important factors. One is firepower, the second is mobility, and the third is communications.

What does he say about our position on each score? If you will turn to page 720, you will find questions by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and answers by General Gavin.

Mr. RILEY. General, could you give me an estimate percentagewise of the increase in firepower in the Infantry in the last 10 years?

General GAVIN. I would say in the last 10 years, about 80 percent.

* * * * *

Mr. RILEY. Would the same thing apply to the mobility, or would that not be quite as great?

General GAVIN. It has been considerable.

Then he goes on and discusses other aspects of it. Further:

Mr. RILEY. And in the next 5 years if your present plans mature, the mobility would be increased considerably over the last 10 years?

General GAVIN. Yes, sir; I would say so. We will make much more progress in the next 5 years than we made in the last 10 years.

Later Mr. RILEY got into the question of communications and asked this question:

Mr. RILEY. Would that same estimate apply in the communications field, or would it not be quite so great in that field?

General GAVIN. I had not thought of it this way, but per pound of weight carried, we can probably communicate twice as far. What I am trying to say, if you double the weight you can probably get twice the range.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a man in the Department of the Army who is better qualified to discuss these three important factors, firepower, communications, and mobility.

If you will look at his testimony, you will find we have made tremendous technical progress in the last 10 years, and you will see on the record and I can assure you off the record, that the progress we have made is small compared to what

we will make in the months and years ahead.

Let us turn to another aspect of why or why not we should reduce the Army strength figures. I believe the strength of our Reserve forces is an essential factor in this overall problem. I believe all military people, certainly in the Army, concur in that observation.

Here are some figures which are important: In the Army Reserve on June 30, 1953, we had 117,000 men. On June 30, 1956, the Army Reserve expects to have 219,000. In other words, in a 3-year period the Army Reserve strength will go up 102,000.

Let us examine the National Guard figures for the same period. The Guard is an integral and important part of our national defense picture. On June 30, 1953, which was during the Korean war, the National Guard had 265,000 men in their various units. On June 30, 1956, it is estimated the National Guard will have a total of 425,000. In other words, an increase in the 3-year period of 169,000. So in a 3-year period your Reserve forces in the Army will increase 271,000, a substantial bulwarking and bolstering of our active duty Army forces.

The question has been asked, Does this Reserve Manpower Act, which the gentleman from Georgia is bringing up next week, have any bearing on the cut in the Army budget? Frankly, at the beginning, I felt it might have a bearing. However, you will find in our committee hearings testimony to the effect that it has little, if any, effect on the fiscal 1956 manpower strength or dollar figures. So whether the Congress passes or does not pass this legislation during this session, will have little, if any, impact on the budget or the strength figures for the Department of the Army in fiscal 1956.

I call your attention to the testimony of General Ridgway in reference to the effectiveness of our Reserve forces. If you will turn to page 104 of the hearings you will see I was questioning General Ridgway about the importance of our Reserve forces and their effectiveness. Here are the answers to the questions.

General Ridgway is saying:

> We think, sir, there is a steady though slow increase in the efficiency of training in the guard. I believe the same would be true, though probably to a slightly lesser degree in the Reserve due to such low strengths of the participating units.

General Milburn, who is in charge of the Reserve program, concurred on the record.

Then I asked this question:

> In other words, we can assume that aside from the number increase, there is increased effectiveness of both the Guard and the Reserve?
>
> General MILBURN. Yes, sir.

Then General Ridgway said:

> I think also, sir, there has been a steady, although again modest, increase in the training level due to our continuing efforts to get quality in our officer corps in these two civilian components.

Yes, we have not only increased the number, but we have increased the efficiency of the National Guard and the Army Reserve forces, and this does help to justify the slight reduction in active-duty forces.

We have a number of allies in this world who are as dedicated as we are to the defense of the free world against communism. I am glad we have them. Right after World War II it became our policy to help them militarily and economically. Frankly, right now we are beginning to get some results.

Let me point out that several days ago Adm. Arthur W. Radford told a committee in the other body, "The military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States defense program."

As you probably know in the foreign-aid budget for fiscal 1956, the President has requested $1,700,000,000 to help our allies by providing equipment so that they could join us in this fight for freedom against communism. Do you realize how much we have paid in foreign military aid—not economic aid—in the past 5 years? Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel testified before the same committee of the other body just a couple of days ago and said that Uncle Sam has paid $11 billion to build up the military strength of our allies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Anfuso	Gamble	Preston
Avery	Gordon	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Granahan	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Green, Pa.	Riehlman
Buckley	Gubser	Roberts
Burdick	Heselton	Roosevelt
Canfield	Hinshaw	Short
Celler	Jackson	Sieminski
Chatham	Keating	Smith, Miss.
Christopher	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Morrison	Teague, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Mumma	Tumulty
Diggs	Norblad	Wickersham
Dingell	Norrell	Young
Dorn, S. C.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zelenko
Eberharter	Pilcher	
	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6042, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 381 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the quorum call, I was discussing the interrelationship of the military-aid program and our own military budget. I indicated that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, several days ago, in testifying before a committee of the other body, had said:

> The military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States Defense Department program.

The headline of this newspaper article says: "Radford Says Aid Cuts Size of United States Forces."

I had just brought out at that time that Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel had told a committee in the other body that in the last 5 years Uncle Sam had contributed $11 billion in military aid for our allies.

Included in the foreign-aid budget for fiscal 1956 is another $1,700,000,000 for military aid and assistance to our allies who are joined with us in this effort to stop communism over the world.

How have we as a nation benefited from this $11 billion expenditure? We now have in being 20 South Korean divisions, plus 1 marine regiment, and certain ROK reserve forces. The money we have spent in South Korea has been vast, but definite results have accrued. For example, General Ridgway testified in the hearings that when he was there he had only 10 South Korean divisions, and they were poorly trained and not entirely adequate. Our funds and equipment have doubled the size and effectiveness of the ROKs. In turn, we can revise our own forces.

So we spend money for our allies but we have gotten results. We have gotten good, strong foot soldiers who can do the job in the far corners of the earth better than ours, giving us as a Nation responsibility to use our talents in the air and on the sea where we are best equipped and best qualified.

We do not have them now, but we will in a relatively short time, maybe a year, a year and a half, or two years, have 12 crack German Army divisions. We expect to have in the not too far distant future a total German Army, Navy, and Air Force of some 500,000. Uncle Sam has already provided most of the equipment for this potentially powerful German military machine.

In addition, we expect to have in being, and I think the record can probably show, at least the newspapers have indicated, substantial Japanese ground forces. We expect to have between 10 and 12 divisions by taking those fine soldiers in Japan, ground soldiers, and adding them to the free world forces. It permits us as a Nation to concentrate our efforts in the air and on the sea.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Will my friend tell us when we expect to have 10 or 12 divisions of Japanese troops? I am afraid he is going to find that is as far distant as the German forces which, by General Gruenther's statement, are about 4 years in the future. I said yesterday 2 to 4, putting the best figure I could on it. My dear friend knows I have the highest regard for him, and I am not trying to disrupt his statement, but I believe his statement of 10 to 12 divisions is an optimistic one, certainly if he means at any near time.

Mr. FORD. I would say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that whether we call the 110,000 Japanese police force divisions or a police force,

they are a decided improvement over the days following World War II, when the Japanese Army was completely disbanded. I am not saying that the Japanese Army has today or will have in 6 months 10 to 12 divisions, but they have around 110,000 of what they call a Japanese police force, which I think could do a pretty creditable job. They are easily transferable to strong, effective army units.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I came in a little late and have not heard all of the very fine presentation the gentleman from Michigan is making. I am just wondering whether the gentleman has pointed out the fact that the completion of the Austrian Treaty will relieve 15,000 American soldiers who can be used elsewhere and brought back home.

I also wonder whether the gentleman has called to the attention of the House a statement made by General Ridgway, which will be found on the bottom of page 81 of the Department of the Army hearings, in which, discussing the increased manpower and firepower of World War II divisions, he said:

> We could beef up the firepower on a percentage basis of our divisions 500 percent or maybe 10,000 percent, by putting a few of these atomic weapons in the division. They are not in the division today, as you know, sir.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the very constructive and most helpful comments of the gentleman from Kansas. That is important information which, I think, the House should know because it does involve whether or not we should approve the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. I think we ought to remember that over the past 5 years, we, as a Nation, have spent over $11 billion in foreign military aid plus sizable amounts of foreign economic aid and assistance. It was predicated and based on the theory, and I hope the practice, that as our friends and allies around the world beefed up and bolstered their military strength in areas and in fields where they can do the best job—on the ground—we, as a Nation, could concentrate our forces in the skies and on the waters. That is what this budget is based on today. It accentuates our air power. It accentuates continental defense program for protection of our own people.

Yes; I think the issues will be clearly drawn later this afternoon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania intends to offer an amendment adding $249 million for the Army which, according to my mathematical calculations, would put on active duty approximately 44,000 or 45,000 more men in the Army. If that figure is correct the strength will not be up to what some people in the Department of the Army feel is necessary. If you put it up to the figure which General Ridgway, I believe, thinks is necessary, you will have to add to the present budget $489 million in 1 year and not $250 million. If you approve the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you must realize that the draft call by the Selective Service will go up so far as the monthly requirements are concerned from 10,000 to anywhere between 15,000 and 20,000. Yes; are you going to increase the call of the draft in order to increase the size of the Army when the President of the United States, probably, the greatest military expert we have in the world today, when Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when Admiral Carney, of the Navy, when General Sheperd, Commandant of the Marines, and General Twining, of the Air Force, are all on record endorsing this budget? It is a serious responsibility for each and every one of us but I say you have to weigh on the scales the extra cost of some $250 million to $480 million plus a doubling of your selective-service call against the military and civilian judgment of the men I have mentioned, the President, and the various members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, permit me at the outset, as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who has presided over our work and our deliberations during the past year. He has been eminently fair and he commands the deep respect of each and every member of the committee, not only for the method and manner in which he handles the affairs of this important committee, but for his many courtesies and his consideration of the other members. May I also pay tribute to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who is the ranking Republican member with whom I have served on the Navy panel during the past 3 or 4 years. I should also like to pay tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the distinguished chairman of the Navy panel, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a long and distinguished career as a member of this committee, particularly his devotion, his applied knowledge, and his application to the problems dealing with our Navy. I am sure I need not tell the Members of this House of the tremendous responsibilities that go with the work of this important subcommittee. Hearings, as you well know, begin early in the year and last anywhere from 4 to 5 months, hearings dealing with the vast operations involving our Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, this is concededly a difficult period for military planning. We must have enough military might to protect ourselves against aggression, yet not so much that it will topple our economy. We must make maximum use of the terrible destructive power of nuclear weapons, while conserving what is indispensable in our traditional forces and concepts. We must be ready for massive retaliation in the event of attack, while enabling a maximum number of our people to enjoy the blessings of peaceful pursuits. And always, we must bear in mind that our ultimate objective is not war but peace. Thus, it is a period of transition in military planning, and subject to all of the stresses and strains, difficulties and misunderstandings that such a period entails.

In considering the bill before us, it is imperative to bear in mind the concepts of military planning enunciated by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson. Let me repeat them here. Very briefly, he said in part:

> The forces envisaged in this long-range program of the Department of Defense constitute by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time. With the incorporation into our Military Establishment of the new weapons that we have developed, they constitute a force of tremendous striking power. We believe that this program developed over many months represents the general order of magnitude of the size forces that the country can effectively maintain, can improve, on a qualitative basis, and that the economy of the country can continue to support.

Mr. Chairman, within that framework, then the Committee's recommendations envision new spending authority for the coming fiscal year of $31.4 billion. This amount, together with obligated and unobligated balances, will provide the Department with total funds available for expenditure in the coming year of $74.6 billion.

The committee has become increasingly concerned with the size of the carryover funds, which now measurably exceed the annual appropriations. They are, in part, the result of the transitional planning to which I referred earlier, but they also reflect the tendency on the part of the Department, to ask for more than it needs, and to squirrel away what it cannot immediately use. To the extent that the carryover cover financing of long-lead items or are essential to the maintenance of industrial-type activities, they are, of course, essential. But the committee believes they have grown far beyond that point, and should be reduced.

It was brought to the committee's attention, for example, that the Department last December transferred to its stock and industrial funds over a billion dollars in unexpended moneys, although it had foreseeable need for only a limited part of that money. The committee has therefore provided that further transfers of currently available funds be made only with its approval, and that future justifications contain adequate explanation of all proposed plans and programs of stock and industrial operations. In addition, it has ordered recission of $1,649,000,000 in working capital funds. This represents cash sequestered by the Department in excess of needs for activities operated on revolving fund principles.

It should be pointed out that the greatest opportunities for economies in

the maintenance of our large defense establishment exist in the field of procurement, and almost half the total sum recommended for appropriation for fiscal 1956 is for procurement. The existence of large, unobligated carryovers does more than dull the appetite for economy; it whets the tendency to overbuy and overspend. In this respect, a leaner budget is a better budget for all concerned.

Other members of the committee have dwelt at some length on the funds provided for the Army and Air Force. As a member of the Navy panel, I would like to point out some salient features of the bill affecting the Navy and Marine Corps.

Reflecting the overall policy enunciated by the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy Thomas has described our present naval policy as comprised of seven essential elements: namely, First, capacity for massive retaliation of a magnitude not only to deter war but to overwhelm the attacker; second, a hard core of mobile land, sea, and air forces, capable of withstanding the initial onslaught of an enemy assault; third, sea supremacy; fourth, a continental defense program; fifth, a quickly expandable reserve program; sixth, an industrial mobilization base designed for rapid expansion; and seventh, research and development to maintain our lead in weapons.

In furtherance of these objectives, the committee has recommended the appropriation of $9,180,157,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps for fiscal 1956. While this is about a half billion less than funds for the current year, the appropriation will provide for an increased shipbuilding and conversion program; an increase in size and power of the naval air arm; and higher pay for personnel as envisioned in the Career Incentive Act.

It envisions a fleet of 1,001 ships, with measurable improvement in their capabilities as the result of the acquisition of new, and newly converted vessels. About 100 vessels will be retired. A shipbuilding and conversion program, contemplated in the bill, will provide 34 new ships and vessels in future years, including a fifth carrier of the *Forrestal* class, 8 submarines, of which 3 will be nuclear-powered, and 13,370 tons of landing craft. The bill also provides for conversion of 28 ships and vessels.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman refers to the retirement of 100 vessels in 2 years, 65, I think, in the fiscal year 1956. Is it not a fact that the record indicates that those vessels are small type landing craft and similar small ships which can be taken out of mothballs and put into active duty again if necessary within 30 days time?

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in that statement, and I think it is important to note that the retirement of these vessels only means that they can readily and quickly be utilized in case of emergency.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, it is also true that of the proposed ships to be retired, the 100 ships to be retired, over 90 percent are amphibious ships or amphibious small boats which are necessary and essential for the Marine Corps in amphibious operations. Is that not true?

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is true, but they can be readily available for use if and when necessary.

Admiral Carney's estimate of this program is that it will improve the Navy's air striking power; maintain our submarine and antisubmarine capabilities, with possible improvements as a result of new developments; maintain essentially the same offensive and defensive capabilities in the mine forces, and curtail in some measure the staying power of the fleet.

I should like to bring forcibly to the attention of the Members of the House that the Navy plays an important role in our air defense and with respect to naval air the bill envisions 10,061 daily operating aircraft out of a total of 13,027 active planes. That is in the Navy alone. It makes available approximately $7 billion in these funds and carryovers for the procurement of approximately 1,600 aircraft for the Navy.

As provided in earlier legislation, there will be reductions in personnel in both the Navy and the Marine Corps, with the Navy reducing its forces by 54,000 men in the coming year, to provide strength of 657,000 by the end of June 1956. The Marine Corps will be reduced by 8,000 in the coming year, for an end strength in June 1956 of 193,000. It is significant and laudable that the major part of these reductions will be accomplished through cuts in supporting forces, rather than combat forces, although some reductions will be accomplished through the retirement of vessels in the active fleet and a moderate reduction in fleet-manning levels.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. In reference to the Navy, may I ask a question on section 639, which says:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense.

What is the intention of the committee as to the words "traditionally performed?" Is that any work that is at the present time performed by a naval or military installation?

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman's point is well taken. Perhaps we should accept the word "traditional" in the general meaning of the term. That is, general custom or the general habits or the practice. I shall be happy to yield to the member of the committee who is familiar with the purpose of the amendment, namely, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. I am sure he has some comment as to the meaning, the intent and purpose of the language.

Mr. SIKES. I think my good friend from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has very well analyzed the meaning of the word "traditional." It is, of course, intended to convey something that is customary, something that has been done for a number of years. It would be difficult to put a time limit on it, but I would have no objection if the House wants to write in 3 or 5 years to tie it down. When you say "traditional", you mean something that is customary.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Does that answer the question ?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I again point out that these reductions that I have referred to are in line with the policies projected by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense on the basis of world conditions, on the basis of new weapons and on the basis of changing concepts of military strategy.

In line, also, with these policies is the provision of funds to permit further expansion of naval and Marine Corps reserve organizations.

On the whole, Mr. Chairman, the bill before you will provide the necessary armed strength and security for our country in the immediate future. It lays the groundwork for the new directions which our strategic planning must take in the light of new weapons now becoming available to us. It gives due recognition, I am sure, to the impact of our Military Establishment on our domestic economy, and it provides a program that is both durable and endurable, a program that will encourage our friends and a program that will discourage our enemies, and, above all, give confidence and security to the people of these great United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have had an opportunity as a member of this committee to bring this important bill to you, and I hope that these funds and this appropriation and this measure will warrant the wholehearted support of the Members of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, for approximately 5 hours we have been debating the defense appropriation bill for 1956, and I am quite sure that some Members perhaps are growing weary and tired. However, those of us who are charged with the responsibility of trying to justify a $31.5 billion defense budget, approximately 75 percent of the national budget, feel very heavily the responsibility of trying to at least place in the RECORD sufficient evidence to warrant our stewardship.

Mr. Chairman, it is a significant honor to serve with the other 14 members of the subcommittee handling the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956.

For many long weeks, we have labored together. Our hearings began on January 31 and continued through April 1, meeting almost every day from 10 o'clock

in the morning until 5 o'clock and later in the afternoon.

The chairman of our Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman MAHON, who likewise served as chairman of our Air Force panel on which I was honored to serve, has inspired all of us as we shared together the responsibility in trying to evaluate the problems and the policy which determine the size and role of our military establishments.

To the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the Congress, the administration, and the country, owes a great debt of gratitude as the House begins to consider this defense budget.

My other 14 colleagues on the committee brought to our deliberations an intelligent knowledge of our overall national policy as well as an understanding of the detailed programs and problems upon which that policy depends.

The ramifications of the Department of Defense and this defense budget staggers the imagination in size and complexity. You feel a terrific responsibility. While the total pages of any hearing are not conclusive evidence of a job well done, yet our hearings will reveal that in no previous hearings have Department of Defense witnesses ever faced a more severe probing.

The overall Department of Defense hearings consists of 826 pages of testimony, the Army hearings involve 1,538, the Navy 1,241, and the Air Force 1,544. A total of 5,149 pages. This does not include off-the-record testimony which would increase the evidence by at least 3,000 pages.

I am reasonably sure that the American people have no conception of the tremendous influence, economically and politically, that is involved by the appropriation in this defense budget. It not only concerns America, but the international projections are highly significant.

This committee is certainly the custodian of not only many military secrets but our recommendations and the actions of this House on this budget will have exceedingly far-reaching implications.

EVALUATING THE TESTIMONY

It is not an easy matter to evaluate all this evidence, yet that is our responsibility to the membership of this House and to the American people. We could only hope that each Member of the House would take the time to carefully review the hearings and submit to our chairman and the executive secretaries of our panels your views on how we may improve upon our craftsmanship.

Speaking of our executive secretaries, I certainly feel greatly indebted to Samuel W. Crosby, who served as executive secretary to our Air Force panel, and also Ralph Preston, of our Air Force committee staff. Each of the panels is served by dedicated public servants.

Mr. Chairman, before we can justify a budget we should determine what is the policy and the program upon which this budget is based. I conceive it our duty to keep in mind these objectives as we think of the entire national defense budget.

It is the duty of your committee—

To relate the budget to the policy and programs which are designed to secure the national defense;

To improve the budget procedures;

To control the expenditure of funds;

To bring about better organization of the Department of Defense in order to promote economy and efficiency; and

To insure that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines have the capability of performing their missions.

It was with these objectives in mind that your Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations came to grips with the Department of Defense budget estimates.

And, Mr. Chairman, if we have failed, as members of the committee, to reach those objectives, then we have not finished our task.

OVERALL NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

The program that the military budget makes possible is only one factor in the general pattern of defense that the United States has developed to meet the problem of national defense and to preserve the ideological integrity of the Western World.

Since our objective is to prevent war and to insure peace, we shall use every measure short of war to maintain stable international relations.

This national concept was further amplified in the words of George Washington wherein it was laid down that the United States would not become involved in entangling foreign alliances. For 150 years we have held to this fundamental precept.

In the 19th century it was crystal clear how this could be defined and implemented, first, because of the lack of communication; and, second, the United States in its infancy was not involved in international struggles based on conflicts of race, ideologies, or religion.

During and since World War II the struggle continues to control the minds of men and nations. Within recent years our Government has attempted to develop a national policy to protect the country and still adhere to the fundamental principles expressed by George Washington. It is not as simple as before.

It has been said that war is an instrument of national policy, but I think we are able to calculate that the consequences of a thermonuclear war practically rule out this method of settling international disputes since a total atomic war would destroy even the institutions and the way of life we are seeking to preserve. We have, therefore, emphasized collective security arrangements with our allies, foreign aid, the United Nations as an international forum for the discussion and possible settlement of disputes, the control of subversive activities within the Nation, and the necessity for a healthy economy.

Our course is still one of walking down the tightrope of pursuing a policy of nonaggression, endeavoring to maintain adequate striking power to counter aggression successfully in sufficient time and without becoming overembroiled in compromising basic philosophies.

President Monroe, our fifth President, defined American policy when he said:

> The United States would consider any foreign power establishing a foothold in this continent as an active aggression against the United States.

We have for a long time adhered to this principle. In the 19th century our frontier was clearly defined as our shoreline. In modern times this frontier, not within the definition of international law, but within the concept thereof we have been pushed across the oceans when thinking of our own national security and in order to effectively protect our shorelines. This is readily apparent when you think of supersonic jet speeds, intelligence reports, and the fact that communism has conquered approximately one-fourth of the land area of the world and approximately one-third of the people of the world.

Added to this is the growing military capability of communism, which is evident in their possesson of thermonuclear bombs and planes to deliver them on western targets. We are aware, perhaps more acutely than when these words were first spoken by Jefferson that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Our Military Establishment is a necessary part of a vigilant attitude, and if we think of it as a kind of police force in being to maintain order in the international community, we can see that its strength and efficiency constitute strong deterrents to any would-be aggressor. Or to put this point another way—without such military strength we could not be as successful in using diplomatic, economic, and political methods to attain our security objectives.

The overall policy which determines the size and shape of the Military Establishment is of primary concern to the Appropriations Committee. Secretary Wilson testified with regard to the military forces required for this policy:

> The maintenance of these forces and their qualitative improvement will require expenditures over an indefinite period of years of many billions of dollars.

We know that our national security policy has been determined by the President, the National Security Council, and insofar as military matters are concerned, has been influenced by the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Thus we have as many safeguards as we can devise in formulating overall policy. But the policy cannot be implemented unless funds are appropriated. The Congress must insist upon a close interrelationship between these factors—the policy, the program, and the budget. It is not only a question of having an adequate Military Establishment to underwrite our policy; it is also a question of having an adequate policy to underwrite our national security.

EVERY NATION FREE UNDER GOD

The United States wants peace in the world. We have made our peaceful intentions very clear. While our servicemen are stationed in every country of the world, we have no desire and neither are we trying to impose our will upon any nation. Wherever our forces are

today, they have been invited. There is no colonization. We want every nation to be free under God.

THE MILITARY PROGRAM

The size of the Armed Forces, and the reasoning which led to the conclusion that our active duty strength should be set at approximately 2,949,000 by June 30, 1955, was set forth in a letter by President Eisenhower to Secretary of Defense Wilson on January 5, 1955. The President was concerned with the minimum defensive structure that should be supported by the Nation in line with our long-term security. We cannot maintain such large standing forces that our economy would be impaired, and therefore it has been decided that the active duty strength will be built up qualitatively with a maximum dependence on science and technology. A substantial portion of the budget has been allotted to research and development. Our military forces are to be mobile so that they can be rapidly deployed from the continental United States in the event of war. In addition, the Regular forces may be augmented by the armed strength of our allies with whom we have collective security agreements, as well as by our own trained Reserves who will ultimately number 2.9 million under the proposed national Reserve plan.

Under the current plans made possible by the 1956 fiscal budget, the total military strength of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force will be reduced to 2,859,000 by June 30, 1956. The actual end strength for fiscal 1954 was 3,302,100, while the estimate for fiscal 1955 is 2,961,300. After the annual printed budget was submitted, there was an increase in personnel that was approved in the total amount of 35,000. This provided an additional 25,000 for the Army; 7,000 for the Navy; and 3,000 for the Marine Corps. In addition to this increase, the committee recommended that 4,400 ROTC officers who graduate during the fiscal year but cannot be absorbed under the national Reserve plan, be given their commissions.

Successive reductions in the Army for the last 3 fiscal years show an actual strength of 1,404,600 as of June 30, 1954, and an estimated strength of 1,114,000 as of June 30, 1955. The projected strength of 1,027,000 by June 30, 1956 was somewhat changed on April 19, 1955 when Secretary Wilson said that the reduction in Army personnel would be somewhat slower than had been planned. By June 30, 1955 the Army will have 1,125,000 rather than 1,102,000—the lower figure will not be reached until 2 months later. This will permit the Army to have 15 combat divisions, 11 regiments, and 135 antiaircraft battalions. Three training divisions will also be available to implement the Army's new divisional rotation program.

The actual strength of the Navy for June 30, 1954 was 725,720, while the current estimate for June 30, 1955 is 672,353. By June 30, 1956 it is expected that naval strength will have been cut to 664,035. Carrier air groups will increase from 16 to 17, a new carrier will be added to the fleet, and 15 antisubmarine warfare squadrons will be kept in readiness. Over $1.3 billion is being made available for building new ships and modernizing old ones. In addition, the Navy will have 13,000 aircraft, 10,000 of which will operate in the Navy, the Marine Active and Reserve Air units.

Comparable statistics for the Marine Corps indicate that on June 30, 1954, the active strength was 223,868; by June 30, 1955, it was estimated that this figure would be cut to 205,000. The projected strength of the Marines by June 30, 1956 is 193,000. The Department estimates, however, that this strength will enable the marines to maintain 3 air wings and 3 combat divisions.

On the other hand, neither the budget nor the military posture it provides would be sufficient to take care of a war of the Korean type—additional funds would have to be requested. We cannot guarantee with this program that we can assure the people of 100 percent continental air defense against nuclear attacks, but that is a matter not merely of money and men, but of technological developments and time. The budget does include a substantial strengthening of this important element in our defense. Actually the military program seems to be considered adequate if the international situation continues along pretty much as at present, and is sufficient to take care of the beginning of a bad situation. But as Admiral Radford testified, new intelligence information of any attack or any serious deterioration in the international situation would necessitate an increase in our military strength and consequently in our appropriations.

The underlying idea upon which our defense system rests was stated by the President in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 6, 1955. After noting that the military threat of increasing Communist nuclear strength was only one menace to our freedom and security—a situation which requires many counteracting methods—the President said:

> To protect our nations and our peoples from the catastrophe of a nuclear holocaust, free nations must maintain countervailing military power to persuade the Communists of the futility of seeking to advance their ends through aggression. If Communist rulers understand that America's response to aggression will be swift and decisive—that never shall we buy peace at the expense of honor or faith—they will be powerfully deterred from launching a military venture engulfing their own peoples and many others in disaster. Now this, of course, is a form of world stalemate. But in this stalemate each of us—every American—may and must exercise his high duty to strive in every honorable way for enduring peace.

The military strength of the Air Force reflects a slight increase. On June 30, 1954, the actual strength of the Air Force was 947,900; on June 30, 1955, the estimated strength figure is 970,000; and by June 30, 1956 it is expected that the number will reach 975,000. The Air Force is scheduled to build up to its 137-wing target strength with 975,000 men, and although this is an increased personnel figure during the last 3 years, it represents quite a reduction from the former plan of having 143 wings with 1,210,000 men. It is not expected that we shall attain the 137-wing goal until June 30, 1957.

This gives us some idea of the strength of our forces and the amount of materiel they will have available to accomplish their missions. They must be ready to defend the United States in line with our continental defense system, and be capable of carrying out a retaliatory attack against enemy aggression. It will be necessary for the Navy to keep open and protect the sea lanes and to be prepared to use its carrier-based planes. The Army must be able to take care of any conflicts that might develop on land, not only in limited wars or local aggressions, but also in the initial phases of a war that threatened to be global.

What can we expect from this military posture, and, even more importantly, what must we not expect? Admiral Radford said that the program would permit us to make stable plans on a long-term basis, to take care of the initial phases of a global war, to launch a retaliatory attack, to have mobile forces to supplement indigenous troops, and to meet local aggressions. This policy means, of course, that there is an increased emphasis on air power. And this fact, in turn, presents a grave responsibility to the Congress in considering the appropriations for the Air Force. Having been a member of the subcommittee that dealt with the Department of the Air Force appropriations for fiscal 1956, I feel a special concern about reporting the progress of our work to the House.

KEY WEST AGREEMENT

As you will recall the mission given to the Air Force by the Key West agreement of 1948 to gain and maintain general air supremacy is a gigantic task, considering the space involved and the increasing air strength of the sworn enemies of our way of life. Associated with the increasing air strength of any potential enemy is the tremendous increase in the destructive capability of the elements of that force, requiring a degree of alertness and readiness that has never before been approached in peacetime.

THE NEW AIR FORCE MISSION

The vital importance of the time element in any future conflict necessitates a departure from the old concepts; time will not permit the traditional dispersion of trained forces to form the nuclei of new units for training and subsequent committal to the operations in progress. The units must be capable of immediate commitment to battle, either in place or after deployment to their preselected wartime location.

To overcome the time factor, the Air Force must preposition certain personnel and supplies in overseas units during peacetime. These units have many and varied responsibilities. Among these are the maintenance of—

First. An air warning net.

Second. An immediately available air defense, strategic, and tactical air capability.

Third. A base complex to accommodate additional forces to be deployed from the Zone of the Interior.

Fourth. A headquarters and logistics structure to direct and support the operations.

Fifth. Facilities to conduct airlift operations, including aeromedical evacuation of patients, for the Department of Defense.

Sixth. Facilities to perform air rescue, weather, air traffic, communications security, and airways communications functions.

Seventh. Facilities to test high-yield weapons and the operational suitability of material under extremely cold weather conditions.

Eighth. Support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, military assistance advisory groups, military missions, and military attachés.

In accomplishing these missions, the Air Force will have approximately a quarter of a million men in uniform overseas by the end of fiscal year 1956; another 15,000 will be in transient status to and from overseas to support this deployment. These men are to be stationed in practically every country in the world, with the personnel strengths ranging from a single attaché to complete combat-ready forces. Geographically, the majority will be in the European and far Atlantic areas, the Far East, and Pacfiic areas, and the northern periphery of the United States. Additional forces will be maintained in the southern and near Atlantic areas. These programs are tied directly to the overall implementation of the 137-wing Air Force by end of fiscal year 1957.

AIR FORCE PROGRAM

The main operations that the Air Force must be prepared to perform, and we must insure that appropriations are adequate to result in these capabilities, are concerned with first, the Strategic Air Command; second, the Tactical Air Command; third, continental defense; fourth, the airlift, and various support functions. The subcommittee heard extensive testimony on the recent progress and present degree of readiness of these vital parts of the Air Force.

The testimony indicated that the readiness and quality of the Strategic Air Command are constantly improving. The retaliatory forces of this command are on a 24-hour alert basis, and it seems indisputable that the preparedness of our striking forces has been a major factor, indeed we might say the main reason, in preventing any major military aggression.

Our medium-bomber wings have been 80 percent converted from B–29 and B–50 planes to the B–47 jets, and will be 100-percent jet-propelled by the end of 1955.

The long-range B–52 bombers are adding to our strategic bombing power because of their increased speed, range, and combat ceiling.

A new jet tanker makes it possible to refuel the B–52's in the air and thus frees the Strategic Air Command from dependence on bases that are not located in the United States.

As for the base situation, it is clear that this is a problem that must remain uppermost in the minds of the committee members as we determine ways and means of increasing the number of bases and assuring their dispersal.

In addition to these measures, there is a high-priority program for the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear airplanes.

In considering the adequacy of the appropriations for this program, the subcommittee realizes that there are two sides to this coin; one is the capability of the striking force, the other is the equally important capability of the defensive Continental Air Force. We recognize, as the committee report points out, that—

> The strength of our Air Force at present rests more on counteroffensive capability than actual defense.

This situation seems to be inevitable at this particular juncture of affairs as we have been going from a point in time when the United States had a monopoly on nuclear weapons into a period when our possible enemies have also developed the means of striking at our own country. The committee intends to adopt all possible measures to insure that this gap is closed. The existence of strong defensive air forces will be just as great a deterrent to enemy attack as fear of retaliation.

The Continental Air Defense Command is therefore being strengthened through the appropriation of funds to improve our early warning net, to develop fighter aircraft and guided missiles as a protection against enemy planes, and to improve the communication and control system which connects the weapons system with the early warning network.

The Tactical Air Command is also being programed to increase its capability for offense and defense. The new fighter-bomber aircraft are coming off the lines and have been built so they can be equipped with nuclear weapons.

In view of the fact that the size and equipment of our Armed Forces are determined in accordance with requirements for mobility and flexibility, the airlift operation must be developed to the point where essential needs can be met. If we are prepared to transport only troops to some trouble spot, the meaning of mobility would be lost if we could not also supply these troops.

It would certainly appear that in the buildup of MATS, high priority should be given to the problem of logistics. This is an example of the type of problem that cannot be solved merely by the appropriation of funds; it also requires determination on the part of the Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see that a program is worked out in accordance with various types of military situations that might have to be met.

THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

Because I served on the Air Force panel that is responsible for the Air Force budget, I would like to give a brief account of the progress that has been made in reviewing their policy, programs, and expenditures.

It is not possible, of course, to consider the Air Force in isolation from the other services. It must first be related to the total defense budget and our strategy for national security.

To put the matter briefly, I know that you want answers to the same questions the subcommittee asked.

Why has the Defense Department and particularly the Air Force requested a budget of this size?

What have they asked for?

Will the appropriation result in a Defense Establishment that is capable of protecting the vital interests of the United States?

Our chairman, Mr. MAHON; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], chairman of the Army panel; the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], chairman of the Navy panel; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee; and other members of the committee have spoken for the overall appropriations recommended in the bill for the budget year 1956. As a part of my remarks, I will insert a summary of the appropriations for 1955, the budget estimate for 1956, and the amount recommended in the bill before you, and will limit my remarks to the Department of the Air Force.

Summary of appropriations

Title	Appropriations, 1955	Budget estimates, 1956	Recommended in bill, 1956	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1955	Budget estimates, 1956
Title I—Office of the Secretary of Defense	$12,750,000	$12,750,000	$12,400,000	−$350,000	−$350,000
Title II—Interservice activities	527,500,000	[1] 682,250,000	672,250,000	+144,750,000	−10,000,000
Title III—Department of the Army	7,619,066,986	[1] 7,573,980,000	7,329,818,000	−289,248,986	−244,162,000
Title IV—Department of the Navy	9,712,823,500	[1] 9,180,157,000	9,071,834,000	−640,989,500	−108,323,000
Title V—Department of the Air Force	10,927,930,000	[1] 14,783,678,000	14,401,904,000	+3,473,974,000	−381,774,000
Total	28,800,070,486	[1] 32,232,815,000	31,488,206,000	+2,688,135,514	−744,609,000

[1] Includes $827,815,000 in H. Doc. 145 as follows: Interservice Activities, $55,000,000; Army, $284,980,000; Navy, $234,157,000; Air Force, $253,678,000.

NOTE.—In addition to the above reduction, the following rescissions are made: Construction of ships, Navy (1948-1951 programs), $8,572,000 prior contract authorization; Working Capital Funds, $1,649,000,000, as follows: Army, $700,000,000; Navy, $469,000,000; Marine Corps, $25,000,000; Air Force, $455,000,000.

THE AIR FORCE MUST ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

A study of the hearings will, I feel, reveal the fact that the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott; the Chief of Staff, General Twining; the Director of the Air Force Budget, General Bogart; and their associates, civilian and military, in the Department of the Air Force are making every honest effort to achieve economies.

On the other hand the officials of the Department of the Air Force must assume a heavy responsibility in the acceptance of approximately 50 percent of the total defense dollar. The 1957 budget estimates will reveal whether or not the application of the new program of financial management in the Department of the Air Force is what it is claimed to do; namely, effect economies and savings.

AIR FORCE BUDGET

The budget requests for the Air Force are based upon reaching a 137-wing goal by 1957 with 975,000 military and 330,000 civilian personnel. By the end of fiscal 1956, it is anticipated that we shall have 131 wings which is well in advance of scheduled plans. The Air Force estimates came to $14,783,678,000 which included a supplemental request of $253,678,000 to take care of the cost of the personnel benefits contained in the Career Incentive Act of 1955. These requests total $3,855,748,000 more than the Congress appropriated for fiscal 1955 to cover the same operations.

After all these requests were considered, both by the subcommittee and the full committee, a recommendation was made to appropriate $14,401,904,000 which is $381,774,000 less than the Department requested, but $3,473,974,000 more than the amount granted by Congress for fiscal 1955. The committee considered that these amounts were adjustments rather than reductions inasmuch as they permit a closer relation between dollar requirements and the planned program but at the same time do not interfere with the expansion of the Air Force to the desired strength goals.

The problem of relating funds and program occupied much of the subcommittee's time, the acute point being the large amount of carryover funds. While this is a problem that concerns the entire Department of Defense, and all three of the armed services, it was natural that the Subcommittee on Air Force Appropriations should ask searching questions with regard to the practice in that Department. The reason for the subcommittee's concern is easy to understand: If the members approve the expenditure of vast sums of money which are said to be necessary for the national defense, and then find that year after year the estimates of what is needed are billions of dollars in excess of what is spent, and that these funds are carried over from fiscal year to fiscal year; then it might appear that either the committee has been lax in looking into the true situation—or it is permitting loose fiscal practices in the Pentagon—or the Congress is losing control of the programs by the time the money is actually being spent. There must be some explanation of this situation and some means of bringing it under control, especially during a time when the Nation is not in a shooting war and when the overall policy is based upon leveling off for the long pull.

AIR FORCE CARRYOVER

The Air Force indicated that in its no-year funds as of June 30, 1954, there was a $7 billion carryover. The estimate for June 30, 1955, was $5.7 billion, a figure that includes $1.05 billion of MDA funds. For fiscal 1956 the estimated carryover—exclusive of construction funds—is $3.7 billion. It is clear that there is sound reasoning behind having some carryover funds. They are necessary to a policy of planned procurement of aircraft over a 4-year fiscal period during which the Department has to take into account the time necessary for negotiation, manufacture, and delivery of planes. As one Air Force official explained:

> This whole thing is based on the principle of programing for the complete requirement for the aircraft or the major item along with all of the supporting equipment that goes with it at one time rather than asking for partial funding of the second, third, and fourth year increments to complete the whole end item (p. 1515, hearings).

The reason given by the Air Force for the amount of carryover funds is that in the last few years there have been changes in our force structure as well as changes in the aircraft programs. It is true, of course, that at the beginning of the Korean war when we were leading into a large planned build-up, it was natural that great sums of money would have to be made available for obligation, and certainly it is no part of the intention of Congress that this money should be spent in any given fiscal year regardless of efficient and economical planning. What is disturbing, however, in addition to the amount of the carryover funds, is that fact that the accuracy of the estimates is open to question. The Department apparently feels that through its arrangements with the Bureau of the Budget, various fiscal devices, and reports to the Congress on reprograming, it has control over this situation. But many of the subcommittee members consider that much more work needs to be done in improving the formulation of the budget and its understandable presentation to the Congress. We have been told that the Department is trying to reduce its unobligated balances to a reasonable minimum figure, and certainly this is an effort which many Members will approve and watch in an attitude of continuing investigation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is performing a real service in demonstrating these figures. I call his attention to the fact that Mr. McNeil, the chief financial officer of the Department of Defense, stated to us that $4 billion was sufficient in unobligated carryover, and here the figures we are presenting call for almost $6.5 billion.

Mr. DEANE. I agree with the gentleman from New York and appreciate his contribution. I realize that Congress and the committee established some years ago no-year funding operations. It was considered wise.

At the same time, the lead time on most items it would seem to me is not sufficient to the point where we must year by year continue to show these enormous carryovers.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] who preceded me expressed his feelings, which I share. We can criticize procurement, we can criticize various functions, but unless we begin really to know the significance of the enormous unobligated carryovers, we do not, I believe, fully understand the real problem that we face, and we will never effect savings until the defense budget is presented on a more realistic basis.

Mr. Chairman, during our hearings considerable discussion was directed toward the large amount of defense dollars expected to remain unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1956.

As indicated previously, my remarks have been directed to the Air Force budget. However, the problem of unobligated dollars is not unique to the Air Force. The other military departments also expect to end the coming fiscal year with rather large unobligated balances. While I shall address my remarks specifically to the Air Force budget, what I have to say applies to each of the services.

The amount of the carryover has reached a point that it demands serious consideration. Although the Department reports progress in reducing these balances, your committee is seriously concerned over maintaining its control over the amounts granted, the purposes for which these funds are to be spent, and in general to protect the constitutional responsibility of Congress to control the purse strings. The problem was put squarely to the subcommittee members by the chairman, Mr. MAHON:

> I think that some of the new members of the subcommittee will be shocked, as I am shocked, over the continued tremendous unexpended funds available to the Department of Defense, and the tremendous sums which are not being obligated from year to year, and which funds it is proposed will not be obligated during the fiscal year 1956.
>
> I hope that the new members will read and study carefully pages 16–21, and if they can bring a fresh outlook to this very perplexing and difficult question we would welcome it. (P. 17, hearings on Department of Defense Appropriations for 1956.)

To give you some idea of the seriousness of this problem of unobligated dollars, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a table giving an analysis of the unobligated funds brought forward, fiscal years 1951–57 which is illustrated by this chart.

On pages 4 and 5 of the committee report you will note a table giving the unobligated carryover. The difference indicated in the figures as given is that my tabulation includes amounts for military public works which was not considered in the course of our hearings on the bill. The totals indicated in the following

table were furnished me by the Defense officials:

Department of Defense budgets—Analysis: Unobligated funds brought forward, fiscal years 1951–57

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total direct congressional appropriations	Total	Unobligated funds brought forward [1]		
			Army	Navy	Air Force
Into 1951 (actual)	$48,087	$805	$118	$426	$261
Into 1952 (actual)	61,411	3,451	1,895	499	1,057
Into 1953 (actual)	49,198	7,085	2,599	1,090	3,396
Into 1954 (actual)	34,554	9,369	2,803	1,306	5,260
Into 1955 (actual)	29,583	15,707	6,240	2,325	7,042
Into 1956 (estimate)	32,233	11,535	4,122	2,491	4,894
Into 1957 (estimate) [2]	----------	6,493	1,700	1,138	3,655

[1] Unobligated funds for OSD and interservice activities were as follows: Fiscal year 1954, less than $500,000; fiscal year 1955, $100 million; fiscal year 1956 (estimate), $28 million.

[2] Excludes potential unobligated balance of proposed fiscal year 1956 military public-works appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I now insert two tables prepared by our staff on the amounts available for obligation and amounts available for expenditure.

We will at the proper time see that the figures are reconciled.

Amounts available for obligation (all amounts exclude public works funds)

1. Estimated unobligated portion of unexpended balances of prior appropriations on hand beginning of fiscal 1956 (July 1, 1955)	$10,462,000,000
2. New obligating authority in the pending bill	31,460,000,000
Subtotal	41,922,000,000
3. Add estimated net reimbursements and transfers which are a source of obligating authority	1,159,000,000
4. Total estimated amount to be available for obligation in 1956	43,081,000,000
5. Estimated obligations in 1956 (estimated by Department at $37,348,000,000, less cut of $744,609,000 made by committee in the budget which probably will reduce obligations by about that much)	—36,603,391,000
6. Approximate unobligated amount remaining at end of fiscal 1956	6,477,609,000

Amounts available for expenditure (all amounts are exclusive of public works funds)

1. Estimated unexpended balance of prior appropriations on hand at beginning of fiscal 1956 (July 1, 1955)	$43,162,000,000
a. Unobligated— $10,462,000,000	
b. Obligated— $32 700,000,000	
2. New funds proposed under the pending bill	31,499,000,000
	74,661,000,000
3. Minor transfer adjustments (p. 6 of report)	—16,000,000

Amounts available for obligation (all amounts exclude public works funds)—Continued

4. Total estimated to be available for expenditure in 1956	$74,645,000,000
5. Estimated expenditures (Department estimate which varies from budget. This will be reduced by unknown amount as result of committee cuts)	—33,353,000,000
6. Approximate unexpended funds to be on hand at end of fiscal 1956	41,292,000,000

As indicated by the chart, these large unobligated balances first became a serious factor during the military buildup June 1950 to December 1953 which followed the Communist attack on South Korea.

LONGER LEAD-TIME MILITARY PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has accepted within recent years the wise policy of appropriating for longer lead-time military programs. For example, the Congress in previous years and your committee is recommending in this budget the total dollars not only to cover the full cost of the aircraft but also the many other component parts like engines, instruments, electronics, armaments, and so forth. Included in this budget are the dollars for initial spare parts for the airplanes to fill the supply line. The recommended budget includes the ground handling equipment and special tools and test equipment required for the maintenance and operation. It includes future and as yet undetermined engineering changes. Our budget includes the transportation of material from the manufacturers to the first receiving point in the Air Force supply system.

DIFFERENT LEAD-TIMES

Mr. Chairman, the various parts of the aircraft procurement program have different lead-times. For example, air frames may have to be ordered 18 to 30 months before the desired delivery date.

Other items, such as wheels and brakes, would not be ordered more than 5 to 8 months before delivery date.

Aircraft tires may not have to be ordered more than 2 to 3 months before the complete airplane delivery date.

Other initial spare parts need not be ordered until after the completed airplane is delivered.

The obligation of funds for engineering changes usually is spread out during the entire production span, as much as 2 or even 3 years beyond the budget year.

Thus it is obvious that the obligation of aircraft dollars for first destination transportation will be spread out over an even longer period of time.

APPROPRIATING ON SO-CALLED NO-YEAR BASIS

It is obvious from what I have pointed out that it is not in the interest of the Air Force or the Government to obligate dollars for these shorter lead-time items any earlier than necessary. To do so would incur unnecessary risk of loss due to advancing technology and required changes in a given program.

It is good business operation to delay financial commitments to the latest point without interfering with the effective execution of a program.

This brings me to a discussion of the so-called no-year appropriations. During our hearings and in previous years the Defense Appropriations Committee has made plain to the military services that it is not the desire of the House that funds be obligated before the end of a fiscal year simply to reduce the unobligated balances. To encourage prudent obligation of defense dollars the Congress in 1948 adopted the policy of appropriating for Air Force long lead-time procurement items the so-called no-year basis. That is, authority to obligate these funds beyond a regular budget year.

That means, Mr. Chairman, that the end of the budget year 1955 the Air Force will have accumulated unobligated funds of approximately $7,042,000,000. For the total Defense Establishment the accumulated unobligated funds brought forward will total approximately $15,707,000,000.

All funds appropriated to the Air Force for aircraft, major procurement, other than aircraft, military construction, and research and development are available until expended by the Air Force or rescinded by the Congress.

This program, Mr. Chairman, has made it possible to plan procurement in an orderly fashion without the year-in buying rush that previously occurred because of the fear of losing funds unless they were obligated by June 30 of each year.

Under these circumstances, your committee recognizes the fact that a considerable number of budget dollars appropriated to the Military Department for fiscal year 1956 will remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal year so long as the Congress follows the policy of fully authorizing each annual military program.

It is the opinion of your committee that the policy we have been following and as contemplated in the 1956 defense budget is sound.

ADVANTAGE NO-YEAR FUNDING

By fully authorizing the annual military programs, your committee and the Congress is in a much better position to review the programs as a whole and determine their total cost before they are authorized. It assures the Congress that it will not be faced with a series of partially completed projects undertaken on the basis of partial financing by a previous Congress and which now require substantial additional financing if the original investment is not to be lost. It assures, for example, that we will not end up with aircraft lacking essential fire-control equipment, aircraft carriers lacking catapults, military barracks lacking heating equipment, and so forth. I think it fair to say that the foresight of the Congress in insisting upon fully financing all programs at the time they are initially approved has greatly improved the management of the military programs and saved the taxpayer substantial sums of money even though, on the face of it, the books show substantial carryovers of unobligated funds.

OTHER PROCUREMENT PROBLEMS INVOLVING UNOBLIGATED CARRYOVERS

In addition to these factors which require what may be called a planned carryover of unobligated funds from year to year, we must expect from long experience that some procurement actions planned for the coming fiscal year inevitably will be delayed to the next fiscal year. Unexpected difficulties may arise in contract negotiations which may delay the final signing of the contract until after the end of the fiscal year. Since the amount of such a contract cannot be legally recorded as an obligation until the contract has been fully executed, it will show up in the unobligated balance at the end of the fiscal year even though for all practical purposes the purchase has been made.

Another cause of delay in the obligation of funds is the difficulty of accurately estimating the time required to complete research and development of the more complicated items of equipment. In this regard it is important to keep in mind that science and technology in the military areas are still moving forward at a very rapid pace. If this Nation is to keep its lead in airpower the products of our research and development efforts must be integrated into our forces at the earliest practicable time. This means that the Air Force procurement program, as reflected in its budget, will always include some items still in the research and development stage. Since, as I have said, it is virtually impossible to estimate accurately the date such items will be ready for production, some delays in the procurement program from this source must be expected and some funds planned for obligation in fiscal year 1956 will no doubt remain unobligated at the end of that fiscal year. Yet we dare not risk delaying the introduction of advanced equipments into our Air Force because of a lack of funds for their procurement. Some allowance for such delays in the program must be made in arriving at realistic estimates of obligations.

HOW UNOBLIGATED CARRYOVERS ARE APPLIED

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind the House that all funds remaining unobligated at the end of the coming fiscal year in excess of those needed to complete fiscal year 1956 programs can and will be applied against the requirements of the next fiscal year. Even so, we do not want to appropriate for the coming fiscal year any funds beyond those required for the successful accomplishment of the programs and missions of the Department of Defense. We must, however, recognize the special problems involved in the longer lead-time military programs, such as major procurement, construction, and research and development, which require, for any particular fiscal year, the availability of the funds beyond what is actually expected to be obligated in that year. We have made every effort in the bill now before you to keep these unobligated balances within reasonable limits and I am happy to report that the unobligated balances in the accounts of all three military departments, which totaled $15.7 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 1955, are being rapidly reduced and by the end of fiscal year 1956 will be approaching a normal level of planned carryover, about $6.5 billion, excluding the potential unobligated balance of proposed fiscal year 1956 military public works appropriations.

SOFT SPOTS IN THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

You can be assured, Mr. Chairman, that your Air Force panel carefully reviewed every program of the Air Force from the most expensive secret operation to paper napkins.

While the total defense budget reductions amount to only $744,609,000, of which $381,774,000 is attributable to the Air Force, your committee is satisfied that soft spots still remain in the Air Force budget. We could have made further reductions. On the other hand, we would share with the officials of the Department of the Air Force the responsibility of the recommended appropriations. At the same time, the Appropriations Committee will set in motion several top level investigations of Air Force establishments so that the taxpayer is given value received for the budget dollar; and to the end that the 1957 budget requests be drastically reduced.

Constantly throughout the hearings, your committee probed for the soft spots. I invite your attention to the testimony of Mr. Roger Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force—Materiel—beginning on page 583 on procurement policies and procedures.

In passing, I feel I express the sentiment of our entire Air Force panel in commending Secretary Lewis on his grasp of procurement problems and his demonstrated ability in dealing with perhaps the most difficult program of the Air Force.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I include as a part of my statement testimony of Secretary Lewis on possible savings in procurement:

Mr. DEANE. I suppose that any appropriating committee would ask, as it began to mark up a bill, Where are the soft spots?

POSSIBLE SAVINGS IN PROCUREMENT

If you were sitting on this side of the table, where would you consider the soft spots in the procurement program where reasonable sums of money could be saved?

Mr. LEWIS. I know quite a little about this budget request. We had it in preparation for several months, and during the preparation of the justifications we had a number of discussions with the Secretary of Defense on this question, and I believe that with respect to the accounts in which I am interested—the materiel accounts—that you could not reduce this budget anywhere without changing the program.

I feel that it has run right down as of this day to the very least that we should have, and retain the integrity of this program.

Mr. DEANE. The only way in which you feel money can be saved is for the Air Materiel Command to ride herd on these contracts, and the only savings which you feel can be accomplished would be in the letting and in the checking and auditing of the contracts which you let?

Mr. LEWIS. I believe that, sir. It is a matter of doing a better job, and a good job of buying the program which we propose, rather than changing the program.

I also know that things will happen in maybe 6 months or 8 months from now, and that there may be some soft spots turn up which might cause us to change our mind, but, as of this moment, I believe this is a good program.

Mr. DEANE. I believe that is all, Mr. WHITTEN.

THE PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

Of the expected Air Force expenditures for the fiscal year 1956 of approximately $15,600,000, the sum of $8,202,000, which represents 52.6 percent of the Air Force budget will be for Air Force procurement. Since close to 53 percent of the Air Force budget goes for procurement and knowing that 80 percent of procurement contracts are placed on a negotiated basis, here is where great savings can be made.

At times committee members felt frustrated as they tried to seek full and complete information from Air Force witnesses who are mainly responsible for the budget estimates and not necessarily operational officers who have little if anything to do in the budget preparation as was the case this year. I want the record to show, however, that many operational Air Force witnesses did a creditable job, but any weak link lowers morale all along the line.

INFORMATION CONCERNING AIRCRAFT COMPANIES CONTRACTING WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this bill yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], our chairman, outlined during the debate some unusual profits being shown by certain aircraft companies who are receiving heavy defense contracts.

I submit for the record a series of questions directed to Mr. Roger Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force—Materiel—concerning aircraft companies contracting with the Government and the answers as given by Mr. Lewis beginning on page 651 of the Air Force hearings.

The information not only indicates the key companies, the principal items supplied to the Air Force, but the total sales, profits, and the dividend record for a period of years. One table gives a comparison of Government and contractor investment. Another table reveals the dollar volume of business during the fiscal year and compares the dollar volume of sales to the Government and to commercial interests.

REASONABLENESS OF PROFITS OF AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Perhaps I am mistaken, but there is a general feeling abroad that maybe the aviation industry, dealing in Government contracts, is making tremendous sums of money, but from the figures which you gave to Mr. WHITTEN, or which were read off here a moment ago, and from your experience in the industry prior to your connection with the Government, do you consider that an unreasonable profit?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not consider the return on sales, sir, from 1945 to 1953, during which period I have the records of all of these companies, and which indicate that the average in 1953 ran 2.5 percent of sales, I do not consider that unreasonable. In 1954 this will, of course, be higher, as a result of the termination of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. DEANE. Would you be in a position to know approximately what the profit has been of these companies engaged in Government contracts, the list of which has been read to the committee?

Mr. LEWIS. This is on Government contracts that I am talking about.

INFORMATION CONCERNING AIRCRAFT COMPANIES CONTRACTING WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. DEANE. I wonder if you would provide for the record—and you indicate there are about 12 companies manufacturing the airframes, and the other major items such as engines, communication equipment, fire-control systems, and what other items are involved?

Mr. LEWIS. Well, our big companies which serve us primarily are, of course, the airframe people, fire control, engine, the instruments, and bombing system materials. There are perhaps 20 companies altogether.

Mr. DEANE. I wonder if you would provide for the record a list of these manufacturers, and what they manufacture, and in keeping with security, the type of contract which they have been awarded, and the total dollar volume involved?

I think Mr. WHITTEN asked whether or not they were Government-owned, or to what extent the Government has financed the plant with Government facilities?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEANE. Then, you should have a final column indicating approximately, as near as you can by furnishing the profit which they have made on these contracts, and select a fairly comparable period of time, 1951 or 1952, when the Air Force began to move out separately, because I really feel that the eyes of Congress are certainly pointed to that particular branch of the service, because the Air Force is receiving the lion's share of the defense dollar.

Would you be able to furnish that information?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, indeed.

I would like to say one thing which I did not make clear in my discussion with Mr. Whitten, which is of great importance to us, and that is the dividend policy which these companies follow. Actually, they have been following a very conservative dividend policy. They have been taking these earnings and plowing them back into plant and facilities with which to do further Government work, and I think that the question of earnings cannot be separated from dividend policy.

I would like to tell you what the dividend policies are for these years, with your permission.

Mr. DEANE. Of course, on that score, they could come in and declare a whale of a dividend.

Mr. LEWIS. We have made it clear that we expect them to continue to follow conservative dividend policies.

Mr. DEANE. Would you show also something about the capitalization of these plants? Do you have that information?

Mr. LEWIS. We can show you that information as to their net worth.

(The information is as follows:)

"The following tables set forth the following information:

"1. Table 1 comprises a list of 18 representative Air Force contractors with a brief description of the principal items they supply and the principal types of contracts employed by the Air Force for the procurement of the items.

"2. Table 2 sets forth for the same companies listed in table 1, the total net sales for the years 1950 to the latest year available, profit for the year before and after taxes, net worth at the end of the latest fiscal year available, and cash dividends per share expressed as a percentage of earnings per share as published in financial reporting services. This last item is offered as being indicative of the past dividend policies of the contractors involved.

"3. Table 3 furnishes information with respect to Government and contractor investments in the various plants in which they operate.

"4. Table 4 sets forth a tabulation of Government and commercial sales volume for 1953. In response to requests by Air Force personnel most of the companies also furnished a breakdown of current backlog between Government and commercial."

TABLE 1

Name of company	Principal items supplied to the Air Force [1]	Types of contracts used in percent of dollars
AIRFRAMES		
Boeing Airplane Co	B-47; B-52; KC-97; KC-135; missiles	FPI 88.5, CPFF 10.7, FP 0.6, FPR 0.2, commercial.
Douglas	B and RB-66, B-47	CPFF 40, FPI 37.9, FPR 2.8, other 19.3.
General Dynamics Convair division	F-102; B-58; T-29; C-131; missiles	CPFF 54.5, FPI 37.3, FP 8.2.
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	C-121; C-130; B-47; T-33; F-104	FPI 45.6, CPIF 27.8, FPR 5.2, CPFF 4.1, commercial.
North American Aviation	F-100; F-86; T-28; missiles	FPI 89.7, CPFF 6.9, FPR 1.9, FP 1.4.
Northrop Aircraft Co	F-89; missiles	FPR 81.5, CPFF 13.3, FPI 3.8, miscellaneous.
ENGINES; ELECTRONICS; FIRE-CONTROL SYSTEMS AND INSTRUMENTS		
United Aircraft Corp., Pratt & Whitney division	Engines	FPI 93.7, FPR 3.0, FP 2.4, CPFF 0.9.
General Motors Corp., Allison division	do	FPR 98.9, CPFF 0.75, FP 0.35.
Curtiss Wright Corp	do	FPR 100.
General Electric Corp., aircraft gas-turbine division	do	FPI 89, CPFF 11.
Westinghouse	Magnetrons, radar, aircraft electrical systems	FPR 61.2, FP 32.3, CPFF 6.5.
Radio Corporation of America	Ground radar; communication equipment; navigational equipment; fire-control systems; missiles, etc.	FPR 93, FP 6.4, CPFF 0.6.
Bendix	Motor generators; electronic equipment; wheels and brakes; pumps; instruments, gyros, etc.	FPR 62.5, FP 33.2, CPFF 4.1.
Kearfoot	Compass systems; synchros, bearings	FP 81.9, FPR 15.2, CPFF 2.9.
Kollsman Instrument	Air-speed indicators, machometers, tachometers, sextants, etc.	FP 62.5, FPR 37.4, CPFF 0.01.
AVCO	Fire-control system; engines, radar navigational equipment.	FPR 84.5, FP 12.3, CPFF 3.2.
Sperry Corp	Bombing navigation computer; autopilot; radar; gyros	FPR 93.1, CPFF 4.5, FP 2.4.

[1] The items listed are not in any special order and are not all-inclusive.

NOTE.—CPFF, cost plus fixed fee; CPIF, cost plus incentive fee; FP, firm fixed price; FPR, fixed price subject to redetermination at stated intervals or upon completion; FPI, fixed-price incentive.

TABLE 2.—*Total sales, profits, and dividends of selected Air Force contractors* [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Boeing Airplane Co.: [2]					
Sales	$307,251	$337,301	$739,010	$918,246	$1,003,176
Net profit before taxes	$24,227	$19,841	$49,784	$58,818	$76,726
Net profit after taxes	$10,827	$7,141	$14,084	$20,318	$36,976
Dividends paid as percentage of earnings per share [3]	30.0	45.5	30.8	28.0	([4] [5])
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954					$109,432
Douglas Aircraft: [2]					
Sales	$128,893	$225,173	$522,619	$874,515	$915,217
Net profit before taxes	$13,214	$18,597	$33,531	$61,534	$79,991
Net profit after taxes	$7,214	$6,713	$10,792	$18,586	$36,157
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share [3]	52.1	60.8	41.7	42.0	([4] [5])
Net worth at Nov. 30, 1954					$120,890
Consolidated Vultee [6] (merged with General Dynamics on Apr. 30, 1954):					
Sales	$255,860	$322,157	$390,997	$370,703	([4])
Operating profit before taxes	$9,853	$11,849	$18,196	$12,279	([4])
Net profit after taxes	$10,241	$7,750	$10,426	$10,254	([4])
Consolidated Vulture—Con.					
Dividends paid as a percent of net earnings per share	24.2	42.7	50.1	58.7	([4])
Net worth				$52,420	
Lockheed Aircraft: [6]					
Sales	$173,330	$237,229	$438,122	$820,466	$732,872
Net operating income	$14,106	$6,329	$17,321	$48,057	$45,846
Net profit after taxes	$7,209	$5,793	$9,058	$15,462	$22,446
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share [3]	46.4	43.1	30.2	32.5	([4] [5])
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954					$88,837
North American Aviation: [2]					
Sales	$143,032	$177,675	$315,217	$634,688	$645,821
Profits before taxes	$13,626	$15,222	$20,321	$40,073	$52,480
Profits after taxes	$8,086	$6,422	$7,821	$12,773	$22,180
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share [3]	53.2	66.8	54.8	40.3	
Net worth at Sept. 30, 1954					$77,795

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Total sales, profits, and dividends of selected Air Force contractors* [1]—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Northrop Aircraft: [6]					
Sales	$43,876	$89,694	$187,161	$184,221	(4)
Net operating income	(4)	(4)	$7,770	$7,634	(4)
Net income after taxes	−$44,974	$3,276	$2,420	$3,360	(4)
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share [3]	None	None	23.7	18.7	(4)
Net worth at July 31, 1953				$12,429	(4)
Republic Aviation: [2]					
Sales	$57,713	$130,441	$412,235	$411,811	$323,456
Profit before taxes	$4,615	$8,083	$27,396	$27,514	$18,592
Profit after taxes	$2,355	$2,935	$8,096	$8,314	$8,976
Dividends paid as percent of earnings per share [3]	21.4	34.2	15.6	19.9	(4 5)
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954					$52,140
United Aircraft Corp.: [2]					
Sales	$269,255	$417,212	$667,769	$817,557	$654,295
Profits before taxes	$25,798	$31,257	$51,419	$69,702	$53,377
Profits after taxes	[7] $13,204	[7] $14,267	$17,809	$21,194	$25,996
Dividends paid as percent of net earnings per share [3]	44.8	49.3	38.6	44.1	(4 5)
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954					$149,495
Curtiss-Wright: [2]					
Sales	$135,663	$176,625	$326,184	$438,728	$475,084
Profits before taxes	$13,629	$14,958	$20,898	$35,403	$39,377
Profits after taxes	$7,279	$6,908	$9,048	$11,403	$19,377
Dividends paid on common stock as percent of net earnings per share [3]	163	133	58.8	44.1	(4 5)
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1954				$125,926	$136,412
General Electric: [6 8]					
Sales and services	$1,960,429	$2,319,347	$2,623,887	$3,128,127	(4)
Net earnings before taxes	$346,246	$393,710	$387,395	$428,627	(4)
Net profit	$165,727	$151,719	$138,116	$173,423	(4)
Dividends paid per share as percent of net earnings per share	62.4	59.2	56.6	69.1	(4)
Net worth Dec. 31, 1953				$932,412	(4)
Westinghouse Electric: [6 8]					
Gross sales less discounts and allowances	$1,091,923	$1,246,801	$1,454,272	$1,582,047	(4)
Profit from sales	$153,220	$168,271	$169,637	$150,770	(4)
Net profit after taxes	$77,922	$64,578	$68,581	$74,322	(4)
Dividends paid per share as percent of net earnings per share	37.3	49.6	47.2	44.1	(4)
Net worth Dec. 31, 1953				$788,810	(4)
Radio Corporation of America: [6 8]					
Net sales and operating revenues	$584,425	$596,769	$690,641	$848,887	(4)
Operating profit	$96,394	$62,142	$67,223	$72,900	(4)
Net income after taxes	$46,249	$31,192	$32,325	$35,021	(4)
Dividends paid per share as percent of net earnings per share	48.2	49.5	47.6	45.2	(4)
Net worth Dec. 31, 1953				$215,719	(4)
General Motors: [6 8 9]					
Net sales	$7,531,086	$7,465,554	$7,549,154	$10,027,985	(4)
Net income available for dividends	$834,044	$506,199	$558,721	$598,119	(4)
Percent of income disbursed or accrued	64.6	71.7	64.8	60.5	
Bendix Aviation: [6 8]					
Net sales	$219,419	$340,540	$508,701	$635,544	(4)
Operating profit before taxes	$27,695	$30,690	$50,730	$62,915	(4)
Net income after taxes	$16,954	$11,818	$15,295	$17,352	(4)
Dividends paid per share on common stock as percent of net earnings per share	59.3	80.6	41.5	45.7	(4)
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1953				$128,241	(4)
Kearfott Co. Inc. [6 10]					(4)
Kollsman Instrument Corp. [6 11]					(4)
AVCO Manufacturing Corp.: [6 8]					
Net sales	$256,996	$286,598	$326,585	$414,783	(4)
Operating profits before taxes	$31,245	$23,029	$24,565	$6,963	(4)
Net income after taxes	$12,635	$10,089	$11,028	$3,368	(4)
Dividends paid per share on common stock as percent of net earnings per share	34.0	54.5	50.0	85.2	(4)
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1953				$94,180	(4)
Sperry: [6 8]					
Net shipments	$162,454	$240,943	$396,218	$464,071	(4)
Operating income	$19,153	$33,448	$51,232	$51,447	(4)
Net income after taxes	$9,588	$10,883	$13,930	$15,801	(4)
Dividends paid per share on common stock as percent of net earnings per share	42.3	37.2	29.6	39.6	(4)
Net worth at Dec. 31, 1953				$78,784	(4)

[1] Net profits before taxes are after depreciation.
[2] Source: Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System, Mar. 16, 1955.
[3] Source: Standard & Poors Industry Surveys, Dec. 16, 1954.
[4] Not available.
[5] Cash dividends paid in last fiscal year were as follows: Boeing, $9,729,000; Curtiss-Wright, $8,891,000; Douglas, $13,850,000; Lockheed, $6,991,000; North, American, $9,446,000; Republic, $2,443,000; United Aircraft, $12,502,000. Source of information re 1954 operations of these companies is Wall Street Journal or verbal information from company officials.
[6] Source: Moody's Industrials, 1954 edition.
[7] Includes income-tax credits.
[8] In view of diversified business, it is not possible, from information available, to determine the effect of Air Force business on the net sales, operating profits or dividends. Government business versus commercial, to the extent available is set forth in a separate tabulation. Dividends paid as a percent of net earnings on Air Force contracts are not possible of segregation.
[9] Separate financial data for Allison Division not available.
[10] Wholly owned subsidiary of General Precision Equipment Corp. No separate financial data published.
[11] Wholly owned subsidiary of Standard Coil Products Co., Inc. No separate financial data published.

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of Government and contractor investment (selected contractors)*

Contractor	Plant location	Government-owned real property	Contractor-owned real property	Government investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost [1]	Contractor investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost [2]
A. Airframes:					
Boeing	Seattle	X	X	$73,400,000	$45,217,000
Do	Wichita	X	X	101,171,000	
Do	Larson	X		11,797,000	
Douglas	Long Beach	X	X	43,843,000	57,503,000
Do	Santa Monica		X		
Do	Tulsa	X		97,499,000	
Do	Tucson	X	[3]	3,300,000	
Loockheed	Burbank-Van Nuys.	X	X	15,818,000	50,389,000
Do	Marietta	X		96,825,000	171,000
Do	Palmdale	X		5,800,000	None
Republic	Farmingdale and Port Washington.	X	X	11,217,000	13,870,000
North American	Inglewood [4]		X	19,299,000	33,622,000
Do	Columbus	X		86,000,000	
Do	Palmdale	X		4,835,000	
Convair	San Diego [4]		[3]	22,577,000	27,889,000
Do	Fort Worth	X		72,427,000	
Do	Palmdale	X		2,500,000	
Northrup	Hawthorne	X	X	22,978,000	8,007,000
Do	Palmdale	X		4,000,000	None
B. Engines:					
Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford		X	147,850,000	175,000,000
Allison	Indianapolis	X	X	114,412,000	69,500,000
Wright Aero	Woodridge	X	X	184,065,000	47,625,000
General Electric	Evendale	X	X	105,052,000	65,000,000
C. Electronics:					
RCA	Camden		X	2,941,000	39,580,000
Do	Los Angeles		X	500,000	7,000,000
Westinghouse	Horsehead, N. Y.		X	1,205,000	5,657,000
Bendix	Towson, Md		X	787,000	9,072,000
D. Instruments:					
Kearfott	Little Falls, N. Y.		X	1,926,000	2,444,000
Kohlsman	Elmhurst, N. Y.		X	12,500,000	3,251,000
E. Fire control and other components:					
AVCO	Evendale and Richmond.		X	5,878,000	3,542,000
Sperry	Long Island		X	191,000	23,611,000
Total				1,272,593,000	687,950,000

[1] Government-owned plant valuations are based upon actual or estimated original costs plus land and buildings or improvements added since World War II.
[2] The information contained in column 6 was obtained from contractors' latest financial statements available to the Air Force as of March 15, 1955. Where brackets are shown in column 6, the figure represents the total contractor investment in fixed assets at acquisition cost without regard to location.
[3] Leased.
[4] Government investment limited to personal property only.

TABLE 4.—*Dollar volume of business during contractors' fiscal year 1953*

Company	Total dollar volume of sales during calendar year 1953 [1]		Percent of current backlog [1]	
	Government	Commercial	Government	Commercial
	Millions	*Millions*		
Boeing	[2] 917	0.9	100	0
Consolidated Vultee	307	64	99.6	.4
Douglas	770	105	81	19
Lockheed	755	65	83	17
North American	623	11	98.7	1.3
Northrop	184	0	100	0
United Aircraft—Pratt & Whitney Division	434	79.7	98.4	1.6
General Motors—Allison Division	430	32.4	93	7
Curtiss-Wright—Wright-Aeronautical Division	303	48.6	92.3	7.7
General Electric—AGT Division	553	0	100	0
Radio Corp. of America	168	673	20	80
Westinghouse	391	1,173	[3]	[3]
Bendix	505	152.7	72	28
Kearfott	40	1	98.1	1.8
Kollsman	30	2.3	97	2.95
AVCO	200	214.7	[4]	[5]
Sperry	250	10.9	99.06	.94

[1] This information was supplied by the contractors involved. The Government versus commercial backlog figures represent current backlog as of approximately Mar. 15, 1955, in all cases except Westinghouse and AVCO. The percentages of current backlog are not necessarily equivalent to the division of sales between Government and commercial in 1953. The sales reported by company divisions will differ in some cases from total sales for 1953 as set forth in table 2.
[2] 9-month figure.
[3] Refused to furnish.
[4] $187,920,000.
[5] Not available.

NATURE OF OWNERSHIP AND COMPETITION IN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Is there any indication that some shrewd dealers—there seem to be some around who can move in and take over a great railroad—but are there any undercurrents indicating that there are individuals who are trying to capture the industry, or is it pretty independently managed, plant by plant? Are there interlocking directors, or other factors, which would lead you to feel that it is monopolistic?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not feel that it is monopolistic.

To answer your first question, it has been reported from time to time that consideration was being given by certain groups to take certain companies over, as in the case of the railroads, which you mentioned. However, I have not seen that done in any case. I feel that that has not happened, and that the companies are widely held by the public, and managed by permanent managements.

On the second question, as to whether or not the industry is monopolistic, I do not think it is. They go through a period, such as during the Korean buildup, where everyone has about all the work they can handle, and they sort of quit being at each other's throats, but the minute that competitors start to work in the industry, as they have already started to work, they compete very bitterly and, while they cannot compete on contracts as such because we cannot buy off the shelf, they are very competitive in trying to keep their labor rates down, their overhead rates down, to keep their man-hours per pound of airplane down, and other measures of efficiency which are well known to us and well known in the industry. They fight very hard to maintain an independent and competitive position.

I do not think there is any monopolistic tendency in the industry at all.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

A significant operation which impressed me during the hearings to which the Air Force can point with pride involves maintenance and operations.

Mr. Chairman, as a part of my statement I will include at this point a table indicating the percentage changes in various programs involving maintenance and operations from the end of fiscal year 1952 until the end of fiscal year 1955. During this debate I refer you to the chart exhibited here reflecting what will appear in the RECORD on maintenance and operation:

Percentage changes in various programs from fiscal year 1952 as compared with changes in the "Maintenance and operations" appropriation

End of fiscal year	On board (military persons)	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)	Total actual flying hours (thousands)	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)	Active A/C	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)	Wings	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)	Appropriation (bill)	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)
1952	973,474		7,105		15,264		95		3.443	
1953	977,593	+1	8,178	+15	17,074	+12	106	+12	3.201	−7
1954	947,918	−3	8,104	+14	18,827	+23	115	+21	3.146	−9
1955 [1]	970,000	−1	9,468	+33	19,713	+29	121	+27	3.493	+1

[1] Budget strength, end fiscal year 1955.

This chart reflects the percentage changes indicated in the above table. At zero, end fiscal year 1952, on the chart, the number of on board Air Force military personnel totaled 973,474. Follow the yellow line. At the end of fiscal year 1955 the number of on board military personnel will total 970,000, a decrease of 1 percent for the period.

The black line represents appropriations. The total dollar increase for maintenance and operations from the end of fiscal year 1952 to the end of fiscal year 1955 is only 1 percent.

These lines on total military personnel indicating a 1 percent decrease at the end of fiscal year 1955 as compared with the end of fiscal year 1952, and with only a 1 percent increase in appropriations for the same period of time, is highly significant when you consider the goals that have been reached. These goals are represented by these lines on the chart.

For the same period, you will note the green curve representing wings, which shows an increase of 27 percent.

For the same period, total active aircraft has increased by 29 percent.

For the same period, from the end of fiscal year 1952 to the end of fiscal year 1955, total flying hours have increased by 33 percent.

This chart, I feel, Mr. Chairman, graphically reveals that we are receiving from the Air Force a rapid and commendable increase in firepower involving only a negligible increase in appropriations and at the same time the military personnel for the period has decreased by 1 percent.

PROJECTED MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS FOR 1956

The budget for maintenance and operations during fiscal year 1956, recommended in our bill, totals $3,615,500, an increase of $112,708. This will be a negligible increase in total appropriations for maintenance and operations when you consider that the flying wings are scheduled to increase by 10, from 121 to 131.

Twenty-five principal installations will be added.

Eighty-three new aircraft control and warning installations will be set in operation.

Fuel and oil costs will increase by approximately 20 percent, due largely as a result of more high fuel consumption from jet flying hours.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Another phase of the Department's work that will require continuous review is that concerned with research and development. The cost of new weapons, the rapidity of scientific advance, and the time to produce new equipment after it has been developed, all these factors combine to create the problem of dividing money between improving the weapons we have and engaging in research and development on the newest possible devices.

We have to peg this situation somewhere; if we concentrate on new weapons to the exclusion of present equipment, we might be too much in the blueprint stage if a war should come; if we do not keep up with technological advances, we might have to fight a war with old-style weapons. The balance between what we have now and what we can have in the future will always be changing, and it is inevitable that any decision will bear the marks of a compromise. The difficulty in this area is clearly highlighted by any advances that may be made in producing an intercontinental ballistic missile. Until such a missile exists we must depend upon fighter interceptor planes and other presently available methods of blunting

an enemy attack. And we must insure that we shall be in the forefront of any revolutionary development of this kind.

My colleague on the subcommittee [Mr. WHITTEN] made a contribution toward the statement of this problem when he asked:

If you have an immediate war in sight, it opens up the possibility of going all out for the very best, but if I be right in my conclusion that the major problem or one of the major problems is the economic shock on the Nation of spending this much over a 15-year or 20-year period annually, I come back to the question as to how often you should switch from one class or quantity of airplanes to a new class, which is better, at the expense of junking all you had (p. 212 of the hearings).

To this Assistant Secretary Roger Lewis replied: "Well, I think you have asked, really, the question which is the heart of this entire military problem."

The committee has recommended $570 million for research and development, the amount of the budget request. A portion of this sum has been transferred from other Air Force funds, with the net result that there is a real increase of approximately $8 million over the amount available in 1955.

I think that all the members were glad to observe that the research and development programs of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force were being better coordinated in the Department of Defense than had been the case heretofore. The committee has been assured that our research and development program "is oriented toward the capability of fighting an atomic war and also being prepared to fight a nonatomic war."

AIR FORCE CAREER PERSONNEL

Although we may talk of planes, bases, and weapons in strengthening our defense forces, we all know that our career personnel is the most essential factor in building an Air Force. Planes require pilots, bases require maintenance, and weapons cannot be used without skilled training. In the last year or two the appropriations as well as the policy committees have given increased attention to insuring that the armed services are made more attractive as a career. This is a problem that requires good administration as well as appropriations, and the subcommittee noted with approval the fact that the Air Force officials are pursuing a variety of approaches looking toward the solution, or at least the mitigation, of many of the situations which have been interfering with reenlistments by our trained men. The ability of the Air Force to man a 137-wing force with 975,000 men is based upon a calculation that these will be trained men. If the Air Force has to deal with a high percentage of trainees over a long period of time, not only will the personnel ceiling figures have to be changed, but the entire operation will increase the cost by millions of dollars.

The problem requires that all concerned should move out on a broad front to take care of such matters as pay and allowances, inducements to enlist and to reenlist, medical and dental care for dependents, movements from one situation to another, education of dependents in foreign countries, equalization of benefits between Regular and Reserve personnel, improved survivor benefits, and adequate housing. The solution of these and other personnel problems is essential to the success of maintaining an Air Force whose trained personnel has been finding many superior attractions in private industry.

CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

The recommended appropriations for fiscal 1956 includes provision for increased pay of military personnel under the Career Incentive Act of 1955, in the amount of $730,011,000. This sum, of course, covers all three of the armed services. The committee considers that adequate funds have been made available to cover pay and allowances of men who are on extended active duty, the movement of household effects for men who have permanent changes of station, subsistence allowances for aviation cadets and enlisted personnel, and travel allowances.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

With particular reference to our air strength buildup, it should be noted that $43,563,000 has been recommended for Air Force Reserve personnel and Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps students to cover pay, allowances, travel, subsistence, and other necessities. This amount represents an increase of $15,563,000 over fiscal year 1955.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air National Guard has been recommended for an amount of $202,841,000, which will enable it to expand and modernize its setup. This appropriation covers all the Air National Guard expenses except the procurement of aircraft, and is $42,841,000 more than the 1955 figure. There is a decrease of $300,000 under the budget estimate, but this is because the price of aviation gasoline is not expected to be as high as originally anticipated.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Funds made available to the Air Force during fiscal 1956 will cover an expansion of medical facilities both within the United States and overseas. They will also cover expenses of our personnel in areas where regular Air Force facilities are not available.

HOUSING

Both the Department and the subcommittee recognize the problems involved in the shortage of housing. This is a problem not only in the United States but also in foreign countries where we have bases. Housing shortages on or near a base can impair the combat effectiveness of our defensive air forces. In an allout emergency it would take too long for some of our airmen to get from their homes to their planes.

Some of the subcommittee members have personally investigated the Air Force housing situation in Europe and elsewhere and have found many of the families living in substandard dwellings. Some improvement is being made. It is a most difficult problem. By June 1956 we expect a marked improvement, in view of new plans and policies as contemplated by this budget.

Last August and September I visited France and Germany and advised with General Hoge and General Tunner, who gave me an excellent firsthand insight into overseas housing for our servicemen. I have pictures of the situation that exists on some of our bases, particularly those which have trailer camps. Neither the Department officials nor the committee members are satisfied with these inadequate housing conditions. The guaranteed housing program ran into trouble because French interests did not wish to build in extremely rural areas unless they had a 7-year instead of a 5-year guaranteed program. I think we could have had suitable housing in France and saved millions in trailers if the guaranty period had been increased earlier. Neither the housing problems in Europe and Africa nor those in the United States can be solved merely by the appropriation of money. We must come to grips with all aspects of this situation, and it is going to require much more coordinated effort than has been put into it in the past. If we are asked to project our planning on a long-term basis so that we can stabilize our Military Establishment, it naturally follows that housing must also be thought of on a long-term rather than a trailer basis.

To provide standard housing for the military in most any area is not easy, and especially in overseas establishments. I commend Assistant Secretary of Defense Franklin G. Floete on his recent decision which will on certain French applications increase the rental-guaranty period from 5 to 7 years. It is indeed a most difficult problem. In Germany the housing problem is not so acute. By June 1956 we can hope that a marked improvement in military housing will have taken place in France.

One of the significant provisions in the appropriations bill for fiscal 1956 is contained in section 635, which permits the use of rental-allowance funds for the leasing of quarters constructed under the rental-guaranty program in foreign countries. Where such quarters are available, the Department will now have authority to see that they are used in preference to substandard dwellings that might be occupied on a rental-allowance basis.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of the Air Force and all those associated with him, both civilian and military, in the administering of the Air Force budget, feel the tremendous responsibility as they contemplate the fact they are receiving almost 50 percent of the defense dollar. To that end, one of the questions that members of the committee had in mind continuously during our hearings was: "Are we seeing evidence of Air Force management by honest and capable people making a real effort to achieve economies of operation?" In large organizations, it is always possible to find inefficiencies, and I am sure this is true in the Air Force as in any other operation of similar or even lesser magnitude, be it governmental or commercial. However, I am convinced, and I am confident that I speak for the whole Air Force Subcommittee,

that there is in the Air Force a gratifying consciousness of the need for economy, and evidence of steadily improving procedures to obtain maximum utilization of resources. Undoubtedly, the increasingly careful review each year by the subcommittee, of the request for new obligational authority, is having its effect, as are some of the subcommittee's specific inquiries into certain practices. But it must be acknowledged, also, that the civilian leadership in the Air Force is of high quality, appears to be well informed, and gives indications of genuine effort toward economical and business-like operation. I have found evidence, too, that the military in the Air Force do support this effort, and, in fact, have continued to initiate many management improvements.

Speaking almost a year ago of the existing civilian-military relationship, a high-ranking Air Force general said:

> A review of the working relationships established in the Department of the Air Force reveals an intimacy and cordiality which lead to ready exchange of ideas, frankness of discussion, and currency of information which would be next to impossible in any organization which included the insulation of top echelons.

I believe the relationship described is essential to effective management, and I am heartily glad to find it exists in the Air Force at this time.

It may be noted that there was reassuring testimony before the subcommittee on various methods used to keep the secretarial level in more intimate contact with the daily problems in all operating areas, including materiel, manpower and personnel, research, financial management, and military construction. It was stated, and I believe it to be borne out in the experience of the Air Force, that the two additional Assistant Secretaries approved by the last Congress for each of the three services has done much to make civilian management more of an actuality.

We think of the Air Force as a young service, recalling that it commenced its separate identity less than 10 years ago. Although it does not have an many senior officers with over 30 years service as the Army and Navy, this could hardly be expected in view of the small number of officers in the Air Corps in 1925 when it was part of the Army. Furthermore, it is my personal opinion that most of the officers I have met who have been selected and promoted for positions of command in the Air Force need yield to officers of no other service in alertness, aggressiveness, general competency, and desire to meet the challenge of the job. These are mighty important qualifications for the managers of a defense force today.

I am by fairness constrained to tell this body that much specific evidence is found in the testimony, of efforts to achieve economies of operation in the Air Force. Progress in financial management techniques is marked in the current fiscal year by the achievement of the first summary reports of the dollar values of inventories at bases and depots in this country and overseas. This will make possible far better control over stock levels and needed procurements than was practicable on an item basis, where over 1 million Air Force items are involved. Progress is also marked this year by production from the Air Force accounting system of the first consolidated financial report. The foreword to this historic publication said in part:

> In order to meet the internal requirements of the Air Force for essential and effective financial control, together with the external requirements imposed by Congress, the Air Force has embarked upon the development of a financial-management system. It is expected that an integrated accounting system will produce for management at all levels reliable financial data which will enable operating and financial executives to better control and manage Air Force personnel, cash and physical resources. * * * This financial report, reflecting data as at September 30, 1954, represents the first consolidation of USAF worldwide costs of assets, liabilities, and operations ever prepared.

As indicated the monetary inventory accounting reports and the financial reports are embraced in what the Air Force calls its financial management system. The fundamental point in regard to this which should be encouraging to this body is the support given to financial management by the military itself. From the letter which General Twining sent to the major Air Force commands on the financial management system, I quote the following:

> Although our main purpose in life is the development and employment of air power, we know we will have to realize those aims within the framework of limited manpower and dollar availability. One of the means to help us endure the long pull economically, as well as militarily, is financial management.

At another place in the letter of the Chief of Staff also said, and I quote:

> Air Force operations have become so complex that the modern air force commander and supervisor must be provided with the least volume and greatest simplicity of data. Financial information developed and interpreted in the financial management system is expected to be one of the primary sources of meaningful and significant guidance for management actions.

As in the case of the other services, the Air Force submitted a number of examples of actual economies achieved in such fields as procurement-contract audits, personnel requirement reductions, procurement cutbacks, and maintenance-cost decreases. These are contained in the record of the hearings before the subcommittee and therefore I need not add them to my remarks at this time.

I would like to conclude this portion of my remarks by saying that our inquiries have satisfied me as to the ability and the will of the top Air Force management, both civilian and military, to continue striving for the economies that we, as representatives of the taxpayers, must demand of them.

AIRLIFT OF ENGINES

The Air Force is responsible for providing appropriate support for our overseas forces in accomplishing our mission. This embodies the movement of large amounts of expensive supplies and equipment in order that they will be readily available in event of war. We are striving to fulfill this responsibility in the most efficient and effective manner.

Careful consideration was given to prestocking many of these varied items; however, it was found to be unacceptable because: First, the total stockpile cost would be astronomical; second, storage costs, plus constant in-storage maintenance of these items, would be excessive; and third, losses due to obsolescence would be beyond reason. The vulnerability of such overseas stockpiles of these high-cost items also influences Air Force decision.

The choice of how to support this overseas requirement was narrowed to the most feasible answer, which is to expedite by air movement the high-cost items and to prestock overseas only those bulk supplies whose nature and cost do not justify the expeditious air movement.

Fortunately, for these high-cost items, air movement is not all added expense. The incremental additional cost of this rapid transportation will be repaid by reductions in the procurement of the high-cost items. Accordingly, stockpiles in this country and overseas can be drastically reduced. Of course, where possible, expedited surface transport will be substituted for airlift, and the services of both the railroads and the trucks will continue to be used within the United States as they fit in the system.

On examination of the most expensive items in our inventories, the Air Force found that aircraft engines are of such high cost that this air-movement plan would so significantly reduce stockpiles and pipeline requirements that engine procurement could be materially curtailed. Spare-engine requirements for fiscal year 1956 were reduced 40 percent with the introduction of this airlift system for the engines. Based on this engine-airlift concept, we anticipate that future requirements for new spare engine procurement will continue to be about 40 percent less than would otherwise be required to support Air Force plans under prior concepts for the movement and control of our aircraft engine stocks.

Last fall, in connection with this type of airlift, the Air Force conducted a survey which revealed that of the Air Force cargo airlifted 85 percent comprised high-value items, such as aircraft parts, electronic equipment, photographic supplies, and machine tools and equipment. Since January of this year the Air Force, using organic military aircraft, has airlifted aircraft engines and approximately 8,300 tons of aircraft parts, electronic equipment, machine tools, and other high-value items. This high-value cargo was delivered to the Air Force commands in Europe, North Africa, Alaska, the Far East, the Northeast Arctic area, and the Caribbean.

Since the results have been so favorable, we decided to expand this operation, and, accordingly, contracts to use three commercial carriers have been approved. We believe that by the end of this fiscal year our day-to-day working relationships with the carriers will solve the minor operating difficulties

pertaining to scheduling, routing, handling, and so forth. This experience in the coming months will afford us the opportunity of more thoroughly understanding how this airlift can be fully implemented. Therefore, in light of the attendant economies of this airlift system and the predominant consideration of the need for this type of movement to support our wartime tasks, we are asking the Congress to approve the program as contained in the Air Force budget for fiscal year 1956.

CONCLUSION

The original budget estimate for the Department of Defense was $32,232,815,000, and after a thorough evaluation was made of the various programs upon which this request was based, the committee recommended $31,488,206,000. This amount represents a reduction of $744,609,000, but it is considered entirely adequate for the efficient management of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and various interservice activities. We realize, however, that it is based upon the assumption that there will be no serious decline in the international situation. If at any time during the coming fiscal year storm warnings should threaten the preservation of peace, we have been assured that the Department of Defense will ask for funds to expand the military program.

It is only upon the basis of this understanding that the defense appropriations are correlated with the planned military manpower cuts. This was one of the main issues that came before the committee, and it is significant that some of the key witnesses were dubious about the cuts, while some of the committee members were vigorously in opposition to reducing the size of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. In line with the emphasis on airpower, the Air Force was increased by 5,000 men, as I have already pointed out.

Another reason that affected the final committee decision was the assurance of the Department of Defense that Reserve forces would be trained and would be prepared to augment our regular troops in time of war. As the committee reported:

> The Reserve programs appear never to have been properly administered or coordinated to provide an effective military force in time of emergency. It is hoped that something positive, both in the forms of needed legislation and better administration, will be done during the ensuing fiscal year.

There are some of us who consider that it is a risk to cut the regular forces before the Reserves are militarily prepared, and we hope that this risk has been so calculated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as not to be out of line with the unfolding events of the future.

A roundup of the most significant committee decisions embodied in the military budget reveals the concern of the members with the problem of continuing congressional control over the purse strings. This involves the harmonizing of policy, program, and the budget lest the final result be impaired by falling between these three stools. To achieve a better balance between these interacting elements, it will be essential that improvements be made in the budgetary process and in the manner in which the budget is presented to the Congress. Specifically, as the committee report states:

> The committee has become increasingly annoyed over the disparities, inconsistencies, and apparent contradictions between the budget document and financial reports of the Department of Defense. * * * The annual budget document appears to adjust the amounts recorded in prescribed accounts in such manner as to make it extremely difficult for the committee to recognize what purports to be the same financial data periodically received from the Department.

In order to ensure that budgeting and accounting are put on the same basis, the committee has directed that present practices be modified before the fiscal 1957 budget is submitted to the Congress.

In addition, the committee has asked that more adequate estimates be made of carryover funds for fiscal 1957. Although some unobligated balances are necessary, it does not seem that such a large discrepancy in estimates should occur as in 1954–55, when the original estimate of $6.8 billion ultimately turned out to be more than $13.6 billion.

It would appear from the testimony that different officials who are engaged in formulating the budget have different ideas as to how long this process takes. If we are trying to relate policy, program, and budget, it is essential to know whether the budget is based upon a recent policy or one that was uppermost some 2 years ago. It is only by dovetailing these factors in a shorter space of time that we can hope to keep up with the present and be prepared in the future.

Detailed chronologies of the budget are necessary if we are to pin down this process so that we can see just who is responsible at any given time.

The committee has several methods for maintaining a continuing control over the expenditure of funds. One method is to insist upon reports in areas where the hearings have revealed that supervision is necessary. For example, in the reprograming of funds which really represents a diversion of funds from the original purpose for which justified, the committee has asked the Defense officials to keep faith with the committee and Congress, and to continue making requests for prior approval of changes, and in addition to submit detailed reports on all reprograming of funds twice a year.

Another method is to reduce funds if the Department does not carry out congressional intent on a given problem. For example, in the matter of inducing reenlistments, it would appear that more could be done by administrative action. Men could be given jobs for which they are qualified and not required to make frequent changes in their permanent stations. The committee has made a 5-percent reduction in funds for travel and the moving of household goods, and has notified the Department that unless there is substantial improvement, by the time hearings are held on the 1957 budget, the committee will consider placing a specific limitation on this type of expenditure.

Another control device is to establish criteria whereby economies may be effected, and the committee has done this in the case of the procurement process.

Investigations are still another way the committee has of discharging its responsibility to control expenditures. An investigation is scheduled for the problem we have just been discussing—frequent changes of station and lack of proper job placements. Then, too, on the problem of procuring spares and spare parts:

> The committee will, between now and January 1956, conduct an investigation * * * so that it may be informed as to controls involving both purchase and issuance and current funding procedures.

In addition to committee investigations, of course, field inspection trips are made by individual members, and this is one of the most valuable ways of checking, not only on how the money is being spent for operating programs, but of learning on the spot the local problems that we might otherwise never hear of in Washington.

The evaluation of the budget requests in such a manner as to promote the national defense is indeed a responsibility that is not confined to the hearing process—the committee members consider that it is a continuing duty throughout the year.

In closing, I want to pay my respects to the many men and women in the armed services—military and civilian—who are working hard to establish and maintain the high standards so essential to the success of our Defense Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, throughout these hearings I was impressed with the fact that because of research and development a weapon, a device, a program was practically obsolete by the time it reaches operation because of more modern techniques, weapon improvements and revised programs.

It impresses upon me this thought—that we must find a superior answer to greater and greater defense budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I note with interest and approval the favorable reaction of the President for a meeting with Russia. We must use every means at our command to find an answer to this ever-increasing budget for national defense.

THE BATTLE OF IDEAS

While I am a strong believer in a sound program of national defense, as we have attempted to spell out in this budget, I do feel we must not stop here.

We live in a day when the struggle is for the wills of men and nations.

We must not only have a gun in our hands but a superior idea in our heads and an answer in our hearts if we stem the tide of a foreign ideology that has captured one-fourth of the land area of the world and hold within their grasp approximately one-third of all the people in the world.

There came to my desk within recent days a provoking newssheet edited by Moral Rearmament which I think has a significant application to the problem before us of trying to use every means at our command to win in this battle of ideas. I was struck with the question raised: "How does an idea capture the

world? The answer: By capturing the wills of individuals. When an idea wins the allegiance of the wills of men it becomes a force in history; it becomes an ideology."

Is there an alternative force? What idea will capture the allegiance of the wills of men and of nations?

My discussion up to this point has involved policies and programs of the Defense Establishment and how to relate policy and programs to the end that we have an adequate Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we must implement this enormous expenditure of dollars to build a great national defense with a superior idea to communism. We must breathe into this budget ideas that will change men and nations. You can kill a man but you cannot shoot an idea. The idea will either rise to bless or to plague you. Thus, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that all of us responsible for the Defense Establishment, the Congress, the military and civilian personnel, bring to our thinking, acting, and living absolute moral standards as the only way by which we can find an answer to greater and greater national defense budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When will I get a chance to ask my question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in no position to give an answer to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is impossible to get recognition in the Committee, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the fact that it is impossible for anyone except members of the committee to get time to speak, and I have no fault to find with that, and it will probably be impossible to get time under the 5-minute rule because the committee will use that, I will have to make a point of order, because I want the Members of the House to hear the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise; and on that motion I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 101.

So the Committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan at this point if he desires to propound a question.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman from Michigan suggests there is more than one Member from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point that there are so many gentlemen from Michigan on the Republican side I do not know which one is referred to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There are a number, I am sure, but I was referring specifically to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I had two questions, one I wanted to ask of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the other of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. I will wait until they get the floor again. I do not want to put upon the gentleman from Wisconsin the responsibility of answering questions that were put to them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I feel in a rather embarrassing position when my recognition was the occasion for a motion that the Committee rise and then other Members felt somewhat disappointed, I am sure, to learn that they were called back in here for a teller vote just prior to my allotted time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Members who came in to answer will be well repaid by what the gentleman has to say, I have no the slightest doubt.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, serving on the Air Force panel this year has been an interesting experience for me. It is the first time that I have had the responsibility of sitting through the details of a request for appropriations by one branch of the armed services, even though for the past 4 years it has been my responsibility to deal with one particular phase of military operations, that of installations, the public works program of the armed services.

One of the things that impressed me considerably and caused no small amount of concern was the actual lack of congressional control over funds that are made available to the Armed Forces. Included in this budget for the Air Force—and I am going to devote my comments entirely to the Air Force atlhough some of the things which I may say, I am sure, will apply to the other services as well—are seven broad categories: Aircraft and related program, about $6 billion; major procurement other than aircraft, about $350 million; research and development, $570 million; military personnel, $3,670,000,000; Reserves, about $43,500,000; National Guard, about $200 million; maintenance and operation, about $3,600,000,000-plus.

The thing that is of considerable concern to me is that the Congress, once it provides a particular number of dollars for any 1 of these 7 categories, loses control of that money from that time on. We lose control of it not only affirmatively but we lose control of it negatively as well. By losing control of it affirmatively I mean that we cannot impose our will on any branch of the armed services to be sure they will use any particular amount of money for any particular purpose.

That is true because of the control of the actual allotment of the funds which has been assumed over the course of the years by the executive branch of the Government. In other words, when we appropriate $570 million, we will say, for research and development, we have no assurance that that $570 million will be actually and affirmatively used by the Air Force for that purpose, because, actually, the Bureau of the Budget has assumed the authority to allot it, to dole it out, to the Air Force during the course of the year.

Just as we cannot affirmatively control the money that is to be used for a single purpose, we are somewhat helpless as a matter of practice in the negative sense as well, because within those large categories of millions and billions there is at least under the law complete transferability within that huge amount of money. So, once the lump sum has been appropriated, even though they may come up with high stacks of justifications to show so many millions for projects in the category they call 200 or in the group of projects in the category 300 or 400, as a matter of fact, they can switch that money around within that amount and completely at their discretion if, of course, they can get the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, also within the executive branch, to make those transfers.

In one case, for instance, we found $150 million that had been obligated in the course of a fiscal year that was in excess of the amount justified for that purpose the year before. When we asked about it, the answer was, "Oh, we simply transferred it from another place where we did not need it quite so badly."

One thing that grew out of the development of that situation has been a commitment that in future years, when major transfers of that kind are made, the Appropriations Committee will be informed at the time that transfer is contemplated. At least that is a step forward. I do not think it represents anything like a complete answer to these lump-sum appropriations and the complete transferability within them, but, while all of the Members of Congress will not be informed, at least the responsible Appropriations Subcommittee will be informed when these transfers are being made. I think it is quite plain, then, that we are almost completely dependent upon the good judgment and the managerial capacity of the people in the executive departments for the efficiency as well as for the strength, the actual strength, of the defense forces of this country. Yes; we can exercise our judgment in making these lump-sum appropriations, but once that has been done, the real progress that must be made, that affects directly the defense of our country, within the executive department. That is true specifically with respect to this procurement program that we heard a considerable amount about. Those few who were on the floor most of the afternoon yesterday, at least, heard a great deal about the procurement program, where a large proportion of the appropriations for the Department of Defense is channeled. I am not in a position as a newcomer to this

particular specific appropriation to defend the procurement policies of the Air Force. Heaven knows that all of us have found occasions to be critical of procurement policies in all branches of the armed services. But, there was one thing that concerned me a bit about the considerable discussion on this point that took place here yesterday on the floor, and that was the impression that could be received by those who listened, by those who read the RECORD this morning, that as far as the Members of the House were concerned, we were willing to cover the whole procurement program with a blanket indictment. I do not believe that was intended; in fact, I know it was not intended by any of the members of the subcommittee who spoke on that subject. But, there were questions asked and comments made by other Members that left, for those through the RECORD this morning, a general impression of such an indictment. I am personally satisfied that there has been such a great improvement in the procurement policies of the Air Force and the other branches of the services in the past 2 years; there has been such a great improvement that the darkness has given way to a gleam of light in that direction, that made it seem particularly unfair that the comments of indictment of the procurement program should be made at this particular time.

There has been great improvement, in my opinion, not only in our procurement processes, but in the overall management of the Air Force as well. In the field of manpower, for instance, when in late 1952 the program contemplated 143 wings, with 1,185,000 men in uniform and another 440,000-plus civilian employees, in the 1956 program it is contemplated that we shall have by the end of that fiscal year 137 wings with 975,000 men in uniform and 330,000 in a civilian capacity. That is a net reduction of 322,000 persons, with a reduction of only 6 wings in the total contemplated target for the Air Force.

Not all of the credit for this improvement in manpower management or utilization goes to the Air Force. The committees of the Congress and the Congress as a whole have been responsible for insisting upon better utilization of that manpower.

So, too, in the field of financial management. The creation of industrial funds and stock funds, so that we now can have a dollar inventory control comparable to the kind of control exercised by private business, represents a great advancement in that field.

One thing occurred to me in the course of our hearings, and that was almost a reticence with which we were told about these great improvements in everyday management of the Air Force and of the other branches of the service. Finally, toward the close of the hearings, when we asked for specific examples, we were presented with a mimeographed list of specific things that had been done in the way of improvement. I do not intend to take the time here or to expand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with it, but I think some of the critics ought to know of the kind of daily management improvement that has taken place within the Armed Forces in the last couple of years.

I was glad that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], who preceded me on the floor, took the occasion to point to some of the encouraging factors that have appeared in this all-important field of improved management. And that has filtered down—this insistence upon better day-to-day management—has filtered down to the base level, to the installations of the Department of Defense. There is, as my colleague from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] pointed out yesterday, an economy consciousness, in my opinion, at the installations that was not present in past years. As I say, I cannot take that entirely from my own experience on this subcommittee, but I can base it on the observations that I have made while serving on another subcommittee which had occasion to visit some of these installations.

To get back to this problem of procurement and the improvement in management that has taken place in it, I think that it can fairly be said that the presentation on this subject made by the people of the military was not effective. They did not do the job they could have done of impressing the members of the committee and the Congress as a whole with the improvements that have been made. But certainly, as my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] pointed out, Mr. Lewis, the Assistant Secretary for Materiel, gave what I considered a most encouraging demonstration of a healthy approach to attempting to get a solution to the procurement difficulties.

I am glad that a study is to be made before next year's hearings under the sponsorship of the Committee on Appropriations, which is completely proper. But it does concern me a bit that from some of the comments that were made yesterday, the indication was that we all feel that the program has sort of deteriorated, bogged down, and that the job of the investigating committee will be to go in and tear it to pieces and lay the pieces separately on the table for the Members of the Congress and the public to study.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. I feel the gentleman is making a very interesting and valuable statement.

I feel that many improvements have been made in the Department of Defense over the years. I think the Department with every passing month is gaining some in cost consciousness and in efficiency, especially since we have leveled off on a stable program. The further we get away from a crash program I believe the more solid that program will be.

I deplore the attitude of anyone who would undertake to paint with a broad brush and destroy the confidence of the people in the good intentions and in the efficiency of our civilian and military leaders. By and large, I have faith and confidence in them. The tendency which existed a few years ago of branding so many of them as either uninformed, or disloyal, or stupid, was very bad, indeed, for everybody. Talk about breaking down morale in the Armed Forces, that is a good way to do it. We have some good men, and they are trying to do a good job.

I recognize that in some of the statements I made yesterday I might have appeared on the surface to be somewhat harsh, but my object was to try to drive home this fact, that we must somehow, thinking not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans, find a way to get more for the defense dollar in procurement. While I have indicted our failures through the years under previous administrations and now, I recognize that it is hard to get the competitive bidding that we want, at times impossible.

We have only one firm, I believe, making the intercontinental B–52 bomber. Often you do not have a lot of people who are in a position to bid. We have only about 12 companies that have Air Force contracting facilities for air frames. I recognize that many of these contracts have to be negotiated. It is because so many of them have to be negotiated that we really need the top-flight men doing the negotiating, because men of less caliber can do the competitive bid basis type of work.

I join with the gentleman in undertaking to put in proper focus this highly important and significant facet of our defense building.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman did make those comments. It is in keeping with his constructive approach to these problems. My purpose has been simply to attempt to correct the overall impression of indictment that could be gained from yesterday's discussions, an impression which was neither completely justified nor fair. I am sure from what the gentleman from Texas has said and from his very consistent conduct in that respect that he will certainly join in the hope that whatever investigations result will not be with the purpose of creating headlines. I am sure that will not be true because of the sponsorship of this particular investigation, but will be to help the executive branch and the Congress meet their joint responsibility in this great field. I cannot help but feel that some of the difficulties we have had in procurement must be brought right home to roost at the steps of the Congress itself. We ourselves have been responsible to no little extent for the fact that we do not have complete competitive bidding in many fields of the procurement for the Department of Defense.

Some of the same gentlemen who were critical of the procurement program yesterday, for instance, were some of those who have been quite pointed in some of the remarks they have made that some defense contracts ought to go into particular hardship areas of this country, regardless of what the additional expense to the Defense Department might be. Too, they have urged that small businesses be considered in place of a large business that might be able to do the job more cheaply.

There is an overriding policy consideration in this respect that transcends the dollars and cents of the broad com-

petitive-bidding program, but that is the responsibility of Congress, it is not the responsibility of the Air Force. Likewise, in the maintenance of alternate sources for large procurement contracts, we in Congress have insisted upon that.

The Department of Defense has insisted upon that at the very top level, also, because we and they felt it was not completely safe to put all our eggs in one basket for any important source of procurement. In that connection, the gentleman from Texas mentioned the alternate sources of B–52 procurement. The second one costs considerably more than the first one, and we could get all of them cheaper probably if we continued to get all of the planes from the one place. But because of overriding policy considerations, we have said to get them from that second place also even though we have to pay more for them. Those are some of the things that enter into the matter both in the field of policy and in the field, shall I say, of congressional interference which have made it impossible for the Air Force to go ahead with most procurement on a completely competitive basis. We know, too, in this field where secrecy is involved, and where we are not dealing with common items, but items which have to be not only manufactured but started from scratch and where we have to go through all the processes of research and development before we get the items, you cannot, therefore, go out and put that on the bidding market and let everybody compete for contracts. It is not too surprising that we must have a large amount of our procurement on something other than a straight competitive basis. I make these comments not as a champion or defender of past procurement policies, but rather to attempt to bring some of these things into focus. In my opinion, they have been taken out of focus somewhat by the discussion had here on the floor yesterday.

There are a couple of other things that I did want to mention. One of them was the Air Force ROTC program. I imagine that a good many of you have had inquiries and letters relating to about 1,300 young men who took the Air Force ROTC program at various colleges and universities throughout the country. They then found at the end of the course, when they were qualified in every respect, that the Air Force Reserve commission which they thought they were going to get, simply was not available to them. About 4,800 of such ROTC graduates were not given Reserve commissions. They were given the alternative of volunteering in a noncommissioned status, letting Uncle Sam catch up with them through the Selective Service, or taking a commisson in the Air National Guard. A number of them took this last alternative, but they found after taking that course that such service was not credited even though they went on duty with the guard for a period of 3 years—that was not credited as service in the Armed Forces. They were still subject to the Selective Service once they resumed status other than active with the Air National Guard. Those 1,300 young men presented something of a problem and in the course of our hearings, it was brought out that legislation is now being submitted by the Department of Defense. I do not know exactly what its status is with respect to the Committee on Armed Services of the House but the legislation is "in the works," to use a slang phrase, to attempt to solve that problem so that they will be credited as long as they have gone on active duty and have worn the uniform, actually, in service, at least as far as the Selective Service Act is concerned.

There is one more item that I want to deal with briefly. It is something for which no funds are included in this appropriation measure. But, it is something for which the Congress has made considerable appropriations in the past, and that is the tactical air-navigation program which, in its abbreviated form, is called TACAN. At about the time our hearings were in progress, a number of newspaper articles and editorials began to appear, inferring a considerable amount of duplication and waste of money through the development of TACAN by the Armed Services at the same time the civilian program, generally referred to as VOR/DME, was being developed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Because of these questions the chairman very prudently brought the head of the communications for the Air Force, General Blake, before us to ask him about some of the items and editorials which had appeared. What has developed since our hearings have been held is this: that the Air Navigation Development Board's recommendation that VOR, as it is called, which is the direction-finding part of the aircraft navigation system, should continue until 1965, but they were going to cut off what they call the distance measuring part of it, DME, on July 1, 1955. They said they could not assure to the civil aircraft participants that DME would be usable beyond that time. As a result of the furor that was raised at about the time our hearings were completed, a revised plan has been submitted, which means that this DME, the one that was the most controversial at the time, has been extended until 1960. So that as far as I know, with but a few minor exceptions, this arrangement has made both the civilian aircraft people and the Department of Defense as satisfied as any compromise seems to satisfy the participants in any controversy. I have some other factual material on this subject, furnished to me by Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, who serves as Chairman of the Air Navigation Development Board, at my request, which I shall ask to insert in the RECORD at this point at the proper time.

BACKGROUND AND ORIGINAL PLAN OF ACTION

The Air Navigation Development Board's plan of action, as announced on February 8, 1955, provided for the continuation of distance measuring equipment on an experimental basis only. Further, no service was guaranteed after the 30th of June 1955. The reasons for this provision were:

Civil distance measuring equipment and the tactical air navigation system—TACAN—used, in part, the same frequency space. This prevented full implementation of TACAN.

The DME program was not complete as far as ground installations were concerned; 447 ground stations were planned to be completed by June 30, 1955, with an additional 55 planned for 1956. Two hundred and sixty-one of these are to be fully commissioned by June 30, 1955.

Information available to the Board indicated that there were less than 200 nongovernment aircraft equipped with airborne distance measuring equipment. This represented a very small segment of the aviation public. For example, 28,000 VOR sets had been purchased by civil aircraft operators; 26,000 VOR sets have been purchased by the Navy and Air Force.

Because the Board had stated TACAN as its objective, it seemed logical to shut down distance measuring equipment immediately. This would prevent further expenditure of public funds and inconvenience the least possible number of airborne equipment purchasers.

The Board's policy did not require the elimination of distance measuring equipment immediately. On the contrary, it provided for the DME ground network to be held in a state of readiness because of the possibility of TACAN failing to measure up to common system standards. This possibility, although remote, nevertheless existed and required that a backup, or insurance measure, be provided. It was, therefore, planned that the present civil DME in combination with an omnibearing system, yet to be developed, which would satisfy both the civil and military—common system—requirements, would comprise this backup system. Civil DME in combination with the new omnibearing device is popularly known as the alternative system.

MODIFIED DME PLAN

Soon after the original ANDB plan had been announced, a definite trend against the discontinuance of DME became evident. Accordingly, it seemed prudent to modify the plan as originally announced where it pertained to discontinuing DME. The change would attempt to satisfy those who wanted DME service by offering a continuation of the DME ground network operation until June 30, 1960. This plan would not interfere with the partial implementation of TACAN already ordered for use by the military and as long as it was clearly understood that this extension was not to encourage the entrenchment of the distance measuring equipment, the ANDB had no objection to it. With these understandings, the ANDB agreed that DME service could be extended, although it was pointed out that the military and the scheduled air transport industry had no plans for it.

The Air Coordinating Committee, by separate action, has recognized and supported the ANDB modified plan of action as announced in its press release of April 20.

Extending DME has many advantages; among the important ones are:

It permits DME service to be given to those requiring it.

It enables both air crews and ground traffic control personnel to become familiar with the use of distance information and to develop and adopt procedures which will increase air traffic control efficiency. These procedures would be applicable to TACAN or subsequent systems having a distance measuring component.

It maintains the DME ground network in readiness to be teamed with the new omnibearing system in event TACAN, for reasons not foreseen, fails to qualify for common system use.

SUMMATION

The Air Navigation Development Board's agreement to extend the life of the distance measuring equipment was partly in response to a desire expressed for this service by a persistent segment of aviation and also because the Board felt it had no right to deny a useful navigation service to those equipped to use it, if it did not interfere with the adoption of the system that had been found best for all users of the airspace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], a member of the committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Are we to sit here and just loaf and wait for these expositions that we are supposed to listen to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the Member in charge of the time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. FLOOD and Mr. WHITTEN have been on the floor constantly for 2 days.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. By prearrangement he was to close the debate, but another speaker to whom I intended to yield is not present. So the gentleman from Mississippi was to close the debate on the Democratic side. He is a very valuable member of the subcommittee and has been waiting to be heard.

I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition given me by the membership when I was yielded this time to discuss this more than $30 billion appropriation.

On this particular matter I am pleased to have a chance to discuss with the membership some things that I think are very important.

I served on the national defense appropriations during World War II, on the Navy Subcommittee. At that time we had a number of developments that showed what could happen and what was happening in any program we had.

For instance, we found that the Navy had entered into a contract with the Standard Oil Company of California to develop Elk Hills where the Navy had a bigger percentage of the land but the contract gave the Standard Oil Co. a far bigger share of the oil. The contract gave to that company all the oil that was produced for the first 5 years. The value of Navy's share of such oil was to be repaid to the Government but at a rate less than interest on the Government's share of the oil which Standard Oil received. It developed that that contract was in perpetuity. Once we got into it, it developed that there had been no approval by the Department of Justice. Upon our objections, the contract was ruled illegal, and the Secretary of the Navy said he had pulled a boner.

During my service on that subcommittee it developed that the Navy wanted to build about $500 million worth of new facilities late in the war. We asked why it was that they did not use the Army-abandoned facilities. They said the Army had abandoned no facilities. At the lunch hour Navy witnesses came back with a statement from the Army that the Army had abandoned no facilities. But when we got into the hearings we got from Army witnesses the facts, and it was developed that while they had vacated facilities, they were not abandoned because they had caretakers there. The services had a committee on the joint use of facilities, but it had not met during the 3 years of the war. The net result of our efforts was the Navy used in excess of 200 vacated Army facilities at a saving of between $400 million and $500 million. But the tragedy of it was, and this is supported by the record, the Army could not tell the Navy, after they found out what was required or desired, until they got on the telephone and called over the country to find out what they had that was vacated, because they did not know here in Washington.

The reason I mention that is that it has been my view for a long time, and it is personal, that the only real way the members of the Appropriations Committee can do you any real good in this year's hearings in considering this year's justifications must be based on what we know they did with what they got last year; in other words, the knowledge that we have of last year's actions is the real basis that we have got to have if we want to do any good in checking on this year's requests. So I have always believed from the start that investigations were highly valuable. I have used it on the Subcommittee on Agriculture during the years that I have been chairman. If I had time, I could recite benefits which have come of the Department, to the Government, and to the people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the donor property bill that I introduced and which passed this House and with which the gentleman is familiar, we had hearings. We found that in connection with stock fund items of the various branches of the Defense Department they were declared excess but not surplus. If declared surplus General Services then would have information which they could use in asking other agencies of the Government if they could use any of the items before they got down to the colleges and the universities, which is proper.

We found that even on property declared excess by the Department of the Army, that the Department of the Navy did not know it nor did the Department of the Air Force, and some of that property could have been used and the taxpayers' money saved. Some of it has been sold to the extent of $2,400,000,000 at a gross average return of about 7 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I want to say that this whole military department is full of illustrations just like that.

But back to this investigation. I made the point repeatedly in former years that the Military Establishment, big as it is of necessity, that the only way to hold them in check is by a continuing investigation. A few years ago under the threat of the McClellan resolution to establish a joint committee on budget for the House and Senate, I got the Appropriations Committee to adopt a resolution providing for annual investigations of each department and agency of the Government by agents of the Appropriations Committee with the subcommittee pointing out the particular place for the investigation to be made. This year I went back on the Subcommittee on National Defense and notwithstanding the resolution I mention, I found that we had not had that investigation for 1953 and 1954. I began to ask questions of the departmental witnesses, what I want to recite to you are largely what they did not know. We had before us the finest group of military people to justify these appropriations. The things they discussed, however, had to do largely with new gadgets, new weapons, new equipment, military equipment which I could not hope to qualify to discuss with them. But when you got them to discussing money and the finances requested they knew as little about that as we did about the military part of it they discussed. Of course among all the witnesses there were some exceptions but by and large it was as I have described. I know somewhere they must have had people with more information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Having served with the gentleman for quite a period of time, I know that he would not make a statement erroneously, so I would like to correct him to this degree: We have had two groups in the last 2 years of special investigators that have been assigned at the request of the respective subcommittees. Those reports are available in the committee for a Member. Perhaps the gentleman did not know that, but that is the truth about the matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the correction by the gentleman. Having served on this committee, my statement bears out the testimony before the particular panel on which I happened to serve, which was the Air Force. I appreciate the correction because I certainly want to be factually correct.

Let me show you what was testified in these hearings. It was testified, for instance, that the Air Force was continuing on a 150-plane contract, each of which cost millions of dollars. After only two planes had been produced, they

had a wing flutter. Instead of stopping the contract then until such defect was corrected, the Department continued the production.

When first questioned about it, one of the reasons given was that to stop further production would mean unemployment. I said, "Well, nobody wants unemployment, but that should be handled through the Unemployment Compensation Commission and elsewhere. The National Defense Department is not the department to take care of that."

It developed then they do not follow such a policy now. Now they fly before they buy. I said to them this change in policy proves the correctness of my objection to continuing this contract pending correction of the defect in the two planes delivered.

"Now," I asked, "having found it out, what is your excuse for carrying on this particular contract?" The answer was anything but adequate. It also developed in these hearings that the Air Force has requested in this bill approximately $150,000 more per unit for a type of plane they have been procuring from the same company for 2 years. For 2 straight years the company has been making the same plane. But in this request the Air Force asked for an additional $150,000 per unit for the planes to be built during the coming fiscal year, which are the same as those heretofore built. When I asked what effort they had made to try to get the contractors to do it at the same unit price, the answer was that they had made such efforts. I then asked that they bring the actual file in. I wanted to see the correspondence. The reply was that they had to get the file from Wright Field. Our chairman supported my request and they were told to bring in the actual file from Wright Field to show what effort they had made to get this contract on the same unit price.

After about 10 days they came back and said they were sorry they had given us erroneous information. The contract had not been negotiated. It had not taken up with the company, but, to play safe, they had estimated they would have to pay $150,000 more per plane. I then asked if they had not only misled us but if by requesting the increased amount they had not given away their hand by saying they would be willing to pay $150,000 more per plane?

But they insisted on showing an example of where they had saved money. Then was presented the facts concerning a certain contract when they had set a target of approximately $400,000 cost per unit with provisions for the Government to pay 80 percent of any overage. After he had been operating they found he was a high-cost operator; then they had gone in and got a contract for two-hundred-thirty-odd planes and in such contract they scaled the cost down to $290,000 per plane.

But, listen, it developed that when the lower price was set for the new contract they had finished only about 16 planes under the other contract, as I recall the facts, which showed it was a high-cost contract, but they did not do anything under their renegotiation rights so far as the original contract was concerned.

Here is the thing that gets you about the laxity of our whole operation and we need to correct it. I was pleased to note the statements made by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

This appropriation is in about eight different parts, so to speak. Within each of those parts they can do almost anything they want to by juggling it around and spending directly opposite to their justifications. The major part of the money, the minute we appropriate it and it comes to them the first of July, they can use it for an entirely different purpose so far as any law is concerned. Now, there is an arrangement where it is supposed to be reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. They have assured us that they would advise us in the future of the substantial shift of the funds, but whether that is carried out or not will require a continuing check to see whether they use it for the purpose requested or in the way that they later tell us that they did use it. This actually requires two budgets: what they say they will do and then a performance budget, what they actually did. The Assistant Secretary for Air made this significant statement:

> We have to have the right to use these millions of dollars that you give us for one purpose; we have to have the right to use it for a different purpose because if we cannot, we would be tempted to go ahead and use it for the purpose we got it for even though we found out it was unsound.

Now, that is the statement in the record.

And I want you to listen to this. I am talking about the appropriation process. In this bill there are millions of dollars for procurement of weapons for which drawings have not been drawn and the use of which is dependent upon a discovery of the Atomic Energy Commission which has not been discovered yet. Now, can you go any further than that in laxity in providing money to the biggest operation that you have? Now, I know these people have just as much desire to save as I do. They were wonderful people, but most of the witnesses before us were primarily fine military men and not grounded in the financial requests that they were before us to justify.

Now, the reason I point this out—and there are some things you can take comfort in in this matter—I gained the impression that our military men play up to the utmost maximum what Russia could do with what she has; and figure her to have the absolute maximum as to what she could have. Then, to play it more safe, we count for ourselves the absolute minimum that we could do under any circumstances in case of attack. So that feeling gives a wide spread for our real degree of preparedness. That is a human action, and it is a case of playing it safe; it at least gives you some confidence that perhaps we are in good shape. Personally may I say we are willing to risk these military men that were before us to fight any war we may have and we will win it. I am talking about the financial aspect. They tell us that we will have to carry this military program on for from 15 to 30 years. That means that half of your annual budget is going to be for military defense for 15 to 30 years. We have had this situation since World War II, virtually, and you are not going to raise in taxes 50 percent of your annual expenditures. You are going to finance half of it by inflation. We have and will. Thus, it becomes imperative that we consider on the one hand the national defense that we believe we must have, but on the other hand we must match against it the economic effect of paying half of your money out each year in national defense. I sympathize with the President of these United States as he has to balance on the one hand the desire for everybody to be protected to the fullest extent, with plans to meet any possible Russian attack as though Russia could fight a war on every front at once, and against that desire the President must balance the economic effect of such tremendous expenditures on our own country in the years ahead. But, the point I make is that these very facts make it imperative that we know what the military is going to use the money for when they ask for it and that we require them to come back and show what they did use it for and that we get a dollar's worth for dollars spent. Now, the best way to save money is to have the military people themselves save it. I think by reason of these hearings and these speeches, and this investigation that we are going to have, the greatest help will be that it will make the top men call on the second men to know what they are doing and right on down the line. We need this investigation badly to help us in the Congress. The national Defense Department needs it just as badly so it will know.

One more thing and I will close. Last year we passed an act requiring the National Defense Department to report to the Congress its contractual obligations as of June 30, 1954. They were supposed to make that report by December 31, 1954. They did not make the report, they did not tell us by December 31; they did not tell us by January 31; they did not tell us by February 28; they have not told us yet. Our committee has repeatedly called for such report. We still do not have it. I am not one who would charge that failure up to arrogance of anybody in the Department of National Defense. The tragedy of the situation is that the Department of National Defense has not told the Congress almost a year after the date on which we asked for the information, because they do not have it themselves.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Did the gentleman know that there is in this bill $400,000 for the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of giving out public information?

Mr. WHITTEN. I heard the point made by the gentleman yesterday.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to tell us that it has been a year and he cannot even get this information yet?

Mr. WHITTEN. I suppose we will never get such information until the Defense Department can find out itself.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think it would be significant to point out, that in his discussion of the procurement problem, the gentleman is somewhat supported by the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Materiel, Mr. Roger Lewis, who said:

> After we have done the very best job we feel we can in placing and administering these contracts, still the very nature of the article and the times under which we are making these procurements make it possible for unusual profits to be realized.

That is in keeping with the gentleman's idea of better contracting.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman and I repeat that most of their contracts in procurement are still what anybody would call cost-plus; they dress it up in some other way, but the target is set and the major contracts provide for such and such a percentage of profit. And the test as to whether they have been paying too much is to see what has happened to the aircraft companies whose chief source of business has been the Government during that period. We got some information in the RECORD on this point. I trust our investigation will disclose more.

I trust that this investigation will be thorough. I trust it will be a continuing one, because I believe the folks who are running the Military Department are just as sincere as I am; they have the same earnest desire, but they sadly lack information. An investigation of this kind will be of help to them and of help to the Congress, and under present conditions is an absolute necessity for protecting the national interests.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour in the day, I would hesitate to take the time of this Committee in further discussion of this measure, which has been so well explained by my colleagues of the committee on both sides of the aisle. As the last speaker on this side of the aisle I would be tempted to rest on the explanations and the masterful discussions that have been made by my colleagues, were it not for the fact that we have not gotten around to what is perhaps the big issue in this bill, as I understand it, which is the question of whether or not the committee's recommendations as to the size of the forces are to be followed, or whether they are to be amended as sought by my distinguished colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Unfortunately, that gentleman is not on the floor at this moment. If he is going to abandon offering his amendments, if we may yield back the balance of our time, we could go ahead with the bill. May I ask, if I yielded back the balance of the 25 minutes that were yielded me, would my good friend, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], move to close the debate and proceed with reading the bill for amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House one must not tempt a fellow Member.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. My distinguished chairman is a most repudiated Member. He is one of the best I have served under but, as I recollect, he polled but three votes on his motion a few minutes ago that the Committee rise. I would really feel sorry for him, were it not a case of his winning by losing.

This appropriation of nearly $31.5 billion is something like 55 percent of our taxpayers' substance for this year. Those of us that have toiled long and faithfully on it will have to inflict our thoughts upon you just a little further because, after all, on the rightness of this bill depends not only a lot of money, astronomical sums, but also our very national safety. I will try to get down to the point about why our committee has recommended the particular amount it has in this bill so far as the strength of our ground forces is concerned.

There has been some implication that there is in progress a cut in the numbers of our Army, our Navy, and our Marines. In a sense that is true, but it is nothing new. This whole thing dates back to the so-called New Look of a year ago, when it was decided that the crash buildup should cease, that we would have to level off for a long term, and keep our powder dry and our defenses in order and on a basis that we could maintain for an indefinite period.

The planners in our Defense Department find themselves in the unfortunate situation of having to be able to run either a marathon race or a 100-yard dash, whichever they are called upon to do by our potential enemies. It might seem in a matter as important as this, that the thing to do would be to give more money and have a little larger force than we think necessary, and then be very safe, but unfortunately it is not that simple.

Because the American taxpayers' dollar is fundamentally the best and the most fundamental ammunition we have, the purchasing power of the American dollar over the years must be husbanded and guarded so that our economy can support not only our defense effort but all the efforts of our great country. Therefore we can ill afford to maintain forces on any level that is not a sound level.

You have been told that our defense expenditures now have leveled off at about what they are likely to be for some years to come, or, rather, that they are expected to level off at about what they are this year, with certain exceptions. Actually, the level of about $35 billion has been estimated. That comes about for two reasons. One is that we are living on some money from previous years, some $2 billion in the Army, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has explained, and I think about three-quarters of a billion in the Navy. In addition, this bill does not include the military construction. But all of our experts have told us that we will level off at about the present strength, so they hope, if there is not some sharp change in the international situation, but that we have to be prepared to maintain this level for years to come.

That makes it imperative that we do not maintain forces at an unjustified level. We should maintain them at a conservatively safe minimum and at the same time there must be balance. Thus, we cannot afford to have too many spare parts when we do not have the motors in which to put them. How do we, of the subcommittee, reach the figures? How do we ask you, Members of the Committee of the Whole and the House of Representatives, to fix the figures? It is very much like the great American jury system. We are not experts. We hear the experts. We hear what they have to say and then in our best judgment we decide what is right. In this instance, the experts, and we have had them, we have had the very finest experts, I believe, that there are in this world, they have told us what our Armed Forces should be for the coming year. They have not all agreed. We, on the subcommittee, do not all agree and, of course, the Members of this great body would not all agree. But by and large the testimony has been overwhelming as expressed by the best experts so that we have almost unanimously agreed upon the formula which our committee is bringing to you today. It is true that certain members of the Army, General Ridgway and others, would like to see a larger Army. So would many of us. In a sense, of course, they are prejudiced witnesses. I say that in the most pleasant sense because I admire them all very much, but they are prejudiced in that any commander would not be worth his salt if he purposely and willingly stood by and saw his tools taken away from him. Naturally, any commander never is quite satisfied that he has enough men or equipment to meet the tremendous responsibility we place on his shoulders. But, we have a formula which was produced to our committee by the best experts we know. I read to you what Secretary Wilson says about that. It is on page 32 of the hearings:

> The determination of the strength of the Army, as well as of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, represents a decision reached after long study within the Department of Defense and the National Security Council and was finally approved by the President. It was not based upon the proposal of any particular individual.

This committee has adopted that program just as a jury decides on a verdict based on the best evidence they are able to get. Such is the testimony we have heard and it should not be lightly ignored. It has been pointed out by my colleague that we still have the greatest peacetime force that we have ever had and we must maintain it in readiness.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not also true that the Joint Chiefs of Staff passed on this matter of the size of the Army. We had hearings and discussions about that in the Armed Services Committee. As I understood, their final conclusion, it was not based on numbers, that is, on the numbers of peo-

ple you have in the Army. The decision was based on the combat capabilities of the individual soldiers, the various units of the division and the capability of the division. That is what tells you how good and how effective in combat the personnel of the division will be. You just cannot count bodies and determine what the size of our Armed Forces shall be. You must understand what equipment they have and what training they have and what morale they have, and all these with other factors will indicate what size a military unit should be to carry out its mission. Since the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded that the size which the gentleman referred to was appropriate for the Army, I am willing to abide by their judgment because in my book they are the last word on this problem.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The distinguished gentleman from California, a very important member of the great Committee on Armed Services, has expressed very ably the views, I think, of most of us. Incidentally, there are some factors we should take into consideration with respect to this program. It has been pointed out by my colleagues that the ground forces, though they may be smaller in number have a greatly increased firepower. They have greatly increased the percentage of combat ready troops as compared with the overall numbers in uniform because they have turned many jobs over to civilians. The numbers in the pipeline have been reduced, and it has been possible to reduce the numbers in training because of increased reenlistments of veterans. Then, above all, we have to look at it as a team proposition and a question of balance, and the thing that our allies and our friends are in a position to supply best for the team is infantry divisions and people on the ground.

We have great allies. When the Korean trouble started we had only half the force we have now. In addition to that, there was no Korean Army to mention, yet today it is one of the greatest standing armies in the world. The same thing may be said of the Chinese Nationalist Army. Our allies are strong in ground forces, and we must put our strength in other places, particularly in the air and on the sea, and in research and development, where incidentally there has been no reduction.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We hear so much about the military trying to get too many men into the service. Do I understand someone is going to offer an amendment adding more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff want; that they are going to offer an amendment in defiance of the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and are going to force more people into the Army than those who are running the military say are needed?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. My understanding is that such amendments are to be offered. Why the particular magic number, I do not know quite what the reason is for the number he has chosen, but I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is going to move that the Army retain the strength that it will have at the end of this fiscal year for the remainder of the next fiscal year.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then I understand the gentleman to say that this bill is about 55 percent of our income and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff say that they do not need these additional men for the security of the country, and then somebody is going to offer an amendment that will cost tens of millions of dollars more to bring those men in?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It will undoubtedly cost more than tens of millions. It will go into hundreds of millions more. Dollars are ammunition. There is nothing that is more wasteful than armed troops who are not engaged in fighting, or standing by. The only excuse is for insurance. If we have enough forces which the best judgment of our greatest military minds say is adequate insurance, anything over and beyond that is wasteful, and perhaps is defeating the very purpose we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understand it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars extra, and it may be possible that we will not balance the budget. These hundreds of millions of dollars extra will have to be borrowed for future generations to pay.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Not only that. There is another angle we should think about. We are told we are in a posture of readiness sufficient for national defense. If we increase it, it could be interpreted as saber rattling. The gentleman from North Carolina, a member of our subcommittee, made a very fine statement with regard to that matter. That is, that there is a lot more to this problem of maintaining peace than armed strength. If we give the world a picture of arming beyond the necessities for national defense and we increase the Army at this time rather than decrease it, it throws us open to misunderstanding throughout the world, which may be just enough to tilt the pendulum away from peace instead of toward it.

There is one other matter I would like to mention. We of the committee do not hesitate to take the gloves off and sail into the armed services when we think they are wrong. Often they are wrong. It is only logical, because running so stupendous, so huge an operation, if misunderstandings did not occur and mistakes were not made by the people in charge, they would not be human. However, I do want to suggest that great care be given in reading these headlines about huge waste, of overbuying and oversupplying.

Bear in mind that when they say "The Army has so many supplies on hand" that the word "Army" is very indefinite. Supplies for a million-man army would last only 3 months when that army is suddenly increased to a 4-million-man army.

It was brought out yesterday that our Army at the time of the trouble in Korea had sunk to one-fourteenth of what it had been a few years before. Purchases jumped up overnight. Incidentally our people cannot afford not to have combat rations on hand; and, incidentally, if you care to read the record, you will find that new processes have made it possible to keep combat rations for 5 years by keeping them at a lower temperature without undue spoilage occurring.

We do not like eating combat rations in time of peace or times like the present except for training purposes and to reduce waste, but what might be a year's supply under present conditions might be but a few months' supply in an emergency. You must remember further that we tell the armed services to be ready to meet any emergency. So do not get unduly excited about some of the headlines.

Another thing we should bear in mind when we talk about manpower is the fact that the Armed Services Committee has reported out a bill which will be before the House in a few days to strengthen our Reserves. What we hope and plan for the Reserves gives further justification in cutting the size of our standing Army. We have high hopes that progress is going to be made in the very important field of having stronger Reserves. And do not forget that it is a great deal cheaper to have capable Reserves available than to have all actually working 365 days a year. Another point I hope we will bear in mind is that the availability of Reserves is dependent upon how quickly they can be put into action after an emergency arises. The fact that individuals are trained and even have had battle experience does not of necessity answer the question, because a unit cannot be put into action until it has had training as a unit any more than you could recruit a group of actors of Broadway experience and put them in a new play without rehearsal, or safely put a football team on the field without the players having practiced together.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It has been said already today that it costs the taxpayers about $5,500 to maintain just one person in the armed services, whether an enlisted man or officer. That $5,500 covers everything from his clothing to the equipment or the installation that he may be part of during that 1 year. Under the new Reserve bill to be considered next week it will be possible to maintain a Ready Reserve at the cost of $1,000 per year, and a Standby Reserve at an annual cost of $300 to the American taxpayer.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. One thing the committee is trying to work out is a plan whereby we can work up a good defense program without spending ourselves into bankruptcy. The committee is giving everything to the Reserve program that it can possibly use and spend to the real benefit of our defense.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it is only fair to say to the Members of the House who are not conversant with the background of the gentleman from Maryland who now has the floor that he himself

has been a member of the military services for nearly 40 years, much of that time in the reserves. Having had that experience of possibly more than 40 years great weight is added to what he has to say.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

I can assure this House that the members of our committee have brought to it as best they could the experience they have gained over their lifetimes. I do not think there is any member of our committee who does not feel that this is a matter of as great importance as anything that can come before this body, and we have brought it to you in the best of faith after our best efforts, and we think we have brought you a good bill and one which will meet the needs of the occasion.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. These recommendations are made, of course, with the understanding that if an unforeseen emergency arises the Department can and will come back immediately to the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Not only is that so, but in the Army part of this bill we have left all of the cushion that could possibly be needed. If the world situation changed, if there were a sudden emergency, I do not believe the Army would have to wait 5 minutes to go into action, with the plans they have, and doubtlessly they have plans designed to meet whatever may take place.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not also a fact that under the terms of this bill, section 616 to be exact, the President has the authority at any time he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense to waive the so-called antideficiency law and to spend the money available as rapidly as he sees fit?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is absolutely correct. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, there is a latitude all through this bill to permit that. That is the whole purpose of the new look, the posture, the readiness, the ability to go in whatever direction circumstances may require and that with the least possible cost in time or money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. From what I hear of the bill that is coming up next week, the modified universal conscription bill, and there has been some discussion of it this afternoon, I am becoming more and more convinced that some people think we can disband the Regular Army with the passage of that bill and we are going to be able to have a Military Establishment capable of defending this country at practically no cost whatever.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think the gentleman's observation is a little exaggerated, but I can assure him that it is my honest belief a sound reserve program will greatly reduce the cost of our national defense and will minimize the need for standing forces. But do not forget that we are now on a 24-hour alert. We have to have a Regular Establishment, we have to have people standing on the ramparts, so to speak, because you cannot start to train a soldier, sailor, or marine to repel an atomic attack after it starts. You have to be in the trenches 24 hours a day and on the lookout 24 hours a day. So we will always need, as we now have, a very fine Regular Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me sum up once more. As a jury we have heard the evidence. It has been overwhelmingly to the effect that the bill which we bring to you is by and large the outgrowth of the composite thinking of the greatest leaders we have in our armed services and in the appropriate civilian parts of our Government. The committee is convinced that this is a good bill. We may differ about any one of the items, but with the fine quality of leadership that we have in all branches of our Defense Department, both military and civilian, it would indeed be unwise, and it would seem to me to be rather presumptuous, for us as laymen to sit down and write a new ticket in an appropriation bill without even the concurrence of the legislative committee. I am told that the leaders of that great committee are in general sympathy with the provisions of this bill and the size of the forces provided. I know when my friend from Pennsylvania addresses you with his usual eloquence, he will move you when he talks about his marines and his soldiers and sailors, but even though I respect his good faith and his fine personality, I hope you will stick by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and back up your committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like the Committee to note my strong support for lines 4 through 13 on page 4 of H. R. 6042, which appropriates $100 million for reserve tools and facilities. This fund is used for the purchase of specialized tools and production equipment of long-lead-time character for mobilization purposes.

The capacity of the machine-tool industry—the backbone of any peacetime industrial or wartime-armament program—has been seriously damaged by reduction in tariff protection and because contractors and industries generally went to Europe to import machine tools during the Korean war. Carefully planned Government purchases, of the type covered in this legislation, will do much to alleviate this situation. This equipment—periodically modernized to meet current weapons design—will be held in storage. Having received such contracts the factories will be kept in production.

The machines to be procured under this program are the type that could not be commandeered from private industry in time of an emergency. Typical of the items being procured are large tools such as planer-type millers, double-housing planers, vertical-boring mills, contour-stretch forming machines, gear hobbers, and mechanical and hydraulic presses costing up to $1 million apiece. The delivery time for these runs from 12 months to 2 years. Consequently, this long-lead-time equipment would not become available for use for many months after an emergency if we waited until then to order. Procurement of these long-lead-time tools at this time will serve to eliminate bottlenecks in the critical early days of an emergency.

I commend the distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations for recommending the full amount of the Defense Department's request.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has any further requests for time?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting situation. The Committee has been discussing this bill for the past 2 days. For 6 hours in their might and their majesty they have supported the bill now before you. I have but 20 minutes to reply to this heavy artillery, but I hope the inherent merit of the argument that I present because of its value can do in 20 minutes without my tongue all that is necessary to answer this barrage of the last 2 days.

Now, what good are all of your dollars going to do you and what good is all of your wealth about which you are so gravely concerned going to do you if you are not adequately and properly defended from enemy attack? You are directing your attentions today in this debate to the intentions of an enemy and to your own intentions. Well, now, instead of being concerned with intentions of an enemy or our proposals or intentions, let me ask you to simply analyze the facts as they exist, and then you apply your treatment there.

My friends on this Committee, from the interrogations that were made, say this is the product of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Why should you presume to substitute your judgment and your opinion for that of the great military and civilian experts evidenced in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the civilian Secretary? Well, my answer to that is very simple. I do not presume to substitute my judgment for that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because this budget is not and never has been the budget of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and any impression that has been created here today or yesterday that this budget was brought to this Congress by the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not true.

Mr. Chairman, there are four members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Ridgway, the Army member, is against this proposal and has made his position clear time and time again, and his position and courage of standing up to another great general, the President of the United States, is going to cost General Ridgway his job. He is going

to be fired as commander of the Army. He is against the bill.

General Shepherd of the Marine Corps was placed on the Joint Chiefs of Staff by this Congress. He was opposed by the Army. He was fought by the Navy, as the Marines always are, and it took the Congress of the United States to give the great Marine Corps a voice on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, there I have one vote, Ridgway. General Shepherd, under interrogation by me, stated very clearly, he is against this cut. That gives me two votes on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So, I am willing to go to this jury 50–50. They have got Carney, CO of the Navy, and Radford, another sailor, and they have two votes. I have got two votes, Ridgway of the Army and Shepherd of the Marine Corps. Now, that is where this case stands as we go to this jury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. No; I cannot yield now, much as I would like to.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman forget the Air Force?

Mr. FLOOD. I am not forgetting the Air Force. I am coming to the Air Force. The Air Force is the white-haired boy. How in the world could we forget the Air Force? Even my distinguished friend from Georgia, Admiral Vinson, is now for the Air Force. I am for the Air Force, too. I want the Air Force for my amendment. So I am for the Air Force.

A great Republican President once said—you know, there were really two Roosevelts and I am talking about Teddy this time—Teddy said, "Tread softly but carry a big stick." I am for peace. I am not rattling any saber. Let us tread softly, and let us carry this big stick.

Do not forget, Mr. Chairman, that it was in this very Chamber—and many of you and I recall it well—that 4 months before Pearl Harbor—it was a miracle, an act of Almighty God—4 months before Pearl Harbor, the Army of the United States was saved from dissolution by one vote. You then tried to destroy the Army, 4 months before Pearl Harbor and, thank God, one vote saved the Army. It took Pearl Harbor to prevent the disintegration of the Army in releasing from duty men who were over the age of 28.

I am not looking into any crystal ball here. I am not asking you to raise the size of the Army. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this clear. The newspapers, and the radio, and this discussion have distorted the picture. I do not want to see the Army raised or increased by one single soldier. I do not want to see an Army provided for in this budget with one single extra gun. All that I want you to do, in the face of the existing circumstances in the world today—and I do not have the time to take you on a Cook's tour of the map of the world; you know the situation. For heaven's sake, let your mind's eye tour the world, north and south, east and west, at this very minute as I speak. All I want you to do is to keep your hands off the armed services. Leave them alone for at least one more fiscal period. Do not cut this Army.

Are you going to send the spokesmen for America to world conferences looking for peace with headlines ahead of them—"The Congress of the United States cuts the defense forces. One hundred thousand cut from the Army"?

Let me tell you this. There are 15,000 men to a division. And you want to cut the Army.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield; the gentleman knows why.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I merely want to correct a misstatement.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield. There are 15,000 men to a division. You want to cut the Army. It is said that I want to raise it 89,000. I want to leave it where it is supposed to be on June 30, 1955.

Do you know that in the Far East, in the entire Pacific, facing the onslaught of the Reds you have only 4½ Army divisions and 2 combat teams, 1 in Okinawa and 1 in Japan? At 15,000 men to a division, you are cutting out of this budget more soldiers than you have in the entire Pacific theater today. Do you know how many divisions you have in NATO? You have five divisions. This cut that you want to make, the number of men that you want to take out of the Army, will equal in bodies the equivalent of five divisions that you have in western Europe. That is what you are up against. That is on the basis of 15,000 men to a division.

Let me say this: The Joint Chiefs of Staff before our committee said in effect, "Yes, when the boss wanted it done, we went along. Yes, we went along when the boss wanted it done." Well, Ridgway would not go along, and he is going to lose his job, and Shepherd had the courage to stand up and say in effect, "I did not want this cut in the Marines. I did not want it."

Let me tell you what General Ridgway said about the Russian Army. If you think you are so good, the most powerful army in the world today is the Soviet. They are not cutting. They are raising their Russian military budget 25 percent. You want a balance of power. Do you know what this cut is based on?

This cut is based on the intention of balancing the budget. A few minutes ago somebody said, "Maybe, perhaps, I think, by golly, we might gee whiz balance the budget." That is nonsense. There is no more chance of balancing this budget and the budget has no more chance of being balanced than the proverbial snowball in you know where. Certainly not. That is a sham and a fraud. So there is the big reason for the cut in the Army, there is the big reason for the cut in the Marine Corps, there is the big reason for the cut in the Navy, in ships. "Let us balance the budget." That is a sham. The budget will not be balanced. There goes the big reason.

The next reason given was, "We are going to get divisions from the Germans, 12 divisions. That will take the place of our arms cut." But you and I know that you do not have the 12 divisions in the Germans, and I am talking about the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and you will not have 12 German divisions next year or the year after or the year after, or the year after that.

Forty divisions in Korea? You will not get any place, and God forbid the fighting starts again in Korea, unless you send the Marines and unless you send back the Army divisions. I do not care if the Koreans and the Thais and the South Indochinese have 100 divisions, if anything happens they will not be able to stand up and they will not be able to do anything effectively until you send back American marines and American sailors and American airmen and American soldiers.

Admiral Radford and General Ridgway in the hearings answered "Yes" when I asked them those questions. That is what happened. So there goes your second big reason.

The third big reason was the Reserves. Oh, we are going to have Reserves they say. Let us cut the Army, the Navy, and the Marines, we are going to have a great Reserve. Well, you have not even passed that bill yet. What Reserves? What are you talking about? My friends are going to save the Army with Reserves? Not only are the Reserves not in being but you have not passed the law.

There are the three reasons.

The National Guard? A great organization. What will happen to the National Guard in case of the outbreak of hostilities? They will cannibalize the National Guard to beef up combat divisions, as they always have. That is what will happen to the National Guard Reserves.

It takes 9 months—do not forget this—9 months to train a man or a division and to put them in the line in combat. The experts tell me that in this atomic war it is going to be over in the first few days. I do not think this is so—but some of the record evidence shows this. What good will your Reserve do? What good will your draftees do you? You will have to train them for 9 months. If all this is true. In 9 months you will be dead ducks—you and the Reserves. What good is that argument for cutting the Army and the Marines and the Navy in 1956? I asked General Shepherd about the Marine Corps. I said, "General, do you want this cut?" He said, "No." I said, "General, how many Marines must you have? How many did you ask for?" He said, "215,000." And do you know what they have done with the Marines? They cut them to 193,000—they cut 30,000 Marines in 2 years, 20 percent of the elite corps—20 percent of your great initial combat force—20 percent of the corps which, according to the strategy and philosophy of this administration, in case of an outbreak of hostilities, they say, "We have a balanced force—this is a balanced force which is set forth in this budget and we will be able to receive the initial impact of an enemy and counter attack."

To be able to counter attack and to be able to meet the first days of atomic warfare, your forces for defense must be forces in being, forces trained, forces ready for the field. And you have not got enough of them. You do not have

them now. How can you afford to cut the equivalent of five divisions out of the Army? How can you afford to cut 20 percent of the United States Marines? I need not speak for the Marines. The great history of the Marine Corps is far more eloquent than my poor efforts. I leave the fate of the United States Marines in the capable hands and the great heart of this House, which has never failed to support the Marines and which has prevented efforts made by the Pentagon before this and now the White House to cut the Marines year after year. Oh, I know a great general, who will remain nameless, who said that they ought to disband the Marine Corps because they make good infantry officers for the Army. How do you like that? That is the opinion downtown about the United States Marines. What did they do with the Navy? What did the big Navy brass with the plumes and the shoulder boards do when they wanted to cut 100 ships out of the Navy? Did they cut the great big carriers? Did they cut the glorious battle items? Did they cut the big brass and the beautiful ships? Oh, no—they cut the small boats of the amphibious corps. They cut the small boats that the Marines must have in the Pacific or for amphibious warfare. "Oh." They said, "Don't worry about that Mr. FLOOD. We will get them back in 30 days." Do they have an arrangement with the Chinese and the Russians that they will wait 30 days? Is this medieval warfare when by agreement you did not fight from sunset on Saturday until sunrise on Monday morning? 30 days? They say no Marines are transferred anyhow. Oh, they are consistent—they are consistent. They cut the Marines 20 percent—30,000 Marines. General Shepherd said to the committee, "You will destroy the effectiveness of the Marines, we will have no staying power. We will not be able to secure replacements." That is what you are doing to the Marines. Who said that—FLOOD? Why, no, the Joint Chief of Staff—General Shepherd.

General Ridgway said, "Give me 173,000 more soldiers." What does the committee want to do? They want to cut that down to $1,025,000? Do you want to cut them nearly 100,000? Who asked for that? Somebody on the street corner? No; the commanding officer of the Army. Do you want authority? I am not substituting my opinion. I am giving you two voices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. That is what you are confronted with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the committee may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the present bill (H. R. 6042) provides appropriations for all regular military functions for 1956 except construction and other public works, estimates for which are now pending.

The committee, in my opinion, has made an exceedingly commendable report. Its study of the needs of our military forces has been careful and sincere. Of course, there may be instances with respect to which there may be some differences of opinion, but, on the whole, the provisions of the bill have been well thought out and due consideration given to our needs for adequate national security.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that this Nation has never had at any time more competent leaders in our military activities. I do not refer alone to those in the military service in its several branches. They are men of exceptional ability. We have confidence in their ability. We are fortunate to have such military leaders in times such as these, and, particularly fortunate to have civilian leaders of outstanding ability. Secretary of Defense Wilson has brought into the service of our Nation his great capacity to evaluate our needs and to procure a high degree of production in the shortest possible time and at the least cost. Nor, can we overlook nor fail to emphasize how fortunate this Nation is in this time of uncertainty to have in the office of President a man with the greatest military skill in all the world. He knows more than any one else in all the world the military requirements of the present time. His background of experience creates confidence in his judgment as to what should be the kind and number of our military forces. Certainly, we know that he will never give his approval to any military appropriation that is not necessary, and, equally certain we can be that he will not accept anything less than what he considers necessary at the present time.

This bill is based on the budget submitted by the President. It, consequently, has his support and it is entitled to our support. We should never forget that weakness in our Military Establishment endangers our peace. The view expressed by President Theodore Roosevelt that "we should carry a big stick and speak softly" is as sound as when he uttered those words.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, this is a comprehensive appropriation bill to provide funds for the defense of this Nation at home and abroad. I want to compliment this committee for the thorough and detailed work and study they have applied to all of the various departments of defense. The economy and caution which the committee has shown in preparing this bill indicates that every consideration has been given to adequate defense in the event of any contingency, including an atomic attack.

The Departments of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force have been given careful consideration as to their needs.

There is a saving of $350,000 in the Office of Secretary of Defense, $289,248,986 in the Department of the Army, and $640,989,500 in the Department of the Navy. The increase in this bill is for the Air Force which will provide funds for the most powerful air force in the world. We must keep our Air Force strong and modern to meet the challenge of our opposition and to be ready for any event of attack upon us.

I favor the passage of this bill in the belief that our national defense must be maintained and that the only sure way to honorable peace is to be prepared for defense against any attack, otherwise we could be led into appeasement and defeat. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in considering a bill such as H. R. 6042, Members of this body, like myself, who are not on the appropriations subcommittees of necessity must carefully follow the explanation and argument of the distinguished members like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and others who have long experience in defense appropriations and the advantage of study of the current situation and testimony during the past 3 months of committee hearings. When one considers the wide range of disagreement between experts as to what form and the duration, as well as the locality, of any possible war in which the United States might become involved, naturally, it becomes evident that an agreement is almost impossible on the relative emphasis which should be given to respective air, naval, and ground services.

It seems, however, there is general agreement that military expenditures will have to be continued on a high level for years to come and, therefore, the right policy is one that provides a level which can be sustained economically over a long period.

After listening to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I am convinced H. R. 6042 is based on a composite judgment which provides a reasonable degree of military strength as between two extreme viewpoints.

Therefore, I am not supporting amendents to deviate from the Appropriations Committee's carefully considered recommendation, and in so expressing myself I am frank in stating I am following the judgment of better qualified men and am basing my position, in particular, on the President's statement that he was satisfied with the Defense Department's program.

Now I would like to express my views in regard to two policy matters which are included in this bill and about which I do know a little more than the average perhaps, because of experiences in the past and their effect on defense installations in my district.

I refer to pages 49 and 50, specifically sections 638 and 639. Section 638 provides that no funds provided in this act shall be used for moving a major permanent facility without justifying the move before the appropriate congressional committee.

In view of recent press reports that the Air Force would discard the standing policy, most carefully arrived at, of dispersal within an area and instead move installations away from the east and west coasts, I believe any attempt to delete this section should be defeated. Sometimes we get officials who become overzealous or overimbued with overall plans. Inspired by the finest of motives,

I am sure, these planners overlook one essential of defense and that is the human element. We get a skilled team of workers together with homes and roots deep in a community. Russia moves communities, but America does not. The people of our country are entitled to pursue happiness wherever they want—and they are not going to be moved out of one area into another. Dispersal inside of one geographic area is such that it is possible to hold skilled workers together. Otherwise, you disrupt an entire project. The workers will turn to some other employment rather than give up their homes and leave their schools, churches and friends.

The other policy in section 639 has to do with preventing what I have on a previous occasion referred to as officials going on an "ideological spree." This section provides that funds appropriated in this act for work traditionally performed by civilians employed by the Defense Department shall not be contracted to private enterprise unless justified before a committee of Congress as economically sound and likewise without endangering national security.

My point here is that there are many operations in an integrated military installation which of themselves might appear to be infringing on private business, but when considered as a whole, if contracted out, would adversely affect efficiency and be economically costly and impractical.

The present criteria for eliminating such work does not include the factor of economy, and I am glad to find this provision in the bill. I hope the membership will resist any attempt to take out this section.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, later in the day when we return to the House, I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and insert proper excerpts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $60,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $12 million.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the House properly expressed grave concern about the cost to the taxpayers of the negotiated contracts which are now in use for the procurement of such major articles of military equipment as aircraft and tanks. It was suggested yesterday that sufficient money could be saved by putting an end to negotiated contracts in the military-purchase program to defray the cost of the farm parity-price program.

There are also other ways to save money and we should not overlook them. I suggest a course today that would make it possible for us to defray the cost of all the Hill-Burton hospitals that are programed, or to build badly needed schools throughout the Nation, or to provide vaccine free to many of the children of the world for the diseases for which there are known vaccines, or to build factories which would provide employment for the unemployed in the distressed economic areas of this Nation today.

Such savings could be realized by eliminating the greater number of the atomic bomb tests. I suspect we have spent that kind of money already this year in tests on the Yucca Flats. I know that many of you have wondered what it actually cost to keep 1,500 civilian defense observers at the expensive hotels on the Las Vegas strip for 10 days waiting for one shot, or what it cost to have several hundred assorted generals fly in from places as far away as Panama and Alaska, most of them with their own Government planes with standby crews. But this is only a small part of the cost of one test. Think of the cost of the bombs, of the test equipment, and all the hundreds of items and activities that go into the preparations for each test.

I do not question the necessity for testing of military equipment. I know that it is essential that we have adequate information, but I seriously doubt that there is anything more that we need to learn from further wholesale live atomic tests. I believe that simulated atomic tests will in most cases suffice for the training that is needed henceforth.

I do know the world is seriously disturbed by the emphasis that we place on atomic energy for destruction. The Soviets have carefully portrayed us as warmongers who seek only to destroy the rest of mankind. Our allies are genuinely disturbed by what they interpret as emphasis on mass destruction. Surely we can now begin to place more emphasis on atomic energy for peaceful pursuits. Surely such a course would strengthen our bid for world peace at this critical phase of negotiations.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great revival of interest in the life and career of Col. David Crockett. To us in Texas and Tennessee his memory will always be dear.

I want to read to the House a few brief excerpts from a report of a speech which Colonel Crockett made on the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, May 19, 1830, in opposition to a bill for the removal of the Indians. I do so that we may have an understanding of the great moral and political courage which he possessed, and I do so because I want to contrast his sentiment and his convictions with the present philosophy that "to get along you must go along." He is reported officially as having said:

He had his constituents to settle with, he was aware; and should like to please them as well as other gentlemen; but he had also a settlement to make at the bar of his God; and what his conscience dictated to be just and right he would do, be the consequences what they might. He believed that the people who had been kind enough to give him their suffrages, supposed him to be an honest man, or they would not have chosen him. If so, they could not but expect that he should act in the way he thought honest and right.

* * * * *

But from the first hour he had entered a legislative hall, he had never known what party was in legislation; and God forbid he ever should. He went for the good of the country, and for that only. What he did as a legislator, he did conscientiously. He should love to go with his colleagues, and with the West and the South generally, if he could; but he never would let party govern him in a question of this great consequence.

* * * * *

He knew that he stood alone, having, perhaps, none of his colleagues from his State agreeing in sentiment. He could not help that. He knew that he should return to his home glad and light in heart, if he voted against the bill. He felt that it was his wish and purpose to serve his constituents honestly, according to the light of his conscience. The moment he should exchange his conscience for mere party views, he hoped his Maker would no longer suffer him to exist. He spoke the truth in saying so. If he should be the only Member of that House who voted against the bill, and the only man in the United States who disapproved, he would still vote against it; and it would be a matter of rejoicing to him till the day he died, that he had given the vote. He had been told that he should be prostrated; but if so, he would have the consolation of conscience. He would obey that power, and glorified in the deed. He cared not for popularity, unless it could be obtained by upright means. He had seen much to disgust him here; and he did not wish to represent his fellow citizens, unless he could be permitted to act conscientiously.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, that those immortal words could be inscribed on a tablet and placed in the House of Representatives. I am sure that if they are practiced by you and me, the security, the liberty, and the happiness of this Republic would be insured for all generations to come.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I want to commend my distinguished friend from Texas for these very fine remarks he has made about our former Tennessean and Texan, Davy Crockett.

David Crockett certainly lives in the hearts and lives of all men who are interested in the progress of our great Nation.

I just had the privilege today of accepting an invitation to Lawrenceburg, Tenn., next Saturday, where in Lawrence County they are going to have Davy Crockett Day. There is a statue of David Crockett in the city square in Lawrenceburg which bears an inscription in these words:

Be sure that you are right and then go ahead.

Those were the sentiments of Davy Crockett. I want to join in the remarks of my friend from Texas in appreciation of the great life of Davy Crockett.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND

For the transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research and development, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, $25 million.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for taking a very courageous position. It seems to me clear that considering the respect in which this Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is held, it takes real conviction and courage to oppose its recommendation, particularly when it is in line with the recommendation of our soldier President.

However, I rise to remind the House of the fact that in another day under another President with a different Secretary of Defense, the House went along, as did the Senate, with defense appropriation cuts which later proved to be unwise. Personally, I am convinced that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is precisely correct when he says that the reason for these cuts is an overriding desire to balance the budget. I am convinced and have been convinced since the advent of this administration to power that many substantive decisions have been made not with a regard to the substance of the decision, but with a regard to the question of whether or not a balanced budget would be brought closer.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that if we are to survive in this world today, when we face the threat of war, and we will for a generation or more, we must be prepared to fight, not only a cataclysmic atomic world war III, prepared to fight it so that it will never come, prepared to fight so that we can maintain the peace, but also we must be prepared to fight those wars which people who have had no experience with them call the little wars, the brush-fire wars. The people who die in the little wars, the brush-fire wars, are just as dead as would be the millions who would die in an atomic conflict. If we are fully prepared to fight them they need not come either. It is my conviction that when we fall into the trap of putting a balanced budget first and fail to see the error of our ways, not only before World War II and World War I, but also post-World War II, when we fail to recognize that our demobilization after V–J Day and our failure to recognize that force was the only thing that was understood by the Communist powers, we are, no matter how good our intentions, endangering our country, our future, and the future of our children.

I submit that today, as in the twenties and the thirties, strength is the only road to peace, and I am profoundly disturbed by the fact that our strength in the Marines and in the Army is being reduced by recommendation of this administration, which there is every indication that the Congress will support.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support the Flood amendments which seek to maintain the level of the Army and the Marine Corps at that at which they are today. If I thought there were hope that such amendments might be passed, I would be in favor of amendments to increase our strength so that it would be at a level equal to our commitments and so that it could not be said around the world, as it is being said today, that America is bluffing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I share and share fully with the gentleman from Missouri the high regard and respect which he has expressed for the members of this fine committee. I have read to the limit of my ability, in the brief time they have been available to me, the hearings conducted before the Subcommittee on Appropriations which has dealt with this vital problem, and I have been impressed and impressed deeply by the thoroughness with which the committee has explored the many puzzling and challenging questions associated with our defense in this time of peril.

Like the gentleman from Missouri, I am compelled to make up my mind in regard to these proposed cuts largely upon the basis of what is in the record, and I find reading these hearings time and time again—and I can understand it; I realize it is necessarily so—time and time again you find the expert witnesses on defense going off the record to answer vital questions. I do not think any Member of this House can read these hearings and read what is in the record and what has been expressed and is there in print to read without having a profound sense of disquiet, discomfort, and apprehension at the thought of reducing our conventional forces, our conventional weapons, and our orthodox forces. You cannot read the report of the committee; you cannot turn to page 19 and read what Matthew Ridgway said; you cannot turn to page 30 and read what Secretary Thomas of the Navy said; you cannot read what General Shepherd of the United States Marine Corps said without feeling that apprehension at the thought of reducing our conventional weapons. Each and every one of these men, experts in their line, is authority for the fact that we reduce our effectiveness in time of emergency if we cut these ground forces and cut the conventional weapons as it is proposed that they be cut. Yet, we see Secretary Wilson saying in connection with these hearings that it is proposed we set up a Defense Establishment which is adequate to fight a nonatomic war as well as an atomic war. How can we fight a nonatomic war and yet reduce our conventional strength, our conventional fighting forces? I say the Senator from Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON, is right when he says if we go through with these proposed cuts, we commit ourselves irrevocably to the use of atomic weapons in the event of disaster somewhere across the world front today. If we want to keep the strength of America strong and adequate to meet what the gentleman from Missouri has described as small wars or brush fire wars, I insist that this Nation can afford to go along with the recommendations of General Ridgway, Secretary Thomas, and General Shepherd. I have deep affection for the members of this committee, but I have been impressed that several of them in private conversation have said, "We have to take a calculated risk. We have to gamble in this day and hour."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this Nation can afford to take a risk. I do not believe this Nation can afford to gamble when we have the resources, we have the power to keep these conventional forces strong enough to deter aggression throughout the world and to assure American victory if we do have fighting.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman remembers the name of a famous wartime play.

In this situation, if there is to be a calculated risk taken, we must be sure, for the safety of America, that there is no margin for error.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am afraid there is no margin for error in this day and time. Personally I see no reason for taking the calculated risk, and I hope this House will vote for the amendments which will shortly be offered which will assure adequate strength in conventional fighting forces as well as in the atomic weapons.

May I say at this point that I heartily approve of many of the actions of this committee. I approve what they are doing with regard to the Reserve forces, the buildup of the Reserve strength. I approve what they are doing with regard to the National Guard and the Air National Guard. These are wise things and good things. But why not go the full route? Why not buy as much insurance as the Nation is capable of buying? Why not make it certain that as far as the Marine Corps and as far as the divisional strength on the ground are concerned to meet the threats which confront the world today in this hour of peril, that we have those necessary forces?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman was a Member of this body last year at the time when the military budget for the fiscal year 1955 was approved. The record shows that on April 29, 1954, the House of Representatives by a vote of 378 to 0 approved the budget for the so-called New Look. I do not know whether the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] was here and voted on

that day or not, but I assume he was. Therefore, any person who voted that day—and there were 378 for the bill and none against it—voted to approve the New Look, voted to put into operation the strength figures for this year and next year for the Department of the Army.

We have taken that step by a unanimous vote of the House of Representatives, and included in the recommendations last year was a strength figure of 17 divisions for the Army, as of June 30, 1955. The picture today is even better. We have, I think, 19 and we expect to have 18 a year hence.

I call that to the attention of the Members of this body, that 378 voted for this program last year and none voted against it. The New Look is part of this program for fiscal year 1956.

Mr. EDMONDSON. But it is my understanding, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will recognize it, that this proposal cuts beneath the Eisenhower recommendation.

Mr. FORD. No; that is not entirely accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Oklahoma is not quite correct in that regard. In the case of the Army, there is a $20 million total cut out of a military budget for the Army of $7.3 billion. The minor dollar cut has nothing to do with manpower strength figures.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is subject to justifiable criticism.

Mr. FORD. I should be glad to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Take this bill today. There may be parts of this bill that many Members may not favor, but when it comes to final passage on rollcall we will vote for it. It does not necessarily follow that because 378 Members voted for the appropriation bill last year that they favored every provision in the bill. The gentleman knows that himself.

Mr. FORD. Certainly, it is a fair assumption that one more or less approves legislation by voting for it. I do not see how anyone can defend his position that he is against the bill when he is on record for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If a Member voted against the appropriation bill last year he would have voted against appropriating anything for defense.

The gentleman knows that when a bill comes to final pasage the situation is entirely different than when it is before the committee in the amendment stage. Many Members vote for amendments to a bill, and even if those amendments are voted down they vote for the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to break with the past. We cling to the old ways, the old times, the old weapons, and the old strategy. Always there are those who want to fight the next war like they fought the last war. And invariably it has ended in disaster.

The French won the first war with their famous 75's. They wanted to fight the second war with the same 75's. But the Central Powers had long since outdistanced the 75's and only the timely intervention of American troops with modern weapons and strategy saved the French Empire.

In every branch of industry modern machinery has reduced the need for personnel. We now do with machinery what formerly required many hands. Recently I heard an aged farmer say that when he first started farming it required 15 men to harvest his wheat and he sat on the fence and watched them. Now, thanks to his combine, he harvests the wheat himself—and the 15 men sat on the fence and watched him.

In war the same principles apply. Machinery supplants men and dispenses with the need for soldiers. In the first war it would have required many divisions to take Hiroshima. But 1 plane and 1 bomb did the work more effectively than a hundred thousand infantrymen. Today we are still further advanced in mechanism and require still fewer men.

Heaven help us if we ever have to depend on foot soldiers to win a war. Russia has incomparably the greatest army ever mobilized. Through sheer numbers and with modern armament the Soviets can overrun Europe and Asia within 30 to 60 days.

My good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says the next war will be of short duration. We are told by those best qualified to judge that it will be determined in the first 10 days or 2 weeks at most. That does not mean that the war will be over in that time but it will have been definitely decided within that time.

Evidence was submitted in the committee to the effect that it would be 10 days to 2 weeks before the Navy could get into the fight and it would take a year for the Army to get in. Any opportunity for participation by the additional troops proposed by the pending amendment would be long past before they could get into the fight—even if the Russians sat down and waited for them.

Members of the committee have been informed by the highest military authority that no further divisions are needed—or could be used even if available.

We were also told at the same time that even the reserves would not be needed for combat duty. The only occasion for providing reserves would be in event of the bombing of our cities by the enemy. If our cities are bombed—as they are certain to be if war is declared—chaos would follow. We could not bury our dead. All semblance of law and order would disappear. With food and water and other supplies contaminated and all communication and transportation facilities wrecked, with survivors fleeing defenseless and hopeless in every direction, martial law would be the only recourse. The 60 years' supply of canned hamburgers if still accessible would prove a boon but it would require reserve troops to control the riots and carry out the orders of the Commander in Chief—or whoever succeeded him. Combat troops to meet and engage the enemy would long since have been bypassed. The decisive stage of the war would be over before they could fire a shot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, here in the press and heat of debate, late in the afternoon of this long and trying day, let us pause long enough to take our bearings. The supreme executive authority recommends this reduction. And incidentally it is in keeping with our policy of international peace. While Russia is talking peace, but feverishly increasing its armies, we are not only urging peace but reducing our troops. The Executive recommends this reduction. Here in the House the committee, which has spent months in intensive study and exhaustive hearings, likewise recommends the reduction. And may I emphasize the fact that this subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], with panels headed by Vice Chairman SHEPPARD of California, and SIKES of Florida, is composed of some of the ablest and most experienced men in the House. Both the subcommittee and the committee voted—not quite unanimously but almost unanimously—to report the bill in its present form.

And I do not have to remind you that important testimony, submitted in executive session, is not on the record. They have been briefed on confidential matters and have information which they cannot pass on.

I trust the Members of the House will consider carefully the recommendation of these belabored men, from both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, before they vote to change this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us see. I think of a story I heard once. There was a boy in my hometown who was drinking a little too much good Pennsylvania rye whisky. His father took him up on the side of a hill looking over our valley. There were a lot of distilleries down in the valley. He said, "Now, look, son." That was after supper, at night. He said, "Look, son, you cannot drink all that whisky. You cannot drink all the whisky that all these great distilleries can turn out down there, can you?" And

the boy, looking at them, said, "Well, I guess you are right, pop, but I certainly got them working night shifts, haven't I?" Well, they are certainly bringing up the varsity on this one, when the distinguished chairman comes here to scare you to death. It sounded like a hallowe'en speech. He had skeletons rattling all over the floor. A-bombs! Let me tell you that the way this A-bomb and the H-bomb are developing, and the way nuclear and fissionable material is being utilized for war by a potential enemy and by our friends, you are going to have a stalemate. You are rapidly reaching the point that before you push the button, before you get as far as push-button warfare, there is not going to be any pushbutton warfare. Everybody has scared everybody else to death.

I was out there at a couple of these firecrackers, with my friend from Florida and my friend from Maryland. We were not back in these dens of sin and iniquity in Las Vegas. We were in the trenches with the troops. That is the last time I will try that one. The next time it is Las Vegas for me, too.

Now, do not worry about this A-bomb war. Let me tell you this. Indeed, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says, there are 3,500 pages of testimony that are not printed. Secret. Cloak and dagger stuff. Even this mustache of mine should have been in that act. Very, very secret indeed. Very theatrical. But let me tell you this, the gentleman from Missouri did not tell you what that secret evidence was, and I cannot tell you either, but I will settle with him if he will go 50–50 with me. Remember I have already got two votes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff for you. There are only four. I have Sheppard and Ridgway. He has got Kearney and Radford. He has got two sailors. I have got two soldiers. I have to go out and fight this war, with soldiers and marines on the ground.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] wants to abolish the Army, abolish the Navy, and just have an Air Force. Now that is all right, provided they talk this over with a potential enemy, but that has not been done. This might be a conventional war, and the Russians have the biggest army in the world. They are building the biggest Navy in the world. They have more snorkel submarines today than the Germans had when they nearly destroyed England and the United States at the beginning of the last war. The Russians have the biggest army. They are building the biggest navy. They are building the biggest marine corps. They are building the biggest air corps. Why? Peace. Prepare for peace. You are going to cut the Marines. You are going to cut the Army. People ask you, Why do you want this done? Why do you want to cut this budget? I do not want to raise anything. I do not want another man. I do not want another gun. All I want you to do, because of the circumstances as they exist today, is for God's sake leave this alone for 1 more year. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an attempt on the part of the committee to cut the budget, because the figures for personnel and all the major activities of the whole Department of Defense are carried at the budgetary figure. The cuts that are made come as a result of the combing of things that were absolutely unnecessary.

Now what is this story about personnel in this picture? The Army, according to this estimate, will be 89,000 less men in the regular Army on the 30th of June 1956, than on the 30th of June 1955, but the National Guard and Reserves will be increased in that same period 91,000. Those men in the National Guard are just as good as regulars, and they can be drawn in and in 3 weeks they can be used in any way that they are needed. We know what happened before. We know what happened in Korea. We know that those people were the best troops at the time and the ones that carried the load until the Army could be prepared.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I refuse to yield because I want the people to understand what the facts are. I do not want them to be fooled.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I will not yield to the gentleman and I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman obviously declines to yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, are we going to have an Army that we can afford to have in accordance with the recommendations of the greatest military leader in the world, the President of the United States, or are we going to run out on him? Are we going to provide the defenses that we need to meet our situation by building up our airplane power, both in the Air Force and Navy, or are we going to mess the whole thing up and get into line with some program that is not in the best interests of the defense of the United States?

Let me give you the Navy picture. There is a cut of 8,400 in the personnel of the Navy, but an increase of 20,000 in the Reserves of the Navy. There is a cut—and just see how small this is—of 12,000 in the personnel of the Marine Corps and an increase of 10,500 men in the Reserves, or a net decrease of only 1,500 in the Marine Corps. Those fellows in the Marine Corps Reserve can be brought right up to full usefulness in a very few weeks because that Reserve with the modern method of handling it is going to be a lot better than any Reserve that we ever had.

Are we going along and try to put our defense on a forward-looking, up-to-date basis, or are we going to tear to pieces the thoughtfulness and the ideas of the folks who really know what we are up against? Are we going to have an effective fighting force or, are we going to let it go and drift along and try to keep up with a lot of things we do not need more of at this time?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the gentleman from Pennsylvania in committee when he offered his amendments to maintain the size of the Armed Forces; I shall support the amendments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he offers them on the floor again.

I dislike very much to disagree with the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for whom I have the greatest affection, but I cannot share the confidence which he has stated he possesses in the Secretary of Defense.

I think that the Secretary of Defense has been changing his mind each year, too. Decisions made one year are reversed the next. There is no steady, stable defense policy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I did not, as I recall it, at any time refer to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. The gentleman spoke about the wishes of the greatest soldier in the world. I assumed, however, he was including the chain of command and that his reference to the greatest soldier in the world included the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CANNON. I assure the gentleman, I referred to a much higher and more experienced authority than the Secretary of Defense—eminent both in war and in peace.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. In just a moment.

Is there any statement in this RECORD that the President of the United States favors these cuts?

There is a statement by the Secretary of Defense and by other Secretaries, but I have not seen a strong statement by the President of the United States saying that he favors these reductions. Until the President of the United States says so specifically I am not willing to take the word of those who say that they are speaking for him, because I have listened to representatives of the President of the United States who have come to the Congress with what they said were his recommendations. The President of the United States later took another viewpoint.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit, the President of the United States signed this estimate before it came to the Congress.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Missouri that on the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the President of the United States signed the budget estimates for various agencies. After the Congress had acted differently than the President had recommended the President did not voice any objection. He recommended a public-housing program, for example. When the program was stricken from the bill he voiced no objection. And frequently, some who were assumed to be speaking for the President were later shown not to have spoken with his approval.

Mr. CANNON. The President has sent this estimate down to us and he has given an indication that he supports it in every respect.

Mr. YATES. Let me say that I have not seen such a firm statement made by the President of the United States. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my remarks, if I may, to the statement made by my very good friend from Michigan [Mr. FORD] the statement that he made that by voting for last year's appropriation bill I was thereby agreeing with the administration's New Look philosophy. I certainly had no such interpretation—and I am certainly not willing to accept the argument.

Does this same argument hold for the Secretary of Defense?

I call attention to the action of the Secretary in 1953 when he discontinued as a military necessity the construction of a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier. Yet, this year, he sent to the Hill a request for a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier. I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Why is he not bound by the decision he made 2 years ago? I objected at the time. A few days later an item appeared in the newspaper, the Washington Post and Times Herald, which read:

Construction of an atomic-powered aircraft carrier will be speeded rather than delayed by the Defense Department's cancellation of its carrier project, high officials at the Pentagon said yesterday.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. Of course I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think the situation is quite different. In 1954 when we were considering the budget for fiscal 1955 we had quite a discussion on the floor, in the committee and in the press and all over the country about the so-called New Look. It was well understood that in the budget for fiscal 1955 we were approving the New Look. It was a general philosophy. It was the first time that I have ever heard the idea expressed that by voting "yes," you mean "no," or by voting "no" you mean "yes." I do not understand such an interpretation.

Mr. YATES. Let me tell the gentleman that if I had voted "No" on that appropriation bill I would have been voting for no defense for the United States of America, and I did not want to do that. If I knew that I was supposed to be voting for the New Look principle I would have certainly prepared a motion to recommit, for I oppose that principle, or what I think is that principle, but I do not think that anybody knows what the administration means, yet this is the only alternative the gentleman chooses to give me. But I say I had more choices than the gentleman gave me.

Now may I continue with my own argument for a while and not yield for a few moments?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think the actions of the Department of Defense under the new administration have been marked more by pat statements, like the one I cited on the cancellation of the carrier reactor; by public relations phrases rather than by preparation for defense. Suddenly, we find now that we voted for the New Look last year. I did not vote for the New Look, because I do not believe in the New Look. Last year there was developed the new concept of massive retaliation. Now we find a new phrase, the posture of readiness. I assume we will be charged with accepting this idea if we vote for this appropriation bill. I do not accept that argument. I will take the word of those in whom I have confidence, and I respectfully refer you to the statement of General Ridgway, which appears in the report at the bottom of page 19. I respectfully refer the attention of my friend from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to the statement of General Ridgway which appears at the bottom of the page:

The foregoing likewise gives you an idea of why we continue to predict that future war with new weapons may well require more, rather than fewer men, in ground operations.

And that is why I say I am going to support the amendments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because in this world in which we find ourselves it is necessary today that we maintain our Nation's strength. We must try to find peace, and I commend the President of the United States in agreeing to a conference at the summit. But, until we know where we are going, until we can see world tensions really dissipated, we must maintain our strength.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to listen to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and hear him be so reckless of the truth and having paid so little heed to the testimony that took place before our committee. I tried to get him to yield so I could correct him several times when he insisted time after time telling you that a division in the Army had 15,000 men. Now, if he had listened to or had read the hearings, he would know that 1 of today's divisions has 17,500 men. And, I am quoting his authority, General Ridgway.

Mr. Chairman, there are three top military men for whom I have great respect, General Ridgway, Admiral Radford, and President Eisenhower. While it gives me no satisfaction to find myself differing with General Ridgway, I feel that the decision reached by the President—and the National Security Council—is a proper decision.

After spending hundreds of millions—yes, billions of dollars—for new and modern weapons, better and faster transportation, and advanced communications, if we cannot now reduce the number of men in the Army a modest amount, we have wasted a lot of money.

As has been pointed out, today's division is nearly one-fifth greater in numbers than in World War II. It is more than 80 percent greater in firepower. In other words, fewer men can deliver more death and destruction than a few short years ago. And that increase does not include any nuclear weapons, which according to General Ridgway would increase the firepower 500 to 10,000 percent—page 81, Army.

Another fact to be remembered when making comparison is that before and during World War II, the Air Corps and the Army was one. Today—to compare, we must take the Army and the Air Force—a total of over 2 million fighting Americans, the biggest military force we ever had without a shooting war going on.

The modest cut will not materially affect our military strength.

Let us see what Admiral Radford said in response to a question I asked. Here are his words, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

We have today the strongest military forces we have ever maintained in peacetime, and from a purely military standpoint I feel that we are ready to take care of those foreseeable actions which might come short of a general emergency, and we are very well prepared to take care of the initial stages of a general emergency.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said—much will be said—about the massive army Russia has. This is nothing new. They have had that strength since 1945, long before we had any recovery or military buildup in Europe. They could have, almost at will, marched to the English Channel in a few weeks. They did not. With stronger western forces now, they still could—with a little more difficulty—taking a little more time.

The forces the United States has there now is not enough to stop a Russian drive.

Mr. Chairman, we presently have right at 250,000 American civilians in Europe, employees and dependents.

As I pointed out during the Defense Department hearings—page 91—it is just this simple:

If there is danger in Europe and our troops are needed to be immediately available as fighting men, we have no business keeping that many civilians there. If it is safe enough to have a quarter of a million dependents, then we can safely cut down the number of military personnel.

The Austrian Treaty will release 15,000 troops.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time the nations of Europe furnish their proper share of the manpower, and let us bring our young Americans home where they should—and want to—be.

Furthermore, with the ratification of the German Treaty, we are now guests in West Germany. Let us not overtax the hospitality of our host.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, the Army is our only military force depending on selective service for manpower. With the increased pay and the reduction to a reasonable size, there is every reason to believe that our Army can be manned, as is the Navy and Air Force, by volunteers.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that facts, logic, and reason support President Eisenhower's recommended reduction in the Army.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, and permanent change-of-station travel, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of camp sites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; authorized issues of articles to prisoners, other than those in disciplinary barracks; subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective-service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement therefor while such personnel are sick in hospitals; and subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; $3,679,095,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 5, line 24, strike out "$3,679,095,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,823,669,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. May I suggest that the gentleman offer his amendments for the Army en bloc?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's usual keenness and perception, he knows exactly what I am going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk a second amendment dealing with the Army, and since it is a question of budgetary structure, I ask unanimous consent that both these amendments be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 8, line 11, strike out "$2,831,019,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,936,019,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as you may gather from the two amendments, the first deals with military personnel, the second deals with what we in the committee call M. and O., which is maintenance and operation; hence the joint and total figure.

I should like to say this to my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] who at one time, many, many years ago, was I believe a captain in the Kansas National Guard and brings us great distinction and military acumen to this bill.

Let me assure you of this. I know how many men there are in a division and I was quoting from the testimony. These interrogations were made by me.

There are two concepts of a division, one 15,000 and one 17,500. And I will settle for the 17,500 because in 5 divisions I would then be short 10,000 men. In the Far East you have 4½ divisions today, and in Europe 5, in the Army; and that is all.

Let me say a word about the atom war, and read to you what the Russians say about atom warfare and the army. I now read to you an article from the New York Times dated April 28. The writer here, Mr. Baldwin, is quoting from Col. F. Gavrikov, who in 1954 wrote in Sovetskaya Armiya, the Russian Army paper, about the army and atom war and the numbers of men necessary. That is what the Russian said:

Atom weapons pose certain problems but they are not to be overestimated. Soviet military art assumes that this new means of combat not only does not reduce but on the contrary enhances the part played by the foot soldier and raises his role to a new level.

That is what the Russians think and that is what General Ridgway thinks. In the testimony of General Ridgway there is a new concept of training for the foot soldier. You must deploy him in depth and in breadth over a front 10 times the size of the front in conventional war, and you will need, believe me and believe General Ridgway, and believe the Russian general staff, many times the number of foot soldiers.

Let us talk about the atom weapon in the field, firepower. Much has been made of firepower. Firepower will take the place of the foot soldier. Well, will it? Let me give you the best atomic cannon operation for tactical purposes that you can put in the field. Suppose I agree with you that 1 tactical atomic cannon will take the place of 1 division of 15,000 or 17,000 men. Let us agree to that for this purpose only—1 atomic cannon, 17,000 men.

Now, suppose without consulting you or the gentleman from Kansas the enemy knocks out your atom cannon. Suppose he knocks out your one atom cannon. Then he has knocked out the equivalent of 17,000 foot soldiers. Is that the way you want it? That reminds me of the meat stew of the horse and the rabbit. That makes a great "horsenpfeffer," 1 rabbit, 1 horse. One cannon is knocked out. In 20 seconds you have lost a division. Is that atomic warfare? That is what General Ridgway does not want, and the Russians do not want it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman, and I serve notice that I will object to every extension until we vote for this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the deep conviction that we are doing the wrong thing if we make the defense cuts contemplated in this bill. I feel that way because of studying the matter and from the testimony that I have heard on this subject.

I do not think there is any foundation for thinking there are grounds for diminishing the size of the Army. I feel the Army cut which is recommended in this bill is not a cut coming from the Joint Chiefs of Staff or from the Chief of Staff of the Army. I think the cut comes purely and simply as a budgetary matter.

As we sit and stand here today, we have some very heavy responsibilities on our shoulders. In the last 6 or 7 years, we have cut taxes to the extent that if they had not been cut we could balance the budget today and also pay for eliminating this defense cut. That is exactly the situation. It is not that the budget can or cannot be balanced—it is simply that we want to cut taxes. We want to live soft, if you please. We want to have the pleasure of cutting taxes in our time.

I do not think we should have made the tax cuts. We should balance the budget; but more important than that we should have the military strength that this country requires. I think there are few, if any, citizens, throughout the country, who fail to take this philosophy on this bill. They want adequate military strength even if our taxes are high or the budget unbalanced.

There is no such thing in 1955 as a pushbutton war. It was not a pushbutton war in Korea. If it had been possible, President Eisenhower or President Truman would have pushed the button. They both had the opportunity if it had been possible. There was not any evidence before our Committee on Armed Services which would indicate that the foot soldier will not be a man who will play an important and decisive part in any future war, if we do have another in the future.

There, I have laid my heart before you. Please do not make this cut in the Army or in the Marine Corps. The citizens of America do not want these cuts. I do not see how we can face the citizens back home if we tell them we made billions of dollars of cuts in taxes, and at the same time cannot afford the military strength that this country requires.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to deal with two impressions, which I believe could be very dangerous if they were relied upon as the basis for a final conclusion in voting on this amendment for additional Armed Forces. The first impression is one that may have been created by my very able and distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. TABER], for whom I have the greatest respect and greatest admiration. When he told the House that these losses in regular fighting

forces in uniformed soldiers ready to fight were going to be made up for by additional Reserve strength and by additional National Guard strength, I know there was not a Reserve officer sitting in this Chamber who did not have serious misgivings in his mind as he thought about his own Reserve program in which he participates and about its inadequacy to fill the gap that will be created by the loss of the Regular soldier and the Regular marine. The Reserve program is a fine thing. It is a good thing. We should expand it and we should continue to work with it, but let no one be under the misapprehension that a Reserve is as adequate to meet an emergency need of our country as is a man in uniform with gun at his side, because he is not. He will not be as ready, and it will take additional time to get him ready to go into the breach. Mention was made of the very fine National Guard units that went over to Korea and that they did a wonderful thing. They did do a fine thing. They performed heroic service for our country. But those National Guard units, and I speak from personal observation with regard to my own National Guard unit from the State of Oklahoma, had to spend a number of months—a number of very costly months getting combat ready before they could be sent into the breach. We cannot afford that kind of a costly time lag in the event of a national emergency.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. The evidence will show, under my interrogation, that 9 months is the figure that the experts gave to put a division in the field.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

The second misapprehension has to do with a quotation which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] gave from General Ridgway, where he said:

> We could beef up the firepower on a percentage basis of our divisions 500 percent, or maybe 1,000 percent, by putting a few of these atomic weapons in the division. They are not in the division today, as you know, sir.

It is true that General Ridgway made that statement. It is true it was given in the hearings, but if you will turn to the top of page 82 and over onto page 84 and read carefully and thoughtfully the statement that General Ridgway submitted in elaboration upon that point, you will find that he made the strong point that this additional firepower was no substitute for manpower, but that on the contrary, experience with additional firepower was that additional manpower was always required from a logistical standpoint and also from the standpoint of having its forces ready to use these weapons and this superior firepower that we have today.

I urge the Members of this House to turn to page 84 and read the supplemental statement that General Ridgway submitted in connection with this statement about beefing up the firepower. I urge that this House enact this amendment and retain the strength of America and decline to gamble with the security of this Nation.

The closing sentence of General Ridgway on page 84 reads as follows:

> Reliance on equipment superiority as a substitute for trained battle units, particularly when we are not certain of such superiority, is an unacceptable risk.

We are being asked today, by cutting these forces, to take that unacceptable risk in the viewpoint of the man who is the Chief of Staff of the Army. Let us not go home and tell our folks that we were willing to take "an unacceptable risk" with the security of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

We have heard quite a few discussions on military strategy this afternoon, but in my opinion the expressions from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] most nearly have expressed the viewpoint taken by every one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services early in the year when the matter of the military budget was under discussion. The main justification for a reduction in the appropriations for the Army—and there are reductions in here also for the Marine Corps and for the Navy—was based on a letter which the Secretary of Defense accepted as instructions from the White House on the defense budget for the next fiscal year. In that letter there was a very interesting philosophy expounded. That was couched in these terms:

> That because of scientific progress and technological advances we should base our security on military formations which make maximum use of science and technique in order to minimize the number of men.

I would like to tell a very interesting story on that particular point on which all of these cuts are based.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has served long and industriously in this House on the Armed Services Committee. He has the respect of every Member of this House. Mr. KILDAY asked one question through all the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee on the matter of the Defense Establishment budget, and he based it on the one proposition: Do the scientific and technological advances in the field of weapons we are now using and that are coming into being minimize the necessity for increased manpower? He asked that question and directed it point blank to each one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Unfortunately, only the reply of one, General Ridgway, is in the printed record, because in the other two instances, in the instance of the Air Force and in the instance of the Navy the question and the replies came in executive session.

The answer in each case was that that philosophy is a fallacy, that rather than fewer men in modern warfare there is need for more men.

That is the reason I say that the best presentation I have heard on the floor today on this matter of the 1954 budget for our Defense Establishment has come from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because before our Armed Services Committee the Joint Chiefs were emphatic on this point. I do not, of course, serve on the Committee on Appropriations, but from what I have heard here—they must have had the same kind of testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But I know from the testimony before our committee that the Joint Chiefs considered these reductions in military appropriations dangerous and a risk to our national security. For this reason I must earnestly support and recommend that the House support the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. Chairman, the question we are dealing with today is the security of our Nation, the naked issue of whether we will have an Army strong enough to meet our necessary commitments.

The simple, unchallengeable fact that emerges from hearings of the Armed Services Committee is that not a single one of the service Chiefs of Staff is happy about the deep cuts made, apparently for budgetary reasons, in the size of the ground forces, the size of the Army.

We have been told in previous years a lot of nonsense about how we can get stronger by cutting our strength. We have been fed doubletalk about "readjustments" and "greater efficiency" in the use of manpower. When we have raised questions, when we have expressed doubt of the wisdom of cutting our air power or our Navy or our Army then we have been told that it is not our place to dispute the military expert in the White House.

Many of us have been deeply disturbed that balancing the budget has been given priority over maintaining our defenses. We have suspected that reductions were forced upon the Military Establishment out of deference to the Secretary of the Treasury's notion of how much we can afford. With all respect, we strongly doubt the capacity of that gentleman to make such decisions. But when we tried to say so then we were told, "Oh, no, President Eisenhower himself made the decisions, and he is a professional military man, and surely he can be trusted to make sound judgments."

The time has come when we in this body must face our own constitutional responsibilities. We cannot shed these responsibilities, and our accountability to the people, by saying, "Well, General Eisenhower's spokesman said he felt so and so, and who are we to question him?"

Let us marshall the facts.

We made a blunder, and so did the famous military experts whose judgment we were told it was indecent to question, when we made cuts in the strength and force goals of the Air Force. Congress and the administration has since conceded this blunder.

It is not within our province to say that the Executive must spend every penny we authorize and appropriate, whether for the Military Establishment or any other Federal function. But it is within our province to say that we do not consent to a scheduled cutdown of forces. It is our function to say that we think the Executive is unwise in scheduling the cutdown and to authorize stronger forces that the Executive proposes if we think that is wise.

We are paying this year because even the Executive has had to reverse its plans, reconsider its thinking about the Air Force, and start climbing back up toward the goals the renowned expert temporarily abandoned.

Did this back-and-fill performance save the taxpayers any money? There was a theoretical saving of some $5 billion in the budget, but the waste and inefficiency inherent in a climb-down and climb-back operation made the actual savings invisible.

Now the major issue that we face is the ground forces, the size of the Army, the number of trained and ready combat divisions which can go do the work the foot soldier has always had to do—the slogging and the fighting in the rain and mud until the last enemy is given a choice between a bayonet down his throat and surrender.

We made a mistake on the Air Force. The professional soldier whose wisdom was supposed to be supreme made a mistake and we allowed him to do it. Are we to say that a blunder on the Air Force last year or the year before excuses us in a blunder this year on the Army?

The proposal that comes to us from the administration is that the Army be cut from its December 1954 size of 1,300,000 men to a maximum of 1,027,000 by the end of fiscal 1956.

This is a proposed reduction by nearly 300,000 soldiers, or more than 9 percent, in a period of 18 months, during which there has been and will be no perceptible reduction in the potential missions of the ground forces.

In the Armed Services Committee we asked the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, the civilian secretaries and the individual chiefs of staff whether the mission of the ground forces had been changed, whether there was in prospect a reduction of commitments, to justify so sharp a reduction of strength.

What we got, in reply, was a series of generalized statements that the budget had been prepared in "consultation" with the military men. What we got was a series of statements that the defense chiefs were seeking a balanced level of forces that we could maintain without ups and downs, that we could live with for an emergency variously estimated as possibly lasting for from 10 to 30 or 50 years.

Secretary Wilson told us frankly that after the various approved requests came back from the Bureau of the Budget, the Air Force felt our defense program was good, the Navy and Marine Corps would perhaps like a few additional personnel, but the Army would still recommend higher strength for its active force.

The Secretary was frank, as I said, but he was certainly not guilty of any overstatement. It became perfectly clear, in the public and particularly in the executive hearings, that the Army would very much like what Mr. Wilson euphemistically called higher strength.

The responsible service commanders, to put it bluntly, are not at all sure that the Army will have sufficient ground forces under this program to do its part in putting out brush fires that may flame in the world, defend our Far Eastern and European positions, and maintain an adequate ready striking force in reserve.

There is some funny business involved in the Defense Establishment total budget for fiscal 1956. There is an overall spending request for $35.75 billion—but the intriguing suggestion was made to us that maybe, after all, $1.75 billion would never be spent, that perhaps the actual expenditures would be only $34 billion.

Secretary Wilson never did explain just how this possible saving would be achieved, except to say that in forecasting big budgets many months in advance some 5-percent margin of error might be expected. But we asked the civilian service chiefs, one by one, how much of that saved $1.75 billion his own service might contribute, and each of them shied away. Secretary Talbott did not want to give up anything from the Air Force, Secretary Thomas did not want to abandon his Navy budget, Secretary Stevens did not want the Army to have to yield anything more.

There was a little talk of slippages, the inevitable delays in procurement, and there was talk of the redeployment home of some divisions from Korea, and there was talk of greater efficiency in handling manpower. But the service heads were extremely reluctant to agree in advance that they would cut their proposed spending so that Secretary Wilson's intriguing $1.75 billion savings might be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, is there anyone in this Chamber who does not know that our Army command has been seriously concerned about previous cuts in our ground forces? When there was talk last year of intervention in Indochina, it was common newspaper report that General Ridgway did not believe we could engage in such a project as a clean, immaculate little enterprise costing nothing. There was a danger that we would have to go in on the ground and there was a danger that we would run out of army.

What is the change in world situation that makes it possible to cut our available ground forces by more than 9 percent and still have enough to meet an emergency? There is no change, and Secretary Stevens was unable to define and localize one for us, although he had many opportunities.

All of us have respect for the job President Eisenhower did when he was commanding general of our forces in Europe. But it is permitted to point out that both during World War II and during his term as NATO chief, the ultimate decisions on the size and allocation of forces were not made by him.

He was a theater commander, doing a job with the forces made available to him. The men who decided what forces he should have, or where and how they should be deployed elsewhere, were his military and civilian superiors.

The President wrote to Secretary Wilson on January 5, 1955, a letter outlining his concepts of the Armed Forces, and in this letter he made this statement:

> Third, because scientific progress exerts a constantly increasing influence on the character and conduct of war * * * we should base our security on military formations which make maximum use of science and technology in order to minimize numbers of men.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] quoted this statement to spokesmen of the three services in turn, without disclosing the author, and asked each whether he agreed. Mr. Speaker, not one of the service representatives agreed with President Eisenhower that scientific progress allowed us the pleasant luxury of thinking we can fight any future conflicts without men, or with just a few men.

Secretary Stevens said:

> My own view * * * is that these scientific advances and improved weapons do possibly justify some smaller total personnel.

But, he said:

> I don't think we have gone far enough to have an absolute answer. I don't think that has been definitely proved by any means up to the present time.

General Ridgway agreed that in a total war the overall strength of the Army might be smaller than in World War II. But we must think of defense now, he said, in terms of a combat zone 150 or 200 miles in depth, in which we must meet hostile air and troop attacks by speedy mobilization, dispersal and redeployment. "It is my reasoned judgment," he declared, "that the integration of new weapons into combat formations will require a given structural force, a field army of certain size," to have "more rather than less men."

This was not the Army viewpoint alone. Neither the Air Force nor the Navy spokesmen agreed that scientific progress had advanced to such a point that the Army could get along with fewer men. They did not know when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] quoted the President's statement, and asked them about it, with whom they were taking issue. But not one of them, in any case, agreed.

When Secretary Stevens later appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, according to the printed testimony, he said that he and General Ridgway differed slightly on the question of new weapons and more or fewer men. But General Ridgway repeated his analysis as he had given it to the Armed Services Committee—that guided missiles and other new equipment require more maintenance men, not fewer, that troops must be more widely dispersed, that there is still a need for soldiers. He did not set himself up in defiance of the constitutional Commander in Chief, but he honestly asserted his own opinions on the military requirements.

Is it not a strange thing that in executive session there was not a single service professional, a single ranking spokesman for the armed services, who would as an expert express his support for the Army cuts imposed by order of the White House?

We learn from General Ridgway that the Army had just completed its plans to cut its strength for 1956 to 1,173,000 men—a bottom platform that Ridgway believed from the program of last year would remain stable—when he got or-

ders to cut some more. He was directed by Secretary Wilson to reduce the Army to 1,100,000 by June 30 of this year and to slash it by another 73,000 next year.

We are past the period, happily, when we can be told that we get stronger by cutting strength. Secretary Stevens did not pretend that an army of 1,027,000 men could do everything that an army of 1,300,000 could do. A onetime Republican presidential nominee, Alf Landon, of Kansas, exploded the strength-through-weakness theme in speeches both last year and this. At Manhattan, Kans., on March 31, 1955, Landon criticized the Defense Department and Congress for failing to provide for enough trained young engineers, for a reservoir of brains to match the Soviet output. On June 15, 1954, he said:

> The United States should abandon its plans to cut its Army from 20 to 17 divisions and add at least another 5 or 10 divisions.

Still, here is this proposal to cut the Army again by more than 9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I say very seriously today that the administration has not made a case for such a reduction.

I say most solemnly that we must pay heed to our own duty, to provide for the national defense, and that we should urgently declare our belief that the commander in chief should reconsider his recommendations.

His judgment is not supported by the judgment of the military men who bear individual responsibility for our strength. It is not sufficient for us to accept a statement that General Ridgway is "parochial" when in fact Ridgway's apprehensions about the size of the Army are shared by other service experts.

All of us abhor war, all of us pray that our soldiers shall never have to fight again in some far corner of the world. But we are a nation with grave responsibilities, and the way we meet them may decide the fate of our own country.

The Army has already taken a tremendous share of the budget cuts for the Military Establishment. Secretary Stevens said that from 1953 to 1956 the Army was swallowing 76 percent of the reduction in Defense Department expenditures.

It is proposed that we now cut our Army by 9 percent more at a time when we have no adequate Reserve program to take up any slack. In all honesty we know that such a Reserve program is not going to spring into existence overnight. But first they want to slash the Army and then look around for the Reserves. And I say again that the administration has not made its case. It is so easy to cut, to slash, to tear down—and so very hard to build up.

Mr. Chairman, we do not yet live in a period of "pushbutton" war, when men safely protected from the heat of battle can run fabulous machines and preserve the country. We still need an army. We still need ground forces to do the jobs ground forces are made to do.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House thoroughly understands what is sought to be accomplished by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not think he informed the House, but this is the objective and this is the purpose of it: He proposes to increase the end strength in July 1956, as far as the Army is concerned, to 1,114,000 men.

The committee, following the recommendation of the Department of Defense, fixes the end strength at 1,027,000 in July 1956. So the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to increase the ground strength of the Army by 87,000 men. Is not that the purpose of your amendment?

Mr. FLOOD. I will answer if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure the great chairman of our great committee does not mean to misconstrue the facts.

Mr. VINSON. On the contrary, the end strength of the Army on June 30, 1955——

Mr. FLOOD. I said 1956.

Mr. VINSON. I am stating what it is in 1955.

Mr. FLOOD. May I answer? On June 30, 1955, it will be 1,114,000 men. All I want to do is to assure that on June 30, 1956, we will have exactly the same number of men. I do not want to increase it any.

Mr. VINSON. The result of the gentleman's amendment will be to increase the ground strength over the recommended number of men by 87,000.

Last January when the budget was submitted to the committee, as chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services and after consultation with the members of the committee to keep conversant with the armed services appropriations and its strength, I opened hearings and had General Ridgway, Admiral Carney, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the proper officials there, together with Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense. We had a long hearing. I had some conferences with them in executive session. After the testimony it was concluded that a reduction to an end strength of 1,027,000, as carried in this bill, did not imperil the security of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here a long time and I have fought year in and year out for increased appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. But the facts in this case do not warrant approval of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I am going to vote against it.

When I talked to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, when I spoke to Admiral Carney and to all of the officials involved, I had no hesitancy last January in saying that they were on sound ground. I believe they are on sound ground and I am going to support them. I am not going to come in here and say that the security of the Nation is in peril because, in my opinion, it is not in peril at all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman's opinion be changed in any way if the bill to come up next week were not passed?

Mr. VINSON. Not one particle at all. We have today, as I stated, the strongest Army, the strongest Navy and the strongest Air Force in the history of this Government. As every Member of this House knows, I have fought for increases for almost 40 years. I am happy this afternoon to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] because this is one of the few times in my career that I find myself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] agreeing. Many times I have been trying to do exactly what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to do today. But I would not be true to my own convictions if I did not advise the House, as far as my personal views are concerned. The position of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the committee's position, are sound, the position of the Defense Department is sound. The security of this Nation is not being imperiled at all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate here today. It would appear to me that members of the Appropriations Committee have arrogated to themselves the functions of the Armed Services Committee. I, too, was quite disturbed when this cutback was proposed for the personnel of the armed services. My chairman, who is here at this time, will agree with me that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have always taken a vigorous position in support of the ground forces and I know there is no question in the mind of any member of the committee as to where I stand so far as ground forces are concerned. The ground forces are the boys who go through the cold and heat, the filth and fatigue, the misery and mud of mechanized warfare. They have turned in, over the years, in all wars, a magnificent and outstanding performance of which they can well be proud. I am strongly in support at all times of the ground forces, let that be understood. However, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services who after 42 long years of service in the House and as chairman for many years of the Armed Services Committee, his word and judgment are to be respected. He is a man of great experience and eminently qualified to submit to us his opinions and thinking as to positions to be taken on this matter.

I resent deeply the implication that any decisions have been reached in this matter for economic reasons or to balance the budget. That is utterly ridiculous. It is a statement that should not

have been made. The patriotism and integrity of the men who serve on the Committee on Armed Services are challenged. The patriotism of men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is challenged. A man who, after 42 years of service in the Congress of the United States, is qualified to determine and recommend what should and should not be done. Let me say for my distinguished and able chairman, that at no time has he ever attempted to cut back any branch of defense but his efforts have always been to build and create without question the greatest defense program and the greatest defense setup that this Nation has ever had. He needs no defense from me. His record, I might say to the Members of this House, speaks for itself. He is a great American and his opinions are to be respected.

I would like also to refer for a moment to my good and able friend, the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREUX, of the Marine Corps and a member of the Armed Services Committee. He is here today and his brilliant record as a Marine Corps general in World War II eminently qualifies him to speak on behalf of the Marine Corps.

Reference has been made here today to the Chief Executive of the United States; our Commander in Chief, who stated in a letter to the Secretary of Defense, and I quote:

> As a goal, I suggest a strength of the order of 2,850,000—with any future material reductions dependent upon an improved world situation. To reach such figures without injuring our combat strength will require continuing close scrutiny of all defense elements, with particular emphasis on administrative overhead.

Now, I might say to the Members of the House that the Commander in Chief is schooled in the art and technique of war; a man who led our forces to victory in World War II; and whose brilliant record since entering the White House has won for him the respect and admiration of the American people. We should be thankful we have a man of his character, experience, and ability to lead us at this critical time in a chaotic world.

I am willing to stand on his judgment because his wide experience in world affairs qualifies him to recommend to us that which he thinks should be done. It is my opinion that we should take the considered judgment of these experienced leaders at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, speaking in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], I feel I would be remiss in my duty to America and the free world if I did not join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], in vehemently protesting what is proposed at this time. The situation today, my friends, is reminiscent of a situation in the postwar days. Let me go back, if you will, to 1949, when former President Truman appointed my distinguished fellow citizen, Louis A. Johnson, of Clarksburg, W. Va., to the post of Secretary of National Defense. We had a proposal at that time similar to your proposal today, and that was to go on an economy drive. The Members who are discussing this amendment today, the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, at the end of 1 year of Mr. Johnson's tenure of office, praised him loudly from this floor for saving $2 billion in defense expenditures. That was fine. Yet, a few months later the Korean emergency broke, and we found that we did not even have shells for what few cannon we had, and the same gentlemen, both Democrats and Republicans, who had been praising Secretary Johnson of the National Defense Establishment denounced him roundly from this floor and forced him from public life. Now, I am saying to you that Mr. Wilson and the staff at the Pentagon are guessing just like Mr. Johnson and his staff guessed. They may be wrong just like Mr. Johnson was wrong. If that is true, that will be bad indeed for Mr. Wilson, but it will not be good for the defense of this country and the free world to continually keep on guessing and guessing wrong.

I want the RECORD to show that at that time our present President, Mr. Eisenhower, testified in favor of the economy program. He was also for a time military adviser to Secretary Johnson on how best to make these economies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out in opposition to this amendment that on page 5 of the Department of Defense hearings for fiscal 1956 the President of the United States is on record in favor of this budget with the manpower and personnel strength recommended by this committee. It should also be pointed out that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford; General Twining; General Shepherd, the Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Admiral Carney are all in substantial agreement with this budget. It should also be pointed out that this dollar amount and the strength figures as proposed here today were approved by the members of our Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, with one exception. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] objected.

Our committee has approved the strength figures and the dollar figures as they were submitted, with minor dollar reduction as set forth in the committee report.

One more point. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has brought up the fact that prior to Korea the Congress took certain action in reducing the military appropriations. The record shows that the Johnson Defense Department budget in 1950 was $13 billion for all 3 branches of the service. The so-called Johnson budget for the Army provided a strength of 590,000. Yes; now we have a Defense budget of $31.4 billion and an Army strength as of a year and one-half from now of 1,025,000 men—twice as great.

Further, and finally, if the Flood amendment is approved you will have an increase in draft calls on a monthly basis from 10,000 to 20,000. You will also have an additional cost of $250 million in 1 year. I might add that the gentleman's amendment only provides, however, for an increase of 40,000-plus, rather than the 89,000 that the gentleman thinks he is talking about, because mathematically a cost of $5,500 per man times 89,000 comes to $489 million rather than $250 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great reluctance to oppose the pending amendment. Had a vote been taken on this before it was announced to the country and the world several months ago, I would have voted against a reduction in our Armed Forces for psychological reasons because we are engaged in a peace offensive and a show of weakness would reduce our effectiveness. But the psychological disadvantages of this reduction have already had their effect and increasing this bill by a quarter of a billion dollars now and restoring 87,000 troops will, in my opinion, not add materially to the strength of our Armed Forces and will have no beneficial psychological effect.

Furthermore, I think that under the circumstances the amendment should not be approved because we will only be providing the money and the chances are that the funds would not be expended.

Furthermore, this addition to our armed strength would not be decisive anyway. If a big war comes next week or next year, nobody who opposes this amendment will need to apologize for his position because an increase of that type in a $100 billion war would be inconsequential. So I do not regard it as significant from that standpoint.

I am quick to agree that we may be in error in our actions; the figure may be too low, it may be too high. Nobody knows with complete certainty just what we ought to do. But under all the facts and circumstances the majority of the members of the committee have felt that we should go along with this portion of the budget, particularly in view of the fact that the major reductions in manpower have already been made under the new program announced by the President many weeks ago.

I think that on this issue we should stand in support of the President's program and in support of the position of the majority of the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> The amount available in the Army Stock Fund is hereby reduced by $700 million, such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 12, lines 4 and 5, after "$700 million", strike out "such sum to be covered into the Treasuury immediately upon approval of this act" and insert, "of which sum $400 million shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act, and $300 million shall be covered into the Treasury no later than December 31, 1955."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there will be any question or controversy about this language. The bill provides $700 million be taken from the Army stock fund and placed back in the Treasury. We have found since the bill was reported that the Army simply will not have $700 million to put into the Treasury as of that specific date, so we are asking that the money be divided into two payments, $400 million to go into the Treasury immediately and $300 million to go into the Treasury not later than December 31, 1955. This appears to be a workable sort of arrangement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Florida has discussed this amendment with me. I wholeheartedly endorse the amendment, and believe the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] likewise concurs in the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. The committee is unanimous on this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 12, add after line 5 a new section to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be used for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 percent of the amount expended for such purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in 1952 I offered a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill, except that at that time the amendment called for spending no more than 25 percent of the amount that was expended the previous year for recruiting purposes. The amendment at that time also prohibited the use of any funds for paying rent on any space for recruiting service.

I am not a military strategist. I think I can talk about something here that everyone can understand. I do not think any of us can say with any certainty how much money we need to spend for the actual defense. When we are talking about billions for defense I think we are getting into something that is away over most of our heads.

I think in this particular instance, I am talking about something that we see every day, the apparent waste that is going on in our recruiting service. In almost every county in the United States, you will see recruiters of the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines and the WAC's all driving around in separate cars and in some cases they have separate buildings for recruiting headquarters. In the report, you will find there is set aside here more than a half million dollars to pay rent on facilities for recruiting. In every town of any size at all, there are facilities that may be used for recruiting without the Government having to pay one cent in those cities, towns, or villages. I think that that item can be eliminated entirely and we could use existing Government-owned facilities. As to the recruiting service itself, I think most of us believe, or at least many of us believe, that through the Selective Service we have, perhaps, the most effective service for recruiting that we could have. I cannot give you the figure, and I doubt if anybody else can give you the figure as to the number of men who go into the so-called career services. I am speaking of the Navy, Air Force, and Marines. They go there and volunteer their services. They are not recruited, they are not sold the idea of entering the service, but they go there because they know that the draft is blowing down on their neck. They go and sign up for a longer term of years. I think General Hershey of the Selective Service made the statement that his organization could save around $40 million a year by letting them do this work. This budget calls for more than $44 million for recruiting service. It is an increase over what we spent last year. I think that with the reduction in force, which it seems we are about to adopt, we will get an adequate force by adopting the amendment which I present to you, which this House adopted, or at least a similar amendment, in 1952. It will result in a saving of several millions of dollars, and it will not disrupt the recruiting service. If you will refer to the hearings of this year and last year or the year before, I defy any Member of the Congress, including members of the Committee on Appropriations, to correlate the figures and have anybody show you how much this recruiting is actually costing in the different services. Another thing, if you turn to the bill which we have before us today, we find on page 7, referring to the Army just two words setting forth, "recruiting expenses." It does not say how much. When we turn to line 13 referring to the Navy, they do not call it recruiting service, but they call it "procurement of military personnel." If you turn to page 25 dealing with the Air Force, they refer to it as "recruiting advertising expense." On page 27, they add "meals for recruiting parties," and "rations for applicants for enlistment." These items are not set up specifically anywhere, but I think by just taking a percentage cut, we will be able to save not less than $10 million by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Does the gentleman's amendment make a reduction of 50 percent in all recruiting costs of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All of them together; yes.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In other words, it is blanketing the entire thing?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes; it blankets them all together and provides that we spend no money to pay rent on other buildings because all of this work can be carried on in public buildings which we own, on which we are already paying rent, or where they have available facilities at courthouses and other places where the work can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly in opposition to the amendment. Its purpose, of course, is commendable. Our committee has always given considerable thought to the expense of recruiting. At first blush it might seem that with the draft law we could fill the forces without recruiting anybody. However, experience has shown that the volunteer is desirable wherever you can get him. At the present time, as I understand it, the Air Force and the Navy are operating entirely on volunteers. You get volunteers better if you bring the story to young people and encourage them.

The testimony also shows that the monthly quotas of draft have been reduced sharply because of the number of enlistments and, very encouragingly of late, the number of reenlistments. Our committee last year learned of—in fact, some of us sought to block a program, whereby the Air Force separated and apparently duplicated, to some extent, recruiting activities that formerly had been made by the Army and the Air Force jointly. We were interested and pleased to find out this year that both the Army and the Air Force found that that separation and in some cases duplication of service, had actually been desirable. It saved money in this way: It has been brought out time after time how important it is to get trained members of the service to reenlist. I think my colleagues on the committee will agree that the showing made this past year by the various services, as to the results of their recruiting programs, were the most gratifying we have had in recent years. Because of that fact, because of the importance of making the service as attractive as possible to young men, and getting young men who want to make it a career, I believe it would be unwise right now, at the time when the program is beginning to show better results, to suddenly cut down the amount appropriated. It might be an expensive thing to do. For that reason I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the Air Force and the Navy were receiving volunteers. You would not want to leave the impression that they are not taking other men of the same age group who are subject to the selective service, would you?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. No. Of course we all realize that many volunteers are perhaps encouraged by the fact that there is a draft law standing behind them and that would make them more willing to enter the service of their choice.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it might be well to point out that a great percentage of the men who enlist in the Air Force and the Navy are under the draft age.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. A great many are. In any case, I am sure the gentleman will agree that it is a healthy thing to have as many volunteers in all services, whether they are encouraged to volunteer or not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What do you think about the payment of rent to the point of a half million dollars a year? Do you think that is necessary?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I am not prepared to say it is not. The justifications before our committee indicated that reasonable economy was being practiced in the program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would like to point out that if H. R. 5297 scheduled for debate next week becomes a law, all young men 17 years of age will have to go to recruiting stations to volunteer for 6 months of training in one of the services, as provided for by the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Of course, there are many things accomplished at recruiting stations other than just signing up young men. It would be dangerous on short notice to radically alter this program without much more study than we are able to give it here and now.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Maryland has stated the case very well indeed. Rent is not paid except in those areas where no Government space is available in post offices and Federal buildings.

The other question involved is the use of personnel for recruiting service. May I point out that the most expensive man we have in uniform today is the 2-year draftee. It is through the recruiting service that we get the career man, the man who stays in the service long enough to become a skilled technician or a skilled weapons man and who knows his job and is able to teach it to others. That is the man we are reaching through the recruiting service.

This is not a new question, we have it before us many times. I assure you there is no justification for any reduction such as proposed by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In view of the statements made by the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Pennsylvania about effecting economies, and in spite of those statements the gentleman is supporting a $200,000 increase in rent this fiscal year over the last fiscal year and proposing to spend over half a million dollars for rent alone, yet everyone knows with your armories, your Reserve training centers, post offices and other Federal buildings, and courthouses there is absolutely no need for this increase for rent.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to agree with the gentleman, but the testimony shows that there is not available space; and as the gentleman knows, rents are going up.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to suggest for the consideration of the gentleman proposing the amendment that even though there is an increase requested, yet it is cheaper to spend money on the recruiting program, for it is through that program we get our career men. Further, the Marine Corps have filled all their requirements through the recruiting service. It certainly is not a waste of money.

Mr. SIKES. I believe it has been through the recruiting service at least in part that sufficient interest has been aroused in enlistments to permit the present very low draft quotas.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that the membership would like to vote very quickly upon this amendment, I do not hesitate to take sufficient time to point out certain information that has not been brought out.

I do not understand that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] asked to cut out recruiting. As the ranking minority member of the committee which handles the appropriation for the Selective Service, my immediate reaction to this amendment was that it was a very good amendment.

Who says this comes so suddenly upon us? For 2 years my subcommittee has been bringing it to your attention and has been saying that this is an extravagant and unnecessary expenditure of money.

The gentleman from Missouri is not cutting out recruiting. Who says the gentleman from Missouri is cutting out recruting? He is arguing against cutting out recruiting. But he says you ought not to increase the amount spent for recruiting; keep it down to a reasonable amount. I rose when he was speaking and asked him to yield to me solely to call his attention to the fact that the money which is involved in this bill is not the amount of money spent by the Army altogether, or the Air Force, or the Marines to get recruits. Men are assigned to that work, automobiles are used for that work, and time is taken for that work which does not appear among the budget items of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force as recruiting service; in fact, the amount spent is a great deal more than is indicated by the gentleman from Missouri.

Let me say further that this question has been a matter of concern to both the Appropriations Committee and the legislative committee. The big question, of course, that arises is: Is it necessary that we should increase the expensive downtown rentals in order to make it possible for these men to select the service they want to go in, when General Hershey is acting as the beaters used to act for European hunters? They beat the game into the park where the hunters stood. General Hershey beats these men into the offices where they can enlist.

It seems to me we should be sensible about this. My own reaction is to vote for the amendment. The only possible objection I can see to it is that we do not know at this moment whether a 50-percent reduction is right because of contracts or leases which may be actually signed nor do we know how much money is actually being spent. Having tried for several years to correct this through another subcommittee, I for one, intend to vote for the amendment as I hope other Members will, knowing that the money will still be more than enough. The service is not fully accounted for in the appropriation bill before us. If there are minor details like leases they can be ironed out in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD) there were—ayes 106, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), training duty travel of midshipmen paid hereunder, and transportation of dependents, household effects, and privately owned automobiles, as authorized by law, for Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing Reserve training; midshipmen of the Naval Academy, and aviation cadets, $2,486,109,900.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 12, line 18, strike out "$2,486,109,900" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,541,109,900."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments that technically I must present. Since they are supporting amendments and they involve the Navy and the cut in the Navy, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FLOOD:

On page 13, line 20, strike out "$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$85,700,000."

On page 14, line 4, strike out "$616,438,000" and insert in lieu thereof $673,667,500."

On page 14, line 15, strike out "$286,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$292,750,000."

On page 15, line 5, strike out "$172,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$187,750,000."

On page 18, page 4, strike out "$779,685,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$802,825,000."

On page 20, line 11, strike out "$62,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$63,600,000."

On page 22, line 2, strike out "$295,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$299,400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the gentleman would tell us just what, in effect, all of these amendments accomplish. I think I know, but I think the membership would like to have it.

Mr. FLOOD. The result will be to restore 8,300 men.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In the Navy?

Mr. FLOOD. In the Navy.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is independent of the Marine Corps?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. Eight thousand three hundred for the Navy, independent of the Marine Corps, and restores 66 ships; in other words, from 1,001 as provided in the budget to 1,067.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Those are landing craft, and so forth. Now, what does it do to the Marine Corps?

Mr. FLOOD. Now I have a problem, and I would like to reply to that. I had a series of amendments on the desk to cover the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, but I did not know anybody else was going to introduce a Marine Corps amendment. However, now my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] tells me he has an amendment on the desk to restore the cut in the Marine Corps. I had no idea that he did have. Now, I do not know where that leaves me, except he is my senior on the committee, and I give you one guess where it leaves me. I did not know it was there.

However, let me tell you this, because I am sure the gentleman from Alabama does not have the figures which I spent some time getting together.

In the Marine Corps military personnel there will be a 22,000 restoration, and the expenditure $57,229,500. Marine Corps procurement, $6,250,000, and then for facilities, which must also follow to support the procurement program—if you have one, you must have the other—$15 million.

The Marine Corps amendment to restore 22,000 men to give us the 215,000 that General Shepherd asked for will be in amount $78,479,500. That is my Marine Corps amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The gentleman's amendment would add eight-thousand-and-some personnel to the Navy, 22,000 Marines, and would add the group of landing ships that he referred to; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. No; may I correct the gentleman in this wise. My amendments read en bloc do not include the Marine Corps at all.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. They did as they were read by the Clerk. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to have them included at this point but I did not intend, and thought I had made it very clear, to have the Marine Corps included at this time; I wanted my amendments considered that were concerned only with the Navy and not the Marine Corps.

Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments, which are a series of technical amendments dealing only with the Navy and not with the Marine Corps, be read at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The gentleman wishes to have considered at this time only his amendments dealing with the Navy proper?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct; with the Navy proper.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] indicate to the Chair specifically the amendments that are included in his last unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania always abides by a suggestion from the Chair, and at this time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments dealing with the Navy proper be read en bloc, without including any amendments I may have at the desk dealing with the Marine Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman advise the Committee how many ships his amendment would bring out of mothballs?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I do not want them to go into mothballs; but if they did, my amendment would bring out 66.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will direct that the Clerk report the amendments that are now offered en bloc by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] dealing solely with the Department of the Navy.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FLOOD:

Page 12, line 18, strike out "$2,486,109,900" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,541,109,900."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "$83,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$85,700,000."

Page 18, line 4, strike out "$779,685,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$802,825,000."

Page 20, line 11, strike out "$62,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$63,600,000."

Page 22, line 2, strike out "$295,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$299,400,000."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the unanimous-consent request pending, is it understood that these sections will be considered as having been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that no request has been made that these sections be considered as having been read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Navy title and Marine Corps title in the bill be considered as having been read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] that the amendments just reported be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in view of my efforts here all day in connection with the restoration of these cuts, I intend to ask recognition on the Marine Corps amendment as soon as this is disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, this cut in the Navy does not deal with many men. My amendment will restore 8,300.

Please let me make it clear again, and I repeat this for the purpose of emphasis, I am not desiring to increase anything, men, material, or ships. This amendment will prevent the Navy from putting into mothballs 66 ships. These are not the spit-and-polish, magnificent things you see in the newsreels coming down New York Harbor into your lap on cinemascope; no, no. These are not magnificent flattops and great battle cruisers and great battle wagons; no. These are all amphibious craft that the marines must have to fight a war.

A great play is being made about saving the dollars and putting the fleet into mothballs. This is not that case. This is part of a deal, again, to make the marines policemen. I think I heard that once before some place. Please believe me.

The answer will be from somebody, for instance, Admiral Carney, that these ships—these are not ships, these are boats; there is quite a difference—can be restored into active duty in 30 days. If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations from Missouri is right—and he has always been right, in my opinion, until today—I never thought I would live long enough to see the gentleman from Missouri in error; however, he tells us today, and he speaks as ex cathedra, that the war will last only a few days. If the gentleman from Missouri is right, then Admiral Carney is wrong, because Admiral Carney and the ships or the boats or nobody else in the event of war will be here in 30 days to get these amphibious boats, these small craft, or take them out of mothballs.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot have this thing both ways. You cut the Army. Now you are going to fool yourselves. You are going to go back and tell your districts what a great economy day this was for the taxpayers. You put 66 ships into mothballs. Do not say that in my district, because I will tell them what happened. You know better; and if you do not, I am telling you. It is a sham. You are doing nothing of the kind. This is part of the Marine Corps cut.

Let me add this: If you cut the Army—and you have cut it—what do you have left? The Air Force and the Navy. This atomic war, all these authorities that spoke all day tell you, is to be an Air Force and a naval war. So you cut the Army. Now you have a naval war

and an Air Force war; so now, consistency being a beatitude, you are going to cut the Navy. You are going to wind up with the Air Force of the gentleman from Missouri before you get through.

Why do you want to cut the Navy? Why under the sun, Mr. Chairman, do you want to make this cut in the Navy this afternoon? Why do you want to do it?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is a soldier, but I will listen to him. What does he have to say about the Navy?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think the Navy is a very fine organization.

Mr. FLOOD. Now we agree.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. But is it not a fact that no witness of any sort appeared before our committee that opposed this reduction in the Navy, even Admiral Carney?

Mr. FLOOD. If Admiral Carney had opposed this cut, he would have been fired, just as they are going to fire General Ridgway for opposing the cut. I guess he did not want to be fired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members I am not going to take a great deal of time because I am just as tired as all the Members are. We were presented with the same situation with reference to the Army and we have the same objection in this instance. I hope these amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that they may be read and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

On page 14, line 4, strike out "$616,438,000" and insert "$673,677,500."

On page 14, line 15, strike out "$286,500,000" and insert "$292,750,000."

On page 15, line 5, strike out "$172,750,000" and insert "$187,750,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make it clear that after all of my talking here today I had an amendment for the Marine Corps on the Clerk's desk where it has been all day, and I would like the House to know what the situation is at this minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offered these amendments in the subcommittee for Navy and also in the subcommittee for defense. The purpose of these amendments is to increase the Marine Corps strength from the present budget by 13,000 officers and men. At the beginning of this fiscal year, the strength of the Marine Corps was 223,868 officers and men. By the end of this fiscal year 1955 the strength of the Marine Corps will be 205,000 officers and men. Under the budget before the House today, the size of the Marine Corps at the end of the fiscal year 1956 will be 193,000 officers and men, or a reduction since the first of this fiscal year of 30,868 officers and men. The amendments I have offered will keep the strength of the Marine Corps through fiscal 1956 at the same size it will be by the end of fiscal 1955, namely, 205,000 officers and men. I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, from having sat through about 3 months of hearings that this budget is sufficient to give us the power to carry out the purposes of our Defense Department. I am convinced from having heard testimony for over 3 months that the purposes of this budget can be accomplished. What is the purpose of this budget? In the event of an allout worldwide war to be in a position to retaliate against our enemy quickly and completely. If we get into a war in the next year or 2 years, and no one knows whether we will or not, it will be 1 or 2 types of war. It may be an all-out war which, as our chairman says, may not last but a few days, and, if that is so, we may not need this additional strength in the Marine Corps.

The other type war we may find ourselves in is the so-called brushfire war. There is where the Marines come into the picture. I do not have to stand here and tell you about the glorious past history of the Marine Corps, but I say to you that the cost of these three amendments will be about $78 million, and it will enable the Marine Corps to retain 13,000 officers and men. General Shepherd told our committee in response to a question I asked him that he would be glad to have these men; that he could use these men, and if he did not get these men he would have to discharge some of the marines he has today.

We are not drafting men into the Marine Corps. The only way men go into that great outfit is by volunteering. The issue is clear. I will not take any more time. I think there is need for at least 205,000 officers and men in our Marine Corps. That is what these amendments do. I hope you will see fit to vote for these amendments, and keep the Marine Corps at the same strength through next year, which it is today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to call attention to the fact that you have the same situation to the degree that you had with the other two amendments. You just rejected the Flood amendment which placed ships in moth balls, and if this amendment is agreed to you would have to go back and flood the ships. Now, we have a balanced program and if we are going to keep it in balance there is only one logical thing to do and that is to vote as you did on the Flood amendments in connection with the Navy.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment is defeated, the strength of the Marine Corps will still be two and one-half times what it was prior to Korea.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 14, line 4, strike out $616,438,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$673,667,500."

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 14, line 15, strike out "$286,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$292,750,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 15 line 5, strike out "$172,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$187,750,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute for this purpose: My amendment calls for the restoration of a sufficient number of men to the Marine Corps to bring its strength, June 30, 1956, to 215,005 men. That is the figure I asked General Shepherd, the Marine Corps Commandant, to state.

The testimony will show I asked him that direct question in the presence of the Secretary of the Navy and in the presence of Admiral Carney, the commanding officer of the Navy:

General Shepherd, how many men do you think should be in the Marine Corps for this coming fiscal period?

You have wanted authority all day, I am giving you the best authority that can be had, the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He said, "215,005."

Now may I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the membership of this Committee wishes to substitute its individual and collective judgment and be presumptuous, as it has been indicated I may have been today, that all you have to do to disagree with the Commandant of the Marine Corps is to vote down my amendment. I do not see how you possibly, demanding authority, could get more than you have.

Let me quote from General Shepherd:

We will not have the backup, the support, the staying power that we have now. Of course, the imposed limited amphibious shipping will decrease the mobility of the fleet marine forces in the event of a sudden emergency.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what you have done with the Army, regardless of what you have done with the Navy, you have never in the history of this House failed to support the Commandant and the Marine Corps when the Commandant has said:

This is what I need for the Marine Corps in a sudden emergency to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, you want authority. If you want to be consistent, you voted to cut the Navy because the commanding officer of the Navy asked for it. You cut the Army because the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for it; now, to be consistent, do not cut the Marine Corps, because the Commandant of the Marine Corps asks you not to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 16, after the word "constructed", in line 20, insert the words "or converted."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment merely to correct an inadvertance in preparing the draft of the bill. The two words "or converted" were carried in last year's law and should be continued. There was no intent to strike them out. This appropriation covers not only new construction but also conversion of existing ships, so the words are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV of the bill?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, news accounts of hearings and statements are necessarily condensed versions of what actually occurs. That being so, it may well be that I have reached inaccurate impressions of what certain Members of Congress and others have said with respect to the President's proposal for an atomic-powered ship. I have been much disturbed by the statements they have been reported to have made. The net effect of them, as I view it, has been to throw cold water on the President's idea.

One of the most astounding developments of our time has been the development of atomic energy. The attention of the people of the world has been directed toward the application of atomic energy to military uses. But, I am personally convinced that the people of the world favor the development of such energy to peacetime uses. I firmly believe that every encouragement should be given to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Statements or acts which discourage such development do a disservice not only to United States citizens but to people of the world generally.

I, for one, am pleased to hear that the Committee of American Shipping Lines favors the President's plan to construct a pioneering model of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. Not only does it encourage development of peaceful uses of such energy, but dramatizes in a most effective way the role of our merchant marine. The atomic ship would capture the imagination of all people, and focuses upon shipping the kind of attention many of us on this committee believe is needed.

Such a ship will serve a practical purpose, and the expenditures involved in constructing it should be viewed in that light. Just as the first jet airplane prototype pioneered the way for present jet flight, so will a nuclear merchant ship show the way for further application of atomic power in at least some of the ships, perhaps, which we have been discussing in connection with the vessel replacement program.

The development of atomic energy uses will without question be rapid. It is conceivable that the experiences with the *Nautilus* will produce atomic-powered propulsion equipment which could be utilized by merchant vessels by the time appropriations are made by Congress, vessel plans are drawn, and a ship hull built.

One of the objections to the building of a nuclear-powered ship which would be exhibited to many people was that only 1 or 2 million people could visit it in a year's time. Perhaps not that many could go through it and inspect it. But many more millions could see it without an inspection routine. Furthermore, countless other millions would be impressed by it without ever seeing it. How many people have seen the *Nautilus*? How many people have gone through or inspected the latest jet planes? Who can say that millions have not been impressed who never saw either? How many persons have actually seen the bomb tests at Yucca Flats? And who would say that these tests have not made an impact on people throughout the world?

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind for cadets and permanent change of station travel for all other personnel of the Air Force of the United States on active duty including duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as amended, or section 252 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (50 U. S. C. 1003) (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the Air National Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training), including commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for issue as rations to enlisted personnel, and clothing allowances, as authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses incident to individual or troop movements (including packing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equipment); ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel rations, and commutation of rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including those sick in hospitals; transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage, and household effects of personnel paid from this appropriation; rations for applicants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners; subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law; commutation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants for enlistment and general prisoners while sick in hospitals; subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members of the Air Force absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case); confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; and donations of not to exceed $25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; $3,670,000,000.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WINNING THE WAR OF IDEAS WITH THE AIR FORCE BAND

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, it is generally known that the Communists are past masters in the use of songs and plays and films to change men. Vishinsky in a London speech some 2 or 3 years ago made the statement that "we will win in this battle of ideas, not by the atom bomb but with our superior brains, ideas, and doctrines." I feel we have been greatly deficient in using ideas which we have ready and available. Take, for example, the overseas tour of the United States Air Force Band. In June 1954 the band, under the leadership of Col. George S. Howard, Chief of Bands and Music of the Air Force, led his musicians through 17 countries in Europe, the Near East, and north Africa. The purpose of the trip was to better troop morale, further Air Force communication relations, and to increase the stature of the United States armed services in foreign countries. It did more than that.

As a part of my remarks, I will extend a full statement giving a detailed review of this outstanding mission. As an introduction to this statement, I would like to quote from an editorial that appeared in the Wesermuender Rundschau following the August 6, 1953, concert of the band. The editorial ran as follows:

It is a fortunate idea to make an orchestra the ambassador of a nation. What the politicians with their sober minds seldom create, the United States Air Force Band succeeded in doing within a few minutes.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that I was on an Air Force mission in Paris during August and September of last year. I met a lady in Paris who gave me her personal reaction to the concert that was given by the band in Paris on July 4 when over 25,000 Parisians came out for the concert. She remarked that as these American musicians played the stirring French patriotic songs that had led France to great victories, moral, spiritual, and military, in past history, tears came to her eyes and to scores and scores of others. To her it represented a superior idea, a new America.

How to reach the heart of an individual and a nation must be our mission.

In further support of what I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, I quote from a story that appeared in the Los Angeles Herald and Express of April 19. This highly respected newspaper of the west coast referred to Dr. Fadhil Jamali, chairman of the Iraqi delegation and former Prime Minister, speaking at the opening of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, who called for "moral rearmament as the need of the world today." The news story in the Los Angeles Herald and Express concerning Dr. Jamali's complete statement at the Bandung Conference was as follows:

In a strong speech in which he attacked "materialistic religions that breed hatred among classes and people," Jamali said, "We must work on the basis of moral rearmament whereby men of all races and nations with clean hearts and with no rancor or

hatred approach each other with humility and admit our own mistakes, and work for mutual harmony and peace. The world would then turn into one integral camp with no eastern or western camps.

"It is our sincere hope that this conference will prove to be a great moral force for ideological disarmament and moral rearmament."

THE MISSION OF THE AIR FORCE BAND

Every American citizen is proud of the United States Air Force—proud of its military record in World Wars I and II, proud of its magnificent contribution to the development of aviation, proud of the fine men and women who constitute its personnel. The Air Force song has taken its place in our folk music with Anchors Aweigh and the Halls of Montezuma and other service songs. Plays and motion pictures and TV performances continually develop the theme of the merits of this branch of our armed services. But there is one activity of the Air Force, not closely related to its functions in the field of military aviation, of which few people are aware, and in my estimation this particular contribution is quite as outstanding as are any of its other better known activities. I refer to the five European tours which have been undertaken by the United States Air Force Band. My remarks on this subject today will be based on the most recent tour of last summer because the story of all five tours would be a very long story indeed.

Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott has permitted me to use records of the 1954 tour of 17 countries in Europe, the Near East, and North Africa which was carried out by 80 members of the band under the leadership of Col. George S. Howard, chief of bands and music of the Air Force. Colonel Howard arrived in Frankfurt on June 16, 1954, and for the next 2 weeks he was engaged in making preparations for the tours and inspecting Air Force bands stationed in Europe. On June 30 the band played its opening concert in Wiesbaden, and during the next 2 months it carried out a mission which Colonel Howard referred to as a "musical venture in American diplomacy." This was not a vacation nor an easy assignment, but a mission which will bring America and American ideals to the grassroots of 17 countries and many more nationalities. He continued:

Eighty Americans will speak to Arabs, Italians, Turks, Greeks, and Europeans in a language everyone will understand. To many this will be their first contact with Americans. To others it may mean a new concept and a more thorough understanding of our country, because we will break through language barriers, tradition, and custom.

There is every evidence to prove that this particular exercise of diplomacy was highly successful—in fact, I have not heard any sort of adverse criticism from any source to contrast with the high praise so freely bestowed on the work of the band. In spite of this outstanding success I daresay that in our complex modern world we cannot substitute tours of American musicians and other forms of cultural contributions for the entire structure of the State Department as our instrumentality of conducting foreign relations, but I feel quite certain that much greater use of such methods can and should be made. I know that my belief will be shared by Members of the House if I tell you of only a few events which took place in the 1954 tour of the Air Force Band.

One simple measure of the effectiveness of their mission is an estimate of numbers of persons who saw and heard the band. The total attendance was estimated at a little less than a million persons. The size of certain individual audiences is also striking—Nancy, 50,000; Berlin, in the Olympic Stadium, 70,000; the airport in Berlin, 10,000; Paris, on July Fourth, 25,000; Luxembourg, 40,000; Trier, 30,000; Copenhagen, 60,000; Kaiserlauten, 30,000; Stuttgart, 25,000; Nurnberg, 55,000; Garmisch, 15,000; Naples, 80,000; Athens, 20,000; the Izmir—Turkey—Fair, 70,000; Ankara, 10,000; Beirut, thirty or forty thousand; Tripoli, 12,000; and Alexandria, 10,000.

But statistics do not tell the story as well as do descriptions of a few of the concerts. You probably remember that in the summer of 1954 there were almost daily rainstorms in all European countries. A good test of interest in the Air Force Band's concerts would be the willingness of audiences to come to their concerts, and to stay through them, in the rain.

On July 6 the band was scheduled to play at Fontainbleu. All day it rained, and at 6 o'clock, when it was time to leave Paris for the concert, it appeared that the downpour would never stop. On arrival, the band remained in their transports, and 30 minutes before the concert the rain turned into a drizzle, but still one too heavy in which to perform. There was 7,000 chairs for the audience and 5,000 additional people were standing, all patiently waiting in the rain. At 8:30 General Hale, of the Air Force, arrived with his party, including the Marshal of France. At this time the clouds began to separate, the drizzle ceased, and the concert began only 10 minutes late. The relatively good weather held out for 2 hours, and just as the band was concluding its concert with the playing of the French anthem steady rain set in again.

May I tell just one more story about a concert in the rain, in the words of Colonel Howard, the chief?

July 17.—Dusseldorf was our next stop. Here, we found the weather impossible. The concert had been scheduled for early evening, 7 p. m., but there was no alternate in case of rain. It was not only cold and raining, but the stadium was at the very edge of the city. The Amerika Haus had given out several thousand invitations to schoolchildren. At six, I decided it was practically impossible to even think of giving a concert, but still I did not like to cancel it out at that point. I asked the band to remain at the hotel while I drove to the concert site. On the way there, I noticed many streetcars crowded with people and when I arrived at the stadium, I found 5,000 children seated under the roofed-in portion, waiting for the band. I simply could not let all those children down, so I telephoned for the band to come on out. A half hour later, the men arrived and I placed them in the center of the reserved section in the regular tier seats. There was no place for cellos, string basses, or music racks. We played a program from memory an hour and a quarter in length and sent the youngsters, plus many adults, home happy. It was a really tough program on the band but I could see no alternative. Had any one of the men been in command, I am sure he would have done the same. I spoke to several of the youngsters and discovered many of them had traveled several hours by streetcar and made as many as two changes in order to attend the concert.

But it did not rain for the concert in Ankara, Turkey. Many persons in the audience of 10,000 drove to the stadium in which the concert was given. The streets were supposed to be sprinkled by the fire department, but shortly before the concert began a large fire broke out and the fire department would not sprinkle the streets around the stadium. As a result, the dust was so thick that it got over everything, the band could hardly see the audience, and breathing became very difficult. But in spite of the dust, the audience and the band stayed at their respective posts. After the first 30 minutes of the concert, the fire department arrived and settled the dust on the streets and parking lots.

Among the very large numbers of people in all countries visited by the band who took an interest in the concerts of the Air Force Band were the Communists. On July 7 the band gave a concert at Evreux, a short distance from Paris, in a lovely park. The audience numbered about 12,000 and this large attendance was attributed in part to the unintentional effect of thousands of handbills distributed by the Communists for the purpose of keeping people from attending. At Nancy there was the same sort of advance publicity from the Communists, but 50,000 persons attended the concert. In Rome the crowd which sought admission to the open-air theater next to the Colosseum was far too large to be accommodated. Some six or seven thousand persons outside the gates listened to the music over loudspeakers. During the first two numbers there were several organized commotion incidents, thought to be Communist-inspired. For the third number the band played "Gopak," by the contemporary Communist composer, Katchaturian. During this number there was absolute silence and it was ardently accclaimed by the audience. It cannot be proved that the Communist composition stopped the heckling, but in any event it did not occur again. Apparently there was some Communist-inspired disturbance during the concert at Beirut in Lebanon.

Colonel Howard planned the programs of his concerts very carefully, and the results demonstrated the value of such intelligent analysis of the interests of widely varied audiences and of the effectiveness of different types of music. I quote Colonel Howard:

The selection of programs were most successful. We gave them what they wanted to hear, what they should hear, and what entertained them. It took real courage to play and announce the composition by a contemporary Soviet Communist composer. The band played with real artistry and captivated the audience from the beginning. Nothing could have been finer. If America could realize the value of this medium, much

money could be saved by a greater support for this medium of improving relations with foreign nationals.

Following the concert in Regensburg Colonel Howard spent an hour with a member of the American Foreign Service, a specialist in Russian language and affairs. He told Colonel Howard that—

The people in Regensburg have never been sold on American procedures and American troops. In 2 hours you have accomplished more and created better relations than we have been able to do in the years I have been here. These relations are my business and I want to tell you that tonight I have seen women walking past your buses after the concert saying "Aufwiedersehn" to your men—women who previously would not even stoop to spit on an American soldier. Tonight you have made American history in Regensburg.

In Naples on the day after a concert attended by 80,000 people, one of the Italian neighbors of an American officer assigned to Naples came to him and said:

You have showed me many pictures of America and told me many stories. I have also read many newspapers, but that is all propaganda. I have heard much propaganda during the war from our own Government and I could see it was not true. Russia, also, has many pictures and news releases, but that, too, is propaganda. But last night—that was not propaganda. It was something I understood and it was better than anything I have ever heard. Never again will I question your word about America.

At Naples the city administration gave good evidence of its attitude toward the Air Force Band concert in its expenditure of some $5,000 to provide overhead lighting, a public-address system, and chairs.

The Marshal of France who attended the concert at Fontainebleau said that he had never heard a finer organization, and he commented on the precision, dynamics, and overall musicianship of the players.

The concert in Hamburg was extremely important because the Soviet-sponsored appearance of the Russian ballet was to be made the next week. Colonel Howard wrote:

To the average American this may have no significance as neither music nor art plays as important a part in our lives as it does in the life of the European. But here the culture of America may be judged on the basis of our performance. While Amerika Haus does a tremendous job of selling America, a concert such as we give reaches more people in 2 hours than the Haus does in a year. The American Consul was very much elated with the whole performance and informed us that real benefit was derived from this Hamburg appearance.

On July 30, the band played in an amphitheater built by Hitler on the top of Holy Mountain near Heidelberg. Thousands of Germans walked to the top of the mountain and it was said that the amphitheater had been filled only once before when the Air Force Band appeared there in 1953. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn and his wife were in the audience and, in spite of extremely damp, cold weather, they remained for the 2-hour concert. Mr. Kaltenborn who could evaluate the audience reaction was extremely enthusiastic. He told Colonel Howard that he had heard so much about the band's performances that he had come to Heidelberg particularly to hear this concert, and he told several reporters that the presentation of the band did more good for European-American relations than all the ambassadors America ever sent over here. Colonel Howard was naturally glad to have the reaction of a man whose opinion is so universally recognized, and he quoted the substance of Mr. Kaltenborn's remarks as follows:

In Berlin there is a very fine boys' choir of 60 voices. I invited this group to appear on our show in a similar manner to the previous year. We had a special arrangement of Berliner Yungens die Sind Richtig (Berlin Children Are O. K.). At the end of our first half of the program, the band played and the "Singing Sergeants" sang the chorus of the song. At the same moment, the 60 boys from the choir, dressed in black velvet suits with short trousers, ran out from the stadium entrance and took their place on the left of the stage. They arrived there just in time to sing the second chorus but this time they sang Berliner Yungens wir Sind Richtig (Berlin Children We Are O. K.). At that same moment the spotlights were turned on the Kinderlift children. The band then left the stage for 12 minutes while the boys' choir performed. As the boys' choir again ran off the stage, the band paraded in (ranks of seven) to resume the program. It made a fast-moving show. Our program again covered the waterfront, from classics to jazz. Twice during the concert the clouds came so low one could hardly see the top of the stadium, but the rain held off until after the performance. I was particularly pleased about this as it gave Secretary Talbott and his party the full benefit of a typical German reception to good music.

I could continue to give you descriptions of concerts quite as interesting as the ones in the Near East and in Berlin, but they would only add strength to the evidence presented in those few examples. I shall conclude by offering you some of the statements and comments concerning the high professional quality of the band's performance and the effectiveness of their concerts in creating international understanding and good will.

The band played at the annual Fourth of July party at the American Embassy in Paris. Both Ambassador and Mrs. Dillon were most enthusiastic about the music, and they assured Colonel Howard that the appearance of the band at the reception was responsible for its success. Old employees of the embassy said that this was the most successful party given at the embassy for as many years as could be remembered.

The band attended a fair held on an international basis in Izmir, Turkey. The fair included a large number of what appeared to be permanent buildings, and the Soviet exhibit of cameras, refrigerators, machinery, furs, electrical equipment, and hundreds of pictures was in a large building surmounted by a red star. Representing the United States was the Air Force Band, and by means of special amplification its music reached everyone at the fair—more people, in all probability, than would have visited an exhibit building in a week. The entire Cabinet of the Government attended the concert, and one Turkish official said that it was the greatest exhibit of the entire fair.

A most unusual audience attended the concert in Tripoli. Colonel Howard described the event in the following words:

Here, the average Arab is very backward and in most cases western music is entirely unfamiliar to him. For these people, an applause of 3 or 4 handclaps is world shaking. True, they gave us that applause, and I must confess no one left the concert until its conclusion, but to look at unemotional faces and to receive the total acclaim of 3 or 4 claps—that is a bit disconcerting for both performers and conductor. But from reports following the concert, it was apparently successful.

Throughout the Near East, Colonel Howard frequently gave a place on the band's program to The Procession of the Sardar, from the Caucasian Sketches, which he described as occuping the same place in their musical literature as the Stars and Stripes occupies in ours.

Colonel Howard's description of the concert in the Olympic Stadium in Berlin presents an audience entirely unlike the Arabs at Tripoli. As usual, the rain which lasted all day made the prospects of playing at night most uncertain. About 6 o'clock the rain ceased, and the band went to the stadium, and at 7:40 Secretary of the Air Force Talbott and his party arrived. Colonel Howard's description of the concert is so excellent that I quote it in full:

At 8 the band played the Air Force March while I entered the stadium in an open sedan, seated on the back of the seat and dressed in Air Force formal (tails and cape). We drove around the track, stopping at the official box to salute the Secretary and General Tunner, then continuing around to the cheers and applause of 70,000 Germans. On arrival at the stage, I dismounted, ascended the podium, and the concert opened with the Ride of the Valkrie by Wagner. For 2 hours we played. Again, as in former years, we were twice greeted with the greatest ovation given by Berliners—absolute silence, then, almost as if on signal, the flaring of a match from somewhere in the stadium, followed by 70,000 matches, lighting up the whole stadium. What a thrilling sight and tribute.

During the concert, I performed the German marching song Ericka. This was done with glee club and band. It is a lovely song, the words of which start off "In the garden blooms a flower and its name is Ericka." It is cleverly written and, of course, is known by every German. It was written by a composer during the Nazi regime, but has no controversial words. Its only crime is that it was written during the wrong era. My reason for doing it was to show that in a democracy we recognize culture and music for its value alone. We do not forbid the playing of good music because it is written by a Communist, a capitalist, a German, or a Jew. We live democracy; we don't just talk about it. We do not put composers in disfavor, as do the Communists, or as did the Nazis. The reception was tremendous. Every time the word "Ericka" came along, the entire audience shouted it in unison. The following day one paper said we could have done without this number, but I gave a release to the press through our High Commissioner's office as to why it was done. It turned into good propaganda.

At this concert we had as special guests children from the Kinderlift. The Kinderlift is a project of the United States Air Force, originated by General Tunner. Each year the Air Force flies German children from Berlin to West Germany for a 2-week vacation with American families. This is a tremendous morale factor for Berliners. Since the children had already been selected for

this trip, I suggested we have them attend the concert as special guests of the band. Approximately 2,000 attended and were given a reserved section.

In Athens the concert was sponsored by the American Ambassador, and the audience was very select, including ambassadors from every country having an embassy in Greece, and many high Greek officials and military commanders. It was held in an ancient amphitheater close to the Parthenon on a beautiful moonlight night. American Ambassador Cannon said that this was the first time America ever indicated to the Greeks, who pride themselves on their culture and background, that we, too, had a culture. At the end of the concert many other ambassadors expressed their wholehearted gratitude to Colonel Howard, and one of them said, "In 2 hours you have won more good will for America than a million dollars would buy."

One of the last concerts was given in the Bull Ring in the city of Tangier. The American air attaché, Colonel White, told Colonel Howard that the Air Force Band concert had now become the social affair of the year and that anyone not on the invitation list simply did not rate. Requests for tickets far outnumbered available seats, and the audience was extremely enthusiastic.

I daresay that Colonel Howard, however much he may have appreciated such expressions of appreciation as those I have recounted, was most happy at the end of the tour to learn from his superior officers in the Air Force that they were highly pleased with the reports which the American ambassadors, ministers, and generals had sent back about the concerts in their respective cities. General Gruenther told Colonel Howard that in his estimation there is no medium which does more for public relations and he extended his personal thanks to every man in the band, congratulating him on having accomplished a great job. Colonel Howard left for the United States with every reason to believe that he had successfully accomplished a mission of importance in international affairs.

My own remarks can add little to this description of certain aspects of the 1954 tour, because you undoubtedly have drawn the same conclusions that I have. No one can prove that any particular concrete results were produced by the tour, but we can scarcely doubt that increased good will toward the United States resulted, even though there is no measure for such an intangible result. If there is any one thing conspicuously lacking in this world today it is international good will, and it would be difficult to place too high a value on any effort that added to the slender store. For a few hours at least nearly a million people in 17 countries in Europe, the Near East and north Africa received from the United States an artistic expression of the highest excellence. We were not trying to sell American music—the band played just the numbers that it might have played in a concert in your city or mine.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, on page 33, line 5, after the parenthesis the capital A in the word "Any" should be spelled with a small a.

On page 46, line 1, the word "first" should be stricken and there be inserted in lieu thereof the word "fiscal." These are purely typographical errors and I ask unanimous consent that they may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 47, line 16, after the word "possessions" strike out the remainder of the paragraph through the word "dislocations" in line 19.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am advised this language was placed in the act in conferences with the other body on 2 or 3 occasions, I am advised by the logistics people of the Department of Defense. The language on page 13 of the committee report explains the matter further, so I will not burden the committee with it.

This in effect hamstrings and prevents the procurement and contract award people of the various branches of the armed services from coming to the assistance of distressed economic areas in this Nation. There have been many Members of the House who have spoken to me in connection with this language. I am more than delighted, since I represent one of the most distressed economic areas, with great unemployment, to offer an amendment to have this language removed from the bill, because it prevents great help being given to dozens of areas where men out of work need jobs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The language that the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to strike out is as follows:

Provided further, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

In other words, if you strike this language out price differentials can be made. Abuses will be encouraged, difficulties will be encountered. We have fought this battle out over the past 3 years. We had this language in the bill 2 or 3 years ago, we had it in a bill last year and we think it is most important that we keep it in the bill this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Strike section 639, lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the committee that I will not trespass very long on their time, but this is a very important amendment. Of course, had it not been for the rule which makes this bill in order, it would have been subject to a point of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Now, let us see what it does. If you will examine the bill, it reads:

SEC. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

Of course, the rule makes it in order, but I am asking the committee to strike it out, and these are the reasons why it should be stricken out. Of course, it is legislation. Now, there is pending before the Committee on Armed Services a bill, H. R. 5115, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, which deals with this identical subject.

Now, what is the subject, and what is the purpose of it? The purpose of it is to keep the Government in business. Everybody understands that. And, I am weighing my words.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I want to compliment the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. TABER. I believe the interest of the Government would be better served by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. VINSON. When I find my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER], and my good friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], agreeing with me, I know I am on sound ground.

I am not going to trespass on your time. Now, we will give the author a hearing on his bill. He will have an opportunity to come before the committee, and it should be considered, because the Government is engaged in a great many things that the security of the Nation requires it to manufacture. But, on the other hand, this amendment would prohibit the Government from getting out of business until it comes back to a committee here. We do not know what committee, either the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, or the committee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]. We do not know what committee it would have to get clearance through. So, the effect of the amendment is to keep the Government manufacturing things that the Government wants to get out of, and they cannot do it, if this section is agreed to, until some committee back here in the

Congress has had a review of it. The committee headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], last year went into this subject matter. They had a long hearing, and they recommended that the Government adopt a policy to get out of business, and that policy went into effect in April of this year. Now, to adopt this section is absolutely in opposition to what the McCormack committee and the Hoffman committee and the others agreed on.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry my friend made reference to the Hoffman bill.

Mr. VINSON. I said his committee, not his bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], because the bill reported out of the committee did not do what the gentleman from Georgia says it did. There was an amendment adopted to the bill freezing it and applying it to the future.

Mr. VINSON. Let the House understand this. If you want the Government in business, you put section 639 in the bill. I do not want the Government in business. I want private enterprise in this country to operate; I want small business in this country. There are certain things it is necessary for the Department of Defense to do, and it is all right to do that, but there are hundreds of things that the Department of Defense is engaged in that private enterprise can do. Private enterprise has to support this country. You have to get taxes out of business to maintain the Department of Defense.

I am not going to take any longer, and everybody understands it. I hope you will vote for this amendment.

Section 639 prohibits the Department of Defense from using any funds appropriated under this act for the disposal or transfer, by contract or otherwise, of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress as economically sound and being without injury to the national security.

Were it in order for me to do so I would make a point of order objection to this section because it is clearly subject to one. But again I am precluded because of the nature of the rule under which we are now proceeding. Therefore, I shall base my objection on the merits of the case.

First, I would like to say that the inclusion of this section somewhat surprises me. I can find no testimony in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee to help us understand it and to justify its inclusion.

While I do not know who the sponsor might be, I would like to point out that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] introduced H. R. 5115 on March 21 and it was referred to the House Committee on Armed Services. I referred it to the Department of Defense on March 23, requesting a report and I would like to point out that the bill now pending before the House Armed Services Committee is almost identical to the provisions of section 639.

If the author of the bill or any other Member would like for the Armed Services Committee to hold a hearing on the bill, the committee will be glad to do so.

Now what would this section accomplish if it were enacted? As I understand it, it would prevent the Department of Defense from transferring to private enterprise any work which was traditionally performed by civilian employees of the Department of Defense unless such transfer were first justified before the appropriate committees of Congress.

We find ourselves in a strange situation. It is the current policy of the Department of Defense, dated April 27, 1955, to use privately operated commercial and industrial type facilities to the greatest extent practicable.

Under that policy it is proposed that everything which can be done by private enterprise, without endangering the national defense, will be done. As I read this section it would require that the Congress would first have to give their permission to the Department of Defense before they could implement this policy.

I would like to point out that the criticism of the services staying in this kind of business was not raised by the House Armed Services Committee. It was raised by another committee of the House which conducted extensive hearings and made many far-reaching recommendations on this precise subject, which recommendations have been faithfully carried out by the Department of Defense.

So, in spite of the mandate of one standing legislative committee of the House that the Defense Department turn over to private industry their commercial and industrial type operations, to the greatest possible extent, we now find a section in this bill which would prevent the Defense Department from doing this without first getting the permission of some committee of Congress.

Most of this type of activity involves small business. Every day we try to help small business but in this procedure you simply place another stumbling block in their way.

The language in section 639 is so unclear that it would be almost impossible to interpret it. For instance, what is "traditional" work? Is it work performed for 5 years, 50 years, or 100 years? Or what other yardstick do you use to establish the meaning of "traditional" work? Frankly, I don't know and I don't see how anyone else could know under the language in this section.

The issue is clear cut. One committee of the Congress has insisted that the Defense Department get out of these commercial-type activities and turn them over to small business and other elements of private industry.

The Defense Department has agreed and adopted such a policy. In addition, there is a bill pending before the House Armed Services Committee on this very subject.

For these reasons I urge the Members to support my amendment in order that we may conduct our business in the Congress in an orderly and intelligent manner.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS to section 639: On page 50, line 8, after "justified", strike out the rest of line 8 and insert "and considered by both the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate and affirmative approval given by each 'committee'."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, here is what my amendment does. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said he did not want the Government in business. My amendment makes our committee, the legislative committee, pass on those things about which he complains before the Department of Defense abolishes them.

I dislike intensely to disagree with my distinguished chairman, for whom I have the most everlasting esteem and of whom I have the most lofty opinion. But here is the kind of business they are in. For 100 years, they have been making rope in Boston. In no place on earth can they make rope the like of which they can make at the Boston Navy Yard.

Down here in Norfolk the navy yard discovered a paint that nobody in the history of that industry in this country discovered before. It abolishes and forever makes needless red lead when you paint a new ship. That is the kind of business your navy yard is in. They have got the know-how to repair clocks at the Boston Navy Yard such as is had no place else on earth.

At the Philadelphia Navy Yard, in the State of my distinguished friend [Mr. GAVIN], they have the know-how to make parachutes and things of that kind that nobody else can surpass.

That is not such a bad business for your Government to be in. These are your navy yards, 11 of them, created by acts of this Congress. I do not think it is entirely right to brand our navy yards as competitors all the way down the line with business.

Of course, everyone here knows my record. My record of conservatism surpasses the record of many others by so far that they could not be recognized as the same.

But I want to tell you this now. This amendment puts this control in our committee, where it belongs. It does not hurt the bill that has been referred to. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is to be commended. They will not veto this appropriation bill, but if we get one out of our committee, God knows where it will end up. Since we are going to legislate, since the Committee on Rules has given them authority to legislate in this bill, let us legislate right. Let us send this to our committee and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and I will take care of this country, as we have been doing.

Mr. VINSON. I do not want it. I do not want the Government in business.

Mr. RIVERS. Seldom have I disagreed with my chairman, but this is one time when my chairman just happens to be wrong. I will tell you something esle. Take the matter of typewriter repairs.

We have got navy yards where they cannot get typewriter repairs, in some of these little, old towns. If we do not repair our own typewriters, who in the name of goodness is going to repair them? So this is not so bad.

I know they are quite intrigued about getting the Government out of business, but we do not want to destroy JOE MARTIN'S Navy yard, we do not want to destroy JIM VAN ZANDT'S navy yard, we do not want to destroy PORTER HARDY'S navy yard. And we are not going to ask you to do it under the guise of getting the Government out of business when you and I know that that condition does not altogether exist.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] exercise his usual good judgment. I think his amendment, which is offered as a clarifying amendment, is a good one.

I had no thought that a simple effort to insure that Congress would be more fully informed on major changes in operating procedures in the Department of Defense—to insure that we in Congress would know something about what happens to the money that we appropriate would precipitate such excitement in some quarters, including my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I have high affection and esteem for this great and distinguished citizen. As a matter of fact I have followed his guidance pretty closely for nearly 15 years. I think this, however, is an appropriate time for him to follow mine.

We are discussing a very simple proposal. Here is the actual language of the bill:

SEC. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

And here is the statement in the report which explains very clearly what is involved:

Section 639: Attention of the committee has on a number of occasions been directed toward plans within the Department of Defense for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes that there may be circumstances which make a contract operation more desirable than continuations of work by civilian personnel within the Department. In some instances, this, however, represents a radical departure from established customs and it is conceivable that contract operations could, if carried to extremes result in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within the departments with the dispersal of tools and facilities and result in an actually greater cost to the Government over a period of years. Particularly would this be true in the event of a sudden emergency which would require rapid expansion of "on-base" activities. The committee has no desire to hamper legitimate transferal of Government activities to private business where it can properly be shown that this is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by contract without danger to national security. In view, however, of the Government's great investment in its own shops and facilities and the know-how of its civilian personnel and because of this committee's responsibility in the matter of appropriations it is felt that a justification of transfers before the appropriate committees of Congress is proper before the transfers take place.

There is nothing here to keep Government in business; nothing to discriminate against private industry; nothing to prevent any legitimate transfer of an activity now performed by Government to private business. I have no desire to hinder such transfers. I simply want the Congress to know that they are proper transfers which will be performed without loss and with proper security to the Government. This language would require that at least one committee in the House and one in the Senate should be made acquainted with reasons and justification for changes in operating procedures of the type covered herein before they are made.

Now we know very well what all this opposition is about—and I am greatly surprised that my wise and astute friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] could be taken in by such maneuvering. Big business does not want any stumbling blocks placed in the way of the give-away programs. His business does not want any possible interference from Congress. They know nothing about this section. They never saw it. They have no idea what language it carries. But apparently they have been told by the Department of Defense that section 639 could upset the gravy train; might put a stop in the handing out of nice, fat, juicy plums. So they, or people in the Department, have been pulling strings all over the Nation. As a result a mounting flood of telegrams has been piling up, protesting this section.

Undoubtedly some of those people have been getting rich or anticipate getting rich through contracts with the Department of Defense.

To me it is rather significant that other wires have been coming to Washington on section 639 also. They are wires from plain people; wires from working people. They want the Government's interests and the taxpayers interests to be protected. I think their wishes are going to prevail here today.

No; I am not against private business. I am not against business taking over any function now performed by Government that business can do legitimately without jeopardizing national security and without costing more money. If however the primary objection to section 639 is based on the assumption that the transfer of Government activities to private business will automatically generate savings, I suggest that you let me quote from a directive which was issued by the Department of Defense—and I did not get this from official channels as you can well imagine. Here is what it states:

As a matter of general policy it is considered that only in exceptional cases should cost be considered a significent factor, and only in very unsual circumstances will substantial savings be the sole criteria for justification of continued operation of a facility.

If savings are not to be the criteria; just what is to govern considerations? In any case, should not the fact be known to Congress?

Let me go just a little further. We in the Congress have responsibility for the funds we appropriate for the Armed Services. We know of many instances where projects which have been justified before the committees and brought to the Congress in good faith by the committees are not carried out by the Department of Defense. The funds are diverted to other purposes, and the Congress is not consulted in any way. Is that a proper thing which helps prevent waste?

No, I am not trying to keep the Government in business. I just want Congress to know what is being done with the astronomical amounts of money we appropriate. I think we have a right to know, and that is all this language does. I am sick and tired of the secretariat of the Department of Defense and of other Departments of Government usurping the privileges of Congress, ignoring the Congress, and refusing to advise with the Congress when major changes are made in their spending programs.

This language is only a 1-year provision. The committee of the gentleman from Georgia will have ample time in that year to bring out corrective legislation to supplant section 639 if they desire to remedy the problem. Congress will be adjourning in a very few months. There is little liklihood, in view of our busy schedules henceforth that permanent corrective legislation will be enacted before we leave here. If section 639 is stricken from the bill, we may be in the position of locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I am trying to get the situation straight in my own mind.

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is the gentleman speaking for the language in the bill or for the language in the Rivers amendment?

Mr. SIKES. I do not object to the language in the Rivers amendment. It is a clarifying amendment.

Now, this in conclusion: What can possibly be wrong in having the military authorities justify to the appropriate committees of Congress the disposal by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally or customarily done by civilian personnel?

I propose nothing that is obstructive, or time consuming, or that will hinder any proper transfer of activity. I do want Congress to be informed on the major changes in the military program, changes that affect not only spending, but changes that affect the lives and the families and the incomes of the people whom we represent.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the same course the gentleman from Missouri took, because actually, I think, the gentleman from Missouri was talking about another section of the bill, but I find it extremely difficult to disagree

with my beloved chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. However, he is off the beam on this thing, too. He gets that way every now and then. He will get back on the reservation if and when this bill is brought in to our committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I would be on the beam if I had a navy yard in my district, as the gentleman has.

Mr. HARDY. I might say to my friend from Georgia, shame. However, it goes further than that, as I shall show in this discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachussetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It applies to the Navy and it could apply to the acts passed by Congress. Somebody might be interested in it.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, we all have certain things we are interested in, and it just happens I do have a navy yard in my district, but I have more than a selfish interest in this section that the gentleman seeks to strike out. Under usual conditions I would prefer to see this proposition come before the Armed Services Committee in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. Under other conditions I would prefer to see this matter handled in the regular routine manner in which it would be considered directly by the Armed Services Committee. Under the present practical situation it cannot be done that way and the reason it cannot be done that way is because of the proposals which are now under consideration by the Navy on which action is imminent.

I am in favor of getting the Government out of business wherever it can be done properly and economically with the best interests of the taxpayers in mind. I have supported a great many moves to get the Government out of business activities, and I think most of the Members of the House here know that during two Congresses I contributed about as much, I expect, as any other one individual toward economy in the Government, so I do not take any back seat to anybody on that.

Now, with respect to the specific matters that are currently under consideration, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] referred to a couple of them. One was the paint manufacturing plant in the navy yard at Norfolk. It manufactures paints that are not made in commercial manufacture. It is true that other paints were manufactured in that shop that were made competitively. Most, if not all, of that has now been discontinued; and, as my friend over here from Iowa just observed, the special paints that are made could be made on the outside.

There is a practical aspect to the matter. Do you think it would make for economy to turn over to commercial interests formulas developed by the Navy, formulas adapted only to Navy ships, formulas that require production in time with Navy needs and according to exclusively Navy specifications. To turn that over to private industry just for the purpose of getting the Government out of business certainly would cost the taxpayer many times as much. I do not believe that is the kind of economy we want. Another consideration right now is that this paint is manufactured only at the navy yard at Norfolk, and the navy yard at Mare Island.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman's amendment require that to be done, that the Navy discontinue manufacturing those paints?

Mr. HARDY. It is going to be done unless some plain language is put in.

Mr. DIES. I say, Does the gentleman's amendment require it?

Mr. HARDY. His amendment would strike out this language.

Mr. DIES. That is not an answer to the question. The gentleman said that they want the Government to stop the manufacturing of paint that no one else makes.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman's amendment would not in itself require it and neither will this language in itself keep it out. That is absolutely correct. But under the practices which are now taking place and the efforts which are now being made, the paint will not be made in the navy yard and the chronometer shops at Norfolk and San Diego are now in the process of being abolished when there is no place in the United States that can perform the service that is now being performed at the chronometer shops in the navy yards.

I favor getting the Government out of business where it is good sense to do so, but does anybody propose that we abolish the navy yards entirely. Do my colleagues recommend that we discontinue ship repair? Should we contract for the repair of all our aircraft? Some people seem to want to do this.

Recently following an unfortunate airplane accident near Norfolk the Navy sought an overhaul job from an aircraft manufacturer, who proposed the overhaul for a price of $120,000. The local air station estimated that the job could be done in the local navy shops for $60,000. After considerable delay the air station performed the job with civilian employees with a final cost of less than $45,000. And this included considerable tooling expense.

So, I say Mr. Chairman, the Rivers amendment should be adopted and the Vinson amendment should be defeated so that the Congress can look at each of these proposals before serious damage is done. No one seriously contends that we should stop building ships entirely, and no one seriously contends that we should stop repairing ships and aircraft. If these functions are to be continued essential related functions must be continued.

Let us decide each of these actions on its merits, and let the Congress have a look at it before the action is taken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is one of the most dangerous amendments for national defense I know of.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Which amendment is the gentlewoman talking about?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. I am trying to strike it out of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It should stay in the bill. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Rivers amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one thing has not been referred to, and that is the great danger, as I see it, to national defense. Where are you going to get your trained workers in the navy yard if they leave to go into other business because they have lost their highly trained work in the navy yards of the country and also the arsenals of the country? They have given their lives to that work. You cannot replace them. It will take years of training to replace them. You are endangering your national defense. Have you ever been in a ship immediately after a fire, as I did once, you would know the value of trained workers. This will not only affect the navy yards, it will affect the arsenals. We in Massachusetts see the workers of the navy yards and the arsenals without work. They are laying off workers and sending them to private industry.

Mr. RIVERS. My amendment does this: During this interim it gives our committee, the committee created by this House, an opportunity to consider legislation. It gives us jurisdiction over the matter, with the opportunity to report back to the House. During the interim we can report back to the House. During the interim we can report a bill out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We had testimony from a group of people from New England the other day. Some of the work that has been taken from the Watertown Arsenal was performed by a private industry. There was a serious explosion and accidents. I do not want that to happen again.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I want to commend the gentlewoman for the fine statement she is making. May I emphasize the fact that the language of section 639 is not intended to keep the Government in business and would have no effect of preventing the Government from getting out of business. It simply would say that the Government would consult a committee of Congress before the step is taken so that the Congress would know what is being done and would know that the Government is getting fair financial treatment in the transaction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also it involves the proper making of the equipment and the things that are made to go to the Navy and the Army. In the navy yards and arsenals the work

is done for national defense by highly trained and skilled workers. It is very vital, as I see it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute or the clarifying amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will not be agreed to. What I am driving at is the elimination of the entire section. The Armed Services Committee should not be required to trespass upon an executive function such as set out in this amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman also propose to give up the passing on real estate projects by our Armed Services Committee, that has been so well and effectively performed by that committee?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman raises that question. It is always the duty of the Government, when it buys anything, to say upon what terms and conditions it buys. It is always the duty of the Government to specify what terms it sells for. That is the difference between the two propositions.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is this not just another attempt on the part of the Congress to really run the executive branch of the Government? Is this not just another effort to prevent the Department of Defense from handling its own executive business, not legislative business but executive business, as was intended to be prevented by the Constitution of the United States to be the case?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Louisiana is absolutely correct. Now you see who is concerned about this. You have heard this afternoon from the great Charleston Navy Yard.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. For your information, we do not manufacture anything but patriotism.

Mr. VINSON. All right. You should not manufacture anything, because you can go out and buy it cheaper.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], to strike section 639 from the Department of Defense appropriaitons bill for 1956.

Mr. Chairman, there are a great many of the Members of Congress who are genuinely disturbed by a growing tendency on the part of the Department of Defense to withdraw from Government installations work that has been traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. I am convinced that it can develop into a dangerous policy inimical to the defense of our Nation. It represents, in some instances, a radical departure from established custom. The policy is already resulting in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within agencies affected by the policy and experience clearly has demonstrated that it has, can and will result in greater costs to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, there are few who will quarrel with a legitimate transfer of Government activities to private business when it can be clearly shown that such action is economically sound and in the interest of the national defense. But, the present policy of the Defense Department and its rush to get the Government out of business, is being carried too far.

My area has had some experience with this matter. I am acutely aware of the effect of the Defense Department plans as they pertain to the Springfield Arsenal. I cannot understand why it persists in its policy. The M–1 Garand rifle was designed, and first produced at the Springfield Arsenal. Skilled workmen—some of the best in the Nation—have spent many years at this plant. It has taken considerable time and money to train this personnel. Under these circumstances, it is inconceivable that the Department would award contracts for the production of the M–1 to private business. But it has done it. And what is more disturbing and remarkable, it has awarded such contracts to firms that have never before manufactured or produced these weapons. It has done so despite the fact that the Springfield Arsenal can produce the rifle cheaper than private industry. The International Harvester Co., of Evansville, Ind., has been one of the beneficiaries of the Defense Department's largesse. It was put on the production line of M–1's only after extensive training by the Springfield Armory. Plans, specifications, equipment, machinery, and particular employees were detailed to assist the International Harvester Co. to get going. And even with this generous assistance, the Springfield Armory had to supply the receivers for the rifle. I am informed that the quality of the work was not as good and the cost per unit was higher.

I sincerely trust that the amendment to strike this section from the bill does not prevail. This section of the bill gives Congress an opportunity to have a look at the kind of policy the Department of Defense is pursuing. It is one way of telling the Department that the Congress will not countenance a pennnywise, pound-foolish philosophy under the bugaboo of getting the Government out of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—yeas 120, nays 120.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair casts a vote in the affirmative.

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VINSON and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 160, noes 134.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: In section 611, on page 37, at the end of line 9, strike the period and substitute a colon and add the following language: *"Provided further,* That, for the purposes of aiding in carrying out the national policy to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small-business enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation, the Department of Defense shall make a monthly report to the President, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives not less than 45 days after the close of the month, showing the amount of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense which have been expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent with small business as defined by the Small Business Administration, and the amount of such funds expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent with firms other than small business in the same fields of operation; and such monthly reports shall show separately the funds expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent for basic and applied scientific research and development."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It imposes new duties on the Department which are not presently authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment will do nothing more than require the Department of Defense to make monthly reports of its contracts awarded to business in accordance with the definition of small business prescribed by the SBA.

The purposes are, however, twofold: First, to force the Department of Defense to accept SBA's definition of small business. Second, to give SBA a club, which it will have by its power to prescribe the detail in which Defense must make reports to Congress, to yield up reports and operating information it needs in order to make (a) an intelligent appraisal of Defense's efforts to place a fair proportion with small business, and (b) to make intelligent recommendations to Defense on how to utilize small business in its procurement programs, and so forth.

The amendment is intended to mean that SBA can prescribe a definition of small business which uses a different standard or criteria for each industry or for each commodity group and to require defense to report the amount of contracts awarded to small business in each industry or commodity group, as well as

to report the amount of contracts awarded big business firms in these groups.

Procurement agencies of the Federal Government are required by three statutes to give a fair proportion of their purchases and contracts for supplies and services to small business. These are the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong., 1st sess.). Nowhere in existing legislation is small business defined except as it is defined in the Small Business Act of 1953. Title II of this act establishes the Small Business Administration and defines its powers and responsibilities. Section 203 reads as follows:

For the purposes of this title, a small business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation. In addition to the foregoing criteria the Administration, in making a detailed definition, may use these criteria, among others: Number of employees and dollar volume of business.

The phrase "Administration" refers to the Small Business Administration and this language in section 203 on the face of it requires the Small Business Administration to make the precise definition of small business within the general policy framework stated in this legislation. Moreover, if there is any question that this responsibility is not clearly that of the SBA, the report accompanying the bill H. R. 5141 makes it extremely clear.

Other sections of the Small Business Act also give SBA other powers and responsibilities concerning Department of Defense procurement and other activities. For example, section 212 states:

The Administration shall have the power, and it is hereby directed, whenever it determines such action is necessary—

(e) to obtain from any Federal department, establishment or agency engaged in procurement or in the financing of procurement or production such reports concerning the letting of contracts, and subcontracts and making of loans to business concerns as it may deem pertinent in carrying out its functions under this title.

Despite the fact that SBA clearly has the responsibility of making the precise definition of small business and of obtaining from any Federal department necessary reports concerning the letting of contracts, and so forth, in order to carry out its other responsibilities under the act, there is a grave question (a) whether the Department of Defense will in any practical way accept SBA's definition of small business, and (b) whether it will give SBA any reports on any subject matter other than in the form and manner in which Defense wants SBA to have reports.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The amendment is a limitation on the language that is in the bill. It merely requires reporting to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas imposes additional duties which are substantive in nature and, therefore, the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader if he can tell us the legislative program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. I will be very glad to do so. On Monday, we will consider the bill, H. R. 2126, the Saline Water Act of 1952.

On Tuesday, the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called, and also the national reserve plan—the manpower bill, H. R. 5297.

As I understand, Tuesday is primary day in Pennsylvania so there will be no roll call on Tuesday. There may be some quorum calls, but any roll call will go over until Wednesday.

On Wednesday, we will consider the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1956.

Thursday, Friday, and Saturday are undetermined.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the gentleman is a little ambitious if he expects to get the Army reserve bill through in time to take up other business on Wednesday.

Mr. BOGGS. We will see what develops.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Page 30, immediately after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the pay and allowances of any commissioned officer, or the wages of any civilian employee, who is assigned to or employed in—

"(1) the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, unless such officer or employee is subject to the authority of a general counsel of the Navy appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department of the Navy with responsibility for all legal functions within such Department under the general supervision of the general counsel of the Department of Defense;

"(2) the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Army, unless such officer or employee is subject to the authority of a general counsel of the Army appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department of the Army with responsibility for all legal functions within such Department under the general supervision of the general counsel of the Department of Defense; or

"(3) the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, unless such officer or employee is subject to the authority of a general counsel of the Air Force appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Department of the Air Force with responsibility for all legal functions within such Department under the general supervision of the general counsel of the Department of Defense."

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and subject to a point of order and I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment today in the hope that it will be adopted for if it is, a tremendous amount of money will be saved by the American taxpayers and, at the same time, the legal services of our Armed Forces will be vastly improved.

The Hoover Commission recently reported on the legal services and procedure of the executive branch of the Government and, in its report, made a strong recommendation for the integration of the legal services of the Department of Defense, the Army, Navy, and Air Force through the General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

This proposition is not a new one, for the Rockefeller committee on the Department of Defense organization presented, on April 11, 1953, substantially the same recommendation. I have introduced legislation, H. R. 6115, to implement those recommendations, but I feel that the same end could be accomplished here today—in time to effect that tremendous saving in the next fiscal year. The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has introduced the same legislation in his H. R. 6172.

In each of the armed services there is a monumental waste of money, talent, and efficiency because of the duplications in legal services. Each armed service has a two-headed monster of a legal department—composed in each instance of a Judge Advocate General and a General Counselor or Department Counselor. Division between the two heads is generally between civilian lawyers and military lawyers and between commercial law and military law. Overlapping of authority in the legal field exists throughout the whole Defense Establishment.

In addition to the dual authority which I have just mentioned there are many separate and independent offices and groups of lawyers, principally civilian, who are attached to the branches, services, corps, or commands and are not connected with, or responsible to, either a General Counsel or Judge Advocate General. The lack of coordination of legal services through a General Counsel of the Defense Department is a primary defect in the organization of the legal services of the Defense Organization.

"Effective coordination and direction of legal services in the Department of

Defense can only be achieved by establishing and recognizing an overall authority and responsibility centered in the General Counsel of that Department," the Hoover Commission report says. The report recognizes that lawyers in different locations should be responsible to their immediate superiors but emphasizes the need for a chain of authority and responsibility.

In addition, there should be established, in each of the armed services, a chief legal officer. This officer should be of Assistant Secretary rank and should be a trained professional lawyer, to be selected from civilian life by the President and appointed by him with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is elementary that professional services should be controlled by well equipped members of that profession.

We shall be discussing this important proposition at length in the future, for all of us here recognize our responsibility to ensure the efficient operation of a strong, well-integrated Defense Establishment. The American taxpayers are entitled to a reorganization which would operate their Defense Department in a more efficient, more economical manner. They are entitled, also, to legal organizations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force which are capable of performing legal services efficiently.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], and the others who say it is foolish to cut our military manpower. If they are correct in the assertion that a balanced budget is the force behind the manpower cuts—then let us consider saving on useless legal duplication and use the money to keep our Armed Forces at the level recommended by their commanders.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHENCK: On page 49, line 22, strike out all of section 638.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, had the Committee on Rules in their rule not included the waiving of points of order I am sure this section would have been subject to a point of order. I take this time now, therefore, to ask that this section 638 be stricken from the bill and to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he wishes to state why this section was put in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. This particular section was placed in the bill to require the officials of the armed services when they come to Congress for money to state what they are going to do with the money. The section reads:

No part of any funds provided in this act shall be available or used for the moving of any major permanent facility until the use of such funds has been specifically justified before the appropriate committees of Congress.

The committee feels that the large sums that are required to move a major facility ought to be requested of Congress and that the Congress should be told that a certain number of thousands of dollars, whatever may be required, will be used for the removal of certain facilities which are of a major nature.

I know the gentleman is from Dayton and that there is a proposal to move air research headquarters from Baltimore to Dayton. We are not objecting to the move of the facilities, but we are objecting to the fact that a forthright presentation was not made to Congress that part of the funds appropriated would be used for that purpose, and this is merely to compel the Pentagon officials to tell the Congress what will be done with the money that is requested of us from year to year. I think it is a fair request.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say to the gentleman that certainly the heads of the various departments of defense know the needs of their departments and how they can best serve in the national interest. Certainly if we require each department of the defense organizations to appear before a congressional committee before it makes any move we surely do hamstring the Department of Defense and often interfere materially with this work which is vital to our national defense. So I hope the House will approve my amendment and strike this from the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the thought here is not that some separate appearance would be needed, but that when officials of the Department of Defense come to Congress for money each year, as they have done this year for $31 billion-plus, that they shall tell the committee what they contemplate doing with the money. There is nothing unfair, improper, irregular, or unusual about that proposition.

It is true, as the gentleman from Ohio said, that the people who run these agencies are best informed perhaps as to whether or not they ought to be moved. This section would simply require that they justify such moves at the time they ask for the money which will be used in bringing about the move.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Do these representatives of the Department not come to your committee?

Mr. MAHON. They come before the committee, but there was no information whatever given with respect to some very significant moves they planned to make with funds appropriated by Congress. Congress did not know what the money was to be used for when it was appropriated.

Mr. SCHENCK. If the gentleman will yield further, these people certainly know what they ought to do and when they ought to do it.

Mr. MAHON. I think generally they do know what is best for them, and if they do and have a good reason they can tell the Congress what they want the money for when they request it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The requirement, as I understand, is that they should give the information to the committee at the time they ask for the money and not that they should report after the money is appropriated.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly, but they should not treat it so lightly, make a major expenditure without even a committee of Congress having been told about it, and without the funds having been requested specifically for the project.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to read the section so the Committee can understand it. Of course, this also would have been subject to a point of order had not the rule waived it. Listen to this:

No part of any funds provided in this act shall be available or used for the moving of any major permanent facility until the use of such funds has been specifically justified before the appropriate committees of Congress.

I would like to ask the gentleman, What does he mean by "permanent facility"? Is it buildings or is it a function?

I call the Committee's attention to the fact that pending before the Armed Services Committee today is a proposition to move the facilities at Baltimore over to the Wright Patterson Airfield. This amendment deals with that and runs counter to any recommendation that might be made unless we say either the Appropriations Committee or the Armed Services Committee or Mr. DAWSON'S committee has passed on it.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to me that the Congress is mature enough and stable enough that it should be told by the Department of Defense, when the Department of Defense asks for money, what it is going to do with the money. If they are going to use it to move a major or permanent facility, and they are designated as either permanent or temporary, if they are going to move that function, they should tell us. It would not be the buildings, it would be that function. If they are going to move that function we should be told. We do not dispute the fact that some moves are desirable. I have an open mind on the proposed move stated here, but let us be given the facts. After all we are dealing with the taxpayers' money and we have a right to know the facts.

Mr. VINSON. How are you going to say what committee is going to deal with it? Is it the gentleman's committee? Is it the Armed Services Committee? Is it the Government Operations Committee?

Mr. MAHON. The amendment speaks for itself—"until the use of such funds has been specifically justified." All funds are justified before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no.

Mr. MAHON. When an appropriation is requested the funds are justified before the Appropriations Committee; if an authorization is requested, it is then before the gentleman's committee. But it would seem to me that the justifica-

tion should be before this committee. If the gentleman wants to burden his committee by including the Committee on the Armed Services of the House and Senate and the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate I would have no objection.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman refers to the fact "before the committees" and not before the committee. Therefore, he had in mind not only the Appropriations Committee but other committees of the House.

Mr. Chairman, we are trespassing upon an area that is dangerous. Pending before the Armed Services Committee is a proposition to transfer something from Baltimore to over in Ohio and in hearings this has been agreed on. Suppose the committee comes in and says "We recommend it"? And the House comes along and says that it recommends it. Then you have a provision in this bill that none of this money can be used to make the transfer.

Mr. MAHON. None of it can be used until it has been justified. Is there any reason why those funds should not be justified before the people who have to stand on the floor and defend appropriation bills? I can see nothing wrong with our having that authority.

Mr. VINSON. It all gets down to the point of trying to legislate on appropriation bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Now, the language of the bill, if I understand it correctly, and if I understand the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], is aimed directly at the attempt to remove this facility from Baltimore—the people want it over there for commercial purposes—up to Dayton, Ohio. It was moved down there temporarily. Now, for a permanent installation they want it back with the other facility. Is that right?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. All that subject matter is pending before the Committee on Armed Services today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. And, when the gentleman says in opposition to the amendment that he wants some committee to justify it, I assume that the Committee on Appropriations got a justification before they put the money in there; at least, they must have heard something on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHENCK) there were—ayes 131, noes 125.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Vinson amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate voted demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 50, strike section 639, lines 4 through 11, inclusive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the Vinson amendment strike out the entire section, which section was perfected by the amendment that I offered?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is in the affirmative.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask to have the amendment reread?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Strike out all of section 639, on page 50, lines 4 through 11, inclusive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 202, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—184

Adair	Bonner	Corbett
Alexander	Bosch	Coudert
Alger	Bow	Cramer
Allen, Ill.	Brooks, La.	Cretella
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks, Tex.	Crumpacker
	Brown, Ga.	Cunningham
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Curtis, Mo.
	Brownson	Dague
Arends	Budge	Davis, Wis.
Auchincloss	Burleson	Dawson, Utah
Ayres	Bush	Derounian
Baker	Byrnes, Wis.	Devereux
Barden	Cannon	Dies
Bass, N. H.	Carrigg	Dixon
Baumhart	Cederberg	Dolliver
Becker	Chase	Dondero
Belcher	Chenoweth	Dorn, S. C.
Bennett, Mich.	Church	Dowdy
Bentley	Clevenger	Durham
Berry	Cole	Ellsworth
Betts	Colmer	Fenton
Bolton, Frances, P.	Cooley	Fisher
	Coon	Fjare
Fountain	Kilburn	St. George
Frelinghuysen	Kilday	Schenck
Fulton	Kilgore	Scherer
Gamble	Knox	Scudder
Gentry	Krueger	Seely-Brown
George	Laird	Selden
Gross	Landrum	Sheehan
Gubser	Lanham	Shuford
Gwinn	Latham	Siler
Halleck	LeCompte	Simpson, Ill.
Hand	Lipscomb	Simpson, Pa.
Harden	Lovre	Springer
Harrison, Nebr.	McCulloch	Taber
Harvey	McDonough	Talle
Hébert	McGregor	Thomas
Henderson	McIntire	Thompson, La.
Hess	McVey	Thompson, Mich.
Hiestand	Mason	
Hill	Meader	Thomson, Wyo.
Hillings	Miller, Nebr.	Thornberry
Hinshaw	Miller, N. Y.	Tollefson
Hoeven	Minshall	Utt
Hoffman, Ill.	Morano	Van Pelt
Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Tenn.	Velde
Holt	Nicholson	Vinson
Hope	Osmers	Vorys
Horan	Ostertag	Vursell
Hosmer	Patterson	Wainwright
Huddleston	Phillips	Watts
Ikard	Pillion	Weaver
Jackson	Poage	Westland
Jenkins	Poff	Wharton
Jensen	Prouty	Williams, N. Y.
Johansen	Radwan	Willis
Jonas	Ray	Wilson, Calif.
Jones, N. C.	Reed, Ill.	Winstead
Judd	Rees, Kans.	Withrow
Kean	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolcott
Kearney	Robeson, Va.	Younger
Keating	Sadlak	

NAYS—202

Abbitt	Ford	Mills
Abernethy	Forrester	Mollohan
Addonizio	Frazier	Morgan
Allen, Calif.	Friedel	Moss
Andrews	Garmatz	Moulder
Ashley	Gary	Murray, Ill.
Ashmore	Gathings	Natcher
Aspinall	Gavin	Norrell
Bailey	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Baldwin	Gray	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	O'Neill
Bates	Griffiths	Passman
Bell	Hagen	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	Pelly
Blatnik	Haley	Perkins
Blitch	Hardy	Pfost
Boggs	Harris	Philbin
Boland	Harrison, Va.	Polk
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Price
Boyle	Hayworth	Priest
Bray	Herlong	Quigley
Broyhill	Holifield	Rabaut
Buchanan	Holmes	Rains
Burdick	Hull	Reuss
Burnside	Hyde	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrd	Jarman	Richards
Byrne, Pa.	Jennings	Riley
Carlyle	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers
Carnahan	Johnson, Wis.	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Chiperfield	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Christopher	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Clark	Kelly, N. Y.	Rooney
Cooper	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Curtis, Mass.	Kirwan	Rutherford
Davidson	Klein	Saylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Schwengel
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Scott
Deane	Lane	Scrivner
Delaney	Lankford	Shelley
Denton	Lesinski	Sheppard
Diggs	Long	Sieminski
Dingell	McCarthy	Sikes
Dollinger	McCormack	Sisk
Donohue	McMillan	Smith, Kans.
Donovan	Macdonald	Smith, Va.
Dorn, N. Y.	Machrowicz	Spence
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Edmondson	Mack, Wash.	Steed
Elliott	Madden	Sullivan
Engle	Magnuson	Teague, Calif.
Evins	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	Mailliard	Thompson, N. J.
Fascell	Marshall	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	Martin	Trimble
Fernandez	Matthews	Tuck
Flood	Merrow	Udall
Flynt	Metcalf	Vanik
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Van Zandt
Forand	Miller, Md.	Walter

Whitten	Williams, N. J.	Yates
Wier	Wilson, Ind.	Zablocki
Wigglesworth	Wolverton	
Williams, Miss.	Wright	

NOT VOTING—48

Albert	Granahan	Pilcher
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	Preston
Avery	Heselton	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Holtzman	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver, P.	James	Riehlman
Bowler	Kearns	Roberts
Buckley	Keogh	Short
Canfield	King, Pa.	Smith, Miss.
Chatham	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	McDowell	Taylor
Dempsey	Morrison	Tumulty
Dodd	Multer	Wickersham
Eberharter	Mumma	Widnall
Fine	Nelson	Young
Fino	Norblad	Zelenko
Gordon	O'Brien, N. Y.	
	O'Konski	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Albert against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Avery for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Tumulty against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Dodd with Mr. James.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Smith of Mississippi with Mr. Young.

Mr. BELL and Mr. CHRISTOPHER changed their votes from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—384

Abbitt	Arends	Bates
Abernethy	Ashley	Baumhart
Adair	Ashmore	Becker
Addonizio	Aspinall	Belcher
Alexander	Auchincloss	Bell
Alger	Ayres	Bennett, Fla.
Allen, Calif.	Bailey	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Baker	Bentley
Andersen, H. Carl	Baldwin	Berry
	Barden	Betts
Andresen, August H.	Barrett	Blatnik
	Bass, N. H.	Blitch
Andrews	Bass, Tenn.	Boggs
Boland	Gavin	Martin
Bolling	Gentry	Matthews
Bolton, Francis P.	George	Meader
	Grant	Merrow
Bonner	Gray	Metcalf
Bosch	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Bow	Gregory	Miller, Md.
Boykin	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Boyle	Gross	Miller, N. Y.
Bray	Gubser	Mills
Brooks, La.	Gwinn	Minshall
Brooks, Tex.	Hagen	Mollohan
Brown, Ga.	Hale	Morano
Brown, Ohio	Haley	Morgan
Brownson	Halleck	Moss
Broyhill	Hand	Moulder
Buchanan	Harden	Murray, Ill.
Budge	Hardy	Murray, Tenn.
Burdick	Harris	Natcher
Burleson	Harrison, Nebr.	Nicholson
Burnside	Harrison, Va.	Norrell
Bush	Harvey	O'Brien, Ill.
Byrd	Hays, Ark.	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Minn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hayworth	O'Neill
Cannon	Hébert	Osmers
Carlyle	Henderson	Ostertag
Carnahan	Herlong	Passman
Carrigg	Hess	Patman
Cederberg	Hiestand	Patterson
Celler	Hill	Pelly
Chase	Hillings	Perkins
Chelf	Hinshaw	Pfost
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Philbin
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips
Christopher	Hoffman, Mich.	Pillion
Chudoff	Holifield	Poage
Church	Holmes	Poff
Clark	Holt	Polk
Clevenger	Hope	Powell
Colmer	Horan	Price
Cooley	Hosmer	Priest
Coon	Huddleston	Prouty
Cooper	Hull	Quigley
Corbett	Hyde	Rabaut
Coudert	Ikard	Radwan
Cramer	Jackson	Rains
Cretella	Jarman	Ray
Crumpacker	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Cunningham	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Mass.	Jensen	Reuss
Curtis, Mo.	Johansen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dague	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Davidson	Johnson, Wis.	Richards
Davis, Tenn.	Jonas	Riley
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Robeson, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Jones, N. C.	Robsion, Ky.
Deane	Judd	Rodino.
Delaney	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Denton	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
Derounian	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Devereux	Keating	Rogers, Tex.
Dies	Kee	Rooney
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Dingell	Kelly, N. Y.	Rutherford
Dixon	Kilburn	Sadlak
Dollinger	Kilday	St. George
Dolliver	Kilgore	Saylor
Dondero	King, Calif.	Schenck
Donohue	Kirwan	Scherer
Donovan	Klein	Schwengel
Dorn, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Scott
Dorn, S. C.	Knox	Scrivner
Dowdy	Knutson	Scudder
Doyle	Krueger	Seely-Brown
Durham	Laird	Selden
Edmondson	Landrum	Sheehan
Elliott	Lane	Sheeley
Ellsworth	Lanham	Sheppard
Engle	Lankford	Shuford
Evins	Latham	Sieminski
Fallon	LeCompte	Sikes
Fascell	Lesinski	Siler
Feighan	Lipscomb	Simpson, Ill.
Fenton	Long	Simpson, Pa.
Fernandez	Lovre	Sisk
Fisher	McCarthy	Smith, Kans.
Fjare	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Flood	McCulloch	Spence
Flynt	McDonough	Springer
Fogarty	McGregor	Staggers
Forand	McIntire	Steed
Ford	McMillan	Sullivan
Forrester	McVey	Taber
Fountain	Macdonald	Talle
Frazier	Machrowicz	Teague, Calif.
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Friedel	Mack, Wash.	Thomas
Fulton	Madden	Thompson, La.
Gamble	Magnuson	Thompson, Mich.
Garmatz	Mahon	
Gary	Mailliard	Thompson, N. J.
Gathings	Marshall	Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.	Vursell	Willis
Thornberry	Wainwright	Wilson, Calif.
Tollefson	Walter	Wilson, Ind.
Trimble	Watts	Winstead
Tuck	Weaver	Withrow
Udall	Westland	Wolcott
Utt	Wharton	Wolverton
Vanik	Whitten	Wright
Van Pelt	Wier	Yates
Van Zandt	Wigglesworth	Younger
Velde	Williams, Miss.	Zablocki
Vinson	Williams, N. J.	
Vorys	Williams, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—50

Albert	Gordon	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso	Granahan	O'Konski
Avery	Green, Pa.	Pilcher
Beamer	Heselton	Preston
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
	James	Reed, N. Y.
Bowler	Kearns	Riehlman
Buckley	Keogh	Roberts
Canfield	King, Pa.	Short
Chatham	McConnell	Smith, Miss.
Cole	McDowell	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Mason	Taylor
Dempsey	Morrison	Tumulty
Dodd	Multer	Wickersham
Eberharter	Mumma	Widnall
Fine	Nelson	Young
Fino	Norblad	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Short.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Fine with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Beamer.

Mr. Green with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. James.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Young.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Dodd with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Tumulty with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Riehlman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include appropriate excerpts, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to have my remarks appear at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on this bill just passed I voted "yea," but I hope in the future when bills for the Defense Department are presented on the floor of the House for approval that they will contain a provision whereby the money will be spent on competitive bids, particularly more so than it is now.

I noted that 85 percent of the money spent for the defense of this Nation is spent on a negotiated basis. I certainly hope that legislation or Executive orders will be issued whereby competitive bids will be taken on procurement contracts for the Defense Department in the future.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION—A LONG WAY TO GO

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask ananimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that over-optimistic reports of alleged improvements in the labor market appearing in the newspapers of the Nation may lull us all into a false sense of satisfaction with the present employment situation. For instance, several days ago—on May 7, to be exact—the Washington Evening Star, on its first page quoted Republican statements to the effect that the new gains in employment "if the trend continues, promises to undermine a potential Democratic issue in the 1956 Democratic campaign."

Let me state here categorically that my concern about such statements has no political overtones. The question of how many Americans looking for work are unable to find it, is to all of us, I am sure, far too serious a matter to be exploited for political advantage.

There have been, of course, numerous recent occasions when we have had good reason to believe that the press of the Nation has dealt politically rather than factually with important national issues.

In this instance, however, the newspapers are not to blame for any misleading statements on the current employment situation that they may print. In good faith, these statements are based upon official releases issued jointly by Secretary Sinclair Weeks of the United States Department of Commerce and Secretary James P. Mitchell of the United States Department of Labor.

These releases, or handouts, present to the press the administration's official interpretation of monthly statistical reports on the labor force prepared by conscientious members of the staffs of both Departments. Certainly under these circumstances the press has no reason to question the authenticity of the statements made.

However, as we in Congress have good reason to know, statistical data is susceptible of many and varied interpretations. This is nowhere more true than in its application to the complex and involved subject of employment and unemployment data.

What are the true facts about employment and the job situation at the present time? They are nowhere nearly so reassuring as the latest statements of Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Secretary Weeks would like to have us believe. Those who will take time to study the fine print in the monthly report on the labor force for April 1955, released on May 6, will find that the accurately reported statistical data does not support the glowing optimism of the administration's spokesmen.

What stands out clearest in the fine print is the sobering fact that although, according to the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production, our national product is now at about the same high level as that achieved in the peak months of 1953, we are accomplishing this production today with 1.2 million fewer workers in our factories and mines than were employed 2 years ago.

Further careful examination of the material presented in detail in the full monthly report on the labor force reveals that in spite of the exuberance displayed in this combined employment and unemployment release, unemployment did not really go down between March and April, 1955, when seasonal corrections are taken into account. Indeed, as the fine print in the full report flatly states the decrease was less than should normally occur. In the seasonally adjusted index appearing at the bottom of table 1 of the current report, unemployment actually rose 6 percent between March and April. As a matter of fact, the number of nonagricultural employees, including the armed services, in March 1955 was still 1.8 million under March 1953.

Today, the officially reported numbers of the unemployed would be far more serious if normal growth of the labor force had taken place during the past 2 years. However, the administration job market has slowed the growth of our work force down to less than half of normal, as many potential workers have left the labor market unable to find jobs for which they are equipped through experience and training. I am particularly worried about the older worker; the experienced skilled worker; the specialist, who with heavy family obligations, cannot move to a new industrial location without help or develop a new skill without additional training. These men—our skilled labor force—are part of our Nation's backbone and have always been a major element in our industrial strength.

Even though we may choose to look at the national employment situation through rosy-hued spectacles, there are many areas in which the situation is still a deep indigo. I represent such an area in West Virginia, and it is not just the coal industry that has created our difficulties. In my home county of Marion, 13½ percent of the working population is jobless and 25 percent of the population is dependent upon some form of public assistance—the distribution of surplus foods, for example—to stay alive.

Two-thirds of the largest labor markets in the Nation now provide fewer jobs than 2 years ago. In many of these areas, including some of the largest urban centers in the United States, there are 5, 10, or even 15 percent fewer jobs than 2 years ago—shortly after the Republicans took over. In a number of areas, one-tenth of the job seekers are officially admitted to be unemployed. In others, the figures are substantially higher.

I am deeply concerned about this failure to provide employment for Americans anxious to work—and who certainly cannot share in our way of life unless they find it. I am worried about our increasing ability to meet our production needs with fewer workers if this real trend continues. I am worried about an administration that sugarcoats and distorts the facts and what they mean to us as a Nation at home and abroad.

No amount of expert public relations will provide jobs for our people; or reassure, for long, a man worried about his family's support; or protect his savings against adversity when he is out of work; or raise his standard of living or even improve his outlook, on the basis of some quoted national average. We cannot count on wartime backlogs, Marshall plans, Government life insurance dividend payments, and larger defense programs or increasing Armed Forces indefinitely. The latter have both already been heavily reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I am measuring my words. We cannot have a better America unless we are mature enough, patriotic enough, courageous enough, and intelligent enough to face the facts which today are being either obscured or even suppressed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALEY and to include a magazine article.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. KEAN and to include a letter.

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KNUTSON.

Mr. PRIEST and to include a letter and statement.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GWINN referring to the Reed-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MOLLOHAN) and include a statement by Honorable Carlos T. Romulo, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $280.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin).

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin).

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. KLEIN).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER, from May 16 through May 20, on account of hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. DOYLE, for 4 days, beginning May 16, 1955, on account of official business as a member of the subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States;

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

791. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

792. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

793. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Capt. William S. Ahalt, and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

794. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claims: *Morongo Band of Mission Indians of California, Plaintiff*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 325), and *The Osage Nation of Indians, Petitioner*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 9), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court; with amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5652. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6063. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State; without amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 6196. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 6197. A bill to incorporate the United Mexican Border Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 6198. A bill to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6199. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6200. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 6201. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6202. A bill to provide that certain findings of disability made for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6203. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6204. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate Patriot's Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6205. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 6206. A bill to provide for the establishment of a purchase program for domestic manganese ore for the southern Appalachian area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6207. A bill to amend subsections (a) and (b) of section 351 of the Public Health

Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 6208. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6209. A bill to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 6210. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6211. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 6212. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to expenses for care of certain dependents) with respect to taxpayers whose wives are physically or mentally incapable of caring for themselves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD (by request):

H. R. 6213. A bill to provide pensions for the dependent parents of certain World War I veterans who die from non-service-connected causes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 6214. A bill to sell certain agricultural lands of the United States in Oregon under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H. R. 6215. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retired pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from June 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 6216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6217. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 6218. A bill to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 6219. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6220. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 6221. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to permit the making of payments to farmers for certain water-conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist States in the carrying out of plans for forest land tree planting and reforestation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 6223. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6224. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child in the employ of his father or mother; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6225. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6226. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in respect of distributions in kind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6227. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6228. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to amend sections 5136 and 5221 of the Revised Statutes; to amend the Federal Reserve Act; and to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6229. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to amend sections 5136 and 5221 of the Revised Statutes; to amend the Federal Reserve Act; and to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 6230. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar, Leyte, and Luzon, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. Res. 243. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the factors involved in the separation or proposed separation of Cpl. Walter William Kulich from the United States Army Reserve; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation readjusting the import duty on vegetables brought into this country from foreign nations sufficient in amount to equalize the difference in cost of production between foreign and domestic-grown crops and to prevent the flooding of our domestic markets by the importation of these foreign agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Delegate from Hawaii to seek Federal aid in investigating the commercial uses for methods of destruction of lava beds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the immigration quotas applicable to the peoples of the Pacific and Asiatic areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 6231. A bill for the relief of the estate of Judge John J. Speight, deceased, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6232. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 6233. A bill for the relief of Francisco Alvarez Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 6234. A bill for the relief of Paul Jordan (or Fryderyk Jakub Einaugler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6235. A bill for the relief of Emma Basili Osorowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 6236. A bill for the relief of Abraham, Fanny Gorda, Claire Sarah and Alain Leo Trigouboff (also known as Traig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6237. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 6238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Auguste French; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

261. By Mr. GATHINGS: Petition of several members of the First Baptist Church of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the post commander, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr. Post 1755, The American Legion, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of H. R. 595, H. R. 3088, H. R. 3318, and S. 967, providing for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Florence Nightingale, National Hospital Week, and Speech by Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 135th anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, the founder of nursing methods as we know them today. During the Crimean War Miss Nightingale raised a band of nurses and took them to the Turkish military hospital at Scutari, on the Bosphorus. On November 4, 1854, she assumed control of the hospital and introduced system and order where indescribable chaos had reigned—and thereby laid the foundations of modern scientific nursing.

But Florence Nightingale is known for more than her heroic deeds in the Crimea. As Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service, says in the appended speech:

All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale.

To Florence Nightingale we owe both the high professional standards and the system of professional education which has given us 390,000 active professional nurses in America today. Other American nurses are giving their services throughout the world. Among them are such women as Mary Mills, of the United States Public Health Service, Chief Nurse, on a technical-assistance mission to Lebanon for the Foreign Operations Administration. I understand that Miss Mills has just been awarded the Lebanese Order of Merit by the Minister of Public Health for establishing the new Makafid School of Nursing in that Near Eastern nation. Miss Mills was previously decorated by the Liberian Government for a comparable feat.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

This week we are observing another major influence on the good health of Americans through National Hospital Week. Just recently I delivered an address at the oldest hospital in the United States, the 200-year-old Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia. The tradition of that fine institution reminded me of how far we have come since the days when hospitals were considered places to die.

Today hospitals are the centers of our community's health services, and our national and State hospital associations are working hard to provide the highest quality care for all Americans.

In the past several years there has been a great increase in hospital construction. This is due both to the stimulus offered by the Hill-Burton Act, and to the determination of the States and communities that their citizens should receive the full benefit of new advances in the medical sciences.

It has been estimated that the number of persons in the United States without access to acceptable general hospital services has been reduced from 10 million in 1947 to less than 4 million last year. New hospitals in rural areas are attracting physicians and other health personnel. Most new hospitals are using sound architectural practices. They are making provisions for consultation services in such fields as pathology, roentgenology, and other diagnostic services. All of these factors contribute to better care of the American people.

There is still ever so much to be done, with facilities for the chronically ill and for mental patients still in very scarce supply. But we are making progress, and that is what is important.

During National Hospital Week and the anniversary of Florence Nightingale, we should all offer our sincerest thanks to the men and women in the health professions who have dedicated their lives to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering, and to preventing needless death.

ARNSTEIN SPEECH

Under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech by one of the leaders of the nursing profession, Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, Chief of the Division of Nursing Resources of the United States Public Health Service. Her address was made before the section on historical and cultural medicine of the New York Academy of Medicine in New York City, May 11, 1955:

THE INFLUENCE OF FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE ON NURSING

Modern nursing derives so completely from the example and teaching of Florence Nightingale that it is hard to pick out the particular practices that owe their existence to her influence. All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale—that her name is a synonym for nursing. She demonstrated in a dramatic fashion in the Crimea that nursing—and sanitation—could reduce mortality, as Dr. Berry will describe to you.

The medical profession has long recognized the essential role of nursing in care of patients and prevention of illness. The Academy of Medicine tonight in paying tribute to Florence Nightingale, is paying tribute to the contribution nursing makes to medical practice.

Nursing literally did not exist, except in a few religious orders, until Miss Nightingale showed what it could do, and more important, established a school to produce people who could do it. This first school at St. Thomas' Hospital in London was a model for all the later schools in England and the United States. Nightingale nurses became heads of all the early schools established in England. Bellevue Hospital School of Nursing in New York, the first in this country to introduce the Nightingale principles, was actually guided by letters from Miss Nightingale.

This evening I would like to detach Miss Nightingale's principles from their historical setting and discuss them in relation to modern nursing. To do this one must recognize that Miss Nightingale had both a good influence and a bad influence on nursing. Most of the bad influence is due to the fact that we have slavishly followed some practices she strongly advocated, long after the need for them has disappeared. Some of it is due to the fact that we have continued with practices she initiated, but have ignored the underlying principles which she set forth.

The influences that have outlived their social usefulness are almost entirely related to the conduct of student nurses. When Miss Nightingale started the first training school, the Nightingale nurse, in the words of one of her biographers, "had to establish her character in a profession proverbial for its immorality."

The probationers, as students were called, had their entire lives controlled by the school as though in a convent. They had 2 hours of outdoor exercise each day, outside the dormitory. They were never allowed to leave the dormitory alone. All other time was scheduled: meals, work and learning, and sleep. All this control probably was necessary at that time. The fact that some of it has lingered on into the middle of the 20th century shows we did not consider the reason for the practice but clung to the practice itself long after the respectability of nursing was established, and young women in our society had attained much more independence.

Miss Nightingale herself recognized the danger of stereotyping. In the paper, Sick Nursing and Health Nursing, that she read in Chicago in 1893, when she was in her seventies, she said, "No system can endure that does not march."

On the other hand, if we had followed as closely all else that she taught, we would not now be trying to undo so much of what we recently have been teaching and doing in this country in nursing.

This astonishing person had such vision and understanding that I sometimes think a school of nursing today could not do better than read from her writings each morning a lesson for the day. The lesson could then be expanded with the knowledge of human relations and with the scientific facts we have acquired since her day, but I doubt that many new lessons would be needed.

It is a little disconcerting to realize some of our most modern ideas—that are still opposed by some nurses and some of the related professions—that these dangerous new ideas were taught by Miss Nightingale 95 years ago. Our leaders in nursing today have come to these ideas quite independently and have contributed greatly to getting us back on the track and several miles ahead of the point where we went off.

We might consider these ideas under three main headings: care of the patient in the hospital and in the home; administration of of nursing services; and education of nurses.

About care of the patient, the most advanced members of the nursing profession are stressing the idea that we must nurse the whole patient and not just his disease. Miss Nightingale expressed the same principle. She said, "The art is that of nursing the sick." And she added, "Please mark—nursing the sick; not nursing sickness."

Her definition of nursing the sick included giving the medicines and stimulants prescribed, and the surgical appliances, proper use of fresh air, warmth, and cleanliness,

proper choosing and giving the diet, and quiet. All this was to be done, she wrote, "at least expense of vital power of the sick."

Psychosomatic medicine is a relatively new concept, yet the great physicians and nurses of the past recognized the influence of emotions on disease conditions. In writing about the care of patients, Miss Nightingale gave attention to the ways a patient's illness is affected by his state of mind, his worries and fears, the attractiveness or drabness of his surroundings, and the noise around him. She summed it up as follows:

"The symptoms or the sufferings generally considered to be inevitable and incident to the disease are very often not symptoms of the disease at all, but of something quite different—of the want of fresh air * * * or of quiet or of cleanliness or of punctuality. * * * The reparative process * * * has been hindered * * * by some want in one or in all of these things."

We can almost hear the modern cardiologist saying, as she did, "Apprehension, uncertainly, waiting, expectation, fear of surprise, do a patient more harm than any exertion."

Psychiatrists today teach us that the type of reassurance which tells a patient not to worry, the operation will not amount to anything, he will be all right, and other such encouragements, often defeats its own end. Today we believe that listening to the patient, the process we call nondirective interviewing, is actually more helpful. Although we did not learn this principle from Florence Nightingale, we might have done so. Although no one had ever heard of "nondirective interviewing," Miss Nightingale admonished, "Do not cheer the sick by making light of their danger," and continued at length to discuss the understanding of patients' fears and their individual differences.

In recent years we have recognized that color affects the productivity of industrial workers, and are now experimenting with the effect of color on patients. Although Miss Nightingale made no controlled experiments, she observed keenly, and in this instance her observations have been proved correct by later scientific experiments. "Little as we know about the way in which we are affected by form, by color, and light," she wrote, "we do know this, they have actual physical effect." Another observation from her writing of the same period was: "No one who has watched the sick can doubt the fact that some feel stimulus from looking at scarlet flowers, exhaustion from looking at deep blue, etc."

On the other hand, Miss Nightingale recognized that the connection between mind and body is not a one-way street. She said she wished "a little more was thought of the effect of the body on the mind." Today we recognize this fact and no longer say, as we did some years ago, that a patient "is or is not cooperative." We try to understand why he complains, or why he is angry, or why he resists treatment. Miss Nightingale summed up the patient's difficulties so succinctly that we might repeat her words everyday: "Almost any sick person, who behaves decently well, exercises more self-control every moment of his day than you will ever know till your are sick yourself."

Until recently, the recognition given Florence Nightingale by the nursing profession has been primarily for her work in establishing decent standards of nursing care for patients and starting a system of training for those who give the care. Yet perhaps her real genius was in the management field. She may have been so far ahead of her time that we did not appreciate the principles she bequeathed us; we have had to discover them for ourselves. Nurses, like hospital administrators, have gone to industry and business for ideas on better management. So we cannot say that Miss Nightingale has influenced our profession greatly in this aspect of nursing service. Yet she knew the basic principles of good management and expressed them so well I would like to quote part of her statement on the first requirement of an administrator:

"To be 'in charge' is certainly not only to carry out the proper measures yourself but to see that everyone else does so too. * * * It is neither to do everything yourself nor to appoint a number of people to the (same) duty."

Miss Nightingale had much to say about applying this principle and other principles of good management. In 1858 she advocated conserving the nurse's time and energy in almost the exact same words that were used in 1955 in a recommendation growing out of a recent time study of nursing activities. I quote from the report by a Michigan hospital:

"Following the study made in our hospital we now have a messenger service that brings supplies and drugs to the patient units and transports patients from place to place in the hospital."

Miss Nightingale said that "nothing should be fetched by the nurses," and that "the nurse should never be obliged to quit her floor except for her own dinner and supper." She had a scheme to make this possible—more revolutionary in her day than pneumatic tubes in ours—a "windlass installation," or lift to bring up the patients' food. She also had a scheme for saving work by having hot water piped up to every floor. Without systems of this kind, she said, the nurse is converted into a pair of legs.

She was not only an administrator but an inventor of labor-saving devices. The intercommunicating system at which we marvel today seems only a natural descendant of her suggestion that "the bells of patients should all ring in the passage outside the nurse's door on that story and should have a valve which flies open when its bell rings and remains open in order that the nurse may see who has rung."

Perhaps some of Miss Nightingale's ideas have remained dormant in nurses' consciousness like recessive characteristics. Even today only the more progressive hospitals have written job descriptions for all nursing personnel. We rather timidly suggest that the good staff nurse should receive recognition through higher pay and more responsibility without necessarily having to become an administrator.

Miss Nightingale said in 1858, in her subsidiary notes as to the introduction of female nursing into military hospitals, that the duties of each nurse, senior and junior, and of the orderly should be clearly outlined. She also wrote: "Many women are valuable as nurses who are yet unfit for promotion to head nurses. It appears to me that it would be desirable to have intermediate recompense."

The recent studies to which I referred have analyzed the pattern of interruptions in the head nurse's activities and have shown that the head nurse seldom spends as much as 5 minutes on an activity without being interrupted. Miss Nightingale had a gloomy outlook for people who spent their days in this fashion. She said, "I have never known persons who exposed themselves for years to constant interruption who did not muddle away their intellects by it at last."

Examples of her astute understanding of administration and her inventiveness could be multiplied for the rest of the evening. I shall quote only one more, under the heading of administration: "Unless the matron's authority is supported by the principal medical officer, the patients always suffer." When we read Miss Nightingale's writings we are never in danger of forgetting the patient.

In the field of nursing education, we have been grappling with numerous perplexing problems and divergent ideas in recent years. Here again Miss Nightingale offered many ideas that today would be considered progressive, perhaps even radical. Many students of our system of nursing education maintain that the school of nursing should be independent of the hospital. It is interesting to note that the first school of nursing, the Nightingale School at St. Thomas' Hospital in London, had its own endowment fund and its own board of managers.

The first schools in this country, at Bellevue and Massachusetts General Hospitals, were not established primarily to insure better care of the sick, but to educate nurses. The impetus for these schools came not from the physicians or the hospitals, but from the New York State Charities, and from the Women's Education Association in Boston. Each was directed initially by its own board of managers.

Recent studies of costs of schools of nursing have wrestled with the question, "Should nursing service personnel, head nurses, and others contribute to the education of the students?" In the Nightingale school, the head nurses and the director of nurses were paid part of their salaries from the Nightingale fund for the training of students. So we at least have a precedent for this practice.

Some of us have believed that having the students work full time on the wards was "the good old way." Yet even in Miss Nightingale's era, when theory was a much smaller part of the preparation for any profession than it is now, Miss Nightingale stated as one of the essentials of a training school that "there shall be an organization which by giving proper help in the wards gives probationers time to do their work as pupils as well as give service to patients. Seventy years later we are proposing not a completely different philosophy of training, but rather more of the pupil and less of the service.

Nursing educators are convinced of the necessity of students understanding the reasons behind the things they do—of the value of the case-study method of teaching. Miss Nightingale must be nodding her head in approval. Her spirit perhaps is murmuring "at last." For in 1882 she wrote, "We require a special organization for the purpose of training." Then she explained:

"Training is to teach not only what is to be done * * * not only how to do it, but why such and such a thing is done, and not such and such another; as also to teach symptoms, and what symptoms indicate what of a disease or change, and the 'reason why' of such symptoms.

"Without time for these things, average nurse-probationers degenerate into conceited ward drudges. Without a system for these things, they potter and cobble out their year about the patients, and make not much progress in real nursing—that is, in obeying the physicians' and surgeons' orders intelligently and perfectly."

In her forthright way, Miss Nightingale's predicted dire things for the students if we do not give them proper training.

She summarized so well all the attributes we want in a nurse today that I am going to end with this quotation:

"Training is to teach a nurse to know her business, that is, to observe exactly, to understand, to know exactly, to do, to tell exactly, in such stupendous issues as life and death, health, and disease.

"Training is to enable the nurse to act for the best in carrying out her orders, not as a machine but as a nurse; as an intelligent and responsible being. Training has to make her, not servile, but loyal to medical orders and authorities. True loyalty to orders cannot be without the independent sense of responsibility, which alone secures real trustworthiness."

Townsend Convention Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address I made before the National Townsend Convention at St. Petersburg, Fla., on May 2, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Townsend, distinguished guests, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a source of personal inspiration to see so many of you here at this, your 15th convention, and to look back on your significant accomplishments under the leadership of your beloved Dr. Townsend.

It is fitting that you have chosen to meet in this beautiful city of St. Petersburg. It is known throughout the land as a haven for our retired senior citizens. I am sure that your visit here will be a most pleasant one.

I come to talk with you, briefly, on a matter in which you, and millions of other American citizens, are deeply interested. I come also to pay a tribute to the founder of your organization, Dr. Francis E. Townsend. In all our land, no other person has done more to improve the lot of the senior citizens of our country. His efforts have done much in lightening the burden of our old folks and in making possible for them a better opportunity for a decent livelihood in their retirement.

I know that the pages of history will duly record his tremendous contribution to the well-being of his fellowmen. His perseverance and courage against overwhelming obstacles serve as inspiration to all of us, and to those who will follow along the path toward social and economic justice which he has so clearly marked.

This 15th convention has been most aptly entitled the "Torchlight Convention." Truly, the purpose of this gathering is to light the torch of truth, showing the way to a better tomorrow for the senior citizens of the Nation and for our younger folks to look forward to.

I have always admired the Townsend organization because of its sincere concern with the problems of people. In this day of increasing mechanization and preoccupation with such things as automation, A- and H-bombs, guided missiles, V–8 engines, television, and other mechanical and technical advancements, it is encouraging to find such a dedicated organization striving to obtain for our old folks an equitable share of the Nation's abundance which you have helped to create.

You have made outstanding progress in an area where any progress is difficult. The struggle for social reform is a constant uphill fight. Tremendous pressures for inertia must be overcome before any advances can be made.

Great gains have been won. And although you have not obtained your objective for adequate insurance or retirement benefits for elderly citizens, you have made great progress. You have been a tremendous force for good. You can rightfully claim much of the credit for improvements that have been made in State and Federal legislation pertaining to problems of the aged. You are a force for good because you put human values above everything else.

We need only to refer to history to find illustrations of successful campaigns which have been won against the forces of social inaction. Some of these fights have taken many decades, others hundreds or even thousands of years.

Consider the struggle over the ages for the realization of the inherent worth and dignity of the human spirit. From the days of Christ, man has been taught that human dignity and spiritual values transcend all other values. The basic elements of Christianity teach that we are all God's children and that we are important in His plan. This teaching survived the tyranny of the Roman Empire, the Dark Ages and was reborn in the renaissance. Down through the centuries man has struggled to break the chains of feudalism, political and religious persecution and to improve his status. Our own forefathers came to America to find a freedom which was denied them in their native lands.

Yes, the struggle for freedom and social progress for the individual has carried down into our own lifetime. We have achieved a measure of freedom and dignity unsurpassed in all of the history of the world. But we continue to fight for an even better life for ourselves and our children and our grandchildren because there still are inequities today which need remedying.

Some of the struggles for social progress have been of a shorter duration, but nonetheless intense. The fight against the inhuman institution of slavery in this country lasted almost a hundred years, and was won at the fearful cost of human lives and suffering in a great Civil War.

Woman suffrage was not achieved until the recent past, after decades and decades of agitation. No, my friends, real social progress is not easy to win. It is a continuing struggle against powerful forces who seek to maintain the status quo and who fear change.

Your program is one which should attract interest from young people as well as old folks. The young man or woman who has the foresight and vision to look ahead, will be interested in the kind of Federal insurance, or social-security program that will adequately provide for them in their twilight years. Young people are naturally concerned about the welfare of their parents and that, too, should interest them in a security program that is adequate in meeting the needs of their elders.

We are not much concerned about the name of a program so long as the objective is to adequately compensate retired citizens and to provide for them the opportunity to properly share in the abundance with which this Nation is blessed.

Any program of social reform which gives a break to the average citizen will always be denounced by those who traditionally have opposed social legislation and social progress.

The objective you seek will one day be realized. It would be unrealistic to expect it to come without great effort and sacrifice, for social reform unfortunately does not move as fast as we would like.

Progress has been slowed down by those who say that the Nation cannot afford a program such as yours or, even programs which are not as far advanced as yours. They ignore the facts that one of our Nation's great problems today is how to meet the challenge of abundance.

We are worried about the great surpluses of farm products. We are concerned because the storehouses are filled with all sorts of electrical gadgets, automobiles, and other items essential for good living. It seems to me that the question is whether we can afford to hold back on programs for adequate retirement benefits. Can we afford to block plans to raise the living level of millions of American workingmen and women and their families who now live on incomes that are not adequate to provide the kind of livelihood and opportunities they are entitled to?

There is something seriously wrong when millions of our fellow citizens are suffering because of the lack of goods which the Nation has in such great abundance. Some folks say we are living beyond our means. They suggest that because of this great abundance we should adjust ourselves downward and backward. Because there is so much of everything they believe people should live on less. That, to me, does not make good sense.

In this great land of ours there is no good reason why everyone should not have the opportunity for a full, happy, and productive life.

In order to build an expanding, full employment economy we must make it possible for our old folks to share in our economic progress. This is one of your aims and it is sound. Increased purchasing power is the key to a brighter tomorrow. Millions of citizens now barely able to exist on meager pensions, inadequate unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, or public assistance today constitute a great potential force for economic advancement if they are given the opportunity to share in the Nation's wealth.

Our Nation was founded by men who had a deep and abiding faith in human progress and a humble respect for the needs of our people. Democracy can be hurt only in times of chaos and in an atmosphere of fear, uncertainty, and hopelessness.

Your own organization was born in the grim days of depression. You remember well that panic which seized our people when our economy was in a state of collapse because of policies which ignored the welfare of the average American. We must remember well the lessons we learned 25 years ago and resist any attempts to again take us down the road to economic disaster.

I regret to say that already I see some of the same danger signals of the 1920's in certain policies of the present administration. The ill-fated "hard money" policy has already forced increases in the interest rates on Government securities and has worked a hardship on borrowers and small businesses. Preoccupation with the alleged needs for encouraging investments has taken precedence over the real needs of the average American for tax relief and resulting increases in purchasing power.

Some people in the administration believe that a float of unemployment is essential in a competitive society in order to keep production on a high level. They overlook human values and fail to see the suffering that comes to several million American families who are compelled to live on inadequate unemployment insurance, public assistance or private charity. They fail to see the tremendous waste in human and natural resources that comes with idle men, idle machines and idle factories.

The real waste in our Nation today is the loss in national output because of this backward adjustment and fear of abundance. This loss last year amounted to something like $30 billion. It does not make sense that several million workers who desperately seek work in our country today are unable to get jobs, particularly when there is so much work to do. There is a great need, all over the country, for more and better schools. There is a crying need for hospitals and increased medical care for our citizens. In all parts of our great country there is the need for the building of highways and expansion of water, sewer, sanitary systems and the like. There is a great new field for employment in serving the millions of people for whom new avenues have opened for longer vacations, travel, recreation and culture because of automation and increased productive power.

We need not fear abundance. We should not be frightened about a program which would permit all of our citizens, and particularly our deserving senior citizens to fully share in the necessities and luxuries of life which we, as a Nation, have in such great abundance.

If we have the vision, our productive capacity can provide more leisure. It need

not be unemployment and suffering amid plenty. If we have the vision, abundance should be cause for rejoicing, not confusion, fear, and sorrow.

But, shortsighted economic thinking and philosophy which we had hoped was discredited, dead and buried in the great depression, is now making its reincarnation. I am seriously alarmed at some striking resemblances to the predepression administration which are now appearing on the present-day Washington scene.

In my opinion the present administration is not concerning itself with the problems of people but is focusing more and more attention on the health of the stock market, the banking interests, and the profit figures of our giant corporations.

The administration should realize that the needs of our aged are becoming more critical each year. The number of persons over 65 years of age is increasing at the rate of over 1,000 persons a day. Senior citizens now make up over 8 percent of our total population and the proportion is rising rapidly as medical science makes new discoveries which prolong our life expectancy.

The hard fact of the matter is that our social and economic advances have not nearly kept pace with our medical, scientific, and technical advances. Concern for human needs has been shoved aside in the mad race for profits and economic power. But how can we achieve real and lasting progress unless the needs of our aged are given the serious consideration they deserve? Today, even middle-aged workers are being discriminated against in employment opportunities. What happens to these citizens who can no longer find employment? A few have been able to accumulate savings in their lifetime, however meager. But how far will savings go when the cost of living remains at such a high level. Some aged persons are cared for by children or relatives, but we know of the natural desire for independence and freedom of action.

One of the most effective ways which the administration could begin to meet the problems of the aged would be in supporting a housing plan for the older citizens of this Nation.

An example of how this plan could be geared to the needs of our aged is to be found in Cleveland, where a public housing development has set aside 100 apartments, with special provisions such as elevators, nonslip floors, handrails and other fixtures which would make life easier for old people.

Rent in such a project would be low and independence would be assured without isolation, since the apartments are a part of a larger development which would have occupants of all ages. This is the type of program which the Federal Government should undertake on a nationwide scale to reassert its interest and concern for the needs of our growing aged population.

Of course, the Federal Government must begin to face up to the realties of the basic financial needs of the senior citizens. Present levels of benefits under the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are pitifully inadequate despite recent increases. Even $100 a month pension would be little enough to buy the bare necessities of life. Millions of Americans are trying to exist today on far less than that. Coverage, while extended recently, still does not provide for aged persons not eligible for benefits at the time of their retirement because of limited original coverage and other disqualifications. Permanently and totally disabled persons are discriminated against under the present law.

I share your views that our present social security law is far from adequate. But it can, and will be improved, as more citizens show an interest in their Government and in legislation that means so much to themselves and their families. We can make our social security law whatever we want it to to be when we arouse enough public support.

Dr. Townsend has displayed wisdom in looking toward his objective. He is realistic enough to know that it requires organization, work, and effort. He has called attention to the great need for unity and action on the part of elderly folks throughout the Nation. He has wisely suggested that you make common cause with organizations of working men and women who are your strongest allies. Labor organizations are made up of members, who like yourself, are deeply concerned about humane problems and about the security of our senior citizens.

Don't forget, there are some in this country who would like to destroy social security, not because they want something better, but because they don't like security at all for the average citizen. They don't like welfare programs. The security that comes regularly with an old-age insurance or pension check—something that is yours as a matter of right—gives to old folks a sense of dignity, self-respect, and independence.

Some folks don't want you to be independent. They don't want you to be in a position where you can't be pushed around or be told what to do. Old-age insurance or retirement pension legislation, or whatever you wish to call it, can be improved to the extent that people desire, if they have the initiative to exert themselves and to apply themselves to the task that must be done.

There is really no need to worry about the financial soundness of the social security system. Social security is just as good and strong as your Government.

The real test, as to whether the Nation can and will adequately provide for retired folks and for all of our people will finally depend upon whether or not we have the real wealth in human and natural resources and in food and other essential goods.

In closing I must say a good word about my friends, Mrs. Ford and Mr. ELLIOTT. They are doing a good job for you in Washington and have the respect of my colleagues in the Congress.

Dr. Townsend is also greatly admired by Members of the Congress for his outstanding leadership in your great cause.

Many Members of Congress have signed the Townsend petition requesting that consideration be given to your program in committees and on the floor of the Congress.

Although this objective has not been achieved, your work has been most fruitful in that it has had a powerful impact on bringing about improvements in social security.

In this beautiful Florida city are a number of people who have come here from my congressional district. I had the pleasure of meeting some dear friends only a few moments ago. I refer to Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Birch, who are now residents of this city and are with us here in the convention hall. Mr. Birch was a prominent citizen of Reading, Pa., and for many years principal of the boys high school. I was one of his students.

I regret that I can't stay here a few days instead of rushing back to Washington. To all of you, my sincere best wishes. May you enjoy continued success in advancing a just cause to which you are so faithfully devoted.

Long-Short Haul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from Chairman Richard Mitchell, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and a statement from the Commission giving its justification for a bill I have introduced today by request of the Commission:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

The Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRIEST: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies of a draft of a bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, together with a statement of justification of the bill.

After an intensive review of the operation of the fourth section of the act, with particular reference to its impact on the work of the Commission and the ratemaking function of the rail carriers, the Commission has come to the definite conclusion that this section should be amended so as to eliminate therefrom all unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, but at the same time retain the central objective of the fourth section, i. e., departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over direct routes.

The Commission would be very grateful for your assistance in introducing the bill and giving it early consideration.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft of proposed bill is intended to amend section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to remove therefrom all unnecessary and unduly burdensome refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, which principle was originally designed to prevent the specific discriminatory practice of charging more for a shorter than for a longer haul. That principle is still valid today.

Section 4 (1) of the act now prohibits any common carrier subject to part I or part III thereof from charging or receiving any greater compensation for the transportation of passengers, or like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance, or from charging any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of part I or III. It further provides that upon application the Commission may, in special cases, after investigation, authorize such carriers to charge less for the longer than for the shorter distances, and that the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated carrier may be relieved from the operation of the section, except that in exercising such authority the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed.

The proposed amendment is specifically designed to make the fourth section self-operating with respect to the right of a circuitous route to meet the rate or rates legally established between competitive points over the more direct routes. No further authorization from the Commission would be required other than the standards laid down by other sections of the act. As an incident of this suggested change we are proposing to remove from section 4 the so-called reasonably compensatory provision. This, in our opinion, would eliminate from section 4 all of the unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, would terminate our responsibility with respect to

fourth-section departures over circuitous routes, and would limit our jurisdiction to authorizations of relief over direct routes, upon application and after investigation, where special justification for such relief is shown.

Experience has demonstrated that the public interest is not being served by the imposition of the restrictions in question. The history of their administration has proved them to be excessively burdensome to all concerned. Together they have resulted in disproportionate expenditures of time, labor, and funds by both the carriers and the Commission in comparison with the relatively small benefits derived. Moreover, almost all of the dissatisfaction with section 4, which is expressed periodically by carriers and shippers alike, appears to stem from the same burdensome provisions.

Section 4 has been highly controversial since its inception both as to its substantive provisions and as to the manner and extent of its administration. In implementing this section the Commission initially adopted a vigorous policy, but due to the early attitude of the courts, especially the narrow intepretation given the words "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions" (which were contained in the original act) in *I. C. C.* v. *Alabama Midland Ry. Co.* (168 U. S. 144 (1897)), the Commission was compelled to abandon, at least temporarily, its forceful approach.

The enactment of the Mann-Elkins Act, June 8, 1910, however, gave new life to the section by eliminating the phrase "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions"; and, as set forth in that act, section 4 appeared to contain all the essentials necessary for effective and efficient administration. The Transportation Act of 1920, however, added two refinements, viz, the "reasonably compensatory" provision and the so-called "equidistant" provision which proved to be troublesome. The latter provision was repealed by the Transportation Act of 1940, at which time the "reasonably compensatory" provision did not appear to be quite so objectionable by comparison. In retrospect, however, it is now equally clear that the carriers should not be required to secure our permission for the publication of rates over circuitous routes equivalent to the going rates over direct routes when in their managerial discretion such rates are necessary because of competitive factors.

The Commission is now firmly of the view that the "reasonably compensatory" provision no longer serves any useful purpose, and that it may well be eliminated from section 4 without jeopardizing the public interest. And, in this connection, we wish to point out that under other sections of the act the Commission is constantly seeking assurance that all rates subject to its jurisdiction, including those published under section 4, are not unjust or unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, nor unduly prejudicial or preferential. For this reason we do not believe that the proposed amendment would detract substantially from our jurisdiction, but would, on the other hand, allow us greater discretion in the administration of this section, which should inure to the benefit of the carriers and the public as well.

It is our view that the central principle of the fourth section, i. e., control of departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over the direct routes—is sound and should be retained, and that enactment of the proposed amendment would serve to streamline section 4. It would likewise enhance our administrative effectiveness and relieve the carriers of an unnecessary burden.

Public-Opinion Survey—11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth consecutive year, I have conducted a public-opinion survey among the constituents of my congressional district, and this year mailed out 19,700 questionnaires, of which 250 were returned undelivered, showing a net mailing of 19,450.

To date, 3,520 questionnaires have been returned and tabulated, which represents 18.1 percent of the net mailing and which, according to professional sampling criteria, is a very good return.

Besides the 4,200 people on my semimonthly newsletter mailing list, the questionnaire was sent into every precinct in the district to people picked at random without prior knowledge of their political affiliation, so that the distribution accomplished was as fair as was humanly possible and indicates that a typical cross-section of the constituency was sampled. The results of the survey are as follows:

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	2,445	69.5	996	28.3	79	2.2
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?	1,579	44.9	1,753	49.8	188	5.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?	1,759	50.0	1,622	46.0	139	4.0
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	2,004	56.9	1,066	30.3	450	12.8
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	2,298	65.3	840	23.9	382	10.8
6. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, just off the Chinese mainland, if these islands are attacked by Chinese Communist forces?	1,221	34.7	2,069	58.8	230	6.5
7. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend Formosa if it is attacked by Chinese Communists?	2,206	62.7	1,136	32.3	178	5.0
8. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public housing program?	1,921	54.6	1,477	41.9	122	3.5
9. Do you favor the Federal Government reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical plans?	1,530	43.5	1,750	49.7	240	6.8
10. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's 10-year highway-construction program requiring the expenditure of $101 billion?	2,680	76.1	717	20.4	123	3.5
11. Do you favor the administration's educational proposal in which the Federal Government share would be $1.1 billion, of which $200 million would be in grants, the rest in loans to support local and State school bonds?	2,539	72.1	842	23.9	139	4.0
12. Do you favor a program of universal military training requiring every man to spend some time in military training and then have to join the Reserves?	2,320	65.9	1,103	31.3	97	2.8
13. Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii with a population of 499,794 (1950 census)?	2,696	76.6	674	19.1	150	4.3
14. Do you approve of statehood for Alaska with a population of 108,543 (1950 census)?	2,664	75.7	697	19.8	159	4.5
15. Do you favor revealing to the American public more of our foreign agreements such as the recently disclosed Yalta documents?	2,852	81.0	567	16.1	101	2.9
16. Do you believe we are spending enough for military security? (The estimated budget expenditure for 1956 is $62.4 billion; 65 percent of this or $40.5 billion is for major national military security.)	2,768	78.7	487	13.8	265	7.5
17. Do you think the average American company can pay its employees a guaranteed annual wage?	1,202	34.1	2,067	58.7	251	7.2
18. Do you favor President Eisenhower's conducting personal talks with the heads of the Russian and British Governments?	2,311	65.7	1,045	29.7	164	4.6
19. Do you approve of a questionnaire of this type as a means of helping a Congressman to know the thinking of his constituents?	3,451	98.0	38	1.1	31	.9

Five of the questions asked in this year's survey were identical in content and similarly worded in 1954 and 1953, and a comparison of the results over these 3 years is as follows:

	Percentages							
	1955			1954			1953 [1]	
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	69.5	28.3	2.2	67.0	29.9	3.1	64.1	35.9
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?	44.9	49.8	5.3	45.7	46.4	7.9	44.7	55.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?	50.0	46.0	4.0	54.4	38.8	6.8	43.3	56.7
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	56.9	30.3	12.8	52.9	36.6	10.5	78.5	21.5
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	65.3	23.9	10.8	58.0	25.9	16.1	84.2	15.8

[1] It is to be noted that in the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers tabulated in the 1953 questionnaire, the "no answers" were not included in the percentage breakdown.

Soroptomist of the Month: Congresswoman From the First Idaho District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time an article from the April 1955 issue of the American Soroptimist which pays tribute to the charming lady from Idaho, the able and conscientious Congresswoman from the First District, Mrs. GRACIE PFOST. Mrs. PFOST is the only soroptimist in the United States Congress, and this outstanding organization has recognized her devoted service to the good people of her district, State, and Nation by naming her as the soroptimist of the month.

Mrs. PFOST and I both came to Congress in 1953. Since the beginning of the 83d Congress I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Mrs. PFOST on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and on several of the subcommittees of that committee. Consequently I have had many opportunities to observe her effective work and her development into a very capable legislator. She has performed admirably for the good people of her district and is dedicated to their service. Her recognition as the soroptimist of the month is a reward she justly deserves.

Therefore I have asked permission to place in the RECORD this article so that our colleagues may know the honor that has been conferred upon our Gracie.

The article follows:

SOROPTIMIST OF THE MONTH: CONGRESSWOMAN FROM THE FIRST IDAHO DISTRICT—GRACIE PFOST, CALDWELL (IDAHO) CLUB

Service—personal, intimate service to the people and the community has been the keynote in the rise of Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, personable Congresswoman from the First Idaho District and the only Soroptimist in Congress.

Twenty years ago she was a young deputy in the county clerk's office, where her more interesting work was the issuance of marriage licenses and the making out of the county warrants. These were depression days, and conditions in the agricultural area were rough.

The young and gracious county official made the problem of each person who came to her her own. In businesslike, personal style, she helped those caught in the complexity of filing legal papers work out their problem.

Friends saw in the dynamic, freckle-faced young redhead a person qualifying for higher responsibility—maybe county clerk—at a future date. For 9 years, she dispensed pleasant, personal service in this position, winning political opponents as well as political friends by the service she gave.

Then came the step-up. The position of county treasurer seemed to be available, and Gracie declared herself a candidate.

"If there is a person in Canyon County Mrs. PFOST does not know by first name, it's because she hasn't visited the maternity ward in the hospital lately," a political opponent remarked in discussing the election prospects.

Five consecutive times the voters trooped to the polls to elect GRACIE PFOST—always by heavy majorities. And she smilingly continued to dispense the same service.

"She listens too well and doesn't talk enough," was the bitter comment of an opponent who could not trap Mrs. PFOST in public debate over issues beyond the jurisdiction of her office. She would discuss freely the problems of her office and the matters pertaining to its efficient operation, and confined herself to matters which were her business.

Her campaigning consisted largely of meeting people and listening. Everyone wanted to tell her how she should campaign. She listened to everyone—and they surprisingly found themselves campaigning for her.

In 1950 she announced her candidacy for the congressional position from the First District. "Gracie is overreaching herself," her political opponents chortled, contending that she was not qualified for so high an office.

Her friends, knowing the First Idaho District, also feared she was overreaching—but for a different reason. The district extends from the Snake River in the southwest, northward and eastward, and includes the panhandle. Its interests include forestry, mining, grazing, cattle raising, as well as irrigation farming.

First District Congressmen have traditionally come from the area north of the Salmon River, which is the heart of the mining-timber area. And here was a woman, from the heart of the irrigated-farming area, seeking to represent the lumber and mining interests of a State which included such vast enterprises as the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, one of the greatest silver-lead producers in the Nation.

GRACIE PFOST calmly set out on her campaign, knowing that she would not be able to shake the hands of all the 100,000 eligible voters on the isolated farms along the Lemhi, in the forest camps of the Sawtooths, or the mining camps along the Lochsa, all in her district, but determined to give it a try. She concentrated her efforts in north Idaho, the region where all believed that she would be weak. She visited the lumber camps, conferred with union officials and others in the mining camps. Five and ten persons in isolated communities back in the mountain areas on a dirt road beside some mountain stream were apt to find themselves shaking hands with a candidate for Congress.

"Covering" the First District in a campaign was an undertaking which made strong men shudder at the prospect, and yet the smiling, friendly, redhead fought for votes where it counted—at the level of the voters themselves—and did a more thorough job than had ever before been done. In the general election, she was defeated by a small margin. But her defeat came not in the northern counties where she had staged her battle, but in the counties closer to her home, where she believed her friends could carry the burden.

Characteristically, Gracie took her defeat in good humor. "Guess I should have spent more time at home," she said, "but, good gosh, I couldn't be home and up there, too."

She settled down in the real-estate business in her home town of Nampa—a city of 16,000. There was little question that she would try again, although she says that she was needled by her husband, Jack, into seeking election in 1952.

Once defeated, the comely redhead was no longer considered invulnerable by her opponents in 1952, they threw all their weight against her along the entire line from Snake River to the Canadian border. Her opponent, Dr. John T. Wood. was the same man who had defeated her in 1950.

Gracie just worked a little harder. Midway in the campaign she was talking in a husky voice a couple of octaves below her normally soft and quite deep speaking voice and certainly a number of degrees harsher. By election time, she was whispering hoarsely.

But her assurances were accepted. In a State which elected Republicans to all congressional positions but one, and which elected Republicans to all major State offices but one, GRACIE PFOST, a Democrat, went to Washington from the First District.

Mrs. PFOST was born in Boone County, Ark., and was reared in the Boise Valley in which she has since resided. Her community activities have been legion since the days in which as deputy county clerk with a half dozen other young kindred spirits, as well as a few older heads, she formed the nucleus of the Democratic Party in Canyon County.

She was active in forming the Caldwell, Idaho, Soroptimist Club when she was county treasurer and served as its first president in 1946. That year, under her leadership, the club laid the foundation for the expansion of the Girl Scout movement in the county seat. The work was not accomplished entirely by delegation of authority. During her lunch hour, Gracie often was seen doing a job of selling the organization's principles to a businessman, a store clerk, a father—anyone who seemed to have a moment on his hands—with missionary-like zeal. She served also as regional treasurer for the Soroptimists.

The pioneers who settled in the small valleys that dot her district, or who prospected in the mountains had only the forces of nature to conquer. Gracie, who spends an average of 16 hours a day on the job, would have found in pioneering a gentle, back-to-earth restfulness had she had an opportunity for a spell of it during the heights of her political campaigning last fall. It was a real uphill battle for reelection, but she won.

Her vivaciousness and enthusiasm left no doubt in the minds of her listeners that the Congresswoman from the Idaho First District was a public servant, and enjoying every moment of it.

Amendment to Section 406 of the Federal Seed Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act.

The purpose of this proposed amendment to one of the penalty provisions of the Federal Seed Act is intended to remove the stigma of having petty and unknowing violations of the Federal Seed Act by reputable businessmen in the seed industry being classified as criminal violations.

This amendment will enable the Government to hereafter have the option to bring civil proceedings for violations of the Federal Seed Act in addition to criminal actions. In civil proceedings the Government will not have to prove intent, but in criminal actions to know-

ingly violate the provisions of the act will be a factor in determining the violator's guilt.

Surplus Wheat and Corn Processed Into Flour and Meal Should Be Made Available to the Unemployed of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee in support of Senate bill 661 which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process wheat into flour and corn into meal for distribution to the unemployed and their families. S. 661 is similar to a bill I introduced on the subject in the House of Representatives.

My statement before the Senate subcommittee follows:

Mr. Chairman, S. 661 is similar to H. R. 2851 with the exception of amendments adopted by the House Committee on Agriculture. I introduced similar legislation in the House because the subject of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal is of great interest to the unemployed people in my congressional district who can use surplus commodities to better advantage, if they are processed as provided for by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time over 18 percent of the civilian labor force in my congressional district is unemployed and is principally composed of coal miners and railroaders who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, liquidated their savings accounts, borrowed on or have taken the cash value of their insurance policies and today are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

To give you some idea of the overall picture of unemployment in my congressional district, let me call your attention to the following chart that describes the number of families and persons receiving surplus commodities:

Surplus commodities

County	Number of families	Percentage of all families	Total number of persons	Percentage of county population
Blair	10,801	26.8	32,561	23.3
Centre	2,939	15.9	9,362	14.2
Clearfield	9,988	42.2	37,179	43.3
Total	23,728	28.8	79,402	27.1
Entire State of Pennsylvania			1,020,963	[1] 9.7

[1] Percent of State population of 10,498,012.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, before you receive coupons for surplus commodities you have to be certified as eligible by a local welfare agency.

Therefore, these figures are official and have been verified not only by the State of Pennsylvania but also by the county commissioners in each of the three counties in my congressional district.

Surplus commodities by carload lots to Mar. 1, 1955

County	Beans	Beef	Butter	Cheese	Dried milk	Rice	Shortening
Blair	2	16	21	19	18	1	16
Centre	½	4	3	5	5	½	4
Clearfield	4	5	16	14	16	1	13
Total number of carloads	6½	25	40	38	39	2½	33
Grand total			184				

Mr. Chairman, there is no denial of the fact that these figures are startling and are an answer to those who smugly insist that there is no acute unemployment problem in the labor-surplus areas of the Nation.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, according to the Pennsylvania department of property and supplies, in this great industrial State of Pennsylvania, out of its 10½ million residents, nearly 10 percent, or 1,020,963 are living on surplus commodities.

In this congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, out of a population of 292,000, nearly 28 percent or 79,402 persons are receiving surplus commodities.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are startling for they truly portray the extent of unemployment in my congressional district as well as in the entire State of Pennsylvania.

As I said in the beginning of this statement, the processing of wheat into flour and corn into meal will enable the families of the unemployed to use these surplus commodities to good advantage since many housewives still bake their own bread and muffins and can put the flour and meal to good use in arranging the family diet.

Mr. Chairman, this idea of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal as provided for in S. 661 will not establish a precedent in the handling and distribution of surplus commodities, because over a period of years the United States Department of Agriculture has been distributing canned beef and gravy in processed form.

According to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, during the period from March to December of 1953, they purchased nearly 172 million pounds of canned beef and gravy for distribution here in the United States, while nearly 12 million more pounds of canned beef and gravy were purchased for export, mainly to Greece and Germany. The cost of these purchases was in excess of $72 million.

Mr. Chairman, if it has been possible to put beef and gravy in a tin container for distribution, I can see no reason why wheat and corn should not be processed into flour and meal for the unemployed of the Nation. Therefore, I hope that S. 661 will receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

Dentists and Their Families Can Profit Greatly by Inclusion in Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter in the RECORD which I have written. A new group has been formed to undertake what I consider a very worthwhile cause. The cause is the inclusion of all self-employed dentists throughout the United States in social-security coverage starting in 1955. Being a member of the House Ways and Means Committee who has devoted many years of study and thought to the inclusion of self-employed professionals in the system, I am fully in accord with this effort. The group is the Congress of American Dentists for OASI. The following letter, addressed to the president of the group, I think fully expresses my views on the importance of the goal they are trying to achieve:

MAY 9, 1955.

J. GARRETT REILLY, D. D. S.,
President, Congress of American Dentists for OASI, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. REILLY: I am extremely pleased that the Congress of American Dentists for OASI has been founded and is prepared to work on a nationwide basis to help get social security for the self-employed members of your important profession.

Now that you have organized to accomplish this worthwhile objective, I would like to point out that your group has no time to lose if the dentists of this Nation—approximately 75,000 strong—expect to receive coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system without being penalized.

Let me explain what I mean by this word "penalized."

Social-security benefits are calculated on the average wage received by a worker from January 1, 1951, until he reaches the age of retirement. However, the law provides that a worker, in making this calculation, may drop out his 4 years of lowest earnings.

Zero earnings under covered employment, of course, will pull down his average wage.

Other professional groups first brought into the system this year will not be penalized because they can drop out the 4 years, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

However, if dentists were not included until after April 15, 1956, they would have zero earnings for 1955 to pull their average wage down. For example, one whose wage computation is based on the maximum $4,200 for 4 years but must include a year of zero earnings has an average wage for the 5 years of $3,560, instead of having benefit entitlement figured on $4,200 for the period.

But, as the self-employed only pay their social-security tax for 1955 when they pay their income tax on April 15, 1956, if dentists are brought into the system before that date and pay their 1955 social-security tax then, they would have no years of zero earnings on their record and, as a result, would get the maximum social-security benefits if they earn $4,200 a year.

Important too is the fact that, under the social-security system, those nearing the age of 65 will be entitled to coverage if they are in the program half the time between 1951 and the date they reach the age of 65 (after using the drop out) with a minimum necessary coverage of 6 quarters (18 months).

Therefore, the sooner those nearing retirement age can join the system the better for them.

In the past some associations have opposed dentists entering the social-security system largely on the theory that many dentists never retire and, therefore, would not receive the old-age-retirement benefits themselves.

Of course, we know that a good many dentists, men whose work is very delicate and who almost always must stand on their feet, do retire at or about the age of 65. However, even if the old argument of some of the organizations was true, we must face the fact that, unfortunately, some dentists do die leaving widows and minor children and some dentists are forced to retire because of ill health.

If my bill, H. R. 6049, to include dentists becomes law what can social security mean to the self-employed dentist and his family? If self-employed dentists are given coverage, a dentist who has an average net income of $4,200 a year, or more, and who has a wife and two children, would have protection for them if he died in the amount of $200 a month tax free until the older child reached the age of 18. At that time, the monthly benefit would drop to $162.80 a month until the younger child reaches the age of 18. After that there would be no benefits until the widow reached that age of 65 when her benefits would be resumed at the rate of $81.40 a month unless she remarried.

If the children were age 6 and 4, these payments would amount to $32,000 assuming that the mother and children live until the younger child reaches the age of 18.

The widow, if she lives to age 65 would then have a life expectancy of 14 or more years and her benefits, in addition to the above mentioned $32,000, would be in excess of $13,000.

It should be mentioned in this connection that the social-security system would also provide a maximum lump-sum payment of $255 to cover funeral expenses.

An income of $81.40 a month is equivalent to $976 a year. It would take $32,500 of accumulated capital invested in Government bonds at 3 percent to produce an annual income of $975.

I will also mention the benefits available to dentists upon retirement. If a dentist should retire after the age of 65 and had earned an average of $4,200 a year, he would receive a monthly tax-free income of $108.50 which would be increased to $162.80 when his wife also reaches the age of 65. At the age of 72 old-age-insurance benefits would be paid to him as an outright annuity.

In addition, the law provides for a waiver of premium for a person who becomes totally disabled before age 65. Because of this protection, a disabled individual can qualify for full benefits at 65 even though full contributions have not been paid.

For all of this protection the dentist with a net income of $4,200 or more a year would pay premiums of $126 annually. The premium would rise by a series of steps beginning in 1960 to a maximum premium—beginning with the year 1975—of $252 annually.

Many dentists have already received social-security credits. Among these are those who have served in the Armed Forces, dentists employed in medical departments of business and industry, those employed on hospital staffs, laboratories, and clinics operated for a profit, and many of those employed by educational institutions and other nonprofit groups. Under the present law, however, self-employed dentists have little opportunity to participate in the program and maintain an insured status.

With the present high income-tax rates, it is difficult for any individual to set aside substantial savings for his dependents. This, of course, is particularly true for those with moderate incomes. The young dentist starting his private practice usually has high expenses and heavy family obligations at a time when his income is relatively low. Death of the young dentist at this time is a real hardship on his widow and children and social-security payments might be the one thing which could keep the family together.

It is difficult to have a comprehensive and fair social-security system with some individuals covered and some individuals not covered. I believe that self-employed dentists, if fully informed, would generally favor coverage. However, knowing the deep respect Congress holds for dentists I realize that persuading that legislative body to include you will continue to be difficult unless representative groups of dentists favor inclusion. Possibly the Congress of American Dentists for OASI of which you are president will aid in starting the necessary movement.

I do feel that the plan that you outlined to me of urging all of the dentists in the United States to record their views, pro or con, about inclusion in the OASI system by mailing a postcard to you at the above address is excellent. This expression of opinion, if those dentists sign their names and addresses on the postcard could make a salesworthy exhibit to offer the Congress as sure proof that the great majority of dentists want social security.

Another thing to remember is that Members of Congress, when they go home for adjournment often visit their dentists for a checkup. Dentists interested in social security can greatly advance their cause by expressing their views on social security to their Congressmen at that time.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT W. KEAN,
Member of Congress, 12th District, New Jersey.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the 7 counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 22 and 23, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 24 and 25, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 26 and 27, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 29 and 30, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 31 and September 1, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 2 and 3, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 6 and 7, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

The Asian-African Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly the Asian-African Conference that took place in Bandung, Indonesia, on April 18–24 last. It is important that its implications as they affect the United States and the free world be carefully studied by us. We belong to the legislative branch of our Government and many of our decisions have a direct bearing on what will result from the decisions made at Bandung.

It should be a matter of gratification for us that when 29 nations of Asia and Africa met, the world found out that democracy is strongly entrenched in that area; that despite the efforts of neutralists and Communists to slant the Conference against the free world, those who believe in freedom asserted themselves and succeeded in defeating all attempts to make of the Conference a sounding board for neutralism and communism.

That we did not suspect this unexpected strength of democracy in Asia and Africa is a lesson we should remember. It shows that we have more friends than we know. In not knowing that we have such stalwart allies we are guilty of either indifference or neglect, and this we should correct at once. This is the first moral that we should draw from the Bandung meeting.

The second lesson is to be drawn from the fact that in Bandung the conferees exercised restraint of the highest order. Their utterances and decisions showed dignity and sobriety. No attacks were made based on racism. Where we feared the color line would be drawn because of the manner the participating countries were selected, nothing in the proceedings of the Conference showed that any of the delegates were animated by racism. Asia and Africa, through their delegates, extended to us the hand of friendship and good will. We should, in equal reciprocity, grasp that hand of

friendship and good will. Here is where we can together lay the groundwork for peace for all mankind.

The third lesson is that we should not be too hasty in judging the motives and purposes of other nations. When the Conference was first announced, it was with misgivings that the convening of the meeting was received. Many fears were expressed. As a result, our Government, through President Eisenhower, failed to send a message of greetings to the Conference. This is unfortunate. We should have been the first ones to welcome the Conference and to send our official greetings to the conferees, the majority of whom turned out to be our best friends and allies. Here the State Department failed us in not giving our Government the correct intelligence and background information.

The fourth lesson is that as Ernest Lindley in his column in Newsweek aptly said, we cannot discount the Asians who in the Conference showed they have statesmen and diplomats of the highest caliber, seasoned and mature, who can match the best of Europe and America. Among these I wish to single out a former Member of this House, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the Philippines' chief delegate in the Bandung Conference. All the press dispatches were unanimous in acclaiming him as the leader of the democratic forces in the Conference. The Filipino people should be proud that in a meeting of 29 Asian and African nations it was a Filipino voice that spoke for democracy so effectively that the whole world listened.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD General Romulo's speech that will go down in history as a classic that turned the tide for the free world in Bandung:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CARLOS P. ROMULO, MEMBER OF THE CABINET, CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE, BANDUNG, INDONESIA

I am proud to bring to this Conference the greetings of the President and people of the Republic of the Philippines.

We of the Philippines have a profound sense of the great historic events dramatized by this unique gathering; we were, may I remind you, the first of the new nations to emerge in the great rearrangement of the world which began after the end of the Second World War. Our Republic came to being, freely and peacefully, on July 4, 1946. Since that time we have watched with proud solidarity and a feeling of oneness the establishment of the other independent nations of a free Asia, so old and yet so new. We have in these 9 years taken our stand firmly behind the struggle of every people to become master of its own fate, to enjoy its own identity, to be responsible for its own acts, to join in the immense task of building a new structure of human well-being and free institutions, the task, indeed, of changing the face of the world. To the peoples of Africa, already setting forth on this same path, we pledge our friendship and all the moral and practical support within our power to give as they join us of Asia in the great universal effort to better man's estate.

We come as members of one great family long separated from each other. In this family reunion we are here to talk of man's estate. But I do not think it will serve us well to have come here from our many corners of the earth to shroud the truth about man's estate in platitudes, propaganda, or easy self-deception. The world is too harsh a place for this, our problems too great, too perilous, too complicated to allow us this luxury. This conference will justify itself if we share our views frankly and realistically as brothers should. We will serve each other if we examine ourselves, if we state the issues and problems plainly as we see them, if we clarify, as far as we can, our needs, our choices, our goals—and our obstacles. Let us seek a true meeting of minds on those we share in common and where there are differences, let us try at least to understand them.

All who are represented here are certainly concerned with the issues of (1) colonialism and political freedom, (2) racial equality, and (3) peaceful economic growth. The history of the world in our time turns on the ways in which these issues are met and resolved, or not met and not resolved. We are part, all of us, of a time of great transformation, for each of us and for all the people on earth. It is a trying, difficult, dangerous time—but with it all a good time to be living in. Never before, surely, have so many people been consciously a part of the history through which they were living. We in this room are, for our brief moment, a part of this history. How do we see it? How do we understand it?

To begin with, the very fact that we have come together here in this manner illustrates the great new fact that these issues of freedom, equality, and growth are no longer merely national problems but world problems. Indeed, the United Nations was created as an attempt to grapple with this great new fact. In one sense, this conference suggests that for the peoples of Asia and Africa the United Nations has inadequately met the need for establishing common ground for peoples seeking peaceful change and development. But I think we must also say that if the United Nations has been weak and limited in its progress toward these goals, it is because the United Nations is still much more a mirror of the world than an effective instrument for changing it. It has been in existence only 9 years, and through that time always subject to all the pressures and difficulties of national rivalries and power conflicts, large and small. It is a place where man, not quite yet a reasonable animal, is trying very hard to become one.

We do not have to be satisfied with the rate of progress being made. But neither can we be blind to the great changes that have taken place in so short a time. The world is a very different place from what it was a scant 15 years ago, and hence the United Nations is a very different body from the old League of Nations. A primary difference is the presence of the new spokesmen for Asian and African peoples who never allow the Western representatives to forget that the United Nations Charter pledged the freedom and self-determination of all peoples and that there are peoples in Asia and Africa who take that pledge with literal seriousness, and who will not rest until it is redeemed.

The majority of independent nations represented here won their independence only within the last decade. Who would have been bold enough, 20 years ago, to predict that this would be so? Who will be bold enough now to say how soon or how slowly those peoples in Africa strong enough to win it will acquire the right to face their own problems in their own way on their own responsibility? The handwriting of history is spread on the wall: But not everybody reads it the same way or interprets similarly what he reads there. We know the age of European empire is at an end; not all Europeans know that yet. Not all Asians or Africans have been or are still aware that they must make themselves the conscious instruments of historic decision.

Political freedom has been won by many different means. The British surrendered power in southern Asia because they knew they could no longer maintain it and were wise enough to base their action on reality. The French and Dutch had to be forced to the same conclusion. The United States has at times appeared to us lacking in consistency and vigor in upholding the right of non-self-governing peoples to independence. It has on some issues leaned heavily in favor of colonial powers and has sometimes disheartened us because of its failure to make its actions dovetail with its ideals of equality and freedom. We think that this was more than regrettable; we think it has been unwise. Let it be stated in fairness however that uniquely among the colonial powers the United States in our case made a formal pledge of independence, fixed a date for it 10 years in advance, and fully and honorably redeemed that pledge. True, we fought ceaselessly for our freedom and never gave up our struggle and we earned it when it came. But we of the Phillippines have directly experienced the basic good faith of the United States in our own relationship and we feel that the principles upon which it was based will ultimately prevail.

It is to be hoped, however, that this conference will help remind all the Western powers that the issue of political independence for subject peoples does not depend on their goodwill or slow access of wisdom or virtue. The age of empire is being helped into oblivion by the aroused will and action of people determined to be masters of their own fate. Those of us here who have already won our independence were only the initiators of this process. All the others, almost all now in Africa, stand at various points along their own roads to full self-determination. There is much, of course, one cannot readily foresee. But everything we know and understand about history assures us that whatever new travails the future holds, the old structure of Western empire will and must pass from the scene. Will it expire quietly and in dignity? Will it go out crashing violenty? That will depend on many things. But the end is not in doubt.

There are at least three things more to be said here about this matter of national political freedom:

First, it is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact. Because it expresses the deepest desires of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a façade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection. I know that on this score there are violently different opinions in the world. I can recall how new nations like India, Indonesia, and Ceylon were called puppets of imperialism when they were newly born to freedom. And of course, the Philippine Republic has been described by these same sources as a mere tool of the United States. On the other hand, there is the way some of us view the position of certain other countries which from our own perspective we consider as subservient to other powers. I wonder if in such countries you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open criticism and other attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence? I wonder if any of the spokesmen of these countries would ever speak as freely in criticism of the bigger country to which they feel friendly or allied as, say, we in the Philippines speak our minds about the United States? I am sure you will forgive my frankness, but in this land of the ingenious and artistic wajang, of the wonderful Indonesian shadow play and puppet shows, I think we ought to say plainly to each other when we think a puppet is a puppet.

Secondly, is political freedom achieved when the national banner rises over the seat

of government, the foreign ruler goes, and the power passes into the hands of our own leaders? Is the struggle for national independence the struggle to substitute a local oligarchy for the foreign oligarchy? Or is it just the beginning of the conquest of real freedom by the people of the land? Is there political freedom where only one political party may rule? Is there political freedom where dissent from the policy of the government means imprisonment or worse? It strikes me that autocratic rule, control of the press, and the police state are exactly the worst features of some colonialist systems against which we have fought all our lives and against which so many of us are still fighting. Is this really the model of the freedom we seek? Or is it the free interplay of contending parties, the open competition of ideas and political views in the market place, the freedom of a man to speak up as he chooses, be he right or wrong? I know there are many possible answers to these questions. But for my part and for my people, may I say plainly that we regard the struggle for freedom as an unending, constant, unremitting demand upon us, that with all our acknowledged failings, faults, and weaknesses, we are seeking to build in our land a society in which the freedom of our Republic will truly become the freedom of every one of its citizens.

Finally, in this world of contending great powers, the independence of the small or weak nation is at best a precarious and fragile thing. Obviously, the ultimate greater freedom will lie in a greater coherence, a uniting of regional interests, in the creation of counterbalancing moral, economic, and physical strength, in the greatest possible common action by all to avert the disaster of a new world war. Let us face squarely up to the fact that within the Nation we can regain our self-respect and grapple with our local problems but that for the primary goals of economic transformation and well-being and peace, the Nation no longer suffices. Western European man today is paying the terrible price for preserving too long the narrow and inadequate instrument of the nation state. We of Asia and Africa are emerging into this world as new nation states in an epoch when nationalism, as such, can solve only the least of our problems and leaves us powerless to meet the more serious ones. We have to try to avoid repeating all of Europe's historic errors. We have to have the imagination and courage to put ourselves in the forefront of the attempt to create a 20th-century world based on the true interdependence of peoples.

I have said that besides the issues of colonialism and political freedom, all of us here are concerned with the matter of racial equality. This is a touchstone, I think, for most of us assembled here and the peoples we represent. The systems and the manners of it have varied, but there has not been and there is not a Western colonial regime, which has not imposed, to a greater or lesser degree, on the people it ruled, the doctrine of their own racial inferiority. We have known, and some of us still know, the searing experience of being demeaned in our own lands, of being systematically relegated to subject status not only politically and economically, and militarily—but racially as well. Here was a stigma that could be applied to rich and poor alike, to prince and slave, boss man and workingman, landlord and peasant, scholar and ignoramus. To bolster his rule, to justify his own power to himself, Western white man assumed that his superiority lay in his very genes, in the color of his skin. This made the lowliest drunken sot superior, in colonial society, to the highest product of culture and scholarship and industry among the subject people.

I do not think in this company I have to labor the full import of this pernicious doctrine and practice. I do not think I have to try to measure the role played by this racism as a driving force in the development of the nationalist movements in our many lands. For many it has made the goal of regaining a status of simple manhood the be-all and end-all of a lifetime of devoted struggle and sacrifice.

Today this type of Western racism survives in virulent form only in certain parts of Africa, notably in the Union of South Africa, but certainly in many other places as well on that vast continent. Against this every decent man on earth has to set his face. In the United Nations the Asian and African states have again and again forced this issue on the unwilling attention of the other members. There we could see palpably the extent to which Western men have had to become defensive about their past racist attitudes. Few of the Western countries were willing to go far enough in condemning the racial practices of the Government of the Union of South Africa. They have yet to learn, it seems, how deeply this issue cuts and how profoundly it unites non-Western peoples who may disagree on all sorts of questions. Again, we can only hope that this Conference serves as a sober and yet jolting reminder to them that the day of Western racism is passing along with the day of Western power over non-Western peoples. Its survival in any form can only hang like an albatross around the necks of those many people in the West who sincerely seek to build a freer and better world.

No less than this can be said. But there is something more, too. It is one of our heaviest responsibilities, we of Asia and Africa, not to fall ourselves into the racist trap. We will do this if we let ourselves be drawn insensibly—or deliberately—into any kind of counterracism, if we respond to the white man's prejudice against us as nonwhites with prejudice against whites simply because they are white. What a triumph this would be for racism if it should come about. How completely we would defeat ourselves and all who have ever struggled in our countries to be free. There is no more dangerous or immoral or absurd idea than the idea of any kind of policy or grouping based on color or race as such. This would, in the deepest sense, mean giving up all hope of human freedom in our time. I think that over the generations the deepest source of our own confidence in ourselves had to come from the deeply rooted knowledge that the white man was wrong; that in proclaiming the superiority of his race, qua race, he stamped himself with his own weakness and confirmed all the rest of us in our dogged conviction tht we could and would reassert ourselves as men.

Our quarrel with racism is that it substitutes the accident of skin color for judgment of men as men. Counterracism would have us do the same: to lump white men by their supposed racial grouping and govern our acts and reactions accordingly. It is our task to rise above this noxious nonsense. We have the responsibility to remain aware that this kind of racist attitude has been the practice, not of all white men but only of some, that it flies in the face of their own profoundest religious beliefs and political goals and aspirations, that in almost all Western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all its manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously.

We have the responsibility to acknowledge more than this; this business of racism, or other things like it, is an outcropping of one of many human weaknesses that we all share. The racism of Western white man has played an especially prominent role in history because the Western man associated it with the establishment of his great power over so many non-Western peoples. As such, it deserves the special and prominent place it must have in the thinking and feeling of everyone. But we must also soberly ask ourselves: Is there a single society or culture represented in this Conference which does not in some degree have its counterpart of this kind of prejudice and ignorance? Where is the society in which men have not in some manner divided themselves for political, social, and economic purposes, by wholly irrational and indefensible categories of status, birth, and yes, even skin color? It was a major part of the greatness of India's immortal leader Mahatma Gandhi, that he devoted so much of his fruitful life of selflessness and sacrifice to a struggle against precisely this kind of thing in Indian life. Would that we all gave as much time to the mote in our own eye as we give to denouncing the beam in the eye of another.

Surely we are entitled to our resentment and rejection of white racism wherever it exists. But we are also called upon, as honest men who want to better man's estate wherever and whatever he is, to acknowledge that in degree we all suffer from the same sin of ignorance and immorality. I ask you to remember that just as Western political thought has given us all so many of our basic ideas of political freedom, justice, and equity, it is Western science which in this generation has exploded the mythology of race. Let us not preserve stupid racial superstitions which belong to the past. Let us work to remove this ugly disease wherever it is rooted, whether it be among Western men or among ourselves.

Lastly, I have said that all of us here are concerned with peaceful economic growth. This brings us closest of all to the hub, the center, the heart of our common preoccupations, because the political forms and methods we seek and choose, the social ideas and ideals we embrace, are all wrapped up in the way in which we strive for growth. Economic growth, economic change, transformation of our backward and inadequate economies—these we all seek. These we must seek, else we stagnate and die. After all, it is precisely because the billion and a half people of Asia and Africa have begun in our time to strive for a better economic stake in life that most of us are here today. This is the great new overwhelming fact of this century. The way in which this is achieved will fix the shape of history for all future men.

We all confront the staggering facts of our economic backwardness. This has been partly due to factors of climate, geography, and the stubborn survival of obsolete social patterns. But it has also in large measure and perhaps decisively been the result of patterns imposed upon us by Western colonialism. This heritage is the heaviest burden we carry with us into the new epoch of national freedom. The great masses of our people live in a state of rural poverty. We need to diversify our economies. We need to industrialize in accordance with our resources and needs. We have to win a more balanced place in the market places of the world. We have to do this in a manner that will effectively raise the standard of living of our people. These are the things we have fought for. These are the things that some of us here are still fighting for. For these things above all, we have needed to be free to seek our own way.

But let us not have too many illusions about national independence. We arrive in the world as nations in the middle of the 20th century, not the 19th or the 18th. We have to strive to become nations in a time when history has already passed from the nation to larger units of economic and social coherence: the region, the continent, the world. It is a world as envisioned by Rabindranath Tagore, "not divided into fragments by narrow domestic walls * * *." The idea of national self-sufficiency served the Western World only for a short time as a means to effective growth. Indeed, the great travail of the Western World, its conflicts, rivalries, and wars have derived in

no small degree from the fact that the nation, as such, has outlived its usefulness as an instrument of progress. Not even the great powers of today can stand alone, much less newly emergent states weak in everything but the will to grow. In this 20th century world the sober fact is that a purely national economy is an illusion. We cannot start where, say, England started two centuries ago. We have to make our places in a world that has already made tremendous advances technologically and where economic interdependence has become the key to effective economic development and growth.

Considering the present state of the world, with its profound conflicts and insecurities, this may be viewed by some as a crippling disadvantage. But in a very real sense, and a more hopeful sense, it is rather an advantage if we can but grasp it. It means that we need not go through the equivalent of the decades and centuries of ugly, painful, and costly development which occurred in most Western countries. It means that if circumstances favor it, we can make use of the most ultramodern technologies to transform ourselves more rapidly, to make new and hitherto unforeseen use of our resources. Who knows yet what the new potentialities of nuclear power are going to mean for Asia and Africa? It is obvious that the real world we live in does not at this moment offer much promise of any early opportunity to find out. But here we have one of the real stakes we all share in preserving the peace, in creating international instruments which will put men to work for man's growth instead of his destruction.

Our fate is bound up with the fate of the whole world. National isolation, in any real sense, is an impossibility in our time, whether we think of an ideal world uniting its human and natural resources for the well-being of all, or the real world, deeply divided and groping its way to decisions that will in one way or another affect every person on earth. The fact is that we will need greater world coherence than we have now if we are to thrive. The fact is that the effective mobilization of world capital and resources will be absolutely vital to us in the process of mobilizing our own capital and our own resources. The fact is that these things will depend in great measure on the further course of the conflicts that now govern all world affairs. It is pure illusion to think that we can be independent of these big facts.

But this by no means leaves us helpless to act in our own interest. It does not mean that we have no choice but to leave the great decisions to others. Quite the contrary. Quite the contrary, because it is precisely in our lands, in our continents, that the most important decisions are going to be made. And it is we who will make them, by what we do or by what we do not do in the coming years.

It could be that Russia's bombs or America's bombs will determine the future shape of the world and the fate of humanity. If it comes to that the tragedy will be total: it will make all we say or do here or anywhere else quite irrelevant. Reason will die and the survivors will move as best they can into a new epoch of savagery. But I do not think the great decisions will come that way. I think the shape of the world is going to be determined in large measure by the way in which the peoples of Asia and Africa go about the business of transforming their lives and their societies.

What do we want? How do we propose to seek it? These are the questions on which the fate of the world really turns. In not fully understanding this, many in the Western World commit their most tragic blunder. For our part, we of Asia and Africa have to face up squarely to the big choices that lie before us. We have to try to understand as clearly as we can exactly what they mean.

There are certain things in all our minds on this matter. We all want to the best of our power and wisdom to seek change in terms of the genius of our own various cultures and histories. We all want no more foreign exploitation of our wealth for the benefit of foreign interests. We do not want our future development to turn out to be another alien graft on our lives. We want this development to raise the physical and educational standards of our peoples. What roads lead to these ends? How do we begin to face up to these vast and formidable tasks?

There is no magic wand or automatic formula to bring about social and economic change. It means that we have to assume our own heavy responsibilities. It means mobilizing people, mobilizing resources. It means great toil, flexibility, adaptability, intelligence. But it also means defining our goal. Is our goal just so many new industries or factories, new dams or bridges or transportation systems? Or is our goal the betterment and the greater freedom, through these and other things, of the lives of the people?

This is no simple rhetorical question. Wrapped up in it are all the troubled issues of our time. And because according to the joint communique of the Bogor Conference "the basic purpose of this Conference is that the countries concerned should become better acquainted with one another's point of view," may I outline for you our views on the possible choices open to us.

There is one road to change which some countries have adopted and which offer itself to the rest of us as a possible choice. This is the road which proposes total change through total power, through avowed dictatorship and the forcible manipulation of men and means to achieve certain ends, the rigid control of all thought and expression, the ruthless suppression of all opposition, the pervasive control of human life in all spheres by a single, tightly run, self-selected organization of elite individuals. I know that an elaborate series of phrases and rationalization are often used to describe this system. But I am concerned not with propaganda myths. I am concerned with realities. I think we all have to be concerned with what this system offers and what it means.

Does the road to greater freedom really lie through an indefinite period of less freedom? Is it for this that we have in this generation raised our heads and taken up the struggle against foreign tyrannies?

Has all the sacrifice, struggle, and devotion, all been, then, for the purpose of replacing foreign tyranny by domestic tyranny?

Do we fight to regain our manhood from Western colonial rulers only to surrender it to rulers among ourselves who seize the power to keep us enslaved?

Is it true, can it be true, in this vastly developed 20th century, that national progress must be paid for with the individual well-being and freedom of millions of people? Can we really believe that this price will, in some dim and undefined future time, be redeemed by the well-being and freedom of the yet unborn?

The philosophers of this system have answered this question through their doctrine of the so-called withering away of the state. But the rulers who have established their power in real life and not in the realm of bookish dreams have abandoned this tenet of their faith. We have had ample opportunity to witness over more than a generation now that this kind of power, once established, roots itself more and more deeply, gets more and more committed to perpetuating itself. Moreover, and the whole logic of human experience throws its weight into the scale, this system of power becomes inherently expansionist. It cannot accept the premise of peace with opponents outside its borders any more than it can make peace with opponents inside its borders. It seeks and must seek to crush all opposition, wherever it exists.

This road is open before many of us. The gateway to it is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clangs behind you. The policeman becomes master and your duty thereafter is forever to say aye. Even those who enjoy the role of mastery must know that this system devours its own.

No, my friends, I don't think we have come to where we are, only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower. We do not want leaderships in our countries subservient to foreign rulers, be they in London or Paris, The Hague, or Washington, or, we must add, Moscow. I think our peoples want to worship the Almighty and live in accordance with His laws, to better their lot, to educate themselves and their children, raise themselves from the degradation of want and disease and misery, by holding up their own heads and acting freely to achieve these great and difficult aims by their own free means in partnership with similarly dedicated people everywhere in the world.

That is the freedom of the democratic way of life. That is the freedom we want all the peoples of Asia and Africa to enjoy. That is the freedom that President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines had in mind when he authored the Pacific Charter which enshrines the dignity of man, his well-being, his security, his progress, his nation's right to self-determination. The Philippine delegation is here not only to reiterate the ideals of that charter but to underscore in this conference that it is the sense of the Filipino people that such right of self-determination includes the right of nations to decide exclusively by themselves their ability to assume the responsibilities inherent in an independent political status. This is the time for Asia and Africa to reassert this principle and serve notice to the world that only by its unqualified acceptance by everyone can there be peace and justice for all mankind.

The success of this Conference will be measured not only by what we do for ourselves but also by what we do for the entire human community. Large as is the cause of Asia, there is a cause even larger. It is the cause of the human family in a world struggling to liberate itself from the chaos of international anarchy. In short, our cause is the cause of man. If the voice coming out of this Conference speaks for Asia and Africa alone, the words will have energy and force but they will make no claim on history. But if our voice speaks for man—man as world citizen rather than world warrior—then we can return to our peoples with the knowledge that we have served them as they need most to be served.

Fellow delegates, our strength flows not out of our number though the numbers we represent are great. It flows out of our perception of history and out of vital purpose for tomorrow. If that purpose is stained by resentment or desire for revenge then this Conference will be a fragile and forgetful thing. Let us, therefore, draw strength not from the hurts of past or present but from our common hopes—hopes that can come to life in all peoples everywhere. And if the test of that strength should be our ability to forgive, then let it be said that we were the giants of our time.

Let us invoke the blessing and the guidance of Almighty God over our deliberations so that this Conference may prove to be the radiating center of the divine injunction "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and we may help to make the East and West live together as enjoined by our ancient Asian creed, "We are all brothers under the canopy of heaven."

We Question George Humphrey's Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following text of a splendid speech made by our colleague, the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner of the Young Democratic Club of York, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23:

ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY AND TAX POLICIES OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY GEORGE HUMPHREY

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Member of Congress)

It is difficult to find or establish a frame of reference for criticism of the present administration. Even before President Eisenhower was elected, it was stated by one of his chief supporters, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, that we should not expect him to have a clear stand on issues but anticipate that he would act on the basis of subconscious principles. We have since been assured that his appointments—Cabinet positions and others—are men of good will. If one questions program or policy, he is readily accused of questioning the integrity and the good intentions of these governmental officials. Mistakes do occur. Republican defenders say the President is not responsible because he was not informed. It was contended in a Washington newspaper recently that the "kitchen cabinet" should be held responsible. Apparently having excused the President, the current move is to excuse the Cabinet and to lay responsibility, if it is necessary to do so, on the third level of officials in the present administration.

I do not tonight intend to criticize the President, nor the third-level Government officials, nor even those in the second or Cabinet level who are not considered strong men or important influences on Government. I would like, however, to take up with you the record and the policies of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, who is generally accepted as being the strongest man in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The story of his appointment as the Secretary of the Treasury has, insofar as I know, never been fully reported. Politically he called himself a Taft man before the 1952 convention. He is reported to have worked in some manner, although there is no extensive public record, for the election of President Eisenhower. Again according to a report, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury on the recommendation of Gen. Lucius Clay. Whatever his background and whoever his supporters were, George Humphrey seemed quite ready to assume the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury. Apparently he almost immediately impressed President Eisenhower, who said, shortly after he took office, that "In Cabinet meetings I always wait for George Humphrey to speak. I sit back and listen to the others talk while he doesn't say anything. But I know that when he speaks up he will say just what I am thinking." If this is actually the case, it would seem quite unnecessary for George Humphrey to speak at all to the President unless the President preferred to have Humphrey tell the other Cabinet members what he, the President, was thinking rather than tell them himself.

The Secretary of the Treasury, as a man responsible largely for fiscal and economic policy of the United States, had when he took office, I assume, some sense of responsibility with regard to statements made by Republicans in the course of the 1952 campaign. There were, of course, the regular, expected denunciations of taxes in general, promises of tax reduction, of balancing the budget, and reducing the national debt. Some Republicans spoke of imposing a 25-percent limitation on personal income taxes, charging that the graduated scale as it existed in the law was immoral. There were many Republicans who denounced the corporate profits tax and others who said that the excise taxes were iniquitous. They expressed general dissatisfaction with what their candidate called treadmill prosperity and spoke of stabilizing and at the same time expanding our economy. The Republican platform promised to "aid small business in every practicable way." "The Republican Party will create," the platform said, "conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability safeguarding the farmers independence and opening opportunities for young people in rural communities." These in general were the promises and the program with regard to Government finance and the American economy.

Let us look now to the performance. In the first 3 years of the present administration, there has been a budget deficit each year, and it is estimated that the deficit for fiscal 1956 will be approximately $2½ billion. If this estimate is correct, the 4-year Republican administration will show an increase in the national debt from approximately $259 billion at the end of fiscal 1952, to approximately $276 billion at the end of fiscal 1956—an increase of approximately $17 billion. The Republicans have attempted to distinguish between good and bad deficits—the standard being for the most part that a deficit occurring under a Democratic administration is a bad deficit, whereas one occuring under a Republican administration is a good deficit. A sharper distinction has been made by one observer who states the difference in these terms: That the Democrats spend more than they collect, whereas the Republicans collect less than they spend. Promises to give the country something other than treadmill prosperity have been partially fulfilled, but in a negative way. The gross national product declined by approximately $7½ billion in 1954. Talk of 100 percent of parity for farmers in the market place does not stand up well in view of the present parity ratio of approximately 86. The fact that farm income is generally down and that the number of people living on farms is declining does not square very well with the Republican platform statement that it would create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability and that it would open opportunities for young people in rural communities. The rate of small business failures has increased.

Of course the Secretary of the Treasury is not entirely responsible for these developments any more than he would be entirely responsible if the level of prosperity had increased, if farm income were high, if unemployment were reduced. There are limits to what Government can do in the way of directing the American economy and fortunately, also, as result of the passage of legislation such as the social security program, the farm program, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, and similar legislation, limitations were placed upon the disastrous effects which the operation of an entirely free economy and unrestrained competition might have upon the domestic economy of the United States. Nonetheless, Government policy, particularly fiscal policy, does have an important bearing upon the economic welfare of the Nation.

Let us look at the record of the administration. Shortly after being established in the position of authority, the Secretary of the Treasury initiated what was called a hard-money policy. This hard-money policy essentially involved an increase in interest rates so that those who had to borrow money would be required to pay more to those persons and institutions who were lending it. The tight-money policy has since been reversed or at least modified. The experiment, however, was expensive. For example, on one long-term Government bond issue, the Secretary of the Treasury set an interest of 3¼ percent, which was 30 percent higher than the previous rate of 2½ percent. This issue was extremely popular. It was oversubscribed by five times. The taxpayers of the country will pay in added interest on this bond issue alone over the life period of the bonds approximately $200 million. Interest rates on other Government securities were also increased and the increased interest rate spread throughout the entire economy. Although the administration has had to retreat from its extreme position on interest rates, its general policy has been one of tightening the money market and increasing the cost of money to borrowers. There is evidence that the economy is recovering now, but, I think, there is no question but what it was staggered and seriously hurt by the hard-money policy.

In the field of taxation, the attitude of the administration, or at least of the Secretary of the Treasury, is becoming clear. There has been, of course, no general attack upon all taxation, as was indicated there might be in the campaign. The direction of the administration's tax policy is indicated in the administration's support of two major tax changes. First, in its support of the dividend exemption provision in the 1954 tax law, and in its more recent opposition to the $20 income-tax credit proposed in the 84th Congress. The administration argued for the dividend exemption on the grounds that this would eliminate double taxation. It is significant to note, however, that at the same time the administration was asking for an extension of the regular corporate profits tax. I think it fair to ask the question as to why, if the administration was concerned about double taxation, it did not simply recommend that the corporate profits be reduced and the complicated provisions with regard to dividend exemptions not be injected into the tax program. This would have been the simple way to eliminate so-called double taxation. As a matter of fact, however, the corporate profits tax is to a large extent a regressive tax which falls upon the purchaser of the corporation's products or services—to a large extent, therefore, in the nature of a sales tax. Dividend exemption, however, gives tax advantage and tax relief to those who receive an income from investment. Seventy-six cents out of every dividend dollar are paid to the top 4 taxpayers out of every 100 taxpayers.

The Republican administration, led by the Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, was successful in defeating the $20 income tax credit proposed by the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives in this session of Congress. The argument of the administration was that the condition of the Federal budget did not justify a reduction in taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury argued that this consideration was the primary one and that in view of the budget deficit the tax rates should not be reduced. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Republican tax reduction bill was under consideration in the 83d Congress, the administration in the face of a budget deficit of approximately $4½ billion supported a bill which was expected to reduce revenue by approximately $1½ billion. They then argued that revenue was not the important consideration, but that the economic effects of taxes were to be given primary consideration. Approximately 1 year later in anticipation of a deficit of $2.5 billion, the administration opposed as unsound a reduction of approximately $815 million in tax revenue arguing that economic considerations were of secondary importance.

On the basis of this record, I think that the following conclusion can safely be made. First, that one can expect no consistency in

the arguments of the administration on tax or economic questions. Second, that the administration is not as strongly opposed to the corporate profits tax as it has sometimes indicated, but is rather concerned about reducing taxes paid by people in the high income bracket, especially when that revenue is derived from investment in corporations. Third, that it is not as anxious as it claimed to be during the 1952 campaign to reduce excise taxes, although there has been little indication of late that the Secretary of the Treasury intends to press for consideration of a national sales tax. Their policy is not one of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, but rather one of overfeeding the goose.

Actually we should not be altogether surprised at the policies which have been adopted and supported by the administration. Examination of the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury indicate that he has acted about as we should have expected him to act and as we may expect him to act in the future. We should not, for example, be surprised that business failures in the $5,000 to $25,000 class increased by approximately 70 percent between 1953 and 1954. We should not be surprised to learn that the administration is inclined to favor in its defense contracts the larger corporations, for the Secretary of the Treasury has said that "America needs big business, its requires big businesses, big enterprises, to do the things in big ways that a big country has to have." I think that we would all agree that America does need big business, but that it also needs small business and businesses of medium size. We should not be altogether surprised that the administration's tax policies particularly have tended to favor investors, for the Secretary of the Treasury, testifying before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1954, said, "There is nothing more important for the future of America than to encourage widespread investment in American business." All of us would agree, of course, that investment in American business is important, but I am sure that few would say that there is nothing more important than such investment. We cannot, for example, sacrifice necessary provisions for defense in order to encourage American business. We cannot neglect our international problems in the interest of stimulating such investment. Nor can we sacrifice any large number of our own people to poverty or to unemployment in the interest of investment in business. What we have reflected in the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury is at best an acceptance of the trickle-down theory, and more obviously an acceptance of the old fallacy of accepting the primacy of economics over every other consideration. It leads one to believe that President Wilson was right when he said that the Republicans thought that the only persons who could be trusted with the prosperity and welfare of the Nation were those who had the greatest material stake in it.

In view of this emphasis on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and the acceptance of his judgments by the President, we should not be surprised to learn, as we could from a recent report of the U. S. News & World Report, that during the time covered by its survey the President had invited 294 businessmen to his dinners but during the same period, only 9 farmers. That while he had invited 294 businessmen, he had invited 8 labor union officials; 294 businessmen, but 6 church leaders; 294 businessmen, but only 30 educators.

We should not be too surprised at what the Secretary of the Treasury recommends with regard to taxes, since he stated to the Ways and Means Committee of the House that the only purpose which the Ways and Means Committee was to take into consideration in connection with tax programs was that of raising revenue. He said that questions of social reform, or social well-being, should not be considered in relation to tax policy. I suppose that had he been hard pressed, he would not have recommended, at least publicly, that taxes should be imposed so heavily upon low-income groups that they could not adequately support their families, but such a conclusion is certainly inherent in the tax policy which he announced to the committee.

The political and economic philosophy is perhaps best summarized in his statement: "We must remember the fundamental principle that the best government is the least government." If this principle, as he calls it, were accepted and carried to its logical conclusion, one would be an anarchist advocating no government at all. This statement of Humphrey does not express any kind of fundamental principle, but rather a fundamental misunderstanding of the function of government. The best government is the government which is adequate to the needs of the people and which performs those functions which government should perform. The function of laws in government and governmental institutions is to protect people from force and violence by those who are more powerful either in terms of physical, or economic power, or whatever other power they may possess; and on the positive side to promote as the preamble to our Constitution says, "the general welfare." In the period in which government was weak in this country, we had exploitation in the economic field by powerful forces—exploitation of men through unjust and depressed wages and inhuman working conditions; exploitation of consumers and of competitors; and exploitation, also, of our natural resources. It was the policy of those who were interested in such exploitation to keep government weak, because they were then relatively strong. The history of the United States shows that through government the people of the country have come to exercise some measure of control over these forces, and through government action to secure some measure of justice for all of our citizens. Of course, if government were weakened, the economic institutions and forces in which the Secretary of the Treasury is interested could operate with greater freedom and independence and so could use their power without intervention, or without opposition by government.

We need not question his integrity, nor his good intentions, but certainly we can question his judgment. If what he has said indicates what he really thinks, and if he intends to carry through to logical conclusions the potential of his political philosophy, then we have genuine cause to be concerned and to be alarmed, and, as active members of the Democratic Party, to intensify our efforts to continue control not only of the Congress of the United States, but also of the executive branch of the Government; not with the intention of using that power and control to advance our personal interests or the limited interests of the Democratic Party, but with the purpose in mind of controlling government and using it so that the best interests of the people of the United States may be served by the Government.

Persecution of the Church in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 8th day of May constitutes the second anniversary of the issuance of the last official protest of the Catholic clergy in Poland against persecution of the church by the state Communist authorities. Severe repression has made subsequent effective protests impossible.

In view of the continued persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain, contrary to all human laws, and to international law, it is timely today to recall this memorable occasion.

On May 8, 1953, the last assembly of the Polish bishops was held in Krakow. The occasion was the 700th anniversary of the canonization of St. Stanislaw Szczepanowski, bishop of Krakow and patron of Poland. The Polish episcopate then assembled in Krakow, sent to Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the State Council in Warsaw, a lengthy document presenting the situation of the church and religious life in Poland from 1950 to 1953 under Communist domination.

The document, an example of a great moderation, of a deep understanding of the apostolic mission of the church and of great love for the Polish nation, does not enter into any polemics, but states and lists "before God and history" the wrongs which Marxism has been doing to the Catholic Church and the Polish nation, trying to deprive it of its thousand-year-old Christian tradition and attempting to destroy in Poland the faith of the people in God.

This memorial has become the last great document of the Polish episcopate containing the signature of the Primate Cardinal Stephen Wyszynski. From that time it was impossible to hold another assembly of the Polish episcopate and from that time on the bishops were prevented from presenting any further documents on religious life in Poland and on the fate of the church there. Five months thereafter Cardinal Wyszynski, the head of the church in Poland, was placed under arrest and has not been heard from since.

At the very beginning of the document, the bishops state: "In accordance with truth, the Polish episcopate feels it is its duty to state that the situation of the church in Poland is not only not improving but, on the contrary, is steadily deteriorating. The responsibility toward God, the community and history demands that at least the more menacing negative aspects be named without covering them up, and defined accurately." After this preamble the bishops gave a list of wrongs which the Communist regime had committed during the past 3 years against the church in Poland. Among these wrongs the episcopate enumerates the "removal of religion from the schools and of God from the hearts of the youth," "political pressure and attempts of diversion among the clergy," "absolute destruction of the Catholic press and periodicals," "intrusion in church affairs and attempts at hindering Apostolic activities of the church," "unusual hard fate of the church in western territories."

Each of these charges was supported by substantial evidence. Furthermore, the episcopate emphasized "attempts and efforts of the episcopate in creating mutual relations."

The document was ended by a solemn declaration of the bishops of the following conditions:

POLISH BISHOPS' DECLARATION

Feeling that it is their highest duty, the Polish episcopate points herewith to the tragic fate of the church in Poland, to the symptoms of the oppression and its causes, and the sources from which flows the concern, the anxiety, and the exasperation of the broad masses of the Catholic community.

We see the basic and main cause of this state of affairs in the hatred which destroys the strength of our country and seems to forebode sinister wrangles. We are acting not with any controversial aims in mind, but only to emphasize the burning necessity of finding an honest and fair way out of the existing situation. We are seeking a positive solution, which would be beneficial both to the church and the state. Nothing is further from us than to destroy the unity, to introduce dissension, or spread hatred. So this time again we do not refuse to reach an agreement, we do not forsake the will for a peaceful solution and collaboration in the important task of a successful settlement of relations between church and state in accordance with the agreement reached on April 14, 1950. However, in the present state of affairs it depends solely on the sincere and good will of the government whether internal peace and reciprocal harmony which are so essential, will be really achieved. It depends on whether the government will forsake its radical, destructive hate toward Catholicism, whether it will abandon its aim of subjugating the church and turning it into an instrument of the state.

We wish that the government should clearly understand what the decree about the filling of church positions really means for the structure of the church. We therefore remind that by this act, which is illegal according to the constitution, the state has usurped for itself the right to a constant intrusion in the internal affairs of the church, sometimes pertaining to the conscience of the priests, and to a willful and systematic subjection of church jurisdiction to its own will.

This is inadmissible from the point of view of the church. First because the jurisdiction of the church pertains to strictly religious, internal and supernatural matters, such as teaching God's revelation, the teaching of Christian morals, the administration of the Holy Sacraments, the organization of religious services, the spiritual guidance of the souls and the consciences of the people.

In the name of what rights could the authority over such strictly religious matters be submitted to the authority of the state, which by its nature pertains to matters which are exclusively secular and temporal? Particularly, if that authority is based upon a materialistic and anti-religious ideology, and is filled with destructive hatred toward the church? Every person, even an atheist, should understand that such a dependence is quite impossible. Therefore Lenin justly condemned the subjugation of the church to the state as a "cursed and disgraceful" thing. This is moreover, an impossible thing for the church because, in accordance with its unalterable constitution, with regard to which even the Pope is helpless, there is not and cannot be in that Catholic community another jurisdictional authority except the one which flows from above, from the Pope and the Bishops.

Therefore, whenever the secular authority willfully tries to grasp the ecclasiastical jurisdiction, in order to make it dependent, it usurps something which does not belong to it, and violates not only the rights of the church, but also the divine law. On what basis therefore could the government require of the Polish episcopate to accept a fact which is so glaringly inconsistent with the structure of the church and its rights, and which even violates the sacred divine laws.

Shortly after the announcement of the decree about filling the church positions, representatives of the episcopate deemed it their duty to make a formal protest in that matter. Today, the whole Polish episcopate protests.

We declare, aware of our apostolic mission, in a most solemn and categorical manner, that we cannot consider as legal and binding this decree, because it is inconsistent with the constitution of the Polish People's Republic, and violates the laws of God and of the church. "One should obey God rather than men."

We do not refuse to take into consideration the motives and the suggestions of the government. But in filling church positions we must be directed by divine and by ecclesiastical law, and we must appoint only those priests whom we consider, in our conscience, as fit and worthy. We find it difficult to hide how little worthy of those positions, especially the more important ones, are those, who yielded to external political pressure and allowed themselves to be used as instruments of diversion in the church. Those priests give very slight guaranty that, as representatives of the church, they will defend with devotion and firmness the essential and divine principles and rights of the church.

If it should happen that external factors will make it impossible for us to appoint competent and proper people to ecclesiastical positions, we are decided to leave them vacant rather than to place the spiritual rule of souls in the hands of unworthy individuals. And if someone should dare to accept any ecclesiastical position from outside (the church) let him know, that by the same fact he falls under the heavy punishment of excommunication.

Similarly, if we are placed before the alternative: either to subject ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the state making it an instrument of the latter, or to bear a personal sacrifice, we will not hesitate, we will follow the voice of our apostolic vocation and our conscience as priests, with peace of mind and the knowledge that we have not given the slightest reason for persecution, that suffering becomes our lot for no other reason than the cause of Christ and His church.

We are not allowed to place the things belonging to God on the altar of Caesar. Non possumus.

We respect the personal opinions of all people, also those of our present adversaries, whom we as Christians are not permitted to hate—but we demand the same respect for the religious opinions of Catholic Poles, especially children and the youth.

We respect the duties toward the nation and the state, and often remind our faithful about them, but at the same time we demand that no obstacles be placed in the way of Catholics for the performing of their duties toward God and the church. We are conscious of the special tasks and duties of the Catholic priest toward his country, and that is why we often reminded our priests about them, requesting their solicitude for the development and welfare of our country. But we also demand with emphasis that our priests should not be torn away from their religious duties, that they should not be drawn into political affairs which are alien to their vocation, that political pressure aimed at using them as instruments in the struggle of the state against the church be stopped, that they should not be forced to break their oath by which they pledged loyalty to the church and their bishops.

In short, in accordance with the principle of separation of church and state, as guaranteed in our constitution, the state must abstain from interfering in the religious, spiritual, and internal affairs of the church.

In the name of the welfare of our nation, we have the right to demand from the leaders of the Marxist camp a revision of the principles of ruthless hatred and ostracism toward our religion, the church and God. The Polish episcopate demands from the council of ministers that, in accordance with article 32.7 of the constitution of the Polish Peoples Republic, it undertake the defense of the rights of Catholics in the Polish Peoples Republic.

This memorable espiscopate letter of May 8, 1953, can be well described as an important historical document in the war against God, religion, and the church in Poland conducted by the Communist regime.

The history of this war with God and religion in a previous period, from 1945 to 1950, is described by another Polish episcopate letter dated September 12, 1950. It was signed by Cardinal Adam Stefan Sapieha and by the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszynski. It was unanimously adopted by all the Polish bishops assembled in Czestochowa and forwarded to President Boleslaw Bierut. In it the following was said:

In the history of the Catholic Church in Poland the last 5 years (1945–50) have been marked by unprecedented oppression. Unilateral withdrawal of the concordat by the Polish state; failure of the state to give recognition to the church organizations in western occupied lands; the failure to permit renewal of Catholic organizational activities; gradual but steady liquidation of Catholic schools; unusually strong limitations on religious press and religious publications by censorship and limitations so that they have almost ceased to exist; depriving the church of diocesan publications; taking over by the state of social organizations and hospitals belonging to the church; barring of organization church life and compulsive registration of cloisters; limitation on the public freedom of religious cults and limitations of the right to conduct Mass and religious practices, such as missions, public processions, religious gatherings and congresses; the liquidation of the church welfare organization Caritas; nationalization of church properties; the press campaign against the episcopate; the limitation of religious practices in schools; removal from the schools of hundreds of religious text books; support of youth organizations with ideology inimical to Christianity; support of publications discrediting historically the accomplishments of the church in the field of scence and national life; antireligious propaganda conducted by the press, by lectures, and by thousands of publications; limitations on the freedom of conscience of members of organizations, parties, and trade unions; antireligious propaganda in kindergartens and schools, summer camps, and in youth camps; the use of the whole administrative apparatus, the courts, police authorities, and tax offices to exert pressure on the conscience of the citizenry and of the priests and bishops. All this is only a partial list and does not give a picture of the whole truth of the situation of the Catholic Church after 5 years (1945–50). Having this in mind the episcopate has, on many occasions, presented its complaints and protests to you, Mr. President and chairman of the committee of ministers. Unfortunately, it was without results. The last year, 1949–50, particularly after the concordat of April 14, 1950, was marked by a hastening of the tempo of the liquidation of the church's social institutions and activities.

This document of September 12, 1950, together with that of the Polish espiscopate of May 8, 1953, gives a true picture of the religious persecution in Poland on the part of the Communist regime in the

period from 1945 to 1953. They present a picture of the brutal war with God, religion, and the church conducted by the Communists in Poland.

With the arrest of the Polish Primate Cardinal Stephan Wyszynski on September 26, 1953, and his imprisonment by the Communists, an end came to the period in which the Polish episcopate could present this type of memorial, which is now a historical document, to the Warsaw regime. Since that time it is unknown where the Polish primate is imprisoned, what his condition of health is, and under what circumstances he is living. Despite the fact that it has been requested from all parts of the world, the Communist regime has to this day given no official information regarding him.

The high moral position which Cardinal Wyszynski has gained in the Catholic world is best attested to by the greeting sent by the American cardinals and bishops to Cardinal Wyszynski through the Voice of America during the last Christmas holidays. Cardinals Spellman, Stritch, Mooney, and McIntyre joined in the greetings, as did also a number of American bishops such as O'Boyle, Alter, Donahue, Keough, Lucey, Byrne, Gannon, Russell, Meyer, O'Hara, Cushing, Wosnicki, Kroll, and many other high dignitaries of the Catholic Church in the United States. They all emphasized the fact that in Cardinal Wyszynski, the primate of Poland, they see "a symbol of courage which every man should display in defense of freedom."

The Communist attack on the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyzsynski opened a new period of religious persecution in Poland. The war with God, religion, and the church took on a new form, but it never stopped or slackened.

After nearly 2 years the Polish bishops and the Polish episcopate are Communist prisoners of the Warsaw regime. Deprived of its leader, the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszynski, there have been no plenary assemblies of the Polish episcopate for nearly 2 years. After 2 years the episcopate has been compelled by the Communist regime to be silent. The bishops have very rarely been able to be heard, and then only on strictly religious matters and on subjects in which they are compelled to speak by the Communists.

On the other hand, immediately after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski the Warsaw regime has pushed to the forefront the so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics. In the memorial of September 12, 1950, the bishops already affirmed that these patriot priests were in conflict with their moral and church obligations, and many of them were under church discipline. As to the so-called progressive Catholics, they were publicly condemned in February 1950 by the Primate Cardinal Wyszynski, who confirmed the fact that their activities and the activities of their publications cannot be considered as Catholic.

In the fall of 1953, after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski, the Communists called to life the so-called State Committee of Catholic, Ecclesiastical, and Lay Activists of the National Front. This committee was given the job of diversional work among the Catholic people. Later the Communists added to this group the "patriot priests," putting them under leadership of "progressive Catholics."

How ineffective was the work of this committee and how effective were the auditions of the western radio, particularly Voice of America, as best evidenced by the statement of the secretary-general of this committee on February 22, 1955, who, despairing on the lack of ability to operate effectively, said:

> This national committee having ambitions to influence and to direct the processes of evolutions now going on in the minds of clergy cannot at any time afford to neglect the influence of western radio of diversional character on a certain group of priests and Catholics in general. These radios lost their appeal for the Polish people by unmasking their lies and hatred toward anything which is cherished in the heart of every Pole. Nevertheless these radio programs aim to disturb the minds of the faithful and to exploit for hostile political aims religious feelings and devotion to the church of people.
>
> One of the means used by these western radios—which flatters us because it strengthens our belief in the righteousness of our ideals—is an avalanche of lies and insults directed against our movement. Our strength and our achievements compelled the enemy propaganda to also change its methods. Even they noticed our great movement and ineffectiveness to combat it from outside as it was when they successfully went to isolate progressive Catholic movement. Therefore the struggle has been changed for a diversion with the scope to concentrate on disintegrating processes and opportunistic tendencies within our movement. It is logical—if one is unable to conquer or destroy a movement, if one cannot retract its development, he must try to weaken this movement, to loosen it and undermine its ideals.
>
> And therefore the weight of enemy propaganda is pushing now not on our organizational forces—it is even afraid to use its name—but is attacking the very ideology. The enemy propaganda is trying to undermine among the people its confidence in this ideology and abate its authority. They talk no more about a heritical group or heretical ideology, they discriminate not only people and their activities, but they strike against the fundamental belief of progressive Catholics.
>
> This is the reason why we must come to certain conclusions for our further activity, why we have to deepen morale of our activists and take care of a high moral standard of our leading groups.

This wailing of those who were bent on destroying religious life in Poland is good evidence that their efforts have been unsuccessful and have not fallen on fertile ground.

In the perspective of 10 years of religious persecution in Poland and in the light of the history of 10 years of the war of Communists with God, religion, and the church in Poland, it is now clear how important were the statements of the Polish episcopate. It is obvious that the Communists to the present time have been losing that war. The Polish nation has successfully fought off the attacks. This, however, does not minimize for a moment the dangers which appear to exist. The Communists have chosen Poland as the base of their great diversion war with the entire Christian world. The so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics are being used by the Communists to divert activities in various countries in the world. They are being sent to Belgium, France, Italy, and even to North Vietnam and to the United States under the guise of various missions, sometime diplomatic. The Catholic mask is used to conceal their Communist activity to procure advantages for Moscow. We must consider these matters when we reflect on this second anniversary of the historical document, the memorial of the Polish espiscopate of May 8, 1953. We must remember that the goal of the Communists is not only to destroy the Catholic world in Poland, but to destroy all religious activities everywhere in the world, including these United States.

Limiting the Power of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the other day a proposal in Congress to reduce personal taxes by a meager $20 a head was called fiscal irresponsibility. That was true because of worse fiscal irresponsibility by Congress for more than 20 years right up to this minute. It has been making appropriations for grants-in-aid, loans, subsidies, and gifts. It has authorized spending, borrowing, and running deficits that make the proposed reduction in taxes impossible—irresponsible. This costs us more than $10 billion annually. It takes at least 1,400,000 Federal employees to operate our extraneous, unconstitutional functions of government. They cost in salaries and other overhead more than $6 billion. Nine hundred thousand employees could perform all the legitimate constitutional nonmilitary functions of government—and do a better job.

Our dollars are cut in half with fantastic Federal debts and mortgages amounting to more than half the value of our property. That means that half the value of our private property has been confiscated or transferred to government already. When income is taken up to 92 percent by government that means individual responsibility to manage ourselves and our property is suspended.

Something has to be done about it. Or we shall have unlimited governmental irresponsibility in the management of our affairs permanently fastened upon us.

Indeed, is it not a fact that any people who tolerate mere men exercising unlimited powers over them have become themselves temporarily irresponsible? No sensible organization of men turns loose its officers to do anything they like and spend whatever they please. Their powers are always specified and limited in scope and spending to carry out the stated purposes of the organiza-

tion. Congress is in that ridiculous position of being unlimited in functions and spending power.

Do we need another decade—even another day—to demonstrate that Congress is incapable of correcting its own helplessness without the people's help.

The simple remedy, then, lies in taking away from Congress the excess power to appropriate the people's property which it now exercises. Limiting its spending power necessarily limits its functions. A first step in that direction has been taken by the introduction of an amendment to the Constitution by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182.

Congressman REED, when he introduced the amendment in the House on January 3, 1955, summarized its provisions as follows:

First. As to income taxes: the amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate incomes may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes: The amendment gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal recognizes some basic first principles that the Marxian tax system we now have does not. First, there is a point of diminishing returns in the collection of taxes. Low rates may produce more revenue than high rates. Second, the great bulk of income taxes in a progressive rate system is collected from the lowest tax brackets; and third, that as between separate governmental taxing units, the one closest to the people can perform most efficiently and economically.

The first principle is best illustrated by the use of Henry Ford as an example. In 40 years, Mr. Ford's fortune increased from $1,000 to $1 billion. If the Ford Motor Co. had been subjected to a 50-percent income tax during that 40-year period, its net worth would have been only $1,470,000 and would have paid only $1,470,000 in taxes; but with a 20-percent income tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been $66,500,000 and taxes collected $16,600,000 or almost 16 times as much as collections from a 50-percent tax. On that principle American mass-production was built. We have proved to the world that mass-produced, low per unit cost products yield more profits and pay more taxes than high per unit costs and high rates of taxes.

To illustrate: During the 1920's the high World War I tax rates were drastically lowered. The following table shows that although maximum rates were lowered and personal exemptions increased the revenue yield was greater:

Year	Total internal-revenue collections	Maximum rate (percent)	Personal exemptions
1925	$2,584,140,000	40	$2,500
1926	2,836,000,000	24	3,000
1927	2,865,863,000	24	3,500
1929	2,939,054,000	20	3,500
1930	3,040,146,000	20	3,500

The reason for this is obvious. The great bulk of revenue comes from the first and lowest bracket of the income taxpayers. For many years about 85 percent of all taxes collected have come from the lowest bracket, viz, being the 20-percent bracket. Only 3 percent, or about $2 billion, is provided by rates in excess of 34 percent.

It is obvious from the foregoing that if the Government continues to require large revenues, the lowest income producers will be required to provide by far the greatest share of taxes. Conversely, tax relief in the lower brackets results in the largest possible reinvestment in production and tends to increase profits and taxes paid to the Government.

So real relief can be effected only by drastically reducing expenditures or by reducing the tax rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. As Congressman REED points out, this would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

The most important effect of the amendment is the restoration to the States of the fiscal ability to meet the needs of their people. The States have lost that power to a great extent and consequently have either been forced to rely on the various grants-in-aid programs, or have surrendered to the Federal Government the responsibility for the performance of services that are primarily of State and local concern. This shift of power and responsibility is in clear violation of our constitutional concept that the unit of government closest to the people can most capably serve them. The Constitution provides for a neat division of powers, reserving to the States the bulk of sovereignty and granting only explicit and very limited powers to the Central Government.

This balance has been upset by reckless use of the unlimited taxing power granted to the Federal Government by the 16th amendment and the court interpretations of it. By preempting the tax sources the Central Government has been successful in arrogating to itself virtual control over the lives and property and liberties of the American people. The States exist too much by sufference and function too often as agents for the distribution of the Federal largesse. The extent of the shift of sovereignty is indicated by the fact that 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax revenues in the Nation, while today the Federal Government collects 75 percent. The pen is indeed mightier than the sword, but the power of the purse is invincible.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal reverses this trend toward centralizing government power by restoring to the States some of the sources of tax revenues. The amendment returns to the States the exclusive power to levy death and gift taxes. These taxes constitute a small item in the Federal tax picture—about 1 percent—but represents a considerable revenue to the States. The right to control the transfer and devolution of property is one of the historical attributes of sovereignty, and clearly belongs to the States. Secondly, the amendment's limitation on confiscatory rates in the higher brackets guarantees to the States that the wealth created within their boundaries will remain there to create more wealth and consequently produce more and greater tax revenues for the States.

The amendment is a compromise, recognizing that in emergency situations the Federal Government must have great fiscal powers. But it also assures the American people of fiscal and, consequently, political sanity in normal times. That is the least we can do for the Nation's 66 million taxpayers.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the House, January 31, 1955, by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introducing House Joint Resolution 182—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ percent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely,

first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be (mean) inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is $63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in brief, Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years of 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

	Expenditures (in billions)
1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)	$44.058
1950	39.606
1949	39.507
1948	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was $18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

First. A reduction in the individual income-tax rataes to 10 percent on incomes up to $10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of $10,000; and

Second. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to $47 billion, which is $3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is $7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to $41.5 billion. This is $2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the $33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about $2 billion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It is too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government; or second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and increases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the Senate, January 21, 1955, by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introducing Senate Joint Resolution 23—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes, and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist Manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance, the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income-tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of $2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than $200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed, the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this: The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small taxpayer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about $2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about $60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only $100 in the present $600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increase would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of $2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small-tax payers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25-percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was $891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of $74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small business. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953 was that estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry.

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

Tax Deductions for Care of Mentally and Physically Handicapped Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide tax deductions for expenses incurred in the care of mentally and physically handicapped dependents. This would amend the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which limit these deductions to a woman or a widower or to a husband who is legally separated from his wife.

Under the present regulation, a man either has to be divorced or legally separated from a mentally or physically disabled wife or else a widower in order to qualify for deductions for expenses incurred in the care of his children. I cannot believe that it was the intent of Congress to discriminate in favor of either death or divorce. A taxpayer having dependents who are mentally or physically incapable of caring for themselves often find it impossible to provide this care personally and maintain his or her employment at the same time. In such a situation, it seems to me that a taxpayer is entitled to relief. By amending section 214 (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, my bill provides this relief not only to women, widowers, and divorcees, but also to those who have maintained their matrimonial ties.

Everyone Is Hard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with prosperity—if determined by dollars in hand—not just around the corner—not sitting on the doorstep—but inside, right at the elbow, practically everyone is having money trouble. It will increase when money becomes tight.

INDIVIDUALS' TROUBLES

An industrial executive had a yearly salary of $75,000; an annual income of an equal amount from dividends. He did not drink, gamble, entertain socially, nor spend his money foolishly. He had a good but modest home in a comparatively small city. He had a summer place in the West; tried to get a month's annual vacation.

However, the demands made upon him for contributions for charitable and other purposes, and which he felt he could not resist, kept him in a financially tight situation where he had to take a look at his checking account before deciding upon any sizable expenditure. His salary and dividends came from a business which he had created, which gave employment to upward of 3,000 people at above the average wage scale. He was as hard pressed for current funds as the lowest paid employee.

Another acquaintance, a professional man in a small community, makes between 30 and 40 thousand a year and though his tastes are moderate, is always hard up when income tax day rolls around.

Then, I know many conservative, would-be industrious citizens who, because they are past 45, find it difficult

to get a job. Others, older—notwithstanding social security or other Government payments, find it extremely difficult to get their hands on funds enough to enable them to live comfortably, even though they have no expensive habits. They suffer more than any other group.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Government, which collects billions of dollars from the taxpayers—it has no other source of revenue—makes no serious effort to live within its income.

The Government on just one item alone—storage of farm surpluses—each day adds $1 million to its national debt—the annual interest charge on which is now upwards of $6.4 billion—but there is still no solution of the farm problem. Farm prices, notwithstanding rigid support, continue to drop.

Municipalities, as well as individuals, seem to have accepted literally the Biblical statement "Ask and ye shall receive"—forgotten that the Federal Government, which sometimes collects $2.19 for each dollar it passes out, does not have creative power—forgotten that "The Lord helps those who help themselves."

THE ANSWER?—IT IS OBVIOUS

Our creative and productive ability has increased far beyond our dreams, but we follow the methods of the Prodigal Son; waste our priceless inheritance. Spend beyond our needs—for things desirable but not strictly necessary. Buying but not paying—postponing to future generations whose welfare we seem to have forgotten the day of reckoning.

Unpleasant as it may be, consideration for those we bring into the world demands that as individuals, as government, we limit our spending to the purchase of necessities—to what we earn or have ability to repay—in the near future.

Unless we do, some of us may live to regret it. Certainly those who come after will have cause to condemn us.

Personal Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 days I have been pretty much flat on my back with a virus that bit me rather severely, and I have been unable to attend the sessions of the House. From the look of the RECORD, it seems as though there have been more rollcalls, quorum calls, and votes than might have occurred normally in the period of a couple of weeks. Since I had no control over the timing when those bugs were going to bite, I was unable to attend the sessions and consequently have no recorded votes on the bills which came up on the floor of the House.

However, had I been present I would have voted for the conference report on the postal pay raise. Although I firmly believe the President will veto the present bill, I nevertheless feel the bill should get before the President for his immediate action so it can become law or be vetoed. Then the Congress can quit playing politics with the purse strings of the postal and civil-service employees of this country and produce legislation which will put money into their pockets now.

I also would have voted against recommittal of the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, for I believe both Territories are ready for statehood. According to the RECORD, there was a lot of talk about Communist influence and Harry Bridges in the Hawaiian Islands and apparently for that reason, a lot of the Members voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I thought the remarks of Congressman RUSSELL MACK, of Washington, were very pertinent when he stated:

Why should we punish Hawaii by depriving her of statehood for something that we ourselves have not done?

In other words, the United States had been unable to get rid of Harry Bridges during a period of a good many years, yet some would deprive Hawaii of statehood for inability to get rid of him in a comparatively short time. This reasoning seems entirely illogical to me.

Coming from a district which is close to Alaska, I am particularly concerned with statehood for that Territory. I believe the people of Alaska have demonstrated their ability to govern themselves and to become a member of the United States. I therefore would have voted in favor of statehood for both of these Territories.

Fishers Island Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the bill which I have introduced calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods, H. R. 6093, I wish to bring to the attention of the House today some additional information.

If I were to predict that during the next Atlantic hurricane season millions of dollars in personal property and many entire industries now located on Connecticut shores will be wiped out, I believe that this body would institute some sort of emergency powers to get action in time to prevent such a catastrophe.

Well, after personally inspecting the Fishers Island Sound area last weekend I do so predict—if last year's violence is repeated. The Stonington area, for example, where one of my Hartford constituents' plant is located, will suffer damage not alone from the extreme violence of a hurricane but even more likely from the lesser furies of Atlantic storms which now sweep in from the east and southeast with increasing regularity.

A native son of Stonington and president of the Stonington Boat Works, Inc., Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., has proposed what appears to be the best defense at the least expense for this extremely vulnerable area. His plan, which suggests a series of breakwaters extending on a broken line, following the reefs, from Watch Hill Point, R. I., to the east point of Fishers Island, N. Y., promises protection for the greatest number of people and their properties. I have yet to see a so-called coastal erosion plan by a single construction project which would protect such an extensive area as these shores of Fishers Island Sound in Rhode Island, New York, and Connecticut.

The proposed Palmer breakwaters would restore that line of reefs from Watch Hill Point to East Point, Fishers Island, to its former protective status.

Since those reefs have been flattened, in recent years, and only since then, has Stonington Harbor lost its value as a harbor of refuge. In a strong easterly storm there is no harbor of refuge now between New London, Conn., and Point Judith, R. I. A comparison of older charts with the new will show that Stonington Harbor, for example, has lost its usefulness as such in almost direct ratio with the gradual lowering of those reef barriers.

Consequently, heavy seas now sweep into the Stonington area directly from the Atlantic Ocean and the wave action continues on down the Connecticut shoreline in a westerly direction. This, I say, happens during easterly storms, which occur with increasing regularity. Water damage along this extensive Connecticut coastline is still greater during the hurricane season.

Connecticut, like many other States, is anxiously trying to attract new industry. But many long-established industries along this Connecticut coastline have said they would leave if they must suffer the severe water damage of 1938, of 1944, of 1954; resulting from the cumulative power of Atlantic wave action; if they must be continually threatened by storm-driven seas which now enter Fishers Island Sound over the once-protective reef line between Watch Hill and Fishers Island. Even the Stonington fishing fleet, Connecticut's largest, will have to seek refuge elsewhere unless Federal action is forthcoming soon.

I have therefore introduced a bill asking for authority to investigate and correct this situation by the construction of breakwaters to protect the entire Fishers Island Sound area. Since personally inspecting the reef line between Watch Hill, R. I., and Fishers Island, N. Y., last Friday, I am more convinced than ever that this is our first line of defense. I ask that the provisions of this bill be given immediate consideration by the Secretary of the Army and that he instruct the Chief of Engineers to expedite the necessary survey and immediately to take appropriate action in the most expeditious manner possible toward the construction of those breakwaters.

I am well aware of the hazards of hurricane violence which threaten the en-

tire Atlantic seaboard. However, while I respect the needs of others, I would remind this body that to my knowledge no other such extensive and heavily populated and highly assessed area so threatened can be so readily protected by a single project of breakwaters construction. The need is apparent to those who would study and compare the coastal charts, past and present. It is a need which can be fulfilled, and easily so, whenever authorized by Congress.

I ask that this project be given serious consideration, that it be given the same degree of priority in any overall Atlantic seaboard coastal erosion legislation that the area in question was given by the hurricanes of 1938, of 1944, of 1954.

"American Secretaries Are Bringing to Their Positions Today a Wider Knowledge of Business and World Affairs Than Considered Necessary in the Past"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks declared April 23–30 as National Secretaries Week. All over the country that week our great band of girl Fridays took bows for their very real contribution to our American way of life. Moreover, the 300 chapters of the National Secretaries Association—International—observed the week by highlighting the educational projects for which it has gained national recognition and which have been of tremendous benefit to secretaries and management.

I was proud, indeed, Mr. Speaker, when my own secretary on Capitol Hill, Miss Marjorie Clough, of Cleveland, Ohio, who has been associated with me for almost 10 years, was invited to speak at an all-day workshop meeting of the chapters of the National Secretaries Association of Greater Youngstown, Ohio.

When Miss Clough reported to the Congressman representing Youngstown—the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN—that she was going into his district, he presented her with a toy donkey which I feel sure she will cherish, especially as Mr. KIRWAN emphasized the nonpartisanship of the little mascot. And he further asked her to convey his greetings to the meeting.

Miss Ann C. Hudak and others of Youngstown had skillfully arranged a full day of activities at the beautiful Butler Art Institute. Included on the program was another good friend of mine from Cleveland, Mr. A. L. Bittikofer, supervisor of character education for the Cleveland public schools, who conducted a lively discussion on human relations in and out of business.

May I express my appreciation at this time to the United States Information Agency and to Mr. William Hamilton, of the public information staff, who generously arranged to have Miss Clough take with her a color movie which vividly portrays what our Government is doing to combat Soviet propaganda behind the Iron Curtain. The showing of this film added greatly to the program of the day.

Mr. Speaker, because I know Miss Clough was speaking for and about us all in this great body, I believe my colleagues will enjoy reading what she said that day in Youngstown. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith the tribute of Secretary Weeks to the American secretary and Miss Clough's statement:

THE SECRETARY SENSES THE NEED

(Remarks of Miss Marjorie Clough, executive assistant to Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, before a meeting of the Youngstown Chapters, National Secretaries' Association, April 30, 1955)

It is a privilege to be here today to join with this distinguished group in paying honor to secretaries everywhere.

When Miss Helmes, of the Women's Bureau in Washington, told me of this workshop you are holding today, I was gratified to know that I would be invited to take part in it.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks is to be commended for proclaiming National Secretaries' Week across the Nation.

Indeed, I think there is special significance for our great army of Girl Fridays in another announcement which came from Mr. Weeks' office this week: The announcement which told of the high state of the Nation's prosperity.

For I would say that without the secretary, equipped as she is with a sort of built-in radar system we call the sixth sense—I doubt if such a record could have been possible by the great and small enterprises which constitute the American way of life.

To be in Youngstown itself, is a privilege. I come from a family of men who have long dealt in steel and the products of steel, I understand what it means to the prosperity of our Nation when the night skies over Youngstown and Bethlehem and Pittsburgh and Cleveland are aglow from the white-hot furnaces and open hearths of the greatest steel industry in the world.

And may I take this moment to tell you what I am sure you already know: That the people of Youngstown are fortunate to be represented in Congress by Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. A high compliment was paid to him recently by a friend who said: "MIKE KIRWAN is MIKE KIRWAN 365 days of the year." It can certainly be said that he puts the welfare of the country and of his people above and beyond party politics.

You may wonder why I have been chosen to speak at your meeting today. They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether or not this is true.

What I do know is that from the first day on that first job many years ago—paying $60 a month, Monday through Saturday—I have been filled with faith in the role which an obscure girl could someday play in our society.

I hope I am not mistaken when I say that only in America are the men and women at Cabinet level, the men and women of the President's Cabinet who make foreign policy and defense policy and domestic policy—known as secretaries!

And today when my Congresswoman leaves the supervision of her congressional office to me when on some important mission in our country or abroad, I realize that the faith of the obscure girl at the Woodstock typewriter has been confirmed.

They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether this is true or not. I do know that I am associated with a wonderful woman in Washington.

In order to tell you about my work, I must tell you something about Congressman BOLTON.

FRANCES P. BOLTON

Public life was nothing new to Mrs. Bolton when the death of her husband, the late Hon. Chester C. Bolton, left a vacant seat in the House of Representatives in 1939. She had had 10 years as wife of a Congressman, and had gone through many campaign at his side, and made many speeches in his behalf.

But now she faced an important decision of her own, whether or not to run for the seat left vacant in Congress. There were the inaudible suggestions that as a woman she was not sufficiently educated in the law or one of the professions. There were the fears and doubts which seem always to beset men and women when comes the call to higher service.

But having put her hand to the plow, and winning that first election hands down back in 1940—she hasn't looked back, but has pushed steadily forward into new and challenging experiences which have inspired men and women everywhere.

Mrs. Bolton is a highly respected member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her thought reaches out to the problems of peoples and nations around the world as their affairs touch upon our own at the international level.

Her deep sense of humanity and understanding of the basic needs of mankind, make her the stanch ally of America's friends the world over.

Mrs. BOLTON enjoys the unqualified confidence not only of her colleagues in Congress, but of the leaders of the executive branch as well. This was borne out when President Eisenhower appointed her the first woman Member of Congress to serve as a delegate to the United Nations. Her services there involved the daily handling of strategic information of the highest classification.

Men grumble a bit sometimes, about women in positions of responsibility. Here's a personal observation to end all grumbling:

A staff member of the Foreign Affairs Committee told me one day that Mrs. BOLTON was one of the few legislators he had ever seen—man or woman—who could influence votes in a committee meeting through pure logic and persuasive ability. She tries to resolve conflict of opinion and bring about a workable and just compromise.

He went on to say that she was the person who had convinced him that women have a constructive place to fill in public life. "Frankly, until I saw her in operation, I thought women ought to stay home."

What a tribute to woman's place in American endeavor today.

A little more about Mrs. BOLTON.

Hard work and long hours on the Hill are what the job demands in Congress. Mrs. BOLTON gives freely of both. She is a perfectionist to the smallest detail, but asks nothing from those around her which she does not first demand from herself. She finds no time in her active life for small talk about people or things.

Her wit and good humor save many a situation in our busy office. Some weeks ago I found a newspaper clipping propped under my nose—at a moment of when things were going "seven ways to Sunday" as Mrs. BOLTON often says.

The story told about a young woman applying for a secretarial position.

"What are your special qualifications," she was asked?

Her reply: "I can look like a woman and think like a man, act like a lady, and work like a dog."

The business of thinking and acting like a whole-souled woman is what is important to FRANCES BOLTON.

STAYING IN CONGRESS

Let nobody tell you that it is easy for a man or a woman to serve in Congress. It takes something special to get there, and something very special to stay.

That something special isn't just the ability to wage fiery battle for some piece of legislation, to meet the needs of constituents, to make quick decisions or to write good letters. Some or all of this, to be sure, is fabricated into the warp and woof of what is called a leader of people.

In my humble judgment, what it takes mostly to stay on in Congress year after year, piling good record upon good record, is not so much the people's faith in the Congressman, as the Congressman's faith in the people. It is the deep conviction that there is far more goodness than badness in the simplest of us; that every human soul is striving for a happier, freer, more secure way of life, and has the right to. It is the deep assurance that one can trust most of these aspirations most of the time, and know that out of them all will come something better, not worse.

Could this not be what George Washington meant when he wrote: "The aggregate happiness of society is, or ought to be, the end of all government."

Our first President spoke not of the special needs of this or that group, but of the happiness of society as a whole. He urged that the energies of government at all levels—local, State, National—concern themselves with what is best for all, not some, in the serious business of making the laws of the land.

How much easier said than done, friends. I have seen our statesmen on the floors of Congress making decisions of grave import to the peace and security of these United States. I have felt the pressures they are under. It is far from easy to think objectively of the whole, when the voices of special interest raise hue and cry. For whether the issue be the always troublesome tariff question, or the number of refugees we bring into our country each year, a labor-management dispute, or the cost of butter, the issues are always debated in terms of the happiness and prosperity of some one, or some group.

The spirit which permeates the foregoing brief passage on the life of FRANCES BOLTON—and what it means to be a Congressman—is the spirit which has filled my life these past 9 years.

A SECRETARY LOOKS AT WASHINGTON

And now permit me to give you a fleeting glimpse of Washington itself—your Capital and mine—the city which is today writing history for millions of people in many lands. America has had to assume a position of leadership among the nations, not because of her material abundance—O wonder of providence that it is—but because of that spirit of freedom and liberty which cradled her birth a short 200 years ago.

Come, drive home from work with me on an evening in April. The rush hour is past. The sun has sunk. The soft evening air is fragrant with springtime's wonders.

Let's stop for a moment and climb the steps of that glorious temple we know as Lincoln Memorial. From the summit, one has an unobstructed view of the Capitol dome to the east. Below our feet lies the long reflecting pool, and framed within it the eternal shadow of the lofty Washington Monument. At one end of an imaginary bar which crosses this sweeping view of the Capitol lies the White House. On the other, the marble rotunda of the Jefferson Memorial. Just behind us, and across the Potomac, the stately mansion of Robert E. Lee looks down from its natural pedestal on his own beloved Virginia hills.

The white crosses and tombstones of Arlington Cemetery lie folded within those hills just across the river. In the quiet of evening one can almost hear the measured step of the sentry pacing his perpetual watch before the tomb of the soldier "Known but to God."

But morning brings other glimpses of life in our beauteous Capital City.

There are the miles of wide boulevards spoking out from the Capitol Grounds and the miles of Government buildings, with their miles of corridors.

There are the storied shelves and the row after row of books in famed Library of Congress, and the seemingly endless queues of wide-eyed visitors around our historic sights. in the hot summer sun.

And everywhere in Washington there is the reminder of more gentle yesterdays which our Capital City has known. Red brick houses close to the road, flanked by shaded walks and alleys, cobbled streets and narrow, walled-in gardens to the rear, all whisper of genial colonial life in the early days of our Republic. Fashionable Georgetown society is preserving these lovely relics for modern living.

Elsewhere there is noisy evidence of new buildings springing up in answer to the incessant demand for modern offices and up-to-the-minute dwellings.

There is still another aspect of life in Washington, friends. A shocking picture it is to those who visit our Capital for the first time; slums within the shadow of the Capitol dome!

What a spectacle all this makes: the stately side by side with the sordid; the traditional vying with the modern, growth, change, displacement.

As you know, Washington has a large Negro population. There was a time when these citizens were not an integral part of life as a whole in Washington. Today they are slowly taking their rightful places among us.

Construction of the beautiful Supreme Court Building—that highest Court of the land which so recently handed down the decision on segregation—displaced hundreds of Negro families. The splendorous marble building which is soon to house the Teamsters Union; and the New Senate Office likewise displaced their hundreds.

Where have these families gone? They are already becoming integrated in all areas of our Capital City. We are indeed setting an example to the Nation.

THE SECRETARY AT WORK ON CAPITOL HILL

Now where is the secretary in all of this—the young woman whom we are honoring today?

Picture her on Capitol Hill, representing the 48 stars in our flag, coming from every walk of life, laboring for every field of endeavor.

In a word, she is all of us.

Can she remain apart from all I have just discussed? I think not. As she emerges in the evening from buildings on the Hill you might think her day's work was over. But like you who have achieved success the hard way, she too must fill some portion of her evening hours with study and more work.

She stops at the beautiful Library of Congress—Congress' own Library—the largest in the world, to gather statistics. Passing through the portals and down the ornate corridors to the comfortable Reading Room, she ponders the timeless words of Francis Bacon:

"Reading maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man."

Going home that evening to retire before another long day of work, is her mind quite free of the issues argued that day in the Halls of Congress? Not entirely. Not if she is the secretary who senses the need. You may be sure that, like her own Member of Congress, the problems and decisions of the day—for constituent and the Nation—weigh upon her thought.

There was the problem of sudden death in the family of a boy serving in our Armed Forces. Had they done everything possible to bring him home?

There was the pitiful letter from the aging widow of a Spanish-American war veteran. What help was there for her?

There was the group of farmers eager to have the Congressman understand the responsibilities they bear in feeding the American people.

There were conflicting engagements on the calendar. Had the most important ones been given preference?

The mail that day had brought more than the usual requests for assistance in the knotty cases of immigrants and refugees seeking asylum in our country.

A constituent dropped in unexpectedly from back home. The constituent is indeed the most important person on Capitol Hill. He must be given time to tell his story to the Congressman before leaving Washington. But when? Can the secretary do the impossible and arrange a meeting when the Member must be closeted all day in executive hearings, keeping one eye on the floor, where rollcalls are expected, and the other on his office?

When will the Congressman write the speech which must be delivered that weekend in his district?

True, there is aid from the experienced staff to deal with all these problems. In some congressional offices there is the legal expert who carefully scans the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each morning, keeps track of the issues, their meaning, and the status of bills on the legislative calendars.

There is the experienced researcher and writer, constructing speeches for the Member out of scraps he has written on the backs of envelopes, preparing statements for the press.

There are the countless tasks which no machine yet conceived can do: the gracious notes of thanks, preparing tickets for travel, keeping harmony between overworked staff members, parceling out the work from an incoming mail basket filled six times each day by mail handlers within the building. The eternal jangling of the phones causes continuous interruptions, but telephone voices must show no irritation.

Time and again it is proven that the secretary, or the person in the executive position, must rely on that something which we like to call the sixth sense to make everything click like a precision instrument.

Even Sally Brown must rely on this sixth sense.

Who is Sally Brown?

Sally is gay and pretty and young. She had 2 years of junior college and 3 months at business school. Her grades were good. She hurried through business school because of general aptitudes and her eagerness to be earning.

Sally is willing to learn, if someone is willing to teach her. She tries to keep personal telephone calls to a minimum, to come to work on time, and to work fairly constantly between breaks for coffee, lunch, coffee, and going home. She's even willing to cut her lunch period short if she must fly home at 5 for an early date.

But, friends, this young woman, except for some miracle of circumstance, is not long for our profession. She is on her way to a more exciting job, a long vacation, or whatever else will give relief from humdrum routine and the business of getting ahead—way ahead.

Her job is primarily for the purpose of earning a livelihood. She is perhaps filling a gap between young womanhood and marriage.

Now, I will not argue as to whether Sally and Joe will make a happy union, since this most wonderful institution of matrimony itself takes talent and imagination, sacrifice, and, above all, devotion to ideals.

Fortunately for Sally, American enterprise furnishes thousands of opportunities to keep her gainfully employed during this interim state of existence. But it is sad to realize that this young woman will miss the opportunities everywhere prevalent—in every business endeavor—to apply her talents in a way to pay rich rewards to herself and her employer.

Friends, I have not come to Youngstown today to speak about Sally Brown, because she is not representative of the secretary who has won laurels for our profession over the decades.

There is an extraordinary shortage of expert secretaries today. Despite the Sally Browns, and despite the fact that employers are paying higher salaries than ever before, there just aren't enough of them to care for the Nation's business.

AMERICA'S MECHANICAL SERVANTS

The wonders of the 20th century have brought to offices the marvelous machines and timesavers of which we are all familiar. They have literally taken labor off the backs and out from under the fingers of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, and many others.

May I, at this point, pay tribute to these wonderful machines, and to the creative genius of the manufacturers who gave them to us.

Like many a GI stationed all over the world, I have seen the look of tragedy and suffering in the faces of our brothers and sisters in the Far East, staggering under backbreaking labor all their lives for want of the automatic servants which we in America take so much for granted.

I have seen the look of childlike wonder come into the eyes of an Indian bearer running his finger over the sharply honed edge of an American razor blade. I have seen a woman's finger caress a safety pin. I have found such booty as a sewing needle, a tube of tooth paste, a broken fountain pen, a can of milk, rolled up in a bit of dirty cloth and tucked away in a secret hiding place.

Friends, I repeat here something I have said many times before, that in the treasury of the Queen of Sheba, with its rare and priceless gems, its ivory, tapestries and cloth of gold, were not such riches as can be found today on a single counter of an American 5- and 10-cent store.

Let us think often of the genius behind the tools which have brought into practical being our American way of life. From the indispensible zipper to the powerful hydraulic presses which stamp out automobile bodies at a single blow, these are the servants of Americans. And we are fast introducing them to people all over the world or their comfort and their well-being, just as fast as they can be absorbed into their economies.

GOOD SECRETARIES ALWAYS IN DEMAND

Figures show that only about 15 percent of the offices in our country have accepted these mechanical timesavers.

But I submit, friends, that if and when every business establishment in our Nation has the means to buy every modern machine invented, they will not have engaged the heart and soul of the secretary, or that sixth sense by which she has grown into a citizen with specific and definite responsibilities.

The bell tolls today for secretaries everywhere. They no longer dare to look upon their profession as a source of livelihood only—necessary as that is to us all. The secretary can and must create the power to serve her fellowman and her country with more skill than ever before, and with more dedication of purpose.

Her services are demanded even beyond the boundaries of our country. I was told just this week how many women are needed today in our foreign service. They must of course have adequate education, and meet other standards, but first and foremost they must have an appreciation for the high significance of serving their country abroad. Many women in our foreign service have risen to posts of great importance due to the faithful application of the talents which they took to their posts.

The age is past when the secretary's share in our common heritage was insignificant. Ours is no more a society which excludes certain professions from full participation in duties and privileges.

AMERICA THE BASTION OF FREEDOM

America has accepted world leadership with all its costs and dangers. We have become the most prosperous and dynamic unit of production the human race has ever known.

We are a vast empire with an enormous reach into all the oceans, and with obligations and responsibilities on every continent.

But all around these continents of the Americas there is dreadful evidence of man's inhumanity to man. There are countries where oppression represents a threat to our own borders. In these countries men are not free but are deprived of those inalienable rights upon which our own way of life is based and which we take so much for granted.

Here in Youngstown you make steel. In many countries behind the Iron Curtain citizens peer out from behind prison cells of steel.

Recently Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in Washington: "Today a third of the world's population—800 million people—live in a nightmare world which has no counterpart in the world of reality."

And wasn't it Abraham Lincoln who expressed the conviction that the ideals of freedom contained in the Declaration of Independence should "give hope to all the world for all future time?"

Not only have those words of Lincoln not yet materialized, but our country is in a position today of having to defend its own freedoms.

Why are these freedoms in danger?

Because totalitarianism, which today enslaves 800 million people is trying to persuade these people that life in America under our constitutional process of government is worse than life in concentration camps.

If these 800 million people are persuaded to believe these pernicious lies, it may be very difficult to keep totalitarianism away from our borders.

VOICE OF AMERICA

America, therefore, is faced with the important problem of trying to get in touch with these people, to tell them the true story about our country and our way of life. We are not telling them that we are going to liberate them—let's be clear about that—nor are we trying to force our way of life upon them. But we are trying to explain that we truly mean it when we say that we want to live at peace with the entire world.

The Secretary then, like every citizen who loves his freedom, should solemnly consider the meaning of the activities of that agency of Government which we call the Voice of America. Its vast network of powerful transmitters is carrying America's message in 38 languages to the oppressed of the world.

Through this agency, as Mr. Dulles said, 800 million people of the world are receiving the only "gleam of truth, and perhaps the hope and courage to keep them alive."

It is possibly too early to tell what the true effectiveness of this costly program is. What we do know is that the best experts of Soviet Russia have put millions of dollars into the most modern jamming apparatus that can be contrived in an attempt to prevent the beams coming from America from reaching the ears of millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In a few minutes you will see a short film descriptive of the operation of this dynamic program.

May I say at this point that the United States Information Agency is today recruiting people—both men and women—for its staffs at home and abroad.

This Agency is not alone in needing able secretaries to fill the many vacant posts through Government. The point to remember is that special requirements are needed for each of them, and proper application should be made to the respective agencies. Congressional offices don't get you these jobs, but are happy to supply information as to how applications can be made.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS ALL

In conclusion, may I say that a more somber word of warning was never written in any age than that which we find inscribed on the beautiful Archives Building in Washington: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The challenges of the 20th century and the atomic age call for dedicated men and women to carry the burdens of high office.

One thing is sure. What the most insignificant citizen feels unable to do, his Congressman—perhaps even his President—may not be able to do. Because, ladies and gentlemen, the President, your Senators, and your Representatives in this free country of ours, are the people.

My appeal to secretaries then, is:

Be not just skilled and alert in carrying out the functions of our profession, but ready and eager to offer a higher service by understanding both our domestic and foreign policies.

Remember that no individual or no smallest private industry can exist today apart from those interests and responsibilities which are the lot of our Government to carry. And because we stand closer than ever to the bastions where a life-and-death struggle may be going on in defense of our freedom, it is indeed a moment of grave importance to us all.

When foreboding clouds threatened the beloved country of Abraham Lincoln in 1861, as he took leave of his friends in Springfield, he spoke certain words which have deep meaning, I believe, for America today.

I could not do better than to leave these immortal words with you:

"Without the assistance of that Divine Being, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN SECRETARY, NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL 23–30, AND NATIONAL SECRETARIES' DAY, APRIL 27

In keeping with the best traditions of their profession, secretaries throughout the United States are shouldering vital responsibilities. They are performing important roles in commerce, industry, and government, and are bringing to their positions a wider knowledge of world affairs and of the affairs of business than was considered a necessary part of their sphere in the past.

The American secretary is an integral part of the economy which has brought to the world the American way of life—free enterprise, freedom of choice, and the highest standards of living existing in today's troubled world.

To honor the secretaries already performing their duties with diligence; to pay tribute to those constantly striving to improve their skills and abilities better to equip themselves as a part of the management team; and to encourage others to enter this worthy profession, it is essential that rightful recognition be given.

Therefore, during this special week we should fully honor the first lady of business—the American secretary.

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.
LILYAN MILLER,
President, National Secretary Association.
SHELDON F. HALL,
President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute.

Confusing and Discouraging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if there is one policy of the Eisenhower administration which has received the united support of Republicans, as well as substantial support of Democrats, it is the effort to get the Government out of businesses which can be carried on by individuals or private organizations.

This because thinking individuals know that, inasmuch as Government depends upon tax dollars for its existence, every time the Government eliminates a business which pays taxes it lessens its ability to operate—or must replace the lost tax by additional levies.

In the 83d Congress, without opposition, the House passed a bill introduced by me, the purpose of which was to get the Government out of taxpaying businesses. It was late in the session, hence, the bill did not reach the floor of the Senate.

The administration, by Executive action, has been trying to get the Government out of civilian activities, but legislation is needed.

May 12, last, when the bill making appropriations of $31,488,206,000 for the Department of Defense came before the House, it carried a section which made it difficult for the administration to curtail Government operations. An amendment designed to further the administration's purpose to get the Government out of activities usually performed by taxpayers was first adopted by the House when in committee by a vote of 160 to 134, but, then on rollcall, was defeated by a vote of 102 to 184. Some Members for no apparent reason reversed their position.

INCONSISTENCY

When the amendment came on for a vote in committee, those who had supported a similar principle in the 83d Congress again consistently voted for it; but on the rollcall vote, many switched positions and voted against it.

Naturally, no Member attempts to tell another how he should vote but it certainly is surprising to see Members of Congress within an hour on as simple and sound a proposition as was this do an about face.

Perhaps one reason for a switch from a position designed to protect the taxpayers to one permitting the Government to engage in commercial activities was in part due to the fact that the Member had a Government enterprise in his District.

The vote not only found the leaders on the Republican side in opposite camps but it also found top-ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations on opposite sides.

DISCOURAGING

Here is the discouraging feature of that action. Everyone knows that, if the Federal Government is to transact the business normally carried on by taxpayers, whether it be production, transportation, merchandizing, or storage of any item, crowding the taxpayer out, ultimately it will destroy itself. Republicans missed the boat on this one. Reason—lack of vigilance, party organization, personal interest.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, turning aside for this hallowed moment from the violence and turbulence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. In Thy presence our faith is strengthened in the supremacy of ultimate decencies. In the silence we hear the ancient assurance: Be still, and know that I am God.

We pray that Thy cool hand may be laid upon our fretting natures and our fevered spirits. Make us quiet before Thee, quiet enough to see the paths our feet must tread, quiet enough to hear Thy voice, quiet enough to realize that in Thy will is our peace and that Thou wilt never leave us without guidance. Teach us by Thy lessons. Show us Thy purpose. Sober us by Thy chastisements, and make us the instruments of a durable peace as in this hour of crisis and tension we lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other puposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the task force of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until next Tuesday at noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and me-

morials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with statements made in connection therewith limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT CHAPLAIN AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF CERTAIN HOUSEHOLD GOODS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the Finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in the Smokemont Campground in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEASE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS FOR MINING PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the authority to lease for mining purposes allotted Indian lands owned by Indian heirs or devisees of allottees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT OF DEBTS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CAPT. WILLIAM S. AHALT ET AL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. William S. Ahalt, and others (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS, CALIFORNIA, AND THE OSAGE NATION OF INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of the claims of the *Morongo Band of Mission Indians of California, and the Osage Nation of Indians* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Whereas Alabama is predominately an agricultural State and the prosperity and welfare of the farmers is fundamental to the welfare of the whole State; and

"Whereas under the laws of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use his discretion in setting quotas for agricultural products and in determining what percentage of parity the various agricultural products shall have; and

"Whereas under this system the percent of parity allowed producers of many agricultural products has been greatly reduced to the detriment of Alabama farmers; and

"Whereas several acts are now pending in the United States Congress which will provide price supports for many agricultural products of 90 percent or more of parity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation which will guarantee price supports for basic agricultural products of at least 90 percent of parity; be it further

"Resolved, That each member of the Alabama delegation in Congress be commended for his support of legislation to provide a sound and fair program for promoting and developing agriculture throughout the Nation, and especially for his efforts to guarantee price supports to farmers; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of the senate to the clerk of each House of the United States Congress and a copy hereof be sent to each Member of the delegation in Congress from Alabama."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to include coffee under the parity payment program

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed numerous legislative measures assisting farmers in the production of specific agricultural commodities; and

"Whereas in order to encourage coffee growing in the Territory Federal support through programs authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is necessary: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to include coffee among the basic agricultural commodities assisted and supported by programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to authorize parity payments to coffee-growers in the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Delegate to the Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution requesting the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii to seek Federal aid in investigating the commercial uses for methods of destruction of lava beds

"Whereas large areas of the Territory of Hawaii, particularly on the island of Hawaii, have been and are from time to time covered by lava flows resulting from the eruption of volcanoes in the Territory; and

"Whereas serious economic loss has resulted from the destruction caused by such eruptions of lava and considerable areas have been rendered unusable for long periods of time as a result thereof; and

"Whereas any means of destroying flows or fields of solidified lava or making commercial use thereof or to scientifically disintegrate or facilitate the deterioration of lava beds so as to make them cultivable would be of great economic benefit to the Territory: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii is hereby requested to determine what agencies of the Federal Government are equipped for research and investigation of the uses of lava or destruction of lava fields and request that such research be afforded the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. The Delegate to Congress is further requested, in the event that such agencies are unable to proceed with such research, investigation, and assistance in the absence of an appropriation or appropriations, to request that the Congress of the United States make the necessary appropriation or appropriations therefor.

"SEC. 3. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 9th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to amend section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920

"Whereas the Hawaii Irrigation Authority, created by Act 245 of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, proposes to construct an irrigation and water utilization project upon the island of Molokai, designed primarily to serve and supply the lands of the Hawaiian Homes Commission on Molokai; and

"Whereas a portion of the funds necessary for the construction of said project have been appropriated by chapter 317 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, and additional funds will be required for the completion of said project, some of which funds may be sought from Congress; and

"Whereas said chapter 317 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, contemplates that the funds appropriated therein shall be spent in accordance with the provisions of said chapter, including the requirements that the same be repaid to the Territory of Hawaii out of charges made for water supplied from such system to said Hawaiian Homes Commission lands; and

"Whereas section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d), authorizes the commission to use, for the purpose of adequately irrigating any tract, Government-owned water upon the island of Molokai free of all charge; and

"Whereas to enable the constructon of said irrigation and water utilization system and the expenditure of the funds appropriated therefor by said chapter 317, an amendment to section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is required to allow charges to be made for water supplied from such system to said Hawaiian Homes Commission lands: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is, requested to enact legislation amending section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d)), so as to allow charges to be made for Government-owned water supplied to Hawaiian Homes Commission lands on the island of Molokai for irrigation purposes; and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to amend section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. That section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d)), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "Government-owned water upon the island of Molokai, and" appearing therein between the words "charge" and "Government-owned", and by deleting therefrom the words "any of the water upon the island of Molokai, and" appearing therein between the words "charge" and "any."

"'SEC. 2. Said section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920, is hereby further amended by adding a new paragraph thereto, to read as follows:

"'"Any funds which may be appropriated by Congress as a grant-in-aid for the construction of an irrigation and water utilization system on the island of Molokai designed to serve Hawaiian Homes Commission lands, and which are not required to be reimbursed to the Federal Government, shall be deemed to be payment in advance by the Hawaiian Homes Commission and lessees of the Hawaiian Homes Commission of charges to be made to them for the construction of such system and shall be credited against such charges when made."

"'SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, relating to provisions contained in patents, agreements, and leases

"Whereas it appears that many of the irrigation projects to be organized by the Hawaii Irrigation Authority will include large segments of public land; and

"Whereas in conjunction with said irrigation projects and in furtherance of the Government's program of homesteading and development of small-scale farming much of said public land will be sold for homesteads and farm lots pursuant to the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act; and

"Whereas to secure the success of said irrigation projects with the resultant benefits thereof to the homesteaders and others participating in said irrigation projects it is necessary to preclude the withdrawing of land from an irrigation project, to the detriment of others participating in the project, after the project has been formed; and

"Whereas the power of the commissioner of public lands to require the retention of lands in irrigation projects is not expressly stated in the Hawaiian Organic Act: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact legislation expressly granting authority to the commissioner of public lands to provide for the inclusion and retention in irrigation projects of public lands sold for homesteads and farm lots, and to that end the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. That section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph thereto:

"'"The Commissioner may include in any patent, agreement, or lease a condition requiring the inclusion of the land in any irrigation project formed or to be formed by the Territorial agency responsible therefor and making the land subject to assessments made or to be made for such irrigation project, which assessments shall be a first charge against the land. For failure to pay the assessments or other breach of the condition the land may be forfeited and sold pursuant to the provisions of this act, and, when sold, so much of the proceeds of sale as are necessary therefor may be used to pay any unpaid assessments."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. In the event the public lands in the Territory are returned to the sole jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii, the amendment of section 73, paragraph (i), of the Hawaiian Organic Act requested of the Congress in section 1 hereof shall become effective forthwith.

"SEC. 3. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 21

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress to enact legislation enabling Hawaii to be admitted to statehood

"Whereas Hawaii was annexed to the United States by agreement between the government of the people of Hawaii, which was then an independent Republic, and the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas under said agreement Hawaii was to become, and did become, an integral part of the United States; and

"Whereas in fulfillment of the terms of the Newlands resolution of annexation the Congress enacted the Hawaiian Organic Act, which constituted Hawaii an incorporated organized territory; and

"Whereas every incorporated organized territory in the history of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii, has invariably been granted statehood upon the successful completion of a reasonable period of pupilage; and

"Whereas inherent in the public acts under which Hawaii became an integral part of the United States and was created an incorporated organized territory; was the implied promise of ultimate statehood on an equal footing with the original States, upon the fulfillment of the traditional requirements for admission as a state established and followed in the admission of every previously incorporated organized territory; and

"Whereas this implied promise has been repeatedly acknowledged by the executive and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and by the Congress of the United States, especially in the reports of committees of the Congress duly adopted by the Congress relating to statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated their political maturity, their ability to govern themselves in accordance with the principles of representative government laid down by the United States Constitution, and their ability to maintain themselves as a sound economic unit; and have fully and unequivocably met every historic qualification for statehood; and

"Whereas in each Congress since 1946 Hawaii has moved ever closer to the attainment of its goal, to such effect that in the 83d Congress both the House of Representatives and the Senate enacted legislation for the admission of the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas title I of H. R. 2535 of the 84th Congress, as recommended to be amended by Report No. 88 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, constitutes a considered disposition of every matter involved in the admission of the new state; is the result of many years of study, hearings, and reconciliation of all points of view; and provides the proper framework for the admission of Hawaii to statehood: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation enabling Hawaii to be admitted to statehood, substantially in the form of title I of H. R. 2535, as recommended to be amended by Report No. 88 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

"SEC. 2. This legislature does hereby reaffirm the desire and will of the people of Hawaii that statehood be granted them, and does hereby reassert that fulfillment of the rights of the people of Hawaii calls for enactment of enabling legislation without further delay.

"SEC. 3. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker

of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the said Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact into law H. R. 588 entitled 'A bill to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II, or the Korean service period in combat, or from an instrumentality of war' introduced by Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress on January 5, 1955

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, in its devotion and loyalty to the United States of America, has given unselfishly of its men to the service of the Armed Forces of the United States of America during World War II and the Korean emergency; and

"Whereas the fortunes of war have seen fit to take the lives of many of these men who left their children behind them; and

"Whereas it is not only fitting, but proper, that we, whom they so loyally served and for whom they made the greatest of all sacrifices, effectuate some expression of our gratitude; and

"Whereas it is felt that such gratitude could be best expressed, among others, by providing opportunities for education and training to children whose education and training would otherwise be impeded or interrupted by reason of the death of their fathers as a direct result of their services in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for aiding such children in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of their fathers; and

"Whereas such a program would be of benefit to the children of these men of the Territory of Hawaii as well as of the Nation; and

"Whereas H. R. 588, should be enacted into law, best expresses the intent and purposes herein expressed: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact into law H. R. 588 entitled 'A bill to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in the line of duty during World War II, or the Korean service period in combat, or from an instrumentality of war' introduced by Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress on January 5, 1955.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 46

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to increase the immigration quotas applicable to the peoples of the Pacific and Asiatic areas

"Whereas the United States of America remains a symbol of liberty and a haven for the oppressed to the peoples of the East as well as those of the West; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by its enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, allotted immigration quotas for the nations in the Pacific and Asiatic areas; and

"Whereas these immigration quotas, although substantially more liberal than those of the past, still are not adequate to admit the many able persons in the Pacific and the Far East who wish to immigrate to our country and can contribute to the strength and prosperity of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to consider favorably the increasing of the annual immigration quotas applicable to the peoples of the Pacific and Asiatic areas, particularly those who are located in the area referred to as the Asia-Pacific triangle; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

KANSAS WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS — RESOLUTION OF COMMISSIONERS OF LAWRENCE, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the mayor and city commissioners of the city of Lawrence, Kans., which I have received from Mayor John P. Crown, petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the construction of projects as recommended and authorized by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the construction of projects as recommended and authorized by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas; and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought, but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

Whereas the Federal Government, through acts of Congress, has delegated to three agencies—namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture—the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation, pollution control, and soil conservation: Be it

Resolved by the Mayor and Commissioners of the City of Lawrence, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions necessary to assure continuous surveys and planning and the early completion of all recommended and authorized projects in the State of Kansas by the three agencies—namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk of the city of Lawrence be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to Mr. Emil Heck for transmittal to Senators SCHOEPPEL and CARLSON; Representative SCRIVNER; CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and Chairman RILEY, of the Missouri-Arkansas Basin Subcommittee.

JOHN P. CROWN,
Mayor.
H. C. FISHER,
City Clerk.

DEVELOPMENT OF DAM SITES BY PRIVATE UTILITIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., relating to the development of dam sites by private utilities.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it appears that the private utilities are attempting to scuttle plans for development of several of the great remaining all-purpose dam sites in the United States; and

Whereas it is our belief that these sites should be considered as natural resources belonging to all of the people of the country; and

Whereas it appears that development of these resources is vital to the defense and production capacity of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our national association be encouraged to vigorously campaign for the best possible development of these great natural resources, and that our Senators and Congressmen and the Secretary of the Interior be informed of the attitude of our group in this matter.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Post 1755, the American Legion, New York, N. Y., favoring a strong, permanent American merchant marine.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT, JR., POST 1755, THE AMERICAN LEGION, NEW YORK, N. Y., ON UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Whereas the American Legion has for over 35 years supported a strong, effective, and modern American merchant marine, and repeatedly urged the Congress of the United States to enact policies to develop and maintain such a merchant marine, including an effective program of officer training; and

Whereas there have been introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 595, H. R. 3088, H. R. 3318, and in the Senate S. 967, providing for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Post, No. 1775, urges the Congress of the United States to enact the aforesaid legislation, which will insure permanently for the American merchant marine the well-trained officers which it needs.

HUGH J. CASEY,
Major General, U. S. A. (Retired),
Post Commander.

INVESTIGATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to an investigation of the State Department concerning its administration of the Refugee Relief Act. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

Whereas the recent dismissal of a high official from the State Department of the United States has created throughout the country varied expressions of dissatisfaction in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make a complete and thorough investigation relative to the operation and administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by the State Department of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the presiding officer of both branches of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1955—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the West Texas-New Mexico Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1644) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF WEST TEXAS-NEW MEXICO CHAPTER, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Federal Construction Act of 1955, S. 1644, has been introduced and been read twice, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

Whereas it is the desire of the electrical industry to act in the interest of the public, to protect unjust expenditures of public funds, and help the public receive full value for their construction dollar; and

Whereas it is the earnest desire of the electrical industry to produce the most qualified mechanical work possible, and give recognition when quality is attained: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the West Texas-New Mexico Chapter NECA, go on record as favoring passage of the Federal Construction Act of 1955, and to convey this information to the committee and request a speedy passage of this bill.

GLENN O. BROWN,
President.
ATKIN COOK,
Board of Governors.
EDWARD STROUT,
Secretary-Manager.

RESOLUTIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a series of resolutions adopted at the 24th annual meeting of stockholders of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"DAIRY PROGRAM

"Whereas farm price-support programs have been developed for all major farm crops but dairy products; and

"Whereas the Farmers Union believes that dairy products are essential for the health and welfare of our increasing population; and

"Whereas the sale of dairy products constitutes the major farm income of the dairy States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the delegates of the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, go on record that dairy products be included as a basic commodity to be supported along the lines of the program adopted by the National Dairy Producers Conference held at Madison, Wis., on January 23, 1954.

"FAMILY FARM POLICY

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY, of Montana, entitled the "Family Farm Policy Act," which sets forth the family farmers bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we the delegates in attendance at this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange go on record in support of the principles of this legislation.

"FARM PROGRAM

"As a wholesale supply cooperative serving the needs of farmers in a six-State area, the Farmers Union Central Exchange performs a vital function in the overall Farmers Union movement.

"It has the endeavor and purpose in common with the other Farmers Union cooperatives and the National and State Farmers Union educational organizations to preserve the family-type farm for our United States of America, and to secure parity of income and living standards for farm families. This is not just a high-sounding phrase.

"The kind of farm program which individuals and organizations develop and support depends on their basic philosophy and purpose. Parity for farmers is not and should not be a matter of partisan politics, but politicians and political parties must be held accountable for their record.

"We condemn the 1954 Farm Act because it is in conflict with the goal and past accomplishments to achieve parity for agriculture. It seeks to regulate production by manipulating prices and to eliminate surpluses by eliminating farmers.

"When production control becomes necessary, it should be by democratic farmer participation in control programs, not by application of a protracted economic squeeze ending in bankruptcy and foreclosure.

"Our State Department has found in a number of foreign countries that monopoly and large-scale land ownership resulted in conditions favorable to Communist expansion. In order to prevent such expansion, our Government has assisted these countries in land reform programs to replace land monopoly with individual family-owned and operated farms. However, the leading proponent and architect of these land reforms for foreign farmers was dismissed by our Secretary of Agriculture as a security risk.

"And our present program for American farmers is leading toward, not away, from land monopoly.

"We recognize that farming operations must keep pace with modern technology and know-how. And that measures for so-called rural slum clearance are necessary. Such measures, however, are a supplement, not a substitute, for price supports. Those who say that we cannot achieve parity of income for farmers lack faith in our free-enterprise system and our democratic way of life.

"The present administration has promised to develop new farm programs to secure full parity for farm products, both storable and perishable. It has not yet succeeded in doing so, and until it does, we urge that the 1954 Farm Act be repealed and that the 90-percent supports under the old parity formula be restored for basic commodities; that acreage allotments and marketing quotas be utilized to achieve a better balance between supply and demand.

"RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

"The management of rural electric cooperatives by the farmers and rural people of the United States, has proven to be a success, by the repayment of loans, together with interest on schedule, or in advance, where ample wholesale power has been available at reasonable rates. In order to continue this most excellent record, and thereby also to more securely safeguard the interests of the United States Treasury in these REA loans, it becomes necessary:

"1. That an ample supply of power be available at all times;

"2. That the preference clause, as embodied in the Flood Control Act of 1944, be not discarded;

"3. That the Power Marketing Criteria of 1954 as announced by the Department of the Interior be better clarified; and

"4. That rates for electric energy from multipurpose dam installations be not increased above present rates. Especially is this true in the Missouri River Basin, where the feasibility of all REA loans was based on cheap hydroelectric power and where the load growth of these rural electric cooperatives has been such that they will be facing a critical power shortage within a couple of years.

"In order to alleviate this shortage of power and also to serve the best interests of all consumers of electric energy in the basin, public development of these installations must be continued until the maximum amount of firm power, which can be economically produced, has been reached.

"Since the maximum amount of firm power which could be produced can readily be sold at a much higher rate than dump power, giving a greater return to the Federal Treasury for the installations made in the basin, and since an abundance of fuel is available in the basin which, if developed, could produce an enormous amount of low-cost electric energy: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., February 28 through March 3, 1955, do recommend that the Congress of the United States authorize the construction of fuel-powered generating facilities in the Missouri Basin to firm up and support the hydrogenerating capacity of these installations; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the congressional delegations in the area served by the Farmers Union Central Exchange."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"RURAL TELEPHONE

"We favor expansion of rural telephone service and urge the Congress of the United States to provide funds for an adequate rural telephone loan program.

"NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

"Through the development of our natural resources, many benefits have been brought to the people of the United States, such as the generation of electric power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, recreation, and wildlife and soil conservation. These hydroelectric generating facilities have brought to our people, through the rural electric cooperatives, electric power that would otherwise have never been available. Therefore we recommend that the Congress of the United States continue to appropriate funds for the development of such other natural power resources of this country, including Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho and the power and navigation development of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with Canada."

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"PUBLIC POWER AND PRIVATE UTILITIES

"Whereas the present policy of the administration in regard to private utilities and power development is:

"1. To turn over to private utilities much of the Nation's public power construction and output, contrary to customary and legally established preference policies.

"2. To permit a type of power construction by private utilities which will bring about the creeping destruction of multipurpose river development.

"3. To compel electric cooperatives through so-called partnership agreements to consent to the expansion of private power while public power projects are being halted.

"4. To subsidize private utilities by guaranteed profits and by various devices such as are contained in the Dixon-Yates contract: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., on February 28 through March 3 do hereby go on record as fully endorsing the valiant efforts of the State and National Farmers Union leadership to block the private power policies of the present administration."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

"Whereas the administration has seen fit to promote a contract authorizing the private power combine, Dixon-Yates, to provide electric power to TVA for use by Atomic Energy Commission; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower ordered this contract signed over the disapproval of both the Chairman of TVA, and the Chairman of AEC; and

"Whereas the Dixon-Yates group was awarded the contract in spite of lower bids from other private groups, and in spite of the fact that TVA maintains that it could build steam generators and transmit electricity to AEC at a lower cost than private utilities; and

"Whereas the administration has refused to present all facts to answer the charges of preferential treatment: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That inasmuch as the administration's conduct in the Dixon-Yates case raised many unanswered questions and inasmuch as there are no apparent reasons justifying such a power contract, the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, do hereby go on record calling upon Congress to conduct a thorough investigation of the Dixon-Yates controversy by the proper investigating committee."

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1955—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes—the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1955—and I submit a report (No. 350) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as reported, show the names of the additional sponsors who have requested that their names be included with those of the author of the bill. The sponsors are the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator fom Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that permission be given to members of the committee who may have differing views to present their views at the proper time, which I believe will be at the end of next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORTS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Originally, this concurrent resolution called for the reprinting of 2,500 additional copies of 14 hearings held before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and 3,000 additional copies of three reports made to the Senate on the same subject.

As amended by the Committee on Rules and Administration, however, the authorization to print the hearings has been stricken and the concurrent resolution now calls for the reprinting of the reports only.

The estimated cost of printing these reports will be $1,592.29. The cost to reprint the reports and the hearings would have totaled $19,348.28.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not like to object to the Senator's request, but at the moment I must object, until I have had an opportunity to discuss the subject. I believe that, after consultation between the majority leader and the minority leader, consideration of the concurrent resolution can be obtained during the afternoon. I object to its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and there is no objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain

hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, on May 2, 1955, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "Judiciary," to strike out "not more than 2,500 additional copies each of 14 hearings held before a subcommittee of the said committee, and", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 3,000 additional copies each of three reports of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), as amended, was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (by request):

S. 1960. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water-carrier certificates and permits under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1961. A bill to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1962. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Medina, of Alcalde, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 1963. A bill to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood-control projects by local interests; and

S. 1964. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, as amended, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters so as to change the method by which the apportionment of total cost is made; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 1965. A bill to repeal a particular contractual requirement with respect to the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1967. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1968. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1969. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax on electric flatirons and electric ironers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BARKLEY):

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Kim Boksoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1971. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ritchie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1972. A bill for the relief of William Theodore and Emily Sansur Saad; and

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of Toufic N. Jildeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Rosa Birger; and

S. 1975. A bill for the relief of Jenny Antoinette V. Ingrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1976. A bill to authorize the payment by the Government of medical expenses of persons contracting poliomyelitis subsequent to receiving vaccinations for the prevention of that disease; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1977. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Congressional Medal of Honor to John C. Reynolds; and

S. 1978. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to John C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Helene Schlegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1980. A bill to amend section 708 of Public Law 690 of the 83d Congress, 2d session (the Agriculture Act of 1954); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONDEMNATION OF DISREGARD BY SOVIET UNION OF PLEDGES TOWARD LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Soviet Union has completely extinguished the freedom and independence which were achieved for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia at the end of World War I by the vigorous efforts on the part of the United States; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has forcibly incorporated the territory of these nations into the Soviety Union in clear violation of the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its condemnation of the willful disregard by the Soviet Union of its pledges, fundamental human rights, and the principle of self-determination, and requests the President to use every peaceful means at the disposal by reason of his office to keep these violations constantly before the attention of all the world.

PROPOSED WORK HOURS ACT OF 1955—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 25, 1955, I introduced a bill (S. 1204) to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to amend the so-called 8-hour laws.

The cosponsors of the bill are the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I now ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be added to the list of cosponsors, and I also ask that his name be added at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENTS OF SENATORS ON 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 42)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements made by Members of the Senate on the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES., ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Addresses on American foreign policy delivered by him on May 12, 1955, before convention of Tax Executives Institute, Inc., in New York City.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Scrap Export Impasse Seen Aiding Russia," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Wednesday, April 13, 1953.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF SANTOS BUXO, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico, for a term of 4 years, vice Donald A. Draughon, term expired, to file with the committee in writing on or before Friday, May 20, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. HERLANDS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Edward A. Conger, retired, to file with the committee in writing on or before Friday, May 20, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HOWARD F. VULTEE TO BE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to say that the Senate received today the nomination of Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations, vice Webster Bray Todd, resigned. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the seventh anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel, which will take place tomorrow, the 14th of May. It is appropriate for this occasion to recall the gallant deeds, in the face of untold hardship and adversity, which brought to fruition the establishment of this democratic nation. At the same time, I am proud to pay tribute to the great achievements of the people of Israel during the past 7 years.

It is indeed unfortunate that strife and struggle have not yet been eliminated in the Middle East, an area so important to the future welfare of the free world. It devolves upon the United States to continue every effort, through the State Department and through the United Nations, to seek the establishment of a peaceful settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

On this anniversary, I am pleased to join in reaffirming the strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Israel, and to express every belief in the future progress and accomplishment of the newest democracy in the Middle East.

POWER FROM HOOVER DAM TO BE REDUCED BY 30 PERCENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the debate on the upper Colorado River storage legislation, I urged that it constituted a hazard to the water rights of the people of California. Now comes a news story from Boulder City, Nev., which reads as follows:

A 30-percent reduction in power commitments from generating facilities at Lake Mead is expected to be announced here tomorrow by the Bureau of Reclamation because of the falling level of the lake.

Wade Taylor, acting regional director, said the Bureau's action would be based on a semiofficial survey of water storage behind Hoover Dam. Letters will be sent to power company customers in Nevada, Arizona, and California notifying then that only 70 percent of the normal power load will be available after June 1, Taylor said.

Power contracts for the new fiscal year will be signed June 1. Last year contracts called for a 15-percent cutback in power commitments.

Southern California Edison Co. and the Los Angeles Water & Power Department buy power from Federal generating facilities, but both have other generating facilities.

The lake level has reached its lowest point since the dam was built more than 20 years ago.

I read that into the RECORD, Mr. President, because I want to indicate to my colleagues that I did not speak in jest, or lightly, during the recent debate on S. 500.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S CANDIDACY IN THE 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of this morning, Friday, May 13, I noted in the column of Mr. Arthur Krock, a good friend of mine and a distinguished columnist, a statement which I wish to correct immediately. In discussing the possibility of President Eisenhower running again in 1956, Mr. Krock said:

But this was before Senator SMITH of New Jersey stressed his belief that the President's abiding hope is for retirement at the end of his term; Senator SMITH of Maine urged the Republicans to be prepared with the best vote getter after Eisenhower, and Roy A. Roberts predicted that only the unmistakable call of duty will induce the President to run for a second term—all in 1 day's span. To politicians the meaning of this is, "They know something."

It was last January that I made the statement to a meeting of our New Jersey Republicans that, in my judgment, President Eisenhower would run again and would be reelected, and that I would do all in my power between now and the national convention to aid in developing a New Jersey delegation to the convention in San Francisco unanimously pledged to his renomination and to his reelection.

The reaction in New Jersey to my statement was spontaneous and overwhelming, and was reechoed by others. The result has been that all 21 Republican county committees in the State have unanimously adopted and forwarded resolutions to the White House indicating support of President Eisenhower as the Republican candidate in 1956.

It is my firm belief that the President will run again and will win. The constructive program which he has offered the country not only on the homefront, but especially in our foreign relations, makes his continued leadership in the years ahead vitally important.

The people of the United States will follow his leadership in 1956, as they did in 1952, and I am confident that he will be reelected next year by a majority as large as that he received 3 years ago.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. President, all of us are rejoicing over the news today that the Austrian treaty is about to be signed, if it has not already been signed. Its signing constitutes another tribute to the great ability of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. At this time I shall not elaborate on that point; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Dulles' Accomplishments Prove the Value of His Travels," which was published this morning in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES' ACCOMPLISHMENTS PROVE VALUE OF HIS TRAVELS

(By David Lawrence)

PARIS, May 12.—There is something very impressive and of incalculable value about the new-fashioned diplomacy which brings the Secretary of State of the United States to Paris for informal talks with the foreign ministers of France and Great Britain, as well as with the top men of other countries that comprise the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Critics may say the head of the State Department should not travel around but it is difficult to imagine how any progress could be made any other way in solving present-day problems among the allies.

Unfortunately, lots of mischievous rumors and some distorted reports reach back home to the parliaments and to the American Congress. It is not always easy to overcome the handicaps that interference, even by American legislators, sometimes brings. But if the Members of Congress who are so reckless with their comments on world affairs, especially the carping critics among the Democrats, could attend a press conference held here by the Secretary of State, they would come to realize how delicate and complicated are most of the questions tackled by the foreign ministers.

THE INDOCHINA PROBLEM

This last week has seen many important conferences, but they are not unlike several meetings held here before. They are all significant. The modern way is for the top representatives of the allies to sit down together and thresh out their differences behind closed doors. They talk frankly and at times heatedly, but they come out of it as a rule with a clear understanding of the viewpoint of their respective countries.

Perhaps the most ticklish of all the questions this week was the problem of Indochina. Neither the French nor the American Government could afford to place itself in the position of trying to settle the internal affairs of South Viet-Nam, as this would only intensify Communist propaganda there. But certain parallel or common policies were agreed upon which may help to bring stability to the situation in the southern part of Indochina. For, although the desire is to see some form of democratic government chosen, it is not easy to establish at once an electoral machinery such as exists in a European parliamentary system. But out of the turbulence of these last few weeks may come a representative system for South Viet-Nam, and that is the objective now.

Despite the newspaper reports about a grave crisis in the relations between France and the United States over the Indochina question, it is a fact that both Governments recognized all along how important it is to reach an understanding and not to allow the Indochina dispute to impair their working arrangements on many other questions of far greater importance to both.

The American people can rest assured that Secretary Dulles handled himself very creditably here. Notwithstanding some garbled impressions that came to certain Senators, there was no mistake made here by Mr. Dulles in talking firmly where firmness was necessary. Those who heard his reply, for example, in the North Atlantic council meeting to Foreign Secretary Spaak, of Belgium, on the Formosa question said it was an excellent rebuttal to a statement that completely misconstrued the American position.

NOT STAMPEDED

Nor is Mr. Dulles stampeded or pushed around by the Soviet tactics. He was clear-cut in his announcement here that he wouldn't go to Vienna until the Austrian treaty provisions had been finally set down on paper ready for signing. He is equally determined not to become involved in a protracted discussion in Vienna about the details of the forthcoming four-power conference.

There is a restraint and a forbearance about Mr. Dulles' manner in these top-level negotiations, and at the same time such an earnest reflection by him of the truly American viewpoint in international affairs that the American people can well be proud of their itinerant Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to say to my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that I believe in optimism, and I wish to congratulate him on being optimistic. However, there are several ways of getting retired, and one of them is to be defeated for office. Sometimes when one runs for office, the people themselves do the retiring.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in reply, I still stand on the statement I made a few moments ago.

THE SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR DISARMAMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 11, the Soviet Union proposed three United Nations resolutions in order to retain the initiative in carrying out the Soviet's long-term policies.

I believe that when the veneer of propaganda is removed, and when the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and to obstruct, rather than to clarify and expedite, is taken into consideration, it will be found that the Soviet proposal is a fraud.

The Soviets' so-called disarmament proposal would, first, destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world, as related to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world in the way that they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information as the press, radio, speech, and public discussion, of course they have nothing to lose by having their proposal adopted.

Second, the Communists claim a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements, both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea, there is still a divided country, despite the pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that Korea would be united and free. In the case of Viet-Nam, the Geneva conference turned over half the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a "successful" conference.

Even today, Mr. President, as we are meeting here, the city of Haiphong is, under the terms of the Geneva conference, being turned over to the Communists. An estimated 1 million free Vietnamese tried to get out of northern Viet-Nam prior to the delivery of Haiphong to the Communists, but were obstructed from doing so. Many of them are of the Catholic faith. They were obstructed by the Communists; and the latest press reports indicate that the Communist forces of Ho Chi Minh have now demanded that all citizens of Haiphong who cooperated in any way with the free world or with the French or with the United States, immediately turn themselves in at the various police stations.

Third, the Soviet proposals provide for the immediate withdrawal of the United States forces in Germany across the Atlantic Ocean, to the United States, a distance of approximately 3,600 miles, whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement—and if the Soviets do live up to it, it will be the first time in a quarter of a century the Soviets have done so—their forces would be only approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would also contemplate, at first, at least, two Germanys—in the same way that Korea and Viet-Nam are now divided—each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the Western NATO Defense Alliance.

Fourth, our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a requisite for discontinuing the arms race. We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

Fifth, our industrial and scientific atomic know-how would be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

Sixth, the Communist proposal would, in my judgment, ultimately lead to yielding to the Chinese Communists' demand for Quemoy, the Matsus, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, and the removal of the provocative 7th Fleet from the Far East—all of which contribute, in Communist eyes, to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

Seventh, the Communists' proposal would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

Eighth, under the Communist proposal, all the above-mentioned steps would be taken prior to getting down to the problem of an effective disarmament, with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations "agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954." That is what Mr. Malik has proposed.

Mr. President, since the free world's forces as of that date are known, and since the Communists' forces are not known, such a proposal would establish as the starting point for future moves a topheavy Communist base. In the free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations are subject to debate and vote in Parliament and Congress and can now be readily checked. In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely upon the Communists' "official figures" 1 month after the convention became effective.

Furthermore, unless and until Communist China becomes a "permanent member of the Security Council," the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Mr. President, since, without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon, Communist power could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of it would work to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5, wherein it is stated that "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces, the states assume a a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

Mr. President, in the first phase of 1956, according to the Soviet proposal, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad, and are to return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic Ocean and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific Ocean, whereas the Soviet Union would pull back 600 miles, at the most.

Under the Soviet proposals, the production of all atomic weapons would

cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities is known, whereas the location of the Soviet installations is not known, and since no adequate inspection system is provided for, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

Mr. President, the second Assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals by the Government of the United States in the atomic and conventional weapon field are still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then provides for a limited type of inspection and control, similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since that system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, and under it the Chinese Communist and the North Korean forces have been able to add to their supply of war materials and build bases and bring in MIG fighter planes, all in contravention of the terms of the Korean armistice, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now proposes, in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection, an arrangement following the Korean armistice pattern.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the three resolutions proposed by Mr. Malik.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 12, 1955]

TEXT OF PEACE PROPOSAL OFFERED BY SOVIET UNION TO THE U. N.

FIRST ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

The General Assembly, aware of the great responsibility which rests with the United Nations for the maintenance of peace among the nations, deems it its duty to draw the attention of all states to the situation that is developing now in the relations between countries.

The peoples who but recently lived through the Second World War, which took a huge toll of human lives and wrought immense material destruction, are more than ever before displaying a firm will for peace.

This deep-rooted desire of the peoples for peace has already made it possible to end the bloodshed in Korea and in Indochina and thereby create more favorable conditions for the settlement of other outstanding international issues.

At the same time the peoples are displaying legitimate concern for the destinies of the world, especially in view of the situation that is developing in Europe and in Asia.

This has been expressed specifically in the decisions of the recent Asian-African conference at Bandung, which is of great importance in the struggle for peace, for the freedom and independence of the nation.

The situation in certain areas of the world, far from improving, on the contrary is becoming complicated and mutual distrust among states is growing.

The absence of the necessary trust in relations between countries is the main cause hampering an adjustment of outstanding issues both in Europe and in Asia.

This above all applies to relations between the great powers, which bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of general peace and the security of the nations.

Cooperation found lacking

Notwithstanding the obligations assumed by the great powers, together with other states members of the United Nations, to cooperate in the maintenance of peace and international security, the relations between them do not conform with these requirements.

Distrust in relations between the powers has brought about a situation in which, after the end of the Second World War, a threat of another war has arisen, a war still more horrible for its consequences.

As a result of this distrust, first and foremost in relations between the powers which are permanent members of the Security Council, the arms race is expanding all the time, the armies, navies, and air forces are being increased continuously.

The greatest achievements of science and engineering are utilized for the production of the most destructive means of annihilation of people.

Especially large is the scale of the arms race in the manufacture of such dangerous weapons as the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

Numerous foreign military bases are being set up on foreign territories, which aroused the legitimate apprehensions of the states in whose proximity these bases are being established. The establishment of such bases also increases the threat to the security of the states on whose territories they are being set up.

The existence of such bases, many of which are used for the atomic-war preparations conducted by certain powers, still more increases distrust in the relations between states and aggravates international tension.

Cold war cited

The result of all this is that the world has for many years been in the state of so-called cold war, while the burden of the military preparation of states is weighing down the peoples more heavily.

Notwithstanding the resolutions of the General Assembly, unanimously adopted as early as 1947, which condemned any form of propaganda designed or capable of creating or increasing a threat to peace, a breach of peace, or an act of aggression, open propaganda of another war is conducted in a number of states.

Calls for war, far from having been discontinued, are becoming more and more frequent in the press, over the radio, and in public statements. Moreover, calls for atomic war have become especially frequent of late.

The traditional economic and trade relations between many countries, which developed in the course of many years, have been deranged, with all the attendant negative consequences for international economic cooperation.

The situation which has arisen demands that urgent and effective measures be taken to ease international tension and to consolidate mutual trust in relations between states.

This object can be achieved only if the cold war is discontinued, if an end is put to the propaganda of another war conducted in certain countries and accompanied by the fomenting of enmity and hatred between nations and the setting of some peoples against other peoples.

Continuation of the propaganda which is being conducted in certain countries and is designed to whip up the war hysteria and calls for war can only aggravate international tension and heighten mutual distrust between states and thereby increase the threat of another world war.

On the other hand, discontinuation of the cold war between states could help to ease international tension, establish the necessary trust in international relations, avert the threat of another war, and create the conditions for a life of peace and tranquillity for the nations.

This, in turn, would create the requisites for the carrying out of a broad disarmament program and the institution of the necessary international control over the implementation of this program.

For these purposes the General Assembly:

1. Recommends to all states to take the necessary measures for the strict implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly condemning any form of propaganda of a new war, for the discontinuation of all calls for war and for fomenting enmity among the nations voiced in the press, over the radio, in the cinema, and in public statements.

Noncompliance with this recommendation will be regarded as a violation by a state of its international duty and its obligation before the United Nations—to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force, not to violate the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

2. Notes with satisfaction the successes achieved in the negotiations on the Korean question between the states concerned, which brought about the end of the war in Korea, and also on the cessation of hostilities in Indochina. Thereby two dangerous seats of war in the Far East have been eliminated.

As a result of the negotiations between the states concerned it has become possible to settle also the question of concluding a state treaty with Austria, which insured the restoration of an independent Austria.

The settlement of the Austrian question represents another important contribution to the strengthening of peace in Europe and helps to create conditions for the successful adjustment of other outstanding postwar issues.

All this shows that by far not all the possibilities have been utilized for settling outstanding international questions through negotiations between the powers in the interests of peace, freedom, and the national independence of the peoples.

3. Holds that relaxation of international tension and establishment of the necessary talks between countries would be promoted by the immediate withdrawal by the four powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Britain, and France—of their occupation forces from the territory of Germany to their national frontiers, except strictly limited contingents of troops left temporarily on the territory of Germany pending the conclusion of an agreement on their full withdrawal.

These aims would also be facilitated by the establishment of strictly limited contingents of local police forces in both parts of Germany and the institution of joint controls by the four powers over the implementation of the restrictive agreement.

The General Assembly will welcome any other steps as may be taken by the four powers to withdraw their forces from the territory of Germany and also to facilitate a settlement of the German problem in the interests of European security and the national unification of Germany as an integral, peaceable, and democratic state.

4. Deems it necessary that the states which are permanent members of the Security Council reach agreement on the dismantling of military bases on foreign territories and inform the Security Council and the General Assembly of the results. Such an agreement would be of great importance for reducing international tension, removing distrust in international relations, and would facilitate the creation of the requisites for discontinuing the arms race.

5. Calls on the states which have experience in the production of atomic materials and atomic energy to render extensive production and scientific technical assistance to other countries in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, without making such assistance conditional upon any demands of a political or military nature.

6. Calls on the countries concerned to settle outstanding questions in the Far East in conformity with the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity as the existing tense

situation in certain areas of the Far East is fraught with the danger of another war and gravely menaces the maintenance of world peace.

7. Considers it necessary that states in their economic relations eliminate every discrimination which hampers the development of broad economic cooperation between them, first of all in the field of trade.

Both private and state interests are prejudiced by the situation when trade ties between countries which have existed for a long time are severed.

The elimination of such discrimination and the broad development of international ties, based on the principle of mutual advantage will strengthen friendly relations between countries and help raise the living standards of the peoples.

Without the elimination of these obstacles to the development of international trade it is impossible to expect real relief of international tension.

An important means for improving mutual understanding and bringing the peoples closer together is also the expansion of international cultural relations, specifically through the broad exchange of delegations and mutual visits by people engaged in industry, agriculture, trade, science, culture and the arts, delegations of students, and through the development of tourist travel.

8. Decides to include in the agenda of its regular session the question of compliance by states with the provisions of the present declaration, having in view that their implementation will conform to the desire of the peoples for peace, will facilitate the establishment of necessary trust between states and thereby will make it easier to carry out a broad disarmament program and to establish effective international control over the fulfillment of this program.

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Regarding the conclusion of an international convention on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons:

The Security Council, striving to save mankind from another devastating war, to ease tension in relations between states, relieve the peoples from the heavy tax burdens they are bearing as the result of the continuing arms race.

Desiring of insuring the possibility of using the released resources to raise the living standard of the peoples and to render extensive assistance to the economically underdeveloped countries.

Instructs the United Nations Disarmament Commission to draw up and submit for approval in the Security Council a draft of an International Convention on Reduction of Armaments and Prohibition of Atomic, Hydrogen and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Such a convention, aimed at strengthening peace and international security, should envisage:

A. Complete prohibition of the use and manufacture of both nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction and the employment of the existing stocks of nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes;

B. Substantial reduction of all armed forces and all conventional armaments;

C. Establishment of a control agency with the right, powers and functions guaranteeing in relation to all states equally effective observance of the agreed prohibitions and reductions.

In conformity with this, the convention should contain the following basic principles pertaining to measures for reduction of conventional national armaments:

Prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction and the procedure for the implementation of these measures during two periods.

First-period measures to be carried out during 1956

The following measures shall be carried out during 1956:

1. The state signatories to the convention undertake, as the first step toward reduction of armaments and armed forces, not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954.

They also undertake not to increase their appropriations for the armed forces and armaments, including atomic weapons above the level of the expenses made for these purposes during the year which ended on September 31, 1954.

The aforesaid measures shall be carried out within 2 months after the corresponding agreement enters into force.

The United States, the U. S. S. R., China, Britain, and France shall submit to the Disarmament Commission, within 1 month after the convention enters into force, full official figures regarding their armed forces, conventional armaments, and expenditures for military needs.

2. An agreed level is fixed for which the armed forces of all states exceeding this level shall be reduced so that no state should possess armed forces which might present a serious threat to international peace.

The armed forces of the United States, the U. S. S. R., China, Britain, and France shall be reduced substantially. To this end the aforementioned five powers undertake to reduce the numerical strength of their armed forces so that they should not exceed the following levels:

The United States: From 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men.

The U. S. S. R.: From 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men.

China: From 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men.

Britain: 650,000 men.

France: 650,000 men.

The five powers undertake to reduce correspondingly their conventional armaments as well.

The aforesaid 5 powers reduce within 1 year their armed forces and armaments to the extent of 50 percent of the difference between the level of their armed forces and armaments on December 31, 1954, and the reduced levels of the armed forces and armaments of each of these states, fixed according to the obligations assumed by each state, as outlined above.

The appropriations of the states for the forces and conventional armaments are reduced accordingly.

3. To convene not later than during the first half of 1956 a world conference for general reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons, with the participation of state members of the United Nations and states which are not members of the United Nations with the object of determining the reduction of armaments and armed forces by other states and prohibition of atomic weapons.

That strength of the armed forces the other states will be allowed to maintain shall be in all cases considerably lower than the levels fixed for the five permanent members of the Security Council.

In fixing the reduction of armaments by states, including the permanent members of the Security Council, a count should be taken of simple agreed criteria, including demographic, geographic, economic, and political factors, having in view the strengthening of general peace and international security and the lessening of the threat of aggression.

4. As one of the first measures in carrying out the program of reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons, the states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons undertake to discontinue the tests of these weapons.

An international commission shall be established for supervising the fulfillment of the aforesaid obligation by the states, and it shall submit reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly.

5. Simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of the armaments and the armed forces of the five powers by the first 50 percent of the agreed reduction to the established levels, the states, prior to the entry into force of the agreement on the complete prohibition of the atomic weapons, assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons which they consider as prohibited for themselves.

Exceptions from this rule may be allowed for purposes of defense against aggression when an appropriate decision is taken by the Security Council.

6. The states possessing military, naval, and airbases on the territories of other countries undertake to dismantle these bases.

The question as to what bases are to be dismantled during the first period should be additionally agreed upon.

The implementation of these measures should consolidate the necessary trust between states and make it easier to carry out the measures for reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons envisaged for the second period.

Second-period measures to be carried out during 1957

The following measures shall be carried out during 1957:

1. The production of atomic and hydrogen weapons shall be stopped immediately and national budget appropriations for military needs shall be cut correspondingly.

2. The United States, the U. S. S. R., China, Britain, and France shall reduce during the year their armed forces and armaments by the remaining 50 percent of the difference between the levels of the armed forces and armaments of each of the aforesaid five states on December 31, 1954, and the reduced levels of the armed forces and armaments of each of these states, fixed according to the obligations assumed by them under the convention.

These states shall reduce correspondingly their appropriations for the armed forces and conventional armaments.

Measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces of other states in the amounts fixed for them at the world conference are also completed during this period.

3. After the armed forces and conventional armaments are reduced by 75 percent of the total reduction envisaged by the convention even for defense, complete prohibition of the use of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass destruction will enter into force. Removal of these weapons from national armaments and their destruction, reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments by the remaining 25 percent of the agreed reduction shall begin simultaneously.

Both these processes shall be completed within definite time limits in 1957. All atomic material will then be used solely for peaceful purposes.

The states shall undertake to promote broad international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This cooperation will also cover the free exchange of information on the employment of atomic energy in industry, agriculture, medicine, and other fields of economy and science. Special attention should be given to the rendering of assistance to economically underdeveloped countries.

Such assistance should not be made conditional upon any demands of a political or military nature.

The states shall strive to devote part of the savings resulting from disarmament on a world scale and the removal of nuclear weapons to the broad utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

4. Measures for dismantling all foreign military naval and air bases on the territories of other states shall be completed.

Upon the carrying out of all the aforementioned it is desirable that the powers further reduce the armaments and armed forces to levels absolutely essential for the maintenance of internal security and the fulfillment of their obligations under the United Nations Charter.

The question of the obligations of China, as one of the permanent members of the Security Council following from the convention on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass destruction, should be examined with the participation of the People's Republic of China.

SECOND ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

Regarding international control over reduction of armaments and prohibitions of atomic weapons:

Recognizing the great importance of and the need for instituting effective international control over the fulfillment by States of their obligations under the convention on reduction of armaments and armed forces and prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons,

The General Assembly notes that at present the necessary conditions are lacking for the institution of such control as would enjoy the trust of all states and would fully conform to the requirements of international security.

It is impossible to ignore the fact that at present there is considerable international tension and distrust in relations between states. This is what explains the fact that in the existing situation of distrust between states all kinds of obstacles are raised, even to the mutual exchange of industrial, agricultural, scientific, cultural, and other delegations.

Such a situation makes difficult the reaching of agreement regarding the admission by states to their enterprises, particularly those engaged in war production, of foreign controllers who could inspect the enterprises.

In the existing situation, when many states display legitimate concern for their security, it is difficult to expect that these states would trustfully give other states access to their industrial and other resources which are of vital importance for their security.

Inasmuch as the necessary trust between states is now lacking, a situation may arise in which the adoption of a decision of international control will actually be reduced to a mere formality failing to achieve the purpose.

This is all the more inadmissible because in the present situation the greatest apprehensions of the peace-loving peoples are aroused by the existence of atomic and hydrogen weapons as regards which the institution of international control is especially difficult.

This danger follows from the very nature of atomic production. It is well known that the production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes can be utilized for the accumulation of stocks of explosive atomic materials and, moreover, in ever greater quantities.

This means that states having enterprises for the production of atomic energy are able, in violation of their respective agreements, to accumulate big quantities of explosive material for the production of atomic weapons.

The danger of such a situation becomes still more understandable if account is taken of the fact that, given the corresponding quantities of explosive atomic materials, the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen bombs as such is a matter fully feasible technically and can be organized on a wide scale.

Thus there are possibilities beyond the reach of international control for circumventing this control and organizing the secret manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons, even if there is a formal agreement on international control.

Under such a situation the security of the state signatories to the international convention cannot be guaranteed insofar as the possibility would be open for the potential aggressor to stockpile atomic and hydrogen weapons for sudden atomic attack on peace-loving states.

Any agreement on the institution of international control, so far as there is no atmosphere of peace, can only lull the vigilance of the peoples.

It can create a false sense of security while in reality there will be the danger of manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons and hence the danger of a sudden attack and the unleashing of atomic war with all its horrible consequences for the peoples.

Account must also be taken of the fact that preparation for another war, the danger of which has been greatly aggravated by the emergence of atomic and hydrogen weapons, is inescapably associated with the need to concentrate at definite points large military formations with big quantities of conventional armaments: aircraft, guns, tanks, naval vessels and so forth.

Such a concentration of big contingents of ground armed forces, the Navy and Air Force and their transfer can be effected only through big junctions, ports and airfields. With the present military techniques the significance of such points for preparing aggressive war, far from declining, on the contrary rises.

In the event of a war breaking out, besides atomic and hydrogen weapons, for all their destructive power, armies of many millions and huge quantities of conventional armaments which are of decisive significance for the outcome of any big war would inevitably be drawn into military operation.

All this must be taken into account in deciding the question of instituting international control over the fulfillment by states of their obligation under the Convention on Reduction of Armaments and Prohibition of Atomic Weapons.

The question of establishment of international control and the rights and powers of the international control agency must thus be examined in close connection with the implementation of the aforesaid measures for reduction of international tension, consolidation of trust between states, and the carrying out of other measures as regards the reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

Proceeding from the above, the General Assembly constitutes an international control agency with the following rights and powers:

1. For the first period of carrying out the measures for reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons:

A. With the object of preventing sudden attack by one state on another state, the international control agency shall set up on the territories of all the respective states along reciprocal lines control posts in big ports, railway junctions, motor roads, and airdromes.

The task of these posts shall be to watch that there should be no dangerous concentrations of ground forces or of air and naval forces.

B. The international control agency shall have the right to demand from the states the necessary information on the implementation of the measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces.

C. The control agency shall have unhindered access to materials pertaining to national budget appropriations for military needs, including all decisions of legislative and executive bodies of states on this question.

The states shall submit periodically within the fixed dates information to the control agency on the implementation of the measures envisaged by the convention.

2. For the second period of implementing the measures on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons:

The implementation of measures envisaged in the above-mentioned declaration and of the measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces and for prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons envisaged for the first period will create the necessary atmosphere of trust between the states.

Thereby the appropriate conditions for extending the functions of the international control agency will be insured.

In these conditions the international control agency shall have the following rights and powers:

A. To exercise control, including inspection, on a permanent basis, on the scale necessary to insure the implementation of the above convention by all the states. The international control agency shall exercise these functions, enjoying also the right to demand from states the necessary information on the carrying out of measures for reduction of armament and armed forces.

Inspection shall be carried out by personnel selected on an international basis.

B. To have permanently in all countries signatories to the convention its staff of inspectors who, within the bounds of the control functions they exercise, would have unhindered access at any time to all objects of control.

With the object of preventing sudden attack by one state on another state the international control agency specifically shall have on the territory of respective states their reciprocal control posts in big ports, railway junctions, motor roads, and airdromes.

C. The control agency shall have unhindered access to materials pertaining to national budget appropriations for military needs, including all decisions of legislative and executive bodies of states in the question. The states shall submit periodically within the fixed dates information to the control agency on the implementation of the measures envisaged by the convention.

3. The control agency makes recommendation to the Security Council on measures of prevention and suppression as regards violators of the convention on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

4. On the basis of the aforesaid principles the functions and powers of the permanent international control agency should be specified and a corresponding instruction given for this purpose.

The above proposal of the Soviet Government was submitted by the U. S. S. R. delegate, J. A. Malik, for consideration by the subcommittee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in London on May 10, 1955.

AUSTRIAN TREATY AND CLAIMS OF VICTIMS OF NAZI PERSECUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 10 years have passed since the end of the Second World War. We are all aware of the tragic loss of life and health, of property and homes, and of the terrible persecutions to which millions were subjected by the brutal Nazi regimes. It was certainly the clear understanding of all our allies, and I belive it remains our firm policy, that the victims of Nazi persecution would be compensated in full by the responsible peoples. I am pleased to say that in Germany the reparation problem has been handled with some consideration for the equities involved, although much remains to be done. In Austria, however, I am sad to state, such has not been the case.

The failure to arrive at a satisfactory solution of this problem in Austria becomes particularly significant now that negotiations for an Austrian state treaty are about to be completed.

I received a letter concerning this problem from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc. I forwarded that communication with a letter of my own to Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.

On May 10 I received the State Department's reply. I am pleased to see that the Department agrees with me as to "the wisdom of concluding a satisfactory agreement on the subject of these claims before the state treaty is presented to the Senate for ratification."

In this conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the correspondence to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 2, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enclose for your information and comment a copy of a letter recently received from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc.

I know that the Department of State and the American Embassy in Vienna have viewed with great sympathy the claims of victims of Nazi action and have indicated their desire to see a speedy and just solution to the problem of claims of individuals and claims with respect to heirless property in Austria. It is my understanding that the Austrian Government, though it has not put forward the proposal referred to in the enclosed letter, has suggested a meeting in Vienna on May 9, at which time it apparently does propose to make its intentions known to the interested organizations, Jewish and non-Jewish.

I know that you will understand my interest in this matter. It would seem to me to be of substantial importance that satisfactory agreement on the subject of these claims be reached before the state treaty is presented to the Senate. Particularly is this so, since it is my understanding that events have long since outmoded that article of the draft treaty which deals with heirless property.

I anticipate that, in view of the discussions which are currently under way in Vienna, as reported in the public press, and in view of the imminent meeting on the claims of Nazi victims, developments will take place in the near future. I should greatly appreciate being informed of such progress as may be made.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
FORMER AUSTRIAN JURISTS, INC.,
New York, April 19, 1955.

The Honorable HEBERT LEHMAN,
Senator of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The undersigned association is composed of former Austrian attorneys, judges, civil servants, and other jurists. Besides on other tasks we are working on the indemnification of Austrian victims of Nazi oppression. We call your attention to the fact that Austria is relucant to enact laws of indemnification. As a proof of this reluctance we stress the fact that Chancellor Raab on the occasion of his visit in Washington in December 1954 promised to propose drafts in this matter 2 weeks after his return to Vienna. We know also that the Department of State told Chancellor Raab that it wants a prompt and satisfactory settlement of this issue.

Until now, however, about 4 months after Chancellor Raab's visit in Washington, not even a draft of legislation has been made. A settlement on a state treaty between Austria and the Soviet Union seems to be forthcoming.

We do not know either the contents of this settlement or the position which the three Western great powers intend to take concerning this settlement. We believe, however, that these three powers are eager to give Austria full independence. We fear that Austria will be more relucant to enact the mentioned legislation after the conclusion of the state treaty. Therefore the Austrian victims are in great danger to lose their claims. It seems necessary that Austria be forced to enact satisfactory legislation on this matter before the state treaty is concluded, and that the United States Senate should not approve the state treaty before the enactment of the said legislation.

Besides we fear that Austria could repeal or impair the indemnification laws after getting full independence. To avoid any later change it seems to be necessary to insert in the state treaty a clause forbidding any such change.

As we know that you are a strong supporter of the claims for indemnification of the Nazi victims not only in words, but also in many acts we beg of you to use your influence with the Department of State and the Senate itself so that no state treaty with Austria should be concluded before a satisfactory legislation in the interest of the victims of Nazi oppression is enacted. If you should want further information and details we will be glad to furnish them.

Thank you very much.

Very sincerely yours,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF FORMER
AUSTRIAN JURISTS, INC.,
SIEGFRIED GEYERHAHN, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 10, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have received your letter of May 2, 1955, which enclosed for information and comment a copy of a letter dated April 19, 1955, from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc.

As you indicate, the Department and the American Embassy in Vienna have viewed with sympathy the claims of victims of Nazi action and have expressed their desire to seek a speedy and just solution to the problem of claims of individuals and with respect to heirless property in Austria. I am pleased to confirm that the Austrian Government did propose a meeting in Vienna on May 9, 1955, at which time it is hoped that the Austrian Government will make its intentions known to the interested organizations. No information is yet available on the results of this meeting.

I am in complete agreement with you as to the wisdom of concluding a satisfactory agreement on the subject of these claims before the state treaty is presented to the Senate for ratification. This view has already been made known to the Austrian Government, both here and in Vienna, and I hope that it will contribute to progress toward a satisfactory agreement during the negotiations which are going on in Vienna between the Austrian Government and the Jewish organizations.

A copy of the letter from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc., is being transmitted to the American Embassy in Vienna for its information. As to the proposal made in the letter from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc., to insert in the state treaty a clause forbidding any repeal or change of indemnification laws after Austria assumes full independence, it seems unlikely that this could be achieved, even if it were proper and necessary, in view of the speed at which the treaty negotiations have been progressing. In any event, you may be assured that the Department and the American Embassy will continue to follow with the closest attention and sympathy the problem of a just settlement of the compensation claims of victims of Nazi action.

Sincerely yours,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Mr. LEHMAN. On May 9 of this year, the Austrian Government proposed to communicate its proposals with respect to the claims of Nazi victims to the interested organizations representing those victims. The meetings at which the proposals of the Austrian Government are being communicated are taking place at the same time as discussions are proceeding in Vienna on the long-awaited conclusion of a state treaty which would restore the independence and the sovereignty of Austria. It would be highly appropriate were these two sets of discussions to be linked and to be viewed as elements in the rectification of the injustices which arose out of the Nazi regime in Germany and subsequently in Austria.

Austria was itself a victim of Nazi action, though it must be said in all candor that the newspaper accounts of 1938 indicate that Hitler was joyously welcomed in Vienna by at least a substantial portion of the Austrian population. Nevertheless, it has been the object of allied policy over the years to restore Austria to that independence which she enjoyed before the events of March 1938 and to insure an Austrian Government which would represent the forces of democracy and of justice. From this objective the United States has never deviated, and Austrian independence has been postponed only because of the excessive demands and the interminable delays imposed by the Soviet Union. It would now seem that, for whatever reason, there is a possibility, though possibly at a very high price, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria may be achieved and the independence of that country restored.

It would be highly inappropriate, on the Austrian side, for the justifiable claims of victims of Nazi action to be forgotten at this moment. The ravages of Hitlerism did not fall with equal severity upon the population of Austria. Some elements of that population profited while others were despoiled and, in the case of Jewish victims, subjected to a systematic policy of mass extermination.

It will be in the interests of justice and equality in the international community, as well as in the interests of Austria itself, if a generous solution to these claims can be achieved simultaneously with or before the conclusion of the discussions with respect to a state treaty.

GENE SYMONDS OF THE UNITED PRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news wires this morning relate another story of Communist brutality.

Early today, Gene Symonds, United Press manager for Southeast Asia, died in Singapore following a savage beating by Chinese Communists. It was a senseless, callous act of the kind that has made the word "Communist" hated throughout the world.

In a very real sense, Symonds died in the line of duty—just as a soldier on the battlefield. He was in Singapore for one reason, and one reason only—to gather facts for the information of the American public.

Symonds was typical of America's foreign correspondents to whom we owe so much. He achieved distinction covering the Korean war from the Pusan beachhead almost to the Yalu River itself. Time after time, he risked his life to cover the news.

I have always felt that one of our first lines of defense against communism is our free press. The American people have the facts upon which they can make their decisions because men like Symonds are stationed in the far-flung outposts of the world.

Day after day they search for the news—fearless and unafraid. And day after day they report the news—keeping our people alert to the realities of our times.

World communism has many deeds—many acts—to its discredit. Some day it will be called to account and among the indictments this stupid act of brutality will loom large.

DOCTRINES OF BIGOTRY AND HATE—ARTICLES BY JACK STEELE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the great public service that has just been performed by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance and its staff writer, Jack Steele. After a 2-month investigation, Mr. Steele wrote a series of 6 articles in the finest traditions of American journalism, exposing specifically named individuals and organizations who are again spreading the diseased doctrines of bigotry and hate.

It is shocking to realize that the bigots and hate-peddlers are again active in our country in their undercover efforts to sell their vicious ideas. Their activities have always been shameful to the vast majority of Americans who subscribe wholeheartedly to the American democratic faith.

The immense value of Mr. Steele's articles lies in the recognition that public knowledge of the facts about the enemies of our democracy is the best weapon to combat the evil ranting and raving of the bigots. The truth, Mr. President, will keep us free.

Mr. Steele describes graphically how the hawkers of hate are capitalizing on the genuine cold war fears over aggressive world communism, just as their predecessors did in the depression-born frustrations and war tensions of the 1930's, the heyday for hate in America.

These articles, published in this city last week by the Washington Daily News, identify the veterans and the newcomers active in the leadership of organized bigotry today, as well as the various magazines, newsletters, pamphlets and other publications they distribute.

They constitute a ready reference, warning all Americans that the war for freedom is never finally won, and that we must remain eternally vigilant to protect our liberties and our honor. Only by knowing who among us is disloyal to our sacred beliefs can we be forewarned and better able to combat these insane attacks on American citizens because of race, color, or religion, even though they are promoted under the false guise of fighting against communism.

Though we necessarily devote our major efforts to defeating the menace of communism, we must not close our eyes to other totalitarian threats which seek innocent scapegoats in religious or racial minorities for the real or imagined ills of today's troubled world.

We preserve and protect our cherished and hard-won rights only so long as we preserve and protect them for all Americans.

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after long hearings and careful consideration, the Senate Public Works Committee has reported S. 1048, a Federal-aid highway bill. This 5-year bill is the first installment of a vigorous program to bring all of America's Federal-aid highways to a point where they can meet the needs of national defense and of the national economy.

Highway construction is expensive. Highways cost money. Roads cannot be built without cost. The bill reported by the committee faces this issue squarely.

In the committee bill, there is no pretense that bonds issued by the United States Government do not constitute debt. There is no contention that we can build a vast system of Federal highways with Federal funds without spending Federal money. I commend the committee for reporting a forthright bill.

Our national traffic pattern is complex. It spreads from coast to coast, from border to border. Moreover, it is growing by leaps and bounds. Few, if any, communities in America are without their traffic problems.

The committee bill seeks to bring about improvement or reconstruction of all types of Federal-aid highways. It does not propose that all additional Federal funds for a long and indefinite period of time be spent on merely one category of roads that carry only a small fraction of our traffic. It does not discriminate against the roads on which most of the people live and travel. I congratulate the committee for viewing our Nation's highway needs in whole, not piecemeal.

The committee bill seeks to preserve the rights and integrity of our various States and State highway departments. It continues the apportionment formula by which each State is assured its pro rata share. It continues the cooperative relationship between the various State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads.

This bill preserves congressional control over appropriations. Under its terms, as is the case now, Congress would consider each year the appropriation requests and needs, and act accordingly.

There would be no effort to take from the Congress its power of appropriation, perhaps its most effective, if not its greatest, constitutional power.

In brief, Mr. President, the committee bill seeks to improve and expand the system of cooperation between the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads. Through the years this system has proved highly satisfactory.

I believe the committee was wise in retaining this basic framework.

The committee has afforded ample time for the preparation of a majority report and minority views, together with any additional views which members of the committee may individually desire to submit. These reports are expected to be printed and available to the Senate not later than Friday of next week.

It will be my purpose to schedule this important bill for consideration in the Senate at the earliest possible moment, perhaps Friday, May 20, or Monday, May 23. It is one of the most important measures that will come before this Congress, and I hope that all Senators will be present for its consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, instead of a defeat, the road bill reported by the Senate Public Works Committee is one of the greatest tributes to the vision of President Eisenhower that has come in his entire administration.

It steps up regular primary, secondary, and urban road building by 30 percent over the current year which in turn last year we had stepped up by 48 percent. And, as for the interstate system, the special object of the Clay Committee, this bill increases that in 4 years to 8,000 times what it was 2 years ago.

To be sure the committee bill is only a 5-year authorization instead of 10 for interstate and a 30-year freeze on the other systems, but if anyone wants to make this a 10-year bill, he can offer an amendment. I would not object too much, although I can see some wisdom in doing what we can for 5 years and then taking a new look at our needs and our pocketbooks.

The committee bill is vastly changed from the original bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The committee adopted many, many amendments. One which I offered will permit States to transfer their Federal-aid allocations between systems up to 20 percent, so they can tailor their programs to meet their special needs. We increased the funds for secondary roads because the interstate roads, which constitute really the cream of the primary system, are getting such a big boost. We put the national forest and national park roads on a 5-year program, too.

All in all, it is a good road program. It is weak on financing. That is primarily because the Constitution says revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. I think a provision to dedicate proceeds of a tax is a revenue measure. I proposed some

use fees but the proposal was not adopted. I also proposed an amendment to defer the effective date until revenue measures had been enacted in a constitutional way. That proposal was not agreed to. I shall probably renew that proposal on the Senate floor. I believe in pay-as-you-go financing as much as possible.

In any event, the committee bill is a victory for President Eisenhower's leadership. It is the biggest program we have ever attempted. It flows directly from his message to the governors and the Congress. It steps up the improvement and development of the country roads along with the turnpikes.

I am not much of a politician, but I see no sense in handing to the very shrewd statesman who is the Speaker of the House of Representatives the fat issue of rural roads to get the farmers out of the mud, versus big bond issues to build boulevards for the large cities and for truck transportation; certainly not when control of the next Congress rests in the Midwest, where a slipping farm income is the weakest sector of the administration front.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, one statement which intrigues me momentarily is that concerning country roads. What does the bill propose with reference to country roads; and what does the Senator mean by country roads?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I mean the secondary system, which has sometimes been described as the farm-to-market system.

Mr. THYE. Would such roads be on the township level or the county level?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would depend upon the laws of the State. There are, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota knows, because he was Governor of his State, several qualifications for highway aid, one for primary roads, one for secondary roads, and one for county roads. Secondary aid is what I am speaking of in connection with country roads.

Mr. THYE. Does the bill propose any changes within the Federal system?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not as to the allocations between the States. It continues the formula of the present law.

Mr. THYE. And within the States?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The States may, if they wish, match the secondary aid or apportion it to the counties or local units of government.

To answer the Senator's first question, last year the allocation for Federal secondary aid was in the neighborhood of $47 million. We stepped it up last year, in the law which is effective this year, to $210 million. This bill will step it up to $300 million. That is a substantial percentage increase, but it does not begin to compare with the percentage increase proposed for primary roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks in connection with the statement of the Senator from South Dakota.

The committee, after many weeks of hearings—I think there were 21 full days of hearings—and after obtaining other information which would aid the committee in arriving at a conclusion with reference to a highway bill, reported the bill which the Senator from South Dakota has been discussing.

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that the 5-year proposition is better; and while it may be said that the bill is antagonistic to the program which was proposed, I assure the Senate that it is not. It will accelerate the construction of highways in the United States to the extent that is feasible at this time. The bill was not reported with the idea of ignoring the Clay report or of saying that it did not have merit, but the Clay report involved such an innovation that the committee felt it was better to go along in the way we have been proceeding since 1916, and in the meantime give the committee opportunity to gather more information with reference to the recommendations of the Clay report.

This bill was not arrived at after 2 or 3 days of hearings. It was after due deliberation by the Committee on Public Works, by members on both sides of the aisle, that the bill was reported. I, as chairman of the full committee, wish to thank Members on both sides. Even when there were differences of opinion, there was no question that we all agreed that it was necessary to accelerate the building of roads and to improve the interstate system, the farm-to-market roads, and the secondary roads.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Chair must advise the Senate that we are proceeding in the morning hour, with a 2-minute limitation on speeches.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may propound a question to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Senator from New Mexico find the so-called Clay report and the President's recommendations most helpful?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Clay report did help in the deliberations of the committee, and some of the features suggested by the Clay report were included in the bill, but we did not think it was the proper time to experiment. The people of the United States are road conscious at this moment, and under the Clay report there would have to be a great deal of experimentation.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, while this is not the time to argue the question of the highway program, in view of the remarks on the subject which have been made during the morning hour, I believe the Senate should be apprised of the fact that a small minority of the Committee on Public Works will file minority views, and will, in due time, on the floor of the Senate, propose a substitute which will go the whole way in carrying out and implementing the program of the President of the United States.

The bill coming from the committee, to be sure, is not the Gore bill; it is a bill which bears the imprints of the bold planning of the Clay report, which was prepared after careful consideration, and the bill itself is a partial implementing of the President's program.

The committee bill, however, does not provide for financing. It does not present a rounded-out program. It may be likened to a proposal which would have provided only in part for building the Panama Canal. The added business, the additional income and the stimulus to our revenues which would result from a national system of interstate highways are discounted and ignored by this part-way measure, and as a consequence, it is readily conceivable that there may be a continuation of the scattering of Federal funds without a definite and fixed purpose.

Therefore, although the bill reported by the committee, I repeat, is in no sense a rebuke to the administration or a defeat of the President's program, the Senate should fully realize that a determined effort will be made to present the full program to the United States Senate in due time.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF 26 MEMBERS OF THE WATTSVILLE MOTHERS CLUB OF LAURENS, S. C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that there are in the gallery today 26 ladies belonging to the Wattsville Mothers Club of Laurens, S. C. This group is under the direction and in charge of Miss Betty Richards, a daughter of a former Governor of South Carolina, one of the greatest governors my State has ever had. If there is no objection, I should like to have these ladies rise, so that Senators may greet them.

[The ladies rose from their seats in the gallery and were greeted with applause.]

THE CASE OF EDWARD CORSI

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 25, 1955, I brought to the attention of the Senate a letter dated April 12, 1955, that I addressed to Secretary of State Dulles relating to the strange case of Mr. Edward Corsi, who was removed from his position as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Migration and Refugee Problems. A reply, dated April 28, 1955, is now in my hands. In view of the fact that it throws additional light on this case, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us briefly review the facts.

On December 30, 1954, the Secretary of State announced Mr. Corsi's appointment to this position. Mr. Corsi has published in the May 5, 1955, issue of the Reporter a telegram and letter received

by him from Mr. Dulles inviting him to accept appointment as a consultant "with responsibilities in the refugee field under the present Refugee Relief Act," and expressing gratification at Mr. Corsi's acceptance of the Secretary's "plea that you come down here to work for us." This correspondence does not even remotely suggest that Mr. Corsi's appointment was to be for only a 90-day period, and Mr. Corsi has stated that he was never given this impression in preappointment discussions. Indeed, Mr. Corsi states that Scott McLeod suggested that he buy a house in Washington.

On April 10, 1955, after 90 days' service in this position, Mr. Corsi's employment was terminated on the grounds that "under the Department's administrative regulations it was impossible initially to offer him a position for a longer period than 90 days." Mr. Dulles has also stated that no question of security was involved in this action.

But the administrative regulations in question are really the State Department's security regulations. They provide that no individual may be employed in a sensitive position within the Department unless a full field investigation has been conducted, with the following exception:

> That in case of emergency a sensitive position may be filled for a period not to exceed 90 days by a person with respect to whom a full field preappointment investigation has not been completed if the Secretary of State finds that such action is necessary in the national interest.

It should be noted that these regulations do not say that an appointment may not be made for longer than the 90-day period, but only that the position may not be "filled" for longer than 90 days. This provision is the State Department's implementation of section 3 (b) of Executive Order No. 10450, which is cast in substantially identical language but uses the phrase "limited period" rather than "90 days." The obvious intended import of this provision is to permit emergency employment of individuals who have not been fully investigated, with the understanding that they would be subjected to a full field investigation during this period on the basis of which they would then be permitted to fill the position beyond the 90 days or limited period.

That the State Department has not generally interpreted its regulations as requiring it initially to offer positions for only a 90-day period in such circumstances is conclusively demonstrated in its admission in its letter to me of April 28, 1955, that the Department has made some appointments prior to completion of a full field investigation which have extended beyond the 90-day period.

The State Department tells me in its letter that it requested FBI investigation of Mr. Corsi on January 18, 82 days before the expiration of the 90-day period. Although the State Department usually conducts its own security investigations, its policy is to request FBI investigation for "high-ranking appointments." In addition, I am told that an FBI investigation was requested "because of the fact that unconfirmed information had come to the Departments's attention which required such action in consonance with Executive Order 10450." In other words, an FBI investigation was required under Executive Order 10450 because of the State Department's receipt of information relating to alleged subversive activities or interests of Mr. Corsi, or information indicating that he has allegedly been subject to coercion, influence, or pressure to act contrary to the interests of the national security.

I am informed by the State Department that it received the completed FBI investigative reports on March 29, 1955, or 13 days before expiration of the 90-day period, and that it received a letter from the Civil Service Commission dated April 5, 1955, or 5 days before the expiration of the 90-day period, advising that the FBI investigation had been completed. It is, perhaps, significant that it was not until April 5, 5 working days after receipt of the investigative reports, that the first mention was made of the 90-day appointment.

The point I am now trying to stress is that a lame-duck, weak excuse of a 90-day period was used as the means to dismiss Mr. Corsi, an excuse which had no relationship whatsoever, I may say, to the appointment which had been offered to Mr. Corsi, or to the field investigation and the subsequent appointment which could have been his.

But the important fact is this: The full field investigation was in fact completed within the 90-day period. Any legal impediment to Mr. Corsi's continued employment which may have existed because of tortured interpretation of the Department's regulations has been removed. There was no conceivable legal reason, even if Mr. Dulles chose to remain a prisoner of his own regulations, why Mr. Corsi could not be continued in this position.

I wish to make it crystal clear that, so far as the regulations and the legal requirements are concerned, there was no legal reason, nor is there any legal reason, why Mr. Corsi could not have been continued in his position.

I do not know why Mr. Dulles dismissed Mr. Corsi. His public statements on this matter are a maze of contradictions. Although Mr. Dulles states there was no security question involved, the fact of the matter is that the State Department felt there was sufficient of a security question to warrant referring the investigation to the FBI, and the Department used its security regulations as the ostensible basis for terminating Mr. Corsi's employment. But whatever may have been the real reason for Mr. Corsi's discharge, there is an important lesson to be learned from these circumstances. This is but another example of the weird uses to which the security programs, operating behind the security curtain and beyond public and congressional scrutiny, have been put. It also represents a classic example of the callous treatment our Government has afforded of late to competent, dedicated men and women in the public service.

Mr. President, I feel that this case will go down in the records of our Government as one of the most unfair and most intolerable cases of public administration and personnel administration which has ever been experienced.

I hope that in due time—and, I may say, at once—efforts will be made to correct the situation which gives rise to unfortunate incidents of this kind, which result in embarrassing people of competence and ability by double talk and by hiding behind security regulations which have no reference to the facts, and then ultimately using those regulations to dismiss someone simply because he may disagree on a matter of policy.

EXHIBIT 1

APRIL 28, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your letter of April 12, 1955, addressed to Secretary Dulles, has been referred to me for reply.

I list below the answers to your seven questions concerning Mr. Corsi's position with the Department.

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. It is the Department's consistent policy to request FBI investigations on all individuals considered for high-ranking appointments. In the instant situation, the FBI was requested to conduct an investigation of Mr. Corsi consistent with this policy, as well as because of the fact that unconfirmed information had come to the Department's attention which required such action in consonance with Executive Order 10450.
5. The investigation by the FBI referred to above was requested by letter under date of January 18, 1955. The completed reports of investigation by the FBI were received in the State Department on March 29, 1955. The Civil Service Commission, by letter dated April 5, 1955, advised the Department that the FBI investigation had been completed.
6. Since the investigation of Mr. Corsi was not conducted by the Department of State, no appraisal of the difficulty, or lack thereof, in this investigation can be made.
7. The Department has made some appointments in grades GS–4, and below, prior to the completion of a full field investigation which has extended beyond the 90-day period. This has not been true in grades classified above GS–4, and we are not aware of any exceptional cases such as you described in your question.

I hope the information included will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

L. & N. RAILROAD STRIKE AND SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO. STRIKE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week I observed with pleasure that the L. & N. Railroad strike, which has been so troublesome to the South and which has had such a bad effect on our economy, was settled by the arbitration method. The men went back to work, the trains began running, and the unresolved issues were submitted to impartial arbitration.

At that time I stated that another strike, now in its ninth week and similarly serious in its effects, could also be settled by the arbitration method. I referred to the telephone strike.

I informed the Senate that I had sent a telegram to both Mr. Fred J. Turner, president, Southern Bell Telephone &

Telegraph Co., and Mr. Joe Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, urging that the telephone strike be submitted to arbitration. Following is the text of my telegram:

The telephone strike, involving some 50,000 workers and seriously affecting my State and other Southern States, is now in its ninth week. It is my understanding that the major point in dispute is a no-strike clause. I urge both parties to this dispute to agree to a resumption of work, submitting all unresolved items of the proposed contract to impartial arbitration, the arbitrators to be made up of a panel selected from a slate named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and findings to be binding on both parties. I feel that the public interest requires early settlement of this strike.

Mr. Beirne, president of the Union, replied by telegram, and following is the text of his wire:

Re your wire of today regarding the telephone strike in the nine Southeastern States and your suggestion that the matter be submitted to impartial arbitration. You are correct that the no-strike clause is the major item in dispute. However, there are some 16 additional items which remain to be resolved. Prior to the actual beginning of the strike, CWA made a proposal to the company to arbitrate these unsettled issues. When the three-governor subcommittee of the Southern Governors' Conference requested of both parties whether or not they were willing to submit the remaining issues in dispute to arbitration, CWA agreed. The company refused. We have continually stated publicly and to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service that we are willing to submit these issues to arbitration. Therefore, to you we unequivocally state that we would be willing to submit the unresolved issues to impartial arbitration and that the arbitrators to be made up of a panel selected from a slate named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and that their findings be binding on both parties. Your interest in this matter is deeply appreciated. The union, too, feels that it would be in the public interest that an early settlement of this strike be consummated. We hope the company will agree to your proposal.

I informed the Senate that Mr. Turner, president of the company, had advised me by wire that he was writing a letter giving the company's position, and that the Senate would be advised of the contents of his letter when it was received.

I have the letter in my hand, signed by Mr. Turner, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. The letter sets forth the attitude of the company in refusing arbitration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.,
Atlanta, Ga., May 10, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Your continued interest in the telephone strike in Tennessee and in the other eight Southeastern States is very much appreciated by me.

You will be interested to know that, as I wrote you on April 4, telephone service in Tennessee and in the other States involved is practically normal. I know of no reason at the present time why the service should not remain substantially normal, particularly since the situation in east Tennessee is now greatly improved.

You may be assured that, I too, am earnestly seeking an early resumption of work by those employees of the company who are still on strike. You, doubtless, have been advised that, although some 30,000 workers are on strike, there are nearly 32,000 workers who are operating the facilities of the company and rendering the service to which I referred.

The issues at stake in the strike are fundamental to the operation of this public-service enterprise. They involve not only the no-strike clause, but also the basic responsibility of management to manage the business. It is our firm conviction that these vital matters should not be subject to arbitration.

The constitution and the laws of your State impose a public duty and obligation on the company to render adequate telephone service when it has sought and enjoyed franchise rights granted by the constituted authorities. Neither your public service commission nor your courts would permit this company to shift its legal and normal responsibilities to those who, having been selected as arbitrators and whose temporary duty had been fulfilled, no longer would have any accountability to the public.

No one is more aware than I of the economic impact of this strike on the individual employees of the company. Each of these employees was employed and trained by the company and the company provided a position of security for them. These positions still await all who desire to return, except those who have participated in criminal conduct, vandalism, and like acts of violence discreditable to the company.

I know that you will be deeply interested in the enclosed bulletin concerning the company's position on arbitration. Your particular attention is called to pages 7, 8, and 9 which show the extent to which arbitration is now available under the company's contract with the union.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is now actively directing collective bargaining between the two parties. I firmly believe that these negotiations will result in a contract that will be fair to all concerned.

Please again accept my very profound appreciation for your interest. You may be assured that I shall employ every resource at my command toward bringing about a reasonable settlement and a return to work of the employees who are on strike.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. TURNER,
President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the letter Mr. Turner makes reference to a pamphlet entitled "Arbitration Is Not the Answer," which he enclosed, and in which he specifically made references to pages 7, 8, and 9, dealing with arbitration arrangements now available. I ask unanimous consent that pages 7, 8, and 9 of the pamphlet be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the pages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following gives more detailed information on the scope of arbitration in our contracts with the union. It contains the wording of article IX, section 2, of the recognition agreement and a check list of the principal items in the working agreement, showing those which are subject to arbitration and those which are not.

ARBITRATION PROVISIONS IN SOUTHERN BELL—C. W. A. CONTRACTS

Recognition agreement

Article IX. Arbitration

SEC. 2. If at any time a controversy should arise between the union and the company regarding the true intent and meaning of any provisions of this or any other agreement between the parties or a controversy as to the performance of any obligation hereunder, which the parties are unable to compose by full and complete use of the grievance procedure set up by article III of this agreement, the matter shall be arbitrated upon written request of either party to this agreement to the other.

Working agreement

The following check list will indicate whether or not arbitration is available on the subjects listed. The list includes all items that are not subject to arbitration.

	Arbitration	
	Available	Not available
Absences from duty:		
Payment for employees who become sick at work	X	
Payment during first 7 days sickness	X	
Extended absence due to illness	X	
Military leaves	X	
Choice of tours	X	
Contract work	X	
Craft work by supervisors	X	
Demotions:		
After 3 months on job	X	
Before 3 months on job		X
(*See* Discharges and demotions.)		
Discharges:		
After 12 months on job	X	
Before 12 months on job		X
Employment termination	X	
Termination allowance	X	
Excused absences with pay	X	
Expense:		
In connection with transfers	X	
Split tours	X	
Supper	X	
Transportation, intercity	X	
Travel	X	
Force adjustments	X	
Reduction in force	X	
Rehiring after layoff	X	
General records	X	
Grievance procedure	X	
Health and safety		X
Holiday pay	X	
Hours of work and basis of compensation:		
Work schedules	X	
Scheduling tours	X	
Arrangement of tours	X	
Part tours	X	
Relief periods	X	
Overtime payment	X	
Call-out pay	X	
Noncompounding of overtime	X	
Sunday pay	X	
Equalization of premium pay work opportunity	X	
Differential payments	X	
Eligibility for payment	X	
Job description, job titles, and job classifications	X	
Leaves of absence		X
Pension plan		X
Limitation on increasing benefits	X	
Personnel records	X	
Promotions and job vacancies	X	
Posting job vacancies	X	
Filling job vacancies	X	
Promotional increase treatment	X	
Appeal rights	X	
Rescheduling absent time	X	
Seniority:		
Extent and limitation	X	
Application	X	
Employees transferred	X	
Effect on posted work schedule	X	
Preference for training	X	
Starting rates	X	
Suspensions (as offered to union on 3-8-55)	X	
Technological displacements	X	
Transfers and travel expense	X	
To exchanges having lower schedules	X	
To exchanges having higher schedules	X	
To lower rated job classifications	X	
To higher rated job classifications	X	
At the instance of employees	X	
At the instance of the company	X	
Travel time and travel conditions	X	

	Arbitration	
	Available	Not available
Union functioning:		
Promotions and transfers of union officers	X	------
Bulletin boards	X	------
Union activity on company property	X	------
Vacations:		
Vacation eligibility	X	------
Vacation assignments	X	------
Vacation pay	X	------
Vacation treatment to employees leaving the service	X	------
Vacation treatment for employees returning to the service	X	------
Vacation treatment for employees transferring	X	------
Vacation treatment to sick employees	X	------
Vacation limitations	X	------
Wages:		
Wage rates	X	------
Starting rates	X	------
Wage progression schedules	X	------
Effective date for progression increases	X	------

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish now to discuss this matter for a moment. It will be noted that there are two arbitration agreements in this pamphlet. The one under the heading "Article IX, Arbitration," is headed "Recognition Agreement," and I understand is the arbitration clause in the agreement by which the company recognizes the union as the bargaining agent. It covers arbitration of disputes arising under that recognition agreement.

The second provision, under the heading "Working Agreement," is a checklist prepared by the company outlining the things for which arbitration is available and is not available under the present working contract.

Mr. President, under the proposed new contract there is a no-strike clause, by which the union agrees not to strike during the course of the contract. A no-strike clause requires enforcement. Work stoppages can and do occur without the intention of any responsible officials of either management or union. Under the no-strike clause the company would take disciplinary action for any such stoppages. What the union wants, I understand, in view of the fact that they will agree to a no-strike clause, is the right to have arbitrated by neutral parties the disciplinary action taken with regard to arguments arising, as a result of the no-strike provision, over such things as suspensions, demotions, and discharges.

I think that reasonable men ought to be able to get together when the differences are so small. However, these parties began their negotiations in July of last year, and negotiated up until the strike began in March. Tempers have flared on both sides. Based on the number of persons who Mr. Turner says are out and the average wage paid them, I would estimate that the strike is costing more than $1,300,000 a week in wages alone in the 9-State area. It is time that it be settled.

This is, it seems to me, a dispute that could be arbitrated. When negotiators cannot agree after 10 months—and when the business concerned is a public utility designed to serve all the people—then it is time to call in neutral outside parties to settle the differences. That is all arbitration amounts to, and I would certainly urge the company to consider the matter further for the benefit of the public interest, if for no other reason.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY REPRESENTATIVES OF ASIATIC COUNTRIES, UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF THE TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say a word of appreciation of a great project which the sponsors of the well-known radio program Town Meeting of the Air have just completed. Their effort resulted in having leaders from a number of Asiatic countries flown to the United States, for the purpose of touring our country, participating in Town Hall programs, giving Americans information on the Asiatic situation, telling our folks how we are regarded in the Asiatic countries, and pointing out ways in which we can bring about greater understanding among the people of our country and the people in their countries.

These friends from Asia traveled in all parts of our country. Some of them spent some time in South Dakota, visiting our farms, talking to our people, and observing Missouri River Dam developments. They were wonderful missionaries of good will.

Following their tour of this country, Representative BROOKS HAYS and I participated in a Town Meeting program with these visitors. I feel that the views they expressed, the observations they made, and the suggestions they contributed are of real interest; and, therefore, I ask permission to have the transcript of that broadcast inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is entitled "As Asians See Us."

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS ASIANS SEE US

ANNOUNCER. Town Meeting comes to you tonight from the Senate Radio Gallery in the Nation's Capitol where we bring together the members of an important project in the field of international relations. Town Meeting listeners still recall the epoch-making world tour of this program in 1949, on which representative Americans, forming the World Town Hall Seminar, met with people of similar interests in 12 nations from Britain to Japan. This was the first of Town Hall's international projects on a people-to-people basis. Since then, this pioneer adult education center has been the spearheading agency for similar missions between leaders of Egypt, and our neighbors to the north and south—Canada and Mexico. This year, Town Hall developed a project with leaders of the Near East and Asia who, with two distinguished Members of Congress, are gathered here in Washington for a report to the American people.

Now, to preside as moderator of our discussion, here is the well-known Washington commentator, Gunnar Back. Mr. Back.

Mr. BACK. Good evening, friends. We have for you tonight, a rather different approach of Town Meeting which, in a basic sense, becomes a worldwide roundtable through the expression of opinion by representatives of 10 different nations, including the United States.

Seated here in the Senate Radio Gallery in the Capitol Building in Washington—with Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota and Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas—are nine members of the Asia Town Hall Mission who have just concluded a 7-week tour of our country—several of them visiting America for the first time. They have seen the east and west coasts, the States between, the North and the South. Accompanied by Mr. Robert L. Clifford, who has directed the project for Town Hall, our guests have visited these American cities: New York, Princeton, Philadelphia, Toledo, Chicago, Dayton, Minneapolis, Yankton, Omaha, St. Louis, Kansas City, Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Dallas, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Cincinnati, and Atlanta—so the impressions which they bring you tonight are based on a very comprehensive look at the United States.

In cooperation with local world affairs councils of the Foreign Policy Association, they have talked with tens of thousands of Americans in this journey of theirs. In keeping with the Town Hall philosophy that the path to mutual understanding is a two-way street, they have come here for a free exchange of ideas, knowledge, and experiences. The members of the mission now return to their home countries. We believe they will have learned a little more about us—as the American people most assuredly have learned more about them and their problems.

So that we may share each other's views with our listeners across the Nation, we have invited them to join us for a frank and informal discussion here on Town Meeting. Senator MUNDT and Congressman HAYS will be glad to answer their questions as we go along, and they also will have questions for our Asian guests.

First, I would like to identify them briefly for you. In the custom of ladies first I'll begin. Mrs. Amina El-Said, a journalist of Cairo, Egypt; Miss Nilawarn Pintong, editor of a woman's magazine in Thailand; Mr. G. Ramachandran, director of the Gandhigram Rural Workers Training Center in India; Mohamad Roem, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia; Roberto Villanueva, general manager of the Manila Chronicle; Abdul Kerim al-Uzri, Member of Parliament of Iraq; George Togasaki, president of the Nippon Times of Tokyo and chairman of the board of International Christian University; Cao Thai Bao, Commissioner for Political and Administrative Affairs of the State of South Viet-Nam; and Musa Nasir, director of the Junior College, Bir Ziet, in Jordan.

To begin our discussion, I'd like to call on several of you first for some general impressions. I know that you must have many impressions. I'm going to hope that you'll make the general impressions fairly short. Mr. Togasaki, will you tell us what your impression has been of this trip?

Mr. TOGASAKI. In the first place, the Americans have become greatly interested in world affairs. We often hear of the isolation policy, but nowhere on this trip have we been faced with isolationist expressions. The efforts of the local authorities—local people—World Affairs Councils, to diffuse world education to the younger generation has been very, very impressive. In general I may say that world education has been diffused throughout the country.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Togasaki, we often talk about our middlewestern area as being isolationist and I note that you did visit some of the middlewestern areas. You found then an interest in world affairs out there in the Middle West?

Mr. TOGASAKI. Particularly so in the Midwest. I was pleasantly surprised in Yankton, a small community of some 6,000 or more, gathering together in the auditorium at Yankton College to hear world affairs and to pose very interesting questions.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Togasaki, let me say as a Senator from South Dakota that I am very gratified to hear that report because Yankton is in South Dakota, in fact, it is the mother city of the Dakotas.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Villanueva, you are a journalist from the Philippines. Perhaps you'll give us your general estimate of this trip of yours?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. During the tour I had only one trouble in America, and that was having my name pronounced correctly. Apparently although Americans are quick to grasp any problem, in the question of foreign languages they have fallen very much behind. But, seriously, we feel like people who have had the opportunity to take a 3-D view of America. We have not only been able to appreciate the size and the magnitude of this country, but the best of the American spirit. In going through different States, coming from the East and going to the West, we have naturally seen great changes in climatic conditions, in the landscape of the country, and differences in the temper, in the mood and in the tempo of the life of peoples—but one thing that impressed us greatly was the great unity that exists among the American people. I think it can be said that America speaks with one voice and acts in unison on great issues effecting this country.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Villanueva. Now let's turn to Mr. Ramachandran for his general view of the United States of America.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. We in India have a fairly good knowledge of what is happening in this country because people are very much interested. The New York Times is widely read in India so I came with certain interests, and I must say that I have received no shock at all. Neither the bigness of your cities, nor the vastness of your areas, nor the temper of your people—the understanding of the people—in none of these areas have I had any shock whatsoever. But I have had, if I may contradict myself for a moment, slightly pleasant shocks—pleasanter shocks than I had expected. For instance, I have found that the people are far more tolerant than they appear to be before world public opinion. People are far more interested in the outside world than I thought that they were. Now this has been a good surprise to me. And one other thing which I must mention is that Americans have some wonderful illusions about themselves. They think, for instance, that they are a terrific people living in a terrific way, but what I have discovered is that the Americans are perfectly normal, good, quiet people with great family loyalties amongst themselves—altogether quite a normal people. This picture I wish to carry back to my country.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Ramachandran, what do you think of American food?

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. American food—again, I had heard before I came was terrific—but it's perfectly normal food.

Senator MUNDT. Maybe he hasn't tried the Senate bean soup. There is something terrific.

Mr. BACK. Perhaps he'll have a chance to do that while he's here in Washington. Let me go to the next question now which, in some respects, has been answered. Do you feel that the American people are sufficiently informed about the Near East and Asia, Mrs. El-Said of Egypt?

Mrs. EL-SAID. Well, sir, throughout our visit, or our tour, which took 7 weeks, we felt that the people were definitely less informed about our problems in the Middle East than we hoped them to be. In some cases they know one side of the subject and not the other. Of course, I must admit that they have always been ready to listen to us and to learn from us, and quick to grasp and to form a just opinion—but we want more and more of this. You know the Middle East, Egypt and the other countries, has become a very sensitive part of the world at the present, if not the most sensitive part of the world. I believe mutual understanding and mutual interests in each other will help a great deal in participating for peace, or, it will help freedom.

Mr. BACK. Mrs. El-Said, did you find that looking over our American newspapers and perhaps having a chance to listen to a radio here and watch television, did you feel that we gave fairly adequate news coverage to the Near East?

Mrs. EL-SAID. No, sir. Very little, I am sorry to say. And what there is is not enough. We want more of it.

Mr. BACK. You would like to see our newspapers cover more stories from your part of the world?

Mrs. EL-SAID. Yes; more news of that part of the world to help the people understand us, because, you see, it is unfair to us that the Americans will judge us through their own standpoint of view. We are very different.

Mr. BACK. Do you, in turn, feel that your papers in Egypt cover us adequately?

Mrs. EL-SAID. We can't help it because we actually live on the West and we can't do without the West. We are so interested in the international problems and in national politics because it affects us directly.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much. I want to turn now to Miss Nilawarn of Thailand with that same question. Do you feel that the American people are sufficiently informed toward your country?

Miss NILAWARN. Yes. As a visitor from Thailand I noticed this all along our tour among special groups, such as the people in the World Affairs Councils and people who are internationally minded. The answer is yes but, by and large, no—because the concern for freedom and the generosity of the American people themselves seem to overwhelm their insight into the minds of the Asia peoples. American knowledge is based more on external appearance of the Asian countries rather than on the substance. What is needed, I might propose, is the deeper and truer sympathy, and not just merely aid.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much. I am sure that the fact that you've been here and we've had a chance to talk to you has helped a lot, and I hope that I'll see a good deal more of that. We Americans have a good deal to learn because we're looking over a vast part of the earth all the time now. Let's turn to our next question. I'm picking these out of the air more or less, but we, ourselves, sometimes find it difficult to define what generally is called the American way of life. We try, of course, constantly, and we are always interested in what visitors to our country might define as the American way of life. Perhaps I might try that with you, Mr. al-Uzri of Iraq. Most people who visit our country have some impression of the American way of life. What is yours?

Mr. AL-UZRI. It is really very difficult to define, the American way of life, especially if you are visiting America for the first time, but I can pick up some of the main features which have impressed me. In the first place, I have noticed this great equality and especially the opportunity for all the people in that there are no classes, no distinctions. Secondly, the great respect for the individual and his liberty and dignity in the United States of America. The third feature found was the high standard of living enjoyed practically by all, and the fourth feature which impressed me was the tempo with which you go about your work.

Mr. BACK. You then feel that we have a tempo here in contrast to Mr. Ramachandran, who feels that we don't move along as fast as we think we do? Did you notice a fast or slow tempo?

Mr. AL-UZRI. We noticed certainly the fast tempo.

Mrs. EL-SAID. I was only going to ask you, sir, a question. Why are you all in a hurry? I mean, I can understand it if it is in business but it's also in pleasure, so why?

Senator MUNDT. I think I can answer that because most of us believe in the philosophy of a great early American by the name of Benjamin Franklin, of whom I am sure you have heard, and in his Copybook he said "Beware of time because that is the stuff of which life is made," and so people want to accomplish a great deal in the span of a lifetime.

Mrs. EL-SAID. Believe me, a little rest will be a great help.

Mr. BACK. Well, I myself would like to take things a lot slower, but whenever I do everybody else is way ahead of me. How about you, Congressman HAYS, what do you think of our tempo?

Representative HAYS. I think there is good counsel in what our visitor has said. I think we should slow down. Of course, we Democrats have to be in a hurry to keep the Republicans from getting ahead of us, but it's still good advice and I think we could profit from it.

Senator MUNDT. That sounds interesting to me, coming from a southerner, because we think the southerners have sort of slowed down the tempo and have a delightful tempo of life which, up in the North, we don't practice to the extent that you do.

Mr. AL-UZRI. I have heard many times—the American people have told us—take it easy. I believe that this take it easy is a necessity because of the American doctrine of life and the high standards generated by Americans.

Senator MUNDT. I sometimes feel that why we're going so fast is because we're more mechanized than other parts of the world. Mrs. El-Said, I have been in Cairo, Egypt, a number of times and I must confess that I am shocked by the tempo with which people on foot move up and down the streets of Cairo.

Mrs. EL-SAID. You mean you were shocked at the speed or the slowness?

Senator MUNDT. The speed—I think they walk more rapidly than Americans.

Mr. BACK. We have a number of questions that immediately concern the United States to a high degree. For example, the Bandung Conference, the Asian-African Conferences just concluded. I know that you've been in this country while it was on, but I am sure that all of you have followed it very closely. What is your feeling about the conclusions that seems to have been reached there, Mr. Villanueva?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. I'm not yet too familiar with all the resolutions adopted at Bandung. I've just read the newspaper this morning.

Mr. BACK. Did it all turn out as the Philippines thought it might?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. Well, actually, it was not so much of a surprise to us in Asia as it was to Americans, by and large. We always thought that a conference of Asian peoples was necessary at this time because it would be a very timely conference. There were very many things that we had in common—many problems that are typical of all our countries on which we could exchange views and information. Now, the Bandung Conference is significant because it has given the Asian and African peoples an opportunity to examine the pros and cons of communism and democracy, and they have faced this question squarely at that Conference. I think it merely reveals that there is a great understanding of the world problems in Asia and Africa today. Now, we all had hopes

that this Conference would devote more time to the economic, social, and cultural problems of Asia and Africa, because it is in this field that we thought it would really do a lot of good. Apparently there was not too much time to do this, but we hope that in the future another conference of this nature could be called to devote the energies and talents of our leaders to this vital question.

Mr. BACK. One more thing, Mr. Villanueva. Did you feel that the non-Communist representatives at that Conference made themselves fully heard? You know, there are people here who thought it might be dominated by the Red Chinese.

Mr. VILLANUEVA. I think they had a chance to do that, not only at the primary sessions, but in their personal contacts with all the delegates at the Conference. I think we all know how conventions are run and many things are done behind the scenes, and I am sure that the representatives of the Communists, as well as the non-Communist nations of Asia, and those who stand for neutrality had a chance to express each other's viewpoints effectively.

Mr. BACK. I want to turn to Mr. Roem. His country, after all, was the host nation to this Conference. He's been an official of his country of Indonesia. Mr. Roem, what is your estimate of the results of the Bandung Conference?

Mr. ROEM. I think that the result of the Bandung Conference is most satisfactory. I may say that it is also satisfactory for those who had expressed some concern before the beginning of the Conference. Stress has been laid on cooperation in the economic and cultural field among the countries who have participated in the Bandung Conference. These are countries who are in the beginning stage of their economic development and cooperation in that field is very important. Cooperation in the cultural field is also very important for these countries because there are so many common things in their culture and in their history. I think the resolutions that were made are mostly based on human rights. About the Palestine problem, we have expressed the desire that the resolution of the United Nations must be carried out, and I think that nobody will be against this, and we expressed the hope that Morocco and Tunisia will be free in the soonest possible time.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Roem. I am sure that the two Members of Congress who are with us may want to ask a question or two on that. I don't want to stay too long on the Bandung Conference, but I did want to know whether you had a question, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Yes, I do. I'd like to ask Mr. Roem a question. I was gratified and impressed by the fact that the Conference at Bandung seemed to place a great emphasis on human rights. I have the personal feeling that any conference in the world anywhere which concentrates its emphasis on human rights, by that very nature has to point out the deficiencies and the weaknesses of communism, because communism is a way of life and a system of politics which entirely nullifies human rights for the individual, and I wonder whether Mr. Roem would agree with me on that observation, or whether he would care to comment about it?

Mr. ROEM. People were concerned about the role which Chou En-lai would play in this Conference, but I think that the outcome of the Conference proved to be that he had not dominated the Conference. I, myself, am for the democratic way of life—not communism.

Representative HAYS. I would like to revert to what Mr. Roem said about economic phases and, of course, the human-rights phases are, to some extent, bound up with economic problems, too. They're not completely separate. One of the visitors from a country that participated in this Conference, and I believe there were about 30, was in America some time ago—a young college student—and one of our college lads asked this question: "What does your country expect of the United States?" His answer was very striking. He said, "Two things: respect and rice, and in that order." I liked that because it did place values in their right relation, and if he should ask me what our country expects I would say respect and a market for rice, in that order, because we have a surplus of rice.

Senator MUNDT. Would you mind including a market for wheat along with that?

Representative HAYS. If I were from South Dakota, I would put it in those terms, but I was glad to have pointed up the problems of our country, and the fact that here we have a common interest. People want rice—we want a market for rice. But I realize, at the same time, there are countries among your 30 that have a surplus of rice, too, and we must not ask for a market in any country that creates economic maladjustments in other countries, and I would like to pose that question for you, who are leaders in your respective countries, to enlighten us. How can we find these markets without disrupting your economic stability, and how can the 30 countries work toward a situation in which they relate their economic interests to our economic interests in the Western Hemisphere? That's a big order, but I thought you wouldn't mind speaking to that question.

Mr. ROEM. My country has not a market for your rice. My country has a market for many other articles from America, so you need not be concerned about that. But the economic cooperation between these countries is the kind of cooperation which is very useful for countries who are in the beginning phase of their economic development. Their experiences in the past few years might be very useful to one another. It does not mean that we are not in cooperation with the countries outside these countries, but as young countries, experience just received in the past few years is very important—perhaps more important than experience of countries who have developed their economy for more than a century.

Representative HAYS. I don't want to take the time, I want our visitors to have the time, but might I relate that to what we have tried to do in the Western Hemisphere through the Organization of American States which has its economic aspects. Now, I realize that the 30 countries spread across a vast area and perhaps in Bandung some preliminary conversations were conducted which would enable them to break it down, so that if the 30 don't get together on some kind of economic interrelationship, understandings, and agreement, that there can be some breakdown into regional understandings. In other words, it will enable us all to get along together a little better in economic terms. I wanted to just add that comment.

Mr. BACK. Thank you, Congressman Hays. I want to go on now to some other matters and we're going to have to hurry a little because the field is very wide. The whole question of Formosa is one that, of course, greatly concerns us, and I was just wondering whether I could ask you, Mr. Villanueva, to tell us how you think Asians would react to United States armed participation in the defense of the offshore islands first?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. I would not pretend to speak for Asia on this issue. It is very explosive, and I know that Asia does not speak with one voice on this matter. Perhaps I shall try to reflect the Philippine view on the subject. Now, as you know, we in the Philippines view with concern the question of Formosa, because Formosa is very close to us. It was the staging point for the invasion of the Philippines, and on a clear day you can see Formosa from our northernmost island, Itbayat, so they're very close to us and we, naturally, would like to see Formosa in friendly hands. The Philippine Government, as a matter of fact, is officially committed to stand by the United States and it has offered its manpower and resources in the defense of Formosa. Now the question of Quemoy and Matsu, in my mind, as a layman, is strictly a military decision. It is one, in fact, which I think should not even be debated publicly. Can we, or can we not, hold Quemoy and Matsu? Well, that is strictly a military decision and the military commanders on the spot perhaps are in a better position to decide that. As a layman, I say that if Quemoy and Matsu—being important for the defense of Formosa, as it has often been pointed out—can be held with the forces that we have on the spot, well, I think it would be a wise military decision to do so, but this would require a full knowledge of the military potential.

Mr. BACK. The Philippines, being a member of the Southeast Treaty Organization, you go along then pretty much with the American position right now?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. We stand side by side with you and we abide by any decision of President Eisenhower.

Mr. BACK. I think now we ought to address the question to Mr. Ramachandran, who represents India today.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. I am very happy you have turned to me for an answer, and I have listened very carefully to what my friend from the Philippines said about it. Any military decision in the modern world becomes at once a world problem. You cannot isolate a decision as a military decision and keep it as a military decision. It immediately can explode into a world problem and the whole question of Formosa, as it strikes India, is that here is a magnificent opportunity for sane people to sit together and prove that the most difficult controversies can be discussed and solved on a peaceful basis. I think the whole of the Bandung Conference is proving that the most difficult things should be capable of being discussed around the table and settled peacefully, so we do not look upon Formosa as a point of explosion for a world war. We look upon Formosa as the point of explosion for a tremendous movement for peace in the world, and peace to be obtained around conference tables. I think this is the great lead that has already come out of Formosa. I would like to ask a question myself. I would like to ask, for instance, Mr. BROOKS HAYS and the Senator from South Dakota, What do you think of the role that India has played in the Formosa Conference?

Senator MUNDT. You mean, I presume, in the Formosan controversy?

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Yes; and the Bandung Conference.

Senator MUNDT. Well, I would say from the standpoint of Formosa that I am one of those who believe that nothing could be more injurious to Asia and its long-term constructive hopes than the loss of Formosa to the Communist hands, that we must make that as the positive goal of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere, that Formosa must not be lost to the Communists. Having said that, I would say that I certainly agree with your hope that we can solve the Formosan situation without loss, that it can be done around the conference table, or that it can be done by peaceful methods, but I do not believe that any of us can countenance the constantly outward march of communism, because if it were to get Formosa, it would never stop there. It would be looking toward Japan, it would be looking toward the Philippines, or somewhere else. But I can assure my good friend from India that Americans abhor war and detest war, probably as much as any people in the world. We have no territorial ambitions, we are not in favor of aggression of any type, and you may be sure that war will not be precipitated, will not be started in that area by the United States.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Would you agree to the United Nations trusteeship over Formosa?

Senator MUNDT. No; I would not agree to the United Nations trusteeship over India, nor over the Philippines, nor over any independent sovereign country such as Formosa.

Representative HAYS. I think in stressing the value of conference our friend from India, Mr. Ramachandran, has made an excellent point, and he asked of Mr. MUNDT and myself judgments as to the participation of India and its contribution at Bandung. I think that while there is not time to discuss it elaborately, that one reply that he would be interested in is the comment of Senator GEORGE, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the newspaper editors the other evening, when he said that while some of the spokesmen for India sometimes bewilder us, and our friend will understand that since we're not so well acquainted with their point of view, nevertheless we feel that in the fundamental cleavages of our world they are on our side. We're all fighting for independence, and they are making a great contribution which we appreciate now, as we did not in an earlier period. Senator GEORGE paid a fine tribute to India, and it was a good plea.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. BACK. Now let's go to South Viet-Nam, that's in our headlines also. Mr. Cao Thai Bao is Commissioner for Political and Administrative Affairs in the state of South Viet-Nam. Can you tell us whether the present government of that country is going to survive, in your opinion and, secondly, how is that election going to turn out?

Mr. BAO. I do hope that in July 1956, as required by the Geneva Pact, we have general elections.

Mr. BACK. That election will determine whether South Viet-Nam continues as a free state or becomes Communist?

Mr. BAO. We have to choose if we want Communist government, or non-Communist government, but, if we can get a free election which we want and we need, we are sure, as far as South Viet-Nam is concerned, that we will win the elections, that is, if we have free elections.

Mr. BACK. What will keep you from having free elections, in your opinion?

Mr. BAO. Under the terms of the Geneva Pact, we are committed to discuss in July 1955, with representatives from North Viet-Nam, the procedures and the type of election campaign we will have in the 1956 elections.

Mr. BACK. What sort of a picture do you see right now? Are you going to get those free elections?

Mr. BAO. If we had the election right now, I can assure you we would win the elections. Note that one-tenth of the population in Communist North Viet-Nam is now migrating as refugees to live in free South Viet-Nam.

Mr. BACK. How about the present government of Premier Diem? Is that government going to survive, in your opinion?

Mr. BAO. I am sure that Premier Diem will survive, although he has many troubles.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, and now let's hurry along here. We have so many fields to cover. Mr. Nasir, of Jordan, you're an educator. I want to ask you this question: Do Asians and the people of the Near East fear western dominance as much as they fear Communist dominance, more or less? What's the relationship, would you say, Mr. Nasir?

Mr. NASIR. That is like asking the question to compare between two meals or two kinds of food—one which you have tasted and one which you never have tasted. We have tasted western dominance and we didn't like it. We have not tasted Communist dominance, but from the description we don't like it, either. The question, however, seems to imply that we must accept either western or Communist dominance. I don't think we agree to this implication and we'd rather have neither.

Mr. BACK. Thank you, Mr. Nasir. Mr. Roem, can I go to you again? Is the struggle in Asia essentially a struggle for the minds of men? We use that term in this country all the time.

Mr. ROEM. Yes; I would say the struggle in Asia is essentially the struggle for the minds of men, and the minds of men can only reach their highest development in a free country. As this question is asked under the heading of "Communism," I would say that our struggle for independence is a positive struggle. We never have said that we are struggling against communism because we haven't been dominated by communism, and I would add, because I would like the people in America to understand it more, my country has an independent foreign policy which is mostly mentioned as a neutral policy. This is a kind of policy that differs from your policy, but in our country we have accepted the democratic way of life, and democracy is not neutralism. I want to point out that if you call it neutralism, that it is only neutralism with regard to foreign policy, but in domestic affairs and in the pace of our life we have accepted the democratic way of life and this is not neutralism at all.

Senator MUNDT. As one of the authors of the so-called Smith-Mundt bill, which set up the Voice of America and our interchange of students and ideas, and our foreign information libraries, I would like to ask my friend, the fellow-educator from Jordan, and anybody else who would care to comment upon it, what your reaction is to the activities of the Voice of America in your part of the world, and to our foreign information libraries and the exchange of students and exchange of culture programs. Do you think this is helping to create mutual understandings and to solidify the democratic people around the world and like-thinking people—or do you think that pretty much our efforts in that direction may be misdirected?

Mr. NASIR. I would not say that the efforts are misdirected. I would say the purpose of this activity has been to create an understanding apparently. From that point of view, I would say it has only created an understanding of things which are simple, but it has not created any understanding or appreciation or acceptance of the policy of the United States regarding the Middle East. I mean the Middle East is very unhappy and this kind of information or education, although it is very helpful and accepted with a tremendous amount of gratefulness, still it cannot make people understand or appreciate, or even accept the policy with regard to the Middle East.

Senator MUNDT. I wonder if Mrs. El-Said would care to comment on that question?

Mrs. EL-SAID. I do agree with Mr. Nasir very much. The people of Egypt are so interested in the international affairs and the news from outside. They listen to the Voice of America and, actually, are very anxious to listen to the Voice of America. The American library we have in Cairo is very popular. Our boys and young people go and get books and really enjoy reading American books. But what is more important to us is the political understanding. That is what we need very much.

Mr. NASIR. Our first contact with Americans was with the American University of Beirut, and that has achieved the very best respect and has been really the cause for the deep respect and confidence of the Middle East toward the United States. It is on account of that American university that respect and confidence still remains, but unless we do something really on the political side, it would be difficult to continue that.

Mr. BACK. Miss Nilawarn, what do you think of our educational exchange program?

Miss NILAWARN. The Fulbright program and the teachers training program are most acceptable to us, but we would like to see stronger efforts made in the educational field to reach more people. That is, we would like to see a program aimed at increasing general literacy and at extending adult education activities and agricultural extension services. We also like the idea of exchanging young people between our two countries as a step in the direction of the one-world idea.

Mr. BACK. In other words, what we have done so far is fine, but you'd like to see it extended in many respects, is that it?

Miss NILAWARN. Yes, because now the exchange program is limited mainly to academic people. The program should be extended to reach the Thai farmers and rural people generally.

Mr. BACK. Thank you. I know that you've all been waiting for me to ask this question and I come to it now, although there are other fields that I would like to touch on some more, and that is, what are some of the major problems of your various countries. I think we've heard something of that. Let me turn to you, Mr. Ramachandran of India, and ask you what are some of the major problems of your country? That's a pretty general question, I know.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. It's a good question, even if it is general. The immediate and the most ardent need is to build up the internal strength in my country, unify the people, put away the caste system altogether which we have nearly done, establish social justice, educate the people and bring up the level of life of the people. They call this a constructive program. The Government of India and the people of India are plunged into this work, but immediately, if we are to continue building up internal strength, we need peace. Any breaking of peace will shatter the whole program of building the strength of the people, so I would say the most ardent problems are the problems of building up the internal strength of the country, and then getting peace to do the job.

Mr. BACK. Thank you. Mr. al-Uzri of Iraq, you are a member of Parliament of your country and I am sure that you can tell us what the pressing needs of your country are.

Mr. AL-UZRI. The most important problems in our part of the world, in the Arab world, and especially Iraq, are five, in my opinion. In the first place, we have the problem of economic and social development, the problem of reconstruction and building up strength. The second problem is the problem of political integration of the small Arab states into a federal state, especially those constituting the fertile crescent as a first step, or a nucleus to the larger federation. We would like the United States to take an interest in this project, similar to the interest it is taking in the federation of Europe. The third problem facing the present Iraq and the Arab world as a whole is the problem of liberating the Arab people still under foreign domination, to gain their political independence. The fourth problem, which is, in fact, the most important, is the Palestine problem, which hangs like a dark cloud on the horizon of the Arab east. Unless that problem is solved in a just manner, peace will continue to be disturbed. The fifth problem facing Iraq and the Arab world, as a whole, is the Communist danger which tries to infiltrate into the Middle East. These, in my opinion, are the five major problems facing Iraq and the entire Arab east.

Mr. BACK. Mr. al-Uzri, has our economic aid been too little, too late, or anything of that sort?

Mr. AL-UZRI. We have had practically no economic aid from the United States. We have had some technical aid by the provision of technical personnel on the basis of point 4. This aid, which we have had from

the point 4 program, was, in my opinion, too thinly spread and I wish we had it more concentrated on one objective, such as the establishment of an efficiently run technical school or a mechanical and agricultural college. In fact, this applies perhaps to all the Arab east. The Arab east, as a whole, has had too little, in fact, many of them have had no economic aid whatsoever.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Roem, of Indonesia, what type of aid does your country need from the United States, and do you want aid?

Mr. ROEM. Let me put it this way: My country is in the beginning of its development period, so we need many kinds of aid, but the problem is also under what terms aid is to be given and, at the present moment, we have accepted aid from the United States in the form of economic and technical aid. We would like to have also military aid but, at the present moment, your policy with regard to military aid is not consistent with our policy so at the present moment we have received and accepted only economic and technical aid.

Representative HAYS. I would like to ask Mr. Roem if he feels that technical assistance is too closely bound up with either military aid or economic aid, and would your people favor our making technical assistance or point 4 work a separate and distinct program?

Mr. ROEM. Yes; we would like to have your economic and technical aid a separate and distinct program from the military aid.

Mr. BACK. I have the impression, ladies and gentlemen, that the technical aid that the United States has given, and the technical aid the U. N. has given, has been one of the real things that you've all welcomed. It has been one of the things that has really meant something to your countries. Is that true?

Mr. ROEM. This is true, with regard to Indonesia.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. May I ask a question of the Senator and the Congressman? Have you studied, or have you cared to study, what is being done in India under the first 5-year plan, and what are the targets we have set before ourselves in the second-year plan? Have you taken an interest in this tremendous work of reconstruction going on, and how does it affect you?

Senator MUNDT. We have taken an interest in it, but, speaking for myself, I must say I am not an authority on the details of the program. I do know that as we consider these aid programs on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve, we try as best we can to relate the aid which we make available to the desires and the ambitions of the people of India from the standpoint of strengthening them as a free part of the world.

Representative HAYS. I am glad that my colleague, Mr. MUNDT, brought that out. As I understand it, our program of technical assistance is not competitive. It doesn't conflict—at least, it should not conflict—with the Colombo Plan and with these other efforts to advance the standards of living there. We're very proud of what has been done in India by our technical-assistance representatives, not only by our Government people but, as we understand it, by many people financed by foundations and private organizations.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Do you know, for instance, that the Ford Foundation is doing a very magnificent piece of work in India, and we are deeply indebted for the help that they have given us. We are also appreciative of the fine work done by the Rockefeller Foundation over the years.

Representative HAYS. That represents the spirit of the American people.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Thank you.

Mr. NASIR. I think all the financial assistance which America has given to the various people is really an indication of the good and genuine spirit of the Americans and this is why, probably, a tremendous amount of good will has been shown by the Americans, and has been more or less accepted by the rest of the world. We have accepted aid and we know that the amount of aid which has come to Jordan, although it was relatively small last year—we received $8 million—but, still, this has helped our economy greatly and we are very deeply indebted for that. There is, however, one thing which I think the Americans ought to know—that this assistance, however necessary and however useful it may be, cannot make people just accept the various policies which may be directed to anyone.

Mr. BACK. Thank you, Mr. Nasir. We have so little time left and, Mr. Togasaki, we haven't heard very much from you since the start of the program, so this will be a hard question and I won't give you very much time, but what are the bases on which the American and Asian people should work to build a free and strong world. What is your estimate of that, sir?

Mr. TOGASAKI. I believe that there should be created a greater mutual understanding between the peoples, and in keeping with the statement made by Senator MUNDT, I must say that the USIA libraries that have been established in Japan, in particular, have been most helpful and most useful and very popular. A greater intercultural exchange will be very helpful and, furthermore, the interchange of peoples is most important through travel. The lubricating of the machinery of world trade on a two-way trade basis—these, I think, are the bases upon which we should work toward creating better understanding amongst the free world.

Mr. BACK. We have just a minute or so left, and I thought perhaps we could make a catchall here. Is there anybody that has another impression of America that they might want to present before we conclude this program? Have we left something out—something you've seen about America that struck you as unusual? Mr. Ramachandran?

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. There is, in this country, a great fund of moral idealism beneath the surface. It comes from Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson and your great thinkers and writers. One thing that India would love to hear is that you are making the rediscovery of the moral and spiritual foundations of your great civilization and culture, and the moment you do it you will not merely materially lead India, but, perhaps, morally lead the whole world.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, and I want to express my thanks to everyone of you. It was sometimes difficult to handle this, there were so many of you and I know you all wanted to talk. Our thanks to all the members of the Asia Town Hall Mission, and to Senator MUNDT and Representative HAYS for this interesting discussion. To our guests from Asia and the Near East, may we say "happy landings" and we hope that you'll come again soon.

Our appreciation to the staff of the Senate Radio Gallery, and James Christenat and his associates at WMAL, ABC in Washington.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, the Senate will proceed, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed with the call of the calendar.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate was announced as first in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOSE PEREZ GOMEZ

The bill (S. 892) for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue and deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Jose Perez Gomez. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Jose Perez Gomez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 153, Calendar 217, let me say that it is my understanding that when this bill was discussed on the floor of the Senate, earlier in the week, announcement was made that certain Senators were preparing amendments to the bill. I further understand that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who reported the bill, is conferring with the Senators who are preparing the amendments; and it is hoped that agreement will be reached.

I wish to have the bill called before the Senate at the earliest possible date; and if an agreement can be worked out

over the weekend, we shall take up the bill on Tuesday, when we meet again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been made to its present consideration, the bill has been passed over.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 300) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 256) to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OF CERTAIN HOLDERS OF MORTGAGE-PURCHASE CONTRACTS

The bill (S. 1645) to permit certain holders of mortgage-purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I wish to submit a statement by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on Senate bill 1645. I am authorized to say that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] joins in the statement and in approving the bill.

I should like to read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN ON S. 1645

The purpose of this bill is to relieve hardship experienced by home builders who have proceeded in good faith, but who have been unable to consummate FHA or VA mortgages in time to deliver those mortgages to the FNMA before certain contracts with the FNMA expired.

Everyone agrees as to the legitimacy of these hardships, but it is most difficult to determine the degree of hardship on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, this bill sets up an arbitrary standard for identifying the cases which have been pursued without negligence, and it enables the FNMA to look favorably upon other legitimate hardship cases which may fail to meet this arbitrary standard.

I cannot guarantee that the standard will not help some person who has proceeded without diligence. But I believe this bill represents the most reasonable solution to a difficult problem.

Mr. President, I repeat that the statement I have just read is one by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and is concurred in by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1645?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1645) to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "a", to strike out "reasonable"; in the same line, after the word "period", to strike out "(not to exceed ninety days), in addition to the time provided in such contract" and insert "of six months after the date of enactment of this act"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "such", to strike out "time" and insert "contract"; in line 7, after the word "any", to strike out "unreasonable neglect" and insert "negligence"; after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. An application shall be considered as timely if it is forwarded to the Association not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 3. A statement by the holder of the purchase contract which identifies the properties to secure the mortgages to be sold under the contract and which properties are the subjects of Federal Housing Administration insurance commitments or Veterans' Administration certificates of reasonable value dated prior to March 1, 1955, shall be sufficient to determine the absence of negligence on the part of such holder.

And after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to permit the sale of mortgages to the Association by the holder of any mortgage purchase contract in a total principal amount which exceeds the amount specified in such contract.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal National Mortgage Association shall grant to any holder of a mortgage purchase contract, entered into with the Association between June 30, 1953, and July 1, 1954, a period of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act and without regard to whether such contract has expired, in which such holder may exercise his right under such contract to sell to the Association mortgages held by him, if the Association shall determine, upon the basis of a timely application filed with it by such holder, that the failure of such holder to fully exercise his right under such contract within the time allowed was not due to any negligence on his part.

SEC. 2. An application shall be considered as timely if it is forwarded to the Association not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. A statement by the holder of the purchase contract which identifies the properties to secure the mortgages to be sold under the contract and which properties are the subjects of Federal Housing Administration insurance commitments or Veterans' Administration certificates of reasonable value dated prior to March 1, 1955, shall be sufficient to determine the absence of negligence on the part of such holder.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to permit the sale of mortgages to the Association by the holder of any mortgage purchase contract in a total principal amount which exceeds the amount specified in such contract.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association."

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming will withhold his objection until I am able to make a brief statement.

Mr. BARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say quite frankly that I think the bill is of such great importance that it ought to be brought up by motion, rather than during the call of the calendar; and I sincerely hope that at an early date such a motion will be made and that the bill may then be discussed and passed by the Senate.

However, for the RECORD, I now wish to make a very brief statement regarding the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to provide the residents of the District of Columbia with a popularly elected mayor; popularly elected city council; popularly elected school board; and popularly elected nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives.

The objectives underlying the bill are, first, to relieve the Congress of the detail of District affairs, as has been done in the case of the Territories, while still retaining in Congress the control required by the Constitution; second, to create a representative local government for the District, chosen by the qualified electors; and, third, to provide an efficient and economical government for the District of Columbia.

Provision is made for the creation of a Board of Elections, consisting of five members appointed by the President, by

and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which Board will conduct all elections provided for in the bill. Such elected officials would be a mayor; District Council, composed of 9 members; a Board of Education, consisting of 9 members; and a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives.

The first provision of the bill to become effective would be a referendum on the proposed charter. If a majority of those voting approve the charter, it would take effect next year; and in October, the officials would be elected to take office in January 1957. The mayor and council would take over the functions of the present Board of Commissioners, which would be abolished.

The basic features of this bill are substantially the same as those of Senate bill 2413, 83d Congress, reported to Senate; and those of Senate bill 1976, 82d Congress, which passed the Senate on January 22, 1951.

On April 27, 1955, the Committee on the District of Columbia was unanimous in ordering Senate bill 669 reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say most respectfully and very sincerely that I believe the Senate should give early consideration to the bill, and that the people of the District of Columbia should not be used any further as a congressional football.

The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to full American citizenship. Today they are not receiving it; and, in that sense, they are second-class citizens. The reason why they are second-class citizens, Mr. President, is that the Congress, in carrying out what I believe to be its clear duty, has consistently, over the years, evaded dealing with the question of giving to the people of the District of Columbia the precious American franchise right of home rule.

Certainly the time has come to call a halt to the delays in the matter of respecting the full citizenship rights of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, my statement is not meant as any reflection at all upon the Senator who objected to present consideration of the bill, for I believe that objection should be made to its consideration during the call of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. Instead, I believe the bill should at an early date be made the business of the Senate, that there should be full debate on it, and that it should be passed, so that the American rights of the people of the District of Columbia, as I think those rights were fully contemplated and intended by the constitutional fathers, will be restored to them.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, my sole objection to the consideration of the bill is that I do not think it is a bill which should be considered on the call of the calendar. Personally, I am in favor of the bill, but I believe it should be brought up and considered by itself, on a day certain.

REGULATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 184) to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment on Senate bill 184.

My colleague [Mr. BEALL], chairman of the subcommittee which had charge of Senate bill 184 in the Committee on the District of Columbia, was unavoidably detained, so that he could not be present when the bill was called. I know the Senator from Maryland would like to have me invite the attention of the Senate to what is considered to be a very important bill.

Here, too, we have a bill which comes to the floor of the Senate with the unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee. It is very important that we clarify certain matters which affect the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

This happens to be a bill introduced by the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. It is a very sound bill. It might be looked upon as dealing with one of the chore duties of the Congress. That is just about what it is. In respect to this bill, we are really sitting as aldermen, as members of a city council. That is the kind of duty and jurisdiction which ought to be taken from the Congress, by its own act, by the passage of the home rule bill to which I have previously referred, namely, Senate bill 669, Calendar No. 256.

The Congress is acting as a sort of super city council. As such we cannot justify constantly postponing action on municipal problems. The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to a governmental organization which will give them efficient administration. Let me say very frankly that they do not now get efficient administration from the Congress. They are accorded exactly the type of treatment which they are receiving at the present time in connection with this bill.

It is easy, on the floor of the Senate, to postpone action upon measures affecting municipal problems of the District of Columbia. We do not consider them of great national importance, or as great national issues. However, they are of national importance. It is important that we, the Congress, the city council of the District of Columbia—which we really are—give the people of the District efficient municipal administration, so long as we retain unto ourselves control over the municipality of the District of Columbia. We should not be postponing action on such bills as this.

The District of Columbia Committee has done a great deal of hard work on the bill, under the able leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The bill is ready for action. The average Senator—and let us be frank about this—is too busy to take the time to study District of Columbia municipal legislative problems, so it is much easier to pass the buck by way of delay.

Let me say most respectfully that the Senate has every reason to have complete confidence in its Committee on the District of Columbia. I have sat with other members of that committee, and I have observed them during the course of many hours of hearings. They are taking their work very seriously as aldermen of the District of Columbia.

I think we have fallen into a bad practice in the Senate when a District of Columbia bill comes before us of postponing consideration of the bill. I do not ask for action as a matter of formality. I want Senators to check into the work of the Committee on the District of Columbia. But it is rather disheartening and discouraging to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, which we all recognize, is considered to be at the bottom of the totem pole, so far as Senate committees are concerned, and then have our hard work meet with postponement and delay in the Senate.

A good job is being done. I speak not of myself but of my colleagues on the committee. A good job has been done by the Senator from Maryland, I think the bill is deserving of the early consideration of the Senate. If we cannot get it through on the call of the calendar, I think the leadership of the Senate should schedule the bill for early consideration.

I understand that we are in somewhat of a legislative lull in the Senate at the present time. Therefore, I respectfully recommend to the majority leader and the minority leader that at an early time—within the next few days—both Senate bill 669, Calendar No. 256, and Senate bill 184, Calendar No. 258, be scheduled for early consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1633) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INVITATION TO HOLD 1960 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES AT SQUAW VALLEY, CALIF.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This joint resolution is the unfinished business. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the winter Olympic games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960, the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic

Committee to hold the 1960 Winter Olympic Games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; and expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 218, House bill 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CAPT. MOSES M. RUDY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BERNARDINO CANARES SACLO

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Saclo was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Bernardino Canares Saclo (A-9799304) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress under date of July 29, 1953, by Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, 83d Congress, 2d session.

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN ALIENS TO BENEFTS UNDER THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "Antonio Aikler"; on page 2, line 2, after the name "Bak", to strike out "Wladyslaw M. Bareszykowski"; in line 7, after the name "Cielankiewicz", to strike out "Stefan Ciundziewicki"; in line 13, after the name "Jankowski", to insert "Roberts Gustav Javalds"; in line 15, after the name "Kaminski", to insert "Sime Ivan Karlick (Sam Karlich)", in line 19, after the name "Kotlarz", to strike out "Piotr Kowalczyk"; on page 3, line 9, after the name "Pietrzak", to strike out "Zbigniew Piotrowski"; at the beginning of line 22, to insert "Jan Srodulski"; and in line 23, after the name "Stubynski", to insert "Silvio Svagno."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the joint resolution would permit the immigration authorities and the State Department to waive certain requirements with respect to entry at this time of certain individuals from Latvia and other Baltic countries. who came to this country without visas, but who are otherwise eligible to apply for an adjustment of status under the Refugee Relief Act.

The joint resolution would enable the immigration authorities to allow them to apply in this country for the benefits of the Refugee Act.

These persons are all bona fide refugees, but in the absence of the provisions of the joint resolution they would have to return to Europe in order to apply for entry. The joint resolution is not opposed by the immigration authorities or the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. This affords me an opportunity to bring to the attention of Senators a matter which was called to my attention yesterday. One of the prominent businessmen in my city of Minneapolis called at my office to tell me of a humiliating experience he has had to suffer as a citizen of this country because of some very unfortunate—and I think utterly ridiculous—rules and regulations pertaining to immigration. This gentleman was born in Ireland. He is a naturalized American citizen. He married a native of the United States in the city of Minneapolis. This friend of mine and his wife traveled to Miami, Fla., and from there went by plane to Habana. Returning from Habana, they arrived in Miami, the port of entry. When they arrived at Miami the customs officers announced: "All those who are native-born American citizens line up in this line. All those who are naturalized citizens line up in the second line. All others will line up in the third line."

My Irish-born friend is sensitive. He does not like to be separated from his wife by a bureaucrat or a customs officer under a law passed by Congress. Nevertheless, even though he has had 40 years of distinguished service in this country and is a prominent businessman of Minnesota, he is told by an officeholder of the Government of the United States, when he returns to the United States from a visit to the neighboring Republic of Cuba, that because he was born in Ireland and is a naturalized American citizen, he must be separated from his wife and stand in another line, while his native-born American wife takes her place in line No. 1 with other native American citizens. He is told, in effect, "Because you were not lucky enough to be born in this country, you must get into line No. 2. If you can find your wife in the Miami Airport later, that is all right, but you must get into another line."

I rise to protest that kind of shameful procedure under American law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we are making a great many enemies by following another nonsensical procedure. I have been told about people coming to this country by plane from Norway, for example. After the plane lands, the last persons to be given customs examination by this Government are the aliens on the plane. In other words, a Norwegian, for example, may be traveling to this country with his brother, who is a naturalized American citizen of Norwegian birth. These two men may be traveling together from Oslo to New York. When they get off the plane at the United States port of entry, they are separated. They may not have seen each other for 20 years, and they are very happy to be together again, and they want to use every minute of their time for conversation. Yet our Government says to the naturalized American citizen of Norwegian birth, "You cannot come first in the customs line. Native American citizens come first. You go in the second line for American citizens." That man's brother, who is a native and citizen of Norway, is told that he will have to wait until the end.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, under our economy measures, we do not have a sufficient number of customs officials to take care of these people. Therefore, even citizens must stand in line for a long time. Such economy measure is similar to the one under which we are now saving money, it is claimed, by not printing new money. As a result, we carry around in our pockets old, beat-up dollar bills. It would cost only a few dollars to print new bills, but that is not done because we are trying to save money. Therefore we are carrying around with us germ-laden dollar bills.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. That is the kind of economy that is a little hard to understand.

However, Mr. President, I protest the indignity which we perpetrate upon good people. It is a shameful demonstration of American poor manners, and it is a lack of courtesy. Furthermore, it is disrespectful and, what is worse, rather stupid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MAXIMILIAN KARL MANJURA

The bill (S. 88) for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed,

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maximilian Karl Manjura may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he

is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

HEDWIG MARIE ZAUNMULLER

The bill (S. 430) for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TOY LIN CHEN

The bill (S. 715) for the relief of Toy Lin Chen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toy Lin Chen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

IRFAN KAWAR

The bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Irfan Kawar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irfan Kawar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for a permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to this alien, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

KOSMAS VASSILIOS FOURNARAKIS

The bill (S. 1513) for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROSITA A. JOCSON

The bill (S. 1517) for the relief of Rosita A. Jocson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosita A. Jocson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GARABED PAFAZIAN

The bill (S. 1521) for the relief of Garabed Papazian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Garabed Papazian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropirate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CONSTANTINOS PANTERMALIS

The bill (S. 1581) for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Constantinos Pantermalis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the deportation proceeding heretofore instituted against Eliseu Joaquim Boa as well as the order and warrant of deportation issued therein; and the said Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall not hereafter be subject to exclusion or deportation from the United States by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding order and warrant of deportation were issued.

GEORGE PAUL KHOURI

The bill (S. 1705) for the relief of George Paul Khouri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Paul Khouri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ELSA LEDERER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 502) for the relief of Elsa Lederer which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elsa Lederer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMBROSE ANTHONY FOX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1035) for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Ambrose Anthony Fox. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Ambrose Anthony Fox shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which

such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Ambrose Anthony Fox. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Ambrose Anthony Fox shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CONCETTA SACATTI SALLIANI

The bill (H. R. 872) for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Sacatti Salliani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERTO DAL BELLO AND MRS. DINA BRISTOT DAL BELLO

The bill (H. R. 876) for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GABRIELLA SARDO

The bill (H. R. 881) for the relief of Gabriella Sardo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MOUNIRA E. MEDLEJ

The bill (H. R. 886) for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELSA DANES

The bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELISEO FELIX HERNANDEZ

The bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIA-TSENG CHEN

The bill (H. R. 921) for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD NOBLE

The bill (H. R. 913) for the relief of Hildegard Noble was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GLORIA MINOZA MEDELLIN

The bill (H. R. 911) for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. DANUTA OKTAWIEC

The bill (H. R. 923) for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH MARRALI

The bill (H. R. 924) for the relief of Joseph Marrali was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD CARL KAISER

The bill (H. R. 958) for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ERATO ARANOPOULOU

The bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FRANCISKA MIHALKA

The bill (H. R. 976) for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. LYCOURGOS E. PAPADAKIS

The bill (H. R. 984) for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEXANDER TURCHANINOVA

The bill (H. R. 1008) for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM LIGH

The bill (H. R. 1009) for the relief of William Ligh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BORIS IVANOVITCH OBLESOW

The bill (H. R. 1020) for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHRISTINE SUSAN CAIADO

The bill (H. R. 1048) for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANITA SCAVONE

The bill (H. R. 1130) for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE MEISTER

The bill (H. R. 1166) for the relief of Florence Meister was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZBIGNIEW WOLYNSKI

The bill (H. R. 1177) for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELITA HABERER

The bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Angelita Haberer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LI CHU FU AND WIFE LEUNG SUE WA

The bill (H. R. 1196) for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife Leung Sue Wa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IVAN BRUNO LOMM, ALSO KNOWN AS IVAN B. JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 1203) for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KLEONIKI ARIGENDELI

The bill (H. R. 1220) for the relief of Kleoniki Arigendeli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANATOLY BATENKO AND VLADIMIR BATENKO

The bill (H. R. 1346) for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LOTTIE LONGO (FORMERLY LOTTIE GUETTER)

The bill (H. R.1351) for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetter) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STYTIANOS HARALAMBIDIS

The bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of Stytianos Haralambidis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW HERNANDES MONTES ROCHA

The bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of Andrew Hernandes Montes Rocha was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH THALHAMMER AND HER CHILD, HAROLD WILLIAM BUSHMANN III

The bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Elizabeth Thalhammer and her child,

Harold William Bushmann III was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT GEORGE BULLDEATH AND LENORA PATRICIA BULLDEATH

The bill (H. R. 1511) for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANIS ARVIDS REINFELDS

The bill (H. R. 1638) for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGINA BERG VOMBERG AND HER CHILDREN WILMA AND HELGA VOMBERG

The bill (H. R. 1645) for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children Wilma and Helga Vomberg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID MANUEL PORTER

The bill (H. R. 1665) for the relief of David Manuel Porter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAREK L. KOROWICZ

The bill (H. R. 1679) for the relief of Marek L. Korowicz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORLANDO LUCARINI

The bill (H. R. 1885) for the relief of Orlando Lucarini was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FAY JEANETTE LEE

The bill (H. R. 1906) for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAMIKO NITOH AND HER CHILD, GEORGE F. X. NITOH

The bill (H. R. 1957) for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIKA RAMBAUSKE

The bill (H. R. 2087) for the relief of Erika Rambauske was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUISEPPE CAROLLO

The bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of Guiseppe Carollo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIDA KOSNIK

The bill (H. R. 2276) for the relief of Vida Kosnik was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER MARY BERARDA

The bill (H. R. 2279) for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARJORIE FLIGOR (NEE SPROUL)

The bill (H. R. 2289) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN P. FARRAR

The bill (H. R. 2346) for the relief of John P. Farrar was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bills to cancel the outstanding warrant of deportation in the case of John P. Farrar. The bill also provides that he shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which deportation proceedings were commenced.

The fact is, Mr. President, that John Farrar is an illiterate Portuguese who has been in this country working as a gardener on Long Island at a salary of $500 a year since 1916. In 1946 he was charged with violating the law relative to the possession of marihuana. He pleaded guilty and served a sentence. It was ascertained that the whole difficulty occurred because he could not read or write, that he was isolated, unmarried, with no one around him, and he did not realize he had committed an offense. His deportation is pending.

The Immigration Bureau did not interpose any objection to the bill. Since coming to this country he apparently has been law abiding and his breach of the law was occasioned by ignorance on his part. Therefore, the Immigration Bureau does not interpose any objection. This is the only way by which they can be relieved of their responsibility.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I withdraw the objection I had interposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THEODORA SAMMARTINO

The bill (H. R. 2348) for the relief of Theodora Sammartino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BASIL THEODOSSIOU

The bill (H. R. 2354) for the relief of Basil Theodossiou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH ANN GIAMPIETRO

The bill (H. R. 2361) for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SING FONG YORK

The bill (H. R. 2731) for the relief of Sing Fong York was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENT PETERSON

The bill (H. R. 2762) for the relief of Bent Peterson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VICTOR AND IRENE-WANDA GOLDSTEIN

The bill (H. R. 2764) for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELFRIEDE MAJKA GRIFASI

The bill (H. R. 2941) for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. IRENE EMMA ANDERSON

The bill (H. R. 2954) for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RENE RACHELL LUYSE KUBICEK

The bill (H. R. 4043) for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. CRISTJO CRISTOFV, HIS WIFE JORDANA DILOVA CRISTOFV, AND HIS CHILDREN GEORGE AND DAPHNE-KREMENA CRISTOFV

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "fees", to strike out "and head taxes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FEDERICO UNGAR FINALY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the

word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NICHOLS JOHN MANTICAS, ANNE FRANCIS MANTICAS, YVONNE MANTICAS, MARY MANTICAS, AND JOHN MANTICAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1328) for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Yvonne Manticas"; and in line 11, after the word "deduct", to strike out "five" and insert "four."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas."

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; and Calendar No. 353, Senate Resolution 35, providing for a study of merchant marine training and education in the United States, I ask that those measures be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The measures will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ATOMS FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, when one pauses to reflect on this Nation's recent history, it seems incredible that what we have referred to many times as the cold war has been with us for nearly a decade.

In spite of the fear, the anxiety, and the tensions of the past 10 years, however, our people and peoples all over the world have shown a remarkable vitality and energy. We have learned to live with fear and, at the same time, to shape the tools for a better future for ourselves and our families. History will surely record the splitting of the atom as the most significant achievement in the first half of the 20th century.

Largely because of that momentous development we have come to refer more and more to the struggle between the free world and the Communist world as one of competitive coexistence. Slowly we are beginning to realize that another war, bringing with it a frightful rain of atomic destruction, would be suicidal for all of civilization. We are reaching the point of atomic stalemate. That fact can give us hope for the future. For while the issues of conflict still remain between the free nations and the Communist world, we can hope that atomic developments will act as a deterrent to the unleashing of a third world war.

The alternative to war is coexistence. But, so long as the Communist leaders are bent on achieving world rule, coexistence must remain strongly competitive.

The arsenal of American democracy has many weapons with which to carry on competitive coexistence. The most powerful weapon we have is our sturdy foundation of liberty and democratic ideals. We must be ever vigilant in the defense of those precious liberties and ideals. Only by practicing what we profess to believe can we convince others that we merit support in building the kind of world for which men everywhere long.

In addition to the right to live their lives in their own way, without outside interference, all men look for economic plenty—for a world in which they and their families are well clothed, well housed, and well fed. Here, too, the United States can exercise stirring and dynamic leadership.

Probably the most effective step which the United States has taken in this direction is the implementation of President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace program.

In the minds of many, America has emerged as a warm and humanitarian nation, interested in peace and plenty for men everywhere. The President's program to harness the atom for peace has done more than any other single action to strike a crippling blow at that Communist propaganda which paints us as a ruthless and warmongering people.

In August the United States will participate with many other nations at an international conference in Geneva to spread information concerning the peaceful uses of the atom. This Conference is the direct outgrowth of the suggestions made by the President before the United Nations nearly a year and a half ago.

The United States has already made a contribution of 220 pounds of uranium 235 to an international pool of fissionable materials for use in encouraging our friends abroad to build their own research reactors. Our Government also plans to build an operating research reactor in Geneva for demonstration purposes at the Conference.

Meanwhile, negotiations are going forward on multilateral agreement which would set up an International Atomic Energy Agency to study new developments in the peaceful uses of the atom.

But this is only a part of the story of how the United States is helping to develop among our friends the technical know-how which can bring the blessings of atomic energy to all men. The Atomic Energy Commission has sent to Italy, Japan, and France comprehensive libraries of unclassified information on the atom, and more libraries are now being prepared for distribution to other friendly nations. Also, 2 of our schools are training 63 scientists and technicians from 29 nations under a Government program to speed the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Two weeks ago, President Eisenhower made the dramatic announcement that he would request funds from Congress for the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship which would visit the ports of the world, carrying with it an exhibit on the peaceful uses of the atom. That would be a fitting sequel, indeed, to the construction of the atom-powered submarine, the *Nautilus*. It would be conclusive evidence that our search for peace continues, even while we must remain militarily strong.

Much has been done and much more remains to be done in our efforts to bring the blessings of peace and scientific development to all men of good will. But President Eisenhower has made a dramatic and successful beginning. He has shifted the spotlight from the horrors of atomic war to the bright new day of atomic peace. He has shown the world that we stand ready to point the way to a better and happier life for all.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPOSURE OF "PARTNERSHIP" POWER SCHEME OF ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent weeks many people with a sincere interest in the program for Columbia River Basin resource development have been led to believe that the beneficial objectives of river development can only be obtained through a "partnership" between the Federal Government and local utilities.

In effect, they have been told by the Eisenhower administration that the Federal Government will not carry through on these authorized projects which are so badly needed to control the floods which ruin their land unless Congress changes its mind and deauthorizes these Federal projects, turning over the profitable power features to local private utilities.

At the same time, a thoroughly false impression is deliberately created that under partnership these projects could spring into being overnight. This callous attempt to force Congress and the people of Oregon to accept a shotgun partnership is a type of political pressure hitherto unheard of on the American scene. Congress has the responsibility of repudiating the administration's pressure tactics.

Fortunately, some of the enlightened editors in my home State of Oregon have taken on the chore of airing publicly the disadvantages and adverse effects of the inadequate partnership proposals. One of the best analyses of the partnership scheme was written by Mr. Byron C. Brinton, editor of the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier, in the April 28, 1955, issue of his newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Brinton's editorial, discussing the partnership proposals of this administration, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW JOHN DAY BILL

How much is $100 million?

We refer specifically to the $109 million bargain which the Portland private utilities would have walked off with had the Coon-John Day partnership bill of 1954 been swallowed. At that time the private utilities would have walked off with the power from John Day Dam for 50 years and we quote from the bill: "The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract with local interests providing for (a) the contribution of funds by such interests in the amount of $164 million."

Under the bill introduced by Congressman COON at the instance of President Eisenhower and the Portland private utilities last week, the power syndicate would walk off with the 50 years contracts and we again quote—this time from COON's 1955 bill: "The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts with qualified applicants * * * providing, among other things, for (1) the payment of funds by such interests in the amount of $273 million."

In cold hard reality COON offered a $320 million dam in 1954 for $164 million. Other than President Eisenhower, Secretary McKay, Governor Patterson, and a few others, spearheading the Eisenhower giveaway program, there were not many suckers for this private utility scheme in 1954. Now COON says the utilities are bidding $273 million for a $310 million dam. Yet he recommended in 1954 that you and I accept $164 million.

In 1954 this writer summarized 10 cardinal points—other than the matter of hard cash—which characterized the Coon partnership bill as the most dangerous piece of financial hokus-pokus ever proposed in Congress. An analysis of the 1955 bill reveals that the new bill puts up a warning sign that the depths of its monopoly manipulation go far deeper than even his former bill dreamed.

Let's look at the blind, dark alley the Coon bill leads the Northwest into.

First. Mr. COON tells the local county assessor he shall not tax the $273 million. But he didn't tell you in his analysis of the bill.

Second. Mr. COON tells the State of Oregon it cannot impose the provisions of its hydroelectric act upon his pet private utilities at John Day. Yet he didn't tell you that also is contemplated under the bill.

Third. Mr. COON tells the private utilities they need not distribute the power widely with preference to residential or rural customers nor in compliance with low-cost provisions of previous power policies. Yet Mr. COON didn't tell you that was part of the bill. In fact he purposely spoke of the "widest distribution to domestic and rural customers" to purposely mislead the public.

Fourth. Mr. COON tells the private utilities they can assign, barter, speculate in, and otherwise deal in their power contracts between each other without the slightest control by the landlord himself—the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. COON doesn't tell you in his analysis that each private utility holds this automatic option upon the other partner private utilities so that the monopoly can grow tighter but can never be broken. The alley is not only dark and blind but is a one-way gangplank.

Fifth. Mr. COON tells the private partners he hands them a blank check upon Uncle Sam for "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." Nowhere is there a specific guaranty that the partners will pay any sum, but clearly there is an agreement that they will receive 100 percent of the power and most specifically that "the contracts provided for herein shall be deemed contractual obligations of the United States Government" even though this bill prevents the Congress from having any surveillance over the project or the contracts. Yet Mr. COON has the nerve to casually remark to you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that this provision on obligations "makes the obligations of the United States rank equally with those assumed by the local interests.

Sixth. Within 6 months after enactment of the bill 99 percent of the public agencies, and perhaps 100 percent, in the Northwest would be disqualified from participation in the project yet he tells you that "the important thing is who is served—not by whom he is served."

Seventh. Mr. COON does not reserve John Day power—not a kilowatt—for national defense. He does not tell you that his bill will require that national defense buy it back from private utilities.

Eighth. Mr. COON tells the private utilities that certain costs at their option may be paid in equal installments over a 50-year period at low-cost Federal interest, but he leads you to believe in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that all the money must be advanced before the power contracts can be executed.

Ninth. Mr. COON grants the private utilities with the contracts not only a monopoly upon the present John Day development, but grants them an option upon all future generators at John Day, even though those added generators might be made possible by future public upstream storage projects.

Tenth. Mr. COON tells the private utilities they can have the franchise for 50 years, yet he tells you "the John Day project will be a Federal project in all respects."

Eleventh. Mr. COON tells the private utilities they are not bound but that the Federal Government is bound to his bill—the bill provides that if John Day turns out to be an expensive project the partners will not pay a nickel, but that if engineers find that it will be a bargain the public will be obligated to contract it at that bargain figure to private utilities. Mr. COON doesn't tell you this is a "heads I win, tales you lose" bill.

Twelfth. Mr. COON directs the Secretary of the Interior to deliver for 50 years power equal to that generated by the initial facilities. However, the operation by the Army of the project as part of a river system may sometimes be less than the partners will contend they are entitled to under contract. Whatever happens to the dam, the private stockholders hold the contract. And this is an obligation of the United States.

Thirteenth. The Coon bill does not require the project to be integrated with the Northwest power system. It does not require that the power be subject to the rate supervision of that system. It provides for the charging of rates on the basis of risk capital under conditions where there is no risk involved.

But Mr. COON does not tell you that in return for the public subsidy, the public contract, the freedom from taxes on the power facilities, the freedom from risk, the low Government interest on much of the investment, the freedom from rent, the freedom from competition his bill doesn't require a single thing in return from the power companies and it guarantees the power consumer nothing.

What in reality it does is give $1,270,000,000 worth of power for possibly $273 million—and if Mr. COON would have had his way in 1954 he would have given it away for $164 million.

And in the bargain Mr. COON tells the utilities if they can get $3 billion in high rates out of the million dollars' worth of power that's O. K. with him. After all, even $100 million isn't much if it belongs to John Q. Public.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is Calendar Order No. 218, House bill 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call that fact to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, H. R. 1573 was, of course, passed by the House of Representatives, and I understand it was passed unanimously, and it also was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I might modify that statement by saying that two or three members of the committee were not present when the bill was ordered to be reported. As to whether they were recorded affirmatively or negatively, I would not say, but all members of the committee present voted in favor of H. R. 1573.

This is a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which section, commonly known as the Holland amendment in the act of last year, denies soil-conservation payments to producers who violate their acreage allotments.

Prior to last year section 348 applied only to cotton producers. Last year Congress extended it to producers of all basic agricultural commodities in the hope that it would bring about increased compliance with acreage allotments. It now appears that, instead of accomplishing this purpose, it is resulting in decreased participation in soil-conservation programs. It has caused particular difficulties in the case of farmers who are exempt from marketing quotas but subject to acreage allotments, such as wheat producers planting less than 15 acres, tobacco producers who have voted down quotas, and others.

This bill was the subject of careful inquiry by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which subcommittee it was my privilege to be chairman. Other members of the subcommittee were the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, in his letter to the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER], dated February 9, 1955, called for the elimination of section 348. I should like to read a passage or two from Mr. Morse's letter to the Senator from Louisiana:

The Department approves of this proposed legislation.

This was at the time the bill was before our subcommittee. I continue to read from Under Secretary Morse's letter:

The Department approves of this proposed legislation. At present the only ACP payments made are for cost sharing with respect to conservation practices carried out on farms, and these payments represent only a share of the cost of performing the conservation measure. There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists. Also, the present average ACP amount of cost sharing of less than $100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

The principal effect of this restriction—

Namely, the Holland amendment—

on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms. Since it is expected that most farmers will comply with marketing-quota provisions, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will affect principally farmers with corn allotments and farmers with less than 15-acre wheat allotments. Under marketing-quota requirements a farmer with a wheat allotment less than 15 acres is permitted to grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without incurring a marketing-quota penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the ACP eligibility requirement of section 348.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, continues as follows, in his letter or report to the committee:

Based on past experience that there will be about 750,000 farms with a 1955 wheat-acreage allotment of less than 15 acres. A high percentage of these farms is expected to take advantage of the 15-acre limit and thereby become ineligible for 1955 ACP assistance. It is estimated that there will be 1,600,000 farms with a 1955 corn allotment. Based on the compliance obtained in 1954 it is likely that up to 60 percent, or almost 1 million farms, will have excess corn acreage in 1955 which would make them ineligible for 1955 ACP payments. Even though some farms with small wheat allotments also grow corn and would be included in both of the foregoing estimates, it is likely that substantially more than 1 million farms would not be eligible for ACP payments, due to the provisions of section 348.

Elimination of this entire requirement of eligibility is desirable. Its repeal would not require additional appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Mr. President, at the time of our hearings, we were privileged to have the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Earl L. Butz, appear before us. He presented a letter to the subcommittee; and, later, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Peterson, also testified in behalf of the Department.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Butz, in his letter of March 10, to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], had this to say:

Since the passage of Public Law 690, farmers have been expecting to be permitted to adjust their planted acreage to come within the allotment on each basic crop if they so desired. To change at this time, with respect to the 1955 crop, would lead to much dissatisfaction, misunderstanding, and administrative difficulty in connection with some crops, particularly corn and rice.

The Department believes that the provision for adjusting the planted acreage to the allotment should be applicable equally to all the basic commodities. In our opinion the provision in the present law should be retained.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that not only did the Department of Agriculture support the particular change we are recommending, but furthermore, the National Farmers Union supported it, as did, I believe, the National Grange. No objection was registered, with the exception of one from the American Farm Bureau; and its objection was not an across-the-board objection, so to speak. It wanted some modification of the present provisions of section 348, but did not wish to go so far as the committee ultimately decided to go.

I do not believe much more need be said regarding the bill, except that the Department of Agriculture was contacted only recently, in light of the fact that I had heard that amendments would be offered. I wish to read the statement reaffirming the position of the Department of Agriculture:

After careful additional review and analysis by the Department of the proposal to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, we wish to reaffirm our position that this section be repealed. While the amendments proposed—

That is to say, the amendments which I gather will be proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other Senators; and it is to those amendments that the Department of Agriculture is directing its attention in this memorandum—

while the amendments proposed by Senator HOLLAND with respect to certain technical objections which we had to this section are generally met, nevertheless, we feel that there should be no relationship between eligibility for ACP payments and participation in an allotment and marketing quota program. In view of the fact that marketing quotas are in effect for all basic commodities except corn, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will, even after amendment, affect principally those farmers with corn allotments. Also, there will necessarily be a tremendous amount of administrative detail. In view of the principle involved and the discriminatory nature of the present legislation, we recommend repeal of section 348.

Mr. President, strange as it may seem, I am hereby presenting an administration proposal. This is a unique position for me to occupy, but I am doing it with a certain amount of pleasure and with deep conviction.

I am confident that the Department of Agriculture has found that section 348, as now written, is a hindrance to an effective soil-conservation program, rather than a help to the so-called acreage-and-production-quota program.

Therefore, the Department and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommend the repeal of this section, as proposed by the pending bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. If the bill shall be passed, is it not altogether possible that the soil-conservation program will be stimulated, rather than hampered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the view of the Department of Agriculture. In that connection, I called attention to the letter of the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Butz, and also the testimony before our subcommittee of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Peterson. It was felt that the present limitation does nothing to strengthen acreage allotments and production quotas, but has substantially weakened what we call the participating program in soil conservation, by means of which the farmer and the Government work together in the soil-conservation program, particularly in the case of the family-type farms. I believe we must view this matter on the basis of what is best for soil conservation.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not also true that the law provides appropriate penalties in cases where they are applicable, anyway?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; it does.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I recall—and perhaps the Senator from Minnesota will wish to refresh my recollection—the bill is not only supported by the Department of Agriculture and two of the large farm organizations, but also is supported by the committee. I believe it was unanimously approved by our committee. I know it was unanimously approved by the subcommittee, and I believe it was unanimously approved and ordered reported by the full Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, although with certain reservations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I qualify my statement by saying that I believe 1 or 2 members of the committee were absent, but were polled. It is correct that all members of the committee present or polled voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. As additional support for that position, let me point out that at the bottom of page 4 of the report will be found a list of a large number of Members of the House of Representatives who have introduced bills along the same general line. Included in the list are members of the House Committee on Agriculture, as well as other Members of the House of Representatives; and they are rather evenly divided as between the two political parties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, let me point out that a number of Senators have introduced similar bills.

Mr. MUNDT. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For instance, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] introduced such a bill on January 6; and similar bills were introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. In the committee there was some discussion as to whether we should report a Senate bill on this subject; but in order to expedite the taking of action by the entire Congress—in view of the fact that immediate repeal of this provision is important for farmers, in connection with their planning of soil conservation—we determined to report to the Senate the House bill, and thus expedite the passage of the proposed legislation. However, I think it should be clear that the Senators who sponsored separate bills on this subject had in mind the same objective. In fact, several of the bills are in identical language.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

I should also like to say that I wish to join with the Senator from Minnesota in urging our colleagues not to endeavor to load up this little corrective amendment with any other amendment at this time, for this is something which it is necessary for us to do soon and quickly if the maximum benefit is to be had.

So I hope nothing which would result in further delay on the House side will be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD the name of the witness representing the Department of Agriculture who appeared before the committee. He is the Honorable Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. The Acting Administrator of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, Mr. F. G. Ritchie, also appeared.

If my colleagues will examine pages 7, 8, and 9 of the hearings, they will find that Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Peterson unqualifiedly endorse this particular program.

Mr. Ritchie was asked by me:

Have you thought that the operation of section 348 has impaired or impeded in any way your ACP program?

That was the question I asked the Acting Director of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Ritchie responded to my question as follows:

I believe it has, as it applied to these crops, such as corn and wheat, particularly. We find a good many farmers who come to the county offices to see about getting cost, sharing under the ACP on the conservation work that they would like to do. We have to inform them about the provisions of this section of the act, to be sure that they are not misled and go ahead and do their work and then find themselves ineligible for ACP help. A large portion of them, when they find that they have to comply with all of the allotments, decide that they will just forego the conservation activity.

Listen to this:

So we feel like it is deterring the achievement of conservation, out of proportion to the benefits that it is getting in causing these farmers to comply with the allotments.

That answers the question of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. Mr. Ritchie says:

So we feel like it is deterring the achievement of conservation, out of proportion to the benefits that it is getting in causing these farmers to comply with the allotments.

Then I asked the following question:

Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, the penalty is not sufficient to get compliance under the allotment, but the loss of the benefits under ACP could in some way retard some of your efforts in soil conservation?

Mr. RITCHIE. That is correct.

Later we had the testimony of Mr. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As I have stated, Mr. Lynn took a little different point of view. This is what he had to say as his concluding statement:

May I conclude by saying that I recognize that the Department of Agriculture has recommended the repeal of section 348 and that we are the only witness recommending the continuance of section 348. We would certainly hope that the committee would give serious consideration to this particular section. If it seems advisable to amend this section to do what I suggested before, to take care of these smaller farmers who need to put out enough corn to fill their silo, or the small wheat farmer who needs to plant enough wheat for his own home consumption, up to 15 acres, we would support an amendment to section 348 to so provide.

Even the Farm Bureau Federation recognizes that the present provisions of law are undesirable, in the sense that they do not strengthen production controls, and do not provide for improvement in soil conservation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish first to clear up any question as to the support of this measure in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have no doubt that the statement which has been made, that the members present voted to report House bill 1573, is correct. However, several members of the committee were not present. Upon the table there is a printed amendment, in the nature of a substitute, submitted by three members of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], former chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], former Secretary of Agriculture, and the senior Senator from Florida, in which they are joined by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. Three of the four authors of the substitute amendment are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we were not in accord with the bill as originally introduced and as reported. Instead, we have submitted a substitute which we think would effectively clear up the difficulties mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, and not cripple the enforcement of the price-support program in the way it would be crippled by the enactment of the proposed repeal measure.

The second thing I wish to say is that, while this amendment bears my name, and I am proud to have it bear my name, the fact is that the amendment is a product of the thinking of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as reflected in resolutions adopted by it last year, and also last December, at the last annual convention. The Farm Bureau Federation of my own State likewise is very strongly in support of the amendment.

What did the provision which is sought to be repealed by the pending measure do? It enacted, in a weakened way, a provision of law with reference to all basic commodities, which had been effective as to cotton, one of the basic commodities, continuously since 1933, without doing violence to the producers of cotton, but, to the contrary, with the accomplishment of sound objectives by way of closer adherence to the allotted acreages than was found in the case of some of the other great industries, notably the corn industry.

In 1933 the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was enacted. I think all Members of the Senate will recall that it was held unconstitutional in 1936. Up to that time a single measure dealt with the entire field of price support, conservation, and other objectives in this field designed to bring greater prosperity to agriculture.

Under the system of rental and benefit payments which prevailed under that act, the linking together of the conservation payment and the price-support structure was effectively accomplished.

After 1936, immediately upon the ruling of the Supreme Court that the original AAA Act was unconstitutional, Congress enacted, within a few weeks, the original Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, which was the first exclusive conservation measure in this field.

Under that measure as well, with reference to cotton, the same provision was applicable. In 1938 that measure was reenacted in more perfect form, and a part of the act of that year was section 348, which Congress amended last year. It has been in force continuously since that time.

Let me read section 348 in the act of 1938, which applied solely to cotton. I omit certain words which are unnecessary in giving the full meaning of that section:

> Any person who knowingly plants cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be eligible for any payment under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

From 1938 until last year, 1954, that provision was in force. Not only did no harm result from it to the hundreds of thousands of producers of cotton in the United States, but a better performance in living up to acreage allotments was accomplished by the cotton industry than was found in some of the other industries, in which no such provision applied. I think the record shows very clearly that the cotton industry is one of the great industries which has not cost the American people heavily under the price-support program or the soil-conservation program. To the contrary, cotton farmers have stood by their guns. They have stood by each other, and have stood by the Department of Agriculture and the Nation in very strictly observing their acreage allotments. Without doubt, this particular section played some part in that strict observance.

When the measure was before the Senate last year, as Senators will recall, a situation was presented in which we were endeavoring to save a price support program, with little reductions, at most, for any commodity, and with no reductions from the 90 percent price support program in the case of commodities of which no great surpluses were created—in other words, commodities the producers of which imposed self discipline.

At the time of the consideration of that measure I offered on the floor the amendment which extended section 348, which had been in force since 1938 as to cotton, so as to apply to all basic commodities, including cotton.

In re-writing the amendment at that time we made it a weaker provision, but we thought a fairer provision, than that which had been contained in the original section 348, because the original section 348 provided that if a grower knowingly over-planted he should forfeit his right to soil-conservation payments.

As we rewrote the provision in the bill last year, we used the words "any person who knowingly harvests." That made it possible for him to adjust his acreage throughout the period of production, in the event he found that he was over his allotment, or in the event there was some trespassing upon his allotment next year.

The form in which the measure was enacted last year is one of the things, it seems to me, that operates as a roadblock in our present discussion, and it seems to me that possible support for the measure, which is now under consideration, comes from those who opposed the bill of last year.

Perhaps the three Senators who gave the strongest or most active support to the enactment of the bill last year were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the senior Senator from Florida. We were proud to give that support. We are not found in support of this repeal measure because we believe it is a salutary thing to provide that the Government shall not, out of one of its pockets, pay money to growers to whom it is offering a very generous program out of another pocket, when such growers refuse to play fair to the second pocket, although they share in the governmental payments from the second pocket which continue in such large measure, in so many billions of dollars. That is how simple it is.

If a grower wants to play ball with his fellows and with his own Government and with the people of the Nation, who are providing funds so generously in order that there may be some stability in his industry, he should at least be willing to be fair enough not to trespass upon the acreage allotments which are given him, and which represents his fair share of the total amount available for his industry. It seems to me that is a fair condition to impose upon him, namely, that he shall observe the provisions of the price-support program, as made applicable to him through his acreage allotments, if he is to hold out his other hand and ask the Federal Government to pay largess for carrying on practices which are good for him, and which, as a rule, he should carry on regardless of whether anyone contributes to the cost of the program.

I do not have a great deal more to say on this subject, except that I wish to voice some disappointment with the fact—and it is a fact, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota—that apparently the Department of Agriculture is willing to blow both hot and cold on this matter. It blew very hot last year, when, with the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and of a majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress, as well as a preponderance of the American people, Congress enacted a program which was designed better to serve agriculture and to retain price supports for certain commodities.

We are sorry that the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to leave us, its advocates of last year, and to take the position that repeal of this provision should now be accomplished.

We are particularly sorry that the Department sees fit to base its position upon something which cannot yet be demonstrated at all, namely, that the provision is crippling the conservation program. The provision did not become applicable until the first of this year. No payments under it can be made until the end of this year. No one knows yet what will be done under it. If one reads the testimony carefully, he learns simply that certain farmers, when informed of this provision, have said that they would rather go ahead and violate their acreage allotments than participate in the soil conservation program.

Mr. President, what I say now I say in complete good humor. So far as I am concerned, if any farmer wishes deliberately to violate the acreage allotments which the Government has prescribed for his protection and for the protection of his fellow farmers and the agricultural industry, I am willing to have him abandon his right to claim money from the Federal Government for pursuing on his land practices—sound practices, I may say—which he ought to be willing to pursue in protection of himself and of his own land and its values, even without Federal assistance.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if there may not be 2 or 3 situations which might possibly be corrected by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad that the Senator from Utah has made that suggestion. The 4 Senators to whom I have already referred have prepared a substitute which corrects the only 4 embarrassing situations we could find lending support to the arguments advanced by the Department of Agriculture. It corrects them entirely without repealing the salutary provisions contained in section 348.

It seems to the Senators who are offering the amendment that what the sponsors of the bill would have us do is to cut off our good right arm because we happen to have a hangnail on one of the fingers, instead of giving detailed and specific attention to the hangnail.

The amendment which we have prepared was submitted to the Department of Agriculture; and the Department of Agriculture, through its Under Secretary, Mr. Morse, admitted to me no later than this morning that it would correct the difficulties of which the Department is cognizant, although he reiterates that it was the preference of the Department of Agriculture that section 348 should be repealed entirely.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota to withhold his question until I have read into the RECORD the proposed amendment, in the nature of a substitute. It proposes that the measure shall read as follows:

> SEC. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests an acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

So far as those words go, that is exactly the language of the present provision. Then we add four exemptions, which comprise all the exemptions so far as we could hear any statement made by anyone that should be made in the revision of the act.

Before I read the four exemptions, I think I should say to the Senator from Minnesota and to other Senators that I believe they will recall that the measure of last year was rewritten in conference; that this particular provision did not come out of conference in the same wording in which it was submitted on the floor and debated on the floor, and that in rewriting the provision in conference there were omitted some of the details, which it now appears should have been included.

I read those four exemptions as follows:

For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity in excess of his farm acreage allotment by reason of harvesting corn for ensilage, harvesting wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, harvesting a commodity or a crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing-quota referendum, or harvesting peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

"Hogged off" is not a very euphonious term. It is used in the peanut belt to denote the harvesting of a crop of peanuts entirely by turning in the hogs and letting them follow their natural instincts by going after the luscious nut under the ground. They are very thorough harvesters, if I may say so.

The problems covered by these four provisions, Mr. President, were the only ones, with the exception of one covered in a later modification of the bill which I shall read, which we were able to find from one end of this country to the other in which the amendment as written in the present law offers any difficulties whatsoever.

The first was with reference to farm acreage for the production of corn harvested for ensilage; that is, to go into silos to become feed on the farm for dairy cattle or livestock, or not to be used in connection with any marketing.

Second. The harvesting of wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres. There is a marketing quota provision which allows the harvesting of 15 acres of wheat without penalty. Judging by the letter from Mr. Morse or by the testimony of Mr. Peterson, if there is any strong feeling at all on the part of the Department of Agriculture, it is that they are fearful that if a farmer whose actual allotment may have been 5 or 10 acres planted, despite his allotment, up to 15 acres, he might have to come under this provision. I think that is a highly strained construction of the law. But whether that is so or not, the substitute as prepared would correct that situation.

The third is the harvesting of a commodity or crop with respect to which the producers have rejected marketing quotas in a referendum. That speaks for itself.

The fourth is the harvesting of peanuts for seed for hogging-off purposes. There are many peanut producers who raise peanuts simply for the purpose of fattening their hogs. Some of those producers felt they should be allowed to grow peanuts for seed in order that they might go ahead with their program.

Mr. President, those were the only four situations which we could find and which the American Farm Bureau Federation could find from one end of the country to the other which required any special treatment under the act to make sure they would be exempted so that no unfair result could come to them under the provisions of the act.

There was likewise a matter of procedure which proved to be burdensome and which we chose to correct by subdivision (b) of the proposed substitute, which reads as follows:

(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be required to establish their eligibility for such payment under this section in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation.

That paragraph would give the Secretary the authority to issue regulations which would make it unnecessary to send out notices to every farmer, even though he could not possibly be affected, and would save an enormous amount of office work which under present regulations would be required, and which I understand from the distinguished Senator from Vermont are actually required in his State, although there was no direct implication in the law that it affected the growers of his State.

So, Mr. President, we think that the substitute is by all means the sound method of approaching the problem, rather than the repealing of a provision which is salutary and which we think is on the side of decency in that it prescribes that a farmer who claims largess from the Government through his conservation payments must at least play fair with his Government and with other producers.

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall wait to get the floor in my own right.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Florida. I shall wait until I can get the floor in my own right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, after listening to the Senator from Florida today, and having heard him previously, I am convinced that he is correct, and that the amendment is a sound approach to the problem. I recognize the fact that there are difficulties in connection with the four categories which he has mentioned. But I think they could be completely corrected by the amendment ment which he has prepared. I was hoping that it would be offered and that we would have an opportunity to discuss it on its merits. I am very happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has made an outstanding record with respect to agriculture in the United States since he entered the Senate. I am glad to go along with him in support of his amendment.

It is very inconsistent, indeed, for men who operate farms, large acreages, who take conservation help and use fertilizers to increase their output, to ask the Government of the United States to give them compensation benefits when they do not comply with at least the spirit of the act.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah. I certainly agree with him completely. The questions involved must be decided, whether my amendment is actually offered or not. I have been disappointed and discouraged in connection with the idea of offering it, because I learned a long ago that it was sort of a futile gesture to hand a gun to a man who would not fight, or to give a tool to a man who would not work, or to present a program to a man who will not use it. I believe that good, firm leadership in this field would lead to a correction of some of the manifest abuses in connection with surpluses which have been piled sky high in the warehouses of the Nation and in the ships which were empty before they were filled with surplus products. We have all been looking for some method of disposing of those surpluses. Many methods have been suggested, and I should like to think most of them are wise. But we are still struggling under those immense surpluses. As I recall the latest report shows a billion bushels of surplus wheat. I do not have in mind the exact amount of the surplus of butter and milk products. But the surpluses are so great as to baffle any solution that has ever been suggested along the line of having them consumed by human beings. As a matter of fact, we have actually turned to chickens and cattle to consume great amounts of dried milk.

Mr. WATKINS. I am a farmer, in a small way, particularly with respect to the raising of fruit, but I never could see a sound policy in any law which provided aid from the Government for doing what I was already doing and had been doing for a number of years, such as fertilizing the orchards. I think that applies all down the line. It seems to me that if the program is unreasonable it is going to be difficult to continue to sell it to the American people, particularly if we continue to allow these absurd situations to develop.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. I think all the public-opinion polls which have been conducted in urban areas or in areas where perishable agricultural commodities are produced, and in other areas of the Nation, have shown rather conclusively that the general public was pretty well "fed up" on the program under which we were operating until last year. I think the public is hoping that the program we adopted last year will be given a fair chance to be effective. I cannot imagine anything which will be more discouraging than to have word go out—and it must go out if this bill is passed—that instead of strengthening the program, we are actually weakening it.

I repeat: The provision as to cotton has been in effect throughout the duration of the law, and it has proved to be a salutary provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

I cannot imagine anything more discouraging and disheartening to persons who are looking hopefully to balanced budgets and to industries which will more or less stand on their own, though I fully agree that as to the basics and as to some other products we must have some support-price program, than to learn that the White Knight who led them so hopefully to higher ground last year has begun to be a little fearful as to whether he can lead successfully. I think it will be a most disappointing and discouraging experience.

Speaking only for myself, as one of the strong advocates of his program last year on the floor and elsewhere, a program which was mine before he came into the picture 2 years ago, it is discouraging to me to find a suggestion in the report that there is no connection between the conservation program and the price-support program. To that subject, I shall devote a little further attention in a moment.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate what the Senator from Florida has been saying. He had been giving a very accurate résumé of the situation with which we are confronted.

When anyone says there has never been any connection between the ACP program and controls, he is simply incorrect, because there has been such a connection for years past.

In view of the fact that the amendment which the Senator from Florida and others of us have proposed exempts from the provisions of section 348 the small wheatgrower, who has no voice in the determination of whether he shall be placed under controls or not; inasmuch as it exempts the dairy farmer, who grows corn for silage, and does not market his corn anyway; inasmuch as it exempts peanuts, which are "hogged off" if planted in excess acreage, or perhaps are kept for seed; inasmuch as it relieves State officials who are concerned with soil conservation from sending questionnaires to hundreds of thousands of farmers who are not affected at all or who do not produce basic commodities for marketing anyway; does it not then appear that the only possible reason for insisting upon the bill as reported by the committee, rather than the Holland amendment, would be to give the green light to the corporation farmers, the large farmers, to go ahead and plant in excess of their fair allotment without incurring the penalty provided by section 348?

Is not that the only possible reason anyone could have for voting for the bill as reported instead of for the Holland amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. That certainly is one of the very persuasive reasons. I think there is another reason, as to which the Senator from Vermont and I might not be in complete accord, having to do with an event which will occur in November of next year. But that I shall waive for the moment.

I thoroughly agree with the position taken by the Senator from Vermont to the effect that the bill, if enacted as it is now before the Senate, would simply play into the hands of the large, mechanized farmers who are already producing at a unit cost very much less than that of the family farmers; and it would put every Member of the Senate who votes for the bill in the position of going further and further toward the stamping out of the family-type farms and the removal of the protection which now is accorded to family-type farmers, and which, under our proposed substitute, would be generously extended to all the small wheat farmers, all the small corn and dairy farmers, and all the other groups which the Senator from Vermont has mentioned.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will permit me to say so, if things in a certain political party continue to go as they appear to be going at this time, I am not so certain that there will be much disagreement between the Senator from Florida and me in November of next year—and I am not referring to the Republican Party.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated, when I adverted to that question, that I did not expect to find the Senator from Vermont and myself in complete accord when we got into that field. I have not been disappointed in his reaction to it.

But certainly, with the exception of the point which he has strongly made, the other point which I have suggested—and I have only suggested it—is about the only other argument I can see for the passage of the bill.

Speaking only for myself, and not from a partisan standpoint, I should dislike greatly to think that the Secretary of Agriculture, whom I have found to be highly nonpartisan in his approach to problems, had another approach to this particular problem. I am simply regretful that he is surrounded apparently by advisers who, I think, have carried him into strange lanes and alleys in the reaching of the conclusion which he appears to have reached as to the pending bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As a result of oral discussions with some of the officials of the Department of Agriculture, I have come to the conclusion that although they are reluctant to reverse the position which had previously been taken, or even to modify it, they would find it highly possible to apply the law equitably and fairly, as intended by Congress under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and other Senators. I feel certain they will not say they could not apply the law fairly; but when he has once taken a position, we know how reluctant any bureaucrat is to change that position, or even to modify it.

I agree with the Senator from Florida that in the Department of Agriculture there are certain persons, acting in an advisory capacity, who sometimes give the Secretary what we might call a bum steer.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is unfortunate that the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture has not had the time—and he cannot possibly have the time in this or any other matter—to master all the details himself, because I have great confidence in his integrity, his soundness of conscience, and his desire to serve all the people and all the producers in any agricultural group. I simply differ with him very strongly in the soundness of the conclusion to which he has attained; whether by guidance or by thinking of his own, I am not able to say.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the Senator from Florida agree, too, that we must be watching the entire principle underlying farm programs in the United States? I am certain the Senator is aware of the reports which have been circulating to the effect that the wheat growers this year may vote down controls. I believe the Senator is aware of the unrest which is developing rapidly in the cotton growing areas, and of the growing demand on the part of cotton growers that they be permitted to run their own business, to recover the markets they have lost during recent years, and to prosper under their own steam.

Furthermore, if I may add another point, I think one clear red light, or at least caution light, which was lit before us in the last 2 weeks, was the spontaneous vote by a substantial majority, in the House of Representatives last week to throw peanuts completely out of the list of basic commodities.

Though the House came back into line later, I suspect that some Members felt the sting of the whip. However, a program cannot be operated forever with a whip.

I think we should take warning from the fact that consumers also have taken an interest in what is going on, and that the next time a commodity is voted out of the law, as peanuts were, it will probably stay out.

I think we should take heed that if we have a program, the way to make the program permanent and successful is to make it work, and not to give a green light to violators and would-be violators.

Certainly the Holland amendment overcomes the weaknesses of section 348. There were weaknesses in that section. I admit that. I know it now. But if it is desired to go beyond that, if it is the intention to say to the corporation farmers, the wheat farmers producing on 1,000, 2,000, or 5,000 acres, "Go ahead and overplant; you will get your money just the same," we will be inviting trouble for farm programs generally.

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not more thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I think we would be inviting not only trouble, but also disaster of the most grievous sort, if we took a step of that kind at this time, when the program voted last year, including the portion of it now under discussion, is just going into effect. I may say that the Senator from Florida has tried to show rather clearly his understanding of the fact that some of the producers in some agricultural industries are going to be finding much difficulty this year. I joined in increasing the estimate of the Department of Agriculture for the ACP program from $195

million to $250 million solely because I thought that there ought to be a little heavier cushion. I want to have that cushion. But, Mr. President, I do not want to have available a cushion which will depend for its availability upon excesses and abuses and violations on the part of the individuals who receive acreage allotments, and who I think, in decency and in honor, ought to observe those allotments if they expect to participate in the ACP program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Florida a fact of which I am sure he must have become aware from the letter of the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, True D. Morse, which appears on page 2 of the report, in which he says, without equivocation of any kind: "The Department approves of this proposed legislation"—period.

I notice that the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry questioned the wisdom of the Department of Agriculture in making that decision, and figured perhaps it reached an erroneous conclusion. In that event, I wonder if perhaps the Senator does not consider that the Department of Agriculture, which he feels could be wrong now, might not have been even more wrong a year ago, when it was recommending, along with the distinguished Senator, the abandonment of the 90-percent price-support program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that inconsistency could not be chargeable to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota because he was wrong last year and he is wrong now. Those who are supporting the pending bill are the ones who opposed the salutary program of last year, including my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota.

If I could hear those who were strong advocates of the price-support program last year come forward and say, "Here is something to make the present program work better," I would be very much comforted. But though I have listened intently, I have not heard the first comment from a Senator who took such a position about bringing into sounder perspective the whole price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. What we are trying to do is to correct, at least to a minor degree, some of the major mistakes of those who last year supported a change in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since the Senator has adverted to the statement of Mr. True D. Morse, I should like to call attention to the fact that the middle sentence in the very paragraph from which the Senator from South Dakota has read does not hold up. That sentence reads:

> There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists.

I have had this matter up, in some detail, with the Solicitor's office of the Department of Agriculture, and it has been admitted to me that they could not point to a law under which that change was accomplished.

Furthermore, it is quite clear to me, and I think it will be to my learned friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that not only has there been the closest kind of interlocking between the two programs from the first year's legislation until now—and I am going to mention the various steps in a moment, if I may—but in the last two appropriation bills there is specific requirement providing for the interlocking of the two programs in the action of the Department of Agriculture in spending their soil-conservation appropriations.

I hope the distinguished Senator from South Dakota will follow me while I repeat a provision from the current compilation issued by the Department of Agriculture in Agriculture Handbook No. 79 of January 1, 1955, containing, among other things, all the provisions of the Agricultural Appropriation Act of last year. I read this provision:

> That in carrying out the 1955 program—

That is the one under which we are working now—

> the Secretary shall give particular consideration to the conservation problems on farmlands diverted from crops under acreage-allotment programs.

Not only were the two programs interlocked already by provisions which are contained in the legislation which established them—and I am going to mention them in a moment—but the Senate and also the House, in the passage of the appropriation bill last year were so fearful that the Secretary of Agriculture would not understand that these two programs were interlocked and were interdependent and should be administered together, that these words were placed for his guidance in the appropriation bill, and I read them again:

> That in carrying out the 1955 program the Secretary shall give particular consideration to the conservation problems on farmlands diverted from crops under acreage-allotment programs.

Of course, we all know it is because of the diversion of more than 30 million acres, under the retracted programs of the last 2 years, that people in certain agricultural industries have gotten into the great straits they are in.

The appropriations measure pending in conference has practically the same words in both the House and Senate versions of the bill. The matter is not in conference now. I read now from the House print of the measure as it passed the Senate, including the Senate amendments, and this was not a Senate amendment:

> *Provided*, That in carrying out the 1956 program—

Now we are looking ahead to the next year—

> The Secretary shall give particular consideration to the conservation problems on farm lands diverted from crops under acreage-allotment programs.

So it is clear that not merely last year, but this year again, the whole membership of both Houses of Congress has understood clearly what apparently whoever wrote the letter which came to the committee from the Department of Agriculture did not understand that there was a careful interlocking of identity, interest, and objectives between the two great programs. So in giving instructions on the expenditures of, I believe, $195 million last year, and this year of $250 million, we have included specific words requiring that the conservation program shall be given impetus in its efforts to take care of diverted acreage which has been made available by acreage-allotment programs in the price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has described the relationship of two general, overall, parallel programs, but he has not referred to any language in the statement of Under Secretary True D. Morse to the effect that there is a recommendation by the Appropriations Committee that soil-conservation-program payments be held up as a penalty. That is the point at issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The members of the Appropriations Committees, along with other Members of both the Senate and the House, joined in enacting legislation last year which is found in section 348 of the bill passed last year. The provision became applicable to each basic crop. That particular provision was contained in the law ever since 1938, and in the law generally since 1933, as it applied to cotton. So there was no moment when it was not true that these two programs were interlocked, and it was recognized to be so.

If the Senator will bear with me, I may refer to one section of the law which affects price supports, coming down from the wording of the law of 1948, at the time when it was first sponsored by my distinguished friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. It was also contained in the soil-conservation measure coming down since 1938, without any change whatsoever. Each of the provisions made it as clear as it could possibly be made that each particular subject, soil conservation on the one hand, and price support on the other, was always to be considered as part of the other program, and that the two were to be regarded as always interrelated.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator were to search for one statement in Mr. Morse's testimony about the relationship of the two programs, I think he would study long and in vain to find any place in the parallel evolvement of these two programs where it is indicated or implied that one program should be used as a club for securing performance of the other program. That is what we are objecting to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator could not be more in error because, since 1938, it has been specifically in the law, and I shall read it again. I read it before the Senator was able to

reach the floor. This provision has been in the law since 1938:

Any person who knowingly plants cotton on his farm in any year in excess of the farm acreage allotment for cotton for the farm for such year under section 344 shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Therefore, it was not a matter of harvesting but of planting. That provision has been in the law and has been enforced as a part of the law. It has been accepted and lived under by the cotton industry, which has a fine record of performance. When one looks at the other industries he will not find such a record of performance.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I was interested in the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Florida, in which the question raised was as to whether or not the entire repeal of the provision would help only corporation farmers and large farmers. In North Carolina there are many very small farmers who raise corn, for instance. They do not make ensilage from the corn. They gather it and shuck it, and then feed the corn to hogs. Under the proposal now made, if such farmers exceeded their acreage by even one stalk of corn, they would lose the benefit of any payments coming to them under the conservation program, would they not? That is my question.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. If they knowingly harvest more than their allotment, and they are given a chance to have a check made not only by themselves but by the local agency, the county agency of the Department, and they do waive their right to soil-conservation payments.

Mr. ERVIN. If they knowingly gathered one additional stalk of corn growing on some of their land, they would forfeit their right under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator making a statement?

Mr. ERVIN. I will put a question mark at the end of my statement. Is not my statement correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The statement is correct if there is a harvesting after there has been a chance for measurement, and after measurement has been made. Then the farmer who has harvested more than he is permitted to harvest—unless he is one who has ensilage which he can use on his farm—has forfeited his soil-conservation payments.

That would simply put on a parity the fine North Carolina farmers who produce corn with the producers of cotton, who lived happily under a similar provision for years, although one which was stronger because it simply provided that if they planted more acreage, they forfeited their right to soil-conservation payments. They have lived very happily under that provision since 1933; and, so far as I know, no complaint about it has reached the committee.

Mr. ERVIN. But why penalize the corn farmer who feeds his corn to hogs? He can plant corn and put it in his silo and avoid any penalty, whereas if he feeds the corn to his hogs, he will forfeit the soil-conservation benefits.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the farmers of North Carolina are no more resourceful than that, I would say that might be the result. But having observed agricultural operations in North Carolina, where the farmers have silos and also have underground storage and other types of storage structures, in which corn can be stored, I do not think there is any serious reason for the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to be disturbed.

On the contrary, I would feel that the Senator from North Carolina would think it only simple justice to require that at long last the producers of corn get their house in order, just as the producers of cotton—of whom I would say there are perhaps several hundred thousand in North Carolina—have cheerfully and effectively lived up to their acreage allotments, and have done a fine job in that connection.

Why should not the corn farmers—the neighbors of cotton farmers, in many instances—be just as cheerful about accepting such requirements, by adhering to the law and to the regulations, as are the cotton farmers?

Mr. ERVIN. Then would it not be advisable to extend this principle a little further, and provide that a farmer must not only obey the acreage allotments, but must also obey the Ten Commandments, if he wishes to receive his soil-conservation payments?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina may have some jurisdiction in that field, but I have not claimed any such jurisdiction. I would not even attempt to say to the good people of my State of Florida what they should do in regard to obeying the Ten Commandments, much less have the effrontery of attempting to tell the free Tar Heelians what they should do in that field. I enjoy too much my visits in North Carolina on my way to and from my own State to attempt to do anything which would jeopardize my welcome there, where I hope to travel immediately after the adjournment of Congress, while I am on my way home.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me point out that normally in North Carolina many farmers grow wheat and feed it to chickens. If such a farmer grows one grain of wheat more than the amount he can produce from the 15 acres, he would also lose the benefit of any soil-conservation payments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe the growing of one additional grain of wheat would cause him to forfeit anything.

Mr. ERVIN. As a matter of fact, if a farmer exceeds his allotment, he already is subject to a penalty under other laws, is he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Under some, but not under others. I do not believe that is so in the case of corn.

Mr. ERVIN. This proposal would result in two punishments for the same offense. The farmer would be placed in jeopardy twice for committing one offense, would he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would not say that. In the case of some of the basic commodities, there is no penalty at all for overplanting.

Mr. ERVIN. But in the case of most of them—the major ones—there is a penalty.

Mr. HOLLAND. How about the planting of corn? Does the Senator from North Carolina understand there is a penalty in that case?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; I understand that a commercial-corn farmer is subject to penalty in case of overplanting.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina represents in part a State which does not have the markets to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, because the corn produced in our southland is consumed there, and not marketed.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; some of the farmers in North Carolina feed the corn to hogs, and do not sell it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I yield, let me repeat that the farther we proceed, the clearer it becomes that the Senators who advocated the passage of the pending bill are the very ones who did not want a good, sound price-support law enacted last year, and fought very hard against it. In fact, some very unkind persons have, in referring to the efforts of those Senators, used the word "filibuster." I was not among that number; but I have not yet heard anyone admit any objection to the position taken by the four Senators in their substitute amendment—except those who, last year, very ardently opposed a realistic coming to grips with the problems of the Nation in the field of agriculture and an attempt to get our agricultural production under control.

I yield again to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I point out to the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate has already, without objection, passed a bill which would exempt the chicken producer of North Carolina from any penalty whatsoever if he produces more than 15 acres of wheat, so long as he uses the excess for his own feeding purposes. The bill is now pending in the House, and we hope it will be acted upon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very grateful to my friend from Vermont for making that comment which, of course, is true. I think it should also be said that in various States which are not in the commercial areas of production, the farmer is completely exempt from any application of these laws, both as to wheat and as to corn.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have a couple of additional questions to ask.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there not a bill before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which would add six States

to the noncommercial area? I am pretty sure North Carolina is one of such States, which would be exempt from penalties.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is such a bill, but I cannot say whether or not North Carolina is one of the six States.

Mr. AIKEN. There are six such States. I know that Georgia is one of them, and there are five others.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Vermont has referred to a pending bill. A pending bill is like the hope of salvation. It may not come to pass.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from North Carolina continues to advert to a field in which the Senator from Florida is not an expert, but he accepts the comment in good faith.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that it would be no fairer to subject the dairyman producing corn for his silo to the penalties of the act than it would be to subject him to penalties for producing clover and other leguminous crops, which are equally rich in nutriment, for the same purpose of putting them in the silo?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senators who joined in the substitute amendment, including both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Florida, felt that such was the case.

Mr. AIKEN. The dairyman ought not to be subjected to a penalty for producing silage corn, any more than for producing clover and other crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have one further question to ask the Senator from Florida.

Is it not a fact that, if the Holland amendment were rejected and the bill in its original form passed, the only persons who could possibly benefit from such action would be those who intend knowingly to violate the law?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is entirely correct. The so-called Holland amendment, which is the American Farm Bureau Federation amendment in the act of last year, affects no one who does not knowingly abuse his Government's generosity, his fellow producers, and the American public in general, by knowingly exceeding his share of the production capacity.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. During the colloquy with the Senator from Vermont the Senator from Florida referred to proposed legislation which the Senate passed earlier this year. It also passed Senate bill 46, which was reported on March 23, legislative day of March 10.

At that time certain products were exempted. Wheat was exempted, provided the wheat was not removed from the farm, but the entire crop of wheat was used for seed on such farm, and so forth, and provided also that such producers complied with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

I wonder whether the amendment the Senator now proposes to superimpose on Senate bill 46 would cause us to back downhill from the action on Senate bill 46, by limiting those provisions, once again, to 15 acres.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; that would not be the case. The bill as it now stands would back down the hill from the position we took last year in the effort to bring about greater compliance with acreage allotments and a higher degree of compliance on the part of producers of all basic commodities except cotton. This regulation had already been applicable to producers of cotton.

We passed section 348 last year. We would back down the hill most ingloriously, in my opinion, at a time when all the people of the Nation expect us, in good faith, to try honestly to make the program adopted last year work, if the pending bill as it is now written were enacted.

I recall that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER]—and he is an able and distinguished Senator and chairman—was quoted in the public press only 3 or 4 days ago to the effect that he would not permit to come up in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year a measure which was barely passed in the House of Representatives the other day, and which would operate to negate the fine effort we made last year, without ever giving the program a trial. He was quoted as stating that he would not permit it to come up this year, because he felt that the program ought to be given an opportunity to demonstrate its value. With that statement I completely agree.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say, first of all, that I hope the Senator from Florida does not pin too much hope on the rather impetuous remark made by the chairman of our committee, on the spur of the moment and before he had an opportunity to canvass the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It may very well develop that there are votes enough in that committee to force action and consideration on the floor of the Senate this year, when the measure can be considered as an economic asset, rather than to wait until next year, when it would be pure political buncombe.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota is, of course, entitled to his own opinion in that respect. However, I invite his attention to recent developments in the so-called Eastland subcommittee. The report of that subcommittee would indicate that instead of losing support in the Senate for the flexible price-support program and all the other reasonable features in the bill passed last year, we are gaining adherents.

Again, the Senator from Florida says that he has no right to speak for any other Senator. The Senator from Florida does not know what will develop when the question arises. But when the chairman of a great committee, a Member of many years' experience in the Senate, a Senator who is known to have fought very hard last year against a flexible price-support program, announces publicly to the press and over the radio that he believes that the country will expect a reasonable opportunity to be afforded for the performance of that program, and that, therefore, he does not propose to call up this year the proposed legislation to which reference has been made, I think more than mere passing comment should be made upon his statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that if my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, has any hope of being able to have reported this year from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the measure of which we speak, he probably has not given as earnest attention to the subject as I believe he will give before he makes any effort in that direction.

Mr. MUNDT. Being a member of the Republican Party, of course, the Senator from South Dakota is a little more dedicated to the concept of individual responsibility, and less dedicated to the concept of leadership, in contrast to members of the opposition party.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me comment upon that statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is a very estimable chairman——

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to reply to the Senator's last statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I thought the Senator from Florida had yielded to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to reply to the Senator's last statement.

I point out that last year, when there was pending on the floor of the Senate a Republican program for price support and for better control of the agricultural production of the Nation, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has referred to himself as a Republican, did not see fit to support that program. At least, that is my recollection. If I misquote the distinguished Senator, I hope he will correct me.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. That confirms the point I make, that, as a Republican, I am a little more dedicated to the concept of individual responsibility than to the leadership concept, which has done so much to injure the great Democratic Party during the past 20 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. As applied last year, I thought it looked more like individual confusion, particularly when it showed up in the position of the Senator from South Dakota and his conferees who, in spite of strong and excellent leadership in the White House, and in spite of strong leadership from the Department of Agriculture—which, I regret to say, is somewhat weakened—and in spite of strong leadership from very conservative farm organizations such as the Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the two cooperative organizations, and others, voted on the other side. I believe the only farm organization on the other side was the Farmers Union, and that certainly is not a Republican organization.

The Senator from South Dakota saw fit to make his bed with the Farmers Union and with the other groups I have

mentioned, instead of following what I thought was strong and constructive leadership, which happened to come from the Republican Party. I did not think the Senator was demonstrating completely, to the satisfaction of all who watched, the soundness of his Republicanism. If the Senator is coming to a different conclusion, of course he is entitled to it, and I shall not question it, because he knows what is in his innermost thoughts. However, looking at his votes of last year, I conclude that he and the Farmers Union and a few others were trying to run in one direction while the Republican Party and a good many Senators from this side of the aisle were proceeding constructively in the sound direction in which we were able to make some progress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize my great disadvantage in trying to say anything if the Senator continues to cut me off every time I stop to take a breath.

Mr. HOLLAND. I apologize.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, the Senator has that right, and if he insists on asserting it, I must struggle along as best I can. First let me refer to the last point the Senator made, the one about my Republicanism. I have already stated that as Republicans we hold to the doctrine of individual responsibility, as opposed to the doctrine espoused for the past 20 years by Senators on the other side of the aisle, which is a form of the European leadership concept, under which the "I am" principle is dominant and under which premiers and leaders of state gain undue control over their people and over the members of their political parties.

However, the point I am trying to make about my Republicanism is that in the State of South Dakota the State Republican Convention—the great convention of that great party of that great State—after due and careful investigation and hearings, endorsed the program of 90-percent price supports, and has continued that position consistently. Therefore, it seems to me to be an economic problem rather than a political program.

What started this interesting colloquy, as I remember, was the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that there would be no vote in that committee on this issue this year, although next year might be the appropriate time for it.

I think there is abroad in the land the thought, which I believe originated in Democratic headquarters, that 1956 will be a better time for voting on the subject of agriculture than 1955. Perhaps that is true from the standpoint of politics. Certainly it is not true from the standpoint of the farmer, if a particular program has merit.

I share completely with the Senator from Florida his admiration for the capacity, and courtesy, and leadership of the chairman of the committee. However, I have never been able to find any corelationship between efficiency on the part of the chairman of the committee and his accuracy as a prophet. The Senator from Florida and I know that we have never polled our committee. We do not know how the members of the committee are going to vote. We have the same membership on the committee we had last year, with one exception, namely, that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] has replaced the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CARLSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall continue to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. I do not wish to cut him off. I was grieved by his suggestion that I had cut him off when his wind was just starting up in good shape. I certainly do not want to do that again.

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing I would rather not do than grieve my delightful friend from Florida. But I should like to make one other comment in connection with the Senator's earlier statement, when he and the Senator from Vermont were having their congenial colloquy while leaning on each other's shoulders and finding much to support in their amendment. The Senators became quite enthusiastic in their exchange of views. However, as is the case in such situations, we sometimes let our adjectives outstrip the facts as they are incorporated in nouns and verbs. It was under such circumstances that the Senator from Florida said, I believe, that the great beneficiary of the bill would be the large-scale farmer, or the corporate farmer, rather than the family-type farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my complete conviction.

Mr. MUNDT. That being true, it grieves me to find the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] so hopelessly in disagreement with the Department of Agriculture, with which they found themselves so happily in agreement only a year ago. I say that because in the letter of Mr. Morse, from which both of us have read, each of us skipping lines here and there to find something pleasing to our point of view, Mr. Morse said:

> The principal effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that——

Mr. MUNDT. I say that as a rejoinder to what the Senator from Florida has stated about corporate farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grieved that the Senator did not continue his reading. If he had done so, he would have made clear, as I shall do now, that the statement quoted corrected by him from the letter from Mr. Morse is followed by two illustrations of defects, both of which are admitted by the proponents of the substitute amendment, and both of which would be cured by the substitute amendment. I continue to read at the point where the Senator from South Dakota stopped his reading:

> Since it is expected that most farmers will comply with marketing-quota provisions, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will affect principally farmers with corn allotments and farmers with less than 15-acre wheat allotments.

Those two situations would be corrected by our substitute amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. That statement by Mr. Morse could not be said to apply to corporate farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I continue to read:

> Under marketing-quota requirements a farmer with a wheat allotment less than 15 acres is permitted to grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without incurring a marketing-quota penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the ACP eligibility requirement of section 348.

That is cleared up by the substitute amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The next paragraph has to do with corn, and the Senator will find—and I shall not read it in full—that in the long paragraph which immediately follows, the distinguished Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse, made it quite clear that his troubles come from small farmer situations in the wheat and corn industries, both of which are cured by the proposed amendment. Therefore that statement in Mr. Morse's letter becomes completely inapplicable in the event the substitute amendment is adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have not alleged that Under Secretary Morse was criticizing the substitute proposal as being designed principally to take care of the big farmer. What I said was in the form of a rejoinder to the statement by the Senator from Florida, that H. R. 1573 would be helpful to the corporate farmer and injurious to the family-type farmer. I think that is clear from the record and from the paragraph the Senator has read.

I also believe that Mr. Morse is accurate when he says that the principal effect of the restriction has been to discourage conservation on family-type farms. It is possible that the amendment would also correct that evil. However, it is not fair to say that our suggestion is conceived to help the big farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The substitute clears up the question entirely with reference to the small-type farmer. It restricts the field of application of the bill entirely to the large type of operation. I am sure that the Senator would agree that section 348 should be applied to the large operations. We want to leave the law so that it can be applied to the farmer who has many acres and a great deal of machinery and operates an industry. However, the insistence of the Senator from South Dakota and his associates, all of whom were opponents of the farm bill last year, that the pending bill must be passed as is, means that instead of taking a substitute measure which cures the defects of the law as it affects the small farmer, they seek the passage of a measure which gives unbounded advantage to the big farmer. The Senator from Vermont was com-

pletely correct in calling attention to that fact a few minutes ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not deny the right of the corporation farmer to have friends and to have his views presented on the floor. However, that is not what I wish to query the Senator from Florida about. Permit me to say that during the first 2 years I was a Member of the Senate I was very much gratified to find that farm programs were not made matters of partisanship. There was no partisanship until a few years ago when efforts were begun to inject politics into the question. I wish to say that American agriculture should not be used as a football for either party politics or political philosophy. I have found among the Democrats some of the stanchest supporters of sound farm programs, not only Democrats in the Congress, but Democrats throughout the country who are leaders of farm organizations. Among them I have found no more stanch supporters of a free and prosperous agriculture and sound farm programs than are the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wanted to make that statement to clear the air. I know those Senators will never agree to put American agriculture under the complete domination of government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to commend the Senator from Florida, as I have many times previously, for his stanch position in behalf of conservation. But since the question of family-size farms has come into the discussion, I should like to suggest that the amendment which the Senator has offered and in which I have been honored to join with him, as has the Senator from Vermont, is, in my opinion, designed to make it possible for conservation payments to continue and for family-size farms to continue.

If the record needs to be made more clear, we can read off item after item which the able Senator from Florida has supported when, in his judgment, it would make possible prosperity for the average size farm. His constant support of measures designed to remove huge surpluses is exemplified in the recent act to provide for the removal of surpluses. But the greatest help we can give to the family-size farm is to provide prices by which the farmers can live on their farms and make a living, and not have to depend on Government subsidies.

I commend the Senator from Florida, as I have many times before.

I should like also to commend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for saying that he has not believed in putting these matters on a basis of partisan politics. I can testify that in 1948, when the President of the United States sent to the Congress a bill providing for flexible price supports and for an entirely new price-support program, the man who took the bill and carried it to the floor and saw it pass on the floor of the Senate was a Republican—the Senator from Vermont—who did not ask what the label was, whether it was a Republican label or a Democratic label, but only whether it would be of assistance to the farmers of the Nation.

I commended his attitude then, and I commend it now. I am happy to be associated with the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico, who, before being a great Senator, was a great Secretary of Agriculture. I know of no person who better understands the problems of agriculture and what is required to make it more stable and more prosperous than does the Senator from New Mexico. It has been a great pleasure to me that my own very strong and longtime convictions have arrayed me on the side of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I listened to the debate with the idea of opposing the Holland amendment, but the distinguished Senator from Florida has led me to believe that he may be on sound ground, after all.

With reference to the repeal of section 348, the inquiries I have received have been from small farmers with respect to their being able to participate in both conservation payments and the price-support program. As I examine the amendment, it leads me to believe that it does not meet all the objections with respect to section 348. Was it not the purpose to eliminate that provision?

Mr. HOLLAND. Undoubtedly, the purpose of those who introduced the bill was to repeal entirely section 348. Based upon the hearing and upon the conference with farm organizations, particularly the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Senator from Florida and his associates who have offered the substitute have found that the situation can, in their judgment, be cleared up entirely as to the small farmers by the adoption of the substitute and still leave in the bill section 348 to prevent large mechanized farms from exceeding their acreage quota with impunity and making it even more difficult for the small farmer to continue to live.

In taking up the measure with the Department of Agriculture, we find that they feel they are obligated to continue their stand for outright repeal. They have said to me that if enacted, the substitute amendment will cure the various defects it seeks to cure, and will, they think, be workable, and that they will be very happy to attempt its enforcement.

Mr. Morse still feels that outright repeal should be had. The attitude of the Department is not unanimous on that point, however.

Mr. CARLSON. The last statement of the distinguished Senator assures me that they have gone into that feature of it. The mail which I have received has not been from large corporation farmers, but from small farmers who were having difficulty in qualifying for soil-conservation payments. If the Senator from Florida will assure me that they will be protected, I shall have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my judgment, it would completely take care of their complaint.

I should like to invite attention to the statement of Mr. Peterson, which appears on page 7 of the hearings:

> We believe it desirable that persons receiving benefits under one program not be in a position to defeat the purposes of other programs.

Then he goes on to say:

> However, the provisions of section 348 as it now stands, we believe, are not particularly effective in accomplishing the intended purposes.

What we have tried to do is to change section 348—and the Senator knows it had to be rewritten in conference—and to put it in a form which meets the five difficulties which we were able to discover which might possibly exist if the language of the act were enforced as it now stands. We believe those difficulties would all be cured and removed, leaving section 348 still applicable. We believe this effect is needed by the large producers as well.

I have repeatedly invited the Senate's attention to the fact that the same provision has been salutarily applied to the cotton industry ever since the beginning of the program, with the result that it has kept cotton acreage closely in line, as compared with other commodities which have not had such a restraining influence.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

I will complete my remarks hurriedly.

There was some question about the tying together of the two programs. I stated that as to each of them, from the beginning, there have been provisions which tied them to each other. In the beginning, there was only one act, the act of 1933, which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1936.

That act was followed in a few weeks, first, by the Conservation Act of 1936, which was reenacted in 1938. One of the provisions of that act has been in existence all the time as section 348, which applied, as to cotton, to anyone who knowingly planted—not harvested, but knowingly planted—more than his allotted acreage. If he did, he lost his right to claim his ACP payments. That was a tying together which was clear and inescapable.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely this language is proper for the protection of the farmer, because the farmer might plant acreage and not have measured it quite accurately. When the county extension agent, or whoever was doing the measuring, came to the farm, he might say, "You are entitled to only 4 acres, but you planted 5."

The farmer could then say, "Well, I had my planting device set to measure, I thought, accurately, but it was not." All the farmer has to do then is to refuse to

harvest from the extra acre, and he will incur no penalty under the law.

We have had such a provision for cotton production for years past, and it has caused no damage. If the cotton farmer planted so much as 1 foot beyond what he was authorized to plant, he could be subject to a heavier penalty. This is a far more liberal provision. So surely, if the cotton provision has caused no trouble in 17 years of operation, there is no reason why the proposed provision should cause trouble, liberal as it now is.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, who is a cosponsor of the amendment. He will remember that the provision in the present law was completely rewritten in conference. It was the intention of the conferees, in rewriting it, to make it more generous from the standpoint of the individual farmer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly the situation. When the difficulties were pointed out, the Senator from Florida took the position, time after time, that he wanted to make this a liberal provision, and not a tight provision, and he hoped the Department would so administer it that it would not be an extremely restrictive provision.

I know the intention of the Senator from Florida is that we should make this useful in the program. But if we are not careful, we will see several of these programs, which we now think are good, suddenly begin to disappoint.

In areas of the United States where tobacco is planted the limitation is as exact as seven-tenths or six-tenths of an acre, and those who plant tobacco will be tempted to use a very poor measuring device when they plant a very limited crop of that nature.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct.

I have already mentioned that section 348, throughout the life of the Conservation Act, has effectively tied together the two programs, namely, that of acreage allotment and soil-conservation payments. As to cotton, there is no question about that. That is a fact.

I now point out that one of the principal objectives stated in section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as it was enacted in 1938—and that provision is in the act as we speak here today—is to reestablish the purchasing power and to give greater value to the commodities the farmer produces on his own farm.

I shall not read all of section 7, but I shall read the applicable portion, leaving it to any other Senator to insert any other portion, if he sees fit to do so. I begin at the first part of section 7, as follows:

(a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purpose of the act shall also include—

Now I shall quote the fifth objective—

reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio.

It is completely clear, therefore, even to the most casual reader, that the objective of the soil conservation law is identical with the major objective of the price support law, which named the base period and contains largely the same language, because the provision comes from the price-support legislation. I have read it because it ties the two programs together.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the bill which the Senate is now considering is a very simple one, designed to correct a specific defect, for which purpose various methods are being suggested.

The bill passed the House on March 2. It is now almost the middle of May. I think it is important that the bill be passed.

I wonder if the Senator from Florida would not consider withdrawing his amendment at this time and presenting it to the committee, where hearings could be held, and the committee conceivably could support the amendment if it has the advantages which I know the Senator feels it has.

If the amendment were to be added to the bill now, the result undoubtedly would be a long conference with the House of Representatives, during which other amendments could be made by one device or another.

The committee could consider the amendment and have a hearing on it. The calendar of the committee is pretty well up to date.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota, but it is not in accord with my own thinking on the matter at all. I am anxious to have continued in the law the salutary portions, of which there are many, of the section of the act passed last year, to which we have made reference, namely, section 348; whereas the Senator from South Dakota apparently desires to invite the nonacceptance of acreage quotas and the violation of acreage quotas wholesale by farmers throughout the Nation, with impunity, if the provisions of the bill should be enforced, insofar as the right to continue to collect ACP payments is concerned.

I do not join with the Senator from South Dakota in that objective. I do not think it is a sound one. I think it would be very hurtful to agriculture. Agriculture is struggling now to preserve its good name.

My observation has been that a great many people are becoming very restless and impatient with those leaders of agriculture, whether political or otherwise, who might feel that agriculture has a free ride to prosperity at the public expense, regardless of whether it is willing to put any power of discipline on itself or not.

I do not subscribe to that kind of approach. I think the better elements in agriculture have always been willing to discipline themselves. They now know perfectly well that the good will of the Nation is hanging in the balance on the whole subject, and that it is important for agriculture to show its willingness to play the game according to the rules. That is all we are asking to be done.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the consideration which the Senator from Florida gave to my suggestion. I am frank to say that I offered it with more hope than confidence. While I am disappointed in its rejection, I am not dejected. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

Our colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who was here earlier, seeking to engage himself in the colloquy, had to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, because some North Dakota witnesses were present. The Senator from North Dakota has now returned to the floor, but he must again go back to the committee momentarily. Therefore, I would appreciate it if the Senator from Florida, if he is of a mind to do so, would yield to the Senator from North Dakota, so that he might ask his questions now.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to do so. I regret that I did not find it possible to yield earlier.

As I recall, I had agreed to yield, but the Senator from North Dakota had to depart; he could not wait.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not desire to ask questions; I seek the floor in my own right.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for the purpose of allowing him to make his statement, with the understanding that I may resume the floor in my right when he has finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, every time a farm bill of any kind comes to the Senate floor the wheat farmers in particular have to take a beating. The impression is left that they are law violators and are trying to get some money from the Government for nothing.

The bill we are considering today will have little effect upon my State. According to the Department of Agriculture's own letter, the bill will affect mostly farmers producing corn and less than 15 acres of wheat. I assume that to mean that it will affect the smaller farmers in the eastern part of the United States.

The Department of Agriculture says that this provision, as written into the law last year, does great injury to the family-type farmer. That position is supported by the grange, one of the oldest, probably the oldest, of all farm organizations, and by the National Farmers Union. If there is merit in the amendment being offered today, I cannot understand why it was not offered in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This amendment does have far-reaching consequences, and I

am sure the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is operating most expeditiously, could consider the amendment in a very short while and take action on it. We have been doing that this past year. We did it last year. I do not know of any bill of this nature which was held in the committee any length of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to remind the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that when the bill was ordered reported the Senator from Florida was not present. He was appearing before a House committee with a delegation from his State. The Senator from Florida asked for the right to be heard; the committee did not see fit to suspend action on the bill until he could get there; and the only way the Senator from Florida can be heard on this matter is to present the substitute now.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it would have been better for the Senator from Florida to ask that the bill be sent back to committee. That could have been done, and the bill could have been reported back in 2 or 3 days.

Mr. President, I think the letter of Under Secretary True D. Morse to the chairman of the committee has a great deal of significance and should be read into the RECORD. The letter reads in part:

> The Department approves of this proposed legislation. At present the only ACP payments made are for cost sharing with respect to conservation practices carried out on farms, and these payments represent only a share of the cost of performing the conservation measure. There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists. Also, the present average ACP amount of cost sharing of less than $100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.
>
> The principal effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms.

Mr. President, I think Under Secretary Morse is right in that respect, and I do not think the law should be loaded down with amendments which would tend to destroy the ACP program and the Conservation Act.

I have heard many statements made this afternoon about the present price-support program. Those statements were made by Members of the Senate who come from areas outside the area that produces most of the basic farm commodities.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from Vermont that the most rigid price controls and regulations we have in the United States are those affecting milk, and fruits, and vegetables. Certainly under the present milk orders, prices have been held at a rigid level over a long period of time.

Try as he might, no midwestern farmer can get a quart of milk into the New York or Washington market, or other eastern areas.

When Senators speak of people getting tired of some of these farm programs, they had better include such programs as I have just mentioned along with the programs under discussion and which have been so roundly criticized. In my opinion, programs affecting milk producers and producers of fruits and vegetables as well as basic commodities, are operating to the great benefit of both consumers and producers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, unfortunately, some of us who are members of the Appropriation Subcommittees have hearings scheduled for the afternoons during legislative sessions of the Senate. Thus we are denied the right to remain on the floor. If we do remain on the floor, we forfeit having the benefit of a great deal of testimony in the Appropriation Committee, when we should not be absent.

I have just returned from room F–39 in the Capitol. This afternoon we had before us representatives from the Navy Department testifying with reference to various appropriations which relate to their department. I could not be absent. I have been in that committee hearing from 2 o'clock practically up to the present time, and the committee just concluded this afternoon's hearing.

I come to the floor to find tension in the Senate amongst Senators representing various segments of the agricultural economy of the United States. Senators are somewhat tense, and their feelings are tense. They have been debating this subject this afternoon. I do not know just what charges have been made against the farm-support program; but I sense a feeling of tension in the Senate Chamber, as I stand here now, and I sensed it as I came to the Chamber a few moments ago.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no room for such tension among these Members of the Senate, some of whom represent agriculture in the deep South, some of whom represent agriculture in the Northwest, and some of whom represent agriculture in the central part of the Nation. We must confer with one another and must determine how best we can serve agriculture. We need to put our shoulders to the same wheel, so to speak, so that we shall be able to get the farmers out of the rut they are in.

I am disturbed because of the fact that in 1947 the farmer was receiving 54 cents of each dollar the consumer spent for food, whereas the last information I have obtained from the statistical section of the Department of Agriculture shows that today the farmer is receiving only 42 cents of each dollar the consumer spends for food, and that probably that amount will decrease to 41 cents. On the other hand, the consumer has not gained in the slightest—not even to the extent of a fraction of a penny—by way of any decrease in the prices he pays for agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, if during the last month the farmer received only 42 cents of each dollar the consumer spent for food, then we know that someone else is receiving the difference between the 54 cents the farmer formerly received and the 42 cents he now receives; the situation is simple. Since the farmer is receiving that much less, and since the consumer is not receiving the difference, where is it going? I ask that question, and I wish to have all my colleagues ponder it.

Each one of us should put his shoulder to the wheel and should confer with his colleagues, and should make every effort to determine how we can regain for the farmer a little of what he formerly received from the consumer's expenditures for food. If that cannot be regained for the farmer, then we had better make sure that the cost of food to the consumer decreases, inasmuch as the consumer is entitled to lower food prices if the farmer is not to receive the benefit of the increased prices charged for the commodities he produces.

Mr. President, House bill 1573 should be passed without extensive debate. House bill 1573 is a proper bill and a good bill. It would rectify a situation which is destroying good, sound soil-conservation practices throughout the land. The bill was introduced in an effort to correct the improper action taken by Congress last year, insofar as good farm practices are concerned.

It is my position that any attempt to amend House bill 1573 would be improper, if it attached to the bill a provision which would cause it to be burdensome, and would result in having Members of the Senate vote against it for the reason that the bill then would carry an amendment or rider which would thwart our attempt to repeal a particular section of last year's amendments of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—a section which, in the course of a year's experience, has been found to be detrimental to the proper practice of soil conservation under a sound program.

So, Mr. President, I hope the debate on House bill 1573 will soon come to an end and that soon the Senate will vote on this measure, which should be enacted promptly, so as to repeal the restrictive provision to which I have referred, which has a tendency to destroy the fine soil-conservation program which, over the years, we have been endeavoring to perfect throughout the Nation. Certainly we need to perfect it and certainly we need to go forward with it rather than retreat.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had about concluded my remarks. In fact, they would have been concluded a long time ago but for the generous number of questions which have been addressed to me by my distinguished colleagues.

I was speaking on the point of the manifest interrelationship between the soil-conservation program and the price-support program. I had commented that section 348 has made a specific tie-in between those two programs since

the date of the enactment of the first Soil Conservation Act.

I had remarked, also, that certain sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act had made specific reference to soil conservation, and vice versa; that certain sections of the Soil Conservation Act had made specific reference to price support.

I believe I have inserted in the RECORD a portion of section 7, namely, subsection 5 of section 7 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

I now wish to place in the RECORD a portion of section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended and reenacted last year as the Agricultural Act of 1954. It is my understanding that this provision, which is the basis for a price-support program, has been unchanged since the act of 1948 which bears the name of our distinguished friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. This provision has been unchanged since the act of 1949 which bears the name of our distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It was left undisturbed by the act of 1954.

For the purpose of brevity, Mr. President, I shall not read all the provisions of section 401, but I wish to read enough to make it clear that it refers to price support, and I shall quote two of the fundamental objectives of price support as contained in the statute itself.

Mr. President, there are 8 different factors listed, but I shall read only the first and the eighth of them, together with the beginning of the statement to which items 1 to 8 are appended:

> The following factors shall be taken into consideration in determining, in the case of any commodity for which price support is discretionary, whether a price-support operation shall be undertaken and the level of such support and, in the case of any commodity for which price support is mandatory, the level of support in excess of the minimum level prescribed for such commodity:

Then are listed the factors Nos. 1 to 8 which the Secretary of Agriculture must consider in the cases of both mandatory supports and discretionary supports. They include, of course, under mandatory supports, both the basic commodities and the mandatory nonbasic commodities. The first item listed is:

> (1) The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor,

This means, of course, that the supply, the production, and the amount to be produced comprise the first factor for consideration.

The eighth factor—and it bears so completely upon the situation which has been discussed at too great length this afternoon that I wish to emphasize it—is as follows:

> (8) The ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

It is very clear that the program of price supports involves soil conservation and land use, and that the program of soil conservation involves economic questions of price, return, purchasing power, and the like, so that even without the inclusion of section 348 throughout all the years as being applicable to make specific the relationship between the price-support operation and the soil-conservation proposition, and even without the enlargement of section 348 last year, so that it now covers all of the basic commodities, it would have been certain that there is a clear relationship between the two operations.

I have already, likewise, quoted from the appropriation bill of last year and from the appropriation bill of this year as passed by the House and the Senate, and which is now in conference. In the particular item which has been quoted, there is no difference between the two Houses. We are now seeking to make it completely clear that the Secretary of Agriculture in his administration of the soil-conservation program must give great consideration to the acreage displaced by the price-support program, and that that is one of the primary objectives to which he shall give his concern.

In closing, I may say that it seems to me that the issue is very simple. It is whether or not we meant what we said last year when we decided to have a price-support program which was realistic, which would give to the growers the responsibility of keeping their supplies in line with demand, which would place upon our administrative officer the responsibility of seeing to it that supplies were kept in line with demand; and of making certain, so far as Congress is concerned, that nothing was done to weaken or destroy the effectiveness of that program, until it had a chance to demonstrate its efficiency or its lack of efficiency.

What we are asked to do is to strike down a very important provision of that program. To do so, in my humble judgment, will have a disastrous effect in that it will show rather affirmatively to all the people of the Nation that we are perfectly willing to have acreage allotments violated. I will not say that we will invite the violation of acreage allotments, because I would not impute that kind of objective to any fellow Senator. But I will say that the passage of the bill would open the door wide, and would leave it wide open, so that any farmer who cared to violate the law could do so, and he would not be subjected to any question at all as to his right to claim and to receive from our generous Government soil-conservation payments, notwithstanding the fact that his own conduct, in relation to the control of his own acreage and the control of his production, violated the purpose of the law and tended to thwart the purpose of the Government and the people in bringing about more stable and more satisfying conditions in agriculture, and at the same time, of course, a more satisfying situation to all the people of the Nation.

I do not believe the membership of the Senate wishes to be left in the position of having deliberately weakened the act, of having deliberately left open the door to violations of acreage allotments before, indeed, there has been any opportunity to demonstrate either of two things: The usefulness of the act as a whole, and the effect of section 348 upon any of the very useful agricultural programs of the Nation.

Section 348 along with other portions of the act has just gone into operation, and no person can state with accuracy what will be the result of a full year's trial or a full year's administration of the program as to its value or its lack of value to the people, and particularly its value or lack of value to the agricultural producers.

I hope the proposed substitute, which meets all the practical situations that are known to exist, and which leaves a club in the act, particularly over large mechanized producers, who have been the gravest violators, and will continue to be so, of their acreage allotments, will be agreed to, thus providing an opportunity to require compliance by other than soft words.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will withhold it for a moment, gladly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think some reply should be made to the discussion which has been in progress this afternoon, prior to having a quorum call. Will the Senator be kind enough to withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had intended to have a quorum call, because some of my associates are not on the floor; and I wish to give them an opportunity to be present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator wishes to have a quorum call, he will have to lose his right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already surrendered the floor and have suggested the absence of a quorum, which is, of course, within my rights.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, in order that Members of the Senate may know of our plans with regard to this evening and Tuesday next. I call the proposal to the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

I submit, on behalf of both the minority leader and myself, the following proposed unanimous-consent agreement:

> *Ordered,* That, effective on Tuesday, May 17, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of H. R. 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the discussion on H. R. 1573 has digressed into many channels and many areas of interest. We have heard speeches raising the question whether or not partisanship was involved in the consideration of agricultural matters.

May I say that I stand here as the living testimony to the fact that there could be no partisanship? Here is an administration proposal which the junior Senator from Minnesota is trying to get through the Senate, and here is an administration proposal which the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is opposing. If there is any partisanship in that situation, it is something like Alice in Wonderland—it is upside down.

I seldom find myself in the rather unusual position of being an advocate of a recommendation from the Department of Agriculture, but I want it made crystal clear that that is exactly what is happening here tonight, namely, that the Department of Agriculture has called for the repeal of section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. President, it will be interesting to note that the bill before the Senate was presented also to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by a number of our colleagues. Those colleagues were the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

It is also important to note that no objection was registered to this bill in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I say that after having carefully checked the record, which shows that no objection was registered by vote or by formal notice in the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. How many members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were present?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not recall. I only know there were no votes in the negative. I know the subcommittee was unanimous. If I recall correctly, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was there at the time. I also recall that there was a quorum present at the meeting of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the Senator from Vermont was late in getting to the committee that day. As I recall, most of the work of the committee had been done. Of course, if I had not been engaged in other official business, I might have been present at the committee meeting. But I wish to make clear that frequently I do not register an objection to the reporting of a bill with which I disagree for I believe that the Senate as a whole should be allowed to debate bills and to register its position on them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respect the judgment of the Senator from Vermont on these matters.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the record will show I was present in the committee on that day, I believe there were approximately three bills left to report when I arrived there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont for stating his position. I do not consider the fact that a committee member voted either one way or another on the question of reporting a bill to be of great importance in connection with consideration of the bill by the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] had asked to be present in the committee when the bill was considered. He was detained in the Committee on Public Works, but was on his way to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If he had reached the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in time, there certainly would have been at least one vote in opposition to having the committee report the bill, and there certainly would have been some debate in the committee in opposition to having the committee report the bill.

But the Senator from Florida did not reach the committee in time. That situation was not the fault of any Senator. Such situations develop simply because all of us are too busy. Certainly no one was trying to harm anyone else. The Senator from Florida attempted to be present, but he was unable to be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what the Senator from New Mexico has said is correct. A large delegation from Florida had come to see me regarding a matter then before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I had made a telephone call to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and had asked that action on this bill be postponed until I was able to reach the committee. The chairman advised me that although the committee's meeting had barely begun, the bill had already been voted to be reported; and later he told me that objection was made to a request for reconsideration of that action by the committee.

So my dissent was quite clearly voiced in the only way I could then voice it—namely, over the telephone, for I did not have an opportunity to be present.

Therefore, Mr. President, under the circumstances I believe the Senator from Minnesota would not say that I agreed to the reporting of the bill by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield at the moment.

Mr. President, I was only stating the facts. It is a fact that in the committee there was no vote in opposition to reporting the bill. It is also a fact that a quorum of the committee was present.

Mr. President, I shall not yield for the moment for a discussion of these technicalities, because the RECORD has been made perfectly clear by the Senator from Florida and by the Senator from Minnesota.

An effort has been made to show that the Department of Agriculture is uncertain as to its stand on the bill. I wish to have the RECORD made perfectly clear, in showing that the Department of Agriculture is not uncertain with regard to its position on the bill. The Department of Agriculture may be overly polite to the supporters of the Benson farm program; but when the chips were down and when the Department had to face its responsibility, it made its position clear.

I am sure it must be difficult for the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture and his many advisers who have been referred to today, to have to disagree with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who, a year ago, did such yeoman service for them. I am sure it must be difficult for the Secretary of Agriculture to have to tell the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] he is wrong. I am sure it must be difficult for the Secretary of Agriculture to have to tell my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that the Department cannot agree with his position.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has been praised very much by my three distinguished colleagues. But is it not interesting for us to note that when the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates have been asked whether they could go along with the Holland amendment—and I can imagine that there was a pleading voice or at least compelling argument on that score—the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department have said, "No."

Let there be no doubt about the matter insofar as the RECORD is concerned. I am unwilling to have the RECORD indicate that there has been any vacillation on the part of the Department on this issue; and I shall not permit the RECORD to indicate that, somehow or other, the Secretary of Agriculture got in line and was committed and that, even though now, on second thought, he might think differently, yet, since he was committed, he is "staying with it."

Mr. President, I cannot believe that a man of principle, such as Ezra Taft Benson, would permit anything of that sort to be done in the name of political expediency. I am sure that if a man of such principle thought the facts compelled him to change his mind, he would speak out and would say so.

What is the statement we have received from the Department of Agriculture? It is as follows:

Statement reaffirming position with respect to a proposal to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. President, I shall read the statement, as set forth in the memorandum coming from the Department of Agriculture. I have this statement from the Department of Agriculture, from the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary:

After careful additional review and analysis by the Department of the proposal to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, we wish to reaffirm our position that this section be repealed. While the amendments proposed by Senator HOLLAND with respect to certain technical objections which we had to this section are generally met, nevertheless we feel that there should be no relationship between eligibility for ACP payments and participation in an allotment and marketing-quota program. In view of the fact that marketing quotas are in effect for all the basic commodities except corn, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will, even after amendment—

Even after the Holland amendments—

affect principally those farmers with corn allotments. Also there will necessarily be a tremendous amount of administrative detail. In view of the principle involved and the discriminatory nature of the present legislation, we recommend repeal of section 348.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I decline to yield for the moment.

Mr. President, my friends, who are so able, and who have explained here, for hour after hour, their amendment—my friends and colleagues, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who have participated in this debate—can explain, and explain, and explain, and they can lead us off into one side road after another; but when the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department were faced with the necessity of making a decision, even after the argument and the persuasive eloquence and the perseverance of the Senator from Florida, the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department said:

We recommend repeal of section 348.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Who signs that communication, I should like to ask.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is a communication from Mr. McConnell.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did he sign it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; but he sent it to me, after a telephone conversation. Does the Senator from Florida doubt that it was sent to me?

I read:

Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, as per our telephone conversation of this morning.

And it is dated "5/9/55."

I doubly checked with Mr. McConnell because of private conversations between myself and the Senator from Florida. I had my administrative assistant check with Mr. McConnell.

While the Department of Agriculture said the amendment of the Senator from Florida might solve some of the difficulties, yet the Department recommended repeal.

I know the Senator from Florida has made a pretty good argument with a fairly bad amendment, and I wish to compliment him on doing what I consider a first-class job on a second-class proposition—and that is no small assignment.

The Senator from Florida has retained in his amendment the language of section 348. He fathered this language. It means something. I now read from the amendment:

Any person who knowingly harvests an acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

That was the original intent, namely, that no payments whatsoever for soil conservation should be made under this title if there had been any variation or any violation of the allotments. Then, after having set forth that noble principle, we find line after line—14 lines—of the amendment to prove to the people and to the country and to the Senate that we really did not mean it. In other words, it is proposed that we follow the moral principle of providing a penalty, and that we provide for rigid control, but that then we say, "But in order to please the wheat growers, we will provide for a little exception, a little later on; and in order to please the peanut growers, we will provide for another little exception, a little later on; and in order to please those who produce corn, if they produce it only for ensilage, we will provide for a little exception for them, too."

In short, Mr. President, the amendment amounts to a botched-up job. I commend the Department of Agriculture for adhering to principle and for refusing to agree to an amendment which does not do the job, and I shall prove that the amendment does not do the job.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to have the Senator from Minnesota make the record clear, for I understand that earlier today the impression was given—given again, let me say—that the wheat farmer is the villain. However, now we find, from the Department's own statement, that this provision affects primarily the corn farmers, who are located principally in the Eastern States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed so.

Mr. YOUNG. In Minnesota and North Dakota, and other States in our area, there is very little noncompliance. The farmers are very careful to comply with all the regulations under the price-support programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Will the Senator tarry a moment and listen to what the National Grange has to say? The Grange favors the repeal of section 348. There was an indication today that only the Farmers Union—even though I consider it to be one of the truly great agricultural organizations of the Nation—came forward and testified in opposition.

Mr. President, the National Grange, through its legal consultant, Joseph O. Parker, speaking in behalf of the National Grange, in its convention assembled, made the following statement:

The Grange favors the repeal of section 348.

The executive committee of the National Grange, on January 24, 1955, adopted a resolution authorizing the national office to seek repeal of this provision. It was their view that payment for conservation practices should not be used as an enforcement measure to obtain compliance with other programs unrelated to conservation matters.

There is no longer any direct relationship between the agricultural conservation program and the acreage allotment and marketing quota program. Conservation payments are so small that, in the main, they would have little effect from the standpoint of enforcing compliance with acreage allotments, but their denial might prove costly in the way of "lost" conservation.

I invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to this:

In addition, the farmers who are most likely to be affected if section 348 remains in the law are the small farmers who need every encouragement to continue carrying out needed conservation practices.

In other words, the way the law is now written, the small farmer is damaged; and if we repeal section 348, it will be helpful to the family-sized farm.

The National Grange is no special interest group. This organization has a reputation second to none for integrity, for honorable purpose, and for objective analysis of many legislative proposals which affect American agriculture.

I wish also to invite the attention of my colleagues, as they read this RECORD over the weekend and prepare to return to vote on this issue on Tuesday, to the fact that the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ervin L. Peterson, said:

This section does not appear to be effective in influencing farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

In other words, section 348 is a dud, a mistake. It has only caused trouble for the Department and for the farmers.

It seems to me that instead of having pride of authorship, instead of being persistent in demanding that this section be maintained, even if its very purpose were practically distorted by amendment, the thing to do would be to take it out of the law, because it is administratively ineffective, because it perpetrates an in-

justice and an inequity upon the farmers themselves. It is doing a terrible thing to soil conservation. Today thousands of farmers in America are being denied soil conservation payment benefits simply because of this provision in the present agricultural law. Those farmers are not, as the Senator from Florida [Mr HOLLAND] said, "on a free ride to prosperity." Those farmers pay 50 percent of the cost of soil conservation practices. They get a 50-percent helping hand from the Federal Government. This program is a part of the diverted acres program. It is a part of the national conservation policy. Our Government, from the Secretary of Agriculture down through the Soil Conservation Service, is deeply concerned over the impediment which has been placed in the way of sound soil conservation practices by a very unfortunate amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act which was adopted in 1954—an unfortunate amendment to an unfortunate and unpardonable piece of legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator know who wants this amendment, besides certain Members of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certain groups of the American Farm Bureau Federation sent representatives to testify in behalf of it, but Mr. Lynn, when he came here to testify, said that the Iowa Farm Bureau was opposed to it. How many more farm bureaus are opposed I do not know, but I do know that the only registered opposition before the subcommittee was from the Farm Bureau, and even that was not too positive, because, as I have mentioned, in the testimony one of the largest sections of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Iowa Farm Bureau, was said to be for the repeal of section 348.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator agree that if this question were left to a vote of the farmers themselves, there would probably be no more than 2 percent of the farmers who would approve of the amendment, and that they would probably be the silk-stocking class?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct, and I think he is being generous in his percentage.

What was the purpose of the soil conservation program? Was it to punish farmers? Was it a disciplinary measure? Not at all. The fact that soil conservation payments were tied in with cotton has no direct relationship to soil conservation payments being tied in with other crops. First of all, there are no production quotas with respect to corn. There are acreage allotments. With respect to cotton, there are both production quotas and acreage allotments. Therefore the control over it is much more rigid. In years gone by there have been farmers who have not agreed to acreage allotments. But we did not try to tamper with the program of soil conservation or to use it as a punitive measure with respect to those who were unwilling to go along with allotments.

What is the penalty for a farmer who does not abide by acreage allotments or production quotas? I will tell the Senate what the penalty is. It is much more severe than the loss of $50 of soil conservation payments. The penalty is no crop loans on his crop, no price supports on his crop. That is an effective penalty. Soil conservation is supposed to have the constructive purpose of building up the soil, and of teaching farmers soil conservation practices, in order to help them to make the soil more productive, to use diverted acres, and to hold those diverted acres in grasslands, and to engage in other soil conservation practices.

I think it is most important to note that all the testimony which came to us underscores everything that those of us who are supporting this amendment have had to say.

I listened with keen interest to the attempts which were made to try to make us believe that the Department of Agriculture did not mean what it said. Let me refer again to what the Department of Agriculture had to say:

> Also, the present average ACP amount of cost sharing of less than $100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.
>
> The principle effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms.

That was not only from Mr. True Morse, Under Secretary, but it was from the Farmers Union, and from the National Grange.

It is very strange to find our friends, who are supposedly supporting the Farm Bureau position, speaking in direct contradiction of the Farm Bureau position. The Farm Bureau says that we ought to separate soil conservation completely from the allotment and production quota systems. The Farm Bureau recommends that we place the entire soil conservation program back in the hands of the States, in the Extension Service.

We find those who are basing their action in part upon the testimony of the American Farm Bureau Federation indicating that there ought to be a direct relationship in terms of production controls and soil conservation, with penalties.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that he is astonished that the Farm Bureau Federation does not own the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. I was astonished that my colleagues, able and distinguished as they are, tried to base a part of their case upon the position of that organization. The only witness to come before the subcommittee in opposition to the repeal of section 348 was the witness of the Farm Bureau Federation, and it was lukewarm in its opposition. Even then it was not unanimous opposition, because the Iowa Farm Bureau was in favor of repealing section 348. What I am saying is that the only outside evidence and support that we can point to from great farm organizations is from the Farm Bureau Federation, and their position is that soil-conservation practices and programs should go back to the States, and much of it put in the hands of the Extension Service.

All I am trying to do is to keep the record straight. I listened this afternoon with considerable interest to the comments about the advisers to the Secretary of Agriculture. Those are the same advisers my distinguished colleagues held in such esteem a short time ago. Those same advisers have been advising the Secretary all along the line. They must be right once in a while. They have apparently come to realize the unfortunate effects of the provisions of section 348. Those advisers, from the head of the soil-conservation program up to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, have stated that this section should be repealed.

I have just 1 or 2 other comments to make on this subject, and I shall yield the floor on this particular item.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I regret he is not on the floor. I had hoped earlier today that I might have a chance to speak with him about his statement. The Senator from Kansas was one of those who proposed a bill to repeal section 348. It is S. 494. What did that bill propose? It proposed to repeal section 348.

The Senator from Kansas listened to the persuasive argument—and it was a persuasive argument—of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]; that is, it was persuasive so far as the argument went. The Senator from Kansas came at least close to saying that possibly the amendment of the Senator from Florida met his objections to section 348. I wish the Senator from Kansas were here. However, I shall rely upon the written record. I want to read from the statement the Senator from Kansas made to the chairman of our committee. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, my bill (S. 494) was introduced for the purpose of repealing section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I feel that it was never intended or contemplated even remotely that the agricultural conservation program should be tied in with the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota law.

The Senator from Kansas says it was never intended or contemplated, even remotely, that the agricultural conservation program should be tied in with the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota law.

I should like to say to my friend from Kansas that the Holland amendment does tie it in. The Holland amendment is predicated upon the proposition that there is a tie-in and a tie-up between soil conservation payments and acreage allotments and production quotas.

I only hope that our good friend from Kansas in reviewing the RECORD will see that the bill he offered is in conflict with the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and his associates.

I continue with the statement of the Senator from Kansas:

> The effect of this amendment, which is now section 348, was to deprive a farmer of his ACP payments if he knowingly exceeded his acreage allotment on any one of the crops then under control. I do not believe there was any element of control contemplated in the original ACP program.

The provision I am attempting to repeal here will particularly affect corn and wheat producers. It will not have any material effect on cotton and peanut and tobacco producers because those commodities are under marketing quotas whenever acreage allotments are in effect, and that almost automatically prevents any farmer from being out of compliance.

Is it not interesting to note that cotton and tobacco and peanut producers for all practical purposes are not affected by section 348? However, the producers of corn and wheat, who have taken severe acreage cuts and have had millions of acres taken out of production, and have suffered a drop in price, should be denied soil-conservation payments.

The situation with respect to cotton and corn is entirely different even under the law, so far as controls and regulations are concerned.

The legislation we are talking about repealing, that is, section 348, is designed in part to help out the farmers who produce wheat and corn in areas that are now arid, drought-stricken, wind-blown, and who are the victims of pestilence. It would give them a little soil-conservation benefits.

If my colleagues wish to apply more severe penalties for violation of acreage allotments, let them write those penalties into law. However, let us not use such a constructive, progressive, and forward-looking program as the soil-conservation program as a club to discipline those who in some manner or another exceed their allotments. We should have soil conservation even if we never have any acreage allotment. We would need soil conservation even if we never heard the words "production quota."

I am happy to note that the Department of Agriculture, on second thought, feels that section 348 is not advisable, that section 348 works in contradiction to the purposes and needs of the farm program, and that section 348 should be repealed.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who presides over the Senate at this time, also presented a bill before our committee. I may say that it was a bill that had exactly the same purpose as H. R. 1573. His bill is known as S. 517. It is noted and referred to in the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Report No. 210.

I have before me the statement of the Senator from South Dakota. It is important that I read 1 or 2 sections of his statement:

This provision of the law—

Speaking of section 348—

was severely criticized by the groups as they do not wish to have this provision applied to wheat or corn. We have had a number of letters requesting that some action be taken to have the above section repealed.

In 1954 in South Dakota it now appears that the compliance in the corn allotment program will only be about 40 percent; in other words, 60 percent of the farmers in the commercial corn area will have overplanted their allotment.

In other words, 60 percent of the farmers do not get the benefit of crop loans, or the price-support program, which is based on crop loans. They have to go into the free market. They must take lower prices. That is enough penalty for one who does not want to abide by the production-control program of the Government.

The Senator from South Dakota continues:

They have lost their price-support protection, but under the present provision governing the 1954 program they will still be eligible to receive Federal cost-sharing payments under the agricultural conservation program. In 1955, if similar conditions prevail, they will not be eligible for ACP payments. It is the general feeling of the farmers that price support should not be tied in with the AC program. Under the price-support program, the producer is being guaranteed greater returns for his product and he receives a direct monetary benefit; but in the case of the Federal cost sharing in the AC program the producer must contribute out of his own pocket not less than 50 percent of the cost of carrying out the practice. The benefits accruing from the conservation practices may not be of a monetary benefit to him immediately; in fact, it may take several years before he realizes any financial benefit from the practices carried out, but the consumers of the United States are assured that the benefits of the soil- and water-conservation program will insure to them a plentiful supply of food and fiber from the farms and ranches of America.

For this reason, therefore, I introduced S. 517, a bill to repeal section 311 (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1954, Public Law 690, 83d Congress.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this information to the members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and will appreciate any considerations given to S. 517.

Mr. President, I think that is a pretty persuasive argument. The Senator from South Dakota has placed his finger on the truth in this particular case. A soil-conservation program has long-range benefits, regardless of any kind of price-support program. A soil-conservation program stands on its own merits, regardless of any acreage allotments and marketing-quota provisions tied into a price-support program. I repudiate the effort which is being made to try to treat these two separate and distinct programs as if they were siamese twins. They are, in fact, separate programs. We might have a soil-conservation program without any price-support program whatsoever. We do have soil-conservation programs for land on which there are no crops which are price supported.

It is interesting to note that the soil-conservation payments which are being used as the penalty are being so used only for those crops which are basic commodities. There are other crops that are planted. There are barley, oats, rye, substitute crops for corn and wheat. Yet section 348 was directed essentially at the so-called basic commodities.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to be clear that nonbasic commodities are also price supported. Yet, if my memory serves me correctly, section 348 applies to the basic commodities.

Mr. President, I hope that when we finally come to vote on this bill on Tuesday we shall keep one thing in mind, not whether we are for high price supports or flexible supports, not whether Secretary Benson is the world's greatest Secretary of Agriculture or is a person of lesser capacity, not whether or not those of us who voted in 1954 were right or wrong, but to concentrate our attention on this particular proposal, namely, the repeal of section 348.

Why do I ask this? Because right now farmers need to know what the policy of the Government is going to be. They need to have a sense of direction from the Department of Agriculture as to what the soil-conservation policies are to be. I can say, in all candor, that they are not going to get much sense of direction from the Holland amendment because it opens up a Pandora's box for administrative abuse, for administrative discretion, and for administrative detail. I listened to the Senator from Florida say that if a farmer violates an acreage allotment it can be measured and ascertained whether there was too much planted or produced. Mr. President, the Department does not have enough people to do that kind of thing. That is why the Department has said in their statement to me that there will necessarily be a tremendous amount of administrative detail, that they will be spending a good deal of time, money, and effort on administrative management of an amendment that is administratively impossible and unwieldy.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment when it is called up. I recognize that there may be a feeling that the whole subject matter needs to be further discussed. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] offered what I thought was a fair and reasonable alternative. He said:

Let us proceed with the repeal of section 348 and then let the Holland amendment go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where representatives of the Department and representatives of organizations which are interested can testify, and we can determine whether there is merit to any of the provisions of the amendment and whether the act of 1954 should be further amended.

I hope that that procedure may be followed, but it appears that it will not.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AT THE STEPHEN WISE AWARD DINNER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that last night one of the most beloved Members of the Senate, the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, received the annual Stephen Wise award at a dinner of the American Jewish Congress at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C.

In accepting the award Senator LEHMAN made a brilliant speech, one which I think will glow in history as a shining example of the statesmanship of the Senator from New York. At this time I should like to read into the RECORD several paragraphs of his speech, in the course of which he discussed civil rights and civil liberties.

On the subject of civil rights, Senator LEHMAN had the following to say, in part:

I do not know whether I will live to see the day when equal rights are assured—and

enjoyed—by every citizen, without discrimination or segregation, direct or implicit. Nor do I know whether enough years will be granted me to observe that day when civil liberties are again enshrined in their proper place in America, and exercised freely, without fear or reproach.

But I pledge you tonight that in what years are left me I will continue to strive toward those goals and to make available what energies and talents I have to the common effort to realize them.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the sentiments expressed in that beautiful statement by Senator LEHMAN only mirror the record the Senator from New York already has made in the field of civil rights. I am sure I express the hopes and prayers of all Members of the Senate when I say we trust he will enjoy a great many more years in the Senate of the United States, to continue the great fight he has made for civil rights and civil liberties.

A little later in his speech—and I now refer to page 4—we find the following statement, on which I wish to comment:

Yet, as Walter Lippmann has brought out so brilliantly in his recent book, "The Public Philosophy," free debate is the heart and soul of democracy. It is the justification of democracy. Without it, democracy does not and cannot function. Unless the representatives of the people can freely debate, and the people freely hear all the arguments, pro and con, on all public questions, democracy becomes merely a form and a phrase. Representative government, without free debate, can become as oppressive as totalitarian government or as destructive and chaotic as anarchy itself. In either case, the end and the result are the same.

Mr. President, I have read that part of Senator LEHMAN'S speech because, in making that statement, he has set forth one of the basic tenets of my own political philosophy, a tenet which Senator LEHMAN has exemplified and personified time and time again here in the Senate. In that connection, I have seen him stand almost alone in the Senate, Mr. President; and only in recent weeks he has demonstrated once again his dedication to the principle set forth in the part of his speech I have just read, his devotion to the principle that free debate is important to the maintenance of our freedom, and his belief that all Members of the Senate, even when they are in a small minority, must be sufficiently courageous to fight for the maintenance of free debate and the opportunity to express views which differ from those of the majority on any issue, and must be perfectly willing to let history judge of the correctness of their course of action.

Mr. President, I have been so favorably impressed with Senator LEHMAN'S speech, and I have been so greatly moved by its symbolism in relation to the meaning of democracy, that I ask unanimous consent to have the entire speech printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT STEPHEN WISE AWARD DINNER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I would be insensitive, indeed, if I were not moved by this gathering tonight of so many good friends assembled here to do me honor.

When I was advised that I was to be given the Stephen S. Wise award, I expressed to the American Jewish Congress my heartfelt thanks and appreciation. I renew that expression here tonight upon the actual receipt of that fine and inspiring award. And I am happy to present the $1,000 check I have just received to the United Jewish Appeal, to further the humanitarian work which that fine organization has carried on for so many years.

The award given me is for service in the cause of civil rights and civil liberties. I said a year ago—it is still true tonight—I consider the award as much a mandate for the future as a recognition of the past. I judge the goals in question to be so far from achieved, and yet so vital to our national salvation, that none of us dares rest on past contributions. This cause continues to challenge the devotion of every American.

I do not know whether I will live to see the day when equal rights are assured—and enjoyed—by every citizen, without discrimination or segregation, direct or implicit. Nor do I know whether enough years will be granted me to observe that day when civil liberties are again enshrined in their proper place in America, and exercised freely, without fear or reproach.

But I pledge you, tonight, that in what years are left me, I will continue to strive toward those goals, and to make available what energies and talents I have to the common effort to realize them.

On the civil rights front, we have made some progress over the past 30 years—remarkable progress. There is a general recognition today of the undeniable right of all Americans to enjoy equal treatment, under law, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. But there is a vast and intolerable gap between the recognition of that right and the realization of it. The theory is accepted, but the practice is still denied.

It is true that the forces of bigotry and prejudice are falling back. Notable victories have been won against discrimination and segreation. But the distance we have yet to go is much greater than that we have already come, and the battles yet to fight, much more arduous than those already gained.

There are still great areas of our country where discrimination and segregation are written into law. And there still are extensive sectors of our national life—perhaps the greater parts of it—where discrimination and segregation are not the written but the unwritten law, rigidly enforced by custom and practice.

Our task is to tear down these walls of discrimination and segregation, both visible and invisible, and thus to insure true equality of rights and opportunity for all our citizens.

The forces opposed to us are strong. In regard to the obvious forms of discrimination and segregation—those provided or sanctioned by law—we face an entrenched and determined resistance. Those who support and defend these restrictions on the rights of minorities occupy strategic positions of authority. In the Congress, they have been able—and probably still are—to block remedial legislation by means of the filibuster. We have yet to secure the weapon—an effective cloture rule—needed to break this blockade of majority rule.

I would be less than honest if I did not also say that the forces in Congress supporting civil rights are less zealous and resolute today than they have been in the past. This is as true among members of my own party from north of the Mason and Dixon Line, as among members of the Republican Party.

Even among some of unquestioned and unquestionable good will, there is a strong tendency to put the civil rights issue aside for another day. Others are resigned to making only token progress, believing that it is better to settle for an inch than to struggle, perhaps vainly, for a mile.

I do not pretend to be all-wise in this or in any other field. But I do not judge this strategy to be either morally right or practically sound. I believe, with all my heart, that in the struggle for basic human values—for equal civil rights for all Americans—the banner must be kept high and the struggle relentlessly pressed. The goal of human equality must never be compromised.

I firmly believe that in this cause, every battle is a victory. The more strenuous the battle, the greater the victory, regardless of how, apparently, the battle goes. For we are pressing forward with a tide that is as irresistible as time itself. The surge for human equality is worldwide and cannot be denied. Let us exert ourselves in that direction, without stint or restraint. We will be restrained enough by those who oppose us.

A very wise man, Harry S. Truman, said recently. speaking on the subject of civil rights, that we should beware of those who urge us not to paddle, lest we rock the boat. I agree with Harry Truman. As every sailor knows, there is nothing more dangerous than drifting.

I recognize that those who counsel patience and plead practical difficulties have a certain logic on their side. Certainly the advance toward full equality should be orderly. But there is an obligation resting upon some of us boldly to spearhead the attack, courageously to join the issue, and resolutely to force the debate. The passion of conviction must animate us. We must fight for what is right.

So much for civil rights. Now, as to civil liberties.

While some progress has been made in the one, we have had little but retreat in the other. In recent months we have indeed scored some few victories for civil liberties, but these have come after such a succession of defeats, that we have far, far to go before we can even say that we are back at the point from which we started.

But let us count our blessings. Senator MCCARTHY has been temporarily forced into eclipse. I am not sure that he is permanently in the shadows, but he is, for the moment, at least, a power not much to be reckoned with.

The fog of fear has lifted, up to a point. The Nation's headlines are no longer preoccupied with smears and reckless charges. Congress serves less as a privileged sanctuary for the launching of hit-and-run raids against the loyalty and reputation of individuals, institutions, and organizations. The mania for congressional investigations of individuals, and for exposing them to trial by ordeal, has somewhat abated.

There has been a change—decidedly for the better. We may all rejoice over this.

But let us not rejoice too long, nor relax at all. We have work to do, a monumental work, just to patch up the ruins, not to speak of recovering lost ground and of preparing for another onslought, if it should come—and it may come.

Should the bird of peace we have recently glimpsed turn into a bird of prey, and of war, the demagogues would surely ride again throughout our land.

And make no mistake about it, the safeguards of our liberties have been greatly weakened. The area of true liberty—of the right to practice the freedoms guaranteed us by the Constitution—have greatly shrunk.

The right of free debate has been effectively curtailed. There are some subjects—too many subjects—which it is impossible to discuss on their merits, without running the dread danger of being called "soft" on communism.

The recognition of Communist China, and the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, is one such question.

The Internal Security Act is another such question. The Smith Act is a third. Our Government security program is a fourth. Wiretapping is another. The fifth amendment and immunity is still another. There are more issues—many more—which lie at the heart of both our foreign policy and our domestic tranquillity which carry the severest limitations in regard to free debate and discussion.

Yet, as Walter Lippman has brought out so brilliantly in his recent book, The Public Philosophy, free debate is the heart and soul of democracy. It is the justification of democracy. Without it, democracy does not and cannot function. Unless the representatives of the people can freely debate, and the people freely hear all the arguments, pro and con, on all public questions, democracy becomes merely a form and a phrase. Representative government, without free debate, can become as oppressive as totalitarian government or as destructive and chaotic as anarchy itself. In either case, the end and the result are the same.

We need urgently to reestablish the right of free debate and to tear down the curtains of fear which now prevent such debate.

I hope the time will come when it will no longer be necessary for every public speaker to prove his loyalty to America by describing how much he hates communism and the Kremlin.

I hope the time will come when loyalty oaths will pass out of fashion.

I hope the time will come, as Robert Hutchins expressed it, when the touchstone of advocacy or action will cease to be the question: "What will people say?" and will become, instead, "Is it good for the people?" and "Is it well for the people to know?"

The loss of the freedom of public men to speak out, without fear of reprisal or condemnation on the basis of being soft on communism, is not the only loss we have suffered to our liberties, although it is one of the most critical.

There is also the infringement of the right to be wrong.

The right of Government servants—civil servants—to be free in their judgment has been altogether denied. Men like John Paton Davies and John Carter Vincent, in spite of complete loyalty, have been discharged for past advocacy of policies which, in the light of today, may seem wrong. Scientists like Dr. Robert Oppenheimer and Dr. Edward Condon have been stripped of so-called security clearance because of personal associations of long ago, or because of views which have subsequently turned out to be unpopular.

A security program has been instituted for employees of the Government which has spread terror throughout the public service. Its sacrificial victims are countless. Suspension from employment without pay for endless months, and finally dismissal and disgrace, are too often based on unsupported allegations made by anonymous informants.

President Eisenhower has described as a basic principle of American democracy the right of every man to meet his accuser face to face, but his Department of Justice recently argued before the Supreme Court that to grant such a right would endanger our national security.

A case was recently brought to my attention by an official of the American Jewish Congress involving a man for 20 years an employee of the Federal Government, about to be promoted, and then suddenly suspended without pay and charged with being a security risk—all because of anonymous and unsworn allegations made against the brother of this man's wife. The wife's brother was charged with having been a Communist back in 1947. One of the items of evidence cited in support of this allegation was that this man, back in 1947, had written an article in his local labor union paper, attacking Governor Dewey's Thruway plan.

Whether the allegations against this individual are as incredibly ridiculous as they sound doesn't matter. The fact is that a man was suspended from a Government job—and it was a nonsensitive job—after 20 years of faithful service—because of anonymous assertions about his wife's brother.

There are hundreds of such cases—many even more shocking than this one. Some few have become known to the public—the case of Abraham Chasanow, an employee of the Navy Department; the case of Wolf Ladejinsky, of the Department of Agriculture; and the case of Lt. Milo Radulovich, an officer in the United States Air Force Reserve.

But for every case of flagrant injustice which has become publicized there have been hundreds, perhaps even thousands, which have not become known. And they are happening every day, even while we sit here tonight.

And this again is but one further aspect of the ravages to which our liberties have been subjected.

There are more. The Fund for the Republic of the Ford Foundation is studying some of them. I hope that these reports will help to awaken the American people to resolute action and to a crusade—if I may borrow back the word—to restore civil liberties to their honored place in America.

And speaking of crusades, one of my chief and most grievous complaints against this administration and against our President is the utter complacency shown in the face of this situation; and yes, the callous indifference to the inroads which have been made and are being made daily in every part of our land and in so many sectors of our national life. I judge those in positions of authority who have sworn to uphold our liberties and who do not rise to their defense to be guilty of complicity in their infringement.

But in a larger sense this is everybody's problem, as liberty is everybody's business. The opportunity which has been given us to regroup the forces of freedom must be seized. The fight for freedom at home, as well as abroad, is an urgent challenge. None of us dares shirk his share of the responsibility. This concern must be secondary to none.

There are three banners to which all mankind has rallied throughout the ages, and which have stirred men's souls from time immemorial—peace, justice, and freedom. Let these banners be raised here in our country, high above all others, and, with the help and the blessings of God, we will prevail.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE WOOL ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I desire to refer to a matter which I understand will be discussed later on in the Senate. I understand that my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will discus this matter in connection with the Wool Act.

I have received today telegrams from Mr. J. P. Steiwer, Secretary of the Oregon Wool Growers Association; from Mr. Bob Franklin, of the National Wool Marketing Association; from Mr. James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; and from Mr. Roy A. Ward, of the Pacific Wool Growers Association.

I wish the RECORD to show that I have received these telegrams, and I now ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOSSIL, OREG., *May 12, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish to urge that you oppose any amendment to Wool Act pending hearing and consultation with wool industry.

J. P. STEIWER,
Secretary, Oregon Wool Growers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 13, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just learned yesterday amendment planned today to be added to H. R. 1573 on Senate floor which would amend National Wool Act. Industry has not been consulted, no hearings held. Do not know full import of proposed amendment but understand it is attack on Cooperatives. Respectfully urge you oppose any wool act amendment without full hearing, consultation with woolgrowers and opportunity for Senators and Congressmen from affected producing areas having opportunity to study.

NATIONAL WOOL MARKETING.
BOB FRANKLIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 12, 1955.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am reliably informed that amendment to REA bill (S. 153) or to ACP bill (H. R. 1573) will be introduced to kill fourth sentence of section 708 of 1954 Wool Act. Such action would be a crippling blow to integrity of farmers cooperatives and a handicap to effective administration of wool act. Might also cause defeat of bill to which attached as rider.

Respectfully request you to oppose amendment of wool act.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 12, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

National Wool Act, section 708, wording Co-ops may vote membership in self-help program vital to success of August referendum vote on self-help program to promote wool-lamb consumption which eventually would reduce need for Government assistance therefor. Appreciate your opposing Anderson amendment, S. 153. Thanks regards.

PACIFIC WOOLGROWERS,
ROY A. WARD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to say to those who have sent the telegrams that, as a result of my discussion with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I am satisfied there is no basis in fact for the fears of those who sent the telegrams that any amendment which will be discussed by the Senator from New Mexico will in any way jeopardize cooperatives in the United States. Certainly such is not the intention of the Senator from New Mexico. We can take judicial notice, in my judgment—knowing the record of the Senator from New Mexico—that it would not be and could not be his intention to have cooperatives in the United States jeopardized in any way.

I desire to say that I join in the suggestion of the senders of the telegrams

that there be an opportunity for hearings on any amendments which may be offered to the Wool Act; and I shall support the holding of such hearings. Furthermore, I think such hearings will be had, because—knowing the Senator from New Mexico as I do, and knowing his record of complete impartiality and fairness to all parties who wish to present their side of a case—I am sure that those who have sent me the telegrams have no reason to doubt that they will receive absolutely fair play from the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to point out that I know the Senator from Oregon remembers that during the Truman administration, when I was Secretary of Agriculture, there was a desire to send to the Pacific Northwest a speaker who would outline clearly the position of the Truman administration regarding cooperatives. The speaker selected by the then President of the United States was his then Secretary of Agriculture. So I went to Everett, Wash., and made clear my own position and the position of the administration on the subject of cooperatives—to the extent that the cooperatives themselves reprinted more than 200,000 copies of that speech.

I can only assure the Senator from Oregon that the way I felt toward cooperatives then is the way I feel toward cooperatives now; and those who inspired the telegrams to which the Senator from Oregon has referred were, I think, in the first place badly misinformed, because at the time the telegrams were sent, I had not offered any amendment, and I have not now offered an amendment. I may offer one for the RECORD, but I believe that to be within my province.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that he does not have to give me any assurance about his position with respect to farmer cooperatives, because I know of no better friend in the Senate of farmer cooperatives than the junior Senator from New Mexico. I am sure that the Senator fully realizes that, the telegrams having been received, they should be made a part of the RECORD. The Senator and I had a discussion earlier this afternoon. He expressed himself as to the soundness of the position taken in regard to the desire to have hearings. However, in fairness to the Senator from New Mexico, even though the senders of the telegrams are my constituents, I think the RECORD should show that I do not share their fear that the Senator from New Mexico is proposing anything which threatens farmer cooperatives.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor and may proceed.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words by way of explanation of a bill which I shall later introduce.

On April 12 this Nation was thrilled by the announcement that the Salk vaccine had been developed to such a point that it was believed by the researchers who developed it, including the great Dr. Salk himself, by the March of Dimes group, and by prominent medical officials of our own Government, to be a successful preventive of polio. I do not know of any news in a long time which has so thrilled the Nation as this news. I suppose no news has been so thrilling since VE–Day and VJ–Day.

According to the best information I can obtain, the indications still are that this vaccine, when manufactured without impurities in it, and without live cells in it, will prove to be an effective preventive of polio in an overwhelming majority of cases. It offers great hope for reducing, at least, the incidence of the scourge of polio. It gives reasonable assurance of protecting large numbers of little boys and girls who otherwise might contract this dreadful disease. Otherwise, annually large numbers of children would contract it.

At this particular time, when it appears that in some instances certain batches of the vaccine which have been manufactured by some drug companies retain some impurities or live cells which apparently have caused some children to contract polio, possibly as a result of the injection of the vaccine itself, it is to be expected that parents across the Nation experience increasing concern about the wisdom of an innoculation program.

As recently as 2 or 3 hours ago, however, the best information I could obtain was still to the effect that, as soon as checks by the Federal Government health authorities have been completed on the various drug companies which are manufacturing the vaccine, it will be possible to go ahead with the inoculation program, as previously contemplated.

However, Mr. President, I happen to believe that the Federal Government has been guilty of gross negligence in this case, because it appears that all the doublechecks to which American parents were entitled before the vaccine was made available for inoculation purposes were not made by Federal officials.

We are dealing with a situation which has very serious potentialities. It seems to me that, under all the circumstances, the parents of America had the right to look to their Government to make "assurance double sure" that every batch of this vaccine, before it was made available for inoculation into the bloodstreams of American boys and girls, was pure. I do not think the Federal Government had any moral right—and I am speaking now about a matter of governmental morality—to permit any pharmaceutical company to proceed to make this vaccine available on the market without a very careful check by the Government itself as to its purity. Why do we have pure food and drug laws?

It is no answer to say that in this instance the authorities have followed a formula or pattern which very often is followed in connection with other drugs. We are dealing with a different type of situation. We are dealing with a vaccine which, if it is impure, does not give a person smallpox, dangerous though smallpox may be. We are not dealing with a vaccine which, if it is not pure, may give a person some diseases much less serious than the terrible disease of poliomyelitis. We are dealing with a vaccine which, if it is not pure, may result in the lifetime crippling and deformity of precious values, namely, our American boys and girls.

This vaccine does not involve injections for hay fever or some other relatively less serious disease. It involves one of the most serious scourges of mankind. The Federal officials responsible for letting the vaccine go on the market without testing the batches manufactured by the drug companies are guilty of gross negligence. Mr. President, the Federal Government inspects meat in the slaughterhouses more carefully than it has inspected the polio vaccine offered by the drug companies to the parents of the Nation for inoculating their boys and girls against this dread disease. If the information which is made available to me is true—and I believe it to be—the fact is that the pharmaceutical companies have been permitted to place batches of the vaccine on the market without a check by the Federal health authorities.

Now rechecks on the vaccine are being made which ought to have been made in the first instance. They ought to have been made before one vial of it was made available for injection into a single boy or girl.

I speak on this subject as a parent. I know what it is to go through the horrible, anxious hours following the initial diagnosis of infantile paralysis in a child. Fortunately, in the case of my family, it was a slight attack, and no deformity resulted. Nevertheless, I shall never forget those hours.

Under the circumstances, Senators can well understand why, on April 14, I introduced in the Senate a bill which sought to place the supply of this vaccine completely under the control of the Federal Government for distribution purposes, until such time as there should be an adequate supply of it for all the children of the country and all the adults.

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, on April 14, when I introduced that bill, 2 days after the thrilling discovery was announced, I proposed that the President of the United States appoint a commission of five, consisting of representatives of the medical profession, pharmaceutical companies, public health groups, State groups, and Dr. Salk, himself. I proposed that the commission have complete charge of the distribution of the vaccine until such time as it could be manufactured in such supply that all the people of the country would have it available to them.

Why did I introduce the bill on April 14? I introduced it on that day because from personal experience I know something about the value of such a vaccine

in eliminating the fears and worries of the parents of America.

The scourge of infantile paralysis is not a private danger. It is not a personal matter. It happens to be a matter of great national concern. I believe that a government representing a free people has the moral duty in a situation such as this to see to it that the vaccine is distributed in a fair manner, which will guarantee the vaccine to the boys and girls, in relation to the priorities of infection possibility, thus making it available first to the boys and girls in the 5 to 10 age bracket, then to the boys and girls in the age bracket under 5, and then in the age bracket above 10. Finally it would be made available to adults, with the understanding, of course, that pregnant women would be in the first priority group, because medical science tells us that women in that category seem to be as susceptible to polio as children in the 5- to 10-year bracket.

The purpose of my bill was to guarantee to the mothers and fathers of this country a distribution of the vaccine equitably and fairly to the boys and girls who are in the greatest danger of polio infection in the epidemic months immediately ahead.

In taking that position, I have the moral law on my side. In taking that position, I am taking a position consonant, in my judgment, with the clear moral duty of my Government. I believe it is to be the clear responsibility of Congress to act in the circumstances.

What were we met with? First, we were met with the statement from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, that the program was to be handled on a voluntary basis. The suggestion was made that here again perhaps the Federal Government was encroaching upon private enterprise. What private enterprise? The vaccine was developed from the dimes of children and parents of America. It was developed from the money the boys and girls and mothers and fathers of America put into the polio fund over the years.

If anything was ever developed and paid for by the people of America, it is the Salk vaccine. The research money for the development of the Salk vaccine came from the great public financial drive known as the March of Dimes. The people of the United States as a people have a vested stake in the Salk vaccine.

I happen to be one who does not believe that there is the slightest tinge of creeping socialism in a bill which proposes that vaccine, which was developed from the dimes taken from the schoolchildren of America and from their parents over the years, shall be distributed by the Federal Government until such time as there is enough vaccine available for the entire population.

Again I am talking about morality. I am talking about moral principles and of doing the right thing in a situation such as this.

We all know the temptations of human frailty. It was no surprise to me that even before the latest crisis inequities and unfairness were developing, and that we were beginning to see the old spirit of commercialism, profit for profit's sake, creeping into the Salk vaccine program.

In view of the fact that the Salk vaccine program was developed from funds collected in the March of Dimes drive, I happen to believe that it ought to be given free by the Government to every child in America in the number of inoculations necessary to provide the greatest security from a possible attack of polio. That seems to call for free inoculations.

So I go back, Mr. President, to my bill of April 14. I say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that the administration to date has fumbled this matter miserably. The administration, in my judgment, cannot alibi itself out of its position of error in regard to it. In my judgment, at the time it announced the discovery it had a moral duty to take the position that the vaccine would be made available through the Government to the children of America until such time as there was an adequate supply for all. Even then, so far as our precious boys and girls are concerned, inoculations should be paid for by the Government, if payment is to be made by anyone.

When we do that we protect the greatest wealth of America. The greatest wealth of America is the boys and girls of America. The future destiny of our country depends on them.

I am sad to see how the matter has been handled, and I am sadder to see how Mrs. Hobby has been trying to alibi herself out of her own errors. Her alibis are not good enough. They are not good enough for the millions of mothers and fathers of America.

I traveled through the country recently, and I talked to mothers and fathers, and I should like to advise Mrs. Hobby today that they are aware of the fact that she has fumbled the program very badly. In fact, I believe she has even misled the President of the United States, because he is not giving the leadership to this matter that the parents of the country have a right to look to him to give.

I believe the first mistake we made in Congress was that we did not live up to our full obligations. I believe we should have been doing something. We should not have been put off so easily as we were put off by suggestions that there would be a White House conference and another conference in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that we should wait until an advisory committee had made its report, or until some other committee had made a report. Inasmuch as it was clear when the discovery of the vaccine was announced that there would not be enough to go around, it was the moral duty of Congress to enact legislation which would guarantee that the amount available would be distributed equitably and fairly. That was our first problem.

Now we face a second problem. The Government fumbled in the distribution of the vaccine, and it has obviously fumbled in the testing program. I believe we had better find out why the batches of vaccine have not been tested.

Since when does the Federal Pure Food and Drug Agency or the Public Health Agency of the United States Government feel itself justified in turning over to pharmaceutical companies the determination of whether they are putting out pure batches of vaccine designed to combat a disease, the control of which is of such vital importance to the health of the people? We are dealing with a disease for which the vaccine must be pure. If the vaccine is not pure it results in such damage to the human body that the Government has the clear duty to make certain that every possible test is applied before a single vial of it is made available to the public.

Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill on this subject. I am not wedded to every phrase of the bill. I am introducing it for two purposes. I wish to be very frank about it.

First, I hope the bill will afford some incentive to check into the individual cases of boys and girls who have contracted polio since they were inoculated with the vaccine, because, Mr. President, I believe we have the duty to find out if there is a cause-to-effect relationship, as the indications are, and as has been suggested by some medical authorities. As we all know, the medical fraternity is very cautious in the language it uses. It is very careful not to deal in terms of absolute findings until it has checked and rechecked and can be positive that there is a cause-to-effect relationship.

It appears, Mr. President—and I dwell on these words, because I use them advisedly and carefully—that it probably is true that some of the boys and girls would not have suffered an attack of polio had they not been innoculated with impure vaccine under this program.

So I am introducing the bill, which I consider to be very important to the Government, because of its laches, because of what, in my judgment, is gross negligence on the part of our health authorities to look into each one of the individual cases, and if it can be medically established that there is a cause-to-effect relationship, then I think the provisions of my bill should automatically apply.

I am introducing the bill, Mr. President, because I hope it may have some effect on the administration, from the White House down, in connection with the entire program, and that they will proceed directly to take hold of the situation and place the health of the American people first, and place the rights of the boys and girls of the country on a basis of the moral obligation of the Government to make sure that pure vaccine is made available to them, without cost, and that it is fairly distributed.

So I introduce a bill which reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed, upon application therefor and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to reimburse or otherwise compensate any individual who contracts poliomyelitis subsequent to April 12, 1955, and after receiving one or more injections of poliomyelitis vaccine, for all medical and hospital expenses incurred by such individual as a result of the contraction of that disease. Such expenses shall

include the cost of wheel chairs, trusses, and similar appliances, and thereapeutic services and treatment.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

A colleague of mine said in the cloakroom, "That expense may go on for years." Mr. President, suffering will be endured for a long time, too, by those who have been attacked by polio as the result of an injection of impure vaccine. Let me say that, in my judgment, this Government owes a duty to the sufferers because of what I consider to be gross carelessness in the handling of the program.

I intend to have more to say on this subject at a later date, if the administration does not proceed quickly to face and correct the blunders it has made in connection with the administration of the Salk vaccine program up to this time, and to live up to what I consider to be its full moral obligations to the boys and girls of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received, out of order, that it be appropriately referred, and that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

I yield the floor, Mr. President, and I ask that my remarks may appear in the RECORD subsequent to the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair.) The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1976) to authorize the payment by the Government of medical expenses of persons contracting poliomyelitis subsequent to receiving vaccinations for the prevention of that disease, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed, upon application therefor and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to reimburse or otherwise compensate any individual who contracts poliomyelitis subsequent to April 12, 1955, and after receiving one or more injections of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine, for all medical and hospital expenses incurred by such individual as a result of the contraction of that disease. Such expenses shall include the cost of wheel chairs, trusses, and similar appliances, and therapeutic services and treatment.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. While I can approve of almost everything he said, I especially wish to join him in the words of congratulation, commendation, good wishes, and good will to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I think all Members of the Senate, regardless of on which side of the aisle they may sit, regardless of the fact that our views may be divergent all the way across the rainbow from extreme right to extreme left, will want to join in those cordial expressions of appreciation.

A POTENT FORCE FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I sent to the Press Gallery a release on a program which I think has real potentialities for building better human understandings. This is the fifth annual observance of what we call Letters From America Week, May 16 to May 22, sponsored by the American Council for American Unity.

I appeal to all Americans to join in waging the battle for peace in the world.

It is not enough to say we want our Government to work for peace. In a democracy, all of us comprise the Government. If we want peace, all of us must speak out for it, and work for the kind of better human understanding so necessary to achieve it.

Many people who might agree will probably say, "But what can I do? I am just one citizen."

Well, there is something every citizen can do—young and old alike.

It is time for Americans to all help spread the story of democracy to the world, people to people, not just government to government. We have a great story to tell, of our own struggle for freedom and progress. Let us tell the world about it—a "living story" of democracy.

The simplest way each of us can do this is to sit right down and write a letter. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have relatives or other contacts in other parts of the world. Millions of other people in other lands, young people in particular, are hungry for letters from Americans—eager to know more about America. Not only what our Government tells them, but also what our people themselves think about America.

A few dedicated people in this country have made tremendous personal strides in encouraging such letter-writing to help explain our democracy and freedom. It is time all of us joined the crusade.

As I have said, May 16 to May 22 has been designated as "Letters From America Week" by the Common Council for American Unity, one of the dedicated groups devoting its energy to this constructive purpose of encouraging such letter writing.

The fifth annual observance of this week will be aimed at focusing public attention on the important contributions which individuals writing about their life in America to friends, relatives, or business acquaintances abroad can make in the fight against Communist-inspired propaganda.

Not too long ago an Air Force Intelligence survey among Soviet emigres was conducted by Harvard University. One of its findings—which applies in varying degrees on both sides of the Iron Curtain—was that "ignorance and distorted views of the outside world are deeper and more widespread, even among the intelligentsia, than heretofore has been realized."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a press announcement from the Council for American Unity about the Letters From America Week, May 16 to May 22.

There being no objection, the press announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVANCE NOTICE—LETTERS FROM AMERICA WEEK, MAY 16 TO MAY 22, 1955

Letters From America Week, May 16 to May 22, will begin the sixth year of the campaign to utilize in democracy's fight against Communist tyranny the millions of letters Americans send abroad. Some 1,800,000,000 letters have been sent overseas from the United States since the letters from America campaign got underway in 1950. A large part of these are being written by first- and second-generation Americans to their friends and relatives abroad.

The letters from America campaign assists these letter-writers through a series of articles suggesting ways of telling the American story and combating Communist propaganda. Special articles have been contributed to the campaign by such outstanding Americans as Henry Ford II, Paul G. Hoffman, Bernard A. Baruch, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Henry Cabot Lodge. Letters from America articles have, for example, pointed out that President Eisenhower has consistently urged the peaceful uses of atomic energy; that the American economy, the bulwark of freedom, is not headed for a depression; that the United States Supreme Court in a momentous decision has barred racial segregation in the Nation's public schools. Such articles, translated into 23 languages, are widely used by foreign-language newspapers in the United States. Hundreds of foreign language radio programs, nationality organizations, and other American agencies also participate in the letters campaign.

The sponsor is the Common Council for American Unity, a nonprofit organization, supported by voluntary contributions, which has been working with American nationality groups for more than 35 years. It has received widespread testimony both from the United States and abroad as to the effectiveness of the campaign. As one letter writer expressed it:

"I would like to help, as much as I can, to overcome the misconceptions that Europeans have about America and that I myself shared when abroad. I am convinced that if I, and others, write systematically and continuously, it will bring results. People are sometimes skeptical when it comes to big speeches, but by reading simple letters about our everyday life, they feel and know this is the truth. If enough individuals become interested in such correspondence, they could help bring about friendlier world relations."

The council frequently receives copies of letters sent abroad. Here is a paragraph from a letter to a friend in Europe from a man who escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. It speaks for itself:

"Last week I had quite an experience. I saw for the first time a real strike. In fact, I was on strike myself. Can you imagine what I would have gotten for that at home? Ten years in prison. Here I got 10 cents per hour more. At the beginning of the strike I was on pins-and-needles. I remembered everything I was told by Soviet educators about strikes in America; how they were dispersed and workers arrested. Sure enough, several cars with police arrived. Well, I thought to myself, now I am in real trouble. But the policemen got out of their cars, walked among the workers, talked with them, and even made jokes. They came only to keep order, to see that there was no violence. Well, that's freedom."

Last year Letters From America Week was endorsed by most governors, many mayors, the Postmaster General, and many others. The United States Information Agency indicated the importance it attaches to the letters from America campaign by awarding the council a certificate of merit for its "noteworthy contribution in helping to develop world understanding of American concepts and purposes." Even wider endorsement of the letters campaign is anticipated this year.

The dates again are May 16 to May 22.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I urge wholehearted support for this constructive effort. Anyone wanting to know more about it may write to the Common Council for American Unity, Willkie Memorial Building, 20 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

There is a particular segment of the American population that can be most effective in support of such a campaign, and that is our foreign born. In these days when some, unfortunately, are inclined to look with skepticism at foreign born or those with foreign-sounding names, it would be well for us to realize our foreign born are a unique and significant national asset. Who can better convince people of other lands of America's true aims for peace, of America's abhorrence of war and conquest, than people of other lands who themselves have found freedom here and learned to love democracy?

In the present struggle for a free world, the United States has at its disposal a unique and powerful asset which is not being fully utilized—our 35 million first and second generation Americans, with their many ties of kinship and friendship abroad. No other country has such an asset. Not to make full use of it is to neglect one of our most effective sources of strength.

These 35 million first and second generation Americans maintain close contact with relatives and friends, not only in every country in Europe but in most other parts of the world as well. They believe fervently in American democracy. They want to see their native countries freed from Communist domination or saved from Communist propaganda and infiltration. To these ends they are engaged in a variety of activity. Much that they might do, however, is not being done. Much that is being done could be coordinated more closely with American policy. For the most part they are left alone to go their own ways—unconsulted, unchanneled, unaided.

Mr. President, properly encouraged and assisted, American nationality groups could exert a far greater influence in combatting communism and promoting American objectives. For that reason I welcome the work of the Common Council for American Unity in that direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a report from the Common Council for American Unity about what these American nationality groups are already doing, along with some suggestions of what more could be done.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AMERICAN NATIONALITY GROUPS HAVE DONE

Historically, American nationality groups have frequently played an important role in the liberation and development of their mother countries. Free Czechoslovakia, for example, came into being largely through the efforts of Thomas Masaryk and American nationality groups. The independence of the Irish Free State and the creation of Israel would hardly have been possible without the support of the Irish and Jewish groups in the United States. Sun Yat Sen's fight for a free China was largely financed by the Chinese American community.

The continuing stream of letters from Americans to their families and friends abroad have had a profound effect on world history. They prompted the great waves of immigration which settled the United States. They helped to spread the doctrines of the American Revolution. As recently as 1948, the letters of Italian-Americans had an influential part in Italy's crucial postwar elections.

WHAT AMERICAN NATIONALITY GROUPS ARE DOING

Today this same type of contact continues between millions of newer Americans and their homelands. They write the bulk of the 380 million letters sent abroad each year from the United States. They are sending hundreds of thousands of packages of food, clothing, and other necessities to relatives and friends overseas. They send abroad, month after month, a large number of American newspapers and magazines printed in both English and foreign languages. They are frequent visitors in their countries of origin. Many of them have an intimate knowledge of the language, geography, customs, psychology, and thinking of their countries of origin. They are working with exiled leaders and displaced persons in the United States. They maintain an active interest in the fate of their homelands and are contributing large amounts of money for the support of organizations and movements in such countries.

These overseas organizations, leaders, and churches are, in turn, in constant touch with their former countrymen in the United States, now for the most part American citizens, usually with some plea for political, financial, or moral support.

THE JOB TO BE DONE

Basically, what is needed is (1) a continuing survey of inventory of the international activities of American nationality groups, and (2) a systematic effort, on the basis of such information, to stimulate and guide such activities.

Activities which would forward American policy should be suggested and nationality groups encouraged to undertake them. Successful activities by one group should be suggested to others. Groups should be urged to intensify existing activity. Efforts not in line with American goals should be discouraged. All this would require not only a climate of confidence and good will but regular contacts with nationality group leaders, their organizations, and press.

There are dozens of ways in which American nationality groups can help in fighting the cold war, promoting better understanding of the United States, and strengthening democratic forces in their countries of origin. Once these groups realize that their activities are welcomed and appreciated, specific ideas are likely to multiply rapidly.

In addition to the overall job of surveying, stimulating, and guiding nationality group activities, there are a number of specific projects which could profitably be undertaken:

Expansion of letters from America campaign: In today's war of ideas, the letters which our 35 million first- and second-generation Americans write abroad are one of the simplest, least costly, and most effective weapons. For the past 5 years, a letters from America campaign has been sponsored by the Common Council for American Unity. The campaign is an attempt to use these hundreds of millions of letters as a means of combating anti-American propaganda and overcoming European misconceptions about the United States. It was undertaken after the council had completed—with the advice of Mr. Elmo Roper—a survey of European beliefs regarding the United States. The campaign urges newer Americans to use their letters abroad to explain in personal terms what life in America is really like. To stimulate such letters, the council distributes a weekly column to the foreign-language press in 24 languages containing suggestions for telling the American story abroad.

At present, the campaign is conducted on a relatively modest scale because of the council's limited financial means. Its effectiveness could be increased if it were possible to provide weekly columns aimed specifically at each of the more important European countries instead of one general, broadside column. Wider personal contacts with editors, radio-program directors, and organization officials are also needed. Pictures and cartoons supplied foreign-language newspapers in mat form and transcriptions for radio stations would add to the campaign's reach and effectiveness.

A 10-minute film, The Million Dollar Nickel, has been produced at the council's request by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. It tells the story of the campaign, dramatizes the value of a 5-cent stamp on letters overseas, emphasizes the important role of newer citizens, and ends with appeals by Pier Angeli (in Italian), Ricardo Montalban (in Spanish), Eva Gabor (in Hungarian), and Leslie Caron (in French), for cooperation in the campaign. Funds are needed, however, to obtain general distribution of the film in the country's theaters.

The usefulness of the campaign might be further increased if arrangements could be made to coordinate the campaign as closely as possible with official Government strategy in the cold war.

WHO SHOULD UNDERTAKE THIS EXPANDED PROGRAM?

Many of the foregoing projects and the broad program of work with nationality groups which has been outlined, could be undertaken by the Government, or by a non-Government, semipublic agency like the common council, or divided between them.

During World War II, both the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services had divisions working directly with nationality groups. Certainly, a Government agency would be likely to have far more adequate resources at its command than a private organization. On the other hand, it would have certain disadvantages. The effectiveness of many of the suggested projects depends on their voluntary, nonofficial character. In the whole field of psychological warfare, indeed, peoples abroad are likely to be suspicious of any activity traceable to an official United States Government source. Furthermore, nationality groups in this country might tend to resent suggestions, which, coming from the Government could be construed as dictation or interference with citizen activity. Also it might be difficult to get congressional approval for formal governmental participation in such a program at any time short of war.

As to private organizations, the number of those in a position to work effectively with nationality groups is extremely limited. Both the National Committee for a Free Europe and the American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism have done some excellent work with exiled leaders. But so far as it knows, the Common Council for

American Unity is the only organization equipped by knowledge and experience, broad contacts, and years of good will to do a job with nationality groups as a whole. If the Government feels it is not in a position to undertake the proposed program, the council would be glad to do so, if the necessary funds could be obtained. In such case, however, the council believes that the most effective results could be secured by some division, or informal sharing, of responsibility. So far as the public was concerned, the council could be responsible for what was done, but it would need to work in close cooperation with appropriate Government officials.

COMMON COUNCIL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH NATIONALITY GROUPS

The council is an outgrowth of work with nationality groups started by the Federal Government—through the United States Committee on Public Information—in World War I. Since 1921 it has been an independent nonprofit organization supported by voluntary contributions. It aims to assist the newcomer to understand American life and institutions, become a citizen and participate fully and effectively in American life.

For 35 years the council has been in intimate contact with American nationality groups, their press, radio and organizations. The council maintains a weekly press service in 25 languages to foreign language publications in the United States. It supplies a similar weekly educational service to foreign language radio programs and broadcasters. It has worked closely with nationality organizations on a wide range of projects, including the letters from America campaign, the 1952 register and vote campaign, etc. It maintains a technical information service on immigration and naturalization problems—interpreter releases—which is widely used throughout the country.

The council's information in these fields is undoubtedly the most complete and accurate that exists. So far as its resources permit, it reads the foreign language press in the United States and follows political and other developments within American nationality groups. On the basis of such information it has recently prepared a series of special articles and reports. Surveys of "Current Political Attitudes and Activities with Respect to their Country of Origin" have been made in regard to Polish-Americans, Ukrainian-Americans, Czech-Americans and some 15 other nationality groups. Other reports have included "Reactionary Influences in the Foreign Language Press and Organizations," "Anti-Bolshevist Bloc of Nations," "Promethean Movement in the U. S. A.." It is now preparing for the Rand Corporation a series of reports on émigré groups from the Soviet Union. Reference has already been made to the council's survey of "European Beliefs Regarding the United States."

During its many years of work with nationality groups the council has not only acquired extensive information and experience, but has built up a vast amount of good will. Because of the confidence and trust which nationality groups have in the council, the flow of information and suggestions between these groups and the council is unusually frank and complete. They are accustomed to turn to the council with information they might be loath to give to an official agency, even if they knew to whom to go. Frequently, indeed, the council has served as a connecting link between them and the Government. In 1951 and 1952, for example, it organized nationality group conferences in Washington for the Mutual Security Agency.

As a result of all these things—experience, information, goodwill, Government contacts—the council is in a unique position to mobilize the invaluable assets our new Americans offer, if the means can be found to go forward with an expanded program.

WINNING THE COLD WAR

Who undertakes the proposed work with nationality groups is not so important as that the work itself be done. America owes its strength, in no small part, to the fact that its people have come from every part of the world, that we are a country of many nationalities, many races, many religions. Not to capitalize on this tremendous fact in psychological warfare is to miss one of our great opportunities in winning the war of ideas.

Because our newer citizens are less apt to take our basic freedoms for granted, they may be in a better position to combat the neutralism which exists in many countries and to arouse people to an appreciation of the spiritual issues which divide communism from the Western world. At a time, too, when attention is so much centered on the Soviet Union and the satellite countries, American nationality groups can be particularly helpful in the equally crucial area of Western Europe.

What makes this whole approach so important and effective is that it relies on natural and spontaneous lines of communication. Millions of Americans of foreign birth or descent are regularly writing their relatives and friends abroad and are otherwise in touch with their countries of origin. The suspicion that attachés to government propaganda does not apply to communications from relatives and friends and fellow countrymen. Here is an inestimable advantage. The opportunity is one whose specific potentialities are likely to increase rapidly as active work goes forward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, other groups in this country are making valuable contributions toward this goal of letter writing. It is a project which should offer a tremendous challenge to our young people particularly.

I want to call special attention to the work of an organization known as Youth of All Nations, Inc., seeking to build lasting peace through young understanding. This organization is dedicated to developing pen pals throughout the world. Young people of other lands are so eager for letters that thousands of more letter writers are needed in this country.

As an example, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to me from five members of Youth of All Nations, appealing for more American pen pals to write to Asians and Africans. What could be more appropriate for us to encourage at this time?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The undersigned have personal friends in most of the countries represented at the Asian-African Conference being held in Indonesia. We think thousands of other Americans, now more interested in that important area, would also enjoy increasing their understanding of it through correspondence with individual Asians and Africans, if they just knew how to go about it. Will you then help us tell them?

Will you introduce your constituents to Youth of All Nations, Inc., a nonpolitical, nonprofit organization we belong to which makes such contacts possible? Say, please, that we invite all between the ages of 14 and 27 to join us. They will find membership informative, challenging, and fun. They will find our bulletin, Mirror for Youth, a unique way to keep in touch with the thousands of members no one can write to personally.

YOAN helps youth everywhere, regardless of nation, race, or religious beliefs, to understand each other's ways and purposes through the only means available to most of mankind—the personal letter. How many of the world's people can, after all, be exchange students or even tourists? During the past 8 years our program has sparked hundreds of thousands of friendly international letters. As we are plain, not official, Americans, our overseas friends readily accept what we tell them about democratic life here. And we, as citizens of an old democracy, are watching the progress of the newer democracies.

We believe you will welcome knowing of private enterprise like YOAN and will like the idea that, although it is informally helpful to that part of the Congress concerned with our country's foreign affairs, no Government funds are involved. Our work has, it happens, been praised before Congress by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio Republican, in the Democratic Digest—September 1954 issue, and in important newspapers. Educational and religious leaders endorse it.

We urgently need more young Americans to write to our fellow YOAN-ers in Indonesia, the Philippines, Viet-Nam, Syria, India, Japan, the Gold Coast, etc., and thousands in Europe, Australia, Latin America, and various islands. For they all want a pen friend in the United States of America. So we, representing the United States members of Youth of All Nations, Inc., appeal for help. Anyone interested not only in telling the American story abroad but also in finding out more about average life in other countries should send a nickel and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to Clara Leiser, executive director, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N. Y.

Thank you, sir, for aiding our efforts to improve international relations.

Respectfully,

YOUTH OF ALL NATIONS, INC.
HENRY FERNANDEZ.
AUDREY E. DAVIDSON.
ROY BLUMENTHAL.
NORMA JAEGER,
RUTH SANDMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope young America will respond eagerly to that appeal. It has been backed up to me in another letter from the executive director and moving spirit of Youth of All Nations, Clara Leiser. I ask unanimous consent for it to appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH OF ALL NATIONS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 26, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I stress the urgency of the accompanying appeal? The five signers represent about 1,000 American "YOAN-ers," who are trying, valiantly, to satisfy many thousands of non-Americans waiting for a personal pen-friend in the United States of America. Can you mention the appeal in your weekly newsletter or radio report? We need thousands of active United States members to help convince youth the world over that this Nation is devoted to achieving a world at peace.

Right now there is high and special value for our country in the simple, forthright, friendly Youth of All Nations approach to youth overseas. We ask them, you see, what they want better known about their own

countries—what misconceptions they feel others have about them—what countries and people they find hard to understand. You might be surprised to see how often "the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A." appears.)

We keep track, too, of current articles and books on foreign affairs. The following very recent observation bears tellingly on our work in Asia. "Where the Government leaves off * * * private enterprise can begin. Individual Americans * * * can speak with a freedom and * * * with the diversity of points of view that is the true strength of democracy. * * * The private American can more easily enter into the free and uninhibited give-and-take of ideas on which our whole concept of democratic progress depends. * * * We should establish fruitful intellectual contacts at every possible level."

We believe the YOAN program responds to those recommendations, and we hope you will agree that our success thus far warrants our asking support to realize YOAN's full potential for United States and world good. Will you help us reach adults who would contribute supplies and/or money? These are income-tax deductible.

YOAN really is winning the minds of the young—and their hearts. But even our modest program requires funds. If, as one vitally concerned with the foreign relations of our country, you agree that American youth can be powerful private voices of America, will you help us to secure a grant from some foundation whose funds are available for peace-building?

Extra important is our small but really loved Mirror for Youth, in which "YOANers" share what they learn from correspondence, and "Headquarters" share what we learn from them all. Want of funds has prevented our issuing MFY as often as we should. Thousands of fine young people are waiting for it.

For what you may do to help this down-to-earth program which works, thanks.

Sincerely,

CLARA LEISER.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this body has given considerable thought to problems of juvenile delinquency. I think it would be well to consider the comment of a young Minnesota girl, a new member of Youth of All Nations, Diane Clarity of International Falls, who wrote in her application to this organization:

> It certainly gives you something constructive to do. If more kids had pen-pals, there would not be so much "juvenile delinquency."

Clara Leiser informs me that United States youth as a rule feels rather bitter about having the whole world think all United States youth is delinquent—as the nature and volume of this publicity given to juvenile delinquency could seem to make them think. Here is a great chance for youth to speak out for itself, and show young people of other lands the real backbone of American youth.

It has been somewhat embarrassing for leaders of this movement to have to tell many overseas members that there are not enough young Americans willing to become pen-pals and answer their questions about the United States of America, giving them an unfair impression that United States youth may be less concerned about contemporaries abroad than the latter are about them. All I think American youth needs is encouragement and the opportunity to learn how many can take part in this great undertaking. They can be a great force for good, and help build for peace.

Let me suggest that anyone interested in furthering this work among young people get in touch with Youth for All Nations, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N. Y.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD just two of thousands of typical comments about this program from the files of Youth of All Nations.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Vicki, an American young woman: "I'm a better newspaper reader these days. How come? I now have personal friends in 'headline countries.' I know how they view this or that about the United States of America, and what they want us to know about them. First-hand accounts of education in Maylaya, reaction to American foreign policy in Germany, little known customs of the Irish and the Greeks, have made me an avid reader of all world news, and now I would like to help your readers share my pleasure in 'YOAN-ing.'"
>
> Jagjit, a member in India: "We [that is, he and his correspondents in four different countries] have developed a good understanding and friendlier world true to the spirit of the organization—YOAN. So much so that even our parents share our views. After this 1-year-old correspondence, I am fully conversant with almost all the traditions and customs of [my friends] countries."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 708 OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I received today a telegram from the National Wool Marketing Association telling me that a very disastrous amendment would be presented on the Senate floor; that they did not know the full import of the proposed amendment, but understood it to be an attack on cooperatives.

I can only suggest to those who sent the telegram that it is a strange message for me to receive, when I realize who it was who put wool into the Agricultural Act of 1954 by an amendment. I put it there because I thought it was good, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry agreed with me.

I believe it is bad policy to say that the cooperative associations shall be allowed to cast the votes of all their producer members. I believe that when they are paying taxes they ought to be given an opportunity to express themselves on the issue. Therefore, I had favored eliminating from the provisions of section 708 the part which reads as follows:

> Approval or disapproval by cooperative associations shall be considered as approval or disapproval by the producers who are members of, stockholders in, or under contract with such cooperative association of producers.

I do not intend, however, to offer such an amendment without consultation with the Members of the Senate who come from wool-producing States and who have been very active in wool legislation. Almost without exception, they have asked me to present this proposal in the form of a bill, which I intend to do.

I now ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill to amend section 708 of Public Law 690, 83d Congress, 2d session, in order that it may come properly before the committee and hearings may be held upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1980) to amend section 708 of Public Law 690 of the 83d Congress, 2d session (the Agricultural Act of 1954), introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I intend to say a few words about the amendment which has been discussed, and then for a few minutes I plan to discuss farm income in the United States, where it is going, and why it is going there.

I had considered offering an amendment to the bill which would not have been germane to it, but I was agreeable to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into a few moments ago which precluded any amendments which were not germane, because I had not intended to call up my amendment.

The very able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] referred to the fact that those of us who had felt that a different version of a repeal or a modification of section 348 should be adopted did not have much support in the hearings before his subcommittee; that there was only one witness who seemed to speak for it, and many persons who seemed to speak against it.

I would only say that not too long ago, I was reading a little play called Enemy of the People, written by a fine Norwegian playwright. He said that he had finally come to a certain conclusion, which was this: That the strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone.

In agricultural policy, frequently persons find it necessary to stand alone. If in this particular instance the Secretary of Agriculture, all the farm organizations, and all their cohorts were on one side, I am certain the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the junior Senator from New Mexico might continue in their position if they thought the proposal was a bad one.

I take only a line or two from the hearings. Much has been said about the benefits in the ACP payments. I certainly would not dispute that; but I would not want anyone to believe that ACP payments are any key to financial success for the farmers of the Nation. As I shall shortly point out, they are having a very difficult time. It is not be-

cause their ACP payments are cut down, nor will their situation be greatly benefitted by an increase in the ACP payments. The testimony given by the Department of Agriculture on this bill, as it appears on page 7 of the hearings, is as follows:

> In the first place, the average payment, that is, the average ACP payment, is less than $100.

If that be true, then surely when farmers are suffering a declining income, running into the billions of dollars, even a few more dollars will not change their position.

In order to be certain of my own position on this matter, in the light of my own experience, I sent for a copy of the exhibit which I had attached to my income-tax statement filed on April 15 of this year, covering the operation of my farm in the year 1954. I find that I spent for salaries and wages, $19,424; for repairs, $4,290; for taxes, $4,116; and on through the various items. My total expenses were $44,150.71.

My total ACP payment was $320.

I do not believe a $320 drop on top of a $44,000 expense will make the difference between success and failure on that particular farming venture.

But whether the American farmer gets more than 100 percent of parity or less than 100 percent of parity, whether he gets 90 percent or 75 percent in the marketplace, makes a great deal of difference.

The able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] started by pointing out that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar had gone down from 54 cents out of every dollar in 1947 or 1948 to 44 cents, and he said it is on its way down to 42 cents. I agree with him. In every one of those years we had 90-percent price supports. They did not save the American farmer from taking an awful licking. The American farmer does not have prosperity built up by any such system as that.

Not long ago a table was placed in the RECORD showing what the American farmer received in net farm income and its relationship to national income. Strangely, even in 1933 the national income was from 12 to 15 times the farm income.

In 1933 the net farm income was $2,692,000,000. The national income was $39,600,000,000.

So it went through the whole scale until the year 1947, when the total net farm income was $16,774,000,000, while the national income was about $198 billion.

Farm income throughout all that period had been moving up in parity with national income. It had not moved up the same number of dollars, but it had moved up to the same degree; it had kept pace with it.

The point was reached in 1947 where farm income was some $16,750,000,000, and the national income was $198 billion.

What has happened since that date? National income has gone up to $300 billion. Has farm income kept pace with it? Farm income should have gone up $6 billion or $8 billion from the $16,750,000,000 figure; but instead of going up, it went down to $12 billion last year.

In every one of those years we had 90-percent price supports. So, I say, farm income cannot be increased merely by support prices, hard as we may try to do so by that device.

We have an agriculture which is enjoying an active, aggressive market. Adding a few dollars by this type of payment is not going to make the farmer well.

It is necessary to move off the shelves of this country the surpluses which now exist, and to get the farmer in a position where he can operate profitably again.

Three-dollar wheat got him well. One dollar and a half wheat does not seem to do so well for him.

I have sold lots of alfalfa at $4, $6, $8, and $10 a ton. But when in a particular period of shortage people came to my place and fought for it at $45 a ton, I began to know what prosperity might be.

In an area in the north central States, $6 a bushel was paid for flax. Farmers do pretty well on that basis.

So I simply believe that while it is true that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped, and dropped drastically, we should be spending our time trying to find ways by which his lost portion of the consumer's dollar can be restored. We cannot accomplish that unless there is control of commodities which are bringing about excessive surpluses in this land.

One of the speakers today said that in a year's time it had been found that the provision written into the Agricultural Act a year ago was detrimental to soil conservation. How that could have been ascertained when the provision has not been in operation, I do not know. However, I did find something I thought was very interesting. The American Agricultural Limestone Institute, which is located in Washington, on May 3, 1955, sent to persons interested in the agricultural conservation program a message dealing with the subject of soil-conservation payments. The message was signed by the executive secretary, Mr. Koch, who has long struggled to see that limestone shall be sold to the farmers throughout this country.

He said:

> A week ago today the Senate, in the most unusual action since I have been associated with the agricultural conservation program, overwhelmingly approved continuing the ACP for 1956—

That is next year—

> at the $250 million level. The administration originally requested $175 million from the House and then, after it was passed by the House at $250 million, it asked the Senate to reduce the amount to $175 million.

He points out that when the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] sought to reduce the amount to $195 million, the Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 76 to 5, approved the amount of $250 million.

I would say that soil conservation generally was getting along pretty well. I voted to keep the amount at $250 million. I think that is where it belongs.

I do not believe we have destroyed soil conservation by this act, which has not become effective.

In the hearings, on page 10, there is a table showing the reduction in crops which has taken place. The table showed that seeded acres of wheat had been reduced from 78,789,000 acres in 1953 to a 1955 allotment of 55 million acres, a reduction of 23,789,000 acres.

Why should not we try to do something about the condition that brought that about? The condition that brought it about was the accumulation of a surplus of 1 billion bushels of wheat which cannot be moved to the markets of the earth. I do not believe that condition can be cured by $250 million or $195 million for soil conservation. The loss of a market for that wheat is a staggering blow to the farmers, and I believe the attention of the Committees on Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture should be primarily directed to the conditions which have brought that about and not to some other issue which I do not think would be of help to the American farmer.

The table to which I referred also shows that seeded acres of cotton were reduced from approximately 25 million acres to approximately 18 million acres in the 1955 allotment. The same table shows that corn acreage was reduced from 57,007,000 in 1953 to 49,842,697 in 1955. There was a reduction of approximately 38 million acres in those 3 crops alone.

I do not believe we will ever get to a prosperous condition for American agriculture until we start finding ways by which the surpluses hanging over the markets can be moved. I do not think they can be moved unless there is a strong aggressive program to move them.

I have regretted that in the discussion some Senators interested in agriculture have been worrying too much about the language of this particular amendment when a condition such as I have described has been going on, and American farmers have to steadily cut down their cotton and wheat acreage and resort to all sorts of devices in order to get increased production from their land.

A publication on the table before me carries a report on cotton acreage production. It shows that the number of bales produced in 1954 was 13,679,000. That was 2,786,000 bales less than the 1953 crop, but it was greater than the 10-year average.

I thought it might be interesting to have the figures broken down, so I have before me a table which shows the cotton acreage harvested in 1952, 1953, and 1954, then the lint yield per harvested acre, and then finally the number of bales produced.

It will be seen that in the State of Arizona there was produced 673 pounds an acre in 1952, 743 pounds an acre in 1953, and 1,039 pounds an acre when the acreage reduction became effective in 1954.

It will be seen that the lint yield per acre in the cotton-growing States increased from 279 pounds in 1952 to 324 pounds in the following year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton acreage harvested, lint yield per acre, and production, 1952–54

	Acreage harvested			Lint yield per harvested acre			Bales produced (500 pounds gross weight)		
	1952	1953	1954	1952	1953	1954	1952	1953	1954
	Thousand acres	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Thousand bales*	*Thousand bales*	*Thousand bales*
North Carolina	745	775	545	366	278	319	569	449	364
South Carolina	1,140	1,175	830	276	281	288	657	690	501
Georgia	1,455	1,375	1,025	241	262	286	731	752	612
Tennessee	860	950	648	355	354	405	638	702	548
Alabama	1,585	1,620	1,170	269	285	298	890	963	728
Mississippi	2,416	2,490	1,960	378	410	384	1,906	2,129	1,571
Missouri	515	555	450	367	386	478	394	449	450
Arkansas	1,940	2,070	1,700	337	358	380	1,366	1,548	1,351
Louisiana	890	950	688	408	407	399	756	806	572
Oklahoma	1,220	1,020	930	104	205	151	264	437	293
Texas	10,700	8,900	7,730	171	233	244	3,808	4,317	3,923
New Mexico	295	315	204	536	497	743	330	327	316
Arizona	674	690	420	673	743	1,039	948	1,070	911
California	1,386	1,340	883	628	632	806	1,818	1,768	1,487
Other States [1]	100	116	68	307	242	367	64	58	52
United States	25,921	24,341	19,251	279.9	324.2	341	15,139	16,465	13,679
Other States: [1]									
Virginia	26.0	30.0	17.1	424	291	285	23.0	18.0	10.2
Florida	60.0	71.0	36.2	249	182	332	31.0	27.0	25.0
Illinois	2.2	2.3	3.0	180	357	444	.8	1.7	2.8
Kentucky	10.0	10.1	9.6	346	480	588	7.2	10.1	11.8
Nevada	1.5	2.3	1.8	569	325	561	1.8	1.6	2.1
American-Egyptian: [2]									
Texas	36.0	30.0	11.5	431	329	471	32.4	20.6	11.3
New Mexico	21.6	20.1	6.7	399	289	457	18.1	12.1	6.4
Arizona	48.0	41.5	15.8	436	375	732	43.8	32.5	24.2
California	1.2	.5	.2	258	246	505	.7	.3	.2
Total American-Egyptian	106.8	92.1	34.2	425	340	589	95.0	65.5	42.1

[1] Sums of acreage and production for "other States" rounded to thousands for inclusion in United States totals Estimates for these States, except Kansas where cotton production is insignificant, are shown separately.
[2] Included in State and United States totals.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Crop Reporting Board.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we will find the production per acre is going to continue to increase not only in cotton but in wheat, in corn, and in many other commodities, as long as we try to solve this problem only by constant reduction in acreage allotments.

While I am not worried about the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida—I think it is a good thing to bring this into balance—I have tried to say to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that we need to spend time trying to find out why it is that, even with production increases, agricultural income is steadily going down year after year. It is a tragedy that the American farmer, producing, as he is, intelligently for the American market, is faced with a return which is already nearly $5 billion below the 1947 figure, while his share of the increased national income should have been at least $7 billion. He is $12 billion short. We cannot have that condition existing without farmers looking for additional ways to get increased production, by changing the width between rows of intertilled crops, or by trying to increase production with the use of new types of fertilizer—all of which throws the whole production picture out of balance.

I intend to vote for the Holland amendment which was offered not because I think it is a cure-all, not particularly because I liked the bill passed a year ago in that respect, but because I think we need to be saying constantly that there should be some way of encouraging acreage limitations. This may not be the way, but some way needs to be adopted. Otherwise we will be out of step.

When we begin to enforce the limitations we begin to come up against surplus acreages. Then we come up against the problem of surpluses and ways to dispose of the commodities produced.

I do not believe this Government has made nearly as vigorous an effort as it should to dispose of the surpluses now on hand. I believe the first duty of the Agriculture Committees of both the Senate and the House should be to discover additional ways of disposing of the surpluses which overhang the market, and which affect the sale of every bushel of agricultural commodities produced on the lands of this country. We cannot have one billion bushels of surplus wheat without affecting production. We cannot have 10 million bales of cotton on hand without influencing the price of cotton, although the price of cotton is not affected so much as are the prices of other commodities, since cotton is readily stored. That is why we have adopted the program we now have with respect to cotton.

I hope the Senate will not lose sight of what I think is the first problem, and that is to find markets for the surpluses by an alert and vigorous program.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, May 17, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, elevated to the United States Supreme Court.

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, to fill a new position.

CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Abdon, Albert L.
Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.
Acton, James B.
Aillaud, Emmett R., Jr.
Albright, Donald S., Jr.
Allen, James A.
Allen, Jesse L.
Allen, Raymond C.
Allen, Thomas R.
Allison, Paul
Anderson, Lee C.
Anderson, Lyle C.
Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Arbuckle, Wallace D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, Julian M.
Arnold, William S. M.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Augustine, William F.
Austin, Fuller A.
Averett, Thomas R., Jr.
Axe, John R.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Babcock, Robert E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Baggett, Talmadge S.
Bagley, Ralph F., Jr.
Bailey, Gilliam M.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, William C.
Baker, Richard L.
Balko, William J.
Barck, Dale E.
Bardecki, Frank J.
Bardes, Charles R.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barker, Warren W.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barnhart, Robert W.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Barrow, Joseph J.
Basso, Robert J.
Bates, George M.
Baty, Edward M.
Beavers, Robert A.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Becker, Donald A.
Beckman, Kenneth L.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Belter, Robert H.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert W.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Bereiter, Edward A.
Bergeron, Roy L.
Bergman, Daniel
Bergstrom, James H.
Bigenho, Roy M.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Biles, Joel T.
Billings, John H.
Billings, Randall K.
Bircher, William B.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Bond, John R.
Bonekamp, Fred H.
Bossert, Richard M.
Boston, Leo
Bottom, George A., 3d

Bowersox, Franklin L.
Boyd, David S.
Bradberry, Richard F.
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bradford, William J. D., 3d
Brady, Gene P.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Brandorff, Paul A.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brett, Morton
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brooks, William T., Jr.
Brown, Charles "D"
Brown, Ernest B.
Brown, James W.
Brown, Robert S.
Brown, William E.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Thomas S.
Buck, Robert A.
Buck, Roger L.
Burden, James D.
Burks, Ernest, Jr.
Burnett, Carl J., Jr.
Burnett, James C.
Burson, Roger T.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Burton, James L.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Butzen, Thomas P.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Calhoun, William P.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Campbell, Donald H.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Norman R.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carlton, George A.
Carmichael, Robert C.
Carr, William K.
Carter, Frank R.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Chaitin, Neil D.
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chapman, Donald E.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Chappell, Lawrence A.
Charnas, Steve C.
Chipman, Eugene N.
Choyce, Charles V.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clarke, Michael
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Clithero, John D.
Cobb, George B., Jr.
Cochran, James A.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerald G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Collins, Robert S.
Colvin, Robert D.
Comerford, James N.
Concannon, Leslie E.
Condit, Maurice J.
Congdon, Walter R.
Conlon, Charles M., Jr.
Conroy, Thomas P.
Cook, Richard M.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Jack E.
Corbin, Rex G.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowhill, William J.
Cramblet, Frank
Cross, Daniel F.
Crow, Dayl E.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Crytser, William B.
Culp, John B., Jr.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Cusack, Warren J.
Czernicki, Leonard
Dagg, Robert M.
Dame, Harold E.
Darfus, George H.
Darnell, Donald P.
Davi, Jerome A.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Frederick P.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, Robert L.
Day, Lawrence C.
Deibler, Daniel T.
Dellinger, Donald B.
DeLoach, Walter M.
DeLozier, Richard G.
DeMers, William H., 2d
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, James M.
Dickins, Richard A.
Dickson, James D.
Diehl, William F.
Dillahunty, Benjamin P.
Dille, Earl K.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Dollinger, Richard E.
Dorsa, Theodore, Jr.
Downs, Leslie R.
Doyle, Richard B.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Dukes, Warren C.
Dunaway, Gene T.
Dunn, Charles C., Jr.
Dunn, Delma D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Dupnik, Joseph J.
Eagye, Thomas R., 2d
East, George W.
Ebelacker, Richard M.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Eliena, Eugene D.
Elliott, James D.
Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
English, Ernest C., Jr.
Enright, George E.
Epeneter, Gus W., Jr.
Estes, Leland F.
Estes, Windom L.
Everett, Elmer C.
Ewertz, Roy W., Jr.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Farnsworth, William B., Jr.
Farrell, John B.
Fassula, Richard F.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald G.
Featherston, Frank H.
Fendorf, James E.
Fenno, Eric N.
Ferguson, George D., III
Ferrier, Harry H.
Ferrucci, David E.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fish, Theodore T.
Fitzpatrick, John R.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fleming, Joseph P.
Fleming, Michael J. J.
Fleming, William O.
Fletcher, James L.
Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forster, William G.
Forsyth, James A.
Forsythe, Forrest
Foscato, Sydney E., Jr.
Foster, James R.
Foster, Paul L.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fowler, Arthur D., Jr.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, George A., Jr.
Fox, Richard T.
Fraasa, Donald G.
Frazier, Montgomery L.
French, Norman M., Jr.
French, Robert D.
Frerichs, John S.
Friesen, Edwin "J"
Fritsch, Thomas D.
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
Fry, Gayle A.
Galloway, Charles R., Jr.
Gamble, Francis T.
Garland, John C.
Garside, Joseph J.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Geraud, Joseph R.
Gibson, Charles L.
Gillespie, Edward A.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gilyard, John G.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F.
Gochenour, David T.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodspeed, Richard E.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Goodwin, George E.
Gott, Herschel L.
Gray, Rockwell M., Jr.
Greeley, William E.
Greene, Leonard B.
Greenwood, Charles L.
Greer, Wiley W.
Gregory, George T.
Grier, Joseph L.
Griffin, Ellegood V., Jr.
Griffith, Thomas J.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grote, Joseph C.
Grove, Michael M.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Gully, Robert L.
Gureck, William A.
Gutknecht, Lowell E.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hahn, William S.
Hall, Donald P.
Hall, Harold D.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hammer, Theodore J., Jr.
Hancock, Virgil R.
Hanson, Carl T.
Hanson, Richard W.
Hardgrave, James B.
Hardin, David L.
Hardy, Corydon C.
Hardy, Martin E.
Harkness, Richard E.
Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
Harris, Dale B.
Harris, Edgar S., Jr.
Harris, John
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Harris, Thomas J., Jr.
Harrison, James R.
Hartwell, Ralf L., Jr.
Harvey, John W.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hayes, Robert W.
Haynes, Richard D.
Hays, Ronald J.
Heerwagen, David D.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Henderson, Burton
Henning, John C., 3d
Henry, Martin H.
Hershel, John A.
Hiatt, Henry G., Jr.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hight, Albea D.
Hill, Allen E.
Hill, Jackson D.
Hill, Lester N.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hoffman, Samuel D.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hoge, Kenneth G., Jr.
Hohn, Henry E.
Hollack, Michael
Holloman, George H.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Hopkins, William H. P.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hoseman, Leland J.
Howard, Joseph B.
Howe, James A.
Hubbard, William F., Jr.
Huber, James W.
Huelsbeck, Gerald
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hunt, Donald B., Jr.
Huntsman, Gary S.
Hussmann, Harry "L", III
Huth, Ralph L.
Ingram, Billy G.
Irish, George E.
Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.
Jaeger, Adolphus F.
Jakimier, Beverly G.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jefferson, Robert R.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenista, John E.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Edwin F.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jessen, George E.
Johns, Ronald L.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Richard L.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Jones, Cevil B., Jr.
Jones, Huby A., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaessinger, Charles E.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kangas, Robert T.
Karns, Dane L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
Kearney, John R.
Keeler, Donald J.
Keevers, Robert J.
Keihner, James K.
Kelley, Bruce E.
Kelly, Ellis G.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kersch, Roger N.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiernan, Warren R.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
Kimball, Edwin D.
King, Robert A.
King, Robert L.
King, Thomas R.
Kingery, Samuel G.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kittler, James P.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Knecht, Harry B.
Knighten, Charles E.
Knutson, Creighton R.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Krag, Robert L.
Kramer, George
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Kropf, John F.
Kuuls, Roderick J.
Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
Kyle, Richard A.
Ladner, Ivan M.
Lally, William K., Jr.
Lampson, James L.
Langton, Charles E., Jr.
Laque, Harold A.
Larish, David C.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lattin, Norman F.
Lawler, William G., Jr.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V.
LeDew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lee, Robert L., Jr.
Lefler, Luther
Lehman, Donald A.
Lemon, Robert T.
Leser, John R.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Lewis, William W., Jr.
Lindbeck, Edwin E.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lipchak, Edward A.
Linsanby, James W.
Littell, Raymond W.
Little, James G.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Long, Charles R.
Long, Donald C.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lord, Warren W.
Losey, Willis M.
Loux, Raymond E.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lyman, Jack N.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lynch, Robert M.
Lyttle, James D.
Mackell, Richard A.
Mackenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Hary P.
Maegli, Richard E.
Mahon, Richard B.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maier, William J., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C. Jr.
Mangus, Thomas B.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Marr, William F.
Marsh, Albert B.
Martin, Gene A.
Martin, Richard W.
Martin, William K.
Mason, Robert C.
Mason, Sidney R.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
May, Daryle C.
May, Donald S.
May, Harry L.
Mayer, Joseph C.
Maynard, Frank T.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
McBroom, William A.
McCarthy, James P., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McConnell, Joseph E.
McCrary, Dewey W.
McCraw, Frank M., Jr.
McDonnell, Harold A.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E. Jr.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McGuyre, Thomas A.
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKee, Richard W.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLemore, Albert S.
McMurray, William C.
McNabney, John F.
McNally, John J., Jr.
McQueen, Ralph E.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Meetze, James C.
Mello, Gilbert D.
Melton, Frank D.
Meyer, Frank G.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miesner, John A., Jr.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Miller, Alfred E.
Miller, Byron K.
Miller, Marvin J.
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.

Miller, Thomas G., Jr.
Miller, William A.
Millpointer, Edward D.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Moffett, Russell G.
Molling, Carl H.
Molnar, Joseph J.
Monroe, Robert R.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Moore, Howard B.
Moore, Thomas L.
Moore, William F.
Morin, Gene D.
Morris, Donald R.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Moss, Robert
Muck, Floyd R.
Mudrock, John
Mull, Charles L., II
Muller, Justus A.
Muller, Leonard A.
Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
Murphy, Garrison E.
Myer, George W.
Myers, Charles B.
Myers, Raymond W.
Nall, Delbert L.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Neithercott, Robert A.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Harry J., Jr.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, William R.
Netro, Robert J.
Neustel, Arthur D.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newman, James F.
Nicel, Emile W.
Nichol, Monte B.
Niesse, John E.
Ninnis, Robert V.
Nix, Henry J.
Noble, James K., Jr.
Noble, Thomas I.
Noonan, John M.
Nordan, Emile E.
Nordyke, Cutlar J.
Notz, Robert C.
Nulton, Frank I.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Oakes, Raymond H.
Oberholtzer, James P.
Oberle, Ronald R.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donel, James H.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
Ohls, Karl E.
Oliver, Robert P.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
O'Reilly, James P., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Owen, Charles K.
Palmatier, Philip F.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parent, Gerald "J"
Parker, James W.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
Pennington, Otis G.
Perkins, William L., Jr.
Perry, Frank M., Jr.
Perryman, Donald B.
Pester, Benjamin H.
Pester, Fred J.
Peterman, Edward E.
Peters, Lyle R.
Petrick, John W.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Petty, William G.
Pezzei, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Pickering, Richard C.
Platte, William A.
Pleasants, John B.
Pond, Richard E.
Porter, Thomas
Portnoy, Howard R.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powel, Samuel F., III
Powell, James R., Jr.
Prange, Eugene H.
Prehn, Frederick A., Jr.
Prescott, Richard J.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Allen B.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Prince, Gordon A.
Profilet, Leo T.
Proper, Worthy "F"
Pulis, Joe H.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Putnam, Charles L.
Putnam, Gerrie P.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Racy, Louis P.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Ramirez-Rodriguez, Fernando
Ramsey, Russell B.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Rau, William F.
Reagan, John H.
Reddick, James P., Jr.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Sherman C.
Reichl, Charles J.
Reid, Eugene L.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reyn, William P.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Ricci, William J.
Rice, Minor T.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Ricker, Stanley S.
Risser, James B.
Robbins, Donald K.
Robertson, Charles G., Jr.
Robertson, John W.
Robinson, James A.
Robinson, Thomas W., Jr.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rochester, Carl W.
Rodgers, James F.
Roebuck, James W.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Roth, Robert D.
Rowe, Bruce W.
Rowe, John D.
Royal, Lee R.
Rubins, Fredrick K.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rudy, Bryan C.
Rule, Adrian O., 3d
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
Sacarob, Merwin
Salter, Winston W.
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sands, James W.
Satre, Robert S.
Sattler, Donald C.
Sax, Joe
Schaub, Robert L.
Scheller, William F.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Scherrer, Orvil D.
Schettino, Joseph N.
Schmidt, Ray A.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Seeman, David B.
Seipp, Russell M.
Semeraro, Angelo P.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Sharpe, William K.
Shartel, Howard A.
Shea, Paul W.
Sheehan, Charles A.
Sheffield, Hughie D.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherin, Joseph E.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shick, George B., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Siegmeister, Robert
Siler, James R.
Simcox, James G.
Simensen, Richard E.
Singer, Arnold N.
Singleton, Floyd R.
Sirrine, Jack D.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skorheim, Robert D.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Sliwinski, Daniel J.
Smith, Allan R.
Smith, Edgar M., Jr.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Leon W.
Smith, Melbourne L.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, Wayne F.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Smoot, William N.
Snyder, Collins
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Sollinger, David A.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Somogye, Roy S.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Spowart, David J., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Sproull, Howard E., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Stanley, Donald E.
Stanley, Gregory W.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stella, Edward C.
Stimler, Richard P.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman. E.
Stollenwerck, William M.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storey, Joseph D.
Streich, Paul R.
Stroupe, Keith K.
Stull, Donald
St. Ville. Edward L.
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Sullivan, Don M.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Sundstrom, Alex L.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
Switzer, James R.
Sybeldon, William
Szymanski, Andrew G.
Taff, Dilian W.
Tagliente, Joseph P.
Taylor, Francis C.
Taylor, John K.
Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Taylor, Robert E.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thom, Norman R.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, John A., Jr.
Thompson, James E.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, Theodore O.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thornburg, Thomas H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Thyberg, Robert C.
Timoney, Gerald P.
Tinkham, John A.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, William E.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trotter, Robert J.
Truitt, Thomas D.
Trzcinski, Edward K.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Ullman, Charles D.
Underwood, Leland J.
Van Kirk, Robert W., Jr.
Van Kleeck, Justin L.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vining, Adrian D.
Vinsel, John E.
Vogel, John J.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseller, James B.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Donald E.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Wamsley, John A.
Ward, Donald S.
Warner, Brooks F.
Warwick, William B.
Washington, Max L.
Weatherly, Robert T., Jr.
Weeks, Grady A.
Wegener, Glenn L.
Werner, Robert V.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
White, Arthur C.
White, John F., Jr.
White, John E.
White, Robert J.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whitmire, Vivien C.
Whittle, William B.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilkes, Gilbert, 3d
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Willard, Daniel D. M.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, Stanwix M.
Williams, William A., III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Wilson, Donald R.
Wilson, James I.
Wilson, William W.
Wiram, Gordon H.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wise, Robert E.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
Wood, John W.
Wood, Peter W.
Wooddell, Allen C.
Wooden, Neal R.
Woodman, Gordon P.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Wooley, Robert T.
Worchesek, Robert R.
Wright, Merritt R.
Wright, William B.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wylie, Henry K.
Young, Casanave H., Jr.
Yowell, Grover M.
Ziegler, Frank G.
Zimm, Alfonz
Zimmerly, Arthur, III
Zink, Stewart T.
Zwolinski, Frank J.

MEDICAL CORPS

Foster, Donald J.
Good, Daniel C.
Kane, John R.
Osgood, Morgan F.
Staggers, Frank E.
Tabor, Richard H.
Turner, Thomas W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Armstrong, George K.
Barber, Ray C.
Bauer, Robert F.
Beatty, Carl N.
Bozewicz, John E.
Carpenter, Norman E.
Chandler, Hugh H.
Colen, Paul
Crain, Cassel O.
Crook, Clifford L., Jr.
Crowley, Charles W.
Curley, Wilfred B.
Davis, James B.
Dewey, Wayne D.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
Dughi, Carl M.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
Ely, William B., Jr.
Emery, William T.
Francis, Evans J.
Fussell, Theodore J.
Geiger, Merrill A.
Gordon, Gilbert H., Jr.
Graham, Robert B.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Gunn, Raymond G.
Halperin, George B.
Hauck, Richard H.
Henderson, John M.
Hoggard, William D., 2d
Johnson, Ernie F.
Jones, Burton H.
Katz, Samuel
Killebrew, Thomas E.
Lynn, James W.
Mason, Philip J.
Mayo, Joseph A., Jr.
McNabb, Thomas R.
Morris, Edwards M.
Morrison, Walton M.
Mulligan, Thomas J., Jr.
O'Neil, Harold P.
Paul, Charles B. III
Peloquin, Ferdinand C.
Pravitz, William H.
Richardson, Mortimer J.
Ringhausen, Robert L.
Rippert, Donald J.
Roberts, Gerald E.
Robison, Gerald M.
Rolen, Loveman F.
Rudzinski, Anthony W.
Slemons, Earl G., Jr.
Smith, Charles W.
Sterner, Francis J.
Stubbs. Raymond C.
Tveita, Reynold C.
Van, George E.
Vroman, William G.
Webb, Davis L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Boyd, George T.
Canfield, Robert A.
Doermann, Martin J.
Doverspike, Dale E.
Eaton, Hal H.
Frank, Joseph A.
Hammond, Edward P.
Hawkins, Thomas G.
Hitchens, Walter C.
Ivers, Victor J.
Jones, William L., Jr.
Kingsley, Donald F., Jr.
LeMaster, Donald C.
Leonard, Guy M., Jr.
Moore, Withers M.
Morris, Bernard N.
Nelson, Everett B.
Otto, Albert J.
Reid, Herbert L.
Richardson, Edward L.
Salter, Dempsey G.
Schultz, Theodore E.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, William G., Jr.
Solomon, Charles W.
Thompson, Harrison R.
Wartes, Arthur J.
Zeller, Kenneth P.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Richard E.
Austin, Bruce G.
Davis, Walter E., Jr.
Forehand, Paul W.
Gillespie, Albert C.
Huffman, James L.
Jones, Robert L.
Lee, Robert S., Jr.
Phelps, Pharo A.
Sherman, George E.
Stetson, John B.
Wagner, Walter R.
Whipple, Caryll R.

DENTAL CORPS

Baxter, Gordon P.
Janus, John T.
Lyons, James J.
McKean, Thomas W.
Pellizzari, Frank J.
Slater, Robert W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Dwight J.
Barkley, Lucien E.
Beam, Walter E., Jr.
Bergquist, Melvin D., Jr.
Biggs, Leland M.
Bobek, Francis R.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Boone, George A.
Bowe, Warren G.
Brouillette, Joseph H., Jr.
Brown, Albert E.
Bryant, Harvey F.
Carr, Charles A., Jr.
Conrad, Ray W.
Courtney, John C.
Daigle, Joseph E. N.
Dailey, William M.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Denningham, John S.
Devins, Thomas A.
Dewitt, Richard G.
Dinwiddie, Carl F.
Douglas, George P.
Duffey, William S.
Elsasser, Edward J.
Freeman, Noel L.
Gay, Laverne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Gellman, Martin
Gibbons, Harry C., Jr.
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.
Green, Barney O.
Grossnickle, Paul "D"
Hanavan, Robert J.
Harvey, Dallas C.
Hosler, Harwin M.
Huber, Godfrey S.
Jones, William H.
Kaufman, Louis R.
Kelly, Daniel L.
Kelly, James D.
Koepke, Milton E.
Kramer, Ernest S.
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtke, Ralph H.
Leach, Thomas G. Jr.
Lee, Raymond W.
Levich, Calman
Lind, Vincent E.
Marsh, William G., Jr.
McCarthy, Daniel F.
McDonough, William A.
McGuire, Francis E.
McIlraith, James D.
McKerley, Lowell H.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
Merrell, Walter C.
Miller, Edwin B.
Moody, John A.
Morgan, William J., Jr.
Murphree, Henry B., Jr.
Newton, Richard R.
Nicholson, Earl M.
Nygren, Raymond A.
Pfau, Bernard J.
Pittenger, Robert W.
Pruitt, John D.
Quinn, John P.
Ramsey, Joseph F.
Rever, Rodney R.
Ridge, Bradley B.
Sandeen, Garnet G.
Sanders, James M.
Scales, Thomas N., Jr.
Schwab, Albert J.
Segars, Clyde B.
Sharp, Robert
Stallbories, Donald G.
Stiles, Thomas R.
Swindal, James R.
Sykes, Stanley E.
Thompson, Robert E.
Tober, Theodore W.
Waggoner, Edgar G.
Warner, Albert D.
Weger, Raymond A.
Wells, William H.
Wheeler, Thomas E.
Zaller, Frank A.

NURSE CORPS

Anderson, June L.
Barber, Mary E.
Barron, Joan L.
Black, Helen J.
Bower, Joan E.
Buckingham, Louise A.
Carpenter, Lois T.
Clemens, Rose M.
Cooper, Opal J.
Craig, Florence V.
Crowe, Patricia P.
Dennis, Catherine E.
Dial, Thelma P.
Easter, Mary R.
Eberhardt, Marie
Eldridge, Ruth E.
Elliott, Laura S.
Fitz, Barbara O.
Fuller, Doris T.
Gasper, Pearl Y.
Greer, Goldie D.
Harrigan, Nancy L.
Hedrick, Betty S.
Henkel, Dolores A.
Herbert, Dellabelle
Jaeger, Elizabeth L.
Kallan, Addie E.
Kirsch, Rose A.
Leutz, Lillian D.
Levin, Mildred R.
Lewis, Margarete "R"
Maguire, Frances P.
Marsch, Doris E.
Martin, Rosalie S.
Merrick, Millicent E.
Michael, Thedia A.
Moffitt, Jeanne T.
Moody, Anna E.
Muhlenfeld, Loretta T.
Odom, Thelma
Pojeky, Ruth M.
Pommier, Angelina T.
Ragland, Wilda R.
Read, Anna C.
Richardson, Elizabeth A.
Schlachter, Wilma R.
Severson, Shirley R.
Sganga, Anna
Shafer, Mary H.
Shelton, Waunie L.
Sheridan, Anne M.
Smith, Donna J.
Smith, Mildred M.
Smith, Vivian E.
Snyder, Mildred I.
Sprowles, Elizabeth F.
Stilwell, Adelaide
Struble, Mary R.
Ulrich, Marian J.
Wheeler, Mary B.
Whitfield, Gilda G.
Whitfield, Gloria M.
Williams, Alice K.

CI——398

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Acosta, William
Adams, Henry R.
Aiello, Carmine P.
Allen, Donald L.
Ambrose, John E.
Amiot, Archie S.
Andrus, Paul G.
Annen, Martin
Armstrong, Robert H.
Arntzen, Arnt N.
Aumack, Robert F.
Baarstad, David E.
Banke, Elmer A.
Barlow, Cecil G.
Barlow, Owen G.
Barth, Ralph F.
Bassett, Edward W.
Bateman, William W.
Bates, Howard, U., Jr.
Baum, Robert W.
Baumhover, Denis A.
Beaudry, Richard E.
Beck, Emil F.
Beesley, Howard L.
Bell, Ronald W.
Bennett, Roland K.
Benner, Patrick H.
Benson, Harry L.
Benson, Melvin A.
Bent, Robert G.
Berger, James E.
Berthier, Neil E.
Bevington, Mearl L.
Birdwell, James E., Jr.
Birkenstock, Arthur O.
Biro, William E.
Bjornson, Carroll N.
Blackington, Robert O.
Block, Martin M.
Blodgett, Dwight R.
Blowers, Paul L.
Boeing, Charles E.
Bonney, Donald R.
Bormann, Robert H.
Bortner, James A.
Boshard, Merrill L.
Bowen, Robert S.
Bowes, Charles L., Jr.
Bowley, James C.
Bowyer, Bobby O.
Boyce, William R.
Boyer, John C.
Braddy, Don L., Jr.
Bradfield, James
Brandenburg, Robert C.
Brand, Alvin
Brawner, Harry C.
Brecheisen, Samuel W.
Brennan, Richard E.
Brewer, Thomas J.
Bristol, William H.
Brown, Noel A., Jr.
Brown, Alfred
Brownley, Robert H.
Brubaker, Edwin A.
Brubaker, Walter Y.
Brusso, Robert L.
Bub, Laurence M., Jr.
Bulloch, MacGregor, Jr.
Burnett, Thomas C.
Burney, James G.
Burrell, John T.
Butler, Richard C.
Cahill, Dan P.
Campbell, William D.
Cannon, Arthur J., Jr.
Carey, David W., Jr.
Carney, Stuart P., Jr.
Carr, Robert L.
Carroll, Norman L.
Carrol, Eugene R.
Casey, Harry J., Jr.
Cashman, Michael R., Jr.
Cass, Sheldon V.
Cauley, Gordon A., Jr.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Chalmers, Harold, Jr.
Chamberlain, George A.
Christensen, Charley S., Jr.
Clark, William A.
Clark, Douglas B.
Clarke, Charles R.
Cleland, William L.
Coats, Lloyd F.
Coburn, Theodore J.
Cochran, Edward D.
Cocker, Neil W.
Coffman, Walter W.
Connolly, Robert D.
Connors, Daniel J.
Conway, Thomas J.
Conway, James J., Jr.
Cook, Frederick D.
Cormier, Warren G.
Cotton, Alfred E.
Covill, Clarence T.
Craven, Alexander T.
Cribbins, Paul D.
Crosby, Richard D., Jr.
Cross, Charles W.
Culbertson, Richard K.
Cumbie, Lorendo A.
Cyr, Charles W., Jr.
Dalla Betta, Aldo
Dalrymple, Stanley M.
Daly, Norman F.
Danahy, James E.
Dangler, Edward
Davis, Richard E.
Day, Putnam R.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Dennis, Jamie
Denton, John R.
Dirienzo, Antonio C. V.
Dobelstein, Robert E.
Donovan, Robert S.
Dougan, Richard A.
Douglas, John M.
Doyle, Thomas E.
Dryfoose, Earl D., Jr.
Dubois, Aldege, N. J.
DuBon, Frederic V., Jr.
Dudley, Robert A.
Duffy, Lawson W.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duncan, Lewis R. W., Jr.
Duncan, Richard D.
Dunnan, Neville D.
Dutcher, Lester A.
Dye, Bertie C.
Eden, John W.
Egga, John P.
Eggen, Robert F.
Ehnes, Walter P.
Elias, Richard H.
Ellison, LeRoy S.
Ellis, William H.
Ellis, Elbert J.
Enright, Marc E.
Farozic, Vincent
Fasold, Karl J. R.
Fechner, Ervin L.
Feifert, Alvin H.
Fenner, Richard C.
Ferer, Harvey
Feretti, John P.
Finch, David L.
Fleming, William T.
Floyd, James B.
Flynn, Donald J.
Ford, Paul T.
Freytag, David R.
Frodigh, Robert C.
Fry, Orris J., Jr.
Gaddis, George E.
Gaddy, James K.
Gamache, Samuel C.
Gardner, Clyde W.
Garner, Mirron W.
Giffen, Kevin
Gilmartin, Bernard F., Jr.
Gimbroni, Donald O.
Glocke, Frederick B.
Goins, Charles W.
Goldstein, Richard K.
Goodale, James E.
Gordon, Lawrence C.
Gorman, Russell W.
Graham, Thomas G.
Gregg, Robert S.
Grenfell, John E.
Groff, Bruce F.
Guggenbiller, James A.
Guill, James H.
Hack, Alfred G.
Hale, George D.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Halle, James E.
Hamann, Donald C.
Hamburg, James E.
Hamlin, Daniel A.
Hammett, Bernard J.
Hampton, Charles T.
Hana, Donald O.
Handzel, Joseph L.
Hanson, Perry W.
Harding, Price P., Jr.
Hargis, Robert F.
Haro, Hilario L.
Harriman, Earl L.
Harris, Vance L.
Hart, Richard S.
Hartzell, Robert H.
Haugner, Raymond C.
Haussler, Warren M.
Heidkamp, Francis G.
Herbst, John M.
Hertzberg, Robert H.
Hess, Robert L.
Hickman, Charles I.
Hickman, Ronald S.
Hirschey, Arthur A.
Hitch, Lyman B.
Hocking, Arnold T.
Hodge, William J.
Hoffa, Franklin H.
Hoffmann, William
Hoffmeyer, John T.
Hofmeister, Howard F.
Hospodar, Robert S.
Howard, Donald H.
Howlett, Eugene F., Jr.
Hoy, Hugh J.
Hubbard, James E.
Hudspeth, Jake W.
Hughes, John A.
Hunter, Paul I.
Hurd, Richard N.
Hurley, John R.
Husmann, Jack H.
Hyler, Robert E.
Iredale, John P.
Irwin, Martin W.
Isherwood, Robert S.
Ivarson, Leonard M.
Jacobsen, Adolf M. B.
Jarboe, Robert W.
Jensen, Donald L.
Johnson, John F.
Johnson, Joseph H., Jr.
Johnson, Paul G.
Jones, Floyd T., Jr.
Kagey, Leslie O., Jr.
Kaiser, Herbert J.
Kaiser, Richard
Kallgren, Bruce M.
Kallsen, Leslie W.
Kampe, John H.
Kamrad, Joseph G.
Kandel, Philip J.
Karsten, Herbert G.
Keefe, Donald J.
Keil, Donald E.
Keller, Robert T.
Kern, David E.
Kiefer, Emil L.
Kilmarx, Robert D.
King, Edwin M.
Klages, William M.
Klippstein, John R.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Knowles, Robert C.
Kohler, Elmer C.
Kopec, Edward
Kowalsky, Bradley D.
Kramer, Stanley D.
Krass, John C.
Kroc, Richard A.
Kusulos, Harold A.
Kutschara, Edwin A.
Lancaster, Samuel B., Jr.
Langston, William D.
Lanier, James S., II
Lassen, William V.
Leary, Ramon W.
Leavitt, William
Lee, Calvin H.
Lee, George E.
Lee, LaVern G.
Lennard, Russel R.
Leonhardt, Robert J.
LeTourneau, Paul J.
Lindemann, Charles T., Jr.
Lindenbaum, Herbert J.
Lindsay, Malcolm, Jr.
Linkenhoker, William "W"
Lion, William D.
Loudin, Donald J.
Lurcott, Charles W.
Lyman, Albie A., Jr.
Lyne, George C.
Lyons, Robert K.
Lyons, Carl P.
Maasbyll, Arthur R.
MacDowell, Charles R.
MacLeod, Richard G.
Mahan, Frank H.
Maher, James J., Jr.
Malander, Vernon C.
Mallonee, Jack L.
Malone, Duane E.
Maloney, Joseph F.
Manderioli, Fred A.
Manderson, Marion C.
Mandle, Stephen I. P.
Maniscalco, Philip M., Jr.
Marriner, Richard E.
Martin, Raymond D.
Martin, James R.
Mathews, Ross A., Jr.
Matson, James C.
Matthews, William E., III
May, Robert L.
May, Warren R.
Mayer, Matthew L.
McCarty, James R., Jr.
McCoy, Thomas H.
McCulley, Wilson, Jr.
McGlone, Richard J.
McGrath, Daniel P.
McKay, John B.
McLeod, William L.
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McMinn, Earl C.
McMurray, John W.
McNabb, Joseph M.
McNaughton, Alan
McNeill, Leo J.
McPherson, Corwin R.
Meadows, Robert
Meckoll, Robert F.
Megquier, Norman L.
Melidosian, Sahag C.

Merkley, Clarence W.
Merton, Harry L., Jr.
Mesh, Stanley J.
Messersmith, John D., Jr.
Metz, Robert E.
Meyer, Paul A.
Meyers, Richard E.
Milani, Albert V.
Milem, Philip L.
Miller, Robert D.
Minkkinen, Erkki O.
Mitchell, Duane G.
Molzan, Edward W.
Montgomery, Loren N.
Moore, John F., Jr.
Moore, Sidney R., Jr.
Moore, Ronald A.
Moore, Robert A.
Mooris, John W.
Mortimer, Edward P.
Mosher, William F.
Mouradian, Michael
Mueller, Richard L.
Mulkeen, Martin J.
Mulvihill, Robert J.
Mushyn, Thomas F., Jr.
Myers, Clifton D.
Myrick, Bishop M.
Nagengast, Philip J.
Nalley, William M.
Naumchik, Alec
Neild, Arthur W.
Neitz, John J.
Nelsen, Norman W.
Nitsche, Paul D.
Noland, Harry M., Jr.
Nylander, Arthur G.
O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
Oliver, Howard W.
Olsen, George W.
O'Regan, Edward
Ortiz, Julian E.
Overbey, Frank E., Jr.
Page, Daniel G.
Palmer, Prosser W.
Papin, Franklin E.
Parent, Gerald J.
Parkes, James A.
Patterson, Donald W.
Pavelle, James R.
Pepoon, John M.
Perkins, Albert E.
Perrochet, George M.
Perry, Joseph M.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pflum, Frederick W.
Philbrick, Alfred R., Jr.
Phillips, Charles T.
Picht, Donald H.
Pietro, Joseph M.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Pollard, Lyle H.
Posin, Jack
Pospisil, Albert C.
Poulakis, William
Powers, Joseph P.
Poyner, Raymond P.
Pratt, William C.
Price, Richard A.
Pritchard, Patrick L.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Raffaelli, Gaston L. J.
Rajczi, Leslie J.
Rand, Joseph S.
Rathbun, Wells A., Jr.
Repovsch, Albert W.
Revenaugh, John J.
Ribble, Richard S.
Rice, Liston M., Jr.
Rice, Merle A.
Rich, Morris S.
Rickey, Charles "S"
Rieber, George E., Jr.
Riggs, Frank D.
Rivard, Earl J.
Rohrbach, Robert L.
Roland, John J.
Rolfes, David H.
Rooney, Richard W.
Rooney, Peter W.
Rose, Raymond C.
Rosenberg, Donald D.
Roulstone, Lawrence M.
Rowan, Robert D.
Rowlands, David M.
Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.
Rubinstein, Alvin Z.
Ruch, Roger E.
Ruggiero, Michael E.
Rush, George H., Jr.
Russ, Joseph A., Jr.
Russell, Peter A.
Ryan, Edward S.
Sallen, Roy P.
Salzarulo, Daniel
Sampsel, Alan V.
Samson, Edward L., Jr.
Sandsberry, Jack C.
Schaffer, Alfred J.
Schleif, Edward H.
Schneeberg, Delvine C.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schreuder, Joseph A.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schultheis, Lawrence W.
Schurman, John R.
Schwartz, Bernard
Schwartz, Burtell W.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scully, Donald G.
Seaver, Richard W.
Seawell, Lloyd M.
See, Elliot M., Jr.
Self, William H. C.
Serini, Domenick N.
Shanks, Donald G.
Shinn, Roy E., Jr.
Shonka, Harold G.
Siebert, Andrew J.
Simonet, John T.
Simone, Joseph R.
Simpson, Louis M.
Sisley, James R.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Smith, Richard B.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Bryan M., Jr.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Henry J. B.
Smith, Merl
Smith, Malcolm C.
Sodersten, Charles M.
Sollecito, Peter
Sorensen, Vernon L.
Space, William E.
Spencer, Richard H.
Spengler, Lewis E.
Spicer, Hugh J.
Stanley, Henry M.
Starbecker, Eugene N.
Stephenson, Robert H.
Stephens, Wayne L.
Stevens, William T.
Stewart, James W.
Stingl, Alfred L.
Stockly, Ayres H.
Stokes, Glenn M.
Stoklosa, Richard G.
Stolmeier, Harry A.
Stone, Frederick G.
Storm, John S.
Strand, John A., Jr.
Strebler, Cornel F.
Stubbs, Robert C.
Study, Kenneth L.
Sugarman, Samuel L.
Sulley, Thomas F.
Summerlin, Kenneth L.
Summitt, Clyde W.
Swaim, Glen R.
Swaim, Marvin W., Jr.
Swain, Frederick C.
Sweigart, Richard D.
Swope, Ralph O.
Szmurlo, Thaddeus F.
Taborsky, George E.
Tadlock, Maurice H.
Taubman, Jerome
Tebo, Ballard W.
Templeton, Kenneth L.
Teplow, Theodore H.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Tiratto, Joseph
Tobey, Richard S.
Tobias, David L.
Tolford, Charles L., Jr.
Toomey, Bernard C.
Toy, Frank E.
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tricco, Gilbert H.
Trindade, Rogerio
Tynan, Robert J.
Ulman, Adran C.
Vacca, Diamante D.
Vanderbeck, Eugene A.
VanDomelen, Peter, III
VanLeuven, Alfred F.
Veasie, Robert H.
Vehorn, Dale A.
Vehslage, Stanley D.
Vlahos, Christopher
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmert, Eugene C.
Wachowiak, Francis G.
Walker, William R.
Walker, George D.
Wallach, Philip
Walter, Earl D.
Warner, Charles E.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Watt, Alan D.
Watters, George D.
Webb, William H.
Weiss, Paul A.
Welcer, Henry A.
Wessman, Robert A.
Westervelt, Henry G.
Westergren, David P.
Whiteleather, Charles H., Jr.
White, Wendell A.
White, James S.
Wiegand, Victor H.
Wilbur, Edward T.
Wild, Robert W.
Wilder, Fred W.
Wilkey, Roscoe S., II
Wilkinson, James D.
Williams, Leland S.
Williams, John A.
Wilson, Marvin J.
Wilson, Richard A.
Wilson, Frank M., Jr.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Robert H.
Winger, Paul J.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wood, Richard D.
Wood, Albert D.
Wood, Arthur F.
Yanovitch, George A.
Young, William P., Jr.
Youngblood, James C., Jr.
Zuclich, Gustav C.

MEDICAL CORPS

Abell, Thomas G.
Aimenoff, Irwin A.
Akin, George M., Jr.
Alderman, George C.
Alexander, George L., Jr.
Allen, Robert G.
Allen, Richard L.
Altschuler, Kenneth Z.
Amsden, Neal F.
Anderson, Lewis D.
Anderson, Richard R.
Aquadro, Charles F.
Arbona-Figueroa, Jose A.
Arthur, Basil C.
Ashworth, Charles R.
Auerbach, Arthur H.
Avent, James K., Jr.
Bahnson, William F.
Bahr, Donald E.
Bailey, Norman W.
Baird, William H.
Baker, Larry D.
Balin, Howard
Barnes, John C.
Barnette, Ortha J.
Barrett, John J.
Barrick, Richard H.
Bauer, Clifford T.
Bean, George W.
Becker, Bruce A.
Beckwith, Frederick D.
Beehler, Ernest W., Jr.
Behrman, Jack
Bell, George R.
Bennett, Wayne E.
Benton, Owen D.
Beres, Joseph A.
Berk, James L.
Berman, Irwin
Bernhard, Robert, Jr.
Biasi, Vincent J.
Blalock, Robert W.
Blanton, Frank S., Jr.
Blau, David
Bloner, Emanuel M.
Blum, Harold P.
Bolanovich, Lester J.
Bonney, James H.
Borrelli, Raphael F., Jr.
Boudreau, Robert F.
Bowen, Reginald S.
Bowlin, Paul F.
Bozer, John M.
Brandon, Leonard H.
Brandt, Henry E.
Bratman, Robert L.
Braunstein, Edgar G.
Brennan, Thomas V.
Bridge, Robert E.
Brink, Paul E.
Brinsley, Bertram
Brod, James J.
Brodie, Sheldon "J"
Brody, Arthur
Brown, Dudley E., Jr.
Brown, Jacob V.
Brown, Philip W., Jr.
Bugg, Charles P.
Burke, Robert A.
Burke, Albert V.
Burman, Don "M"
Burris, Boyd L.
Butler, Milton C., Jr.
Byrd, William M.
Byrum, Graham V.
Cady, Gerald W.
Candels, Lothar R.
Cannon, Joseph N., Jr.
Carpenter, Harry M.
Carson, William E.
Carter, Donald L.
Carter, Henry S.
Casebolt, Donald E.
Cather, Carl H., Jr.
Cauffman, William J.
Chears, William C., Jr.
Christiansen, Kjell H.
Cicalese, Gerard T.
Cline, Thomas J.
Cole, Buell C.
Collins, James E.
Constable, John D.
Copeland, Sam "P", Jr.
Corso, Philip F.
Corson, Hampton P.
Corwin, Leonard J.
Cox, James L. D.
Cox, John W.
Crisp, George O., Jr.
Critzer, Ben L.
Crook, Angus M. G.
Crum, Robert B.
Dalrymple, Richard E.
Darden, John S.
Dardis, Alfred R.
Davis, Richard G.
Day, Francis T.
Deach, Robert A.
Dearani, Abraham C.
DeLave, Daniel P.
Delgado, Delio D.
DeMeo, Daniel R.
Dexheimer, Frank R.
Dickerman, Herbert W.
Dobel, Gerald F.
Dole, Kenneth V.
Doloff, Leonard
Donaldson, Robert M., Jr.
Dooley, Thomas A., III
Dooley, Michael B.
Draheim, Jerry W.
Dudley, Hugh R.
DuLaney, Charles H.
Dunlap, James A., Jr.
Dunn, Thomas S., Jr.
Eagan, John T.
Easterday, Robert H.
Eastwood, Robert A.
Eckert, Herbert L.
Edmunds, Meade C., Jr.
Edwards, Sears E.
Edwards, Ernest G.
Efron, Robert
Egbert, Lawrence D., Jr.
Ehlers, Charles W., III
Ehrlich, George E.
Ehrlich, Edward N.
Elam, William N., Jr.
Elesh, Fred S.
Elgin, Lee W., Jr.
Eliasoph, Ira I.
Emery, Walter C.
Eney, Irving P.
Epple, Kenneth H.
Epple, Lawrence K.
Eskelson, David W.
Evans, Frederic M.
Ewing, Chaning L.
Fabricius, Richard N.
Fadul, Armand
Feenstra, Laurence "H"
Feigelman, Howard F.
Felton, Lester M., Jr.
Fennel, Peter "J"
Fierer, Eugene M.
Fitchett, Vernon H.
Flanagan, William L.
Fletcher, William P.
Fogelman, Henry
Folmsbee, Glenn A.
Fortenberry, Jerry "A"
Foster, James B. T.
Fote, Francis A.
Fowler, Robert R.
Freeman, Gordon R.
Freeman, William T.
Friedberg, Samuel J.
Fry, William J.
Fuchs, Paul D.
Garrison, Joseph S., III
Gebhart, William F.
Gerber, Edward
Gerety, Robert P.
Getzen, Lindsay C.
Giannelli, Stanley, Jr.
Giles, Ben J.
Glotzer, Donald J.
Godley, Milton L.
Goetz, Henry E.
Goldhirsch, Henry
Goldstein, Marcy A.
Goodwin, Robert
Gordon, Robert B.
Graff, Shirl R.
Green, Leo R.
Greenberg, Joseph
Greenberg, Wayne V.
Griffin, Edwin D.
Grote, Arthur J.
Grubbs, Thomas A., Jr.
Guderian, Arnold M.
Gussack, Harold A.
Gussler, Charles G.
Guthrie, Andrew D., Jr.
Hadley, David M.
Hall, Louis A.
Hall, William M.
Hamilton, Carroll S.
Hamilton, Frank A., Jr.
Hardey, Carlton E.
Harm, John P.
Harris, James G.
Hart, George R.
Hartman, John M.
Hassan, Kamel J.
Hay, Gene R.
Heaton, Elton, Jr.
Helgren, Donald G.
Hemness, Edwin M.
Hensold, William F.
Herring, William B.
Hicks, Jesse R.
Hill, William N., Jr.
Hinton, Benjamin F.
Hnilo, Joseph M.
Hochman, Richard I.
Hoerner, Oscar G.
Hofmann, Walter D.
Hoover, Robert T.
Horner, Robert L.
Howren, Harry H., Jr.
Huffer, John C.
Huffman, Thomas A.
Huggins, Charles E.
Hurley, Lloyd A.
Hutchins, Vince L.
Hyman, William
Irons, Raymond J.
Jacob, James A., Jr.
Jamison, Harwin B.
Jamison, William A.
Jauchler, Gerard W.
Johnson, Arthur J.
Johnson, John D.
Johnson, Louis L.
Jones, John R.
Jones, Reinold J.
Josel, Mark S.
Josey, John S.
Judge, Walter F.
Jumonville, Alcee J.
Justiniano-Diaz, Raul T.
Kaplan, Meyer
Karr, Samuel L.
Katims, Robert B.
Keill, Stuart L.
Kelleher, Robert E.
Kelley, Thomas J., Jr.
Kemp, Verbon E., Jr.
Kenley, James B.
Kenlon, Andrew M.
Keyes, George W.
Khairallah, Philip A.
Kilgore, James M., Jr.
Killeen, Raymond N. F.
Kinder, Eugene J.
Kindler, Jack
King, Philip J.
King, Lawrence M., Jr.

Kingsolver, Wendell R.
Kirk, Robert F.
Kleh, Thomas R.
Koeff, Steve T.
Koloski, Martin G.
Koth, Douglas R.
Koury, Thomas L.
Krasner, Bernard
Kuczko, Edward P.
Kulp, Robert L.
Kurilecz, Peter, Jr.
Labitzke, Hermann G.
Lance, Kendrick P.
Lanni, John P.
Lavell, Thomas E., Jr.
Lebovitz, Jerome J.
Ledwith, James W.
Leenhouts, Kenneth C.
Lefer, Leon
Leibow, Sheldon G.
Lensgraf, Donald D.
Lesslie, Peter B.
Leventhal, Harvey R.
Levy, Marshall S.
Lewis, Lawrence J.
Libo, Hershel W.
Liebendorfer, Richard A.
Linn, Bernard S.
Linz, Werner A.
Lister, Julius
Livingood, John K.
Locke, Francis A.
Lohnes, John H.
Long, Henry H.
Lorber, Mortimer
Lowe, Kurt J.
Luchi, Robert J.
Luina-Diaz, Ramon R.
Lutterloh, Isaac H., Jr.
MacLeod, Colin C.
Magnan, Charles G., Jr.
Mammel, Clayton "K"
Marcotte, Maurice G.
Markee, Alan S.
Markovits, Andrew S.
Martin, Sidney A.
Matsumoto, Kenneth D.
Mattson, Daniel H.
Mauch, Eugene W.
Mayberry, William E.
Mayle, Francis C., Jr.
McGee, Lawrence S., Jr.
McGhee, John M.
McHenry, Laudie E., Jr.
McLean, George E.
McMahan, Robert O.
McMahon, Donald, Jr.
McNeely, Irwin H.
McPheron, Glen E.
Medic, Walter T.
Mehan, Donald J.
Mellette, Russell R.
Mendelsohn, Ronald E.
Meredith, Charles E.
Metcalf, John W., Jr.
Mishkin, Mark M.
Moersch, Richard N.
Monroe, Kenneth E.
Moss, Allan T.
Moya, Frank
Mushovic, James
Myers, James D.
Nellermoe, Carrol W.
Nelson, Raymond M.
Nemerovski, Sheldon A.
Nirschl, Boyd F.
Nix, Thomas E., Jr.
Noonan, Frank J.
Nora, Paul F.
Nowell, Peter C.
Nunnery, Arthur W.
O'Connell, Fred H.
Odell, Gerard B.
Ornitz, Edward M.
Ostlund, Philip D.
Ottum, John A.
Oudenhoven, Richard C.
Ovington, Robert C.
Owsley, John Q., Jr.
Packert, Richard C.
Packer, James T.
Page, Benjamin S.
Paladino, Joseph A.
Park, Lee C.
Pawlowski, Joseph M.
Pearse, Jack H.
Pennisi, Joseph A.
Perot, Phanor L., Jr.
Perry, John F.
Phillips, John R.
Pierce, Chester M.
Pierce, John R.
Pinto, Peter S.
Piper, Charles E., Jr.
Pomponio, Joseph G.
Posey, Edward W.
Postle, Jack R.
Potter, Clinton B.
Prather, Victor A., Jr.
Prentice, Robert J.
Proulx, Harvey J.
Quickert, Marvin H.
Rabinov, Keith R.
Raffensperger, John G.
Rambo, Rawdon E.
Rando, Joseph J.
Rasmussen, Peter
Reagan, James L.
Reiser, Albert I.
Reisser, John M., Jr.
Resto-Soto, Andres D.
Reynolds, Arthur M., Jr.
Reynolds, Hugh
Richards, John B.
Richards, Lynn S., Jr.
Richardson, Joseph H.
Riley, Bennet J.
Ring, John J.
Ripple, Rudolph J., Jr.
Rittenbury, Max S.
Roberts, Arthur R.
Rodgers, Theodore Y. III
Rossway, Warren H.
Roth, Dover
Rothenberg, Herbert
Rothrock, Irvin A.
Royce, Paul C.
Rundle, Frank L.
Russell, John M., Jr.
Sacrinty, Nicholas W.
Sager, Stanley M.
Saville, John W.
Savitt, Allen J.
Schilp, Arthur O.
Schilling, Richard J.
Schmitt, James N.
Schmitz, Gerhard W.
Schneider, Richard H.
Schneider, Stanley H.
Schoeffel, Michael E.
Schreier, Arthur J.
Schulman, David
Schwartz, Julius L.
Schwartz, Lester
Scott, George E.
Sears, Peter D.
Sencindiver, Paige V.
Shafran, Morton E.
Shea, Martin C., Jr.
Sheffel, Donald J., Sr.
Sheldon, Gerard P.
Sherman, Marion M., Jr.
Shrago, Earl S. P.
Shutt, John P.
Sifford, Richard L.
Silva, Thomas F., Jr.
Silver, Stuart R.
Simmons, Ernest C.
Singer, Herbert I.
Singleton, Samuel W.
Sinnott, Edward C.
Slager, Richard F.
Slater, John B.
Smathers, Charles R. II
Smith, Asa J.
Smith, Jack G.
Smith, James W.
Smith, Robert A.
Smith, Robert C.
Smith, Wiley R., Jr.
Smythe, Lowell J.
Sode, Jonas
Soderstrom, John F.
Solberg, Lincoln E.
Sowers, Clarence R.
Spratt, John S., Jr.
Standifer, John J.
Steele, Jack T.
Steg, Joseph
Steller, Robert E.
Stephens, Joseph H.
Stern, Charles
Stevens, Benjamin C., Jr.
Stevenson, Andrew W., Jr.
Stewart, Charles C.
Stewart, Edgar B.
Stimets, Wendell A.
Stohlman, John W. III
Stormont, James M.
Strickler, James C.
Sullivan, Martin R.
Sullivan, Robert F.
Sumi, Walter T.
Syms, Charles A.
Taggart, George W.
Tarride, Joseph, Jr.
Tartell, Paul
Taylor, Robert D.
Teel, Peter
Teel, Theodore T., Jr.
Territo, Joseph J.
Tessler, Arthur N.
Teynor, Joseph W.
Thompson, Arthur F.
Thompson, Joseph M.
Tobias, Gordon L.
Tobin, Arnold D.
Torsney, Jerome M.
Trabaudo, Lawrence E.
Trapnell, Richard H.
Trostle, Henry S.
Turkalo, Jaroslav K.
Tyrrell, Joseph J.
Veggeberg, Kermit R.
Viger, Leopold A.
Volkman, Alvin
VonEssen, Carl F.
Waive, Henry J.
Ward, Franklyn P.
Ware, Robert E.
Warren, George W.
Weeth, John B.
Weidner, William A.
Weiner, David B.
Weis, Donald R.
Westman, Jack C.
Werman, Robert
Westphal, Benjamin H.
White, Bradford C.
White, Jack C.
Wilkie, Ormond L.
Williamson, Russell G.
Williams, Larry E.
Willis, Harlan L.
Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Frank L., Jr.
Wilson, John G.
Wingfield, Richard W.
Wolf, Robert L.
Wolfson, Mast, II
Wood, Loring W.
Wurzel, John F.
Yaffee, Howard S.
Yeagley, Heber E.
Yopp, Lloyd G.
Zehl, William F.

SUPPLY CORPS

Acheson, Robert G.
Beam, Loudin J.
Bennett, Donald E.
Borbidge, George F.
Brinkley, William C.
Brown, Everett G.
Brownell, William H.
Brunke, John F.
Busse, Ralph E.
Carmody, Barry S.
Crowley, Charles W.
DeVilbiss, Robert J.
Fraley, Hugh K.
Goldfield, Herbert S.
Hamilton, Paul B.
Hudson, Richard S.
Kendrick, Thomas F., Jr.
Kreissl, Leary B.
Lennox, Grenes J.
Lewis, Frederick W.
Liska, Mitchell C.
Neill, Julian F.
Pattisson, Donald N.
Raven, John F.
Roth, Eugene E.
Rothstein, Arnold J.
Sappanos, Louis M.
Schumacher, James T.
Snow, Joseph C.
Sumner, "H" "L", Jr.
Tauer, Thomas J.
Willis, Robert G.
Wise, William L.
Wolter, Fred

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bosca, Joseph R.
Carnes, John H.
Casey, Vincent deP
Chrisman, Myron W.
Cohill, John W.
Ernst, Elmer F.
Garvens, Eugene A.
Gould, John D.
Heim, Robert L.
Hill, Rodger F.
Kane, Dennis C.
Kempson, Farell W.
Kenny, Thomas A.
Koch, David C.
Martin, James B.
McClain, Benjamin J.
McKnight, Peter G.
Newman, Thomas A., Jr.
O'Connor, John J.
Pieper, Paul F. W.
Powell, James A.
Reid, James D.
Schroerluke, Henry P.
Smith, Earl W.
Stroman, Henry W.
Zimbelman, Charles R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Baton, Leo L.
Belcher, Philip G.
Bourne, William A.
Clerc, Louis H.
Degnan, Henry W., Jr.
Emery, Byron M.
Junghans, Clifford A.
Loomis, Raymond W.
Taylor, Lewis B., Jr.
Winkler, Robert L.

DENTAL CORPS

Aaronian, James B.
Allan, Lamont D.
Allbeck, Lester W.
Anderson, Gordon D.
Andrews, Jack W.
Antonieski, Eugene P.
Baahlmann, Ralph H.
Bacon, Stanley H.
Badner, Jack
Baker, Martin H.
Barber, Herbert
Beckmann, William J.
Benes, Mark
Benton, Robert H.
Bettis, Ray P.
Bicknell, Gordon H.
Bjerken, Maurice R.
Blackmon, William L., Jr.
Black, Marion M., Jr.
Blagbrough, Richard W.
Bohacek, Joseph R.
Boline, Charles A.
Bork, Fred F.
Bouquet, Jean-Pierre E.
Boye, Kenneth
Bradley, Daniel M., Jr.
Brofsky, Herbert B.
Brokaw, Rodman
Brown, Donald S.
Brown, Seymour L.
Brownstein, Martin M.
Brunson, Benjamin M., III
Bryan, William J.
Buckley, Arthur B.
Burkhard, Robert W.
Burns, Kurt D.
Caldwell, Robert L.
Carroll, William J.
Carusillo, Louis J., Jr.
Chain, Robert R.
Cherry, Daniel V.
Chianese, Thomas C.
Childress, James R.
Choisser, Frederick G.
Christenson, Robert E.
Christie, Robert W., Jr.
Ciolino, Vincent P.
Clapp, Johnny R.
Clippinger, Richard V.
Cody, Donald J.
Cordes, Richard H.
Cornish, Robert L.
Cowen, Charles E., Jr.
Cox, Robert M., Jr.
Cromartie, Thieran A.
Cullom, Robert D.
Curley, Philip W.
Daines, William F.
Damiano, Maurice A.
Davis, Thomas G.
Day, Lawrence D.
de Julien, Lorenz F., Jr.
Demaree, Neil C.
Deutsch, Thomas J.
Devine, Robert K.
Dickson, Floyd J.
Dillard, Clarence E., Jr.
Dodelson, Donald J.
Douglas, Dan E.
Drake, Daniel H.
Drechsel, Lewis W.
Duca, Lawrence P.
Dvorovy, Eugene S.
Eaton, Emmett A.
Epstein, Norman A.
Ewen, Earl A.
Fields, Ellis S.
Fink, Herbert A.
Fiocca, Robert A.
Fiocchi, Raymond M.
Fletcher, Lelland M.
Foster, Glen E., Jr.
Freeburn, Harold E., Jr.
Freed, Sidney
Friend, Max W., Jr.
Fritsche, James
Gabriel, Thomas W.
Garbett, Harry N.
Garman, Thomas A.
Gates, Richard H.
Gervason, Richard E.
Gilbert, Melvin L.
Glasser, Harold N.
Glassman, Milton S.
Golan, Theodore P.
Goldstone, Stanley
Gordon, Jerome
Gould, John C., Jr.
Graham, Barney D.
Gray, Paul H.
Gregory, William A.
Grippo, John O.
Grover, Alan J.
Gugino, Carl F.
Guichet, Niles F.
Hall, Robert M.
Hansen, Richard P.
Harpine, John W., Jr.
Harrison, Byron D.
Harris, Joseph C.
Hartland, Thomas J.
Hartley, Bruce R.
Hays, James W.
Hazen, Stanley P.
Heath, Wayne L.
Hebert, Jules J. D.
Heinkel, Erwin J., Jr.
Hickey, David G.
Hill, Jay W.
Hillebrand, Paul J.
Hodson, Charles G.
Hoien, Ralph D.
Hollis, Robert H.
Hollingsworth, John H.
Holton, Philip J.
Hooke, Will M.
Horton, Leland C.
Hyde, Philip L.
Hylton, Roscoe P., Jr.
Immel, Norbert L.
Isbister, Leonard B.
Jacobsen, John D.
Jacobson, Robert L.
Jaffe, Raymond P.
Javois, Alexander J.
Johnson, Thomas E.
Johnson, George S., Jr.
Jones, Bruce D.
Kaep, Thomas J.
Kahn, Arthur M.
Kaplan, Herman
Kaufman, Jerome
Kellogg, Keith D.
Kelly, Joseph M.
Kelly, William P.
Kessler, William B.
Kiwatisky, Frank
Kloefeler, Gale D.
Knowles, Ralph E., Jr.
Kronfeld, Gerald W.
Kwait, Donald
Labriola, William H.
Lamermayer, Richard N.
Landgraf, John R.
Lavelle, John J., Jr.
Laws, Robert K.
Lawson, Edward M.
Lawton, Edward A.
Leidich, Ray N.
Leiser, Fred C., Jr.
Lesinski, Eugene F.
Lewandowski, Anthony
Licht, Richard P.
Liebster, Louis I.
Lindenauer, Irving H.
Loewenthal, Harold
Lombardi, Ludwig A.
Love, William "C"
Lozano, Carlos
Lucia, Ralph W.
Magnusson, Gordon K.
Mahn, Ronald E.
Markwood, James A.
Marsh, Charles W.
Mason, Jack R.
Matarazzo, Joseph T.
McCauley, Robert B.

McClure, Thomas "A"
McDevitt, Edwin R., Jr.
McDonald, Richard L.
McIntosh, Richard A.
McWhorter, Howard B.
Meka, Edward M.
Mendel, Robert W.
Mercer, Victor H.
Michels, Gerald L.
Miller, David L.
Millians, Frank A., Jr.
Minker, Jules S.
Mitchell, Earl L., Jr.
Mitchell, Howard C., Jr.
Moll, Robert K.
Montgomery, Wendel E.
Moore, Frank B.
Moore, Robert L.
Moore, Robert L., Jr.
Murray, James N.
Nagelsen, Joseph C., Jr.
Nagourney, Frank E.
Needle, Robert N.
Nelson, Donald W.
Nied, Walter S., Jr.,
Nolf, Robert S.
Norton, James A.
Oenbrink, Philip G.
Olswang, Kay B.
Pace, Madison S.
Page, Charles L., Jr.
Painter, Everett G.
Perrodin, John A.
Peterson, Abraham F., Jr.
Pfeifer, John S.
Phillippi, John W.
Picard, Jean A.
Pike, John S.
Pinter, James E.
Pomije, Earle F.
Post, Roger A.
Powell, Kershaw E.
Prahl, Jerome H.
Rappaport, Albert
Rashkind, Herbert E.
Rasor, Richard D.
Ratcliffe, James R.
Rathburn, Marion
Ray, Charles E.
Reese, James W.
Regan, Frank G., Jr.
Reider, Robert D.
Restelle, Charles F., Jr.
Rice, Donald K.
Riffle, Harry J.
Riggs, Lawrence B., Jr.
Romzick, James P.
Rougeux, Lawrence J.
Roy, Hector H.
Rucker, Henry W., Jr.
Samuels, Benford L.
Saul, Charles O.
Sawusch, Raymond H.
Sawyer, Charles K.
Schneider, Leon E.
Schoemaker, Darvin D.
Schroeder, Ralph C.
Seamons, Dick C.
Segal, Jerome S.
Sepe, George J.
Sheffler, Edgar A.
Shepard, Leon A.
Silvestri, Joseph G., Jr.
Simpson, Keith B.
Sims, William P.
Smith, Donald C.
Smith, George E., Jr.
Smith, John P.
Smith, James O.
Sones, John R.
Sorokin, Raymond L.
Sowter, John B.
Starosta, Norman M.
Steinberg, Alvin L., Jr.
Stein, Howard N.
Stetzel, Robert "M"
Stier, Joseph B.
Stoltz, David R.
Story, Gordon H.
Sullivan, Charles R.
Sweet, Thomas O.
Swimmer, Leonard
Tanner, Thomas P.
Taylor, George J.
Taylor, Ray P.
Taylor, Albert J.
Taylor, William N.
Tertel, Kenneth J.
Tesch, Robert
Thomasson, Howard K., Jr.
Thomas, Julian J., Jr.
Thomas, Benjamin "L"
Thompson, Robert G.
Thompson, James C.
Tow, Herman D., Jr.
Trent, Calvert E.
Tylicki, John F.
Valentine, Rodney F.
VonBerg, Donald R.
Wall, Joseph R. P., Jr.
Walters, Percy F.
Watson, Henry S.
Weaver, Charles L.
Webb, John J.
Weinberg, Lawrence A.
Weiss, Arnold
Werner, Robert A.
Westcott, Maurice E.
Whatley, Samuel J.
Whitman, Jack K.
Wieland, Martin J.
Wise, Harry W., Jr.
Wolf, Merwin
Woody, Wilton G.
Wright, Francis H.
Wuthrich, Frederick J.
Yonally, James F.
Zawrotny, Raymond
Ziemer, Donald N.
Zuber, Walter H., Jr.
Zweifler, Leonard J.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bower, Harold R.
Briggs, Dennie L.
Charles, John P.
Gaspar, Andrew J.
McMichael, Allen E.
Perkner, Ralph
Puckett, Lucien E.
Still, Donald E.

NURSE CORPS

Andrus, Viola L.
Belezos, Caliope M.
Burns, Anna M.
Byers, Celia S.
Carpenter, Barbara J.
Chadwick, Katherine
Chittick, Marian F.
Corbin, Dorothy E.
Cox, Ann B.
DalMaso, Amelia M.
Drakes, Ellen E.
Evans, Elizabeth L.
Fisk, Grace O.
Glynn, Catherine M.
Griz, Albena I.
Griz, Aldona M.
Hanley, Eleanor T.
Hanson, Dorothy J.
Hill, Gretchen S.
Hogan, Hazel L.
Kuenzi, Pauline J.
Laughlin, Kathleen M.
Madsen, Gladys
Marco, Helen
Markosky, Dolores M.
Reese, Mary D.
Reid, Johanna
Ristoff, Dorothy A.
Rowe, Constance H.
Schweiger, Dorothy L.
Serak, Helen
Stahlman, Mary S.
Stewart, Mary G.
Strank, Ann B.
Trappe, Ursula E. F.
Warren, Marion E.
Wheeler, Laura C.
Yarnall, Ada M.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Beverlee J.
Barteau, Celia L.
Bittner, Emily C.
Borbidge, Dorothy A.
Cady, Joan J.
Darr, Dorothy J.
Dehart, Gloria F.
Dobson, Barbara J.
Duacsek, Ada L. R.
Fralic, Jimmie R.
Gore, Mary A.
Harrison, Mary L.
Helleberg, Jacquelin
Hopf, Margaret E.
Krebs, Frances J.
Lintott, Catherine
Lloyd, Rebecca A.
McMillan, Margaret A.
Read, Elizabeth A.
Reed, Susan K.
Richardson, Marjorie L.
Stolarow, Rhoda L.
Till, Marilyn J.
Zook, Joan E.

Lt. (junior grade) Katherine Keating, Medical Service Corps, United States Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Stanley Meeks, Dental Corps, United States Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abeles, Charles C.
Abernethy, Robert B.
Ackerman, Richard F.
Ackerson, David J.
Adair, Frederick S.
Addis, Robert W.
Alberty, Owen N.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, Marvin G.
Alexander, John P.
Alexich, Milton P.
Allen, Robert D.
Allen, Robert R.
Allison, Robert C.
Altwegg, David M.
Ambler, Kirby P.
Amor, Raymond C.
Amoruso, John J.
Anaston, Tommy K., Jr.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Alden B.
Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Duane E.
Anderson, Roger A.
Andrade, Leo R., Jr.
Andrews, Charles E., III
Andrews, Leon L.
Andrews, Rex D.
Angevine, Franklin L., Jr.
Aquadro, Lincoln
Argiro, Vincent J.
Arison, Rae E.
Armatrout, Merritt F.
Armitstead, Paul T.
Armstrong, Thomas F.
Arp, Phillip S.
Arroyo, Gilbert L.
Ashley, William H.
Ashman, Lee E.
Askin, Thomas B. H., Jr.
Atamian, Leon J.
Avallone, Eugene M.
Averyt, Howell D.
Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
Bachle, Carl F., Jr.
Bacon, James E.
Bader, John P., Jr.
Badger, Robyn L.
Badgett, John J.
Badt, Milton B., Jr.
Bahm, John J.
Balch, Alfred H.
Baldridge, Louis D., Jr.
Balmain, Leslie H.
Bandurraga, Thomas, Jr.
Banghart, Leslie L.
Banks, William E., IV
Banner, Conrad S.
Barbee, Delbert F.
Barker, Merle M.
Barron, Randall K.
Barry, Peter F.
Bartlett, Donald A.
Bartling, Mebus
Bates, John A., Jr.
Battin, Peter C.
Bauchspies, Frank T.
Bauer, Howard J.
Baum, James R.
Bean, Irving J.
Beck, Glenn A.
Beech, Wayne "L"
Beecher, John D.
Benjamin, Richard L.
Bennett, Alexander K.
Bennett, David R.
Bennett, Thomas J.
Benson, Charles W.
Benson, Merrill R.
Benton, Hugh A.
Berg, Richard C.
Berndt, Donald J.
Berry, George H., Jr.
Berry, Raymond L., Jr.
Bestler, James M.
Bethke, Earl E., Jr.
Bevington, David M.
Billion, Olivier R.
Bilodeau, Armand A.
Bioff, Allan L.
Bird, Charles S.
Bishop, Daniel M.
Bivenour, Charles A., Jr.
Bixby, Harry L., Jr.
Blackadar, Paul F.
Blackwood, Jack D.
Blades, Lawrence T.
Blair, Closkey L., Jr.
Blair, Robert M.
Blanding, Robert L.
Blide, Dan C.
Blohm, Ralph W.
Blount, William K.
Blue, Earl R.
Bolander, Jack "C"
Bolger, Justin C.
Borden, Lucien P.
Boreri, Richard S.
Bos, Roger C.
Bose, Robert B.
Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
Bowen, William J.
Bowen, William S.
Bowman, Donald E.
Box, Eugene L.
Boyer, Kenneth G.
Boyle, Richard J.
Brackney, Louis S.
Bradshaw, Brice L.
Brady, Donald G.
Brady, John H., Jr.
Brandel, William J., Jr.
Brandfass, Dean W.
Branyon, James C.
Bress, Allyn
Brewster, Vernon H., Jr.
Briska, Philip T.
Brooks, Alfred P.
Brooks, Walter A.
Brooks, William E.
Broshar, John C.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, George W. M.
Brown, Gideon L., Jr.
Brown, Jacob C.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Laurence A., Jr.
Brown, Richard N.
Brown, Robert M.
Brown, Willoughby D.
Brownley, John H.
Brownrigg, Richard T.
Bruning, Richard A.
Brunner, Edward A.
Buck, Donald D.
Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.
Bull, David M.
Burckmyer, Lawrence L.
Burger, Richard L.
Burgess, Norman A.
Burgin, Joe C., Jr.
Burke, Gerald
Burke, William J.
Burkhart, Paul C.
Burnett, John H.
Burnham, Rowland E.
Burns, Richard C.
Burridge, Herbert M.
Burstyn, Harold L.
Busch, Donald F.
Bush, James T.
Cagney, Thomas P.
Califf, Toxey H.
Calkins, Robert E.
Callaghan, Jerry E.
Callahan, Cornelius P., Jr.
Cameron, Donald A.
Campbell, Ronald A.
Campbell, Richard H., Jr.
Canby, Thomas Y., Jr.
Cantacuzene, Rodion
Cardeiro, Charles P.
Carl, William T.
Carlisle, David R.
Carlstead, Robert H.
Carroll, Edward E., Jr.
Carroll, William E.
Carson, Ralph
Carter, Tandy W.
Caruso, Richard P.
Case, George P., Jr.
Case, Richard W.
Cassani, Henry L.
Casser, Donald G.
Cassidy, Joseph B., Jr.
Cates, Frederick S., Jr.
Caudill, William E.
Caulk, Robert F.
Caulkins, Thomas V., III
Chadwick, John R.
Chalk, Jeff "D", III
Chalmers, Robert A.
Chambers, Lawrence C.
Charbonneau, George L.
Chasse, Robert L.
Cheatham, Augustus B.
Cheek, Ralph L.
Chesky, James A.
Chinn, Clarence E.
Chittenden, Richard M.
Christensen, Donald A.
Christy, Richard S.
Cizek, John T.
Clark, Andrew
Clark, Robert T.
Clark, Whaite M.
Clarke, Robert R.
Cleary, Robert J.
Clegg, John B.
Clew, William M.
Clough, Richard L.
Cloutman, Roger H.
Clowe, James R.
Clutz, John J., Jr.
Cobb, Virgil W.
Coburn, Robert L.
Coe, Thomas J., Jr.
Cohee, George E., Jr.
Coiner, John A.
Cole, Halbert N.
Collins, Harold E.
Collins, Jack C.
Collins, Robert A.
Combs, Robert E.
Compton, Robert E. L.
Conn, Lannie, Jr.
Connelly, Glenn H., Jr.
Conrad, Harry E.
Conrey, James R.
Conway, Richard E.
Conyers, Willard O.
Cooke, Robert A.
Copenhaver, Robert T.
Corbin, Harold S.
Cornwell, Robert Z.
Cosgrove, Martin J.
Coski, Bernard J.
Costigan, Robert A.
Cotten, Thomas R., Jr.
Couch, Ira L., Jr.
Craig, Charles F.
Craig, Robert E.
Craven, Robert C. E.
Crawford, Francis, Jr.
Creelman, Gilmore B., III
Crittenden, Carl S.
Crockett, John W.
Cruikshank, Barry A.
Culpepper, William R.
Curran, Lowell F., Jr.
Curran, Robert W.

Cywin, Lawrence
Dahlen, Wallace A.
Dalpian, Joseph H.
Danaher, James W.
Danell, Paul W.
Danneel, Clifford M.
Dapocny, Robert J.
Darrell, Charles G.
Davee, Robert C.
Davey, John N.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davidson, Christie H.
Davies, Paul G.
Davis, Daniel T.
Davis, James G.
Davis, James R.
Davis, Jimmie E.
Davis, Ralph E.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Thomas L.
Davis, William K.
Davison, David D.
Davison, Hessel L.
Defriez, Edwin H.
Demun, Taylor K.
Denbigh, Robert S. Jr.
Deppen, John B.
Deer, John P.
Dersin, Clement
Desjardin, John W.
Dewispelaere, Earl L.
Dickerson, Jaime E.
Dieffenbach, Otto W., Jr.
Dietz, Richard C.
Dimitruk, Eugene
Dimmick, David K.
Dion, Laurent N.
Dixon, Thomas M.
Dobbins, Robert N., Jr.
Dodge, Robert S.
Dodson, Charles H. Jr.
Doermann, Humphrey
Dolan, John F.
Donahue, Thomas W.
Donihee, James B.
Dooley, Charles E., Jr.
Dorman, Gerald H.
D'Orn, David W.
Dorso, James N.
Doty, John P.
Doughan, Joseph P.
Doyle, William J.
Drake, Frank D.
Dreger, Harry D.
Dresser, David I.
Drews, Sheldon
Dreyer, George J.
Driver, Glenn C., Jr.
Drummond, Oliver E.
Duckett, Philip V. H.
Duclos, Paul J.
Duff, Ernest A.
Duke, Frank M.
Dunn, Theodore Y., Jr.
Dupree, Thomas P.
Dyer, George T., Jr.
Dyett, Maxwell J.
Dykers, Andrew W.
Dykers, Thomas M., Jr.
Dysart, Roger A.
Eagleton, Richard E.
Eakin, James E.
Ebbert, Donald G.
Ebbert, Edwin L.
Echols, Kenneth W.
Eddy, William C., Jr.
Eddy, William P., III
Edlund, Timothy W.
Edmunds, Philip H.
Eggan, Burton M.
Eggert, Lowell F.
Ekman, Roger E.
Elder, James C.
Eline, Gervase F., Jr.
Eller, Richard L.
Elliott, Charles L.
Elliott, Richard G.
Ellison, John C.
Emmons, Willard F.
Endsley, John H., Jr.
English, Joseph A., Jr.
Engquist, Gordon W.
Enos, Ralph L.
Ensign, Frank B., Jr.
Epping, Robert A.
Epstein, Charles S.
Erspamer, Franco M.
Eshman, John R.
Evanco, John R.
Ewy, Howard W.
Fadden, Michael F.
Faessel, Matthew W.
Faisant, Robin D.
Fakoury, Ernest P.
Farrell, Joseph A., III
Farris, George K.
Fasnacht, William E.
Faver, Walter M.
Fay, Edward S.
Federico, Charles D.
Feely, Robert J.
Fehrman, Gerald L.
Feller, Donald L.
Fellingham, Robert W.
Fenn, Edward M.
Fenton, Thomas T.
Ferguson, William F.
Field, Richard L.
Fielder, Robert D.
Filburn, William S.
Fisher, Robert W.
Fisher, William G., Jr.
Fitts, Jean M.
Fitzgerald, Nathan M., Jr.
Flaherty, James H., Jr.
Flaherty, Michael P.
Fleeman, Frederick M.
Fleeson, Richard J.
Fleischer, Allan A.
Flitter, Wallace F.
Flucker, Ronald L.
Fogarty, Michael J.
Foley, William M.
Fonville, Henry P.
Forbes, John, Jr.
Ford, Leon E., Jr.
Forrester, James H.
Foster, John F.
Fowler, Richard T.
Fowler, William L.
Fox, Raymond G.
Foy, Edward W.
Francis, Thomas L.
Franklin, Billy D.
Franzen, Edward C., Jr.
Freeland, Thomas H., III
Frohman, Louis T.
Fuller, Jack R.
Furlow, Charles M., III
Gaebler, James E.
Gair, Bruce O.
Gallen, Lawrence C.
Gantt, Martin B., Jr.
Gardner, Arnold G.
Gardner, Howard W.
Garland, Daniel H.
Garofalos, John
Garvin, Robert G.
Gasche, Arnold C.
Gash, Donald E.
Gaskin, Herbert L., Jr.
Gassaway, Charles L., Jr.
Gaston, Gerald W.
Gates, Harold R., Jr.
Gatje, George C.
Gauthier, John O.
Gayman, Wendell R.
Gaynor, Robert C.
Geiger, Lin T.
Genter, Ernest R., Jr.
Gerlach, Richard E.
Gerling, Carl R.
Gerwe, Eugene F.
Gery, Herbert C., Jr.
Geyman, John P.
Gibbins, Gareth W.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Giedraitis, Robert B.
Gifford, James M.
Gilgen, Albert R.
Gill, Chester C., Jr.
Gillan, Martin J., III
Gillcrist, Paul T.
Gillies, Richard W.
Gillig, Benjamin
Gilligan, Eugene F., Jr.
Ginn, Robert L.
Gire, Howard A.
Gleason, Richard E.
Glenn, James J., Jr.
Glerum, James N.
Gnadt, Frederic
Godman, Carl L.
Goldschmid, Jack P., Jr.
Golenor, John A.
Gooding, William J., Jr.
Goodwin, Robert W.
Gordon, David E.
Gordon, Harry E., Jr.
Graham, Andrew J.
Graham, Bruce H.
Grammer, Frederick E., Jr.
Grant, John, Jr.
Grant, Richard T.
Gray, Harvey, Jr.
Gray, James H.
Gray, Walter S., III
Green, Morris J.
Greene, Ernest H.
Gregory, James W. P., Jr.
Gregory, William A., Jr.
Griffith, Donald E.
Griggs, Arthur E.
Griswold, Don W.
Groehn, Gerhard C.
Gronewold, George F.
Gronlund, Thomas R.
Gross, Ralph, Jr.
Grossheim, Ralph E.
Grossman, Herbert L.
Gruppe, Henry E.
Gunn, William J.
Gurney, Charles E., III
Gusdonovich, John, Jr.
Gustaff, Vito J. V.
Haest, Martin J.
Hagan, James S.
Hagen, Donald L.
Hagensick, William H.
Haigh, Alfred D., Jr.
Halbrooks, William J.
Halff, John F.
Hall, Paul F.
Hall, Peter T.
Halladay, Jack F.
Hamilton, Arthur N.
Hamilton, Edgar W.
Hamilton, Leo L.
Hamilton, Leroy A.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hansen, Robert F.
Hansen, Whitney
Hansen, William A.
Hanson, Donald O.
Hardesty, John F.
Hardesty, Loyd B.
Hardisty, Huntington
Harling, Frederick F., Jr.
Harlow, Albert L.
Harp, Robert M.
Harper, Edwin F., Jr.
Harper, Rollin H., Jr.
Harrington, Donald E.
Harris, Cecil J., Jr.
Harris, David G.
Harris, Douglas H., Jr.
Harris, Jack R.
Harrison, James H., Jr.
Harrison, Varick D.
Hart, John R.
Hart, Richard L.
Harthorn, William G.
Hartley, John D.
Hartman, Robert T.
Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
Hartranft, Milton L.
Hasenwinkle, Earl D.
Hatcher, George M.
Hatcher, John L.
Haveman, "O" "H", Jr.
Hawes, David W.
Hawk, Conrad F., Jr.
Hayes, Morris L.
Hayutin, David L.
Headley, Allen B.
Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
Hedges, Ralph R.
Heffernan, George A.
Heighway, John E.
Heigl, Frederick T.
Heins, Robert A.
Helgerson, Warren A.
Helgeson, Norman G. P.
Helland, Gerald H.
Helt, Franklin R., Jr.
Hennes, Randolph Y.
Henson, Otis A.
Hervey, Frank, Jr.
Hess, Adolph W., Jr.
Hess, Paul J.
Hickey, James F.
Hickman, William J.
Hicks, Harold F., Jr.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Higgs, Richard F.
Hilfrank, William E.
Hill, George W., Jr.
Hill, John W.
Hill, Lucio W.
Hines, Edward L.
Hipple, William J.
Hirvi, Henry E.
Hirz, Joseph D.
Hiscock, David F.
Hobbs, Billy B.
Hoenie, Clifford E.
Hofer, John F.
Hogan, Robert L.
Hoge, James H.
Hollandsworth, Roy M.
Hollick, Frederick B.
Holmberg, Lennart G.
Holmes, William P.
Honeycutt, Robert D.
Honeywell, James O., Jr.
Horn, Donald N.
Horne, Charles F., III
Horrocks, Jay "B"
Horwath, John A.
Hostetler, Robert J.
House, Harry M.
House, Rodney M.
Hubbard, Dwight E.
Hudson, Earl M.
Huesgen, Eugene L.
Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
Hull, George T.
Hull, Lynne H., II
Hultkrans, Hilding R.
Hunter, Glenn A.
Hunter, Thomas H., Jr.
Husmann, Donald
Hyde, Oliver W., Jr.
Hyde, Robert A.
Hyers, Kemper K.
Hynnes, William J.
Iannotti, Lawrence W.
Ikeler, Harold E., Jr.
Ilsemann, Frederick J. Jr.
Ingersoll, Richard W.
Inman, Wayne D.
Itzkan, Irving
Ivey, John S.
Ivey, John H.
Jackson, Davis H.
Jackson, Dempster M.
Jackson, Emmette G., Jr.
Jackson, Robert G.
Jacob, Robert E.
Jacobs, Charles E., Jr.
Jacobson, William A.
Jagel, Robert C.
Jameson, Henry C., Jr.
Jansen, Gerhard C. J.
Jarboe, George G.
Jarosz, Joseph A.
Jarrett, Alonzo C.
Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
Jayne, Gordon H.
Jeanes, Lincoln D., Jr.
Jeffries, John W.
Jennett, John W.
Jezek, George M.
Johannsen, Robert A.
Johns, Burton E.
Johnson, Alan H.
Johnson, Dale W.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, Donald M.
Johnson, Eric W.
Johnson, Frederick W., Jr.
Johnson, Frederick C.
Johnson, Glenn M.
Johnson, Guy D.
Johnson, Kenneth H.
Johnson, Oriz W.
Johnson, Philip E.
Johnson Robert M.
Johnson, Robert C.
Johnson, Ronald C.
Johnston, Douglas F.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Richard H.
Jones, Robert C.
Jordan, Clive N.
Josephson, Henning C.
Joubert, Douglas J.
Judah, Nelson V.
Kaczmarek, Carl C.
Kaiser, Karl D.
Kampe, Robert F.
Karvala, Curtis A.
Kasehagen, Arthur T.
Kay, Jack G.
Keane, James P.
Kebschull, Herbert W.
Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
Kenney, William E., Jr.
Kelleher, Ronald W.
Keller, John A.
Kelley, Frederick W.
Kelley, John P., Jr.
Kelley, Robert F.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kennedy, David R., Jr.
Kennedy, Martin H., Jr.
Kennedy, Ronald W.
Kennedy, Robert C.
Kennedy, William B.
Kenny, John J.
Kenyon, Jack A.
Kermes, Albert J.
Kershaw, Daniel J.
Kidd, Charles R.
Kidd, Vernon G.
Kidd, William S.
Kiechel, Doane F., Jr.
Kilduff, Paul E.
Kilhefner, Paul T., Jr.
Killian, Michael J.
King, Charles W.
King, Lyman S.
King, Terry D.
Kinnebrew, Thomas R.
Kinnier, Richard R.
Kirbach, David S.
Kirby, Albert D.
Kirk, Myrl S.
Kirkman, William J.
Kitchens, William L.
Klein, Donald E.
Klein, Irving
Klein, Patrick E.
Klenk, Eugene L.
Knauss, Robert L.
Knipple, Herbert C.
Knoll, David W.
Knopp, William A.
Knowles, Arthur D.
Knutson, Wilbert D.
Kocak, Theodore J.
Koch, Joseph
Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
Koehne, Richard J.
Kohler, Walter, Jr.
Kolankiewicz, Robert A.
Korb, Lawrence J.
Korbitz, Robert F.
Koslow, Jack E.
Kosmela, Walter T.
Kovanic, Edward F.
Kovarick, Frank L.
Kraft, Frederick W.
Krayer, Robert S.
Kreps, Allyn O.
Kuhn, John G.
Kuncas, John W.
Kunnath, Jerome G., Jr.
Kunze, Martin W.
Kuzenski, Kenneth F.
Laak, Edwin F.
Lackey, Harry A., II
Lacy, Joe R.
Lafalce, Peter R.
Lambert, Lloyd M., Jr.
Lancaster, Robert W.
Lance, William R.
Lander, Richard A.
Langford, John M.
Langley, Lawrence W.
Langloh, Walther G.
Larsen, Richard L.
Larson, David T., Jr.
Laskey, Richard P.
Lasseter, Jack K.
Lauderdale, Robert A.
Laulor, Richard J.
Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavin, Charles V.
Law, Thomas L.
Lawless, John H.
Layman, Lawrence
Leach, Richard P. P.
Lechner, George B.
Ledbetter, James A.
Lees, Frederick J.
Leftwich, James M.
Legg, Douglas R.
Lenox, Glen W.
Levy, Ted
Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.
Lewis, James T.
Lidel, Carl J.
Lincoln, David.
Lippincott, James E.
Lipski, Arthur A.
Liston, Thomas L.
Locke, Walter M.
Lockwood, Douglas L.
Lockwood, Forrest P.
Loftus, John A.
Loggan, Wilfred J.
Lohman, John A.
Long, Thornton M.
Looney, Francis L.
Loposer, Avery K., Jr.
Lorenz, Robert F.
Lossing, Fay A., Jr.
Louchheim, William S., Jr.
Louden, Robert O.
Loughlin, William J.
Louzensky, George J.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lucas, William R.
Luckett, Thomas W.
Lumsden, Richard E.
Lurie, Fred M.
Lykes, William F. G.

Lyman, Alexander S.
Lyons, James A., Jr.
Lyons, Robert D.
Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.
Maatta, Gilbert H.
MacDonald, William P.
MacGregor, Herbert C.
MacLeod, Kenneth H.
MacPherson, John J.
Madeo, Joseph F., Jr.
Madigan, James A.
Maich, Robert C.
Majesky, John D.
Malament, Jerome M.
Mallace, Alexander D.
Malone, John S.
Maloney, Peter M.
Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
Mandley, Wilfred J., Jr.
Manfredi, John P.
Mann, Charles R.
Mann, Robert E.
Manring, Charles D.
Marble, Richard W.
Marin, Juan R.
Marino, Lawrence L.
Marlor, Russell L.
Marn, Louis E.
Marrion, Robert W.
Marron, James V.
Marshall, Donald A.
Marshall, James J.
Marshall, John C.
Marshall, Michael M.
Martens, William H.
Martin, Alexander, Jr.
Martin, Clyde D., Jr.
Martin, Tyrone G.
Martineau, James P.
Martz, Charles R., Jr.
Maslin, Charles W.
Masse, Donald M.
Mathis, Thomas R.
Maus, Lee J.
Mayes, Jared D., III
Maynard, James H., Jr.
McBrayer, James B.
McCafferty, William E.
McCarty, Richard W.
McClannan, Ralph L.
McCollum, Arthur H., Jr.
McConnell, Thomas O.
McCune, Joe D.
McCutcheon, Edwin L.
McDonald, Clyde D.
McDonald, Robert P.
McDowell, Russell N.
McElhattan, James R., II
McEligot, Donald M.
McGaughy, Richard W.
McGaw, Richard W.
McGee, Bernard J.
McGeough, Robert S.
McGlinn, William D.
McGregor, Jack R.
McKee, Robert X.
McKenny, James L.
McLaughlin, Richard A.
McLemore, Ralph S., Jr.
McMillan, Louis K., Jr.
McNeely, James S.
McNeill, Archibald J., Jr.
McPadden, Donald F. X.
McWilliam, John R.
McWilliams, Frederick F.
Mead, Theodore E.
Meardon, Louis F.
Meeks, Thomas L.
Meigs, Gilbert R.
Melson, Hollard R., Jr.
Meltzer, Melvin
Merrill, Forrest "J"
Messmer, Everett P.
Mester, Ernest L., Jr.
Metz, Forrest E.
Meyers, John E.
Meyers, Walter T.
Mhoon, Fred M.
Michaels, Robert J.
Michie, Harold W.
Mighell, John H.
Millard, Junius W.
Miller, Bruce A.
Miller, Charles E.
Miller, John L., Jr.
Miller, Kenneth R.
Miller, Phillip
Miller, Richard J.
Miller, Robert F.
Miller, Robert L.
Mills, Roger E.
Mireault, Norman G.
Mitchell, Gregory A., Jr.
Mitchell, "J" Wallace
Mitchell, John R. C.
Mitchell, Leland G.
Mizell, Hardy P., Jr.
Moehle, Robert C.
Mohrman, "J" "H"
Moncure, Edwin C., Jr.
Moody, Thomas J.
Moore, Arthur H.
Moore, Charles E.
Moore, Charles D.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Ernest M., Jr.
Moore, Mallie B.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.
Moran, Thomas P.
Morgan, William N.
Morley, Kenneth B.
Morley, Robert R.
Morris, Henry C., Jr.
Morris, Robert E.
Morrison, Daniel N.
Morrison, Julian K., III
Morrison, Royden U.
Morrow, George F.
Morse, David S.
Moses, Allen D.
Moss, McKenzie
Moss, William C., Jr.
Mountford, Edward J.
Moylan, Robert J.
Mullane, Thomas F.
Mulloy, Paul J.
Muncy, William E.
Munsell, Raymond T.
Munson, Jack V.
Murdock, Lloyd E.
Murphy, Douglas C.
Murphy, Gerald E.
Murray, Robert A.
Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
Myers, David M.
Mylander, Stig J.
Nachtrab, Herbert R., Jr.
Nachtsheim, Philip R.
Nalen, Craig A.
Naugle, James O.
Nelson, Jack H.
Nelson, James N.
Nelson, Leroy C.
Nelson, Raymond A.
Nerheim, Noble M.
Neumann, Donald E.
Newland, Charles W.
Newman, Wilbur D.
Newsome, James W.
Newton, Howard J., Jr.
Newton, Robert B.
Niedbala, Thomas F.
Niederkrome, James S.
Nielander, Ralph T.
Norling, Richard E.
Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
Norris, James L.
Northup, Wilmer R., Jr.
Norton, Richard J.
Nowak, Theo T.
Numbers, Earl W.
Nunneley, James K.
Nyvold, Robert H.
Obrey, Robert L.
O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.
O'Brien, James J.
O'Connell, John F.
O'Connell, Linus J.
O'Connor, Dennis E. W.
O'Connor, Edward L.
O'Connor, John E.
Oder, Howard W.
Odman, William A.
O'Donnell, Canton, Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
Ohanneson, Gregory S.
O'Haren, Patrick J., Jr.
O'Kane, John D.
Okun, Sherman K.
Olandt, Robert H.
Oldham, Albert W.
O'Leary, Jeremiah D., Jr.
Olson, Darwin D.
Olson, Richard S.
Olson, William, Jr.
Organ, James W.
O'Rourke, Joseph J.
Orr, John D.
Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
Orzalli, John B.
Osgood, Franklin T., Jr.
Ott, Billie D.
Owen, George E.
Owen, John R.
Pacl, Lawrence J.
Paff, George H.
Palo, David B.
Paluso, Edward M.
Pappas, Sophocles G.
Parch, Joseph R.
Paris, Thomas A.
Parker, John R.
Parker, Millard M.
Parmer, Merle E.
Parrish, Thomas K., III
Parrish, Vernon L.
Patterson, James R.
Pavloff, George
Payne, Douglas W.
Payne, George P.
Pearce, Earl H.
Pearse, Roger N.
Pearson, Clinton J.
Pearson, John F., Jr.
Pecaut, Richard A.
Peelle, Morris A.
Pelton, Paul C., Jr.
Pennypacker, William S.
Perkins, Raymond B.
Perl, Burton K.
Perry, William N.
Peters, Herbert J.
Peters, Paul F.
Petersen, Arnold O., Jr.
Peterson, John B., Jr.
Peterson, Marvin A.
Peterson, Norman G.
Petherick, George L.
Pettigrew, Richard R.
Philips, Frederic M.
Phillips, Robert A.
Phillips, Robert N.
Phillips, William G.
Pierce, Ray E.
Pierson, William R.
Pike, Thomas J.
Pike, William E.
Pilon, Jerome R.
Ping, Vernon "S", Jr.
Piper, Harold L.
Pipkin, Robert G., Jr.
Pittman, Paul H.
Plager, Sheldon J.
Platt, Grafton S.
Plow, Arthur E.
Podaras, Nicholas C.
Podsiadlo, Edwin L.
Pogson, Charles H.
Pohli, Richard R.
Polatty, Donald B.
Polen, Charles R.
Poling, William E.
Pollak, Charles D.
Pollak, Morris
Poor, William C.
Porter, Alvin J.
Porter, Asa S.
Post, Robert E., Jr.
Postak, John N.
Postich, George
Potts, Raymond A.
Pratt, Richard W.
Preble, Russell A., Jr.
Precht, Robert H., Jr.
Pregnall, William S.
Prezioso, Ronald
Price, David J.
Price, Robert T.
Pugh, Jack M.
Pulley, Gerald P.
Pusey, Richard D.
Pyron, John E., Jr.
Quartararo, Michael A.
Quick, Jay E.
Quimby, William E.
Quin, Clayton W.
Quinn, Robert T.
Rafalowski, Joseph W., Jr.
Railing, James M.
Ramsey, Forrest G., Jr.
Randall, Thomas R.
Randolph, Joseph L.
Randolph, Thomas F.
Rankin, George M., Jr.
Ransdell, Paul E.
Rapkin, Jerome
Ratenburg, Robert N.
Ravan, Landrum E.
Ray, Glen P.
Rayburn, Ralph G.
Raymer, Edward C.
Reed, Donald A.
Reed, Richard W.
Reed, Robert G.
Reed, William H.
Reeder, Ralph J.
Reep, Harlan E.
Regalia, Edmund L.
Reichelderfer, Bruce A.
Reif, William B.
Reilly, James F.
Reischauer, Robert E.
Remund, Robert N.
Reynolds, David S., Jr.
Reynolds, Robert R.
Rhodes, John P.
Rhodes, Stuart W.
Riba, Robert
Ricardo, Benny J.
Rice, James O.
Rich, Richard
Richard, Jackson B.
Richards, William D.
Richardson, Howard P.
Richter, Paul E.
Ricks, Robert R.
Ries, Allen L.
Riggs, Weldon M.
Riley, Tad T.
Rinzel, Emery J.
Rivers, Wendell B.
Roane, Donald P.
Roberts, Dean E.
Roberts, Douglas H.
Roberts, William E.
Roberts, William E., Jr.
Robinson, Adrian B.
Robinson, Donald W.
Robinson, Peter W.
Roby, Grady H.
Rockett, John S.
Rockwell, Richard B.
Rodgers, Frederick A.
Rodrigue, Louis W., Jr.
Roesch, Malvin B.
Roeser, John F., Jr.
Roessner, Eugene F.
Rogers, Stephen H.
Rollins, James "J"
Ronnenbert, Francis G.
Rood, Gerald D.
Ross, Billy D.
Ross, John P.
Ross, Robert P.
Roth, Irwin
Roush, Randall C.
Rowden, William H.
Rowland, Mervin
Rowland, Milton
Roy, Clarence H.
Rozell, Curtis J.
Rudisill, Brantly
Rudolph, Raymond F.
Ruecker, Kenneth H.
Ruesswick, Douglas L.
Runser, James A.
Russell, William D.
Ryan, Donald W.
Ryan, William J.
Saffell, Arliss K.
Sagerholm, James A.
Salerno, Frank E.
Salisbury, John F.
Salmirs, Seymour
Salsburg, David S.
Sample, William H.
Sanders, Joseph G.
Sanford, Stephen J.
Sanscrainte, Willard A.
Santucci, Carlo V.
Sapp, John, Jr.
Saulnier, George I.
Saxton, Frank
Sayer, William D.
Sayoc, Raymond G., Jr.
Sayre, Robert E., Jr.
Scalese, Anthony C., Jr.
Scherer, Ralph S.
Schluter, Hugo E.
Schmitz, Charles J.
Schmokel, Harold O.
Schofield, John J.
Schonenberg, Hans P.
Schreiber, Leo R.
Schucker, Raymond E.
Schulze, Robert H.
Schurr, Thomas P.
Schwarz, Edward P., Jr.
Scott, Michael
Scott, William C.
Searfus, William H.
Seeger, Charles E.
Segal, Philip D.
Selby, Howard K.
Seljos, Lloyd T.
Sellers, Jeff C., Jr.
Sellgren, David M.
Semotan, William F.
Shafer, Lawrence
Shaffer, George W.
Shanahan, William F.
Shannon, Eugene R., Jr.
Sharts, Clay M.
Shaver, Frank M.
Shaw, Charles M.
Shea, Philip J.
Shearer, Burdett L.
Sheehan, Charles J.
Sheehan, John E.
Sheehan, William F., Jr.
Sheets, Andrew T.
Sheldon, Robert E.
Shelley, Leon R.
Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
Sherar, Joseph W.
Shettles, Mack W.
Shillinger, George L., Jr.
Shiver, Edwin C.
Short, Francis R.
Shuler, Ashley C., Jr.
Shumway, John N.
Siebert, John C.
Siems, William R.
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
Simms, James T., Jr.
Simons, Donald W.
Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
Sinclair, Valvin R., Jr.
Slaughter, John R., Jr.
Small, Joseph F.
Smith, Addison R., II
Smith, Bob L.
Smith, Carol C., Jr.
Smith, Clifford R.
Smith, Frederick E., Jr.
Smith, Gerald M.
Smith, Gilbert E.
Smith, Howard J.
Smith, Howard W.
Smith, Hugh T.
Smith, James R.
Smith, Jerrold C.
Smith, John V.
Smith, Keith D.
Smith, Kenneth G.
Smith, Lawrence L.
Smith, Noel I.
Smith, Ordell
Smith, Richard C.
Smith, Richard K.
Smith, Samuel H., III
Smith, St. Clair
Smith, Verne W.
Sneed, Beckom U.
Snell, Glen A.
Snider, Claude F., Jr.
Snow, David T.
Snyder, Allan E.
Snyder, Fred D.
Snyder, Herbert J. V.
Snyder, Howard A.
Snyder, James M.
Sorensen, Everett B.
Sothan, Norman L.
Sowinski, Stanislaus J.
Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
Sperling, David J.
Sperr, Andrew L.
Spolinsky, Leon G. R.
Sprehe, Paul F.
Springer, Kay S.
Squier, Lucius R., Jr.
Stadelhofer, Robert R.
Stafford, Richard L.
Stamm, Richard H.
Stanch, Harmon E. J.
Stangl, Richard J.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Staple, David F.
Stark, Arthur R., Jr.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Stauffer, Dale E.
Steckbeck, Francis J.
Stein, Norman F.
Stein, Raymond W.
Stelfox, James
Stelt, John H.
Stephens, George M., Jr.
Stern, Charles A.
Stern, Philip A.
Stewart, Charles W.

Stewart, James P.
Stinner, Robert J.
Stock, Richard L.
Stolle, Edward S., Jr.
Stone, James M.
Storper, Stanley A.
Stottlar, James F.
Stradtman, John F.
Strandjord, Paul E.
Strehlow, Paul V., Jr.
Strockbine, Richard E.
Stromire, Leon C.
Strong, William L.
Sugg, Ross E.
Sullivan, Alfred B.
Sullivan, George H.
Summit, Roger K.
Sumser, Raymond J.
Sutherland, John A., Jr.
Sutherlin, Benjamin T. W.
Swadley, "W" "C"
Swalley, Robert F.
Sweet, William J.
Sweigert, Cloyd S.
Sylvester, Gerald D.
Talkin, Philip S.
Tanner, John W.
Tarker, Matthew F., Jr.
Taylor, Charles A.
Taylor, Clinton W.
Taylor, Jack G. N.
Taylor, Robert S.
Teeter, Robert W.
Tetreault, Paul J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
Tholl, Jack C.
Thomas, Alfred R., III
Thomas, Douglas N.
Thomas, George C.
Thomas, James R.
Thomas, Richard H., III
Thomas, Robert F.
Thomas, Svend E.
Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thompson, Guy L.
Thompson, John L.
Thompson, James J.
Tiffany, Walton C.
Till, Ernest A.
Timlin, Thomas N.
Tinker, Richard V.
Todd, Alexander M.
Tombari, Henry A.
Tomkiewicz, Ralph E.
Tonseth, Thomas H., III
Treiber, Arthur E.
Treuhold, Charles R.
Troffer, George J., Jr.
Tucker, McKendree T.
Turnage, Robert L.
Turner, Harvey S.
Turner, James D.
Turner, John B., Jr.
Turpin, Lander H.
Tuszynski, Raymond S.
Tuzo, Lamar W.
Usilton, William B.
Vahsen, George M.
Valade, Larry G.
Vandine, Harold F., Jr.
Vanhouten, Laurence P.
Varley, James F.
Vasey, Richard C.
Vaught, John C.
Vay, John P.
Vickroy, William R.
Victor, Francis W.
Vincent, Dwight H.
Vine, Victor J.
Wadsworth, Francis L.
Wagar, John A.
Waggoner, Donald E.
Wagner, Ralph L.
Wagner, Richard M.
Wahrmund, Louis M.
Wakeman, Curtiss O.
Walbert, William A. Jr.
Walczak, Norbert F.
Walden, John W.
Walker, Elmer E.
Walker, Homer L.
Walker, Samuel B.
Walker, William B.
Wallace, Cedric S.
Walsh, Thomas P.
Walther, William J.
Wanamaker, Floyd E.
Ward, Conley R.
Ward, John E.
Ward, Joseph V., Jr.
Warner, Paul M., Jr.
Wasserman, Arthur L., Jr.
Waterloo, Francis C.
Watkins, Bobby B.
Watkins, Charles E., Jr.
Watt, Richard M.
Weaver, Carl B.
Weaver, Edward H.
Webber, Gene D.
Webster, Charles H.
Webster, Edward W. V.
Webster, Jack T.
Weeks, George H.
Wehking, Frederick W.
Weigle, Wallace F.
Welham, Robert M.
Weller, Thomas G., Jr.
Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
Wentz, Howard B., Jr.
Wessman, Robert L.
Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.
Wheeler, James W., Jr.
White, John A.
White, John C.
White, Paul G., Jr.
White, Richard K.
White, Steven A.
Whiting, Albert W.
Whorton, William R.
Widder, John A., Jr.
Widner, Ralph R.
Wilde, Stanford R.
Wilder, Philip H.
Wilder, Richard D.
Wilder, William E.
Wildridge, Robert E.
Wiley, Kenneth R.
Wiley, Robert L., Jr.
Wilkens, John, Jr.
Wilkerson, Robert B., III
Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, Edward J., Jr.
Williams, Floyd B.
Williams, Henry W., Jr.
Williams, James E.
Williams, James G., III
Williamson, John C.
Williamson, Paul W.
Willis, Chesley E., Jr.
Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Edward W.
Wilson, Francis M.
Wilson, Harold K.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.
Wilson, James R.
Wilson, James W.
Wilson, Randolph G., Jr.
Wilson, Richard H.
Wilson, Richard S.
Wilson, Robert D.
Wilson, Robert R.
Wilson, Thomas O.
Winant, Barent P., III
Winkler, Richard C.
Winkler, Thomas Q., Jr.
Winterfield, Adrian B.
Winters, Charles A.
Wise, William E.
Wiseman, Charles H.
Wiseman, Hobart J.
Withers, Christopher
Witty, Robert D.
Wolak, Joseph E.
Wolff, William M., Jr.
Wood, Cecil E.
Wood, John F.
Wood, Thomas H.
Woods, Searle W.
Woolway, James E.
Wright, Philip H.
Wright, Richard L.
Wroth, Robert S.
Wyatt, William C., III
Yamnicky, John D.
Yates, Glen B.
Yetman, William R.
Young, "J" Rollin, Jr.
Young, John C.
Young, John W.
Young, Robert O.
Youngquist, John A.
Yuill, Robert T.
Yulsman, Sylvan A.
Zacharias, Jerrold M.
Zastrow, Robert R.
Zeithaml, Donald P.
Zibilich, Michael A.
Curry, Thomas E.
Bassett, Jerry S.
Shepherd, David C.
Daniels, Verlyne W.
Nichols, John F.
Rosson, James W.
Williams, Frank
LeBlanc, Georges E., Jr.
Clark, William
Painter, George V.
Wyatt, Charles M.
McBrayer, John E., Jr.
Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Preston, Edgar H.
Higgs, Jay D.
Robertson, Coll E.
Kling, William T.
Caines, Robert H.
Tobias, Robert E.
O'Neil, Louis C., Jr.
Bozeman, Henry G.

SUPPLY CORPS

Agnew, Donald C.
Allenstein, Richard V.
Appell, Leroy G.
Baglow, Charles T.
Balint, William S., Jr.
Barrett, William L.
Beargie, William T.
Beeson, Jerome F.
Beier, Frederick R., Jr.
Benedict, Joseph W.
Blanchard, Townsend E.
Bloom, Thomas F.
Bondurant, Edward J.
Boswell, Sam P.
Boyle, John J.
Bradshaw, Carl J.
Buckman, Robert S.
Burrell, Jack L.
Carroll, Robert H.
Carson, Donald E.
Catanach, Anthony H.
Clark, Alan F.
Close, Paul D., Jr.
Cohig, James C.
Conner, Berry, Jr.
Cooper, Elliot I.
Curran, Daniel, S.
Curtin, Pat
Cuson, Charles E.
Davis, John A.
Desroches, Sylvio J., Jr.
Dewinter, Richard E.
Diebenow, Julius F.
Donnell, Floyd W.
Drake, William D.
Epstein, Edwin S., III
Farmer, Kenneth F.
Firth, Forrest "E"
Fisher, Gorman L., Jr.
Flood, John E., Jr.
Foster, Robert W.
French, Robert T.
Fuller, John P.
Gillespie, James A., Jr.
Goerner, Edward A.
Gordon, Donald K.
Goslin, Thomas C., Jr.
Gray, Edward J.
Grimes, Fred M.
Gustavson, Arthur R.
Haggard, Howard F.
Sheets, Roger E.
Pattridge, Roger H.
McCardell, James E.
Person, Ross
Thomas, Donald P.
Thoreston, Glyn T.
Williams, Randall
Jaburg, Conrad J.
Edwards, Forrest L.
Benton, Jerry S.
Schaub, John R., Jr.
Harris, James W.
Knight, Charles H.
Spear, Willard W., Jr.
Bachtel, Mary A.
Beane, Carolyn M.
Boss, Jo E.
Bradford, Alice V.
Brooks, Irma J.
Brown, Julia A.
Burgess, Elizabeth H.
Cass, Sylvia S.
Clark, Marion J.
Coder, Margaret A.
Dantley, Audrey D.
Dewitt, Lois V.
Dixon, Ann
Donovan, Patricia R.
Ellis, Shirley L.
Frawley, Mildred J.
Garoutte, Joan
Gautreaux, Helen
Hanson, Elinor F.
Haugen, Sylvia N.
Hoy, Barbara J.
Kiley, Patricia E.
Knoph, Madella L.
Koons, Joan
Labonté, Nadene B.
Lowrimore, Earlene
Mader, Barbara A.
Mandt, Maxine A.
Marshall, Alice C.
Meadow, Jane
Miller, Elizabeth H.
Miller, Nancy J.
Nardi, Rosemarie L.
Nyman, Louise F.
Phillips, Elizabeth C.
Prewitt, Edith E.
Roberts, Betty J. W.
Robnett, Martha L.
Rupp, Lois J.
Savage, Peggy A.
Screws, Margie A.
Smith, Claire L.
Smith, Martha B.
Sullivan, Barbara T.
Thompson, Lloyda L.
White, Joanne E.
Wier, Mary L.
Williams, Barbara A.
Williamson, Mary L.
Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
Hamilton, Walter S.
Helder, George K.
Hill, Robert E.
Hopkins, Jack W.
Horrigan, James O.
Huhn, James V.
Huising, Don L.
Humphreys, James A., Jr.
Illig, Albert H.
Ingram, Henry V.
Inman, John P.
Jackson, Arthur D.
Johnson, David D.
Kelly, Robert C.
Kindley, William E., II
Kirchegessner, Robert A.
Lambert, David R.
Laveau, Phillip J., Jr.
Lochrie, Gilbert H.
Lockwood, Albert N.
Luallin, Norman D.
Luftglass, Murray A.
MacLafferty, Paul S.
Maier, Raymond G.
Maldonado, Teodosio
Martin, James H.
Mason, Albert G.
Matson, Richard L.
McCoy, Thomas E., Jr.
McDonald, Francis E.
McGowan, Joseph J., Jr.
McKeown, John M.
McVay, Richard L.
Miller, Allan R.
Mills, Richard F.
Morrison, Quinn B.
Murphy, Joseph W.
Murphy, Maurice J.
Needham, Thomas P.
Nelson, John R.
Nieder, John D.
Noel, William L.
Nulty, Jerome B.
Oelkers, Harvey S.
O'Malley, John A., Jr.
Palmer, William J., Jr.
Pancoast, John W., Jr.
Parker, William W.
Parks, Garnet R.
Patterson, Frank H., Jr.
Peters, Richard D.
Phypers, Dean P.
Picht, George C.
Polunsky, Robert "I"
Posey, Bruce G.
Poss, Henry M.
Potter, David W.
Pound, Carey
Rains, William D.
Rech, Henry J.
Rhodes, Daniel M.
Roman, William E,
Roper, Patrick E.
Rose, Robert Z.
Ross, John H.
Rowley, Allyn E.
Rupp, Glen L.
Sabec, Edwin J.
Sammons, Joseph E.
Sandrock, John E.
Schriner, James A.
Scrudato, Joseph F.
Sebes, Edward A.
Shipley, Robert W.
Smith, Charles E.
Smith, Reavell S.
Sovey, Louis T., Jr.
Strange, Hubert E., Jr.
Strickland, Robert L.
Sumner, William M.
Swanson, Bruce W.
Thompson, Gerald J.
Trueblood, Howard G.
Vandegriff, Alvin L.
Vanert, Willard L.
Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
Warren, Richard D.
Watt, Robert C.
Wells, John L., Jr.
Werfel, Merton A.
Whitney, William G.
Witzler, James D.
Wyman, Winthrop A.
Yake, Richard T.
York, William B., Jr.
Young, Wesley E.
Allen, Nellie K.
Antolowitz, Gertrude
Dunne, Cynthia C.
Tomsuden, Ruth M.
White, Joan L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bannister, William H.
Bortko, Walter S.
Coughlin, Richard D.
Current, Neal F.
Dixon, Olin L., III
Dodd, Joseph C.
Dufour, Richard M.
Fail, Raymond P., Jr.
Guernsey, John M.
Jay, Robert R.
Larue, Van B.
Longmire, Richard M.
Lookabaugh, Guy J.
McMillin, William B., Jr.
Mooney, Malcom T.
Nielsen, Thomas H.
Osborne, Robert F.
Scott, William, Jr.
Sullivan, Edward F.
Sutley, Robert M.
Thorpe, Lowell T.
Whitehurst, Marshall N., Jr.
Zimmerman, David C.
Zobel, William M.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Ambrose, Edward A.
Anderson, Floyd H., Jr.
Bean, Willis E.
Bender, Urban J.
Bennett, Paul P., Jr.
Blackmon, Edward H.
Brown, Staley W.
Browne, Weldon G., Jr.
Bryant, Billy "B"
Buckley, Emanuel N.
Campbell, Howard B.
Cloud, Joe W.
Cole, James R.
Costa, John F.
Daniel, Harold E.
Dean, Jerdon, J.
DeBerry, Patricia
Dolan, William R.
Doucet, Louis E.
Drake, Wilbur R.
Elliott, Gordon E.
Elmore, Milford D.
Flournoy, Rollin H.
Garver, Richard M.
Gill, Robert L.
Goding, Hubert M.
Green, Gale R.
Green, William J., Jr.
Guinn, John W.
Gutekunst, Richard R.
Harris, Albert C.
Havice, Andrew J.
Honish, Joseph E.
Howard, Wallace R.
Huff, Samuel L.
Hughes, Robert G.
Hypes, Kenton, Jr.
Irvin, Ernest J.
Johnson, Cecil R.

Jones, Earmon R.
Jordan, Charles J.
Jula, Paul N.
Karrer, John L.
Kirsch, Jean P.
Knight, Jerry B.
Kolb, William H.
Koon, Robert L.
Larson, Alfhild L.
Leonard, Russell D.
Lewis, Robert K.
Lewis, Thomas W.
Liedtke, Fred E.
Longest, Clifford B.
MacCraken, Raymond J.
Mangham, Alonzo L., Jr.
May, Carl R.
Mayfield, Kenneth D.
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.
McDuffie, Wilbur B.
McKay, Charles E.
Meyer, Robert E.
Newman, Buther L., Jr.
Oakes, Harry A.
O'Neill, Joseph M.
Owen, Orville K.
Peake, Stanley C.
Peppler, Leonard A.
Pike, William B.
Roman, Roy P.
Rossan, Richard N.
Shaffer, Weller J.
Smith, Denson L.
Steward, Edgar T.
Tapscott, Donald E.
Tedford, Charles F.
Thompson, John M.
Verme, Dominic A.
Vise, Lee P.
Walwick, Earle R.
Wells, John E.
White, Leland E.
Wilson, James R.
Wolf, John W.
Wylie, David M.
Young, Johnny W.

NURSE CORPS

Beck, Anne C.
Beveridge, Robina W.
Branam, Stella P.
Chandler, Rebecca
Chart, Helen L.
Cole, Helen M.
English, Mary F.
Fine, Rachel A.
Gallineau, Billie J.
Graves, Ellen G.
Gurgul, Stephanie D.
Jordan, Reba B.
Martin, Zuleime L.
Meyer, Florence M.
Michaud, Lucille M.
Moore, Elizabeth J.
Ortenzi, Filomena E.
Parker, Viola J.
Rinas, Agnes E.
Smalling, Floy I.
Trebbe, Myrtle F.
Welcer, Mary F.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent and temporary grades as indicated:

For permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Sellman, Lloyd E.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bayers, John A.
Foster, Paul L.
Piazza, Thomas J.
Wills, Donald S.
Lindgren, Paul W.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Hartman, Willard R.
Brown, Louis F.
Boyd, Paul C.

ENSIGN

Boyer, Charles L.
Frost, Shirley D.
Lemly, William D.
Meyers, Walter T.
Postak, John N.
Ryan, William J.
Sowinski, Stanislaus J.
Bolander, Jack C.
Woods, Robert C.
Wilson, Walter Q.
Schwartz, Robert J.
Hage, Jerald T.
Guhl, M. John

For temporary promotion:

LIEUTENANT

Bayers, John A.
Piazza, Thomas J.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Hartman, Willard R.
Brown, Louis F.
Boyd, Paul C.
Foster, Paul L.

The following-named ensigns of the line of the Navy for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

Agee, Aaron B.
Bigelow, David S.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Merica, Charles A.

Mitchell, Thomas J.
Olson, Paul D.
Tombari, Henry A.
Williams, Edward J., Jr.
Yoshihira, Takesha

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Amick, Donald D.
Anderson, James L.
Arceneaux, Ewell J.
Arnold, Ray W.
Bracey, Monroe L.
Cappeletto, Nicholas
Cutler, Lamont M.
Day, Leslie P.
Dubois, John H.
Fitzsimmons, Raymond F.
Fritz, Ivan L. P., Jr.
Fullinwider, John A.
Garner, George M.
Gidley, Ross E.
Godenius, Walter E. G.
Gordon, Abie
Grebenstein, Edward E., Jr.
Hammons, Elvis G.
Harris, James B., Jr.
Layman, Daniel F.
Lee, Joseph L.
Long, Guy M., Sr.
Luttge, William G.
Matson, Kenneth S.
McAlexander, Donald E.
Mullen, Joseph E., Jr.
Newman, Jack W.
Palonis, Anthony J., Jr.
Parker, Roy I.
Perkins, Hewitt C.
Ratigan, James W.
Ridgway, George A.
Simmons, Bernard P.
Skinner, Richard F.
Sperry, Willard J.
Steward, Jimmie L.
Vuckovich, Joe
Werder, Robert J.
White, John L.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ziegler, Adolph.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered last night before the convention of the Tax Executives Institute, Inc., at New York City.

There being no objection; the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE TAX EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE, INC., WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, American foreign policy is the people's business. There is no American man, woman, or child who will not be affected directly or indirectly by the present and future aspects of our foreign policy.

Our basic foreign policy is and should be peace with honor. This is far different from a policy of peace at any price.

As an example of our ultimate objective, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where for a long period of our history neither that country nor ours has found it necessary to have forts or military establishments for the purpose of defending one country against the other along the entire international frontier of 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We certainly hope that in our lifetime or the lifetime of our children all other nations not only in the Western Hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, might live together as good neighbors as we do with Canada.

If we are half as prudent as those who gave us this Republic and later ones who preserved the Union or helped to win and develop the great West, we will continue to work, hope, and pray for peace but we will keep our powder dry.

A climate is being promoted—in the Communist propaganda broadcasts, by party-line followers overseas and within the United States and by many good people who may honestly believe that even a survival under Communist tyranny would be preferable to the risk of no survival at all in the event of World War II—that anyone who questions Soviet good intentions is a warmonger.

According to this line of reasoning, George Washington would be considered a warmonger for having joined our other Founding Fathers in striking a blow for freedom.

Abraham Lincoln would fall into the same category for having taken the provocative step of supplying the Federal garrison at Fort Sumter.

And as for Patrick Henry—he, too, would be muzzled for his speech wherein he said:

"Is life so sweet and peace so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, almighty God. I care not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

On Wednesday, May 11, the Soviet Union proposed three resolutions in order to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

When the veneer of propaganda and doubletalk is removed we can see the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and obstruct rather than to clarify and expedite. The Soviet proposal is a fraud.

Let us examine their so-called disarmament proposal:

1. It would destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. The proposal claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. It provides for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic Ocean to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have) their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would at first also contemplate two Germanys—like divided Korea and Vietnam—each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the Western NATO defense alliance.

4. Our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a requisite for discontinuing the arms race. We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. Our industrial and scientific atomic know-how to be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal contemplates yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations and removal of the provocative 7th Fleet from the Far East, all of which con-

tribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

8. All the above steps to be carried out prior to getting down to the problems of an effective disarmament with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations "agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954."

Since the free-world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not, it sets as the starting point for future moves a topheavy Communist base.

In free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations is subject to debate and vote in parliament and congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely on their official figures 1 month after the Convention enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Since without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon communism could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of the same works to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5 wherein it states "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces * * * the states * * * assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

In the first phase of 1956, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad and return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic, and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific, whereas the Soviet Union pulls back 600 miles at the most.

The production of all atomic weapons to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Soviet locations are not known, and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

The subsequent assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals of the United States in the atomic- and conventional-weapon field is still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then sets up a limited type of inspection and control similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, to Yalta, and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China, and to Geneva and its impact upon Vietnam.

The heads of the free governments will be accountable and responsible to their people and to their Parliaments or Congress.

To whom will Bulganin be accountable? To the presidium or to Khrushchev? If Bulganin is indeed himself at the summit today, will he be there when the Big Four meet in June or July?

Are our western allies prepared to stand against a condemnation to perpetual slavery behind the Iron Curtain of the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, North Korea, and China?

Are we to insist on previous agreements being honored before we take the Soviet's word on a new scrap of paper?

Will plans for the Republic of Germany's part in a western defense be scrapped to placate the Russian bear?

We might recall Kipling's The Truce of the Bear. While this was written concerning the Imperial Russia of the Czar, it is more applicable to Soviet Russia today.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;
"When he stands up as pleading in wavering, man-brute guise,
"When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes;
"When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer;
"That is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear."

Will we insist on the Soviet Union withdrawing, as pledged, their troops from Rumania and Hungary when the Austrian Treaty is signed? Their only excuse for being in those two countries was to keep open lines of communication to their troops in Austria. Or will this promise also be overlooked in order not to offend the Muscovites?

There is no real reliable evidence to date that would warrant a prudent person in believing that the Soviet Union or international communism have changed their basic long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom. In discussing American foreign policy before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C., on April 22, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, said:

"The Communist enemy, regardless of any momentary change of tactics, regardless of any treaty the Kremlin may sign, is bent on conquering the entire world—the United States not excluded—and remolding it in the form of the totalitarian dictatorship and slave economy imposed on the people behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia, Rumania, Outer Mongolia, and on the Chinese mainland. American labor never can be, and never will, be submissive or neutral toward such a total menace."

Certainly, American businessmen and the public generally should be no less alert to the dangers of communism than is the American Federation of Labor, as so ably and courageously expressed by the president of that great organization.

International treachery, individual and collective deception, high-level assassination, and rank and file cold-blooded murder have been, and are, today accepted Communist doctrine. The Communist leopard has not changed its spots, because Chou En-lai and Molotov happen to smile rather than to frown on any given day.

Our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support, and what retards it we should oppose.

The age of colonialism in Asia is dead. The people in that part of the world want no part of it. Any American policy in that part of the world will suffer a handicap if it is tied directly or indirectly to European colonialism.

Nowhere in the long history of Russia under the Czars or under the Commissars is there anything equal to the United States establishing the free and independent Philippine Republic nor, for that matter, is there anything equal to Great Britain setting up a free and independent India, Pakistan, and Burma.

To the contrary, during the same period the Soviet Union was destroying the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, though they had signed treaties of friendship and nonaggression with all three of those Baltic Republics.

Americans must never lose sight of the fact that ours—at the time of our independence and today—is the authentic revolution. It not only freed us from colonial rule, but it developed a charter of liberty which established a constitutional form of government to serve us for all time to come.

Other nations have had their revolutions, but either immediately or in the not distant future the people found they had supplanted one ruler for an even more despotic one.

We should be proud of our revolutionary past and help to encourage in the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain the revolutionary zeal for freedom which won us a nation.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the agressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties, including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

How can our associates even consider compromising principle and honor to that extent? What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

How long is the United Nations going to pussyfoot on this question of American prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice? Of the 15 the Chinese Communists admit holding, 11 have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years.

These men were shot down in January of 1953. Last fall it was suggested in Government quarters than public discussion be held down until Mr. Hammarskjold had completed his mission to Peiping.

He came back in January and held a press conference in New York on January 14 in which he admitted that the prisoners had not been released nor did he have any firm commitment as to when they would be released.

It was suggested again in Government and United Nations quarters that the American Congress and the American people be patient and that perhaps Chou En-lai would release them prior to the Bandung Conference.

The Bandung Conference has now come and gone and the prisoners have not been released.

Are we expected to wait until these prisoners have been completely brainwashed and

then released to serve the Communist propaganda purposes as has been the case of some of the civilians?

It is time for Mr. Hammarskjold to make his report to the United Nations and to the people of America.

What is intended to be done about Communist failure to comply with the terms of the Korean armistice?

If the United Nations as an organization is paralyzed from taking action, then the Government of the United States has an obligation to men wearing the uniform of this country to take some effective steps in getting our men released.

There was a time at the turn of the century when a single American civilian held as a captive brought from President Theodore Roosevelt the effective ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Now our associates want to reward the Communists with membership in the United Nations.

Have we forgotten the bibilical injunction in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has lgiht with darkness?"

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu and admission into the United Nations. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and the Pescadores.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist-pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou en-lai.

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American's.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

Export of Scrap Iron and Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whatever may be the intentions, some of our shortsighted policies are actually helping Soviet Russia. There seems to be considerable confusion between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State over the matter of the export of scrap iron from the United States. I do not think it is too much to ask that the Department of Commerce and the Department of State pass 1 or 2 resolutions, first, that they are part of the same Government; and, second, that it might be well, since they might agree that they are part of the same Government, to have a uniform policy on a matter which affects our foreign trade and foreign policy.

Our domestic steel industry is trying to compel Western Europe to buy semi-finished steel or finished steel. They are trying to prohibit export of scrap iron and seem to have the blessing of the Department of Commerce in doing so. As a result, they are unknowingly or otherwise providing Russia with a powerful lever to force Western Europe to ship copper to them, despite the free world shortage of copper and the fact that it is a strategic material badly needed in Russia.

I respectfully suggest it is time for the White House to take a look at conflicting viewpoints between the Department of State and the Department of Commerce on this issue, and establish an American policy that takes into account what Russia is doing to take advantage of the present situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, April 13, telling of a talk on this situation by Eliot Janeway, a recognized authority on economic research.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRAP EXPORT IMPASSE SEEN AIDING RUSSIA—REDS GETTING COPPER IN DEAL WITH BRITAIN, ECONOMIST REPORTS

The problem of export of scrap iron and steel to Europe is tied in with Russian procurement of copper and presents a knotty problem to the administration in Washington, in the opinion of a New York economist.

Eliot Janeway, of New York, editor of Janeway's Memos, an economic service to business, was in Pittsburgh last night to address the advance management group of the School of Industrial Administration of Carnegie Institute of Technology in Webster Hall Hotel.

DECISION UP TO WHITE HOUSE

Many of the ideas discussed with a reporter were touched upon in the economist's address.

It is his opinion that the White House will have to decide the question of whether unrestricted scrap exports to Europe shall be permitted. At present, there is a trickle of scrap exports under license.

The State Department has decided there is no scrap shortage in the United States, while the Commerce Department is in the corner of steel producers, who wish scrap exports to be prohibited. The steel industry says, in effect, that if Europe needs metals, it should buy semi-finished or finished steel.

RUSSIA SHIPPING TO ENGLAND

During the impasse, according to Janeway, Russia is shipping pig iron to England at a delivered price slightly under the delivered price of American steel scrap there. As part of the pig iron deal, there is a reciprocity arrangement, he said, whereby England supplies Russia with badly needed copper.

Janeway said that the decision on larger scrap steel exports should be made on a basis of the least cost to the American economy. In any event, he is in favor of permitting scrap exports only if the steel made from it is used by Western Europe for defense purposes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the inspiration of all sincere and earnest prayers and their only answer, help us to believe and know that the secret of a happy and victorious life is to be found in a mind and heart inhabited and controlled by Thy Spirit.

May we begin this new week with the glad assurance that what we need more than anything else in the strain and stress of life, both for our peace and power, is Thy divine presence and guidance.

Inspire us with the certainty that there are no crises we cannot face, no temptations we cannot master, no problems we cannot solve, no wrongs we cannot set right, and no victories for righteousness and justice we cannot win when Thou art our companion and counselor.

Grant that we may never become disheartened and discouraged as we continue to set ourselves to the difficult task of building a nobler civilization and seek to help all mankind achieve the highest and happiest kind of life.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;
H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;
H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;
H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;
H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;
H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;
H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;
H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;
H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;
H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;
H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;
H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;
H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;
H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;
H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;
H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;
H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;
H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;
H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;
H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;
H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);
H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;
H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha;
H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;
H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath;
H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;
H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;
H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;
H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;
H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;
H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee;
H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;
H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;
H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;
H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;
H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;
H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);
H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;
H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;
H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;
H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;
H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;
H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;
H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;
H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;
H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and
H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children, George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv;
H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly;
H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;
H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; and
H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;
S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller;
S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;
S. 715. An act for the relief of Toy Lin Chen;
S. 892. An act for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez;
S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox;
S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kawar;
S. 1513. An act for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis;
S. 1517. An act for the relief of Rosita A. Jocson;
S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian;
S. 1581. An act for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis;
S. 1645. An act to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association;
S. 1654. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa;
S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri;
S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.;
S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; and
S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Scalo.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. WHITTEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the investigation of the air-navigation system generally known as visual omnirange distance measuring equipment tactical air navigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DAVY CROCKETT

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, interest in the Davy Crockett story is not confined to the boys and girls of this country. Last Thursday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], speaking in the well of the House, referred to that story and drew certain lessons from the record and career of this great American when he served as a Member of the Congress more than 100 years ago. Davy Crockett is generally understood to have been a native of the State of Tennessee. A mere statement of that fact, however, does not tell the entire story. When Davy Crockett was born on August 17, 1786, the State of Tennessee was not in existence. It was then a part of the territory which comprised the State of North Carolina. So it can fairly be said, Mr. Speaker, that Davy Crockett was a Tar Heel born, although we will have to concede that he was not a Tar Heel bred, and when he died he was not a Tar Heel dead. But we take great pride in the fact that he was born a resident of our State.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate that what the gentleman has said is historically correct; but in view of the popularity of the present song, the record of history probably will show that he was born on a mountaintop in Tennessee.

Mr. JONAS. I think that is true; but we in North Carolina have a right to claim part of the credit for this great American.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 231 will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126, to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H. R. 2126 would amend the Saline Water Act of 1952, to provide for uninterrupted continuation of the saline water conversion research program. The act of 1952 had authorized the appropriation of $2 million to carry on a 5-year research program in order to develop economically feasible methods of converting sea and other saline waters to fresh water of a quality suitable for agricultural, municipal, and other uses. If H. R. 2126 is passed, the period of the research program would be extended, the amount authorized to be appropriated for conducting this research would be increased, and finally the bill would permit research to be carried on within specific areas in existing Government laboratories.

The report on H. R. 2126 indicates that the extension of this legislation is necessary at this time because under the provisions of the Saline Water Act of 1952 all work must be completed prior to July 15, 1957. Thus the report goes on to state that the most active research would have to be terminated by about December 1955 in order that the work might be completed under the present contracts and that the reports might be submitted by the deadline of July 1957.

Specifically H. R. 2126 would provide for the uninterrupted continuation of the saline water research program and would permit the officials in charge of the program to have the use and the help of a certain amount of technical assistance from existing Federal scientific facilities. The bill would amend present law to permit use of the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories. The present act would be amended to raise the limit of funds authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $6 million. Out of this amount, not more than $1,500,000 could be used for the direction of the program and for the correlation and coordination of the studies and information and not more than $500,000 could be spent for research and development in Federal laboratories. The program itself would be extended through fiscal year 1963 and would provide for 1 additional year for correlating and coordinating the results, studies, and research undertaken under the program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Department of the Interior also favors its enactment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to this rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTEND HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon unanimous consent will be asked for the consideration of a resolution to extend the Hoover Commission for 30 days until June 30. Under present law it expires this May 31. This resolution would give it 30 more days, or until June 30, to makes its reports, and then 90 additional days to liquidate. It is my understanding that all reports will be filed within the 30 additional days.

This morning you as Members of the House received a document on business enterprise.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it might clarify the thinking of the Members to point out that the 30-day extension would apply to the life of the Commission itself for the purpose of making its reports. The Commission would not be in existence during the 90-day period. That would simply permit the Chairman of the Commission to return to the proper agencies of the Government and to the Treasury and moneys left over, and all this and that. It is simply to wind up the activities of the Commission. The Commission itself would come to an end on June 30.

Mr. PATMAN. That means that all reports will have been made, of all types and characters?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All reports, yes. One of the purposes of the resolution is to give time to get these reports printed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this time was given to me in order that I may speak on this matter now and not get the time by reserving the right to object to the consideration of the resolution when it comes up. I have no objection to the resolution to extend the Commission 30 days, although I am not in favor of the Hoover Commission, but I would certainly be against the creation of another Hoover Commission. I feel that this is the last commission of that type we will have in the Congress. I hope so, because I think we made a serious mistake in starting out on this approach.

In the 80th Congress, when the question was first submitted to us, of having a bipartisan commission composed of a former President of the United States, who certainly knew something about the executive branch, to head the Commission as chairman, and an outstanding Democrat to be vice chairman, and the Commission to be composed of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats in order to make a study and an investigation to prevent duplication of effort in the Government, and to prevent waste and extravagance, it certainly did appeal to all Members of the House. I know it appealed to me. It passed unanimously. It was a fine approach. It was looked upon favorably. And it was all right—they did some fine work. But then in the 83d Congress, which was 2 years ago, a resolution was passed to provide for another Hoover Commission. We naturally looked upon it as a continuation of the first Commission. But it is not a continuation of the first one. Instead of just investigating waste and extravagance, it is also going into the policymaking business as the Commission feels it has the authority to go into policymaking.

A PART OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH?

The other day I was attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and I heard a chairman, Mr. J. P. Binns, of one of the Hoover Commission task forces make the statement for the record in writing that the Attorney General of the United States has ruled that the Hoover Commission is part of the legislative branch of the Government. Let me repeat that—that the Attorney General of the United States has ruled that the Hoover Commission is a part of the legislative branch of the Government. That was disturbing to me and it should be disturbing to every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You know that he cannot do any such thing as that. He cannot create a Commission. What are you talking about?

Mr. PATMAN. He has a ruling that it is part of the legislative body. Now that means that we have delegated a lot of power to an outside group. That means that we have farmed out to an outside group a lot of power that we should exercise as the legislative Representatives of the people. Under the Constitution we have the three separate branches of government. All legislative powers, of course, are vested in the House of Representatives and the Senate. There is no question about it. It is our duty. We

are elected by the people here in the House of Representatives. Every person here is elected. Not one has ever been appointed and under our present system, no one will ever be appointed to the House of Representatives. In the other body, of course, under certain conditions, a Member can be appointed by the governor of a State until the next election, but they are generally selected and elected by the people. So in these two bodies, the legislative power is in the House and Senate, the Members of which are elected by the people, and we are charged with the duty of doing all the legislative work that is to be done under our form of government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why you know and every schoolboy knows that the legislative power—the first 15 words of the Constitution state that the legislative power is vested in the Congress. So what are you talking about? What is the idea?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I thought the gentleman would be disturbed when he found out that he actually, he and I, delegated some of that power we did not know we delegated to this Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, we cannot do that.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we have anyway according to the report of the ruling of the Attorney General of the United States. We have anyway.

Mr. Speaker, whenever there is a suggestion of a change in our Government coming from anyone, and I do not care where such a suggestion may originate, that suggestion and idea should be given consideration. Whether such a suggestion comes from the Hoover Commission or from any member of a task force or anyone else, it should be given consideration.

But who should consider it? Should some outside agency consider it? No. A committee of the Congress should consider it. A congressional committee should have before it any person it wants to hear. Mr. Hoover? Certainly, he should be heard, but he should be heard before a congressional committee. Certainly members of the task forces, who have unusual knowledge and information about subjects which they are on the task force to represent, should be heard, not by an outside agency or an outside commission, but should be heard by a recognized committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate. In other words, when you delegate to a group to assemble facts for you, as the Hoover Commission has been doing, whenever you delegate to a group to present to you conclusions on which to act and pass legislation, we are going beyond what was intended in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If what you say is true, that the Congress delegated legislative power to the Hoover Commission, how come it does not legislate? What are we doing here?

Mr. PATMAN. They do not legislate, but they have a lot to do with legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, you say we delegated legislative power to the Hoover Commission.

Mr. PATMAN. I will explain to you what I mean.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very well. I am listening.

Mr. PATMAN. We have delegated or farmed out important functions of the legislative branch; that is, to let a private agency—and some of them have conflicting interests—get up the facts for the Congress and present to us conclusions for us based on their assembled facts to act on. We do not have any of the detailed information. They have that in their own files, but they get up the facts as they want them assembled for presentation. They arrive at their conclusions and present them to us, and then they try to force those conclusions through in the form of a law. Therefore, they have an important legislative function to perform, and they are performing it. They have an important agency. Of course, it is unofficial, but they have an important agency to help them. It is the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

Before you received this booklet on Business Enterprises that came in this morning, the most recent report of the Hoover Commission, you received on Saturday or Sunday, or 1 or 2 days before, this report from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, telling you about this Business Enterprises report. In other words, this lobbying organization gets the information first from the Hoover Commission and the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; this lobbying organization gives you a clarification, evaluation, and appraisal of what the Hoover Commission has done through it, the lobbying group; that is, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Of whom are they composed? Some of the finest and best people in the country but most of them have their own axes to grind. They solicit contributions from the biggest corporations in the country to carry on this pressure group. They get contributions from corporations, individuals, and everybody. They are a lobbying organization, but yet they have not registered. I do not know why they have not. They should. They are violating the law. There are 33 smaller, little Hoover organizations in the States. They have not registered either. They are raising money. They are trying to pressure Congress into passing laws. They are violating the Lobbying Act. They have not registered either. Yet we get this information through this lobbying organization, this unregistered lobbying organization.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just who is violating the law? What law are they violating?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we have the Lobby Registration Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know about that, but who is violating it?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going into the details, but the Lobbying Act provides that people who are raising money to pressure Congress are supposed to register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. They have not done it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without getting into the friendly colloquy between the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan in talking about violations, something may not be legalistically a violation, but the spirit of the law could be violated.

Mr. PATMAN. This is both, in the spirit and the plain letter of the law. There is no question on earth about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not quite understand the gentleman's argument. It seems to me, from my viewpoint, that what the Hoover Committee does is to gather facts and then make certain deductions. When we pass on one of their proposals, if we are interested, and I have been interested in some, and need a factual statement on which they support their conclusions, it is submitted. If we do not like their proposal we turn it down. How in the world does that infringe on the powers of Congress? I really cannot understand the gentleman, and he is one of the most intelligent men in Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, and I will state that I know the gentleman from California is a very sincere and able Member of this House. He asked a question expecting a sincere answer; he sincerely asked it and I will try my best to answer it.

The truth is that this power delegated to the Hoover Commission has been farmed out and delegated—this power from the Congress. It was in the 80th Congress to investigate waste and extravagance, but since the last Hoover Commission was organized they have gone out into policymaking. So there is where they overreach into the legislative.

If all the committees would do as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] suggests that his committee would be expected to do, it would be all right; but they have not been doing that, and they are not going to do it. What they should do, just like the gentleman from California said his committee would do, is to call Mr. Hoover up before the committee and say: "Mr. Hoover, you have made certain recommendations here; upon what do you base them?"

Then he would turn to one of his task forces for assistance. He has a task force of 15 to 25 men on every subject. He would ask the chairman of the task force to come around and explain it to the members. He has volumes of information and testimony, files filled with all kinds of documentary evidence, which, of course, the gentleman is not going into. From that information, from these facts he has gotten up certain conclusions which he is giving to you, and this Hoover Commission back in the gentleman's home State is wiring him every day and every night, and writing him letters and putting on a propaganda campaign: "Be sure and pass Hoover recommendation No. 4. Pass Hoover recommendation No. 4; we want it done."

There is where the pressure comes in and whether you are a Member of Congress or not, you will forget the facts and the conclusions they arrived at and begin to think about Hoover recommendation No. 4, or whatever the number is.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Many people get letters from a great many groups in the country, but we do not always give in to the so-called pressure. Most of the men I know in Congress abhor pressure, and I really cannot see why the committee that has to do with this subject cannot call Mr. Hoover, if it wishes his conclusions fortified by evidence taken by the Commission or one of the task forces. It could subpena him and question him concerning his conclusions. Customarily a recommendation by the Hoover Commission is accompanied by a full explanation in writing to support its conclusions. The congressional committee would not have to accept the recommendation and, of course, neither of the branches of the Congress would have to accept it. But just the mere fact that Mr. Hoover does not always appear as a witness should not condemn what he has asked the Congress to do, which I think is usually very constructive.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman believes, then, that they should call Mr. Hoover and the members of the task force that made the recommendations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I said they could do it if they wished to.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think they should?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not want to tell congressional committees what they should do, but we have had Mr. Hoover before the Armed Services Committee of the House on several occasions to explain various matters to us.

Mr. PATMAN. For the gentleman's information, every time the members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report sends out something to their Members that needs legislation to carry out the Hoover recommendation it gives them the names of the members of the Senate committee that will handle it, the States that the members are from, and also gives you the names of the House committee and the States that they are from, so that the people can immediately commence pressuring these members to get a bill out of committee. That is bypassing Congress to that extent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman is sincere in everything he said, but I believe he should differentiate in his own mind and we should differentiate in our minds, individually and collectively, between the so-called Hoover Commission and the voluntary National Committee for the Hoover Report, which is an entirely separate organization and over which the Hoover Commission has no control.

Mr. PATMAN. May I interrupt to say that Mr. Hoover is the president of that organization. He is the honorary president of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He certainly is not the honorary president of that organization.

Mr. PATMAN. But he is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He has been given certain recognition through it, but he does not control or run it and the Commission certainly does not. I as one member of the Commission want to say that I had nothing to do with the selection or organization of any committee in support of or in opposition to any of the Hoover reports. If Mr. Hoover has had any connection with that organization it is purely a personal matter and one that has not been done by the committee, which is an arm of the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Some of your task force members are directors of the Citizen Committee for the Hoover Report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate the fact that perhaps the gentleman as a Member of Congress may also be interested in some outside activities.

Mr. PATMAN. Not like this and no other Members either.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is an author in his spare time and he has done a very good job. Let us try to differentiate and not try to tie the two together. I would like to point out one other thing if I may. That is that any suggestion or recommendation or finding of the Hoover Commission comes to the Congress and it is entirely up to the Congress as to what may or may not be done with it. The Commission itself does not legislate.

Mr. PATMAN. I am going to conclude with the expression of the hope that every committee that has anything to do with these reports will call not only Mr. Hoover but members of the Commission who know anything about the reports and also the task forces. Remember, these task forces are the only ones that did the work and they are exempt from the conflict in interest statute. A lot of them are interested adversely to the Government on these reports. They admit that and they know it. They are serving without compensation from the Government, but are paid by their private employers, there is no question about that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, of course, well knows that the various committees of the Congress do call members of these task forces before them. For instance, last week where there was a question or a dispute that arose between some of the military departments and some of the members of the task force in their report, a committee of the House, the Committee on Government Operations, did hold a hearing and heard witnesses from both the task force and from the military department involved. I believe also that the gentleman from Texas appeared before that committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

AN EXACT COPY OF ACT CREATING HOOVER COMMISSION

I am inserting a copy of Public Law 108, 83d Congress, which created the Hoover Commission during the 1st session of Congress of President Eisenhower's administration. It is as follows:

[Public Law 108, 83d Cong., ch. 184, 1st sess.]

S. 106

An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;

(5) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;

(6) defining responsibilities of officials; and

(7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government except the Judiciary and the Congress of the United States to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time, or times, as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1955, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Approved July 10, 1953.

I desire to particularly call your attention to the following facts:

First. That a Commission of 12 members is established to carry out the declared policy.

Second. That a member of the Commission, or any individual employed by the Commission, shall be exempt from the laws prohibiting such a person from serving who has an interest in conflict with the United States Government.

Third. The 12 members are appointed; 4 by the President, 4 by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Fourth. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, section 4.

Fifth. The appointments made by the Commission are exempt from the provisions of civil-service laws and the classification acts.

Sixth. An appropriation is authorized, which up to date has been about $2,585,059 for less than 2 years' work, and the Commission is asking for about $350,000 more, which will make over $3 million in all.

Seventh. The Commission is authorized to make a study of all agencies of the Government except the Judiciary and the Congress.

Eighth. A comprehensive report of its activities was required to be made to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, with a final report not later than May 31, 1955.

Ninth. The Commission is authorized to have hearings and to sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such documents as the Commission or the subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

SPECIFIC CRITICISMS OF THE COMMISSION ASSUMING POLICYMAKING POWER IT DOES NOT HAVE

I desire to invite the attention of the Members to certain criticisms of the present Commission that I believe are justified, as follows:

First. It is not a bipartisan commission as advertised by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and by the Hoover Commission itself. It is composed of 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats. The people are led to believe by the statements issued by Mr. Hoover and others that it is a bipartisan commission like the first Hoover Commission, under President Truman, set up in 1949. The first Commission was bipartisan, composed of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats, with Mr. Hoover, a Republican, as chairman, and Mr. Dean Acheson, a Democrat, as vice chairman.

Second. Mr. Hoover has refused to put the question to the Commission of the selection of a vice chairman, and this new Commission has never had a vice chairman, which is contrary to the plain language of the law. This gives the chairman full authority. It creates a doubt as to the legality of the whole Commission as it is not organized in accordance with the plain language of the law under section 4 of the act creating the Commission. Section 10 of the act gives the vice chairman specific responsibility.

Third. A Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report is set up with Mr. Hoover, chairman of the Commission, as honorary chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Many individuals connected with the Hoover Commission are members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and some are directors. This committee receives advance copies of all reports of the Hoover Commission and takes care of the public relations and releases publicity favorable to the Hoover Commission when the reports are released. In fact, a Member of Congress almost invariably receives a report from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report in the same mail with the report the Commission itself is making on the subject or ahead of it.

Fourth. The law setting up the Hoover Commission does not permit the establishment of a subcommittee, or a task force, to do the work of the Commission. The work must be directed, including all hearings, by the Commission itself, or by a subcommittee of the Commission, or a member of the Commission. Instead, Chairman Hoover has organized what is called task forces that have conducted the hearings without the presence of a member of the Commission.

Fifth. The Attorney General of the United States has ruled that the Hoover Commission is a part of the legislative branch of the Government, according to the testimony of J. P. Binn, chairman of a task force before the Committee on Government Operations of the House last week. This means that Congress has farmed out part of its legislative duties, and, further, members and employees of the Commission should take the oath of office as other public officials are required to take.

Sixth. Under the first Hoover Commission in 1949, task force members were selected, subject to the approval of the whole Commission. Under this new setup, or present Hoover Commission, the

Chairman received authority from a majority of the other members of the Commission to make all the appointments himself without referring them to the Commission for approval, and having no Vice Chairman, Mr. Hoover did all the appointing and confirming himself.

Seventh. This Commission has encouraged a lobbying organization, a Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, that is acting contrary to the law requiring the registration of lobbyists. The national organization is not registered; neither is any State organization of this group registered. This is in plain violation of the law.

Eighth. A careful reading of the act creating the present Hoover Commission will disclose that it does not give the Commission policymaking powers as assumed by the Commission.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE FIRST HOOVER COMMISSION

In the publication by a citizen's committee for the Hoover Report published in the latter part of 1953, it was stated:

Groups of distinguished citizens who are familiar with a specific field to be reviewed and unbiased in their approach to the problem make a study of broad fields of Government activity and administration. Subsequently the task forces formulate their conclusions and make recommendations to the Commission.

Up to this time the Commission has set up about 12 task forces bearing from 8 to 26 members each. There are now 140 members on its staff. In an address that Mr. Hoover delivered at the National Press Club March 10, 1954, he stated:

Last time we had a limited authority. It did not cover policy questions. This time our authority to inquire and to recommend is almost unlimited. The law provides, however, that we leave the Congress alone. This time we are required to present the actual legislation which will express our recommendations in legal terms. This time we have some teeth. We can subpena documents and persons.

No one would minimize the immense importance of inquiries by congressional committees. The difference is that they are seldom specialists in these matters. And among their multitude of responsibilities they have little time or staff for such highly technical inquiries. Moreover, few Members of the Congress have served in the executive branch of the Government.

Up to date we have set up 10 task forces, varying from 8 to 26 members on each. The 140 members of our staff, so far chosen, are solely from among professional men, business executives, or former Government employees. They are all men in responsible positions outside the Government. Government spending and taxes are no academic abstraction to them. They cause them acute grief.

CONGRESS FARMING ITS WORK OUT?

These task forces are being called upon to perform duties that Members of Congress are charged with performing. Members of Congress are elected by the people for that purpose. There is no reason why Congressmen should farm this work out to private groups. If Members were given the same help that experts, economists, and technical advisers can give and has provided to these task forces, the Congressmen could perform these duties much better and more satisfactorily. Mr. Hoover says that the Congressmen have little time or staff for such highly technical inquiries. This can be overcome. Congressmen on committees occupy a position similar to a judge or a jury in a trial of a case in the courthouse. They listen to all the testimony and then make up their minds. That is much better from the standpoint of the people than having people who are biased or prejudiced serving on these task forces and who are not charged with the responsibility of protecting the people's interest. Furthermore if Congressmen are conducting the hearing, they will make up their minds how to vote on a proposal. A task force member can only help prepare a record for the information of Congress. If task force members should desire, they could very easily prepare a record that would support their personal views.

Mr. Hoover in a letter to the press January 13, 1954, stated:

For the purpose of amassing the facts each task force has been given adequate research staff.

Considering the fact that a member of the task force is paid $50 a day and expenses for the time that he serves and considering the cost to the Government for other purposes including experts, economists, and other help, it would probably be less expensive to the Government to furnish each Member of Congress an administrative assistant which would put the Members in a position to do the work and do it in a more satisfactory way than the Hoover Commission.

It will take a lot of congressional committees to spend as much as this second Hoover Commission is spending.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR HOOVER REPORT WRITES SPEECHES FOR CANDIDATES IN 1954 CAMPAIGN

In 1954, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report prepared and sent out to congressional candidates what was called Congressional Candidate's Packet on Better Government.

It was an elaborately prepared brochure setting forth what was considered great accomplishments of the first Hoover Commission and the great accomplishments expected and aims of the new Hoover Commission.

It stated:

This kit has been prepared by the bipartisan Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. * * * It is being sent simultaneously to all candidates of both parties.

It further stated:

The Citizens Committee believes that this is a splendid opportunity for candidates of both parties * * * to encourage the new Commission in its endeavors.

After the first page, there is a suggested plank for a congressional platform, pledging support of all Hoover Commission recommendations which further the objective of better government. Also attached is a self-addressed, stamped postal card to be returned by the candidate to let the Citizens Committee know that the packet has been received and he will make active use of it and that "I subscribe to its objective of a more economical and efficient Federal Government." Also enclosed is a suggested speech for use by congressional candidates, starting off:

It is a great pleasure to be with you today and to talk briefly—yet earnestly and with all the strength at my command—of the vital need in this country for better, more efficient, and less expensive government. More than that, I want to go on record at this time in pledging my full support to these principles. You may be assured that, if I am elected by the people of this district on November 2, I will do everything in my power to insure that American taxpayers get a genuine dollar's worth of service for every dollar they pay in taxes.

I am in strong accord, as I believe you are, with the action taken by the Congress last year when it unanimously established another bipartisan Hoover Commission. * * * Last year a new Hoover Commission was created—again bipartisan in its membership and again searching for new ways and means of saving money for the taxpayers. * * *

In conclusion, I would be remiss if I were not to express my thanks to each of you for the interest you have shown in my candidacy. Your support is something I cherish today and shall cherish always.

One final word—I want to restate my pledge to do everything in my power to insure that the American taxpayers get a genuine dollar's worth of services for every dollar they pay in taxes. I promise you I shall never give up in my fight for better government.

PRESS RELEASE ALSO PREPARED

After the suggested speech, there is a press release on the speech by a congressional candidate, which is already prepared with nothing remaining to be done except the insertion of the candidate's name and the district and State that he is from. The release also contained the following statement, which was in the prepared speech:

I am in strong accord, as I believe you are, with the action taken by the Congress last year when it unanimously established another bipartisan Hoover Commission. * * * I support the objectives of the Commission and intend to carefully review its forthcoming recommendations and give my utmost backing to those which carry clear promise of Federal economy and efficiency.

In outlining his stand on the need for continued vigilance and active interest in the operations of the Federal Government _____ referred to five specific
(Name of candidate)
instances of waste uncovered in congressional findings and through researches of the original Hoover Commission:

1. A congressional committee found that the Federal Government was supplying certain American employees in Germany with 12 water glasses—and a total of 84 liquor, beer, and wine glasses—all at the taxpayers' expense.

2. The Post Office Department was spending over twice as much money in shipping concrete mailbox posts to the west coast as the posts themselves cost in the first place.

3. In the Panama Canal Zone the Federal Government has 5 bakeries. One of these alone can produce enough bread to fill the need.

4. The Federal Government has accumulated enough records to fill eight Pentagons.

5. The Federal Government has made loans to such enterprises as: (a) A pet hospital, (b) a jukebox operator, (c) a beauty parlor, (d) an interior decorator, and (e) a snake farm.

Candidate _____ told his audi-
(Name of candidate)
ence that "The people of this district can rest assured that, if elected to office, I will lend my best efforts to prevent and stop any

such examples of waste and inefficiency in the Government's administration and operations." Mr. _____ concluded by
(Name of candidate)
promising that he would never give up in his fight for better government.

In order, doubtless, to properly inflame the minds of the candidates and to enable the candidates to inflame the minds of the voters, a statement was inserted in the packet on conspicuously colored paper, as follows:

WASTE OF THE TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

Set forth below are 10 examples of governmental waste: Only continuous vigilance by the Executive, the Congress, and the public will prevent such instances from occurring in the future.

1. Overseas activities: A congressional committee found that the Federal Government was supplying certain American employees in Germany with 12 water glasses—and a total of 84 liquor, beer, and wine glasses—all at the taxpayers' expense.

2. Public lands: One vast stretch of public land in Oregon is owned by the Federal Government. Divided into squares, 1 mile by 1 mile, 1 Federal Department administers the odd-numbered squares and another Department administers the even-numbered squares.

3. * * *.

4. Competition with private business: The Government runs hotels, tugboats, and banks. It manufactures paper, rope, rum, clothing, spectacles, and false teeth.

5. Red tape: Each year the Federal Government writes and produces approximately 9,800,000,000 pieces of paper, or 196 pieces of paper for each family in the United States.

6. Personnel: The Federal Government not long ago spent $500,000 in an unsuccessful endeavor to remove one employee.

7. * * *.

8. Surplus files: The Federal Government has accumulated enough records to fill eight Pentagons.

9. Money for nothing: Some Federal business enterprises are permitted to buy Government bonds with interest-free money that the Government loaned them in the first place.

10. The President: Sixty-five agencies report directly to the President. If he were to spend even 1 hour a week supervising each, how could he possibly have time for his other important official duties?

Such charges are a reflection on the agencies involved and are not complimentary to Congress or congressional committees.

HORRID EXAMPLES AND APPEALS TO PREJUDICE

Excerpt from February 25, 1955, issue of Washington Report, published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., editorial entitled "Two Hundred and Fifty Million Dollars Savings—Hoover Commission Offers Way To Cut Government Red Tape":

Here is a selection of these facts which you may find worth passing on to your friends, employees, and community leaders:

Paperwork in the Federal Government costs taxpayers $4 billion annually.

The average family pays Uncle Sam $100 a year as its share of the paperwork burden.

The $4 billion annual paperwork cost is 12 times the total national budget in 1912.

The Federal Government produces 25 billion pieces of paper annually.

End to end, these pieces of paper would reach to the moon 13 times.

About 750,000 Federal employees are required to handle the paperwork.

In 40 years the volume of Government letters has increased 60 times.

Letterwriting has outpaced the growth of Government personnel 10 times.

Government records would fill a file drawer reaching from the Pentagon to the Kremlin.

The quarter of a billion dollars which would be saved annually through the Commission's program could supply 250,000 families with a $1,000 downpayment on new homes.

ADMITS PRESSURE GROUPS

Excerpt from a reprint of a portion of Newsweek, October 18, 1954, issue, under heading "Big Government: The Hoover Team's Attack":

But the Commission's work will only be a starter in the tremendous task of setting the Federal Bureaucracy in order. Inertia and special interest will be stumbling blocks. But a counterpressure will work for enactment of the commission's recommendations—the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. This pressure group to end pressure groups has been systematically mobilizing public opinion. And it will fight tenaciously for the kind of good government which it believes "big government" precludes.

This reprint was sent out by the Citizents Committee for the Hoover Report just before the general election November 2, 1954.

SECRETARY WILSON WARNS SERVICEMEN TO BEWARE OF SUCH UNAMERICAN METHODS

Excerpt from publication, You and Your USA, April 14, 1954, issue, published by the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C., Hon. C. E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense:

Most pressure groups are watching out for the interests of some group of people. However, there are two dangers we should know about. First, we should not permit a pressure group to force through a proposal which will benefit one group at the expense of all the rest of us. Second, pressure groups sometimes use unethical means to achieve their objectives. In trying to win public support, they often arouse emotions and avoid the appeal to good judgment. Any organization which attempts to influence people by taking advantage of their prejudices is employing un-American methods of persuasion. The American way is through an appeal to the intelligence.

Notice what Secretary Wilson says about appeals to prejudice. Is that what the Hoover Commission is doing?

NOT INTENDED TO BE BIPARTISAN

In the packet also was a statement about the accomplishments of the Hoover Commission, which was referred to as a bipartisan commission. This reference to a bipartisan commission as the first Commission was bipartisan, but when the resolution passed in the 83d Congress to establish the second Hoover Commission, the word bipartisan was deliberately stricken out so that the authors evidently did not intend it to be a bipartisan commission.

In the packet also was a three-page statement about the facts regarding the new Hoover Commission, which contains the following paragraph:

THE COMMISSION'S METHOD OF ORGANIZATION

The Commission has utilized the task force approach to meet its problems. For each area to be examined a group of eminent citizens who have a proven competence in the field have been appointed. These task forces vary from 5 to 26 members, the total, including consultants, being over 200. Many of them serve without compensation. The task forces, with the assistance of research staffs, investigate the important aspects of their subjects, present the facts, and make recommendations to the full Commission. The Commission has the final responsibility of making recommendations to the Congress.

* * * * *

Many of these task forces are divided into subcommittees of which there are a total of over 30. Where necessary the coordination of the Commission's work is accomplished by interlocking membership on the task forces or joint subcommittees.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

In the packet also was a 16-page statement of the status of the Hoover report, 1949–54.

The Hoover Commission, in February 1954, issued a release including the names of the task forces and the members thereof, as follows:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Budget and accounting: Stewart, J. Harold, chairman; Browne, Dudley E.; Humphreys, Jr., H. E.: Jarchow, Christian; Price, Gwilym Alexander; Tiffany, Kenneth C.; Wright, J. David.

Business organization of the Department of Defense: Hook, Charles R., chairman; Binns, Joseph P.; Brainard, George C.; Bruce, Howard; DeBakey, Michael; Folsom, Frank; Hall, Joseph B.; Kelly, Mervin J.; King, Arthur Franklin; Mead, George Houk; Neely, Frank H.; Robertson, Jr., Reuben B.; Schneider, Franz; Wolcott, Robert Wilson; Wood, Robert E.

Legal services and procedure: Douglas, James Marsh, chairman; Clark, Herbert Watson; Fowler, Cody; Harno, Albert J.; Landis, James McCauley; McFarland, Carl; Malone, Jr., Ross L.; Maxwell, David F.; Medina, Harold R.; Peck, David W.; Smith, Reginald Heber; Stason, E. Blythe; Tuttle, Elbert Parr; Wright, Edward Ledwidge. Consultants: Jackson, Robert H.; Roberts, George; Vanderbilt, Arthur T.

Lending agencies: Grady, Paul, chairman; Bestor, Paul; Bliss, George L.; Bodman, Henry T.; Campbell, William W.; Cole, Albert Leslie; Cooper, Clifford D.; Cowles, Gardner; Hotchkis, Preston; Keller, Arnold B.; Sproul, Allan.

Medical services: McCormick, Chauncey, chairman; Braceland, Francis J.; Brandhorst, Otto W.; Churchill, Edward D.; Crosby, Edwin L.; DeBakey, Michael; Graham, Evarts A.; Gregg, Alan; Hawley, Paul R.; Klumpp, Theodore George; Leavell, Hugh Rodman; MacLean, Basil C.; Martin, Walter B.; Miller, James Roscoe; Wilbur, Dwight L.; Winternitz, Milton C.

Personnel: Dodds, Harold W., chairman; Abrams, Frank W.; Barnard, Chester I.; Cuyler, Lewis B.; Josephs, Devereux C.; Mitchell, Don G.; Paul, Willard S.; Ramspeck, Robert; Tuck, William Hallam; White, Leonard D.

Procurement: Wolcott, Robert Wilson, chairman; Folsom, Frank M.; Kelly, Mervin J.; Mead, George Houk; Mosher, Ira; Neely, Frank H.; Peale, Mundy I.; Proctor, Robert; Schneider, Franz; Stilwell, Charles J.

Subsistence services: Binns, Joseph P., chairman; Appel, Vallee O.; Coppers, George H.; Crotty, Andrew J.; Drake, Albert B.; Garvey, James McB.; Hennessy, John L.; Jones, Ollie E.; Kraft, John H.; Krimendahl, Herbert F.; Lee, Joseph A.; Mardikan, George M.; Shoemaker, Perry M.; Stouffer, Gordon A.

Surplus property: Wood, Robert E., chairman; Erlicher, Harry; Greene, Leroy D.; Ilgenfritz, Carl A.; Jolly, Thomas D.; Kresl, Carl; Mooney, James D.; Renard, George A.; Starr, Jr., Edward; Tangeman, Walter W. Consultant: Forbes, Russell.

Water resources and power: Moreell, Ben, chairman; Andrews, Charles L.; Bates, William B.; Brock, Pope F.; Brown, Carey H.; Edison, Charles; Growdon, James P.; Hinds, Julian; Horner, Wesley Winans; Jirgal, John; Kracke, Edward A.; Lee, J. Bracken; Mattei, Albert Chester; Miller, Leslie A.; Morrison, Harry Winford; Murrow, Lavey V.; Newman, Jr., Frank H.; Pirnie, Malcolm; Polk, Harry E.; Pound, Roscoe; Reavis, John Wallace; Richberg, Donald Randall; Roberts, Arthur B.; Sawyer, Robert William; Shannon, William D.; Tipton, Royce J.

Commission staff members: Bragg, K. B.; Brassor, Francis P.; Heddleston, Russell A.; Hollister, John B.; Kennedy, Robert A.; Kieffer, Jarold A.; Lindemer, Lawrence Boyd; McClelland, George K.; Merriam, Malcolm M.; Metz, Harold W.; Monat, Anna H.; Roback, Herbert; Scull, Jr., Miles; Shine, Jr., Henry M. Consultants: Coates, Charles B.; Klein, Julius; McCormick, Robert L. L.; Underhill, John; Westcott, Jay B.

SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION NOT LIKE FIRST

In January 1954 the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report reported to the President "for the purpose of amassing the facts, each task force has been given adequate research staff. The recommendations of the task force and their staff will be reviewed by the Commission." This discloses that the task force, contrary to law, will conduct the hearings and make the recommendation to the Commission without any member of the Commission being on the task force.

In May 1954 the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Commission issued a document, which contained the following language, "The second Hoover Commission—almost like the first—officially known like its predecessor as a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, was unanimously created by Congress on a bipartisan basis under the Brown-Ferguson Act, signed by President Eisenhower on July 10, 1953." In referring to the Commission as a bipartisan Commission, the statement leaves the distinct impression that it is bipartisan like the first Commission, which included six Democrats and six Republicans. This is not true. The word bipartisan was stricken out of the resolution creating the second Hoover Commission and the members include seven Republicans and five Democrats.

VETERANS BELITTLED

In a legislative report gotten out by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, volume 8, No. 10, it was stated:

Hoover Commission Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative service on June 3, appeared before the Hoover Commission Task Force making a study of the requirements for admission to practice before Federal boards and commissions—

And so forth. Other national veterans organizations made similar reports. Doubtless, it is crushing and belittling to a veteran of a war—many of them outstanding heroes of a war—to be required to go through a group of special-interest representatives in order to get his views presented to a Congress elected by the people. Why should any veteran, or any other citizen, be required to have his views screened through a Hoover Commission, or any other commission, in order to get them presented to elected representatives of the people?

Concerning the task forces, all members of the task forces are selected by the Chairman, Mr. Hoover. In the first Hoover Commission, all selections were approved by the entire Commission, not just by Mr. Hoover. The members appointed represent his personal choice and very likely his philosophic views. Many of the members have interest in conflict with their duties. The task force selected to consider a major political and economic question is not balanced with an equal number of those who oppose the proposal. In other words, if it is a question in which liberals and conservatives are known to oppose each other, the task force does not include as many liberals as conservatives.

AMERICAN LEGION DISAPPOINTED

The National Legislative Bulletin of the American Legion, issued March 11, 1955, contains the following statement:

"If at first you don't succeed, then try, try again" must surely be the motto of the Hoover Commission when it goes into its studies and recommendations on reorganizing veterans' benefits and programs.

Five years ago the first Hoover Commission recommended dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration, the merging of VA hospitals into a gigantic Federal medical system, and the subjugation of veterans' preference in Federal employment. Those bitter pills were camouflaged with a coating of honeyed words that went something like this: The program for veterans will thus become more efficient; nothing will be taken away from them; they will get better service at less cost; and so on, and on. The American Legion and many Members of Congress quickly saw through this camouflage. There were but few who swallowed the pills because most everyone knew that the less-cost factor would ultimately mean less benefits and less service for the veterans.

The second Hoover Commission has changed its tactics. It comes right out and says what it wants the executive branch and the Congress to do. There is no attempt to disguise the plan.

Let's take a look at some of the recommendations.

They would set up a Federal Advisory Council on Health which would impose authority over and inhibit the administration of the VA medical and hospital system.

To save money they would close down 20 VA hospitals. This at a time when there are some 20,000 eligibles waiting for hospital treatment.

Attacking non-service-connected hospitalization now available to veterans who cannot afford to pay for hospitalization, and then only if a VA bed is available. Closing down 20 hospitals will make less beds available for this purpose. They would curtail non-service-connected hospitalization by thoroughly checking whether or not the veteran lied when he made his statement to the VA that he could not pay. Perhaps the veteran would have to wait several weeks before being admitted, while the check was being made. Further, they recommend that if the "broke" veteran ever gets on his feet and has some money, he should pay what he owes the Government for hospital treatment. Of course, this would mean that the strictly indigent veteran would be getting no veterans' preference—he would simply get an extension of credit. One can, without too much imagination, foresee the time when further recommendations are made to force the veteran to repay out of monthly compensation or pension checks, should he be fortunate enough to receive them. Underlying all this is the main effort designed to eliminate non-service-connected hospitalization entirely.

The Commission also recommends a complete reevaluation of service-connected disabilities rated at 30 percent or less. Seems they think these veterans are getting too much gravy because they are working at decent salaries. The top compensation for this group is $50 per month. It is likely that the beneficiary does have to supplement the compensation in order to get along, at least to get along very well.

To further confuse the issue, the Commission feels that the term "compensation" for war-service wounds, injury, or disease is too significant; that it should be reduced to something less understandable such as disability allowance. That goes hand in hand with still another recommendation that disabilities be geared to what a veteran is able to earn, regardless of the degree of disability. For example, if he lost an arm in the service and is now rehabilitated to make a decent living with the other arm, then his compensation consideration should be less. The American Legion has always believed that the war wounds should be compensated alike, regardless of ability to earn.

HOOVER COMMISSION PLAN TESTED

The first Hoover Commission recommended that each agency of the Government reimburse the Post Office Department for the use of the mailing privileges used by such agencies. This recommendation was carried into effect by the passage of Public Law 286, which was signed August 15, 1953. The committee report stated:

The objective of this legislation is in accordance with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

The Hoover Commission in January 1955 reported as follows:

A little over a year ago the Post Office Department was freed of bearing the entire cost of Government mail and the unrealistic deficit this had caused. The individual agencies now pay the Post Office about $38 million a year. This is as it should be.

It is alarming to note, however, that to develop their usage figures so that they may reimburse the Post Office Department the agencies are spending almost $3.8 million, equivalent to 10 percent of postage costs.

That is an example of the results of a change that we made at the request of the Hoover Commission. Here is the same Commission that requested the change be made, the Congress made the change exactly as the Commission requested, and the cost of taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into another pocket just on one item alone was $3,800,000. That is a 10 percent increase.

HOOVER HAMBURGER FORMULA

If we use the Hoover hamburger formula for determining the savings in our national budget because of the Hoover Commission reports, we would say that instead of the Commission saving money, it is costing 10 percent more or $6 to $7 billion a year. These figures would be arrived at by arbitrarily considering that all of the Hoover Commission recommendations cost the Government 10 percent more by using the Post Office case as an example. Mr. Hoover arrived at the 60-year supply of hamburger for the Navy by the use of a trick formula that was no more deceitful and misleading than this one. It left the impression that the Navy had enough hamburger meat for 60 years. The truth was it had about 800,000 pounds, which would not be enough to last the Armed Forces over 1 day. After all, 800,000 pounds of

meat is the equivalent of only 400 good-sized steers. It is inconceivable to think that a quantity of meat the size of 400 steers, that could be corralled and kept on one part of the White House grounds, would be sufficient to last the great Navy or the Armed Forces 60 years. This is a sample of the ridiculous manner in which the high-powered public relations firms employed by the Hoover Commission have overdramatized and misrepresented the work and accomplishments but hid and submerged the devastation of the Commission.

HORRID EXAMPLES EXPECTED

March 10, 1954, Chairman Hoover stated in a speech at the National Press Club:

All the task forces are now in the midst of our inquiries and no horrid examples are ready for publication and no fine recommendations have as yet been put on paper; however, we are learning a lot.

At that time, Mr. Hoover expected his public relations task force to be able to disclose horrid examples.

An agency of the Congress would normally be expected to advise Congress first of any horrid examples and make sure that Congress was not reflected upon by overdramatization and also for the purpose of giving Congress an opportunity to correct any valid mistakes.

ADMITTEDLY A PRESSURE GROUP

The citizens committee for the Hoover reports in January 1955 published a document which was widely distributed to schools and universities in which it was stated:

For the first time in United States history, a pressure group has been formed to bring about a general reorganization. The citizens committee has kept the Commission's recommendations before the country and has not allowed them to be forgotten as such efforts have been in the past.

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GROUP ARE ADVERTISED AS TAX EXEMPT

It will be noticed the citizens committee admits it is a pressure group and its activities clearly disclose that it should be registered under the Lobbying Act. In the same booklet, it is stated that the Commission's influence was not limited to the national level. In 33 States and 2 Territories, little Hoover commissions have been established since 1949.

It was also stated in this booklet:

The citizens committee has operated as a pressure group against pressure groups.

DID MEMBERS TAKE OATH AS REQUIRED BY LAW?

On March 29, 1955, I addressed a letter to Mr. John B. Hollister, Executive Director of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, in which I asked for certain information. It is as follows:

Please advise me if the 12 members of the Hoover Commission take an oath as required by public officials to support the Constitution and laws of the United States, etc. Also please advise if the members of the staff likewise take such an oath.

If you will give me this information right away, I shall appreciate it very much.

On March 29, 1955, Mr. Hollister replied to my letter as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of today's date. All 12 Commissioners took the oath of office the day of the first meeting of the Commission on September 29, 1953. This oath was administered by Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Burton. All the employees of the Commission take an oath of office before beginning their duties.

On March 30, 1955, I sent Mr. Hollister another letter, which follows:

I received your letter and thanks for the information about the 12 Commissioners and the employees of the Commission taking the oath of office.

Please advise me if the members of the task forces have also taken the oath and if their employees have likewise taken the oath.

Mr. Hollister's reply to my letter dated March 30, 1955, follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of today. All members of the task forces who draw any pay have taken an oath of office. Those who accept no pay are not asked to take an oath.

The task forces have no employees of their own. All staff who work with them are employees of the Commission.

Again on April 4, 1955, I wrote Mr. Hollister. My letter follows:

If you will give me a list of the members of the task forces who have drawn pay and who have taken the oath of office, as well as the list of those who have accepted no pay and, therefore, have not taken the oath, it will be appreciated very much.

If you can send it this week, please mail it to me here in Texarkana at Post Office Box 868, and oblige.

Mr. Hollister replied to my April 4, 1955, letter on April 8, 1955, as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 4, last. I could easily give you the number of task force members who have drawn pay and taken an oath of office and also the number who have not. I am somewhat loath to give you the individual names, for I do not believe the Commission would feel that it should make any public distinction between the man who because of his own personal means, the willingness of his company to pay his expenses or his own excess of patriotic zeal does his work without remuneration and the man who does the work and draws all or part of what the Congress authorized him to be paid for his work.

I should be glad to discuss the matter informally with the members of the Commission if you would care to have me do so.

On April 11, 1955, I again wrote Mr. Hollister, and my letter follows:

Although I do not agree that the reason you have given is sufficient to justify withholding the information I have requested, I wish you would furnish me the number of members who served without pay or compensation, and therefore did not take the oath, and also the number of members who were paid and took the oath. After I get this information, I shall be very glad to talk to you about the other information, if I desire to pursue the matter further.

If you will furnish it to me right away, it will be appreciated.

The reply which I received from Mr. Hollister, dated April 13, 1955, is as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 11 last and hasten to enclose you a sheet which is attached to a progress report I am making to the Commission. This gives the breakdown of Commission personnel for September 30, 1954, and for each month, beginning November 30, 1954. This will give you the information you have requested.

Breakdown of Commission personnel

	Sept. 30, 1954	Nov. 30, 1954	Dec. 31, 1954	Jan. 31, 1955	Feb. 28, 1955	Mar. 31, 1955
Commissioners	12	12	12	12	12	12
Commissioner's assistants and secretaries	21	23	23	23	28	28
Staff personnel	28	30	28	34	37	39
Task force members with compensation	84	87	84	84	53	52
Task force members without compensation	77	78	77	77	92	83
Task force assistants and clerical personnel with compensation	213	211	211	152	149	124
Task force assistants without compensation	90	103	89	83	43	25
Total	525	544	524	465	414	363

The last letter I sent to Mr. Hollister, dated April 29, 1955, follows:

In your letter of April 13, 1955, you gave me information concerning the breakdown of Commission personnel. However, it does not give me the breakdown as to each Task Force.

I wish you would furnish me by Monday, May 2, at noon, the following information:

1. The name of each Task Force.

2. The number of members in each Task Force with compensation.

3. The number of members in each Task Force without compensation.

If you will please furnish this information to me by the time mentioned, it will be appreciated very much.

Mr. Hollister's reply to my April 29, 1955, letter, dated May 2, 1955, is as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 29, which unfortunately did not reach me until after 10 o'clock this morning.

However, I am now sending you a statement along the lines you have requested.

Breakdown of task force members

1. Budget and Accounting Task Force:
   - a. Number of members with compensation ---- 0
   - b. Number of members without compensation ---- 7
   - Total ---- 7

2. Intelligence Activities Task Force:
   - a. Number of members with compensation ---- 3
   - b. Number of members without compensation ---- 3
   - Total ---- 6

3. Legal Services and Procedure Task Force:
   - a. Number of members with compensation ---- 9
   - b. Number of members without compensation ---- 5
   - Total ---- 14

Breakdown of task force members—Con.

4. Lending Agencies Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 1
   b. Number of members without compensation 9
   Total 10

5. Medical Services Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 15
   b. Number of members without compensation 0
   Total 15

6. Overseas Economic Operations Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 1
   b. Number of members without compensation 8
   Total 9

7. Paperwork Management Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 0
   b. Number of members without compensation 5
   Total 5

8. Personnel and Civil Service Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 4
   b. Number of members without compensation 5
   Total 9

9. Procurement Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 3
   b. Number of members without compensation 10
   Total 13

10. Real Property Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 5
   b. Number of members without compensation 2
   Total 7

11. Subsistence Services Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 0
   b. Number of members without compensation 15
   Total 15

12. Use and Disposal of Surplus Property Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 2
   b. Number of members without compensation 7
   Total 9

13. Water Resources and Power Task Force:
   a. Number of members with compensation 21
   b. Number of members without compensation 5
   Total 26

14. Committee on Business Organization of the Department of Defense:
   a. Number of members with compensation 5
   b. Number of members without compensation 13
   Total 18

Breakdown of task force members—Con.

Total number of members with compensation 69
Total number of members without compensation 94
Grand total 163

LAW ABOUT VOLUNTARY SERVICE TO GOVERNMENT

Title 31, section 665, of the United States Code, 1946 edition, contains the following excerpts:

Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government * * * except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

At the end of the paragraph, there is a heavy penalty for its violation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to have the special order granted him today put over until tomorrow.

EXTENSION AND FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1763) relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 142), is hereby amnded (1) by striking out "May 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the chairman of the Commission shall have charge of the final liquidation of the affairs of the Commission after June 30, 1955, including the printing of reports, the payment of bills, the transfer of records and documents to the National Archives, and the disposition of furniture and other equipment of the Commission. The Chairman of the Commission shall designate such members of the staff of the Commission as he deems necessary for these purposes. Such liquidation shall be completed within a period of not to exceed 90 days after June 30, 1955, and the funds of the Commission shall remain available for necessary expenses during such period."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, and insert "Component research facility for nuclear propulsion, improvements to an existing transonic tunnel, additions to two existing laboratory buildings, repairs and modifications to utility installations, and acquisition of not to exceed 500 acres of land, $8,760,000."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "$8,450,000" and insert "$13,300,000."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "$8,450,000" and insert "$13,300,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, everyone is for this bill, and the only reason it is here on the floor today under a rule is because it authorizes the appropriation of an amount of money in excess of that which would make the bill proper for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Chairman, the bill was favorably reported on by the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior report was favorably cleared by the Bureau of the Budget. The bill was unanimously voted out of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and was unanimously voted out of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The rule granted on this measure took up something less than 10 minutes of consideration by the Committee on Rules.

The bill before you, H. R. 2126, is coauthored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Its predecessor act of 1952, which this bill amends, was coauthored by the gentleman from California, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Senator CASE, formerly a Member of this body.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, extends the operation of the Saline Water Act of 1952. The Saline Water Act of 1952 provided for research in the development and utilization of saline waters by providing for federally financed contracts to carry out the necessary scientific and engineering research to accomplish the desalting of sea water, saline and brackish water. In setting up that legislation in 1952, which carried with it an appropriation of $2 million, and which has since that time been in operation, we were very careful not to provide for the Department of the Interior setting up a large scientific agency for the conduct of this research but rather for the coordination and correlation of the efforts of other Government agencies, of private industry, and of educational institutions.

The Interior Department was directed to carry out the research through contracts with private industry, with educational institutions, as well as to correlate the efforts of other agencies of the Government, such as the Navy Department, which had already gone into a good deal of experimentation in this field. The first program was to last a period of 5 years and, as I say, carried an appropriation of $2 million.

Because these research contracts have to be executed some time prior to the end of the program, the last contract will have to be wound up by December of 1955 unless this act is extended. As a consequence, we are here today asking to extend this research program for another 5 years and to add $4 million to the initial appropriation.

The results of the investigation and research up to the present time have convinced everybody connected with this program—the Interior Department, our committee, and the research scientists—that it should be continued. When this research program started, it cost between $400 and $500 an acre-foot as a maximum to reduce sea water to a condition which would make it fit for municipal, industrial, or agricultural use. The Interior Department set up as its initial goal reducing the cost to $120 an acre-foot, which is about the top that can be paid for municipal use, and $40 on brackish water for irrigation use.

The Interior Department informs us, and the representatives of the Department in their testimony before our committee said, that they are now within range of achieving those objectives; that is, of being able to reduce sea water—to reduce the salt in sea water—at a cost of $120 an acre-foot and brackish water for irrigation use to a cost of as low as $40 an acre-foot. I do not say that they have accomplished that yet, but they are within sight of that goal at the present time, and if they can continue with the same progress they have shown since this program started in 1952, it is a certainty that sea water will be made available at a cost for industry and municipal use that they can afford, and that brackish water—large quantities of which exist throughout the western part of the United States and other parts of the world—will be made available to agriculture at as low as $40 an acre-foot.

The present bill extends the period of this research for 5 years. It allows an additional $4 million. The $6 million mentioned in the bill is the total of the $4 million plus the original $2 million. It allows the use of approximately a half-million dollars for research in Federal laboratories. We did not permit that in the original act because we did not want the Federal Government getting into the field of research. We wanted that done by contract. But now we are getting to the stage of research where it is necessary for the Federal Government to evaluate the progress made by private industry and by the various educational institutions. Of course, each thinks his own is a little better and therefore the program needs some impartial group in the Federal Government to make a comparison of the various processes which are presently in the works. Half a million dollars is allowed out of the $4 million for that purpose. That comes out of a limit of $1½ million which the Department of the Interior can use for administrative purposes and for pilot-plant operation.

In short, we have strictly limited the amount of money that can be spent administratively or that the Government itself can spend on direct research. The rest has to be done in contracts such as has occurred in the program up to the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a research program that can have a tremendous and historic importance for the entire world. It can change the economics of the coastal areas of our country and the arid areas in the North American Continent. In addition, it can make great changes throughout the entire world. There are areas in the world today whose living conditions would be completely revolutionized if they could use sea water at a price which is economic.

This is the kind of research, in my opinion, that the Congress of the United States and the Federal Government should be willing to spend money on. It is the same kind of thing we did, for instance, on polio, except in a different field.

Whenever this kind of research is successful, it adds tremendously to the wealth and the growth of not only our own people but people throughout the entire world. When we consider the revolutionary effects that a successful conclusion of this research program may have, the money we are asked to put up for this research is a mere pittance, a small amount of money, indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to this bill at the present time. It has a good purpose. It is sponsored and coauthored by men on both sides of this aisle, and I hope it will be passed without any difficulty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand, this provides for a spending program of $6 million over a 10-year period. It that approximately correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is approximately correct. There is $2 million already appropriated, which is being used and which has been mostly used up. This adds another $4 million and extends the time 5 years, which would add up to what the gentleman says, $6 million over 10 years.

Mr. GROSS. What are the States which will be directly benefited by this program? What are the States doing? What contribution are they making to this experimentation? How much money are they spending?

Mr. ENGLE. It is hard to say just what States will profit more than others.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will agree with me that California, for instance, will profit more than the State of Iowa?

Mr. ENGLE. Not necessarily. If Iowa has brackish water that can be cleaned up by this process and made fit for human consumption or irrigation, Iowa might profit, too.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we do not irrigate in the State of Iowa. Is the State of California, for instance, spending any money today on this sort of experimentation?

Mr. ENGLE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. None of the other States, then?

Mr. ENGLE. Not to my knowledge. There is a bill pending presently in the State legislature of California to authorize the State of California's participation in this program, but I cannot tell the gentleman that the bill has passed. It has been introduced and is pending in the present session.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that I think it is worthy experimentation, but I still think that more of the States which would be most directly affected ought to be carrying some part of the load for this experimentation.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the gentleman that these States all ought to try to help themselves, but if we waited around to get them all together and get them all in it, it would be a long time before anything was done.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What does the phrase "acre foot" of water mean? Does that mean 12 inches of rainfall over an acre of ground?

Mr. ENGLE. It means an acre-foot of water, which is an acre of ground a foot deep in water.

Mr. MASON. That would be 12 inches of rainfall on an acre of ground.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct, if it rains.

Mr. MASON. That costs $40 an acre to change brackish water into water that can be used for irrigation purposes, if they accomplish their objectives.

Mr. ENGLE. They are aiming at $120 an acre-foot for municipal water and $40 an acre-foot for irrigation water. They think they can make it. They say they are within range of those targets now. Forty dollars an acre-foot is a lot, by the way, for irrigation, but in

some areas of California they do pay that much. On the other hand, with reference to municipal water where it is used for municipal purposes and industrial purposes, that can rather easily carry $120 an acre-foot.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just want to add this brief statement in reply to the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself would both be very much in accord with the gentleman's idea that the States should enter into this cooperatively, but up to the present time there has been no opportunity for the States to spend money because the work has been experimental and has to be carried on at a different level. The gentleman from California should not overlook the fact that the University of California has been spending money and working on this experimentally—and that is State money.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true, and I should add that some of the Department of Interior contracts have been with the University of California and the Federal Government, therefore, has entered into a sort of partnership arrangement with the university.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. Would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs agree with me that this is a broad and national program? It is not a regional program in any sense. Of the 24 contracts that have been let to date, the people doing the contracting are spread all over the country in places like Massachusetts at Yale University, Pennsylvania State College, Texas A. and M., and some of the field testing, for instances, has been done in inland States such as the States of Arizona and South Dakota, and the State adjacent to that of the gentleman from Iowa. So would the chairman agree with me that it is a broad national program from which all States and all areas of the country will benefit?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. In recent years metropolitan areas on the cost line in the East as well as the West have found out that they had to turn down industries because they did not have enough fresh water to run those industries.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman, which touches upon the response of the gentleman from Arizona? As I understand it, there are 1 or 2 pilot plants that have spent all of their time on this work. The gentleman from Arizona pointed out that universities throughout the Nation have been experimenting in this field and carrying on the work on their own initiative. How many pilot plants have been spending full time on this objective?

Mr. ENGLE. There are no pilot plants currently in operation. They have not got up to the point yet where they can go into pilot-plant operation. That is what this bill provides for. This bill provides money for pilot-plant operation. It provides half a million dollars. Therefore, under this legislation, there will be such pilot-plant operation.

Mr. WIER. How do you distribute this $4 million in the future? Is it distributed to the universities or is there what I term a pilot plant where the work is being carried on? Do you distribute this to the various institutions?

Mr. ENGLE. Not except under the contracts as they were made with the Department of the Interior to carry on various phases of this research. Some of it is being carried on in one place and some in another, but on the pilot-plant operation, it is contemplated that the Department of the Interior itself will do that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. In answer to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, there are three stages in this sort of work. First, the research laboratory, which has been taken care of up to this time to a certain extent. Next will be the pilot plant of which the gentleman speaks. This bill would provide for the establishment of one pilot plant, as we were advised. Then the demonstration plants, which would come later, and which would more than likely be the responsibility of the industry itself.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has explained very thoroughly the objectives of this saline water bill. It has been before the Congress for several years. It is a research bill, and this bill provides some additional funds which can be allocated to more than a score of universities for carrying on research work.

Now, what is research work? It is nothing more than asking questions of nature and trying to find the answer. Research has been carried on in many fields. In the medical field many diseases have yielded to research. In the field of animal diseases, the foot-and-mouth disease laboratory is being completed on Long Island, and the cause, cure, and treatment of foot-and-mouth disease in animals is being studied.

But here is a piece of legislation which says, Can we feasibly convert salt water into potable water? Water supplies of many communities and many cities are being jeopardized because of long-continued droughts. Some of those areas are along the seacoast where they have access to ocean water. If salt water can be made into potable water with a limited amount of expense, it should be carried on.

After all, water is worth what it costs when you are thirsty. Water is worth what it costs when you need it on irrigated land.

Here is a proposition that has for its purpose carrying on research and asking questions of nature to just find out how our salt water can be made into potable water.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the legislation here proposed parallel in great measure the legislation authorized by the Congress some years ago for the study of liquid fuels?

I just had the pleasure of attending the dedication of a pilot research plant for the study of liquid fuels located by the Bureau of Mines in connection with the University of the State of West Virginia at Morgantown. I assume what you are trying to do here is to handle this problem through a number of years of research, and that will require, as we have built in Morgantown, a pilot plant to carry on the necessary demonstrations. It is practically the same type of legislation, is it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct. It is research similar to your oil research, and also wood research, and others that have been carried on. As I understand it, when the answers are found through the universities that have been working on the problem during the years, the University of California and other universities, then it is made available to private industry. The Government is merely an umpire, guaranteeing that there will be fair play. The Government is an umpire to insure that when these findings are made they can be made available to people who can then in turn make application of the facts found through research. There are great possibilities in this legislation, as there are in other research problems, such as the handling of oil shale in Colorado. I think we have made great progress, because we have billions of barrels of oil stored up in those shales, and now we know how to convert some of that oil into industry. I am satisfied that the experiments carried on in South Dakota and in Arizona, where pilot plants working on brackish water on a small scale have been carried on, have given us some valuable information.

I would hope that the Congress would pass this legislation and make the knowledge available to those who can use it in research.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think attention should be called to the method by which the correlation of research people and private industry is cared for in this legislation. When the program was instituted, the Secretary of the Interior appointed a group of nine eminent leaders, educational, scientific, and industrial organizations to provide him with the necessary information as to how the program should be carried on. Those gentlemen have been working since the institution of the program for no remuneration at all and very slight travel expense. That in itself tends to tie the everyday working operations right in to the area where the research scientists and investigators may later on make use of the information.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman will yield, may I suggest in connection with

this venture that the gentleman from Iowa, who raised the question about what Iowa would get out of it, that if you can get alkali out of the water in South Dakota and Nebraska that will be a great accomplishment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], a member of the committee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I think the question has been very well covered by the distinguished gentleman from California and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. I would just like to make a few comments.

This, in my opinion, is a very good way for research to be handled, under Federal auspices; taking advantage of existing laboratory and university facilities, on a contract basis and then making the facts available to States, irrigation districts, cities, and individuals for further development of the program.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this bill is not just merely one dealing with the purification of sea water: There is a lot of water in the United States of America today which is not potable because of the fact that it has a high saline content, and it is not confined to the waters which are in the oceans near our coasts.

In Arizona we have today a pilot plant operating on a well which belongs to the Buckeye Irrigation District. It is being operated under a contract through this very program. The water which comes from that well has a salinity content so high that it is very difficult if not impossible to use the water for the irrigation of crops. Through the operation of this plant at the present time the saline content of the water has been reduced to the extent that it may now be used for crops, and the whole area certainly will benefit because of that.

I want to mention also a problem that is a corollary to the problem of taking the saline content out of water. That is the disposal of the waste material. We have not yet been able to discover a means of disposing of this waste material which is taken from water in the desalinity process. That is a subject which must be gone into either in this program or in another separate program before we will really have any practical means of reducing the salinity of this water.

Furthermore, this is a universal program and not one which applies to one State or a group of States. I daresay that every State in the Union has some water which has too high salt content to be potable. I would call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that a few years ago the great State of New York was very short of water; in fact, water was being rationed and people were being urged to repair leaking faucet washers so water would not be wasted by dripping from faucets. It was a very serious situation.

So the shortage of water is not a phenomenon of the arid West; it exists throughout the United States today. If the predictions of certain scientists are true we may well be entering upon a dry cycle in the world's history. If this be true, then certainly the Federal Government should do everything it can to attack and master this problem, which extends beyond State boundaries.

We have in many instances gone into programs which should have been conducted by the States and not by the Federal Government, but it was found necessary for the Federal Government to get into it in order to get the program off the ground to supply a need which exists and which is fairly universal throughout the Nation. I would consider the program of vocational rehabilitation to the physically handicapped to be in that category.

Certainly the primary responsibility for that program was on the State and local governments but where a need exists the Federal Government participates initially to get the program started, and provide the spark to get other echelons of government into the field. I hope the Congress in its wisdom sees fit to pass this legislation to give the States some impetus to get studies going in this field of endeavor. There is a great deal of national interest involved, since the need for potable water transcends State lines. It is hoped, by this research, that we can furnish States, irrigation districts, and private citizens of the country the first answers to the difficult questions involved, so they may go on from there to develop a practical system for removing salinity from water.

In the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs it was brought out very forcefully by Mr. Sheppard T. Powell, that more than one system of taking this water and purifying it is needed. A system which works well in New York might not work out in Arizona or in California. So it becomes necessary that more than one system be adopted.

As far as means of furnishing power for the project are concerned, you will find that in the Western States where the sun shines without being impeded by clouds or trees too much, solar rays may be adaptable for the use of this particular project. In other States, of course, you will find that nuclear energy may be used at some time in the future. The whole program is just as broad as the scientific development of the United States in the last few years has been broad.

In order to cut the cost of this water down to where it can be used for agriculture, for industry, and for municipal purposes, a few more years of experimentation are very definitely indicated.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House will pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who on several occasions has been the author of similar bills.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the field has been amply covered in reference to this bill. I should like to say I am very happy to have been coauthor of the legislation with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and I compliment him for the manner in which he has handled this bill both in the committee and in having it brought to the floor of the House at this time for consideration. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been considered by this Congress and previous Congresses or will be considered by this Congress.

Coming from Ohio, I have had several ask me whether we have salt water out in Ohio. We do not have. However, I have traveled throughout my country and I have seen a serious situation in many States. I believe that the people of Ohio will want to see this situation remedied. It will be to their benefit both directly and indirectly.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out one thing that I do not believe has been covered. Private enterprise, private industry, throughout the United States has been working on this question for many years. Through this legislation we will be able to correlate the experiments being made by large industrial plants so that their plans and ours will be worked together and information distributed among those who are interested in the development of this system. Not only are the universities doing experimental work but private enterprise at its own expense through money that does not come from this bill or from the taxpayers is working to perfect various methods of desalting water.

It has been suggested that this is important to New York, and it certainly is. It is important in other ways, too. We have found in some cases that a system of desalting water purifies the water of atomic contamination. So if we develop the process we are working on, it can be used as a standby in those areas where water is taken from lakes and from reservoirs and purified, eliminating the effects of atomic fallout or atomic contamination.

Looking further into the future in reference to the question of fresh water, it seems to me we are making a contribution not only to our own country but to the world. Those who have traveled through the Middle East can readily see the possibilities. Take, for instance, Egypt, with her great areas of fertile soil but little good water, and plenty of hungry people. The development of this area may be possible through the installation of saline water conversion plants, thereby enabling water to be put on the land. We must also look forward, I think, within the very near future to atomic reactors which will be used in conjunction with this type of program. So we will be making a contribution not only to our own country but to the peoples of the world. We are not alone in this. Other nations are carrying on research. I think there is one nation, perhaps, that has gone a little ahead of us in the past in the development and perfection of these processes, but we are now working with the other nations of the world in this same study. It is so important not only to us but to others. We can think of our own possessions, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and other places, where it is so necessary to bring fresh water onto their lands in order that they may develop.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this legislation will pass and that it will have the full support of the Congress.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district in California, Los Angeles, which is vitally interested in the whole problem of water and particularly, I might say, Colorado River water at the present time. I think it would be well to make clear that our interest in this bill does not mean that the Members from California are any less interested in Colorado River water. Actually, I think there is very evident already conclusive evidence that the need for water in southern California will be such that Colorado River water alone will not fulfill our needs and that the processes which are under investigation and which will be conducted, I hope, under this bill will be needed if that area of the country is to continue to grow.

I think, however, it is also important to point out that it is possible, of course, if this process is eventually successful, that at some future time there can be less dispute, perhaps, or less opposition to sharing other available water supplies.

Mr. Chairman, I would very much appreciate the opportunity of asking the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], a question in relation to the coordination of this program between the Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission. As I am sure all of us realize, the success of this program on a commercial basis is largely dependent on whether or not low cost power can be had in sufficient quantities to make the process at a cost low enough to make it commercially feasible. I wonder whether there is any program that the committee knows about at the present time for coordination or cooperation between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of the Interior for the development commercially in various areas so that the two can be tied together.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be delighted to have the gentleman read the statement on page 40 which appears in the report on the research program in our hearings on this matter before the committee which deals with the very subject matter that he has mentioned. The power or the heat to carry out the desalting process is the crucial element. Therefore, if atomic energy, for instance, could be used in generating the necessary heat or power to carry on this type of work under one or another of the processes which are being studied, then the opportunities of success are very much better. I assure my friend from California that the testimony indicates that there is close collaboration between the people in the Department of the Interior carrying out this program and its relationship to the development of atomic energy in the field of heat and in the field of power, because those are the two that are so essential to the success of this program. So, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, specifically the answer is yes, that that coordination is in progress and will be intensified.

Before I quit responding to the gentleman's inquiry, I would like to add my endorsement to what he has said with respect to whether or not this program has any particular applicability to the water claims of southern California on the Colorado River and to say to him that his statement in respect to that matter is exactly right. As a matter of fact, southern California is going to run out of water if it gets all the water that it claims on the Colorado River in between 13 and, as a maximum, 19 years, according to the information that I have. As a consequence, they have to get the water and they will either have to get it out of the sea or go over the Tehachapi Mountains and bring it down from northern California, from one of the rivers up there.

This does not affect southern California's position or the claims of the city of Los Angeles or any of the southern California water agencies upon the Colorado River whatsoever. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, so we can make it perfectly plain. The same can be said with reference to Arizona. It would not affect its claims, either, on the Colorado River.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would dislike to second the last remark of the distinguished chairman of the committee. Of course, this has nothing to do with the claims of either State regarding Colorado River water. I would agree with the chairman when he says that if southern California continues to grow at its present rate, there would not be enough water in the Colorado River to take care of its needs. I would say that would be equally true of the State of Arizona. This is a project which is certainly necessary for the future. I would like to say to my good friend from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that I am looking forward to the day when we can reverse the pumps on the metropolitan water aqueduct and bring purified sea water back inland into the State of Arizona.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and I join in his hopeful statement. I hope it will not be in the too far distant future. I thank the chairman of the committee very much for his very interesting statements.

I would like to point out for the record that at the present moment the Atomic Energy Commission is selling heat or energy generated by a reactor unit set up by the North American Aviation Co. Part of this heat has been contracted for, I believe, by the Southern California Edison Co.

I sent a telegram on Friday to the Los Angeles Bureau of Water and Power suggesting—as a public body I believe they have preference to whatever may be left over—that they should ask for the opportunity to get the balance of that generated heat. I hope that they will coordinate it, if it is possible to do so, under this law with a coordinated pilot plant in order that the two might go forward together at this very critical place where I think we need it so badly.

I certainly hope this bill will pass.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes and then intend to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

I do this because I am pleased to see the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] bring up the question of the Colorado River and the possibility of desalting the water from the Pacific Ocean so that it may be brought back to Arizona. That would be an interesting process. But I think it is not beyond the realm of possibility under a properly conducted saline water research program.

With reference to the North American Aviation Co., they will probably shortly be given a contract to build an atomic reactor plant in the State of Nebraska using sodium graphite as the reactor. That is now in the works.

In connection with that, I would like to brag a little about the State of Nebraska. California is talking about some 15 or 16 million acre-feet of water that they have in the Trinity River. Nebraska has in its sand hills more than 600 million acre-feet of water, an adequate supply that needs only pumps. And we have 10,000 or more pumps tapping that underground supply of water. There is ample water to supply an atomic-energy plant. So when the North American aviation group builds their sodium graphite reactor plant in the State of Nebraska, all they need to do is dig a hole in the ground and the water will run out. There will be plenty of water that will not need desalting, good, fresh water, which I presume comes from Rocky Mountain area through underground streams before it reaches Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if I were to choose the two problems in the United States, of greatest importance to the people, in which the Government could interest itself I think they would be water and the conservation of land; that is, the conservation of water, the development of new sources of water, the use of water to its fullest capacity, just as we have now before us the problem of the conservation of land which has been washing away. In that way there is a certain similarity between the subjects, because we are wasting these two essential, and perhaps greatest assets that any nation could have.

As the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], said, I have been interested in this, and the RECORD will show I was one of the first to put in a bill to try to do something about it. I am still interested, and I know this bill will pass because of its importance.

I think the RECORD should show that it is a broad subject, that it is not entirely a question of taking sea water out of the ocean and getting the salt out of that, and then either putting it upon land or using it domestically. There is the question of the transportation of water. Some islands have been compelled

to use sea water, in dual lines, so they may conserve the fresh water and use the salt water for fire protection. The amount of fresh water that we put into the great cities of this country daily in the sewage disposal plants is unbelievable.

All of this is involved in the question of the use of sea water which has been rendered either pure or practically free from salt. It is only a beginning. I look for great advances, under the terms of this bill.

I am very much in favor of the bill. I know it will pass.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

CIO SPOKESMAN URGES QUADRUPLING OF FUNDS FOR SALINE WATER RESEARCH

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the noncontroversial nature of this legislation, I do not feel it necessary for me to take the time of the House to urge its enactment. I know it will be passed, and that the membership is convinced of the value of the research now being done in this field of converting salt water for irrigation and other purposes.

However, because of the widespread interest in the subject matter of this legislation, I do think it would be worthwhile to have as part of the record of the debate here, an excellent statement on the program generally, presented last month to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by Joseph Applebaum, vice president of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO.

Mr. Applebaum, who has been a friend of mine for many years, has just recently moved from St. Louis to Denver, Colo., which is now his headquarters. In this matter, he testified in behalf of the National CIO, as well as his own union.

Mr. Applebaum endorsed wholeheartedly the objectives of the saline water program, and not only urged the extension of the program as provided for in H. R. 2126, but suggested that instead of an overall limit of $6 million in preparations for this work, as provided for in H. R. 2126, that the ceiling be raised to $25 million.

Because of the interest I know exists in this program, I include Mr. Applebaum's statement to the Senate committee, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH APPLEBAUM, VICE PRESIDENT, OIL, CHEMICAL, AND ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, CIO, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, SALINE WATER PROGRAM EXTENSION, TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Joseph Applebaum. I am vice president of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO, with headquarters located in Denver, Colo. I am testifying here in behalf of the national CIO in support of the extension of the Government's saline water program.

Until recently, and prior to the merger of the Oil Workers International Union and the United Gas, Coke, Chemical Workers Union, I was western regional director of the United Gas, Coke, Chemical Workers Union. In that capacity I appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture in Whittier, Calif., on November 12, 1953, in support of the further extension of the Government's saline water program. At that time I said, "CIO * * * today is happy to pay tribute to the great foresight of those legislators of the West who realize the great social and economic potential that lies in the sea at a time when no one else but a handful of scientists share their vision."

Since that time we in CIO have been impressed with the developments which have occurred in this field. We know that there has been proven a practicality to this program which now justifies the most optimistic hopes of our earlier testimony. We know that an application of vigor and intelligence can bring an early solution to many of our most pressing water-shortage problems.

Yet we stand here today in a period when the pressure of water shortage is an increasingly critical problem throughout the United States. In the past there have been occasions when it was safe to say that the water-shortage problem was primarily the problem of the West. With the passage of time, the growth of population, the increasing need for water in industry, agriculture, and for domestic use, it is now clear that water shortage is a national problem.

Therefore, gentlemen, it seems to me that the efforts of the past in solving this problem must be reexamined in the light of the new pressures, and steps must be taken to apply knowledge and technology which have been developed in this field in a more vigorous way looking toward the solution of this most pressing problem.

In the past week we have found general acceptance to a solution of one of the Nation's most pressing problems. The Salk vaccine may well end the fear of the dreaded disease polio. Given adequate funds and the application of trained technicians, we can solve some of our most serious problems. And no problem today is more serious than the growing shortage of water. Last week as I moved from St. Louis, my former home, to Denver, Colo., I experienced the effect of the snowstorm in eastern Colorado. This is one of the areas which has a critical water shortage. This storm, which delayed my trip, was greeted with jubilation in the eastern Colorado area. The more snow that fell the more water that would sink into the ground, the less the area would be affected by the scourge of the dust blow which is affecting this whole area. It is now taken for granted in the West that in the year 1955 this country will see the biggest dust storm in the creation of a new dust bowl with all its devastating effects covering 25 million acres.

Mr. Chairman, I propose that we immediately expand the Government's saline water program if for no other reason than to seek to end this menacing dust bowl condition, and that we provide the program with funds equal to $1 an acre of the area affected, and that we call upon the scientists and the technicians and the irrigation experts to figure out ways and means of bringing an end to this condition brought about in such large part by the shortage of water.

Mr. Chairman, I said earlier we have been encouraged by the progress of this program. That is to say, we have been encouraged by the few experiments which prove that the program has developed a potential technology and an economic range of operation which can release the giant source of the ocean to meet the water needs of almost any area in the world.

The development of a power source known as the package reactor in the field of atomic energy means that we can now provide the technology of the saline water program to the most critical areas throughout the United States and the whole world, and use our developments in this field to meet the most pressing needs of the underdeveloped countries of the world in their economic developments.

Mr. Chairman, the CIO believes that this program should be given a priority equal to that of our most pressing military development programs so that we can show the world that we are prepared to effectively aid them in raising their standard of living.

Recently the secretary of our National Committee on Resources Development drafted a memorandum on the Application of Atomic Power to the Demineralization of Sea Water for Irrigation or Domestic Use. Mr. Chairman, without reading this memorandum I would like permission to place it in the record at this point.

It shows, Mr. Chairman, that the direct power costs of the electrodialysis method of demineralization of brackish or sea water constitutes more than 50 percent of the total costs. But, it also shows the direct advantage which is gained from increasing the size of units involved. One million square feet of membrane area requires 1,600 kilowatt-hours per thousand gallons. Ten million square feet of membrane area reduces the power requirement to only 160 kilowatt-hours per thousand gallons. It is clear, therefore, that this program needs some immediate large-scale experimentation. It is likewise clear that we will never get the "bugs" out of the technology of this development until we try it in many places and on an increasingly larger and larger scale. Our technicians and the members of my own union have called our attention to the many places where this program can be immediately put to test. In some of the very areas affected by the dust bowl there are oil wells producing quantities of salt water which could be demineralized and used as potable water. The Department of the Interior's third annual report on saline water conversion says:

"The work accomplished so far indicates that attainment of the first goal of winning fresh water from sea water at a price which municipal users and some industries might pay, and the conversion of brackish water to irrigation uses, seems to be in sight although much work will be necessary before either can be brought to realization."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, while I endorse the intention of S. 516 I recommend on page 2, line 5, the phrase "$6 million in all" be stricken and in place thereof the committee substitute the phrase "$25 million a year"; and in line 17, page 2, the figure "$500,000" be stricken and in place thereof "$5 million."

Mr. Chairman, the memorandum to which Mr. Applebaum referred in his testimony, The Application of Atomic Power to the Demineralization of Sea Water for Irrigation or Domestic Use, is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

From: Leo Goodman, secretary, CIO national committee on atomic energy, power, and resources development.

Re the application of atomic power to the demineralization of sea water for irrigation or domestic use.

MARCH 15, 1955.

There has been since 1952 an appropriation of $400,000 a year for the saline water conversion program by the Congress to the Department of the Interior. The goal set for this program has been the reduction of acre-foot of potable water at a cost of approximately $125. This is based on a survey of the cost of water to 400 American cities.

For irrigation purposes the objective has been production in cost to $40 per acre-foot.

Substantial success has been achieved through the use of an ion transfer membrane demineralizer. This has been tested for both brackish water and sea water.

Brackish water in South Dakota has been demineralized at an estimated cost of $4 per acre-foot predicated upon an estimated conversion plant installation cost of $1,700,000, and salt content of 855 parts per million.

In Arizona, where the water contains 4,635 parts per million salt, the estimate is that brackish water can be made potable with a $10 million investment and a cost of $20 per acre-foot.

In Texas estimates run to $40 per acre-foot in a $20 million plant based on salt content of 10,000 parts per million. This process uses the property of certain plastic membranes to pass only electrically positive particles (cations) and other membranes to pass only electrically negative particles (anions). When salts are dissolved in water they break up into equal quantities of cations and anions which move in opposite directions in an electrical field. The power requirements to reduce salinity to approximately 350 parts per million were experimentally determined. The energy demand per gallon treated in a given sized unit was shown to be inversely proportionate to the production rate; that is, the higher the production rate the lower the energy consumption per gallon. In producing a water product with 350 parts per million salt content to produce 10 acre-feet per hour, that is salt content of 350 parts per million from sea water which contains approximately 35,000 parts per million is shown in the following table:

Membrane area:[1]	*Sea water*[2]
1	1,600
3.3	480
10	160

[1] In million square feet.

[2] Kilowatt-hours per thousand gallons.

For each of the types mentioned above of the total cost per acre-foot the power cost was:

Type:	*Total cost*	*Direct power cost*
South Dakota	$4.08	$2.56
Arizona	19.53	10.34
Texas	40.07	22.60

The above estimates are based on the assumption of 0.3 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Using the above estimates the Bureau of Reclamation has concluded that portions of the southern California and Texas coastal regions where water requirements exceed present local supplies, and those which can be developed, it is physically possible to meet all the future water requirements of those areas with converted sea water. (Saline water conversion program, Research and Development Rept. No. 3, entitled "Potential Use of Converted Sea Water for Irrigation in Parts of California and Texas," p. 2).

The fundamental problem, therefore, is the lack of power in areas which need this program the most. Southern California and Texas do not have available the large blocks of surplus power which would be needed to make such a program feasible at this time.

It is proposed, therefore, that the Atomic Energy Commission build some of its experimental atomic-power reactors in these areas of sufficient size to supply the power necessary for further development of the saline-water program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and compliment the committee on bringing out this bill at this time. It deals with the question of research and development in the problem of desalting water, a problem which is an important one throughout all the arid areas of the world. In many places the great salt ocean borders upon the lands. If that water could be utilized, uncounted millions of acres could be brought into production. I think we should look at this thing realistically. I realize that this is not an event that will occur overnight. It may take several years. However, certainly, in view of the progress that has been made in the research and development and in reducing the cost of desalting water, we should proceed with those very modest research and development projects which are now in existence, and in my opinion we should increase them.

Last week this body passed a $31.4 billion defense bill, thirty-one thousand millions of dollars. We are coming forward here with a very modest request for a total authorization of around $6 million to be spent over a period of time. It seems that when we are spending so many thousands of millions for arms because of the troubled conditions of the world, we are certainly justified in spending a few million in the field of development of cures for some of the reasons for tensions in the world.

Undoubtedly, throughout the world not only in our own country, but throughout the world, lack of food is one of the great tensions that produce disquiet and unrest and eventually prepares the seedbed for the seeds of communism. If we could produce food in abundance in those areas of the world which now cannot produce it because of lack of water, this would be one of the very valuable results of such a program as this. I think it is a modest program and it is something which, I think, the House will approve. I commend the committee and ask for full support by my colleagues of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with those who have spoken in support of this bill. I represent a rather unique district in the State of California. We have 400 miles of coastline. Directly in from that coastline we have 400 miles of territory which desperately and urgently needs water. Anything that can be done along this line experimentally certainly will be most useful and beneficial not only to the State of California, but to the country as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328; 42 U. S. C., secs. 1951 ff.), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By modifying subsection (a) of section 2 of said act so as to read: "by means of research grants and contracts as set forth in subsection (d) of this section and by use of the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories within the monetary limits set forth in section 8 of this act, to conduct research and technical development work, to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation."

(2) By modifying section 8 of said act so as to read: "There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $6 million in all, as may be required (a) to carry out the provisions of this act during the fiscal years 1953 to 1963, inclusive, (b) to finance for not more than 2 years beyond the end of said period such grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and studies as may theretofore have been undertaken pursuant to this act, and (c) during the same additional period plus 1 more year, to correlate, coordinate, and round out the results of studies and research undertaken pursuant to this act. Departmental expenses for direction of the program authorized by this act and for the correlation and coordination of information as provided in subsection (d) of its section 2 shall not exceed $1,500,000, and not more than $500,000 shall be expended for research and development in Federal laboratories. Both of said sums shall be scheduled for expenditure in equal annual amounts insofar as is practicable."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL AID IN FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes. I might say I have cleared this matter with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations and with the minority whip.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "agency head" means the head of any executive department, military department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government;

(b) The term "fire protection" includes personal services and equipment required for fire prevention, the protection of life and property from fire, and fire fighting; and

(c) The term "fire organization" means any governmental entity or public or private corporation or association maintaining fire protection facilities within the United States,

its Territories and possessions, and any governmental entity or public or private corporation or association which maintains fire protection facilities in any foreign country in the vicinity of any installation of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) Each agency head charged with the duty of providing fire protection for any property of the United States is authorized to enter into a reciprocal agreement, with any fire organization maintaining fire protection facilities in the vicinity of such property, for mutual aid in furnishing fire protection for such property and for other property for which such organization normally provides fire protection. Each such agreement shall include a waiver by each party of all claims against every other party for compensation for any loss, damage, personal injury, or death occurring in consequence of the performance of such agreement. Any such agreement may provide for the reimbursement of any party for all or any part of the cost incurred by such party in furnishing fire protection for or on behalf of any other party.

(b) Any agreement heretofore executed which would have been authorized by this act, if this act had been in effect on the date of execution thereof, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

SEC. 3. In the absence of any agreement authorized or ratified by section 2, each agency head is authorized to render emergency assistance in extinguishing fires and in preserving life and property from fire, within the vicinity of any place at which such agency maintains fire-protection facilities, when the rendition of such assistance is determined, under regulations prescribed by the agency head, to be in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 4. Any service performed under section 2 or section 3 of this act, by any officer or employee of the United States or any member of any armed force of the United States shall constitute service rendered in line of duty in such office, employment, or force. The performance of such service by any other individual shall not constitute such individual an officer or employee of the United States for the purpose of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended.

SEC. 5. Funds available to any agency head for fire protection on installations or in connection with activities under the jurisdiction of such agency may be used to carry out the purposes of this act. All sums received by any agency head for fire protection rendered pursuant to this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, a number of departments and agencies of the Federal Government maintain installations in the United States and other parts of the world which are located in or close to local governmental units and other organizations which maintain fire-protection facilities. It has been the practice for Federal agencies maintain-such installations to enter into reciprocal agreements with local fire-protection organizations providing for mutual aid in fighting and preventing fires.

These agreements have proved very satisfactory to the Federal agencies concerned, particularly the military departments and the Veterans' Administration. By making arrangements to obtain the benefit of equipment and personnel available in neighboring communities, it has been possible to save substantial sums which otherwise would be required to provide and maintain additional Federal equipment and personnel.

In 1952, the Comptroller General expressed the opinion that payments to Federal employees for services performed in fighting fires on non-Federal property pursuant to a mutual-aid agreement would constitute an unauthorized use of appropriated funds unless it were shown that such services were necessary to safeguard Federal property. However, the Comptroller General stated that, in view of the protection secured to Government property by mutual-aid agreements which otherwise could be obtained only at greatly increased expense, the General Accounting Office would not object to the mutual-aid agreements with the understanding that the matter be presented to Congress with a view to securing legislative authority for such agreements.

S. 1006 is designed to carry out the recommendation of the Comptroller General. It would grant specific legislative authority to agency heads to enter into mutual-aid agreements with local fire-protection organizations and would ratify and confirm existing agreements.

No actual additional cost to the Federal Government would result from passage of S. 1006. However, if S. 1006 is not enacted and it becomes necessary to cancel existing mutual-aid agreements, the Defense Department alone estimates it would have to spend more than $20 million annually for additional fire-protection personnel and equipment.

This legislation has the approval of the Comptroller General, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and the other agencies which are affected by its provisions. The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations unanimously recommended the favorable consideration by the full committee of an identical bill known as H. R. 6015. The Committee on Government Operations reported H. R. 6015 without a dissenting vote. The committee's report contains a more detailed explanation of the benefits to be derived from H. R. 6015 and from the identical Senate bill, S. 1006. Under unanimous consent, I include this report with my remarks:

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS BETWEEN AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES FOR MUTUAL AID IN FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6015) to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

H. R. 6015 would grant specific legislative authority to department and agency heads to enter into reciprocal fire-protection agreements with local governmental units and public or private organizations maintaining fire-protection facilities near installations under the jurisdiction of such heads within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, or in any foreign country. The bill would ratify and confirm existing agreements for such mutual aid.

Such reciprocal agreements for mutual aid in fire protection have been in effect for a number of years. However, the Comptroller General held in 1952 that, in the absence of specific congressional authority, the use of Federal personnel and equipment to fight fires on non-Federal property in accordance with such reciprocal agreements constituted an unauthorized use of appropriated funds.

The primary objective of this bill is to approve such mutual-aid agreements in order to enable the Federal Government to provide maximum fire protection for its installations and activities at a minimum cost through utilization of local fire-protection personnel and facilities on a reciprocal basis.

The bill would also authorize such agency or department head in the event of an emergency, in the absence of such reciprocal agreement, to make available Government fire-protection personnel and equipment to assist in extinguishing fires and preserving life and property threatened by fire in local areas at or near Government installations when such assistance is determined to be in the best interest of the United States.

BACKGROUND

Many Federal installations in the United States and other parts of the world are located in or close to municipalities or other local governmental units which maintain organized fire-protection facilities. It has been the practice of a number of Federal agencies to enter into reciprocal agreements with local fire-protection organizations near Federal installations providing for reciprocal fire-protection assistance. These arrangements have been very satisfactory, particularly to the military departments and the Veterans' Administration, which have a large number of Federal field installations under their jurisdiction. Federal agencies, by making arrangements to obtain the benefit of equipment and personnel available in neighboring communities, have been able to save substantial sums which would otherwise be required to provide and maintain Federal equipment and personnel.

In past years, mutual fire-protection agreements have apparently been entered into on the assumption that agency heads had implied authority to enter into such agreements and to expend funds pursuant to such agreements in order to carry out their duty to safeguard Federal property under their jurisdiction. In a decision of August 13, 1952, however, the Comptroller General disallowed overtime payments to Federal employees for services performed pursuant to a mutual-aid agreement in extinguishing a fire on non-Federal property. The Comptroller General stated that, in the absence of a showing that such services were necessary to safeguard Federal property, such payments would constitute an unauthorized use of appropriated funds. In concluding his decision, however, the Comptroller General said that in view of the value of the protection thus secured to Government property which otherwise could be obtained only at greatly increased expense, the General Accounting Office "will remove any exceptions still outstanding and raise no further objections to such mutual-aid agreements with the understanding that the matter be presented * * * to the Congress * * * with a view to securing legislative authority for such agreements."

In order to carry out the recommendations of the Comptroller General the Navy Department in 1954, after consulting with other interested agencies, proposed a bill authorizing such mutual-aid agreements. As S. 3773 of the 83d Congress, this bill passed the Senate on August 11, 1954. A similar bill, H. R. 10188, was introduced in the House of Representatives on August 5, 1954, but was not acted upon.

H. R. 6015 is substantially similar in purpose and effect to S. 3773 of the 83d Congress, although different language is used in H. R.

6015 in order more clearly to express the intent of Congress.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H. R. 6015

Section 1 defines the terms used in H. R. 6015.

Section 2 (a) authorizes agency heads to enter into reciprocal fire-protection agreements with local governmental units and public or private organizations maintaining fire-protection facilities near installations under the jurisdiction of such heads within the United States, its Territories, and possessions or in any foreign country. Each such agreement shall provide that the parties thereto waive all claims for loss, damage, injury, or death that may arise against each other in the performance of such agreement, and may provide for reimbursement for the cost of furnishing personnel and equipment pursuant to its provisions.

Section 2 (b) ratifies and confirms existing fire-protection agreements which would have been authorized had the act been in effect on the date of execution thereof.

Section 3 authorizes agency heads, in the absence of any agreement authorized or ratified by section 2, to render emergency fire-protection assistance near any place at which such department or agency maintains fire-protection facilities, when such assistance is determined to be in the best interest of the United States.

Section 4 provides that service performed under section 2 or section 3 by a Federal officer or employee or a member of any armed force of the United States shall be considered to be service performed in the line of duty, and that performance of such service by any other individual shall not constitute such individual an officer or employee of the United States for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Section 5 authorizes the use of funds to carry out the purposes of the act, and provides that sums received by agency or department heads for fire protection rendered pursuant to the act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

ESTIMATED COST

The committee staff was advised by representatives of the Department of Defense that no actual additional cost to the Federal Government would result from the enactment of this measure. However, if the measure is not enacted, various agencies would be required to expend large sums of money for additional fire protection equipment and personnel. Thus, if any additional expenditure for Federal firefighters and equipment becomes necessary under these agreements it will be more than offset by the savings these agreements make possible.

In this connection, the Department of the Navy has advised the committee that, in the absence of such mutual-aid fire protection agreements, the Departmens of the Army and the Navy would have to make an initial expenditure of approximately $5,960,000, and an annual recurring expenditure of approximately $19,820,000 for personnel and equipment. The Air Force estimates an initial expenditure of some $20,000 and annual recurrent expenditures of approximately $35,000 each for an unspecified number of additional companies which would be required.

The Veterans' Administration, with some 65 installations throughout the United States, estimates that without mutual-aid agreements it would have to make an initial expenditure of some $75,000 and an annual recurrent expenditure of approximately $1,250,000.

The Comptroller General has advised that the provisions of section 2 (b) and section 4 of the act would validate past payments of overtime compensation made to Federal civilian fire fighters who rendered services outside the limits of United States reservations in connection with mutual-aid agreements existing prior to the passage of this act. Therefore, these provisions would also authorize retroactive payments in those cases where payments have not been made. However, the General Accounting Office states that it believes that "very few, if any, such payments would be involved" and that it does not object to the retroactive features of the provisions. Furthermore, in view of the explicit statement of the Comptroller General that the General Accounting Office "will remove any exceptions still outstanding and raise no further objections * * * with the understanding that the matter will be presented * * * to the Congress" it is doubtful if any retroactive payments would be involved."

AGENCY COMMENTS

In commenting on S. 3773 of the 83d Congress, a bill similar to H. R. 6015, the State Department said:

"The interest of the Department of State in the proposed legislation is limited to the extent to which it would permit the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to conclude mutual-aid agreements regarding fire protection, with foreign governmental units, such as municipalities and other political subdivisions of foreign states. From the standpoint of the foreign relations of the United States the Department perceives no objection to the military authorities concluding such agreements on the local level and would interpose no objection to the enactment of the proposed legislation."

The Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the Department of the Interior also recommended passage of S. 3773.

The Veterans' Administration expressed an opinion that the provisions of the proposed legislation might extend line-of-duty coverage to Government employees whose assistance in fighting fires was neither requested nor desired. However, the committee believes as does the Comptroller General, that the legislation provides sufficient safeguards to prevent undue liability to the Government and at the same time makes it possible to utilize the services of other than fire-fighting personnel. After calling attention to the above reservation, the Veterans' Adminstration stated that the legislation "would afford a means of obtaining maximum protection of human life and Government and other property at a minimum of cost. The Veterans' Administration strongly recommends its favorable consideration."

The Department of the Navy advised that "the benefits derived through mutual fire assistance have, without question, been overwhelmingly in the Government's favor * * *. Favorable action on the proposed legislation to authorize reciprocal fire protection agreements between military departments and public or private organizations, providing for mutual aid in extinguishing fires, is considered to be highly desirable."

The Department of the Air Force stated that it "strongly supports this legislation which would authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities."

The Department of the Army advised that unless legislation clearly legalizing mutual-aid fire protection agreements is enacted, it would be necessary to cancel present agreements for such mutual aid. The Department stated that "this would be detrimental to both Government and civilian communities with the additional personnel and equipment needed to maintain protection of the caliber now provided resulting in greatly increased expenditures by the Government."

The Department of Agriculture advised the committee it favored enactment of this legislation since the authority provided "would facilitate the protection of forest and range resources from fire. One feature * * * of particular interest to this Department at the present time is the provision for international agreements. Exercise of this particular authority would be primarily in connection with fire protection in the national forests and other lands under the administration of the Department of Agriculture, bordering on or near Canada where at present no authority exists for reciprocal aid agreements."

The Bureau of the Budget recommended favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Comptroller General stated that the legislation "would supply the statutory authority which the Comptroller General has held is necessary for the use of Federal appropriations for mutual aid by the Federal Government and local public or private organizations for fire protection of public and private property * * *," and recommended favorable consideration.

SUMMARY

The enactment of H. R. 6015 would:

1. Meet the objections of the Comptroller General to making payments to Federal personnel for services rendered in fighting fires outside Federal property and to using Federal equipment in fighting such fires when such payment or use is pursuant to a mutual-aid agreement.

2. Result in a substantial saving by making the purchase and maintenance of additional equipment and the hiring of additional personnel unnecessary.

3. Authorize fire-protection assistance in the vicinity of Federal fire-protection facilities in emergencies and when there is no mutual-aid agreement, where such assistance is in the best interest of the United States.

4. Meet with the approval of the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense and other agencies which are affected by its provisions.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(By unanimous consent (on a motion of Mr. FOUNTAIN), a similar House bill, H. R. 6015, was laid on the table.)

MINNESOTA CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my distinguished colleagues from Minnesota in offering a bill today to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union.

When our State came into full partnership in the Union on May 11, 1858, it was already a thriving, progressive Territory, rich in resources and richer still in the enterprise of its people.

While glancing through the "One Hundred Years Ago" column of the nearby Virginia newspaper, the Alexandria Gazette, recently, I came upon this item from its issue of February 8, 1855:

The progress of Minnesota Territory is truly wonderful. It was organized only 6 yeas ago. Thirty counties have since been laid off and nearly all are organized. The population has increased from 5,000 to 30,-

000 or more. The taxable property of the Territory is estimated for 1855 at $7 million. A wire suspension bridge has been thrown over the Mississippi River above the falls of St. Anthony.

This must have been exciting news from the wilderness for the people of Alexandria, the kind of news that led new immigrant pioneers to accept the challenge of carving an empire from the tangle of lands and streams and lakes.

This short passage from one of the great eastern newspapers of the time gives us a clue, I think, to Minnesota's greatest asset when it was admitted to the Union 3 years later—and still her greatest asset—the spirit of hard work.

The pioneers who migrated to Minnesota were not primarily the debtors, heretics, or persecuted who founded so many of our other great States. They were people looking for a home and economic well-being. They came for furs, for lumber, for farms, and finally to build factories.

Under the flags of France and England and Spain, men came to test our unmapped geography and unknown resources. After the Louisiana Purchase and after the British relinquished claim to the Red River Valley, all of Minnesota came under the dominion of the United States.

Americans arrived to stay in 1819 with the founding of Fort Snelling at the confluence of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers. Behind the troops came the enterprising Yankees of the 1830's. Along with the Yankees, in the early 1850's, came the Germans, the Irish, and the Scandinavians. All of these people shared a genius for thrift and hard work.

They set about building farms and towns. They started fur and lumber industries. They turned from the steamboat to cutting roads and building railroads. In the doing they suffered loneliness and back-breaking work, privation and suffering, but most of them stayed on.

Significantly, they dotted the land with churches and schools.

All of them—the Yankees, the Germans, the Irish, the Scandinavians—shared a deeply rooted respect for education along with hard work.

With the Territory only 2 years old, a Territorial legislative committee in 1851 called for the establishment of a university.

The committee's report said that—

> The cause of education in the Territory demands the early establishment of an institution of learning, which shall afford to the youth of the Territory an opportunity of obtaining a liberal, scientific, and classical education. * * * Men do not "gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," neither does society grow virtuous citizens from haunts of vice, or exalted minds from the abodes of ignorance and stupidity.

Wisely, the committee went on to say:

> To govern and restrain the ignorant is far more difficult than to educate and fit men to govern themselves.

Thus 7 years before Minnesota became a State, the Territory chartered the University of Minnesota.

The story of Minnesota's growth and development is really a story of the spirit. More than its resources, the thrift and hard work of its sturdy pioneers mark the reason it thrived and grew into a State of rich and varied opportunities.

The descendants of these settlers still farm the land and work the factories with the same determination to make a home and a way of life out of the resources God has given them. They have preserved the same genius for thrift and hard work.

A hundred years is not a long time in the history of man. But the history of a State is the story of millions of men who lived there in a hundred years, each adding to the great heritage we will commemorate in 1958.

The Minnesota story is a fascinating one, and I wish, Mr. Speaker, that we could tell you more of that story today. We are proud to be part of this great country and therefore are asking you to join with us in marking our 100th year in the Union.

The commemorative coin is only a symbol, but through it the Congress, the Federal Government, and our State exchange appropriate respects on 100 years of happy association.

We hope, too, that all of you will visit us during the centennial year to share more personally in this patriotic celebration to demonstrate our genuine gratitude to the United States as a proud member of the Union.

HOOVER COMMISSION STUDY OF WATER RESOURCES AND POWER

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, a task force of the Hoover Commission has completed a study of water resources and power. This is the largest single project of the Hoover Commission. The membership of the task force comprised some 26 persons including various advisers. The staff hired by the task force numbered some 46 at the peak. Approximately 1½ years were devoted to the investigation and preparation of the report. The task force will have expended, when the printing is completed, more than $400,000 to make this study. These are taxpayers' dollars appropriated by the Congress. I believe that the taxpayers are entitled to know what are the findings and conclusions of the Hoover Commission task force.

Who appointed the task force to make this expensive study? Not the Congress of the United States. The 83d Congress, under a Republican majority, authorized the creation of the second Hoover Commission, just as the 80th Congress, with a Republican majority, authorized the creation of the first Hoover Commission. But Congress did not authorize the creation of a series of satellite commissions known as task forces. So far as I can ascertain, the task force on water resources and power was appointed by Mr. Hoover himself.

Mr. Hoover's views on Federal power development are no secret. He has stated them in speeches and in his memoirs. Why should the public have to pay more than $400,000 to get a documentation of Mr. Hoover's power philosophy?

But the money has been spent and the study has been made. This study should be made public at once so that the people of the United States can find out what new skulduggery is afoot. Considering the composition of the task force, and of the Commission itself, I do not find it difficult to surmise that the task force report on water resources and power will be the giveaway to end all giveaways.

I realize, of course, that the Hoover Commission itself may modify some of the findings of its task force. Nevertheless, the public funds were expended directly by the task force. Its voluminous report undoubtedly will be the bible of the private utilities for years to come.

The release of this report by the Commission will not interfere with the Commission's preparation of its own report. Indeed, the Congress and the public will be better able to appraise the Commission's report if it has a sufficient opportunity to examine the task force report.

Unless the task force report is made public now, probably we will not have an opportunity to see it until the Hoover Commission is about to disband and the Congress is about to terminate its session. The Hoover Commission is slated to terminate May 31, or June 30 if a requested extension of 1 month is granted by the Congress.

The Commission is supposed to be an advisory group to the Congress. Why should the Congress have to wait so long for a completed study? Why all the secrecy?

I hope that other Members of Congress will join me in demanding that the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power be made public at once.

THE LATE MICHAEL E. HENNESSY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks on the death of Michael E. Hennessy, an outstanding newspaperman for 60 years, and to include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Boston Globe of May 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, one of the outstanding members of the profession of journalism, one of its leading figures for many years, Michael E. Hennessy, of Boston, Mass., passed on to his great reward. For over 60 years Mr. Hennessy was connected with the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass.

For many years, wherever correspondents and newspapermen met, and Mr. Hennessy was present, he was always recognized as the dean of those present. He enjoyed the confidence and respect of everyone, either in or out of public life. To those occupying public life, he enjoyed their friendship and their confidence, no matter how high and exalted

or how small their position might be. Possessing great power as he did by reason of his position and standing in his profession, Mr. Hennessy always exercised it constructively, for he was a builder in public opinion.

The private and professional life of Mr. Hennessy was exemplary—above reproach, and an inspiration for all others to follow. He lived up to the highest and noblest traditions of his profession. His profession is enobled by the contributions made to it by him during his lifetime.

In the death of Michael E. Hennessy, or "Mike" Hennessy, as he was so endearingly termed, his countless friends have lost a valued friend. His profession has lost one of its finest assets. Mrs. McCormack and I, who enjoyed his friendship for many years and who valued it very much, have lost a personal friend.

To his loved ones left behind, his two daughters and son, their father and my late friend has left to them a heritage that in their grief and sorrow will always be a consolation to them, and an inspiration for them in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an article on Michael E. Hennessy appearing in the Boston Globe of May 13, 1955, as well as a letter to him from the late James Morgan, appearing in the same issue:

THERE WAS NEVER A BITTER LINE IN MIKE HENNESSY'S POLITICAL WRITINGS

A unique type of personality in American journalism takes leave, with the passing of the Globe's Mike or Colonel Hennessy, as thousands of friends and admirers in New England and all over the country called him.

The high qualities of Mr. Hennessy's character and abilities, and the values of his practically lifelong labors in the reportorial profession are perhaps best epitomized in four testimonials to him:

When friends gathered 'round the festive board at a Boston luncheon to the colonel on his 73d birthday, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent the following greeting:

"My hearty congratulations and all good wishes on your birthday. I hope that for long years to come you may continue to exemplify those rare qualities of a good reporter—honor, honesty, and alertness—which make you a veritable landmark in American newspaperdom. May your shadow never grow less."

And for a similar observance arranged by friends on the day that Mr. Hennessy was passing his 80th milestone in life, President Truman's salutory letter read:

"DEAR MIKE: A wonderful thing it is to reach the fourscore mark after 57 years of active service with the Boston Globe, and eyes still on the future, the best yet to come.

"There are few newspapermen more familiar with national politics than you—few who have enjoyed a larger acquaintance with political leaders or been honored with fuller confidence.

"I salute a hale veteran still serving with distinction in the profession of journalism—admired by all, beloved by many."

LAUDED BY COLLEAGUES

The late William Allen White, sage of Emporia and as publisher of that Kansas city's famed Gazette, an unfailing attendant was Colonel Hennessy at every quadrennial convention of the major political parties since 1900, also held Mr. Hennessy in high regard.

Frederic William Wile, clever foreign correspondent after wide service with the Philadelphia Public Ledger, addressing the Boston Chamber of Commerce 1 day a quarter century ago, praised Mr. Hennessy as "one of the most skillful gatherers of Washington news that any paper has," and added:

"I am a bold man to come to Boston to talk to you about the situation at Washington today when Boston has a correspondent like Mike Hennessy, who flares like a flaming comet across the political firmament at Washington."

These hearty testimonies to Mr. Hennessy's personal and professional worthiness were to be reinforced through the years by countless others from lesser lights in politics, in newspaper work in ecclesiastical circles, in business—but all were of the same refrain. A Boston newspaper dean who had followed his stories from the earliest lately remarked that in 60 years of Hennessy writings "there was never a mean line."

ALL IN GRACEFUL STRIDE

The colonel took it all in graceful stride—none of these or other praises ever swelled the size of his head or swerved his fingers on his trusty typewriter. As the principal speaker at one of his own recent birthday shindys (as he called them), Mike, with his wonted modesty, told his friends in a few well-chosen words: "I thank you with all my heart. I am grateful that you should come in a busy hour of the day to help me celebrate an event in my life. Lowell said, 'He who has a thousand friends has not one friend to spare.' I thank those who have arranged this dinner, for I prefer an ounce of taffy while I'm alive to a pound of epitaphy when I'm dead."

Along with his keen mind, his alertness for political news, his soundness of judgment upon its values and his unfailing sense of fairness in setting it forth, Mr. Hennessy had a strong instinct for sociability. With this trait went a lively humor, which made him ever a well-remembered figure to the lowly he met in his daily rounds, no less than to men and women of distinction in the world of politics.

Mr. Hennessy began flourishing as a reporter at the big conventions and as a commentator on figures on the national stage, soon after getting his primary schooling covering on the Globe staff in the old Federal Building. Those were days when Democrat Leverett Saltonstall (Senator SALTONSTALL'S grandfather) was Grover Cleveland's collector of the port here. Afterwards, Mr. Hennessy was for many years the Globe man at city hall and then at the State house.

FROM GROVER CLEVELAND TO TRUMAN

Thus, beginning with President Cleveland in the days when sturdy Grover summered at Buzzards Bay, Mr. Hennessy had been on cordial terms with every President and Vice President in all the intervening years up to Mr. Truman—and with many a Cabinet officer, governor, Senator, member of the judiciary, and miscellaneous others in high place. Candidate Dewey greeted him as Mike after a little chat between them had established the fact that their maternal ancestors had been reared in Clonakilty in Ireland.

Mr. Hennessy had traveled with most successful presidential candidates on campaign tours. The long perspectives which his journalistic experiences gave him, plus his studious reading of the Nation's political history and his ready knowledge of the record sources made him a quick-reference judge on questions pertaining to individuals, or facts and figures in the never-ending game of politics. He was a tireless, keen-eyed, fast-witted watcher of the political parade—he saw them come, and saw them go, and never lost his head and the vast majority of those he met respected him deeply.

There is the tale from one of Mr. Hennessy's local journalistic buddies about a visit to Boston of Dutch-ancestored President Theodore Roosevelt. Spotting the ample figure of Mr. Hennessy waiting in a corridor for the interview, the President hopped down the steps two at a time, grasped the reporter by both hands and started a jig, chanting:

"The Irish ain't much,
The Irish ain't much,
But a darned sight better
Than the damned old Dutch."

President Taft, on tour or in a White House press conference, always would make much of Mr. Hennessy. He crossed the continent with President Wilson on that last fateful campaign trip, and when the latter broke with Secretary Joseph F. Tumulty, Mr. Hennessy continued his close friendship with Joe.

Mr. Hennessy had by bad luck missed "making" at Plymouth, Vt., the special train bearing President Coolidge Washingtonward after he had taken the oath by lamplight. But by rare good luck he did catch up with, and boarded the train at Bennington.

Mr. Coolidge had inquired for Mr. Hennessy en route, and when told that Hennessy had wired that he would be at Bennington to join the party, the President remarked to his informants: "We ought to hear his chuckle by this time, if he's there, hadn't we?"

President Franklin Roosevelt, on many an occasion, manifested his esteem for Mr. Hennessy, as did Gov. Alfred E. Smith, James F. Byrnes, James A. Farley, John N. Garner and Alf Landon. All of them completely trusted him.

And for his mellow wisdom and his unfailing good humor, the "colonel" was as popular with his coworkers across the country in the journalistic vineyard as he was with the politicos. His distinguished colleague—the Globe's James Morgan—cites a typical demonstration of the affection in which they held him.

At the Chicago convention which gave Franklin Roosevelt his first nomination in 1932, assembled newspapermen from all corners of the country were waiting for their first press conference on that occasion with Al Smith, when Mr. Hennessy hove in sight to join it.

It was his first appearance among his fellows at the big show, and Mr. Hennessy received cheers as loud as if he himself were a candidate. They welcomed him because they knew that he could be depended upon to discount the noisy hoopla, sift the lurid rumors, and somehow keep close to the developing facts in that convention, as he had in so many before.

At one Republican national political convention, a Globe man rode in a hotel elevator with Henry L. Mencken, noted Baltimore Sun writer.

"Where's Mike Hennessy?" Mencken asked the Globe man. He was told that Mike was not able to make the convention; that he was at home.

"It ain't legal," exclaimed Mencken.

Mr. Hennessy's sociability was recognized by his Bostonian coworkers as early as 1911, when he was elected president of the old Boston Press Club, the year of its silver anniversary.

HEADED CLOVER CLUB IN GOLDEN YEAR

A more marked honor in this line came to him in 1933, when he was chosen president of the Clover Club of Boston at its golden anniversary. For several years before that he had been this organization's secretary, and had assisted actively in arranging the bright, breezy, and educational programs at its seasonal dinners.

For this social side of his life, as for his articles, Mr. Hennessy had a great fund of anecdotes and humorous yarns. This was the style of material which enlivened his column in the Sunday Globe Round About With M. E. Hennessy, and shone out over the years in his topical news stories on the

passing political scene. Many of his fans remember to this day some such stories from his series of weekly broadcasts under Globe auspices from station WEEI in 1935.

Out of his personal newspaper experiences and the jottings of his prolific notebooks, Mr. Hennessey found the energy and the time to produce political volumes which remain today as standard records; the first, on the epochal Massachusetts, constitutional convention (1917). The second 7 years later, was titled: "Calvin Coolidge—From a Green Mountain Farm to the White House." In 1935, he revised his earlier-written record of Four Decades of Massachusetts Politics, spanning the stretch between the great Democrat William E. Russell and Representative Samuel W. McCall—so bringing that volume up to date with the Curley regime on Beacon Hill.

AN AMERICAN WITHOUT A HYPHEN

Although Michael Edmund Hennessy was racially Irish to the very core of his heart, he was patriotically an American without a hyphen. While both his parents were natives of the Ould Sod, 'twas in London that he was born, October 24, 1866. For all his traveling on this continent, he was not to set foot on Ireland until 1926. Mr. Hennessy had interviewed Eamon de Valera when that foredestined leader first came to Boston in the twenties—so on that visit to Ireland, he and Mrs. Hennessy were shown around as well as you may imagine for a de Valera Cook's tour.

And at "Dev's" more recent visit to Providence and then to Boston, "Mike" was along with him.

Mr. Hennessy's parents were in process of migration to America at his own birth in London. They brought him across in his ninth year, settling in Jamaica Plain. Brotheen Mike attended Mount Vernon Grammar School, West Roxbury, when that now very populous residential region was all remotely rural from the city in which he was to win distinction. Later, he attended Eliot Academy, Jamaica Plain.

After cub training on the West Roxbury Advertiser, he want to work for the old Yankee-controlled Boston Record-and-Advertiser. In 1889, he joined the Globe staff. A year later, he married pretty Catherine E. Sullivan, of Charlestown. They settled at 46 Gardner Street, West Roxbury—and from the first days onward, his generous heart and her gracious spirit made that home remarked for its hospitality. This was to remain the family home through all the years. Mrs. Hennessy died in 1940.

Among Mr. and Mrs. Hennessy's five deceased children was James Morgan Hennessy, who for several years was secretary to the late William D. Sullivan (then the Globe's managing editor).

He is survived by two daughters, Anna G. and Kathryn Sullivan Hennessy, both of West Roxbury.

LETTER FROM MR. MORGAN, THEN 92, TO M. E. HENNESSY ON REACHING 87

OCTOBER 22, 1953.

CARO MICHELE: Your being a kid of only 87 is no subject for congratulations by me. Rather, I am congratulating myself on the lengthening of the great and precious friendship you have given me through near two-thirds of your life.

Always I see with the eye of memory a young chap who brought in an interview with Ben Butler, wherein he endorsed Russell for governor. As Ben was not noted for a forgiving and forgetting disposition, I doubted his approval of a son of an anti-Butler father, and I asked you to take a proof of your interview back to him for verification. You returned it with his immaterial corrections scrawled in the margin, and that proof still is among my keepsakes.

That was the first and the last time I questioned anything you have written in the some 6 and 60 years that I have summered and wintered with you. Nor have I a recollection of anyone ever challenging your accuracy, though you were in the thick of the political battle for an epoch.

Before you were done roving, with that notebook in which naught was set down in malice, there was no member of the American press more widely known and liked than you from coast to coast. Friend of Presidents and proletarians, you are the best anecdote I know, and many of my most interesting stories of public men I stole from you. Laurence once grumbled that he had to make himself known all over again at every meeting with people at the conventions, but that it was "Hi Mike," with them at every sight of you. Somehow you etched on the minds of all you met the impression of an unforgettable personality. I mind the time that your fellow passengers either stayed up or got up to give you a sendoff at Cobh at an ungodly hour in the morning.

Helen and I are most indebted to you for our acquaintance with the rare beauty of your home life. You have been called upon to endure more than your share of family bereavements but you have borne them as gallantly as you have these long years of separation from the queen of your heart. Fortunately, you have the devotion of the two daughters who are so admirably qualified to carry on the tradition of their mother's gracious hospitality.

You and I have not kept books on each other. But I know that a balance sheet would disclose me hopelessly in debt to you who is happier in giving than in receiving.

United love and good wishes from Cousin Helen and me to you and yours.

JAMES MORGAN.

MICHIGAN WEEK

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, starting this past Sunday, May 15, and continuing through to the following Saturday all Michiganders will observe Michigan Week. I should like to extend to my colleagues here an invitation to join us in our week-long trumpeting about our great State. If the members of the Michigan delegation are seen stalking about with an increased air of pomp and elegance, I would ask the indulgence of your collective understanding for our proud behavior in the coming few days.

I am sure that the Members of this House are equally proud of their home States, and that they, too, have allocated given days of the calendar to bringing public recognition and observance of the many attributes of their State. It is right and proper that we vigorously maintain our singular identity of individual statehood, and staunchly pursue our separate objectives within the framework of our federally constituted Government—for in our diversity we have uncovered the strength that this unselfish individuality affords.

MICHIGAN'S SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION

Each day of this week will have a special significance. Yesterday, Sunday, was designated "Michigan Spiritual Foundations Day," which was devoted to the recollection of the spiritual basis of religious and patriotic values that are fundamental to our system of State government. Our great State has had a particularly close bond with religion. A great deal of the early pioneering settlements of our Upper Peninsula were the results of devoted Catholic missionaries such as Father Jacques Marquette, who found Michigan's first permanent settlement at St. Ignace in 1670. The first Territorial representative to the Congress was the much revered Father Gabrier Richard, the cofounder of the University of Michigan. Yes, the spiritual foundations of Michigan were indelibly recorded by the courageous and dedicated pioneerings of the religious missionaries, who ventured forth unafraid into the unknown in search for the freedom and opportunity that is not afforded by the intolerant. The heritage of Michigan is one of love—love of freedom, love of opportunity, and, most of all, love of God.

EXCHANGE OF MAYORS

Today, Monday, has been designated "Exchange of Mayors Day" for the purpose of promoting better understanding between the peoples of the local villages and cities. By viewing at first hand the community problems of your neighbor, the barriers of misunderstanding are sure to collapse when the spirit of good-neighborliness prevails.

Tuesday, May 17, will be "Michigan Hospitality Day," a day set aside for emphasizing the wealth of attractions that our State holds for the perennial tourist. The natural friendliness of Michigan people is sure to make any visit a memorable one.

EDUCATION

The following day, Wednesday, May 18, is Education Day. The important role that education has played in our State's growth and development will be highlighted by the convening of the White House Conference on Education. Our State has long been a leader in the important field of education. Its educational system has been used as a model in nearly all the Western States. Michigan stands third in the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Founded in 1817, the University of Michigan is regarded as the mother of State universities because of its leadership in the development of State-supported higher education. Michigan State College, now celebrating its centennial, was the first agricultural college in America. The University of Detroit, my alma mater, is one of the largest Jesuit universities in the world. As has been said of the British Empire "that the sun never sets on England's possessions," so it has been said of the work of the Holy Order of the Society of Jesus. It's present president, Father Calestin Steiner, is a recognized leader in the field of Catholic education. Just recently the University of Michigan was the site of the historical medical victory achieved by Dr. Jonas E. Salk over the polio virus. The efforts of our State in the field of education emphasizes our belief that knowledge is power and the greatest deterrent to the evils of ignorance and suppression of the truth.

OUR LIVELIHOOD

This coming Thursday, has been chosen as Our Livelihood Day. On this day all Michiganders will reflect upon the diversity of means by which the people of the community make their living. The paramount manufacturing industry of our State is, of course, the automobile. From Detroit comes over one-half of the Nation's total production of passenger cars. Over 1 million persons are employed by Michigan's 10,000 factories. Michigan ranks first in percentage of income derived from manufacturing. But, Michigan, is also a great agricultural State as well. Michigan is the most self-sufficient food producer in the Nation. It leads the country in production of sour cherries, navy beans, cantaloupes, celery, cucumber pickles, and strawberries. The richness of our natural resources is attested to by the following facts: The only large commercial deposit of native copper in the world is located in Michigan. Michigan has more forest land than any other State: 937,687 acres. Located in our upper peninsula is one of the largest iron-ore producing regions in the world. From these natural ingredients of natural and manufactured wealth there is found in our State practically every known craft, art, or vocation that our civilization has uncovered. The opportunities for making a living are many in the State of Michigan.

HERITAGE

Appropriately one day, Friday, May 20, has been set aside to memorialize the heritage of Michigan. It will appraise the traditions, culture, and resources that stand today as the "mainsprings" of this and future generations of our State.

NEW FRONTIERS

The last day, Saturday, May 21, properly looks to the future. On this day, New Frontiers Day, the people of Michigan will take a vigorous look to the future with the sober realization that our State must secure for itself and all America the fruits of a truly revolutionary era. Three great human advancements will be centered about the State of Michigan: the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which will open the heart of America to the seaports of the world; the advent of automation, which will radically effect the now major element of manufacture, labor; and the first commercial use, for peaceful purposes, of atomic energy. The responsible use of these three great additions to our technical genius will require the leaders of our state to weigh judiciously, in the scales of human justice, the inherent rights of labor along side the revolutionary methods of manufacture. To achieve one, at the expense of the other, will reward us with chaos. I have faith that the wisdom that these leaders have demonstrated in the past will be reflected in their policies of the future.

I'M GLAD I LIVE IN MICHIGAN

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will not judge Michiganders as conceited when they hear repeated the theme of Michigan week 1955 "I'm glad I live in Michigan." This expression is not to be interpreted with a silent "rather than." It is really a demonstration of appreciation by all Michiganders for the multitude of opportunities that exist in our State for serving all America. It is joyous gratitude for our God-given special endowments, and through their display it is a sharing of those gifts with the rest of the world. It is this spirit of sharing that we extend to you, our sister States, during Michigan week.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks made in Committee of the Whole in connection with the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126 just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONFUSION ABOUT SALK VACCINE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now over a month since we learned that the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis was proved successful and effective. We were told then, that the mass innoculation of all our children could begin immediately. Our joy and our gratefulness knew no bounds.

However, the elation we all knew on April 12, 1955, when with unstinting fanfare the success of Dr. Salk was announced, has been reduced in a few short weeks to bewilderment, worry, and new fear, bringing the entire situation to the border of pandemonium. The most horrifying aspect being the fact that the ugly morning after is not wearing off. It lingers and seems to get worse. The confusion engendered by the niggardly attitude and pronouncements of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is indeed a sorry sight. From April 12 on to today, no plan, no program, in fact, no suggestion or guidance has been forthcoming from the Department of the United States Government charged with responsibility over our health and welfare. Were it not for the fact that lives are at stake, time could be relied upon to correct Mrs. Hobby's folly. Children's lives are being endangered if not lost by each minute of delay.

Several bills designed to give President Eisenhowever standby power to put Federal control into effect over the price and distribution of Salk vaccine have been introduced. The first of these was proposed on April 18. The chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. SPENCE] has scheduled and held hearings on these measures, which would put the ultimate decision to invoke control in the hands of the President. The Surgeon General has appeared before that committee, suspended and now partially restored Federal approval of the vaccine. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, was scheduled to appear before our committee last week. She begged to be excused and despite repeated invitations to testify at a time convenient to her has remained unavailable to the House of Representatives while her subordinate, the Surgean General, states he cannot speak for the Department.

Certainly, no one would suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is not concerned and worried and working. They appear to be breaking all records for holding intra-office, closed conferences. These proceed night and day. The result of each, as the New York Herald-Tribune has so ably pointed out, is a marked lack of clarity. Nothing has been put forward up to this time by the Office of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby which brings light to the situation or brings order to the confusion created by this apparent abnegation of her duty. There has been far too much lack of clarity in what was from the outset an emergency situation of national proportions.

On April 13, 1955, it was reported that Mrs. Hobby called off a full-dress, ceremonial press conference scheduled for 4 p. m. because the Public Health Service had not yet submitted its final judgment on the vaccine evaluation study made by Dr. Francis. At 5:15 p. m. that day Mrs. Hobby signed the documents licensing but six pharmaceutical firms to manufacture the vaccine. Every public statement issued by Mrs. Hobby indicates that her Department did not know until April 12 that the report on the Salk vaccine would be favorable; that it made no preparations whatsoever based on the eventuality that the report might be favorable, and that it did not begin to study the Francis report until that same day. This fantastic failure would be ludicrous if it were not so patently tragic.

The Public Health Service entered the picture as early as late in 1953, when it was invited to participate by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. On May 13, 1954, Dr. W. G. Workman, of the National Institutes of Health Laboratory of Biologics Control of the Public Health Service, attended a conference where he helped Dr. Salk and members of the staff of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis explain the step-by-step process of both producing and testing the Salk vaccine to representatives of 11 drug companies.

Two of the firms represented at the 1954 meeting, which were licensed on April 12 of this year to manufacture the Salk vaccine, have their stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange. On March 1, 1955, the price of these 2 stocks was 23¼ and 37⅞, respectively. By April 11, before the results of the Francis report were made public, these 2 stocks were selling for 29¼ and 49⅝. Perhaps it is mere coincidence, but these two prices are about the highs for both firms this year.

I am proud to say that Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of the health department in my own New York

City, was preparing last fall for what Dorothy Kahn in the April 19 issue of the Reporter magazine calls one of the greatest opportunities in preventive medicine in our time. On October 24, 1954, Dr. Baumgartner told the New York Times that her office was making plans to protect as many children as possible if the vaccine should prove effective.

But the Public Health Service of the United States says it knew nothing until April 12. Since then, however, the Surgeon General and Secretary Hobby have conferred and conferred and conferred. The only tangible result of their deliberations thus far has been the entire suspension of the inoculation program, now partially restored, and the repeated statement that no need exists for Federal control or standby authority over the distribution of the vaccine.

Walter Lippmann, in a brilliant article published May 10 in the New York Herald Tribune, lucidly set the record straight. He wrote:

> The fact of the matter is that on April 12, the responsible authorities went off half-cocked. * * * The inaction of the Federal Government was due in some considerable degree to theoretical misconceptions, to unexamined and false notions of the general principles of free enterprise, voluntary cooperation, and decentralization—and to the strange prejudice that the only way the Federal Government can assume direction and control of anything is to build up a vast bureaucracy.

Certainly it is a good thing to have differing schools of thought on the question of Federal control. Honest differences of opinion and their open discussion have built this great country. Mrs. Hobby could have helped that process by coming before a committee of the House and making an attempt to clarify the issues, inform the public, and candidly express her views as to granting President Eisenhower the power to decide whether we should have control or not.

I think we must have control now. Too much time has already elapsed. My bill would give the President power to use control or to use voluntary agreements. We can give the President the authority to take action quickly and effectively. Further delay could be disastrous. I am confident that the House will take the appropriate and necessary action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the bill S. 1006, and include a report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon in executive session during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, while the House was in Committee of the Whole, I asked and received unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD.

I now ask unanimous consent to include therewith a statement made before the Senate Interior Committee in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS FOOD PROGRAM IN ILLINOIS

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it came to my attention recently that the Illinois Public Aid Commission, the State agency who had been handling the distribution of surplus food commodities in my district and other Illinois critical labor areas, had indicated its desire to discontinue this food distribution program to needy people. Even though no indication was given by the commission as to why it desired to discontinue this program, it is entirely possible that it was discouraged by the present investigation now being conducted by the House subcommittee of the Illinois school lunch program.

Having been advised by the United States Department of Agriculture that it had adequate surplus commodities available and ready for shipment into this depressed area, but that the Department of Agriculture could not ship such surplus commodities without a request from the proper State agency, I sent the following telegram to Governor Stratton on May 4 urging immediate action by him so that this program would not be discontinued:

MAY 4, 1955.

GOV. WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Springfield, Ill.:

Investigation by me as to the probable discontinuance of distribution of surplus food commodities in my district and other Illinois critical labor areas reveals Federal Government has adequate surplus commodities available and ready for shipment into this stricken area. Am further advised by the Director of the food-distribution program, United States Department of Agriculture, that the Illinois Public Aid Commission has indicated its desire to discontinue this distribution. The United States Department of Agriculture cannot ship such food commodities to Illinois without request from the proper State agency. Inasmuch as group IV, critical labor areas, are in dire need of continuance of this assistance program, urgently request that you take immediate action to designate appropriate State agency to continue the administration of this surplus commodity program in Illinois. Please wire collect advising action taken by you.

PETER J. MACK, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Although I have not, as yet, received an answer to my telegram to the Governor, and regardless of the reason the Illinois Public Aid Commission desired to discontinue the handling of these much needed surplus food commodities in these critical labor areas, I am pleased to inform the House today that the commission has advised me of its willingness to continue this program, and has also advised that 2 days after my telegram to the Governor the commission "notified all counties in group IV, critical areas of Illinois, that surplus food commodities would be continued." It is most gratifying to know that this action has been taken by the State agency following my telegram to Governor Stratton, inasmuch as these people in this depressed area are badly in need of this Federal assistance.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE SHOULD BE REVIEWED IMMEDIATELY BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, ever since Congress enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, each year as I take my active duty for training as a Naval Reserve captain, I am confronted with criticism of the code from officers of all branches of the armed services with whom I come in contact.

As yet I have not found a single officer who favors the code in its present form.

In fact, many officers urged me as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to interest my colleagues in Congress in seeking a careful review of the code to the end that it may be substantially revised.

Mr. Speaker, the Uniform Code of Military justice made little change in the substance of the criminal law which governed the armed services prior to and during World War II, but it did make tremendous procedural changes in that law.

It is in the field of procedure that changes are now required.

Present procedure imposes a great burden upon the United States, a burden which results in no compensating benefit to anyone.

This burden is a costly one.

It is estimated that the annual cost of administering the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the armed services is at least $158 million.

This estimate includes only those items of cost which are susceptible to exact computation, namely, the costs of trial, the costs of operating places of confinement, and the wages paid persons in confinement.

This sum, $158 million, would provide pay and allowances for 90,000 enlisted

men of the lowest pay grade for a year; it would pay for all the gas and oil used by all Navy and Marine Corps aircraft for 1 year; it would purchase 930 training aircraft.

The burden imposed by the code is costly, too, in that it has increased the time spent by personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps in confinement.

Before the code came into effect the Navy and Marine Corps confined an average of 3.5 persons per thousand.

Now the Navy and Marine Corps confine an average of 8 persons per thousand.

The incidence of confinement has more than doubled.

The burdens which the code places upon the United States are such as no civilian criminal jurisdiction could tolerate for any appreciable length of time.

For example, no civilian jurisdiction could operate its criminal code for long without recourse to bail.

There is no equivalent for bail in the criminal code of the armed services.

Military offenders must be confined if they are escape risks.

Most are escape risks because 80 percent of them are guilty of some type of absenteeism.

Ordinarily civilian criminal codes do not require mandatory reviews of the record before the sentence can be executed.

After conviction by a criminal court a civilian offender may begin to serve his sentence.

This is not true in the military practice.

Before the sentence may be executed there are certain reviews that must be accomplished.

The record must be reviewed by the officer who convened the court; in most cases there must be a review by a supervisory authority as well; and in cases approaching any degree of severity of sentence there must be a review by a board of review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned.

Superimposed upon all of these mandatory reviews there is a 30-day appeal period during which an accused person may file a petition for a review by the United States Court of Military Appeals.

This period must be allowed to elapse in appropriate cases before the sentence may be executed.

During the time consumed in making mandatory reviews of the record and during the mandatory appeal period the United States must keep its military prisoners confined.

There is no bail.

However, the sentence of confinement, if any, against an accused person begins to run from the date he is sentenced by the court.

This, of course, is fair and should remain in effect.

Ordinarily in a civilian criminal practice, it will cost an accused person something if he wishes to appeal.

There are likely to be costs of court for him to pay, and he will in most instances be faced with the necessity of employing a lawyer.

These costs will not be encountered by a military offender.

There are never any circumstances under which any court costs are are paid by an accused; and, unless he wishes to employ civilian counsel, the Government will furnish him counsel free, not only for his trial but for the entire appellate procedure as well.

Financially speaking, therefore, there is no impediment upon an accused person appealing his case all the way, even if he entered a plea of guilty at his trial.

Perhaps the most significant and important procedural defect in the uniform code of military justice lies in the fact that the appellate bodies provided by the code are in no way protected from frivolous appeals.

It has been pointed out that there is no fiscal impediment to appeal.

There is no essential impediment, either.

There need be no real cause for appeal.

A petition to the Court of Military Appeals will come about upon the simple announcement by an accused that he wishes to appeal.

He need specify no reason; in fact, he need not have a reason.

The procedural difficulties previously discussed, namely, no bail; multiple mandatory reviews of the record of trial; a mandatory appeal period; no costs to an accused person; and the fact that appellate bodies are not protected from frivolous appeals; combine to place a burden upon the United States which is unreasonable and harsh and does no one, not even the accused, any good.

It is a common problem with the services to find an accused who wishes to have his sentence finally executed but who cannot be accommodated, although the Government is willing, because of the procedural requirements which must first be satisfied.

The cost, the wasted time are serious burdens imposed by the new code.

However, a more lamentable result of the code has been that although it was designed to make things easier or fairer for accused persons, its net effect has been to make Federal criminal offenders of many young men who, but for the code, would have had their cases disposed of by a commanding officer and would thus have avoided a record of conviction by court-martial.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice is said to apply adversary proceedings to the trials of persons for crimes in the armed services.

It surely does this.

Its adversary proceedings have replaced for the Navy and Marine Corps the procedures under the Articles for the Government of the Navy which are often described as paternal procedures.

A paternal procedure for administering discipline is not a bad system.

In replacing the Navy's and the Marine Corps' paternal systems with the adversary system of the uniform code, the powers of commanding officers to dispose of cases of infraction of discipline without reference to a court were greatly reduced.

This has inevitably resulted in more punishment by court-martial in cases which in the past would have been handled by the commanding officer himself.

The men have suffered.

More of them go before courts and become convicted of Federal offenses.

The code is an important Federal criminal statute.

Men convicted under it enter the category of those convicted of violations of such Federal statutes as the Lindbergh Act, the Dyer Act, the Mann Act, and others.

Actually most military offenders are mere juvenile delinquents, mere wayward boys guilty in 80 percent of the cases of some form of absenteeism which in civilian practice is not a crime at all; and yet the delinquent boy achieves the role of one convicted of a Federal offense.

His commanding officer has no alternative unless he will excuse the offense or inflict completely inadequate punishment, either of which will ruin the discipline of his command.

For the reasons I have cited, the Uniform Code of Military Justice should receive careful scrutiny during the present session of Congress with a view to substantial change.

The feeling in this regard is greatly strengthened by an opinion that the code's cumbersome procedures, burdensome and time consuming as they are, could not stand the test of mobilization.

The strain of mobilization would result in a breakdown of the code's processes and leave the services with no formal machinery for the maintenance of discipline and good order among its members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SILER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER and include an article on Iowa manufactures.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

Mr. FJARE.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. BOYLE in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ENGLE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SISK regarding the farm program.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speak-

er's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Toy Lin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 892. An act for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kawar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Rosita A Jocson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1581. An act for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1645. An act to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Scalo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gariella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Buildeath and Lenora Patricia Buildeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

795. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

796. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841), the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

797. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending March 31, 1955, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

798. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending March 31, 1955, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

799. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 7 of 'An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

800. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

801. A letter from the executive secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit of the American Society of International Law by a certified public accountant for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the act of September 20, 1950 (64 Stat. 869); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, entitled 'Crimes and Criminal Procedure,' of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

803.—A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report pertaining to war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public for the period as of March 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

804. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $3,700,000 for the Department of the Interior, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

805. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on business enterprises, pursuant to section 1 (5) of Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc.

No. 162); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

806. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1955, the following bill was reported on May 13, 1955:

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6239. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 16, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H. R. 5239. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 590). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Reorganization Act of 1946 regarding an investigation of the development of the common system of air navigation and traffic control (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4853. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1955, the following bill was introduced on May 13, 1955:

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 6239. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred May 16, 1955*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 6240. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6241. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Alaska so as to provide for a 30-day session of the legislature in each even-numbered year; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6242. A bill to grant school lands in Alaska to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6243. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6244. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6245. A bill to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colón, Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6246. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6247. A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6248. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6249. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6250. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6251. A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14—discharges, when granted—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended, and subdivision (b) of section 58—notices—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6252. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6253. A bill to provide for an annual audit of the accounts of the White County Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6254. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 6255. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to increase the annuities of present and future annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 6256. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 6257. A bill to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6258. A bill to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6259. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6260. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 6261. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6262. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 6263. A bill to amend section 1233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 117 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6265. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 6266. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 6267. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 6268. A bill to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 6269. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 6270. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 6271. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 6272. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide a preference for elderly couples in determining eligibility for admission to low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 6273. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 6274. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 6275. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to provide that gifts to certain religious, charitable, and other organizations shall not be deemed nondeductible because of activities carried on outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6276. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6277. A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6278. A bill to authorize the conveyance for public purposes of certain lands in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Res. 244. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. Res. 245. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JUDD: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota requesting issuance of coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to flood control in San Bernardino County, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the protection of the public health and safety from the hazards of peacetime use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to include coffee under the parity payment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide continued reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients in Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a tariff on fresh, frozen, and unprocessed fish, and to devote the proceeds to research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama and the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of the next of kin of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Uyehara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 6279. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha K. Martensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6280. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6281. A bill for the relief of Capt. William S. Ahalt, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6283. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6284. A bill for the relief of Emilio Poglianich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6285. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

263. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of 66 railroad employees of Sioux City, Iowa, members of the Railroad Employees Clubs of America, Inc., urging enactment of legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act with respect to retirement age and years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

264. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of citizens of Ilion, N. Y., favoring H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

265. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Holy Name Society, St. Jerome's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Administration's Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks both William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff have made important proposals for winning the cold war, and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate, has called for the greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war. General Sarnoff, in a memorandum presented to the President on April 5 urged that an amount equivalent to 5 or 7½ percent of military defense appropriations be granted to a strategy board for political defense. This, of course, without reducing the military budget and not counting foreign military aid and point 4 types of expenditure. General Sarnoff said:

> I am convinced that if the American people and their Congress are made fully aware of the menace we face, of the urgent need for meeting it, and the possibility of doing so by means short of war, they will respond willingly as they have always done in times of national crisis. They will realize that no investment to win the cold war is exorbitant when measured against the stakes involved, and against the costs of the bombing war we seek to head off.

I have introduced several bills in this Congress which are designed to enhance the cultural and artistic prestige of our country for I am convinced that this is as important as any of the "guns and butter" programs which we support. One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the

peoples of the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cue from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist Parties in the various countries and the U. S. S. R. find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1955, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has this to say:

Mr. President, I have been pleased to note the increasing evidences of America's counteroffensive against the worldwide Soviet cultural propaganda effort. That Soviet effort is two-pronged. It is (a) designed to defame American culture as allegedly "crass" and "materialistic"; and (b) it is designed to paint a rosy picture of what is actually the barren and enslaved so-called culture of the U. S. S. R.

I am glad to say that an invaluable instrument in our own accurate worldwide cultural effort is the American National Theater and Academy, which was wisely chartered by the Congress under a bill signed by the President of the United States as far back as July 5, 1935.

General Sarnoff states that:

Before essaying a breakdown of cold-war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking. The expanded offensive with nonmilitary weapons must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it.

As early as 1948 John Foster Dulles wrote that:

We need an organization to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is working and winning its victories. * * * We ought to have an organization dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense, just as the present Secretary of Defense heads up the organization of military defense. The new department of nonmilitary defense should have an adequate personnel and ample funds.

Perhaps the most important of the bills I have introduced in the present Congress is H. R. 5040 which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. A subcommittee has just been established to consider the administration's bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the other bills before the committee which provide for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. With the growing recognition of the importance of these proposals and the challenging plans of Mr. Hearst and Mr. Sarnoff before us it is high time that hearings were held and that meritorious legislation be reported to the floor for consideration by this Congress.

I include here editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, and the Washington Post and Times Herald which discuss the administration's proposals and the other bills before this Congress. Also included is an article from the Chicago American, by David Sentner, chief of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1955]

OUR CONGRESS COPES WITH CULTURE

(By Jay S. Harrison)

The traditional lethargy that inevitably smothers the question of governmental assistance to American artists and art has recently been dealt a decisive jolt. Though they have achieved no especial notoriety, several bills, motions, and suggestions have in the last month been discussed in Washington that point to a renewed interest on the part of our lawmakers in the forces and functions of culture. In fact, they are so many and their stipulations so elaborate that only a few, at best, can be summarized here.

On April 20 Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New York, introduced a bill, thereafter referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which was designed to "provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes." In part, it stated:

"(A) That the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative."

VITAL TO GENERAL WELFARE

"(B) That the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, is essential to the general welfare and the national interest; and

"(C) That the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government."

Having thus lucidly established its premise, the measure declares in the second section:

"There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. * * * The Commission shall be composed of 21 members, appointed by the President, from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one of more of the arts."

STUDIES OUTLINED

And as to the bill's meaning, the following explanation is made in section 3:

"The Commission shall undertake studies of, and make recommendations to, appropriate methods * * * for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies shall be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the field of art involved, appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission."

The remainder of H. R. 5756, for so the bill is numbered, devotes itself to the implementation necessary to setting the Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts on a footing sound and firm.

The administration's bill, H. R. 5756, was further accompanied by an excerpt from the President's state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955:

"In the advancement of the various activities which would make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

These sentiments alone, formulated by an eminence in our political hierarchy, indicate that the Government has seriously begun to concern itself with an enterprise previously left pretty much to its own tottering devices. And as if this healthy sign were not enough, the current issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, published May 9, contains a lively debate on the construction, in Washington, of a civic auditorium "including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center." Holding to the view that such a hall is necessary to insure that the District of Columbia become an authentic cultural capital, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey—who, incidentally, has introduced several excellent bills similar to Representative WAINRIGHT's—has this to say:

"One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a Nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world.

"The fine arts are a unifying force, as Washington and Jefferson knew, and they are especially important to us now when our country is assailed from within and from without by divisive and undemocratic forces from the right and from the left."

These, clearly, are the words of an enlightened man. They reflect a judgment that knows art, understands what its powers are. And Representative THOMPSON's is no voice crying in the wilderness. Given time, one suspects he will be joined by a hale chorus of supporters sharing his goals and supplementing his ideals.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 16, 1955]

FOR AN ARTS COMMISSION

The hope of a civic auditorium and fine-arts center for Washington was pushed a tiny step forward last week with House passage of a bill creating a Commission to form plans for such a project. Planning is an indispensable preliminary. But the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts urged by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January is still a radiant but remote vision. Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, a Republican, has introduced a bill drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which embodies the President's ideas in this connection. Its merit is attested by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, a Democrat, who some time ago made a rather more comprehensive proposal for an arts commission plus an auditorium and art center for the Nation's Capital.

The President was right when he said in his state of the Union message that "in the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities." We believe that governmental encouragement and stimulation—something altogether different from the regimentation and control characteristics of totalitarian states—can give great impetus to the arts. And we heartily agree with Secretary Hobby's observation that "encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a

nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny."

No better beginning could be made by a Federal Acts Commission than the creation of an auditorium and art center in Washington. This is why we prefer Mr. THOMPSON's bill to Mr. WAINWRIGHT's. The need for such a center was underscored this week by the Metropolitan Opera Co.'s recourse to a motion-picture theater for temporary accommodation here. The opera, and other forms of art, need a home of their own in Washington.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 11, 1955]

AUDITORIUM STUDY

Washington's lack of a civic auditorium adequate to the needs of a city of this size and importance long has been of concern to public and private interests. Demands for a hall large enough to accommodate unusual national or local events, such as inaugural balls, operas, expositions, and the like, have been recurrent over recent years. There never has been a special study of the various problems involved in a major project of this kind, however. Therefore, the House has taken a step in the right direction in voting to create a 21-member commission to consider the auditorium problem.

The move is timely because of the possibility of fitting the project into the broad program for redevelopment of Southwest Washington. The Zeckendorf plan envisions a large meeting hall and cultural center in the heart of the rebuilt community along the water front. Sites in other parts of Washington have been suggested from time to time, including one near the East Capitol Street Bridge. More vexing than the site question is the problem of financing so huge an undertaking. Always in the past any proposal for Federal or District financing has withered under the drought of funds for nonessential improvements.

Lately, however, there has been talk of interesting private investors in a community auditorium enterprise. There have been reports that outside promoters have made inquiries into the availability of suitable sites and into economic aspects of such a plan. The proposed commission can help to clear up the confusion over location, sponsorship, financing, and uses of a great hall for public and commercial gatherings in the Nation's Capital. Until some authoritative information on the project is prepared, the auditorium idea is not likely to make much headway.

[From the Chicago American of April 29, 1955]

HOUSE GROUP OKs PLAN FOR CULTURE HALL

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, urges congressional action to promote American culture and sports.

The action would be in line with the program for competitive coexistence with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

The House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON's first bill on the subject. It provides for creation of a Federal commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center.

WARNINGS CITED

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers and by Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing supremacy at the international games.

THOMPSON said his legislation is designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain, where he interviewed the four top Russian leaders.

The proposal would create a National Advisory Committee under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

Welfare Secretary Hobby has approved a bill, introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New Jersey, for establishment of a Federal commission on the arts and for other purposes.

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

RUSSIAN LEAD

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games unless there is a sudden reawakening in this country.

THOMPSON declared:

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, started more than 20 years ago, was a substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Radolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

THOMPSON added that the legislation introduced by himself, Representative ROOSEVELT, of California, and Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, is designed to carry out the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst.

Progress Report on Desalting Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, in the last decade the diminishing water supply in this country has become a matter of great concern. To realize there is good cause for this concern one only needs to examine past history where whole civilizations have vanished from certain areas of the earth because their water supplies were exhausted.

As the water needs of our country grow, as agriculture and industry require more and more water and our available supplies dwindle, the importance of water to our well-being and to our overall national economy is impressed upon us more and more. Expansion of our industries, our growing populations, and expanding agricultural production have increased tremendously the demand for large quantities of fresh water. This continued growth and expansion has placed a severe drain on water resources in certain areas. The sources of water on which we normally rely are gradually being exhausted and, through use and reuse, the supplies derived from these sources are being contaminated. There is an urgent need then for finding additional fresh-water sources.

Last year thousands of cities and towns throughout the Nation were forced to adopt measures curtailing water use. The availability of water has become a major factor in the location of industry, as industrial water needs rapidly expand.

In the face of this alarming water situation, there is encouraging news for many of the areas most concerned over their dwindling water supplies. These are the areas that have an unlimited source of water but up to now this water has not been useable because of the salt content. There is enough fresh water in 1 cubic mile of ocean water to supply the entire Nation for 8 days. The problem then is to separate the pure water from the salt and this problem is well on the way to being solved.

On June 2, 1952, this body—House of Representatives—passed legislation establishing a research program with the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting saline or salt water to fresh water. This legislation was enacted and became known as the Saline Water Act of 1952. I am happy to report that progress under this research program has been encouraging. No longer does any area have to face the possibility of running out of water as long as there are supplies of salt or saline water available. Economic demineralization of saline water is in sight.

By this program initiated by the Congress in 1952, the foundation is being laid for realistic development of practical conversion processes. At the beginning of the program the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was estimated at about $400 to $500 an acre-foot. The initial cost goals for the program were set at $125 per acre-foot for municipal water and $40 per acre-foot for irrigation water on the basis that these amounts represented about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use. These goals are in sight and it is believed that they can be reached and lowered if the research is continued.

In accordance with the Saline Water Act of 1952, the research program is being accomplished under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior through, first, federally financed contracts for conducting scientific research with private scientists and engineers, educational institutions, scientific organizations, and engineering firms; second, encouraging development of saline water conversion processes by correlating and coordinating efforts in this field; and third, stimulating the interest of private and public organizations and individuals in the

program. Some of the outstanding scientists in the country are working on the problem. In addition, there is a group of eminent leaders of educational, scientific, and industrial organizations serving as an advisory board to provide the Secretary with advice on broad policy matters relating to the program. The research and development now in progress is being watched with much interest by those engaged in similar projects in a number of foreign countries and there is cooperation between this Government and those abroad having mutual interest in this problem.

Many ideas and processes have been studied. Some have shown promise and some have been discarded. The processes under study include: First, electric membrane processes; second, vapor compression distillation; third, solar distillation; fourth, critical pressure devices; fifth, osmotic processes; sixth, solvent extraction; and seventh, separation by freezing. The technical details of these processes for those who are interested may be obtained from the printed hearings before the Interior Committee or may be obtained from the Department of the Interior.

The program embodied in the 1952 act was for 5 years and called for the expenditure of $2 million over the 5-year period. H. R. 2126 would amend the Saline Water Act of 1952 to provide for uninterrupted continuation of the saline water conversion research program. This legislation would modify the basic act by extending the period of the research program by 5 years, by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $6 million, and by permitting research to be carried on to a limited extent in existing Government laboratories.

Under the provisions of the 1952 act, all research activities and field tests, including reports thereon and the correlation and coordination of all data, must be completed prior to July 15, 1957. It is necessary that extension of the program be authorized at this time if it is to continue without interruption. Under the existing law, most active research contracting would have to be terminated by about December of this year to permit completion of the work under the contract and final reporting of the results and conclusions by the deadline of July 1957.

Unless the program is extended, it would be terminated just at a time when the need for advance research and development of the most promising processes is expected to be paramount. Up until now, most of the research and development on processes has been on a relatively small-scale laboratory basis. Much of this exploratory research needs to be continued; however, in addition a few processes have shown sufficient promise to warrant the installation of pilot plants or the undertaking of field tests. Such plants and tests are essential in order to obtain reliable cost estimates and information on the durability of the unit, production capacity, power requirements and other data necessary to demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale conversion.

The need for authority to use Government laboratories to a limited extent is primarily for the purpose of making unbiased comparisons of processes in confirmation of research results.

With the encouraging results from recent advancements, primarily as a result of the legislation passed in 1952, I do not hesitate to predict that this research program, if it is continued, will result in development of processes which will, within the extension requested by this legislation, produce fresh water for municipal use in certain areas at a cost that is competitive with other sources and will produce fresh water for agricultural purposes in certain areas from brackish water at a cost which will be feasible.

Biscuits and Cornbread for Coal Miners and Other Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3706, similar to several others of equal intent and purpose, seeking to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to process our surplus grains, now owned by the taxpayers but which are no more useful than a miser's coins under the floor board, in order that those grains may become flour and meal for our unemployed coal miners and for other Americans. Like the hoarding miser, we know the grain is ours somewhere in nice storage piles, but in our inner wisdom from the Lord, we also know that such stored grain will never be useful until placed in channels of human consumption at home or abroad. And I for one believe in being good to our own before we hunt for recipients for our goods in Turkey or Pakistan. I do hope many Members of this body will give much thoughtful consideration to the desirability for this type of legislation during these days of unemployment in our great coal industry. If we encourage Venezuela by permiting that country to ship unlimited quantities of residual oil into America to compete with our domestic coal industry, then we ought to encourage our own unemployed coal miners by enacting legislation authorizing the processing of surplus grains into flour for biscuits and into meal for corn dodgers for the worthy families of some of the best Americans this side of Paradise, the mining people of southeastern Kentucky and of other sections of our coal-mining regions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a poet. But once I was booked for a memorial address at a little mining community down in Whitley County, Ky., in honor of the departed coal miners all of us had known and loved as neighbors and friends before they were called to that mystic bourne from which no traveler has ever returned. So, I came up with a little poem honoring the miners we proposed to remember on that occasion. It follows below:

THE MINING MAN

(By EUGENE SILER, Williamsburg, Ky.)

(Read at homecoming of Bon Jellico miners on September 17, 1950)

Miner, miner shining bright
Down in caverns of the night.
How could wheels make their turn,
How could bright fires dance and burn
Without you, O mining man?

War or peace must have your coal,
A world is waiting for black gold.
So make a cut and shoot it down,
Load it up to go to town.
Blessing on you, mining man!

Toil and danger both you know,
Sometimes joy and sometimes woe.
But light of night comes by your hand
And with your help we run this land.
Hail to you, O mining man!

So now, Mr. Speaker, I trust this body at the proper time will not merely consider doing the Democratic thing or the Republican thing but rather the Christian thing toward the unemployed "mining man" and others in giving support to the legislation I have mentioned. I have decided that during my own congressional career, whether short or long, I do not intend to be pro-labor nor pro-capital nor pro-conservative nor pro-radical, but I do intend to be very pro-Christian and very pro-American. And I believe this legislation I have mentioned is both Christian and American in its basic character.

Don't Turn Diverted Acres Into Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our present Federal farm programs have not solved the many problems facing the dairy farmers of the Nation. In fact, some elements of the general farm program not related to dairy farming actually impose new problems for dairy farmers and the dairy industry. I refer specifically to the problem of diverted acres from other types of farming. It appears that in the past the diverted acres have been temporarily turned into use for dairying. This, of course, intensifies the problems of farmers normally and regularly engaged in dairy farming.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 7, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer which discusses this problem. Here is the full text of the editorial:

It is true that the milk surplus picture looks a bit brighter than in 1954. However, there is still a big black cloud hanging over the dairy future.

The thought of 30 million diverted acres is a continuing worry to dairymen. These are the acres taken out of corn, wheat, and cotton production by farmers who comply with Federal crop controls.

Government policy is to get these extra acres into hay and pasture crops. This is good for the land but it is sure to mean extra competition and more milk surpluses.

More acres of hay and pasture are sure to mean more meat and milk. The only thing to do with forage is to feed it to cattle and sheep. Some of those added cattle will be dairy cows.

We hate to see these diverted acres shifted from corn, cotton, and wheat and put into milk production. Competition is tough enough as it is.

Acreage taken out of those crops should be taken completely out of circulation. Otherwise they solve one problem only to create another.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5942, which I believe solves the problem of diverted acres. Briefly, my bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to annually determine and proclaim prior to November 15 of each year a national conservation acreage reserve for the succeeding year. The Secretary of Agriculture, after surveys, will determine how many acres of land are needed for current production needs and how many acres of land are to be diverted into the conservation reserve.

The national conservation reserve will then be broken down into State allocations. The States in turn will allocate the reserve acreage to counties in the same ratio as the previous year's acreage in national production totals. County farmer committees will then allocate the county's conservation reserve to individual farmers on a similar basis.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into annual agreements with individual farmers for the making of incentive payments to farmers who agree to put the specified number of acres into a conservation reserve on their farms. Such incentive payments will be based on the value of the customary landlord's share, in the area where the farm is located, of commodities which the Secretary determines would be produced on the reserve acres if they were used for commercial production for the crop year on which the contract is made. The bill limits incentive payments to $2,000 for any farm operator's unit.

I believe if my bill is adopted it will solve the problem of diverted acres—diverted acres that in the past have sometimes been turned into dairying or other types of farming. Under my bill diverted acres will be used for a conservation reserve. It is a reserve plan that will protect our top soil when we need it for an emergency or in the not too distant future to meet increased population of the Nation.

Developing a Sound Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of having as my guest on a radio program for the people of my district, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of this House. I was so struck by his informative discussion of our farm problems that I would like to repeat here some of the ground we covered and plead for quick and vigrous action by this Congress toward developing a sound farm program.

In casting my vote for H. R. 12, which would restore 90-percent parity price supports for basic agricultural commodities and put a floor of 80 percent under dairy supports, I am not under any illusion that this measure is any more than a step in the direction of adequate farm income security. I would like to make it clear that I do not consider price supports, whether fixed at 90 percent or flexible, as anything more than a temporary prop to try to keep a large number of our farmers from going bankrupt and losing their farms during the period before we can work out a sound, permanent, and effective program.

In the first place, I am unhappy because H. R. 12 makes no provision to help agricultural industries outside the so-called basic crops and dairying. I believe that other farmers, raising other crops, are as much entitled to help as are the producers of the basic crops. In my own district we have large production of grapes, raisins, fruits and vegetable crops and the farmers who are supplying these essentials to the Nation have problems equally difficult with those of the producers of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts, and I believe their economic welfare is as important to the Nation as is the survival of farmers producing basic commodities.

I think it must be apparent that if price supports are to serve any effective purpose in saving our farm families from going under, they must be at 90 percent of parity. Actually, the difference between the 90 percent and the 75 percent or 80 percent they would receive under the flexible support program is the amount keeping them alive and eating and able to operate their farms. For a large percentage of our farms, it is the slim margin of survival. The Secretary of Agriculture has publicly stated that the policy of the administration is to eliminate 10 percent of farm families. That means about 500,000 families, about 2 million men, women, and children of America who have chosen farming as a way of life. The Secretary of Agriculture also advocates the flexible price support program and it is apparent he and the administration propose to use this device as a means of accomplishing his purpose to drive farmers away from their farms.

Recently President Eisenhower delivered a message to the Congress endorsing a program of farm help put together by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. After wrestling with the problem of what to do with our farmers who are on the verge of going under, what do they come up with? A proposal that the Federal Government assist them by educating them not to be farmers. They propose we solve our farm problem by educating farmers to be laborers or mechanics—not by helping them to be better farmers, or trying to solve their price or distribution problems. This would sound ridiculous if it were not tragic confirmation of the existence of an administration program to liquidate farm families. Actually, it fits into a program which also is designed to pinch off and abandon reclamation, which would put water on millions of acres and in many instances convert them from marginal to fine, producing acres, helping to solve the world's food shortage.

May I recall to you the prediction of former President Truman when he dedicated an important reclamation dam in 1952 and told his listeners to mark it well, for if the Republican Party gained power, they would not see another dam like it? How well he knew the plans of the present administration is shown by the fact that there has not been a single new reclamation start since January 1953.

All this fumbling with our farms adds up to an administration philosophy I think is unknown to many of our farmers. It amounts to a plan to drive farmers out of business and herd them into industrial pursuits. As tools to accomplish this purpose we have flexible, bankruptcy price supports, stopping reclamation programs which would create new irrigated farms, and proposals to recruit farmers into industrial plants. Instead of a program to keep farmers in business producing food and fiber, we are asked to go along with a program to drive them off the farms. This is the opposite of a farm program as I see it.

Since I have been in Washington I have been astonished and aghast at the hopeless, helpless attitude of the Department of Agriculture. I wish our farmers generally could see the callous and cold reaction of the leaders in that Department to the human problems they should be trying to solve. Believe me, when I take up with officials of the Department of Agriculture the acute and immediate problems of a major segment of agriculture, the turkey industry, and am informed the Department proposes to do nothing to cooperate with the industry, I cannot accept their plan to shake out less efficient producers—to solve the problems by permitting chaos in the industry this fall, with inevitable bankruptcy for thousands.

The fact of the matter is that a continued program of price supports is necessary at this time primarily because the administration has completely failed to develop a farm program. It appears we cannot expect such a program from the hopeless, helpless group now charged with this responsibility. As I see it, development of a long-range farm program is up to us and we cannot expect cooperation from the administration. When such a program is developed, we no longer will be concerned with either flexible or rigid price supports on their present basis, and I, for one, will be happy to see the end of this artificial emergency aid.

How shall we go about working out a farm program? Certainly, we have a valid objective, and that must be to provide a farm economy in which every hard-working farmer will know that by proper, efficient farm management, he

can recover his costs of production and receive a profit sufficient to raise and educate his children under a standard of living we want in an American home.

Because we have proof with which we cannot argue that the world as a whole has a serious food shortage, we must grant that our local situation, with what appears to be surpluses, can be smoothed out by proper distribution.

Reciprocal trade provides the basic tool for foreign agricultural distribution, and it is too bad the Department of Agriculture continues to drag its feet in developing world markets for our surplus farm production.

We need also to encourage marketing agreements, cooperative marketing associations, advertising and distribution programs to knock off the peak of surplus production and fill in the valleys of underproduction.

We must curb food profiteering and speculation abuses and cut the costs of distribution, so that consumers can get food and clothing at fair prices while farmers receive a fair return. I am most happy to learn from Congressman COOLEY that the Agriculture Committee of this House is embarking on a program to study consumer and farm prices, and I have every hope that legislation to deal with this problem will result.

We need more advance planning of projects to convert marginal land into good farms, through increased soil conservation and a renewed program for reclamation, and we must overcome and throw aside the reluctance of the present administration to go ahead with these vital projects.

In the face of a hopeless, helpless administration, the need of action by this Congress is urgent, lest delays wreck our farm economy and change our most basic strength into an agricultural shambles.

Administration Gives Only Lipservice to Career Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has built a reputation for giving lipservice to many fine principles, and then by its actions completely and callously disregarding these principles.

The list of examples is long. Nowhere is it more in evidence than in connection with the civil service. From the President on down, and from the President's Silver Spring, Md., campaign speech in 1952 we have heard very high-sounding pronouncements, with which we may all agree, about the administration's devotion to strengthening the civil service; and more about eliminating favoritism, political and otherwise, in the selection and promotion of career employees.

Last year it was the infamous Willis directive, issued from the White House, which gave the career service a body blow. This year it has been the fine print in Executive Order 10577 which has brought so many complaints and charges of favoritism and discrimination in connection with the conversion program to the offset of those Members representing districts where there are a number of Federal employees.

The National Civil Service League, a nonpartisan organization composed of some of the most outstanding people in the country, has proved to be a good watchdog, and constantly calls our attention to abuses by the administration.

Mr. James R. Watson, executive director of the league, discussed some of the more flagrant cases of abuse in a speech he made before the Society for Personnel Administration. In so doing he called the roll of the many instances where practice has differed sharply from the lip service of the administration.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a news account of Mr. Watson's remarks written by Joseph Young in the Washington Evening Star for May 12, 1955:

POLITICAL FAVORITISM CHARGED IN PROMOTIONS

(By Joseph Young)

The executive director of the nonpartisan National Civil Service League charged today that partisan politics and favortism are influencing the promotion and appointment chances of Government career employees.

James R. Watson, executive director of the league, told the annual meeting of the Society for Personnel Administration:

"This is where the patronage problem is especially serious. * * * It is impossible to sufficiently emphasize the demoralizing effect of such efforts.

"If we are to have a system whereby certain so-called career people must get political indorsements and be subjected to political tests before receiving appointments to career positions, then we will never achieve the advancements in the civil-service system which we need."

The official of the 80-year-old business-supported organizaiton called on the administration to clarify its policy regarding the career service and remove any cause for suspicion of partisan influence which will prevent the constructive programs now under way from realizing their full potential.

AFFECTS SELECTION

"If the career service is to be subjected to political tests, Philip Young and his staff at the Civil Service Commission might as well abandon their progressive efforts to improve executive development and training," Mr. Watson said. The public cannot afford to train executives in the career service who will be subjected to political suspicion by future administrations. Adequate selection of people for training cannot be accomplished where political favortism is involved.

If there are to be political tests, then President Eisenhower might as well discontinue efforts for the President's incentive award program. What kind of incentive award system can we have if every person receiving an award is going to be suspected of being a political favorite?

Mr. Watson cautioned Government personnel officials not to resist changes in the civil-service system that will make the system more dynamic and workable.

HELD TO NEED IMPROVEMENT

Declaring that civil service "needs improvement," Mr. Watson added: "Just as we guard against favoritism, we must also be careful that we do not view every proposal for change as a raid on the merit system. In other words, civil service must be protected from the entrenched bureaucrats just as much as it must be protected from the pious politician who is going to save democracy from the civil service."

Mr. Watson observed that political patronage, rather than civil service, was on the defensive these days, because the American public and the Nation's press are strong supporters of the merit system.

PROGRAMS STALLED

At yesterday's afternoon session in the Hotel Statler, CSC Chairman Philip Young told the SPA the current hassle over Federal pay-raise legislation threatens to delay action this year on other administration employee-benefit proposals, such as group health insurance and employee training programs.

Mr. Young also declared that the present system of having Congress adjust classified and postal salaries is too slow and cumbersome. He urged consideration of plans to place all Federal agencies on a full or partial wage-board basis, the same as is the base for per diem workers.

Acknowledging that such plans offer some practical difficulties, Mr. Young said that might be adaptable within a general framework of congressional control.

The CSC Chairman also said that a number of difficulties have to be ironed out before the Government joins in the single-packaged community charity drive. Mr. Young emphasized he is not opposed to a single-packaged drive. He said, however, the problem must be carefully studied and worked out before it is put into operation.

Mr. Young also strongly praised the administration's constructive personnel program for Government employees during the past few years, citing the numerous fringe benefits given to Federal workers.

Milk Prices Will Increase if Surplus Decreases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 7, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer. The editorial follows:

Should milk supports be boosted back up to 90 percent of parity? No one would blame a Wisconsin farmer for quickly answering "Yes" to that question. However, it is not that simple.

In April 1954 Secretary Benson cut supports from 90 down to 75 percent of parity in a single day. We argued that the drop was too far and too sudden and unfair to dairying compared to other farm products. We still feel that it could have been done differently.

How does the situation look as of May 1955? Is this the time to push for a return to 90-percent supports?

People are definitely using more milk, butter, and cheese than before the price drop. Production has leveled off. So the surplus picture has improved.

Milk checks took quite a beating during the past year. Dairymen realize more than anyone just how much that hurt.

But we must keep two things in mind. First, there is no chance politically of getting 90-percent supports without controls on production. Second, if production isn't controlled, the country might get fed up with

dairy-support programs and we would lose what we have.

Congress will vote 90-percent dairy parity only if the program carries built-in controls on milk output. Do you want to be told how much milk you may produce?

There is a tool which would solve surplus troubles. It is production payments and it should have been given a trial long ago.

Let the market drop to where it will. Then let the Government make direct payments to farmers to make up the difference between market price and support price.

Once that surplus is handled, dairy supports and prices can again work their way higher, where they belong. Not only 90 percent but 100 percent of parity.

The editorial, as you will note, correctly observes that dairy products will never be supported at 90 percent of parity unless there are production controls and marketing quotas applied to the industry in the same manner as basic commodities are supported.

I do not know if the majority of the Nation's dairy farmers are willing to accept controls and marketing quotas. The reason that I do not know is because the Nation's dairy farmers have never been given the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of such a program. It is my hope that the Dairy Subcommittee of the House will hold some hearings this year out in the country to get grassroots thinking of dairy farmers on this and other related problems.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, which will make dairy products a basic commodity and which provides for control and marketing quotas. If the program is approved by Congress, dairy farmers will receive compensation through incentive payments, as suggested in the editorial quoted above.

I believe H. R. 4360 has considerable merit, but before action in Congress on it I would like to have it fully understood by the Nation's dairy farmers. If the majority of dairy farmers do not want such a program—and we don't know at this time what their thinking is on this matter—then the issue would be resolved on this approach. Until such time as we have sufficient opinion from all of the major dairy producing areas we cannot say that dairy farmers favor the program or that they oppose it.

That is why I hope the Dairy Subcommittee will hold the hearings I have suggested to get the broadest possible view of dairy farmers on support programs.

The Conference at the Summit—Its Basic Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 15, the Polish American Congress of 400 organizations of Americans of Polish descent, held appropriate ceremonies in Cleveland commemorating Polish Constitution Day. It was my privilege to be the speaker on that occasion. My remarks were devoted to an expression of the unbreakable connection between the spirit of human freedom as expressed in the Polish constitution and the current struggle in which are now engaged to save individual liberty and the free institutions as we know them. Our participation in any meeting involving the masters of the Kremlin, whether it takes place at the summit or in a more realistic atmosphere of open covenants, openly arrived at, must be based upon a clear recognition that the cause of freedom is both indivisible and timeless. Since I offered what I consider to be some practical suggestions for the administration in connection with the possibility of such a conference taking place, under unanimous consent, I include my address in the RECORD:

THE CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT—ITS BASIC ISSUE

I am honored to be able to join with you today in commemorating Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and sixty-four years ago Poland established a constitution which, in its basic essentials, reflects the great moral and political principles of our own American Declaration of Independence.

This constitution was enacted at a time when Poland was under an alien occupation, by a parliament of true and patriotic Poles, who were determined to create an indelible instrument to stand as a symbol of the great Polish spirit.

The magnitude and enduring quality of that constitution is attested to by the fact that it has endured as an indestructible symbol of the Polish nation.

It would do us well today to examine, for a moment, article 5 of the Polish constitution. Article 5 best expresses the form of government which the framers of this constitution intend for Poland and which, in my opinion, is a true reflection of the Polish spirit throughout all of recorded history.

Article 5 reads as follows:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on lasting foundation."

It is clear that the will of the people was the determining element in all matters requiring parliamentary action or civil authority.

Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights are, above all other things, founded upon the basic concept that the will of the people is paramount.

We are saddened today as we see the Polish nation suffering under a new occupation—Russian communism, the most cruel, barbarous, inhuman, evil tyranny ever visited upon any people or nation in the long history of mankind. We recall that in the period between the two World Wars, there was a rebirth of Polish independence and an almost unprecedented revival of the rich and generous culture of the Polish.

We also remind ourselves that when the conspiracy of communism was probing into the nations beyond the confines of the prison of nations which we know as the Soviet Union, the Polish nation remained stanch and fearless in its treatment of the threat of communism.

It is an undisputed fact of history that communism was never an internal threat to the security of the Polish nation and that the Polish Government never feared to call the hand of the Russians on any matter affecting the security of Poland.

This is a lesson which we, the people of the leading Nation of the world today, should carefully consider and reflect upon in these trying times.

We also recall that with the rise of Hitler and his anti-Christian theories of nazism, the Polish nation stood firm in the face of this new danger.

When Hitler, encouraged and stimulated in his plan of aggression, by the demonstrated lack of moral courage and principle on the part of western statesmen, made threats against the Polish nation, he learned that the Poles intended to fight for what was right.

The Polish nation was caught in the merciless vise of the dictators, Stalin and Hitler.

It is a fact of history that when most of the larger and more secure nations of Europe were urging that Poland take a conciliatory tone toward Hitler in order to prevent the outbreak of war, the Polish people did not hesitate to stand up for those basic principles upon which the cause of human freedom depends, and without which the tyrant and despot makes easy prey of nations and men.

It was in these circumstances that heroic Poland, standing fast in defense of the cause of justice and freedom, was invaded by the overwhelming power of the dictators, Hitler and Stalin.

It is therefore accurate for us to say that World War II was fought for the cause which Poland so nobly represents even though the Polish people received the most frightful rewards in the postwar period.

The great event in history which we commemorate today would be a very shallow affair if we did not ask ourselves these questions—what are the hopes for Poland in the foreseeable future? What have we done? What can we do to bring the Polish nation back to its well deserved place in the family of free and sovereign nations?

These may not be popular questions and indeed they may be questions which frighten the more timid of men who, in any case, have never been defenders of the cause of individual liberty or the rights of nations.

But these are questions which disturb the conscience of all freemen. Finding the answers to these questions, in my opinion, will likely spell the difference between peace and war.

It is part of our great American heritage that we seek peace and comity among all nations. But it is also part of our heritage that we have the courage to stand up for what is right regardless of what the immediate cost may be to us.

During the last session of Congress, I was a member of a select committee which did attempt to find the answers to these questions and consequently made an exhaustive study of the entire background leading to the loss of individual liberties and national sovereignty by Poland and all the other non-Russian nations now enslaved within the empire of communism.

After completing that study and hearing the testimony of hundreds of eye witnesses, we concluded the following, among other things:

"That the continued occupation of the captive nations by Soviet Communist power is the basic cause of the growing menace of war and stands as a threat to the security of the United States. This threat is increased in direct proportion to the time and opportunity afforded the Communists to digest and consolidate their gains, and to use these gains as bases for further and greater aggressions. This threat is diminished in direct proportion as the Communist hold on the captive nations is weakened by a positive policy that promotes the forces of national independence behind the Iron Curtain."

This committee also recommended that our Government, in the interest of preventing world war III, undertake a political action program against the international Communist conspiracy. It charted a specific course of action involving 13 principal points and urged that the Government immediately undertake that course of action in the interest of peace with freedom and as a means of preventing world war III.

Now, against that background, we have heard a good deal of talk in the last week or two about what is being called a conference at the summit. In language that you and I can understand, this means a meeting of the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

A great number of important questions have been raised in connection with this proposed conference. For example, where is the summit; and if the place finds a geographical location, what is the meaning of the word "summit"?

Could this term have the meaning of old Greek mythology that the gods were meeting at the high point of land.

There is also a practical question raised as to who, if anyone, can speak for the masters of the Kremlin.

In my considered judgment, the most important question of all is, What are those who participate in the conference going to talk about and what are the prospects that such a conference might, in any way, contribute to man's age-long quest for peace and freedom.

In this connection the Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate Communist Aggression, which I have referred to previously, made this, among other, recommendations:

"That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected."

I do strongly commend this recommendation as the steady guidepost to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles to be used in all their advanced preparations for the conference, as well as such deliberations as may develop as a consequence of the talk now going on about a conference at the summit.

If we, as a Nation, fail to do less than follow the course which this recommendation clearly charts, we will, in my opinion, have deserted our fundamental traditions and political institutions.

The many enslaved nations which cry out for the emancipation of their people look to the United States as their last great hope.

The people of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Slovakia, Chechia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and other enslaved nations suffering under a common tyranny, have the common aspiration for those freedoms which are reflected in the spirit of the constitution of Poland which we commemorate today.

When these nations are freed from the chains of Russian communism and have, by the unqualified exercise of the principle of national self-determination, regained for themselves and their posterity the benefits of liberty and self-government—only then will we have opened the door to a just and enduring peace.

The spark of individual liberty and love of human freedom has burned brightly in the breasts of all true Poles down through history. It was this spark which brought General Kosciuszko and other Polish heroes of the Revolutionary War to our shores. It was this same spark which brought thousands upon thousands of the sons and daughters of Poland to America to help build this great democracy which we today so cherish. It is this same spark burning in the breasts of mankind which will eventually put us on the path to peace and freedom—a goal which will be attained only when all the enslaved nations are liberated.

Davy Crockett Was a Tar Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the Davy Crockett smash-hit song has focused the attention of the American people on the life and exploits of one of our most colorful early pioneer heroes.

The passage of time has somewhat dimmed the record of Davy Crockett. Although he was one of the best known of all the frontiersmen of the early 19th century, historians have not given his life the attention it deserves. Until just a few weeks ago, the mention of Davy Crockett would hardly have stirred a ripple of interest. Today his name is a household word—at least in every household where there are youngsters.

It remained for a talented songwriter, recognizing the dramatic appeal of the Davy Crockett story, to capture the imagination of the American public by depicting the highlights of Davy's career in a song that has literally taken the country by storm.

As proof that interest in Davy Crockett is not confined to boys and girls, I remind you that on last Thursday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], speaking in the well of the House, paid his respects to the memory of Davy Crockett and reminded us of some of the lessons we can learn from the example of his record and career as a Member of Congress more than 100 years ago.

Davy Crockett is generally understood to have been a native of Tennessee. The author of the song says that he was born in that State, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke of the pride Tennesseeans have for him as a native son.

I cannot contradict the claim that Davy Crockett was born on soil that is now Tennessee. But, the statement that Davy was born in Tennessee does not tell the whole story. At the time Davy Crockett was born on August 17, 1786, the State of Tennessee was not in existence.

Davy Crockett was born a resident of the great State of North Carolina and remained a citizen of our State until 1790 when Congress accepted a deed of cession from North Carolina for the territory which is now Tennessee.

Indeed, we have even closer ties than this with the Crockett family. Davy's father lived for a time in my home county of Lincoln in the State of North Carolina. He fought against the British and Tories at King's Mountain in a battle which, incidentally, was the turning point of the Revolutionary War and led directly to the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

Tradition has it that Davy's father struck up a close acquaintance with some of the men who came across the Blue Ridge Mountains from the then western territory to help fight the British at King's Mountain, and, after the war, he was persuaded to return with them to the territory which a few years later became Tennessee.

Although Davy Crockett is said to have been illiterate, he was sufficiently educated to write a very readable and interesting autobiography. He did not have the advantage of much formal schooling, but acquired his education in the same way that Abraham Lincoln did. If his autobiography was not written in classical language, it shows that he possessed great native intelligence and a ready, if rustic, wit.

The following sentences are quoted out of context from Davy Crockett's autobiography to show something of his style of writing and as evidence on the question of his nativity:

> My father's name was John Crockett, and he was of Irish descent. He was either born in Ireland or on a passage from that country to America across the Atlantic. He was by profession a farmer, and spent the early part of his life in the State of Pennsylvania. * * * He fought in the Battle of King's Mountain, against the British and Tories, and in some other engagements, of which my remembrance is too imperfect to enable me to speak with any certainty. At some time, though I cannot say certainly when, my father, as I have understood, lived in Lincoln County, in the State of North Carolina. How long I don't know. But when he removed from there, he settled in that district of country which is now embraced in the east division of Tennessee, though it was not then erected into a State.
>
> I was born, according to the best information I have received on the subject, on the 17th of August, in the year 1786; whether by day or night, I believe I never heard, but if I did, I have forgotten. * * * At the time my father lived at the mouth of Limestone, on the Nolachucky River.

Davy Crockett was elected to Congress as a supporter of Andrew Jackson, and the district from which he came was predominantly Jackson territory. However, when President Jackson departed from what Davy Crockett believed to be right, Davy vigorously opposed him. Davy's strong opposition to some of the policies of President Jackson brought down upon him the displeasure of the administration, and in his autobiography Davy credits his defeat for reelection to the active fight made against him in the campaign by officials of the administration.

It was after his return to private life that the struggle of the Texans for independence attracted Davy Crockett's attention. He says in his autobiography that he was appealed to by Texans to come to that territory and help them in their fight for independence. He threw himself into that struggle and gave his life in the cause of liberty, just as he sacrificed his political career because he would not surrender his principles to hold public office.

This is the great lesson we can all learn from the life and career of Davy Crockett.

Davy apparently kept a diary during the battle of the Alamo, because the

closing chapters of the book contain a day-by-day account of the siege. His last entry in the book was made on March 5, 1836, and in the closing pages he described a sortie from the Alamo in which Davy and several companions ventured out into "no man's land" to rescue a member of the besieged party who was returning to the fort following a fruitless effort to get help.

The following is the last entry made by Davy in his book:

March 5. Pop, pop, pop. Bom, bom, bom. throughout the day. No time for memorandums now. Go ahead. Liberty and independence forever.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has now reached its 40th anniversary. It is difficult to assess the tremendously significant part this organization has played in the progress of aviation in this Nation. The great strides that the aviation industry has made could not have been possible without the research and advice of the NACA. Its contribution to the national defense is incalculable. The NACA is the Government agency charged with the responsibility for conducting an adequate program of scientific aeronautical research. It was established in 1915 to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution. The committee serves without pay; its only compensation being the great satisfaction it receives from the importance of its work and the success of its research. Its membership is comprised of its Chairman Jerome C. Hunsaker, Vice Chairman Detlev W. Bronk, Joseph P. Adams, Allen V. Astin, Preston R. Bassett, Leonard Carmichael, Ralph S. Damon, James H. Doolittle, Rear Adm. Lloyd Harrison, Ronald M. Hazen, Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, Donald A. Quarles, Arthur E. Raymond, Francis W. Reichelderfer, Oswald Ryan, Gen. Nathan F. Twining.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in its issue of May 13, 1955, tips its editorial to the NACA on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

NACA AT FORTY

One of the bulwarks of our national defense and a spearhead of our peacetime progress in the air is celebrating the 40th anniversary of its establishment. This is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics founded by act of Congress and first appointed by President Wilson in 1915. Serving without pay, the committee operates like a board of directors, establishing policy and planning the research programs to be followed by the 7,000 civil-service personnel who make up the technical and administrative staff. The programs have resulted in developments without which we would have lagged behind both in the weapons which have protected our freedom and in the great network of commercial air transport which knits the Nation so closely and binds us in so short a space of time to the rest of the free world.

At the great Langley Aeronautical Laboratory in Virginia; the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory at Moffet Field, Calif., and the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, many of the enormous forward strides in aerodynamical design which make possible today's flight above the speed of sound and in engines and rocket-power plants have received their initiative and progressed through technical guidance from the committee. As Representative VINSON, of Georgia, has well said, "There is not a military or commercial plane flying today in this country which does not reflect in some way the research of the NACA."

Norway Independence Day in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon at Leif Eriksson Square in Brooklyn, N. Y., the Norwegian-American 17th of May Committee of Greater New York, 1955, celebrated Norway's Independence Day. There was an immense colorful parade and a gathering of at least 20,000 people who listened to the program at the parade's conclusion. My good friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] and I were accorded the honor of addressing the huge assemblage. The program read as follows:

PROGRAM

(Leif Eriksson Square, Brooklyn, N. Y., Sunday, May 15, 1955—3 p. m.)

Star-Spangled Banner: The Freeport High School Band, Dr. J. Maynard Wettlaufer, director.

Introduction: Einar Bredland, cochairman, 17th of May Committee.

Master of ceremonies: Edward C. Halvorsen, chairman, 17th of May Committee.

Invocation: Rev. Leif T. Gulbrandsen, pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Flushing, N. Y.

Welcome and opening remarks: S. A. Haram, president, the Norwegian Children's Home Association.

Greetings: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Member of Congress.

Greetings, Norwegian Government: Hon. Thor Brodtkorb, Consul General of Norway.

Ja, Vi Elsker Dette Landet: Viking Junior Band, Irving Bardon, director.

The Norwegian Singing Society: O. William Erickson, director.

Greetings: Hon. John J. Cashmore, president, Borough of Brooklyn.

The Freeport High School Band, entertainment: Dr. J. Maynard Wettlaufer, director.

Greetings: Hon. JOHN H. RAY, Member of Congress.

Seventeenth of May Sermon: Rev. J. Ingvald Opsal, pastor, Our Saviour's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Gud Signe Noregs Land (first verse): The Freeport High School Band.

America (first verse): The Freeport High School Band.

Crowning of Miss Norway: By Consul General Thor Brodtkorb (sponsored by Scandinavian American Business Association, Inc.).

Selections by Peder Tonnesen, tenor.

The following were my remarks on this occasion:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, my distinguished friend and colleague, Congressman RAY, the Honorable Consul General of Norway, Commissioner Nolan, all the distinguished guests here on this platform, ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a privilege and a high honor to address this distinguished gathering at this wonderful parade today which commemorates the 141st anniversary of Norway's Independence Day, May 17, 1955. Especially is it so for one born here in Brooklyn of Irish parents who has had the opportunity to visit beautiful Norway on three occasions over the years.

I am grateful to your chairman, Mr. Halvorsen, Mr. Bredland, Reverend Opsal, Reverend Gulbrandsen, and all the members of your committee for their kind invitation to address you briefly on this historic occasion. I have always followed the developments and activities of Norway with a great deal of admiration, and I applaud the achievements of Norway's stable and democratic government in a world faced with strife and discontent in many areas, particularly those unfortunate nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Throughout the past 141 years the Constitution of Norway has withstood the test of time. The people of Norway have decisively rejected communism and all other forms of government alien to their democratic ideals and principles. As a matter of fact they have made the ideals of democracy a living and revered reality.

We in the United States shall long remember the determined and courageous stand of the Norwegian people against Nazi Germany, both in combat and in the tenacious unrelenting underground struggle in the years that followed. The people of Norway not only vigorously fought and opposed Nazi Germany but also have consistently defied Communist Russia, despite the fact that Norway has a common boundary with the Soviet monster and is menaced by the huge Red army which is in such close proximity.

Not only have the people of Norway demonstrated rare courage and bravery in war and in the potential threats of this cold-war period, but equally important, they have created an example of democracy that serves as an inspiration to the freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Americans of Norwegian birth and descent have made great contributions toward the things that make for a better life here in the United States. They have played a decisive role in the enrichment of our lives by their culture, their music, their industry and their strong religious and moral convictions. Because of these strong convictions and their love of American ideals they have given us many notable and effective leaders in our Government and in our public service.

This is truly a heartwarming and inspiring patriotic demonstration. I not only extend congratulations to the people of Norway on the anniversary of their constitution but also my friends here in Brooklyn of Norwegian birth and descent.

My fervent wish for Norway is that this annual celebration shall stand as a symbol of the continuing close association between our two countries in defense of that political liberty for which the Norwegian constitution stands. May all of us be blessed by the establishment of peace and freedom everywhere, and a world in which peaceful citizens and nations need no longer be on guard against aggression and tyranny.

Public Law 24, the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thinking it will be of general interest to my colleagues, I am extending my remarks to include a tabulated summary of the appropriations provided for in Public Law 24, the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act. This was compiled at my request by Elizabeth Elward, of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It follows:

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural Research Service	$650,000
Agricultural conservation program	* [1]
Total, ch. I	650,000

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce: Office of the Secretary	* [2]
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Federal Airport Act	* [2]
Civil Aeronautics Board: Payments to air carriers	8,900,000
Maritime activities:	
Operating-differential subsidies	50,000,000
Salaries and expenses	400,000
Repair of reserve fleet facilities	970,000
Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)	* [3]
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Federal-aid highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	95,000,000
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	3,500,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	875,000
Total, Department of Commerce	159,645,000
Independent Offices—Small Business Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	* [6]
Revolving fund	

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

[1] Continues available uncommitted balances through Dec. 31, 1955.

[2] Authority to transfer not to exceed $110,854.

[3] Authority to transfer not to exceed $840,000.

[5] Increase of $75,000 in limitation.

[6] Authority to transfer an additional $224,000.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER II—continued

Department of Defense, Civil Functions—Department of the Army, Canal Zone Government: Operating expenses	$230,000
Total, ch. II	159,875,000

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense—Interservice Activities:	
Claims	(4,320,000)
Retired pay	(8,000,000)
Do	(14,000,000)
Military personnel, Army	(150,000,000)
Military personnel, Air Force	(110,000,000)
Total, ch. III	[7] (286,320,000)

CHAPTER IV

Foreign Operations—Mutual Security: Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance	[8] (6,500,000)
Independent Offices—Export-Import Bank: Administrative expenses	[4] (55,000)
Total, ch. IV	(6,500,000)

CHAPTER V

Independent offices:	
Federal Civil Defense Administration: Surveys, plans and research	
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	85,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	100,000
General Services Administration: Expenses, general supply fund	[9] (200,000)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Salaries and expenses	240,000
Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission	15,000
Veterans' Administration:	
Compensation and pensions	240,000,000
Readjustment benefits	155,000,000
Grants to Republic of Philippines	611,000
Total, Veterans' Administration	395,611,000
Total, ch. V	396,051,000

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources	350,000
National Park Service: Jones Point Bridge	600,000
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Salaries and expenses	2,570,000

[4] Increase in limitation.

[7] To be derived by transfer from available appropriations.

[8] To be derived by transfer from "Mutual Defense Assistance, Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific, 1955."

[9] To be derived by transfer from "Defense Public Works, community facilities."

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER VI—continued

Independent Offices—National Capital Planning Commission:	
Salaries and expenses, Washington regional mass transportation survey	$200,000
John Marshall Bicentennial Commission	10,000
Total, ch. VI	3,730,000

CHAPTER VII

Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security:	
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	* [10]
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees	7,500,000
Total, Department of Labor	7,500,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education:	
Payments to school districts	20,000,000
Assistance for school construction	48,500,000
Public Health Service:	
Assistance to States, general	* [11]
Indian health activities	[12] (100,000)
Social Security Administration—Bureau of Public Assistance: Grants to States for public assistance	238,000,000
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance: Salaries and expenses	[4] (10,620,000)
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services	
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	306,500,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Salaries and expenses	[13] (256,000)
Total, ch. VII	314,000,000

CHAPTER VIII

Public Works—Department of the Interior—Southwestern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance	400,000
Total, ch. VIII	400,000

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

[4] Increase in limitation.

[10] Language change.

[11] Increases limitation for personal services from $2,400,000 to $2,418,000.

[12] To be derived by transfer from "Retired pay of commissioned officers," fiscal year 1955.

[13] Language making this appropriation available for the payment of members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department.

[16] To be derived from the Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund).

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER IX

Department of State:	
Salaries and expenses	[17](\$750,000)
Contributions to international organizations	----------
Missions to international organizations	[18](12,500)
International contingencies	[19](100,000)
Department of Justice:	
Legal Activities and General Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals	300,000
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals	200,000
Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry:	
1954	198,267
1955	870,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	1,100,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	1,250,000
Federal Prison System:	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	180,000
Support of United States prisoners	600,000
Total, Department of Justice	4,698,267
The Judiciary:	
Supreme Court of the United States: Care of the building and grounds	12,500
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	13,300
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:	
Salaries of judges	900,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	86,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	380,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	45,000
Salaries of referees	[20](20,800)
Expenses of referees	[21](34,575)
Total, the Judiciary	1,436,800
Total, ch. IX	6,135,067

CHAPTER X

Treasury Department:	
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses	85,000
Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	[15](1,100,000)
Retired pay	[13](584,000)
Reserve training	[13](46,000)
Total, Treasury Department	85,000

[13] To be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."

[17] To be derived by transfer from "Government in occupied areas," fiscal year 1955.

[18] To be derived by transfer from "Contributions to international organizations," fiscal year 1955.

[19] To be derived by transfer from "Educational aid for China and Korea."

[20] To be derived from the referee's salary fund.

[21] To be derived from the referee's expense fund.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER X—con.

Post Office Department: Foreign mail transportation, 1947	[14](\$25,000)
Independent offices — Tax Court of the United States:	
Salaries and expenses	63,000
Total, independent offices	63,000
Total, ch. X	148,000

CHAPTER XI

District of Columbia:	
Operating expenses:	
Office of Corporation Counsel	[22](2,500)
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention)	*([15])
Department of Public Health	(650,300)
Public welfare	(152,900)
Settlement of claims	(28,008)
Judgments	(10,587)
Audited claims	(155,095)
Total, operating expense	(996,890)
Capital outlay: Capital outlay, miscellaneous	(26,500)
Total, ch. XI	[23](1,023,390)

CHAPTERS XII AND XIIA

Legislative branch:	
Senate: Salaries and expense allowance of Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, and salary and expense allowance of the Vice President:	
Compensation of Senators	320,001
Compensation of the Vice President of the United States	1,667
Office of the Secretary: Joint recording facilities	3,905
Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For adjustment of salaries	140
Joint Committee on the Economic Report, salaries and expenses	3,800
Contingent expenses of the Senate:	
Furniture	5,000
Miscellaneous items	51,950
Packing boxes	500
Postage stamps	115
Total, Senate	387,078
House of Representatives:	
Salaries of Members	1,468,000
Coordinator of Information	2,000
Majority leader	5,400
Folding documents	10,000
Total, House of Representatives	1,485,400

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

[14] To be derived by transfer from "Railway mail service, 1947."

[22] Increase in limitation for settlement of claims.

[23] Unless otherwise provided, District of Columbia appropriations shall be paid out of the general fund for the District of Columbia.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTERS XII AND XIIA—con.

Legislative branch—Continued	
Capitol Police:	
Capital Police Board	\$21,139
Capitol Police Board	38,972
Total, Capitol Police Board	60,111
Architect of the Capitol:	
Capitol Buildings	16,000
Capitol Grounds	611,000
Senate Office Building	53,000
House Office Buildings	----------
Additional House Office Building	5,000,000
Additional Senate Office Building	----------
Total, Architect of the Capitol	5,680,000
Government Printing Office:	
Printing and binding	700,000
Total, chapters XII and XIIA	8,312,589

CHAPTER XIII

Judgments and authorized claims:	
Judgments and authorized claims	3,234,377
Judgments and authorized claims	6,269,842
Total, ch. XIII	9,504,219
Grand total	898,805,875

NOTE.—Continues antistrike provisions.

Collector of Customs Appointment for the Idaho-Montana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter I have today sent to the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury. Yesterday a gentleman from Idaho was nominated to be the new Collector of Customs at Great Falls, Mont. We in Montana regard this as one of the few Federal jobs that rightfully should be filled from our great State, and consequently I am vigorously protesting the nomination from our neighboring State of Idaho.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 12, 1955.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been informed that an Idaho man has been nominated for the position of Collector of Customs for the Idaho-Montana District, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

I want to vigorously protest the nomination, and ask that the nomination be reconsidered, because this position has historically belonged to Montana. We have the

great majority of interest in every respect in this position, by virtue of miles of boundary served, number of ports of entry, volume of traffic, and flow of commerce.

Your careful reconsideration of this nomination will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely yours,

ORVIN B. FJARE.

Increase Minimum Wage to $1.25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage is being considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. I appeared before the committee today and made my plea in behalf of the underpaid workers who are looking hopefully to Congress for relief and a decent living wage. It is my sincere hope that the committee will act favorably so the bill can be considered by Members of the House whom, I am convinced, will set a minimum wage which will more nearly approximate today's high living costs.

My statement before the committee follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Education and Labor Committee, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to testify before this committee today on the proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The proposal to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to extend coverage of the act to workers not now protected by a minimum wage floor and the provisions for time and a half for overtime work will continue to enlist my complete support.

An increase in the minimum wage is not only a family necessity, but it is a national economic necessity as well. We must think in terms of increasing the purchasing power of the low income earner. A clear analysis compels us to regard the worker as a consumer whose increased purchasing power could stimulate a lagging economy, rather than thinking of him as an economic liability to his employer whose wages, if increased, will either drive his employer out of business or raise prices for all of us.

Opponents of the $1.25 minimum wage repeatedly say that this would increase unemployment and many firms would be forced to reduce their payrolls or even go out of business. This is the same argument that was used when the minimum wage was set at 30 cents in 1939 and again when it was set at 75 cents in 1950. This grim prophecy simply has not been borne out by facts.

In 1950 when the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents an hour, there were practically no plant shutdowns or layoffs resulting from this measure. Opponents of the measure then, as now, had predicted economic disaster.

In fact, the Department of Labor studies revealed that in five low-wage industries—southern sawmills, men's dress shirts and nightwear, fertilizer, men's seamless hosiery and wood furniture—even though the higher minimum wage required increased wages for a substantial proportion of the workers in those industries the adjustment to the higher wage scale was made with "only minor determinable effects."

At that time the Secretary of Labor said in his annual report, "Prices for products of low-wage industries affected substantially by the necessity for the payment of higher wages do not seem to have risen as a group any higher than prices of other products. * * * Increased efficiency of production, particularly through mechanization and high volume operations, apparently absorbed much of the increased cost."

It is self-evident that every American worker is entitled to a decent standard of living. It is also axiomatic that no worker can enjoy what we like to refer to as the American way of life on less than $1.25 per hour.

The average worker putting in a 40-hour week will earn approximately $2,500 a year if he makes $1.25 an hour. An annual income of $2,500, although it may be an improvement over the income derived from the present 75-cents-an-hour provision, is still far from adequate to meet the minimum budget requirements of an average family.

In 1951, the Bureau of Labor Statistics worked out a minimum-income chart for an average family of 4 based on living costs in 34 cities throughout the United States. The budget required for a basic minimum standard of living varied from $3,812 to $4,454. It would require a minimum wage of $1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest income requirements for a decent standard of living as defined by this study. The lowest budget figure was $3,812, the minimum necessary to live in New Orleans.

A minimum wage of $1.25 an hour does not sound unreasonable to me. I don't know of a single area in the United States where you could provide your family with decent housing, clothes, adequate food, and even minimum medical and dental care on an income of $1.25 an hour or $2,500 a year. And this includes no allowance for recreation or luxuries.

The administration proposal to scale down to 90 cents an hour what already appears to be a barely adequate increase in the minimum wage, to $1.25 an hour, is sheer ignorance of the basic facts of the living costs in today's economy.

The Consumers' Price Index rose 14 percent between January 1950 and November 1954, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wages have been raised five times since 1950 in major American industries. The minimum wage was set at 75 cents an hour in 1950. Today, 5 years later, it is still 75 cents. It is totally inadequate and unrealistic in view of the economic picture today to increase the minimum wage to anything less than $1.25 per hour.

The administration proposal to increase the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour will not improve the living standard of 3 million workers who earn more than 90 cents an hour, but are still existing on a substandard level. The 3 million workers who earn 95 cents or perhaps $1.04 an hour would receive no benefit from such legislation. They will continue to exist on a powdered-milk and dried-meat diet. They will still be unable to afford adequate housing and even modest conveniences.

In addition to increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, I sincerely hope that coverage will be extended to many groups not currently protected by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

According to recent estimates there are approximately 44 million people engaged in private employment, exclusive of proprietors, self-employed persons, unpaid family labor, and executive, administrative, and professional employees.

Of these 44 million employees, 13.6 million were not covered because they were engaged in intrastate activities and 6.4 million were specifically exempted from the minimum wage and overtime provisions.

The present Fair Labor Standards Act provides more limited coverage and contains more exemptions from the wage and hour provisions than the original act of 1938 did.

Coverage should certainly be extended and many of the groups now exempted should be protected under this law.

An inadequate minimum wage is responsible for unbalanced diets, the inability to afford medical and dental care and poor housing. These conditions foster malnutrition, sickness, slums, illiteracy, juvenile delinquency, and crime. The entire community and the Nation as a whole, suffers when our most valuable asset—our citizens—are forced to live on a substandard level.

For these reasons, the majority of the constituents of the 12th District of Illinois favor, and I shall support, a $1.25 an hour minimum wage and extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Iowa Manufacturers Important in Nation's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Iowa has long been recognized as the leading agricultural State in the Nation but few realize the extent of Iowa's industrial development.

Hundreds of Iowa's industries are nationally known, and several rank as the biggest of their kind in the Nation. For instance, Iowa has the largest cereal plant, washing machine industry, fountain-pen manufacturer, door and millwork factory, fresh-water pearl-button industry, popcorn processing plant, processor of honey, plastic fiber skatewheel plan, silvery iron factory, independent pork processing busines, wringer manufacturer, wheel tractor manufacturing plant, single operated packing plant, manufacturer of portable crushing and screening plants, aluminum plate rolling mill, warm air heating systems manufacturer, poultry equipment manufacturer, cellophane producing plant, rotary pump builders, producer of automatic valves and regulators, 2- and 4-cycle gasoline engine manufacturer.

With 3,736 manufacturing plants located in 588 cities and towns, there is a wide and even distribution of industry throughout the State. There are 2,270 different products made in Iowa, and world trade carries the products of 539 Iowa manufacturers who are directly engaged in exporting.

Since Iowa produces 10 percent of the Nation's food supply, food manufacturing and processing leads all other industries in the State, accounting for more than half of the value of the State's manufactured products. But food is just one of the major manufacturing industries.

BIG STRIDES IN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

During the post-World War II years, nearly 900 new industries have set up shop in Iowa, affording more than 35,000 additional job opportunities and creating an additional annual payroll in excess of $120 million. Figures indi-

cate that the growth and development of Iowa is going forward at a faster rate than the Nation as a whole. With the value of Iowa's manufactured products exceeding the value of her agricultural products, the State has a fine economic balance.

Father's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I take the floor of the House as Father's Day approaches this year, in support of a joint resolution asking our President to set aside a day as an official tribute to the millions of fathers in America.

This day should stand as a symbol of the important role of the head of the family, not just on Father's Day, but every day throughout the year.

It has often been said that the home is where democracy begins. This is true because the home is not a place where democracy is merely talked about. It is not a mere word. It is a way of life that is practiced day in and day out. If every member of the family is treated with respect and love; if every member of the family honors his responsibilities, shares the burdens as well as the pleasures of family life, then we have built a group of citizens who will have respect for the rights of others and will approach their responsibilities toward their fellow citizens and their obligations in a democratic society with a cooperative spirit and a willing hand.

Since children look to their father as an example for their conduct and a guide to follow over the rough road of growing up, it is his responsibility to set a standard of conduct in his relations with the family that will be worthy of emulation. Fatherhood is the highest fiduciary relationship. It demands that he set aside the time and develop the patience that will make him the kind of father that is always available when his children have a problem, when they feel the need to talk over some little difficulty—no matter how small this problem may be. A small problem to an adult mind may be a huge burden in the mind of a child. It is the father's heavy obligation to be available to help resolve this problem.

When I read the tragic stories that appear daily in our newspapers of delinquent juveniles I often think to myself, how different this story might have been if there had been an understanding heart and a guiding hand when the early signs of that child's frustration, hostility, and insecurity first became evident in his belligerent or perhaps withdrawn conduct.

A child does not turn into a juvenile delinquent overnight. There are many danger signs to the observant father. But the danger signs will go unheeded unless that father is an astute and sensitive observer. So many of us in the hustle and hurry of modern living attempt to compensate for our failure to provide time, companionship, and society by giving our children material gifts and a questionable higher standard of living.

It is almost impossible for a loving father who spends time with his youngsters, who plays with them, who discusses their school problems, their friends, and their daily experiences with them, to fail to observe that something is troubling a child. If his attitude toward his schoolwork, toward his brothers and sisters is an unhealthy one, this is the time to set the course straight again. When the problem is just developing, the solution is fairly obvious and quickly achieved.

Family life is actually the child's first experience in group living, in learning the joys that come from working together as a team, in experiencing the rare pleasure that comes from understanding that it is truly better to give than to receive. Family life is the child's first contact with discipline. It is where he begins to appreciate and understand that you learn to rule by being ruled.

Under the guiding hand of the father and mother working together as a parent team, the child comes face to face with what is expected of him in his relations with the other members of the family and society. Here the child will acquire the spiritual values which will develop into his philosophy of life.

The father's role is not an easy one. With 10½ million married women employed in the new social structure, the amount of time available for supervision and rearing of children of necessity has become limited in a number of homes. Many additional chores of family upbringing have now in the new order fallen to him.

While his obligations to his family are heavy, the rewards are rich indeed. The father who has fulfilled his responsibilities as a loving and understanding parent is truly helping to build a mature and worthwhile adult. He has helped to build a family relationship that is a full and rewarding experience for every member of the family and is the bulwark of a democratic society. He has respected the individuality of every member of that family unit so that together they are a team, and individually they will become democratic adults who can face any decision, or challenge that life will present to them.

For all of these sacrifices fathers make in giving their children emotional security, spiritual guidance, compassion, and understanding of their fellowmen, I propose that we set aside the third Sunday in June of each year as a justly earned tribute to the Nation's fathers.

The Scintilla Division of Bendix Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the village of Sidney, in Delaware County, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent, the Scintilla division of Bendix Aviation, is to receive its second star on their civil-defense flag.

We are very proud of the Scintilla Division in Delaware County. Their factory is ideally situated in a beautiful village of 5,000 and their labor-management relations have always been of the best.

Mr. John A. MacLachlan, the publisher of the Sidney Enterprise, in a recent letter to me, has this to say about Scintilla:

> Scintilla division of the Bendix Aviation, which as you know is our big Sidney industry (employment about 4,000 people) is to be honored next week by receiving the second star in their civil-defense flag. The presentation is to be made by Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner, New York State, director of civil defense.
>
> Scintilla is the first industrial plant in New York State to achieve the honor of being a three-time winner. First the flag, then one star, and now the second.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain. Teach us to value a conscience void of offense and the royalty of inward peace and confidence above all the pedestals, prizes, and preferments earth can give.

May the tyranny of majorities and the tirades of minorities be equally impotent to sway us from the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. Along the road of this day, as we face its demanding tasks, and of every day, may we walk with Thee in the bright fellowship of those who are able to say at the last, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith." In the name of the Master of all good workmen, we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, a Senator

from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAYNE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 13, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gariella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu, and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Buildeath and Lenora Patricia Buildeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MCCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet on May 18 and 19, during the sessions of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice George Templar, resigned.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Marvin B. Miller, for permanent appointment as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nomination today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF GEN. CHARLES PELOT SUMMERALL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes in commenting on the life and service of General Summerall, who passed away last Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate learned with sorrow last Saturday of the passing of that gallant old soldier, Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall. This afternoon he will be buried with full military honors in Arlington Cemetery.

The famed general had lived a full life of 88 years, studded with many heroic exploits on battlefields stretching from the gates of the Imperial City of Pekin, China, in the Boxer Rebellion, to the bitter fighting at Cantingy and Soissons in France, in World War I. On retirement, after 39 years of military service, he was equally effective in civilian life, where for 22 years he served with distinction as president of The Citadel, the Charleston, S. C., military college.

The State of Florida and its citizens deeply cherish the memory of this gallant military leader. He was born near Lake City, Fla., on March 4, 1867. At the age of 12 he moved to the little community of Astatula, in Lake County. He attended the public schools of Lake County, and graduated from Porter Military Academy, Charleston, in 1885.

Returning to Florida, he entered the teaching profession, and taught in Astatula in 1886. At the age of 20, in 1887, he became principal of the Leesburg, Fla., schools.

That same year he stood a competitive examination for the United States Military Academy and received an appointment from Congressman Charles D. Dougherty, of the Second Florida Congressional District.

He entered the Academy June 16, 1888, and graduated June 11, 1892, as first captain of the Cadet Corps.

From then until 34 years later, when he was named Chief of Staff by President Coolidge, General Summerall followed a military career that saw combat service in the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, and the First World War. He was cited by his own country six times for gallantry in action, and he also received major decorations from France, Belgium, Italy, Montenegro, and Panama.

His feats of valor were numerous, but one has become a legend in the annals of United States Army history. As a young artillery lieutenant in the Boxer Rebellion, Summerall covered the advance of the 14th Infantry storming the Imperial City—Pekin. During the assault Summerall and his platoon wheeled 2 field pieces alongside the infantry and blasted open the Imperial City gates of the 4 successive walls and the Forbidden City gate.

In 1918, as commanding general of the famed First Division, Summerall was awarded a DSC for his "great gallantry and utter disregard for his own safety" in leading his troops to victory at the decisive battle of Soissons. A short time later he was promoted to command the Fifth Corps, a post he retained until the close of the war.

In 1919 he was appointed by the Supreme War Council on the Allied Mission to Fiume, and later was attached to the American Mission to negotiate peace in Paris.

From 1921 to 1924 he headed the Hawaiian Department, which, under his devoted leadership, progressed rapidly in military efficiency, equipment, and supplies at a time when that area became one of our most vital and important military commands. Likewise, General Summerall's intelligent and considerate handling of many pressing diplomatic relations contributed immeasurably toward our amicable international associations in the Pacific.

His administration as Chief of Staff of the Army from 1926 to 1930 is remembered particularly for his efforts to improve living conditions of Army personnel, increase the fire power of ground troops, and develop the effectiveness of tanks and armored cars.

In March 1931 General Summerall retired from active service and returned to his native Florida. His sojourn at home, however, was brief, as that same year he accepted the presidency of The Citadel. For over 2 decades he contributed the same peerless leadership to that historic South Carolina institution that he gave to the United States Army.

Our country will never have a more courageous, conscientious, or devoted military leader. Florida joins the Nation in extending our sincere and deep sympathy to the members of General Summerall's family. We fervently hope that their sense of loss will be tempered by the rich heritage of achievement and the splendid record of service to his country left to them by this grand old soldier.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, since we last met on Friday, death has removed from the national scene one of America's most distinguished soldiers and educators, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, of Aiken, S. C., which is also my home town. General Summerall served his country as a soldier with distinction for almost 40 years, capping his Army career by serving as Army Chief of Staff during the period 1926 through 1930.

His brilliant record as a soldier contains many achievements; among them are 15 ribbons for major decorations awarded him for personal bravery, efficiency, and leadership in the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, World War I, and for outstanding service in time of peace as well as war. We in South Carolina, however, remember the beloved general even more for the outstanding role played by him as an educator in our State. After serving his country for approximately 40 years as a soldier, General Summerall then began another distinguished career as president of The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina. Here he served for 22 years, developing The Citadel into one of the Nation's nine distinguished military colleges. While president of The Citadel, General Summerall built up the cadet corps from 600 to more than 1,800. Also, under his presidency, the number of buildings on the campus increased by almost a score. As a soldier, he naturally strengthened the military standards of our great school, but, in addition, he raised the scholastic standards there to a new high.

South Carolina, the Nation, and the entire world will sorely miss this great soldier, educator, and Christian gentleman. I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD, along with my remarks, an editorial from the Aiken Standard and Review, of May 16, entitled "Death Removes a Great Man," and also a news story from the Augusta Chronicle of May 15, entitled "Summerall Last Rites To Be Held at Arlington."

There being no objection, the editorial and news story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Aiken Standard and Review of May 16, 1955]

DEATH REMOVES A GREAT MAN

Death has removed one of the Nation's famous old soldiers and one of Aiken's most beloved and revered citizens—Gen. Charles P. Summerall, Army Chief of Staff during the Coolidge administration.

General Summerall was a soldier whose career was symbolical of the American tradition. The span of his service stretched from the Boxer Rebellion of 1900 through the bloody battles of World War I, and into the trying and pacifistic times of the early 1930's. Capping his career as a military leader was the assignment which marks the peak of an officer's ambition, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

At the age of 64, General Summerall became president of The Citadel, South Carolina's military college. He served at this post for 22 years training Army officers and citizens.

Quoting from the pen of W. D. Workman, Jr., who served as a cadet under General Summerall is the following which shows the place he held in the hearts of the men under him.

"In both roles—as troop commander and as college president—General Summerall manifested those qualities of personality and principle which stamped him as a man apart from the average run. He believed in form, and propriety, and, above all, in moral rectitude. He had no tolerance of laxity, whether of performance or of discipline. There was a right way and a wrong way to meet a situation, and there was no room for compromise between the two.

"It was that determined and inflexible adherence to principle which won for him the

respect—sometimes grudgingly—of those who served with him, or under him. He had little patience with, or understanding of, the frailties of lesser men, and always he held the high moral ground on any field of controversy.

"General Summerall had a deep and abiding love for the college where he spent his declining years. If there were dozens who resented his autocratic methods, there were hundreds who grew to revere his name and who henceforth will cherish his memory. If there be some who felt the sting of his displeasure, there are others who recall and retain the benefit of his stern, fatherly advice.

"And if there be those who remember him as being always the general, there are those who know of his humility of spirit, expressed quietly in such matters as refusing to own automobiles beyond the economic reach of his lowest-paid faculty member.

"His death has drawn into one respectful body all those who ever had association with him. None can deny that the American scene, and in particular, the South Carolina scene, has lost a great figure.

"General Summerall led a life of great moments, and of great decisions. It was not an easy life, for it is not an easy thing either to lead men into battle or—an even harder thing for the truly professional soldier—to send men into battle. Nor is it an easy task to preside over the troubled and sometimes troublesome lives of young men in college. But General Summerall never sought the easy task. He took the hard way as the normal way, and wrapped up into two separate careers a lifetime of public service to State and Nation.

"Four more stars have been added to the firmament of bygone American generals, and they add luster to the lot."

In 1953 when General Summerall retired from The Citadel he came to Aiken to spend the remainder of his life at Whitehall which had been given to The Citadel to be used by the general upon his retirement. The donor was the late Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune who served as a major under the command of General Summerall during World War I. This again showed the esteem in which he was held by those who were associated with him.

We recall the words of General Summerall when he came to Aiken. He said: "This part of the country is home to me. My mother's family, the Pelots, are from Greenwood. They were a French Huguenot family which came to South Carolina in the late 1700's, and moved to Greenwood in 1832."

He loved Whitehall, its spacious rooms where he had on display his many relics of the wars in which he engaged.

He also loved the Aiken Rotary club of which he was made a life member and kept in touch with the activities of the organization during his illness.

Speaking for the citizens of Aiken, we are aware of many hearts full of memories of General Summerall though he was privileged to live here but a short while.

We count it an honor to have known him and to have had him a citizen of Aiken.

May his high standards be carried aloft by the many men who have come under his influence.

[From the Augusta Chronicle of May 15, 1955]

Summerall Last Rites To Be Held at Arlington

Washington, May 14.—Death today overtook another of the Nation's famous old soldiers—Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall of Aiken, S. C., Army Chief of Staff in the Coolidge administration.

The distinguished soldier-educator who tried to wake up America on the preparedness issue long before the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor died at 11:50 a. m. at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 88.

General Summerall had been a patient at the hospital since last August. A son and daughter-in-law, retired Army Colonel and Mrs. Charles P. Summerall Jr., of Belmont, Mass., were at the bedside.

Other survivors are a grandson, Charles P. Summerall III, a student at Harvard Medical School, and a granddaughter, Mrs. John C. Smith, Rochester, N. Y.

Funeral at Arlington

The Pentagon announced that funeral services will be held at Fort Myer Chapel at Arlington National Cemetery at 2:30 p. m. next Tuesday.

General Summerall was Chief of Staff of the Army in 1926–30. He had been the country's oldest ranking soldier since the death of Gen. Peyton C. March last April 13 at the age of 90. March was Chief of Staff during World War I in which Summerall distinguished himself in France.

When he retired as Chief of Staff, Summerall became president of The Citadel, military college at Charleston, S. C. He made a fine record during his 22 years there before retiring in 1953. Gen. Douglas MacArthur succeeded him as Chief of Staff.

Clark Pays Tribute

Gen. Mark Clark, retired, who succeeded Summerall at The Citadel and who is visiting his mother here, said he saw Summerall this morning before his death.

"He not only was a great soldier, but he was a great educator," said Clark. "He will be missed by everyone who felt his influence."

Secretary of the Army Stevens said Summerall was a "brilliant leader" who contributed immeasurably to the Army's progress. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, present Chief of Staff, said the Army and Nation greatly benefited from Summerall's "unstinting devotion to duty" during a career of almost 40 years.

Aiken Residence

Summerall moved to Aiken in June 1953, and established residence at Whitehall on Whisky Road.

The house was deeded to The Citadel by Col. Robert R. McCormick, late editor of the Chicago Tribune, with the understanding that it be a retirement home for Summerall. It will now revert to The Citadel.

McCormick served under Summerall during World War I and they became close friends.

The general, always in great demand as an after-dinner speaker, was an honorary member of practically every civic organization in Aiken and Aiken County.

Summerall, for nearly 40 years a distinguished soldier, became an educator when he retired from the Army and distinguished himself anew.

He rounded out his Army career with a 4-year term as Chief of Staff, during which he concentrated upon improving the Nation's general staff and building up housing facilities at posts in all parts of the country.

Many Decorations

The Florida-born officer retired with the rank of general early in 1931, possessor of at least 15 ribbons for major decorations from many nations, in addition to numerous citations for personal bravery, leadership and efficiency under trying conditions.

Soon afterward he became president of South Carolina's State military college at Charleston, The Citadel, a school that had stressed the military type of education since its founding in 1842.

In the next dozen years, Summerall built up the cadet corps from less than 600 to more than 1,800, and under his presidency the number of buildings on the campus increased by almost a score.

The general took over his educational post at a time when the economic depression had caused drastic cuts in State appropiations. But he plunged into his duties with the same zest and determination that had carried him to the top in the Army, and the school began to grow in spite of the depression.

Strengthened Citadel

A soldier, he naturally strengthened the military standards of the Citadel, but he strengthened its scholastic standards also.

Long before Pearl Harbor, Summerall made speeches advocating preparedness and deploring what he termed the apathy of Americans to their own national safety.

Sixteen months prior to Japan's attack, he warned that "there's less time than you think" for the United States to get her defenses in order. In an earlier speech he had said:

"Let us no longer delude ourselves with the fetish that the oceans protect us. Unless we control them, they make us more vulnerable."

In the summer of 1941, he told an audience at Gastonia, N. C.:

"For 22 years we have slept as to national security, contemptuous of all warnings by those charged with our defense and blind to the preparations of the dictators for conquest."

In blunt soldier talk, he went on:

"Because of our weakness and indifference, we must wait like fat oxen for the butcher with the carving knife.

"The people must awaken to the danger and make war the chief aim of their lives until the future is sealed with victory or defeat. Either is possible now."

Japan's sneak attack on Pearl Harbor came December 7, 1941.

Cited for Bravery

Summerall began winning citations for bravery as a first lieutenant of artillery in the Philippines in 1899 and 1900. He was mentioned for gallantry six times during the campaigns against the insurrectionists.

In August 1900, he took a prominent part in a battle upon which the eyes of the civilized world were focused. It was the storming of Peking by the China Relief Expedition during the Boxer Rebellion.

Summerall sent his platoon of field guns with the forces attacking the Imperial City. After he had dashed forward under heavy enemy fire to mark the gate with a large white "X," his guns blew open the gates to the four outer walls surrounding the so-called Forbidden City, and then blasted open the gates to the Forbidden City itself. He was twice again cited for gallantry in action.

After America entered World War I, Summerall was assigned to command the artillery brigade of the 42d (Rainbow) Division and went to France with that division, but later was transferred to the First Division as commanding general of artillery.

His brigade went through the Cantigny fighting in May 1918, the first important battle for the American forces, and it was credited with producing artillery results without precedent in United States history.

The next month he was promoted to major general and given command of the division later known throughout the Army as the Fighting First. He led it in the Aisne-Marne, second Marne, and the Meuse-Argonne offensives.

Headed Corps

A month before the armistice Summerall took command of the Fifth Corps, which, as usual with his commands, "reached all objectives." After the armistice he commanded the Ninth and later the Fourth Corps.

His leadership and ability in France won for him the United States Distinguished Service Cross, and the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Honor of

France, Belgium's Grand Officer of the Crown, and Italy's Commander of the Order of the Crown.

He received decorations also from Poland, Panama, Montenegro, and Cuba for his achievements with the American Expeditionary Force.

The citation for one of his decorations said that due to his great courage and utter disregard for his own safety, the men of his division were inspired to enormous and heroic efforts.

A staff officer who served with him in France said that, invariably, after a particularly hard day of fighting, the general would order another day of activity. He would argue that the enemy was just as tired and ought not to be given a chance to rest. After the armistice Summerall served as a member of the Allied Mission of Generals sent to Fiume and later with the Peace Commission at Paris.

NATIVE OF FLORIDA

He was born near Lake City, Fla., March 4, 1867, the son of Elhanan Bryant Summerall and Margaret Cornelia Pelot, both natives of South Carolina.

He received his early education in the schools of Florida, then attended Porter Military Academy at Charleston, an Episcopal preparatory school for 3 years. After graduating from Porter he taught school for 2 years.

He was graduated from West Point in 1892. His first Army assignment was with the infantry, but after a few months he transferred to the field artillery. He married Laura Mordecai in 1901. Their son, Charles P. Summerall, Jr., served in World War II. As a lieutenant colonel commanding a field artillery battalion, he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action. Summerall was an Episcopalian and a 33d-degree Mason.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have just returned from the funeral of one of America's outstanding figures, a personal friend of mine, the late Gen. Charles P. Summerall.

I served under General Summerall in the First World War. As history would have it, in later years I again knew General Summerall when I was Governor of South Carolina. He was then president of The Citadel, a college which today bears the impress of his reputation for honor and devotion to country.

As chairman of the board of visitors of The Citadel, I came to know General Summerall for the man that he was. His clean living, his high standards of morality, his devotion to religion, and his loyalty to family and country, were and today still are guides for thousands of men in all walks of life.

A man could not know General Summerall without being affected by his striking character. He was a resolute man who placed duty and honor before all else. His life is truly the American story—a youth of small means coming from the bosom of the people to become one of the great military leaders in time of war, and an outstanding educator in time of peace. From cadet at West Point to retired Chief of Staff he served his nation more than well. As educator he went on to teach thousands of young men the meaning of a clean and wholesome life, and to be ready to answer the call to defend the United States, which he loved so dearly.

Mr. President, I have known no one in my lifetime whom I have respected more for high principles and integrity than the late Charles P. Summerall. The people of my State and the rest of the Nation mourn his passing. He will not be forgotten, for the impact of his character will be felt among us for long years to come.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the legislative branch, involving an increase of $844,335, for the fiscal year 1956, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts for research and development had been negotiated during the 6 months from July 1 through December 31, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by the Administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contributions made by that Administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on "Business Enterprises," dated May 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

FACILITATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO CERTAIN HIGHWAYS AT NAVAHO INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE TO AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk and certain marine and liability insurance to the American public, as of March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THOMAS W. BEVANS ET AL.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO EMBEZZLEMENT OR THEFT OF CERTAIN INDIAN PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the executive secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that society, for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED POLIOMYELITIS IMMUNIZATION ACT OF 1955

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to flood control in San Bernardino County, Calif.

"Whereas in 1938 there occurred floods in San Bernardino County, Calif., of such great severity that much damage was done to persons and to property and the city of San Bernardino was isolated from the cities of Colton and Redlands; and

"Whereas since 1938 many fires have destroyed forest lands and denuded valuable watersheds in that area, the most recent fire having added over 2,500 acres in Cable Canyon to such previously denuded forest lands; and

"Whereas the decrease in watershed areas combined with the present lack of flood control facilities render the San Bernardino area dangerously vulnerable to flood damage; and

"Whereas the city of San Bernardino and the adjacent areas have undergone rapid development and expansion in recent years; and

"Whereas unless immediate steps are taken to provide flood control facilities there is a great possibility of a major disaster in the San Bernardino area due to floods; and

"Whereas in order to protect the people of this State from further loss of life and property and to prevent great harm to our national defense facilities in the San Bernardino area, it is essential that flood control facilities in the San Bernardino area be provided immediately: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to appropriate, without delay, such funds as may be necessary to construct adequate flood control facilities for the city of San Bernardino and the adjacent areas in the county of San Bernardino; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution relative to the protection of the public health and safety from the hazards of peacetime use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material

"Whereas eminent scientists, officers, and agencies of the State of California have called attention to a potential hazard to the public health and safety of the people of the State of California resulting from the peacetime medical, industrial, and scientific use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 establishes responsibility for the protection of the public health and safety from the hazards of peacetime uses of special nuclear material, byproduct material, and the disposal of radioactive waste materials resulting from that use, with the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

"Whereas despite the representations of the Atomic Energy Commission that these responsibilities are being fulfilled, eminent scientists have advised the legislature that they continue to believe there is a need for State legislation and for a State agency on radiological services to guard the people of the State of California against the potential hazards resulting from the peacetime use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material; and

"Whereas there is confusion as to the extent of State jurisdiction to legislate with respect to ionizing radiation and byproduct material due to the assumption of jurisdiction within the field by the Federal Government under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to conduct studies to determine whether or not the Atomic Energy Commission is fulfilling its responsibilities for the protection of the public health and safety against the hazards arising out of the peacetime use of special nuclear material, byproduct material, and the disposal of radioactive waste materials resulting from that use, and to determine the extent it is desirable or necessary for the several States to legislate or to provide services to protect the public from the hazards arising from the peacetime use of special nuclear material, byproduct material, and ionizing radiation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Resolution 30

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to provide continued reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients in Hawaii

"Whereas Public Law 411 of the 82d Congress, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 157), provides that the Surgeon General of the United States shall pay to the board of health of the Territory of Hawaii upon funds being available a sum of money to be computed upon the per diem cost of caring for Hansen's disease patients in facilities operated by the board of health; and

"Whereas the Public Health Service budget includes a request for $1 million to reimburse the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients; and

"Whereas the public services offered in the Territory of Hawaii to persons suffering from Hansen's disease have proved an invaluable service both to the people of the Territory and to all citizens of the United States through the furthering of research in this field: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to approve the budget request of the Public Health Service of the United States which will continue the present Federal aid to the Hansen's disease program of the board of health of the Territory of Hawaii, now provided by Public Law 411, 82d Congress, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 157).

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 12th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a tariff on fresh, frozen, and unprocessed fish and to devote the proceeds to research

"Whereas the waters of and adjacent to the Territory of Hawaii contain vast quantities of fish capable of supporting a large fishing industry; and

"Whereas the development and success of such an industry is dependent upon protection against the competition of foreign nations; and

"Whereas the development and prosperity of Hawaiian fisheries and fish canning and processing industries in the Territory of Hawaii would be conducive to the prosperity of the Nation as well as the self-sufficiency of the Territory with respect to food supply; and

"Whereas the development of Hawaiian fisheries and fishing industries necessitates intensive research and investigation: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is requested to enact a tariff imposing tariff rates on fresh, frozen, and unprocessed fish products sufficiently high as to afford protection against foreign competition to the fishing industries of the United States and those of the Territory of Hawaii in particular.

"SEC. 2. That the Congress be requested to earmark and set aside the proceeds of such tariff for scientific research designed to foster and develop Hawaiian and other American fisheries and fish canning and processing.

"SEC. 3. That duly certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. That this joint resolution take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to revise and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended

"Whereas the sugar industry of Hawaii, composed of several thousand growers of sugarcane, is an integral and vitally important part of the economy of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the dynamic progress and technological advancements which have distinguished and do now distinguish the Hawaiian sugar industry from other segments of the domestic sugar industry, require that all domestic sugar-producing areas of the United States shall henceforth share in supplying the continued growth of the sugar market in the United States; and

"Whereas there have been introduced in the Congress of the United States identical bills known as S. 1635 and H. R. 5406, which propose amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and such bills provide for restoring to domestic sugar-producing areas, including Hawaii, their historic right to share in the continued growth of the United States sugar market: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation with provisions identical to those now contained in S. 1635 and H. R. 5406 in the Congress of the United States, amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to the Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 12th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 27

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and all sales of public lands consummated pursuant to said statutes

"Whereas there are many small and scattered remnants of public lands resulting

from the abandonment of roads, railroads, or ditch rights-of-way, or portions thereof, and the taking by the Territory, under its power of eminent domain, of land in excess of that needed for public purposes, because public policies or other justifiable cause necessitates such taking; and

"Whereas these remnants of public lands are usually too small in area or too irregular in shape to be of any use to anyone except abutting landowners; and

"Whereas whenever there is no further public use for these remnants and the same shall be disposed of by the Territory, they should first be offered to the abutting landowners; and

"Whereas the legislature has enacted statutes to provide for such disposal, but these statutes have never been ratified or confirmed by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, requested to enact legislation ratifying and confirming the provisions of section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes, and to that end the said Congress is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes

"*'Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945 is hereby ratified and confirmed.

"'SEC. 2. Section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

"'SEC. 3. All sales of public lands to abutting landowners consummated pursuant to the terms of the foregoing statutes are hereby ratified and confirmed and shall be deemed and held to be perfect and valid as of the date of the sales.

"'SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation permitting the Territory of Hawaii to guarantee or insure disaster loans

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii and its people have been subjected, from time to time, to the action of some of the most destructive forces of nature, such as earthquake, volcanic eruptions, tidal wave, drought, and flood; and

"Whereas it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the people of the Territory of Hawaii to protect their property adequately against such hazards; and

"Whereas it is in the public interest for the government of the Territory of Hawaii to do what it can to make such provision that persons will lend money to those who have suffered damage from the action of these forces of nature: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to pass legislation enabling the Territory of Hawaii to guarantee or insure loans made to persons who are required to borrow as a result of damage caused by some natural force such as earthquake, volcanic eruptions, tidal wave, drought, or flood.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to admit members of the immediate families of resident nationals and permanently resident aliens into the United States, its possessions and Territories, on a nonquota basis

"Whereas there are large numbers of nationals and permanently resident aliens on the continental United States and its possessions and Territories; and

"Whereas presently said nationals and resident aliens are physically separated from their respective families, and in many instances such separations have been for a number of years; and

"Whereas presently these family members may only enter the continental United States, its possessions and Territories, under the quotas assigned for such nations; and

"Whereas these prolonged separations have given rise to undesirable social consequences to the extent of becoming a morals problem, and which undeniably have contributed to crime incidences; but more particularly, these separations have been an attributable cause of the breaking up of family units: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to admit members of the families of resident nationals and permanently resident aliens into the United States and its possessions and Territories on a nonquota basis: *Provided, however,* That such nationals and resident aliens have been bona fide residents of the United States or its possessions or Territories for no less than 10 years preceding the date of the enactment of such legislation: *And provided further,* That such nationals and resident aliens are gainfully employed at the time of their application for the admission of their family members into the United States or its possessions or territories.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to the Delegate to the Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 43

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama and the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa

"Whereas the fishing sampan *Shinei Maru,* owned by Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama, a citizen of the United States, was attacked by United States planes on December 8, 1941, resulting in the destruction of the sampan as well as in the loss of the lives of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa, both citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas no reimbursement has been made to Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama for the loss of the sampan or compensation allowed the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa for damages suffered due to their death; and

"Whereas at the time of such loss and for a number of years thereafter no right of legal action lay against the Government of the United States whereby, in situations comparable to this, damages might be obtained; and

"Whereas despite the adoption of Federal enabling legislation, there yet appears to be serious doubt whether action lies or could be successfully prosecuted against the Government of the United States for the recovery of damages suffered through the loss of the sampan and the lives of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama and for the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa to compensate them for the loss of the vessel *Shinei Maru* and the lives of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"House Concurrent Resolution 44

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of the next of kin of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Uyehara

"Whereas the fishing sampan *Kiho Maru,* owned by Kiichi Kida, a citizen of the United States, was attacked by United States planes on December 8, 1941, resulting in the destruction of the sampan as well as in the loss of the lives of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Uyehara, also a citizen of the United States; and

"Whereas no reimbursement or compensation has been made to the next of kin of Kiichi Kida for the loss of his life and of the vessel nor to the next of kin of Kiho Uyehara for the loss of his life; and

"Whereas at the time of such loss and for a number of years thereafter no right of legal action lay against the Government of the United States whereby in situations comparable to this damages might be obtained; and

"Whereas despite the adoption of Federal enabling legislation there yet appears to be serious doubt whether action now lies or could be successfully prosecuted against the Government of the United States for the recovery of damages suffered through the loss of the lives of Kiichi Kida and of Kiho Uyehara and the loss of the sampan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the

United States be requested to appropriate funds for the relief of the next of kind of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Uyehara to compensate them for the loss of their lives and of the vessel *Kiho Maru;* and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Cook County Council, the American Legion, Chicago, Ill., relating to illegally held prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on the 164th aninversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, relating to Polish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Holy Name Society, St. Jerome's Rectory, Brooklyn, N. Y., signed by Louis Einstman, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that society, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., relating to lawmaking by treaty, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mary O'Connell, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce

"Whereas there is pending in Congress a bill to have the regulation of the so-called field price of natural gas removed from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; and

"Whereas this bill involves a group of bills which would remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to regulate prices of natural gas at the source and shipped in interstate commerce; and

"Whereas the removal of Federal regulatory jurisdiction would be financially injurious to the many users of natural gas in Massachusetts communities; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts hereby expresses its opposition to the passage of legislation which would remove the rate-fixing powers from the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECOGNITION OF EASTERN (GREEK) ORTHODOX CHURCH—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America and the National Council of Eastern—Greek—Orthodox, a letter urgently recommending the official recognition of the Eastern—Greek—Orthodox faith, for the purpose of identifying religious affiliation of United States servicemen, under Senate bill 106, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I strongly favor this bill because I feel that it embodies a basic American principle—the right of religious freedom.

This bill is designed to give official Government recognition to the Eastern—Greek—Orthodox Church and to instruct the Armed Forces to mark the dog tags of servicemen with the initials "E. O." Certainly the 7 million Americans who are members of this faith merit this consideration. In past years members of this faith going into the armed services, have had to register either as Protestants or Catholics, although the Greek Orthodox Church contends that neither designation properly applies. Young men of this faith have gladly laid down their lives in wars this Nation has fought. They are entitled to this small consideration. I cannot see any valid basis for opposition to this bill.

The resolution which I am attaching from the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America, summarizes their stand on this matter most appropriately.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: The Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America and the National Council of Eastern (Greek) Orthodox, speaking in the interest of 7 million Eastern Greek Orthodox urge you, a member of the Armed Forces Committee of the United States Senate and a stanch supporter of and fighter for the rights and dignities of man, to give due consideration and deliberation to Senate bill 106 of the 84th Congress. After such consideration and deliberation, we are sure you will reach the conclusion that S. 106 should pass.

S. 106 officially recognizes the Eastern Greek Orthodox faith and authorizes the armed services to mark the dog tags of servicemen with the initials "EO." For your consideration and the consideration of the Members of Congress, we submit the following resolution:

"Whereas the Eastern Greek Orthodox faith was founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles with the establishment of churches in Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople; and

"Whereas today there are approximately 250 million followers of the Eastern Orthodox faith throughout the world, 7 million of whom are citizens and residents of the United States of America; and

"Whereas during World War II the members in the Armed Forces of the United States of the Eastern Orthodox faith were not given a preference of designation as Eastern Orthodox but were required to register as Catholics or Protestants indiscriminately; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America and of the 48 States guarantees freedom of religion and equal rights and privileges, with no one church gaining any preference over the other; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has recognized Eastern Greek Orthodox priests to administer the religious services and sacraments to members of the Eastern Orthodox faith in the veterans' hospitals throughout the United States and these priests have an admirable record for services rendered; and

"Whereas during World War II and today there were and are thousands upon thousands of members of the Armed Forces of the Eastern Orthodox faith; and

"Whereas thousands of members of the Eastern Orthodox faith have made the supreme sacrifice in fighting for the democracy of the world, one of which principles is freedom of religion: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to vote favorably on Senate bill 106 and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Armed Forces Committee of the Senate of the United States and of the House of Representatives of the United States."

THE VOICE OF GREEK ORTHODOXY IN AMERICA,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EASTERN (GREEK) ORTHODOX,
By LA JOY CHUMBRIS,
Acting Secretary.

THE TREATYMAKING POWER AND OPERATION OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, at the request of the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by that organization relating to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 relating to the treaty-making power, and to the operation of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans of Polish descent, assembled on this 1st day of May 1955, at the Modjeska Hall, Wilmington, Del., to commemorate the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence, have adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas liberty is the most precious possession of mankind. We Americans possessing liberty should exert the eternal vigilance which is necessary to preserve it; and

"Whereas our American Government is founded on the concept of the individuality and the dignity of the human being under God. Underlying this concept is the belief that the human person is important because he was created by God and endowed by Him with inalienable rights which no civil authority may usurp; and

"Whereas we cannot remain silent and indifferent. We have reached a point that we must decide whether our rights and freedoms are truly inalienable or whether they are subject to alienation by a treaty or an international agreement; and

"Whereas unlimited treaty power poses a continuing threat to the Constitution, this threat having been recently augmented by

the fact that four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States actually held that the United Nations Charter—ratified treaty—supersedes our Constitution; and

"Whereas amending the Constitution is a subject in which the President has no legal concern whatsoever. In 1798 the Supreme Court held (3 Dallas, 378) that a proposal by Congress to amend a Constitution is not a legislative subject and therefore not for consideration by the President: Be it

"Resolved, That we, assembled in this commemoration meeting, reaffirm our previous support of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) petitioning our Representatives in the United States Congress to support the adoption of this legislation to be a part of the fundamental law, which would not interfere with the power of the President and the Department of State to negotiate treaties and other international agreements and thus to properly conduct our foreign affairs: It would only prevent treaties from violating the American Constitution and prevent them from becoming internal law within the United States until implemented by appropriate American legislation.

"Whereas, the United Nations is completely ineffective as an instrument of peace, further, the United Nations Charter 'stands as a constant threat and peril to the Constitution and precious liberties and rights of American citizens, the United Nation is clearly demonstrated to be a spawning ground for spies and subversives and has been used as a sounding board by the Russians for propaganda purposes'; and

"Whereas, efforts are being made, through suggested amendments, to convert the United Nations into a world government from which there would be no escape: Be it

"Resolved, That we, assembled at this commemoration meeting, favor that the United Nations should be kept only as a forum for discussion in international disputes, it should be prohibited from any 'evolution into a world state.' It should be outlawed in all its efforts to write domestic laws for member nations such as, for example, the Convention Against Genocide and the Covenant on Human Rights; further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen from Delaware, chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision, and to Senator JOHN W. BRICKER."

JOHN F. KANICKI,
Presiding Officer.

Attest: VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER IN KANSAS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received from Howard Payne, city clerk of the city of Kansas City, Kans., a letter transmitting a resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of that city, favoring the continuance of surveys and planning for the conservation of soil and water in the State of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
May 13, 1955.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith for your consideration a resolution adopted by the governing body of Kansas City, Kans., in re flood control in Kansas.

Mayor Mitchum had planned to bring the resolution to Washington but was prevented from attending because of a previous commitment for a meeting with the Kansas Turnpike Authority.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

HOWARD PAYNE,
City Clerk.

Resolution 15130

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water, and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation, pollution control, and soil conservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Kansas City, Kans., That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions are necessary to assure continuance of surveys and planning and assure cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water, by the three agencies, namely the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Kansas City, Kans., this 5th day of May 1955.

HOWARD PAYNE,
City Clerk.

PAUL L. MITCHUM,
Mayor-Commissioner.

EARL B. WARNER,
Commissioner Finance, Health, and Public Property.

JOSEPH P. REGAN,
Commissioner of Streets, Parks, and Boulevards.

GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR NURSES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a statement by deans and directors of graduate educational programs for nurses, setting forth the reasons for requesting special attention to the critical needs for education and research projects in the field of nursing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The statement will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. McNAMARA was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

AREAS OF HIGH PRIORITY NEED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO NURSING SERVICE AND NURSING EDUCATION

After careful study and assessment of the key barriers to providing the kind, amount and quality of nursing services needed by the people of this country, the deans and directors of graduate educational programs for nurses listed below recommend that priority be given both in the appropriation of Federal funds and in the approval of projects for the following areas of critical need in education and research in nursing.

A. CRITICAL NEED FOR MORE AND BETTER PREPARED NURSING PERSONNEL

1. Nurses to fill key administrative and supervisory positions in hospitals and public health agencies, in order that nursing services may be improved throughout the country.

2. Faculties for schools of nursing, especially nursing faculty for graduate programs, directors of schools and teachers of nursing, so that students graduating from basic nursing programs may be more ready to cope with rapidly changing health needs of the people.

3. Clinical nursing specialists qualified to give expert nursing care and serve as consultants in agencies that render nursing service.

4. Nurses skilled in research to add to the body of knowledge of nursing as a discipline, and to bring to the study of problems of nursing practice, organization and administration of nursing services, and education of nurses, the same scientific approach and methods that have proved successful in the fields of engineering, medicine and the other sciences.

B. URGENT NEED FOR EXPANSION OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, TO PREPARE THE REQUIRED NURSING PERSONNEL

1. Financial aid to institutions of higher education that offer programs approved for preparation of key nursing personnel. This should include assistance for the development of demonstration units, provision of additional faculty, buildings and other educational facilities and resources.

2. Scholarship and fellowship aid for individual nurses who qualify for admission to approved basic and graduate programs, to make it possible for the required number of nurses to undertake preparation for these key positions in the shortest possible time. Of key importance is financial aid to graduate nurses to prepare for teaching, supervisory, and administrative positions.

C. AREAS IN WHICH THERE IS CRITICAL NEED FOR RESEARCH

1. Function of nursing: Research is needed to further clarify the role and proper functions of the professional nurse and other nursing personnel providing nursing services to individuals and families in light of changing health needs, advances in medical practice and extension of health resources.

2. Application of science to the techniques and art of nursing: Such research should continuously add to the body of knowledge of nursing in a systematic way, replacing the empirical basis for practice with a scientific basis that will insure keeping the practice of nursing in pace with advances in the related physical, biological, social, psychological, medical, and health sciences. The cooperation of specialists in these sciences is needed to advance nursing knowledge.

3. Organization and administration of nursing service: Such research should provide for the application of the science of human engineering to the organization and administration of nursing personnel to make most effective and economical use of their nursing and related skills. The cooperation of specialists in business administration and industrial engineering as well as hospital administration is needed to advance knowledge in this area.

4. Education for nurses: Such research should provide for the application of the science of education to the development of programs preparing the various types of nursing personnel and preparing the teachers of nurses. This should include with respect to educational programs for each type of personnel, research in selecting students, designing curricular patterns, selecting learning experiences, and developing methods and tools of teaching and evaluation.

Miss Marjorie Bartholf, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Texas, Medical Branch, Galveston, Tex.; Miss Elizabeth S. Bixler, Dean, Yale University School of Nursing, New Haven, Conn.; Miss Katherine J. Densford, Director, School of Nursing, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Miss Katharine Faville, Dean, College of Nursing, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.; Mrs. Lulu Wolf Hassenplug, Dean, School of Nursing, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Miss Julia Hereford, Dean, School of Nursing, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; Mrs. Ruth Kuehn, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Henrietta Adams Loughran, Dean, University of Colorado School of Nursing, Denver, Colo.; Mrs. R. Louise McManus, Director, Division of Nursing Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Sister M. Olivia, Dean, School of Nursing Education, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; Miss Louise M. Schmidt, Director, Graduate Program, College of Nursing, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Miss Edith H. Smith, Dean, Syracuse University School of Nursing, Syracuse, N. Y.; Miss Martha Ruth Smith, Dean, School of Nursing, Boston University, Boston, Mass.; Miss Frances C. Thielbar, Chairman, Nursing Education, the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Mary S. Tschudin, Acting Dean, School of Nursing, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 352); and

H. R. 3322. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 351).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1795. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 353).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 33. A bill relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 356).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 51. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 357).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 358).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary;

H. R. 4052. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 354).

GEO. D. EMERY CO.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Geo. D. Emery Co., and I submit a report (No. 355) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 427) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1981. A bill to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes; and

S. 1982. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1983. A bill for the relief of Myra Louise Dew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1984. A bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1985. A bill for the relief of the St. Alexius Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1986. A bill for the relief of Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1988. A bill to authorize the issuance of death certificates in the case of members of the Armed Forces who have died while on active duty subsequent to September 16, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1989. A bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1990. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to require in certain cases that air carriers provide transportation for additional baggage at airfreight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1991. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to authorize production payments, limit price-supports eligibility, and provide 90-percent price supports for basic family-farm production; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1992. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1993. A bill authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1994. A bill transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.;

S. 1996. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1997. A bill to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1998. A bill to amend section 70a (5) of the Bankruptcy Act;

S. 1999. A bill to amend section 70d (5) of the Bankruptcy Act; and

S. 2000. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 2001. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2003. A bill to provide for the payment of more adequate compensation to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation for land taken from them by the United States in 1942 for military purposes; and

S. 2004. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2005. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2006. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to stimulate the development and construction of cooperative housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2007. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 2008. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMPLETING CONSTRUCTION OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

The bill (S. 1981) to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of late the Congress and the executive departments have indicated thier friendship to Latin America—friendship that will bring about good will, better understanding, and economic betterment.

To me, those have been beautiful words; but in order to carry out those noble sentiments, I believe that something practical should be done to indicate that we mean what we say.

Hence, I am introducing a bill which will authorize appropriations for the construction of the Inter-American Highway. The bill is simple. It authorizes that the amount for 1957, 1958, and 1959, under the 1954 act, be appropriated immediately, and be available until expended; and that an additional sum of $25,730,000 be authorized and appropriated immediately, for the purposes of, and in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the 1954 act.

If the bill becomes law, it surely will prove to our friends of Latin America that we mean what we say.

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY FOR SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement concerning the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

The bill (S. 1982) to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill would authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all work incidental thereto. Such a building is needed to replace the Arts and Industries Building, a 75-year-old structure of very cheap construction. The present building is impossibly overcrowded and utterly inadequate for the purposes it should serve, namely, the preservation and exhibition of the priceless collections memorializing our Nation's history and technological development. The purposes of the bill have the approval of the Smithsonian Institution, General Services Administration, the National Capitol Planning Commission, the Commission on Fine Arts, and the Bureau of the Budget.

PROPOSED POLIOMYELITIS IMMUNIZATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes.

The bill is designed to carry out the recommendations on this subject in the report to the President made on yesterday by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $28 million in Federal grants to the States, to be available until December 31, 1956.

It is my hope that the bill, which represents an integral part of the administration's comprehensive program, as reported, will receive early consideration and approval by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the letter of transmission from Secretary Hobby to the President of the Senate be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1984) to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Poliomyelitis Immunization Assistance Act of 1955."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of assisting States to assure that no child will be denied immunization against poliomyelitis, during the current shortage of the poliomyelitis vaccine, because of inability to pay for the cost thereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $28 million, to remain available until December 31, 1956. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, applications for carrying out the purposes of this act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2, the Secretary shall allot to each State which has an application approved pursuant to section 4 an amount equal to 20 percent of the number of unimmunized children in such State multiplied by the product of (1) the cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine per child and (2) the State's allotment percentage. The amount so computed for each State shall be reduced by the percentage by which such sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 are less than the total of the amounts so computed for all States.

(b) A State's allotment percentage shall be equal to the per capita income of the United States divided by the per capita income of the State. Such percentage shall be determined by the Secretary, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of information furnished by the Department of Commerce; except that the allotment percentage for Hawaii shall be 100 percent and for Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Canal Zone shall be equal to the allotment percentage determined above for the one of the 48 States which has the lowest per capita income.

STATE APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDS

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall approve the application of any State for payments under this act if such application—

(a) sets forth a statewide program for use of the poliomyelitis vaccine purchased with funds paid to the State under this act, which contains reasonable assurance that no child, or, if (and for so long as) any priority groups are established by the Secretary under this act, no child within such priority group or groups, will be denied vaccination against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the cost thereof: *Provided*, That this shall not prevent a State from providing for the free vaccination against poliomyelitis, without regard to ability to pay, of all unimmunized children, or all such children within any one or more groups determined by the State, but, in such case, the amount paid to such State under this act with respect to the poliomyelitis vaccine for such children may not exceed the allotment percentage for such State multiplied by the cost of the vaccine for 20 percent of such children;

(b) provides for administration or supervision of administration of the program included in the application by a single State agency;

(c) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act, and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(d) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this act for any period, and shall pay such amount to such State, from the allotment available therefor, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this section) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period under this act was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this act. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

USE OF FUNDS PAID TO STATES

SEC. 6. Funds paid to a State under this act may be used solely for the purchase, prior to December 31, 1956, of the poliomyelitis vaccine for use in carrying out the program set forth in the application of such State approved pursuant to section 4.

FURNISHING OF VACCINE BY SECRETARY

SEC. 7. At the request of any State the Secretary may use all or any portion of the allotment of such State under this act for the purchase of the poliomyelitis vaccine, to be furnished to the State in lieu of such State's allotment (or such portion thereof). Vaccine so furnished shall be subject to the same requirements as to use as vaccine purchased from payments to States pursuant to this act.

PRIORITIES AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. Priorities established by the Secretary for purposes of section 4 (a) shall be based on the relative susceptibility of various age groups of children to poliomyelitis. The Secretary is authorized to establish an advisory committee on distribution of the poliomyelitis vaccine to advise and assist him in the establishment of such priorities. Appointed members of such committee who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2).

DIVERSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

SEC. 9. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the program included in the application of such State approved under section 4, finds that—

(a) such State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions of this act or the terms and conditions of its approved application; or

(b) any funds paid to such State or supplies of vaccine furnished to it under this act have been diverted from the purposes for which paid or furnished;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made (or no further supplies of vaccine will be furnished) to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such State agency repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended (or for repayment of the cost of the vaccine which has been diverted).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(b) (1) The term "child" means any individual who has not attained the age of 20 years;

(2) The number of children shall be determined by the Secretary, as of June 30, 1955, on the basis of the latest information furnished by the Department of Commerce;

(3) The number of unimmunized children means the number of such children, reduced by the extent to which any such child has received the vaccinations against poliomyelitis, determined by the Secretary as of such date or dates as he may select for purposes of this act;

(c) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia;

(d) The cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of information available to him; and such cost may be determined from time to time or as of a specified date and may be determined to be a single figure for all States or varied in accordance with actual cost.

The letter presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

MAY 16, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of a bill (the Poliomyelitis Immunization Assistance Act of 1955), to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes.

This bill is designed to carry out the recommendation in my report to the President on this subject. With the cooperation of the States, it would assure, as the President indicated should be done, that no child would be denied immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay for such immunization.

The bill would authorize the appropriation of $28 million, to be available until December 31, 1956, for grants to States. This amount of money is estimated to be sufficient to purchase the vaccine required to vaccinate 22 percent of all children through age 19 who are not vaccinated under the program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

The amounts appropriated pursuant to the bill would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative child population (under age 20) and the State's allotment percentage. The allotment percentages would be varied inversely with relative State per capita income, with the percentage for the average State set at 20 percent. The State with the lowest per capita income would receive an amount sufficient to pay for the vaccine for about 41 percent of its children, while the State with the highest per capita income would receive enough for about 15 percent of its children. Under this formula, sufficient funds would be alloted to provide vaccine for 22 percent of all unimmunized children in the United States, and for substantially greater percentages in States with lower than average per capita income. This should make it possible for each State to provide the kind of assurance which the President recommended.

The allotments would be made to States on the basis of applications setting forth a statewide program, administered or supervised by a single State agency, which would provide reasonable assurance that no child will be denied vaccination because of inability to pay. As priority groups are established by the Secretary for purposes of this bill—because of shortage of the vaccine—the State's assurance would apply, so long as such priorities are in effect, to the children included in the priority group or groups. These priorities would be based on the relative susceptibility of various age groups to the disease. The State could, however, if it wished, provide for free vaccination against poliomyelitis for all children (or all children within any one or more groups determined by the State) not already immunized against the disease. But, in such a case, the amount paid the State could not exceed 20 percent of the cost of the vaccine for such children multiplied by the State's allotment percentage (which increases the 20 percent figure in the case of the low income States, and decreases it for the high income States).

Payments to the States from their allotments would be based on advance estimates with later adjustments to take account of errors. The funds so paid could be used only for purchase, prior to December 31, 1956, of the poliomyelitis vaccine for carrying out the State's program included in its approved application.

Provision is made under the bill for use by the Secretary of all or a portion of a State's allotment to purchase the poliomyelitis vaccine. The vaccine would then be turned over to the State for its program. This use of a State's allotment can only be made at the State's request.

Any priority groups for purposes of the bill would be established by the Secretary with the advice of an advisory committee appointed for this purpose.

If funds paid any State are diverted or there is substantial failure to carry out the State program included in its application, the Secretary would be authorized to withhold further payments to the State. This could be done only after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

I would appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the enclosed draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to authorize production payments, limit price-support eligibility, and provide 90-percent price supports for basic family-farm production. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1991) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to authorize production payments, limit price-support eligibility, and provide 90-percent price supports for basic family-farm production, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill is aimed at removing some of the criticisms and objections to existing and past price-support programs in regard to the proportion of benefits going to large corporation-type farm operators. Instead, it would channel the price-support benefits where they are needed most—to the average farmer's basic living costs. It introduces a new two-price concept into the support program, with a complete cutoff of support benefits for production exceeding $50,000 in gross value from any one farm.

Under terms of this bill, farmers would be granted not less than 90 percent of parity price supports on products from any one farm up to a gross value of $25,000.

For additional farm production with a gross value up to $50,000, farmers would be eligible for price supports of not less than 75 percent. For production above the $50,000 gross value limitation, no support would be provided at all.

Nothing in the bill limits the initiative of individual farmers or larger commercial operators, even though its benefits are concentrated upon family farmers. Whatever the size of his operation, a farmer would be entitled to 90-percent support on the first basic $25,000 value of his production, 75 percent on the next $25,000 worth of production, and still be free to sell on the open market without support any production beyond $50,000 in value.

However, I believe it achieves a better balance between economic and social objectives of farm legislation by offering some semblance of protection toward fair prices for the basic production required to meet living expenses of a family farmer, yet removing support incentives for the big corporation farm operator to increase production beyond the point for which there is effective demand in the open market.

Most of our family farms do not exceed the $25,000 gross value of production. For a typical midwest farm, that $25,000 gross production would only mean around $7,000 net income. That is far more than the majority of our farmers ever achieve in net income.

I wish to emphasize that the vast majority of the American farmers have gross incomes which are far below $25,000, and net incomes away below $7,000.

My price-support bill would extend support to cover such perishables as hogs, eggs, farm chickens, broilers, turkeys, beef cattle, whole milk and butterfat, but authorizes use of production payments as an alternative means of support for such commodities to avoid full dependence on purchase or storage that takes such commodities from the consumer. Under the terms of the bill, any such payments would be limited to $2,500 in any 1 year for the products of any 1 farm.

I believe that by so doing we shall meet much of the criticism which relates to the extensive use of price supports in what are called large commercial operations, and I thereby have outlined a proposal which would meet the requirements of maintaining a family farm pattern in the United States, under which the individual farmer must rely upon the production of his commodities for his income and for the sustenance of his family.

The bill calls for supporting soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and rye at the same levels as the basic commodities, and fixes the support level for grain sorghums, barley, and oats on the basis of their comparative feeding value to corn.

The purpose of this is because some of the commodities I have mentioned, such as sorghums, barley, and oats, are alternative feeds for wheat and corn—particularly corn. Therefore, it is my view that price supports should be tied in with the alternative feeds as related to the feed value of corn, since the price of corn is supported.

I believe this farm bill would be a constructive step in the right direction. It is also a new step, one long overdue, in the direction of effective, constructive price-support mechanism.

That direction is toward equality of economic opportunity for our farm people, and preservation of the historic family farm pattern of agriculture that has meant so much to our country.

Our current fight for agriculture has very properly been an economic one, but it is a social one as well. Most of us have long realized that all progress in rural America really stems from an adequate opportunity for diligent farm people to earn a decent and full living.

Without economic opportunity, little social progress can be made in agriculture. We cannot have adequate rural schools, rural housing, and rural health facilities until farmers themselves get a decent return for their toil and production. We are not going to do the job we should be doing in conserving our heritage of productive soil unless farmers have the opportunity of providing properly for their families without having to mine and exploit the soil.

We are not going to be able to preserve our family pattern of agriculture unless economic opportunity continues to exist for young people to stay on the farm. We need these young people in American agricultural production.

My objectives for family farming in America have never changed. They were summed up in broad terms in an address in 1953 before the Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, as a family farmer's bill of rights. Included as goals to which I declared at that time American agriculture should be entitled were—

First. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

Second. The right for improved standards of rural living.

Third. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.

Fourth. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

Fifth. The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.

Sixth. The right to decent land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.

Seventh. The right to a democratic voice by farmers in their own farm programs.

Eighth. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

Ninth. The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

Tenth. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

They were my goals and objectives before my formalized statement of the farmers' bill of rights, and they have been my goals and objectives ever since. They should be the goals and objectives of this Congress.

Last fall, I looked back upon that 1953 speech and asked myself: Which way have we been moving in the past year? Closer to those objectives, or drifting away from them? That is the question we should all be asking ourselves today.

My conclusion, I regret to say, was that we were drifting further away, rather than making progress.

It is for that reason I have sponsored legislation seeking to bring our farm program back onto the main track of such objectives.

I believe the bill I am today introducing is a step in that direction.

I have never contended that farm-price supports alone could and would meet all the problems in agriculture. Yet they are a necessary foundation stone to preserving economic opportunity in agriculture. Linked with such economic protection must be more effective means of making production adjustments, such as incentives to divert some of our unneeded cropland into grassland so that its fertility can be conserved in the soil. By such means we can store in the ground the potential production that will eventually be needed to feed our growing population, instead of being worried about storing temporary excesses of food supplies for which there is no immediate market.

I respectfully suggest that in the years to come this Nation will not be faced with the problem of overproduction. It may well be faced with the problem of undersupply. Our population is growing at a rate of not less than 3½ million a year, and the availability of new cropland is very limited. Therefore we must look to the future in terms of fertility

and productivity of this land of ours, which is the only means we have for sustaining a high standard of living.

Other steps in a more effective farm program must include greater attention to increased utilization of our abundance, and stimulation of consumption. We must encourage greater research, particularly into developing new domestic uses and outlets for our abundance, and improved marketing procedures and methods. We must give more thought to such ideas as food-stamp plans to enable our low-income families to become greater consumers. We must reappraise the credit needs of agriculture. We must encourage vocational agricultural education to step up the efficiency of our upcoming generations of farmers. Yet we must provide our new young farmers an opportunity to make use of their training and knowledge by making sure economic opportunities are preserved for them to make a decent livelihood.

We must make greater use of our food abundance as an effective arm of our foreign policy. We must accelerate and promote our foreign trade in agricultural commodities. This is a top priority item on overall agricultural economic policy. We have paid too little attention to the possibilities of finding or creating new markets abroad for our agricultural commodities. Likewise, we should explore some form of international food and fiber reserves or world food bank, to act as an international stabilizing device.

We need greater consideration of the serious economic plight of our more depressed farm areas, of the low-income farmers who are unable to earn more than $1,000 a year. None of these views are new. They are convictions I have long voiced, as consistently exemplified by my votes in this Chamber.

Many constructive measures have been introduced in this session to make real progress on these objectives. My hope is that we can have the vision to look at the farm situation in the broad perspective, and authorize a sound program that meets all of its needs, not just part of them.

Yet the basis for almost any other approach to higher rural living standards rests on a decent income for the farmer.

We recognize the necessity for adequate research to develop new and more efficient farming methods. Yet the average farmer usually can only take advantage of new ideas to modernize his operations if he is making enough money to invest a bit more in his enterprise.

We realize the imperative necessity for greater attention to sound conservation farming practices; yet history of several decades has shown us that conservation takes a setback when farm income is down, and makes its greatest gains when farmers are making a decent living.

It is not my intention at this time to review the entire critical economic situation in American agriculture. Yet, anyone is blind who does not see and recognize that farmers are in trouble. And anyone is foolishly blind who does not see the relation between present troubles in agriculture and grave future consequences for the rest of the country. We are not in a healthy condition as a nation, when some segments of our economy are enjoying a boom and other segments are in a serious recession. It is time more of us turned our eyes away from soaring stock markets and industrial profits as a barometer of this Nation's economic health, and looked instead at the economic weakness of what should be our basic productive strength—the producers of food and fiber.

I urge careful consideration of the farm price-support bill I have proposed, for I believe it charts an improved course.

By extending some semblance of economic protection to producers of our meat animals, it can open the door to using our abundance of feed supplies instead of just storing them.

By providing a cutoff point for price supports, and level of price supports, it removes any barrier to production adjustments by encouraging those adjustments among the brackets best able to make them, instead of among the smaller farm operators least able to make them.

Mr. President, the direction my measure seeks to take is a direction toward which many thoughtful students of farm problems have recognized we should be aiming.

To the February 5 issue of America, the national Catholic weekly review, its economics editor, Father Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., contributed a constructive and thought-provoking article, entitled "Farm Program of Abundance." At that time I wrote to inform him that I concurred most heartily in his views.

Because I believe his article deserves careful consideration, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

FARM PROGRAM FOR ABUNDANCE

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Sometime during the life of the 84th Congress, most probably next year on the eve of the 1956 elections, a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives will challenge the administration's farm price-support program. They will roundly condemn Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson's flexible price supports and demand that basic crops be supported rigidly at 90 percent of parity. On Capitol Hill they will very likely win their fight, but they will lose it in the White House. With the farm bloc in Congress split over the issue, they will be unable to muster the two-thirds majority required to override a Presidential veto. And a Presidential veto is just what a 90-percent-of-parity bill will get.

Though such a struggle will not lack interest or importance, it looks from this vantage point like a fight over the wrong issue at the wrong time. The rival corners are not debating the essentials of our agricultural policy; they are only quarreling over details. They agree that farm prices must be supported artificially. They agree that in order to accomplish this the Government must pay some respect to the law of supply and demand. They agree, therefore, that the other side of the price-support coin is a Government curb on planting and marketing, since without restrictions of some kind huge surpluses will accumulate and eventually wreck the program. They disagree only on a matter of detail; on whether the objective of the program—the assuring of a fair income to farmers—can be better attained by flexible supports or by rigid supports.

Note a very important implication of this controversy. Both sides are fearful of abundance. They are, in fact, opposed to abundance. They do not see how abundance can be reconciled with a just return to the farmer for his productive energies. They point out that the farmer, unlike the businessman, cannot shut down his plant when inventories hang heavy over the market. He cannot tell the cow to stop giving milk, the chickens to cease laying eggs, the wheat and corn to quit growing. He cannot readily shift his product to meet variations in demand. He cannot control his price, as many businessmen can and do control their prices. The more the farmer produces, the less he is apt to receive for his produce.

In time of war, say the advocates of price supports and crop controls, abundance may be a blessing, but in time of peace it is at best a problem and at worst a curse. Remember when farmers killed little pigs with the benediction of the United States Department of Agriculture, and used wheat for fuel in their kitchen stoves?

If all the peoples of the world enjoyed a decent minimum diet, this fear of abundance might make sense. It might even be justified as a guiding motive for agricultural policy. But how can it possibly make sense, not only to a Christian, but to any normal, God-fearing man, when a sizable fraction of the people on the face of the earth don't know what it is to have a square meal, and every night go to bed hungry? How can it make sense when communism is sweeping through Asia on the wings of a promise to give the peasants land and the suffering, nameless masses a better break in life? Fear of abundance? We must be out of our minds.

ABUNDANCE: BLESSING AND RESPONSIBILITY

Though it does not say this in so many words, that is exactly how the National Catholic Rural Life Conference regards our thinking on the farm problem. The delegates who attended its last convention, held in Davenport, Iowa, in October, knew all about the $7 billion worth of farm surpluses which a harried Government has stored on farms, in elevators, in caves, even in the holds of ships anchored in the Hudson River. They knew all about the cuts in acreage and the curbs on marketing which Secretary Benson has been obliged to impose. Yet, knowing all this, they proceeded to adopt a resolution which begins in this way:

"The NCRLC is deeply grateful to Almighty God for the abundant production of food and fiber during 1954 in the United States, His fruitful blessing has been placed on the difficult and devoted work of our farmers and has brought it to success. This year again there is true cause for thanksgiving."

Jabbing the needle still more deeply into the restrictionists, the delegates noted with warm approval the trend toward increased production both per acre and per person. This, too, though it partially nullified the Government's acreage limitation program, the delegates insisted on regarding as a special gift from God and a source of added wealth to the Nation. Finally, as if to make sure that even the most obtuse got the point, they added this paragraph:

"We regret to hear from many voices in this country a growing chorus of alarm over what is called surplus production. We believe that the concern is misplaced. The real matter for alarm is that the surplus is not recognized as a great blessing and a rare opportunity."

In refusing to swim with the anti-abundance stream, the NCRLC is not acting naively or perversely. Even this lukewarm generation, which has diverged so widely from the paths of its ancestors, should recognize, if somewhat vaguely, that the conference is motivated by Christian principles. To the delegates at Davenport, the obligations of charity do not stop at national

boundary lines. To them it is unthinkable that United States surpluses should be permitted to pile up in bins and barns while millions of people elsewhere are in desperate need of them. The real problem, therefore, is not production. It is distribution. We have surpluses, explains the NCRLC, only because we have forgotten that we are, under God, stewards, not absolute owners, of our rich resources; and that these resources are intended, through our conscientious management, to satisfy the needs of all.

After this criticism of the basic philosophy of the farm price program, the delegates naturally felt obliged to offer an alternative. In rough outline, here is what they proposed.

The NCRLC agrees with the proponents of price-support programs that farmers labor under special handicaps which require governmental intervention. Without help of some kind, they cannot earn a fair share of the national income. Yet, in return for discharging their social duty of producing food and fiber, they have a right to such an income. The Government's efforts to assure them a fair return on their work and investment is merely an exercise of distributive justice. Though the NCRLC appreciates how unfair is some of the criticism of present price-support programs, it also recognizes the shortcomings of these programs. It is ready to concede that present methods of price support have neither satisfied the consumer and the taxpayer nor solved the major problems which beset the farmer. Therefore, a fundamentally new approach is needed.

A NEW APPROACH

Such an approch should be fair to consumers as well as to farmers. It should encourage, not discourage, production. It should be workable, that is, it can attempt to blunt the full effect of the law of supply and demand, but it must not try to repeal it. Is such an approach available? The NCRLC thinks that it is. It recommends, as a more workable solution than price supports, a system of carefully planned direct subsidies to farmers.

The system would work in this way. Farmers would produce anything they liked, and as much as they liked. They would sell their products in an uncontrolled market, where prices were set by supply and demand. Meanwhile, the Government would compute the parity price for each product, the price, that is, which is fair relative to the prices which the farmer pays for labor equipment and living needs. The difference would then be ascertained between the parity price and the price which the farmer obtained for his product when he brought it to market. This difference the Government would pay to the farmer in cash as a direct subsidy.

The NCRLC does not believe, however, that the Government should subsidize the total production of American agriculture. It wants the law to distinguish sharply between small, family-type farms and "factories in the fields." The resolution adopted at Davenport reads: "We feel that no subsidies should be paid on operations which exceed a specified maximum number of units." For anything over this maximum number, farmers would receive for their products no more than the market price. That would do away with the bias toward bigness in the present law, which requires small cotton farmers, for example, to reduce their acreage at the same rate as the owners of huge plantations.

FOR OPEN TRADE CHANNELS

As an essential complement of its direct-subsidy proposal, the NCRLC strongly advocates a liberal foreign-trade program. "We stand," said the delegates at Davenport, "for the gradual and progressive removal of tariff and other obstacles to trade among free nations." The fact is that, regardless of how reasonable prices might become under a system of direct subsidies, our farmers can produce more food and fiber than we can possibly consume. The NCRLC wants our surplus products to flow freely through world trade channels to people who need them. These people can provide us in return with many articles and services which will enrich American life. Such an exchange would help reverse the anomalous, and dubiously moral, policy of restricting farm production when world population is growing and unnumbered millions are hungry or starving.

Is it too much to hope that the administration and the 84th Congress, instead of fighting over the virtues and defects of flexible and fixed price supports, might give serious consideration to a fresh approach to farm income? Is it beyond all possibility that they can rid themselves of the restrictionist hangover from depression days and see abundance as the blessing it is? If they need an extra nudge to break with the recent past, let them remember that the way of price supports is the way of ever-increasing shackles on the freedom of American farmers. That is not the way of our pioneering forbears.

The NCRLC would be the first to admit that direct subsidies offer no panacea for the problems of agriculture. Perhaps for certain products they offer no answer at all. All the NCRLC says is that direct subsidies, whatever their defects, have notable advantages over the price-support approach. A number of farm authorities, including a former Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan, agree that this is so. At least in one case, so do President Eisenhower, Secretary Benson and a majority in Congress. At any rate, Congress voted last year direct subsidies to the Nation's wool growers and the President signed the bill. If these subsidies are good for wool, why not for corn and wheat, cotton and tobacco, butter and eggs?

On a question of this kind, urban opinion naturally carries little weight. It is probably biased anyway. Under price supports, urbanites pay twice to assure farmers a fair income—once at the grocery store in the form of high prices and again in the form of taxes at the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Since under a program of direct subsidies they would pay only once—in the form of taxes—there seems little doubt about where their sympathies lie. Naturally they are for subsidies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, another provocative, yet constructive, discussion of this problem appeared in the April 11 issue of the New Leader, in an article by E. G. Shinner, entitled "Toward Permanent Farm Prosperity." While Mr. Shinner's recommendations are more extreme than anything my measure proposes, his article emphasizes the need for channeling our support program more directly to the average operator and away from the big mass producer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shinner's article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 2

TOWARD PERMANENT FARM PROSPERITY

(By E. G. Shinner)

America's No. 1 industry—agriculture—has come upon troubled days. Yankee ingenuity in making two blades of grass grow where but one grew before has hoisted us on our own petard. In a sense, we are the victims of our own genius. The use of revolutionary power machinery, the development of hybrid plants with high resistance to weather and disease, the elimination of pests, and the scientific use of fertilizer have all greatly contributed to raising our per-acre yield to unprecedented heights. As a result, we are possessed of a glut of farm products. The orderly distribution of this farm surplus has become a problem which has baffled the most ingenious and analytical minds.

In producing this surplus, ease of production has been coupled with the inducements offered by the Federal Government in the way of a guaranteed market for unlimited quantities of agricultural products. We are now producing food and fiber clearly beyond the capacity of both the domestic and foreign markets to absorb.

There are other complicating factors in the present dilemma of our farm economy. The development of synthetic fibers and foods (for both human and animal consumption) can no longer be ignored. Such formidable giants as rayon, dacron, nylon, etc. are making tremendous inroads in the use of cotton, wood and other natural fibers. In addition, the use of silicon in the treatment of fabrics is producing fantastic results. The life of natural yarns so treated can be increased, in some instances, as much as 10 times. Public acceptance of new synthetic fabrics is a fait accompli.

Less well known is the successful use of stilbestrol and urea in the feeding of cattle and sheep. Estimates of the savings in grain which result from the use of these miracle drugs range from 10 to 40 percent. One should also mention the increasing use in the human diet of oleomargarine, saccharin, sucaryl, various extracts, etc.; this type of chemical competition with natural farm products will undoubtedly increase as time passes. Also increasing is the national consciousness of the waistline; the persistent recommendation by expert dieticians of the desirability of reducing the intake of sweets, fats and starches establishs an effective roadblock in the way of greatly increased food consumption.

While it is true that there are still several million people in the United States who are undernourished, it is difficult to see how the farm problem can be solved in any permanent way merely by improving their diets. We must rather effect a reasonable balance between production and consumption if we are to have a permanently healthy agricultural economy.

Lest there be any question about agriculture's importance, the following figures compare the gross annual output (in millions) of our five leading industries (construction figure for 1954, the rest for 1953):

Agriculture	$35,430
Construction (plant and residential)	26,100
Oil (est. refined product)	23,000
Automobiles	13,984
Steel	12,433

Not only must we protect and stabilize our leading industry; we must protect and stabilize our huge farm investment, the aggregate of which is over $150 billion. While farm indebtedness is, percentagewise, comparatively small (roughly $18 billion), it is nevertheless true that many farms are mortgaged up to 50 or 75 percent of their current market value; hence, it becomes an elementary economic necessity that, farm values be maintained at or near their present level. Our vital long-term mortgage investment can easily be impaired, or even destroyed, by either deflation or inflation of any significant magnitude.

The importance of a healthy agricultural economy can hardly be overestimated. When agriculture falters, there is no other sector of the economy capable of taking up the slack. Farm recessions, as we have learned by bitter experience over the last 3 decades, quickly infect other sections of our economy. The farm situation today is not healthy.

Per capita income is perhaps the best means of measuring economic health. In

uniform 1953 dollars, per capita nonfarm income was $1,921 in 1946, $1,970 in 1953, and $1,926 last year. For the same 3 years, farm income was $851, $709, and $688, respectively. By the end of 1954, the per capita farm income of $652 was about a third of nonfarm income; it was about 44 percent just after World War II. Moreover, while nonfarm income now is slightly higher than just after World War II, farm income has shrunk by almost 20 percent.

Notwithstanding this sharp decline, our concern is more for the farmers' future than for their immediate present. If conditions in the industry were stabilized and would not in the foreseeable future grow worse than they are today, there would be comparatively little cause for alarm. Unhappily, the end of the farm decline is not in sight.

The present farm price-support program is both inequitable and ineffective. It falls far short of its major purpose—stabilization of the farm economy. Just a casual glance at the distribution of the money spent for farm support readily reveals the inequity and futility of the present program.

The latest census figures indicate these startling facts:

One and nine-tenths percent of the Nation's farmers received more than 25 percent of the total price-support benefits.

Nine percent received in excess of 50 percent of the benefits.

Ninety-one percent of our farmers received less than half of the price-support payments.

Price-support loans, for example, to the 5 largest cottongrowers in California averaged $649,335 in 1953; the overall average was $1,731. The 5 largest wheat loans in Montana and Oregon that year averaged $176,000 each, against an overall average loan of $4,000 in Montana and $6,293 in Oregon. The 5 largest corn loans in Iowa averaged $98,000 against an overall average of $2,154.

While it is true that even this inequitable distribution of public support has made some contribution to the farm economy, it is inconceivable that it be continued as permanent Government policy. In common justice, we cannot continue to pay huge sums of money to factory-in-the-field type of operations, and at the same time permit only a dribble to reach the vast majority of our farm population.

Since 1935, the number of farms of 1,000 or more acres has increased 37 percent. These farms now contain a total of 494 million acres, or 42.6 percent of all United States farm land. The trend toward gigantism and the factory-in-the-field type of farm is astonishingly rapid.

When we moved armies of occupation into Italy, Germany, and Japan, among our first acts was to break up the great feudal estates. Right now, we have a Government land expert in Indochina engaged in a similar program. In our eagerness to promote and develop democracy in agriculture abroad, we have seemingly neglected to protect our own agricultural economy against the growth of a kind of creeping feudalism.

My approach to the present farm problem would be to abandon completely our present system of purchasing and/or providing nonrecourse loans on farm products. I would substitute for it a system of direct production payments to the individual farmer—in an amount sufficient to give him and his family a reasonable basic income. Furthermore, I would limit the amount of production payments which any individual farmer could receive to a maximum of $2,000 annually. I would allow the individual farmer full parity on his production up to $7,000 of gross annual product and stop all payments at that point. Prices of farm products would be permitted to seek their own level in the open market. Production payments would consist of the difference between the parity price and the price the farmer received in the free market.

The total gross income of farmers in the record year of 1951 was $37 billion. That was, roughly $7,000 per farm, the figure which I have arbitrarily used as a limit of income on which production payments would be made. The following example will more clearly illustrate my plan:

Farmer A raises 10 bales of cotton (5,000 pounds), which he sells for, say, 25 cents a pound in the open market, realizing $1,250. The parity price is, say, 35 cents a pound. He would be entitled to a subsidy payment of 10 cents a pound, the difference between parity and market, or a net total payment of $500.

Farmer B, a plantation owner, raises 1,000 bales of cotton (500,000 pounds), sells it for 25 cents a pound, for a total of $125,000. He, too, is entitled to a subsidy payment of 10 cents a pound on the first $7,000 of gross production (in this case, the first 20,000 pounds), but not more than $2,000. In this case, the difference between market and parity would exactly equal the $2,000 maximum.

If certain wealthy individuals and/or corporations wish to engage in farming as a business, let them do so by all means. But they should depend on the open market rather than on the Government for the sale of their product. Vast production of wholly unneeded products for sale to the Government should cease forthwith.

Similar production payments would be made on any and all products which Congress might see fit to include under the price-support system. It would seem feasible, however, to exempt sugar and wool from the above program. The present regulations appear to be getting reasonably satisfactory results on these products.

It has been argued that my figure of $7,000 is too low; that $10,000, $12,000, or even $15,000 would be more realistic. It has also been suggested that a graduated support system might be established with the payments, lowered by stages, up to a total of $15,000 of gross annual production. I regard the figure as less important than the principle, but whatever figure may finally be adopted should not be so high as to defeat the objective—to effectively divert price-support benefits away from the wealthy 9 percent who do not need them, to the 91 percent of small farmers whose need is vital.

Such a farm program would simply do for the small farmer what is being done for the worker by labor unions and by the minimum-wage law. It would serve as a floor—an assurance that if the farmer makes the effort, he can get a reasonable return for his labor.

Certain economists have suggested a food-stamp plan as a means of disposing of our unmanageable surpluses. I regard food stamps as un-American in concept, basically a form of charity rather than a fair reward for labor. To be reasonably effective, a stamp plan would involve a gigantic problem of administration—a bureaucracy previously unknown to us in peacetime. Furthermore, it would become a badge of pauperism, publicly displayed throughout the retail markets of the Nation. Our people don't want charity; they want the opportunity to earn the money with which to buy food, and at prices which they can afford. A stamp plan is, at best, only a palliative. It does not attack the roots of the farm problem.

One of the most serious aspects of the farm problem is the constant drift of the farm population into the industrial labor market. Since 1930, the farm population has shrunk by over 8 million, while the overall population of the Nation has gained by 41 million. Over the last 10 years, an average of 77,000 families has made the exodus from farm to city each year. If each family represents approximately 1.5 workers (the actual figure is a bit higher), we are augmenting our city labor force by roughly 115,000 workers every year.

This exodus from the farms means that small towns and villages are suffering a similar fate. The shrinkage of farm population means a comparable shrinkage of the small-town population—professional men, merchants, and a great variety of service tradesmen. It is safe to estimate that our urban labor force is being annually augmented from this source by another 30,000 or 40,000 workers.

All of this should cause labor leaders to take heed, especially in view of the fact that urban production and employment are constantly yielding to technological improvements. Government figures show that in January 1955 the factories of the Nation were employing 400,000 less people than they employed in January 1954, notwithstanding an overall increase in production of some 8 percent. Factory employment in January 1955 was a cool million and a half below that of January 1953. The lesson is clear: Factory production is rising, while employment is steadily on the decline.

Labor groups increasingly pressured by the annual addition of 140,000 to 150,000 displaced rural workers must also face some startling facts about industrial automation. It is reliably reported that the Western Union Telegraph Co., through the adoption of automation, has reduced employment by more than 39,000 persons since 1945 and by some 18,000 since 1952. The advantage the company has gained from this curtailment is apparent; operating costs were reduced some $4 million for the first 9 months of 1954, compared with the same period in 1953; earnings per share were $7.50 in 1954, compared with $6.77 in 1953, $1.04 in 1952, and $4.85 per share in 1951.

While estimates of the effects of automation on the Nation at large are, at best, educated guesses, students of the problem believe that insurance and communication companies, public utilities, and similar concerns which have a high degree of repetitive clerical operations will, within the next 2 or 3 years, install much automatic equipment. By so doing, they can easily reduce their working force by literally several hundred thousand persons annually.

A certain group of economists and some businessmen contend that this process will simply release these people for more constructive work elsewhere. (Benjamin Fairless of U. S. Steel expounded this theory in a recent speech before the Johnstown, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.) Apropos of this argument, there is a story that Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, was displaying the newest automatic machines to CIO President Walter Reuther and asked: "Walter, how are you going to collect union dues from these guys?" Reuther was not at a loss: "How," he asked, "are you going to get them to buy cars?"

Admittedly, automation has created a new industry; but I am unable to find where it has increased employment in any of the so-called basic industries. Automation is here to stay, and a process of intensive study should be directed toward meeting this challenge—without delay. I had a feeling of frustration and deep disappointment when I read the President's 1955 Economic Report and found not a word on this all important subject.

I know no better place to start attacking the problem of automation than on the farm. All the facts of the urban labor situation point to the conclusion that we should seek to improve and conserve rural life by every means possible. We should keep the door of opportunity open not only for the small, family-sized farm but for the business and professional men of the small towns and villages, who depend for their livelihood upon a healthy farm economy.

What are the overall benefits to be derived from a program such as I have outlined? The first is obvious: lower food prices. These

would amount to an automatic wage increase for the entire economy.

Second, the farmer would be free to operate his farm in accordance with his own judgment. He would be freed of the burden of providing storage, conforming to acreage allotments and all of the many regulations to which he is now subjected.

Third, we would once more be in a position to compete in the markets of the world for our just share of foreign trade without fear of ridicule or criticism. We could no longer be charged with dumping by the various nations of the western world whose good will we so earnestly need and seek.

The question of the cost of such a program is, of course, proper. But, in evaluating its cost, let us bear in mind the health of our agricultural economy and its proper priority in relation to other major governmental expenditures. We are currently spending some $40 billion annually on national defense. It is now proposed that the Federal Government contribute some $2.5 billion a year to assist in improving our educational facilities, and, in addition, sponsor a highway program to cost $101 billion over the next 10 years. I submit that, in order to meet the cost of these programs (all of which, for the purpose of this discussion, may be accepted as necessary), a sound and healthy national economy must be maintained. And our economic history is replete with indisputable evidence that the basis of our prosperity depends at all times on the degree of mass purchasing power which we are able to maintain.

Here we have an opportunity to improve the economic status (purchasing power) of some twenty-odd million of our farm population and, to a lesser degree, help the entire population through a reduction in the cost of living which must inevitably follow the restoration of a free market on agricultural products. All of this can be accomplished to the slight disadvantage of only 1.9 percent of our farmers (the group currently getting 25 percent of Government-support benefits).

While it is impossible to state with any positive degree of accuracy exactly what the program might cost, the most intelligent estimate that I have been able to obtain would place the maximum annual cost under $3 billion; it might run as low as $750 million a year. But this program would take the Government completely out of the picture insofar as buying, selling, and storing farm products are concerned, and would accordingly permit it to start an orderly process of liquidating the $8 billion hoard of products now on hand. Therefore, it is conceivable that the money derived from liquidating the present surplus would completely finance the new program for at least 2 or 3 years. During this period, we would gain the necessary experience upon which to predicate a permanent program. It would be presumptuous to suggest that the factor of trial and error can henceforth be completely eliminated.

Administration of such a law should be relatively simple. The Bureau of Internal Revenue could easily amend its tax forms to show what products a farmer had produced and sold, for how much, and the amount of payments due from the Government, settlement to be made annually at the earliest date feasible after filing of the income-tax return. This showing of payments due would permit the farmer to establish immediately the basis for a bank loan of a comparable amount, as his needs may arise.

I am aware that certain economists will declare that this program penalizes efficiency. They will say that factory-in-the-field farms, whether operated by individuals or corporations, are most efficient. Even assuming this is correct, I would like to call attention to the phrase in our Declaration of Independence which speaks of our inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness. And I contend that there is much more happiness on the farm than there is in the city slums to which many of our displaced farmers must migrate. The pursuit of dollars—efficiency, if you please—is not mentioned in the Declaration or the Constitution.

Since colonial days, the American farmer and the family-sized farm have been the very backbone both of our free-enterprise system and of our political democracy. Our present farm-support program has substituted a high degree of regimentation and an insidious type of creeping feudalism, both of which are utterly distasteful to the rank-and-file of our farmers. Because the present support program is also economically unsound, a new approach to the farm problem seems very much in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long thought it extremely unfair to American farmers for some of our major newspapers—and yes, regretfully, even the present Secretary of Agriculture himself—to criticize American agriculture for producing the abundance it was called upon to produce as part of our war effort.

When industrial readjustments had to be made after World War II and after the Korean war, we did not quibble about the costs to protect the major manufacturers from losses. If they overbuilt to meet wartime needs, they were entitled to compensation. They were protected against loss.

Yet what about agriculture? We called upon them to expand production for wartime needs. They did it—without benefit of contracts protecting them in the future, such as we gave industry. But our moral obligation was the same.

It is certainly regretful now that a Secretary of Agriculture will turn his back on the patriotic response of American agriculture, and ignore the role farmers played in helping win the war. It is regretful that he ignores this basic reason for our surpluses today, and tries to lay the blame entirely upon our price-support measures, which offer the only hope of some economic protection for farmers.

Mr. President, one of the great spokesmen for American agriculture throughout its fight upward from the depression years has been M. W. Thatcher, of St. Paul, general manager of the great Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association serving the Midwest. Mr. Thatcher made a radio address last May 5, on the occasion of his birthday—and the anniversary of passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933. Because that brief radio talk so effectively tells the real story that needs to be told today, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 3

Mr. M. W. THATCHER. Even though 22 years have passed, it seems not long ago since I sat in the gallery of the Senate in Washington and watched the final vote on the first important agricultural law to protect the farmers of this Nation. It was an overwhelmingly favorable vote. I am familiar with the background because in those days I served on the committees in Washington that prepared the basic and fundamental laws dealing with agricultural income and agricultural credit. So much has happened during these past 22 years—the great World War II, the Korean war, and what now is in front of us—and our money being used by the billions in preparation for another war, or for war itself.

But my mind goes back today particularly to the building of the agricultural programs. For 20 years those programs were constantly moved forward and strengthened in the interest of the farmers of this country. And it was so, all through the years, until the beginning of 1953. But the Eisenhower-Benson farm programs are a complete reversal of all of those things that we fought for and for which we made so much gain during 20 years. I follow carefully the views of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson. I read everything they say. I listen to every word they express. I try to understand their philosophy. And I can come to but one conclusion—they believe, as the American Farm Bureau Federation urged them to believe, that there is inefficiency in our farming, there are too many farm families on the land, some 3 million or more are inefficient and ought to get off the land and find some other way of life.

In the city, a man can move from a flat or a house to some other place. But a farm family doesn't move too conveniently. Farm people don't give up their years of work, their aspirations, their hopes, and their plans so easily, because they were not brought up in that way of thinking and planning.

Then my mind moves to the situation in the spring of 1952. That was the year of decision for the people of this country in choosing a president. In that year, we were in a Korean war. It was Secretary Brannan's responsibility to see that we had adequate production of farm supplies to take care of the needs of this country and to aid our allies and others in the world. And I remember his fight for more steel for machinery; his fight with the draft service to keep more boys on the land; and the effort that he made in all respects to get more agricultural production, particularly of cotton, corn, and wheat. I've read the reports of hearings when he was before the committees of Congress—committees of both Republicans and Democrats. He was telling why it was necessary to get the required production, to assure our campaign of victory in the way, and to help take care of the needy people in the world who were short of our supplies. No one challenged those objectives.

The other night, in Washington, when I was speaking at the annual convention banquet of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, in the Mayflower Hotel, we had among our guests 20 United States Senators. Then I repeated what I have just stated to you. Six of the Senators present were members of the Senate Agricultural Committee. I reminded them of what the Department of Agriculture, in the spring of 1952, asked of the Congress—aid and assistance in getting all-out production of wheat, and other crops, and got the backing of Congress. I challenged those six Senators, Republicans and Democrats, sitting behind me, to take the platform and debate with me the truth of the record that I was charging to the Congress and the President and the whole administration. I called for keeping faith with the people from whom they had asked this tremendous production. I called for an end to this condemning farmers for the surplus they produced for this country and the world, at the behest of the administration and the whole Congress of the United States. I charged that, in comparison to the treatment given to labor and industry, farmers had been treated cruelly. Farmers were asked to produce abundantly, and this they did. Then, beginning immediately with the new administration, we began to hear charges that farmers are inefficient, that they have overproduced, that they have produced for the Government. Well, that last

part is true. They did produce for the Government at the request of the Government. But to charge them with producing for the Government as though they were guilty of taking advantage of the Government is most unfair. It puts farmers in position of getting nothing more than a Russian agreement. That's the way Russia operates. Now, with that background, let's consider the wheat situation.

There has been a lot of misinformation and inaccurate information going out to the people of this country about the terrible wheat surpluses and their cost. Let me tell you a few simple facts about wheat.

I got the facts out of the records. Then, yesterday, I called the United States Department of Agriculture for confirmation of my figures. And I got them, right out of the United States Department of Agriculture. They cannot be questioned, unless the Department of Agriculture doesn't know simple arithmetic. The total supply of wheat on hand under Mr. Benson's control and what he is going to get in his hands before the new crop is 1 billion and 10 million bushels. For your figuring, 1 billion. Put it down on a sheet of paper—1 billion. Half of that is not in Mr. Benson's hands at all. It's the 500 million bushel set-aside. It may not be sold in the United States. And it may not be sold in competition in the world markets. It's 500 million set-aside for what may happen, and the Lord only knows. So you take out that 500 million and forget it.

So, we have remaining, therefore, only 500 million bushels of surplus. We are going to talk about that. It's all we have. Based on the Department's figures, the crop we are going to raise this year is less than will be needed for our own consumption and exports. Thus, it'll even cut into the 500 million we've got on hand. Normally, we should have on hand 300 million bushels of wheat. So, we are not talking about anything but 200 million bushels of wheat that ought to be taken care of. That is all. And if Secretary Benson had lived up to the letter of Public Law 480, which Congress passed, that 200 million bushels would long ago have been gone. And you would not now be wondering about your support prices in 1956. They would be at 90 percent of parity. There would be no referendum to talk about. Yes; you are only 200 million bushels away from solving your problems. So don't think of voting out our wheat program after 22 years of hard work. This is the time to get out and fight to preserve our program. Vote "Yes" on the referendum.

I'll be talking to you Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to echo his concluding remarks about the wheat referendum. American agriculture can be thrown into chaos if farmers, upset by this administration's policy of lowering price supports, vote to reject entirely the only vehicle at their command for production adjustment. I am sure most Senators recognize the seriousness of this wheat vote, whether they are in wheat States or not. If this one program collapses, all farm programs will be shaken to their foundations, and farm prices will collapse.

Mr. President, no greater encouragement could be given our farmers to support this referendum and continue their united efforts toward production adjustment than some indication that the Senate was aware of the seriousness of their problem, and determined to do something about it.

That is why I have asked for hearings in our Agricultural Committee on a price-support bill, now, not next spring or next summer.

That is why I hope others will join me in that effort.

Mr. President, because it is typical of the appeals coming out of our great midwestern breadbasket, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald-Review, published by Larry A. Rossman, entitled "The Help the Farmer Needs."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HELP THE FARMER NEEDS

The agricultural administration at Washington has tried to do two things that seriously affect agriculture. The first was a policy of deflation. That was repetition of the policies which followed the First World War and which helped to lay the foundation for the great depression. The administration seeks to deflate the farmer. But it has done nothing to deflate wages, profits, and prices. Now the proposal is that of a dole for those who have been injured.

The proposals, the weak thinking, and the foolish talk from the National Capital suggests that some million farmers of a so-called "marginal" type be given direct assistance and that many of them be moved from the farm into town or placed on the rolls of industry. No proposal could be more contrary to the desires of the American people and welfare of so many deserving citizens.

First, who is the marginal farmer? There are certainly some farmers who may never succeed too well as tillers of the soil. They may not be suited for farming. They have been raised on the land and know nothing else to do do. There are a small proportion of such people who are problems on the farm and will be even a more distressing problem when forced from the land. The farm home may be poor, but not half as bad as the slums to which these people may be consigned by an unsympathetic Government.

There is another group that may be thoughtlessly termed as marginal. These are newer farmers seeking to learn the business, build their herds, and equip their farms. There was a time when agriculture was simple and most farmers were about on the same general basis. Today the investment in land and equipment requires the earnings of a lifetime. Most of this group will succeed, or if the task proves too great, will go into other activities of their own choice without the direction of far-off Government.

Farmers in a new land can possibly never measure up to the ideals of the distant politicians. It is easy to call those who are developing farms marginal or misguided. There was a time when nearly every farmer who was clearing the land or breaking the prairies was poor. But he had faith, industry, and purpose. The reason that so many farmers of the older areas are prosperous is that their parents and grandparents were poor and ambitious. Much of the agriculture in northeastern Minnesota is marginal and can be nothing else except as courage and industry change its character with more land under the plow.

When the administration cut the price of dairy products, when they cut the income of all farmers, they helped to make the best farmers somewhat poorer. They made the farmer who was just getting by with his payments a marginal farmer. They made the marginal and struggling farmer submarginal.

A full and fair parity price for agricultural products is the greatest hope and inspiration to those farmers who are struggling for existence. The farmer wishes no dole. He will be the last man in America to ask for it. Give to those who farm the hope of a fair return for effort and there will be no problems of marginal agriculture for which a handout will ever be a sound and enduring solution. The best way to treat the problem of marginal farmers is to stop making farming marginal, or more marginal, by unfair and unwise agricultural policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a number of telegrams I have received on the matter of price support and the wheat referendum, as well as a letter which our distinguished colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, on April 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 16, 1955.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have received the news of your determination to fight for 90-percent support prices for the basic commodities as the most important domestic news of the day. We are in the midst of a very costly advertising program in addition to our radio to explain to the farmers the calamitous situation that may confront this country if our support programs fall apart in 1956 and 1957. We are very proud of our Senators from these central northwest States. Our continuing farm survey audit discloses the same general character of economic deterioration on the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if our Senators do their utmost that we can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before the wheat referendum of June 25, the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate would, in my judgment, cause irreparable damage to the entire price-support program. The House has approved this legislation, and I now believe that if the Senate approves it, President Eisenhower would not veto it.

Deep appreciation and best regards,
M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union
Grain Terminal Association.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *May 16, 1955.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our members in regular session unanimously request early Senate action on H. R. 12. We cannot afford any further trial of Benson formula. Cost of bread up 3 additional cents last week in Ray, N. Dak., Other retail prices move accordingly. How can we go on with sagging wheat prices?

WHEELOCK-MARSHALL
FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
F. B. DANIEL, *President.*
WHEELOCK, N. DAK.

AREGENT, N. DAK., *May 16, 1955.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

I urge that you use your influence to bring House bill H. R. 12 to a vote in the Senate as soon as possible.

WALTER BARTHOLOME.

APRIL 28, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
The Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish most respectfully to draw your attention to some important questions facing American agriculture.

An adverse vote in the July wheat quota elections could well have far-reaching consequences. Price supports would drop from the present level of 82½ percent to 50 percent of parity. With world surpluses of wheat, including our own, cash prices would drop to near the new support level of $1.19 a bushel.

Some the factors which will have a great bearing on the outcome of this election are:

Increasing dissatisfaction among farmers who believes it is unreasonable to have wheat supports reduced, and especially at a time when they are being required to reduce their acreage by more than 30 percent. (USDA April forecasts indicate wheat production will be down one-fourth over previous 10-year average.)

When all provisions of the new flexible price-support program become effective, the minimum support price will be reduced by approximately one-third. The support prices for other basic farm commodities—tobacco, cotton, rice, and peanuts—remain at 90 percent, and corn is supported at 87 percent.

Proponents of the two-price or certificate-support plan for wheat are much more opposed to the present flexible program than they are to that of 90 percent. A very large percentage of our wheat producers are rightfully concerned about the higher level of supports being provided for the poor quality wheats than is available for top quality baking wheat. Invariably, low quality wheats are much better yielders than top quality wheats and are in far less demand in the market place. This has been a very important factor in the buildup of our present surpluses. A record acreage of low quality feed wheat has been seeded this first year under the flexible-price-support program which you were successful in getting Congress to approve.

Here are some startling figures (source: USDA):

The support price for top quality wheat produced in Montana is $2.08 a bushel, and the Government is expected to take over only 6 percent of the 1954 crop. The support price in Delaware for its garlicky soft red winter wheat is $2.44 a bushel. The Government is expected to take title to 51 percent of the total production. The average farm price support for the principal wheat producing State—Kansas—is $2.27 a bushel, while the support price for wheat in New York State is $2.39 a bushel.

Durum wheat is produced principally in North Dakota. It is in extremely short supply, selling on the cash market for more than $4.30 a bushel and with a support price of only $2.25 a bushel. The CCC is not acquiring any durum wheat. In contrast, Maryland has a support price for its soft red garlicky winter wheat of $2.42 a bushel and the CCC is expected to take over 42 percent of the 1954 production.

The following figures (USDA) clearly indicate some areas of the United States where the CCC is taking sizable losses in price-support operations on poor quality wheats. The 1954 terminal price support for wheat at Kansas City was $2.53 a bushel, and the average cash price at Kansas City on April 18, 1955, was $2.41 a bushel. Comparative figures for other markets are: Minneapolis support price $2.57, cash price $2.50; Chicago support price $2.53, cash price $2.17; Baltimore support price $2.62, cash price $2.29.

From 1942 through 1952, except for a brief period, the demand for wheat was so great that we were able to dispose of our wheat production even though it was of poor quality. As late as July 1, 1952, we had a carryover of only 256 million bushels which was insufficient to meet our then wartime security requirements. There is a great amount of wheat suitable only for feeding purposes produced in almost every area of the United States. The unwise policy of providing higher supports for poor quality than for top quality wheat came into being long before you became Secretary of Agriculture. You have the authority, and responsibility, however, to make the necessary corrections.

Mr. Secretary, most wheat farmers believe that the present flexible price-support program is your program. They believe that unless you abandon your often stated position of neutrality or indifference to the outcome of the quota vote, and elect to defend your program, which includes quotas, the vote is very apt to be adverse. You are in a key position as Secretary of Agriculture.

May I respectfully request your answers to the following questions:

1. If wheat supports were reduced to 50 percent of parity, would it be feasible to support corn at any appreciably higher level?

2. Isn't it inevitable that the large stocks of feed wheat we are accumulating will sooner or later have to be sold as feed grain? Isn't it inevitable, too, that this feed wheat, together with our increasing accumulations of other surplus feed grains (a large part of which are imported) will be translated into more surpluses of dairy commodities, beef, pork, and poultry?

3. Isn't it a fact that there is little possibility of still lower wheat prices being reflected in lower bread prices to the consumer? For example, in January of 1948 the average farm price for wheat was $2.81 a bushel and the average price for a loaf of bread was 13.9 cents. By January of 1955 the average farm price for wheat had dropped to $2.14 a bushel but the price of a loaf of bread had risen to 17.6 cents.

4. Do you not believe that more consideration should be given to reducing farm surpluses by taking several million acres of our poorer land out of production and placing them under soil-building and soil-conserving programs?

Very sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the letter of the Senator from North Dakota to the Secretary points up the imperative necessity for action on the wheat referendum that will bring a favorable response.

Otherwise, Mr. President, the vote may very well lower the price of wheat to $1.20 or $1.19 a bushel, which, in turn, will lower the price of every other agricultural commodity. If that happens, I warn my colleagues in the Senate that they will have a major depression on their hands. We cannot permit the development of a situation which will destroy the economic foundation of the producers of food and fiber without bringing down the entire structure of the American economy.

BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills which have been submitted by the Secretary of the Army, and the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Secretary of the Army, and the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1995 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, May 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill "for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.," which it is recommended be enacted into law. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the payment of $1,293.65 to Warrant Officer (jg.) Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr., 2036 Monroe Lane, Gary, Ind., for the damages sustained by him on account of the destruction of his household goods and personal effects when the house occupied by him and his family under a private rental agreement at Hayama, Honshu, Japan, was destroyed by fire on November 15, 1953, for which he has not heretofore been fully compensated.

The records of the Department of the Army show that Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr., was born at Chicago, Ill., on December 3, 1922; that he was inducted into the Army of the United States on April 15, 1943; that he subsequently enlisted in the Regular Army and advanced in grade; that he was honorably discharged on February 1, 1952, as a master sergeant; and that on February 2, 1952, he entered on active duty as a warrant officer junior grade.

Warrant Officer (jg) Pierre, W2151033, completed 10 years service for pay purposes on July 2, 1953, and his pay aggregates $375.49 per month.

Pursuant to competent orders, Warrant Officer Pierre departed the United States on September 14, 1952, on a foreign-service tour with duty assignment in the Far East Command and, thereafter, he was assigned to the Skego Ammunition Depot, 8152d Army Unit, APO 503. He was joined on October 28, 1953, by his wife and two infant children. Permission was granted by the commanding general to members of the command with dependents to enter into private rental agreements to obtain quarters and, accordingly, Warrant Officer Pierre and his family moved into and occupied a Japanese-style house at Hayama, Honshu, Japan, under a private rental agreement. This private rental house burned to the ground on November 15, 1953.

The circumstances of this incident are explained in a sworn statement of Warrant Officer Pierre as follows:

"On November 15, 1953 (Sunday), the 'private rental agreement' home located at No. 17 Hayama machi, Nagae, Hayama Honshu, Japan, which was occupied by myself and my family (wife and two children) burned to the ground under the circumstances as follows:

"At approximately 1135 hours my wife discovered the area immediately to the rear of our two burner kerosene cooking stove was afire. She immediately called to me and I

came from our bedroom and tried to take steps to extinguish the fire. Upon seeing that the fire was out of control and was spreading rapidly throughout the house, I gathered my wife and children together and took them to a spot outside and away from the house. I then returned to the house in an attempt to save our possessions, but was able only to retrieve one arm load of assorted clothing, 2 footlockers, and 2 suitcases which were in the bedroom.

"At approximately 1205 hours the building was completely burnt out and down and I then proceeded to telephone my unit and report the incident to the officer of the day."

The fire was duly investigated by the military and Japanese authorities and it was concluded that there was "no violation of any statute, ordinance, or regulation by Warrant Officer Pierre with respect to rental of house and subject incident" and "due to there being no existing liability against Warrant Officer (jg.) Pierre, it is the opinion * * * that he was not in anyway responsible for the occurrence of the fire; also that the losses indicated herein (substantiated list) were not caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of he (him) or his agent."

The loss sustained by the Japanese owner of the house was referred to the Japanese Government in accordance with the terms of the administrative agreement between Japan and the United States.

On September 10, 1954, Warrant Officer Pierre filed a claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of $4,782.05, for the damages sustained by him on account of the destruction of his personal property by fire while such property was located in quarters not within the continental United States. After a careful consideration of all the evidence in this case, it was found that the total damage caused to the household goods and other personal property destroyed by the fire amounted to the sum of $3,793.65, and the claimant presently concurs with the Department's careful determination. No part of this damage was covered by insurance. All of the property, for the damage to which this claim was filed, was reasonable, useful, necessary and proper for the claimant to have owned and to have had in his possession.

The only statute under which this claim could be considered by the Department of the Army was the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c), as amended by the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 321), which provides, among other things, that the amount which may be paid under such statute in any one case shall be limited to the sum "not in excess of $2,500." Prior to the enactment of the last-cited act there was no limitation with respect to the amount that might be paid by the Department of the Army to a claimant under the Military Personnel Claims Act for damages on account of the loss of his personal property. In view of the limitation contained in the act of July 3, 1952, supra, the maximum amount in which Warrant Officer Pierre's claim could be paid by the Department of the Army was the sum of $2,500. The claim, therefore, was duly allowed in the sum of $2,500 on December 30, 1954, and a check in that amount has been dispatched. After the making of said payment there remains a balance of damages sustained by the claimant in the sum of $1,293.65, for which he has not been compensated. There is no method by which he may be reimbursed for this loss except through the enactment by the Congress of a private relief bill.

The claimant in this case is a relatively young warrant officer with a family and he has over 10 years of honorable military service. It would be a rather severe hardship for him to bear the loss sustained as a result of this fire. It is the view of the Department of the Army that under the facts and circumstances in this case Warrant Officer Pierre is justly and equitably entitled to recover the full amount of damages sustained by him. The Department, accordingly, recommends the enactment of this proposed legislation granting an award to the claimant in the sum of $1,293.65.

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $1,293.65.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1996. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1996 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the absence of Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of this Office, I have the honor to transmit for the consideration of the Senate of the United States, the draft of a bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of such section. Section 66a now provides that dividends and other moneys which remain unclaimed for 60 days after the final dividend has been declared and distributed, shall be paid by the trustee into the court of bankruptcy. The regular registry account of the court is used for this purpose.

The amendment of subdivision a of section 66 would add at the end thereof a new sentence providing that unclaimed moneys and dividends shall be deposited and withdrawn as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 2042, and shall not be subject to escheat under the laws of any State. Section 2042 provides that moneys not withdrawn from the registry account within 5 years shall be deposited in the United States Treasury and that any claimant entitled thereto, may upon petition to the court and upon notice to the United States attorney, obtain an order directing payment to him of any sum due him.

At its meeting in June 1952 the Judicial Conference of the Seventh Circuit adopted a resolution regarding the amendment of section 66b. This proposal was brought to the attention of the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1952 and was referred to a special committee for study of the proposal and draft of an amendment. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1952, pp. 11 and 12.)

The special committee, consisting of United States Circuit Judge F. Ryan Duffy, chairman, United States District Judge Charles G. Briggle and Edwin L. Covey, Chief of the Bankruptcy Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, reported to the Judicial Conference at its meeting in March 1953. The Judicial Conference, in accordance wtih its usual practice, directed that the report be circulated among the circuit and district judges; that the judges and the judicial conferences and the judicial councils of the circuits be requested to express their views upon the report and the proposed amendment; that all views expressed be communicated to the Committee on Bankruptcy Administration of the Judicial Conference at its next regular meeting. (See report of the Judicial Conference, special session, March 1953, pp. 11 and 12.)

The report was circulated as directed and the views expressed communicated to the bankruptcy committee. This committee recommended, and the Judicial Conference approved, that section 66a be amended by adding a sentence at the end thereof so that as amended it would read as follows:

"Dividends or other moneys which remain unclaimed for 60 days after the final dividend has been declared and distributed shall be paid by the trustee into the court of bankruptcy; and at the same time the trustee shall file with the clerk a list of the names and post-office addresses, as far as known, of the persons entitled thereto, showing the respective amounts payable to them. Such moneys and dividends shall be deposited and withdrawn as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 2042, and shall not be subject to escheat under the laws of any State." (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1953, pp. 10 and 11.)

Section 66b of the Bankruptcy Act now provides as follows:

"Dividends remaining unclaimed for 1 year shall, under the direction of the court, be distributed to the creditors whose claims have been allowed but not paid in full, and after such claims have been paid in full the balance shall be paid to the bankrupt: *Provided*, That, in case unclaimed dividends belong to minors, such minors may have 1 year after arriving at majority to claim such dividends."

With the amendment above proposed, section 66b is no longer needed. The bankruptcy committee recommended, and the Judicial Conference approved, the repeal of section 66b. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1953, pp. 10 and 11.)

A bill (H. R. 8209) was introduced in the 83d Congress carrying out the proposals, but not acted upon. The Judicial Conference at its meeting in September 1954 upon the recommendation of its bankruptcy committee reaffirmed its previous approval of the measure. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1954, pp. 14 and 15.)

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

ELMORE WHITEHURST.

S. 1997. A bill to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1997 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the absence of Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of this Office, I have the honor to transmit for the consideration of the Senate of the United States, a bill to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—and clause 2 of subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended so as to permit the 30-day notice of the last day fixed by the court for the filing of objections to the discharge of the bankrupt (sec. 58b) to be combined with the 10-day notice of the first meeting of creditors (sec. 58a (33)). In the interest of economy in the cost of administering bankruptcy cases these

amendments were approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its regular meeting in September 1953 (see report of September session of the Judicial Conference, pp. 13 and 14).

Under the present provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, at least two separate notices are required to be given in every case. The first is a 10-day notice of the first meeting of creditors and the second is a 30-day notice of the last day fixed by the court for the filing of objections to the discharge.

Section 14b provides, however, that the order fixing the last day for filing objections to the discharge shall not be entered until after the bankrupt has been examined. This makes it impossible to combine the two notices even in the simplest case.

The amendment of section 14b would permit the 2 notices to be combined in approximately 75 percent of the ordinary bankruptcy cases and would effect an estimated saving of $40,000 a year in postage alone. But an even greater indirect saving would be accomplished in the expenditures for clerical help, supplies and equipment. Such procedure would eliminate the cost of preparing, folding, stuffing and sealing 1 set of notices, the cost of addressing 1 set of envelopes, and the cost of paper and envelopes for 1 set of notices (about 1,400,000 notices a year).

Section 14b as amended would read as follows:

"After the filing fees required to be paid by this act have been paid in full the court shall make an order fixing a time for the filing of objections to the bankrupt's discharge which shall be not less than 30 days after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors. Notice of such order shall be given to all parties in interest as provided in section 58b of this act. If the examination of the bankrupt concerning his acts, conduct and property has not or will not be completed within the time fixed for the filing of objections to the discharge the court may, upon its own motion or upon motion of the receiver, trustee, a creditor or any other party in interest or for other cause shown, extend the time for filing such objections. Upon the expiration of the time fixed in such order or of any extension of such time granted by the court, the court shall discharge the bankrupt if no objection has been filed; otherwise, the court shall hear such proofs and pleas as may be made in opposition to the discharge, by the trustee, creditors, the United States attorney, or such other attorney as the Attorney General may designate, at such time as will give the bankrupt and the objecting parties a reasonable opportunity to be fully heard."

Under General Order 35 (4) of the Supreme Court a petition in a voluntary proceeding in ordinary bankruptcy may be accepted for filing by the clerk of the court if accompanied by a verified petition of the bankrupt stating that he is without and cannot obtain the money with which to pay the filing fees in full at the time of filing. Subsection c of General Order 35 (4) further provides: "No proceeding upon the discharge of a bankrupt or debtor shall be instituted until the filing fees are paid in full." The new language at the beginning of section 14b as amended would conform with General Order 35 (4) (c). About 25 percent of all ordinary bankruptcy cases are filed without payment of the filing fees at the time of filing and as to these the 2 notices mentioned above could not be combined under the proposed amendment of section 14b. It is essential in order to keep the bankruptcy system on a self-sustaining basis that these filing fees be paid and for this reason it is not advisable to set the discharge procedure in motion until the filing fees are fully paid.

A conforming amendment in section 58b (2) is made necessary by the present requirement of that subsection that a copy of the discharge notice be mailed to the trustee and his attorney. Obviously if the two notices are combined and mailed at the beginning of the proceeding, it could not be sent to the trustee, as he would not have been appointed when the notice is mailed. Section 58b, as amended, would read as follows:

"The court shall give at least 30 days' notice by mail of the last day fixed by its order for the filing of objections to a bankrupt's discharge (1) to the creditors, in the manner prescribed in subdivision a of this section; (2) the trustee if any and his attorney if any, at their respective addresses as filed by them with the court; and (3) to the United States attorney of the judicial district wherein the proceeding is pending. The court shall also give at least 30 days' notice by mail of the time and place of a hearing upon objections to a bankrupt's discharge (1) to the bankrupt, at his last known address as appears in his petition, schedules, list of creditors, or statement of affairs, or, if no address so appears, to his last-known address as furnished by the trustee or other party after inquiry; (2) to the bankrupt's attorney, if any, at his address as filed by him with the court; and (3) to the objecting parties and their attorneys, at their respective addresses as filed by them with the court."

In order that the trustee would be notified immediately upon his appointment of the last day fixed for the filing of objections to the discharge, the Bankruptcy Committee of the Judicial Conference suggested that the Supreme Court be requested to amend General Order 16 so as to read as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the referee, immediately upon the appointment and approval of the trustee, to notify him in person or by mail of his appointment and of the time fixed for the filing of objections to the bankrupt's discharge if such time has been fixed; and the notice shall require the trustee forthwith to notify the referee of his acceptance or rejection of the trust, and shall contain a statement of the penal sum of the trustee's bond."

The Conference approved this suggestion (see report of September 1953 session, p. 14).

A bill (H. R. 8210) to carry out these proposals was introduced in the 83d Congress and passed the House of Representatives on August 3, 1954. No action was taken in the Senate. At the meeting of the Judicial Conference in September 1954 the Conference upon the recommendation of its Bankruptcy Committee, reaffirmed its approval of this measure. (See report of September 1954 session, pp. 14 and 15).

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

ELMORE WHITEHURST.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE LIABILITY UNDER INSURANCE CONTRACTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

In view of the recent decision of *Lake* v. *New York Life Insurance Co.* (218 Fed., 2d., 394), a life-insurance company which, without knowledge of a pending bankruptcy proceeding, innocently, and in good faith, loans money to a bankrupt after the petition in bankruptcy is filed, can be held liable for payment of the same amount the second time upon suit by the trustee in bankruptcy.

To protect themselves, insurance companies will be forced to engage in protracted and expensive investigations before loans on policies are made as a result of the court decision. This will mean unusual delays when policyholders seek to borrow for emergency purposes to meet immediate needs. These bills, if enacted, will eliminate this problem.

The first bill would amend section 70a (5) of the Bankruptcy Act and would provide when any insurance company, in good faith, and without actual knowledge of the bankruptcy proceeding, makes any payment under a life-insurance policy, either before or after bankruptcy. Such payment shall have the same effect so far as the insurance company is concerned, as if no bankruptcy proceeding were pending.

The second bill would amend section 70d (5) of the Bankruptcy Act, and would likewise relieve an insurance company from double liability after bankruptcy and before adjudication.

I ask unanimous consent that each of these bills may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1998

Be it enacted, etc., That clause No. (5) of subdivision a of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (11 U. S. C. 110 (a)), is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*And provided further*, That when any insurance company, either before or after the adjudication of bankruptcy, in good faith and without actual knowledge of bankruptcy, makes any payment pursuant to the provisions of a life-insurance policy or contract, such payment shall have the same effect so far as such company is concerned as if the bankruptcy were not pending."

S. 1999

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence contained in paragraph (5) of subdivision d of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (11 U. S. C. 110 (d)), is amended to read as follows: "Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, in the third proviso of clause (5) of subdivision (a) of this section, and in subdivision (g) of section 21 of this act, no transfer by or in behalf of the bankrupt after the date of bankruptcy shall be valid against the trustee: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall impair the negotiability of currency or negotiable instruments."

NATHAN L. GARNER

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner. The bill has been submitted by the Secretary of the Army, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany this bill the letter forwarded with this proposal by him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and ap-

propriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2000) for the relief of Nathan L. Garner, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Nathan L. Garner," which it is recommended be enacted into law. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the payment of $1,600, plus all accrued interest, to M. Sgt. Nathan L. Garner, Mount Olive, N. C., for the loss sustained by him because certain deposits of his savings made at Fort Bragg, N. C., in 1953–54 to Soldiers' Deposits were never applied or returned to him by the responsible officer and for which he has not heretofore been fully compensated.

The records of the Department of the Army show that M. Sgt. Nathan L. Garner, RA 6852930, was born at Mount Olive, N. C., on December 5, 1911. He enlisted in the United States Army on August 9, 1934, at the age of 22 years, 8 months, and since that time he has been a career soldier. He fought as a combat infantryman in the grade of corporal at Bataan and was taken prisoner there by the Japanese forces. Corporal Garner was a prisoner of war from April 9, 1942, to August 28, 1945, during which time he suffered physical deterioration from malnutrition and disease. Corporal Garner was liberated on August 28, 1945. The next day he was promoted to sergeant and shortly thereafter he was transferred to the United States for physical recoupment and reassignment. He was promoted to staff sergeant on June 8, 1948, to sergeant first class on November 30, 1948, and to master sergeant on September 11, 1953.

The monthly pay of Master Sergeant Garner is $304.20. He is married and has two children.

Early in his military career Master Sergeant Garner initiated a program of depositing a small portion of his pay each payday in Soldiers' Deposits, a system established by Congress whereby soldiers are permitted to deposit their savings. He deposited $25 on February 1, 1936, and, depending upon his financial ability, he continued the practice of making regular deposits, increasing the amount of deposits with advancement in grade. His balance as of June 30, 1953, amounted to $6,600.

Master Sergeant Garner joined Headquarters Company, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, N. C., on July 29, 1953, and thereafter he conducted his soldiers' deposits transactions with Chief Warrant Officer Robert M. Unchester, W907032, the personnel officer who was officially authorized to handle the Soldiers' Deposits of personnel of the organization. On June 19, 1954, Mr. Unchester departed the organization for reassignment and the next day, June 20, 1954, irregularities regarding the handling of soldiers' deposits in the organization were discovered and brought to the attention of the military authorities.

This matter was duly investigated, and, on August 5, 1954, it was determined that contrary to established procedure, the personnel officer had retained in his custody the deposit book of Master Sergeant Garner, that the deposit book could not be located, and that certain sums submitted for deposit had not been credited properly. This investigation resulted in a recommendation for immediate enforcement of all safeguards relative to soldiers' deposits and that appropriate disciplinary action be taken in respect to the personnel officer who is presently confined in the Post Stockade, Fort Bragg, N. C., awaiting trial by court-martial under charges and specifications involving desertion, fraudulent enlistment, and larceny.

This investigation disclosed that Master Sergeant Garner turned over to the personnel officer for deposit in Master Sergeant Garner's soldiers' deposit account the following sums of money on the dates indicated and he received receipts for same (with exception noted) from the personnel officer:

Oct. 31, 1953 (this deposit was made during the period July–October 1953 and a receipt was obtained, but after a length of time the receipt was discarded)	$200
Oct. 31, 1953	$200
Mar. 17, 1954 (a redeposit of a previous withdrawal)	3,000
Mar. 31, 1954	500
May 31, 1954 (date established, however receipt is undated)	200

The investigation further disclosed that the above amounts, aggregating $4,100, were not returned to Master Sergeant Garner, were not properly accounted for by the personnel officer, and were never credited to the Finance office records and the pay records of Master Sergeant Garner.

On September 28, 1954, Master Sergeant Garner filed a claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of $4,100, plus interest, till date of payment. The claim was submitted under the provisions of Army Regulations No. 25–100, subject: Claims, dated August 20, 1953, which states in pertinent part:

"3. Claims payable.—a. General.—Any claim falling within the statutory provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, not hereinafter excluded, may be submitted for consideration and in proper cases approved for payment in an amount not to exceed $2,500.

"b. Examples:

* * * * *

"(5) Money: When personal funds of personnel are accepted by personnel acting with authority of the unit or detachment commanding officer for safekeeping, soldiers' deposit, * * *, and such personal funds are neither applied as directed by the owner nor returned to him, such losses are reimbursable when established by satisfactory evidence."

The only statute under which this claim could be considered by the Department of the Army was the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c), as amended by the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 321), which provides, among other things, that the amount which may be paid under such statute in any one case shall be limited to the sum "not in excess of $2,500." Prior to the enactment of the last-cited act there was no limitation with respect to the amount that might be paid by the Department of the Army to a claimant under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act for the loss of money under circumstances such as presented in this case. In view of the limitation contained in the act of July 3, 1952, supra, the maximum amount in which this claim could be paid by the Department of the Army was the sum of $2,500. The claim, therefore, was duly allowed in the sum of $2,500, and a check in that amount was dispatched to Master Sergeant Garner on November 10, 1954. After the making of said payment there remains a loss sustained by the claimant of the sum of $1,600, coupled with the sum of $110.22 (interest on the certain sums aggregating $4,100, computed to November 10, 1954), and interest on the outstanding balance of $1,600, at the rate of 4 percent per annum from November 10, 1954, to the date of making final payment.

On November 9, 1954, Master Sergeant Garner advised the Department of the Army, in part, as follows:

"2. I will accept, as partial payment only, the sum of $2,500, which is to be mailed to me. I protest the decision to pay only the reduced amount, and request that, * * * the file in this matter be forwarded to the Secretary of the Army for the purpose of bringing it to the attention of Congress for consideration.

"3. I further protest the disapproval of my claim for interest. Under the terms of the soldier's deposit agreement, interest at the rate of 4 percent is to accrue on all deposits after 6 months. The interest that has accrued, and is accruing, is part of the principal of my claim, and should be paid, together with the return of the principal. I am not seeking interest on the amount of the claim. I am only claiming that the terms of the soldier's deposit agreement be met, and that I be made whole on the loss."

The attitude of this claimant relative to the loss of his savings is natural and expected. The practice of economy and utilization of savings plans have been emphasized in the military. Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard have been informed as to the merits of savings plans including Service Deposits (Soldiers' Deposits) and advised:

"Speaking of soundness, you can be sure that the various plans for your future economic safety offered by virtue of your being a member of the Armed Forces are completely sound. For behind each such plan stands, as your guarantor against loss, the full strength of the United States Government." (Armed Forces Information Pamphlet No. 4, December 11, 1953.)

Congress established the Soldiers' Deposit System on May 15, 1872. In effect, a Federal facility was established whereby enlisted members of the Armed Forces were permitted to build up a money reserve with interest while in uniform. The rules have changed but little over the years relative to the basic requirements that the deposits of enlisted men must be made to a properly authorized officer; that the deposits must be made in cash; that the deposits may be in any dollar amount not less than $5; that a deposit book shall be furnished the depositor; and that an interest rate of 4 percent per annum shall be paid for any sums not less than $5 deposited for a period of 6 months or longer. (10 U. S. C. 906, 907; 68 Stat. 485; 10 U. S. C. A., sec. 908 a and b.)

The receipts issued to this claimant do acknowledge the receipt of money from the depositor for deposit with the United States. They are substantially certificates of deposit and obligations or securities of the United States. The law imports the time and conditions of repayment (*Neall* v. *U. S.* (Cal. 1902) 118 F. 699; 56 C. C. A. 31). As to the matter of interest, the general rule is that the United States is not liable for interest on its obligations except where interest is stipulated for in legal and proper contracts, or where the allowance of interest is specifically directed by statute (27 Comp. Gen. 691).

M. Sgt. Nathan L. Garner has had a long and honorable career in the United States Army. It would be a rather severe hardship for him to bear the loss of any part of his soldiers' deposits or interest incident thereto. It is the view of the Department of the Army that, under the facts and circum-

stances, this claimant is justly and equitably entitled to recover the full amount of the loss sustained by him. The Department accordingly recommends the enactment of this proposed legislation granting an award to the claimant in the sum of $1,600 and providing for full payment of interest.

The cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $1,600, together with interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from November 10, 1954, to the date of final payment and the sum of $110.22, representing accrued interest on certain deposits to November 10, 1954.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2001) to amend the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

I am introducing a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in a number of important particulars.

The bill will provide standards for the guidance of the Federal Power Commission in seeking to further the sound conservation and utilization of natural gas, grant regulatory jurisdiction to the Commission over direct industrial sales of natural gas, to the end that it will be able to stop the sale of this scarce commodity at less than the actual cost including a fair share of the transportation costs, and provide that applications to import natural gas would be subject to the same standards which govern domestic applications for authority to establish a pipeline.

These proposals are in the public interest because they will contribute to the national security, assist in prolonging the supply of this valuable natural resource for its more beneficial uses, and will contribute to the maintenance of a strong mobilization base within the domestic fuels industry.

The enactment of my proposals will contribute to the long-range benefit of the general gas-consuming public, because it will slow down the uneconomic waste of gas for inferior purposes, thereby extending the period of time during which this convenient fuel will be available to household consumers. This is an extremely important objective, in view of the fact that the life index of natural gas reserves has decreased rapidly in recent years to the point where the known reserves constitute a supply sufficient to last only 22.5 years at the present rate of consumption. Natural gas sales have increased some 660 percent since the Congress passed the Natural Gas Act in 1938, and we have an obligation to protect the public's interest under these changed circumstances.

My constituents in the State of West Virginia include the gas-consuming public, people employed in competitive fuel industries, and natural gas producers. At the present time the State of West Virginia is still a natural gas exporter. In sponsoring this legislation, I am acting in the interests of all of these various groups in my State, as well as in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Proposals are pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to deal with some of the problems which have arisen under the Natural Gas Act. The act itself has not been the subject of major revision since its enactment 17 years ago. In that period of time the rapid growth of the natural-gas industry, the accelerated depletion of gas reserves, and experience gained in the administration of the act bring about a situation which demands that the Congress now proceed to consider and take action upon all of the major problems involved in the proper utilization and conservation of this scarce resource.

We will be delinquent in our duty if we consider at this time only one or a few of the many problems which require solution for the protection of the national interest with respect to this limited natural resource.

CURRENT STRENGTH OF THE SOVIET AIR FORCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for many years some of us have been warning the American people not to rely on those who would minimize the ability of the Soviet Communists to produce modern combat weapons. But even I am shocked and astounded upon learning more about the announcement made last Friday by the Department of Defense with respect to the current strength of the Soviet air force.

It is now clear that the United States, along with the rest of the free world, may have lost control of the air, except for the possibility we still have advantages in base location and training. But it is now also clear that in quality, as well as quantity of planes the Communists are at least in the process of surpassing the United States; and I am confident they are well ahead with the production of the possible ultimate weapon; namely, the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Why is this true? Is it because some of us believe that money is more important than freedom?

If this statement from the Department of Defense was issued, as some have felt possible, to obtain more funds for the military, the President should promptly discharge those responsible for the release. If it was not, we are entitled to have the President tell us more of the facts, more details to back up this somewhat vague warning.

In any case, we should now be given an accounting, a balance sheet, as to our strength, as against that of the Communists. We are entitled to the facts. It is time to put an end to this game of blind man's buff.

We must always remember that adequate arms are necessary, not only for defense, but also for permanent world peace. If, however, we are to have that greatest assurance toward peace, disarmament, we must negotiate from a position of strength.

Only last year the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, emphasized to the American people that the Soviets were building primarily a defensive air force.

The statement now issued by his authority proves that he was dead wrong. Throughout his tenure of office, Mr. Wilson has underestimated the strength of the Communists and their ability to produce modern arms. Nor has he taken the steps necessary to obtain adequate arms for this country.

The American people want and deserve an accounting. They want and deserve a military balance sheet from their Commander in Chief, because unless this danger is now recognized, and adequate steps taken to overcome it, the lights of freedom will soon be going out, all over the world.

Mr. President, in this connection I submit a resolution, and ask that it be read and referred to the appropriate committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was read, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the Department of Defense has now announced that the Soviet Air Force has achieved a position of great offensive strength as well as defensive strength; and

Whereas this announcement conflicts with information previously published and circulated with respect to the position of the Soviet Air Force; and

Whereas administration representatives appearing before the Congress have attempted to justify their planned further heavy reductions in the Army and the Marine Corps, on the grounds that the United States holds air supremacy over the Communists; and

Whereas the spiritual, economic, and military strength of the United States is the last bastion of the free world capable of resisting the great and growing strength of international communism; and

Whereas the ultimate salvation for all mankind is permanent world peace, which can only be obtained through negotiations for disarmament, conducted from a position of real and relative strength; and

Whereas it is imperative that the people of the United States and their elected representatives be fully and truthfully informed as to the relative military strength of the United States and the Communist forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate investigate this announcement recently put out by the Department of Defense and the implications thereof, and that the Senate take appropriate steps to determine the relative strength of the Communist forces as against the forces of the free world in all military categories, and with respect to all weapons systems.

PROPOSED CODE OF FAIR PROCEDURE FOR SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a number of other Members of the Senate I am again submitting a resolution to establish a code of fair procedure for Senate investigating committees. Senators joining with me are: Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GORE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr.

McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. SPARKMAN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER for himself and other Senators, was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas investigation of matters of public importance through committee hearings is of vital importance to the discharge of the constitutional functions of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas the investigative power of Senate committees is derived from the power of the Congress to inquire into matters of public importance within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas article 1, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the following be, and hereby are, adopted as the Code of Fair Committee Procedure of the Senate of the United States in connection with all investigations and hearings involving alleged violations of law or improper or unethical conduct.

SUBCOMMITTEE, MEETINGS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND REPORTS

SEC. 2. (a) Subcommittees, as required, shall be appointed by the committee chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee, and shall ordinarily consist of no less than three members, a proportionate ratio of whom shall be members of the minority (the designation of the majority and minority members of a subcommittee shall be subject to the approval of the majority and minority members of the committee, respectively, in caucus assembled). Subcommittees of less than three members may be designated by the chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee.

(b) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 16 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. This provision may be waived by the assent of the majority of the members of the committee.

(c) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) and committee investigations shall be scheduled and conducted only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(d) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings or ordering a particular investigation shall state clearly and with particularity the subject thereof, which resolution may be amended only upon majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(e) The chairman or a member shall consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

(f) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

(g) No testimony given in executive session or part or summary thereof shall be released or disclosed orally or in writing by a member or employee of the Senate without the authorization of the committee by majority vote at a meeting at which a majority of members are present. No committee or staff report or news release or statement based upon evidence or testimony adversely affecting a person shall be released or disclosed by the committee or any member or employee orally or in writing unless such evidence or testimony and the complete evidence or testimony offered in rebuttal thereto, if any, is published prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the report, or news release, or statement.

(h) The rule as to the secrecy of executive sessions as set forth in subsection (g) of this section shall be applicable to Members and employees of the Senate for a reasonable period following an executive session until the committee has had a reasonable time to conclude the pertinent investigation and hearings and to issue a report; subject, however, to any decision by a committee majority for prior release in the manner set forth in subsection (g).

HEARINGS

SEC. 3. (a) Witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, of their own choosing, who shall have the right to advise witnesses of their rights and to make brief objections to the relevancy of questions and to procedure.

(b) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

(c) At least 24 hours prior to his testifying a witness shall be given a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution scheduling the hearing stating the subject of the hearing; at the same time he shall be given a statement of the subject matters about which he is to be interrogated.

(d) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileged character of communications between clergyman and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, and husband and wife shall be scrupulously observed.

(e) No testimony shall be taken in executive session unless at least two members of the committee are present.

(f) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right to make an oral statement and to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

(g) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, so far as practicable, shall be available for inspection or purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public hearing. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY TESTIMONY

SEC. 4. (a) A person shall be considered to be adversely affected by evidence or testimony of a witness if the committee determines that—

(i) the evidence or testimony would constitute libel or slander if not presented before a committee of the Senate; or

(ii) the evidence or testimony alleges crime or misconduct or tends to disgrace or otherwise to expose the person to public contempt, hatred, or scorn.

(b) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom adverse information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the adverse material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

(c) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing that person shall have the right—

(i) to appear and testify or file a sworn statement in his own behalf;

(ii) to have the adverse witness recalled upon application made within 30 days after introduction of such evidence or the termination of the adverse witness' testimony;

(iii) to be represented by counsel (as in (3) (a) hereof;

(iv) to cross-examine (in person or by counsel) such adverse witness; and

(v) subject to the discretion of the committee, to obtain the issuance by the committee of subpenas for witnesses, documents, and other evidence in his defense. Such opportunity for rebuttal shall be afforded promptly and, so far as practicable, such hearing shall be conducted at the same place and under the same circumstances as the hearing at which adverse testimony was presented.

Cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour for each witness, unless the committee by majority vote extends the time for a witness or group of witnesses.

(d) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in executive session or by material in the committee files or records, and if public release of such evidence, testimony, or material is contemplated, such person shall have, prior to the public release of such evidence or testimony or material or any disclosure of or comment upon it by members of the committee or committee staff or taking of similar evidence or testimony in a public hearing, the rights conferred by subsection (4) (c) hereof and the right to inspect at least as much of the evidence or testimony of the adverse witness or material as will be made public or the subject of a public hearing.

(e) Any witness (except a member of the press who testifies in his professional capacity) who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person may be required by the committee to disclose his sources of information unless the committee determines that to do so would endanger the national security.

SUBPENAS

SEC. 5. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of a committee only upon written notice to all members of the committee with a statement as to the identity of the witness or material and their relevancy to the investigation or hearing already authorized. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote.

COMMITTEE STAFF

SEC. 6. The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

TELEVISION AND OTHER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND REPORTING

SEC. 7. (a) Subject to the physical limitations of the hearing room and consideration of the physical comfort of committee members, staff and witnesses, equal access for coverage of the hearings shall be provided to the various means of communications, including newspapers, magazines, radio, newsreels, and television. It shall be the duty of the committee chairman to see that the various communication devices and instruments do not unreasonably distract, harass, or confuse the witness and interfere with his presentation.

(b) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during the hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

SUPERVISION, APPEALS, AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8. The application of this code shall be supervised in the Senate by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and four Members selected by the Senate (not more than two of the Members selected shall be of the same party), who shall have authority (1) to receive and investigate complaints of alleged violations of this code filed by persons claiming to be aggrieved and by Members, (2) to advise committee chairmen of their conclusions and their suggestions, and (3) to present their findings to the Senate, with such recommendations for remedial and disciplinary action, if any, they deem appropriate.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. As used in this act—

"Committee" shall mean any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and any subcommittees of the foregoing.

"Person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is the same resolution that most of us joined in submitting at the last session. For a long time, some of us have been trying to get a set of fair and impartial rules of committee procedure before the Congress.

In August of 1951, I submitted such a proposal to the 82d Congress, but no action was taken on it. I reoffered it on February 10, 1953, soon after the beginning of the 83d Congress, but again there was no action.

Similar attempts to bring order and uniformity into congressional proceedings have been made by Senators DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, MORSE, and others. Last year we decided that those of us who had sponsored such codes in the past should make some effort to arrive at a plan on which we could all agree, and after numerous sessions the present resolution resulted. We submitted it last May. Again there was no action. We are resubmitting it today; and at this session we hope to be successful.

This resolution includes some of the features of all of the previous proposals which we have offered as individuals. It does not include all of the proposals made by any one of us. It is a joint product of our determination that the United States Senate shall be preserved as the embodiment of our finest traditions of freedom and justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary of the proposed code of fair procedure for Senate committees.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CODE OF FAIR PROCEDURE FOR SENATE COMMITTEES

Provisions covering committee organizations, investigations, reports:

1. Approval of full committee required for appointment of subcommittees with less than three members.

2. Selection of committee staff and personnel subject to approval of the majority of committee members.

3. Written notice must be given 16 hours prior to committee meeting, unless waived by the majority of committee.

4. The resolution setting forth the subject and scope of committee hearings or investigations must be specific and can be amended by majority vote of full committee.

5. Submission of any official committee report to all members 24 hours prior to its consideration by committee is required.

6. Testimony taken in executive sessions cannot be released by members of staff without prior authorization by majority of full committee.

Provisions covering the rights of witnesses:

1. Twenty-four hour prior notification must be given a witness called by committee outlining the subject matter on which the witness is to be interrogated.

2. The right to make an oral statement or submit a sworn statement is given to every witness, and the statement must be included in the transcript of the hearings.

3. Release of statements or material adversely affecting an individual by a member of committee staff is prohibited, unless there has been prior or simultaneous release of rebuttal statement.

4. Persons adversely affected by testimony taken in public hearings are given the right to: cross-examine witnesses in public hearings, be represented by counsel, and subpena witnesses and documents on his behalf at the discretion of the committee.

5. Persons adversely affected by the release of testimony taken in executive sessions are given the same rights to cross-examine, etc., as if the testimony had been taken in public hearings.

Supervision and enforcement: 1. The Vice President and four other Members of the Senate are constituted as a group to receive complaints and investigate violations of these rules. They can advise the committee chairmen of their findings, and present their findings to the Senate with such recommendations for remedial action as they deem appropriate.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to unexpended balances of Federal appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Agencies of the Federal Government in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1955 spent $31.5 billion, and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $116.1 billion.

As of December 31, 1954, military services, exclusive of civil functions, in the first 6 months of the year had spent $17.4 billion, and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $66.2 billion.

During the first 6 months of fiscal year 1955, the Foreign Operations Administration had spent $2 billion, and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in its appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $10.9 billion.

Other agencies of the Government in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1955 spent $12.1 billion and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $39.1 billion.

Of the $31.5 billion spent in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1955, $13.3 billion was spent from appropriations and other authorizations enacted for fiscal year 1955 and $18.2 billion was spent out of balances carried over from appropriations and other authorizations enacted in prior years.

These figures were revealed today in the 17th report in a series of compilations of "Federal Appropriations and Authorizations, Expenditures and Unexpended Balances," by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The term "unexpended balances" in appropriations and authorizations does not mean that the cash is in the Treasury. It means the agencies, on December 31, 1954, were still authorized to call upon the Treasury to meet their obligations to the amount of the so-called unexpended balances in their appropriations and other spending authority. As the bills come due, the Treasury must provide the funds from tax collections, other cash on hand, or from borrowed funds which increase the Federal debt.

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORITY TO EXPEND FROM PUBLIC DEBT RECEIPTS

The $116.1 billion in unexpended balances included $94.2 billion of balances in appropriations, etc., and $21.9 billion in unused authority to expend from public debt receipts. Expenditures from appropriations, etc., and use of the authority to expend out of the debt, along with the balances in each of these categories as of December 31, 1954, are summarized as follows:

Appropriations and authorizations

[In billions]

	Prior year balance	Current fiscal year 1955	Transfers	Total after transfers	Expenditures	Unexpended balances
Appropriations	$77.6	$48.1	----------	$125.7	$31.5	$94.2
Authority to expend from public debt receipts	20.8	2.9	−1.8	21.9	----------	21.9
Total	98.4	51.0	−1.8	147.6	31.5	116.1

Figures in the committee report are summarized as follows:

Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government,[1] showing appropriations and other authorizations by current and prior years; and 1955 expenditures from appropriations for the current year and appropriations enacted in prior years, and unexpended balances, as of Dec. 31, 1954

[In thousands of dollars]

Department or agency	Appropriations and authorizations					Expenditures (through Dec. 31, 1954)			Unexpended balances as of Dec. 31, 1954
	Prior-year appropriations and authorizations [2]	Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1955 [3]	Total funds	Transfers [4]	Total after transfers	Out of prior-year appropriations and authorizations	Out of current appropriations and authorizations	Total [5]	
Executive Office of the President	2,731	8,755	11,486		11,486	647	3,681	4,329	7,157
Funds appropriated to the President (including foreign aid)	11,463,675	2,823,668	14,287,343	−19,797	14,267,546	1,915,684	143,174	2,058,851	12,208,695
Independent offices	12,577,751	3,275,873	15,853,624	−171,856	15,681,768	2,902,790	349,157	3,251,952	12,429,817
General Services Administration	1,258,709	535,394	1,794,103	+6,732	1,800,835	499,245	71,883	571,129	1,229,705
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,923,563	570,555	6,494,118	−129,193	6,364,925	174,508	−128,450	46,060	6,318,865
Department of Agriculture	5,555,971	2,837,034	8,393,005	−2,960	8,390,045	1,621,240	340,171	1,961,409	6,428,637
Department of Commerce	303,792	971,798	1,275,590	+1,102	1,276,692	79,523	572,165	651,689	625,003
Department of Defense	55,470,562	30,118,853	85,589,415	−1,058,691	84,530,724	10,236,608	7,514,619	17,751,234	66,779,491
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	588,778	1,354,068	1,942,846		1,942,846	374,253	619,944	994,197	948,650
Department of the Interior	289,197	474,564	763,761	+2,238	765,999	157,275	129,095	286,368	479,631
Department of Justice	23,810	181,365	205,175	−1,268	203,907	15,988	75,544	91,535	112,372
Department of Labor	55,987	338,205	394,192	−1	394,191	32,697	133,557	166,257	227,933
Department of the Post Office	365,576	126,500	492,076		492,076	276	149,212	149,489	342,587
Department of State	59,662	130,240	189,902	−6,341	183,561	14,409	64,215	78,626	104,934
Department of the Treasury [6]	4,479,866	7,248,006	11,727,872	−424,857	11,303,015	142,849	3,300,922	3,443,771	7,859,244
Undistributed [7]						15,439		15,439	−15,439
Total	[8] 98,419,630	50,994,877	149,414,507	[9] −1,804,893	147,609,614	18,183,461	13,338,889	31,522,333	116,087,279

[1] Excluding trust and deposit fund accounts.

[2] Includes balances in 1953 and 1954 appropriation and other authorization accounts and balances in no-year and multiyear appropriation and other authorization accounts.

[3] Includes all regular appropriations and all supplemental appropriations to date.

[4] Represents transfer of funds from one account to another within the same agency or among agencies; funds so transferred from parent accounts are merged with balances in recipient accounts, and all expenditures are charged against the recipient accounts and not against the parent accounts.

[5] Negative expenditures in these columns represent an excess of collections over disbursements, for example: Credits in the expenditures of working funds represent advances to the funds from other accounts. Expenditures will be charged against these funds as work is performed or completed.

[6] Includes interest on the public debt. Excludes principal of refunds of receipts representing overpayment of taxes.

[7] Represents $25,000,000 estimate of undistributed overseas disbursements for which reports have not been received and $9,560,741 credit representing net differences resulting from variations in methods of reporting and classifying expenditure data. For this reason expenditures stated in this report may differ slightly from those reported in the Monthly Treasury Statement in certain line items.

[8] Includes relatively small amounts for which time for obligation has expired, and time for transfer to surplus has not arrived.

[9] Represents largely transfers to the surplus fund and capital transfers representing payment to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury for the retirement of capital stock and for disposition of earnings of business-type activities (principally wholly owned Government corporations).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Fiscal Service, Bureau of Accounts, Department of the Treasury. (Expenditures are stated on the basis of checks issued and cash payments made as reported by Government disbursing officers.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before the Cleveland Engineering Society, at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 16, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by himself on immigration and nauralization policies, and excerpts from address by Irving Engel, president of the American Jewish Committee, delivered before the executive board of the American Jewish Committee, in Washington, D. C., on May 7, 1955.

My Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by Senator GOLDWATER on May 12, 1955, before the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce.

Article entitled "The Struggle for Survival," written by Senator BUTLER for the Marine News of May 1955, dealing with the precarious status of our merchant marine.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Article entitled "The Future: Sound as a Dollar," written by Hon. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, and published in Fortune magazine for April 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Portion of article relating to lack of adequate detention facilities for juvenile delinquents, published in the Woman's Home Companion for May 1955.

By Mr. THYE:

Article headed "Minnesota Editors Say," published in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune of May 11, 1955, which quotes from an article by W. F. Schilling, of the Northfield (Minn.) Independent.

By Mr. BENDER:

Returns in registered voters' poll of Ohio sentiment concerning Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the committee on the Judiciary:

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, elevated to United States Supreme Court.

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired.

Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge, for the eastern district of Wisconsin, to fill a new position.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Tuesday, May 24, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 25, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

John R. Brown, of Texas, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Robert Lee Russell, deceased.

William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge, for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

RETURN OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL FOR DUTY IN THE UNITED STATES—LETTERS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I sent on May 11 to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, in regard to the desirability of having Foreign Service personnel who have served continuously for long periods overseas, return to spend some time in this country.

I ask that there also be printed my letter of the same date to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who wrote me in regard to this important matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 11, 1955.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A review of the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Justice Departments prompts me to write on a matter affecting your Department, which I feel strongly should be developed immediately.

As you know, under your initiative a citizen's committee to study the Foreign Service submitted a report last year recommending a number of steps in which there could be developed a stronger Foreign Service with the Department of State. I have become particularly interested in that phase of the Wriston committee report which calls for the transferring of Foreign Service personnel from overseas posts back to the United States after an extended term of service abroad.

Your attention is directed to the fact that 102 of the 564 members of the Foreign Service have over 15 years' service and have not had any part of that service in the United States. There are 51 members of the Foreign Service who have more than 20 years' service, and the longest anyone of that group has served in the United States is 2 years and 10 months.

I am sure you will recall that the Wriston Report observed that the Foreign Service is, in effect, in a condition of exile abroad. Despite a general willingness and desire on the part of the corps to alternate home duty with foreign, the great preponderance of Foreign Service officers spend their period of service out of the United States and the Wriston report further observed that it has been a serious mistake to keep so much of the Foreign Service orbiting overseas so long.

In view of the fact that the United States today has activities extending over the face of the globe and we are trying through our American representatives abroad to develop friendship among our foreign friends, it is evident to me to be necessary to bring back our representatives to this country at periodic intervals in order that they may be thoroughly refreshed in our American way of life. It is imperative that these members of our Foreign Service who have served continuously long periods overseas should be brought home for service here or on leave, so that they will be encouraged to renew their association within their home communities and with their fellow citizens, in order that they may be reacquainted and refreshed with the circumstances and attitudes that shape national policy at home.

I believe it inevitable that if we leave these people overseas too long it is only natural that they get out of touch with the principles and the attitudes and faith which they are trying to develop and point out to our friends abroad.

I, therefore, would like to inquire what steps have been taken by the Department to carry out the recommendations of the Wriston report on the rotation of Foreign Service personnel and would appreciate your advice on the progress of the Wriston program.

With kindest regards, I am
Most sincerely yours,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

MAY 11, 1955.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Thank you for your letter of May 5, urging that efforts be made to insure that the Department of State carry out the Wriston program of transferring personnel from overseas posts back to the United States after extended periods of service abroad.

I am in complete agreement with your view that the Wriston program should be carried out and am enclosing copy of a letter I have just sent to Secretary Dulles pointing out the need for transferring back to this country periodically our Foreign Service personnel, in order that their knowledge of American life may be refreshed.

With kindest regards, I am
Most sincerely yours,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

SIGNING OF THE AUSTRIAN TREATY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, all of us are rejoicing over the wonderful news, which came to us on Sunday, of the signing of the Austrian Treaty. At an appropriate time I hope to address myself to that subject; but, Mr. President, at the moment I submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a splendid editorial entitled "Austria Is Free," which appeared in the New York Times of May 16, yesterday. In my judgment the editorial is a wonderful tribute to this outstanding accomplishment by our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who has just returned from Austria.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTRIA IS FREE

The cause of freedom won another important triumph when the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain, France, Soviet Russia, and Austria signed and sealed in Vienna yesterday the long-delayed treaty which makes Austria again a sovereign and independent country. The treaty must still be ratified and the foreign occupation troops must still be withdrawn. But the notable Soviet concessions in this case give assurance that these steps will be taken without undue delay, and that the pledge of Austria's liberation made by the big powers in their Moscow declaration as far back as 1943 will now be redeemed.

To Austria this was a day of thanksgiving and jubilation. After 17 years of subjection to foreign rule—first under Hitler and then under Hitler's conquerors, in particular the Soviets, which bled the country of all they could—the Austrians can look forward again to becoming masters in their own house in a matter of months. What is more, owing to the Soviets' renunciation of some of their most onerous previous exactions, Austria has been able to obtain a far better treaty than appeared possible only a short while ago. No wonder the flags were flying, the church bells were ringing, the bands were playing, and the people were dancing in the streets all over Austria. The free world will join the Foreign Ministers in congratulating Austria on this happy event.

But the Austrian treaty has also world political implications reaching far beyond Austria. Like the latest Soviet peace and disarmament proposals, like all recent Soviet moves, the concessions to Austria, made in return for Austrian neutrality, are merely part of a wider program being built up by the Soviets for the forthcoming big power conference at top levels, to which they have agreed. That program takes into account the patent fact that all the Soviet threats and bluster have been unable to prevent the implementation of the Paris pacts. The Soviets seek, therefore, to supplement their threats with more amiable gestures designed to persuade—and lull—the world into the belief that they have suddenly become reasonable and open to conciliatory negotiations when in reality they continue to pursue their unchanging aims.

Their long-term aim is, of course, a Communist world. And their continued resort to threats is demonstrated by the formal military alliance between Soviet Russia and its European satellites and the creation of a unified command under Soviet Marshal Konev for the integrated satellite armies. But the attainment of the long-term aim is dependent on the prior achievement of some more immediate objectives, and it is to these that the Soviets now devote their energies.

These more immediate objectives are, quite obviously, the nullification of the Paris alliance pacts that include Germany and the creation of a neutral belt reaching from Yugoslavia across central Europe to Sweden and Finland. These objectives were frankly disclosed by Foreign Minister Molotov in Vienna when he called on other nations to follow Austria into neutrality. This call is addressed first of all to Germany, which is promised unity and liberation in return and is threatened with continued partition and subjugation of her eastern part if she refuses. But it is also addressed to Marshal Tito, whom the topranking Soviet chiefs propose to visit soon to mend the quarrel that drove Yugoslavia out of the Cominform. Marshal Tito does expound an independent policy which eschews alliances with any blocs, but neither Germany nor Yugoslavia is likely to fall into a Soviet trap which would mean their end.

As for the Austrian treaty itself, it brings Austria not only sovereignty and freedom but also abrogates previous clauses limiting her armaments, endangering the refugees within her borders, and gratuitously charging her with war guilt. It does so at the cost of heavy economic burdens and at the price of severing the Western military front between Germany and Italy. But such as it is, it is a welcome first dividend of the Paris pacts, and there is every reason to assume that continued Western firmness and solidarity will bring even greater results in the future to the benefit of the free world and of peace.

TREATMENT OF ASIA AS A REGION IN THE MUTUAL-SECURITY BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, those of us who are studying the mutual-security bill of this year are naturally interested in the new stress and the special emphasis laid on the Far Eastern area of the world. We are considering especially the question of treating Asia as a region, to be dealt with by itself under a special provision of the bill to provide for the expenditure of certain funds in accordance with the discretion of the President.

Already there have been some conversations in regard to treating Asia as a region, in this connection. Because of the confusion in the minds of many of the people of the country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Asia as a Region," which appeared on May 16 in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIA AS A REGION

Planning for United States aid to Asia on a regional basis has received something of a setback at the just-concluded Simla Conference. The Asian states that would have been the beneficiaries of American help could not agree upon any program in which they could share as parts of a regional whole. Naturally there is disappointment in this country, but it may be well to look the facts

in the face and rid ourselves of some preconceptions.

We think and speak too often of Asia and Asians as if we were dealing with one cohesive part of the world and one unit of its populations. The Simla Conference should have made it plain to us that there are differences, areas of mistrust and antagonism, conflicting views and aims that will make it difficult, if not impossible, to deal with a geographical area as if it were unified in spirit as it is in need. The unity does not yet exist and the Conference made it clear that it is still some considerable way in the future.

This does not mean, however, that the idea of regional planning is unsound. Far from it. The very differences that were expressed at this Asian economic conference make it clearer than ever that the problems posed and the questions raised cannot be solved on a narrow basis.

Several of the Asian states, apparently concerned over the possibility that individual assistance might be lessened if there were any commitment to assistance to all, insisted that all the aid program must continue on a bilateral basis. Their concern is understandable, but their reasoning is sufficiently unsound to be self-defeating in the long run.

It cannot be expected that the United States will continue for an indefinite time to be the illimitable source of American money for all nations that are in need. The whole basis for our economic assistance was set forth, from the beginning, as mutuality of effort. If there is not a "counterpart" in the countries that need and want help our assistance become ineffective.

We earnestly hope that our Asian friends will understand this fact. It will be to their great disadvantage if their inability to make even tentative agreements becomes a weapon in this country that can be used, politically, to defeat an essential part of our foreign-aid program.

Asia, as such, is not a "region." But the idea of having special funds that can be used in multinational projects is thoroughly sound. Congress should approve the earmarking of such funds, and the Asian states should take advantage of them.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the House of Representatives, in approving funds for the international education exchange program, reduced the amount of $22 million, requested by the Department of State, to $12 million. This is a drastic reduction, and is $6½ million below the $18½ million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

This is an important program, and it seems to me it is one for which funds should be increased, rather than decreased.

Unless increased funds are voted by the Senate, we must drastically curtail these worthwhile activities in all parts of the free world, and must eliminate them in 31 out of 75 countries. The plans for 1956 called for an expansion of the program, as recommended by high officials of the executive branch, and supported by several congressional committees, in the Far East, Near East, and Latin America. Not only will the reduction of the appropriation wipe out the possibility of expansion, but it will result in the program being cut below the present level in all three areas. In the Near East, South Asia, and Africa, for example, the program would have to be cut 53 percent below the present level.

One of the most important and effective features of this program is that providing grants to prominent foreign leaders and specialists—in government, labor and management, the press, and other fields—to enable them to come to the United States for observation and to gain practical experience. The program for 1956 proposed to bring 1,284 such persons to the United States. The cut in the appropriation would reduce this number to 221, and would allow no leaders and specialists to come from 31 countries.

The programs for bringing foreign nationals to this country for study, teaching, or teacher-training would also be severely curtailed, and would be completely eliminated in a dozen or more countries. Even the small, but significant, amount of aid we are giving to American-sponsored schools in Latin America, to supplement the salaries of American teachers, and to provide guidance in educational methods, would be cut in half—from $250,00 to $128,250.

Recently, I received from Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of Kansas University at Lawrence, Kans., a letter urging favorable action on the part of the Senate of a proposal to restore the full amount requested by the State Department.

I have also received letters from Dr. James McCain, president of Kansas State College, at Manhattan; and Dr. Rees Hughes, president of the State Teachers College at Pittsburg, Kans., and other leading school men in our State urging the same course.

Dr. Murphy's letter frankly discusses the need for increased appropriations, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, April 26, 1955.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
and
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I find myself writing you on a matter about which I wrote you last year, and from the looks of things I expect you will have to be burdened by an annual letter from me on this matter.

The House of Representatives has reduced the appropriation for the International Education Exchange program from a requested $22 million to $12 million, which is actually a reduction of 6½ million below the 18½ million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

My basic comment must be, "How dumb can we get?" Here is the Russian, trying by every means at his command to get as many of the young potential leaders of southeastern Asia and central Europe to come to Russia for study (and of course indoctrination). These are the newspaper publishers, the scientists, the political leaders, the business leaders, the teachers, of today and tomorrow in vast parts of the world which we desperately hope will follow the real freedom as portrayed by the United States, rather than that of the tyranny of the Russians.

Nearly every day I keep reading the comments of political leaders, educators, and practically every top person, that the issue today is the battle for not the bodies but the minds of men. With our international education program already too tragically small, we nonetheless annually have been bringing to this country the smarter motivated and able young men and women from Europe, the Middle East and Asia. Here with their own eyes and not through a picture of biased press, they can see how our economic and political system really works, that Wall Street is actually no more important than Main Street, and that nowhere in the world does an average citizen have a greater opportunity, etc., etc. Further, they have the opportunity of a professional or technical education in any American institution so that they can return and do a better job for their own people. Subconsciously, for this they must always be grateful to the United States, and more often than not remain basically ever her friend.

What purpose technical assistance to underdeveloped countries if there are no trained natives of that country capable of picking up the ball when our technical missions leave? We spend billions building plants, dams, etc., in all parts of the world—facilities which could easily become part of the arsenal of the Communists if such countries become overrun—and yet we are unwilling to spend a few millions to provide the greatest opportunity to convince the present and the future leaders of these same countries that we are sincere in our desire to help, not to conquer, and that we have a system quite worth emulating, at least within the economic limitations of each country.

Apparently we still can't understand that in this cold war of unlimited duration we need the hearts and minds of the potential leaders around the world. And as I pointed out above, the Russian has fully understood this and has annually geared up his educational exchange program far beyond what we have even contemplated doing.

Everybody seems to feel that these educational exchange programs are among the most important things we do in regard to our foreign policy—at least so the representatives of the NAM, the United States Chambers of Commerce, church groups, labor groups, educational groups, and political groups all say.

And yet apparently either as a result of oversight or just plain lack of understanding, we are willing to cut away, not fat but muscle and blood vessel itself. If we set a budget for ourselves in building our own home, it seems to me that it is unwise to come within that budget by cutting out a part of the foundation or some of the major beams. Rather, we should get along with a little less fancy wallpaper.

I shall not deny that this action last year (which was finally corrected in the Senate) angered me then, as it does now. I have with my own eyes on the campus seen young Indian and Egyptian journalists and scientists change their feeling about America 180° after having been here for 6 or 8 months. I have seen them come to these shores, cynical and questioning, and have seen them leave as enthusiastic friends and supporters of our system. I can only say that if this kind of shortsighted disposition of the available tax dollar continues, the Communist himself could not have hoped for greater good fortune.

I hope you will clearly understand that I am not critical of anyone to whom this letter goes, either in original form or copy. I note that none of our Kansas representation in Congress was on the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee dealing with this matter. I further note that rarely do I bother you gentlemen with an expression of this vigor and intensity. It is not a large amount that is involved, and perhaps to some the issue itself is small, but to me it is a classic example of the kind of

thing meant in the old ditty, "For want of a nail the shoe was lost * * *."

I do hope that these restorations can be made, and would further hope that Congress might understand the crucial desirability of not shrinking but expanding these programs so that this issue of restoration does not become an annual matter.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. MURPHY,
Chancellor.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Commonwealth Club of California in connection with the so-called Bricker amendment. I particularly invite the attention of Senators to the poll which was taken by that organization, showing an overwhelming number of votes in favor of the Bricker amendment.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, May 6, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: You may be interested in a vote just taken by the Commonwealth Club of California on the Bricker amendment and related issues.

Before this poll was taken, the club's section on international relations had made a year's study of the Bricker amendment, hearing speakers from every point of view.

The section's printed report, summarizing all pro and con arguments, was then mailed all members of the Commonwealth Club in all parts of California and a ballot was subsequently submitted to them.

The tabulation of the Commonwealth Club ballot returns is recorded on the attached sheet.

Very truly yours,

STUART R. WARD,
Executive Secretary.

VOTE OF COMMONWEALTH CLUB ON BRICKER AMENDMENT

Ballot of club membership following circulation to all club members of report of international relations section and pro and con report meeting discussion (vote tabulated April 21, 1955).

TREATIES

1. Are existing provisions of the Constitution adequate to prevent abuse of the treaty-making power? Yes, 583; no 509.

2. Do you believe treaties should be able to impair the protections given the people in the first ten amendments? Yes, 61; no, 1,053.

3. Should the Constitution prohibit the Federal Government from entering into international pacts which invade the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution? Yes, 615; no, 475.

4. Do you think the Constitution should have an express provision to the effect that no treaty shall supersede any provision of the Constitution? Yes, 645; no, 469.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

5. Do you believe that treaties are in danger of being supplanted by executive agreements? Yes, 626; no, 490.

6. Do you believe that an executive agreement—

(a) Should prevail over the laws of a State? Yes, 304; no, 806.

(b) Should prevail over Federal laws? Yes, 112; no, 1,001.

7. Do you believe that the power to make executive agreements—

(a) Has been abused in the past? Yes, 796; no, 324.

(b) May be abused in the future? Yes, 808; no, 277.

8. (a) Should the President as director of our foreign affairs have the power to make such an agreement as Yalta? 246; or

(b) Should Congress have the power to regulate it? 131; or

(c) Should such power of the President be subject to approval by the Senate? 728.

9. (a) Should approval by both Houses of Congress be required before the President as Commander-in-Chief may make an agreement bringing hostilities to an end (as in the Japanese surrender)? Yes, 249; no, 782.

(b) Should such power be subject to approval by the Senate only? Yes, 612; no, 351.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

10. (a) Should section 1 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 647; no, 467. (Section 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.)

(b) Should section 2 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 562; no, 512. (Sec. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be vaid in the absence of treaty.)

(c) Should the first sentence of section 3 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 517; no, 575. (Sec. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization.)

(d) should the second sentence of section 3 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 547; no, 518. (All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.)

NINETY-PERCENT PARITY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a Member on this side of the aisle, let me say that I believe the other side will be responsible for whether or not the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on 90-percent parity. The people of my State are very eager to have a vote on this question, even though the bill, if passed by the Senate, should be vetoed by the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have written to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; also a letter which I have written to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas]. I sincerely hope that we may have an opportunity to vote on House bill 12 before the adjournment of Congress.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 16, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committe on Agriculture, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Rightfully or wrongfully, the statement has gone out that the Senate is not going to consider H. R. 12, passed by the House on May 4, 1955, for 90-percent parity.

While I realize that the bill passed the House by only a margin of five, nevertheless, I am stating the views of my constituents in North Dakota—and I believe in the Northwest—when I respectfully ask that under your chairmanship, this bill be reported to the Senate.

Even if the bill is vetoed by President Eisenhower, the people in my State will want to know where the responsibility for not passing this bill—which was promised to the people during the last campaign—may lie.

Thanking you for the many courtesies you have shown me, and hoping that you are well and happy, I am

Sincerely,

MAY 16, 1955.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Majority Leader of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Rightfully or wrongfully, the statement has gone out that the Senate is not going to consider H. R. 12, passed by the House on May 4, 1955, for 90 percent parity.

While I realize that the bill only passed the House by a margin of 5, nevertheless, I am stating the views of my constituents in North Dakota—and I believe in the Northwest—and I respectfully ask that under your leadership of the Democratic majority, that an opportunity will be given the Senators to vote upon this bill.

Today I have written Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, asking that the committee report out the bill for action by the Senate, because even if the bill is vetoed by President Eisenhower, people in my State want to know where the responsibility for not passing this bill—which was promised to the people during the last campaign—may lie.

Thanking you for the many courtesies you have shown me, and hoping that you are well and happy, I am

Sincerely,

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the same connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from Hon. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 16, 1955.*

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We have received the news of your determination to fight for 90-percent support prices for the basic commodities as the most important domestic news of the day. We are in the midst of a very costly advertising program, in addition to our radio, to explain to the farmers the calamitous situation that may confront this country if our support programs fall apart in 1956 and 1957. We are very proud of our Senators from these Central Northwest States. Our continuing farm survey audit discloses the same general character of economic deterioration on the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if our Senators do their utmost that we can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before the wheat referendum of June 25, the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate would, in my judgment, cause irreparable damage to the entire price-support program. The House has approved this legislation and I now believe that, if the Senate approves it, President Eisenhower would not veto it.

Deep appreciation and best regards.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

STATUS OF VISA APPLICATIONS UNDER REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, Expellees, and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a statement submitted by the Department of State on May 6 last relative to the status of visa applications under the refugee relief program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Refugee relief program, status of visa applications, May 6, 1955

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	Far East	Others	Total
1. Applicants notified of documents required	62,744	17,506	1,211	19,307	9,552	2,175	3,970	116,465
2. Visas issued	17,946	4,761	512	1,730	2,298	584	462	28,293
3. Visas refused	1,465	674	25	1,846	853	569	236	5,668
4. Canceled action	543	106	109	876	495	67	247	2,443
5. Applicants still in process	42,790	11,965	565	14,855	5,906	955	3,025	80,061
6. Assurances received by Administrator	5,705	8,874	300	11,291	4,313	2,648	3,607	36,738
7. Assurances verified and sent to field	4,820	7,894	178	10,110	3,999	2,157	2,779	31,937

Assurances received	36,738
Assurances sent to field	31,937
Assurances canceled returned	2,296
Assurances on hand	2,505

NOTE.—All figures cumulative. Items 6 and 7 reflect principal aliens only.

Source: State—FD, Washington, D. C.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO GOOD CITIZENSHIP BY GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, everyone interested in developing an informed and active electorate will rejoice with me, I am sure, at the news that the Girl Scouts are continuing their efforts to train girls in participating citizenship. Word has just reached me that the national Girl Scout organization once more has reminded its 1,340 councils of plans for local get-out-the-vote campaigns, and has urged girls in Scouting to cooperate as aids to voters with the voter education drives of nonpartisan organizations. Initiated in 1952, the Girl Scout aids-to-voters program each year has given hundreds of thousands of girls opportunities to work with adults to bring about as high a level as possible of voter information and activity.

One may ask how in the world little girls can help increase voter interest. Basically, they furnish willing hands and nimble feet to augment the effectiveness of adult volunteers. They influence their families, neighbors, and adult friends. Even 7-year-old Brownies can distribute informational literature, hang reminder tags on doorknobs, obtain pledges to register and vote. And the clever little hands that stuff envelopes for the March of Dimes or the Christmas Seal campaign certainly can contribute the same girl power to a get-out-the-vote drive.

In the aids-to-voters program older Girl Scouts man information centers, demonstrate the use of voting machines, and help adults locate their own voting districts or polling places. They serve as babysitters to release adults for educational activities. On registration, primary, or election day, they set up informal nursery centers where babies and toddlers can be cared for while mothers go to the polling places.

All these very practical contributions to voter information and activity are a part of an overall Girl Scout program whose objective is to help girls grow up to be useful citizens.

The aids-to-voters program is, in addition, a part of a citizenship training program exemplified by such proficiency badges as "Active Citizen," "My Community," "My Country," "My Government," for which more than 100,000 girls, 10 through 13 years old, qualify each year.

These various badges cover a broad range of information important to citizens of all ages—information about the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship, the basic documents of American democracy, the workings of representative government, and the functions of government at local, State, and National levels. The most difficult of them, "My Government," was introduced 2 years ago. When it was brought to my attention at that time, I found myself in hearty agreement with the educators and civic leaders who helped the Girl Scouts outline and develop it, and who felt that the requirements would have been challenging even for an adult.

Even though the "My Government" badge is one of the most difficult ever offered to girls in Scouting, more than 11,000 girls of junior-high-school age have qualified for it in the 2 years since it was introduced. Because it provides, in effect, a postgraduate course in citizenship knowledge and skills, its popularity indicates that we may look forward to growing numbers of girls who, thanks to their Girl Scout training, will reach voting age with an exceptionally broad background of useful information. And since the hope of the future lies in the skill, the knowledge, and the sense of responsibility of our voters, I am happy to bring to the attention of Senators the contribution to the growth of informed citizenship which is being made by the Girl Scout organization.

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for more than the usual 2 minutes, so that I may make a brief statement on Norwegian Independence Day, May 17.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, May 17, 1955, finds millions of Norwegians and persons of Norwegian descent commemorating the 141st anniversary of the declaration of Norway's independence. It was with faith and vision that a small group of men met at Eidsvold on May 17, 1814, to promulgate a constitution which would guide the destinies of their country for generations to come. The dramatic and moving chapters of the story of Norway and its people have left a lasting imprint on world history.

To understand how such a relatively small country could contribute so much to civilization, one must come to recognize the characteristics of its people. They are a reverent people, who recognize man as the creation of God. A driving spirit of independence and love for freedom is a part of all Norwegians. They are highly creative, and inherent in their makeup is a restraint and calm which has tempered their action and thinking.

The United States, within its 48 States, has more than one million people who were either born in Norway or are of Norwegian descent. In Minnesota we have nearly one-fourth of this total. These people began a migration to the United States when 53 immigrants from Stavanger landed in New York Harbor on October 9, 1825. The spirit of Norway was carried by subsequent immigrants who settled in Illinois, moved north into Wisconsin and Iowa, and west to Minnesota and the Dakotas. Next came a major move into Montana and a final path into the great Pacific Northwest, with settlements springing up in Washington and Oregon. Later, California attracted a sizable number, as did Alaska.

These were the people who went into the forests of the North and West and made logging and sawmill operations an exciting era in our history. It was the Norwegians who tilled the soil and built up the farms which provided food and fiber for a growing country.

They used the lumber to build communities which still stand as testimonials to their courage and industry. They also turned to the waters in the development of the shipping and fishing industries.

Underlying all this activity there was a consistent determination on the part of these people to provide for future generations. This was not a selfish exploration of land and resources with no thought for tomorrow. They demonstrated a lesson in living which we will do well to emulate in our day.

As they worked long hours to provide for the necessities of life, so also did they erect schools for their children, churches in which to worship, homes which exemplified family life at its best, and local governments which fostered freedom. Here we find the seeds from which grew the great contributions the

Norwegians have made to the history of the United States.

To call the roll of all who have risen to fame from the ranks of these Norwegian immigrants would fill volumes. But to remind us of this great heritage, let us go through the ranks and demonstrate their contribution by citing a few examples.

Olaf Hoff constructed tunnels under the Detroit and Harlem Rivers. In New York City, the Holland, Lincoln, and Queens Midtown tunnels were built by Ole Singstad. We look across at the Supreme Court Building here in the Nation's Capital and recall that it was built by Gunvald Aus and Kort Merle, who also erected the Woolworth Building in New York.

Today we live in the atom age and realize the impact of science on our lives. Science claims the names of Oswald Veblen, John A. Eisland, Ostein Ore, Merle Tuve, and Lawrence Hafstad. In 1939 Ernest O. Lawrence won a Nobel prize for his invention of the cyclotron.

Just a few short days ago, the entire world woke up one morning to hear of the Salk vaccine to combat polio. Once again the wonders of medical science and research were revealed to us. Norway has given us many famous men in medicine. Dr. Ludwig Hektoen is well recognized in the area of cancer research, while Dr. Alfred Owre gained prominence in dentistry.

One of the greatest contributions has been made in the field of education. A few miles from my farm home in Northfield, Minn., is St. Olaf College, one of the leading Lutheran colleges of the United States. Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; Concordia College at Moorhead, Minn.; Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.; Waldorf College in Iowa and numerous Lutheran parochial schools are living tributes to a people determined to afford educational opportunities for its children.

Norwegian contributions in the field of arts and letters are well known. I think of O. E. Rolvaag, who wrote Giants in the Earth. Dr. F. Melius Christiansen is known the world over for his contribution to music both as a composer and as founder of the world-famous St. Olaf Choir.

The Norwegian Lutheran Church was founded in 1917 and now, as the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, continues to serve the entire Nation by bringing the word of God to its people. L. W. Boe, John Aasgaard, T. F. Gullixson, S. W. Eastvold, Lawrence M. Stavig, C. M. Granskow, and the Preus family are only a few, both past and present, who have dedicated their lives to the church.

Herman Ekern, who founded the Lutheran Brotherhood Life Insurance Co.; publisher Victor F. Lawson; and Eric Sevareid of the Columbia Broadcasting System further illustrate the versatility of the Norwegian people.

The names of Knute Rockne, Sonja Henie, and Torger Tokle will live forever in the field of sports.

Norwegians have been well represented in government on both State and national level down through the years.

The contributions of Norwegians in both World War I and World War II were honorable ones. At Fort Snelling, Minn., in World War II we had a Norse battalion trained as a part of the Ninth Infantry Regiment. They were trained in the rigors of winter combat conditions to help in the liberation of Norway from Nazi rule. Evans Carlson commanded the famous Marine Battalion known as Carlson's Raiders. From Red Wing, Minn., came Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad.

Today, as we recall this history of a great people and their contributions to our life, we look to Norway where the flame of freedom flares brightly after 141 years of independence. Norway, since World War II, has assumed its role of leadership in exploring the frontiers of a new era of tensions, threats of conflict, and hopes for world peace. Norway's contributions to the United Nations and to NATO have been an inspiration to all member countries. From the famous fjord country, from the farms, from the cities, and from her mountains, Norway has justified the faith and vision demonstrated at Eidsvold in 1814. As one who was raised by a Norwegian mother and father, I am thankful for this heritage and proud of this country whose people are dedicated to God, to freedom, to peace, and to the dignity of men.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder why the Senator from Minnesota omitted to mention the name of perhaps one of the greatest Norwegians ever born in the United States of America, Ben Eilson. He was a pioneer in aviation in the United States. He was born in North Dakota and was killed on a mission of mercy in Alaska, flying serum to that Territory. He now lies buried in the soil of North Dakota. As I listened to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, it occurred to me that perhaps with one exception, no greater Norwegian ever lived than Ben Eilson, who was born in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. THYE. When the distinguished Senator from North Dakota brings back to my memory the facts he has stated, I only regret that Mr. Eilson's name was not included among the list of Norwegians to whom I have referred. But I could have read on for most of the afternoon in paying tribute to those of Norwegian origin who have made important and valuable contributions to this country as they blazed trails across the Nation, creating homes and communities which later became incorporated as States of the Union. I could not touch on all of them. That is my only regret. I thank the Senator for calling to my attention the achievements of Mr. Eilson.

THE LATEST RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the latest recommendations of the Hoover Commission task forces would put Government in my State back in the "dark ages" before Teddy Roosevelt rode up San Juan Hill with the Rough Riders.

These recommendations would wipe out the postal savings system, although this is the only banking available to people in very remote rural areas, far from commercial banks.

They would raise parcel-post rates, although men and women in many sections of Oregon are totally reliant on parcel post for delivery of the necessities of life.

They would wipe out post exchanges and military commissaries, although these so-called fringe benefits have been regarded for decades as a part of the retirement pay of thousands of retired servicemen who are trying to exist on comparatively meager military pensions.

They would totally end the philosophy of the United States Government as a service organization, providing many essential benefits for citizens.

These recommendations of the Hoover Commission are a challenge to the Republican Party, for it is up to that party either to repudiate the advice of its only living ex-President or to take the responsibility for limiting governmental services of vital importance to millions of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask that these latest recommendations of the Hoover Commission, as printed in the New York Times of May 16, 1955, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of the Senate and the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER UNIT ASKS GOVERNMENT END 1,000 ENTERPRISES—CITES MILITARY COMMISSARIES, POST EXCHANGES, POSTAL SAVINGS, TVA STUDY

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—The Hoover Commission recommended today that "going out of business" signs be nailed on more than a thousand Government enterprises competing with private business.

And, within a "reasonable time," it said, they ought to be closed or transferred to private hands.

The Commission cited military commissaries and post exchanges, bakeries, meat-cutting houses, clothing factories, dry cleaning plants, laundries and other Federal businesslike ventures.

The Commission urged a gradual end to the Postal Savings System. This had been previously recommended by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury. Deposits in the system, set up in 1910 to serve bankless towns, have declined from a peak of $3,393,000,000 in 1947, to $2,251,000,000 last year.

PARCEL POST RATE RISE

Under the Commission's proposal, depositors would have 5 years to exchange their deposit certificates for United States Savings Bonds or place their savings elsewhere.

The Commission also proposed an increase in parcel-post rates because their failure to cover the full cost of service constitutes a subsidy to parcel-post users and represents unfair competition for private express services.

Moreover, the Commission recommended that the Tennessee Valley Authority end all chemical research. The TVA's fertilizer research functions would be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. And, the Commission suggested, the price of TVA-produced fertilizer should be raised to cover all costs, including the loss of taxes that could be obtained from private industry.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, as

directed by Congress, went beyond the report of the old 1947–49 commission, but did not go as far as had been forecast.

The more limited recommendations of the old commission, also headed by former President Herbert Hoover, were far from embraced in full by the Executive and the Congress. Of its 23 proposals for getting the Government out of business, only 4 were adopted in their entirety. Ten got no approval. The other nine were adopted only in part.

In its report today, the 10th of the current series, the Commission made 22 proposals. It could not estimate what they would save if enacted.

"Far more important than the dollar savings are the beneficial results to our economy from eliminating Government competition to the greatest practicable extent," the Commission declared.

It said unjustified continuance is a definite injury to the vitality of the whole private enterprise system on which our future security and prosperity is based.

TAX LOSS CITED

Except in a few instances, it continued, Government business-type enterprises pay no taxes and pay little or no interest on the capital invested. They seldom charge depreciation and frequently do not include their personnel on their payroll.

They also deprive the Government of taxes that would otherwise be paid by private enterprise if it conducted the operations, the Hoover group added.

The Commission said that the Defense Department alone operated about 2,500 stores, shops, and other businesses with a total capital investment of more than $15 billion.

About 1,000 of these could be eliminated "without injury to our national defense or any essential governmental function," the Commission said.

In addition, it added, probably a few hundred businesses in the civilian branches of Government could be closed in favor of private interests.

Two of the 12 commissioners dissented from the report. James A. Farley, of New York, the former Postmaster General, objected to the proposal calling for an end to all TVA chemical research. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat of California, in a general dissent, objected to the "summary, mechanical, and sometimes arbitrary manner in which the Commission's report would dispose" of Federal activities.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, who frequently has dissented from Commission reports, said the majority had failed to consider that the curtailment of the TVA fertilizer program, for example, might benefit some fertilizer firms but not the farmer.

"An increase in parcel-post rates might benefit the Railway Express Agency but not the businessmen who use parcel post extensively and the consumers who benefit by cheaper rates," he added.

In casting the role of private business, he continued, it is not enough to say "Government enterprise is inherently bad and private enterprise is inherently good."

ADDITIONAL POINTS MADE

In its report, the majority made these additional points:

Congress should appoint a commission to study the effect on the industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in 10 Navy shipyards. The commission should recommend the transfer, where possible, of all such work to private yards.

As many as possible of the 288 large industrial plants in the national military industrial reserve should be sold to private companies. The Government investment in these plants—mostly built in World War II—is about $9 billion and maintenance costs run about $200 million a year.

Despite "minor" competition with private industry, the industrial output of 49 shops in 19 Federal prisons should continue. The question of competition is outweighed by the social importance of occupation, discipline, and rehabilitation afforded by the prison shops.

The Post Office mailbag and lock manufacturing and repair operations be transferred to the Federal Prisons Industries, Inc., the Government enterprise that operates the prison shops.

All military post exchanges and commissaries should be eliminated except those where "adequate or reasonably convenient services are not available." Their prices should be increased to cover all costs; the Department of Defense should enforce penalties against resale of the goods bought at bargain prices; and remaining post exchanges should stop selling jewelry, sporting goods, cameras, and other items of high value.

"The real justification of the continued operation of most these stores," the Commission commented, "is a 'fringe benefit' to the military personnel and their families."

The Government should discontinue, where possible, its aluminum-sweating operations and scrap baling and dispose of the processing plants.

The Defense Department should be commended for its recent efforts to get out of business. While the Commission's report was being prepared the Defense Department, in a constructive move, scheduled the closing of nearly 100 facilities.

The Department of the Interior should study all ways to lease or sell the Federal helium-production plants "and still protect strategic requirements."

Rates of the Alaska Railway should be increased. Its hotels and its other commercial services should be leased or closed down whenever feasible.

The Commission noted that it was keenly aware that its recommendations, if enacted, would mean that "many loyal career Federal employees would lose their jobs."

Similarly, it added, communities where the Federal activities are closed down would suffer economic hardship.

Accordingly, it proposed that in the implementation of its recommendation the Government proceed on a "reasonable time schedule," providing advance notice of its actions and assisting dismissed employees in obtaining other jobs.

The Commission's report, entitled "Business Enterprises," was based on the studies of 4 task forces, or study groups, 2 committees, and 2 subcommittees.

GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP—LETTER FROM FLOYD OFFICER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a constituent of mine in Seneca, Oreg., Mr. Floyd Officer, has symbolized the strange administration power partnership in a fine letter sent to the Pendleton East-Oregonian, and reprinted in the Pacific Northwest Ruralite.

Mr. Officer suggests a lumber partnership with the Government on the same terms that the utility companies seek to take over powerplants at such dam sites as John Day, on the Columbia River.

I myself often have wondered why smaller industries did not seek the same preferential treatment the utility industry tries to get under the administration's power partnership. Why should not farmers seek to claim the advantages which the utilities will get under partnership?

Mr. President, I am curious to know, for example, why the partnership at our powerplants should not be reversed, so that the utilities would get the fish ladders, and the public would get the powerhouses. I wonder whether the Interior Department still would be interested in such a partnership, or would it not interest the power companies, which want the revenues and the kilowatts from the dams on the Columbia, but not the deadweight, such as fish ladders and floodgates?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks the pertinent letter written by Floyd Officer, of Seneca, and published in the Pendleton East-Oregonian and the Northwest Ruralite.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERSHIP IN THE LUMBER BUSINESS

DEAR SIR: After due consideration, I have come to the conclusion that there is nothing wrong with Douglas McKay's power partnership policy. That is, nothing wrong, unless it cannot be extended to other fields of endeavor.

Now I have in mind an excellent plan promulgated along the same lines, except that the Government and I are going in together on a sawmill.

The Government will build the mill, supply the logs, pay for the cost of milling, and other incidentals. All I want is the green chain, which I will build and maintain. I will hire the labor to pull the lumber from the green chain into neat little piles, these little piles of lumber will, of course, be mine. I will also agree to build and maintain roads into the mill on which to haul the loot—whups, I mean lumber, away from the mill. All this expense to me is to be financed by long-time loans from the Government at a low rate of interest.

The big thing about it is that this partnership is to last for only 50 years, after which time the whole operation, green chain and all, will revert back to the Government. All, that is except the roads which will still be mine. The Government can either buy them at my price or pay toll whichever they wish. All I'll get out of the deal is a 50-year practically free supply of lumber. I can't see anything ridiculous about that since the Government will still own the mill.

I am sending out a feeler letter to good ole Doug today, and who knows, within a fortnight, I may be in business with the Government.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD OFFICER.

SENECA, OREG.

DEATH OF FORMER SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the wires have just brought to us the sad news of the passing of former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts at his home near Phoenixville, Pa.

The United Press reports that—

Former United States Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts died today at his home in nearby West Vincent Township.

The 80-year-old "great dissenter" of the High Court had retired from the bench 10 years ago, devoting his time to civic affairs and an occasional appearance in court as an attorney.

Roberts left behind a reputation as an independent and "unpredictable" jurist who frequently cast the deciding vote in 5 to 4 decisions of the high tribunal.

Roberts died at his farm home, Bryncoed, after an illness of 4 months, which left him bedfast.

His wife and his daughter, Elizabeth, were at his bedside when he died.

Roberts died of a heart ailment. Private funeral services will be held Thursday.

Mr. President, Justice Roberts was one of the greatest legal minds of our times. He participated in some of the most important judicial decisions of the past few decades.

It is not often that a man of Justice Roberts' capacity and intellectual ability comes along. When he does, a nation can rejoice.

Justice Roberts was a man of outstanding integrity and unshakable independence of thought. He refused to be bound by narrow customs, and he insisted upon making his decisions in accordance with the great traditions of the American judiciary.

When he retired from the bench 10 years ago, he did not retire from public life. He felt that he had an obligation to his country, an obligation which could be discharged only through service.

He has devoted the past 10 years to civic affairs, and his friends, his neighbors, and the whole country have been enriched by his activities.

His passing leaves an aching void in our national life. But to those of us who knew him and admired him, he will always be with us.

A man of such stature never really dies. His personality and his character are stamped upon the permanent life of our country. And this consolation will forever be with his friends and with the dear ones he has left behind him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I desire to join the distinguished majority leader in expressing deep regret over the passing of former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts.

Justice Roberts was 80 years of age. According to the Associated Press dispatch, he died at his home at Phoenixville, Pa.

Mr. President, Justice Roberts was not only a distinguished jurist whose decisions will be respected over the years for their wisdom and legal content; but during the time when he was a member of the Supreme Court, he always maintained an active interest in the civic and economic problems of the Nation. After retiring from the Supreme Court in 1945, Justice Roberts continued to take an active interest not only in the law, but in political, economic, and world problems of many kinds. He served as dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, where he rendered outstanding service to one of the finest law schools in the Nation.

He was active in his support of efforts of both Democratic and Republican administrations to bring about peace in the world. His support and testimony in behalf of the United Nations, NATO, and other efforts are well known to Members of the Senate.

Justice Roberts was also national chairman of the Atlantic Union Committee, which is one of the outstanding organizations of the Nation. It is composed of many prominent men and women in all stations of our society who have been trying to make a contribution toward an effort which would give us an opportunity to ease international tensions and bring the democratic nations closer together.

Justice Roberts was always interested in young men. He gave generously of his time to various causes; and he will be remembered as one of America's greatest jurists and most outstanding citizens.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill, and concurred therein.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee; and

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical-research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC POWER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for a long time now we have heard rumors about what the Hoover Commission had in mind so far as the future of public power is concerned. The task force, which was stacked against public power in its membership, has been working for many months. Early this month the task force completed its report which embraces some 1,800 typewritten pages, touching on every power and resource development in the country.

This report is a most closely guarded secret. Last Saturday, I understand that Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, a member of the Hoover Commission, tried to get the task force report published, but was overruled. Mr. HOLIFIELD said:

The report is completely one sided, which was all that could be expected from a task force composed entirely of proponents of private power and antagonistic to public power.

I am today dispatching the following telegram to Mr. Hoover:

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,

Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Washington, D. C.:

Urge that your Commission release the task force report on public power and water resources. Reports are that recommendations contained therein are of sweeping variety. Public has vital interest in the recommendations, since public owns these properties involved.

ESTES KEFAUVER.

I have before me an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of last Sunday, by Mr. Edward F. Woods, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER SURVEY ABOUT TO DROP BLOCKBUSTER ON LOW-COST POWER—STACKED REPORT DRAFTED BY STACKED COMMITTEE IS AIMED AT CURBING TVA TYPE OF PUBLIC UTILITY SYSTEMS

(By Edward F. Woods)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—A task force of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has prepared for publication in mid-June a set of recommendations intended to doom low-cost power undertakings, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Post-Dispatch learned today.

The task force report, which is being kept secret until its publication as an official document of the Hoover Commission, will be a blockbuster against TVA and similar projects. It will not advocate outright sale of TVA to private interests but the net effect of its recommendations would be the breakup of TVA and the systems of public-power distribution which TVA represents.

While all members of the Hoover Commission are bound by secrecy against revealing the contents of the task force recommendations, the Post-Dispatch has learned from other sources that, from the standpoint of the public power interests, it is a stacked report by a stacked committee.

CALLED "BIBLE" FOR UTILITIES

The report consists of about 1,800 typewritten pages in its present form. It is said to be the most comprehensive and statistically documented work of its kind ever drafted against public power. It also has been described as a document which will serve the public utilities for at least 20 years as the "bible" for private power lobbyists who wish to see the public projects wind up in the hands of private interests.

The task force, the Post-Dispatch learned, is composed of 26 men, all of whose backgrounds lend themselves to antagonism to the idea of public power at low cost. The task force was selected in September 1953, it was learned, after a bitter fight within the commission, in which former President Herbert Hoover's selections of its personnel prevailed.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD (Democrat), California, who is neither a public power nor private power man, insisted that of the 26 to be named to the task force, at least 2 should be persons who represented the public power point of view so that when the commission got around to evaluating the task force's recommendations it might have the varying viewpoints before it.

HOW COMMISSION DIVIDED

HOLIFIELD's motion, it has been learned, was voted down by 7 to 5. Those on the Commission who favored this fair approach were former Postmaster General James A. Farley, Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican Representative from Ohio, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (Democrat), Arkansas, and HOLIFIELD.

Against the Holifield move were Hoover, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., Arthur S. Flemming, Senator STYLES BRIDGES (Republican), New Hampshire, Robert G. Storey, Sidney A. Mitchell, and Solomon C. Hollister.

Sources close to the Commission say that since the Hoover Commission went back into business in July 1953, the forthcoming attack upon public power has been its main objective.

It was Hoover and Mitchell who handpicked the task force of anti-public-power members. Mitchell is a director of the American Gas & Electric Co. and a private-utility-career man. His father, Sidney Z. Mitchell, organized the electric plants of the Edison Co. and was chairman of the board of the Electric Bond & Share Co.

Electric Bond & Share Co.'s wholly owned subsidiary, Ebasco Services, recently was approved by the Atomic Energy Commission as engineers and construction management contractor for the controversial $107,250,000 Dixon-Yates power project at West Memphis, Ark.

Despite bad management and waste of the taxpayers' money, according to the General Accounting Office, on an AEC project at Joppa, Ill., Ebasco also has been selected for another AEC project at Portsmouth, Ohio.

The fight over personnel of the task force centered on the fact that of the 26 members not 1 was sympathetic to the philosophy of low-cost public power, and none had even had any administrative experience in the field.

Hoover has said publicly he thought TVA should be sold to private utilities. The task force report will fit in with his philosophy.

It is going to be extremely difficult for Hoover to keep the contents of the task force report secret much longer. There will be demands from Congress next week that it be released.

This task force has, since February 1954, spent more than $324,000 and before it is finished its bill will run upwards of $400,000.

The Hoover Commission on the whole, since September 1953, has spent more than $2,500,000 on various studies and is expected to ask for more money from Congress Monday.

There have been frequent demands on Hoover that the reports of the so-called task forces be made public as they are submitted to the Commission so that the Commission might, in drafting its reports, have the benefit of public reaction.

Hoover has turned down these requests with the observation that to publish the task force reports would only stir up controversy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This article reports that the task-force report is a blockbuster against TVA and similar projects. The article continues:

While all members of the Hoover Commission are bound by secrecy against revealing the contents of the task-force recommendations, the Post-Dispatch has learned from other sources that, from the standpoint of the public-power interests, it is a stacked report by a stacked committee.

The Nashville Tennessean, in a copyrighted story this morning, reports that the report recommends that Congress immediately take bids from private industry for the sale or lease of all TVA facilities by private industry except those facilities used by the AEC for its supply of power. The AEC would take over TVA power-producing facilities which it requires. The Commission suggests that local and State governments also be considered if they desire to lease or purchase the TVA facilities. The Corps of Engineers would be required to transfer all of its facilities on the Cumberland River to TVA in order that they might be included in the sale or lease of such facilities.

Mr. President, since February 1954 the task force has spent more than $324,000, and before it is finished its bill will run upward of $400,000. This force was assembled by Mr. Hoover and Sidney A. Mitchell, a director of the American Gas & Electric Co., son of the man who was chairman of the board of Electric Bond & Share Co. Therefore we expected an attack upon all public power. It is regrettable that it cost $400,000 to find out the views of Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Hoover. However, since they have spent that sum, and inasmuch as it is our property that they are here disposing of, we have a right to know what is proposed. I hope the report will be made available immediately.

INTEREST AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE IN CONSERVATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is most refreshing and reassuring to me as a conservationist of long standing, to see the interest in conservation that is now developing among the young people.

In my own State, Boy Scouts, 4–H Clubs, and other youth groups have undertaken extensive conservation projects and have made and are making an impressive contribution to the care and preservation of our lands, forests, and wilderness areas.

One of the outstanding activities of this kind which has come to my attention recently is the publication of a special conservation issue of a monthly newspaper of a small-town elementary school in my State. This publication was issued in March by the Milford Elementary School, under the supervision of Faculty Adviser Curn C. Harvey. To my knowledge, this is the first student newspaper to devote a complete issue to conservation.

This special publication of the Siren received commendation in the current issue of Nature magazine, published by the American Nature Association. A brief review of this article was published in the May 5 issue of the Milford News, a community newspaper.

The Milford Elementary School also had another distinction recently. They solicited an article on Youth's Part in Conservation from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. He complied with their request, and his article will be featured in a supplementary issue of the school newspaper.

However, because of the general interest in this subject among the young people of the country, and because of the possibility that other schools may wish to emulate this pioneering activity by the Milford Elementary School, I request unanimous consent to have Secretary Benson's article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH'S PART IN CONSERVATION

Natural resources, either through their exploitation or wise use, have played a leading part in shaping the history of all mankind. The young people of today have an opportunity to study the most important phase of our history—the history of man; the development of his arts and sciences over the years; his progress from savagery to civilization; his exploitations, travels, and discoveries; his standard of living through the years up to the present time; and his ability to exist, which has been shaped to a large extent by the available land and water resources and his need for additional resources.

Professional conservationists, educators, and scientists are amazed with the progress and contributions to conservation being made by the youth of today. The seeds of conservation are in the classroom, the church, schoolgrounds, the fields, the forests, streams, camps, and all other areas where youth groups assemble. In these days of crowded classrooms the teachers are not disposed to enlarge the curriculum. Fortunately, the best interest of conservation is not served by squeezing in a course labeled "conservation." The growing number of conservation-minded teachers recognize that the many-sided subject lends itself to treatment of conservation in some degree in all existing courses from simple reading and drawing exercises to the highly technical scientific subjects. Young people love it, and that is being demonstrated in the classrooms all over America today.

All youth groups have come to realize that we can no longer afford the luxury of waste. They have come to know that conservation of soil, water, grasslands, forests, wildlife, and minerals is not something that should interest only farmers, ranchers, timber owners, miners, and sportsmen.

Conservation is an integral part of the National 4–H Club program. During 1953 nearly 254,000 boys and girls received specific training in soil and water conservation. More than 196,000 club members received training in forestry.

During the same year 30 States conducted organized land appreciation schools and land, pasture, and range judging contests. It was estimated that more than 150,000 boys and girls participated in these soil projects.

Last year 49 percent of the 371,000 members of Future Farmers of America participated in the National Awards Program on Soil and Water Management, which is sponsored by the FFA Foundation. Awards were made to 4,850 FFA chapters throughout the country. In Alabama alone, FFA boys planted more than 1 million tree seedlings. During the same year more than 100,000 boys participated in the FFA National Speaking contest. More than 20 percent of these boys selected "conservation" as their topic.

During the past few years hundreds of conservation-minded organizations and groups have sponsored conservation contests and field days of one kind or another for youth groups. A good example of this is the annual national essay contest sponsored by the National Grange and the American Plant Food Council. Last year approximately 25,000 boys and girls participated in the contest, the topic of which was "Building Fertility."

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four was proclaimed "Boy Scout Conservation Good Turn Year" by President Eisenhower, honorary president of BSA. It is estimated that approximately 1 million scouts participated in conservation projects of one kind or another in soil, water, wildlife, and forestry. It is truly amazing the number of conservation activities that were accomplished by the scouts during the year. During scout week—February 6–12 of this year—I had the pleasure of presenting certificates to the 12 regional achievement award winners here in Washington.

This wide interest of young people in conservation is both stimulating and encouraging. We must continue and, where possible, enlarge the opportunities for furtherance of this interest.

We must also create a recognition that our resources are to be used to produce the materials to make the lives of our people possible and satisfying and to contribute toward a spiritual awareness of the Creator's boun-

tiful blessing. To this end we must use these resources wisely, and this is the real purpose of conservation, so that future generations shall share in the Creator's great bounty.

Our use is transitory. Our use must not destroy. It must satisfy our needs and, at the same time, enhance our great natural resources so that future generations may find satisfaction equal to ours from these great national assets.

Mr. WATKINS. I also wish to commend the students and faculty of the Milford Elementary School and all young people and youth groups everywhere who are taking such an active interest in the subject of conservation. Youth has a real stake in the conservation of our soil, water, and other natural resources, and I am extremely gratified that young people in my State are taking a leading part in this burgeoning interest and activity in that important field.

In connection with the statement I have just made, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the Nature magazine article, published in the Milford News of May 5, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURE MAGAZINE LAUDS SIREN CONSERVATION ISSUE

Nature magazine, published by the American Nature Association at Washington, D. C., has an article in the May issue, just off the press, praising the Milford Siren for the special number for March on conservation.

The article points to the special edition of the Siren as "an outstanding example of what boys and girls in grade schools can do to help with conservation, and especially to make people of their communities conscious of conservation needs."

It suggests that other schools would find editions of their papers on this theme valuable.

"Pupils in Milford Elementary School who worked on the articles, who made drawings to illustrate it, as well as those who participate in the activities described, proved themselves to be real conservationists," the articles states.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Baltimore Sun, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it for not more than 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none. The article will be printed in the RECORD, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

The article ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

EISENHOWER O. K.'S PLAN ON VACCINE—VOLUNTARY DISTRIBUTION SETUP DEFENDED BY MRS. HOBBY

(By John Van Camp)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—President Eisenhower this morning approved a voluntary plan for the distribution of Salk antipolio vaccine, and early in the afternoon Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, author of the plan, appeared before a Senate committee to defend it.

The 11-point voluntary plan carries with it a $28 million appropriation to make sure no child goes without Salk shots because of his parents' inability to pay.

The plan also calls for additional appropriations to expand research, testing and policing by the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

CHALLENGES CRITICS

Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been accused of having no plan at all for distribution of the antipolio vaccine.

With her jaw jutting and her back stiff as a ramrod, she challenged critics on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to show her a federalized control system that would work as well or as fast as her proposals.

She was back up by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who said the Government already has all the laws it needs and that new laws could do nothing to speed up production of the vaccine.

One new medical fact was brought out when Senator IVES, Republican, of New York, asked if Salk shots would be administered during the height of the polio season—August and September.

HELD NOT YET RESOLVED

Dr. Scheele said that was a medical question not yet resolved.

It is still expected that enough vaccine will be available within the next 60 to 90 days to give second shots to the Nation's first- and second-graders and to the "polio pioneers," those children who took dummy shots in the great experiment last year.

There are 9 million children in this group, and completing their inoculations will require 18 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. So far 7,362,000 cubic centimeters have been released.

Not all of this, however, has been "reappraised" and given a second approval. The withdrawal of the vaccine made by the Cutter Laboratories, of California, and the subsequent moratorium on use of the vaccine for a double check at the manufacturing plants are the two factors causing the delay.

FINAL TARGET NOTED

The final target is inoculation of all persons in the 1-to-19 age group and all pregnant women. There are 59 million in these groups. Dr. Scheele said that under present conditions they all will not get their shots until late fall or early winter.

These are the 11 planks in the voluntary program which Mrs. Hobby recommended to President Eisenhower, and which he adopted:

1. The Public Health Service must have every facility, including additional funds and staff, to insure maximum precautions in continued testing of the vaccine for safety and potency.

2. The dedication of the first 18 million cubic centimeters of vaccine to the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis for free immunization of first- and second- graders and "pioneers" must be honored.

3. For the time being, vaccine must go only to the most susceptible group in the population—children between 5 and 9. Further priorities will be announced by the National Advisory Committee on Allocation of the Vaccine.

4. Mrs. Hobby will direct the allocation of vaccine among the States, on the basis of age groups. The manufacturers have pledged to observe these allocations.

5. The supply will be allocated among the States until all children in the 5-to-9 group are inoculated. Manufacturers will make reports to Mrs. Hobby on their shipments.

6. Each State will assume responsibility for distribution within its borders and will decide what portion goes to public agencies and what portion to the private medical profession.

ASKS POLICING FUNDS

7. Additional funds must be given to the Food and Drug Administration for policing to make sure supplies do not get outside authorized channels of distribution for prescription drugs.

8. Medical associations will be urged to take steps to assure that each physician gives shots only to children in the priority age groups and that he keeps a record of the child's name, the age, date of vaccination, manufacturer of the vaccine, and lot number of the vaccine.

9. That the drug system—from manufacturer to corner druggist—insure that every transaction involving Salk vaccine is recorded and that the record includes the name of the manufacturer, the lot number, and the person or agency making the purchase.

10. Action by Congress to appropriate $28 million for grants to the States for the purchase of the vaccine for indigent children.

NAMING OF SPECIAL GROUP

11. Appointment of a special congressional committee to study methods of assisting other nations to get needed supplies of Salk vaccine.

It is expected that after the 5–9 age group is inoculated, the Advisory Committee on Vaccine Allocation will issue new recommendations.

These are the other age groups, in the descending order of susceptibility: 1 to 4; 10 to 14; 15 to 19; 20 to 45.

At the base, as a representative of the Department said, the program rests "on the faith that the medical profession will give the vaccine to the 15-to-19 age group first."

POWER OF STATES QUESTIONED

Senator HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, and Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, questioned the power of the States to control the allocation of the vaccine between private physicians and public agencies.

Mrs. Hobby answered that governors did not seem to have any hesitation about their powers to control distribution within the States.

LEHMAN wanted to know why Mrs. Hobby had waited until after April 12—when the results of last summer's experiment was announced—to start formulating a plan for distribution.

Mrs. Hobby said the Salk vaccine was "unique in medical history * * * no one could have foreseen the public demand."

FOUNDATION LAID PLANS

The Polio Foundation, however, in October of last year laid its plans for inoculating first- and second-graders. Its contracts with the manufacturers, according to Mrs. Hobby's report to the President, helped underwrite the risk involved in keeping facilities and staff intact while waiting for the evaluation of the experiment.

Mrs. Hobby, in her reports to the President and the Senate committee, said the voluntary plan was based on these four principles:

1. Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION

2. The vaccine must be distributed on an equitable basis among the States and among individuals within the States.

3. Children should be able to receive the vaccine regardless of the ability of their parents to pay.

4. Any distribution system adopted must be as practical, fast, and effective as is possible while still meeting the foregoing principles.

Mrs. Hobby said that a poll of 51 governors of States and Territories taken last week showed that 43 believed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should stand

responsible for vaccine allocation. Six governors objected, and two did not comment, she said.

Already, Mrs. Hobby added, 29 States have established advisory committees to deal with allocation of vaccine within the States.

REACTION IS MIXED

The Hobby voluntary plan for the control of Salk vaccine met with a mixed reaction. Democrats were in general critical and Republicans receptive.

Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, thought it would only add to the "confusion," while Senator SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, complimented Mrs. Hobby on her program.

Representative SPENCE, Democrat, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said he would not have final comment until he studied the report further. But he said it was his feeling that strict Federal controls, of a mandatory nature, still were needed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read a paragraph or two from the article and then make a brief statement.

Speaking of Mrs. Hobby's testimony, the article says:

Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been accused of having no plan at all for distribution of the antipolio vaccine.

With her jaw jutting and her back stiff as a ramrod, she challenged critics on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to show her a federalized control system that would work as well or as fast as her proposals.

She was backed up by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who said that Government already has all the laws it needs and that new laws could do nothing to speed up production of the vaccine.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am not at all impressed with the efforts of Mrs. Hobby to bullhead through and alibi her horrendous mistake in connection with her handling of the polio vaccine problem. I am not at all impressed with her record in this matter; and that statement goes for Dr. Scheele, too.

Both of them months ago knew that the vaccine was about to be made available, but neither of them did anything to protect the boys and girls and the parents of this country by seeing to it that the vaccine was thoroughly tested before being released to the public. They left that matter up to the drug companies. The public was entitled to have a very careful testing check placed on the drug companies by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, they knew for months that there would be a shortage of the vaccine. Now they are trying to alibi their way out of the mistake they made by proposing an administrative monstrosity, whereby the vaccine would be made available and distributed on the basis of 48 distinct setups. They are opposed to a Federal law to cover the distribution of the vaccine. The fact is a Federal law would have protected the boys and girls of the United States from the damage which has been done to some of them because the vaccine got into the stream of commerce without being tested.

Meat is tested and inspected more carefully in the big packing plants than Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Scheele permitted the polio vaccine to be tested by the Federal Government. If they did not have sufficient personnel to provide for testing the vaccine, they had the power to prevent its release until the testing had been consummated. The soundness of my criticism that the vaccine should have been tested by the Federal Government batch by batch before it was released by the drug companies is borne out by the fact that after defective vaccine was discovered on the market a stop order had to be issued.

If Secretary Hobby wants to know of a better plan, let me tell her of the introduction on April 14 of the Morse bill, which would have brought the vaccine under Federal control until an adequate supply was available for all the boys and girls of the United States.

The distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] sometime later introduced a similar bill.

That is my answer to Secretary Hobby.

She emitted from her lips yesterday in her testimony before a Senate committee not one word which justifies the horrendous mistake she has made. She and Dr. Scheele will have much to answer for to the parents of the children of this country for allowing this mistake to be made. What Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Scheele ought to be required to do is to visit the hospital rooms of the boys and girls who have contracted this horrible disease, largely, I think, because the Federal public health authorities did not test the vaccine, or see to it that it was tested, before it was released.

That is my answer to Secretary Hobby. She has not met the problem calling for a fair distribution of the vaccine by the kind of administrative monstrosity she proposed yesterday. What ought to be done is to bring the limited supply of vaccine under complete Federal control until an ample supply is available for all the people of the United States.

Furthermore, with respect to Mrs. Hobby's proposal to make the vaccine available without cost to those who are unable to pay, let us not forget that the vaccine was developed from the March of Dimes drives over the years. It ought to be made available free, irrespective of ability to pay, to all the children of the country. All of us who are adults have a great interest in our boys and girls. They represent the greatest asset our Nation possesses.

I think this is a Federal public-health problem which ought to be handled by Federal public authorities. The inoculations, when the vaccine is declared to be safe, should be made available free to every American boy and girl. However, each batch of the vaccine should be double-checked by the Federal authorities before it is released.

I again refer Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Scheele to the Morse bill or the Ives bill. I think they are just as sound today as when we introduced them. Nothing Secretary Hobby said yesterday, in my judgment, justifies the kind of administrative monstrosity she proposes. She deserves severe public censure.

Mr. BENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was on the floor of the Senate during the most unfortunate comment by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] regarding the President of the United States, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General of the United States.

If the American people will read the report made to the President by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the committee hearings of yesterday before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am sure they will get a wholly different view and form a different estimate of the work done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with the Salk vaccine program.

Certainly, the Department has been on its toes, and certainly it has been aware of the problem. The Department knows what to do, and it is doing it. The Department is protecting the people of the United States, particularly the children, in handling a difficult situation in the most intelligent and professional way any such situation has ever been handled.

I am sure the medical profession, along with the Department, deserves the greatest credit for its wholesome treatment of the subject and for meeting its responsibilities.

Mrs. Hobby distinguished herself as a great stateswoman and as a fine leader by the manner in which she answered questions and presented the facts.

Certainly the matter should be handled by the States, instead of by the Federal Government. The administration of the Selective Service Act works extremely well through a system of cooperation between the Federal Government and the various States. Whenever a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has any problem in any State, the first person he contacts is the State director of health.

To establish a new bureaucracy, necessitating the hiring of a great many employees, to handle the problem would be expensive and needless. To deal with matters affecting the health of the Nation we already have at work a fine system which operates through the cooperation of the various States with the Department.

All questions involving the Salk vaccine are being handled in an intelligent and proper manner for the protection of all the people.

I suggest to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that he read the report and the hearings before the committee yesterday. All Senators present at the hearings, both Democrats and Republicans, almost without exception were very well satisfied, in my opinion, with the report made by the distinguished member of the Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby.

(At this point Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained unanimous consent that, following the discussion of the subject of Salk vaccine the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Adminstration Appropriations, action on which appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial printed in a newspaper published in the State of Ohio. The editorial is my reply

to the Senator from Ohio. I suggest that he read it. The editorial was published in the Trainman News of May 16, 1955. It is entitled "Send Hobby to Hubby."

In the course of the editorial the editor states:

For several months, the Government has known that the Salk formula was going to be successful. It also knew that for some time after its release, the vaccine would be in short supply. And it should have known that along with the great strengths of the free enterprise system, there are some weaknesses, among them being that sometimes profiteering and favoritism retard fair distribution of commodities in short supply. And it should also have known that production of a medicine, particularly a new, long yearned for and relatively untried one, requires more than normal precaution in manufacture.

In the face of this, the Government indifferently let matters rock along, unguided, uncounseled, until the present disgraceful situation resulted.

The blame for this must fall more heavily on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and its head, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, than on any other department of the Government, since it was close to the vaccine development from the beginning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in full be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEND HOBBY TO HUBBY

The temporary halting of the Salk vaccine program was the only course possible after the Government's shocking failure to provide an orderly procedure for the antipolio serum's safe manufacture and fair and fast distribution.

While the serum and the methods of production are being rechecked, Congress should enact legislation rigidly controlling the manufacture and distribution of the vaccine, finally giving us the protection which the Government should have already provided.

Congress should also find out why the administration did not take steps long before the public announcement of the vaccine's success to protect the people.

As it stands now, the people have considerably more confidence in the probable effectiveness of the Salk vaccine than in the ability of the present administration to see that it is safely manufactured and fairly and quickly distributed.

This is unfortunate, but what other conclusion can be drawn from the monstrous muddling and confusion which has marked the Government's handling of the antipolio program so far?

For several months, the Government has known that the Salk formula was going to be successful. It also knew that for some time after its release the vaccine would be in short supply. And it should have known that along with the great strengths of the free-enterprise system, there are some weaknesses, among them being that sometimes profiteering and favoritism retard fair distribution of commodities in short supply. And it should have also known that production of a medicine, particularly a new, long yearned for and relatively untried one, required more than normal precaution in manufacture.

In the face of this, the Government indifferently let matters rock along, unguided, uncounseled, until the present disgraceful situation resulted.

The blame for this must fall more heavily on the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and its head, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, than on any other Department of the Government, since it was close to the vaccine development from the beginning.

If President Eisenhower wants to restore public confidence in the antipolio program, he should immediately call for the kind of regulation an effective program needs and fire the lady Cabinet member who failed to give him or the people the kind of advice that is expected of all public officials, especially those concerned with the people's health, welfare, and education.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully but solemnly that in my judgment Secretary Hobby has been guilty of bad administration, which borders on immorality, so far as living up to her moral responsibilities as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is concerned. As I said before, what she ought to be required to do is to visit the children who have become the victims of polio, because, in my opinion, of the gross incompetency of which she and Dr. Scheele were guilty in not seeing to it that the vaccine was tested before it ever was used to inoculate American children. As I said the other day, I speak as a parent, who knows what it means to have polio strike one's home. Fortunately, our case proved to be a mild one, but the anxiety was terrific. I have some idea what parents whose children are suffering from the affects of impure vaccine must think of Mrs. Hobby's bungling. In my opinion, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, ought to be removed from office today for her gross incompetency in the handling of this matter.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is quite wrong if he thinks the Secretary has unanimously convinced members of the Senate Labor Committee. I have talked to some members of the committee, and they have briefed me on their criticism of Mrs. Hobby's unconvincing alibi. Her effort to alibi her mistake in the bullheaded manner she has followed does not relieve her of the charge of incompetency. The Federal Government should take over the supply of vaccine and distribute it until such time as there is an adequate quantity for the needs of all the children of America. This is about as glaring an example of how a Secretary of a Government department should not act as I have ever seen in the administration of our Government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report to the President by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ON DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE, MAY 16, 1955

INTRODUCTION

On April 14, 1955, the President directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to survey and report to him on the best means of assuring an equitable distribution of the Salk polio vaccine. This directive resulted from the great significance to the Nation and to the world of the announcement at Ann Arbor, Mich., on April 12, 1955, of the success of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine which was field tested during the summer and fall of 1954, and licensed for commercial production on April 12, 1955.

In making this survey and report we have received the greatest possible cooperation from scientists, technical experts, representatives of the health and medical professions, the pharmaceutical industry, and of health, welfare and public interest organizations.

This report deals almost entirely with the problems of equitable distribution of the vaccine. It deals only in summary form with the technical and scientific problems relating to preparation, production in quantity and testing of the vaccine. A more detailed report by the Surgeon General on the technical and scientific problems will follow.

The principles that guided us in our study of the situation, and in our actions to date, are:

1. Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration; and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.

2. The vaccine must be distributed on an equitable basis among the States and among individuals within the States.

3. Children should be able to receive the vaccine regardless of the ability of their parents to pay.

4. Any distribution system adopted must be as practical, fast, and effective as is possible while still meeting the foregoing principles.

Since the first official action of this Department with respect to the vaccine was the licensing of the manufacturers on April 12, 1955, a brief summary of the background of the licensing process is set forth below.[1]

I. LICENSING THE MANUFACTURERS

Under the biologics control provisions of the Public Health Service Act, Salk vaccine, because it is a biologic product, cannot lawfully be imported, exported or shipped between States for sale unless it has been propagated or manufactured at an establishment holding a license issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Biologic products are defined as medicinal preparations made from living organisms and their products, and include serums, vaccines, antigens, and antitoxins.

The Secretary acts upon recommendation of the Surgeon General, who, in turn, bases his decisions on the findings of the Laboratory of Biologics Control of the National Institutes of Health, the research arm of the Public Health Service.

The purpose of the law and of the licensing procedure is to insure the purity, potency, and safety of biologics manufactured and distributed in interstate commerce and those which are imported or exported.

Under the law, before a manufacturer undertakes production of a biologic product, his plant and equipment are inspected by the Laboratory of Biologics Control and the personnel involved in its production are interviewed on their backgrounds and competence.

The laboratory, thereafter, if it deems necessary, may review individual lots of the product. The method by which this is accomplished is as follows:

Such review consists of checking what are known as protocols. These protocols are extensive reports sumarizing and precisely detailing all events in manufacture and results of all tests made by the manufacturer during the production process. If, in the judgment of the laboratory, there are insufficient data, further information may be required. The laboratory may require that, in addition to protocols, samples of the material be submitted for laboratory analysis and study. If the protocols contain all essential data, and, in the judgment of the

[1] See appendix No. 1 for events concerning the preparation and testing of the vaccine after Apr. 12.

laboratory, give satisfactory evidence of compliance with the standards to assure the purity, potency and safety of the product, no further action is taken.

During the field trials of the Salk vaccine in the spring and fall of 1954, the manufacturers, Dr. Jonas Salk, and the Laboratory of Biologics Control separately tested each lot of the vaccine. The manufacturing standards and the testing procedures used were developed jointly by Dr. Salk, the manufacturers, an advisory committee of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and experts of the Laboratory of Biologics Control. The laboratory collaborated in developing these procedures and acquired many months of experience in testing under circumstances that permitted comparison and assessment of the performance of the several laboratories.

The six manufacturers that are now licensed for poliomyelitis vaccine have produced biologics for many years. The Laboratory of Biologics Control is familiar with the scientific qualifications of personnel of these manufacturers, their methods and standards of manufacturing, and the physical layout of their plants.

In addition, the field tests conducted during 1954 provided the widest possible experience, unique in the history of testing new drugs, concerning the safety of the vaccine used. These field trials consisted of a systematic testing of the effectiveness of the vaccine among some 400,000 first and second grade school children in scattered localities. This was the largest field test of a new biologic product in history. These results were evaluated under the direction of Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., chairman of the department of epidemiology at the University of Michigan School of Public Health. These results, announced on April 12, 1955, proved the vaccine prevented from 60 percent to 90 percent of the cases of paralytic poliomyelitis which might otherwise have occurred among these children. In addition, the study clearly showed the safety of the material used in the field trials.

On the basis of this solid knowledge of the vaccine, the Director of the Laboratory of Biologics Control, on April 12, 1955, with the concurrence of a group of eminent scientific advisers, recommended to the Surgeon General, and the Surgeon General recommended to the Secretary, the licensing of six manufacturers: Cutter Laboratories, Berkeley, Calif.; Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.; Parke-Davis & Co., Detroit, Mich.; Pitman-Moore Co., Zionsville, Ind.; Sharpe & Dohme, Philadelphia, Pa.; and Wyeth Laboratories, Inc., Marietta, Pa. The Secretary, with whom the Surgeon General had previously discussed the proposed licensing, signed the licenses on the same day.

II. SUMMARY OUTLINE OF EVENTS FOLLOWING LICENSING OF PRODUCTION

The following is a brief summary of events since April 12, 1955, concerning the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On April 14, the President directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to survey and report to him on the best means of assuring equitable distribution of the vaccine.

On the same day, a senior member of the Department met with the presidents of 5 producing companies, and the executive vice president of the sixth firm, to discuss supply and distribution problems and the proposed meetings on April 21–22.

On April 20, a scientific meeting was held at the National Institutes of Health with technical representatives of the manufacturers to review technical problems in manufacturing and testing.

On April 21, interviews with individual manufacturers brought out essential facts about present and estimated future production of the vaccine. (The manufacturers have reported that, since this date, they have sold no vaccine in commercial channels.)

On April 22, a scientific and technical meeting called by the Secretary was attended by 25 groups and organizations representing the health and medical professions, the pharmaceutical and drug industries, and other professional groups. Among the recommendations that came out of the meeting was the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine to serve during the next few months. The Secretary, on the same day, recommended to the President and received approval for the appointment of such a committee.

On April 26, a telegram was addressed to the governors of all States and Territories requesting their help in distributing the vaccine equitably.

On April 27, a meeting of some 50 national organizations broadly representative of the public interest was held to provide them with current information about the availability of the vaccine and to obtain their views on the questions of supply and distribution.

On the same day, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, in response to reports of six cases of poliomyelitis among children who had been vaccinated with material from the Cutter Laboratories of Berkeley, Calif., instructed that manufacturer to withdraw all of its vaccine from distribution.

On the same day, two scientists were dispatched from the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda to Berkeley, Calif., to conduct an on-the-scene study of the manufacturing and testing of the Cutter product.[2]

On April 28, the Surgeon General directed the establishment of a Poliomyelitis Surveillance Unit within the Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga., to maintain day-by-day information on the occurrence of poliomyelitis.

On April 29–30, a committee of 11 scientific advisers met with the staff of the National Institutes of Health to review the situation with respect to the Cutter vaccine, and to recommend specific steps in the investigation of that problem.

On May 2, the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine had its first meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs and adviser to the President on poliomyelitis.

On May 3, the Secretary and the Surgeon General presented an up-to-the-minute resumé of the poliomyelitis vaccine situation at the Governors' Conference. On the same day an advisory committee of governors was named to work with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on problems of vaccine distribution.

On May 5–6, a special committee of experts met at the National Institutes of Health to advise on testing procedures with respect to safety of poliomyelitis vaccine.

On May 7, the Surgeon General issued a bulletin recommending that States and municipalities postpone their vaccination programs until Public Health Service recommendations could be released on Sunday, May 8.

On May 8, the Surgeon General recommended that all poliomyelitis vaccination programs be temporarily suspended pending a reappraisal of all production procedures and testing methods.

On May 9, a meeting was held between the Secretary and three members of the advisory committee of governors to obtain their suggestions regarding recommendations to be contained in this report.

[2] A summary of technical and scientific problems in this connection is contained in appendix 1.

On May 11, the first field review following the Surgeon General's action of May 8 was begun at Parke-Davis & Co., in Detroit.

On May 13, the Public Health Service announced the release of virtually all of the Parke-Davis & Co. vaccine that had been reappraised.

On May 15, the Public Health Service announced the release of all Eli Lilly & Co. vaccine that had been reappraised.

III. SUPPLY

Throughout the history of the development of new vaccines and other modern drugs, there have been a variety of production problems at the start. Large-scale production of a new biologic product presents initial technical problems which can only be solved through experience.

A. Production problems

Why cannot the production of this new vaccine be speeded up? The answer lies in the fact that the problems inherent in the production of Salk vaccine are among the most complex in the field of large-scale biologic preparations.

1. Limited Number of Manufacturers

There are at present six licensed manufacturers of the Salk vaccine, the product of one of which has been recalled. These were the only companies that the NFIP could interest in entering the field to produce vaccine for use in the large-scale field trial of the vaccine in 1954.

Only two manufacturers produced quantities early enough and in sufficient volume to be used in the field trials. The expense of tooling up for the production of such large quantities of Salk vaccine was guaranteed in part by the NFIP. All six manufacturers also contributed substantial risk capital for the development of plant capacity. Inasmuch as the outcome of the field investigation during 1954 could not be predicted there was little inducement for other manufacturers to engage in producing the vaccine, and no others applied for licenses.

2. Expansion of Production Capacity

Discussions with the manufacturers indicate that with the present techniques used in the manufacture of poliomyelitis vaccine, each now is or soon will be operating at maximum capacity. In addition, it was announced by one of the manufacturers on May 11, 1955, that construction will begin immediately to double the company's production of the vaccine. It is estimated that such construction will take 4 months.

The possibility of encouraging other manufacturers to enter the field has been considered. The time needed for tooling up and acquiring know-how for the production of the vaccine would probably require 9 to 12 months, or possibly longer. Consequently any such move would have no effect on the vaccine supply for the current year.

An accurate estimate of the vaccine supply at any future date is impeded by the complexity of the biological and chemical processes on which manufacture is dependent, by the intermediate testing procedures by which each step in manufacture is regulated, and by the final quality control tests that each lot of vaccine must meet. The processing may offer technical problems at any point with a consequent effect on the yield of finished product. From beginning to end the cycle of manufacture requires at least 90 days, so that any delay or failure of a particular lot may have a significant effect on the supply at any given time.

B. Supply estimates

1. Prior to April 12, 1955

On March 29, 1955, initial contact was made with the manufacturers about production estimates if the field trials showed the vaccine to be effective. Rough estimates

were submitted to the Department by each manufacturer on April 5.

2. For April 22, 1955, Meeting

As a result of the favorable report on effectiveness of the vaccine, arrangements were made on April 15 for obtaining production estimates for presentation at the scientific and technical conference on April 22. The estimates announced at the meeting were later revised, and, as of April 28, new cumulative production estimates were made.

3. As of May 3, 1955

Subsequently, there was another revision of the estimates, as of May 3. It is important to emphasize that all these estimates are subject to a variety of factors which might necessitate either upward or downward revisions. Biologics are subject to fluctuations in production because of the sensitive nature of operations involved. The production schedules assume each finished batch will successfully pass the necessary tests. Failure of any batch, therefore, cuts production schedules. Further, the production of vaccine by the manufacturer, as of any given date as shown in his estimates, assumes that the stated quantity will be checked out and released for clinical use by the Laboratory of Biologics Control. Data furnished by industry as of May 3 on estimated production indicated that there would be enough vaccine by July 1 to make possible two inoculations for all children in the particularly susceptible age group 5 to 9, inclusive. Estimates of production as of that date indicated that, if no delays developed, approximately 58 million cc. might be available (including NFIP contract material) or enough vaccine to provide two injections for approximately 29 million persons, through July 31, 1955. This represents roughly 94 percent of the children age 1 to 9 inclusive, the most susceptible age groups. Data on the estimated supply of vaccine as of May 3 indicated that production was expected to increase steadily to a cumulative total of at least 120 million cc. produced by January 1, 1956. This is equivalent to vaccine for two injections of close to 60 million persons. This does not take into account the additional supply that will be produced as the result of the planned plant expansion reported on May 11, 1955.

On the basis of recommendations made by the scientific advisors who met April 29–30, 1955, further detailed consideration has been given to the problem of safety in producing the vaccine in large quantities. As a result of recommendations made by the expert committee on May 5–6, and the action of May 8, new techniques may be developed in the manufacturing process. It is not possible, therefore, to provide a reestimate of projected production at this time, and no attempt has been made to revise the last estimates prepared on May 3, 1955.

In any event it appears that the period of greatest shortage would fall between now and August 1, 1955. However, as has already been noted, these projections must be reappraised in the light of later developments and their effect on delivery dates.

C. Distribution to date

1. National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis

(a) NFIP contracts

Dr. Salk and his associates began to work on a poliomyelitis vaccine with the financial support of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, during 1951. In early 1953, Dr. Salk began his own clinical trials.

In early 1953, the NFIP met with approximately 10 manufacturers experienced in producing biologic preparations. The purpose was to determine who would be willing to participate in the large-scale production of the Salk vaccine. In late 1953, the NFIP made agreements for the production of enough vaccine for large-scale field trials to be instituted early in 1954. The foundation underwrote the cost of this material.

In October 1954, the foundation announced that contracts were being negotiated for enough material to inoculate 9 million children. A primary purpose of the foundation's contracts was to provide some financial assistance, so that industry would keep its technical staff and production facilities active and in readiness if field trials indicated that the vaccine was effective. The decision to use this material for children in the first and second grades was reached after consultation with a committee of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association and other epidemiologists and health experts. The foundation first agreed to purchase all vaccine produced through June 30, 1955, up to 27 million cubic centimeters. It has since announced that it will purchase 18 million cubic centimeters, enough for two shots for all first and second grade children, and in addition, for all participants in the field trials who received placebo injections (dummy shots).

(b) NFIP contract fulfillment

The NFIP present purchase goal is for the delivery of 18 million cubic centimeters of Salk vaccine during 1955. As of May 6, according to information furnished to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by the NFIP, manufacturers had shipped 7,361,690 cubic centimeters, on NFIP contracts.

The withdrawal of Cutter vaccine on April 27 upset the NFIP timetable. The foundation now holds options under which other manufacturers will provide sufficient quantities of the vaccine to take care of the foundation's program.

2. General Sale

At the time of the purchase agreements announced by the foundation in October 1954, it was thought production would be sufficient to permit concurrent production of some vaccine for general sale. Consequently, by April 12, 1955, a small supply had been prepared for other than foundation use, packaged in individual doses, and labeled for general sale. Information furnished individually by the manufacturers indicates that after April 13, this small quantity, approximately 650,000 cubic centimeters, packaged in individual dose containers was distributed by three companies for general sale. This was the basis for reports of sale of vaccine or administration by physicians to their private patients.

Four companies relabeled material they had packaged for commercial distribution and provided it to NFIP when the need for additional vaccine became apparent. Each manufacturer has informed the Department that no vaccine has been delivered to anybody, except on the NFIP contract, since April 21, and that no vaccine will be delivered in commercial channels until the NFIP's first and second grade vaccination program has been completed.

The assembly of information having to do with the production and distribution of Salk vaccine has been facilitated by the extremely cooperative relationship that has existed between the Department and representatives of six firms. Each manufacturer individually has exhibited complete willingness to give confidential information with respect to current production and future estimates. Each manufacturer has also made clear his willingness to cooperate in a plan for distribution of the vaccine on an equitable basis among the States.

IV. CONSULTATION AS TO DISTRIBUTION

A. Meetings with outside representatives, April 22 and 27, 1955

Immediately following the President's directive of April 14, 1955, the Secretary invited representatives of the medical and health professions, the pharmaceutical industry, and others to a technical and scientific meeting in Washington on April 22, 1955. (Appendix 2 is a list of organizations and representatives in attendance at the meeting on April 22.)

On April 27, 1955, a meeting called by the Secretary was held with representatives of approximately 50 national organizations representing the consumer public. The purpose was to present the findings of the April 22 technical and scientific meeting and to obtain from those who attended a full expression of their views about allocation and equitable distribution of the vaccine. (Appendix 3 lists the organizations represented at the meeting on April 27.)

The essence of the discussions at the technical-scientific group meeting on April 22 and the meeting of representatives of citizens groups on April 27 is:

1. There will be a continuing need for expert, technical assessment of the vaccination program. This continuing evaluation should be made by a committee appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service from the leaders in poliomyelitis research and control.

2. Definite age-group priorities for vaccination should be set for the guidance of the general public, health officials, practicing physicians, and the drug trade. Wide circulation of the agreed-upon priority schedule would be in the public interest, and is, in fact, essential to a national utilization of vaccine while it remains in short supply. The most effective mechanism for determining the priority schedule would be a national advisory committee appointed at the highest possible level of Government.

3. The equitable distribution of vaccine should be assured.

All children within the priority age-groups should have an opportunity to be vaccinated.

B. Organization and first meeting of National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine

The membership of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine was announced by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on April 27. The membership of the committee includes:

Chairman: Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Members: Dr. Philip S. Barba, American Academy of Pediatrics, 5919 Green Street, Germantown, Pa.; Dr. Daniel Bergsma, State commissioner of health, State department of health, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, executive secretary, American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Frank W. Moudry, National Association of Retail Druggists, 5th and St. Peter, St. Paul, Minnesota; Mr. Basil O'Connor, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Malcolm Phelps, American Academy of General Practice, El Reno, Okla.; Dr. Julian P. Price, trustee of American Medical Association, 117 W. Cheves Street, Florence, S. C.; Dr. George M. Uhl, health officer, city health department, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Charles L. Williams, National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers Association, 1200 NW 6th Avenue, Miami, Fla.

The committee first met on May 2 and discussed thoroughly the current status of supply and distribution of the vaccine. A review was made of (1) the epidemiological considerations in poliomyelitis; (2) the activities of the laboratory of biologics control; (3) the present data on the vaccine supply and requirements; (4) population and distribution by age groups and by States; (5) State programs for poliomyelitis vaccination.

The committee discussed thoroughly the question of commercial sale, emergency supply and reserve, and equitable distribution. The committee's first recommendation was that the supplies of Salk vaccine be distributed on a State-by-State basis, and that the total supply for the next 2 months (that is, until July 1) be limited to children aged 5 through 9. The complete recommendations made at this meeting are included in appendix No. 4.

C. Consultation with States

A telegram was addressed to the governors of all States and Territories on April 26, 1955, requesting each of them to name an individual or State agency to serve as primary point of contact in connection with the activities on allocation. This action was taken in anticipation of the need for an organized system for the distribution of vaccine which was to be the subject of the aforementioned meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

At the afternoon meeting of the Governors' Conference on May 3, an up-to-the-minute résumé of the Salk vaccine situation was presented by the Secretary. There was a discussion of the current supply situation (based on May 3 telephonic reports by the manufacturers), and the problems of equitable distribution of the vaccine, including the areas of Federal and States responsibility.

Following the meeting with the governors, an Advisory Committee on Salk Vaccine was named as follows: Gov. Frank J. Clement (Tennessee), chairman; Gov. J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Maryland; and Gov. Robert B. Meyner, New Jersey.

This committee is to work closely with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on problems of vaccine distribution, and will serve as liaison with the governors of all the States.

A wire to all governors was sent out by the Council of State Governments the evening of May 4 asking these questions:

1. Do you think that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should assume responsibility for equitable allocation of available poliomyelitis vaccine among the States on the basis of child population within the critical age groups and other relevant factors?

2. What agency or department in your State will cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in advising it as to how to have the States' allocation of vaccine shipped within the State? That is, how much should go into normal commercial channels, and how much in other channels such as tax-supported agencies?

(NOTE.—This was in effect a follow-up of the earlier telegram of April 26.)

As of May 12 replies to the telegram on May 4, mentioned above, had been received from 51 governors, of whom 43 replied that they believed the Department should assume responsibility for allocation among States of vaccine supplies. Nine of these answers were qualified in some way. In general, the qualifications were that the Department act with the advice of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine or some other group, or that allocation by the Department was advisable only if there is no other way to insure equitable distribution. Six governors indicated that they did not think the Department should assume such responsibility, and two made no commitment on the question.

Forty-nine governors said that the State health officer or State health department would be the effective agent to work with the Department, six of them in cooperation with a State advisory group. In one State the State advisory committee would be the cooperating agency. One governor did not answer this question. There are now State advisory committees dealing with Salk vaccine in 29 States.

On May 9 three members of the Governors' Advisory Committee on Salk Vaccine met with the Secretary and other senior officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At this meeting the broad outlines of the recommendations to be included later in this report were discussed; and the committee agreed to poll the governors of all the States with respect to certain questions. The governors present at the meeting indicated their general approval of the plans being framed by the Department.

D. State plans for vaccination

State health departments are presently concentrating on carrying out the recommendations of NFIP for administering the vaccine to children in the first and second grades.

States have expanded substantially their plans for using the vaccine. By May 13, 1955, 25 State health departments either had extended or were contemplating extension of their programs to provide free vaccine to other than first and second graders. By that date, 12 State legislatures had already made special appropriations for extending the vaccination programs, and 13 others were considering additional appropriations. Six additional States are using other available funds to purchase vaccine.

E. The Congress

While at a hearing before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on April 13, 1955, the impact of the Francis report of the previous day was discussed. At that time the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service stated that the Service was already in touch with the president of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association to discuss the possibility of having a conference of members of the medical profession and various other groups to discuss the number of technical questions which had arisen in connection with the best plan for utilization of the available vaccine supply.

Members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and representatives of the committee staffs attended the meeting with representatives of the health and medical professions and the pharmaceutical industry on April 22.

At hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 27, representatives of the Public Health Service told the Committee about the problem with Cutter vaccine. The possible need for additional funds for testing, research, and epidemic intelligence was discussed. The Committee said it wanted to facilitate this work and asked to be told of specific additional requirements as soon as they were formulated.

A variety of bills has been introduced into the Senate and the House dealing with various aspects of the poliomyelitis vaccine program. Essentially, these bills provide (1) for a commission to plan and carry out the distribution of the vaccine; (2) for an extension of the authority of the President or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish rules and regulations for the control and distribution of the product; or (3) for financing purchase of the vaccine for free distribution.

Representatives of the Department attended an informal meeting with the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on May 4 to discuss the entire problem of allocation and distribution of poliomyelitis vaccine. On May 6, and again on May 13, the House Banking and Currency Committee conducted an open hearing at which the principal witness was the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

V. ANALYSIS OF DISTRIBUTION PROBLEM

Because of the limited supply of vaccine, it is apparent that not all children can be immunized by the end of the summer 1955. Hence, it is imperative that an equitable priority system be established and adhered to during this period of limited supply.

We believe that the basic elements of an equitable and sound priority and distribution system during the shortage period are these:

1. Responsibility in a single agency at the national level to direct the division among States of the entire output of the manufacturers, in accordance with an overall plan.

2. A technical advisory body to that agency, which will recommend priorities on the basis of age groups and other epidemiological factors.

3. Responsibility in a single agency at the State level to direct the intra-State distribution of the vaccine made available to each State, under the plan recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

4. Assurance that the vaccine shipped into a State in normal drug distribution channels will remain in those channels, and will be sold at the retail level only to licensed physicians or on their prescriptions.

5. Adherence by all licensed physicians within a State to the priorities and distribution plan established for that State.

6. Sufficient public or privately raised funds to assure that no child will be denied opportunity for immunization by reason of the cost of vaccination.

The distribution system, established by the NFIP, under which the vaccine is distributed free, has, in effect, embodied the foregoing six basic elements (except No. 4, which is inapplicable, since the vaccine did not flow through commercial channels). The pertinent aspects of the NFIP system are as follows:

1. Essentially the entire initial output of vaccine was pledged to fulfill the contracts which had been made between NFIP and the manufacturers. The NFIP program to vaccinate first- and second-grade children therefore became, in effect a national allocation plan.

2. NFIP had a technical advisory committee which recommended age group and geographical priorities on the basis of epidemiological factors.

3. NFIP dealt with State health officers who, with assistance from NFIP, effectuated the intra-State distribution to first- and second-grade children.

4. The physicians who administered the inoculations with NFIP vaccine gave it only to first and second graders, in accordance with the national plan.

5. The cost of the vaccine and distribution costs were met with NFIP funds. Physicians and others donated their services in connection with administration of vaccinations.

As soon as the NFIP free distribution program has been completed, another national distribution plan must be ready to go into immediate effect. Such a plan is set forth below, constructed on the six basic elements already described. The required mechanics of the plan are, in large part, already in operation.

1. Single national agency to allocate entire output of vaccine among States

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by virtue of its status, as the principal Federal agency dealing with health matters, should, we believe, properly continue to assume responsibility for establishing a national allocation plan which assures each State its fair share of the total output of the vaccine. The great majority of Governors of the several States have expressed their agreement with this proposal. On April 22, each manufacturer individually pledged his company to ship vaccine only in accordance with a voluntary-allocation program, recommended by a national advisory committee and adopted by the Secretary.

This voluntary commitment is a key factor in the entire supply and distribution picture

which has been generally overlooked. It enables the Secretary to allocate the available supply of vaccine in accordance with a formula developed by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine. Since April 21, 1955, no vaccine has been shipped into commercial channels; it is being delivered solely to complete the NFIP contracts.

No legislation is necessary to carry out the allocation among States described above.

2. Advisory Committee to recommend priorities

As described above under part IV of this report, a National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine was established on April 27, and it held its first meeting on May 2.

The National Advisory Committee has recommended a first priority age group of 5–9, without variation for geographical or other factors.

3. Agencies at the State level to direct intra-State distribution

In their responses to telegrams addressed to them on May 4 by the Council of State Governors, the Governors of the States have indicated generally their willingness and desire to accept responsibility for intra-State distribution of any allocation to their respective States. In almost all cases, they have designated the State health officer to carry out that responsibility.

The State officials—the Governor and his designee, such as the State health officer—can direct and carry out a distribution plan within any State far more effectively than could Federal officials set up within each State to do the same job. The time required to establish a Federal organization, with the difficult problems of recruiting and assigning personnel, would result in prolonged delay in getting the vaccine to the children.

4. Assurance of sales in authorized channels and on prescription

The usual laws applicable to the distribution and sale of prescription drugs are applicable to the distribution and sale of the Salk vaccine.

Under the terms of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, section 503 (b) (1), the Salk vaccine may be lawfully sold only to a licensed physician or on the prescription of a licensed physician. Penalties are provided for unauthorized sales—up to a $1,000 fine and 1 year in prison ($10,000 and 3 years for second offense).

In addition, other sections of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provide sanctions which help to assure that in the distribution channels above the level of retail sales—that is, during the course of the flow of the shipments from the manufacturers through the wholesalers and to the retail druggists—the vaccine will not get into illegitimate channels of trade.

Under section 502 (f) (1) of the act, a drug is deemed to be "misbranded" unless its labeling bears adequate directions for use. The vaccine, as a prescription drug, would be subject to seizure, under the provisions of section 304, if it were found in the possession of a person[3] not regularly and lawfully engaged in the manufacture, transportation, storage, or wholesale distribution of prescription drugs. Furthermore, the person making a sale to such an unauthorized person would be causing a "misbranding" and subject to the same penalties mentioned above.

Thus, existing Federal laws provide adequate sanctions against unauthorized sales of such portions of the vaccine as may be distributed through normal commercial channels within the State. Furthermore, State laws relating to distribution and sale of drugs generally provide similar protection.

5. Adherence by licensed physicians to priority plans

The American Medical Association and other medical groups have pledged their full support in carrying out a voluntary distribution and priority system. The establishment of definite age group priorities will help the practicing physician determine which of his patients may be immunized first. Medical societies will back up these priorities, and help to make them widely known and understood. The physicians of America can be counted on to adhere to a priority plan.

6. Funds to assure that no child will be denied immunization by reason of the cost of vaccination

Many steps have been taken by State legislatures, local public bodies, voluntary organizations, groups of doctors, and other groups of citizens, to assure free vaccination of all children, including those whose parents might not be able to afford it.

To supplement these steps and in order to carry out your expressed desire, Mr. President, that no child be denied immunization by reason of the financial inability of his parents, we recommend Federal funds for grants to States. These grants would provide for purchase of vaccine to be used after completion of the NFIP free distribution program. These funds must be sufficient to pay the cost of vaccine for children in low-income families.

Conclusion: In conclusion, we are convinced that the most effective and equitable distribution of the vaccine will be accomplished through the voluntary cooperation of all concerned, within the framework of existing law, for the following reasons:

First, there are only six manufacturers, each of whom has agreed to dedicate his total output in accordance with an overall plan of division among States developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Since April 21 the manufacturers have shipped no vaccine in normal drug distribution channels.

Second, the governors of the States and the State health officers can guide the intrastate allocation of the vaccine.

Third, a well regulated and established channel of distribution already exists, into which the vaccine not purchased for public agencies may flow. All vaccine in commercial channels is subject to a body of food and drug laws, built up over many years, relating to prescription drugs.

Fourth, the problems of fair allocation are minimized by the facts that (a) the priority consumers of the vaccine at any given time are a clearly and easily identifiable group—children within a specified age bracket, and (b) within the priority consumer group, there is no demand for more vaccine per individual than that needed for the single series of vaccinations.

Fifth, only a voluntary plan utilizing existing organizational machinery can be mobilized quickly enough to be effective during a brief period of shortage.

Sixth, all groups involved in the distribution flow, including the organized medical profession, have pledged their full cooperation in making a voluntary control plan effective.

On the basis of these conclusions, we make the recommendations which appear below.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

In making these recommendations, we emphasize that the safety of the vaccine must always be the first consideration. Distribution must be secondary to safety. The safety of the vaccine released for use will continue to be the responsibility of the Public Health Service under the biologics control provisions of the Public Health Service Act, and is receiving the constant and diligent attention of the Public Health Service.

Recommendation No. 1. Resources of the Public Health Service

That, with safety the paramount consideration, the Public Health Service must have every facility, including necessary additional funds and personnel, to insure maximum precautions in continued testing of the vaccine for safety and potency.

Recommendation No. 2. National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis free immunization program

That all current distribution be directed toward fulfillment, at the earliest possible date, of the NFIP contracts and the free immunization program for first and second graders.

(NOTE.—Recommendations Nos. 3 through 11 outline an equitable distribution plan, based on age group priorities, to become effective as soon as the NFIP free distribution program is completed.)

Recommendation No. 3. Priorities

That, in accordance with the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine, the vaccine should be administered for the time being only to children of the most susceptible age group, 5–9, inclusive.

Further priorities should be announced from time to time on the basis of recommendations of the National Advisory Committee.

Recommendation No. 4. Departmental responsibility

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare direct on a national level the division among the States of the entire output of Salk vaccine, as pledged by the manufacturers.

Recommendation No. 5. Plan of allocation among the States

That the supplies of vaccine be allocated to each State on the basis of its population of children within the 5 through 9 age group until all children of that age group have been vaccinated. The Secretary will receive continuing reports from the manufacturers as to their total output and deliveries, and will keep the individual manufacturers advised of the quantities of vaccine they should ship to each State to assure fair allocation.

Recommendation No. 6. State responsibility

That each State, through an appropriate single agency to be designated by the Governor of the State, direct the distribution of the vaccine within the State. The State agency should advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the desired shipment of the State's allocation—for example, that portion which should be distributed through normal drug-distribution channels and that portion which should be shipped to public agencies.

Recommendation No. 7. Enforcement of Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and State laws

That, in order to give special attention to vigorous enforcement of those portions of the food and drug law prohibiting sales of the vaccine outside authorized channels for prescription drugs, additional funds be requested for Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is further recommended that State and local officials give special emphasis to the enforcement of applicable State laws relating to prescription drugs.

Recommendation No. 8. Adherence to priority plan by physicians, record keeping

That, with the cooperation of the medical profession pledged to insure the success of

[3] Other than in the possession of "a retail, hospital, or clinic pharmacy, or a public health agency," where to be dispensed on prescription.

a voluntary control plan, medical organizations take all appropriate steps to assure that:

(a) physicians will administer vaccinations only to, and issue prescriptions only for, children within the priority-age groups;

(b) physicians will, in accordance with the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine, keep a record of the name of each child receiving a vaccination, the age of the child, date of vaccination, site of vaccination (place on body), name of the manufacturer of the vaccine used, and the lot number.

Recommendation No. 9. Record keeping by distributors

That manufacturers, pharmaceutical organizations, wholesale and retail drug organizations and States and other public agencies, whose cooperation to make a voluntary control plan work has also been pledged, take necessary steps to assure that every distributor of the vaccine keep a record of the name of the manufacturer, the lot number, and the customer receiving the vaccine he handles.

Recommendation No. 10. Federal funds for grants to States

That legislation which has been prepared by this Department be submitted to the Congress to make Federal funds available to the States for the purchase of vaccine (or in lieu of funds, the vaccine itself). These funds must be sufficient to pay the cost of vaccine for children through age 19 in low-income families. The funds would be used after the NFIP free immunization program has been completed and until December 31, 1956. These funds would be paid to States upon assurance by the State that no child within the priority age groups would be denied vaccinations by reason of the cost.

Recommendation No. 11. International supply

That you designate a special committee to further study methods for assisting other nations of the world.

This voluntary control program, supplemented by existing law relating to drug distribution and Federal leadership and funds provides an immediately available system of distribution. Under this program, the vaccine will be distributed equitably and administered in accordance with scientifically established age priorities. It will get the vaccine to the children who need it most with the greatest speed, fairness, and effectiveness.

We will continuously review the progress of the total national program for distribution of the vaccine. A supplemental report will be submitted to you on or about July 1. In the event there should be any situation, either prior to or at that time, threatening the successful operation of the distribution program, which would warrant requesting additional legislation, we shall promptly recommend necessary action.

Respectfully submitted.

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

APPENDIX 1

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC PROBLEMS

While the technical and scientific problems relating to the vaccine which have developed since April 12 will be treated in detail in the report of the Surgeon General, a brief summary is set forth below.

During the working hours of Tuesday, April 26, a report came to the Director of the Laboratory of Biologics Control that four children had developed paralytic poliomyelitis following injection of vaccine produced by the Cutter Laboratories, of Berkeley, Calif.

During the night of April 26 and the morning hours of April 27, the reports on the four children were confirmed and two other cases were reported and confirmed.

Shortly before noon, acting upon the recommendation of the National Institutes of Health, the Surgeon General directed that the Cutter product be immediately withdrawn. This decision was immediately communicated to State health officers and made public.

On April 27 it was decided to call an immediate meeting of technical advisors to review the situation presented by the vaccine of the Cutter Laboratories. Two representatives of the National Institutes of Health were dispatched to Berkeley by plane to conduct an on-the-spot investigation at the laboratory.

On April 29–30 a committee of 11 scientific advisors met with the staff of the National Institutes of Health to consider the problem. The committee included:

Dr. David Bodian, Johns Hopkins University, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Polio Laboratory.

Dr. John Enders, head, Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, Harvard University Medical School.

Dr. Thomas F. Francis, Jr., University of Michigan School of Public Health.

Dr. W. McD. Hammon, head, Department of Epidemiology and Microbiology, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health.

Dr. Edward Lennette, California State Health Department, director, Viral and Rickettsial Disease Laboratory, California.

Dr. Ford McGinnes, medical consultant, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Dr. H. J. Shaughnessy, director of laboratories, Illinois Department of Public Health.

Dr. John R. Paul, professor, preventive medicine, Yale University Medical School.

Dr. Albert Sabin, fellow-in-charge, infectious disease division, Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Cincinnati Department of Pediatrics, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk, University of Pittsburgh, Virus Research Laboratory.

Dr. Joseph Smadel, chief, Department of Virus and Rickettsial Diseases, Army Medical Service Graduate School, Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

This committee considered possible explanations for the occurrence of paralytic poliomyelitis following administration of vaccine. Three possible explanations were proposed: (1) coincidence; (2) the provoking effect of an injection given while virus was in the blood stream as a result of natural infection; and (3) presence of a virulent virus in the injected vaccine. A number of studies was recommended in an attempt to determine which of these alternative explanations is correct.

The committee expressed the belief that continuance of vaccination with products of other manufacturers was warranted as of April 30, 1955. It suggested that a small technical committee be appointed to study and make recommendations concerning the minimum requirements for production of poliomyelitis vaccine to determine whether additional safeguards are possible.

The membership of this subcommittee was made up of:

Dr. H. J. Shaughnessy, chairman; deputy director of laboratories, Illinois Department of Public Health, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John Enders, associate professor of bacteriology and immunology, Department of Bacteriology, Harvard University Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk, research professor of bacteriology and director, virus research laboratory, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dr. David Bodian, associate professor of epidemiology, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Joseph Smadel, Chief, Department of Virus and Rickettsial Diseases, Army Medical Service Graduate School, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Thomas F. Francis, professor of epidemiology and chairman, Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

All of these doctors are experts in poliomyelitis, and represent the outstanding technical competence available to study and evaluate the problems associated with poliomyelitis vaccination.

On May 5 and 6 this subcommittee met with scientific personnel of the National Institutes of Health. They were joined on May 6 by technical representatives of industry. On Saturday, May 7, in view of the fact that a number of States was scheduled to conduct vaccination programs over the weekend and there was insufficient time to evaluate the committee's findings, the Surgeon General told State health officers that the Service recommended that they await a report to be made May 8.

The following statement with respect to the poliomyelitis vaccination program was issued on May 8, 1955, by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SURGEON GENERAL'S STATEMENT

"I know that the American people are concerned over recent developments with respect to the nationwide poliomyelitis vaccination program.

"As Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, my primary responsibility is to assure that our Nation's health is protected and that we make continuing progress against disease.

"In this capacity, I want first and foremost to assure the parents of children who have received an injection of poliomyelitis vaccine this spring that in the very best judgment of the Public Health Service they have no cause for alarm.

"Yesterday, May 7, I recommended that vaccinations immediately scheduled be postponed pending this report.

"This action was taken because several States are now in the midst of or are about to start inoculation programs. Since the final evaluation by a fact-finding group which has been consulting with us on the cumulative experience in the manufacture and testing of the Salk vaccine had not been completed, it seemed the wisest—and the safest—course to advise the health authorities of the Nation of this fact.

"What are the facts?

"Over 5 million children have been vaccinated with Salk vaccine thus far this year. To date there have been 50 confirmed cases of paralytic poliomyelitis and 2 cases of nonparalytic poliomyelitis among these children. Forty-four of them followed injection with vaccine produced by the Cutter Laboratories prior to its withdrawal from distribution on April 27.

"It must be remembered that last year nearly half a million children received Salk vaccine without any indication that it was hazardous. It must be remembered also that except for the unfortunate occurrences in California and Idaho there have been only sporadic cases in which poliomyelitis occurred within a short time after vaccination.

"The incidence of paralytic poliomyelitis among vaccinated children, other than those who received the Cutter vaccine, has been only 1 in almost 700,000. This corresponds to the expected natural occurrence of poliomyelitis in the United States among these children at this time of the year.

"So, simply in statistical terms, there is every reason to believe the product of the other manufacturers is safe.

"The five manufacturers whose vaccine has been used to date are: Cutter Laboratories, Eli Lilly & Co., Parke Davis & Co., Pitman-Moore Co., and Wyeth Laboratories, Inc.

"On April 27, after six cases of paralytic polio appeared among children inoculated with vaccine produced by the Cutter Labora-

tories, I directed the withdrawal of all lots of vaccine which had been distributed by that company pending a careful examination of their manufacturing processes.

"The steps taken were as follows:

"The Public Health Service immediately initiated a thorough check at the Cutter plant itself. We started extensive laboratory tests of samples of the vaccine itself. We organized a nationwide network of scientists, epidemiologists, and laboratories to collect and interpret significant data on every case of paralytic polio among these children and others of both the vaccinated and the unvaccinated population. This provides us with continued and quick intelligence on all cases of poliomyelitis reported to the Service.

"In addition, a group of the country's outstanding experts in poliomyelitis virology and epidemiology was immediately called to Washington to advise the Public Health Service on the interpretation of all data flowing in from the sources indicated above.

"This advisory group has included Dr. John Enders of Harvard, recent Nobel prize winner; Dr. John Paul of Yale, noted virologist and epidemiolgist; Dr. Albert Sabin of Cincinnati, expert in virus diseases; Dr. Thomas Francis, whose recent report confirmed the efficacy of the Salk vaccine; Dr. Joseph Smadel, Army research specialist in virology and epidemiology; Dr. David Bodian, outstanding neuropathologist from Johns Hopkins; Dr. Jonas Salk, famed for the development of the vaccine now in use; Dr. Edward Lennette, Director of Laboratories of the California Department of Public Health, who brought first-hand reports from the California Department of Public Health; and Dr. Howard Shaughnessy, Chief of Laboratories of the Illinois State Department of Health.

"These men have been consulting with the Public Health Service almost continuously since April 28. They have studied the complex data from all sources, giving particular emphasis to the manufacturing and testing processes.

"The last of these meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine composed of Drs. Bodian, Enders, Francis, Salk, Shaughnessy and Smadel took place on May 5 and May 6.

"It was in order to make sure that their recommendations could be given the most careful consideration by scientific personnel of the Public Health Service, that early on May 7 I recommended that inoculation programs be suspended.

"That study has now been completed and the position of the Public Health Service is as follows:

"1. A detailed reappraisal of each lot of vaccine already prepared or in the final stages of production is being undertaken immediately by the Laboratory of Biologics Control, with suitable consultants.

"2. For the present, all vaccinations should continue to be postponed.

"3. As the reappraisal proceeds, vaccine will be cleared for use on a lot-by-lot basis.

"The reviews will proceed on a manufacturer-by-manufacturer basis, taking them in the order of their entrance into production—i. e., Parke-Davis, Eli Lilly, Wyeth, Pitman-Moore, and Sharp and Dohme. It is hoped that this process will result in a return of vaccine to availability beginning in the latter part of the current week. This program of action has been discussed with industry, and the Public Health Service has its assurances of full cooperation and support.

"The undertaking of such a review—and the slight delay in mass immunization—does not arise from lack of confidence on the part of the Public Health Service in the fundamental safety of the Salk vaccine that has been used to date, or will be available in the future.

"On the other hand, a great deal of new information has been developed during the past 10 days as the result of continuing consultation between the Public Health Service and its consultants, and between these groups and the senior technicians of industry. It is only prudent to make the total industrial experience available to each separate manufacturer for use as a background in the review of past production and present processes—particularly in the interest of affording additional factors of safety in their distributed product. The manufacturers have indicated their desire to have this additional information and assistance.

"The reason for the association between administration of the Cutter vaccine and the few cases of poliomyelitis that have developed after its administration has not been determined. The association is so definite, however, that until the precise cause is found the vaccine produced by this laboratory will remain suspended.

"During the period of consideration by the Public Health Service consultants and the deliberations of our staff which has been under way, certain important facts have emerged.

"The vaccine is so prepared that the amount of residual infectious virus is below a level that is detectable by laboratory tests made in tissue culture and in monkeys or is expected to be harmful to man. In this respect, this vaccine is similar to other vaccines prepared in a similar way.

"I want to make this point absolutely clear. The vaccine has been called a 'killed' vaccine because of the theoretical total inactivation of virus particles with respect to their ability to cause disease in man—a fact which is borne out by the safety record among the 5 million American children who have received one or more injections of the Salk vaccine.

"We have derived valuable data from the manufacturers themselves. They have brought to us honestly and fully the sum total of their manufacturing experience and their professional skill. They—since the very beginning of the polio vaccine program—have acted with complete integrity and foresight. Our inquiry has revealed that they have, in many instances, gone far beyond the normal requirements of the pharmaceutical industry in checking existing procedures and making improvements as new information became available to them. To no small extent, the speed and efficiency with which we have been able to review an exceedingly complex situation is due to the aid of the senior professional staff of the manufacturers.

"We have been guided, too, by a continuing flow of detailed information on cases which has been supplied by the Poliomyelitis Surveillance Unit of the Public Health Service's Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga. State and local health officers are cooperating fully with this unit. At the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., the staff has also been working on assessing the technical and scientific data which have been accumulating.

"I want to enumerate now some of the facts which we have considered in relation to medical and public-health practices of long standing.

"1. Although the first injection of this vaccine confers a degree of immunity, the full value of the immunization process is not achieved until all three shots have been given. Thus, it is quite possible for polio to be contracted after the first or second injection without indicating that the vaccine is unsafe or ineffective.

"2. The Francis report on April 12 demonstrated that the experimental vaccine administered in last year's field trials was 60–90 percent effective, and that it is less effective against type I (which is the most prevalent type) than it was against types II and III. The difference was due to the effect of a particular preservative. This has now been corrected. The vaccine cannot be expected to prevent all polio. Dr. Salk is continuing work to improve the vaccine's effectiveness.

"3. Few important medical techniques are ever 100-percent safe. When a doctor gives an injection of penicillin, performs a tonsillectomy, or vaccinates against smallpox, there is always a possibility that something may go wrong. A physician's work consists in large measure of making decisions in which he weighs the benefits and the possible drawbacks, however small, in a given course of action. When, in his judgment, the values outweigh the possible hazards, he acts accordingly.

"The division on use of the poliomyelitis vaccine is based on such a series of calculations and judgments.

"Public health physicians are specialists in the practice of public health. They must exercise broad responsibility for the health of the American people. They thus share the responsibilities of physicians in private practice. Public health physicians, by and large, do not make decisions in matters of individual medical practice. Physicians are the best guardians of every individual's health and will at all times base their judgments on the soundest technical information available at the time. Health science is never static. Knowledge increases with passage of time and medical and health practice changes and improves in pace. But there has never been a time when medical and public health have been in important conflict.

"The Public Health Service, is discharging its responsibilities under this concept, is acting on the conclusions which have emerged from our study which, in our judgment, will guide and influence progressive improvements in production and testing of poliomyelitis vaccine.

"It is evident that the decision of the Service will cause some delay in making the vaccine available to the American people. I know that they will fully understand and appreciate the reasons for this decision which has been taken in their interest and on behalf of the children of the Nation. There will in time be ample safe vaccine for all who need it and wish it.

"In summary, may I say that the Salk vaccine has had careful and thorough development over a long period of time. It has emerged, as the culmination of the work of dedicated men and of the historic achievement of one of them, Dr. Jonas Salk. His achievement is a milestone of medical progress. It promises significant reduction in the occurrence of paralytic poliomyelitis.

"The Public Health Service has every faith that, within the ever-narrowing limits of human fallibility, that the Salk vaccine is safe and effective."

The first of such reviews was begun on May 11 and concluded on May 13 at the Parke-Davis plant in Detroit, Mich., with a team of Public Health Service scientists, headed by Dr. William Workman, chief of the Laboratory of Biologics Control, and including an outside consultant.

APPENDIX 2

ATTENDANCE AT TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEETING ON SALK POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 22, 1955

American Academy of General Practice: Dr. John R. Fowler, president; Dr. William B. Hildebrand; Dr. Malcom Phelps, chairman, board of directors.

American Academy of Pediatrics: Dr. Crawford Bost, president; Dr. E. H. Christopherson, executive secretary.

American Drug Manufacturers Association: Dr. J. H. Fitzgerald Dunning, president; Dr. Karl Bambach, executive vice president.

American Hospital Association: Dr. Morris H. Kreeger; Mr. Kenneth Williamson, associate director; Dr. Albert W. Snoke.

American Medical Association: Dr. Elmer Hess; Dr. Frank Wilson; Dr. George F. Lull, secretary.

American Osteopathic Association: Dr. R. C. McCaughan, executive secretary; Dr. Chester D. Swope, chairman, department of public relations.

American Pharmaceutical Association: Mr. Newell W. Stewart, president; Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, secretary.

American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association: Mr. Kenneth F. Valentine, president-elect.

American Public Health Association: Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, president; Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham.

American School Health Association: Dr. Claire A. Christman, director of school health; Miss Mary A. Thompson, superintendent, health education.

American Surgical Trade Association: Mr. Russell Schneider, consultant.

Cutter Laboratories: Mr. E. A. Cutter, Jr., executive vice president; Dr. Walter Ward.

Eli Lilly & Co.: Mr. Eugene N. Beesley, president; Mr. Forrest Teel, executive vice president.

Hospital Industries Associations: Mr. J. J. Egan, president; Mr. William Smith, executive secretary.

Manufacturers Surgical Trade Association: Dr. Arthur L. Faubel, secretary; Mr. F. A. Holt, Jr.

National Association of Chain Drug Stores: Mr. J. Louis Gundling; Mr. John E. Donaldson.

National Association of Retail Druggists: Mr. John W. Dargavel, executive secretary; Mr. George B. Frates.

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis: Mr. Basil O'Connor, president; Mr. Raymond H. Barrows, executive director; Dr. Hart Van Riper, medical director.

National Medical Association: Dr. W. Montague Cobb, Dr. Joseph G. Gathings.

National Wholesale Druggists Association: Mr. James E. Allen, chairman of the board; Mr. E. Allen Newcomb, executive secretary.

Parke-Davis & Co.: Mr. Homer C. Fritsch, executive vice president; Dr. Fred Stimpert, director, microbiological research.

Pitman-Moore Co.: Mr. K. F. Valentine, president; Dr. S. R. Bozeman.

Sharp & Dohme, Inc.: Mr. William L. Dempsey, president; Mr. John G. Bill, vice president.

Wyeth Laboratories: Mr. Harry S. Howard, president; Mr. H. W. Blades, executive vice president.

Congressional: Senator Lister Hill, Alabama; Senator William A. Purtell, Connecticut; Representative J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Representative Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Representative John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Mr. Harry Carter, executive assistant to Senator Alexander H. Smith, New Jersey; Mr. William G. Reidy, professional staff, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; Mr. Kurt Borchardt, professional staff, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

State and Territorial health officers: Dr. D. G. Gill, Alabama; Dr. Stanley H. Osborn, Connecticut; Dr. Floyd I. Hudson, Delaware; Dr. D. L. Seckinger, District of Columbia; Dr. Ralph W. McComas, Florida; Dr. John H. Venable, Georgia; Dr. Roland R. Cross, Illinois; Dr. B. Groesbeck, Indiana; Dr. Edmund G. Zimmerer, Iowa; Dr. Thomas R. Hood and Dr. Philip A. Bearg, Kansas; Dr. Edward Davens, Maryland; Dr. S. B. Kirkwood, Massachusetts; Dr. Albert E. Heustis, Michigan; Dr. Daniel Borgsma, New Jersey; Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe and Dr. Robert F. Korns, New York; Dr. J. W. R. Norton, North Carolina; Dr. Ralph E. Dwork, Ohio; Dr. Abel DeJuan, Puerto Rico; Dr. N. H. Dyer, West Virginia; Dr. Carl N. Neupert, Wisconsin.

APPENDIX 3

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON SALK POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 27, 1955

Advertising Council.
American Academy of Obstetrics and Gynecology.
American Association of School Administrators.
American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Association of University Women.
American Council on Education.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Federation of Labor.
American Legion.
American Medical Association.
American Municipal Association.
American National Red Cross.
American Parents Committee, Inc.
American Public Welfare Association, Inc.
Association for Childhood Education.
Boys' Clubs of America, Inc.
Camp Fire Girls.
Child Welfare League of America, Inc.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Cooperative Health Federation.
Council of State Governments.
General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc.
Girl Scouts of the United States of America.
International Association of Machinists.
National Catholic Educational Association.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Conference for Cooperation in Health Education.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Farmers Union.
National Grange.
National Jewish Welfare Board.
National School Board Association.
National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc.
National Urban League.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
Save the Children Federation, Inc.
Spokesmen for Children, Inc.
Temple Hill Baptist Church.
United Mine Workers of America.
United Parents Association.
United States Conference of Mayors.
Young Women's Christian Association.

APPENDIX 4

MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE

The following recommendations were made at the first meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

(a) That the supplies of Salk vaccine be distributed in the most equitable manner on a State-by-State basis, and that the total supply for the next 2 months (i. e., until July 1) be limited to children 5–9 inclusive.

(NOTE.—This recommendation appears to vary somewhat with the epidemiological and geographical characteristics of poliomyelitis. The reasons for selecting this age group on a country-wide basis are:

(i) NFIP program has included 9 million children in this age group as their first priority.

(ii) It is not only the most susceptible age group for the whole country, but it is also the group in which there is evidence that the vaccine is effective.

(iii) It is currently estimated there will be enough vaccine to immunize age group 5–9 in the United States before the peak of the polio season.

(iv) It is a group easy to reach.

(v) If age priorities were set up on a State-by-State basis, it might create confusion between neighboring States.)

(b) That every physician keep a record of the name, address, age and date of vaccination on the individual, as well as the lot number and names of the distributor and manufacturer; and that every distributor keep a record of the lot number and manufacturer and the customer.

(c) That State advisory committees be set up immediately to gather information concerning the needs, distribution, and uses of vaccine within the States and that these committees be representative of the health departments, medical societies, pharmaceutical associations, and general public.

(d) That the State advisory groups work closely with the staff of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine to determine how much vaccine is needed for public agencies for the immunization of children who cannot afford to pay for it. Thus a fair proportion of the vaccine may be allocated for such children and who will be in the age group 5–9 years for the next 2 months.

(e) That the manufacturers report their supplies of vaccine to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare every 2 weeks so that the National Advisory Committee can recommend to the manufacturers equitable geographical distribution of vaccine so that it will reach the greatest number of 5–9 children during the next 2 months.

(f) That an allocation be made for the Department of Defense to procure vaccine for personnel of the uniformed services and their dependents, in accordance with recommendations of the National Advisory Committee for Poliomyelitis Vaccine as to distribution.

(g) That vaccine for members and dependents of the uniformed services abroad, and for personnel and dependents of the Department of State and other United States Government agencies abroad be administered by the Department of Defense; and that allocations for such use be determined by the committee consistent with the age-group priority in effect in the United States.

(h) That the vaccine should be made available on a world-wide scale as soon as possible.

In connection with these recommendations, the committee urged that the people of the United States be kept thoroughly informed of the status of vaccine supplies, priority groups, allocation plans, and the like.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the colloquy between Mr. MORSE and Mr. BENDER on the subject of the Salk vaccine, the following occurred:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the House has adopted the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is in the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the statement by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the conference

report may be in order immediately following the Senator's statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has unanimous consent been granted that the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill may be taken up at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent has been granted for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings on pp. 6456–6457.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand correctly that all the conferees were present when the conference report was agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was signed by all conferees on the part of the Senate who attended the conference. The minority was represented by the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking member of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. Also present was the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report? Without objection, the report is agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the report been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the distinguished Presiding Officer was inquiring whether there was any objection to the consideration of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Presiding Officer heard no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore the Presiding Officer assumed that the report should be considered and adopted at the same time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I inquire what the status of the conference report is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will withhold announcement of agreement to the conference report in order that the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a question or two which I should like to address to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who was chairman of the conference committee which considered the bill.

I note, first, a reference in the report indicating that the action of the Senate in stepping up by $308,700 the amount for plant quarantine inspection at ports was agreed to in conference, and that that additional amount will become available if the report shall be adopted. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment in respect to that item. It provides for $308,700, which I think is the largest amount which has ever been made available for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is, for plant quarantine at ports of entry, particularly where the hazard is the greatest?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I assume that the Department of Agriculture will use the greater part of this sum at ports where the hazard is the greatest. That was brought out in the hearings, and I think that was the general understanding of the conferees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I should like to ask another question. The Senator will recall that the Senate committee took action by which the fund for emergency outbreaks of insects causing plant diseases was increased from $400,000 to $1,100,000. As I understand the report, which I have had in my possession for only a few minutes, it seems to indicate that an increase from $400,000 to $1 million was approved, but the complete increase to $1,100,000 was not approved in conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. However, I should not like to have the RECORD closed with that statement, becouse it was generally understood that if it were necessary to have additional funds, they would be provided by way of supplemental appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, there was no feeling evidenced at all in the conference committee of an unwillingness to meet any outbreak of that sort?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all. There was some difference of opinion as to the sum that might be needed, but it was a matter of sheer conjecture on the part of the conferees on both sides, because we did not have the scientific information which would enable us to ascertain to a nicety the amount of money needed to deal with any emergency outbreak.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

My next question relates to the general amount available for research in the field of controlling, and, we hope, eradicating, screw worm, the pest which is so adversely affecting livestock, particularly in the southern portion of the United States. Is there in the report any departure from the approval of that objective?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I think the report very clearly indicates that it is the intention of the Department to deal with every one of the items set forth in the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Including research in the matter of spreading decline in the citrus industry?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. There is no question that the Department is obligated to do work in both of those fields.

Mr. HOLLAND. For the present, that work is to be in research and surveys, with the direction contained in the report of the Senate committee still standing that a speedy report be made if a method of control or elimination is discovered.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the conference report or in any agreement between the conferees of the House or the Senate that would in anywise indicate that a report will not be expedited as rapidly as may be possible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I warmly congratulate the distinguished Senator and his fellow conferees upon retaining in the conference measure the important items which I have mentioned, as well as others.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if there is any change at all in the sum of money made available for the conservation program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount provided for the next calendar year is $250 million. As the Senator knows, the program operates on the calendar-year basis rather than on the fiscal-year basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I notice that the conferees agreed to the House language providing for a special study of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer, and for that purpose appropriated the sum of $250,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The conferees, after some intensive discussion, concluded that that would be a sufficient amount to get the study under way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The study will be conducted by the Department of Agriculture under its marketing service program, will it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. They have a trained staff available to conduct that study.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the study also require some companion action by an appropriate committee of the Congress to doublecheck the survey and analysis which may be made?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of nothing that is more important at this time to combat the unreasonable attitude of some persons toward the farmers than is a study of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer. I believe that if consumers were aware of the fact that the farmer's share of the dollar spent by consumers for food and clothing is constantly decreasing every year, they would have an entirely different attitude toward farm legislation which would place farmers on a parity with their fellow Americans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, and I commend him for the wonderful contribution he has made toward bringing to the Senate and piloting the agricultural appropriation bill through the conference committee with the help, of course, of other Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have those kind words from such a stout fighter for the farmers of the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5239, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 17, 1955.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make to the Senate, and I should like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

When action has been concluded on H. R. 1573, which is the unfinished business, I hope it will be possible for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 217, Senate bill 153, to amend the REA loan formula. An effort is being made to reach an agreement among the members of the committee and other Senators interested in the measure.

I also wish to place the Senate on notice that it is planned to consider Calendar No. 234, Senate Joint Resolution 8, to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster. I have previously cleared this measure with the able minority leader.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization, of the Committee on Government Operations, has ordered reported H. R. 3322, a bill to improve the administration of the program for utilization of surplus property for educational and health purposes. That bill could not be considered today, but it is possible that it may be called up on Thursday. I wish Senators to be informed of this possibility, and I should like the able minority leader to check H. R. 3322, since I have not previously cleared it with him.

I understand that the committee of conference will meet tomorrow to consider the reciprocal trade bill, so it may be that the conference report will be available for consideration by the Senate on Thursday. I desire to place the Senate on notice as to that possibility.

Also in conference are the Department of the Interior and the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bills. As soon as the conference reports on those bills are ready, I hope that the Senate may proceed promptly to consider them.

It is my plan to have the Senate take up on Friday Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, the road bill. The report on that bill is due to be filed on Thursday. By agreement, no votes will be taken on the bill on Friday, but Senators may engage in as much discussion as may be desired on that day. The Senate will again be in session on next Monday, and during the early part of the week a determination can be made as to when the Senate may wish to vote on that measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as the program which the distinguished majority leader has outlined up to this time is concerned, it is entirely satisfactory, with the exception of the new bill he has mentioned. I will immediately check as to H. R. 3322. However, as to the other sequence of bills, I am certain that we will cooperate in every way possible.

I also want to call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to my uncertainty as to proceeding with S. 1048, the highway bill. That bill has been called to my attention by a number of Senators on this side of the aisle. I understand, as the majority leader has stated, that the report and minority views are due to be filed Thursday noon and presumably will go to the Public Printer at that time. The printed copies should be available and on the desks of Senators by noon on Friday.

But because the minority views constitute the supporting document for an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the proposed $27 billion road bill, as to the need for which there is an honest difference of opinion, some Members, especially those who are not on the Committee on Public Works, have suggested that it might be more satisfactory for them to have the weekend in which to study the minority views and the accompanying amendment in the nature of a substitute, so as to enable them to participate more fully in the debate on Monday.

I merely mention this to the distinguished majority leader because I have had a number of requests from Senators on this side of the aisle to permit that to be done, if it would fit in with the plans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My inclination always is to conform with any suggestion made by the distinguished minority leader, if it is possible to do so. I would be the last to urge that any action whatsoever be taken on the road bill on Friday, other than to afford Senators who are prepared to discuss the bill an opportunity to do so.

The bill was reported last Friday. It is somewhat unusual, whether it be an appropriation bill or a $27 billion road bill, for a committee to have a full week to file a report on action which it has taken. But, Mr. President, the committee did have a week. The bill was reported to the Senate last Friday, and no action will be taken until Friday of this week, and then there will be only general discussion, and any 1 of the 96 Senators can take home the majority report and the minority views, and any individual reports which may be available, study them, read them, and digest them until Monday. I expect that the Senate will be considering the road bill into Tuesday, and perhaps Wednesday.

I desire to make it abundantly clear that I have assured the minority leader that there would be no votes on Friday, but I have also assured other Senators that we would proceed to the consideration of the bill, if the Senate sustains me, on Friday, for the purpose of having general discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at the insistence of minority Members who requested that they be given until Thursday to file their views, the matter was delayed. As a matter of fact, I asked unanimous consent, because unanimous consent had to be obtained, that the minority be permitted until Thursday to file their views. The only reason for the delay is that they wanted time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I am sure the majority leader knows, it is the desire at all times of the minority leader, in the normal processes of the Senate, to cooperate fully, but the report of the committee itself, as shown on page 6 of the calendar, was apparently filed on May 13. This is only the 17th——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call attention to the fact we are not debating the bill today. The report was filed last Friday. We are not even going to start debating the bill until next Friday, and then there will be nothing but general discussion. The bill will be discussed again on Monday. If the distinguished Senator from California desires, I am willing to agree that there be no votes on Monday. I am certain there is no possibility of getting a vote on Friday, and probably not on Monday.

I did not object to the unanimous consent request of the minority that they have one full week to explain what they had voted on a week before. I thought it was unusual. I said so to the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee. I desire to go along with my delightful friend, the minority leader, and the other Members of the minority, but I do not want to have further delay in the case of an important bill or program, for which the President has a plan; for which he submitted a recommendation; on which

in the committee there have been weeks and weeks of hearings, and then weeks of voting; and in connection with which there has been a week to write about what the committee did, and then another week to explain what the minority did. Senators can read the views on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and vote on Tuesday. The Senate is going to be crowded at the end of the session if we keep dragging our feet, and that is exactly what I think was done in the matter of filing the minority views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not discuss too much dragging of feet——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California can say what he wishes to, but the Senator from Texas will say it is unusual for a committee to take a week to have minority views filed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator remember the tax bill, when we had a discussion as to how much time should be allowed for filing minority views, after the bill had been reported by the Finance Committee, without a single change from the bill as passed by the House? There was a request for unlimited time within which to file minority views. After discussion we finally arranged for a certain period. I do not wish to trust to my recollection, but as soon as I can get the information——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will take the same position with regard to the filing of minority views on the road bill as on the filing of views on the tax bill, we shall have no difficulty. As I remember, the Senator from California did not wish to agree to giving unlimited time. He wanted prompt action. He was willing to let it go over the weekend, until Tuesday or Wednesday. Finally we arrived at a date which was agreeable.

I can understand no earthly reason why any Senator should object to having a general discussion of the road bill on Friday, when the minority views are to be filed on Thursday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator from Texas, both in his capacity as a distinguished Senator and as the majority leader is, that, in my capacity as minority leader, I also have some obligation to Members on our side of the aisle. What we agree to do is not a matter of personal convenience to the two of us. We can generally get to an understanding on these matters, and I intend to continue to try to do so. But some Senators on our side of the aisle who are not members of the committee are interested in the bill, and the governors of their States are interested in the bill. There has been discussion as to whether the highway program should be financed in one way or another way. There is a desire that progress be made. Since the minority views will not be available until Thursday, and the amendment is going to be in the nature of a substitute, it was thought it would be reasonable that the debate not start until Monday. I am merely trying to carry out a specific request, and at least explore the situation with the distinguished Senator, who is always so generous and affable in trying to adjust such matters to the satisfaction of 96 Senators, each of whom has a different view regarding the procedure which should be followed and as to when a measure should be taken up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's position. I appreciate that some Senators on his side of the aisle make certain requests of him. There are occasions when Senators on my side of the aisle make certain requests of me. I think most of the time they are reasonable requests. Sometimes they fall in the category which the Senator has indicated. I would be the first one in the Senate to see to it that the Senator from California and the minority had full and ample time. The minority asked for a week to file their views, and got every day they requested. They got it by unanimous consent. The views are to be filed on Thursday. I think if the request had been made that the views be filed on Friday, the Senate would have gone that far. But, as the Senator from Texas has said to members of the committee, the highway measure is a major bill. There are Senators—certainly there are on the majority side—who will consume several hours discussing the action taken by the committee. I think Friday can be profitably used in that debate.

If the minority does not choose to speak on Friday, at the conclusion of the general discussion by Members on this side of the aisle the Senator from Texas will move that the Senate recess to Monday. He has already assured the Senator from California that there would be no votes on Friday. Such an arrangement would give every Senator an opportunity to confer with his colleagues, to confer with himself, if he needed to, and to confer and clear the matter with the governor of his State. The bill will merely be discussed, and it is not going to be passed on Friday, or on Monday, either. However, if we do not get started on it, there may be no bill passed at all.

I think the proposal before the Senate is a reasonable one. In view of the assurances I have given the distinguished minority leader, I hope he will do what I am sure I would do if I were in his position, which would be to say to the majority leader, "It is not proposed to have any votes on the bill. Senators can read the reports over the weekend. We do not think there will be any votes on Monday. On Tuesday perhaps we can decide when we can vote."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wanted to clear the RECORD about the statement that the request with respect to the time within which to file minority views was unprecedented.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I never said it was unprecedented.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from New Mexico indicated either that it was unprecedented or at least that it was unusual.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said it was unusual, and I think the record will so show.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But this year, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, after considerable colloquy, during which the minority leader was prepared to agree to the allowance of a week's time for the filing of minority views on the tax bill, there was considerable discussion to the effect that 1 week would not be sufficient time in which to prepare and present the minority views; and finally we agreed upon 10 days for the filing of the minority views. So I am not particularly raising the point as an issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from California in that connection, and I appeal for the same generosity now.

Of course at this time there is a somewhat different situation. On the other occasion I was in Minnesota, in a hospital bed, and I had not had a chance either to see and study the report which was prepared or to prepare separate views.

Although later it was determined that the report did not appeal to a majority of the Senate, the Senator from California agreed to provide that opportunity at that time; and in this case I shall appreciate having him read and digest the majority report, which I also hope he will support.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement which applies to the further consideration of the unfinished business will be read at this time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that, effective on Tuesday, May 17, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of H. R. 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I call up the amendment which lies at the desk, and ask to have it stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I expect to join in making such a request at the appropriate time. However, there are some Senators who have said they

wish to change somewhat the wording of the amendment. So I prefer to leave to myself the right to change the wording, if such a request is made, and if it seems wise to change it. I assure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that at the conclusion of the debate I shall join with him in requesting the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment. I wish to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment, and I hope that all Members of the Senate will have a chance to express their position in that way.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. HOLLAND, on behalf of himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS, was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective with respect to 1955 and subsequent crops, to read as follows:

"SEC. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests an acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity in excess of his farm acreage allotment by reason of harvesting corn for ensilage, harvesting wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, harvesting a commodity or a crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing-quota referendum, or harvesting peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

"(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be required to establish their eligibility for such payment under this section in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that 1 hour is now available to each side, for debate on the amendment, with the hour for the proponents to be controlled by myself, and the hour for the opponents to be controlled by the majority leader. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; if the majority leader is opposed to the amendment; otherwise, the time in opposition to the enactment will be under the control of the minority leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in order to read a communication to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and to various other Senators. The communication, which came this morning, May 17, 1955, from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 17, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

DEAR SENATORS: Our views have been requested on the proposed amendment to H. R. 1573 which was discussed in the Senate on Friday, May 13. This proposed amendment would retain section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as it now stands but would add language to exempt corn for ensilage, wheat acreages not in excess of 15 acres, crops with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas, and peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

The proposed amendment generally will tend to make eligible the smaller farms and thereby overcome many of the objections which the Department has to the provisions of section 348, as amended, by the Agricultural Act of 1954. However, these exemptions will involve some problems of administration, especially with respect to ensilage corn and seed peanuts.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I believe it is in the best interests not only of the American farmers, but also the general public, that H. R. 1573 in its present form not pass the Senate. Rather, I am of the opinion that the basic problem which this bill is designed to correct can better be handled by adoption of the amendments in the nature of a substitute which has been jointly sponsored by Senators HOLLAND, AIKEN, ANDERSON, and myself.

H. R. 1573 would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1954. Section 348 provides that—

Any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for each year * * * shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (Agricultural Conservation program).

The problem here, which H. R. 1573 hopes to solve, is basically this: Under marketing quota requirements, a farmer with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres can grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the eligibility requirement for payments under the Agricultural Conservation program as provided in section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I do believe that it is rather inconsistent for the law to permit a farmer to market up to 15 acres of wheat without penalty when quotas are in effect and qualify for price support at the same time, but on the other hand to deny him assistance under the Agricultural Conservation program unless he plants within his acreage allotment. Why? Because marketing quotas are a much more severe form of control than acreage allotments, yet when quotas are in effect a farmer can qualify for Government benefits even if he markets more than his acreage allotment, so long as it is less than 15 acres, while if only acreage allotments are in effect he cannot qualify for assistance under the Agricultural Conservation program if his acreage allotment is less than 15 acres and he should plant up to 15 acres.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. My time is limited, and I prefer to complete this statement. Then I shall be glad to yield, if I have time left.

Although H. R. 1573 would solve this problem, as would the amendment proposed by Senators HOLLAND, AIKEN, ANDERSON, and myself, it has certain other defects which seem in my opinion to outweigh its benefits. On the other hand, the substitute we have proposed not only would solve this problem, but has additional advantages as well. This I believe will be apparent, Mr. President, from the following analysis:

The basic reason for requiring that farmers must comply with acreage allotments in order to receive assistance under the agricultural conservation program, is to provide an added sanction to induce compliance with production controls so that production can more nearly be brought into line with demand. Although production controls at best are not too effective in bringing and keeping supply in line with demand, it is important in light of the big surpluses on hand of basic commodities that they be reinforced by other sanctions such as that provided by section 348. This is especially true with respect to the farms owned by one-third of our farmers, who produce 80 percent of our marketable crop value and who receive 85 percent of our net farm income.

However, I do agree with the committee which reported H. R. 1573, that section 348 should not apply to our small farms, especially those having wheat and corn acreage allotments of less than 15 acres. But I cannot agree that it should not be made applicable to the large commercial farms, which, though fewer in number, produce the bulk of our food and forage crops. Specifically, my reasons for this are:

First. If public funds are to be used to increase the capacity of these commercial farms, as is the case with respect to the agricultural conservation program, while at the same time the Government is obliged to support the prices of the crops in question, then the public interest certainly requires that sanctions be imposed which will work toward the goal of keeping supply in line with demand.

That the bulk of payments now made under the agricultural conservation program are for practices which primarily increase output rather than build the soil as do more permanent type practices, is revealed by table 5 of the Summary of the Agricultural Conservation Program for 1953 published by the Department of Agriculture. In 1953, 42 percent of the $185 million farmers received was spent for fertilizer and in-

organic materials—limestone, phosphate and potash. Another 14 percent was used for protective manure crops.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the commercial fertilizer producers are well aware of this fact, as the following newsletter dated May 3, 1955, by Robert M. Koch, executive secretary, National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., indicates:

ACP AUTHORIZATION FOR 1956

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

To Persons Interested in the Agricultural Conservation Program:

A week ago today the Senate, in the most unusual action taken since I have been associated with the agricultural-conservation program overwhelmingly approved continuing the ACP for 1956 at the $250 million level. The administration originally requested $175 million from the House and then, after it was passed by the House at $250 million, it asked the Senate to reduce the amount to $175 million. When the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee reported the bill at $250 million, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, made an attempt on the Senate floor to reduce the 1956 ACP to $195 million. In spite of the fact that his effort was to leave the program at $20 million higher than that recommended by the Department of Agriculture, the Senate by a rollcall vote of 76 to 5 approved the $250 million.

Strong bipartisan support was given to the program when many leading Republican and Democratic Senators pleaded for an adequate ACP. Everyone interested in the ACP should write to their Senators thanking those who supported the program at $250 million and raising the question with those who voted against it as to whether they are voting in the best interests for the conservation of the soil in their States.

HOLLAND AMENDMENT

Furthermore, the repeal of the Holland amendment which had been expected momentarily has run into a serious snag. Here at the congressional level many fail to appreciate the significant effect which the so-called Holland amendment has on the administration of the ACP and the participation of farmers in this important program. Even though the House passed this bill unanimously to the Senate floor, we need grassroot support to assure passage. When Senator HOLLAND objected to passage of this bill on Monday, April 25, on the Consent Calendar, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader, scheduled it for consideration immediately after the USDA appropriation bill Tuesday. However, Senator HOLLAND then asked for time in which to work out an acceptable compromise. He is planning to propose this compromise this week and we need contacts from the grassroots to assure repeal of this obstacle to the administration of the ACP. While airmail letters may be in sufficient time, if the bill comes up Thursday or Friday of this week, we need telegrams and telephone calls to head off the industrious work of Senator HOLLAND and the American Farm Bureau Federation, which is actively backing Senator HOLLAND'S effort to restrict the administration of the ACP. On the back of this letter is a complete list of Senators and how they voted on the ACP. Be sure and contact them on both the ACP and Holland amendment repeal.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. KOCH,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—Both USDA Assistant Secretaries McConnell and Peterson testified for repeal of H. R. 1573.

CI——404

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the Members of the Senate will not yield to this type of selfish pressure.

Second. If we want to really advance soil conservation on lands devoted to the growing of soil-depleting crops, then farmers, if they are to be eligible for price supports on such crops—and they are the crops in question here—should be required to observe acreage allotments. In this respect I invite attention to the fact that from 1936 to 1944 the Department of Agriculture paid farmers $1,666,300,000 under the agricultural conservation program to withdraw from production soil-depleting crops, including those here in question. Farmers were given an acreage allotment, and if they kept within that allotment they received an agricultural conservation program payment.

That such a practice was more of a permanent soil-conserving nature than most of those for which farmers are compensated today under the agricultural conservation program cannot be disputed. As Rainer Schickele, chairman of the agricultural economics department of North Dakota Agricultural College, has so ably stated in his recent book, Agricultural Policy:

> The public interest is concerned primarily with erosion control, with keeping the topsoil in place, because it constitutes the nonrenewable-fund resource of the soil. Fertility maintenance, better farm use of water, and maintaining forages are essential only insofar as they are needed to control erosion. The ACP objective fails to make this important distinction. Consequently, a certain proportion of the available funds is used to pay for practices on land which would not have been permanently damaged if these practices had not been performed * * *.
>
> There can be no question that a considerable part of the ACP payments are being made for practices on land where those practices are not necessary for the public interest in soil conservation * * *.
>
> If the funds now disbursed on lands not subject to erosion could be shifted over to unprotected erosible lands the effectiveness of the program could be substantially increased. We, as a nation, would get more real soil conservation per tax dollar spent than we are getting now (p. 104).

Contrary to the opinion of some with respect to this matter, it is evident that not to require compliance with acreage allotments on soil-depleting crops as a condition for receiving ACP payments on farms having an allotment of over 15 acres would result in less conservation worthy of the name than would be the case if section 348 were repealed outright.

Third. The situation which H. R. 1573 is designed to correct is a problem primarily in only the commercial wheat and corn areas. Wheat farmers in the following States are not affected by the eligibility requirement imposed by section 348, since they are outside the commercial wheat areas and acreage allotments are not allocated to farmers: Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

The same is true with respect to corn farmers in the States of Arizona, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

With respect to wheat and corn farmers having allotments of less than 15 acres, the problem can more effectively be solved by the amendment which Senators HOLLAND, AIKEN, ANDERSON, and I have proposed to H. R. 1573.

Mr. President, that concludes the statement I had intended to make on this amendment. I shall be glad now to respond to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the point in the Senator's remarks, where I sought to interrogate him, my attention was attracted by his reference to a comparison between marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

I thought I understood him to say that marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was wondering on what basis he felt that was true.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know that I understand all the technicalities involved in the question, but I believe that to be a correct statement. I am not a member of the committee. I take that statement largely from Senators who have made a study of the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If a farmer has an allotment and he violates it, he loses his price support; if he violates his marketing quota he suffers a stiff penalty, which probably makes it unprofitable for him to violate the agreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not sure that that goes to the point here involved. I must say that my feeling through the years has been more and more that a marketing-quota system would be preferable to acreage allotments. I recognize the fact that that may be true in my case particularly, because of the problem that arises in an area of uncertain rainfall. Very frequently corn growers in South Dakota do not know whether they will have a crop or not because of the deficiency of rain. If there were a marketing quota, instead of an acreage-allotment system, the farmers would have the privilege of marketing a certain amount of their crop in a given season. If the rainfall was sufficient to enable them to reap a normal crop and anticipate their marketing quota, they could store it or carry it over. If in the next season the crop was short, they could perhaps benefit from a more normal marketing, and in that way have a normal income.

When acreage allotments under rigid controls are applied, and the allotments are cut successively 11 percent, or even as much as 30 percent, as happened in some of our counties in the past few years, the farmers are so restricted in their acreage that they do not have enough total production, even in a good year, to carry the cost of the equipment which it is necessary for them to have if they are to produce corn or wheat.

Therefore I have felt that it would be more humane and much fairer to apply

a marketing quota system instead of an acreage allotment system. Each farmer could then carry his own ever-normal granary, so to speak, and have a normal income during the year.

Mr. WATKINS. There is considerable merit to the argument of the Senator from South Dakota. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the remark of the Senator from Utah that marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. WATKINS. That may be, but that happens to be my opinion after studying the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask one other question, which goes to the question of tying soil conservation practice payments to crop production allotments.

In my State soil conservation payments are tied to some specific program, such as the building of a dam or terracing or the planting of trees or the planting of legumes in place of crops. To do any work of that kind a farmer must necessarily make an investment himself. He must put some money into the operation, and also some effort. He sacrifices the prospect of immediate returns in the form of the production of a crop by devoting his land or his money or his effort to conserving water or conserving soil, from which he will get no monetary return. Therefore why should he not be encouraged to engage in such conservation practices, instead of being subject to the second penalty of being denied any cooperation on soil conservation practices if he exceeds his acreage allotment?

Mr. WATKINS. There is a very simple answer to that question. All the farmer has to do is obey the law which provides for the acreage allotment to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Obey the law?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Obey the law, or obey a regulation?

Mr. WATKINS. A regulation which is authorized by law and which the farmers accept voluntarily.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Why does the Senator believe 60 percent of the corn growers of South Dakota—and although South Dakota is not entirely a corn-growing State, a considerable quantity of corn is grown in the eastern and southeastern areas of the State—refused to sign up last year? It was because the repeated cuts in the acreage allotted to them had so reduced their crops that they could not get a sufficient return to carry the investment in their land and machinery.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. That is likely to happen under the program we have today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not know who controls the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. I control this time, and I do not know how much time the Senator from Florida wants me to take. Perhaps I am trespassing on the time of another Senator.

Mr. THYE. Will the other side of this question give me 1 minute so that I may make a brief statement? Will the other side allot a minute to the Senator from Utah so that he may yield to me on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor under the statement by the Senator from Florida for as much time as he may desire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order to comply with the request of my distinguished senior colleague, I am willing to yield a few minutes for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, who is being charged with the time that is now being taken in this colloquy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time now being used is under the control of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Approximately 20 minutes of that time has been used.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to know whether the time that is now being used by other Senators is time that has been allotted to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield time for a question by the Senator from Minnesota, provided that we will be reimbursed for that time by the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 2 minutes for that purpose. Let us be brief.

Mr. WATKINS. I have already yielded to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish me to yield to him so that he may answer a question of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THYE. I should like to make a brief comment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I believe a comment might well be made at this point on the subject under discussion between the Senator from Utah and the Senator from South Dakota. A small producer who intends to feed most of his crop, whether it be corn or wheat, is not concerned at all about his acreage allotment, because he would not seal up any corn. The acreage-allotment provision would concern him only if he were to seal up any of his grain.

Since the so-called Holland amendment, or section 348, which we are now considering, was enacted, any good farmer in the diversified farming area who planted more than his allotted corn crop was disqualified from benefiting by the payments for soil conservation practices which are so desirable and necessary, if future generations are not to have land which is eroded and depleted.

All I am concerned with here is whether our soil conservation practices are to be continued. If they are, there is need to provide incentives to assure their continuation. The Extension Service which has existed for many years was trying to educate American farmers in good farming practices. However, many of those practices were not followed until an incentive program was established under the Agricultural Act.

I believe the proposed amendment contains more dangerous defects from the standpoint of damaging soil conservation practices than anything I can imagine. That is why I should like to have section 348 in the present act repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. The whole theory of the price support program and the acreage allotment system is to bring supply and demand into balance. It has not been brought in balance up to the present time, and it looks as though greater incentives will be needed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We are not providing any way by which it may be done. We would be doing precisely the opposite, if the pending amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. That is not the way in which I view it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A double penalty is involved.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, but the Senators to whom I yield wish to make speeches.

I have no further time, unless the Senator from Florida desires to yield it to me. I have finished what I had to say.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The issue in this matter is whether to change the present law which provides for acreage allotments and is supplemented by a provision to the effect that if a farmer knowingly exceeds his acreage allotment he shall thereby be deprived of the largesse extended by Uncle Sam, and of receiving money from Uncle Sam under the ACP program.

We come down to this stage: During the past year I have heard many Senators say, "We believe in the rigid price-support program. We know perfectly well that a part of it involves strict acreage allotments. We believe in those strict acreage allotments and we believe in strict enforcement. The question is, Is the Senate of the United States when saying all those good and high-sounding things, going to put its tongue in its cheek but at the same time refusing to accept one of the methods which is so effective in causing the farmer to live up to his acreage allotments? Are we in earnest about reducing the great agricultural overproduction which we have had, or are we merely saying we want to reduce it and, at the same time, propose so to cripple the Administrator and so to weaken the law that overproduction will continue?

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had not expected to speak quite so early this

afternoon, but I shall do the best I can under the circumstances.

Last year section 348 was inserted in the Agricultural Act of 1954. It was approved by the majority of the conferees of the House and the Senate. The provision was placed in the law in order to bring the other basic agricultural commodities under the same regulation under which the cottongrower had to operate for the past 15 years.

The provision was put into the act in an effort to find a way to enforce compliance with the law by those persons who had asked for the very law which some of them show every indication of violating, or encouraging the violation of, at the first chance they get.

Section 348 of the 1954 act had some defects. The Holland amendment is an effort to remedy those defects.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida would do these things:

It would exempt from the provisions of section 348 wheat growers who produce less than 15 acres of wheat. It is definitely an effort to assist small farmers who might be expected not to understand the law too well.

The amendment would exempt corn for silage. This would cover the situation referred to by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], where farmers plant more than their allotment of corn. The amendment would permit them to put the corn grown on the excess acreage into the silo without incurring a penalty. In fact, I do not think silage corn should have come under the law any more than red clover, alfalfa, cr other legumes and proteins.

The Holland amendment would do away with the necessity of the State committees of the respective States sending questionnaires or forms to every farmer, whether he produces basic crops or not. That is one of the nuisances resulting from the 1954 law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have only 10 minutes.

This amendment would also relieve from the penalty the producer of those crops as to which controls had been voted down. That should be of particular interest to the wheat grower this year, in view of the rumors we hear that controls over wheat may be voted down. I am not expressing any opinion on that point.

If the Senator from South Dakota has a short question, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was there not an exemption of peanuts?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, of peanuts to be "hogged off." If a planter raises more peanuts than his allotment, then, instead of digging them, he can turn the hogs in to the field.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the same thing apply to corn that is "hogged off."

Mr. AIKEN. It would apply under the proposed amendment to silage corn.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senator from South Dakota that as the law now stands and as it has always stood, peanuts solely for fattening purposes have never come under acreage allotment. The purpose of this exemption is to protect the farmer who has no acreage allotment and who does not want to sell under the price-support program, but raises enough feed for his own operation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is undoubtedly aware of the complaints of dairy farmers because the law places ensilage corn under controls. The amendment which is now proposed removes controls on corn raised for the silo, and I am sure it would be gratefully received by the dairymen of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Illinois, and other States. It really liberalizes the law.

Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Florida, however, a slight modification in his proposed amendment. In March the Senate passed without objection Senate Bill 46, which exempted from control wheat producers who used all their wheat on the farm who did not sell any at all, but used it for feed or for seed, and received no supports at all.

On page 2 of the amendment, line 8, after the word "acres," I would suggest adding the words "harvesting wheat for use as feed or seed on the farm where produced." Those words would be inserted to cover that type of crop, in the event the House should pass S. 46 which has been before it for the past 2 months. I do not know whether the Senator from Florida will accept that modification.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to accept that modification, and I call attention to the fact that the very proposal of the insertion of the provision suggested was to take care of the problem facing the farmers, regardless of whether the House passed the other bill or not.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say, Mr. President, that the amendment does very well take care of the small farmer. It does not give the corporation farmer or the large farmer who cultivates from 100 to 10,000 acres the right to violate the law willfully without incurring the penalty provided by section 348.

By the vote on the amendment, Mr. President, we shall be able to ascertain whether those who in the past have said, "Give us these high supports and we will control our crops" meant what they said, because if the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other Senators shall be rejected, it can only result in encouraging widespread violations of the law on the part of the corporation farmers and the large farmers who are not covered by the so-called Holland amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator from Vermont realize that the amendment affects, to any degree, only the Midwest States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin? They are the States which would be hardest hit by the amendment. The amendment would have little affect on North Dakota or the other major wheat-growing States.

Mr. AIKEN. I am satisfied that there is pretty good compliance with the law in North Dakota. It could not be otherwise, because North Dakota is principally a one-crop State. I believe the benefits to Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana would be very marked, indeed, if only by reason of the elimination of silage corn from the penalties.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Vermont said that North Dakota was a one-crop State. North Dakota is one of the most diversified farming States in the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that my own State also is largely a one-crop State, because three-fourths of the agriculture income is derived from dairy herds.

I believe that 52 percent of the income in the Senator's State of North Dakota, agriculturally speaking, comes from price supported crops. The income in North Dakota from that source is among the highest in the Union, in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As best I can see, those who would profit from the rejection of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida would be those who intend to violate the law. If they simply overplant, the 1954 act provides that they may correct their acreage. For instance, section 374 of the 1954 act reads:

> The Secretary shall provide, through the county and local committees, for measuring farms on which corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, or rice is produced and for ascertaining whether the acreage planted for any year to any such commodity is in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm under this title.

Paragraph (c) of the same section provides:

> If the acreage determined to be planted to any basic agricultural commodity on the farm is in excess of the farm acreage allotment, the Secretary shall by appropriate regulations provide for a reasonable time prior to harvest within which such planted acreage may be adjusted to the farm acreage allotment.

That would give farmers time in which to cut off their extra planting of corn and to put it in the silo. It would give them time to curtail their acreage, so that they would not incur either the penalty provided by section 348 or the penalty of 50 percent of the support price, which is found elsewhere in the law.

I should say that if the proposed amendment should be rejected, then we should only be giving a green light to those who willfully and knowingly intend to violate the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall not ask for additional time now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota; and if

he needs more time, I shall be happy to comply with his request.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think the junior Senator from North Dakota can speak as objectively on the proposed legislation as can the sponsors of the amendment. The amendment would have little effect on North Dakota. Practically all our wheat farmers are in compliance; and North Dakota has only one county in the commercial corn area.

The States of four sponsors of the amendment, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]—are all outside the commercial corn area, so they are not affected at all in that respect. Some wheat is produced in those 4 States, but 2 of the States are outside the commercial wheat area and not affected by the pending amendment.

The amendment exempts the farmer who produces only a few acres of wheat.

All of us who have spoken thus far today are pretty much outside the area which would be hardest hit by the amendment. On the basis of last year's compliance with quotas and acreage allotments, this would be the effect:

The State hardest hit would be Illinois. 32,352 wheat farmers were out of compliance last year. 150,356 corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

The modified amendment does fairly well by wheat producers, so many of the farmers who were out of compliance last year would now be in compliance. But the amendment would do little to change the corn situation, according to the top officials of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, to allow farmers to harvest a few more acres of corn to fill silos would change very little the figures of noncompliance last year.

The State which would be the second hardest hit would be Iowa. The amendment would have little effect on its 695 wheat farmers who were out of compliance. But Iowa had 122,381 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The State which would be third hardest hit is Indiana. Indiana had 36,112 wheat farmers and 114,434 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year.

Nebraska would be hard hit. It had 7,024 wheat farmers and 53,146 corn farmers out of compliance last year.

Wisconsin, Minnesota, and South Dakota would be hard hit, so far as the corn farmers are concerned. In these States hundreds of thousands of farmers would be ineligible for soil-conservation payments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from North Dakota have the figures with reference to the total number of corn farmers in South Dakota who would be affected?

Mr. YOUNG. In South Dakota, 638 wheat farmers were out of compliance last year. Most of them would be in compliance under the modified amendment. Twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and forty corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and forty corn farmers is a pretty sizable proportion. I think that number is probably more than the 60 percent I suggested.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. The very fact that a farmer is denied soil-conservation payments takes away the inducement for him to comply with the corn allotments or the wheat quotas. A corn farmer can raise additional corn and make far more money than he can by receiving a small soil-conservation payment, which does much in a State like Massachusetts to help bring about better soil conservation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not bring a corngrower into compliance; it merely induces him not to do anything with respect to soil conservation in a cooperative plan.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from North Dakota have the figures as to noncompliance on the part of wheat and corn farmers in Kansas?

Mr. YOUNG. In Kansas, 9,787 wheat farmers would be out of compliance on the basis of last year's figures. But, again, most of them, under the modified amendment, would be in compliance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Kansas would have 18,397 corn farmers out of compliance.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a rather interesting figure. I am in accord with the Senator's view that the wheat farmers would largely be in compliance under the Holland amendment. I have a grave question about the 18,397 corn farmers, because in a few counties in Kansas, in the commercial corn area, corn is not used for silage, except in certain instances. It is grown to feed cattle, and is not sold. So that is an important item in the bill, and I appreciate receiving the figures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a short question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should not a corn or a wheat grower, producing grain for commercial use, comply with the law, whether he be in Illinois, Ohio, Kansas, North Dakota or any other State? Why should he not comply?

Mr. YOUNG. I think every farmer, taking advantage of price supports, should comply, and it is to his best interest to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. They would not lose anything under the ACP payments if they complied.

Mr. YOUNG. I think many corn farmers feel it unnecessary to comply. There were nearly 1 million corn farmers who did not comply last year, but still we do not have a surplus of corn this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Why not take them out of the program?

Mr. YOUNG. Why destroy the soil conservation program to get even with some farmers?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota is making a reasonable and sound explanation of the entire question. Suppose I were a corn producer, growing 100 acres of corn in northern Iowa, and I were feeding 400 head of steers. I would feed them all of my corn, and probably buy some from other producers. Under the particular amendment before the Senate, if such a farmer in any sense should grow more corn than had been allotted to his farm, even if he did not intend to sell a bushel of it, he would immediately be disqualified to receive payments for good conservation practices, such as taking care of an eroding ditch or taking care of some of the contour in the rolling countryside of western Iowa. He would be absolutely disqualified from coming under any phase of the program. Yet he does not ask for a cent from his Government in the way of price supports, because he feeds every bushel and acre of corn he produces.

We have that kind of farmers in Minnesota. That is one reason why the greatest number out of compliance so far have been in Nebraska, Iowa, Indiana, and Minnesota. Most of the producers there grow their crop to feed their own cattle, or use it for other feeding operations. The only reason why they concerned themselves at all with the program was their desire to carry out what was advocated as a sound conservation program to preserve the fertility of the land for future needs.

I say section 348 in last year's agricultural act had a tendency to stifle and spottily to destroy good soil conservation practices. That is the reason why I am opposed to that section.

I am fully aware that the Farm Bureau is supporting the amendment, so I am in opposition to an organization with which I have worked for years. But when one applies the results of the operation of the section to the Nation as a whole, he will see that it makes soil conservation practices spotty. Any producer who stepped out of line to get the feed he needed for his feeding operations would be denied the right to participate in payments for soil conservation practices, whether they be technical, or liming for the purpose of getting a good stand of legumes.

I say there are times when we walk ourselves into difficulty, and dislike to turn around and get ourselves out of it. The amendment before the Senate is a proposal to modify something we should not have done last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] for his appropriate remarks. He has been a farmer all his life and is a farmer now. I know of no man better qualified to speak on the

subject than the senior Senator from Minnesota.

I have always believed that the soil-conservation program was tremendously important. I thought it was good enough to stand on its own legs. I should dislike very much to see the program destroyed by making farmers ineligible for its benefits because they had not complied with some other program which probably was not nearly so important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the chart from which I just read, which was prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

State	Wheat	Corn
Maine	42	
New Hampshire	2	
Vermont	65	
Massachusetts	13	
Rhode Island	14	
Connecticut	20	
New York	12,441	
New Jersey	1,341	2,262
Pennsylvania	24,744	33,101
Ohio	49,106	97,352
Indiana	36,112	114,434
Illinois	32,352	150,356
Michigan	28,547	50,480
Wisconsin	3,491	59,192
Minnesota	3,699	78,357
Iowa	695	122,381
Missouri	35,460	77,466
North Dakota	559	1,178
South Dakota	638	29,740
Nebraska	7,024	53,146
Kansas	9,787	18,397
Delaware	175	3,941
Maryland	2,161	10,632
Virginia	15,108	4,962
West Virginia	1,591	
North Carolina	24,036	31,345
South Carolina	11,694	
Georgia	7,336	
Florida	255	
Kentucky	7,504	33,119
Tennessee	11,293	16,868
Alabama	1,618	
Mississippi	854	
Arkansas	2,227	5,421
Louisiana	171	
Oklahoma	8,153	
Texas	7,953	
Montana	1,547	
Idaho	5,934	
Wyoming	449	
Colorado	2,232	
New Mexico	307	
Arizona	78	
Utah	3,745	
Nevada	215	
Washington	484	
Oregon	2,527	
California	590	
United States	366,389	

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a chart, also prepared by the Department of Agriculture, showing how many tobacco farmers were out of compliance and would be ineligible for soil conservation payments. The total for the United States is 30,839.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

TOBACCO

Alabama	61
Arkansas	2
Connecticut	40
Florida	142
Georgia	631
Illinois	6
Iowa	0
Indiana	529
Kentucky	10,240
Maryland	500
Massachusetts	10
Minnesota	2
Missouri	22
New Hampshire	0
North Carolina	7,583
Ohio	629
Pennsylvania	1
South Carolina	2,914
Tennessee	5,218
Texas	1
Vermont	0
Virginia	1,883
West Virginia	386
Wisconsin	39
	30,839

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing how many cotton farmers were out of compliance last year. The total number in the entire United States was only 11,197.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

COTTON

Alabama	3,108
Arizona	144
Arkansas	210
California	103
Florida	58
Georgia	1,221
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	207
Mississippi	778
Missouri	242
New Mexico	67
North Carolina	1,200
Oklahoma	619
South Carolina	784
Tennessee	1,604
Texas	793
Virginia	51
Total	11,197

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the average 1953 ACP payments, or soil conservation payments, made to the farmers of the respective States. Again, for the benefit of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I should like to say that table shows that the State of Kansas received the highest average payment under the soil conservation program, $151. New Jersey was the second highest, with average payments of $107. The average payment in North Dakota was $82.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average 1953 ACP payment

Arkansas	$94.00
Delaware	109.00
Illinois	72.00
Indiana	57.00
Iowa	54.00
Kansas	151.00
Kentucky	56.00
Maryland	84.00
Michigan	63.00
Minnesota	$54.00
Missouri	81.00
Nebraska	70.00
New Jersey	107.00
North Carolina	47.00
North Dakota	82.00
Ohio	54.00
Pennsylvania	79.00
South Dakota	93.00
Tennessee	67.00
Virginia	69.00
West Virginia	51.00
Wisconsin	54.00

1953 appropriation, $250 million.
1954 appropriation, $195 million.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a table showing the estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment with respect to peanuts be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

PEANUTS

Alabama	300
Arkansas	25
California	1
Florida	159
Georgia	750
Mississippi	1
New Mexico	25
North Carolina	2,000
Oklahoma	400
South Carolina	50
Tennessee	4
Texas	1,000
Virginia	950
Total	5,665

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the Holland amendment and will pass the Humphrey bill which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the arguments used by the proponents of the Holland amendment is that if we repeal section 348 we will be condoning breaking the law, and we will be giving the green light to farmers to overplant and violate the law. Those arguments are fallacious, and, what is more, they do not stand even the test of logic.

First of all, the soil-conservation program was never intended as a punitive measure.

Secondly, the thing that is wrong about section 348, and the reason it should be repealed, is that it is out of harmony with control mechanism in the matter of corn production.

I should like to use an analogy. What the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and their colleagues are saying is that if the driver of an automobile speeds, using the parlance of a traffic violator, he should lose the right to have safe driving lessons. In other words, here is a violator who is subject to prosecution for speeding under a certain law, to be hauled into court, to be subject to the jurisdiction of the court, and to be

fined, or to be sentenced to the workhouse. But the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Florida say that it is not sufficient. Of course, the promoters of the safe driving program which has been sponsored by the schools as a public service contend that a violator of the law who comes before the court should be subject not only to fine or the possibility of imprisonment, but he should be required to take safe driving lessons.

I use the analogy because the soil-conservation program is designed to help farmers to produce better and to conserve their land. The soil conservation program was not designed to be a club or a stick to discipline farmers into compliance. The soil-conservation program was designed to protect the fertility of the soil.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator has time to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am trying to get the picture of the situation which is presently before us. The proposal before the Senate would repeal that section of the law which penalizes the farmer by taking away from him conservation rights if he violates production limitations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have always assumed that the farmer, who is a victim of the seasons, did not violate the law or regulations intentionally.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, let me say that section 348 says "farmers who knowingly."

Mr. BARKLEY. That is simple enough.

What does the Holland amendment do?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps I should rely upon the sponsors of the Holland amendment to explain it, because I have had a little difficulty in determining exactly what its result will be. But I can say that the Holland amendment makes special provision for wheat farmers who grow wheat on 15 acres or less, and it also makes some special provision for ensilage.

At this time I yield to the Senator from Florida, so that he may tell us what the other provision is.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are two other provisions, one is in case a price-support program has been voted down by the farmers, so that such a program is not applicable; and the other is in the case of peanuts, where the farmer is planting peanuts for seed only or for the fattening of hogs, by turning them into the field. In such case the peanut farmer is allowed to raise enough peanuts so that he will have sufficient seed for the next year.

There is also a provision allowing the Secretary of Agriculture some latitude in the regulations, so as to prevent much of the paper work which at the present time is required.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank both Senators. However, I am not yet quite clear as to the effect of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to help the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have felt for a long time that it was quite unfair to penalize a farmer who had slightly overproduced because nature had stepped in and played its part. It has seemed to me that a farmer who is the victim of such circumstances should not be denied his soil-conservation payments on that account. So I am in favor of repealing the section which would penalize the farmer in that way.

I do not understand clearly how the amendment of the Senator from Florida would modify that section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall let the Senator from Florida speak on the amendment in his own time.

At this time I wish to say that the point attempted to be made by the proponents of the Holland amendment is that the repeal of section 348 will encourage law violation. Let me say that if section 348 shall be repealed, there will be no such law to violate. Section 348 is bad law, in the first place, and never should have been included in the bill of last year. It was not in the bill when it was passed by the House of Representatives, but came into the bill as the result of the conference. I may remind my colleagues that a substantial number of the Members of the Senate voted against all parts of the bill which came, last year, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, soil conservation stands on its own right and has its own privileges and responsibilities. We have provided severe penalties for violating marketing quotas, and we have provided penalties for violations of acreage allotments. If a farmer violates his acreage allotments, he receives no price supports; and that means that he will not receive a loan upon any crop he may have to store, in order to wait for a better market. That penalty is in effect. Why use soil-conservation payments—which never were supposed to operate as a penalty—as a further club or disciplinary weapon over the farmer?

My distinguished colleague, the Senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], pointed out very aptly what happens. Large numbers of farmers, particularly corn farmers, never take advantage of the price-support program. Instead, they feed to livestock the corn they produce. However, if such a farmer exceeded by one-tenth of an acre or one-half of an acre or 1 acre his corn allotment, he would be denied soil-conservation benefits, even though he would never sell 1 ear of corn in the market, and even though he would not seek a loan, and even though he would not go into the market at all, to sell any of his product.

It is true, Mr. President, that we wish to have production quotas and acreage allotments enforced. But soil-conservation benefits should not be used as a means of enforcement. There is other provision of law for such enforcement.

Soil conservation payments are to be used by farmers in a cooperative relationship with their Government. As a matter of fact, the average soil-conservation payment from the Government to the farmer is approximately $50. Let us be frank about this matter, Mr. President. If soil-conservation benefits or payments are canceled, certainly there is no punitive effect in respect to preventing a farmer from overplanting, for if he overplants only a little, he will receive a greater benefit from the overproduction than the total amount of his soil-conservation payments. The result is that many farmers overproduce; and if thereafter the farmers' soil-conservation payments are denied them, with the result that they do not engage in soil conservation, the resultant situation operates to the detriment of the land and to the detriment of future generations.

Mr. President, soil conservation is needed, regardless of whether there is a price-support program. Soil conservation is long overdue, regardless of whether we ever dream of having a crop-loan and crop-storage program.

All I can say about section 348 is that it never should have been in the law in the first place. Yet the proponents of the Holland amendment say, "The repeal of section 348 will result in violations of the law."

Mr. President, in the District of Columbia there are some ordinances which are antiquated and outmoded and ineffectual; and day by day various persons violate them. In that case, the thing to do is to repeal such antiquated laws. Today we do not tell people that they must drive down Pennsylvania Avenue only 5 miles an hour with a team of horses. Instead, we repeal any such antiquated law. That is what I recommend that we do in this case.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture reported to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that section 348 is ineffective, is difficult of administration, is retarding soil conservation, and is not controlling crop production. So why should such a provision be retained in the law?

The fact that we made a mistake once does not mean that we have to compound it by now adopting the Holland amendment, which only would put a new suit of clothes on an old frame which long ago should have been discarded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to the objections the Senator from Minnesota has raised, is section 348 enforceable?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is not enforceable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Department of Agriculture so reported?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Department of Agriculture has recommended the repeal of section 348. The Department says section 348 is administratively difficult to handle and to enforce, and the Department sees no particular benefit to accrue from section 348.

Furthermore, last week two national conferences of soil-conservation officials—one in St. Paul, Minn., and the other in Memphis, Tenn., where the chairman of the committees and other officials met—expressed their concern

because Congress had not yet repealed section 348. They are concerned because of the serious interference of section 348 with a large number of farmers in their participation in the 1955 soil-conservation program.

We suffer from wind erosion and drought. Yet the farmers who may have overplanted corn, wheat, or other supported crops are finding themselves denied the benefit of soil conservation at a time when they need it the most.

Mr. President, how ridiculous can we get? It means to me that we have a moral obligation—for the good of the entire future of agriculture—to rectify an existing error in the law.

I know of very few organizations in the Nation which are interested in soil conservation and production control which are not in favor of the repeal of section 348.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota follow me in a brief description of a situation I have in mind, so as to see whether I correctly understand this matter. I understand that if a farmer desires to engage in soil-conservation practices, the Government wishes to encourage him to do so; and because such practices are expensive, and because when he engages in soil-conservation the farmer must devote some of his land to the building of dams or to the building of terraces, and because such practices do not pay immediately, with the result that temporarily the farmer has to sacrifice some of his income, the Government says to him, "If you engage in this practice, we will share the cost with you."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is done as a means of encouraging the farmer to participate in the soil-conservation program.

In addition, the Government says to the farmer, "If you reduce the production of certain crops, we will provide you with a high support loan."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the case of some farmers who were not able to comply with the acreage allotment now, because of the Holland amendment of last year, the Government says, "If you do not comply, we cannot go along with you on the soil-conservation program." So the effect of the pending amendment, it seems to me, would simply be to reduce farmer cooperation in the soil-conservation program. Furthermore, I do not believe the Holland amendment will persuade a single farmer to be in compliance with the acreage allotments or production quotas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota has stated the argument succinctly, concisely, and persuasively. He is exactly correct. I say that the proponents of the Holland amendment or the proponents of section 348 can bring to the Senate no evidence which would indicate that if we were to keep section 348, as now written in the law, or as modified by the Holland amendment, it would promote any further compliance with acreage allotments and marketing quotas. It would not have such an effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not have such an effect; and on the other hand, so far as soil conservation is concerned, it would be definitely a destructive measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota is correct and I thank him.

The other specious argument which has been raised in support of a political and economic ghost is that a repeal of section 348 will help the corporation-sized farms. Let us take a look at that argument. Nothing could be further from the truth. Is a farmer who grows 6 acres of corn to feed his livestock when he has only a 5 acre allotment a corporation-type farmer? Is a farmer who grows 16 acres of wheat a corporation-sized farmer when he has an acreage allotment of only 15 acres? Such farmers and all others in the family-size farm category would be ineligible for ACP payments under the proposed substitute, just as they are under the present section 348.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that I understand that some of the farmers of Vermont grow a little tobacco. They may grow an acre and a half or 2 acres of tobacco. I would hardly call them corporation-size farmers. Under the present program, because of section 348, or under the Holland amendment, if they should exceed their allotment by 0.1 or 0.2 of an acre, they would lose all possibility of soil conservation benefits for their land under the ACP program.

I feel that our responsibility is clear-cut. We happen to have a bad provision, among other bad provisions in the law. Here is an opportunity to take some remedial action.

This has nothing to do with flexible price supports or rigid price supports. That is a non-germane, extraneous argument. Whether price supports are 50 percent of parity or 75 percent of parity, or whether they flex like an old rubber band makes not a bit of difference. The truth is that both under flexible price supports and rigid price supports acreage allotment and, in some instances, market quotas, all imposed for production control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 1 more minute.

If the argument advanced were sound, it would make no difference whether the price support were 110 percent of parity or 20 percent of parity. If a farmer violates his acreage allotment, he loses his ACP payment. So let us not bring in the argument of price supports, to see if we cannot muster some flexible price supporters against the repeal of section 348, or muster some rigid price supporters for the repeal of section 348. The two are unrelated. They are not even close cousins. They are not even kinfolk. They live in different parts of the political atmosphere. I suggest that we stay with the issue.

Do we wish to provide for further soil conservation, or do we not? Do we wish to restrict the soil conservation program by making soil conservation payments a club and a punitive measure for rigid price support enforcement, or do we wish to progress on the basis of conserving the soil and cooperating with the farmer and the Government in a relationship which has been established for almost 15 years?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield some time to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. THURMOND. I think the Senator has covered my point in his argument, but I should like to ask a specific question.

Is there not sufficient penalty under the law now to punish for overplanting, if section 348 is repealed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed there is.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there any connection between denying a farmer soil-building payments if he engages in soil-building practices, and punishing him for overplanting, which is an entirely different matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. THURMOND. Is there any connection between denying a farmer soil-building payments if he performs soil-building practices, and punishing him for overplanting, which is a different subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no relationship whatsoever.

Mr. THURMOND. Should there ever have been a combination or merging of those two subjects in the same provision of the law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There should not have been, particularly when we consider only acreage allotments. If we are considering marketing quotas, it is easier to enforce production controls, but acreage allotments are not quite so easy to enforce.

Mr. THURMOND. Would not the repeal of section 348 tend to stimulate soil building rather than to discourage those practices?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the view of the Soil Conservation Service. It is the view of those in the Department of Agriculture who are responsible for soil-conservation programs under the ACP program. It is the view of the State committees on soil conservation. It is the view of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is the view of the Grange, and of the National Farmers Union. I know it is the view of several State farm-bureau organizations.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there anything more important we can do for this generation of farmers and the future than to encourage soil-building practices?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that one of the great moral, economic, and social responsibilities of this generation and all generations yet to come is to protect, with all the force and power at our and their command, the

fertility of our soil. That is a great resource which belongs to the people. It is the basis of a strong American economy. For the life of me—and I say this most respectfully—I cannot see why we should want to tie in a constructive, forward-looking program like soil conservation as a club or punitive measure to enforce price-support regulations. That would be like denying a child the opportunity of going to Sunday school because he had stayed out late some night during the previous week. The fathers and mothers of America have other means of disciplining delinquent children. They usually encourage them to go to Sunday school if they break the rules of the household. But that is not true in this instance.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in his amendment says, in effect, "If you stay out late, not only will you be spanked, but we will not let you go to Sunday school." What good does that do? It seems to me that the spanking ought to be enough, and that the Sunday school is long overdue.

If a farmer violates his acreage allotment and production quota, he gets the penalty of no price supports. He gets the penalty of no crop loan. He is left on his own, with no help from the Government to enable him to obtain a fair price for his commodity. That is ample penalty. But we should not compound that penalty by saying, "Not only shall you suffer that penalty, but we will also deny you the right to take good care of your soil. We will also deny you the opportunity to work with the Government of the United States in a great program established for the public good."

I cannot understand why we even hesitate. I do not think we shall. I am ready to vote now. I am sure that logic, reason, and prudent judgment are on our side.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that all the bill does is to eliminate the penalty provided by section 348?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota has a minute I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the price support program is a year-by-year program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be continued or it may be terminated in any year by a two-thirds vote of the farmers. They decide whether or not they want it. On the other hand, soil conservation is a long-term program, not limited by years or by decades. It is a program for the future as well as for the present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Its design and purpose was long-range, from decade to decade and from generation to generation. One of the reasons we have provided these payments is to encourage farmers to engage in the early practice of soil conservation, to help them to help themselves. We have done this all around the world, for other people. It seems to me that we ought to do it at home.

Mr. BARKLEY. Two decades ago we woke up to find that about a third of our rich soil had washed away and been eroded, and that if that process were to continue we might, as our population increased and as our soil fertility decreased, find ourselves in the situation in which many other countries are, namely, overpopulated and underproductive. Therefore the soil-conservation program is a long-term program, which has no connection whatever with the year-by-year program of price supports for the various crops included in the law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator's observation. Now that the proponents of the Holland amendment are recommending a very slight modification of the objective of section 348, I want them to produce one scintilla of evidence that section 348, as written, or section 348, as modified by the Holland amendment, has any effective relationship to price supports and production controls. In other words, does it operate to control production? I believe the answer is obvious that it does not, because where this program is most desirable and where it is needed the most is in the great midwestern area, in the corn-producing States, in which are found probably the largest number of farmers who are not in compliance with their quotas. They will not be in compliance with their quotas, I say respectfully, for a benefit payment of $25 from the Federal Government. They will not do it. If we want to pass soil-conservation legislation, let us pass that kind of legislation. If we wish to have price supports, we should legislate price supports. We should not mix the two. When we mix the two or set either up as a yardstick or as a disciplinary weapon, we destroy the whole effectiveness of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The first thing I wish to do is to answer the challenge of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to whether section 348 will work or can work. The best evidence of the fact that it will work and can work is the fact that in the cotton industry, to which it has applied continuously for many years, there is the highest degree of compliance that is found in any large agricultural industry of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has put into the RECORD some figures which are pertinent. My recollection is that he said the number of cotton farmers in the Nation who were out of compliance last year—and that was planting out of compliance, and those farmers could still comply before harvest time, as most of them did—was only 11,000. That is 11,000 out of more than a million cotton farmers in the Nation.

In other words, about 1 percent were out of compliance in their planting. Under the provision of last year's act, which became applicable for the first time this year as to other commodities, but which was applicable last year to cotton——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not wish to yield at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the provisions of that law, which allowed farmers to come into compliance by harvest time, very nearly all of the cotton farmers were in compliance by the time of the harvest.

That fact is incontrovertible, and the Senator cannot and need not try to controvert it. The cotton producers of the Nation are the ones who have been in closest compliance with these programs all the way through.

The reason why they have been in such close compliance is that a similar but stronger provision was made applicable to them through these programs. There cannot be any better evidence than the type of performance we have had, and Senators know that the cotton industry is a complying industry.

Listening to the arguments of the opposition, one would think that it is almost a crime to comply with the acreage limitation restrictions of the act. The purpose of the act is to protect the farmers. It offers them a chance to control their production. The world knows and our people are keenly aware of the fact that we are producing more than we can consume. The warehouses are full of agricultural commodities. Ships are full of them. Every place we can find to store such commodities is full.

Last year we passed a law in the hope of putting some brakes upon overproduction. Now come distinguished Senators who try to take off one of those brakes. It is a brake which has shown its effectiveness in the cotton industry. It is a brake which will show its effectiveness in other industries, if it is given a chance to operate. It has not been given a chance, because it has only become effective this year for the first time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield at this time. Are Senators fearful that the same degree of effectiveness will prevail in the other agricultural industries that has already prevailed in the cotton industry? Are they afraid to allow a year's experience on this restriction, which would encourage compliance? Or are they simply pleading, like angels with trumpet tongues, for a violation of the law?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator speaks about making it more necessary for the wheat farmer to comply with the program. Under the modified amendment of the Senator, the wheat farmer is almost entirely out of it, and the amendment affects almost entirely the corn producer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator could not be more mistaken. The only wheat farmers who are out of it are those who produce up to 15 acres of wheat. The

Senator has stated in his able argument that there were so few affected farmers in his own State that the provision hardly applied to his State. The fact is that the only farmers who are taken from under the act are those who are already out from under it, in decency and equity, because of the provision of the price support act which is already in effect, that when a farmer plants up to 15 acres, he is exempt. However, in order to have no question raised on this point, the pending amendment was offered by myself and three other Senators. That amendment makes it clear that a wheat farmer can plant up to 15 acres not only under the price restriction provision of the act, but also under the other provision.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I have the assurance of Mr. Ritchie, of the Department of Agriculture, that the Holland amendment, as modified, would put most wheat farmers into compliance, and that the most pronounced effect would be on the corn farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fact is that it would put most of those who violated the provision in compliance with it. No one wants to hold them to one standard of compliance under one provision of the act and to a different standard of compliance under another provision of the act.

Those who are opposing the amendment would like to eat their cake and have it too. They are trying to get full advantage of the price support program for farmers even when they overplant, and at the same time draw benefits from a generous Government for conservation practices. They are something like a man I once knew when I was practicing law. He always wanted to trade with one hand and fight with the other. That is not the practical way to do things. The farmers who have the advantage of this beneficent program should do no less than comply with acreage allotments.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, able as he is, make a statement to the effect that corn would not be brought under this provision, and that corn was not particularly affected because so many corn farmers do not sell their corn under the price support program. We have known that all along. We have known that so long as no penalty is imposed on a farmer who does not sell his corn, there is no chance to bring him into line. The question arises whether we will have one provision in the law which gives some chance of bringing the corn producers into line, and whether we will have one provision in the law which provides that the important segment of our agricultural industry which produces corn shall have to obey the law in order to get the benefit of it. I believe we should have this provision in the law.

Those of us who are pleading for the amendment know that Senators who have spoken against it are those who were opposed to the price support provisions in the bill last year. They are in favor of continuance of overproduction and overstimulation without any brakes at all being applied to payments that farmers receive from the Government.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield, unless I am granted further time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes the Senator from Florida allotted to himself have expired. The Senator from Florida has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we have 22 minutes left on this side of the argument. I should be glad to have the Senator use some of those minutes so that I would not be trespassing on his time. So, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask a question.

The Senator stated that the cotton producer was mostly in compliance.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated that the cotton producers had made the finest record of compliance of any great agricultural producing group.

Mr. THYE. This is the question which I should like to ask the Senator. How would a cotton producer use all his cotton if he did not put it through commercial channels? It can be made into textiles or put to whatever commercial use can be made of it. If his cotton is put through commercial channels his compliance is positive. The farmer who sells his wheat will be in compliance. The farmer who wishes to feed a few bushels of wheat in his general dairy-mix will grow a few acres of wheat for that purpose and use it in that manner. But in the general operations in the great corn-growing areas of the Nation, when the corn is grown strictly for feeding purposes, we should encourage the type of farming which puts the feed into livestock and markets the product in the form of pork, diary products, or beef. No one will deny that that is the kind of practice we wish to carry out. What we are trying to do is to provide for sound conservation practices which will assure future generations fertile lands to till.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was glad to yield for a question, but——

Mr. THYE. Any time I take comes from our side, and then the Senator from Florida will have free time to go on with his speech.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. The first thing I wish to say——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just a moment. I am in charge of the time, and I should like to know where we are. Are we charging it up thus far to my good friend from Florida? I am willing to yield whatever time is necessary for the presentation of the senior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that the Senator from Florida had 14 minutes remaining. At the present time he has 11 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yielded for a question, and I expected it to be asked, but I had to call a halt because my time was ebbing away. I called my distinguished friend's attention to the fact that he was using my time without asking a question.

The first thing I should like to call to the attention of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is that the remarks he has made with reference to the cotton farmer apply to the small cotton farmer. They do not apply at all to the great cotton farmers of the Southwest, to the great cotton farmers of the Mississippi Delta, and many other cotton farmers who are also alined with exporters, ginners, processors, and others who handle large stocks of cotton from year to year. Before the law providing for controls was passed there had always been a very heavy carryover of cotton. Improvements in merchandising on the part of those who handle our cotton crop have improved that situation. I do not think I need to remind Senators of the tie-in of Anderson-Clayton with the great cotton production of this country. Cotton is storable indefinitely, and the cottonseed meal, cottonseed oil, and other products coming from it are salable. Once the cotton is ginned those products are available for any purpose for which they may be used.

Some of us have been speaking as if we are not concerned about corn, as if we are perfectly willing to have the corn producers overproduce. They can double, triple, or quadruple their acreage, and, apparently, it makes no difference to our friends who are opposing this particular amendment. That is one of the troubles we are having in connection with the whole program, and the very figures presented by my distinguished friend from North Dakota show that compliance in the corn industry is the worst of any that can be found.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment.

I wish to remind Senators that corn production is linked inseparably with barley, oats, rye, and other grains. The Senate will remember that last year when we were debating the bill which was then before the Senate, the junior Senator from Minnesota was asking a special kind of consideration for and special inclusion in the law of small grains because they should be given the same sort of treatment which was given corn and be given the same sort of chance to prosper. Those of us who were on the floor during that long debate will remember perfectly well that that was the case.

One of the things causing the most trouble is that in the case of the corn industry the violations have been so numerous, the impact upon the use of small grains has been so violent, and the impact on the whole picture has been so great, that we have not been able to bring order out of chaos.

An effort is being made to remove the only chock we have under the wheel although we see piling up in ever more mountainous lots corn which is produced not in compliance with the allotments made by a generous government as representing production to which the corn farmer is entitled.

Mr. President, we have got to get down to brass tacks and decide whether we want compliance completely or whether

we do not. I think agriculture must realize that if it continues to follow this irresponsible course, if distinguished Senators continue to urge this path of irresponsibility, there is just one answer, and that is the loss of the whole very valuable price-support structure. There is no way to escape from that.

The thing we must do is to find out whether the average decent farmer who will comply will have his hands upheld, or whether those who want to take advantage of others are going to be encouraged in their ever-increasing violations so that production will be much in excess of the allotments.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not a fact that in spite of considerable noncompliance on the part of corn farmers, there is little surplus of corn? The Secretary of Agriculture set corn supports at 87 percent of parity for 1955 because he believed there was little or no surplus. I think that fact belies the statement made by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I dislike to disagree with my friend, but in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he has several times called attention to the fact that price supports on small grains have been reduced unduly, and that the reason for it is the overproduction of corn.

Mr. YOUNG. That was not the reason.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from North Dakota will, of course, admit, I feel certain, that several times he has called attention to the fact that, in his judgment, the price support for small grain has been too greatly reduced.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to read a telegram I have received from Mr. Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and to ask the able Senator from Florida if Hassil Schenck has an understanding of his amendment. Mr. Schenck's telegram reads:

> Senator HOLLAND has amendment to H. R. 1573 striking section 348 of 1954 act which denies ACP payment to anyone knowingly harvesting more than allotment. HOLLAND is proposing amendment to retain section 348 but modify it to permit harvesting (1) wheat up to 15 acres, (2) corn for silage, (3) peanuts for seed for hoggins-off—

Evidently Mr. Schenck means "feed for hoggins-off."

Mr. HOLLAND. No; "seed for hogging-off."

Mr. CAPEHART. I continue:

> (4) above allotted acres on basics if quotas voted down. Also applicants need not certify have not exceeded allotments in areas where allotments not applicable. Would appreciate your support Holland amendment.
>
> HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
> *President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.*

Does Mr. Schenck properly describe the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. He does, with complete propriety. Also, there has been one more factor added today, of particular value in areas with acreages of wheat produced for poultry and other feed, completely in line with the purposes and objectives of the bill.

While I do not know the gentleman who signed the telegram, he certainly has a clear understanding of what is being attempted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Schenck is president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not happen to know the gentleman.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I understand, the amendment is designed to aid the small-size farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my judgment, the amendment removes every handicap that could have been imposed upon the small farmer by the strict enforcement of section 348.

Mr. CAPEHART. Particularly the marginal farms.

Mr. HOLLAND. The large farms and the marginal farms are included in the compliance. I am sure the Senator from Indiana will be one who will say, that when we have a system such as this, a farmer who does not comply, is not entitled to any sympathy, much less to be accorded aid in his evasion by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. It sounds good to me. I think I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have heard this afternoon that there were a million violators among the corn growers last year; 11,000 among the cotton growers, and more than 30,000 among the tobacco growers. But if the violators among the wheat, rice, and peanut growers were included, there would probably be a million and a half violators among the 3 million commercial producers in this country.

If 50 percent of the corn growers were violators, it is a fact that those violators came under the rigid 90 percent support program, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly is.

With reference to the tobacco growers, because I do not think they should be brought into the picture, the larger part of their noncompliance was in the burley field. That situation has been frankly faced by the Senators who represent the States where that kind of tobacco is produced.

Last year Congress was asked to "up" the penalty to 50 percent, as I recall, and this year to a higher percentage, in an effort to continue to bring the greater and greater pressure toward compliance.

Shall we reverse that stand? Shall we reverse that kind of operation by reducing the pressure that calls for compliance?

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not also true that thousands of tobacco growers in Maryland voted last year against the control program?

Mr. HOLLAND. My recollection is that in Maryland, compliance as to that particular variety of tobacco was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, those farmers would have no quotas to comply with.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I resent the statement by the Senator from Vermont which questioned the figures I presented this afternoon. They came from the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary is Ezra T. Benson. They are authentic figures.

Furthermore, I cannot understand the motives of those who are sponsoring the amendment. If they really want to attack the surplus problem, then why is it that they have offered an amendment which would take care of most of the wheat producers, outside of the established wheat-producing areas while penalizing the corn farmers?

The actual fact is that just a very few of the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation never have thought much of the soil conservation program known as ACP. They have appeared every year to reduce the appropriation for that program.

I know of no better way in which to destroy the ACP program than to agree to the Holland amendment. I think the farmers all over America would disagree almost entirely with the viewpoint expressed today by the four Senators who sponsored the amendment.

I think it is rather significant that the four Senators who have sponsored the amendment come from States outside the area which is affected.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I come from a State which has more farms than has any other State in the Union. Many persons do not realize that. A great number of those farms are small ones, as the allotments on the various crops will show.

North Carolina this year, I regret to add, because we do not like to advertise ourselves in this respect, stands 44th among the States in income, but we stand about fourth in the amount paid to the Federal Government in excise taxes.

Among those in the lower income group, most of them are in the farm group.

The amendment under consideration will affect approximately 109,000 farm people in 91 counties. I should like to remind the Senate that North Carolina has had 3 severe drought years. In addition, we experienced Hurricane Hazel, which was the worst hurricane we have known in our lifetime.

Furthermore, we have sustained the most severe late spring freeze we have ever had. I had the opportunity to be in the Carolinas early this morning. I saw wheat and barley which were damaged. But I saw the farmers cutting hay and going ahead, doing the best they could. I saw whole fields of barley which were damaged.

By daylight early this morning, I saw people working in the tobacco fields, trying to make the best of an extremely bad situation.

I see no reason why ACP payments should be tied to crop compliance. There is no relationship. We are but the tenants of the Almighty. We are charged with the responsibility of determining how we shall use land which the Lord has given us to work with. We are doing the best we can. We need no handicaps.

I am reminded of the story of a man who met a neighbor across a rail fence. The first man saw an animal disappear into the ground, and he went after it. The neighbor, coming up to him, said:

"John, that is nothing but a groundhog. You don't eat groundhogs, do you?"

The first man said, "No; but we need meat at our house, and I am glad to have the meat."

That is the situation we are in. We do not need the helping hand of the Government in the way in which it is said the amendment would help.

ACP payments should not be in any way tied in with compliance with the crop-control program in one way or another, especially when it gives advantages to peanut growers in some States, but penalizes the corn growers in about 25 counties in my State simply because they follow exactly the same principle which is carried out in the contingent-feed programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject. I yield back the remainder of my time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

Most of the opposition that has been expressed to H. R. 1573 is based on the argument that section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 discourages farmers from overplanting acreage allotments.

It is argued that if farmers are deprived of their ACP payments for overplanting allotments, then the end result will be that farmers will plant within their allotments.

It is also argued that this has been the case in respect to cotton. Since 1938 farmers who overplanted their cotton allotments have lost ACP payments.

In respect to cotton there are a few facts that should be brought out. Cotton acreage allotments were in effect from 1938 through 1942—a period of 5 years. Then there were no cotton acreage allotments again until 1950, a period of 7 years. There were acreage allotments on cotton in 1950 and 1951. Then came another period of 2 years, 1952 and 1953, when there were no cotton allotments in force. Cotton allotments were restored in 1954 and are again in effect for this crop year.

Consequently, in using cotton as an example, it must be taken into consideration that cotton acreage allotments have been in effect only 4-crop years since 1942, a period of 13 years. On the basis of these facts it makes it impossible to get a clear picture on just what effects overplanting cotton have on the ACP payments.

On the basis of information from Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation officials in North Carolina it is found that 23 North Carolina counties are classified as commercial corn counties. In these 23 counties there are 54,000 farms that produce corn. In all there are 240,000 farms in North Carolina and almost without exception, each one of these farms produces corn for one purpose or another. On a vast majority of farms in North Carolina corn is produced solely for livestock feeding purposes. According to ASC officials very little corn is sold in the commercial market. In most cases the corn is harvested in the fall of the year, then stored for use as livestock feed through the winter months. In other cases corn is hogged-off. This is largely true in the eastern counties of the State where most of the swine is produced. The State produces about 60-million swine a year and a large percentage of the corn production goes into feeding these hogs.

If the amendment proposed by Senator HOLLAND is passed, it will mean that and farmer in the commercial corn counties who overplants his corn allotment regardless of what he uses the corn for—will lose his ACP payments. Farmers who are outside the commercial corn counties can plant all the corn they please and still get their ACP payments. This is gross injustice. It means simply this:

A man in a commercial corn county with a 10-acre allotment of corn could plant 11 acres and lose his ACP payments. The man on the adjoining farm, if he is outside the commercial belt, can plant a thousand acres of corn if he so pleases and still get his ACP payment. Situations of this sort would exist all over the State if the Holland amendment becomes law.

As for wheat, most of this production in North Carolina is for home consumption, and 95 percent of the wheat farms in North Carolina grow less than 15 acres of wheat. In all there are 53,000 wheat farms in North Carolina with wheat acreage allotments in 98 counties. In most cases wheat is grown for hay and milled for livestock feed and home consumption. The majority of the wheat growers of North Carolina are in the 5-acre bracket. They grow a few acres of wheat and have it ground and mixed at the milling plants for winter livestock and poultry feeds. Under the Holland amendment wheat farmers would be allowed to harvest up to 15 acres of wheat—if their allotment is anywhere under 15 acres—without losing their ACP payments.

In practice the amendment would have this effect:

A farmer with a 5-acre wheat allotment could harvest up to 15 acres of wheat—planting 10 acres above his allotment—and still get his ACP payments. This same farmer, if he has a corn allotment and is in a commercial corn county, will lose his ACP payments if he plants any corn over his allotment. It would simply mean that a farmer could grow wheat above his allotment for livestock feed and home consumption without being penalized while he would not be able to grow corn above his allotment. He would be penalized for overplanting corn, but he would be within the law for overplanting wheat.

In the case of a farmer who has 50 hogs and raises corn above his corn allotment to feed these hogs, the Holland amendment would require him to purchase corn in the commercial market if he continued to receive ACP payments. A farmer who gets, for example, $75 a year in ACP payments and would have to purchase $200 worth of corn to feed his hogs through the winter, would have no other financial choice than to forgo his ACP payments and raise the necessary corn to feed the hogs.

In North Carolina particularly, as a result of the drought, Hurricane Hazel and the recent freeze, many farmers are being forced to diversify their operations. If a farmer has never raised hogs before and decides to do so this year, and wants to plant corn to feed them, then he may find himself ineligible to take part in the ACP projects. Consequently, if the Holland amendment becomes law, it is conceivable that many, many farmers not only in North Carolina but throughout the country will find themselves handicapped in going into swine or livestock production as a means of replacing income that they have lost as a result of drought and other weather conditions.

If there is a real desire to reduce the overplanting of acreage allotments in corn and grain, then there is a much more effective way to go about it than the means proposed in the Holland amendment.

Take tobacco for example:

As a result of recent legislation, tobacco farmers who overplant their acreage allotments this year will have to pay a penalty of 75 percent of the parity support price on the tobacco that they produce above their allotment. In practice this means that a farmer must pay 40 cents per pound penalty on tobacco he produces over his allotment. When the average market price of tobacco is between 55 and 60 cents a pound—as it was last year—then a farmer cannot afford to pay 40 cents a pound penalty on that tobacco he produces over his allotment. If there is any way to keep a farmer from producing above his allotment then such a penalty as this is the way to do it.

In the case of cotton there is a stiff penalty, but it is not as rigorous as that on tobacco. Farmers are required to pay 50 percent of the parity loan rate on all cotton they produce over their allotment. In practice this means that a farmer must pay 16 cents per pound penalty on all cotton he produces over his allotment if the support price is 32 cents a pound.

If there is any one reason for cotton farmers staying within their acreage allotments, the penalty provision of the law is the reason—not the loss of ACP payments.

If there is a real desire to keep farmers from overplanting corn and wheat allotments, then the proper and effective way to go about it is working out a penalty program that is stiff enough to force farmers to lose money on the wheat and corn they sell above their allotments.

In the case of wheat the current penalty is about $1.12 a bushel. In the case of corn there is no penalty because of the fact the Secretary of Agriculture has not declared marketing quotas for corn.

The effect of section 348 as it now reads can be seen in the following figures by North Carolina ASC officials:

At this time last year about 25 percent of the farmers in the commercial corn area of North Carolina had made application to participate in the ACP program. This year so far only about 6 percent of the farmers in the same area have made applications to take part in the program. This means that 75 percent of the farmers in the affected areas who took part in the soil conservation program last year have abandoned plans to do so this year. The reason is clear. The farmers in this area must have feed for their own livestock, and they will continue to grow their livestock feed, even if it means losing their ACP payments. Consequently, section 348 has not kept the farmers in these areas from overplanting. They have been overplanting in past years, and they will continue to plant to fill their needs. It does mean, however, that they are being forced out of the soil conservation program.

The soil conservation program is reaching only about 50 percent of the farmers in North Carolina now that it reached only 2 years ago. Because of the new regulations and changes in the program, only about 60,000 North Carolina farmers took part in the soil conservation program in 1954. In 1953, 112,000 North Carolina farmers took part in the program. In 1952 the number was even larger.

Thus, the trend is toward fewer farmers taking part in soil conservation. Instead of increasing the number of farmers who are taking part in the ACP, we are losing them year by year. If the Holland amendment becomes law, we will lose even more.

If the trend continues and steps are not taken to bring more farmers into the ACP,

then the entire program could well die on the vine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota. How much time does the Senator desire to have?

Mr. THYE. I do not think I will take more than 3 minutes, or thereabouts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am holding in my hand the report on H. R. 1573, calendar No. 218. On page 2 of the report there appears a letter addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In the letter will be found various places where the Under Secretary of Agriculture refers to the particular amendment before the Senate, but the most interesting and striking sentence of the letter of Under Secretary True D. Morse is:

Elimination of this entire requirement of eligibility is desirable. Its repeal would not require additional appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

The letter is dated February 9, 1955. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter of Under Secretary True D. Morse printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, because there have been so many statements made to the effect that we who are opposed to the amendment are trying to destroy some phase of the farm program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 9, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in partial reply to your letter of January 19, 1955, requesting reports on certain bills relating to agriculture. We are herein reporting on S. 494, S. 517, and S. 532. These bill are identical and would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This section which was amended by section 311 of Public Law 690, 83d Congress, provides that any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity on his farm, which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment, shall not be eligible for any ACP payment. All persons applying for any ACP payment are required to file with the application, a statement of facts showing eligibility under this provision.

The Department approves of this proposed legislation. At present the only ACP payments made are for cost-sharing with respect to conservation practices carried out on farms, and these payments represent only a share of the cost of performing the conservation measure. There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists. Also, the present average ACP amount of cost-sharing of less than $100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

The principal effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms. Since it is expected that most farmers will comply with marketing quota provisions, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will affect principally farmers with corn allotments and farmers with less than 15-acre wheat allotments. Under marketing quota requirements a farmer with a wheat allotment less than 15 acres is permitted to grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without incurring a marketing quota penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the ACP eligibility requirement of section 348.

Based on past experience it is estimated that there will be about 750,000 farms with a 1955 wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres. A high percentage of these farms is expected to take advantage of the 15-acre limit and thereby become ineligible for 1955 ACP assistance. It is estimated that there will be 1,600,000 farms with a 1955 corn allotment. Based on the compliance obtained in 1954 it is likely that up to 60 percent, or almost 1 million farms, will have excess corn acreage in 1955 which would make them ineligible for 1955 ACP payments. Even though some farms with small wheat allotments also grow corn and would be included in both of the foregoing estimates, it is likely that substantially more than 1 million farms would not be eligible for ACP payments, due to the provisions of section 348.

Elimination of this entire requirement of eligibility is desirable. Its repeal would not require additional appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on page 3 of the report appears another letter addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. It is dated March 10, 1955, and is signed by Earl L. Butz, Acting Secretary. Let me read one sentence:

With respect to the effect of this bill on section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, this Department recommends that the entire section 348 be repealed. The proposed bill would repeal only that part of the section which was added by Public Law 690, 83d Congress.

Mr. President, can you imagine what we are arguing about, when True D. Morse, the Under Secretary, proposes and advocates the repeal of section 348, and when the Acting Under Secretary, Earl L. Butz, proposes its repeal? I think that in itself should eliminate any question as to whether I am right when I urge the repeal of this particular section of the law, or whether the proposal to modify a provision of law the Department of Agriculture wants stricken out entirely is sound.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of March 10, 1955, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and signed by Mr. Earl L. Butz, Acting Secretary, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 12, 1955, for a report on S. 139, a bill to repeal the amendments to sections 348 and 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which were made by section 311 of the Agricultural Act of August 28, 1954 (Public Law 690, 83d Cong.).

With respect to the effect of this bill on section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, this Department recommends that the entire section 348 be repealed. The proposed bill would repeal only that part of the section which was added by Public Law 690, 83d Congress. If S. 139 is enacted, the provision that a person comply with his cotton acreage allotment would remain in effect. It is the view of this Department that ACP's eligibility should not be conditioned on compliance with any of the acreage allotments. The principal effect of such restrictions is to discourage the carrying out of needed conservation work. This Department therefore favors the elimination of the entire eligibility requirement imposed by section 348 rather than elimination of the requirement for only a part of the crops with acreage allotments. More details of our recomendation are contained in our report to you wtih respect to S. 494, S. 517, and S. 532.

The Department recommends against the provision of S. 139 which would repeal the 1954 amendment to section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. That amendment directed the Secretary to provide a method by which a farmer who overplants any basic crop allotment may adjust the planted acreage to the farm acreage allotment. S. 139 would restore, in place of this provision, the last sentence of section 374 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was similarly worded except that it applied only to cotton.

Since the passage of Public Law 690, farmers have been expecting to be permitted to adjust their planted acreage to come within the allotment on each basic crop if they so desired. To change at this time, with respect to the 1955 crop, would lead to much dissatisfaction, misunderstanding, and administrative difficulty in connection with some crops, particularly corn and rice.

The Department believes that the provision for adjusting the planted acreage to the allotment should be applicable equally to all the basic commodities. In our opinion the provision in the present law should be retained.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the farmers of New York State do not raise a great quantity of grain, since New York is primarily a dairy State, but with respect to the grain which they do raise, they are not at all interested in support prices, since they sell virtually none of their grain in the market.

The grain which the farmers of New York raise is fed to poultry and other animals on the farms. The farmers have no interest whatsoever in price supports, but they have a very vital interest in soil conservation.

Soil conservation is practiced, and has been for a number of years, to the great advantage of the farms and the rural areas of the State. Within my lifetime I have personally seen the tremendously beneficial effect that soil conservation and reforestation have had on the farms and countryside of my State.

I do not want to see anything done which would take from the farmers of my State the benefits of soil conservation, in which they are deeply interested,

as are the farmers, I believe, in almost all other States.

Because of that fact, I shall vote against the Holland amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received scores of telegrams from farmers and from social clubs, all opposed to the Holland amendment. More particularly, the telegrams have made the prediction that we are due, either this year or next year, to have another dust-bowl area. Therefore, they, as well as businessmen, are interested in seeing that the soil conservation program is maintained.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think we can bring the debate to a conclusion with a few final observations I should like to make. The points have been made in substance, by those who have participated in the debate. I am particularly grateful for the arguments made here by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and other Senators who have expressed their views. I desire to leave none out. I think they have stated the case clearly.

One claim the Holland amendment proposal advocates take unto themselves as conclusive evidence in favor of the adoption of the proposal, is that when there is overproduction there must be penalty provisions to keep farmers in line so that they will not violate acreage allotments.

The interesting point was made this afternoon that the greatest amount of overproduction is in wheat, and it is the one commodity which the Holland amendment eliminates. I think the principle of divide and conquer has been used. That is, a special exemption has been made as to wheat farmers, and wheat is a commodity of which there are surpluses, and no exemption, which is meaningful, has been made with respect to corn, of which commodity there are no surpluses, or small surpluses.

I say the Holland amendment, instead of controlling production, would encourage it, and at the same time would do damage to soil conservation.

I have heard further comment today that farmers ought to comply. Of course, farmers ought to comply, if they can make a living; but one reason why farmers have not complied with acreage allotments is the high cost of farm operation and the reduced income from farm production.

It is perfectly true that the factor which is most controlling to a farmer is his personal economic situation. Therefore, many farmers have not complied with acreage allotments because they were not designed to benefit him or his family; nor did compliance make it possible for him to pay his bills.

I think it is most important that those who have complied with the acreage allotment laws are those who are basically feeders, who are using their corn or grain for feed, and not for commercial uses in the normal channels of trade.

The Senator from Florida has emphasized the fact that the growers of cotton are in compliance. I think we owe a great deal of gratitude to the cotton farmers. In fact, if it were not for them we would not have had the price support program. They led the way and pointed the way. They not only have acreage allotments, but marketing quotas.

As has been stated on the floor, when there are in effect both acreage allotments and marketing quotas, compliance is enforceable. Farmers do not eat or feed cotton; therefore, the temptation or the necessity for going beyond the acreage allotment is not present.

We have been accused of following an irresponsible path by proposing repeal of section 348. I listened attentively as the distinguished Senator from Florida said that those who oppose the repeal of section 348 are following an irresponsible path. The distinguished Senator surely includes a great many people. The Secretary of Agriculture and the whole Department are recommending the repeal of section 348. The committee heard two witnesses who were sent by the Department of Agriculture, and who recommended the repeal of the section.

Mr. President, Representative HOPE, of Kansas, a Republican Representative, and an ardent champion of agriculture, is the author of the bill, now before us, to repeal section 348. The National Grange, one of the truly great farm organizations of the Nation, has recommended the repeal of section 348; and the Iowa Farm Bureau has also recommended the repeal of section 348. I do not believe that these great and steadfast people are following an irresponsible course of action.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that during the debate today I have heard it said again and again that in favoring the repeal of section 348, we favor a course of action which would promote law violation. It is interesting to me to note that the substitute proposal is not only one which would not require compliance, but that it has been amended a little so as to say, in effect, "Do not comply occasionally." In other words, the Senator from Florida is opposed to sin on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday; he skips Friday; but he is in favor of sin on Saturday and Sunday, because the Senator from Florida would permit escape for corn for ensilage purposes and for peanuts and for wheat. He would provide all kinds of escape hatches; but the trouble is that the escape hatches he would provide, and which would permit this economic sin to occur, do not help the people who need to be helped to escape. The escape hatches the Senator from Florida would provide do not provide for soil conservation.

Mr. President, I conclude my argument by saying that if we need more law on the statute books, so as to have acreage allotments enforced or so as to result in compliance with acreage allotments or marketing quotas, then let us write such a law, just as we did in the case of certain kinds of tobacco. We did not say that the way to get the tobacco farmer to comply was to double the penalty, in terms of a denial of soil-conservation payments. If we need more law, in order to compel the farmers to obey and to comply with the acreage allotments and the marketing quotas, then let us write such a law. But let us not use the constructive, positive, progressive program of soil conservation as a stick or club or punitive measure to enforce a law which relates to price supports and crop loans.

Mr. President, the great tragedy in this debate, if it can be termed such, is that some Senators are trying to use the soil-conservation payment program as a weapon or a club with which to enforce acreage and marketing quotas in the price-support program. However, soil conservation and the price support program are not tied together.

Mr. President, I repeat that if we never had a price-support program on the statute books, we would still need soil-conservation payments. I regret to see Senators who have done so much for agriculture mislead themselves and attempt to mislead others by advocating a proposal which would weaken the soil-conservation payment program, which has constituted a great forward movement in the effort to provide a constructive policy with respect to the use and production of the great land resources of the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Minnesota will join me in requesting the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me; and, following a quorum call, I shall suggest that the Senator from Florida and I join in requesting the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let us make that request now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the Holland amendment, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has all the time under the unanimous-consent agreement been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the proponents of the amendment has been completely used; and the Senator from Minnesota has just yielded back the remainder of the time available to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "Nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "Yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "Yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "Nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF and Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "Yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Frear	Payne
Allott	Goldwater	Potter
Anderson	Gore	Purtell
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bennett	Holland	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Bush	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kuchel	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Chavez	Millikin	Williams
Cotton	Pastore	

NAYS—49

Barkley	George	McCarthy
Bender	Green	McClellan
Bible	Hayden	McNamara
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Butler	Hill	Morse
Carlson	Hruska	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Daniel	Kerr	Scott
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Lehman	Thurmond
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Young
Ervin	Malone	
Fulbright	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—12

Beall	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Jenner	Murray	Wiley

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by Mr. HOLLAND, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the Senators in control of the time for debate prepared to yield back the time on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has expired. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1573) was passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate has concluded its business today, it stand in recess until next Thursday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point editorials published in various newspapers throughout the country dealing with the President's road plan.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Morning Tennessean of January 19, 1955]

MR. BYRD HITS SHAM ROAD PLAN

"Thoroughly unsound" was Senator HARRY F. BYRD's verdict on the multi-billion-dollar highway program formally proposed to President Eisenhower last week by his advisory committee for a national highway plan.

The contemplated procedures, he added, would "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." With a good deal of restraint he avoided the obvious word, "sham."

First among the Virginian's targets was the proposal to set up a Federal corporation to sell $20 billion in Government-guaranteed bonds at 3 percent interest. The bonds would be retired from revenues from the 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax, and $5 billion more would be raised by taxing filling stations and motels along roads.

This bond issue would cost taxpayers more than $11.5 billion in interest, which would mean every dollar borrowed would eventually cost $1.55. But to make matters worse in Senator BYRD's opinion, it is proposed that the bonds not be included in the regular Government debt figure. This would mean keeping two sets of books and pave the way for endless outlays for other building programs under the same formula of financial ledgerdemain. Furthermore, it is predicted, the bonds will probably not be paid off at maturity, in keeping with the current idea on debt retirement.

Having had long experience with road building in his own State, Senator BYRD proposes an alternate plan.

First, he suggests that the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it. Secondly, the present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, should be continued on a long standing basis. This amounts to $535 million. Further, the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued, and finally a ½-cent-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax be imposed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly would be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

"Under this plan," it is declared, "States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

By comparison, the Byrd program stands out as a forthright approach to a major problem without an effort at financial trickery and misrepresentation of the kind that has been offered to Mr. Eisenhower. And as such, it is recommended reading for Gen. Lucius D. Clay, head of the presidential advisory committee, whose voice carries so much weight at the White House. Its importance is already conceded by the Democratic Congress.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel of January 17, 1955]

MR. BYRD WARMS UP

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has come out with a preliminary appraisal of the $101 billion highway program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission.

The respected Virginian has made it clear that he is choosing his words with restraint, pending Ike's formal announcement on where he stands.

While merely warming up, so to speak, Mr. BYRD has this to say:

"Legerdemain * * * thoroughly unsound * * * a procedure that would violate financial principles, defy budgetary control, and evade the Federal debt."

That is pretty good for a starter. In full voice, Mr. BYRD may peel the paint right off the White House.

We admire both his splendid early season form and his views on this matter.

The President's Commission says among other things that if a Federal corporation is set up, and if that corporation sells $20 billion worth of 30-year bonds, then for some reason or other we can just forget about adding the total to our national debt.

Nonsense, says Mr. BYRD. The so-called corporation plans to pay 3 percent interest to the bond buyers. Over 30 years, that will mean the buyers must be paid back their $20 billion plus $11.5 billion in interest. And who will be in hock for all those billions? The taxpayers, of course. If that isn't adding to the national debt, what is?

Good luck, Senator BYRD. From any angle, the whole setup looks about as sound as a chain letter.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of January 21, 1955]

GOLD BRICK HIGHWAYS

Senator BYRD has a plan for financing the $100 billion, 10-year highway program proposed by the President's advisory committee.

Instead of the gold-brick scheme devised by the committee, which would hike the

Federal debt without acknowledging it, the Senator suggests:

Repeal the two-cent Federal gasoline tax so the States may reimpose it and pay for their own highway construction. Use a Federal tax on lubricating oil and a new one-half cent tax on gasoline to finance the present Federal aid program for roads.

This, the Senator estimates, would save loading the cost of the program on future generations—with an additional price tag of $11.5 billion for interest on the debt.

In the Senator's own State of Virginia, a first-class highway system has been built and maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis—which makes it cheaper and doesn't indulge in the sleazy trick of passing on to the children our own obligations. What's wrong with Virginia's way?

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of February 25, 1955]

THEY'RE BUILDING ROADS AND BRIDGES

From all that is being said on the subject one might get the impression that road-building in the United States has come to a standstill.

But is the situation so bad that President Eisenhower's hundred-billion-dollar highway program should be put down as a must?

The fact is that throughout the United States, year after year, new roads and bridges are being built and the Nation's highway network is steadily expanding. This expansion may not be all that is desired, but it is taking place and as years go on the system of arterial and local routes will accommodate more and more traffic. It is costing vast sums of money, and it is a question whether the huge 10-year outlay so urgently recommended by President Eisenhower is advisable.

Under this 10-year program the Federal Government would provide about 31 of the $101 billion, with the remainder coming from the State governments. It calls for financing of a sort that is frowned upon in many quarters as unsound and deceptive. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, pronounces it "just pure pork barrel" and says it would be inflationary. We have enough confidence in Senator BYRD's judgment to accept his verdict as confirming our own suspicions.

Either of its own volition or as a result of high pressure the administration is calling for programs that mean heavier and heavier Federal financial commitment—for roads, schools, and the like. It all holds out prospect of "pork barrel" expenditures on an alarming scale, along with more demands upon the taxpayers. There ought to be a halt to it.

Should the administration's highway program be rejected it would not mean the cessation of roadbuilding. It might mean a longer time to reach the goal of entirely adequate highways, but it would proceed largely according to the needs and wishes of the various States.

All sorts of arguments are being advanced for this hundred-billion-dollar program. Some of them are specious. Most of them are answered by what is actually being done in the way of expanding the country's highway network.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of February 23, 1955]

ONE HUNDRED AND ONE ROAD BILLIONS

The President sent his mammoth highway-construction program to Congress yesterday, where it seems destined to stir one of the major controversies of this session. Some of the opposition already developing is deeply political, some is in sincere doubt over the fiscal formula and the inclusion of toll roads in the national-traffic grid.

The magnitude of the plan almost staggers imagination. Mr. Eisenhower recommends a 10-year building schedule which would embrace expenditure of $101 billon in Federal, State, and local funds. Such a network of highways and streets would give America the greatest road system in the history of the world. It would be a tremendous prime for the country's industrial and economic group, a potent factor in raising the gross national product from around $365 billion to the goal of $535 billion in 1965.

Before submitting his recommendation to Capitol Hill, the President held a long conference with Democratic and Republican leaders of Congress. This was the first bipartisan meeting the White House has held with the legislators on a domestic issue. The gathering was friendly, but it ended with Democrats challenging several facets of the plan and promising a fight.

Senator CHAVEZ declared the proposal full of holes. Senator GORE, who has his own highway bill before Congress, objected to the financing setup, as did Senator BYRD, normally a pro-Eisenhower Democrat. Their criticism was mainly aimed at Ike's scheme for funding the Federal share of the huge program—about $31 billion—through issuance of bonds, which would be retired over a 30-year period from taxes on gas and oil, and similar commodities.

The Gore bill would keep the present system of road financing, raising the Federal contribution from $875 million to $1,600,000,000 a year—less than one-fifth of the President's building program. Senator BYRD contends the bond interest would raise costs to Federal taxpayers about 55 percent. The American Automobile Association also opposes the fiscal plan, arguing it would force States to build toll roads or suffer loss of toll-road subsidies.

Although both parties have executed pledges to bar politics from the road program, inevitably Congressmen will feel the hot breath of political opportunism in a vast program involving billions on billions of tax dollars. The Clay report, which Mr. Eisenhower's proposition closely follows, would seek to guard against anything resembling pork barreling, and so, of course, would the President.

But the danger is inherent and will require many barriers. There is also the element of Democratic repugnance for so enormous a public-spending project, sired by the GOP administration, and likely to be well under way by 1956 elections.

One good portent, however, is that a general realization seems to exist in Congress regarding the need for a dynamic highways plan. Whatever conflicts arise over different features of the road prospectus, probably this Congress will launch a giant road-building venture. For its industry, economics, transportation, and strategic development, the Nation needs a highways blueprint similar to that envisaged by the President. It needs far more than the Gore measure offers.

No doubt the President expects some changes will be made in his imaginative plan. He observed in his message that inescapably the vastness of the highway enterprise fosters varieties of proposals which must be resolved into a national highway pattern. Presumably he expects amendment, alterations of his far-reaching recommendation. But a new, immensely more comprehensive road system looks to be in the works.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 23, 1955]

WHICH ROAD IS RIGHT?

President Eisenhower's new highway message to Congress has this in common with a new highway: the citizen has to proceed to the end of it to make sure of the destination.

The first section of the message deals with the need for better highways in terms of common knowledge: traffic fatalities on unsafe roads, high-cost transportation on slow roads, inadequate communications for defense. Most citizens will concur with the President that "action, comprehensive and forward-looking is needed."

Mr. Eisenhower then deals at length with the outline of a 10-year road program offered earlier by a special commission under Gen. Lucius D. Clay. This program calls for Federal-State expenditures of $101 billion, and the core of the proposal is for the Federal Government alone to spend $25 billion on the interstate-highway system.

Only in the last paragraphs of his message, however, does the President deal with the question which threw the Clay report into controversy. That is how to pay for this expanded Federal share in highway building. On this point Mr. Eisenhower is not nearly as specific as the Clay report.

General Clay's commission suggested establishing a Federal corporation to issue 30-year special road bonds at 3 percent interest. The bond debt would not show up in the Federal budget, yet the Government would be obliged to pay off the bonds.

Now Mr. Eisenhower says that "I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues," but he does not commit himself specifically to the Clay proposal. He appears to add a suggestion which the Clay group rejected: namely, that Congress earmark revenues from gasoline and other highway taxes to pay off bonds.

Since the President and his special commission seem to be in some disagreement as to just how to pay off a special highway bond issue, this aspect of the program is bound to cause some guesswork in Congress.

But congressional criticism of the Clay report has already shown that the main issue will not be how to finance bonds, but whether to issue special bonds at all.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, quoted in today's Mirror of Public Opinion, objects that such special bonds would be a subterfuge. Issued outside the budget, they would evade the debt limit and make the budget appear closer to balance than it really is.

Aside from that, this type of bond financing is far more expensive than the traditional pay-as-you-go method of highway appropriations. Senator BYRD estimates that in 30 years every dollar borrowed through bonds would cost the taxpayers $1.55 because of interest payments.

One related question also has arisen to the bond proposal. Why is the administration willing to issue $20 billion for a 10-year road plan, but has proposed to underwrite no more than $900 million in school bonds, and has offered a health reinsurance plan of just $25 million? Necessary as new highways are, should they have such great precedence over school aid?

Rumblings in Congress about these questions were not quieted by the last-minute White House conference with congressional leaders. This was the first time the administration had called in Democrats on a domestic program. But Presidential assistants said no major changes would be permitted in the program, so the purpose of the meeting was not consultation but a preview.

Since Congress had nothing to do with forming the road policy, that policy is bound to face critical examination as it goes before Congress. The Nation does not have to be told that it needs new highways. It ought to be told how it can get them economically, and that at least should mean keeping Federal highway costs in the Federal budget.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of February 25, 1955]

HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending $101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about $25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. We in Pennsylvania are very familiar with the trick.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have-you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an all-out highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized Nation in the world. They are falling further below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, February 23, 1955]

BIPARTISAN ROADS

Divided highways and divided politics flock together, if this week's Washington doings are any criterion.

On the one hand, for the first time outside of foreign affairs matters, a president took the unprecedented and praiseworthy step of calling in members of both parties to help solve our national highway crisis.

Simultaneously, Democratic Congressmen fell all over each other in their efforts to take potshots at the President's program and to develop makeshift, sectional, and partisan plans falling far short of needs.

In view of all the furor, it is not difficult to understand why Mr. Eisenhower gave the once-over-lightly to the two most controversial aspects of his road blueprints, based on extended studies of the Clay Commission. They are:

Establishment of a Federal highway finance corporation to raise $25 billion over 30 years (entailing additional 3 percent interest costs of $11,500,000,000).

Reimbursing those States which have already built toll highways fitting into the national interstate system.

The President said only that he felt it sounder to finance the program by special bond issues rather than by an increase in general revenue obligations. This bumps head on into the objections of Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who cannot stomach what he terms legerdemain financing.

BYRD argues that we cannot saddle these road debts on our grandchildren because it is a violent assumption to predict the highway bonds will be retired upon maturity—no other long-term United States bonds have been within the past 25 years.

Be that as it may, roads are a matter of expediency. Right now we are wasting $5 billion each year because of deaths, wear and tear, time loss, and other factors tied to a wholly inadequate highway system. Does the American public really care about the financial technicalities in such a pressing situation?

On the toll road score, helpful as it might be to Ohio to be repaid in part or whole, we think such a feature unfair to other less populous and wealthy States. In effect, this saddles State governments with excessive control over private businesses such as gas stations, restaurants, or motels, the necessary fixtures of limited access superhighways. Indeed, must motorists everywhere become the captives of bondholders?

Some unusual questions of constitutional law will also be raised by the President's highway recommendations. He suggests that the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gas tax be earmarked to retire the highway bonds. But can one session of Congress obligate succeeding sessions to continue any appropriation?

Regardless of the complications—and how silly it would be if the whole program fell by the wayside because of details or differences over methods—there is at least healthy agreement over objectives of the program.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of February 26, 1955]

HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending $101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about $25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have-you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an allout highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized Nation in the world. The are falling farther below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News of February 23, 1955]

HIGHWAY DEBT CANDOR

President Eisenhower's delayed highway message to Congress stated the case for a massive road-building program in dramatic and compelling terms, but glossed over the all-important subject of financing.

No one who has traveled the Nation's highways is likely to quarrel with the President's contention that a massive construction program is essential to business health, to the defense effort, and to the safety of human life.

By devising a $30 billion Federal spending program designed to trigger another $70 billion in outlays by the various States, the President's advisers have come up with a plan adequate to the need.

The difficulty is in finding a financial formula that will get the job done and still suit congressional economy advocates, one that will build highways and yet square with the President's avowed aim of avoiding deficit finance. No such formula has been devised, nor is it likely to be. To attempt to mask Government borrowing by setting up new Federal agencies, as recommended by the Clay report, is pure sophistry and HARRY BYRD was justified in tagging it as such.

Rather than try to get something for nothing, the better course would be for the President to lay his plan frankly and honestly before the people with the candid concession that it will require an increase in the Federal debt. Then, with enactment of Mr. Eisenhower's proposed use taxes through increases in gasoline and diesel levies, the borrowed money could be retired at a lower interest rate than if it were borrowed by a dummy agency as proposed in the Clay report.

This is the honest and open way to do business, in full candor with a citizenship which time and again has demonstrated its willingness to meet needs once their urgency was made clear.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Times of February 11, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The Committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the "other side" of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal aid program as it is today to primary, secondary, urban road systems, on the longstanding matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News of February 23, 1955]

CONGRESS MAY COMPROMISE PRESIDENT'S HIGHWAY PLAN

Congressional controversy over President Eisenhower's proposed highway-building program will center on the method of financ-

ing, for there is no reasonable question but what the size of the program is geared to urgent and clearly foreseeable needs.

The plan's scope was developed by Federal-State cooperation led by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The best highway and traffic thinking in the country went into that planning.

Briefly, the proposal is for a 10-year, $101 billion new construction program, with the Federal Government financing $31¼ billion and State and local governments the remainder.

Distribution of projects would be $37 billion urban, $64 billion rural, which would give a deserved break for financially strained cities. Distribution of cost would be roughly a third for each level of government—Federal, State, and local.

Though a heavier load would be placed on State and local governments for matching outlays, the proposed increase in Federal aid would be far greater. The Federal share of overall highway work would be hiked from the current 9 percent to 30 percent. And the $31¼ billion proposed Federal aid over 10 years is estimated to be about four times what the Washington Government has spent for that purpose since its aid program was begun in 1916.

It is apparent that an expanded highway-building program of such magnitude could not be financed from highway-and-car-use taxation at current rates. President Eisenhower believes that source should shoulder the cost burden.

But, to avoid higher tax rates, the President joins the Clay committee in recommending financing with $25 billion in 30-year bonds, not tax free, managed by a new Federal corporation and retired by pledging current and expanding billion-a-year revenues of related Federal taxation to that purpose.

After a backstage row among Presidential advisers and congressional leaders, the President tread lightly on that financing plan in his highway message. He thus virtually invited compromise, which seems the only salvation of the program in face of rising opposition.

Texans on the House Public Works Committee, to which the proposal will be referred, are all against bond financing, and they include a liberal Democrat, conservative Democrat, and Republican. That is a significant indication of Texas opinion.

Representative BRADY GENTRY, of Tyler, former chairman of Texas Highway Commission, objects that bond financing would add up to $11 billion in interest to cost estimates. And he says that it would inflate highway-building prices to add further to total cost.

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, long-time Treasury watchdog, has denounced (1) the fiction that the bonds would not add to the national debt, (2) the impropriety of any Federal financing outside the regular national budget, and (3) the illusion that added highways can be had without added taxation. This, he argues, could set off a new wave of "something for nothing" Federal spending in other fields. And congressional opposition will center around his objections.

Texans should note that their State's mandatory pay-as-you-go financing would be hard-pressed indeed to match Federal bond-financed and tax-fund outlays. Other States constitutionally prepared to match such Federal spending with bond issues of their own might get a lion's share of the aid.

Likely prospect is that the Eisenhower highway plan will be scaled down to what can be met by moderate increases in highway-car-use taxation. That prospect could be altered only by the President throwing all his personal popularity vigorously into a fight for the bond plan, which appears most improbable.

[From the Mechanicsburg (Pa.) Local News of February 21, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The Committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The Committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary secondary urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of February 23, 1955]

BILLIONS FOR HIGHWAYS

No long argument is needed to prove that the American people could make good use of $101 billion worth of new highways. Present traffic jams and increasing number of motor vehicles prove the need for more and better road mileage.

President Eisenhower has added another reason for faster action on highway improvement. He points to the danger of deadly congestion in the event of atomic warfare and the need for rapid evacuation of large urban areas. The accident and death toll would be lessened if safer conditions obtained on the Nation's many thousands of miles of roads, Congress was told in a statement that came from the White House on Tuesday.

It costs money, said the President, to drive automobiles over poor roads. Higher transportation costs are reflected in the price of goods moved along the highways, said the President, so the consumer pays either way and it would be much better to spend money for new highways than to have it go to meet the higher costs occasioned by inferior road surfaces.

In the Eisenhower plan is provision for an outlay of about $30 billion. States would provide twice that amount for a 10-year program. This vast expenditure would be financed by a bond issue and the debt would be serviced and retired through Federal gas and oil tax revenue and, in some instances, by tolls. The proposal, in the main, follows the recommendation by a special advisory committee of which Gen. Lucius D. Clay was chairman, in which the country was urged to spend $101 billion during a decade for highway construction.

At present there is a 2 cents per gallon Federal tax on gasoline and the greater part of that money is returned to the States as Federal aid for roads. The Eisenhower program is intended to be a supplement to what the States, with Federal assistance, are now doing. The National Government now refuses aid for roads on which tolls are charged. Connecticut is one of the States that have asked justifiably for a change in that policy. The Clay committee backs the critics of current practice.

Many Congress Members, Democrats and Republicans, like the idea of Federal aid for highways but they want the Government to raise all the money for such projects. A large proportion of them wouldn't mind if the national debt was thereby increased. This bond-issue idea is something else, especially since an independent agency is provided for to sell highway bonds and, it is insisted by the administraiton, such indebtedness would not become a part of the national debt. Economy exhorters, like Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, will claim that the bond plan seems to be an attempt to get around the constitutional debt limit.

Basic in all this discussion is the question as to how far American Government should go in financing capital improvements through the issuing of self-liquidating bonds. States have been doing that for some time. In Connecticut hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on roads, bridges, and buildings with debt retirement provided for through collection of tolls or other fees. Adequate income is probable in prosperous times, but there can be trouble ahead if the total of revenue bonds climbs to dizzy heights and national income dips.

Federal and State gasoline tax income and State motor vehicles fees yield huge sums for highway construction, but the total is inadequate. It is easy to suggest that such levies be raised to retire road bonds and the resistance of motorists might not be bitter so long as take-home pay includes a margin for those extras.

Debt is debt, though, whatever the euphemisms that prompt us to think of the new roads instead of the bonds. The Eisenhower proposition calls for bond-retirement payments over a 30-year period. Long before final expiration date we shall need even better and much more expensive highways. It would be better to plan repayment in terms of a decade at a time rather than a third of a century. And Connecticut, which in recent years has earned a splendid reputation for getting its money's worth from highway expenditures, might discover under a huge Federal program that many billions were being spent on debt charges and administration rather than road building.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch]

THE PRESIDENT PRESENTS HIS $101 BILLION ROAD PLAN

The highway program as presented to Congress by the President is the program as recommended by his special advisory commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. It calls for the expenditure of $25 billion more in Federal funds in the next 10 years than is now being spent, and $54 billion more in all funds than the $47 billion Federal-State expenditures under the present system. The objections to this program are not removed by the President's explanation and his emphasis upon the need for an expanded national highway system as a measure of defense.

One of the basic objections to the President's plan is that it would fan the flames of inflation. Though there would be no compulsion on the States to increase their expenditures to the amounts suggested by the Clay Commission, unquestionably they would be under pressure for large-scale increases in outlays. This would mean inevitably a large-scale increase in taxes in one form or another.

Another basic objection is one that has been raised by Senator BYRD. It is the objection to the manner in which the proposed Federal expenditures would be financed. The President, and the Clay Commission, have suggested that the expanded highway system would of itself increase traffic and produce additional revenue from the tax on gasoline and oil. The President proposes that special bonds be issued for the Federal expenditure, and that they be retired by these increased gasoline and oil tax revenues, and in some instances by tolls.

This would mean in the course of 30 years the expenditure of about $11.5 billion in interest. And certainly there is no assurance that the bonds would be paid off at maturity. In any event, it would therefore mean a cost, not of $25 billion, but of more than $36 billion for this Federal project.

This plan would plunge the Federal Government deeper into a function which, essentially, belongs to the States. Like the proposed Federal aid program for education it would be an increased invasion of State functions. All such projects call for additional spending that means additional debt, or additional taxes, which is the same thing. It means more inflation, with its attrition upon the national economy. The road program is a good place, we think, for Congress to put its foot down on high and wide Federal spending.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of February 23, 1955]

AN INCLINATION TOWARD BONDS

Just about everyone agrees that highways across the Nation are dangerously inadequate for today's traffic.

So the question for public consideration is not whether to embark on a major building program but how to pay for it.

The Commission appointed by President Eisenhower to study the problem came up with the conclusion that $101 billion ought to be spent in the next 10 years, of which the Federal Government should contribute about $30 billion.

In passing these recommendations on to Congress yesterday, the President said:

"I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues, to be paid off by the abovementioned revenues (taxes paid by highway users) which will be collected during the useful life of the roads and pledged to this purpose, rather than by an increase in general revenue obligations."

Assuming that a continuation of appropriations at the present rate would provide about $10 billion in 10 years, the Commission suggested a month ago that a Federal highway corporation be created with authority to borrow the other needed $20 billion.

This brought an immediate blast from Senator BYRD, who said, "such a procedure would violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law."

Obviously, this was embarrassing to President Eisenhower and the Republican administration. BYRD's criticism was probably the reason for a 3-week delay in passing on the program to Congress and for the President's rather tentative approach to the bond proposal as evidenced by the words "I am inclined * * *."

As has been observed by others, there can be no doubt that if a Democratic administration had advanced such a financing plan, the Republicans would have jumped on it with both feet.

However, there is nothing partisan about the need for roads. Republicans and Democrats alike travel the highways. The traffic toll knows no party lines. Citizens of all parties will have to help pay for better roads—if and when they are built.

The public aversion to higher taxes being what it is, it is safe to assume that the extra expense involved in an accelerated highway building program is going to have to be financed with borrowed money.

That can come from either of two sources: (1) Special bonds as suggested by the President's commission, or (2) an increase in the public debt to take care of the increased deficits caused by larger highway appropriations.

So long as Congress and the public go into it with their eyes open and acknowledge the fact that the money is being borrowed, we, like the President, are inclined to go along with the bond program.

It seems to us to have the advantages of putting the highway building program on a more stable basis and at the same time keeping the debt in a more conspicuous position where it can be less easily ignored.

It would be a national tragedy if a stalemate over financing should result in failure of Congress this year to take any action to speed up construction.

Let the experts figure out the best way to raise the money. But, by all means, let's start building more and better roads.

[From the Massena (N. Y.) Observer of February 21, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Nobody will argue with the President when he says that the United States is "caught in a traffic jam." But several objections are being fired at the details of the White House $100 billion program to get the Nation out of the jam.

Very shortly the President will send his program to Congress for action. Motorists, bus riders—just about all of us—have a stake in this Federal highway program, so let's take a short look at it and some of the objections.

The American Automobile Association objects principally to the building of any more toll roads. This is part of the President's proposal. The New York State Automobile Association says this State should not rely on the national program. The State should go ahead and spend the proposed $750 million agreed on by both parties at Albany, says the NYSAA, making sure that any increase in motor-fuel taxes is used to pay for better roads.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Virginia Democrat who now heads the Senate Finance Committee, also has an objection. He doesn't like the idea of tieing up the revenues from Federal taxes on motor-vehicle fuel to pay for highway bonds. The Senator suggests that these Federal fuel taxes be cut so that the States can raise their own taxes on gasoline and diesel oil. That way, he says, the States can build these roads and control them. His idea is undoubtedly good, so far as it goes, for the bigger, more populous State. But will the smaller States be able to pay for their share of the roads we will need to carry the 80 million vehicles that will be crowding them within 10 years?

Even Senator BYRD and the group that support his distaste for the financing plans of the President's program do not come out flatly and say we do not need a national net of superhighways. That would be something like saying we do not need peace on earth. There seems to be recognition that we as a nation have committed ourselves to living on wheels. The problem is bigger than the ability of the separate States to cope with it. Whatever is done in this Congress to the President's program, if the alterations result in putting off the solution, may be regretted by the whole Nation. Details may be altered, but some national program should be started.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of February 25, 1955]

ISN'T WASTE INFLATIONARY?

The administration's road program has been getting some dead cats thrown at it from various directions. Senator GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, has said it seems to be a $25-billion program rather than a $101-billion program—and he calls President Eisenhower's suggested financing plan "irresponsible." Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, has called it "just pure pork barrel" and will oppose it as inflationary. Nor are theirs the only strident voices raised in criticism.

But those who, like the President, think there is a need for a major attack on this problem can take comfort in what the critics are not saying. They are not saying that the roads are not needed. Nor are they taking issue with the President's main argument, which is that the country cannot afford to do without a road system capable of carrying traffic efficiently now and in the future.

What does it cost not to have adequate roads? In his special message the President pointed to the 36,000 deaths that occur on our streets and highways each year. He said that to the home where the result of a traffic accident is a tragic gap in the family circle the monetary worth of preventing that death cannot be calculated. But "reliable estimates" put the money cost of traffic accidents at $4,300,000,000 a year.

Then there is the increased cost of operating vehicles when a highway system is inadequate. According to many estimates, the President said, this burden is as high as a cent a mile. At that rate, we are paying around $5 billion a year in tribute to inefficiency. What the cost will be when in 1965, when 180 million Americans will be operating 81 million motor vehicles, he did not predict; but it is obvious that the figure is bound to keep rising unless we build a system to do the job.

We are paying now, somehow, for our failure to keep pace with the problem. What can be more irresponsible than a refusal to come to grips with it? Can an investment that would cut down the cost of accidents and inefficiency by billions of dollars be called inflationary? Senators will have a hard time coping with those questions.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of February 24, 1955]

FINANCING IS THE HURDLE

The President's 10-year, $101 billion highway program met the expected reception on Capitol Hill.

There was accord with the administration on the need for a long-range, well planned, cohesive and integrated nationwide road program for the defense needs of the atomic age and to gear highway transportation to the national motor-car economy.

There was, however, opposition—which crossed party lines—to the President's plan of financing his recommendations.

The road building message was scheduled to go to Congress on January 27. On January 11, the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program was made public. It immediately provoked opposition because of its financing methods. The President wisely delayed sending up his message until he could analyze the objections.

The President stuck by the committee's report. Yet he did not insist on the financing method, to which the Democrats sharply

object and which many Republicans do not find to their liking.

He did not back down. He simply said he was inclined to favor the committee's money-raising plan.

The committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, proposed that a Federal highway corporation be formed. Its purpose would be to float $20 billion of bonds. These securities would not be considered part of the Federal budget. They would be retired from the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. An additional $5 billion would be raised from fees paid by gasoline stations, motels and other roadside businesses.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, argued that the scheme would completely destroy the budget and the Federal debt limitations:

"If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything."

The Senator's fears are not ungrounded.

After the weeks of discussion between the formal submission of the program and the publication of the Clay committee's report Congress should by now fully understand that the financing, which the President is inclined to favor is a historic and drastic departure from the country's past fiscal policies.

The country stands in immediate and in some ways critical need to modernize the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways.

Those who do not approve the suggested financing, should concentrate on producing an acceptable policy that will remain within traditional fiscal methods, yet provide the improvements that the President urgently recommends.

[From the Madison (Ky.) Messenger of February 5, 1955]

TRAFFIC JAMS IN BIG HIGHWAY PROGRAM

People in our area who have been reading about the vast highway program which has been proposed in Washington—and about the vast outlay of billions of dollars which the vast program entails—are aware that U. S. 41, which is of a lot of consequence here, is not included in the plans.

As we have said before, maps which show the routes under consideration by the President's advisers stress, so far as Kentucky is concerned, a mighty proposed highway between Louisville and Nashville. Apparently the route leaves Kentucky and enters Tennessee at Franklin, Ky., or thereabouts.

We are told from Washington that the Nation must more than double its spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic. White House advisers on the subject have placed the cost at about $101 billion, but as usual in such cases there are critics.

For instance, a sharp attack on one phase of the program has been made by none other than able, influential Senator BYRD, of Virginia, whose ability with a sharp pencil is questioned by no one. The feature which the Virginia Democrat criticizes is the $20 billion 30-year 3-percent-bond issue recommended by the administration, together with the proposed Federal corporation which would float the bonds. Pressure groups for and against the vast highway plan are choosing up sides, and Washington expects plenty of fur to fly when the mighty project gets to the debating stage.

Another point of criticism which the Messenger has seen in the papers is the proposal to continue the Federal gasoline tax as one major source of Federal revenue. This is favored by such interests as the railroads, which argue that highway should be self-supporting through use charges. However, as is pretty well known repeal of the Federal gasoline tax is being urged by farm and truck spokesmen, who insist that collection of gas taxes should be left to the States, which are having their own financial troubles, too.

As another phase of the big dispute which is shaping up over this vast new road program, some of the States are already worrying about how they are going to dig up their share of the $31 billion provided by the White House program. Some have been building roads on a pay-as-you-go basis, since their constitutions forbid issuing bonds for the purpose. Others have gone into debt for roads already built or now being built, and in general the States are spending all they take in, already, and some are spending more.

With schools, hospitals, and other public agencies and services badly in need of billions of dollars, too, it becomes that a controversy over details of the highway plan is shaping up—a controversy that will match in size the vast building program itself. Already those specialists who have highways as their principal concern are becoming convinced that although the need for roads is one of our present big needs, mighty traffic jams are going to develop when Congress gets down to studying the Eisenhower program.

We are a long way, in other words, from a hundred billion-dollar outlay for highway construction.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Wall Street Journal of February 24, 1955]

MEETING THE NATION'S NEEDS

It doesn't take too much imagination to see that in a dynamic and growing country like the United States it will be necessary to spend many billions of dollars in the next generation in building anew the facilities by which we live.

The list of things to be done will include highways, schools, houses, electric power facilities, hospitals, and airports; indeed the list is almost endless.

Thus when President Eisenhower says that this country in the next few years is going to require a vast expansion in its roads, he is speaking of a need that is very real and plain to see. When he puts the cost at a hundred billion dollars he may even be underestimating; in any event it will be a very large sum.

The question is not of need but of the best way of meeting it. The best way of seeing that we get the right kind of roads in the right places. The best way of paying for them.

And it is here that Mr. Eisenhower's highway program, as he himself suggests by the tentative way he puts it forward, raises some very serious questions.

For this is a proposal that says, first, that this is a need which can be met only by another vast Federal spending program. And secondly, that the Federal cost should be met by some hocus-pocus bookkeeping that would hide from the people the nature of what is being done.

Senator BYRD and others have already had something to say about this bookkeeping. The proposal is for the Federal Government to borrow some $25 billion from the public, spend it on roads, but then pretend that it has added not 1 penny to the Federal debt. It would do this by setting up a Highway Authority which would do the actual borrowing but whose debts would be guaranteed by the Treasury just like any other Federal debt.

This would simply be a bit of shenanigans to get around the legal limit on the Government's debt. And if it can be done for highways then of course it can be done for those other things, schools, hospitals, and the like. This would open the way for a Federal bookkeeping system that would be essentially dishonest because it would offer the pretense that a debt isn't a debt.

Yet there is more to this program that ought to be looked at than the bookkeeping. For this is not simply a program for increasing Federal assistance to State highway commissions; it would begin to make the planning and paying for the Nation's roads a Federal responsibility.

It offers the plea, in effect, that if the Federal Government doesn't provide us with the new roads we won't get them. And this in the face of the fact that the roads we now have were built by the cities, counties, and States with but the smallest participation of the Federal Government.

At the end of the First World War there were barely 387,000 miles of paved highways in all the United States. The total amount spent in 1919 on highway construction was only $429 million.

Today our highway system covers 3,366,000 miles and represents an investment of nearly $50 billion. The expenditure of States and other local authorities for new roads is some $3 billion a year and steadily rising. And all this without benefit of any grandiose Federal bureau and, indeed, with very little money from the Federal Treasury. In 1952 Federal aid amounted to only $45 million out of $2.8 billion spent on roads.

Certainly the building of our future highways will be a stupendous job and there is much the Federal Government can do to help—one thing would be to take less from taxpayers so that the States would not be so hard pressed for funds.

But to say the Nation's needs can be met only by Federal planning and Federal taxes is to deny both our tradition of local government and the history of its success.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the junior Senator from Minnesota to the motion I am about to make.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 217, S. 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment. On page 1, line 11, after the word "years", to insert "The Administrator shall, within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving central station electric service.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903), is amended by striking out subsections (c), (d), and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years. The Administrator shall, within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving central station electric service."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 3 of such act is redesignated as subsection (d).

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 904), is amended by striking out "the provisions of sections 3 (d) and 3 (e) but without regard to the 10 percent limitation therein contained", and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator's amendment a substitute for the entire bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that it is not in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is now in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subsections (c), (d), and (e) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903 (c), (d), and (e)) are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service. The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service.

"(d) The remaining 75 percent of such annual sums shall be available for rural electrification loans in the several States and in the Territories, without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as, in the opinion of the Administrator, may be effectively employed for the purposes of this act, and to carry out the provisions of section 7: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 percent of said unallotted annual sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories.

"(e) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator during the balance of such fiscal year and in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "10 percent" and inserting "25 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment would prescribe a different formula from that which now exists and which was originally adopted in 1936.

The present Rural Electrification Act has a very strict formula which was designed at the time of the passage of the act to insure that there would be funds available for each and every State in the Union for purposes of REA loans. The present act provides that 50 percent of the annual sums made available and appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in proportion to the total number of farms in the United States not then receiving service.

Then the present formula goes on to provide that the remaining 50 percent shall be available "without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as in the opinion of the Administrator may be effectively employed for the purposes of the act."

What my amendment does is to change the formula from a 50–50 ratio to a 75–25 ratio.

Mr. President, I should like to yield to the sponsor of the proposed legislation, my senior colleague, but may I say, first, that it was felt by the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electrification cooperatives that the rigid formula which was established by the act of 1936 was no longer operative or effective. In fact, the rigid formula of 50 percent being available to the States on the basis of the number of unelectrified farms in those States placed a burden upon REA in terms of not providing adequate funds for the kind of rural electrification program we need today, with new generating plants and firming up of power lines.

The formula which I have suggested will give the REA Administrator 75 percent of all funds for his discretionary use to carry out the purposes of the act, as compared with the former formula of 50 percent. The amendment would provide 25 percent of the funds appropriated in a special category to be allocated to the States on the basis of the number of nonelectrified farms as related to the total farm population.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no fixed objection to the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota is offering, but may I inquire whether this change was brought before the committee and discussed in the committee at all?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was not. But I respectfully suggest that I have discussed it with several members of the committee, including the chairman of the committee. There has been a feeling amongst some of our colleagues who are deeply concerned about the program that a formula such as was originally contemplated might very well leave certain States without adequate services. Furthermore, I consulted with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Electrification [Mr. RUSSELL], and both of them felt that there should be some formula of the kind suggested. In fact, they advised and counseled that it would be extremely difficult for the Appropriations Committee to do the job required of it unless there were such a formula.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no particular quarrel with that point of view, although it seems to me that in the normal course of legislating it might have been preferable, at least, to have the proposed amendment laid before the committee so there could have been some discussion of it, because we have today what appears to be a rather substantial amendment, which was read, but which has not been printed, and which is not available for study by Members of the Senate. I am not constrained to ask that the matter go over, but I think it is a fairly substantial amendment to be presented without any copies of it being made available to Members of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Basically I agree with the Senator's observation. I reported from the committee a bill which removed all the restrictions; in fact, it was that particular bill which I favored. However, after not only 1 day, but many days, of consultation with Members who were deeply concerned about the matter, and also after consultation with representatives of the Rural Electrification Administration itself, as well as with representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, it was agreed that some formula which would give more leeway to the Administrator would be acceptable.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say to the Senator from California, if he will give me his attention, and to other Senators that the proposal to abolish entirely the money distribution formula came from the committee. But I was one who opposed the outright abolition of the formula, not only as it might apply to my State of Mississippi, but also because it took the Committee on Appropriations entirely out of the picture.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had somewhat the same viewpoint, as did the chairman of the subcommittee. No one opposed the modified formula.

The amendment which has been offered is along the same lines as the committee bill, except that it does not change the present law so much. The amendment, therefore, is more conservative, by a considerable degree, than is the committee bill, and is not a departure from the standards which have been approved for 20 years.

In that respect, the amendment is a proper one to be offered now, although I am opposed to the bill entirely.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who is the principal sponsor of the bill which was reported by the committee, and also the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is likewise a sponsor of the bill, possibly would like to make known at this time their views of the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduced Senate bill 153 because I believed that the earmarking or restricting provision in the act allocating certain sums of money was having the effect of actually impounding funds which were never used, and that there was great need of funds in some areas where there was an inadequate supply of energy, or in areas where there should be generating plants, or an expansion or enlargement of facilities in order to provide an adequate supply of electrical energy.

We did not interfere with the funds impounded in certain States which were allocated or earmarked for those States. We felt that what should be done was to retain the earmarking provision in the act, and to trust to the good judgment of the Administrator of the REA to allocate the funds wherever approved REA projects existed.

In the first place, a project must be developed by a user; and if it is an economically feasible project, and is approved by the Administrator of the REA, the funds are then made available.

I think the Nation has been plentifully covered with REA associations. There are now only isolated areas which need to be taken care of, and they are being taken care of whenever it is economically feasible to extend transmission lines to them. For that reason, I have thought that the act itself had really reached its maturity.

We have never questioned the amount of money which has been requested and for which need has been shown. Whenever a project was proved to be necessary, Congress appropriated the funds for it. There has never been a misuse of the funds. I think the REA has the best record of any governmental activity with respect to the expenditure of funds, and also as to the benefits it has conferred, and the services it has rendered in the development of the various REA associations.

I became apprised only in the last 30 minutes of the amendment which has just been offered. I do not know what the attitude of the REA would be with respect to it. I have not had an opportunity to examine the amendment sufficiently to know whether it would continue the restrictive measures which were recognized as being undesirable. However, in the case of a State which still has a number of farms which are not electrified, I can foresee that there might be concern with respect to the percentage of the annual appropriation which is earmarked for that State.

But, in the main, I believe the fears are unfounded. I do not believe any member of the Committee on Appropriations or any official of the REA would deny to any community the right to funds with which to construct REA lines, if it were proved that the project would pay its way and pay for itself.

Therefore, I think the amendment offered by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may not be necessary. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations for many years, I would be willing to go on record as saying that at any time the committee had before it a request for a regular or a deficiency appropriation, and if it could be proved that there was a community anywhere in the United States which was qualified to receive an REA line, but a question of funds was involved, such an appropriation would be favorably acted upon.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], is concerned, and rightfully so, about some areas within his own State. I commend him for his concern. I think possibly he had much to do with the offering of the amendment, because I know he objected when the bill was called up for consideration on the unanimous-consent calendar.

I know of the great concern of the Senator from Mississippi for the farmers and others in his State who might at some time desire to become affiliated with an REA association. That is all to his credit.

But I believe the REA has grown up. I do not believe the proposed restriction is necessary. If there is any intention of voting on the question this afternoon, I would urge that a vote not be taken until I have had an opportunity to get an expression of the views of the REA in the matter.

I do not want to see continued a restrictive measure which in the past has proved to be unwise. I know that thousands and thousands of dollars have been earmarked to different States which could not suggest a project. They had nothing to propose, but they simply wanted to have a generating plant.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the bill and his understanding of my concern in the matter.

Under the terms of the amendment, is it not true that 75 percent of the money appropriated would be invested entirely in the discretion of the Administrator of the REA, subject only to one limitation, namely, that he could not spend more than 25 percent of the 75 percent in one State? That is the purpose of the amendment now before the Senate.

The other 25 percent would be subjected to the formula for 6 months only. If it was not used or applied for by the States within a 6 months' period, the money would then revert to the general fund and could be used only in the discretion of the Administrator.

That is going far by way of compromise to meet the terms of the Senator's bill. It leaves only a fragment of a formula under which Congress can make an appropriation. Otherwise, there would be no restraints, no restrictions, and no control whatsoever. Congress would appropriate money which could be used in the discretion of the REA.

Frankly, I think we would be going backward, at least by one step, to abandon the entire formula. So the amendment is more acceptable, in that it retains at least a fragment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, my reply to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is that the money was earmarked in the first place because there was such a crying need in every area of the United States. Then a question arose as to whether a State was a little tardy in developing a project. The question of who would use the money was not involved, because no other State would be given the funds.

We have gone through that stage. We are no longer in that development period. For that reason I believe we could trust any administrator of the REA, because he has to come before the Appropriations Committee at the next regular appropriation session, which is no more than 12 months from any particular date. If the Administrator had been in error in the manner in which he had been in error in the manner in which he had administered the program the previous year, we could always write restrictive measures into the law.

I have not had a chance to study the amendment, but on the surface of it, if the restriction of 6 months were adopted, I am wondering whether, in controlling the operation for 6 months we would again be imposing a restriction which would be administratively unwise. If the REA could examine the proposal overnight, then at the next session of the Senate, which will be on Thursday, as I understand, we could determine whether we desired to act on it.

I have no pride of authorship of the bill. I merely took the Department's recommendation and embodied the recommendation into the bill. I introduced it, and it went to a subcommittee. The subcommittee studied it, and it is now on the floor with its recommendation. The bill came up on a call of the calendar. It was objected to. This afternoon there is before the Senate what is absolutely a substitute proposal. I have not had a chance to look at it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I shall conclude my remarks with the statement that it may be that the Department will accept the proposal as one under which it will be administratively possible for them to do a good job. If that is the case, it is perfectly all right. The Department may say it is not what it hoped for, or what it thought should be done. I should like to have a report from it. All I ask is that the proposal go over

until we may obtain a report from the Department. It may turn out to be perfectly acceptable to the Department.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is not trying to push the passage of the bill; the Senator from Mississippi is against the passage of the bill.

Mr. THYE. I know the Senator is.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is against the bill, but as a matter of getting the question settled, I agreed not to oppose the amendment. That is my position. I shall speak at length upon the wisdom, as I see it, of retaining the formula.

Mr. THYE. I answer my good friend, and I say "good friend" with all sincerity, in this manner: If there are funds earmarked here and there throughout different States, as the act now provides, and if a generating unit is needed in a certain region, which might comprise 3 or 4 States, funds are impounded under a restrictive provision in the act. One area might have a deficit of current, and there would be no way the administrator could recognize that there was a deficit, and administratively take care of it.

If the State of Mississippi needed 25 percent of an allocated sum of money for a 6-month period I would not deny that to Mississippi; but the restrictive provision in the act makes it impossible to meet the needs, when for instance, the greater problem might be that of increasing the capacity of rural lines or providing more generating capacity in an area comprising perhaps several States, because there was not available either the current to meet the load demand or there was not in existence a line which could carry the load it was required to carry in order to serve users on that line.

Most of us who put electricity in our homes 20 or 30 years ago thought we would probably use only a few thousand kilowatts. Now we find ourselves using 7, 8, 10, and 100 times what we anticipated we would need. It means the lines have to be increased in their carrying capacity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say first I fully agree with the position just taken by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to the effect that the amendment should lie over until we can all examine it. Certainly, I particularly agree with the position taken by the Senator from Mississippi, to the effect that this is something which requires all of us to be extremely cautious.

As I understand the matter, the bill as reported would permit the Administrator of the REA to funnel the whole amount available under an appropriation into 1 or 2 or 3 States.

I cannot imagine anything more potent or more tempting, from the political standpoint, to cause REA to be made a political plaything, which of course it has not been, and I hope the Senate will see fit to let the matter lie over.

By way of one additional comment, if I may put it in the RECORD, I should like to say this bill was reported by the committee apparently on the same day the bill the Senate just acted on was reported. I was unable to be present. I have never heard of it before. As I understand the content of the proposal, it would completely destroy the formula under which we have lived very happily, and would ignore the fact that replacements of weak lines of a distribution system by stronger ones are needed everywhere, even in those States electrified to a very high degree.

I certainly hope we can come up with a sound formula rather than a weak formula, because it would tend to make the whole system subject to political control and manipulation, if such desire were present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does not the Senator believe that before we act on the proposal we should have a report from the department?

Mr. THYE. That is my position. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would like to permit the act to remain as it has been, and I can appreciate his views. For that reason, it is not a question whether the Senator from Mississippi desires to have the proposal acted on or not. I personally want to have an opportunity to look at the amendment which is before the Senate, and should like very much to have a departmental report on it. I am in no hurry. All I wished to do by introducing the bill was to try to help the REA function more efficiently and do a better job in the various States and areas of the Nation which are affected. That was my only concern. So I hope we can let the bill go over to a later date.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am unable to express an opinion on the proposed amendment, because I have never seen or heard of it until this afternoon. The original bill was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota and two of his colleagues last January, and was referred to a subcommittee, which held hearings, at which time anyone who was interested could appear and express his opinion on the bill. As I recall, the farm organizations were in agreement on the bill, including the amendment, which was included by the subcommittee, and it cannot be too bad when the Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers Union advocate the same provisions. However, the bill went to the full committee; and, as I recall, was reported without opposition, although no doubt not all members of the committee were present at that time.

The purpose of the bill is to get away from exorbitant appropriations which would be necessary in order to meet the needs of each State under the old allocation law. For instance, last year it was impossible to meet the requirements of Colorado and Illinois; it would have been necessary to have appropriated $450 million in order to give them what they really needed under the formula.

So it is generally agreed by those who have been interested in rural electrification work—and as I have said, the farm organizations, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and all other groups in this field take the same position—that at this time the formula is a drawback, rather than an asset, as regards carrying on the work of the REA.

However, I do not know what would be done by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It is proposed, I assume, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota did not offer it in his own behalf, I take it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield at this point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, the Senator from Vermont knows that I happen to agree with the bill, as it was reported from the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, I wish to say it is one bill regarding which we had no opposition from any witness.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose in offering the amendment, Mr. President, is to give the Senate an opportunity to review the effect of such a formula, as compared to what I call an open-end authorization, as provided by the committee.

I have no doubt in my own mind that the REA administrators, whoever they may be, will "play it square" under this arrangement. Certainly we have nothing to indicate to the contrary. I felt that with the REA associations and the Farm Bureau and other interested groups getting together on the bill, it must be a rather good one.

Let me say it is not my view that we should attempt to have the Senate act on the bill tonight.

As to the amendment, I think it is an equitable one; if a formula is desired, I think the amendment proposes as good a formula as we can find. But I believe we would be derelict in carrying out our responsibility if we were to attempt to hold the Senate in session tonight and to have the Senate act on the bill tonight. I believe the Senate should take a recess until Thursday, by which time we can obtain word from the REA associations and other interested groups in our respective States; and then we shall be in a much better position to legislate on this subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the statement that the REA administrators have been absolutely fair and square; and certainly that statement applies to Mr. Cooke and to Mr. Wickard and to Mr. Nelsen, who is following in the steps of Mr. Wickard. I have no complaint at all about them. I cannot conceive that any administrator of this great agency would be unfair to Mississippi or to any other State. In fact, I would be surprised if some States, and possibly Mississippi is one of them, would not fare much better under the bill, rather than under the present formula.

However, we should know what is in the amendment, which is in the nature of

a complete substitute. We should hear from the Rural Electrification Agency and from Mr. Nelsen, as to whether the amendment contains any administrative bugs; and then we can determine what we wish to do about the matter.

But I believe we should amend the law, so that we shall not have to make enormous appropriations of funds, possibly as large as $500 million, in order to give one State what it needs under the formula, whereas otherwise $150 million or $175 million a year would suffice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to underscore and emphasize what the amendment provides, so the RECORD will be crystal clear for those who will study it during the next few days.

The amendment provides that 75 percent of the total appropriation shall be within the discretion of the Administrator. The other 25 percent, which will be allocated under the formula, will be restricted by the formula for 6 months; and if during the 6 months' period the States which are entitled to participation under the formula have not used all their funds, as thus allocated, then the total sum thus remaining will revert to the 75 percent fund, which could easily mean that the Administrator during at least 6 months of the year would have 100 percent discretionary authority, complete control, over the entire appropriation.

The purpose of the formula—which, by the way, was discussed with representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has felt very strongly about this matter—was to protect the States which as yet have not been able to catch up with the full development of rural electrification, and to give them the consideration they justly deserve.

The second purpose of the formula was to make sure that out of the total appropriations, there would be reasonably controlled distribution, thereby limiting any one State to not more than 25 percent of the total appropriation. I think that is a rather fair limitation.

Previously, I said that I, personally, felt that we could well support, and could do so with honor and validity, an open-end authorization, so to speak, by which I mean removing all restrictions; and that is what was requested by the former Administrator of the REA and also by the present Administrator.

But there are those who feel that for the purposes of controlling the appropriations, it would be desirable to have a formula which would relieve the Administrator of any necessity to pass judgment on each and every project contemplated, because the formula will provide that authority for the REA Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill, as reported, as I recall—having read it here on the floor, since it was called up—provided that any unused or unallocated funds appropriated might go over to a subsequent year or subsequent years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment, as offered by the Senator from Minnesota as I have read it hastily, does not so provide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it does.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; because at the end of 6 months, if any unallocated funds are available, they will revert to the general fund.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, they will revert to the 75 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the 75 percent may go over to a subsequent year or years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and the 25 percent, if not used during the 6 months' period, can also go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, whatever is left at the end of the year, out of the total amount, can go over to a subsequent year or years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the amendment, whatever is left from the 25 percent will go to the 75 percent, and then will go over to a subsequent year or years, will it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. So, Mr. President, under the discretion of the Administrator, the fund may very well build up, at least if anything from the year's appropriation is left over. In other words, if the appropriation for the fiscal year 1956, let us say, was not used under the 25 percent limitation of the formula, any of the 25 percent thus remaining would go into the category of the 75 percent of the total appropriation under the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. The original bill sounded a little simpler.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because it did not provide for the 75-percent and 25-percent categories. I believe those categories are responsible for a little of the confusion which has developed in the minds of Senators.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I was profoundly in support of the original REA Act, and I believe it has provided one of the greatest programs for the benefit of agriculture. I would not wish to have anything in its operations restricted beyond a reasonable extent. Therefore, I believe it is wise for this matter to go over until Thursday, so that Senators may study it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the modified formula, as presented, does more for the farmers, under the REA, than the present formula could ever do. The modified formula, as presented, will release millions of dollars of locked-up funds, and will provide the Administrator with almost unlimited authority to use the funds for developmental projects, but at the same time with insistence, in the best meaning of the word—in other words, with a cautious concern on the part of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]—that the program be deemed desirable. That is why the amendment was submitted.

There are Senators who felt that the Senate should have a choice between a well-considered formula and an open-end authorization to the Administrator, with no formula.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. How is it proposed, between now and Thursday, to obtain reports from the administrator and the farm cooperatives whose views are to be sought?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the amendment which was presented was developed in cooperation with the representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. That is the national association.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am familiar with that association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have not had an opportunity to take this particular amendment up with the National REA Administration under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I wish to say, however, that I have consulted by telephone with one of the officers of the REA, and while the REA officials have not given their approval, they have not given a negative reaction. I feel that it is the duty of the subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, to consult the REA officials in the Department and obtain their views, as well as the views of any other agency interested. I shall certainly do that between now and Thursday, and present those views to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and other Senators who have contributed to the substitute, which provides some sort of legislative standard. I was very apprehensive about the original bill, which provided for a lump-sum authorization. It is all well and good to say, "We know that the Administrator will not do this, or will not do that." That is the kind of argument which brings about government by men rather than government by law.

It is the function of the Congress to provide some kind of standards, if possible to compose a standard, which will give some measure of protection to every section of the country.

It has been almost the unbroken history of Government that lump-sum authorizations, which call for lump-sum appropriations, without the benefit of budget estimates as to breakdowns, have brought about earmarking by the Congress. It is much better to have some simple standard at the outset than to bring about a wild scramble on the part of the members of the Appropriations Committee and other Members of Congress to try to have their own particular projects earmarked.

I have handled appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration for

18 or 20 years. It is my opinion that it is much better to have certain standards, simple though they may be, and even though they may be accompanied by escape clauses to permit the funds eventually to be channeled at the discretion of the REA Administrator, than to appropriate $150 million to $160 million out of hand, and say to a particular individual, "Here it is; allocate it as you see fit."

In the long run I think it will serve the interest of all those who are interested in promoting the work of this agency, which has, perhaps, in some respects been the greatest accomplishment of the so-called New Deal, and which has brought about more permanent good than any other agency, to have it operate under certain simple standards. Certainly, that could interfere with the administration of the agency in any way, but such standards would serve to protect us from a situation in which the Congress undertakes to earmark funds in years to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Those are reassuring words. There is no more stanch advocate or friend of the REA in the Congress than the Senator from Georgia.

As the Senator knows, I respected his judgment in this matter, and sought his counsel and advice, as I did that of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I feel that between now and Thursday, if we have an opportunity to look the situation over, we can reconcile any differences there may be, and report a bill for the good of REA. That is what we are really interested in. We want the REA to move ahead, and not be in any way encumbered with standards or formulas which will restrict its operations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], we had another schedule for Thursday. It was our understanding that the pending bill would be acted upon today. It was the opinion of the majority leader that an agreement had been reached between the two Senators from Minnesota and the Senator from Mississippi. Now we are confronted with a problem. It may very well be that the conference report on the reciprocal trade extension bill will soon be ready. We have assured other Senators that proposed legislation in which they are interested will be considered on Thursday.

Is it the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee that much time will be consumed on this subject on Thursday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that the junior Senator from Minnesota has had a most difficult assignment with this particular bill. I have been trying to reconcile some of the conflicts of opinion in the Senate. I felt, and still feel, in view of the expression of some of our colleagues, that it would be a bit unfair to a number of them to try to remain in session and force a vote upon this particular issue before they have had an opportunity to read the printed record and obtain an expression of views from any persons they may wish to consult.

Therefore I respectfully request of the majority leader that the pending bill be made the first item of business on Thursday, if he can so arrange it, unless a conference report or some other privileged matter intervenes. I am sure that my senior colleague [Mr. THYE], who is the principal author of the original bill, will wish to expedite action, as will the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I can assure the majority leader that my debate on the question will certainly be limited. All I wish to do is to determine whether anyone objects to the restriction which would be imposed by the proposed amendment. I wish to give the REA Administration in the Department an opportunity to examine the amendment and submit a report on it. The reading and explanation of the Department's report will constitute any argument I desire to advance.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as one of those who have worked on this subject, and as one who does not wish to delay action merely for the purpose of delay, I feel compelled to serve notice that I oppose the bill as reported by the committee, and that I reserve the right to oppose it without limitation.

However, I think there should be some modification of the present formula, and I would approach the subject with that view in mind. I am willing to try to agree on a proposal which I think meets the requirements, as reflected by the present amendment. I, too, believe that under the circumstances it would be well to postpone consideration of the bill for the purposes suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no desire to rush the Senate into action on this bill or any other bill. I wished to inform Senators that we had made certain plans for Thursday. I hope those plans will not have to be entirely laid aside because of the necessity of spending the day on this bill. If Senators who are interested in the bill can utilize tomorrow, while the Senate is in recess, to obtain the information they need and come to an agreement, we can spend a reasonable amount of time on Thursday discussing the bill and trying to have action taken upon it. If not, we may have to keep our commitments to other Senators and to proceed to the consideration of other measures.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the recess following today's session, duly enrolled bills passed by the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEDICATION OF PORTIONS OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I can save time on Thursday by placing certain material in the RECORD at this time. I shall require approximately 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. President, at the joint suggestion and invitation of the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, a United States delegation left Washington on Thursday, May 5, to participate in ceremonies held on the Nicaragua-Costa Rican border marking the opening of a link in the Inter-American Highway from Santa Cruz, Costa Rica, to the Nicaraguan border. The delegation consisted of—

Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, House of Representatives.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Roads, House of Representatives.

Representative TOM STEED, member of the Subcommittee on Roads, House of Representatives.

Representative WALT HORAN, member of the Department of Commerce Subcommittee, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives.

Representative WALTER NORBLAD, member of the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and related agencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was delegated by Hon. CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to accompany the delegation.

Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Wilson, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Mr. Frank Turner, Assistant to the Commissioner, Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. Oscar H. Nielson, Budget Officer, Department of Commerce.

Mr. Norman B. Wood, Chief, Latin American Office, Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. Charles P. Nolan, Officer in Charge, Transportation and Communications, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State.

Our group left Miami by air on the morning of May 6. En route to Managua, Nicaragua, the plane stopped at Habana, where the group was very courteously received by Ambassador Arthur Gardner, and at San Salvador, El Salvador, where the Chargé d'Affaires of the American Embassy, Mr. Chadwick Braggiotti, and the members of the em-

bassy staff were at the airport to extend to us their kindly greetings.

Our group reached the capital of Nicaragua at 3:30 on the afternoon of May 6. Upon arrival at the airport at Managua, most of the United States delegation immediately took off by helicopter for a 2-hour trip along the Rama Road. This proved to be highly interesting and an excellent means of evaluating the very great importance of the Rama Road to Nicaragua and indirectly to the United States.

After spending the night in Managua, our delegation left by automobile on Saturday, May 7, for the Nicaragua-Costa Rican border. This drive took about 2½ hours over the Inter-American Highway. The border was the site of a colorful ceremony which marked the opening of a link in the Inter-American Highway from Santa Cruz, Costa Rica, to the Nicaraguan border. Eloquent statements were made by the distinguished Foreign Ministers of both Costa Rica and Nicaragua on the occasion, copies of which I am putting into the RECORD. They highlighted the advantages to both countries, which will accrue from the completion of this important link in the highway. On behalf of the United States delegation and surrounded by all members of it, I delivered a short address appropriate to the occasion. At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks but at the end of same, translations of the body of the eloquent speeches, following their salutations, made by the Foreign Ministers of Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the remarks which I made on the occasion on behalf of the United States delegation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, after an informal picnic luncheon a short distance within Costa Rica, the United States delegation continued 2 hours by automobile to Liberia, Costa Rica, where we stayed at the Bureau of Public Roads camp. The United States delegation was honored that night by a dance given by Senor Carlos Alfaro, Governor of the Province of Guanacaste.

It may be interesting to note that for the first time in many months many Costa Ricans and Nicaraguans crossed their borders, using the highway; in fact, it was reported that over 500 Costa Ricans spent the night of May 7 in Managua, Nicaragua. I also wish to point out on the same day that the new Inter-American Highway link was open, a car from California and one from Texas crossed over into Costa Rica. These are small indications of what this highway, when completed, will do for promoting travel of citizens from adjoining countries as well as from the United States along the whole Inter-American Highway.

On May 8, some of us drove by automobile from Liberia to San Jose, Costa Rica, a 5½-hour drive, completing the 300 miles or more of highway travel begun at Managua. The trip proved to be most scenic and afforded me an opportunity to obtain concrete evidence as to the value of the Inter-American Highway in the economic development of Costa Rica. On the afternoon of May 8, the United States delegation was received cordially by His Excellency President Jose Figueres of Costa Rica at the presidential palace.

On Monday, May 9, the United States delegation proceeded by plane to Guatemala City. Enroute the plane landed at Managua, Nicaragua, where the party was very courteously received by His Excellency, General Anastasio Somoza, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, at the Presidential Palace. General Somoza then went to the airport to personally see us off, which was a most gracious gesture.

We arrived in Guatemala City on the afternoon of Monday, May 9. At 6 o'clock that evening, the United States delegation was received by His Excellency, Lt. Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Presidential Palace. At the express wish of Colonel Castillo Armas, the United States delegation drove by automobile some 40 miles south of Guatemala City on Tuesday morning to Barberena, where Colonel Castillo Armas inaugurated a new fine strip of the Inter-American Highway completely financed by Guatemalan funds.

The United States delegation left Guatemala on Tuesday afternoon, May 10, arriving in Washington on Wednesday just after noon.

May I express, on behalf of the United States delegation, my warm thanks to the Honorable Robert F. Woodward, American Ambassador to Costa Rica, and Mrs. Woodward, to the Honorable Thomas E. Whelan, American Ambassador to Nicaragua, and Mrs. Whelan, and to Mr. Thomas C. Mann, Chargé d'Affaires of the American Embassy at Guatemala City, and Mrs. Mann, for the very cordial entertainment extended by them to the delegation at the respective Embassies. Our warm appreciation is also expressed to Ambassador Gardner and to Mr. Braggiotti for their kindly greetings.

The participation of the United States delegation in the ceremonies marking the linking of Costa Rica and Nicaragua on the Inter-American Highway was highly beneficial from all points of view to the United States. The visit of the delegation to Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala was warmly received by officials of all three countries, and I believe that it made an excellent impression and will be productive of increased understanding and good will between our friendly neighbors in Central America and ourselves.

As a result of this trip and the opportunity I had to inspect portions of the the Inter-American Highway in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, I am more strongly convinced than ever that it is very greatly in our national interest that the Inter-American Highway be completed as rapidly as possible.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS OF SENOR DON MARIO ESQUIVEL, FOREIGN MINISTER OF COSTA RICA

This ceremony in which we have the privilege of participating today is the culmination of an old dream and long efforts. Although the noble ideal of a republic of Central America was checked 117 years ago, we must recognize that that happened because, although destined by providence to be a single entity and to live together, we were, in human terms, isolated from each other. We could not even communicate with each other. The very news of the independence attained at a glorious moment in history took a whole, long month to reach our old capital of Cartago. Under such deplorable conditions it was difficult to get to know each other, to establish the constant and necessary contact that would have convinced us of the necessity and advantages of living together closely. After more than a century the miracle of this highway again unites the people of Central America. This link between Costa Rica and Nicaragua was lacking and here we, the representatives of all the countries of the isthmus, have come to see how this idea has been put into beautiful reality. We deliberately wished that, together with the countries which formerly constituted with us the Central American Federation, a representative of Panama could share this happy occasion. During the colonial days the frontiers were traced by the sword or by a pen tracing greedily on a map. And it was thus that Panama was not included within the limits of the first Central American Republic which, at the beginning of its constitutional life, we had to create from the provinces of the then captaincy general of Guatemala. But Panama has been and is part of our ethnological orbit. It shares our troubles and our problems. There could today be no Central America which did not include it. We, ourselves, since we started to participate in foreign affairs 7 years ago, have been making every effort to have Panama form part of all Central-Americanist endeavors and we today hope that its formal entry will be self-understood, as is the common destiny of our peoples.

There have been many who have coordinated desires and efforts to the end that this highway which we are inaugurating today should become a reality. The Ministry of Public Works of Costa Rica was always able to count on the invaluable cooperation of the Public Roads Administration of the United States of America; and, in a common endeavor with the Ministry of Development of Nicaragua, these titans of work, with Marvin Harshberger at the head of the legions of work and progress, managed to fashion a new link between the two sister nations.

The Central American Embassies in Costa Rica were also a fruitful element of stimulus and solidarity; the diplomatic representation of the United States of America was an active, opportune, and indispensable element for the success attained.

It would be unjust not to take this unique opportunity to bring out properly the inestimable aid and the effort made for over 20 years by the Government of the United States in this matter and not to dedicate a few words of gratitude to the Vice President of that great Nation, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON, who, after honoring our countries by his recent visit, returned to his country to devote himself with all the fervor of a citizen of America toward having the indispensable funds of his country's quota allocated to the successful completion of a project which would consolidate the way of life of continental Pan America.

But it was not only hope—now all converted into splendid reality—that Vice President NIXON left with us during his opportune and pleasant visit. We Costa Ricans also had the honor, on the one hand, of hearing from his lips and, on the other hand, of reiterating before him the repeated statements of our two governments which are today celebrating this territorial linkup that, with unshakable faith in the juridical system of America, and interpreting the mandate of their people and the desires of the governments constituting the continental charter, they will know how to live together peacefully as neighbors, as representatives of two countries which are united by nature and brought together by tradition, thus strengthening and invigorating by their example the principle in the legal doctrine of America that there is not, nor should there be, in our America any problem without a solution.

We are preparing duly to celebrate next year the centenary of a glorious action in which Nicaragua and Costa Rica united their efforts to rout a common enemy, showing thus how valuable the exemplary solidarity between nations can be and what heights it can attain. Today, a century after that heroic epoch, we find that there are many routes which, in devotion to the aggrandizement of our nations, we must follow together, many enterprises to undertake together, many Central American dreams to convert into reality, shoulder to shoulder with the other countries of Central America—for we must not defraud the permanent hopes of the nations, those nations which should be eternal and, having common problems, confront a destiny which is also common.

This very day there are meeting in San Salvador the ministers of economics of Central America. History and necessity showed us the path, and we are advancing with great strides toward economic integration. The plan for mutual investment of the reserves of our central banks is already going forward; the bilateral agreements on free trade, some of them being studied, some already being fully and successfully carried out, are other steps forward in our complementary economy, with larger markets and greater efficiency in stepped-up production. Perhaps it is not for us but possibly for our children to witness the political integration of the Isthmus; the human integration, the integration of the people, has always been a fruitful and generous reality which has never suffered any regression even in times of great hardship. The Nicaraguan in Costa Rica is no stranger, nor the Costa Rican in Honduras, nor the Honduran in Guatemala, nor the Guatemalan in El Salvador, nor the Salvadoran in Panama, nor the Panamanian in Nicaragua. Above the fragmentation, above the differences which may have occurred between the various countries in the course of our history as Republics, the confraternity of our peoples has predominated and survived safe and sound. The peoples of Central America can live together; our mission, our obligation is to demonstrate that fact to those who doubt, to take down the barriers wherever there are any, forget where we should forget, mediate where that is necessary, always coordinating our efforts; that is our duty, and I am sure that it is not a difficult task, for it will take place in fertile and fertilized ground.

Each time a link is formed there are the beginnings of a new era. Today with this highway which is bringing Costa Rica and its sister Republics closer together and is opening for them a path of hope and joy, there begins for all of us an era of fraternity and prosperity which can satisfy the longing of our peoples.

Each time a medium of communication is opened, there begins a new state in the relations of the peoples. Such a stage would begin today even if we did not want it. But we do want it. We see it approach today with great emotion, and we see in this a day of jubilation in the history of the two peoples which today are being closely connected. Nature, which never really wanted to separate us, has been conquered by the effort of man. The inter-American juridical system, in guaranteeing by means of law the security and political independence of the nations of the hemisphere, is gradually converting barriers into imaginary lines and illusory boundaries. Let us hope that this border only a few steps from us here, will become just another line of points to show the student of geography that progress can destroy all barriers. Central America is decisively going ahead along that broad roadway of progress. From the Costa Rican point of view, and therefore from the American point of view, this highway is, my brothers from Central America, the carpet which we stretch forth to receive you with the demonstration of all the great friendship which lives inextinguishably in the heart of Costa Ricans. Men of America, here you have the highway. Welcome to this land, which is also yours.

(TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.—Applause, interspersed with shouts of "Viva los Estados Unidos" [long live the U. S.] and "Viva Costa Rica")

EXHIBIT 2

ADDRESS OF DR. OSCAR SEVILLA SACASA, FOREIGN MINISTER OF NICARAGUA

The establishment of inter-American communications has always been considered to be connected with the achievement of Pan Americanism, whose bases are found in the farsighted vision of the liberator, for international roads or communications not only bring about the development of the countries that they cross, helping their commerce and resources, but also bind the common interests and ensure peace among them.

Pan Americanism, at the new stage of its evolution determined by the international conferences, recognized in the first of such events held at Washington in 1890 that the railroad which links all or most of the nations represented at the conference would contribute powerfully to the furthering of the moral relations and material interests of their nations.

That concept was then reaffirmed at the Second International Conference held at Mexico City in 1902 and at the seventh which took place at Montevideo in 1933.

At the Sixth Inter-American Conference of Habana it was decided to recommend to the Pan American Highway Congress, which was to be held at Rio de Janeiro in July of that same year of 1928, that it consider and adopt agreements leading to the construction of a highway running the whole length of the hemisphere; and, at the Inter-American Conference for the Consolidation of Peace held at Buenos Aires in 1936, it signed a Pan American Highway Convention in whose preamble are made some timely remarks concerning the belief that direct and material contact between the American peoples would necessarily strengthen the bonds of friendship between the countries of this hemisphere and thus ensure continental peace.

But the establishment of international communications as a means of uniting peoples has been the desire not only of Pan Americanism but also of the Central Americanist movement, which is now and has been crusading for the fusion of all the countries of the Isthmus into one vigorous Republic.

As a matter of fact, at the stage of that movement which began with the Washington Conference of 1907 under the auspices of the Government of the United States of America and of Mexico, there was placed on the agenda to be taken up by the Fourth Central American Conference of 1912 held at Managua a convention for the establishment of Central American communications in which nine of the signatory states obligated themselves to put their territory in communication with that of other adjacent countries, either directly by means of railways or by using the Gulf of Fonseca and the navigable lakes and rivers, for which purpose new routes would be constructed or the existing ones would be extended.

With respect to Nicaragua, especially, in 1943 we had only 10 kilometers of paved highways and 20 of all-weather roads. Now the government headed by the president, General Anastasio Somoza, has given so vigorous a drive to the construction of highways and roads that today my country has 339 kilometers of paved highways, 900 kilometers of all-weather roads, and 1,805 kilometers of dry-weather roads; this highway development, together with a wise credit policy, has achieved the surprising economic transformation through which my country is now passing.

In regard to the Nicaraguan sector of the Inter-American Highway, it is well known that it has been in service between our two northern and southern borders for some years.

In view of all the antecedents to which reference has been made, the inauguration of the junction of the Pan American Highway between Costa Rica and Nicaragua is cause for justified rejoicing not only for the two sister countries directly bound by ties of neighborhood but also for the other sister nations of the isthmus and for those of our American regional community that have stimulated the establishment of international communications as an effective means of strengthening the sentiments of American solidarity.

The Government of Nicaragua has viewed with keen satisfaction the execution of the work whose junction with Nicaragua we are inaugurating in this solemn ceremony, not only because it will contribute to the progress and prosperity of the sister Republic of Costa Rica but also because it will come to constitute a new bond of union between our peoples in facilitating a current of material and spiritual exchange, constituting furthermore a symbol of the cooperation and joint effort of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and the United States of America.

Once the work is inaugurated, all that is lacking is the fulfillment of the aim which we all hope it has—that the goodwill made evident today in this simple but transcendental act will also give impetus to the transportation which, flowing over the highway like blood through the veins, will stimulate the exchange of interests, creating new bonds of permanent union between our peoples and burying prejudices and misunderstandings, in order that there may shine with noonday splendor the cordiality and good understanding to which our neighbors and other sister countries have a right above the passing contingencies that fate may have dealt to them.

May the permanence of the junction being inaugurated be a sign of the durability of the good relations between the two peoples.

Completely in accord with these sentiments of cordiality, President Somoza, in his last message read before the National Congress on April 17 of this year, referring to Costa Rica said: "I wish to express on this occasion the traditional sentiments of sympathy and admiration which all Nicaraguans and my Government have always professed for the noble people of Costa Rica, and the faith which I have in their glorious destiny."

In the name and in representation of my Government, I desire on this historic occa-

sion to make public the gratitude of Nicaragua toward the noble people of the United States of America and their illustrious Government, whose destinies are so worthily guided by his excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower, for the friendly cooperation which in the full Pan American spirit they have given to the work of the Pan American highway section in Nicaragua. My Government especially desires to express its gratitude for the presence on this occasion of the honorable mission of the United States of America so worthily headed by his excellency Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and composed of distinguished Members of the House of Representatives and officials of the executive branch.

I should also like to express my gratitude to the excellent and honorable diplomatic representatives and officials who with their presence have contributed toward giving special significance to this occasion.

Pray God that this event, which has taken place under such noble aims, may constitute the beginning of a new chapter of close and sincere ties in the relations between our sister countries.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

I consider it a rare opportunity and privilege to be the spokesman for the several United States Government representatives who are taking part in this important ceremony, particularly for the six-man delegation from both Houses of Congress, including representation from both of our political parties, who stand here together on the platform at this moment.

Today we see the forging of another important link in the Inter-American Highway. Today we close another gap of what will soon be, I hope, an all-weather road stretching from the southern border of the United States to the Panama Canal. I like to think of this highway as more than just a good road. To me it is a means whereby the peoples of the Americas will surely get to know one another better. To me it is a carefully forged chain which binds together the destinies of all the Americas.

My present duties, as chairman of a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee directly concerned with the Inter-American Highway, have given me an opportunity to keep fully informed about the status of this important project. My interest in the highway, however, goes back many years when I was a member and later chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee which handled this project. In 1952, I attended, as a representative of the United States Senate, the special Pan American Highway Congress which was held in Mexico City. And last year I was present at the Sixth Pan American Highway Congress which was held in Caracas. At those congresses I learned firsthand of the tremendous interest and enthusiasm which exists throughout the Americas for the rapid completion of this important highway. This enthusiasm, I assure you, is shared by our Government. There can be no doubt that the prompt completion of the Inter-American Highway is a prime and established objective of United States foreign policy.

Recently, the President of the United States sent letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives urging the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to speeding the completion of this highway. This legislation is, at present, being considered by the Congress. Naturally, I cannot here today forecast what the final action will be, but I can state that the Congress realizes the importance—to the United States and to Central America—of completing this Inter-American highway as soon as possible.

Today, Nicaragua and Costa Rica join the chain of neighbor countries linked by an all-weather highway in Central America which also includes Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. There are still gaps in the highway. But even as we gather here today work is going forward to eliminate those gaps and to make the completed highway a reality. When completed, it will be possible to travel by highway—in any season—from any point in the United States, through Mexico and Central America, to the Panama Canal.

The completion of this highway will bring important political, economic, social and cultural benefits to all the friendly countries, including our own, which it will link. Economically, the highway will mean increased trade and the opening of hitherto inaccessible markets. Already trade among the countries of Central America and between the countries of Central America and the United States has increased tremendously as a consequence of the completion of portions of this highway and this trend will be continued at an accelerated pace as work progresses on the road. Increased trade brings with it, inevitably, increased economic development and a higher standard of living for our peoples. And that, of course, is one goal toward which all of us are striving.

Another economic benefit to be derived from the completion of the highway will be an increase in the rate of economic development in the area. It cannot be denied that the lack of adequate surface transportation has seriously hindered and retarded economic development in Central America. With the completion of the highway will come feeder roads and the opening of undeveloped lands. This economic growth will result in the establishment of new markets, will enlarge opportunities for trade and will stimulate more rapid internal development.

In addition to increased trade and economic development, an all-weather highway will serve as a strong impetus to attracting tourist travel to these beautiful countries which, thus far, are known to only a few of my countrymen. This morning, for example, we traveled from Managua to this point on the border, through countryside that, I think, is equal to any in this world for its sheer beauty. And I know that the other areas through which this highway passes provide attractions which, when known and readily accessible, will result in increased tourism. Tourism, I should add, in addition to making an important economic contribution also serves as a means of allowing our peoples to know one another better. It is unfortunate that, because of the lack of cheap, reliable, adequate land transportation, the cultures of Central America, both new and old, are not well known in my country. And, conversely, I also think that it is too bad that the sowers of dissension have been able, at times, to spread successfully their misstatements about the people of the United States because the peoples of this area have not had adequate opportunity to know our fellow countrymen. The completion of this highway will contribute greatly to the elimination of this type of misunderstanding.

Early completion of this vital highway will be a significant step in our common defense effort for the Western Hemisphere, since it will provide overland contact and communication with the Panama Canal from all points in the North American continent.

The United States, together with the friendly cooperating countries of Central America, and Panama, has already made large expenditures toward the completion of the inter-American highway. Our country is prepared to continue our role in this important cooperative venture. All of us see here today part of the fruit of our joint labor. I look forward joyfully to being present before many years at a grand ceremony which will mark the closing of the final gap, the forging of the final link in the inter-American highway—a network of friendship and freedom.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HOLLAND. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, May 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, O16225, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall, Trapnell, O16782, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16993, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be major general

Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809, United States Army, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the quiet of this noon hour, we are centering our thoughts upon the amazing greatness and grandeur of the Prince of Peace in whom we find our noblest incentives for right living and heroic service.

Grant that our own life may bear clear and unmistakable testimony that we are seeking to emulate and incarnate his spirit of love and good will and striving to deliver humanity out of the bondage of rancor and hatred and lead it into the paths of brotherly kindness.

Help us to feel that the hour has struck when the moral and spiritual forces must accept the leadership in dispelling from the hearts of men and nations all bitterness and prejudice.

Take away from us the moods of discouragement and defeatism, and may we believe that our longing for peace on earth is not merely an idle dream and a vague impossibility but a glorious, divine inspiration which someday will be a blessed reality.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BILL, 1956

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 590)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10 and 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 17, 19, 21, 25 and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,658,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,046,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not less than $250,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to gather statistics and conduct a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not less than $250,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,144,300"; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment No. 24.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
WILLIS A. ROBERTSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY
(per MILTON R. YOUNG),
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Research: Appropriate $37,800,000, instead of $37,000,000 as proposed by the House and $38,040,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate House language earmarking funds for a special study of effects of acreage reductions. In view of the urgent need for research on basic problems, the conference committee insists that research projects of limited value, such as orchids of Guatemala, Flora of Dominica, differences in clothing of farm and urban people, population dynamics, rural sociology, methodology, and child-rearing practices,

and projects undertaken primarily for the benefit of employees doing graduate work, be discontinued in favor of more important work. The conferees are in full agreement that discontinuance of nonessential and nonproductive research projects, such as those listed above, will make it possible for the Department to cover all valuable and worthwhile research projects proposed in the budget. The final amount agreed to includes sufficient funds to provide for research projects inserted by the Senate and emphasized in the Senate report, including $100,000 for research on acreage reductions and $50,000 additional for the National Arboretum. The conferees are also in full agreement that the recent action of the Department decreasing attention to home-economics research should be reviewed and a portion of the funds transferred to human nutrition should be redirected to its original purpose, as contemplated by the amendment adopted in the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $18,658,700, instead of $17,750,000 as proposed by the House and $18,758,700 as proposed by the Senate, and increase the fund for emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases to $1,000,000. The conferees have agreed to an increase of $308,700 for added plant quarantine inspection at major United States ports in view of (1) the increasing threat of importation of nematodes, citrus blackfly, fruit flies, Khapra beetle, and other plant pests from various areas of the world, and (2) the decreased quarantine inspection resulting from the gradual reduction in number of customs inspectors in recent years.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 5—Penalty Mail: Appropriates $1,650,000, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 6—Conservation operations: Appropriates $59,300,000, instead of $58,612,579 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Authorize $22,800,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $22,500,000 as proposed by the House and $23,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide $4,320,000 for section 392 expenses, instead of $4,020,000 as proposed by the House and $4,520,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Eliminate language proposed by the Senate relative to the 5 percent transfer of funds for technical services required in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program, and restore language as proposed by the House.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12—Marketing research and agricultural estimates: Appropriate $11,046,000, instead of $10,981,000 as proposed by the House and $11,096,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore House language providing for a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer, changing the amount named therein to $250,000. The conference committee is in full agreement that the July crop reports for popcorn and honey should be reinstated within the amount appropriated.

Amendment No. 13—Marketing services: Appropriates $11,960,000 instead of $11,810,000 as proposed by the House and $12,010,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Amendment No. 14: Restores House language providing for a special study of foreign agricultural production, changing the amount named therein to $250,000. In view of foreign expansion at the expense of American producers, the conferees agree that the bringing of statistics on foreign agriculture up to date is highly important to the success of the new program being inaugurated by this service and is basic to the formulation of agricultural policies.

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 15—Agricultural adjustment programs: Authorizes $6,000,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House and $6,165,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—Sugar Act program: Authorizes $1,575,000 for administrative and related expenses, instead of $1,440,000 as proposed by the House and $1,617,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 17: Changes code citations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes transfer of not to exceed $450,000 from the Farm Tenant Mortgage Insurance Fund, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Changes code citations as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21: Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $2,079,000 as proposed by the House and $2,164,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize transfers of $375,000, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,144,300, instead of $2,116,000 as proposed by the House and $2,172,600 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 23—Limitation on administrative expenses: Restore language proposed by the House, changing the amount named therein to $1,000,000.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 25—Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for transfer of wheat to Pakistan: Appropriates $69,385,831 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,273,881 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26—Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples: Appropriates $9,545,830 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,676,628 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 27—Section 504: Eliminates the words "or apples" inserted by the Senate. The conference action is based on the fact that this matter is being handled by the appropriate legislative committees. The conferees do not approve of any forecast of apple prices by the Department during the coming fiscal year unless contrary legislative action is taken by the Congress. This restriction is not intended to affect other types of forecasts for apples.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I would like to make it clear that in this conference report where you have stated:

> The conferees are also in full agreement that the recent action of the Department decreasing attention to home-economics research should be reviewed and a portion of the funds transferred to human nutrition should be redirected to its original purpose, as contemplated by the amendment adopted in the Senate.

That the conferees in this report do not agree that home economics as such be dispensed with by the Department of Research; is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say to the gentlewoman that certainly that is our intent. We tried, in the language, to make it quite evident that that was our position. May I say that is as far as we knew how to go. The Senate amendment was hardly needed to get the job done, in that it took the place of what the House had in its report. We mentioned the Senate amendment to make it clear that by not including it—there was no need to include it—we did not need to change the intent of that amendment in the least. So, insofar as we could—and the conference report was unanimously adopted—we made it quite clear at least how the conferees felt about this matter.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I should like to ask the gentleman further, in general these departments have followed the intent of Congress; is that not true?

Mr. WHITTEN. In general I would say that the gentlewoman is correct. There have been exceptions, but if they do not, there is nothing that can be done other than to tell them what to do.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Then I would like to ask further, the amount of money that was appropriated originally contemplated that home economics research, apart from that in the nutrition field, would be continued; is that not so?

Mr. WHITTEN. We did not try to earmark a definite amount of money. We did say, and the Senate amendment provided, that not less than $40,000 be retransferred. In the opinion of the House committee, in view of the overall size of the appropriation for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, we seriously questioned whether that was an ample transfer. We feel that a substantial part of the work heretofore done by the home economics section should be restored. Insofar as pinpointing exactly how much, we have not tried to do that.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But the amount of money that the Department asked was an amount sufficient to have carried on home economics research as it was originally set up; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the original amount was $1,426,000 and when this home economics work was cut out at the direction of the director, no money was returned to the Treasury, but all the funds were transferred to the work on human nutrition. So the full amount formerly carried for both lines of work

is retained. They are merely directed to reallocate or to give back a reasonable share of the money to the home economics work.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman very much. In view of the fact that the gentleman has made it amply clear that it is the sense of this body that the home economics research, apart from that connected with human nutrition, is to be continued in this Department as it has been for the last 32 years, I withdraw my objection.

There should now be no doubt in the minds of Secretary Benson and others in the Department that the Congress intends for this worthwhile research program to be reinstated and continued.

Progress in any human endeavor results directly from impartial, objective research activities. The American home and family living should be given as much importance in the consideration of a balanced research program as any other matter.

One of the great contributions of home economics research by our Government is the fact that this work is not duplicated anywhere else. Our great home economics teaching programs, the work of home demonstration agents, and the progress of individual homemakers depends upon a continuation of a balanced research program within the Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 22, insert ": *Provided further*, That $934,914 of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUSTRIA IS FREE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Austria is free. The rejoicing of her people is understandable and moving. Yet strangely this freedom for much of Austria comes as an anticlimax. Actually the allied sections of Austria have been free in nearly all aspects since shortly after the end of World War II. Had not the Russians interposed endless objection all of Austria would have been fully free 5 years ago. Yet I fear that Russia now gets the lion's share of the credit in the minds of the Austrians for the freedom which finally has come to them. So cleverly did the Russians maneuver the final preparation and signing of the treaties that the Allies found themselves clambering to get on the bandwagon of Austrian freedom which the Allies themselves had long previously endorsed.

There is in this a very pointed lesson. Top-level talks are programed on peace and coexistence worldwide. I earnestly hope America's leaders do not find themselves again clambering to get on a bandwagon for the unification of Germany after Russia grabs credit with the Germans for putting it in motion. I hope our leaders are able to convince the world that we are the ones who have sought peace; the ones who have paid dearly from our own resources to help others; the ones who really believe in and practice freedom for others.

At this point the Russians are preparing to claim all these things as their own private inventions—and to brand us as the obstructionists who have prevented their realization. It will be interesting to see how much we have learned about dealing with the rest of the world. We have had some costly lessons. I hope the scheduled top-level conferences will not prove to be just another costly lesson.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., secs. 104–106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated each year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission of Fine Arts to carry out its functions under this act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3878) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended by section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That there is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $15,000,000 to be expended in flood emergency preparation; in flood fighting and rescue operations, or in the repair or restoration of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, including the strengthening, raising, extending, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the work for flood control. The appropriation of such moneys for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis, is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of the Army may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropria-

tions to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made. The Chief of Engineers is authorized in the prosecution of work in connection with rescue operations, or in conducting other flood emergency work, to acquire on a rental basis such motor vehicles, including passenger cars and buses, as in his discretion are deemed necessary."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA WATER RESOURCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4753) to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "two years" and inserting "three years" in lieu thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF BONDS COVERING POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Postmaster General determines it to be to the best interests of the Government he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, purchase, out of appropriations or other funds available to the Post Office Department, such blanket position, position schedule, or other type of surety bonds as he may deem appropriate to cover any or all categories of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, and mail clerks in the armed services and the Coast Guard, required by law or administrative determination to be bonded. The bonds may cover periods not in excess of 4 years, and shall contain such conditions and be in such penalty as the Postmaster General may deem necessary to protect the interests of the Government. Nothing in this act shall relieve such postmasters, officers, employees, contractors, and mail clerks and their sureties from any liability otherwise imposed by law.

With the following committee amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 9, strike out "categories of."

No. 2. Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "contractors with the Post Office Department".

No. 3. Page 2, line 4, after "The" insert "premiums on any such."

No. 4. Page 2, line 5, after "four years, and" insert "the bonds."

No. 5. Page 2, line 9, strike out "contractors."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone could give us an explanation of the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. This resolution provides for the participation of the Congress of the United States in a NATO meeting in Europe. Ten or 12 NATO countries have already signified their intention of sending representatives there. We have an invitation from the Scandinavian countries and also, the United States has been urged by the other NATO countries, particularly Canada, to participate in this conference. The Executive department is anxious that the Congress of the United States get its viewpoint across in this conference. The resolution provides that 14 Members, 7 from the House and 7 from the other body be sent as delegates in July to the conference to be held this year in France.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from South Carolina understands that we already have the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. RICHARDS. We do not have any representation in the NATO conference at all. The Interparliamentary Union is an entirely different thing. This resolution was passed out of committee unanimously. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of this organization in addition to spending the taxpayers' money, let me ask?

Mr. RICHARDS. The purpose of the organization is to create better understanding and to draw closer together the parliamentary bodies of the NATO countries. As the gentleman knows, we have an alliance which may easily lead us to war. It is being handled by the diplomats of the several countries. We have guaranteed in case those nations are attacked, we will help defend them. It would, therefore, be wise for our parliamentary bodies to keep in close touch.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these countries are not represented in the Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know about that. I just know that this organization is made up of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance countries. I believe we would be making a mistake if the Congress did not exert its influence and its viewpoint on that gathering.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that is what they have been saying about the Interparliamentary Union for a good many years. I am one of those who is completely unconvinced that the Interparliamentary Union has contributed a single thing toward our international relations. I think it is a first-class junketing organization and I am afraid that is what this organization is going to be. Until I can get some further information concerning this organization, I do not intend to permit this resolution to go through the House.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel it is very important that in our discussions with our European allies regarding the common problems that affect us in the NATO organization, Representatives of this Congress, who are closest to the American people, should be present in order to express to our allies the viewpoints we hear expressed almost daily here in the Congress?

Often times we hear the criticism that our delegations to international conferences speak only for the executive department and not for the American people and the Congress. Do you not think it would be better for our country to have these Members of Congress abroad to help our allies know what the American people think?

Mr. GROSS. You already have the Interparliamentary Union that takes a trip once a year to some European country. I suspect that all countries that are here represented will be represented in the Interparliamentary Union. Why this duplication and this additional expense?

Mr. JUDD. The Interparliamentary Union covers the whole planet. It involves general discussion of the problems that legislative bodies face. This conference will discuss and deal with the specific commitments, obligations, responsibilities, and duties of the NATO organization of which the United States is a member.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to take further time in connection with this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF PORTION OF CAMP MABRY MILITIA RIFLE RANGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 489) authorizing the transfer of a portion of the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range tract in the city of Austin, Tex., comprising 189.11 acres, to the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Texas 189.11 acres (together with all improvements thereon) out of the original 200 acres known as the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range tract in the city of Austin, Travis County, Tex., also referred to as the "Old Deison Farm," which 189.11 acres is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the 53-acre tract heretofore conveyed to J. J. Gasser by deed dated February 23, 1895, recorded in volume 129, page 347, of deed records of Travis County, Tex., said corner also being the southwest corner of the 38.55-acre State tract numbered 2 surveyed March 30, 1934, by M. V. Homeyer, county surveyor;

Thence north 60 degrees west, with the original line dividing the Townes and Mabin tracts 1,113 varas to a stone corner on the east line of the W. C. Phillips timber tract;

Thence with the east line of said W. C. Phillips tract north 36½ degrees east, 1,139½ varas to a stone corner on the south line of the Charles Thiele tract, from which an elm 20 inches in diameter marked "X," bears south 32 degrees west 10 varas and a small live oak marked "X" bears south 62 degrees east 10 varas;

Thence south 60 degrees east 613 varas to an angle in the stone fence dividing the Deison and Thiele tracts;

Thence with said fence on the dividing line between the Deison and Thiele tracts and also the Deison and Reid tracts, south 168 varas to a point;

Thence south 57 degrees east 160 varas to a point;

Thence southeast 108 varas to a point;

Thence south 9 degrees west 100 varas to a point;

Thence south 10 degrees east 100 varas to a point;

Thence south 5 degrees west 86 varas to a point;

Thence south 3 degrees east 77 varas to the southwest corner of the Elanor Reid tract on the north line of the Gasser 53-acre tract;

Thence north 60 degrees west with the north line of the Gasser tract, 147 varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south 30 degrees west with the west line of said Gasser tract, 640½ varas to the place of beginning;

Containing in all 200 acres of land, less and excepting from this 200-acre tract above described, a tract of land containing 10.89 acres, more or less, described by metes and bounds as follows:

Beginning at the northwesterly corner of the 200-acre Deison tract;

Thence south 60 degrees east along the northerly boundary line of the Deison tract 466.2 varas for corner;

Thence south 30 degrees west 129.6 varas for corner;

Thence north 60 degrees west 478.8 varas to the northwesterly boundary line of the Deison tract for corner;

Thence along said boundary line north 36½ degrees east 130.68 varas to the place of beginning, containing 10.89 acres more or less, to be retained by the United States;

The land to be transferred to the State of Texas containing in all 189.11 acres more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion of the original 200-acre tract conveyed by deed from Eliza C. J. Deison, et al., to the United States of America, dated June 28, 1909, as same appears of record in volume 239, pages 82 to 84, inclusive, of the deed records of Travis County, Tex., after deducting therefrom the 10.89 acres more or less, to be retained by the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall execute and deliver in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the conveyance of such 189.11 acres: *Provided,* That there shall be reserved to the United States of America all minerals including oil and gas in the lands herein authorized to be conveyed.

(b) There shall be further reserved to the United States of America in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights of ingress and egress over roads in the above-described lands serving buildings or other works operated by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the 10.89 acres above described located immediately adjacent to and northwest of the property herein authorized to be conveyed. There shall be further reserved in said lands all rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, power lines, and such other utilities as now exist, or may become necessary to the operation of said 10.89 acres retained by the United States and excluded from the transfer.

(c) Such conveyance shall contain a provision that such 189.11 acres shall be used primarily for training the National Guard and Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the primary purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Texas during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(d) Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Texas for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Texas together with any or all facilities and improvements, appurtenances, and utilities thereon or appertaining thereto. Such conveyance shall provide that same is subject to any valid easements which may exist against the said property.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "189.11" and insert "200."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby."

Page 4, line 23, strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 14 be substituted in lieu of H. R. 489.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States, in and to the following-described land in Austin, Travis County, Tex., together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land including approximately one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres out of the original two hundred acres known as the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range Tract, also referred to as the "old Deison Farm":

Beginning at the southwest corner of the fifty-three-acre tract heretofore conveyed to J. J. Gasser by deed dated February 23, 1895, recorded in volume 129, page 347, of deed records of Travis County, Tex., said corner also being the southwest corner of the thirty-eight-and-fifty-five-one-hundredths-acre State tract numbered 2 surveyed March 30, 1934, by M. V. Homeyer, county surveyor;

Thence north sixty degrees west, with the original line dividing the Townes and Mabin tract one thousand one hundred and thirteen varas to a stone corner on the east line of the W. C. Phillips timber tract;

Thence with the east line of said W. C. Phillips tract, north thirty-six and one-half degrees east one thousand eight and eighty-two one-hundredths varas to a point; said point being south thirty-six and one-half degrees west one hundred thirty and sixty-eight one-hundredths varas from a stone corner on the south line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east along the south lines of the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel comprising five and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps, armory parcel comprising five acres, four hundred seventy-eight and eight-tenths varas to a point, the southeast corner of the said Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel;

Thence north thirty degrees east with and along the east line of the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, one hundred twenty-nine and five-tenths varas to a point on the southerly line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east one hundred forty-six and eight-tenths varas to an angle in the stone fence dividing the Deison and Thiele tracts;

Thence with said fence on the dividing line between the Deison and Thiele tracts and also the Deison and Reid tracts, south one hundred and sixty-eight varas to a point;

Then south fifty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty varas to a point;

Thence southeast one hundred and eight varas to a point;

Thence south nine degrees west one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south ten degrees east one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south five degrees west eighty-six varas to a point;

Thence south three degrees east seventy-seven varas to the southwest corner of the Elanor Reid tract on the north line of the Gasser fifty-three-acre tract;

Thence north sixty degrees west with the north line of the Gasser tract, one hundred

and forty-seven varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south thirty degrees west with the west line of said Gasser tract, six hundred forty and one-half varas to the place of beginning;

Containing in all one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres of land more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion of the original two-hundred-acre tract conveyed by deed from Eliza C. J. Deison, et al., to the United States of America, dated June 28, 1909, as same appears of record in volume 239, pages 82–84, inclusive of the deed records of Travis County, Tex., after deducting therefrom the five and eighty-nine one-hundredths-acre United States Air Force parcel and the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel above described, a total of ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres to be retained by the United States.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. There shall be further reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights of ingress and egress over roads in the above-described lands serving buildings or other works operated by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres referred to in section 1 of this act as the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, powerlines, and such other utilities as now exist, or which may become necessary to the operation of the above-described ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Texas shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 5. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon during its occupancy by the State of Texas, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Texas, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Similar House bill H. R. 489 was laid on the table.

CI——406

CAMP DODGE, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 755) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Iowa all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described land in Polk County, Iowa, together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land being formerly designated as Camp Dodge, Iowa:

Parcel one: Commencing at a point, the northwest corner of section 30, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian of Iowa and running thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-nine minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred two and four-tenths feet to a point on the Des Moines River, thence south seven degrees thirty-three minutes west a distance of four hundred eighty-four and one-tenth feet; thence south fifty-four degrees six and one-half minutes east a distance of four hundred sixty-one and eight-tenths feet to a point on the east side of the Des Moines River, thence south sixty-two degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of two hundred eighty-eight and two-tenths feet; thence south seventy-four degrees twenty-nine minutes east a distance of five hundred and seven feet; thence south no degrees thirteen minutes west a distance of one thousand one hundred and ninety feet; thence north seventy-one degrees thirty-four minutes east a distance of four hundred fifty and nine-tenths feet; thence south eighty-eight degrees thirty-eight and one-half minutes east a distance of six hundred sixteen and two-tenths feet; thence south four degrees fourteen and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred sixty-eight and nine-tenths feet; thence south four degrees four and one-half minutes west a distance of two hundred thirty-nine and two-tenths feet; thence south nineteen degrees no minutes east a distance of two hundred thirty-four and seven-tenths feet; thence south fifteen degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of three hundred two and six-tenths feet; thence south thirteen degrees twenty and one-half minutes east a distance of one hundred ninety-seven and six-tenths feet; thence south thirty-nine degrees two and one-half minutes east a distance of two hundred fifty-six and three-tenths feet; thence south eighty-four degrees twelve minutes east a distance of two hundred ten and five-tenths feet; thence north sixty-five degrees fifty-eight minutes east a distance of one hundred ninety and seven-tenths feet; thence north seventy-five degrees thirty-one minutes east a distance of nine hundred and ninety-one feet; thence north twenty-nine degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of seven hundred sixty and five-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-three minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred eighty and one-tenth feet; thence south no degrees twenty-two minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and twenty feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred and thirty feet; thence south no degrees six minutes west a distance of one thousand five hundred and twenty feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-four minutes west a distance of nine hundred and twenty feet; thence south five degrees forty six minutes east a distance of five hundred sixty-one and two-tenths feet; thence south twelve degrees one minute east a distance of four hundred and seventy-eight feet; thence south twenty-one degrees fifty-three minutes west a distance of five hundred thirty and three-tenths feet; thence south forty degrees fifty-five minutes west a distance of five hundred seventeen and one-tenth feet; thence south forty-nine degrees thirty minutes west a distance of nine hundred eighty-eight and three-tenths feet; thence north sixty-one degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of three hundred sixty-eight and nine-tenths feet; thence north fifty-two degrees forty-three and one-half minutes west a distance of four hundred and twenty-one feet; thence north thirty-nine degrees fifty-three and one-half minutes west a distance of four hundred thirty-six and six-tenths feet; thence north sixteen degrees twenty-six and one-half minutes west a distance of three hundred seventeen and two-tenths feet; thence north two degrees twenty-nine and one-half minutes west a distance of three hundred forty-five and four-tenths feet; thence north twenty-four degrees thirteen and one-half minutes west a distance of nine hundred and twenty-nine feet; thence north seventy-four degrees fifty-six minutes west a distance of two hundred sixty-nine and two-tenths feet; thence south sixty-five degrees nine and one-half minutes west a distance of two hundred fifty-seven and five-tenths feet; thence south twenty-five degrees forty-eight minutes west a distance of two hundred seventy-two and seven-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west a distance of one thousand seven hundred sixty-nine and four-tenths feet; thence north no degrees ten minutes west a distance of one thousand three hundred seventeen and seven-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west a distance of six hundred ninety-seven and two-tenths feet; thence north no degrees forty minutes east a distance of eight hundred sixty-one and nine-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees twenty minutes west a distance of one thousand seventy-two and five-tenths feet; thence south no degrees forty minutes west a distance of eight hundred and seventy-five feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-eight minutes west a distance of nine hundred and ninety-five feet; thence north no degrees twenty-nine minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred fourteen and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of six hundred forty-three and four-tenths feet; thence north no degrees thirty-nine and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred twenty-three and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees eleven and one-half minutes west a distance of six hundred seventy-nine and four-tenths feet; thence north no degrees twenty and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and eighteen feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees eleven minutes east a distance of one hundred one and six-tenths feet; thence south sixteen degrees forty-five minutes east a distance of fifty-eight feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of one-thousand two hundred eleven and eight-tenths feet; thence north no degrees four and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and seventy-eight feet.

Parcel two: Commencing at the west quarter corner of section 35, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian, Polk County, Iowa, runs thence north no degrees one and one-half minutes west of the north eighth line of section 27 a distance of six thousand six hundred twenty-nine and five-tenths feet; thence west along said north eighth line of section 27 to the east eighth line of section

27 a distance of one thousand three hundred thirty-eight and six-tenths feet; thence north no degrees five and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred twenty-one and nine-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-four and one-half minutes west a distance of one thousand three hundred thirty-five and nine-tenths feet; thence north no degrees fourteen minutes west a distance of two thousand six hundred forty-five and three-tenths feet to the center of section 22; thence north no degrees fourteen minutes west a distance of three thousand and fifty-three feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes east a distance of two thousand six hundred seventy-two and eight-tenths feet; thence north no degrees twelve minutes west a distance of two thousand two hundred forty-five and five-tenths feet to the east quarter corner of section 15, township 80 north, range 25 west; thence south eighty-nine degrees seventeen minutes east a distance of one thousand nine hundred forty-eight and six-tenths feet; thence south no degrees twelve minutes west a distance of six hundred seventy-two and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight and one-half minutes east a distance of seven hundred and ten feet to the north south center line of section 14; thence south no degrees thirty-two minutes west a distance of six hundred fifty-two and seven-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees eleven minutes east a distance of seven hundred twenty and eight-tenths feet to the public highway described as highway No. 141; thence south twelve degrees seven minutes east a distance of eight hundred seventy and five-tenths feet; thence south twenty-one degrees eight minutes east a distance of four hundred eighty-four and four-tenths feet to the north line of section 23; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-seven and one-half minutes west a distance of four hundred and seventy-eight feet; thence due south nine hundred feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-seven and one-half minutes west a distance of three hundred feet; thence due south one thousand two hundred and seventy feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred and fifty feet; thence due south four hundred seventy-seven and nine-tenths feet to the east-west center line of section 23; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of six hundred and seventy feet; thence south along the east eighth line of section 23 south no degrees twenty-five and one-half minutes west a distance of two thousand one hundred and twenty-two feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and ten feet to public highway No. 141; thence south no degrees eighteen minutes west a distance of five hundred and seventeen feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of five hundred seven and eight-tenths feet; thence south two degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of four hundred eighty-four and three-tenths feet; thence south eighty-four degrees seven and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred ninety-six and five-tenths feet; thence south no degrees forty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of seven hundred twenty-one and five-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees twenty-two and one-half minutes east a distance of five hundred seventy-one and three-tenths feet; thence south twenty-two degrees forty-seven minutes east a distance of one hundred sixty and three-tenths feet; thence south twenty-seven degrees fifty minutes east a distance of one thousand four hundred eleven and two-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of two hundred twenty-three and nine-tenths feet; thence south no degrees twenty-two minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred twenty-two and five-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-two and one-half minutes west a distance of one thousand six hundred thirty-eight and five-tenths feet to a point on the west right-of-way line of the Des Moines and Central Iowa Railroad; thence south twenty-four degrees eighteen minutes east along west right-of-way line a distance of two thousand eight hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet to the north eighth line of section 36; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-six minutes west a distance of four thousand seven hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet; thence south eleven degrees thirty-seven minutes east a distance of one hundred ninety-six and five-tenths feet; thence south fifty-four degrees fifty-three minutes east a distance of three hundred fifty-four and one-tenth feet; thence south four degrees one and one-half minutes west a distance of one hundred sixteen and nine-tenths feet; thence south thirty-five degrees twenty-six minutes west a distance of three hundred ten and four-tenths feet; thence south twelve degrees six minutes west a distance of one hundred ninety-eight and nine-tenths feet; thence south eleven degrees eight minutes east a distance of three hundred sixty-eight and two-tenths feet to the east-west center line of section 35; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of one thousand one hundred seventy-four and eight-tenths feet to the point of beginning, except that parcel commencing at the northeast corner of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 22, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian thence west along the north line of said south half of southeast quarter of section 22 for a distance of seven hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet; thence in a southeasterly direction nine hundred and thirty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 22, thence north along the said east line of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 22 for a distance of five hundred forty-one and eight-tenths feet to the place of beginning, said tract of land being further described as the town of Herrold, Polk County, Iowa, and containing four and forty-four one-hundredths acres; and further excepting a parcel commencing at the intersection of the west boundary of the right-of-way of the Des Moines and Central Iowa Railway and the south quarter line of section 22, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian thence due south two hundred feet; thence west two hundred and sixty-four feet, thence north two hundred feet, thence east two hundred and sixty-four feet to the point of beginning, said tract being further identified as the Herrold School and containing one and twenty-one one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration, to the State of Iowa, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the Camp Dodge Military Reservation, Iowa, comprising one thousand eight hundred forty-eight and thirty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, and Polk County Target Range, Iowa, comprising seven hundred forty-two and thirty-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, both together with all buildings and improvements thereon, and all appurtenances, easements, rights-of-way, and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

"SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act are hereby reserved to the United States.

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall vest in tlhe United States without payment of compensation therefor.

"SEC. 4. The conveyance authorized by this act shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such national emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

"SEC. 5. In consideration for the conveyance of the lands described in section 1 of this act, the State of Iowa shall agree to use for military purposes only and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain lands (hereinafter called State lands) and improvements thereon which are owned by the State of Iowa and are used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range as of the date of the act. The State of Iowa further agrees that

it will, prior to delivery of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr., a description and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein. In the event that the State of Iowa at any time shall breach the agreement defined in this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the property conveyed to the State of Iowa by the United States under the provisions of this act shall revert to the United States without cost. The State shall further agree that in the event that the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, the use of the State lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense, be used by the United States during such emergency without cost to the United States.

"SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

"SEC. 7. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this act and any related documents."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 148 be considered in lieu of the bill H. R. 755.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Iowa all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the Camp Dodge Military Reservation, located in Polk County, Iowa, comprising 1,848.32 acres, more or less, and Polk County target range, Iowa, comprising 742.34 acres, more or less, both together with all buildings and improvements thereon, and all appurtenances, easements, rights-of-way, and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Iowa shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon during its occupancy by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such national emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 5. In consideration for the conveyance of the lands described in the first section of this act, the State of Iowa shall agree to use for military purposes only and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain lands (hereinafter called State lands) and improvements thereon which are owned by the State of Iowa and are used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range as of the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the improvements on such lands which are now being used by the State of Iowa for other than military purposes may continue to be used for such purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the utilization of such lands for military purposes. The State of Iowa further agrees that it will, prior to delivery of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr., a description of and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein. In the event that the State of Iowa at any time shall breach the agreement defined in this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the property conveyed to the State of Iowa by the United States under the provisions of this act shall revert to the United States without cost. The State shall further agree that in the event that the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, the use of the State lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense, be used by the United States during such emergency without cost to the United States.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

SEC. 7. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this act and any related documents.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Similar House bill H. R. 755 was laid on the table.

INTERCHANGE OF SUPPLIES BETWEEN THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4294) to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 640 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting the term "Air Force," immediately after the term "Navy."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE FOR NATIONAL GUARD PURPOSES OF JACKSON BARRACKS, LA., TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5170) to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W-766-QM-6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six one-hundredths acres, more or less, in Orleans and Saint Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property to be used for the training and support of the National Guard of Louisiana, and the conveyance to be made without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the reservation by the United States of all mineral rights, including oil and gas; the right of reentry and use by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training and support of the National Guard of Louisiana, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States; and such other reservations, restrictions, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Louisiana.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill (S. 653) for the bill H. R. 5170.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W-766-QM-6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six one-hundredths acres, more or less, in Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana and for other military purposes, and the conveyance to be made without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the reservation by the United States of all mineral rights, including oil and gas; the right of reentry and use by the United States

in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States, and, in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Louisiana shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 2. The costs of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Louisiana.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5170) was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL THE FEE STAMP REQUIREMENT IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5841) to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of April 5, 1906 (34 Stat. 102), as amended (22 U. S. C. 1196), be repealed; and section 1728 of the Revised Statutes (22 U. S. C. 1194) be amended to read as follows:

"ACCOUNT OF FEES: CERTIFICATION

"Every consular officer responsible for the collection of fees, in rendering his account of fees received, shall furnish a full transcript of the register which he is required to keep, and certify that such transcript is an accurate and complete record of all fees received for the period shown."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING SERVICE CHARGE FOR MAKING AND AUTHENTICATING COPIES OF RECORDS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 213 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 166) shall be and the same is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE OF FEE FOR PASSPORT APPLICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4573) authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and other purposes, Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas or the United States applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferrred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR LOS EBANOS, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2984) authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and other purposes, E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possesed by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas or the United States applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to E. B. Reyna, his heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROADS AND BRIDGES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 245) to amend the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to

provide for the construction and maintenance of roads, the establishment and maintenance of schools, and the care and support of insane persons in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322), is amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior, or such officer, or officers, as may be designated by him, shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, upon his own motion or upon petition, to locate, lay out, construct, and maintain highways, roads, trails, and bridges from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to and through any town, mining or other industrial camp or settlement, or between and through any such town, camps, or settlements therein, if in his judgment such highways, roads, trails, or bridges are needed and will be of permanent value for the development of Alaska; but no such highways, roads, trails, or bridges shall be constructed to and through any town, camp, or settlement which is wholly transitory or of no substantial value or importance for mining, trade, agricultural, or manufacturing purposes: *Provided,* That only such highways, roads, trails, and bridges, including access roads to military reservations and other Federal installations, as may be designated by the Governor of Alaska and approved by the Secretary of the Interior may be constructed and maintained through any town, camp, or settlement."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the third sentence of section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 322), is further amended to read as follows:

" 'The Secretary of the Interior, or such officer, or officers as may be designated by him, shall, upon his own motion or upon petition, locate, lay out, construct, and maintain roads, trails, and bridges from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to and through any town, mining or other industrial camp or settlement, or between and through any such town, camps or settlements therein, if in his judgment such roads, trails, or bridges are needed and will be of permanent value for the development of Alaska: *Provided,* That within incorporated towns only roads and bridges which are designated by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the through highway system of the Territory of Alaska may be constructed under this section: *Provided, further,* That no roads or bridges within incorporated towns shall be maintained under this section'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 322)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 603) to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act making an additional grant of lands for the support and maintenance of the Agricultural College and School of Mines of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091; 48 U. S. C., sec. 354a), is amended by striking out "nonmineral" and inserting after "in the Territory of Alaska" the following: "whether or not such land has mineral deposits therein."

SEC. 2. That section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "at the capital and in a newspaper of like circulation which shall then be regularly published."

SEC. 3. That section 5 of such act is amended by striking out "nor, in case of the sale of the land, less than a minimum price of $5 per acre."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of such act is amended by striking out "secretary of state" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Administration."

SEC. 5. That the proviso in section 6 of such act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. That references in such act and other acts of Congress to the Agricultural College and School of Mines in the Territory of Alaska shall be deemed to refer to the University of Alaska.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 1 of the act of January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091; 48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 354a), hereafter referred to as the act, is amended by deleting the words 'nonmineral surveyed', and by inserting after the words 'in the Territory of Alaska' the words 'whether or not such lands contain mineral deposits.'

"SEC. 2. The following sections shall be added to the act as sections 3 and 4, and the present section 3 and all subsequent sections shall be renumbered accordingly:

" 'SEC. 3. That, upon the revocation of any order of withdrawal in Alaska, the order of revocation shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective during which the Territory shall have a preferred right of selection, subject to the requirements of this act, except as against prior existing valid rights or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation: *Provided,* That upon the subsequent disposition of any lands selected under this section, persons now or hereafter entitled to benefits under section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 748; 43 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 282), as now or hereafter amended, shall be afforded a 90-day period in which to acquire the lands upon the terms and conditions upon which the Territory has determined to dispose of the lands: *Provided further,* That the foregoing proviso shall be terminated or repealed by the termination or repeal of section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944, as now or hereafter amended.

" 'SEC. 4. That, following the selection of lands by the Territory and the approval of such selection by the Secretary of the Interior, but prior to the issuance of final patent, the Territory shall be authorized to lease and to make conditional sales of such selected lands.'

"SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act as so renumbered is amended by deleting 'nor in case of the sale of the land, less than a minimum price of $5 per acre.'

"SEC. 4. Section 8 of the act as so renumbered, is amended by deleting 'secretary of state' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Board of Administration.'

"SEC. 5. The proviso in section 8 of the act as so renumbered is repealed.

"SEC. 6. All references in acts of the Congress to the Agricultural College and School of Mines in the Territory of Alaska shall be deemed to refer to the University of Alaska."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARK COUNTY, MO., TOLL BRIDGE CHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 625) to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the event that the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., shall issue toll bridge revenue refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding or redeeming its outstanding 4 percent toll bridge revenue bonds dated December 1, 1935, which were issued to provide funds for the construction of the bridge authorized by an act of the 72d Congress, 1st session, approved February 14, 1933 (Public Law 337), or in the event that the said district shall extend the maturity date or dates of said outstanding bonds, the rates of toll to be charged for the use of said bridge shall be so adjusted as to provide sufficient revenues to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal, interest, and redemption premium, if any, of such toll bridge revenue refunding bonds, or of said outstanding bonds, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not exceeding 30 years from the date of approval of this act, and such tolls shall be continued until such payments shall have been made. After such bonds and the interest thereon shall have been paid, said bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5166) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT TO CARRY FIREARMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5860) to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if somebody can give us some reason for arming State Department employees. Are these to be in foreign countries or this country?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 5860 is to authorize a small number of security officers of the Department of State to carry firearms when they are assigned to protect high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States, as well as our Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State.

When heads of foreign states and other distinguished representatives of foreign governments visit the United States at the invitation of the President, the responsibility for managing their visit falls upon the State Department. As a part of this responsibility, it is the duty of the Department to insure the safety of these visiting dignitaries. It is true that in every jurisdiction into which the visitor's trip takes him, State and local police are assigned to assist in giving him protection. However, as the visitor proceeds from one police jurisdiction to another, the State Department security officer is the person responsible for his constant protection. This officer is forced to assume a tremendous responsibility totally unarmed, as there is no existing authority for security officers of the State Department to carry firearms.

Prior to 1953 certain security officers of the State Department were permitted to carry weapons. However, when the question was raised as to whether or not there was authority for such practice, the legal adviser of the State Department determined that there was not. Warde M. Cameron, assistant legal adviser, Department of State, submitted the following memorandum dealing with this subject:

AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO CARRY FIREARMS

There is no Federal law which specifically authorizes special agents and other officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms for protective purposes, such as protecting heads of foreign states and other high officials of foreign governments who are in this country as distinguished guests of the United States, and the Secretary and Under Secretary of State, and guarding classified material at international conferences. In the absence of Federal legislation on the subject, the right to carry firearms is regulated by applicable State, county, and municipal law, with which such officers and employees must comply.

WARDE M. CAMERON,
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Therefore, we now have the extremely dangerous situation wherein the persons with primary responsibility for the protection of the lives of distinguished foreign visitors do not have the full authority necessary to carry out their functions properly.

Certainly a serious situation could be created if any harm came to a foreign official while he was visiting in the United States. Not only have relations between friendly governments been strained often to the breaking point by incidents of this sort but in the history of the world such incidents have even been the sparks that set off wars. To date, our Government has not experienced an occasion when it would have been necessary to use firearms. We have indeed been fortunate in this respect. However, there is always a first time, and we should be prepared in the event that time arrives.

Although not specifically spelled out in the Constitution, it has always been accepted that the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States is a Federal function. Who can question that the protection of a foreign visitor, the guest of the President of the United States, is an integral part of the conduct of our foreign relations and clearly a Federal function? Under international law and practice it is the duty of a host state to insure the safety of officials of foreign states traveling or sojourning in its territory. As long ago as 1790, the Congress recognized this responsibility and its Federal nature by the enactment of a criminal law providing penalties for assaulting an ambassador or public minister in violation of the law of nations. There can thus be no question as to the authority of Congress to enact legislation enabling officers of the Federal Government to carry out a Federal responsibility.

The carrying of firearms is governed generally by the laws of states and local governmental subdivisions. In the absence of overriding authority in the form of Federal legislation, a Federal official would be required to comply with all local regulations, a manifest impossibility for one traveling through many jurisdictions, with many different types of laws and regulations. The Congress has recognized the need for such legislation in the case of other Federal officials. The Secret Service, with its responsibility to protect the President of the United States and members of his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President, as well as with its general police powers with respect to matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, is specifically authorized to carry firearms by section 3056 of title 18 of the United States Code. Similar authority is given to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by section 3052 of the same title, and to United States marshals and deputies by section 3053. Certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency are given this authority by section 403 (j) of title 50 of the code.

It may be asked why it is necessary to create a fourth category of Federal officials, exclusive of the armed services, who will be authorized by statute to carry firearms. The answer to this in my judgment is equally clear. The authority of these three agencies to carry firearms is prescribed by statute. The protection of foreign visitors is not one of their responsibilities. Furthermore, as the Federal agency concerned with maintaining relations with foreign governments, the Department of State is not only the logical agency for carrying out this function but is the agency that has long had this responsibility. The protection of visiting foreign dignitaries is so closely related to other duties of the Department of State as to make it thoroughly impracticable to give this responsibility to another agency.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the enactment of this legislation is essential if we are to enable this government to give to distinguished foreign visitors the same protection that we would expect our officials to be given when they are visiting in other countries.

Mr. GROSS. It is limited to a very few people?

Mr. SELDEN. Yes. I am advised that during the past year a total of 18 men were used on these assignments at various times.

Mr. GROSS. And does it apply both domestically and in foreign countries?

Mr. SELDEN. No. This measure applies only in this country.

Mr. GROSS. In this country only?

Mr. SELDEN. That is correct. The question of whether a State Department security officer can carry a firearm in another country is, of course, a matter to be decided by that country.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it not possible that these security officers could get permission to carry firearms the same as a private citizen when he shows a reason why he should?

Mr. SELDEN. This would hardly be feasible. These security officers accompany distinguished visitors on their visits throughout the United States and, in doing so, travel through many different police jurisdictions. It would be practically impossible to comply with all local laws and regulations as one passes swiftly from one jurisdiction to another.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, special agents and other officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service who have been designated by the Secretary of State, are authorized to carry firearms for the purpose of protecting heads of foreign states, high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Under Secretary of State, and official representatives attending international conferences, or performing special missions.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 4, strike out "special agents and other officers and employees" and insert in lieu thereof "security officers."

In line 6, after "State", insert "and who have qualified for the use of firearms."

In line 11, before "attending", insert "of foreign governments and of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION OVER HIGHWAYS AT FORT DEVENS, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3825) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby makes retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on concurrent jurisdiction over the following-described land:

Parcel "A": A parcel of land in the town of Harvard, comprising a portion of the original reservation of Fort Devens, shown on sheet numbered 1 of a plan on file in the Office of the Corps of Engineers, New England Division, at Boston, Mass., as number MED–PA–638, dated May 1946, said parcel being located in the northernmost portion of said original reservation and being bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound in the boundary line of the aforesaid reservation marking a point of curvature in the southerly location line of the right-of-way of the Fitchburg and Leominster Street Railway and extending thence by said boundary southeasterly by a curve to the left of 1,025.00 feet radius 222.45 feet to a point; thence leaving said boundary line and extending north 83 degrees 32 minutes 58 seconds west 520.53 feet to a point on the dividing line between the towns of Harvard and Shirley as approximately located by the Nashua River; thence following said dividing line north 55 degrees 52 minutes 17 seconds east 110.22 feet to the aforesaid boundary line; thence returning by said boundary line south 71 degrees 6 minutes 53 seconds east 221.30 feet to the point of beginning; containing about 15,000 square feet.

Parcel "B": A parcel of land in the town of Shirley, comprising a portion of tract numbered 201, shown on sheet numbered 1 of a plan on file in the Office of the Corps of Engineers, New England Division, at Boston, Mass., as number NED–PA–638, dated May 1946, said parcel being located in the northeasterly corner of said tract and being bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound marking the northeasterly corner of the boundary line of said tract and extending thence by said boundary line south 27 degrees 36 minutes 2 seconds east 55.34 feet; thence leaving said boundary line and extending south 67 degrees 31 minutes 31 seconds west 619.41 feet to a point again on said boundary line; thence returning by said boundary line north 62 degrees 23 minutes 58 seconds east 616.93 feet to the point of beginning; containing about 17,070 square feet (the above-described parcels of land being the same parcels covered by a grant from the Secretary of War to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, dated June 18, 1947, authorized by the Act of Congress approved July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. 104)).

Parcel "C": A parcel of land comprising a portion of the Fort Devens Reservation, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the westerly boundary of said reservation (in the town of Lancaster) at bound numbered 39 thereof, and extending thence (along said boundary between said bound numbered 39 and bound numbered 40) north 60 degrees 32 minutes 27 seconds east 623.39 feet; thence leaving said boundary and extending (partly in Lancaster and partly in Harvard) south 79 degrees 15 minutes 41 seconds east 1,074.93 feet; thence in Harvard north 48 degrees 32 minutes 49 seconds east 368.43 feet; thence north 23 degrees 41 minutes 23 seconds east 375.84 feet; thence south 73 degrees 6 minutes 56 seconds east 90.00 feet; thence south 3 degrees 1 minute 55 seconds east 502.16 feet; thence south 15 degrees 29 minutes 11 seconds east 533.03 feet; thence south 51 degrees 39 minutes 51 seconds east 496.49 feet; thence south 79 degrees 15 minutes 41 seconds east 5,656.00 feet; thence by a curve to the left of 2,400.29 feet radius 524.96 feet to a point on the northwesterly location line of the right-of-way of the Boston and Maine Railroad (Worcester to Ayer); said right-of-way location line also marking the easterly boundary of the aforesaid Camp Devens Military Reservation, and said point bearing north 6 degrees 40 minutes 47 seconds east and being 101.06 feet distant from station 1314+79.63 of the base line of said railroad right-of-way; thence following said railroad location line southwesterly by a curve to the left, as shown on plan, of 1,951.33 feet radius 5.87 feet; thence south 30 degrees 45 minutes 59 seconds west 151.40 feet, north 59 degrees 14 minutes 1 second west 16.50 feet and south 30 degrees 45 minutes 59 seconds west 85.78 feet; thence leaving said railroad location line and returning westerly by a curve to the right of 2,600.29 feet radius 423.91 feet; thence north 79 degrees 15 minutes 41 seconds west 6,534.00 feet; thence (partly in Harvard and partly in Lancaster) south 67 degrees 1 minute 10 seconds west 1,415.90 feet; thence (in Lancaster) north 47 degrees 47 minutes 4 seconds west 949.51 feet to a point on the aforesaid westerly boundary of Fort Devens Military Reservation, on the line between bounds numbered 37 and 38 thereof; thence by said boundary line north 70 degrees 11 minutes 26 seconds east 202.26 feet to the said bound numbered 38, and thence north 4 degrees 41 minutes 41 seconds west 503.20 feet to the point of beginning above described, at the aforesaid bound numbered 39.

The area of the above-described parcel is 91.20 acres of which 43.77 acres are in Lancaster and 47.43 acres are in Harvard.

The above-described parcel is shown on a plan signed by P. H. Kitfield, chief engineer, and entitled, "The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Plan of Land in the Towns of Lancaster and Harvard, Worcester County, in Which an Easement for Highway Purposes Is To Be Conveyed to the Commonwealth by the United States of America. Scale: 100 feet to the inch." (The above-described parcel of land being the same parcel covered by grant from the Secretary of the Army to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, dated May 22, 1950, authorized by section 7 of the Act of Congress approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 643).

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction herein contained shall take effect upon acceptance by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4359) to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif., is amended by the repeal of sections 3, 4, and 5 thereof, and the substitution of the following:

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized herein shall include all right and title of the Secretary of Commerce in and to that certain personalty now installed within the bed of the said Central Drive, to wit: Approximately 3,700 feet of 12-inch steel pipe, being a water main; and approximately 5,090 feet of 6-inch steel pipe, being a gas main. The city of Richmond may transfer or convey or otherwise dispose of the right, title, and interest in and to the aforesaid personalty, or permit the use thereof to others, whether by deed, lease, permit or otherwise, and grant as well a perpetual easement, any other provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding, over the lands the conveyance of which is authorized in section 1 hereof, so as to permit the replacement, maintenance, operation, renewal, and repair of said personalty: *Provided*, That as long as the property presently occupied by the said Maritime-Richmond Yard No. 3 is held by the United States, the city of Richmond shall bind itself, its successors and assigns, its lessees and permittees to provide service through said water main and gas main or through any replacement or relocation thereof to said Maritime-Richmond Yard No. 3 as is required of water and gas utilities under the laws of the State of California.

"SEC. 4. In consideration of the conveyance authorized in section 1 hereof, and in addition to the conditions set forth in section 2 hereof, the city of Richmond will at all times maintain the said public highway to provide and permit perpetual access to the said Maritime-Richmond Yard No. 3 via said highway for all purposes, and will bind itself and its successors, assigns, lessees, or permittees, as the case may be, to any of the said pipes and pipelines, to provide and permit such service of water and gas as is required of water and gas utilities under the laws of the State of California through said pipes and pipelines or through any replacement or relocation thereof to said yard, as long as the property presently occupied by said yard is held by the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5398) to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 4, 1907 (ch. 2918, sec. 1, 34 Stat. 1322) as amended (33 U. S. C. 862) is further amended to read as follows: "Commissioned officers, ships officers, members of crews of vessels, and field employees of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey are authorized to make assignments or allotments of their pay under such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe."

SEC. 2. (a) The last proviso of the first paragraph of section 16, act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 88; 33 U. S. C. 854), is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be appointed ensign and no commissioned officer shall be promoted to a higher permanent grade on the active list until he has passed a satisfactory mental and physical examination in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce."

(b) Section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 88; 33 U. S. C. 856), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the third paragraph and substituting therefor the following:

"When serving with the Army, Navy, or Air Force, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall rank with and after officers of corresponding grade in the

Army, Navy, or Air Force of the same length of service in grade."

SEC. 3. (a) The second proviso of section 2b of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 7; 33 U. S. C. 854a (b)), as amended is further amended by inserting a period after the word "engineer" and deleting the words "in excess of one year" which appear at the end of the proviso.

(b) Section 8 of the act of January 19, 1952 (56 Stat. 8), as amended (33 U. S. C. 852b), is further amended to read as follows:

"The Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the active list of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander, for a term of 4 years, and may be reappointed for further periods of 4 years each: *Provided*, That the appointment of the Assistant Director shall terminate 6 months after the appointment of a new Director. His appointment shall create a vacancy and, while holding said office, he shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a rear admiral (lower half).

"Any officer who may be retired while serving as Director or Assistant Director, or who has or shall have served 4 years as Director or Assistant Director and is retired after completion of such service while serving in a lower rank or grade, shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade or rank held by him as Director or Assistant Director: *Provided*, That any officer, upon expiration of his appointment as Director or Assistant Director, shall, unless reappointed, revert to the grade and number that he would have occupied had he not served as Director or Assistant Director and such officer shall be an extra number in his grade."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 6 (a) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 298; 33 U. S. C. 853e) is amended by changing the period to a colon at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That whenever there are vacancies in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), officers in the permanent grade of ensign may be promoted to and appointed in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) upon completion of 2 years' service.".

(b) Section 10 (a) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 299; 33 U. S. C. 853i (a)) is amended to read:

"Appointments in and promotions to all permanent grades shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

SEC. 5. The following statutes are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 4687 of the Revised Statutes (33 U. S. C. 886).

(2) Section 4688 of the Revised Statutes (33 U. S. C. 887).

(3) Paragraph 7 of section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (28 Stat. 613; 44 U. S. C. 247).

(4) The last paragraph of section 1 of the act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 974; 33 U. S. C. 863).

(5) The act of March 9, 1909 (35 Stat. 1064; 33 U. S. C. 889 and 890).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF FIREWORKS IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4650) to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding a new chapter, number 26, embracing sections 521 and 522, and reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 26—REGULATION OF SALE AND USE OF FIREWORKS

"Sec.
"521. Regulations authorized.
"522. Punishment for violations.

"§ 521. Regulations authorized

"The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to prescribe, and from time to time alter and amend, regulations prohibiting, limiting, or otherwise regulating the sale and use of any fireworks within the Canal Zone, or any portions thereof, as he may deem necessary to public safety.

"§ 522. Punishment for violations

"Any person who shall violate any regulation prescribed under authority of the next preceding section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $100 or by 30 days imprisonment in jail, or by both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANDS OF THE YAKIMA TRIBE (STATE OF WASHINGTON)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1802) to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the act entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of Indian lands situated within the State of Washington for business and other purposes," approved August 9, 1946 (25 U. S. C., secs. 403b and 403c), or any other provision of law, the Yakima Tribe acting through its tribal council may lease to the State of Washington that land more particularly described in section 4 for the purpose of developing, maintaining, and preserving Fort Simcoe (Mool-Mool) for historical and for park purposes.

SEC. 2. The lease entered into under authority of the first section of this act—

(1) shall be null and void and the Yakima Tribe shall have the right of immediate possession if the State of Washington ever ceases to maintain Fort Simcoe (Mool-Mool) for historical and for park purposes;

(2) shall be entered into for a period of 99 years with the right of renewal for an additional term upon agreement of the parties;

(3) shall not contain any provision permitting the exploitation of any natural resource;

(4) shall specifically reserve to the Yakima Tribe all mineral and other subsurface rights in such lands which such tribe possesses on the date of enactment of this act; and

(5) shall be entered into under such rules and regulations, and contain such other provisions, as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. The existing agreement between the Yakima Tribe and the State of Washington may be amended to comply with this act.

SEC. 4. (a) The land on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., which may be leased pursuant to this act, is more particularly described as follows:

The east half of the northeast quarter of section 20, and the west half of the northwest quarter of section 21, and the west half of the east half of the northwest quarter of section 21, all in township 10 north, range 16 east, Willamette meridian, containing 200 acres more or less.

(b) Such additional tribal lands of the Yakima Tribe as adjoin the land described in subsection (a) may, pursuant to all of the terms and conditions of this act, be leased by such tribe, acting through its tribal council, to the State of Washington.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "with the right of renewal for an additional term upon agreement of the parties."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2682) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions with respect to subjection of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation to exploration, location, and entry under the mining laws of the United States in the Executive order dated February 1, 1917, creating the Papago Indian Reservation, and in the third proviso in section 1 of the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1202), and the provisions of subsection (b) (1) and (2) and of the remainder, following the word "purposes," of subsection (b) (4) of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U. S. C. 461–479), as amended by the act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 862, 863; 25 U. S. C. 463), are hereby repealed, all tribal lands within the Papago Indian Reservation are hereby withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under such laws, the minerals underlying such lands are hereby made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian tribe, and such minerals shall be subject to lease for mining purposes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347): *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not be applicable to lands within the Papago Indian Reservation for which a mineral patent has heretofore been issued or to a claim that has been validly initiated before the date of this act and thereafter maintained under the mining laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 348; 25 U. S. C. 396f), is amended by deleting therefrom "the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITY OF REFUGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5300) to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, when title to such lands located on the island of Hawaii, within the following-described area, as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary and suitable for the purpose, shall have been vested in the United States, said lands shall be set apart as the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the benefit and inspiration of the people:

PARCEL 1

Being all of R. P. 3306, L. C. Aw. 7219, Apana 2 to Kaliae, all of L. C. Aw. 9470 to Muki, and portions of R. P. 7874, L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi (Ahupuaa of Honaunau), and R. P. 6852, L. C. Aw. 7712 Apana 1 to M. Kekuanaoa (Ahupuaa of Keokea).

Beginning at a 1½-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani," at the southeast corner of this parcel, the northeast corner of parcel 3, and on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kiilae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Seventy-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred and eighty feet along the land of Kiilae, L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu and passing over a rock called "Kuwaia," marked K+K at six hundred seventy-three and two-tenths feet to high-water mark; thence along high-water mark, along seacoast for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seacoast being:

2. One hundred and thirty-five degrees fifty-one minutes three thousand nine hundred seventy-six and one-tenth feet;

3. One hundred and fifty-two degrees twenty-five minutes one thousand and seventy-eight feet;

4. Two hundred and forty degrees fifty-five minutes one thousand two hundred four and four-tenths feet;

5. Three hundred and fifty-four degrees nine minutes two hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi, along stone wall and old trail;

6. Two hundred and sixty degrees fifty-four minutes one hundred seventy-five and nine-tenths feet across old trail along stone wall to a "+" on rock;

7. One hundred and fifty-eight degrees six minutes seventy-two feet along L. C. Aw. 7296 to Puhi, along stone wall;

8. Two hundred and sixty degrees thirty-six minutes ninety and seven-tenths feet along stone wall;

9. One hundred and ninety-four degrees ten minutes sixty-two and nine-tenths feet along stone wall along L. C. Aw. 7295 and 6979–B:2 to Keolewa;

10. One hundred and seventy-five degrees fifty-four minutes twenty-six and nine-tenths feet along stone wall;

11. Two hundred and fifteen degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-seven and four-tenths feet along stone wall along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

12. One hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty-eight minutes forty-eight and one-tenth feet along same;

13. Two hundred and twenty-six degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the south side of fifty-foot road;

14. Two hundred and sixty-four degrees fifty-one minutes one hundred fifteen and two-tenths feet along the south side of fifty-foot road;

15. Two hundred and fifty-two degrees thirteen minutes two hundred and two-tenths feet along same;

16. Two hundred and eighty-six degrees thirty minutes one hundred seventy and nine-tenths feet along same;

17. Two hundred and thirty-eight degrees twenty-five minutes ninety-two and eight-tenths feet along same;

18. Two hundred and twenty-three degrees one minute one hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet along same;

19. Three hundred and thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds four thousand nine hundred eighty and three-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi and L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument at one thousand four hundred eigthy-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, one hundred sixty-six and ninety one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 2

Being portions of L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi, R. P. 7874 (Ahupuaa of Honaunau).

Beginning at a pipe in concrete at the northeast corner of this parcel, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being two thousand one hundred thirty-nine feet south and eleven thousand six hundred seventeen and nine-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred fifty-eight degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred sixty and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

2. Ninety-three degrees thirty minutes two hundred and sixty-nine feet along the same, along stone wall, along lot 2 of the subdivision by B. P. Bishop estate;

3. Eighty-two degrees no minutes three hundred and eighteen feet along same to the east side of fifty-foot road;

4. Thence along the east side of fifty-foot road, the direct azimuth and distance being: one hundred seventy-one degrees twenty minutes two hundred ninety-one and five-tenths feet;

5. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes six hundred and twenty feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the point of beginning.

Area, three and seventy one-hundredths acres.

Together with an easement six feet wide for a pipeline right-of-way extending from the Government road to parcel 1, the south side of said right-of-way being described as follows:

Beginning at the east end of this right-of-way on the common boundary of the lands of Honaunau and Keokea, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being three thousand one hundred ninety and eight-tenths feet south and eleven thousand seventy-eight and eight-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Eighty degrees thirty-six minutes five seconds one hundred and seventeen feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa, to the Triangulation Station "Ahupuaa" of the B. P. Bishop estate;

2. Eighty-two degrees twenty minutes seven thousand two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument on the east boundary of parcel 1 the coordinates of said point of the end of this six-foot right-of-way referred to Government Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being four thousand one hundred eighty-two and four-tenths feet south and three thousand seven hundred thirty-nine and four-tenths feet east.

Area, one and two one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 3

Being portion of L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu, being portion of the Ahupuaa of Kiilae.

Beginning at a one and one-half-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani" at the northeast corner of this parcel, the southeast corner of parcel 1, on the common boundary of the land of Keokea and Kiilae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred thirty eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds five hundred ninety-five and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu to the eight thousand foot south coordinates line referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni";

2. Ninety degrees no minutes one thousand ninety-nine and seven-tenths feet along same and along said eight thousand foot south coordinates line and across school grant 7 Apana 6 to high-water mark;

3. Thence along high-water mark, along sea, the direct azimuth and distance being: two hundred six degrees thirty-three minutes thirty seconds four hundred eighty-two and nine-tenths feet;

4. Two hundred fifty-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred eighty feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a rock called Kuwaia, marked K+K at six and eight-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, ten and twenty-five one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. Upon the vesting of title in the United States to such lands as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary and suitable for historical park purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this act, the City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be established by order of the said Secretary, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any other lands within the area described above shall become a part of the national historical park upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States and upon publication of an appropriate supplemental order by the said Secretary in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, by donation or purchase, with any funds that may be available for that purpose, lands and interests in lands which may be needed for the City of Refuge National Historical Park within the area described in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 4. In order to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in consolidating in Federal ownership lands within the area described above, and to facilitate acquisition of the lands needed for the national historical park, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is also authorized to acquire lands for said park, at the expense of the Territory of Hawaii by exchange or otherwise, in accordance with procedure prescribed by the act of February 27, 1920 (41 Stat. 452).

SEC. 5. The City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, and such additional authority compatible therewith as is contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 461–467), with regard to preservation of historic sites and objects of national significance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATION OF LIMITATIONS ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5376) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

BULK PURCHASE OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION ASSETS BY FEDERAL LAND BANKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 941) to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some member of the committee if the conditions under which the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation can be purchased have been set out? If there is no one present to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF JEFFERSON AND PLAQUEMINES DRAINAGE DISTRICT, LOUISIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1768) for the relief of the Jefferson and Plaquemines Drainage District and certain persons whose properties abut on the Federal Government's right-of-way for Harvey Canal in Louisiana.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SUBPENA POWER FOR COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4514) to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some Member certain questions about this bill. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1955

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5650) to provide for the setlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H. R. 5650, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF PATIENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5787) to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, not to exceed $25,000 to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to settle or compromise all claims by various persons of right or title to or interest in certain structures (including furniture and fixtures therein) which were erected prior to January 1, 1954, by patients of the Public Health Service hospital at Carville, La., at their own expense on the grounds of the hospital. Such claims may be settled or compromised, with the approval of the Administrator of General Services, for such amounts as may be arrived at by agreement between the Secretary and the persons claiming such right, title, or interest. Nothing in this act shall effect the authority of the Attorney General to conduct litigation affecting the United States, and no funds available for purposes of this act shall be available for paying any judgment or settlement arising out of any such litigation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 1721, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5417) to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1721, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 1721. Sale or pledge of stamps

"Whoever, being a postmaster or postal service employee, knowingly and willfully; uses or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards entrusted to his care or custody in the payment of debts, or in the purchase of merchandise or other salable articles, or pledges or hypothecates the same or sells or disposes of them except for cash; or sells or disposes of postage stamps or postal cards for any larger or less sum than the values indicated on their faces; or sells or disposes of stamped envelopes for a larger or less sum than is charged therefor by the Post Office Department for like quantities; or sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards at any point or place outside of the delivery of the office where such postmaster or other person is employed; or for the purpose of increasing the emoluments, or compensation of the postmaster or any employee of a post office or station or branch thereof, inflates or induces the inflation of the receipts of any post office or any station or branch thereof; or sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards, otherwise than as provided by law or the regulations of the Post Office Department; shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "willfully" and insert "willfully:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOWERING LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE RETIREMENT AGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3399) to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former lighthouse service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZE EARLY COAST GUARD DISCHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5224) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting following and underneath item 369 in such analysis, the following item:

"370. Discharge within 3 months before expiration of enlistment."

SEC. 2. Chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately following section 369 thereof, a new section, as follows:

"§ 370. Discharge within 3 months before expiration of enlistment.

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any enlisted man may be discharged at any time within 3 months before the expiration of his term of enlistment or extended enlistment without prejudice to any right, privilege, or benefit that he would have received, except pay and allowances for the unexpired period not served, or to which he would thereafter become entitled, had he served his full term of enlistment or extended enlistment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard', to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5875) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of this bill or some member of the committee in reference to it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INCORPORATION OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3786) to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CORPORATION CREATED; INCORPORATORS; NAME

SECTION 1. The following persons, to wit: James G. Walsh, Distinguished Service Cross, 50 Patten Street, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Robert G. Woodside, Distinguished Service Cross, 3858 First Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Deming Bronson, Congressional Medal of Honor, Route 2, Box 322, Roseburg, Oreg.; George E. Parker, Jr., Distinguished Service Cross, Lutherville, Md.; Leo L. Zingale, Distinguished Service Cross, 3612 East 117th Street, Cleveland, Ohio; John Davis, Congressional Medal of Honor, 800 North Shore Drive, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Glen O. McEwen, Distinguished Service Cross, Box 737, Spokane 3, Wash.; Ben. Prager, Distinguished Service Cross, 316 Court House, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Earle D. Norton, Distinguished Service Cross, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Ray Eastman, Navy Cross, 396 LaSalle Avenue, Buffalo 15, N. Y.; Ben Neff, Distinguished Service Cross, 208 Evanston Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Warren L. Granger, Navy Cross, 703 16th Street, Alexandria, Va.; William Oliver Smith, Distinguished Service Cross, 907 Holt Drive, Raleigh, N. C.; Robert M. Gaynor, Distinguished Service Cross, 621 South Taylor Street, Arlington, Va.; Leon M. Hanna, Distinguished Service Cross, Box 217, McHenry, Ill.; Bruno O. Forsterer, Congressional Medal of Honor, Walker Street, Oakland, Calif.; Elmer R. Hangartner, Distinguished Service Cross, 2103 Lynn Avenue, Altoona, Wis.; Thomas Eadie, Congressional Medal of Honor, 120 Gibbs Avenue, Newport, R. I.; John D. Hawk, Congressional Medal of Honor, 3243 Solie, Bremerton, Wash.; Leon A. Dombrowski, Distinguished Service Cross, 137 Highland Drive, Williamsville, N. Y.; William C. Hardie, Distinguished Service Cross, Post Office Box 1396, Billings, Mont.; E. Lee Henderson, Navy Cross, 10948 Fruitland Drive, North Hollywood, Calif.; Othel J. Gee, Distinguished Service Cross, 416 Medical Arts Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Leslie Hardy, Distinguished Service Cross, 1021 East Sierra Vista, Phoenix, Ariz.; A. Allen Johnson, Distinguished Service Cross, 953 Dixwell Avenue, New Haven, Conn.; Dennis C. Turner, Distinguished Service Cross, 1008 Missouri Avenue, Houston, Tex.; Columbus Whipple, Distinguished Service Cross, 2704 Brinker Avenue, Ogden, Utah; John D. Licklider, Distinguished Service Cross, 229 Woodrow Avenue, Martinsburg, W. Va.; Murry Wolffe, Navy Cross, 240 Gregory Avenue, Passaic, N. J.; Willard H. Marshall, Distinguished Service Cross, 31 West Whitney Street, Sheridan, Wyo.; and such persons as may be chosen who are members of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., an incorporated patriotic society of service men and women and ex-service men and women to whom has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, or the Navy Cross, and their successors, are hereby declared to be a body corporate. The name of the corporation shall be Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

ORGANIZATION OF CORPORATION; DELEGATES

SEC. 2. The persons named in section 1 of this act and such other persons as may be selected from among the membership of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., a New York corporation, are hereby authorized to complete the organization of said corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and to do all other things necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act, at which meeting any person duly accredited as a delegate from any local or State chapter of the existing corporation, known as the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., shall be permitted to participate in the proceedings thereof.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to commemorate the best traditions of the citizen and professional soldier, sailor, and marine; to foster the spirit of patriotism and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States; to perpetuate that spirit of comradeship which was the greatest single factor in the success of the armed services, and to keep alive the heroic incidents of the armed services and preserve the memory of our departed companions.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AMERICAN LEGION CHARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3813) to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285, title 36, U. S. C. 1940 edition, sec. 43), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the purpose of this corporation shall be: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to promote peace and good will among the peoples of the United States and all the nations of the earth; to preserve the memories and incidents of the two World Wars and the Korean hostilities fought to uphold democracy; to cement the ties and comradeship born of service; and to consecrate the efforts of its members to mutual helpfulness and service to their country."

SEC. 2. That section 5 of such act of September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285, title 36, U. S. C., 1940 edition, sec. 45), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That no person shall be a member of this corporation unless he has served in the naval or military services of the United States at some time during any of the following periods: April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918; December 7, 1941, to September 2, 1945; June 25, 1950, to July 27, 1953; all dates inclusive, or who, being a citizen of the United States at the time of entry therein, served in the military or naval service of any of the governments associated with the United States during said wars or hostilities: *Provided, however,* That such person shall have an honorable discharge or separation from such service or continues to serve honorably after any of the aforesaid terminal dates."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AMVETS CHARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4754) to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act approved July 23, 1947, Public Law 216, 80th Congress (61 Stat. 407; 36 U. S. C. 67e), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and on or before January 31, 1955, is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation. No person who is a member of, or who advocates the principles of, any organization believing in, or working for, the overthrow of the United States Government by force, and no person who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, shall be privileged to become, or continue to be, a member of this organization."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 734) to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That title 18, United States Code, section 871 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 871. Threats against President, President-elect, and Vice President

"Whoever knowingly and willfully deposits for conveyance in the mail or for delivery

from any post office or by any letter carrier any letter, paper, writing, print, missive, or document containing any threat to take the life of or to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, the President-elect, or the Vice President of the United States, or knowingly and willfully otherwise makes any such threat against the President, President-elect, or Vice President, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 41 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 871 of such title is amended by deleting

"871. Threats against President."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"871. Threats against President, President-elect, and Vice President."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING SALARIES FOR PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4791) to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 40. Compensation of referee's salary and expense funds; retirement of referees: a. Referees shall receive as full compensation for their services salaries to be fixed by the conference, in the light of the recommendations of the councils, made after advising with the district judges of their respective circuits, and of the Director, at rates not more than $17,500 per annum for full-time referees, and not more than $9,000 per annum for part-time referees. In fixing the amount of salary to be paid to a referee, consideration shall be given to the average number and the types of, and the average amount of gross assets realized from, cases closed and pending in the territory which the referee is to serve, during the last preceding period of 10 years, and to such other factors as may be material. Disbursement of such salaries shall be made monthly by or pursuant to the order of the Director."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, immediately after "40a," add "(11 U. S. C. 68 (a))."

Page 1, line 5, change the word "referee's" to "referees" and immediately after this word "referees" add a semicolon and the word "Referees'."

Page 1, line 6, delete the short line between the word referees and the letter "a."

Page 1, line 11, the figures "$17,500" should be changed to read "$15,000."

Page 2, line 1, the figures "$9,000" should be changed to read "$7,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADVANCES FROM THE UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5462) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska, or any other act of Congress, or any of the Territorial laws, to the contrary, to obtain from the Federal Unemployment Fund, established pursuant to the "Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954" (Public Law 567, 83d Cong., approved August 5, 1954), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the Territory of Alaska may qualify for and as may be necessary to obtain for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to claimants entitled thereto under the Alaska employment security law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided*, That the general fund of the Territory of Alaska from which advances have been made for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits shall be reimbursed from advances made through the Governor of Alaska from the Federal unemployment fund."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate 1650 and insert the provisions of H. R. 5462 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 5462 was laid on the table.

SALE OF LAND TO THE CITY OF WOODWARD, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1762) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Woodward, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I could have the attention of some member of the committee or the author of the bill. I note that this provides that the city shall pay one-half of the appraised value of this tract of land. I am wondering what the excuse is for the United States selling this property for half of its appraised value rather than its full value.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE OF MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6043) to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1126), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Commerce shall maintain a Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., for the instruction and preparation for service in the merchant marine of selected persons as officers thereof. Competitive examinations shall be held annually among those persons nominated as candidates to the Academy by Senators and Representatives. The number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportioned to the representation in Congress from that State. Appointments from each State shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce from among qualified candidates nominated from that State in the order of merit established by the examinations. In case vacancies remain after the appointments under the preceding sentence have been made, the Secretary of Commerce shall fill them by appointments from qualified candidates from other States.

"(2) In connection with such instruction and as a part thereof, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide for training of merchant marine cadets on Government-owned and subsidized vessels and, in cooperation with other governmental and private agencies, on other vessels, and, for instructional purposes only, in shipyards, plants, and industrial and educational organizations, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and upon such terms as the Secretary of Commerce may arrange, and expenditures incident to such training are hereby authorized.

"(3) Cadets appointed to the United States Merchant Marine Academy may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy as Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy and may be commissioned as Reserve ensigns in the United States Navy upon graduation from the Academy.

"(4) Cadets at the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall receive allowances for all required uniforms and textbooks as prescribed by rules and regulations under this Act, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet.

"(5) (a) 'Representative' as used in this Act shall include Delegates to the House of Representatives from Alaska and Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(b) 'State' as used in this Act shall include Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last bill eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

DR. CRISTJO CRISTOFV ET AL.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and head taxes."

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERICO UNGAR FINALY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS JOHN MANTICAS ET AL.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H R. 1328) for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "Yvonne Manticas."

Line 11, strike out "five" and insert "four."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas."

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON ATTORNEY GENERAL TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, with Senate amendments there, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Antonio Aikler."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Wladyslaw Barczykowski."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Stefan Ciundziewicki."

Page 2, line 13, after "Jankowski", insert "Roberts Gustav Javalds."

Page 2, line 15, after "Kaminski", insert "Sime Ivan Karlick (Sam Karlich)."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "Piotr Kowalczyk."

Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Zbigniew Piotrowski."

Page 3, line 20, after "Splawinski", insert "Jan Srodulski."

Page 3, line 21, after "Stubynski", insert "Silvio Svagno."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEMNITY FOR LOSSES AND EXPENSES INCURRED IN DESTRUCTION, ETC., OF SWINE, ETC.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1133) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954, in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema, which has already passed the Senate and is identical to a House bill H. R. 4576.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to indemnify in an amount equal to 50 percent, but not exceeding the indemnity paid by the State in which such losses and expenses were incurred, of the losses and expenses incurred by all persons whose swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses were destroyed, treated, or processed, under authority of law, in July 1954, as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease known as vesicular exanthema.

SEC. 2. The payment of indemnities under the provisions of this act shall be limited, in the absence of Federal appraisal, to those losses and expenses where required proof of such losses and expenses has been made to the State in which such losses and expenses were incurred and 50 percent of such loss and expense has been paid by such State.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be made from funds currently available to the Department of Agriculture.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4576) was laid on the table.

AMENDING SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. R. 246, Rept. No. 593) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

POSTPONEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to postpone the special order granted him for today to Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ATSUKO KIYOTA SZEKERES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress

favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7125281, Berend, Peter Mihaly or Peter Michael Berend.
0300/370564, Boon, Lim Jew.
A-7849663, Brieze, Roberts Martins.
A-7849664, Brieze, Milda Hermine.
A-9555132, Chan, Si Heung.
0300/43030, Chen, Chen Ah.
A-6052568, Chen, Lin or Chen Lin.
0300/27496, Chen, Mrs. Susie or Cheng Shun Fan.
A-9766040, Chit, Ho Fung.
A-8031725, Chiu, Teng Hoik or Ting Hsieh Chow or Chow Ting-Hsieh or Hsieh Ting Chiu.
A-6851319, Chow, Marie Patrice or Kwang Hua Chow.
A-7073707, Chow, Tseng Kam.
A-9658660, Dong, Ng Eng.
0300/387990, Fong, Ho Wah.
A-8057994, Foo, Sin or Foo Sin.
A-6779040, Frankel, Edwin Nessim.
A-6819141, Hajduszewski, Tadeusz.
A-6970000, Hayya, Jacob.
A-6962959, Ho, Frank Hung Fai.
A-9661887, Ho, Lim Gat.
0300/390670, Huen, Kwai Chuen.
A-7863034, Kadegis, Arvids Gustavs.
A-7863033, Kiss, Eduard.
0300/402141, Kok, He Schiek or Schiek He Kok.
A-6788959, Kringelis, Teodors Andrejs.
A-6788960, Kringelis, Austra.
A-6788961, Kringelis, Daina.
A-6788962, Kringelis, Imants.
A-6634875, Krol, Kazimierz Julian.
A-9669192, Kum, Lay.
A-6843498, Lee, Mary Min Chen.
0300/30416, Lek, Yee Kow.
A-7249066, Liepa, Janis.
A-9682636, Man, Seid.
0300-134639, Mao, Henry Shu-Tsing.
A-6379854, Mei, Chu Chow Ah.
A-6794934, Mitri, Moise Hanna.
A-6971771, Pikkel, Miralda (nee Piht).
A-7204903, Rod, Anna Agnes (nee Kukol).
A-6848225, Shen, Frederick Albert.
A-8196650, Shim, Chong.
0300-420528, Siang, Sung Chan.
A-7249064, Sturmanis, Karlis.
A-6965379, Tashkovich, Gligor Tashko.
A-6848676, Ting, Lu.
A-7129774, Tsai, Poo Hubbert.
A-7863001, Ulmanis, Ludvigs.
A-7249880, Valm, Mihkel.
A-7250165, Valm, Aleksei.
A-7249882, Valm, Theodor.
A-9802613, Yick, Tong.
A-6967695, Yin, Huo-Bing.
0300-83569, Ying, Chan.
A-9542543, Yu, Ling Tao or Lum Tow EE.
A-8082386, Yuen, Chan Kam or Chan Hong Kow.
A-6703490, Zee, Robin Joseph or Zee Yao-Shun.
0300-397560, Cheung, Wah or Cheung Wah.
0300-427936, Chow, Chung Shan.
T-278683, Fong, Koo Chee.
0300-390908, Hon, Kong or Hon Kong.
A-8082075, Kwan, Wu Sing.
A-6971768, Sooaar, Voldemar.
A-6971757, Sooaar, Hela (nee Feder).
A-6910014, Lokiec, Majer.
A-8039688, Tsai, Sung Chu.
0300/29659, Chan, Ah Hoe.
0300-418043, Chan, Cheung Yuk or Chan Yuk Cheung.
A-9687373, Chan, Tim.
0300-370929, Cheng, Bou Ching or Mu Bou Cheng Ching.
A-6972945, Cheng, Pauline Ming-Hung.
174/736, Cheong, Mong.
A-9533428, Ching, Mark.
A-9687173, Chiu, Loo or Lo Chin.
A-8039173, Fok, Lam.
0300-400335, Fong, Lee.
A-6936267, Geiger, George.
A-6936268, Geiger, Ella (nee Spielman).
0300-423621, Hin, Wong Sui or Wong Kin.
A-6965180, Hsu, Chien Hwai or Jay Hsu.
A-6965179, Hsu, Jiu Hwai or Mai Hsu.
A-6958731, Janovitz, Serena (nee Simon).
A-6971749, Kaevando, Roman.
A-6971748, Kaevando, Helmi (nee Lents).
A-8015625, Kam, Cheung or Cheung Wuen.
A-6692899, Kramar, Branko.
A-6910269, Kramar, Maria.
A-6985975, Kulp, Karel.
A-6971798, Lepp, Aleksei.
A-6971759, Lepp, Agathe (nee Hanslep).
A-6888878, Lien, Din Shiang.
0300-66727, Linic, Vladimir.
A-9782777, Loo, Sam Teer.
A-6772581, Maksimovs, Eriks or Maximovs.
A-6917065, Maksimovs, Michelis or Mikels Maksimovs.
A-6670578, Pang, Yee.
A-7135610, Perl, Lazar.
A-9765644, Piccini, Francesco.
A-6955590, Pulauskas, Matas.
A-7809727, Shak, To or Doo Sat.
0300-400854, Shing, Lo Kam.
A-7849428, Silins, Adolfs Janis.
A-7849429, Silins, Maija Alexandra.
A-7849430, Silins, Jr., Adolfs.
A-7084938, Sipos, Marianne Margaret Kertesz.
A-9804295, Suurna, Mihkel.
A-9561923, Tee, Toon Hue.
A-6307394, Tom, Gong or Tom Gong or Tom Shing.
A-9533429, Tong, Shing or Chung Shing or Tom Shing or Chung Chuen.
A-8258584, Too, Fung or Too Fung.
A-8082014, Toong, Cha Ching or Toong Chue Ching or Peter Chue Ching Toong.
A-8091339, Tuum, Aleksander Villem.
A-6967364, Wang, John Y.
A-6851357, Wang, Richard I-Hsiang.
A-7476304, Yao, Ting Hui or Michael T. H. Yao.
A-9507456, Yow, Choy or Choy You.
A-7292642, Boldyreff, Antonina (nee Zhigmanovsky).
A-7292641, Boldyreff, Helen or Helene.
A-8082841, Chen, Yen or Chen Yi Shi or Yi Shi Chen.
0300-249540, Chojnaki, Eugeniusz.
A-7210403, Christopoulos, Yoanna Khamis or Jeanette Christou Christopoulos.
A-6971650, Erdi, Anthony or Antal.
A-9647005, Fang, Pow Foo.
0300-97188, Fook, Tsang Koon.
0300-424088, Fu, Quo or Pang Choy.
A-6775569, Hlavac, Frantisek Josef.
A-7073610, Hlavac, Marta.
A-8082037, Huang, Mary Sei Mei.
A-6830536, Irani, Joseph Isaac or Joseph Irani.
A-6899364, Kazimierski, Stanley.
A-7863216, Kesteris, Mikelis.
A-7863217, Kesteris, Ilze.
A-7863218, Kesteris, Andrejs.
A-9836636, Lian, Shin Ah.
A-6851636, Liu, Julius Yun-I.
0300/408693, Moy, Young.
A-7084232, Petraitis, Juczas or Joseph Petraitis.
A-7243875, Stenclavs, Krists.
A-7244305, Stenclavs, Augusts.
A-6704110T, Sun, Pao-Chih or Paulette Pao-Chi Sun.
0300-402447, Teng, Wong Gee or Wong Kee.
A-6851366, Tien-Jan, John Paul Ly.
175/651, Wan, Lam.
A-9778441, Wei, Toh Chung.
A-8065346, Wei, Wang Ah or Wang Ah Vee.
A-6851523, Yang, Thomas Meng Ping.
A-9731090, Ching, Pang.
A-7863027, Eidok, Walter.
A-9644600, Fai, Cheung.
A-7087608, Fasko, Daniel.
A-9764648, Lewandowski, Julian.
0300-399882, Ng, Tou.
A-6986534, Odelia, Sister Mary (li Feng-yu).
A-7863008, Ritums, Janis.
A-7248309, Salme, Karli.
A-9633107, Skratic, Dragutin Pranjo.
A-7863203, Stendzis, Janis.
A-7863204, Stendzis, Ilze Pusaudze.
A-7863205, Stendzis, Imants Arvids.
A-6929742, Tam, Dianalihue Kao.
0300-373583, Wong, Ah King or Wang Ken Sing.
A-6044499, Woo, Sze Lu Hsiang.
A-8078864, Hao, King Fah.
A-8050321, Blascovich, Attilio.
A-7095908, Bogacki, Waclaw Zdzislaw.
A-8082842, Bors, Tibor Eugen.
A-7975342, Boucher, Arsene Andre.
A-6967730, Chen, Wen Pin.
A-6901310, Cheng, Chang Sin.
0300-417793, Chong, Fong or Chong Fong.
A-6986509, Chu, Sister Mary Dulcia.
A-6522833, Chu, Wei Liang.
A-7863026, Eizis, Aleksandrs.
A-7356380, Frankel, Maurice Solomon.
A-7863031, Galvans, Peteris.
A-8091397, Gega, Anthony John.
A-7863032, Gorbants, Imants.
A-9782690, Hee, Wong.
A-7354351, Huang, Shao Chi.
A-9703852, Kam, Mak or James Mak.
A-6848646, Gao, Rose Tse Ching.
0333-403722, Kee, Shum.
A-7095531, Kersna, Johannes Maks.
A-7095532, Kersna, Salme.
A-9573456, King, Ho Ah.
A-9196442, Kirs, Alexander.
A-7204900, Krno, Ladislav Gejza.
A-7204901, Krno, Katherine.
T-1144870, Krno, Katherine Tatiana.
A-7873848, Kum, Chow.
A-7048906, Laupa, Armas.
A-6812186, Lenart, Leslie Oscar.
A-7863225, Lidums, Rudolf.
A-7863227, Lidums, Olaf Rudolf.
A-5971242, Liu, San Koon or Liu San Koon.
A-6854454, Luca, George or Gheorghe.
A-6854456, Luca, Elena.
A-9684344, Lung, Shung Sin or Chung Sin Lung.
A-9825451, Magic, Zdenko.
A-7138009, Matusoff, Ethel.
A-7223209, Mejzr, Miroslav.
A-7223210, Mejzr, Ruzena.
T-2645007, Mejzr, Miroslava Marie.
A-7193990, Mejzr, Ivanka.
A-7802065, Petersons, Karlis.
A-6971770, Piht, Eduard.
A-6971772, Piht, Liidia.
A-9765057, Polushin, Walter John or Viacheslav Ivanovitch Polushin.
A-6405622, Rashin, Louis Nathan.
A-6703361, Shie, Wei Wu.
A-6855586, Shie, Susan Ding Neh (nee Wang).
A-7193991, Spitz, Ruzena.
0300-396920, Sufich, Giovanna.
A-9554379, Sui, Lui or Liu.
A-7975174, Surian, Luca.
T-1144528, Velcich, John.
0300-289791, Vlacich, Ferruccio.
A-6851354, Wang, Chou-Chiu or Gordon Wang.
A-6881707, Yang, Chi.
A-8065847, Yau, Loo.
A-6949354, Zee, Tsong Ngo or Ah Neng.
A-6589294, Aboody, Ruben Moshi.
A-9948302, Canaletich, Mario Giorgio.
A-6709262, Chang, Yuan Chun.
A-6171208, Chen, Kwei Sen.
0300-280451, Chen, Mes Chih Ping.
A-7879678, Chen, Thomas.
A-6970307, Chen, David.
0300-424485, Chen, Peter.
A-7955258, Chmielewska, Maria.
A-6988894, Chuck, Lou Yuen or Low Yean Choe.
A-7243252, Creglia, Giordano.
A-6971766, Esberg, Adele.
A-6971765, Esberg, Juta.
A-8021324, Fatutta, Marco.
A-8065726, Fong, Wong or Fong Wong.
A-7249077, Freimanis, Teodore Genrichs.
A-7249076, Freimanis, Anna Elena Olga.
A-6263402, Gartenszteig, Israel.

A–8031589, Ha, Tsong Tong or Tsong Tung Ha.
A–6971758, Hiiesalu, Endel.
A–7366483, Hsueh-Yung, Shu or Evan Hsueh-Yung Shu.
A–6660388, Hu, Tsei Suan.
A–7283198, Inwentarz, Izak.
1100–29956, Kao, Yun-Chen or Mary Yun-Chen Kao or Mary Kao.
A–8082033, Kenul, Marcello.
A–8031384, Kow, Ng Kung.
A–6966542, Kuty, Frances.
A–6978177, Lederman, Pejsach or Pejsach Lederman Grezelak or Paul Lederman.
A–6690537, Lee, Han Duck or Henry Lee.
A–6690619, Lee, Tom Shee or Tom Kim Hing.
A–7056802, Loh, Tsau Yueh or Thomas Y. Lowe.
V–305539, Mih, Alexander Wei-Shan.
A–9782737, Ming, Tung.
A–6971802, Oja, Harry.
A–6971796, Oja, Ruth.
A–8065366. Pomasan, Stefano.
A–2823761, Radulich, Mate.
A–7178411, Reinvald, Manivald.
A–8001335, Rubinich, Joseph.
A–7873098, Runco, Anthony.
A–7095534, Savisaar, Elmar Johannes.
A–7095535, Savisaar, Armilda Kolk.
A–7095536, Savisaar, Atso.
0300–418127, Sepcich, John.
A–9770642, Shi, Chang or Fred San.
A–6904332, Sipajlo, Jiri.
A–7809912, Strmecki, Josip.
A–7941177, Szubert, Konrad Joseph.
A–9765493, Tamme, Heinar.
A–6887270, Tang, Michael Tsin-Chien.
A–6448741, Tsu, John Bosco or Bing Ming Tsu.
A–9245758, Yiu, Young.
A–6704228, Zak, Helena or Sister Mercita Evita.
A–7095021, Brody, Alexander.
A–6712046, Fok, Dso Yun.
A–9559819, For, Leung or Leung Kai.
A–9799220, Hop, Chu or Chew Hop.
A–8039680, Jurasic, Angelo or Iurasich.
0300–387739, Kam, Sheh.
0300–245055, Kasser, Elizabeth Aranyi.
0300–245055, Kasser, Ivan.
0300–245055, Kasser, Mary.
A–9623303, Ko, Lee King or Lee Kam Ho.
0300–12942, Leong, Sing To.
A–7483853, Simcha, Helene (nee Rosenberger).
T–666654, Soo, John Yun-Chun.
A–6816885, Spitzka, Aloisia.
A–4039059, Toll, Friedrich Alexander.
A–8106037, Tong, Tsang.
0300–409250, Tsia, Ah San.
A–6694159, Weissbart, Esther Vera (nee Blinchevsky).
A–6847895, Chow, Ho.
0300–405869, Foo, Lee or Lee Wai Foo.
0300–408016, Fook, Lee.
A–6938801, Grive, Ansis.
A–9553994, Hing, Lee Ah.
A–9544110, Koel, Valdemar.
A–7126610, Lee, Ted Teh-Yuan.
A–9684355, Liu, Huo Shin or Fok Lau.
A–9529877, Mai, Lee-Shing.
A–7052332, Markovits, Salamon.
A–7138329, Markovits, Ilona (nee Weisz).
A–6974328, Meisels, Martin.
A–7139340, Shaw, Julia Chang.
A–7297278, Steinmetz, Abraham.
A–6933818, Stern, Tibor.
A–6953157, Sulyok, Dezso Karoly.
A–6970438, Sulyok, Etelka.
A–9571956, Tak, Lee.
A–8091549, Vosilla, Angelo, Otavio.
A–6858256, Wen, Peter Liang.
A–6694209, Wen, Amy Tang.
A–6028252, Wong, Yun Jee.
A–7074880, Yeh, Te Fung.
A–7874913, Celich, Frank.
A–9765153, Donatich, Giuseppe.
0300–429047, Fong, Lee Tsi.
A–6735483, Hallac, Joseph Paul.
0300–413098, Hing, Lo.
A–6578981, Kozarski, Danilo Zivko.
A–6640338, Szor, Leopold.
A–6345116, Szor, Irena Philipp.
A–8039682, Tsai, Hong Ping or Ping Tsai Hong.
A–8021319, Babenko, Gennady Konstantinovitch.
0300–387987, Chan, Hong Kong or Chan Pui.
A–9231941, Chew, Tan Sing.
A–7366302, Chu, Pan.
A–7383067, Garbin, Luka Eduard.
A–6499962, Hirsch, Nathan Alfred.
A–7128158, Ilich, Sofia.
A–6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.
A–7849673, Kleinbergs, Mile Anete.
A–8082060, Lubicich, Mario.
A–7849671, Ozolins, Armins.
0501–19752, Pe-Kuang, Patrick or Pe-Kuang Tseng.
A–6971769, Peters, Juuli.
A–8065425, Shih, Shio Nia or Shia Nia Shih.
0300–421797, Sing, Wang or Wong Park.
A–6848091, Tan, Ying Chun.
A–6938807, Tipans, Valija (nee Ievins).
A–6887732, Tsao, Shu Yun Tseng (nee Shu Yun Tseng).
A–7056816, Tuzar, Jaroslav.
A–7358945, Tuzar, Jirina.
A–8015056, Tuzar, Jana.
0500–33535, Wimmer, Katalin.
A–6986573, Wong, Kau Sau or Kai Sau Wong.
A–7383351, Yang, Samuel Hsueh-Lun.
A–7383352, Yang, Hsiu-Hwa.
A–7283009, Borsic, Aladar.
A–6371814, Choi, Ho Liang.
0300–405913, Chong, Yun or Cheung Wan.
A–7350611, Chow, Chung Lee or Ven Sih Chow.
A–6320011, Chu, Choy.
A–7189791, Dambos, Kostas.
A–7243855, Fridmanis, Imants Egons.
A–7243067, Fridmanis, Erika Upite.
A–7138432, Grabowski, Bronislaw.
A–9501262, Grandke, Telesfor.
A–6952325, Grunfeld, Juda.
A–6857659, Habbab, Abdulghani Joseph.
0300–379350, Hah, Ng.
A–9686792, Kin, Chan.
A–7061800, Koci, Vaclav.
A–6971809, Kukk, Verner Reinhold.
A–6971810, Kukk, Fronelly Franziska.
A–6971777, Kukk, Harald.
A–5951611, Lung, Ben or Long.
A–8091360, Mon, Lum.
A–7244196, Nagy, Ivan Gabor.
0400/54441, Raicovich, Giuseppe.
0300–92577, San, Lum Hong or Chow King Fen.
0300–410615, Sang, Tsang.
A–8082091, Scaliordick, John or Giovanni Sgaliordich.
A–9560203, Sing, Foo Wah or Foo Wah Teng.
A–7138246, Sturm, Jolana Judita.
A–6381281, Tien, Sheue Fung or Arthur Whitfield or Stanley Tien.
A–9513949, Wai, Nam.
A–6624918, Woo, Henry Kyi-Oen.
A–6971805, Wosa, Aino Adele or Aino Adele Riks or Aino Adele Edal.
A–7961771, Wosa, Oscar Adolf.
A–9705521, Yee, Ho or Yee Ho.
A–8091322, Yee, Sang Fon or Yee Sing or Yu Hsing.
0300–422039, Yow, Ng or Ng Yin.
A–7244303, Akmans, Marta Emiolia.
A–7992859, Chew, Chan formerly Chan Shing Jow.
A–7457745, Foo, William Er Chen.
A–7249874, Kermon, Rudolf.
A–9733412, Kong, Ngo Ying.
A–6958636, Lin, Chao-Han.
A–6849918, Liu, Chia-Lo.
A–1903522, Liu, I. Hsin.
A–9744381, Toong, Ding Yao.
A–7138447, Winternitz, Jenta.
A–7120716, Balassa, Bela.
A–7173016, Balassa, Ida Bogyor.
A–6301049, Cerven, George.
A–6792244, Chang, Sing Chen or Sing Chen Chang.
A–7197313, Chang, Chien Wei Lan or Chien Wei Lan or Chang Lah Chien Wei.
A–7197314, Chang, Chung Yung or Judy Yung Chang or Judy Chung Yung Chang.
A–9635195, Che, Leong.
A–6163714, Ho, Lien Yu.
A–7395257, Ho, Yin Hwa Cheng.
A–7395258, Ho, Henry Nieuhan.
A–7395259, Ho, Stephen Shianoling.
A–7395260, Ho, Barbara Beeyuan.
A–7395261, Ho, Margaret Yustang.
A–6674633, Komarek, Vit.
A–7398466, Krizanova, Maria.
0300–416920, Li, Sheng Sen.
A–6026376, Lo, Arthur Wu-Nien.
A–6403589, Lo, Elizabeth Heng-Hui Shen.
T–1892157, Loy, Too.
A–6935169, Mok, Charlie or Mak Wee.
A–8282626, Sung, Zee Hu.
A–6847853, Tyau, Louise (nee Shu-Chiu Luan).
A–6847962, Wang, Yu Chiang or Richard Y. C. Wang.
A–6453829, Albrecht, Marie Neumannova.
A–7210188, Barta, Tibor.
A–6798984, Briedis, Arturs.
A–7087346, Chuh, Sharlin or Sharlin Charlie Chuh.
A–9569306, Foo, Wong Kia.
A–6849448, Guang, Mann-Lo or Michael Kan.
A–6971789, Hyvonen, Alice Uustalu.
A–6851462, Kiang, Lu Yu.
A–7171983, Knauer, Eugenie, formerly Strakaty (nee Petersen) or Indra Devi.
0400/47451, San, Yao Chin.
A–7202554, San, Vera.
A–7202882, San, Sio Chu.
A–7205703, Wong, Sio Yu San.
A–7202553, San, Yu Lan.
0400/54495, San, Yu Lin.
A–7178373, Sarapik, Evart.
A–9825044, Splawinski, Franciszek.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 4, strike out the name "Lek" and substitute "Lee."
Page 4, strike out all of line 6.
Page 8, line 2, after the name "Ng", strike out the period and insert a comma.
Page 8, line 23, after the name "Elizis", insert a comma.
Page 12, line 15, strike out the name "Rubinish" and substitute "Rubinich."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A–7118684, Chen, Jeanne Kuo-Cheng.
A–7790096, Chou, I-Kua.
A–6958664, Hsi, Eugene Yu-Cheng.
A–6848000, Hsi Eugenia Min-I (nee Huang).

A-6965690, Keh, Shou-bing (Alfred).
A-6845060, Lee, Kui-Lung (Cecilia).
A-6703299, Lee, Tsai Hwa.
A-6967575, Liu, Yung-Szi (Frances).
A-6589958, Tsien, Vee Chang.
E-079901, Chong, Kwai or Kwai Chong Chung.
E-092370, Tan, Tommy Sie-Chang.
A-6620717, Dunn, Lily Wen-Yuen Fong.
A-6564145, Fok, Ruth Louise (nee Shen Hsun-Lan) also known as Ruth Louise Hsun-Lan Sung.
A-6851384, Hsia, Chih Tsing or Hsia Chih Tsing.
A-6403564, Hu, Shengen.
T-1144534, Shew, Jimmie Chu Ting.
A-6457337, Tchou, Montchen Tu-Tsang.
0300-217753, Ting, Anna.
A-6008482, Ting, Sheng.
A-6760595, Wen, Richard Yutze.
A-4468478, Chiu, Katherine Yu (nee Tseng).
A-6435876, Chu, Esme Yun-Yun.
A-6691415, Nieh, Eunice Chen Yu.
A-6623014, Ying, Lu Lan.
A-6171334, Chiang, Pang Sun.
A-6351604, Chung, William Y.
A-6457476, Pan, Chi-Hsun.
A-6847923, Pan, Kay.
A-6403565, Shen, Constance Ming Chung.
A-6699858, Tai, Hsia Tao or Tao Tay Hsia.
A-6148143, Tang, Harry Kong Hung also known as Kong-Hung Tang.
0300-455922, Tung, Cheng Yu.
A-6847794, Woo, Dah-Cheng.
A-6848709, Young, Frank Kuankiang.
A-7414876, Chang, Che-Tyan.
A-6844259, Chu, Power Yung Chao.
A-6769936, Bittar, Evelyn Edward or Bittar, E. Edward.
A-6522835, Chu, John Wen-djang aka Chu, Wen Djung.
0200-130593, Hsia, David Yi-Yung.
0200-130594, Hsia, Hsio-Hsuan (nee Shih).
A-6421076, Jung, Angela Chih-Ying.
E-5755, Kaasik, Harald.
A-6688266, Teitelbaum, Tauba Raca.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR H. VOGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 899) to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized, for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act, to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to Oscar H. Vogel, for homestead purposes, the following-described land situated in Alaska:

Lot 3, section 25, township 11, north, range 7 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, containing twenty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That the purchase price for the land shall be the reasonable value thereof without improvements, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior but not less than $1.25 per acre.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5146) to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to promote Paul A. Smith, captain, Coast and Geodetic Survey (retired), to the rank of rear admiral (lower half), on the retired list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and that such grade will entitle him to all the benefits and privileges commensurate with that grade.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERWIN S. DeMOSKONYI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1034) for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erwin S. DeMoskonyi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 7, after "fee", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLORIA FAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2360) for the relief of Gloria Fan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Fan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IWAN BONK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam Bonk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Iwan Bonk", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Tacianna Bonk", strike out the remainder of line 4.

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Bonk."

On page 1, line 11, after the word "deduct", strike out the words "the required" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "two."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRUNO MICHAEL KIURU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bruno Michael Kiuru shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-contral officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENIO MAIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 928) for the relief of Eugenio Maida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenio Maida may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA LOUISE ANDREIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Louise Andreis shall be deemed to be the minor child of her mother Egidia Bonessi Schaetzler, a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purpose of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Louise Andreis shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Egidia Bonessi Schaetzler, a lawfully resident alien of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSANNE FELLNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 988) for the relief of Susanne Fellner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Susanne Fellner shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAKAKO RIU REICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 990) for the relief of Takako Riu Reich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Takako Riu Reich may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and insert in lieu thereof the word "provisions."

On page 1, line 7, after the words *"Provided, That"*, strike out the remainder of line 7, and substitute in lieu thereof the words "these exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the syllable "tion."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRACE CASQUITE HWANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1060) for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Grace Casquite Hwang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in the act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVAGELOS B. TZARIMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1217) for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Evagelos B. Tzarimas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Enggill A. Zayemopoulos.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRA DOMENIKA GRGURINOVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1218) for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mira Domenika Grgurinovich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Nick Nickolich.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE PAUL KHOURI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1311) for the relief of George Paul Khouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1705, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Paul Khouri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1311) was laid on the table.

SISTER ANTONINA ZATTOLO AND SISTER ANTONINA CALI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1406) for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY KRAEMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1407) for the relief of Henry Kraemer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Kraemer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any bond which is outstanding in the case of such alien.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, after the words "is available.", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATERINA RUELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of Caterina Ruello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Caterina Ruello shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee", change the period to a colon and add the following: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN E. COX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of Helen E. Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helen E. Cox may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELGA KUTSCHKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1503) for the relief of Helga Kutschka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helga Kutschka, the fiancée of Vic M. Schreiner, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Helga Kutschka is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Vic M. Schreiner and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helga Kutschka, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helga Kutschka, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Helga Kutschka as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "242 and 243."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREAS KAFARAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Andreas Kafarakis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Peter G. Kiryakakis, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARY PEROUZ DERDERIAN DONALDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCETTE HELENE ADAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1651) for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucette Helene Adams may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "provision" and insert "provisions."

Page 1, line 4, insert "(9) and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "this exemption" and insert "these exemptions."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIS DERIBERPREY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1869) for the relief of Luis Deriberprey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luis Deriberprey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIUSEPPE TUMBARELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1897) for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Tumbarello may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIUSEPPA CURRO TATI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1935) for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppa Curro Tati may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS ATHENA KITSOPOULOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Athena Kitsopoulou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 23, 1947, the date of her admission into the United States as a student, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "September 23, 1947, the date of her admission into the United States as a student" and insert "the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HILDEGARD HERRMANN COSTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1964) for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "provision" and insert "provisions."

Page 1, line 4, insert "(9) and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "this exemption" and insert "these exemptions."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMIL ARENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5456) for the relief of Emil Arens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emil Arens may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DE SOTO LEAD & ZINC CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 208) providing for sending the bill H. R. 5543 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5543) entitled "A bill for the relief of De Soto Lead & Zinc Co.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK P. FULMER

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 229) providing for sending the bill H. R. 5630, and accompanying papers, to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5630) entitled "A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALEN H. CLARK PACKING CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 230) providing that the bill H. R. 1901, and all accompanying papers, shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 1901) entitled "A bill for the relief of Galen H. Clark Packing Co., Inc.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal and equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORA L. POWERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1145) for the relief of Ora L. Powers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Ora L. Powers, of San Antonio, Tex., and her claim for compensation for disability resulting from pulmonary emphysema contracted while in the performance of her duty as chief clerk at the station hospital, Camp Swift, Tex., between April 1, 1942, and February 29, 1944, is hereby authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Ora L. Powers, of San Antonio, Tex., and her claim for compensation for disability resulting from pulmonary emphysema alleged to have been contracted while in the performance of her duty as chief clerk at the station hospital, Camp Swift, Tex., between April 1, 1942, and February 29, 1944, shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK REDMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1415) for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond, New York, N. Y., the sum of $15,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the personal injuries and all expenses incidental thereto of the said Frederick Redmond sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States mail truck in New York, N. Y., on March 16, 1945. This claim is not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2680, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Frederick Redmond, an infant, and Ruth Redmond, his mother and natural guardian, Staten Island, Richmond, N. Y., against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained allegedly as a result of the negligence of a driver of a United States mail truck.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claims may be instituted within any time of 1 year of the enactment of this act. In any such suit brought pursuant to this act, proceedings shall be had and the liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States (title 28, U. S. C., sec. 1346 (b)): *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH J. PORTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Joseph J. Porter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph J. Porter, Claremont, Calif., the sum of $65.39, as payment of hospital and medical expenses incurred from July 14, 1953, to and including July 24, 1953. The payment of such claim shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Joseph J. Porter against the United States on account of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as a result of such illness: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD RIECK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of Howard Rieck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard Rieck, of Millville, N. J., the sum of $6,162.60. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Howard Rieck against the United States for damage caused October 19, 1951, to property on Cedarville Road, Millville, N. J., by falling aircraft belonging to the Department of the Navy, the occurrence not being cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act (title 28, U. S. C.): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,162.60" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES F. BULLETTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2338) for the relief of Charles F. Bullette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles F. Bullette, Racine, Wis., the sum of $297.21, as payment of hospital and medical expenses incurred from August 24, 1953, through September 5, 1953. The payment of such claim shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Charles F. Bullette against the United States on account of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as a result of such illness: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOSETTE L. ST. MARIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the application of all laws relating to benefits payable on account of death in the United States Army, the late Frank P. St. Marie, private, 31st Cavalry Reconnaissance Troop, Camp Shelby, Miss., whose death occurred at Camp Shelby, on March 9, 1943, shall be held and considered to have died in line of duty.

With the following committee amendment.

Line 8, after the word "duty", insert "*Provided*, That no benefits under this act shall accrue prior to the date of the application filed by Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie on August 31, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES R. LAW, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2768) for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Law, Jr., Cameron, Tex., the sum of $7,747.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of clothing and household goods destroyed by fire, such fire having occurred in January 1954, when a North American Van Lines truck, which had been contracted for by the Air Force, was involved in an accident and burned, thereby destroying said clothing and household goods. The sum mentioned above is the value of said clothing and household goods for which Mr. Law has not received compensation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,747.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,651.81."

Page 2, after line 4, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENNESSEE C. BATTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2769) for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Tennessee C. Batts, Waco, Tex., is hereby relieved of all

liability to refund to the United States the sum of $647.50. Such sum represents compensation received by said Tennessee C. Batts as an employee of the Post Office Department during the period April 1, 1952, to include October 15, 1953, while he was also employed at the Veterans' Administration, and was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Tennessee C. Batts, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from the sums due him in the complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for such refund.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET MARY HAMMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3024) for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, secs. 765–769; Supp. V, title 5, sec. 770), are hereby waived in favor of Margaret Mary Hammond, of Columbus, Ohio, and her claim for compensation for the death of her husband, William Corbett Hammond, allegedly due to an injury sustained on April 26, 1938, while in the performance of his duties as a laborer with the Works Progress Administration, New Philadelphia, Ohio, is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. S. BERNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3194) for the relief of E. S. Berney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. S. Berney, of Fallon, Nev., the sum of $12,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him as a result of representations made to him, on or about August 1943, by responsible officers of the Department of the Navy to the effect that the Navy would take over his ranches to be used as part of a bombing range on or before October 1, 1943, with the result that he moved or sold his cattle and other property at a loss, when, in fact, the Navy did not enter on such ranches until April 10, 1944; and for which losses he has never been compensated since the ranches were considered abandoned property in fixing compensation in the condemnation proceedings which followed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of E. S. Berney, of Fallon, Nev., against the United States for damages sustained as the result of any representations made to him by responsible officers of the Department of the Navy that the Navy would take over his ranches to be used as part of a bombing range on or before October 1, 1943.

"SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for such damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

"SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by any time within one year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, as amended. Enactment of this act shall not be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMDR. GEORGE B. GREER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Comdr. George B. Greer, United States Navy, the sum of $2,206.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Comdr. George B. Greer against the United States for compensation still due him for personal property lost or damaged on August 16, 1953, in an explosion in Quarters "M," New York Naval Shipyard, which he occupied as Ordnance officer of such shipyard. The board of investigation which inquired into the explosion recommended (in its report dated August 23, 1953) that suitable payment be made the said Comdr. George B. Greer for personal property losses, and the Bureau of Naval Personnel subsequently determined that $4,706.66 was due him on the claim, but he could be paid only $2,500 on account of the limitation contained in section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIUS G. WATSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3354) for the relief of Julius G. Watson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the 1-year limitation of time contained in the first proviso of section 303 (d) (1) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1949 (63 Stat. 867) is hereby waived in favor of Julius G. Watson, Key West, Fla., with respect to his claim for compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for injuries sustained on March 4, 1949, while in the performance of his duties as engineman at the naval air station, Boca Chica Field, Key West, Fla., if he files a claim for such compensation with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KINGAN, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of Kingan, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, out of money heretofore made available for the eradication of the disease vesicular exanthema in swine, to Kingan, Inc., of Richmond, Va., the sum of $13,095.82, an amount equal to that heretofore paid by the State of Virginia. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Kingan, Inc., against the United States arising out of the destruction of swine at its plant in Richmond, Va., in January 1953, because of the infection and exposure of these swine to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema. Such swine were destroyed by order of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Virginia, cooperating with the United States Department of Agriculture, under an agreement whereby such losses were to be indemnified on the basis of 50 percent by the State and 50 percent by the United States. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD L. GRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4198) for the relief of Howard L. Gray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C., 765–770), the Secretary of Labor is authorized (1) to consider any claim filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Howard L. Gray, of Fayetteville, Ark., for compensation for disability resulting from illness contracted by him while employed as a hospital attendant at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fayetteville, Ark., and (2) to award to the said Howard L. Gray any compensation to which he would have been entitled had such claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such sections. No benefits shall accrue under this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Howrd L. Gray, of Faytteville, Ark., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from encephalitis lethargica alleged to have been contracted while in the performance of his duty as a hospital attendant at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fayetteville, Ark., between the years 1938 and 1941 shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 1 year after the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Howrd" and insert "Howard."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Faytteville" and insert "Fayetteville."

The amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN F. KENDRIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4902) for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan, Army of the United States, retired, is hereby relieved of any obligation to repay amounts of overpayments made to him by the United States during the period beginning on May 24, 1951, and ending on February 7, 1952, when, as a result of a misinterpretation of section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, he was employed as a supply clerk at Fort Lewis, Wash.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan a sum equal to the amount of any repayments made by him to the United States on account of the overpayments described in subsection (a): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan, Army of the United States, retired, of Tacoma, Wash., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any part of the compensation paid to him by the United States for services rendered by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army at Fort Lewis, Wash., during the period from May 24, 1951, to February 7, 1952, inclusive; such employment of the said Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan having occurred as a result of a misinterpretation of section 212 of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended by the act of June 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 761; 5 U. S. C. 59a).

"(b) That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan, a sum equal to the amount of any repayments made by him to the United States on account of the payment of compensation to him referred to in subsection (a), plus any pay withheld from him at the time of his separation from the service as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army on February 7, 1952, including all pay withheld covering accrued leave: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFRED J. STAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred J. Stahl, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $34,732.22. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Alfred J. Stahl against the United States (Philippine War Damage Commission claims Nos. 417 and 482) for compensation for certain business and property losses which he sustained as the result of enemy activities in the Philippine Islands during World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$34,732.22" and insert: "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVAN N. BURLINGAME, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5494) for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration the amounts listed opposite their names, which amounts represent moneys paid from their personal funds to liquidate deficiencies incurred in their accounts in good faith and without fraud, collusion, or negligence on their part:

Ivan N. Burlingame, general housing manager, Badger, Wis., $10.

John Marlin, general housing manager, Tullahoma, Tenn., $29.84.

Thomas C. McDougald, management aide, Carver Court housing project, Coatesville, Pa., $25.

Irene K. Shinn, accounts clerk, San Diego, Calif., $20.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN L. BOYER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5633) for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John L. Boyer, Jr., 5454 Mary Lane Drive, San Diego, Calif., the sum of $496.89, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by him as a result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in a fire that occurred in the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer and Storage Co., 2301 Mills Street, El Paso, Tex., on June 3, 1954: *Provided*, That nothing in this act does or shall affect the right, title, and interest in and to any claim which the Government of the United States has as a result of this fire: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions

of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIE C. PICKETT, GEORGE WILLIAMS, AND HERMAN L. LOONEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5634) for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney, employees in the Helium Activity, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, at Amarillo, Tex., are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $466.57, $923.47, and $66.90, respectively, which they received as excess compensation as a result of their promotions approved on November 8, 1951, and which were the subject of the Comptroller General's opinion of May 5, 1954 (B–119468).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. WOLODYMYR FEDYNIAK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5635) for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision contained in the Supplemental Appropriation, 1952, approved November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 736), prohibiting the payment of compensation from appropriations contained in that or any other act to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts and to relieve certifying officers of liability for such payments for services rendered by the following former employees of the United States Department of Agriculture: Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, Dr. Wladyslaw Albert Grajewski, Ivan Kuidych, Sam Popeil Oleskowicz, Vladimir J. Pelenskyj, Petro Pshyk, and Bohdan Tkaczuk.

SEC. 2. Where credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts or where certifying officers are relieved of liability in accordance with section 1 of this act, the former employees receiving the payments shall not be required to refund the amounts thereof, and any such amounts which have been collected from such former employees shall be refunded to them.

SEC. 3. Any former employee named in section 1 of this act who rendered service during the period November 1, 1951, through February 29, 1952, without being compensated therefor on account of the citizenship prohibition cited in section 1 hereof shall be paid for such services out of current appropriations or funds otherwise available for salaries and expenses.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. C. ISRAEL COMMODITY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5809) for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of $7,582.57. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said company against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid (under protest) by such company on December 13, 1945, as damages for alleged violation, in connection with the sale by such company of imported chocolate bars, of price regulations established by the Office of Price Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT WOOLSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5907) for the relief of Albert Woolson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to the proper person or persons an amount equal to the total expenses incurred by Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., the last surviving member of the Union Army, for medical treatment and care required as the result of his recent illness, and for any medical treatment and care required by the said Albert Woolson after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS BERTRAM BRENNAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 128) for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Francis Bertram Brennan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of William F. Brennan, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KURT GLASER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 143) for the relief of Kurt Glaser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kurt Glaser shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILOPIMIN MICHALACOPOULOS (MIHALAKOPOULOS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 163) for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUNE ROSE McHENRY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 271) for the relief of June Rose McHenry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, June Rose McHenry shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANDRA LEA MacMULLIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 386) for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sandra Lea MacMullin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INGE KRARUP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 409) for the relief of Inge Krarup.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Inge Krarup shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANASTASIA ALEXIADOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 416) for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anastasia Alexiadou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHOKICHI IRAHA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 891) for the relief of Chokichi Iraha.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chokichi Iraha shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

T-2672008, Alcala-Jiminez, David.
A-8258497, Bernhus, Christopher Olsen.
A-8258490, Bernhus, Ellen Olea.
A-8258491, Bernhus, Anne Mathilde.
A-8258492, Bernhus, Nils Christian.
A-8031685, Brown, Frank Naaman.
0300-201464, Cernilogar, Mario or Mario Merkle.
A-3442862, Dapello, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-9746898, De Roche, Lawrence Henry.
0300-405108, Eronen, Tynne Katariina or Tynne Katerina Koski (nee Talvite).
A-7712697, Forbes, Reginald.
A-8078862, Juarez-Chavez, Evaristo Jose.
A-6435718, Koslevsky, David or David Coster.
0300-351695, Lemos, Christos Panelis.
A-5801906, Molnar, Louis.
A-6153079, Mukoyama, Chiyoka K.
A-6153075, Mukoyama, Luis Reiichiro.
A-6153076, Mukoyama, Jorge Shojiro.
A-6153077, Mukoyama, Teresa Misuzu.
A-6153078, Mukoyama, Federico Takumi.
T-2760652, Naka, Hajime.
A-6154907, Noguni, Kamata.
A-6154905, Noguni, Nobuko.
A-6154904, Noguni, Hiroshi.
A-6154903, Noguni, Sadao.
A-6154906, Noguni, Yoshiko (Victoria).
A-7115197, Perides, Emanuel E.
A-3817461, Persoelis, Costas.
A-5401551, Popetz, Traian or Thomas Popetz.
0900-55372, Quilici, Cesare Ermanno.
T-1496855, Rodriguez-Unciano, Alicia.
A-5333372, Ruiffs, Albert Richardt Cornelus.
A-5284140, Shimotsu, Teru.
A-2658933, Tomaszek, Hugo Nicolas.
A-6777797, Tsu, Wan-P'ei Chang or Wan-Pei Pauline Chang or Un Pui Cheung.
A-7130708, Urias, Josefa Carrasco Vda De.
A-5609541, Valadez, Pedro.
A-3781283, Yamauchi, Kiyoko or Kiyoko Takemori.
0402/13555, Benedikty, John.
A-3485407, Chang, Pearl Chin-Ju.
A-6045012, Chauvet, Norma or Marie Raymonde Norma Chauvet.
A-4957901, Choy, Ming Chow or Wing Chow or George Choy.
A-5950851, Connelly, Richard or Connolly or Connely.
A-6849528, Douglas, Frederick Charles or Frederick Douglas.
A-4037689, Fernandes, Caetano or Cyril Fernandez.
A-9550591, Fragna-Rey, Juan.
A-5655987, Grisiuk, John or Jan Grisiuk or Ignat Sliva or Jenat Sliva.
A-7439189, Laca, Fernando Ignacio.
E-093560, Metti, Philip Jacob.
A-5919881, Piiparinen, Mauri.
A-5570728, Rai, Lal Singh.
A-3247861, Retter Friederich.
E-078907, Rodriguez, Leopoldo Cantu.
E-086948, Salgado, Mario.
A-6922766, Stagner, Rose Louise Pearson.
A-9727441, Tin, Chin or Lee San or Lee San.
0900-64111, Velasquez-Estrada, Celestino.
E-061647, Wilman, Rosa Salazar de.
1409-10532, Aguirre-Gomez, Pedro.
1409-10531, Aguirre, Catarina Ramirez De.
V-172461, Andreoli, Carlo.
A-1613805, Bieh, William or Wilhelm Herman.
A-1010587, Brown, John or Charles Brown.
A-6165969, Carter, Martha Antonia (nee Tablas Landa).
T-2760659, Cervantes-Diaz, Jose Luis.
A-8031923, Chiara, Gian Paolo.
A-7601311, Das, Abinash Chandra.
A-9511929, Fredriksen, Erik Emanuel.
A-6531519, Garcia-Orozco, Daniel.
A-6944242, Grossman, Chaskiel.
V-556765, Grossman, Fanni.
A-8196295, Gutierrez-Carlos, Federico.
A-8038726, Hansen, William Leonard.
T-303640, Isomoto, Masanao or Masanao Nojima.
0300-302349, Kui, Fung Ming or Harris Fung.
A-7961879, Kynard, Edna Sonia or Edna Sonia Artemenko.
A-2191134, Martin, Juan Rodrigues or Juan Rodrigues or John Martin.
A-4632828, Meron, Joseph.
A-2244858, Nitta, Sadakazu or Kazushige Yoshida.
0900/64623, Orozco-Torres, Jose.
A-7203339, Partridge, Josephine (nee Godinez) formerly Laborra.
A-3580428, Rafal, Pedro Corpos.
A-1171058, Suliman, Vait.
T-2671954, Villalobos-Ruiz, Eustaquio.
T-1496942, Villalobos, Ramona.
T-1496943, Villalobos, Sacarias.
T-1496944, Vilalobos, Maria Felis or Felix.
T-1496945, Villalobos, Marina.
A-6357958, Voikos, Sophia Arthur.
A-5993267, Wong, Jimmie Justo formerly Justo De Jesus.
A-5541529, Chung, Raymond or Kuang Wu or Raymond K. Wu or Chung Kwong Wu or Kuang Chung Wu.
E-084932, Colmelo, Antonio Dominguez or Antonio Emilio Rivero.
A-3112391, Drayer, Hyman.
T-2671873, Froberg, Wilhelmina formerly Kollmann.
T-2671874, Froberg, Maria formerly Kollmann.
A-1740189, Gutierrez, Demetrio or Demetrio Machado Gutierrez.
0900-39076, Juarez, Pedro Alonzo or Manuel Alonzo or Manuel Moreno or Tomas Pizano.
0900-39376, Alonzo, Antonia Aimaguer de.
A-5581921, Shimotsu, Itaro.
A-4496136, Trotta, Michele or Mike.
E-057313, Cameron, Elsie.
A-6028662, Contreras-Chavarria, Jose Angel.
A-6027750, Contreras, Esperanza De La Rosa De.
A-6162249, Eto, Some.
A-6162248, Eto, Yoshimitsu.
A-6162246, Eto, Nobuko.
A-9635249, Foo, Kut Chong.
1500/45912, Garcia, Margarita.
1500/47966, Garcia, Luis.
A-4885164, Glatter, George.
E-6167, Gum, Ho.
0300-376815, Ho, Zee Kwei or How or Zee Swei Young.
A-6421265, Lewis, Norberta Oquias.
0300-308151, Liu, Hsing Hui.
A-3559629, Magallanes, Josefina Aquiniga (nee Vasquez).
A-6153080, Mukoyama, Koshiro.
A-5328243, Pina, Jose.
A-6075197, Rose, Senior, George Edward.
A-6075199, Rose (nee Switzer), Ada Phyllis.
A-3793462, Schroeder, Alfons.
A-5265690, Schroeder, Clara Cecelia (nee Hoedt).
A-6345970, Simotas, Rose.
0300-9214, Spinozzi, Umberto.
A-6585178, Squeglia, Carmela or Carmela Volpe formerly Saggesse.
E-8309, Squires, Lionel Allen or Kenneth Inness.
0300-400307, Ten, Yuen or Yung Ten Yueh or Youen Loung.
A-2722769, Tsang, Fan F. or Tom Qui Tsang or Sam S. Tsang or Am-Ton.
A-6839003, Williams, Carolyn Elizabeth Waldron.
A-4477561, Wilson, Mary formerly Solomon (nee Grossman).
A-5031118, Zentack, Michael (Mike).
A-5311563, Zentack, Sophie.

A-2900415, Vartanian, Mary.
A-4878124, Ball, Marjorie Isabel, also known as Marjorie Hurley, Marjorie Flores, and Marjorie Barclay.
E-095789, Bobek, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-6799994, Caffrey, Lena Serafina or L. Serafini Perchiazzi, also known as Serafina Perchiazzi Johnson.
0901/20233, Escobedo-Herera, Salvador.
A-7138225, Fischer-Stern, Andrea.
E-061661, Gonzalez-Castillo, Guillermo.
A-1384235, Hui, William Lien-Chia.
A-6855176, Jack, Yee Monor Yee Jack, also known as Charley Leung Yee.
E-082880, Trematore, Anthony Frank.
A-7197918, Vieyra-Mondragon, Jose.
A-7138224, Fischer-Stern, Janos.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, strike out all of line 7.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-9540876, Andra, Ervin Rudolf.
A-8057219, Bacchia, Ermanno.
T-2786643, Bain, Hong Yuan.
A-9512692, Bang, Cheung or Cheung Ping.
A-9825169, Barulich, Antonio.
A-7186356, Basch, Marton.
A-6207921, Bistreff, Stanu Salvov.
A-6207920, Bistreff, Eugenia.
A-7538670, Chang, Yi-An Rosita.
0300/419969, Ching, Ah.
A-8082325, Chung, Cheng.
0300/396020, Chung, Shin or Shiu Chung.
E-094561, Ding, Sing Yoh.
A-6969986, Fabian, George Stephen.
A-9678368, Fat, Wong or Wong Man.
176/484, Foo, Yee King.
A-8082056, Fook, Lo.
A-7351309, Gruenberg, Dora.
A-9749483, Heinsar, Meinhard or Heinsaar.
A-9686736, Hop, Leung.
A-7779095, Hung, Chung Shu or Francis C. S. Hung.
A-6971746, Huva, Walter.
A-6971747, Huva, Leili.
A-4191741, Kaminski, Kazmer or Kazimierz.
A-7863018, Kancans, Edgar Arnolds.
A-9575626, Kaneps, Peter Voldemars or Peteris Voldemars Kaneps.
A-6967285, Kao, Evelina Tse-Ven.
A-9139291, King, Chin or Chan Kin.
0300/396086, Koo, Lee Yong.
A-7133274, Ku, Min-Chuan.
A-4760478, Lee, Ching-Ye (nee Ling).
A-8117995, Lee, Tong.
A-7064133, Li, Ching Po.
A-6017699, Liang, Vi Kang or Wei Kang or Wei Kang Liang.
0300-405868, Ling, Ah Fook.
A-6849848, Ling, Linda Chiu Huang.
A-6703496, Lo, Yu-Cheng.
A-6703484, Lo, Woo-Lih Lena Dunn.
A-6962954, Loh, Arthur Tsung Yuan.
A-6041575, Lowe, Donald Ming-Dah.
A-7046279, Marton, Tibor William or Mayer or Tibor Marton, or M. T. Marton.
A-7200780, Mascitelli, Teresa (nee Tobolik).
A-9731869, Ming, Chan Choy.
A-7879331, Mintz, Samson or Szymszon Minc.
A-9825225, Morin, Silvestro.
0300-18256, Nee, Kai Sung.
A-9518299, Neng, Tan Jee or Tan Gee Ning.
A-9577665, Olman, Karl.
A-7371655, Paczosa, Marja.
A-7975173, Pien, Pao Chi.
0501-19744, Hu, Yu Ming.
A-8031504, Ping, Lai or Lai Pyee.
A-9290467, Poa, Tan Ki.
A-6756976, Potasz, Judithe.
0300-304535, Raczynski, Waclaw.
A-6393475, Rajczyk, Szmul Dawid.
A-9554180, Sai, Leong Kee.
A-5869957, Sang, Tsang.
A-6887953, Sefcik, Ludvik Tom or Louis H. Sefcik.
A-8091316, Sen, Tek or Fu Theh Shin.
A-8082001, Shah, Victor Stephen.
A-8091356, Sing, Leung.
A-8106036, Song, Lim Shi.
A-9609271, Soon, Jong.
A-7849432, Steinbergs, Juris.
A-7849433, Steinbergs, Velta (nee Brieze).
A-7849427, Steinbergs, Marija (nee Labonovsky).
A-7074013, Straka, Marie.
A-7886251, Straka, Karel Alex.
A-7061816, Sununu, Alfred Saleh.
A-7991591, Szabo, Senior, Thomas P.
A-7991592, Szabo, Eva Agres (nee Vicenty).
A-7991593, Szabo, Thomas, Jr.
A-7991594, Szabo, Adam.
A-9561964, Sze, Chen Tek.
A-7095904, Szonyi, Giselle.
A-6971787, Tischler, Albert.
A-6971783, Tischler, Vilma.
A-8001228, Tom, Hay or Og Tom or Toy Loo or Choy Loo.
A-9529458, Tsou, Fong Shi.
A-6938806, Virdzenieks, Niklavs.
A-9810517, Virkebau, Uno or Wirkebau.
A-8082068, Wai, Lee.
A-6041703, Wu, Nelson Ikon.
E-094562, Wun, Choy or Won Sang or Wan Sang.
A-8039752, Yang, Lee Ah.
A-9677800, Yap, Lee Eng or Yap Eng Lee.
A-9571659, Yeh, Lau.
A-6952737, Yuen, Yee Sin.
A-6967543, Liu, Chin Po.
A-6967507, Liu, Dah Wen.
A-9525198, Kovacevic, Mitar.

The House concurrent resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VASSILIKI D. PAPADAKOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1405) for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vassiliki D. Papadakou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST TOMASSICH AND YOKO MATUSO TOMASSICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1868) for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Matuso" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Matsuo."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUFEMIA BENCICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1929) for the relief of Eufemia Bencich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eufemia Bencich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONIUS MARINUS KRONENBURG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3972) for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa

fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on line 7, page 1, after the words "visa fee", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT IN CIVILIAN POSITION IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWIN B. HOWARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. METCALF objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my opposition to consideration of S. 1271 and S. 1272 on today's consent calendar.

These bills would grant exemption from our long established dual position statutes and permit Generals Partridge and Howard to accept positions as Assistant Commissioners of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, which is already headed by General Swing. If these bills were enacted, retired generals would occupy 3 of the top 5 operating positions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

In testimony before the Legal and Monetary Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, in justifying the employment of these generals, General Swing stated that—

When a man has a big problem facing him he likes to have people he knows and can depend on and knows their qualifications.

Normally, there would be no objection to such a statement, however, the situation is immediately complicated by General Swing's background which has been exclusively military. As a retired general, he appears compelled to depend only on other generals or officers whose activities he was able to observe when he was in the Armed Forces.

General Swing recently stated before the Armed Services Committee:

I couldn't find anyone to take over the whole operation—

Of the Border Patrol—

and coordinate it from the Gulf to the Pacific.

And again referring to the two positions proposed to be filled by retired generals, he stated:

There was no one present in the Department who could satisfactorily fill them.

I feel compelled to observe that these statements of the general are completely incredible. The Immigration and Naturalization Service is an old established agency. It has over 7,000 employees. Yet, General Swing could find no qualified persons in the agency. In fact, it appears he could find no qualified civilians anywhere.

I am sure that no one of us is ready to abdicate traditionally civilian functions to the military—and frankly I cannot accord any substance to General Swing's alleged inability to find either civil-service career officials or civilians from outside of government to fill these positions. To me, this indicates a severe case of military myopia. Given adequate funds for its operations, as the Service has been given by this Congress, I am certain that civilian personnel would impressively acquit themselves in these positions.

General Swing has claimed that at no time prior to his administration has the wetback problem on the Mexican border ever been brought under control. If the General were acquainted with the history of his own agency, he would know that as recently as 1951–52 this border was effectively controlled when Congress, through a supplemental appropriation, approved the assignment of additional border patrolmen, and an airlift operation which carried wetbacks to the interior of Mexico. However, in the succeeding regular appropriation these funds were withdrawn and the patrol was reduced to inadequate strength. It was not secured again until General Swing took personnel from other branches of the service and assigned them to border patrol work. Since that time, he has been given the most generous appropriation ever granted to the Immigration Service for border patrol. In his first year as Commissioner—fiscal 1955—General Swing received $1,300,000 more for border patrol work than his predecessor had in fiscal 1954. For fiscal 1956, the general will have the unprecedented amount of $12,177,000, almost double the amount appropriated in fiscal 1953. If General Swing were honest with the Congress, he would admit to the fact that had he not received the appropriation requested he would not be able to do the job—not even by the grace of General Partridge.

The Service is charged with administering the immigration laws and has functions under the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Act of 1953. These laws were adopted by the Congress to give sanctuary to all peoples—and more recently, to give sanctuary to victims of totalitarian communism and nazism. I firmly believe that all of these laws can be more effectively and humanely administered by civilian than by those whose total experience has been in military activities—I say this, recognizing as I always have, and without in any way disparaging the significant contributions our military personnel have made in the realm of military activities.

I suggest that persons whose total experience has been in the Army are rarely fit by experience, training, or ability to carry out functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We are familiar with the hackneyed criticisms of so-called government by crony. Today such criticism may properly be changed to government by generals and this would seem to hold good throughout the entire Government from Generals Swing, Partridge, and Howard up to, and including, General Motors.

I am completely convinced that there is nothing unique in the services or experiences of these generals that warrants the passage of special legislation to provide them with an exemption from the dual-position statutes that have long been a part of our legislative pattern—and from which I submit, there should be no casual deviation.

APPOINTMENT IN CIVILIAN POSITION OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. METCALF objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA TO PACIFIC NORTHERN TIMBER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4853) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pacific Northern Timber Co., an Alaska corporation, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the said Pacific Northern Timber Co., the following described land situated in Alaska: That strip of tidelands in Shoemaker Bay approximately 6 miles south of Wrangell, Territory of Alaska, containing approximately 45 acres more or less and lying between mean high water and mean low water and abutting upon the land included in United States survey 3000, and lot 10, public service site, lot 11, lot 12, lot 13, and lot 14 of the United States survey 2589, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at meander corner No. 1 of lot 14 of United States survey 2589 and extending along a line south 89 degrees 30 minutes west approximately 8 chains to the mean low water line of Shoemaker Bay; thence following the mean low water line in a southerly direction to a point where it intersects with a line extending north 72 degrees 10 minutes west from meander corner No.

1 of United States survey 3000; thence south 72 degrees 10 minutes east along such line approximately 9.1 chains to said meander corner No. 1 of United States survey 3000; thence northerly along the mean high water mark or the Shoemaker Bay boundary of the property shown on the plats of United States survey 3000 and United States survey 2589 to the point of beginning: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey only that portion of the above-described property which is abutting upland property owned by the purchaser.

SEC. 2. That the land shall be sold to the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. at a reasonable appraised price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey. Conveyance shall be made only if the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. makes the total payment due within 5 years after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due: *Provided*, That the coal, oil, and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That any such patent shall be revoked and shall be of no further effect in the event the Pacific Northern Timber Co. fails to construct the sawmill facilities at this site required by its contract A10fs–1283 with the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Shoemaker Bay" and insert "Zimovia Strait."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "Shoemaker Bay" and insert "Zimovia Strait."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "Shoemaker Bay" and insert "Zimovia Strait."

Page 2, line 25, strike out the remainder of line 25 and all of lines 1 to line 11 on page 3, and insert the following: "The conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. for the land at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey, after taking into consideration the purpose for which the land is to be used. Conveyance shall be made only if the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. makes the total payment within 1 year after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further.*"

Page 4, line 5, strike out "at" and insert "on or adjacent to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Calendar No. 83 on the Consent Calendar, the bill (S. 941) to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have just talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who earlier objected to the consideration of this bill, and explained that the bill allowed the Federal land banks to pick up what remains of the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. These assets have gotten so low now that the cost of servicing the loans which average only about $600 each, is out of proportion to the cost of carrying them. The land banks are already servicing such loans and can do it cheaper than if this work is divided up between two operations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I had reserved the right to object in order to ask a question, but there was no Member on the floor at the time who could give me the information, so I asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice. The gentleman from Texas has satisfied me that the bill should be passed, so I have no objection to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Twentieth. Without regard to any limitations or restrictions of this act, to purchase all assets, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests, held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation as a result of loans made on or before July 1, 1947, in the farm credit district in which said bank is situated and to assume the liabilities of said Corporation for future payment funds of borrowers and trust accounts applicable to said assets. The purchase price of notes and mortgages, purchase money mortgages, and real estate sales contracts shall be equal to the total of the unpaid balances on such items and accrued interest thereon at the date as of which purchase is made, less the total of the liabilities of the Corporation being assumed by the bank as herein provided. The purchase price of real estate, sheriffs' certificates, loans called for foreclosure, loans in suspense, judgments, and for any other assets eligible for purchase under this paragraph but not specifically identified herein shall be equal to the fair market value of the assets as determined by agreement. The total consideration for the purchase shall be payable over a period of not more than 10 years from the date as of which purchase is made, and upon such terms as shall be agreed upon through negotiation with the Board of Directors of the Corporation."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Abbitt	Fenton	Morgan
Albert	Fino	Morrison
Ashley	Flood	Mumma
Barrett	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Becker	Friedel	O'Konski
Bentley	Fulton	Osmers
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gamble	Pelly
	Garmatz	Pilcher
Bowler	Gavin	Pillion
Buchanan	Gordon	Powell
Budge	Granahan	Prouty
Burleson	Gray	Quigley
Bush	Green, Pa.	Radwan
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Carrigg	Hiestand	Roberts
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Saylor
Christopher	James	Scherer
Chudoff	Jarman	Scott
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Sieminski
Corbett	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kearns	Taylor
Dague	Kelley, Pa.	Tollefson
Dingell	King, Pa.	Tuck
Doyle	Latham	Wainwright
Eberharter	McConnell	Walter
Evins	Macdonald	Zelenko
Fallon	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1413) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the House passed a bill covering this matter. This is a similar Senate bill that should have been offered at the time the bill was called on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is right. This bill puts on a limitation that was not in the other bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., secs. 104–106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding $35,000 a year is hereby authorized."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the action by which the House passed the bill H. R. 4534 will be vacated and the House bill laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve

itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5297, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one that has been badly misunderstood by the public generally; in some instances misunderstood by the press; misunderstood by the people of the United States, and misunderstood, too, by Members of the Congress. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the members of this committee if they will suffer the inconvenience of not interrupting me and not asking questions until I have had full opportunity to explain the bill. I will then be glad to yield to anyone and everyone insofar as time lasts and explain the bill as best I can.

I have a chart here to my left. I am not going to present the chart immediately. I want to take up preliminaries before explaining the chart.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, in the first place, that this is an administration bill. It is a bill that has the endorsement of the Defense Department, the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense. It has the endorsement of the Armed Forces generally, the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Department of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of the Air Force. It has the endorsement of the commandant of the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps itself. It is a bill that is endorsed by the White House and has the approval of the President of the United States. As far as I am concerned, I know of no one in the whole world that today has the military judgment that we can use to rely upon in writing those measures for the defense of the Nation as has the President of the United States, and I am willing to follow his judgment in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the hearings in connection with this bill were not rushed hearings at all. They required 8 weeks, and 8 weeks of hard work. I want to pay tribute to the subcommittee that sat with me mornings and afternoons and worked long hours, under difficult conditions and under pressure at times to thoroughly work out all of the details of the bill and satisfy themselves that the bill was the type of measure that should be submitted to the full Committee on Armed Services and should likewise be submitted to the Congress of the United States.

When I say that this measure was approved and supported by the Pentagon, I do not mean, Mr. Chairman, that your committee accepted the Pentagon version of the bill blindly. On the contrary, it did not. It scrutinized every feature and every stipulation in the bill and satisfied itself in that connection before it was prepared to submit the bill and recommendations with approval to the House of Representatives. I do not mean that we did not amend the bill, either. We did amend it. We took out features, and we added features. If I were to tell you how many amendments we added or made changes in the bill and I should say there were 127, I think that I would be most conservative in that respect. We had 115 witnesses to hear. They came from all parts of the United States and from all groups. They came from patriotic organizations, church organizations, military organizations, and every single person who asked at the time of the hearings to be heard was heard respectfully and patiently by your subcommittee. I say again I want to pay our committee members a tribute for the service that they rendered to the country and to the defense of the Nation in handling the measure as they did.

Coming to the bill itself, this measure was first mentioned in this Congress by the President in his speech of January 13, 1955. I am going to read only a short paragraph from that speech which indicates the position of the President:

> Under the new national Reserve plan, selective service, and the Reserve forces in conjunction with our Regular Establishment will fulfill our security needs with the least possible disruptive impact upon the life of the individual citizen and the civilian economy. Flexibility is a primary characteristic of the plan. Constant scrutiny and review of the operation of the services will assure its increasing efficiency.

That comes from the President's message on January 13, 1955.

The measure is in no sense a UMT plan. I have received, I suppose, hundreds of letters from all parts of the country saying we were writing a UMT bill. I think nothing is farther from the mind of the committee that wrote the bill than that we were writing a bill which would be a universal military training bill or be a side door entrance to universal military training. On the contrary, this bill has no features of universal military training.

In the first place, the bill is not adapted to universal military training. Two branches of the armed services, for instance, the Air Force and the Navy, demand long term voluntary enlistments. The fundamental feature of universal military training is a short term training program for everyone. Long-term enlistments are a demand of at least two branches of the service, the Navy and the Air Force. In my judgment they would have opposed a universal military training bill at this time for the reason that they feel it would prevent them from getting long term voluntary enlistments which they need so badly in the technical features of their work in the defense of the country.

Universal military training is a permanent program. This is a temporary program, Mr. Chairman. This program is only for 4 years. It means that we take up our military situation at this hour, we take our country down its road of destiny for 4 years. At the end of 4 years the bill cuts off. Your Congress meets and decides then whether or not it wishes to extend the bill, modify the bill, or drop the whole matter entirely. That is 4 years hence.

This bill is not universal military training for the reason that there is no compulsion of anyone for entrance into the armed services.

You say that we have the draft. The draft comes in under a separate bill, which was passed by this House several months ago. Every portion of this bill provides only for voluntary enlistments in the armed services.

You have heard it bandied around that there is a 6 months' program for men. There is a 6 months' program, but that is purely voluntary and no young man is forced under any circumstances to accept the 6 months' program of training which is presented in this bill. The armed services today still wish to rely upon the voluntary system as much as possible and this bill seeks to help them in that program as much as possible.

This bill is not universal military training, because it is not universal. Mr. Chairman, how can you have a universal military training program when it is not is not universal? This bill provides that not exceeding 250,000 young men reaching the age of 17 and not above 19 may be enlisted voluntarily for 6 months' training in the armed services of the United States. Therefore it has none of the fundamentals of universal military training. It is not permanent legislation. It is not compulsory legislation. It is not universal legislation. It is not adapted to a UMT program.

As a matter of fact, the bill presents no new obligation of a military nature to our young people in the United States. It simply seeks to work out the obligation we have had on the statute books of this country for many years.

You say, "Yes, this provides for 8 years of military obligation, but it does not provide for an 8-year program." That obligation was set up first in 1941 as a 10-year military obligation for everyone, voluntary and compulsory, who enters the armed services. In 1948 that obligation was set up as an 8-year obligation. It has been carried on the statute books of this country since then. This bill does not seek to write out an 8-year obligation or any kind of long-term obligation for the individual that enters the armed services, regardless of the way he enters it, but it merely accepts the statutes and the laws as we have had them on the books for many years. It seeks, operating under the law that you have passed and that you have kept on the books for years, to write out a program of training for these people and to give our country a far better Reserve program to back up an incomparable regular Military Establishment to meet our troubles in time of great emergency.

What are our troubles, Mr. Chairman, in the international field? I want to read you a very short statement that will give you some idea of what I think we have to contend with at the present time from the only powerful nation that may really give us trouble in the field of international affairs, and that is Soviet Russia.

The Soviet Army consists of 2,500,000 men organized into 175 divisions sup-

ported by 400,000 security—NKVD—troops and 80 east Europe satellite divisions. The Red Chinese have 2 million regular army troops and 1 million uniformed security troops.

Within the Soviet Army are 65 tank and mechanized divisions equipped with 40,000 new tanks, and 40 new airborne divisions. Other divisions have been motorized and provided heavy artillery support. On May Day this year the feature of the parade in Red Square was reported to be a huge new artillery piece regarded by western military attachés as the counterpart of our atomic cannon.

Russia and her European satellites have 6 million men under arms and it is estimated that they can field 400 divisions within 30 days of mobilization.

Within the week it has been announced that Russia has built several thousand MIG–17 supersonic jet fighter planes. Their speed is put at 850 miles per hour or more—comparable to our F–100 Supersabre. The Soviet Strategic Air Army is operating units equipped with their new type 37 heavy, jet, intercontinental bombers. These are the equivalent of our B–52's. Estimates of Soviet military aircraft production generally are being revised upward, including data concerning their counterpart of our B–47 medium jet bomber, which they call type 39.

Soviet aircraft also reported are a small rocket-driven interceptor able to climb nearly 3 miles a minute at takeoff, and more than 7 miles a minute above 20,000 feet; a double delta-wing plane able to climb straight up; a tailless fighter, carried by a TU–4—B–29 type—mother ship, judged equal in capability to our F–100 Supersabre; and a 4-engined turboprop bomber able to fly 7,650 miles nonstop.

In support, major Red air bases are said to have been quadrupled in the past 4 years. The 20,000-plane Soviet air force has a strength of 600,000 men. That is merely a little bit of data I have to present to you to tell you why I think we must, in this period of international tension, have a trained, well-equipped Reserve, ready to move without further training when the emergency occurs. In the old days when our forefathers set up this Government, they were able to go to the walls and take their muskets down off the side of the wall and go out and in a minute they were ready to fight the battles of this country. At the present time, no such situation exists. You must have a trained Reserve ready to move at an instant's notice, if you are going to properly protect the freedom of the people of the United States of America, their safety and their very survival. So I tell you that is the reason I think we need a better trained and more efficient and better organized and better equipped Reserve than we have at the present time.

I want to say one more thing too in that connection. We need it for the reason that when Korea came, we found that there was no one available to use instantly except those who had already carried the heavy burden of combat in World War II. Therefore, we called out the trained men who had served our country in a prior war and we, your committee, feel that we have an obligation to provide additional prior-trained men so that in the event of another emergency, of the Korean type, we will be able to rely on others than those who fought World War II and those who fought in Korea so that we will not have to use them again in another emergency comparable to Korea. Therefore, we present this bill to you.

I am going to try to explain the bill to you by means of this chart. I will try, as best I can, to show you exactly what the purposes of the bill are and how it will work. We are providing a Regular Establishment of 2,850,000 men. We hope to provide a Reserve of 5 million men. Numbers of men are not the important feature in the bill. The important features are training, equipment, and organization of Reserves, as we see it. Under this program, we would have a Reserve of 2.9 million in the Ready Reserve, that is, 2.9 million men ready to go in the event of an emergency without a great deal of prior training, and we would then have the remainder of them in Standby Reserve as a manpower pool to use in "an all-out emergency," after Congress has declared an emergency exists and a state of war in fact exists with some other country. Then we would expect them all to go. We would have a Standby Reserve in shape and we would have the names, addresses, and communications, with those who are needed in that great emergency when it came.

Now coming to the bill itself, as I said, the bill provides no method other than voluntary enlistment in the armed services. I point out this chart to you. Each one of these columns represents a method whereby men can enter the armed services of the United States whether it be the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard likewise is supporting this measure.

In the first column we have in mind taking care of the National Guard. The bill covers the National Guard as well as the National Reserve generally. The guard is a part of the Reserve.

In this column we would show you how a young fellow 17 years of age, or before he reaches 19, who wishes to avail himself of the opportunity of going into the service. If he has decided he wants to volunteer for the 6 months' plan, with a 7½-year obligation, this is the way he would operate. He would go down to the National Guard unit and he would enlist in the National Guard for 6 months' training in the active field, and for 7½ years in the Reserves. It is purely voluntary on his part. He would enter in this column. He would serve 6 months. At the end of that 6 months he would be through his active obligation and then he would be placed in the National Guard training unit back home that he enlisted in. That would mean for 7½ years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

That would give him 7½ years' obligation to train with his guard unit back home. If, however, he wishes to go into the Regular Reserve and not the guard, he would then go down to the Reserve unit back home or in his neighborhood, and he would enlist in that unit for 6 months' active training in the field, and 7½ years in the Reserve training at home. This portion in red represents the 6 months' active training in the field that he would get. Then he would be passed into the Reserves back home, and he would be given 7½ years in the Reserve. During that 7½ years, what would he do? He would attend weekly drills. Under the law as we have provided in this bill, he would have 48 weekly drills throughout the year. He would take his training during that time and he would comply with the needs of the training period in that way. Sometime during the course of the year he is obligated under this program to 2 weeks' training in the field, and he would be sent sometime during this year for 2 weeks' training while he was on the inactive portion of his obligation of 7½ years. When he got back he would reenter training in his Reserve unit at home.

This column represents a new type of voluntary obligation which we have written into this bill. We have written it in in response to a request of the Navy and the Air Force. This provides that a young man wishing to enter the service may go down voluntarily and enlist in his Reserve unit, and he would be told that he would be called to duty at some time during the first 2 years after he entered his Reserve program. Before he took his active field duty he would be given the usual training back home in his unit as a reservist. Then he would be called to duty sometime during the first 2-year period. He would serve 2 years on active field duty, following which he would return to the Reserve and serve the balance of the 8 years, 4 years more, in his Reserve unit.

Then, here we come to the third column. This is the case of the draftee. A man is drafted for 2 years, and he served that time in the active field and the balance of the time he puts in the Reserve at home.

This column represents a voluntary obligation. It is a man who wishes to go in for 3 years voluntarily in the service. The balance of his time would be 5 years additional. Then this man volunteers for 4 years in active duty. The balance of his time would be spent in the Reserve. This man would come in on 5 years of active duty. The balance of his time, 3 years, would be spent in the Reserves in training. But all of that is three voluntary enlistments.

Now I want to say how this works. We want to give these men an incentive to get out of the Ready Reserve if they do good work. We want to give them an incentive; so how do we work it? We provide that the man who serves 5 years will not have any duty in the Ready Reserves; he will be within the Standby Reserves.

The man who volunteers for 4 years will serve 1 additional year in the Ready Reserves where he will do duty as an Inactive Reserve training at home.

The man with 3 years voluntary service would have 2 years in the Reserves training at home.

The drafted man would have 3 years if he did satisfactory work and performed satisfactorily, he would cut his active obligation from 8 years to a total of 5, and this portion of the obligation would be spent in the Standby Reserves where he would be called upon for no active training of any sort.

Likewise, coming to this chart in the case of the man with 6 months' volunteer training, that man would be given another opportunity to cut short his time by reducing his active training to 6 months. In other words, by taking more training in the field he can cut his Ready Reserve obligation down, but the men with only 6 months active duty in the field cannot reduce their obligation for training. It is an obligation for 7½ years in the Reserves. In this way we compensate for the fact that the 6 months' trainee has a very short active training period in the field.

We provide, also, in this bill for an ROTC. We have had trouble in the past with the fact that ROTC boys stay 4 years in college and when they get out some of them fail to get commissions. In this bill every ROTC man who graduates satisfactorily from the college and the ROTC program would be given a Reserve commission. If he is needed, he serves 2 years on active duty; if he is surplus to the immediate officer need of the Regular Establishment, he is given 6 months' training following his college career and then goes into the inactive training period subject, as I explained to you in this chart.

We provide also in this bill for a State guard. Let us assume that an atom bomb falls on a great city in the United States; our Regular forces are deployed overseas in the emergency and have reduced their forces here at home. We call our Reserves into active operation at once. They are called into operation, the guard is called out in my State, Louisiana, for instance, and sent up to New York perhaps. We provide under the terms of this bill for a State guard. The States may organize their own guard. We do not put up money for it, we provide surplus equipment already in hand to meet such a situation of crisis which, God grant, may never come, but when the National Guard is called into active duty there will be some organization to take its place there in a critical emergency, and that organization is the State guard.

I want to conclude at this point, then I will be glad to answer questions. I want to remind you, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that the idea of a Reserve is nothing new. George Washington, the first President of the United States, mentioned in one of his great messages to the American people on the state of the Union, the need for what he called a well-organized militia. Throughout the history of the 13 Colonies on the Atlantic seaboard there was a volunteer militia. It was organized to protect them first against the incursions of the savage redskins who sought to terrorize the colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. In every war since the birth of this Republic we have used components of our Reserve in the Active Army. In the War of 1812, we used them to man our forts and man our garrisons throughout the continental United States. In the War with Spain we found for the first time that our Reserves were sent overseas. They were sent to Cuba and Puerto Rico. But before they were sent they had to be well trained to meet the forces of Spain in that emergency.

In the two great world wars that we in our lifetime have passed through, we have sent our Reserves into the field in large numbers to back up the Regular establishments, but they went into the field of combat only after they had received long periods of training. It was my privilege to serve in World War I, and it was 14 months after we declared war before we had a major fighting unit in France on the western front. In World War II we trained our National Guard for 12 long months before they were in shape to go out to meet the enemies we had in the Atlantic and in the Pacific.

In Korea we had to call upon those who had borne the heavy brunt of battle in World War II. I think it is unfair to ask a man to fight in a great war, like World War II, then have to turn around and call that same man out of his home, away from this family, his business, his obligations and his ties to fight another war such as we had in Korea.

We hope we can give you a Reserve establishment which will permit us to broaden the obligation of citizenship, also broaden the military obligation, so come a future Korea in the history of this country we can reach down and call upon men who are not veterans, but at the same time men who are well trained and have no prior combat experience.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Suppose you have more men who elect to serve under the first column than the National Guard will take care of?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We do the same as we do now. We limit now the size of the guard of every State. When the number of volunteers to the guard in your State exceeds the quota for your State, they must draw on the quota of another State, or it will become "a first come, first served" basis. Likewise with the Reserves, assuming that the number set by the President of the United States as a quota for the Army Reserves is exceeded by the volunteers, it is on "a first come, first served" basis, which is as fair as you can make it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman mentioned over and over that there was no compulsion in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman tell me why it seems to be correct to force a man into the Regular service but it is wrong to force men to serve in the Reserves?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I cannot disagree with the able gentleman who is chairman of a great committee in that statement. I can say that the bill is so drawn that it is not compulsory to enter the Reserves. We do have the draft, which is the law of the land today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Was not the very heart of the program which the President sent up the fact it compelled people to serve in the Reserves and this bill does not do that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill compels them to do good work after they have entered the Reserves. There is no drafting of men for this 6 months' period into the Reserves. Does that answer the question? I want to say that the committee was satisfied with the bill that is presently reported.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the able gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In reference to active service under the National Guard and the Reserves, what would be the difference in the training that those two groups would have, or would they be taken at the same time and in the same units?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The guard is under the governor of each State. We run there into a historic situation. The guard is a State force. We have to work with the governors. A man would enter the State Guard, then he would be transferred to the regular establishment for 6 months' training, then he would be transferred back to his unit in the guard following his 6 months' training.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. With reference to the National Guardsmen and the reservists, those two groups might be taken to the same camp and put under the same program at the same time, then are transferred back to the guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The idea is to integrate them there. A man can sign up with the guard or Reserve, and he will be sent to camp or put in a unit. They might, in one or two instances, open up some additional parts of camps, but generally speaking, he will be put in a unit in existence for his training, and he will be required to get his training like any other trainee would, whether a guardsman or a reservist.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do I understand that you will set up periods of training for these groups and you will take them in in groups, say, at every quarter or every month or something like that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They estimate there would be something like 8,500 per month the first year. But, of course, that is based upon a floor of 100,000, which would be the minimum amount which might be set for volunteer purposes under the 6 months' training for the first year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would those people have the opportunity in the National Guard, then, to select the branch of the service? In other words, the Army, the Air Force, or the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would be handled just exactly as it is handled

at the present time. In fairness to everyone, let me say this, that the Air Guard is pretty well filled up. I would not want to tell this Congress that if the Air Guard were completely filled up and a man wanted to go down to the Air Guard, that they would open the ceiling just to get him in when the Air Guard had been filled up. Likewise, if you take the Navy and the Air Force, they have said that they think they can get under this long-term program of voluntary enlistment the number they need for the air program. They say they would rather have a man coming in 4 years voluntarily than a 6-month trainee. If they can get their volunteers for 4 years or 3 years, they are going to take the volunteers until their quota is filled up.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri, if I understood it correctly, he can volunteer for some particular Reserve component before he gets his training. In other words, he volunteers for 6 months' training in the Army Reserve, under the National Guard, or the Air Force or the Navy air force program, and then he gets his training and reverts back to that particular service. However, with the permission of the two services, he can transfer.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is very true, and I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the Defense Department appropriation bill was before the House last week statements were made that the Reserve setup had been poorly handled in the past. Does the gentleman think that the Reserve setup is now competent to handle this influx of reservists?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Well, we have to depend upon the executive branch of the Government. I will say this, it was poorly handled; it has been poorly handled in many cases in the past. We hope and trust to exercise some surveillance over the Department, as a legislative body, to try to see that the Reserve program is more efficiently handled than in the past.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. To answer that part of the question as to whether or not the Reserve program will be properly carried out, we have provided, of course, in this bill for a report from the Department of Defense each January so that we can review the program to see whether or not it is being properly executed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. This is just a hypothetical case. In the event that someone volunteers for 4 years as compared to somebody that just joins the Reserve for 6 months, in the event of an emergency does this bill determine which will first be brought back into Federal service?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In Korea, when the emergency came along, we had no method of screening. We called, for instance, at that time, as a truck driver, a man who had been practicing law for 5 years. We called as a bookkeeper a man who had been practicing dentistry for 5 years. We called into service for Korea men who had been dead for several years. We had no way of screening. We had no way of keeping up with the reserves. This bill provides that we shall screen these reserves from time to time, and if there is any Reserve that cannot go, he will be screened out of the Ready Reserve.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, the volunteer for 4 years might be brought back into Federal service before the 6-month trainee. In the event of an emergency, does this bill provide that one who has merely taken a 6 months' training course will go into active service sooner than someone who had served for 4 years as a volunteer?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; it is on a different basis. The basis is this. Where you need a certain number of engineers, you call engineers. If they need a dozen engineers, for instance, they would consider the equities; is it fair to call in a man who has done such yeoman duty for a long time or call in another one? In other words, they are to consider the equities in that case.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, under this bill someone who had served 4 years, in comparison with someone else who had had training for 6 months, could be brought back sooner than the one who had served only 6 months?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If they needed a lawyer or an engineer or a scientist, and he had been in service for 4 or 5 or 6 years, they could call him back if they had to have him. If a hardship is created, a Reserve would not be called.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. And let some of the 6 months' trainees go?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It could happen, yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was interested a while ago when the gentleman began his talk, in his statement that there was much confusion and misunderstanding about this bill, not only here, but with the people back home. I find that to be a true statement. There is much confusion. I wonder if my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would answer a question or two in the hope that we might clear up some of that confusion?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should be glad to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that this bill, if enacted, will become a part of the Selective Service and Training Act which is now the law? That is, this bill is an amendment to it, but this bill is a voluntary matter, and will become part of another law that has a compulsory feature. Therefore, if this bill is enacted, we will have a law that is one part compulsory, the present law, and this new bill which is purely voluntary; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is right; that is substantially correct. I thank the able gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have one more question I would like to ask, if I may.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. On page 5 of the bill, in the second paragraph, I find this:

> Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may enlist in the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, or in the Reserve or in any unit of the Reserve.

Is not that the gist of the gentleman's bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. There is a 4-year period of enlistment that can be had voluntarily. We hope by the year 1960 that we can come to the Congress and say that we have a Reserve composed of prior trained servicemen who have at least 6 months' training in the active field.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One more question, if I may. Then under this bill, if it becomes law, no boy not now in the service will be required or compelled or ordered to leave his home and go to the recruiting station and enlist, is that true?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. It is purely voluntary.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But once he does enlist, he is in for a total of 8 years, 6 months of which is training and the balance various kinds of training, the Standby Reserve, the Ready Reserve, and so forth. Under the original part of the legislation, which is the present Selective Service Act passed by this Congress, he has a total of 8 years, of which the first 2 years are active training; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. I can say this for these young men who are 17 years of age who come down and volunteer for 6 months, that they are going to be required to get their parents' consent, just as all minors are required to have the consent of their parents before entering the service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Earlier in the consideration of this bill the gentleman from Iowa indicated that the military subcommittee on appropriations had been critical of the Reserve program. I think it should be pointed out in all fairness that any criticism we had was primarily directed at a lack of manpower and not necessarily directed at the management of the program. As I understand it, this proposed legislation is a big step forward to produce the necessary manpower.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. I will say that we have a legal limit on the Ready Reserve now of 1½ million men, but we actually have in the Ready Reserve 2½ million men. We do not train them. There is no procedure which would require them to train and to be well organized and well equipped for use in the immediate emergency. That is what we have provided.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. Referring to the fourth category, where the man is drafted and in for 2 years, and then is liable for 3 additional years, what is the present law?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The present law is for a total of 8 years. The difference we make is that we give him encouragement, let him do good work, as is shown on this chart, in his Reserve duty training, and then if he does that we release him to the Standby Reserve where he will have no training.

Mr. BELCHER. But it does not change that obligation at all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It shortens the Ready Reserve obligation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to say first of all that as far as I am concerned I am going to support this proposition because I think it is needed and necessary.

I want to add one further word to the proposition raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. In the course of certain conversations about this measure some question was raised. As far as I am concerned, I think we need some reserves other than the boys who have already served 4 years. While possibly it might not be effective to try to write definite language into the law requiring that the boys in the Reserve who come in for the 6 months in the Reserve be called first in all cases, I think the record here as we make it ought to make it abundantly clear that we are in very large measure passing this legislation to create a body of reserves other than among the boys who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. Wherever possible the people having the program in charge should call the boys who have come in for the 6 months to be a part of the Reserves ahead of the boys who have already served their time but are required to serve a certain time in the Reserves.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That certainly sounds equitable. I call the attention of the gentleman to page 17 of the bill. We take the combat veteran off the hook in this bill, because under this classification he will not be called until consideration has been given to the others. Then we provide for certain categories which I commend to the Members of Congress to study.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What does the gentleman mean by a combat veteran?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I mean a man who served in the course of the Korean war. We provide for the date July 27, 1953. That was the termination of the Korean war.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So that if I join the Army or the Navy and do my enlistment, whatever it is, how long do you put me in the Reserves, then?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It depends on how long you join. If you enlist for 5 years you are in the Standby Reserve with no obligation of training of any sort for 3 years.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, but you are obligated to be drafted if we have a war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. You are obligated to be drafted whether you are in the Reserves or not if we have an allout war.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How many Reserves do we have now?

Mr. VINSON. Two million two hundred thousand.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We have 3 million under arms?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We are reducing to a regular establishment of 2,850,000.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has referred to column No. 4 as the draftee column for the 2 years.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Two years' drafted active service, the balance is in the Reserves.

Mr. VORYS. Is there not still a possibility of volunteering for 2 years for service in the Army?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; you can go in through the Reserves here as a volunteer, and then sometime in the first 2 years you will be called to active duty for only a 2-year active period.

Mr. VORYS. I thought that there was a Richards amendment that was still in the law that provided that a man could still volunteer for 2 years of active duty in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is the way they go in, but I understand it is legal to accept 2-year volunteers.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman made some reference indicating that this bill may change the status of graduate ROTC men.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; it will guarantee him a commission. It does not change his status, but it will guarantee that he will get a commission when he finishes the ROTC course.

Mr. MORANO. Assuming that this bill becomes a law, with what graduating class will it take effect?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It will take effect within 2 months after the bill is passed and signed and becomes a law.

Mr. MORANO. Does that mean a class graduating this June would come under this bill, if it is passed?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If it becomes a law by then.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just have one question. An emergency happens. I have been in the Army for 4 years. You have been in the Army for 6 months. I do not care whether it is a draftee or not. Who is better prepared to handle that emergency and go right into battle—the 6-month trainee or the 4-year trainee?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, the gentleman answers his own question.

Mr. MASON. That is exactly what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] was getting at and what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was getting at. The fellow who is best able to do the job that is needed is the one who is going to be called.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman, in my opinion, there would be few volunteers if they knew you would keep taking them back first in the event of an emergency. You would have no volunteers whatsoever.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I point out that the man who is in the Standby Reserve will not be called out of the Standby Reserve to active duty except through the draft board. The draft board will screen them and see that equity is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for his extreme patience in hearing everybody and anybody who had anything to say about this bill, with the exception of one person who came before us about whom we knew a little concerning his background. When he insisted that he would not answer certain questions we immediately arose and would not hear him any longer.

First of all, in the approach of this bill, I think we want to keep in mind that this bill is designed to meet the needs of our forces so that we can properly defend our country. You must not forget that. This may not be the solution, but certainly, in our judgment, the members of the committee and the subcommittee, it is the best solution we have been able to arrive at under the circumstances. We are not just trying to pile a lot of people in and push them through a UMT program. We are trying to provide a Ready Reserve that could be called upon in case of emergency, and which will, in truth, be ready so far as we can be ready with a Reserve force. We must remember that we have a 6 months' training program which is a minimum. In the judgment of our best advisers and in our best judgment, this is necessary to give a foundation so that men who then go on into the Reserve units and continue with their training will be of some value; a ready force, and the minimum that we need to defend our country.

The question about whether the program will be good or bad is just like any other law that we write. Perhaps we will have to ride hard on the Department of Defense to see that the program is properly executed. We do that by making the Defense Department come back to us once a year and report on their stewardship. We have given a certain amount of flexibility to the Defense Department because you have so very many variables to be considered in any such program as this. But I can assure you that we have not given the Department of Defense carte blanche so far as the execution of this law is concerned. There has been a great deal of criticism of our so-called Reserve as of today. I think a great deal of that is justified. However, one of the big things we have

found during our hearings was that we now have units where we have a strong nucleus of officers and noncommissioned officers, but we have nothing but chiefs, and no Indians. I assure you, you cannot keep officers interested unless you have some tools for them to work with.

With reference to the question about those who will come in under the 6 months' program, I know there will be great opposition brought to bear upon that section, saying it will disrupt the high-school programs of various boys. Remember, they will not be accepted unless they have their parents' consent. So that puts to rest that part of it.

I think perhaps it was not brought out too clearly, but, for instance, those men who enlist in the National Guard or the Reserves are enlisted for 8 years—2 years of which will be on active duty. So that they do, in fact, have 6 years' Reserve obligation. However, we say, "If you properly and faithfully perform your Ready Reserve obligation—that is, 1 or 2 or 3 years—then you go over into the Standby Reserve." That is the same program we have for all of these men, with the exception of the 6-month boys. The reason we cannot make that program too attractive is the fear that it might be so attractive that you would have everybody going into that program and it would cut down on our volunteer program.

A man who serves 5 years active duty goes immediately into the Standby Reserve. On this whole program we are trying to design it for a long-range pull. We have blown hot and we have blown cold. We have had our peaks and our valleys. But we must set up a sound plan. One alternative we have is the one we had at the beginning of the Korean war. We had no Ready Reserve. As a result we called on everybody and anybody, helter skelter, hither and yon. We all know the objections we had to that. Many men were called to active duty who should not have been called. But under this program we will continuously screen men, first from active duty in the Ready Reserves. Then, while they are in the Ready Reserves, they will be continuously screened as to whether or not they should be in the Ready Reserve. When we speak of the Ready Reserve, we want people who are ready to go at a moment's notice. We will screen out the people who have hardship cases, because their status has changed, because they have essential skills, and so on. We will not disrupt the economy of our country. In that way we will take away many of the objections that some people have to this bill.

I cannot see any easy way out on providing these forces. To, you who can find an easy way out, my hat is off to you. It is our responsibility to provide defense forces for our country. We must provide them one way or another, either by a strong Ready Reserve or a huge standing force. We have no other choice. If, however, we have a properly trained Reserve, then we can, in my judgment, reduce our standing forces to a degree.

As far as I personally am concerned, I am willing to accept my responsibility and vote in support of this measure.

I think, however, before this debate goes very much further we are going to hear a great deal of criticism of the militaire. Perhaps I should not bring this up, having served a few years in the Regular forces myself, but let us not forget this:

> It was Tommy this and Tommy that
> And Tommy go away,
> But it was "Howdy, Mr. Atkins"
> When the band began to play.

Fortunately, the band is not playing now, but let us not be so shortsighted that we will not vote to support the reasonable program which your Committee on the Armed Services has presented.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. We all have tremendous respect for the gentleman's experience and ability. Will the gentleman tell us, or will we find in the report some place an explanation, how this 6 months' training plus 48 hours or evenings, plus 2 weeks, is going to provide an Active Reserve that is able to go into action immediately when there is an emergency? In prior times we found when we had a National Guard with some similar amounts of training that they had to go to camp for 6 months or a year before they could go into battle.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe I can explain that to a degree. They, of course, will not be battle-worthy troops, there is no question about that; to think so would be to fool ourselves. However, they will be very much better prepared than under our present program and primarily because in the National Guard and the Reserve units, when a man enlists he goes directly for 6 months' training. Without it he would be a very, very raw recruit and as a result your officers and senior noncommissioned officers have to devote the greater part of their time and attention to training them in the fundamental school of the soldier, and so forth; whereas with this 6 months' program he will have accomplished that and the man will have gone on into specialized training. Then when the man goes into the Reserves it will be possible to go ahead with the unit training. Do I make myself clear on that?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. How does the Reserve obligation of a man who elects a 2-year period of active duty compare with the Reserve obligation of a man who ignores it altogether and elects to be called up by selective service?

Mr. DEVEREUX. As far as the Reserve obligation is concerned it is exactly the same whether the man enlists or is drafted; the total service is exactly the same.

Mr. JONAS. But in the matter of his obligation in the Reserves, how will his length of service in the Reserves compare?

Mr. DEVEREUX. It is shown by this chart.

Mr. JONAS. Are we requiring the men who are discharged now after an experience of 2 years to enter the Reserves? We are not sending them to the Reserves, are we?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes. They go into the Reserves.

Mr. JONAS. I know, but they do not have these 48 drills a year, they do not go into the Active Reserve.

Mr. DEVEREUX. They have an obligation and, fortunately, to a certain degree, men are recognizing the obligation of going into it. As far as the implementation of the thing is concerned, the Defense Department has been hesitant to implement the law.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest reluctance I rise to express grave doubts as to the validity of this measure. I had not the opportunity of serving on the subcommittee which sincerely and earnestly studied it for a good many days. I had only the advantage of reading most of the voluminous testimony and hearing the testimony that was adduced before the full committee. It is with a great deal of trepidation, therefore, that I rise to express these doubts, because I have just been informed that the administration thoroughly supports this measure.

Who am I to question the judgment of the greatest military geniuses of our time? I would, however, in the small time allowed me, as a plain country lawyer from Maine, as a man who has served his country, and who has served in a Reserve unit and who is presently a member of the Air National Guard, like to express the doubts which I have about this bill.

In the first place, the key to our defense in this atomic age is a fine combat-ready standing force. Whether you believe in the theory of atomic retaliation or you believe in fighting all of these peripheral wars, the first requisite is a combat ready Air Force, a combat ready Navy and ground force.

What does this bill do in that respect? If you will read the testimony of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and of the Chief of Staff of the Navy you will find there is a question in their minds, and a grave question, as to what effect this bill providing for the volunteer induction of 6 months' trainees in numbers between 100,000 to 250,000 will have on the 4-year enlistees which the Navy and the Air Force have so long acquired. They express a doubt that if this goes on and is poorly administered, as it might be, it will seriously affect volunteer enlistments in those two branches of the service. There can be no question but what it does each year dry up to the extent of 100,000 to 250,000 men, men who might otherwise be volunteer enlistees in the Air Force and in the Navy.

Here is the second thing that gives me concern about this bill. It is true that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Forces is still considering the matter. It is the fact it does not do anything to remedy this Nation's plight with regard to scientific and engineering personnel. It does not do a thing in that respect. I know that the gentleman from Maryland wants to ask a question,

but if he will let me go on I think I will cover it.

We had testimony before our committee that this Nation is presently producing 22,000 scientific and engineering personnel a year as against 54,000 being produced in Russia. All this bill does is to say that those who are employed in scientific and engineering pursuits essential to the national defense can volunteer for 6 months and thereby be taken away from essential defense work for 6 months. Is there any necessity for that?

Third, this bill further complicates the situation of American youth in planning their future. It just adds another bewildering, confusing alternative; and if you do not think it is bewildering and confusing, just read the terms of this bill. Shall he volunteer for 6 months? Shall he take a chance on being drafted? Shall he go to school and try to be deferred, then when he gets older be drafted for 2 years?

If you are going to have a scientific and engineering personnel, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has so ably told our committee, these boys must be able to plan their future, plan their education, plan their graduate work. We are woefully behind in scientific and engineering personnel.

Just what does this bill do, when you analyze it? The first way to analyze it is to note those who appeared in opposition. There appeared in opposition to this bill the Air Force Association, the Naval Reserve Association, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, all in opposition to the bill. The Air Force Reserves and the Naval Reserves say they want to continue the reserve system that is voluntary and they want no part of a compulsory reserve system. Read, if you will, the testimony of the Air Force and the Navy—lukewarm, very lukewarm, in their endorsement of this measure, an endorsement, I think I may say, because for almost a year I learned part of the politics I now possess over in the Pentagon, because it was part of a Pentagon arrangement between the services.

The title of this bill should be "A bill to build up the reserves of the Army," because neither the Navy nor the Air Force want any part of compulsory reserves, nor do they want any part of the 6 months' trainees.

The Navy and the Air Force need 4-year enlistees, and there is every reason in the world that they need those 4-year enlistees, after they have completed their training, because modern technological warfare requires that the Air Force and the Navy have these technical men in their Reserves and not just 6-month trainees. I believe that this bill will weaken rather than strengthen our reserve system. It is a bill primarily to build up the Army Reserve. Will it succeed? Who knows? How many young men 17 to 19 would volunteer to go in 6 months with a 7½-year Reserve obligation? If it does not work, what is the Army going to do? The next thing for the Army to do is to come in here, not to ask for universal military training—I do not use that word—but to come in here and ask this Congress to conscript 6-month trainees in the proper Reserve. And then what a story we will have. While we are conscripting young people for 6 months to go into the Army we will be drafting the young men living next door to him to go into the Army for 2 years.

Now, I believe that this legislation is in large measure not legislation but a complete delegation of our legislative authority to the Executive. In the first place, for the first time to my knowledge we are giving the President the unprecedented authority of calling up a million reservists without the consent of Congress. Prior to that, he could call up the Reserves, but Congress had to specify in what number.

Now, read the terms of the bill. It is a complete delegation of authority to the military. It gives them complete control over the lives of these youths. What of these 6-month trainees? It is noted in the bill that persons with critical skills engaged in critical defense supporting industries may be allowed to fulfill their military obligation by serving on active duty for training. Who determines that? The President, undoubtedly, through the military. Then it sets up a system of screening where you get a proper distribution of critical skills between military service and essential civilian service. Who determines that? The military again; not your local draft boards, but the military. Then, when you finally get the members of the Ready Reserve in the Standby Reserve, you flop over again and let the draft board determine how that Standby shall be screened.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Maine has advised the committee that he is opposed to this bill. Does he not think he is under obligation to advise the committee of a plan or what he proposes to do about it? What suggestion does the gentleman have to offer in lieu of this proposal?

Mr. NELSON. Well, I would say to my distinguished chairman, the illustrious gentleman from Georgia, that if the gentleman from Maine had had more than 10 minutes, now almost gone, he would certainly endeavor to answer his question.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and he had ample opportunity there in the committee to point out what should take the place of this program. I am not trying to be critical, but I would appreciate it, and the Congress would appreciate it, and the committee would be benefited if the gentleman would offer his alternative to this proposition.

Mr. NELSON. Well, there are a good many alternatives, I would say to my distinguished chairman. I would just suggest one to him that was suggested to me by the members of the National Guard. The National Guard feel that they could completely and adequately take care of this problem if their appropriation was increased and their quota increased to take care of this number of men, 100,000 a year. But the Army does not want them in the guard.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask the gentleman concerning the language on page 5 where it says three different times about what people may enlist or volunteer for this particular 6-month training. If the gentleman will refer to page 5, he will see that it says:

> Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may, within quotas—

And so forth. Then on line 12 it says:

> Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army * * * any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty—

And so forth. Then on line 20 it says:

> Any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve—

There are three different conditions. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] referred to a boy 17 to 19 years of age as being the only one eligible for this, and yet there are two other classifications of persons. Now, what applies?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will say this: If the gentleman will read those sentences very carefully and study them, as I did last night, he will find that they are entirely harmonious; that a young man 17 to 19, before the draft board gets behind him, can avail himself of this 6 months' volunteer program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, that is covered by the previous language, that any person can, but he does not have to be 17 to 19.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That means anyone 17 to 19, provided the draft board has not yet sent him notice.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will read the language beginning on line 16, he will see that it says:

> Any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training——

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That refers to those who are 17 to 19, as the gentleman will see when he studies the bill carefully.

Mr. HINSHAW. The next line reads—that is, line 20—

> who is under the age of 19 years.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then there is duplication of language there.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is some duplication, but it does not hurt the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am bringing up the question because I know these boys, and when they start reading this language and try to find out what it means, they are going to be confused, just as is the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana is not confused. He knows what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on many aspects of military legislation I defer to the experienced judgment of my colleagues in this House who, as members of the Armed Services Committee, the House Appropriations Armed Services Subcommittee, or the Government Operations Committee, have made these subjects a matter of extended and intensive study over the years. I expect to continue to do so, at least until I have acquired a great deal more experience and wisdom in this highly technical and specialized field than I now possess.

But from time to time legislative proposals in the military field also involve basic principles and issues of governmental philosophy important to all Americans, vitally related to our very form of government and directly affecting the lives, plans, and freedom of our citizens.

A Member of Congress—even a new Member—who addresses himself to such a subject does not thereby assume the role of technical expert but rather, it seems to me, meets a fundamental obligation as an elected Representative under our constitutional system.

I feel very strongly that the legislative subject involved in H. R. 5297, the national Reserve plan, partakes of this broad character and imposes this responsibility. I am impelled to speak because there is no issue before this present Congress which has brought to my desk as large a volume of correspondence from my district, both pro and con. I am further emboldened to speak on this subject by the fact that my deep interest in this matter had its genesis in my 3½ years' association with my distinguished and beloved predecessor, the late Congressman Paul W. Shafer, who served long and ably as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Let me preface my statement of views on this proposed legislation with a a rather elementary analysis of the problem before us.

We are dealing here with one facet of the broad problem of procuring needed manpower for the Armed Forces—in this case for the National Guard and a Ready Reserve. The proposal before us envisions a total Ready Reserve of approximately 2,900,000. I am not here concerned with any question as to the proposed size of this force but solely with the question of the proposed methods of military manpower procurement under this program.

Now, fundamentally, there are three methods of procuring military manpower, whether for active duty forces or for the Reserves—First, the voluntary method; second, the compulsory method; and, third, the threat-of-compulsion method.

Today the voluntary method of recruitment has become very limited and circumscribed in its operation due, of course, to the continuation of the draft with the factors of compulsion and threat-of-compulsion which this involves.

Once upon a time in American history all military manpower was recruited by the voluntary method. Today the only true and identifiable volunteers are the men who enlist or reenlist for military service—Active or Reserve—after having fulfilled their draft duty requirements.

The compulsory method of military manpower procurement is self-explanatory. It applies specifically to those whom General Hershey taps on the shoulder.

The ultimate application of this method occurs in wartime when all voluntary enlistments are arbitrarily suspended. The ultimate application of this method in peacetime would occur under a system of universal compulsory military training and/or service.

The third method of military manpower procurement—the threat-of-compulsion method—is something new so far as the nonwartime experience of the American people is concerned. It is the product of the carry-over of the draft into peacetime. This method can be described with equal accuracy as a quasi-voluntary method and as a quasi-compulsory method. It is a sort of twilight zone between absolute voluntarism and absolute compulsion. It is neither white nor black but gray.

With the extension of the draft law and the draft threat there exists a climate of compulsion which brings in enlistees without the formality of an induction order. Today's lowered draft quotas indicate that this is numerically the most productive source of military manpower at the present time.

I should note in this connection one subsidiary but nonetheless important fact. Undoubtedly under this threat-of-compulsion situation there are many young men who are bona fide but unrecognized true volunteers. These are the young men who would enter the service as a career even if there were no draft threat hanging over their heads but who, because of this existing threat, cannot actually be identified as true volunteers.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the existing climate of compulsion and threat-of-compulsion obscures the identity of these young men. It is particularly unfortunate that it also obscures the true numerical potential of a genuine voluntary method of military manpower procurement. This fact, of course, enables the advocate of the compulsory and threat-of-compulsion methods to argue that we are getting our present large number of enlistments only because the youth of America have General Hershey breathing down their necks.

Both historically and in the present operation of our miiltary manpower procurement system, there are varying shifts in emphasis on these several methods of manpower procurement. Sometimes these shifts are made by administrative decision and action, as, for example, by the raising or lowering of draft quotas.

But the initial, basic policy decisions—for example, application of the compulsion or threat-of-compulsion methods to some new area of military manpower procurement—these decisions are legislative. They require the concurrence of the Congress.

Today we are faced with just such a basic, legislative policy decision in the form of H. R. 5297.

Today we are being asked to make fundamental, far-reaching, precedent-breaking and precedent-setting shifts of emphasis and of authority to the compulsion and threat-of-compulsion methods in the manner of procuring military manpower for the National Guard and the Ready Reserve.

To be sure the shift is being attempted on an easy-stages, painless, noiseless, soft-pedal, blandly reassuring, rubber-caster basis. But it is a very real shift that is being undertaken. Moreover, there are some not so reassuring, not so noiseless, voices in the background which have plainly said that this is only a beginning.

Let me refer to just two such fundamental changes involved in this bill. And let me interpret these proposed changes in terms of this threefold method of military manpower procurement I have described.

The first major provision of this bill would give 100,000 to 250,000 predraft age youths annually the option and opportunity to enlist in the National Guard or Ready Reserve, undergo 6 months of active training, and then be deferred from the draft subject to satisfactory participation in regular training for an additional 7½ years. The training would involve 48 weekly drill periods a year and 2 weeks in an annual training camp or, in lieu thereof, 30 days in an annual training camp. Failure to maintain training would make the enlistee liable to induction for 2 years active duty. While ostensibly applicable to all branches of the service, the bulk of the enlistees—99 percent—would be assigned to the Army Ready Reserves after their initial 5 months training.

This, of course, is an extension and application to the National Guard and the Ready Reserves of the threat-of-compulsion method of recruitment.

This has been facetiously described as a "bargain basement" deal for young men who face the draft threat. I am not so sure of the accuracy of that description.

I think it is a more accurate and forthright description to say that this is an opportunity for these young men to take their compulsion on the installment plan, with a downpayment of 6 months' active duty for training; with a 7½ year mortgage on their time, plans and freedom after the downpayment; with regular weekly and annual installments, and finally, with an unconscionably large forfeiture clause—2 years of compulsory active duty—for failure, anywhere along the line, to keep up on the installment payments.

There may be some honest differences of opinion as to just how great a bargain this really is.

Now I want to be entirely fair and realistic about this particular proposal and the problem that it is designed to solve.

I fully realize that there are problems of military manpower procurement for the Ready Reserves, and particularly so far as the Army's Ready Reserve is concerned.

I do not question the desirability and need for an Army Ready Reserve, provided its size is kept within sound and realistic limits and provided it is not a universal military training program in disguise.

I am not prepared to dispute the value of some period of preparatory basic training for men who are to enter the Ready Reserves. I belong to the old Civilian Military Training Camp era.

Moreover, while I prefer the genuinely voluntary method of recruiting manpower for the Ready Reserves, I would favor an optional enlistment in this program under threat of draft compulsion over any form of outright compulsory recruitment for the Ready Reserves.

Accordingly, I have no basic objection to offering the prospective draftee some type of optional enlistment in the Ready Reserves in lieu of draft induction and with a requirement that he maintain training standards in the Reserves. I understand this is now done with respect to National Guard recruits.

On the other hand, I question very seriously the necessity or wisdom of extending this period of obligated training for as long as 7½ years.

I say all of this, however, with three very important reservations. These reservations are so important in my mind that I am unable and unwilling to vote for this proposal at this time.

The first reservation is based on the fact that the bill originally submitted by the Pentagon called for compulsory drafting of men for the Ready Reserves if the optional-enlistment method failed to provide the quotas set for the Ready Reserves.

I congratulate the Armed Services Committee for its wisdom in striking out this provision.

However, I am well aware that the Army can be expected to come back next year, or the year after, with the report that the optional-enlistment plan has not worked and with the demand that they be given authority to draft. I am sure that a great many of the Armed Services Committee and of this House have the same opinion, and I am sure, I regret to say, that the Army will see to it that the optional-enlistment plan does not work because they want to extend the compulsory method of manpower recruitment to the National Guard and Ready Reserves. Their dream of universal military training dies hard.

There is a second very important reservation in my mind so far as this particular proposal is concerned. I have in mind that the Navy and Air Force have indicated no compelling need or desire for this particular feature, apparently because they are finding that the voluntary and optional-enlistment method of manpower recruitment is working successfully so far as their Reserve procurement needs are concerned.

I also have in mind the fact that some grave misgivings were expressed by Navy and Air Force witnesses that this proposal for optional enlistments for training only might seriously compete and conflict with their own programs of long-term enlistments. Obviously there is more than one side to the issue, even in the minds of many of the military.

I have still another very important reservation so far as this particular proposal is concerned. I have been amazed and shocked by the charges made by responsible and knowledgeable Members of this House that the Army has not really tried to build up its Ready Reserves and has not really tried to make methods of military manpower procurement, other than compulsory or threat-of-compulsion methods, really succeed.

In saying this I have in mind the statement of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] in this House only last Wednesday during debate on the Defense Department appropriation bill:

> It is of great concern to this committee that no really workable Reserve program has been brought forward in all the years since World War II. The committee has seriously wondered on many occasions whether there is a real interest in and appreciation for the Reserves among many of the professional soldiers who dominate the thinking in the Pentagon.

And Mr. SIKES went on to point out that—

> Reserves are pushed around in little ways—denied promotions, denied even the right to participate in study courses after the age of 45. Heretofore they have been denied the right of weekend drills. Our committee assumed that a quirk in the law was at fault, but found that there simply had been no implementation of regulations to permit weekend training of Reserves.

I have in mind also that this charge was repeated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] during their able discussion of this bill last Sunday on the television program Both Sides of the Aisle.

I have in mind the apologetic "Maybe we haven't done as well as we should, but we will promise to try to do better" note in the testimony of Defense and Army Department witnesses before the Armed Services subcommittee.

Further, I have in mind the statement made before the subcommittee by our distinguished former colleague, retired Maj. Gen. Melvin A. Maas, of the United States Marine Corps, that "90 percent of the question of whether we are going to have an effective Ready Reserves is not the amendments to the laws we are passing, but it is a question of whether we are going to have actual facilities and a real training program."

I have in mind General Maas' testimony that "in the areas where there are adequate facilities, proper leadership and real training programs, you have waiting lists" for the Reserves.

I have particularly in mind that in answer to a specific question by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] as to whether he included the Army in that statement, General Maas replied emphatically in the affirmative and stated that in places where the Army does have the facilities, programs and leadership they are getting results.

I have in mind, finally, the question asked Col. Robert J. Philpott, president of the Active Duty Reservists Association, by my esteemed friend, the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SHORT] and Colonel Philpott's reply:

> Mr. SHORT. If an honest, eager, sincere, determined effort had been made to implement the Reserve laws or even administer it as Congress had passed them, we wouldn't be in the awful predicament we are today?
>
> Colonel PHILPOTT. Not at all.

Now, just to keep the record straight and our perspective accurate, permit me to recall another occasion when this lack of a reserve program was a subject of similar complaint and of similar promises to do better.

This was also before the House Armed Services Committee, on January 24, 1951, and the witness was Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg.

In response to a question from the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] as to what specific proposal is there at this time by the Department of Defense for strengthening the Reserves? Mrs. Rosenberg replied:

> We will come up in no later than 6 months with a plan on an improved Reserve. We are very conscious that every time we have asked for something we have always given a thought to the so-called improved Reserve, but never set a deadline on which we would submit this.

Army plans and promises to do something really effective with or for the Reserves, like old soldiers, apparently never die—but they sure do fade away.

What, incidentally, is the Army's present plan for effective operation of the Ready Reserves it will acquire, or have the power to acquire, under this bill if it is enacted?

Or will this plan, too, fade away—and be followed by a new and urgent demand for full power of compulsion in this area of military manpower procurement?

A second provision of this bill I wish to mention briefly is the totally new requirement that all veterans of 2-year draft service and 2- to 4-year enlistment service, who began their service on or after July 27, 1953, must remain in the Ready Reserves and follow through on a compulsory program of weekly drills and annual camp training for at least 1 to 3 years additional. Failure to maintain training would result in recall for 45 days active duty and possibly additional years of obligation.

This is a totally new extension and application of the outright compulsory method of military manpower procurement to the National Guard and Ready Reserves. It is a totally new extension and application of the compulsory method to men completing regular draft or enlisted service.

I know it is denied that this is really new. I know it is alleged that there already exists in the law a statutory period of military obligation and that men can be compelled to continue training under this provision. That, I might add, was another one of those easy-

stages, painless, noiseless, rubber-caster propositions.

Actually, however, no attempt has been made to implement this generality and it has been conceded that it was unrealistic and impractical to do so under the broad generalities of the present law.

But that attempt is being made right here and now in this bill.

That is something new—and do not let anybody tell you different. Above all, I would respectfully advise you not to try to tell the returning veteran, subject to this added compulsion, that it is not something new.

The strange thing about this provision is that it has the support of many of those who have complained the loudest about equity of service and about veterans being required to perform double duty.

Aside from the inequity this imposes on the veterans, consider for a moment what this provision means in its broadest aspects.

It means, first of all, that hereafter, and for the duration of this law, every man serving in the Armed Forces for any period up to 4 years, either through draft induction or enlistment, will or may be compelled to continue military training for as much as 3 years after completion of his active duty service.

Consider also, what this provision does to those branches of the Armed Forces, particularly the Navy and Air Force, which have developed active and successful volunteer Reserve programs and which have sold returning veterans on voluntary enlistment and participation in these Reserve programs.

The method and spirit of compulsion is being arbitrarily imposed upon these services and these veterans. These services are being told, "You cannot have the voluntary system." And the veterans of these services are being told, "You cannot volunteer." All because compulsion is now the order of the day. What a farce. What a tragedy.

I revert to the premise with which I began these remarks.

We are dealing here today with a legislative proposal in the military field which, above and beyond its complex technical aspects, involves basic principles and issues vitally affecting our very form of government and directly touching the lives of our citizens. I earnestly hope that it will be viewed in that broader perspective.

The growing power of government over our lives, the growing encroachment of government upon the affairs and plans of young Americans, and above all the increasing careless and lazy reliance upon the methods of compulsion or threat of compulsion, which restrict and narrow down the freedom of Americans to do what they wish and can with their own lives, ought, it seems to me, to be a matter of the gravest concern to all of us.

I fully realize the difficulties faced by those who, well aware of the dangers of which I speak, must still grapple with the practical problems of building and maintaining adequate defense.

I fully realize the necessity of maximum reliance upon compulsory methods in time of all-out war—as, I am sure, do the American people generally.

I accept the fact that we still have the draft law—with its factors of compulsion and threat of compulsion.

But I also believe that we are far from exhausting the voluntary methods of military manpower recruitment—that, in some areas, we have not even begun to exploit these methods.

I believe that all too often those who today are urging optional recruitment under threat of compulsion have in mind that this is a step to their goal of outright reliance upon compulsion, and that they are accepting and urging it only on this basis.

And I believe that the methods of compulsion are a deceptively simple and lazy way of dealing with problems—a method which is no cure-all to the problems and which can enervate and destroy the freedom, initiative and creativeness which is the secret of America's greatness.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to register my objections to this bill and state that I intend to vote to recommit it.

I think it is rather difficult to discuss comprehensive legislation of this nature in 5 minutes, but maybe I can point out my objections by referring to a paragraph in the committee's report on page 10. It is the sixth paragraph down. I am going to read it:

> In the development of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, it was anticipated that the Ready Reserve would become a well organized and highly trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was believed that men with a statutory obligation in the Ready Reserve would participate in voluntary training in order to establish eligibility for transfer to the less vulnerable Standby Reserve. Such has not been the case; this incentive provision alone has not produced the desired result.

Of course, an incentive provision alone cannot produce the desired results, if those in charge of trying to make it work are not sincerely going about making it work. I submit that the present bill is no more than the previous one. It is again an incentive provision, and I happen to agree with the statement that this is not a UMT bill. In my judgment, it is not. It is not compulsory. It is the same type of thing, however, of providing an incentive. I recognize it as a very serious charge when I say that the Pentagon has not tried to make this previous system work. However, you can judge it this way. I am speaking mainly of the United States Army because the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are not particularly interested in this. It is mainly the Army's portion and the enlisted men's Reserve that has not been functioning and has not been working. Those who are in charge of the Reserve program in St. Louis, Mo., said that they never had a field rank officer of the Regular Army come down there one time to try to find out what their difficulties were in making the Reserve program function. That same kind of information comes from all over the country. Of course, if the top ranking men in the Army are not going to pay attention to these things, it cannot work because incentive alone will not do the job.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill is intended to carry out the terms of the reserve act of 1952 from which the gentleman has just quoted. It will implement it and assist the Pentagon and others in charge in making it work as it should work.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, but in my judgment I have not noticed in the hearings any indication or explanation from the standpoint of the high-ranking men in the Pentagon of why this system did not work and what they had been doing to make it work.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I would like to note that I absolutely know that as far as the present people are concerned, every effort will be made to make this reserve program work. I would like to point out this other distinction, too, which occurs to me as I listen to the gentleman, as I always do with interest and understanding. The Reserves, as we have known them heretofore, have been made up of boys who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. To my mind, we are undertaking by this bill to create an entirely different group who come into the Reserve to be essentially the Reserve of the country. They come in voluntarily and get 6 months' training and not 2 or 3 or 4 years. Then they are under compulsion to participate in the required activities of their Reserve unit. So it seems to me we have here a much better prospect for an active, functioning ready and alert Reserve than we have ever had heretofore.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I point out to the gentleman there are many other aspects of this bill, and for other reasons I am afraid this program, as has already been pointed out in the judgment of some, is going to make it a great deal worse rather than better. I was pointing to the key of the situation, and the key is this: Until the military establishment comes before the Committee on Armed Services and explains in detail why a particular program which has been made law has not worked and what they have been doing to make it work, we are going to get nowhere. We can legislate again next year, and I expect they will be in here next year saying, "Well, we told you this would not work and it has not." And there we will go again. I think we have to dig into these things a little bit more to find out what we are trying to do.

The basic question I raised back in 1951 during the debate on the original Vinson UMT bill still remains unanswered. You talk of training, and throughout the committee's report on this bill there is reference to training, but nowhere is there attention paid to what we mean by training. The word training to have significance must reveal what we are training for.

Now I ask just what are the skills the United States Army needs in order to

be able to fight a modern war. Are they just combat skills as the term military training suggests? The answer, of course, is that they are by no means just combat skills. As a matter of fact any cursory study of the matter reveals that over half, and I estimate as high as 80 percent, of the skills used by the military establishment in World War II and needed today to fight a modern war are skills which have their counterpart in our civilian economy. There is nothing military about operating a bulldozer, repairing a truck, running a typewriter, keeping track of stock or painting a building.

I have quoted General Hershey's statement several times before to illustrate the Pentagon point of view. He said in effect the civilian skills are largely of no value to the Military Establishment, in fact they are somewhat detrimental because the military has to untrain them and then retrain them. Now this statement may be largely true when applied to combat skills and if combat skills were what the military needed his statement would have some meaning. But his statement I suggest is only 20 percent true. It is 80 percent untrue, and applied to the 80 percent civilian type skills the military may have need for it is terribly in error.

The Reserve program is based upon training, but the training is largely for civilian type skills for which the Military Establishment has no need to concern itself about other than to make certain that these skills exist in sufficient quantity in the civilian society so that they will be available to the military at such time as they might need them. That is the very essence of a real Reserve program.

Unfortunately, the statement quoted from the President's message to the Congress on January 13, 1955—page 5 of the committee report: "In the same period, exhaustive studies have been made on manpower—the key to proper military posture," cannot be substantiated. Far from exhaustive studies being made on the subject we are just beginning to make these studies and the Military Establishment has done little along these lines. What studies there are have been made in the past 2 or 3 years by the National Manpower Council working at Columbia University with the human resources project study. The preliminary studies published by the National Manpower Council and the Columbia study group all state one basic thing, the studies are just beginning to get into the meat of the matter.

Now until we get down to brass tacks and start treating this entire matter with the respect it deserves we are going to continue to get nowhere fast. There is no sense in the Military Establishment setting up a complete duplicate vocational educational system within the military departments. Instead they should avail themselves of the present very fine vocational education system with its schools, classrooms, teachers presently available. The cost of training a bulldozer operator through the civilian means is one-tenth the cost of the military doing it and you end up with a better bulldozer operator through the less costly system to boot.

Again I say until we do a job analysis of the skills the military needs we will get nowhere. It is time we stopped this talk of military training and asked ourselves just how many of the men in uniform will be expected to have combat skills and direct our military training to this group.

Nor will I buy this talk that all men need some combat training. This is a generality that cannot be backed up by any realistic look at the matter of modern warfare.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I must disagree with my chairman [Mr. BROOKS] in one statement that he made, that this is an administration bill. I have had a number of Members ask me why I opposed this bill. I did fight all the way through the 8 weeks' hearings against the administration bill that was supported by the Defense Department as originally submitted. We had under consideration in committee the original bill that placed compulsion on approximately 100,000 of these boys, with 10 years' Reserve service, not 8. And in that bill they could have given a discharge other than honorable, to prior servicemen who had served this country faithfully for 2 years or 4 years, but who did not actively participate to the satisfaction of the military in the Reserve organization. No Member of this House would oppose that bill stronger than I.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is not a bill that was sent to us. The gentleman will say that the bill had the support of the Defense Department, the White House, the President, and all of the patriotic organizations, and many others.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Exactly so. What I want to call attention to is this: If you read the 2,300 pages of testimony that we had in the subcommittee, you do not even get testimony for or against the bill which is before you today. Most of those witnesses testified for the original bill or against the original bill. I believe we have cut out the features which were objectionable to most of the witnesses on the original bill. For fear that we might have a bill that I could not support, I offered H. R. 4848 as a plan that I thought would be better than this, but if this bill were amended to 4 months' training, and the total 8-year obligation reduced to 5 years and the compulsory feature of 45 days for prior servicemen deleted, it would largely do what my bill offered to do. Therefore, I am supporting this bill.

In the full committee I offered a motion to cut out the 45-day compulsion against prior servicemen, but that motion was defeated. But let me say this about compulsion in this bill, it is nothing like as severe as the penalty against prior servicemen under the present law. In brief, the opposition I find to this bill, most people believe it is UMT, or that we on the Committee on Armed Services have endorsed the Pentagon bill. The fight was rather close in the subcommittee. Those of us who did not agree with these unreasonable requirements won most of the decisions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement, because as a matter of fact this bill was really a bill written by a discussion among the members of the subcommittee themselves. One of the things that the gentleman who is now addressing the committee urged, especially my friend from Mississippi, was that we should take out the compulsion, and not compel any man to serve who had served in the Armed Forces and had an honorable discharge. We discussed many of the features pro and con, and I think we have as workable a bill as you can get, with the diverse opinion that is obtained with this type legislation.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think Mr. Burgess did a great job to the various Departments of Defense to even agree on the general objective. I never heard as much testimony in my life that agreed on a general objective. But very few agencies or individuals agreed on methods of obtaining these objectives. No doubt every Member of this House believes it is necessary that we build a stronger Reserve than we now have. I could spend my entire time condemning and criticizing the Military Establishment myself, because I do not believe they have done all they could in order to build a Reserve. But that is not the question. Where do we stand today? We stand with a paper Reserve, regardless of what they tell you. If it had not been for World War II and the Korean war and the experience our men have had, we would have had practically no Reserve except a paper Reserve. I am convinced it is essential to strengthen the Reserve.

Now, what does this bill do? It imposes nothing more exacting than is already imposed, but it does grant additional opportunities for young men to volunteer in Reserve organizations, and fulfill their military obligations through a new type of program, strictly upon a volunteer basis.

Let me say that I supported UMT; I would support it today, but you cannot pass it. I say, however, to you who have opposed UMT that you would be far better off today if you took the American Legion plan, which is a UMT bill, than you would to put compulsion in the bill as it came from the Pentagon.

But I want to assure you again today that there is not a UMT and I cannot see, to save my soul, how a man can oppose this bill since it is amended to make a more workable solution for building our Reserves. As I said, it takes nothing away from anyone, it imposes little hardship upon anyone, and the military tell us they need 100,000 of the 6-month trainees each year for the next 4 years.

Our manpower pool, according to General Hershey, is close to 1,500,000 men subject to 1-A classification. We will

have approximately a million men coming into the 1-A group each year for the next 4 years. I am concerned about this, and I followed this point all the way through the hearings with practically every witness that we had: I could not quite subscribe to letting a man come in voluntarily for 6 months, and another man be forced in by the draft for 2 years. That is not good, but as the law now stands and under present conditions every young man faces the draft for 2 years and that alone adds nothing to the effectiveness of our Active Reserve strength.

If we get involved in a global war a strong Reserve is absolutely essential. If we stay out of war we must have a strong Ready Reserve force, established to protect us and give us the security we need. In my opinion without a strong Reserve we cannot have security. As to whether or not they will make it work I do not know. This is a task for the Army. The Air Force does not expect to use it. The Navy tells us they do not expect to use it. The Marine Corps testified they would accept 1,000 of the 100,000. But this bill provides that each branch of the service, should they fall short of what they now plan to do, may use this bill.

Let me say another thing, that in the case of the National Guard, under a similar program, approximately 30,000 men a year volunteered into the regular service from the National Guard. If you will make this attractive and permit these young men to go into this training program for 6 months, and the military will use any commonsense at all, this can and will be an effective program. If they would go to these youngsters who have had the training, give them a pat on the back, and say, "Young man, you show ability, but over in our Reserve service we will give you additional training," they would create an attractive atmosphere. I contend that a little commonsense from military leaders with the legislation we now have, and even without the provisions of this bill, we could go very far toward establishing a good Reserve organization.

So I shall support the bill even though it does not comply with my full desires or my opinion as to the best way to do it. I am sure this is the opinion of the men who have studied the military program and the Reserve program as I have for 12 years—and some of our committee members much longer. We must do something to build a Reserve that we do not have but that we must have.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman said that in the existing law the penalties are greater than they are in this bill.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Under the present law they are subject to trial in Federal court with a penalty, upon conviction, of 5 years imprisonment or $10,000 fine, or both.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman think that although the penalty in the present bill is somewhat lesser that it is equally obnoxious?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I offered an amendment to strike this compulsion out, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. On this question of whether or not you can issue an order that can be carried out—under the provisions of this bill of course we allow them screening and a certain flexibility of the Ready Reserves, but they have obligations, they can give an order and carry it out.

Under the present law, with the screening out that is involved, you would have every Tom, Dick, and Harry who got out of the military service subject to be called into the Regular service.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is right.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The Defense Department realizes that and that is one of the reasons they could not go for it.

Mr. WINSTEAD. This is much more practical than the penalties you now have.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In mentioning the groups that intend to use the bill, the gentleman overlooked the Coast Guard.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes; the Coast Guard. They are anxious for the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They want 2,000 the first year. I want to say in reference to the Army and the Navy and the Air Force that we put in provision for enlistment into the Reserve, to be followed by 2 years' active duty and training in the active establishment, especially for the Navy and the Air Force. They need that very badly.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The Navy can continue with the same Reserve program they have, even if we pass this bill, and they have done a good job. I think the Air Force will fall flat on what they claim they will do. The Air National Guard is the strongest arm the Air Reserve has. Now they do not want anybody except men who have had 4 years of service. The Air Force may have none but commissioned officers and master sergeants. They have agreed and this bill provides that they must use these trainees if they cannot meet their quotas under their plan. We give them a chance to try it. In other words they can do about what they want to do. This bill provides the machinery for each of them for reserves. Frankly, I think I will offer an amendment to this bill, or suggest to the chairman of the committee that he appoint a subcommittee with an adequate staff that will follow this from day to day and see that they try to make this bill work.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman that we cannot build the security of the future on the mistakes of yesterday. I would like to have the gentleman's reaction to see if he may not agree with me, that the Pentagon is so afraid and ashamed of what they have done in its massacre of the Reserve system that they will use every possible means to make this thing work successfully.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think some of them will, but I cannot say that for all of them. I hope they will.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman tell me why the provision for a National Security Training Commission has been limited?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I may say that provision, if I remember correctly, was stricken from the bill. It has no actual connection or reference to any part of this bill. So, to clarify the situation, on the subject of UMT, it was deleted.

Mr. DEVEREUX. May I answer the question? We are charging the Defense Department with the training of these men and, therefore, we do not want to have split authority or have a civilian commission, which it is, going into the various phases in which they are not qualified.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would not the gentleman say that Admiral Kinkaid, a former commander of the American Legion, and Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, as members of this Commission are qualified to comment?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would say those particular ones are, but you would have others. Then you would have to build this up.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is 4 out of 5 who are qualified.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Only three.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Julius Ochs Adler is another well-known Reserve officer.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is arguing for a split authority, two lines of authority, for the Army personnel. I do not think we have great reason for setting up a commissar system in our military composed of civilians. My distinguished colleague from California has mentioned and referred to certain men who are able, but they will not be here all the time. It would set up a commissar system.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I would just like to conclude by saying this, that I did not have my way totally, but I had quite a little say, and I and those who shared my opinion in the subcommittee got considerable consideration. Let me repeat, there is no UMT here. This bill was not drawn by the Pentagon. It can do no harm to anyone. It imposes no hardship upon anybody. It gives additional opportunities to young men of this country if it is to their advantage, as long as the quota will permit, to volunteer their services in a Reserve component, train 6 months, return to their homes as students, attending their schools and churches, and engage in their active participation in a Reserve unit. I can personally see no reason to oppose that type of legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will go through with his idea of setting up some kind of commission check on our Reserve program. The

gentleman has studied the Reserve program for 12 years, and he well knows the reason we did not have any Reserve: First, because the people running the Reserve did not want a Reserve. They could have a Reserve today without this bill before us. The gentleman from Maryland says that we have heard criticism of the military today. I doubt whether there is anybody who has greater admiration for our military than I, but no one is more critical of them than I so far as our Reserve is concerned.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman from Texas, whom I consider one of the most solid Members of this House. I appreciate the comments of one with such an outstanding war record. I do not believe there is too much difference in the way we feel about the need for a Reserve program and the best way to accomplish this. The gentleman has himself submitted a bill on this subject, which is indicative of sound thinking on his part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have ever opposed a bill reported out of a committee of which I was a member. I do find it necessary to oppose this bill.

In this debate much has been said as to the dangerous world conditions. No one denies that. Much has been said as to the need of a strong Reserve. No one denies that.

Now, as for the need for a strong national defense, every Member of this body is for a strong defense. Every person here is for a strong, capable Reserve. The exact number needed in our Reserve is a matter of opinion, but every one of us here is interested in having a defense that can adequately take care of the needs of the United States. So, I am not going to take up your time repeating facts to which we all agree. I am, however, going to try to explain to you in the brief time allotted to me how this bill, instead of helping provide for a Reserve, will absolutely defeat the chance of providing a satisfactory Reserve.

First, what does this bill do? Of course, in the bill we have the usual platitudes about the intent of the bill. That is always said in favor of any bill. Second, we provide for creating a home guard in case the National Guard is called into active duty, which is really no part of this bill. The Committee on Armed Services could report out a bill to provide for a home guard at any time.

So, what is this bill? First, the Navy says they cannot use it. The Air Force says they cannot use it. Today, without this bill, any man between the ages of 17 and 18½, physically qualified, can enlist in a branch of the Reserves. I am going to specifically mention the National Guard, because the National Guard today is decidedly the strongest branch of our organized Reserves, and I believe the real reason for that is because the States have something to do with the National Guard. I think if the National Guard were exposed entirely to the Pentagon without the help of the individual States they would be in the same position as the organized Reserves. Today, the young man between the age of 17 and 18½ can enlist in the National Guard, and if the draft bill this body passed the other day becomes law, at the age of 26, his military obligation will be fulfilled. The National Guard has been able to meet every quota ever assigned to it and is doing so today. But if this bill becomes law, that man has got to take 6 months' training before he can even be a member of the National Guard or any other organized Reserve unit. It becomes far more difficult than it now is to become a member of an organized Reserve unit. Some of us have tried to get the compulsory time in this cut down to 4 months or 3 months, but the Pentagon was adamant in their stand that we must have 6 months. I do not know whether the Pentagon deliberately wanted to make it more difficult to build up a Reserve. It is difficult for me to understand why the Pentagon wants more training before a person can enlist in a Reserve unit than they have for a person entering the regular service.

Today a soldier entering the Regular service is given 8 weeks' basic training and 8 weeks' secondary training. Four months in all. That is what it takes today to train a man to go into a Regular unit. It only takes 4 months and yet they demand 6 months before a man can even commence training in a Reserve unit. This will destroy the organized Reserve.

During World War II basic training at times was fixed at 13 weeks.

I am and always have been for a strong Reserve. The first time I took military training was at the age of 18 years and I have been active in the Reserve from that date to this. I want to repeat this for the record: If we pass this bill and it becomes law, a year from the day it becomes law we will have less members in the National Guard than we will have when the law becomes operative. Is that the way to build up the Reserves to 3 million?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman knows that there is a provision in the bill to guarantee the full strength of the National Guard. We have pledged to guarantee the National Guard full strength.

Mr. BRAY. That is just the same as if I were to make a pledge to pay a million dollars. I have not got it; neither will the Pentagon be able to provide the men. Where are they going to get the men? Sure, they make a pledge to take care of the guard. They will do anything to get this bill through. Furthermore, the only person who is going to be forced into this program is the veteran who has already had 2, 3, or 4 years of service. It has been mentioned in this debate that the American Legion favors this bill. Perhaps they do believe that this bill may be a step in the right direction. However, a careful study of the American Legion bill and this bill will show that there is a slight similarity. The American Legion—and for that matter other veterans' organizations—want a Reserve program that will protect the veteran from again being called into service. Under this program the only person who is forced into a Reserve program is the veteran who has already served 2, 3, or 4 years. I am a strong supporter of the American Legion and I am active in its work, and I am certain we can get a better bill than this one.

I wish to read what Mr. Seaborn P. Collins, commander of the American Legion, said in the hearings on this bill, which statement is found on page 1987:

> The one big roadblock to an effective Reserve is the absence of a training program that would feed into Reserve units qualified replacements for the veterans of active military service.
>
> The present system requires that a few men carry the whole burden of national defense. It selects 1 man out of 4 for 2 or more years of active service, then obligates him to further training in the Reserves while requiring neither service nor training of the other 3.
>
> The unfairness of this double-duty requirement was dramatically demonstrated during the war in Korea. More than 800,000 World War II veterans were called back to active duty to fight that war. Two and a half million men, who had reached military age after VJ-Day and had not trained or served a single day in the uniform of their country, were left at home.

This bill is absolutely against what Commander Collins wanted. This is the situation you are going to have under this bill. The man who has already served 2, or 3, or 4 years is the only man who will be forced to take this program. They say that he will not be forced, that there will be no court-martial. I asked at the hearing what they will do with that man if he does not take the weekly training that they tell him to and they said, "Well, we will work out a program so that he can go for 30 days of summer training."

I asked, "If he does not go for 30 days of summer training, what then?"

They said, "Well, we will give him military orders for 45 days."

I said, "If he does not go, then what?"

"He will be tried under the Uniform Code of Military Justice."

That means a general court-martial and the penalty is whatever a court may direct. And then you say that you are not forcing that veteran of 2, or 3, or 4 years of service to take this training. If that is not compulsion, what is it? He is the only man who is forced into this deal, the veteran of 2, or 3, or 4 years.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that those people have enlisted voluntarily and assumed that obligation; and if they have assumed that obligation, why should they not be required to carry out their obligation.

Mr. BRAY. Just one moment; the gentleman misunderstands me. I was not saying that at all. The man who takes the 6 months' training and then later does not carry out his obligation certainly should be forced to do so. I am talking about the man who is drafted

today, who is serving his 2 years but who, when he gets out, is going to be forced into this. You say that by present law he is forced to do this. Perhaps that is true. But the military has never tried to enforce that. I do not know why, but perhaps they want us to restate that power, give them that power again. But they say they already have it. Maybe they failed to use it, the same way they have never tried to build up a Reserve.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] said, some members of the Department of Defenses have tried to make the Reserve program effective; I will admit that and they certainly deserve our praise. But I will say that this work has been futile, because others sabotaged their work.

I believe the National Guard is strong because the National Guard, as I see it, is assisted by the State and there is a certain State pride there. Any of the Members who have been officers in the service know this, you can make good soldiers out of persons who may not want to be soldiers, but when they take them and put them in a camp and keep them there 24 hours a day, 30 days a month, 12 months a year, they can make soldiers out of them. But a Reserve who you only have for training a couple of hours a day presents a different situation. However, by this bill you propose to force this man who has already served 2, 3, or 4 years to drill weekly or otherwise train. He is the only one forced to take this training. As for new enlistees you are making it far more difficult for him to get into a Reserve unit. He must train for 6 months before he can even be a member of a Reserve unit.

As for this man of 2, 3, or 4 years' service that you are forcing to train, you only have him 2 hours a week, everybody else having 6 days and 22 hours a week of his time. You know what that man is going to do. He will discourage and cause discontent among the new enlistees who are interested and want to make good. It will demoralize the entire program.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that in the National Guard if a man does not participate he is subject to compulsion by the State law?

Mr. BRAY. Certainly, and he should be. He has enlisted in that Guard and he should carry out the obligations of the Guard. I do not want any milktoast type in the Guard or the Army. In the tanks we expected men to keep their obligation and I know the Marines did, too.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman said the Air Force and Navy were not going to use this bill if it did become law.

Mr. BRAY. That is correct.

Mr. AYRES. It was practically all for the Army?

Mr. BRAY. Practically all.

Mr. AYRES. What would be the effect if we changed the present law and permitted a man to serve only 2 years in the Army, and still be subject to the rules that exist under present law?

Mr. BRAY. I do not quite know what the situation would be there. I am not trying to say that the National Guard or the Reserve is trained as good as it should be. I have never seen the unit yet that has been trained as good as it should be. Much can be accomplished in 3 months' training, which is more than you had in the replacement training centers getting men ready to go into a unit that was to go into battle. Three months is all they had. Three months' training would take only one summer between the junior and senior years of high school, or the year after they got out of high school. Our American youth is our greatest asset. We should do all to help him in life instead of retarding him.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recognize the gentleman is a very good student of military problems and has a tremendous war record, but regarding the 6-month period, it seems that General Walsh, who talks for the National Guard of the United States, said that was entirely satisfactory to the Guard.

Mr. BRAY. I want to repeat exactly what General Walsh said. He said, as I recall, they would prefer 4 months. I had many conversations with General Walsh on this matter, because I am deeply interested in having a strong Reserve. I believe if this bill is defeated we can go back and pass a bill to help get a good Reserve, instead of injuring the Reserve.

As to this 6-month training in the bill you are not training a man to be a finished soldier, you are merely training him to enter into a Reserve organization and continue his training. I have even seen some pretty creditable soldiers turned out in 1 month of training. The 3 months of training would not wreck anyone's life. I am not saying we have a perfect Reserve. We can improve it a good deal. That is what I want to do. But I do not want legislation that will prevent the Guard from reaching its quota. I am just as interested in the other branches of the Reserves as I am of the National Guard. The members of the Organized Reserve are just as capable as are the members of the Guard. The difference is that one of them has the State backing. The guard has done a good job, and the other units of the Organized Reserve would do a good job. I want to see them have the same rights as the guard has.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. When this program was first presented to some of us I wondered particularly about the equality of obligation that would be involved in this Reserve service. In other words, it has always been my idea that if we have some sort of training Reserve program along with Selective Service there should not be too much discrimination against the man who comes in for the 2, 3, or 4 years. Does the gentleman feel that if you further reduce the time that the man coming into the service must serve and otherwise lessen the obligations that now exist against him, he would still have that equality of obligation that I think we certainly would all want in these troublesome times when we have to do so many things we do not like to do?

Mr. BRAY. Are you aware that at the present time a person can enlist in the National Guard at 18 years of age and he will not be called into service unless his unit is called out? That is the law today. This bill does not provide anything that we do not have today except that you are making the man serve 6 months' time before he can even be a member of the National Guard, which he would be able to do today without that training. Few people are aware that that is the law today, and has been for a long time.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am sure the gentleman, from his experience in the military service, will recognize the fact that a man who goes into the National Guard, as he does today, without any prior basic training, is not a good man and that does interfere with the National Guard program. That is one reason why when the National Guard is called to active duty, they have to go through this great amount of training.

Mr. BRAY. I am very familiar with that situation. I was not in the Guard before the war, but I did take command of a unit of the National Guard just before World War II started. I am not trying to say that their training is perfect, but I am trying to say that the same training that you gave a basic before he entered the unit, ready for combat in World War II, certainly should be sufficient training to put a man into a unit of the National Guard or the Organized Reserve.

Mr. BROWNSON. I am curious about this matter. On page 16 of the report, we find the statement that during the entire period of more than 2 years that the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 has been in effect, the Ready Reserve has exceeded the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000, and it gives us the Ready Reserve as 2,500,000 at the present time. If this Ready Reserve has constantly exceeded its statutory ceiling—is the problem getting more Reserves in at the bottom or doing something to train the Reserves in the program now?

Mr. BRAY. At the present time the name Ready Reserve means nothing. What we would like to do is to make the Ready Reserve mean something. If you pass this law, you will be passing a bill that will deter people from enlisting in it. I have talked to, I believe, 12 battery and company commanders of the National Guard and asked them what their enlistments would be if the enlistees were forced to have a 6 months' training period before they could enlist. Every one of them, without exception, said it would absolutely ruin enlistments in the Guard.

In conclusion, I would like to state that the issue in this bill is not whether we

want a capable Reserve of sufficient strength. All of us desire that. The question is whether this bill before the House gives us a capable Reserve such as we desire. I have tried to point out that instead of bringing new youth into the Reserve, that this bill will discourage enlistments in the Reserve, for while today they can enlist without prior military training, if this bill becomes law, the youth who desire to enter the Guard or any other Reserve unit, must first complete 6 month's military training, which is far more than the Army has at the present time, or ever has had, in preliminary training before entering a regular unit. This 6 month's service which is required before a person can enter a Reserve unit, cannot help but deter enlistments. The National Guard has met every quota assigned to it, but will not be able to do so if this bill becomes law.

If the youth are to be deterred from entering the Reserve units, where will we obtain the strong Reserve that the proponents of this bill say we need? The only source from which we can obtain these reservists is from those who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. This is unfair and against the general desire of the American people. It places an undue hardship upon these ex-servicemen, and it is extremely doubtful that these involuntary veterans will be of any value to the Reserve program. On the contrary, they may be injurious to such a program.

As I stated earlier, I expect the proponents of this bill, if it becomes a law, to return to us next year, or the one after, stating that this bill has failed to get a Reserve. I certainly believe it will fail, and that they will ask Congress to give them more and greater control over the youth of America. No one wants a strong America more than I, but I believe that all the strength of America is not in battleships, bombers, tanks and rifles. The greatest strength in America is in the hearts and souls of a free people, and their great spiritual and economic strength, and anything that tends to destroy the freedom and dignity of man and replaces it with regimentation, destroys the real strength of America. In providing an adequate defense we must never create a Frankenstein of regimentation and militarism which will destroy us. We can have a strong defense in America without resorting to this.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In this letter, which we received from the Republican whip this morning, in paragraph 3, he says:

> Universal military training is intended to mean what it says—universal; that is, to take all young men at the age of 18 and so on.

And then he says:

> This bill imposes a ceiling of 250,000.

Is it true that all of these young Americans who are physically and mentally qualified, and who do not belong to that 250,000, can be exempt?

Mr. BRAY. I do not care to comment on the whip's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking about the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H. R. 5297 because I believe it to be a step in the right direction, even though that step is a somewhat timid one. The fact is that we must do something, however small, to strengthen our Reserves to remedy its greatest weakness—the absence of trained enlisted personnel. Here are some of the facts of the issues. Russian communism wants the world. She will stop at nothing to gain the prize. Our Nation is the only nation strong enough to stop her.

The only issue here today is, How can we remain militarily strong without spending ourselves into economic collapse? One aspect of this problem may be simply stated: How do we build strong Reserves and how do we do it quickly without delay? What can we learn from our mistakes of the past?

Between World War II and Korea about 4½ million young men came of military age. About 1,100,000 saw service through being inducted or enlisted. Nearly 3½ million did not. Some of these, about 900,000, would have been 4–F under present standards. The balance were fit in every way for military service and yet were required neither to train nor to serve. So when Korea came and we had to mobilize rapidly, we had no source of trained manpower to tap—no men who could be used quickly except the veterans of World War II who still had a Reserve obligation even though it was not realized by a great many of them.

About 975,000 Reserves were recalled for Korea—over two-thirds of them being recalled in the first year. Between 600,000 and 700,000 of these, or about 70 percent, were veterans of World War II. A recent report by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee on the status of the Reserve indicates that probably more than half of all these recalled reservists were inactive reservists in a nonpay status. These veteran reservists when they were recalled to duty were fathers, essential workers, scientists, technicians, college students, farmers, apprentices, and just plain men earning a living. They were recalled to service regardless of any of the above situations which would have deferred them from initial induction while men younger than they who had never served their country before and who were fathers, essential workers, scientists, technicians, college students, farmers, apprentices, were either exempted or deferred from induction for service on the identical basis.

By the end of the first year of the Korean war, over 700,000 reservists were on active duty. They constituted about 22 percent of our Armed Forces. Five hundred and twenty thousand or 15 percent of the Armed Forces were World War II veterans. More reservists were called during the first year of the Korean war than we inducted through the Selective Service System. The Korean war began in June of 1950. By the end of September, about 250,000 reservists had been recalled.

Contrast this with the draft. In July no one was inducted. In August about 1,500 were inducted. In September 50,000 were inducted. In the months following September, the rate leveled off to about 50,000 but these men could not be used for at least 4 months after their induction. This was through no fault of the Selective Service System. They could have drafted many more but the untrained men must be trained before they can fight. The 1,500 inducted in August could not possibly have seen action in Korea before February of 1951—7 to 8 months after the war began.

The first and most horrible year of the Korean war was fought by Regulars but were brought up to strength by the veteran reservists—some of whom were in Korea in a matter of weeks after their recall. Where do we stand today? In almost exactly the same position we were in before Korea.

While we had at the beginning of this fiscal year over 2½ million in the Reserve, approximately 2,250,000 of them being in a so-called Ready Reserve status, more than 78 percent of this Reserve is composed of veterans of World War II, Korea, or both. The percent of veterans in the Reserve grows daily as more and more men who served in Korea conclude their tours of service and move into Ready Reserve status for 6 more years. Of these over 2½ million reservists, only about 750,000 are in a drill-pay status.

The requirements of the National Reserve plan are 2,950,000. It should be pointed out that the veteran Reserves of this figure are largely those who enlisted or were inducted for the Korean emergency and thus were given by the Congress an overall 8-year service Reserve obligation. Of the reservists who are active today, the great bulk are nonveterans and inadequately trained to be truly ready. The Army and Air National Guard permit nonveterans to enlist in their units and a large portion of their strength is in this group. The National Guard does an excellent job but as they themselves assert would be much better with pretrained personnel. The Navy, Marine Corps, and just recently the Air Force permit nonveterans to enlist in the Reserve provided they agree to be active in units with the provision they may enlist in that particular service in the event they receive a draft call.

The result is that about half the active ready reservists are nonveterans who have received no basic pretraining and receive in their Reserve units only 150 to 200 hours per year. The remaining numbers are veterans—the largest number of them being officers and noncommissioned officers. Therefore, the active enlisted Reserves are almost totally nonveterans and trained only briefly.

Ever since the end of World War II it has been the same old Reserve story. First, there was no organized input of trained enlisted men into the Reserves. The only trained men entering the Active Reserves were officers and noncom-

missioned officers who had served their country in wartime. There were few enlisted men for these officers to command except in the National Guard. In the National Guard, what enlisted men there were, were largely untrained so that these reservists were faced with the dismal routine of giving basic training over and over to the enlisted recruits. Thus, there was little real incentive for veterans to join the Reserve facing endless meetings of giving basic training over and over.

The second cause of the weak Reserve, and to me the most important one, has been that those in military authority have taken little or no interest in the problems of the Reserves. This has been true throughout most of our history. I received my Reserve commission back in 1933 and kept my Reserve commission and kept up my Reserve work—not because of any encouragement or any help from the Regular service but in spite of them.

Problems concerning the Reserve have always been shunted to the bottom of the pile of things to do on the desks of our military leaders. Too few of our military men who have been charged with our Reserve affairs have actually cared whether or not we build a Reserve. Some have actually tried to keep us from doing it. Too many of our civilian Secretaries charged with the Reserve responsibility have either devoted their time to other matters or have been ineffective spokesmen for the revervists. I believe that it can be proven that the Regular services have over and over attempted to prevent our having a strong Reserve. It makes little difference what kind of a law we pass here in Congress unless the people handling this program want it to work, it will not work.

We have a Reserve Forces Policy Board which was created by this Congress to advise the Secretary of Defense on Reserve affairs. It would be interesting to know whether or not the Secretary of Defense has ever accepted a recommendation of this Board. From what I can find out, they have too often been considered as an advisory board whose advice was not wanted. Being adviser to the Secretary of Defense they have no real independence. Too often their views have been filtered of all their substance by the military and civilian authorities which serve as a buffer between them and the Secretary. They were relegated to the back room in 1953–54 when Mr. John Hanna was the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel and have been there nearly ever since.

One of the greatest rays of hope I have received along these lines has been the interest shown in the Reserve affairs by the new Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carter Burgess, because it does not matter what we legislate here it will be a failure unless men with initiative and imagination administer it vigorously. It is probably true that our Reserve would still be forgotten even now, we would have no bill before this Congress today, and the Department of Defense would never have initiated a study of the Reserves, if a wholly independent group acting independently at the direction of the President had not been directed to make a study of the Reserve affairs in 1953. This group was the National Security Training Commission who due to their independence were able to report directly to the President as a result of which he ordered the Department of Defense to take action to develop the National Reserve plan. This plan is actually very simple. It proposes to remedy the one weakness of the Reserve upon which the Congress had failed to legislate. It provides an avenue for supplying trained enlisted men into the Reserve. That is the core and the heart of this bill.

My only misgivings about it are that the bill fails to provide that in the event the yearly quotas of volunteers for this program are not met, induction shall not be used. This was requested by the President. The committee failed to grant it. It seems strange, indeed, to me that we should provide induction to meet the needs of the Regular military service and should be too timid to provide induction to meet the needs of the Reserve. We have certainly had no qualms about enlisting men for 2, 3, 4, and 5 years of service or inducting men for 2 years of service and placing all of them on an 8-year obligation whether or not they wanted it.

The trouble with the present system is that a great many of those who have seen service for 2 years or more do not care to be active in Reserve affairs so long as they know that so many hundreds of thousands of others have done nothing and are being required to do nothing. One reason we have no well-trained enlisted men in our Reserve is because a man who has seen 2 years of service if he is any good is a corporal or sergeant after his 2 years' service. If he is still a private or private first class he should not be in the Reserve anyway.

The Air Force and the Navy apparently desire Reserves composed entirely of officers and noncommissioned officers, with no enlisted men, that is, if they actually desire Reserve at all, which I doubt. This is the same problem which I talked about earlier in saying that this program must have sympathetic administration once it is passed. This bill seeks to remedy one of the glaring inequities of the Korean recall of Reserves. It permits combat veterans and others who have seen prior service to be screened to the Standby Reserve. Then in the event of a national emergency declared by the Congress, Standby Reserves will be called to active duty only through the machinery of the Selective Service System. Many of the inequities of the Korean emergency will thus be avoided. In that emergency inactive reservists who would have been deferrable under Selective Service were called to active duty while younger nonveterans who were in the identical categories were either exempt or deferred from the draft.

Although it is not provided in this bill, I, for one, would like to receive an annual report from a wholly independent group regarding the progress of the entire Reserve program. I would like this group to be one whose first interest is in the Reserve forces and not the Regular establishment. I would like to see an independent group with authority to at least nudge the Armed Forces in the right direction in carrying out the intent of this bill and the Armed Forces Reserve Act. True, I think that the present Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel is interested in this, but he has many problems other than those relating to the Reserves. Reserve affairs are a full-time job for any man. Also, we should remember that unfortunately Mr. Carter Burgess will not always be in his present job. His predecessor, in my opinion, was no friend of the Reserve. The man who follows him might be of the same caliber.

Mr. Chairman, I hear it said that this is a UMT bill. It is extremely difficult for me to follow this logic. It is not UMT. In the first place, no induction of any kind or any type can be found anywhere in this bill. That bill on induction was voted on last February—the extension of the draft. At that time, with only four dissenting votes, this House voted to continue Selective Service for 4 more years. There were no cries of UMT at that time; yet, under the provisions of that bill we could conceivably induct every young man in the United States under the age of 26 for 2 years of service if necessary to meet our military requirements. There were no cries of UMT then. I am still not clear as to why it would not be just as logical in order to meet our military requirements for the Reserve forces to allow induction for the training program just as we do for the Regular services.

I would point out also that under this bill deferments continue as under the present system. UMT would allow no deferments. This bill limits the number of men going into the training program to 250,000 a year. UMT would include everybody.

This plan is designed to meet the military security requirements of the Reserve—not to train everyone for the sake of training. This bill is to expire in 4 years. UMT was conceived as permanent legislation.

Lastly, this program is so far from being universal that those who call it such should brush up on their arithmetic. Even if all possible avenues for fulfilling the military obligation are taken into account, the program is far from universal. We have over 1½ million men in class 1–A today. This does not include the 1 million men who became fathers during the Korean war who are exempt from military service under present regulations. We have between nine hundred thousand and a million physically fit men coming of age each year. Only about one-half of these are required for military service each year either through volunteering or being inducted. If the full quota of 250,000 men each year is enlisted into the military training program, hundreds and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of physically fit young men will not have seen service or training or reserve obligation by the time this bill expires in 1959.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation's security, fairness, in equity demand that we pass this bill. We should never let happen again in our country what happened

when all our World War II veterans were called back in for the Korean war. The postponement of this or any other measure for our defense cannot postpone the disaster to which unpreparedness may lead us. Many opponents of this measure say to us to let those who have served and fought once or twice go out and fight again when the next crisis arises. They say that no one really cares about the matter of equity and fairness in this program. The argument is raised that the Nation's security comes first and that equity can be forgotten.

No one can deny that the Nation's security comes first. But I most emphatically deny that the basic American principles of equity and fairness can be forgotten. If inequity and unfairness can be avoided at the same time we can serve the cause of national security, inequity and unfairness should be avoided. To say otherwise is doing cynical thinking which can endanger our very security itself, for inequity and unfairness lead to poor morale and the core of all security is the high morale of the men who serve.

If we take no action here, it means that in the future inequities will be heaped upon those who have already suffered much in the past. It means that we refuse to build a combat Ready Reserve composed of young men who have not seen prior service. Thus in the event of a future emergency, we must call back reserves who have seen service not only in Korea but perhaps in World War II as well. It means in effect that we are telling the veterans of this Nation that we desire to compound inequities on them rather than ask that some who have never served before, who might never serve in the future, take their fair share of the burden of defending this Nation's heritage of liberty and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time for false optimism. A failure to pass this bill is to legislate unpreparedness for this country. If we lose our present struggle against communism, it will not be through any overwhelming strength from the part of the Soviet Union. It will be because we have failed to use the strength, the moral and the physical strength, which we possess.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we pass this bill and get on with building a strong Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say that the reservist is a needed individual in the defense scheme of our country. He is the best friend that the Department of Defense has because he will support any worthwhile legislation or any congressional budget within reason for the improvement of national defense. In peace he will give up his recreation and spare time to carry on his military training. In war he will liquidate his business and professional career to serve in the Armed Forces. He only asks for the right to train and serve in the highest capacity in which he is capable—to be recognized and treated as an equal part in the service of his country. A civilian soldier in peace or in war is a valuable part of our Nation's security forces.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NIKE

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon the Army's Nike site at Lorton, Va., was on display for the Members of Congress. I was one of the few able to attend. This visit brought to my attention the importance and value of the role the Army has in preparing to defend our country against air attack and the magnitude of the task which is now being accomplished throughout the United States.

Since most of my colleagues were unable to attend, I feel it is my duty and privilege to briefly inform you of what I saw and heard yesterday afternoon at an operational Nike guided-missile site, which is ready and prepared on a few minutes' notice to defend our Nation's Capital against enemy bombers.

As we drove down Shirley Highway and on the winding roads near Lorton, I congratulated myself on having taken advantage of the opportunity to spend such a beautiful day in the outdoors. Suddenly we were at the control area of the Nike battery. It was a surprise to find that we were so close before I had noticed it. The long, low concrete-block buildings are painted light green, with a dark green trim, and blend so successfully with the spring landscape that it is very difficult to pick them out at a distance.

Since we do not have time this afternoon for a full description of all that took place, I will only touch upon what to me were the most important features.

The first of these is the fact that the Army is a highly important member of the team on which we rely for our protection against air attack. The Army, by means of Nike, the 90-millimeter and 120-millimeter guns, and Skysweeper, is providing defense for our most important cities and installations. The Nike defenses are constantly ready, day and night, week in and week out, to seek out and destroy enemy bombers while they are still many miles from the vital area being defended.

Because it is impossible to provide an antiaircraft defense for every city and installation worthy of protection, it is necessary to select the areas to be defended after due consideration of a number of factors. Among these factors are the following:

The population density.

The relative industrial importance.

Geographical location.

Availability of other means of air defense.

Availability of antiaircraft weapons and crews.

I am happy to report that mass production of Nike and the training program for the troops are progressing very satisfactorily.

The second highlight of the day was the construction at the battery. I mentioned before how the control area buildings blend in with the countryside. Let me assure you that the buildings now being provided our "frontline soldiers"—the antiaircraft batteries—are a far cry from the wartime emergency type of construction to which we all are accustomed. The concrete block type of building now being constructed for our antiaircraft personnel are attractive, comfortable, and economical. I can well understand why some communities have, in the past, objected to giving up land for the installation of an antiaircraft battery. The people were afraid that, based on the type of structure which was built during World War II and is still so prevalent at Army posts, the local battery would be an eyesore and seriously affect surrounding property values. Now that I have seen an example of the construction which is being put up throughout the country, I can assure you and your constituents that the Nike batteries will be a credit to any community.

Another phase of the construction that impressed me was the underground magazines. These massive structures, filled with deadly Nike missiles, are completely out of sight. By storing the missiles underground, the area required for one battery is reduced from nearly 150 acres to about 50 acres. Here the missiles wait until an enemy is detected, stored at under nearly optimum conditions and without danger to adjoining areas in the event of an explosion. As General Hendrix informed us yesterday:

> We want the people to feel and see that the Army is doing everything possible to maintain high standards; that the Nike site is not dangerous, but as safe as a gas station; as important to security and as much a part of the local community as the police and fire departments; and that the physical appearance of our sites will blend with the adjoining civilian areas.

A third highlight of the day was the Nike equipment. Anyone who has stood in the control area of a Nike battery, watching the three radars and associated equipment while the highly trained crew goes through the preengagement routine, cannot help but be impressed, not only with the complex equipment, but with the skill and efficiency of the men manning the equipment. To me, the real thrill so far as the equipment was concerned, came in the launching area. Here, when the long slender Nike's were erected on their launchers—impressing the viewer with both their beauty and lethal efficiency—I could really visualize the true effectiveness and value of this new and deadly antiaircraft weapon—the only known operational surface-to-air missile in the hands of troops.

We have been hearing for years about this missile system or that one. How effective each will be—when it is perfected. Yesterday I did more than hear about a missile—I saw it, ready to go into action now against any enemy which might attack us.

The last, and possibly most important, highlight of the day was the antiaircraft personnel. As I looked at the men manning the equipment, the battery and battalion officers, and the general commanding the defenses of this and other cities on the east coast, I felt that the

trust we and the people of this country have placed in them was well bestowed.

The men in a Nike battery must be highly trained in order to adequately maintain and operate their equipment. A Nike specialist who has gone through the long training courses at Fort Bliss is an electronic technician who can readily find a job in civilian industry. I am happy to state that I was assured that recent action by this Congress has improved substantially the economic status and morale of the soldiers, and that it is hoped that more of the specialist personnel will now remain in the Army.

From the young private, only a few months away from home, to the general, veteran of many years' service, I received the same impression—competence in his job, awareness of the importance of his mission, confidence in his weapons, and resolution to do his part to defend his country.

Gentlemen, in closing let me assure you that I wish everyone of you could have been with me yesterday. It is most heartening to turn for a moment from our daily task of deciding what should be done for the Nation's welfare to actually see what has been done as a result of our past actions. We, as well as the Army, should be proud of the Nike.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, no legislation will come before the Congress this session which deserves more thoughtful consideration than H. R. 5297, the so-called Reserve manpower bill.

My particular concern arises from the many letters received from people in my district expressing their views. These opinions come from citizens whose interest in the welfare and future of this Nation is paramount, and while the conclusions of those who wrote differ, the underlying and common desire of all is to avoid militarism and preserve our peaceful civilian mode of life.

We Members of the House recognize from our correspondence when the hearts and minds of constituents are speaking, as against organized self-interest pressure mail. I know of no mail on controversial legislation of recent years which originated from finer motives of freedom and patriotism. On the one hand, a fear was registered that this program is a step toward Prussianism; on the other, it is considered a step in the other direction.

Here is a case where we have the responsibility of digging out the facts and casting our vote, either for or against strengthening the Reserve military forces, on the basis of information available to us. Facts and not emotionalism should be the governing factor.

I hold here in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Socialist Labor Party entitled "Stomp UMT. It's a Step To War and Fascism." In its four closely printed pages there is not one reference to the provisions of this bill. There is no analysis or argument—just emotionalism saying "militarism will continue to flourish until the workers, enlightened and conscious of their potentially invincible might, consolidate their power in the Socialist Industrial Union, and shielded by their political organization, take over and run the industries of the Nation, for the common good." It sounds like substituting one kind of fascism for another to me. But if any Members have received anticonscription resolutions, it might be because of the suggestion of this Socialist Labor Party literature. I did not get any. The only thing sent me was the pamphlet with a strongly worded letter protesting its contents and distribution.

Now as to the Reserve manpower bill itself, to me it is a step toward disarmament and demilitarization. Certainly there must be great misunderstanding about it.

I can see the argument that a program which is set up on a voluntary basis can be changed to a compulsory plan, more easily than a new compulsory program can be established. However, it would seem to me opponents of militarism would favor a reduction in full military service for many, rather than continue the extent of the draft as it has been and complete disruption of civilian life for so many young men, interrupting their education and preventing the normal process of starting in on careers.

As has been pointed out under this law, a boy who is subject to the draft if he elects, and only if he so elects, may volunteer for the Reserves. If he volunteers, he is then obligated to a 6-month training period. When he completes this 6 months' training he is relieved from further training except in the event of a national emergency when all Reserves would be called. Meanwhile, he has an obligation to attend drills, either go to camp 2 weeks each year or to attend 48 drills a year. He stays in this reserve status for 7½ years. Under the draft law, if the boy preferred not to volunteer under the Reserve program, he would have 2 years in the service and then would be on reserve status for 6 more years. This law does not change the length of time the boy remains in the Reserves.

The only change is that young men who find it less disrupting to their lives and prefer it, have an opportunity to volunteer and take 6 months' training rather than being drafted for 2 years' service.

So, as I say, this legislation seems to me to be a step away from militarization, and it is most certainly not universal military training. What it is, as I view it, is a modification of Selective Service. I think there is a widespread lack of information on the bill as reported from the Committee on Armed Services and it is lack of understanding which has caused considerable misapprehension. The world is divided into two armed camps which is tragic and wrong, but as long as the Communists adhere to their objective of world conquest we must be prepared to defend ourselves and strength of potential trained manpower to resist aggression is our best hope of peace.

A study of the bill and a careful examination of the Armed Services report of the hearings on it convince me I am doing right to support this legislation.

This Nation will never be in danger of militarism as long as the congressional representatives of the people follow the recommendations of their consciences, and I, for one, am heeding mine in saying I am supporting this bill.

And in conclusion let me just add, since this is fundamental legislation and highly important as far as our future national policy is concerned, I am thankful partisan politics is not a consideration. I respect the opinions of members on both sides of the aisle who differ from my conclusions. This is not an issue on which one follows a leader, the President, the Secretary of Defense, or anyone else. Today, we follow our own thinking and as the Bible says, we must look to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I can honestly say I have looked to myself in this respect and as such urge passage of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use my allotted time to discuss the bill before us in detail either critically or otherwise. I propose at this time to discuss an amendment, which I am going to offer to this bill. The amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 3, strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any male person 17 years of age or older who has not received notice to report for induction under this act, but who is enrolled in a full-time course of instruction at a high school, college, university, or similar institution, may, by filing a notice with the appropriate local draft board, elect to receive training and service, and serve in a Reserve component, under this paragraph in lieu of performing active duty for training and service in a Reserve component under any other provision of this act or any other law. No person less than 18 years of age may make such election unless he has the written consent of his parents or guardian. After such person has made such election, if he continues to attend such an institution, he shall, on or after the 1st day but before the 11th day of June in each of the next succeeding years in which he is physically able to serve on active duty for training, be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 91 consecutive days during each such year for not more than 4 summers. Such person and his dependents shall be entitled, with respect to all such periods of active duty for training, and necessary travel to and from such duty, to all the pay, allowances, and other benefits to which enlisted members of the uniformed services in pay grade E–1 (and their dependents) are entitled with respect to periods of active duty or authorized travel, as the case may be. If, before completing four annual periods of active duty for training under this paragraph, such person ceases to attend an educational institution under circumstances (other than by transfer or graduation) which indicate that his enrollment in such institution may reasonably be considered to have been voluntarily terminated, or if his enrollment is termined (other than by transfer or graduation), his election to receive training and service under this paragraph shall be deemed irrevocably canceled, and he shall thereafter be liable for induction for training and service under the remaining provisions of this act; however, full credit shall be given him toward completion of his required period of active duty for training and service, and service in a Reserve component, for all active duty for training performed by him under this paragraph (4).

Where such person graduates from an educational institution and enolls in another educational institution, or where he transfers from one educational institution to another educational institution, he shall not thereby become liable for induction for training and service under any other provision of this act if he otherwise meets all requirements of this paragraph (4). After such person has been ordered to active duty for training under this paragraph (4) during 4 years, he shall be placed in the Standby Reserves for 1 year. After he has been a member of the Standby Reserves for 1 year, such person shall be released from all liability for training and service under this act and any other law. If any such person is not permitted to serve on active duty for training under this paragraph (4) by reason of a disease or disability of a permanent nature which would afford a basis for deferring him from induction for training and service under this act, he shall thereafter be deferred from training and service under this act, unless he volunteers for induction for such training and service. This paragraph (4) shall not be operative in time of war or during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the Congress."

It has to do, in my opinion, with the preservation of one of the finest educational systems on earth.

I have been a member of the Committee on Education for over 20 years. Prior to that time I was interested in the field of education. I have thoroughly discussed the amendment mentioned with the 30 members of the Committee on Education. No formal action was asked because the matter was before another committee of the House. To me it is perfectly astounding that this, the Congress of the United States, should be assembled here discussing a bill affecting the future educational standards of this great Nation—the opportunity and privilege of boys going to school. I mean, discussing those things that not only affect, but control—and not one single word is said in behalf of the boys, or the future of their educational opportunities, and the military has not exhibited any interest in the field of education, with the exception of insisting, and they can, will, and should provide, such education as in their opinion the young men should have, but carefully avoid even mentioning our traditional methods or institutions. I looked at a television program this morning, in which the Armed Forces educational system was being advertised and promoted—the recruiting offices are full of pamphlets, programs, beautiful expensive booklets — advocating what? That they can properly educate the youth of this land, the citizens of tomorrow. Turn them all over to us. Listen to this advertisement, a beautiful 8-page booklet—red, white, and blue—with 8 action-colored pictures. I am reading:

The guard offers unlimited educational opportunities. Your son may attend Regular Army or Air Force service or technical schools with pay, or he may take correspondence courses. Through these schools, which offer more than 450 courses, he may improve his education, boost his military specialty, and increase his civilian earning power.

Which in effect is saying, "We can offer more courses than any college in America and can pay you while you are being educated."

Correspondence courses. Yes, but the military shudder when one mentions using our high schools, prep schools, private schools or colleges. They not only recommend these military schools which offer more than 450 courses, where he may improve his education, and boost his military specialty and increase his civilian earning power, but leave the impression that they seek authority to make them use these schools or else.

All this time I have been dumb enough to think that the fine educational system of this country, the public school system, the private school system, the church schools of this land, the colleges, the junior colleges, and the prep schools were to educate our youth and were doing a grand job. But they can make no such claims as the military is making.

And when asked, through the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am chairman, for a report on the operation of their schools, the activities of their educational program and its cost to the taxpayers, the Department of the Army furnished the following foolish and meaningless reply:

It has not been possible to provide meaningful figures in some reports concerning obligations. Estimates were made, when possible, but the nature of some of the Army educational and training activities is such that even approximate estimates are not possible. At Army service schools, for example, the only available information concerns amounts obligated under "Army training" which cannot be furnished as representing the total cost of operating the schools since they do not include amounts required to furnish standard supplies and equipment issued through normal supply channels, such as travel in connection with the schools or numerous expenses provided for in other cost categories. In this same connection, it should be noted that the pay of personnel participating in Army educational programs is paid from other appropriations, and consequently is not included in obligations shown for education activities. (Reference: H. Doc. No. 428, p. 165, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

The gentleman handling and directing this bill has not opened his mouth about encouraging education or giving the average kid of 17 or 18 years of age one thing in the world that would encourage him to get along with his education. America did not grow great by accident, improvement in living standards was not just handed to us. All the educational institutions in America from the little red schoolhouse to date have certainly been one of the greatest contributors toward making this Nation not only a powerful Nation, but also the greatest producing Nation of everything from necessities to luxuries on earth, all of which play a large part in the high living standards we now enjoy, and I am now reluctant at this late date to trade off the views of our educational leaders for the views and ambitions of the Pentagon.

I feel this so deeply that I must express my resentment to the highest military officials, whether they be in the Pentagon or wherever they are, that want to control and regulate but not educate. They want to subordinate education, revise it, revamp it, and worse still, direct and control it. I fear this policy and attitude.

No. They do not lend a hand. At the same time they seem to take the attitude that education is not one of the very foundation stones upon which this Nation must defend itself; yes, even survive, unless provided by them at taxpayers' expense—in the most expensive and haphazard way.

I would like for the gentleman or anyone else to challenge that statement.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not want to get into a debate with my good friend. However, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he believes that every young man has a very definite obligation in the defense of his country?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to my distinguished friend, I wish you had not directed that question to me. Both you and I know the answer to that so well, and every person in this House knows the answer to that. I recognized mine. You recognized yours. And I have faith and confidence enough in the youth of this land to say that the generations to follow after you and me will be just as good, yes, I hope better and more cognizant of the responsibility that they have to this country. That is not the issue. Are you trying to force the choice that they must give their all to the country and ignore their preparation for themselves, their families for good citizenship, and what we call a better way of life in America? No, you are not doing that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I certainly am not, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Exactly what is the point you are getting at? That we are requiring military service through the draft?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from Maryland is a faster thinker on this than I am. The point I am getting to is this: We can stand here and let out these blood-curdling yells about the scientific men Russia is turning out, about those planes that go 850 miles an hour, about those terrible death-dealing scientific machines they have.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Not now.

We can hear all of that if we please. How did they get them? It was not the soldier who could just do "squads right" or "squads left"; it was the scientific men, the chemists, the physicists, the electrical men, the well-trained men, those who can think, invent, and understand those gadgets and develop them.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a minute, just a minute.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Just at that point.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a minute. Well, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I hope I have not taxed the gentleman's patience.

Mr. BARDEN. You did not, but you almost did.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am happy I did not go that far, but my good friend, colleague, and chairman——

Mr. BARDEN. All right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to give the gentleman's background as chairman of the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives. I want to join in your fine tribute to education. I am agreeing with every word you say. I hope that your able committee gets to work, writes some provisions within the views that I expressed on Federal education. I do not want Federal control of education, but within those views write some legislation on education and bring it before this House, then we can carry out some of the gentleman's excellent views.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to my friend that we have enough laws in America guaranteeing an education if you will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am sure the gentleman——

Mr. BARDEN. Now, you wait a minute; you are going to listen to this whether you like it or not. What good would it do for the Committee on Education and Labor to double the number of school buildings in America and treble the number of school teachers if you are going to be standing there at the door of the high school to take him away and put him in a camp for such a long time that he does not want to go to school any more?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me pursue this just a little. Under our military program the school enrollment has doubled, trebled, and increased beyond all bounds until the universities are fairly bulging and not able to take care of enrollments. There is more education now in the United States than there has ever been.

Mr. BARDEN. Listen, my friend, that is not because of the Armed Services Committee, but in spite of it. And let me say another thing, that I hope those schools and colleges will continue to bulge, and I hope the output will be more and more and better and better.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I join you in that.

Mr. BARDEN. All right. Now, what I am trying to point out—under difficulties—is this: I have proposed an amendment, or will propose it when the opportunity presents itself, that when a boy reaches the age of 17, whether he be in high school or college, that he may with the consent of his parents up to 18—and after 18 it does not require consent—volunteer for a reserve program. My amendment does not cut one thing in the world out of the bill. It adds an option, that is all. You have a lot of options in here, but I reserve the right to express by opinion on them later. It gives another option: a boy can serve 91 days in the summer, go back to school in the winter, serve 91 days the next summer, go back to school, whether he wants to be a doctor, whether he wants to be an engineer or whether he wants to be a businessman or whatever he wants to be, and follow that 4 years.

When he has completed those 4 years, he is in the Standby Reserve, whatever that is—I have had several definitions of that term—for 1 year. The Standby Reserve does not require drills or active service except in time of war or emergency declared by Congress.

Now, what have we accomplished? Which is more valuable to America in time of war or peace, an educated boy or an uneducated boy? Which is more valuable to America, certainly in war or in a threat of war, a boy who is freshly trained every year for 4 years or draft him, put him in for 2 years, then let him forget all in 12 months? It is that simple.

There is another fair provision in the amendment. Probably he would go for 3 years, which would be 9 months of active service; then conditions at home, illness, his own condition or something else might arise that would prevent him from finishing up. This amendment provides that he shall have credit for the 9 months that he served. Why shouldn't he? Then he would serve only 15 additional months.

The amendment will provide that he draw a private's pay, about $80 per month. One of these provisions in the pending bill, I do not know which one it is, provides for $50. The bill holds out some bait, then puts something on it that would not make it taste good by cutting it down to $50. The gentleman brought out the officers' pay bill some time ago.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman did not bring out an officers' pay bill, may I suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman was riding along with it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman voted for it and I voted for it. May I say that we did not cut the pay of the trainee at all; we raised it. It was recommended at $30 and we increased that to $50.

Mr. BARDEN. Who recommended that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The Pentagon.

Mr. BARDEN. If we could get a great volume of commonsense and get you to thinking, and cut you loose from the Pentagon, we would get further.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I think the gentleman will recall that 4 years ago both of us opposed universal military training.

Mr. BARDEN. With everything there was in me. That was the boldest attempt to militarize this Nation ever made.

Mr. BATES. In both of us. Will the gentleman tell the committee that in the event his amendment passes he will support this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, I will, if my amendment passes.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. I think there is so much possible good in it. Now, I am glad the gentleman did not press me and ask me what I was going to do if the amendment does not pass. But, I will say this, that I have not heard any valid reason why the amendment should not pass. We are cutting down, as somebody said a while ago, on our scientific men. We are just simply depleting our ranks of scientists. You say there are more men in college now. Why, we have more people. We just have more people. So we cannot go by what has happened in the past.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. As a school man of over 30 years' experience, the gentleman's idea is an idea that has been promulgated on this floor more than once, training in school and with a school program. I am for it 1,000 percent.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah. A fine educator—one who has had the responsibility of a college president, and above all a fine delightful gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's position. Boys at 17 years of age usually have not graduated from high school. If they go into the service for 6 months and come back to school in the middle of the school year, most of our high schools cannot enter them because they do not have a program that begins with the quarter or semester as do the colleges.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. DIXON. If they cannot enter school they will go to work. Then, if they go to work, they are weaned almost entirely away from high school. If they do not get a high-school education, they are not eligible for the many fine positions which are open to them and they are under a great handicap. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's position. But in the bill may I ask this question? If the period of enlistment in the bill were changed to read "any high-school graduate who has reached his 17th birthday and under 20 years of age and any non-high-school graduate who is 18½ years of age and who is under 20 may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training," would that not be a simple solution and still protect the boy's right to a high-school education?

Mr. BARDEN. I will say this to the gentleman, there is a tremendous number of students who finish high school considerably before they are 18 years of age, and I do not have to tell you that if they are drafted into the Army, that is too bad, or too good, one or the other, and I am trying to follow the reasoning of the committee. They set out these various things and say they will take this 6 months or something else is going to happen. These provisions illustrate the objectionable approach which this program makes to military service. It puts a threat over the heads of all of those likewise, and the penalty behind this threat is that the boy will be called up for active service. I think that is emphasizing patriotism in reverse. I hope some day the Army will learn that they have a selling job to do somewhere other than on the television screen and these pamphlets. They can do a selling job in the camps, and a much better selling job than they have been doing, and they will have more volunteers and we will have less trouble. Let's produce

more doctors, and make the Army more attractive somewhere else besides on television and pamphlets. It will then not be necessary for more and more force. But, I do want to emphasize that I have been on the floor on this subject many times, and regardless of how long I stay here, every time I have an opportunity I shall attempt to emphasize the absolute necessity of education in our defense setup as well as in our Government and otherwise. We cannot be strong militarily unless we are strong mentally. I think that is fundamental. We must have more scientifically trained men, more men who understand the speed of this age, because we cannot put out as many foot soldiers and depend on mass warfare any longer. You must be able to compete in speed, in science, and anybody who is thinking knows that the next war we have—and God forbid we ever have one, but if such should happen—you know it will not be fought and won with brawn alone; it will be a brain contest of science, of electronics, atomic and kindred weapons. It will be a question of getting the high-speed jet bomber before it delivers its lethal cargo. If we cannot do that then the number of men will amount to little. In my opinion, our survival could very easily depend, as it has at times in the past, upon trained, skilled, and scientific minds.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my task this afternoon is certainly not an easy one, and it is by no means a pleasant one. However obnoxious one's duty may be, it should and must be discharged; and however heavy one's responsibility may be, it cannot be shirked or avoided. Certainly I do not relish my present position of having to go against my own President, the leadership of this House, and many of my best personal friends on both sides of the aisle. Heaven knows, if any four men on this earth could convince me of anything, I think they would be Dwight Eisenhower, Arthur Radford, Carl Vinson, and Joe Martin. But I am not going to live with those gentlemen forever, which is most fortunate for them; and certainly they will not always be with me to grant their wise counsel and fearless direction. But a thing that I have considered bad under previous administrations, whether Roosevelt or Truman, I consider bad under Eisenhower, Smith, Jones, or anyone else.

There is one person I must live with forever, and from whom I can never run away, and that is DEWEY SHORT.

A great man once said:

To act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright.

And when he nailed the 95 theses on the cathedral door at Wittenberg, he said:

There I take my stand. I can do naught else. So help me God. Amen.

No, it is not an easy nor a pleasant task that I have. After wrestling with my conscience, and talking to myriad friends, and after receiving at a conservative estimate 3,000 messages, letters and telegrams on this particular bill before us, and after being torn asunder by good, loyal friends, dear and near to me, pulling in opposite directions, it is not an easy decision I have been called upon to make.

Now let us look at this bill. What is the history of it? One does not have to be a Member of Congress, a Philadelphia lawyer or a Ph. D. to know that ever since the close of World War I, there has been a persistent, pugnacious, perennial, relentless, costly campaign to cram down the throats of the American people universal military training or peacetime conscription.

Having served in this body for almost a quarter of a century, having served on the different committees, special as well as regular legislative committees of the House that have considered this and allied problems, I know the tremendous pressure, I know not only the cajolery and the pleas, but even the threats, the use of the taxpayers' money to spread propaganda, to cut the political throat and nail the political hide of anyone who dared to oppose the different programs that have been offered from time to time.

In the Democratic-controlled 82d Congress in 1952 we succeeded in the well of this House by a margin of 74 votes in defeating the UMT bill. This present bill is not UMT, granted. It is limited and restricted and has a termination date. Oh, yes, it terminates on July 1, 1959, if not extended—if not extended. But you get your foot in the door, let the camel get his nose under the tent. You pass this legislation, and it will bring us just a little closer to the water's edge, to thrust upon us a foreign philosophy, an alien ism. You will find it very difficult to repeal. It is not where you begin, but where you end that counts; not where you start, but where you stop. It is not UMT, and compulsion was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman and members of his subcommittee, who worked so long, faithfully, and hard on this bill, and who improved it enormously, particularly by eliminating the discharage other than honorable. I wish they had accepted the amendment I offered to cut down the length of Reserve service from 8 to 4 years, because these 18-year-old youngsters take their 6 months' training between their 18th and 19th birthdays. I was the only one to vote for my amendment, but at times it is great to be alone. I shall offer my amendment on the floor. Oh, yes, there will be volunteers, but that volunteering, with the draft hanging over their heads, does not give them too much freedom of choice. Of course, they will volunteer for this 6 months at $50 a month, and the minute they sign up they are hooked for 8 long years, from 18 to 26. You know, and I know, that most of these youngsters before they reach their 26th birthday will be married, perhaps have a child or 2, perhaps have gone into business or entered a profession. Then he is required to take 48 weekly drills a year for 7½ years, and not more than 17 days of training in summer camp, giving up his vacations. I do not know whether his employer is going to be willing to grant him 17 days off each summer for 7½ years. He is going to do that, but if he wants to surrender the 48 drills and the 17 days of camp in the summer for 30 days of concentrated training he can do that. If he does not carry out satisfactorily the provisions of the Reserve bill, then he can be drafted for 45 days. If he does not perform that satisfactorily, even at the end of the 6 months' training or a year or 2 after he can be inducted for 2 full years, 24 months, or he could, in dire emergency, be court-martialed under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. You call that voluntary when they once sign up? Nonsense. There is little freedom in this.

Which branch of the service can he enter? The Air Force says, "No; we don't need him." The Navy says, "We don't expect to use him." The National Guard is not satisfied with it. We were told that 99,000 out of 100,000 supposed to be taken in would go into the Army Reserve. So that is what it is, 99,000 of the 100,000, and the others perhaps would go into the Coast Guard or the Marine Corps. There is not much choice in it. Let us now tell these youngsters the truth.

Then, after this youngster 18 or 19 years old takes his 6 months and he performs satisfactorily his service in the Ready Reserve for the next 2 years, suppose when he reaches the age of 21 or 22 we become involved in a global conflict. What happens to him then? Do you think by that little training he has had he is equipped and ready, and because he is in the Ready Reserve do you think the Reserve is ready—trained in units to go into combat—when our experience is that it has taken the guard almost a year to get ready? And where is this boy actually going to take his 48 weekly drills when he lives 50 or 150 miles from the nearest armory? A group of us last Friday flew out to Colorado Springs and back to Washington on Sunday. As we went over the vast open spaces of western Kansas and eastern Colorado, over that Dust Bowl, I just asked some of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans both, who were along, "How is that boy down there in that Dust Bowl or wheat field going to carry out his Reserve service when he lives perhaps 200 miles from Denver or Colorado Springs? And how about his 6 months' training? How are you going to teach him to use the latest and most powerful weapons? You can teach him to use a rifle and do squads right and left and all about sanitation and hygiene and carry out military discipline and orders—all of which is already taught in the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, as well as the ROTC"—and I am not so sure that the discipline he gets on our athletic fields and in our gymnasiums at their own expense instead of at the expense of Uncle Sam is not just about as valuable and good. A great Englishman said:

World War I was won on the hockey and cricket fields of Harrow, Eton, Oxford, and Cambridge.

In the case of a boy who takes 6 months' training—when war breaks out 2 or 3 years later—do you know that youngster will have to be called in and physically reconditioned and perhaps have to be taught how to use an entirely new and different set of weapons?

The rapid changes in techniques and methods of modern mechanized warfare renders the training of these men most expensive, and I cannot escape the feeling that it is a waste of manpower, materiel, and money because ground troops with a rifle, machinegun, tank, or a field gun cannot shoot down a super bomber carrying an atom or a hydrogen bomb. I do not want the American people to be led astray by Maginot line thinking or World War I psychology by putting faith in sheer numbers of men. Heaven knows, we can never match man for man the hordes on the Asiatic Continent. They are expendable; we are not. The cheapest commodity in the Orient is human life. I do not believe that if our ground forces are built up, it will help us too much in these days of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb. Suppose we build up our Reserves from 700,000 to 2,900,000, plus 3 million in the active forces making 6 million plus 2 more million in the Standby Reserves. Even if we had a total active force and Reserves in Ready and Standby of 8 to 9 million men, I do not think it would add too much strength in this atomic and hydrogen age. I do not believe that America could get an expeditionary force from this country to Europe today, in a short period of time, even if our active, standing forces were twice as large and our Reserves were three times as large. I do not believe we could get enough ground troops to Europe in time to stop aggression by Soviet Russia on the ground. If we do not stop her with our airpower and naval power, and with superior weapons, we are in one awful fix, because Heaven knows in a global conflict our only chance of victory and our only hope of survival is in the superior power of our weapons and the superior skill of the men who man those weapons. I feel wholeheartedly, as I have during the past 20 years, as does the able and fearless gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], that no nation can be stronger than the intelligence and character of its people. It is in the American home and in the church and high schools and universities under our system of free education that we have grown to be the richest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth. Nothing in this world is great but man and nothing in man is great but mind.

God did not endow all men with equal talents and ability. Why should we, therefore, compel the genius to walk or train with the sluggard merely to please the sluggard? Put the right man in the right spots. They will be coming back. If a hundred thousand boys under this program do not volunteer, what happens? It is innocuous. We have much ado about nothing. A lot of senseless chatter; an enormous and inexcusable waste. If more than 250,000 want to come in, who is going to select them? Remember, only 100,000, as stated in the original bill, were to be admitted. Oh, the bill is far from perfect. If more than 250,000 young Americans want to take this 6 months' training, rather than be drafted for 2 years—I am going to have a little difficulty when I go back to the Ozarks in explaining to my people why we had the courage, just a few months ago, in this present session of Congress, to vote to conscript their sons for 2 years and send them to serve on foreign soil, but do not have enough guts to vote to conscript for 6 months boys to stay here at home. Who is going to select these boys? This might be an elite guard. Who is going to choose these 250,000 young men? Oh, what a chance to play favoritism and politics. This bill is full of headaches and heartbreaks.

I am not going to quarrel with a single Member of this House about how he votes on this bill, or any other bill. I have never done that. Strong as my convictions are, deep as my feelings are, I am not going to quarrel with you. I will still respect and love you. I just hope and pray that some of my close friends will be as charitable to me. I like to be on the team. I want to go along. I bend over backwards at times, almost choke on my Adam's apple when I vote for the brass and the braid, not only to increase their pay and hospitalization and family care, voting for dependency benefits, PX and commissaries and all the rest of it. I want to be their friend. They are great and good men. But as I have often said, no general ever had a big enough army to command any more than a preacher ever had a congregation big enough to preach to.

Now, you say this is not compulsion. I will tell you what it is. When I was a barefoot boy and a barehead youngster down in the Ozarks in southern Missouri—I live quite near the gentleman who is now in the chair [Mr. TRIMBLE]. We are both ridge runners and hillbillys. In fact, I get lost over in Jim's district and he gets lost in mine. We always manage to find our way out—but when I was a youngster I drove a team of jennies. I know how I got my education too, GRAHAM BARDEN. I got it the hard way, but I got it the free way. I could follow my own inclinations and talents, if God had given me any. The worst part of this military is that we have too many square pegs in round holes. Misfits. Let each man follow his own conscience and carry out his own will, the equal of every other man, and to go his own way. I believe in freedom because in freedom is our strength.

So I used to go out to these little jennies in the field with a nice big ear of corn in front of me, but I always had a halter or a bridle back of me. These young jackasses would come up to get a bit of that free corn, and when they would come to get something for nothing, then I would put the halter on them. Oh, they have sugar-coated this bill. They have made it palatable. They have watered it down. It is a little innocuous thing. They offer these boys 6 months' training, and they think they are going to escape service. Yes. They will come to get a bite of the ear of corn, but always they will get that halter on them. I would get the halter on those jennies and get them up to the barn and harness them and hitch them up to the wagon, and then I would take the blacksnake and I would whale the everlasting wind out of them. I had them where I wanted them.

And here they come. Greeks bearing gifts. Offering you a sour pickle covered with honey. They have tried to do something with this bill—I will not call this a subterfuge; I will not say they are trying to come in the back door or the side door—but they just want to get the thing started, get the halter on you; oh, just 4 years; 1959.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that no one in this body is so naive as to believe that there will not be a determined effort made to get this bill, if enacted, extended beyond 1959. I dare predict that the Defense Department will be coming back asking that compulsion be added to the bill.

It is also a bit incongruous at the very time the President asks for world disarmament to have this measure brought in to increase our armament, though I doubt the effectiveness of this bill in building up our military strength. How can this administration or this Government reconcile the appointing of Harold Stassen as the Secretary of Peace with the enactment of this questionable bill?

One more point, Mr. Chairman, that must not be overlooked is the enormous cost of this new legislation which will jump from $700 million to $1,156,000,000 next year and will approach approximately $2 billion in 1959. Personally, I think we will not get our money's worth out of these vast expenditures, and God help us if we continue to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. That is what the Soviets have hoped and planned for and if we are not careful we will knock ourselves out by our own proficiency.

The bill should be recommitted and a measure brought in that would not have such serious impact upon the individual lives, the freedom of our people, and the terrific shock on our industrial might and sound domestic economy.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I do not think there is a Member of the House but who respects the opinion and conclusions of the gentleman from Missouri, and I have stood by the gentleman's side in a determined effort to fight universal military training, compulsory military training, and still so stand and will continue to stand with the gentleman against that. However, having convictions of my own, having voted for the extension of the draft which incorporates the principle of picking out boys and inducting them for 2 years' service with 6 years obligation to the Reserve plus a penalty of $10,000 and 5 years in jail, in my own mind I cannot stand against something that softens the approach to the problem.

Mr. SHORT. I thank my very dear and good friend for his remarks. Of his honesty and sincerity there can be no doubt. I just do not capitulate quite so easily. I want the world to know that I have and want no better friend than LES ARENDS.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, by the Declaration of Independence, the adoption of the Constitution, our adherence to its objectives and principles, we are today productively and

militarily the most powerful Nation in the world.

Our citizens have more of the good things that men desire than any other people who at any time lived anywhere on this earth.

Freedom, opportunity, prosperity, security for the individual have been ours.

Independence and security as a Nation we have attained.

All these blessings and more—because of the inspiration which gave us the Declaration of Independence, because of the wisdom written into the Constitution, because of our adherence to the tenets therein set forth, because we have followed the advice of Washington and Jefferson, have been ours.

The principal reasons which drove our ancestors to leave their homes, face and conquer the hardships of the hostile world, were the tyranny of a king, their hatred of conscription for military service to fight wars in which they had no personal stake, their lack of opportunity.

Through our adherence to United Nations we have surrendered a part of our national independence, the right of the Congress to declare war, the ability of our people to avoid wars in which they have no vital interest.

Our youth lacks neither the ability, the courage, the independence, the determination, nor the inclination to fight and die for home and country.

Their failure to enlist in the armed services in numbers sufficient to satisfy the demands of the armed services to implement our foreign policy is not because they lack patriotism or courage.

It is due to the fact that they and their fellow citizens are now convinced that those who conceive, formulate, and administer our foreign policy have forgotten the causes which made us a Nation, the reasons for our national existence.

In recent years our foreign policy, which calls for burdensome taxation, the unprofitable expenditure of billions of dollars, the sacrificing of thousands of our young men, has been conceived and administered by individuals who refuse to accept the reality that we cannot by force of arms conquer and hold the rest of the world—subject its people to our thought, our way of life.

Assuming their patriotism, there remains the sad, sorrowful fact that, as a result of their thinking, today the revolving world, as it falls away from the last rays of a sun sinking beyond the horizon, in every land and on every sea, brings darkness and night to shadow the land, the water, which hides the grave of a son of an American mother.

Here in the homeland, there is scarcely a square mile in the country, a town or city, where does not dwell a father, a mother, a wife, a son, a daughter, who does not mourn—suffer—because of the loss of one who, called to the defense of his country, fought not under the Stars and Stripes, but under the flag of the United Nations—not to defend or fight in the interest of his own country, but because of a policy which serves the interests of other countries.

In the wars which world politicians, internationalists, and the U. N. have brought us, cooperation forgotten, we have been left to furnish in money, munitions, and manpower, all but a small fraction of the cost.

From those wars, certainly from the last one in Korea, which the politicians prevented us from winning, we, as individuals, as a Nation, have gained nothing of spiritual, material, lasting benefit.

Why the recent and present demands for a continued and enlarged participation in world affairs?

Why, Europe having been made comparatively secure, shift the policy of stripping America of its resources to an aid-for-Asia policy?

Why the ever-continuing, ever-increasing propaganda of fear?

In recent years, we have been governed by fear—a synthetic fear—generated and imposed upon us by those who have little faith in the principles enunciated in the Constitution, in the ability, the courage, the patriotism of our youth, by those who refuse to accept reality—to admit that, great as they may be, our resources, our manpower, our military might are not inexhaustible.

We insist that we love peace; that we are not an aggressive people or nation, but from our shores our Armed Forces go east, go west, until they meet on the other side of the world—while peace, we insist, is our objective.

Our excuse for the establishment and maintenance of more than 900 military installations outside of the continental United States is that we desire to contain communism.

It can no more be successfully either contained or suppressed by force than was Christianity.

If Red China or Russia be the embodiment of communism and a threat to our national existence, if war must come then let our answer be quick and firm. Let it be directed at the source of the opposition, not at its puppets.

If our scientists, our military men, know what they have accomplished; if their statements as to our military might are accurate, then, at the first knowledge of real danger, let our A-bombs, our H-bombs, our guided missiles, our fleet, our submarines, our air force, whatever and all weapons that we may possess, be directed against the military installations of those countries.

Let us not sacrifice our foot soldiers in a futile invasion of either China or Russia. To attempt an invasion of either would mean the loss of our men to their teeming millions.

Before we invade either let us read history's primer.

The legislation before us today and supplementary legislation which will follow will destroy the freedom, the opportunity, which our forefathers came here to attain.

It will give us universal military conscription, return to the youth of today and tomorrow the military servitude which our forefathers came here to escape.

King George III hired the Hessians to fight the colonists. They fought for pay.

We would have our youth fight the battles of other nations, but without pay.

The answer that we cannot avoid war; that, unless we travel half way around the world to fight, to carry on a war, war will be brought to our shores, is answered by the fact that in preceding world wars neither Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Portugal, nor Spain participated. Today no nation will carry war to us.

There is no sound reason why a peace-loving nation, the most powerful military nation in the world, should be so fearful as to impose upon the present and future generations conscription, which requires every mentally and physically qualified young man, when he reaches the age of 18 years and 6 months, to enter and remain under the direction of military men for 2, then an additional 6, perhaps 8, years.

The average conscription service in other countries is less than 24 months. Russia, which we characterize as a nation whose citizens have no civil rights, imposes but 24 to 60 months military service upon its people.

We, the representatives of a free and independent people, so-called, today are asked to force our men—and if present trends continue, will be asked to force our women—into the service of the military for a period of 96 months, or 8 years, or, as some insist, possibly 120 months, or 10 years.

With our productive ability, our military might, the answer to the demand for universal military conscription for a period of at least 8 years is that we insist that the State Department shape its thinking and its policy to fit the Republic and the purposes for which it was established.

That the military cut its demands to the preparation of an adequate, efficient national defense, to the establishment and maintenance of a trained, efficient armed force whose sole objective is the protection of the interests of the United States, the preservation of our national sovereignty, the freedom of our people.

Once convinced that the sole purpose of the State Department and of the armed services is the protection and the preservation of the Republic, the freedom and the opportunities of our people, there will be no need for conscription of any kind.

Until the State Department and the armed services announce and adhere to the purposes set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, I will not by my vote take from the present or future generations the blessings which have come to us because of the love of freedom, the wisdom, of those who established this Nation, which have been so dearly earned and preserved by the efforts and the sacrifices of those who have gone before.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in calling for a greatly improved reserve program, the Government is taking another important step to reinforce our immediate and long-range security.

I believe the program offered in H. R. 5297 is both realistic and fair. It will help provide this country with a genuine

military readiness for the long haul which may lie ahead.

It is part of a related program to bolster our active forces, and to provide us with a capacity to mobilize swiftly and without undue difficulty if war should come to us.

Better than a year of exhaustive study and analysis on Government and related levels went into formulation of the administration's reserve program. Senate committee studies, veterans' association testimony, and other expert analysis had earlier defined a clear need to revise the Reserve program to get a more effective military instrument. The House Armed Services Subcommittee, headed by Mr. Brooks, has now spent better than 2 months in further study and refinement of this measure.

It should, I believe, be considered as one more positive step in the process of evolving a sound and equitable reserve program in this country. Basically, it amounts to a sharpening and tightening of the legal basis for a reserve established by Congress in the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

Like most legislation, it probably will not satisfy the objections of all interested parties. But I am convinced that it offers the best approach to a serious problem, and one which sincerely tries to deal constructively with the interests of all concerned.

Generally speaking, in many instances, H. R. 5297 follows the recommendations of the President as outlined in his January 13 message which listed the requirements for a Reserve as follows:

First. Improve the Reserve structure.

Second. Supply initially trained young men to the Reserve forces without adverse effect on the Active forces.

Third. Assure supply of trained personnel to the National Guard by assignment of obligated reservists.

Fourth. Secure compliance with Reserve training participation requirements.

Fifth. Permit organization in peacetime of State militia.

H. R. 5297 would accomplish each of these principal requirements.

The Reserve forces, composed of a Ready and a Standby Reserve, will be expanded to around 5 million men by 1959. The Ready Reserve will become properly organized and trained. The Standby Reserve will be nonorganized, but will contain trained personnel available in an emergency proclaimed by Congress.

The 6-month program for supplying initially trained young men to the Reserve forces will be volunteer in character, with a minimum and maximum quota of 100,000 and 250,000 annually, set by statute, and the numbers to be trained under these limits will be determined by the President. This program will have minimum effect on the Active forces because manpower pool levels will be protected.

The National Guard will be insured a supply of trained personnel, both through the 6-month program, and, if volunteer methods fail, by assigning reservists leaving active duty to guard units on the request and approval of appropriate authorities.

Compliance with the training program will be secured by stressing the obligation to serve in the common defense of the country, by proper incentive and earnback privileges, and by limited enforcement measures.

When the individual's participation in drills and annual training is deemed insufficient to maintain proficiency, he may be offered 30 days annual traning. Reservists who fail to perform duties under either choice may be required, without their consent, to take active duty for training for a total of 45 days annually. This, in the place of discharges "under conditions other than honorable," seemed to the committee a more positive approach to the problem of insured participation.

The organization of State militia in peacetime is permitted by the bill because of a need to underwrite internal security at times when the National Guard of the State is absent on Federal missions. I can see no conflict with the proper area of the guard in this arrangement, and such a militia in each State would unquestionably strengthen our civil defense.

This, in general terms, is the proposed Reserve program. Some details remain to be worked out, but in the main the provisions of H. R. 5297 provide for these results.

I might add a special word about the ROTC program. Special attention is given to this area in the national Reserve plan.

Under the proposed legislation, the ROTC program will be stimulated and brought into a more realistic unity with the remainder of the defense system. Basically, this has meant solving the problem of a greater ROTC production than our active forces require—short of mobilization. Added to this has been the need to maintain equity of service between ROTC graduates and all other able-bodied young men.

The national Reserve plan will allow qualified ROTC graduates to be assured of their commissions. Those in excess of active force requirements would take 6 months' training and spend the remainder of their military obligation in the Reserve. In addition to stabilizing the question of ROTC commissions and service, I am advised that the Department of Defense is actively promoting measures to upgrade the quality of the entire ROTC program.

ROTC graduates have more than proved their tremendous value to our defense in the past. This vital program shall be used to the full extent of its facilities.

The Reserve program of the administration recognizes the folly of trying to match the massive manpower of the Communist bloc of nations by maintaining equivalent active forces. Such a policy would quickly transform us into a garrison state, in which the loss of individual freedom would be an inevitable result.

We are, instead, placing our emphasis upon an active force of adequate size and power to handle the initial phases of any attack upon us, backed by a quickly mobilizable Reserve of trained manpower, and an ability to strike back with devastating force.

Add to this, the existence of the greatest industrial plant on earth, a constantly increasing technological ability—including the area of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons—and the proven fighting qualities of the American serviceman.

Properly integrated with the sizeable contributions of our allies, these separate factors add up to a formidable combination.

I believe the improved Reserve program now being proposed will do a sound and constructive job, and one which will generate increasing public confidence as it moves along.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with those who are in opposition to this bill. I speak partly because I have two sons who someday in the very near future are going to be affected by this type of legislation. Secondly, because although I was also on active duty for about 5 years, I have been a member of the Reserves for a great many years.

Some of you may remember the broadcast which took place about a week ago in which the people who took part in it reviewed the 10 years since V–E Day. The first group of people who appeared were military men. They prayed and hoped that we would not have an atom war, but they insisted that we be ready for an atom war. The next group of people, two of the finest cartoonists that came out of the recent war, predicted that we certainly would have a war.

Then, third, there was a little boy, I think he was about 10 years old, who prayed that we might be able to have, and he believed we would have when he grew up, a better world. Someone asked him if he would have to take part in military training. He said he supposed he would.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to think in the terms of that little boy because we owe him the duty of writing the kind of legislation which is adequate and which really does a job for our country. My objections to this bill are twofold. First of all, it has provisions in it which would, in my opinion, give to the military absolutely uncontrolled power over the young people of this country at a time when that power should not be exercised in times of peace. Secondly, it does not provide a decent Reserve for the kind of emergency which we will have to face. It provides merely a Reserve for the Army. It makes no provision for an all-out, well-rounded military Reserve program. It does not even go into the qualifications that the Pentagon will set up to provide the kind of training which will be needed. And, I know that many people here know at this very moment, even under the compulsory program that we helped to vote for, that the Pentagon today is not providing a decent training program for those who are forced and inducted into the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but believe that the Committee on Armed Services can do much better than this bill does; that they can, expressing some of the ideas that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], so well brought out here, make use of the educational facilities of our country; that they can go even further into the industrial units of our country and get them to cooperate in the kind of a Reserve program which will keep our men and our women all the time up to date in a program which will be needed if we have an all-out war.

This program that we are faced with today is simply a kind of a stop-gap program that the Pentagon has forced this committee to take in order to have some improvement over the utter failure that they have provided so far. I cannot help but believe that we live in a serious enough time so that it is the duty of this House to send this bill back to the committee and ask them, in view of all the things which have been said here this afternoon, to again put their wonderful efforts to work and bring out a bill which will provide us with an adequate Reserve and which, at the same time, will not interfere with the youth of our country and put them in the hands of the military 1 day a week in order that the military may sell their program to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know whether the gentleman is discussing the security bill and the defense of this country or discussing the convenience of individuals. Now, we cannot always conform to the convenience and the pleasure of individuals when we have the national security at stake, and we look at the problem primarily as a way to protect our country, even though some individuals might be seriously inconvenienced. No matter what kind of a bill you draw, there will be flaws in it. I do not care how wise you are or how skillful you are, whatever bill you draw will be a compromise of conflicting views.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let us get a bill that does not have all the flaws that this bill has in it. I think we can have a better bill. This bill is full of flaws. It does not provide—and I think you will admit this—it does not say a word about the kind of technical training which we talked about the other day when we passed the bill for the appropriations for the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There are some provisions in there on that topic that might be improved. I will concede that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But I do not concede that the bill is full of flaws; not by any means.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad tomorrow to point them out 1 by 1.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman said that the bill does not provide for what kind of technical training and so on?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It does not make use of and it provides no incentives for the young people of this country to stay in school and stay in college and work out their proficiencies along the line which will be something that they can take up afterward under civilian control rather than under military control.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am afraid the gentleman has not read the bill completely.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, I have.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Under the present law we can draft individuals into the military service.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, but you draft only a very small number.

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is true, but it may be the rare bird that you draft into the service. Under this program, a man who has exceptional ability after he finishes his 6-month period will be screened then into the Standby Reserve. He will have no Ready Reserve obligation whatsoever. Therefore, we have an improvement over the present law. We have recognized the individual repeatedly. We have corrected the bill so that we do take care of those people with exceptional skills where we are in short supply.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Why must they have exceptional skill? We need lots of these people. Is there anything which says who is going to decide that this man has the kind of skill which will put him in this Reserve?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is the military, is it not?

Mr. DEVEREUX. No, no; it is not. As a matter of fact, when that question was brought up, it was under a board established, and naturally established, by the Secretary of Defense. Seeing the danger in such a procedure as that, I personally offered an amendment to change that and set up a board under the President of the United States because, after all, he must consult with other departments of the Government.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Has the gentleman any assurance that that board will not be made up of military people?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Why, certainly, because, for instance, the head of manpower, or labor—all of those people must of necessity be consulted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be glad to see the language in this bill that says a single word about a civilian being on that board.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; and experience has demonstrated that it does not make very much difference, perhaps not at all, what the Congress writes into the law. The armed services interpret it the way they want to. And all anyone needs to do to confirm that is to look at the history of the Tydings amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as one who has been in the Naval Reserve for over 14 years and who has served more than 8 years on active duty, I regret that I must take the floor to oppose this bill, especially in view of the fact that I have been a long-time advocate of a strong Reserve program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I know the gentleman is sincere and honest in his conviction. I wish the gentleman as he goes along would offer to the committee an alternative program, assuming that this is not what he wants. Will the gentleman give us his ideas on what we ought to have?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think, if the gentleman please, it would be a bit presumptuous of me to write a bill for his committee; but I do not think it is presumptuous of me to criticize this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is it any more presumptuous to say that this bill is not satisfactory than it would be for the gentleman to say, "Here is my plan, I think it is a good one; this is what I would offer?"

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am not proposing the plan. I am undertaking, as I consider I have the right to do as a Representative, to criticize some specific parts of the gentleman's plan.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman is well within his rights, of course. The committee was sincerely trying to work out a program that would fit the convenience of the individual and limit the authority given under the bill to the extent they could. I think the committee was very sincere and honest in trying to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think so; but I regret I have not been here quite long enough to even presume to write such a bill.

I object specifically, if it please the gentleman, to the punitive aspects of the plan. One gentleman took the floor in support of the bill and said he admitted the present punitive aspects of the selective-service law were obnoxious and that those included in the measure are just a bit less obnoxious. He did not say, however, that they are not still obnoxious.

I do not think that these young men are sufficiently developed mentally at the age of 18 to make binding decisions which will affect their lives up through the age of 26. I do not think that every commanding officer in the Reserve is competent or well enough supervised by his superiors to be able to send a boy back into the service for 45 days if merely in the officer's judgment, the boy is not performing satisfactorily. I am told positively that neither the Army nor the Marine Corps plans to make use of the punitive aspect of this legislation; but it is still there.

I am not sure what the Army Reserve is going to do. I have been a bit amused by some of the statements to the effect that the Army Reserve program has been admitted by the committee to be a rather complete failure. I have as yet seen no

complete exposition of the reasons for that failure. We only have assurances that they know they have failed so far and only promises that they will not fail any more. I have seen no plan to overcome their deficiencies.

This is not an armed services Reserve bill, this is an Army Reserve bill. If it were so labeled I would be perhaps a little more sympathetic to it. I know it does nothing for the Air Force and nothing for the Naval Reserve. I do not know the Coast Guard problem. It seems to me a bit ridiculous to turn in 181 amphibious ships last week and this week ask for a larger Reserve, because it is going to take more than just a few days, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said the other day, to put 181 amphibious vessels back into commission to carry the big Reserve that you are going to build up.

I do not think I can write a better bill, on the basis of my own limited experience, and I acknowledge my limitations, but until I learn more I do not intend to vote for this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, every Member of the Congress has received many letters, phone calls, and personal visits from people who are worried about the possibilities in the National Reserve plan, as embodied in H. R. 5297, of the creation of a militaristic state. All of us, I am sure, share in that concern. I believe the record should be made clear in regard to several complaints made against this proposed plan.

First, we are told that we cannot prevent war with a big military establishment. May the record unmistakably show that no one in authority in this Government has any illusions that military might alone will prevent war. We are well aware that war can be prevented only by solving our economic, social, and spiritual problems. It was well stated by General MacArthur, when he spoke in this Chamber, that "wars could be prevented only by a rebirth of the spirit."

Actually, it is primarily because of our failure to carry the message of the spiritual nature of our concept of freedom that we have lost so much ground in our ideological conflict with communism.

It is important to remember, however, that communism uses physical force not merely as a weapon on the battlefield but as a diplomatic and psychological weapon. Unfortunately, in order to neutralize the effect of Communist use of physical force it is necessary to maintain a physical force of comparable power.

Many of our constituents argue that history shows that the establishment of a large military machine has not kept nations out of war. We are well aware of that. But by the same token failure to maintain an adequate defense has not prevented a nation from involvement in war; as witness Korea and other nations, too numerous to mention. Moreover, nations which have been careful to keep an adequate military defense have been able to avoid wars, such as Switzerland and Sweden.

Finally, it is argued that a large military machine may lead us into the role of an aggressor and we may be tempted to use it for selfish purposes as other nations have done.

It must be admitted that this is a risk. Historically, we have a good record. We have led the way in granting independence to peoples who have come under our control. Whether we fall into the error of misusing our military power will depend upon the character and spiritual strength of we, the people, who are the sovereign power of this Nation. If we are to win the ideological war with communism, we cannot fail in this test of our character and spiritual strength.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman has said, that military power and strength of itself will not prevent war, but I think my friend will agree with me that adequate and powerful military strength and power might deter and prevent an aggressor from making war.

Mr. HYDE. It might, but I am afraid the best use that can be made of it is simply a balance against the physical forces of atheistic communism.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I also wish to compliment the gentleman on his very interesting statement. Is it not conceded by almost everyone, both those opposed to the bill and those who are not opposed to it, that we can have the best kind of protection if we have military strength when we bargain. Also, I call your attention to the fact that General MacArthur in the last issue of the Reader's Digest booklet states that the only way to solve the problem of war is to abolish war. I am sure that General MacArthur, when he advocates the abolition of war as the only way to cure the situation we are in, believes that we must maintain a strong military posture, to move in the direction of the abolition of war as a means of settling international disputes.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman. I think there is no question about it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has 34 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICA LIVES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the smooth, uneventful American Airlines return flight which I took last Tuesday morning following the acceptance of the Georgetown University John Carroll award at Boston, Monday night, vividly emphasized that America lives.

It is a drive of about 17 miles from my hometown, Rockville, Conn., to Bradley Airport, the fine, new terminal which serves the Hartford, Conn.-Springfield, Mass., area. While some may still be sleeping, there is great activity at 6:30 a. m. on the road I must travel to the airport, since it is a main artery for workers in this section of eastern Connecticut who are employed at the new plant of the Hamilton Standard Propeller Co.

Invariably the workers drive their very own cars, having left their self-owned homes. But the report that I desire to make to the House today concerns the overall picture, the activity that is everywhere viewed from the plane en route to Washington.

Very shortly after we were airborne there appeared to be more than the usual number of lakes and ponds on either side of the Connecticut River than are indicated on the map of the State. These are tenting being spread over wires under which tobacco plants will be set out in another 2 weeks, and Connecticut shade-grown tobacco, the best cigar wrapper, will be in production again. From the air the white netting simulates water.

In minutes, one sees the tall spire of the Travelers Insurance Co.—its distinguishing beacon light now extinguished since the sun has brilliantly risen and it is 7:15 a. m., albeit daylight saving time. Thin smoke emanating from lofty chimneys atop the Hartford Electric Light Co. plant near the Charter Oak Bridge proclaims the approach to Hartford, the State capital, where the wheels of its diversified industry are humming with activity as attested to by the many workers' autos which surround the buildings. Incidentally, much West Virginia coal is used by the Hartford Electric Light Co. A quickly disappearing white steam shooting from low stacks on the east side of the river confirms that jet engines are being tested at Pratt and Whitney Aircraft.

The route to New York discloses new industrial plants which contribute much to the economy of the local community by creating a need for additional workers, homes, schools, churches, stores. New railroad spurs are being put in place leading to these new plants to insure rapid and efficient handling of interstate commerce.

The first glimpse of New York City is always a most exciting and invigorating sight. While practically circling the city to land at LaGuardia, the viewer notes the consolidation of great wealth which makes an immediate and indelible impression on the mind. The highways, skyways, and byways leading into the

city are alive with traffic which resembles a blending of the colors of the rainbow.

After a short stay at LaGuardia, the flight is resumed and this time the plane heads for the George Washington Bridge to cross the Hudson and then to head south for Washington. There comes the opportunity to the passenger to catch a panoramic view of Manhattan Island, its skyscrapers, its avenues, its wharves and piers. The human eye records this never-to-be-forgotten scene that will remain in the recesses of memory and the entire picture recalled vividly with the mere thought and reminder of this morning.

Ships are now moving into and out of New York Harbor past the Statue of Liberty.

Many tugboats are shifting barges and cargo and passenger vessels into loading and unloading piers—everything is alive—it is a new dawn, a new day, a new era, America proceeds to its greater destiny, America lives.

Mr. Speaker, I continued to be overwhelmed with the scenes below of great chemical plants, various other heavy industry, as we proceeded toward Philadelphia and I can recall where a month ago on a similar flight I had seen clusters of trees and small hills. Today they are gone, the trees have vanished, and the elevation is leveled. Foundations are in place and a large shopping center in various stages of construction is well underway.

In another section, a housing project—individual homes—multicolored roofs, all new, are clearly delineated from the air.

The trains, buses, trucks, smoke from refineries are all symbols and evidence of the continuing prosperity and greatness of America.

The bulldozers, tractors, and other equipment actively engaged in road building along the New Jersey Turnpike reminded me that more of this is needed today and tomorrow to cope with our expanding economy and American automobile ingenuity. Recently, I heard a highway engineer state that 1 month's auto production placed bumper to bumper would stretch for a distance of 90 miles.

There was a repetition of these sights and scenes as we flew over Philadelphia and on to my ultimate destination, Washington.

The longest freight train I had ever seen was crossing the 14th Street Bridge into Washington, D. C., just as the plane came in for the landing at National Airport. The closed sides indicated that the boxcars were filled—a proven barometer of healthy business activity.

My fellow passengers who transferred at La Guardia to planes bound for the Middle and Far West and others who continued their journeys to Florida and Texas in my plane saw a continuation of varied signs which, translated, spell peace and prosperity. Yes, Mr. Speaker, truly America lives.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, I sent a questionnaire to the voters of the Fifth Congressional District of New York in an effort to determine their views on pending legislation and subjects that might give rise to legislation. I endeavored to reach every household in my district that had a registered voter.

Question No. 38 on this questionnaire was as follows:

Would you favor a national lottery to help defray Government expenses?

Eighty-two percent of my constituents who answered this question were in favor of a lottery.

We are all interested in balancing the budget, and I do feel that we should explore this possibility for obtaining the necessary funds for this purpose. Many countries have found this to be very satisfactory and by using the lottery they have been able to keep their tax rate down.

I am today introducing a resolution which, if passed, would direct you, Mr. Speaker, to appoint a select committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine the advisability and feasibility of using a governmentally conducted lottery as a means of raising additional revenue for the support of the Government. I hope that my colleagues will see fit to support this resolution.

THE NATION NEEDS AN ADEQUATE RESERVE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, conditions which confront the free world today make it mandatory that the United States and its Allies look to all aspects of their security.

The nature of the Communist threat has remained basically unchanged.

World War II saw the Soviet Union emerge as the greatest single power on earth next to the United States.

But when the United States and the remainder of the Allies who had fought against the Axis Powers disarmed after that war, the Soviet Union remained fully mobilized, and began a feverish buildup of those areas of its military might which the war had depleted.

From this fact has sprung the basic misery of the present time—which is a world threatened by the possibility that unrestrained military destruction will be unleashed upon mankind.

From their position of power, it was an easy thing for the Reds to ignore promises and honorable commitments previously made and to further advance world communism.

In close cooperation with the Soviet forces stand the armed millions of Communist China, whose leaders continue to be dependent upon the Kremlin for the industrial sinews which their war machine requires.

Here it is pertinent to note that about 3 months ago the Peiping government announced a vast overhaul of its Armed Forces, and a compulsory program of active and reserve military service for every man from the age of 18 until he reaches his 40th birthday.

It requires little imagination to surmise the total numbers of trained men any such program as this will provide the Chinese Communist military planners.

Thus the Communist powers of the world stand today—armed to the teeth and determined to grow even stronger in every military capacity.

From their position of massive armed might they support their worldwide program of infiltration and subversion, espionage, intimidation, and outright challenge of democratic processes in country after country.

At the present time, most of the tension forthcoming as a result of these facts centers around the area of the Formosa Straits, and in the region of the China coast.

In the past, however, and in much the same fashion, the deadly influence of massive Communist military power has caused upheaval, conflict, and even open war in areas like Czechoslovakia, Greece, Berlin, Iran, Korea, Indochina, first one and then the other.

So what we face today in the creeping expansion of communism backed by hundreds of divisions, guns, bombs, and a manpower supply running into the millions, is a long-term challenge to the free nations of the world, and to every individual living in them.

The United States today is making response to this fundamental threat in a variety of ways.

The bonds with our allies are being strengthened—in NATO, in the London and Paris accords, in the Manila and Rio pacts, and in our mutual-defense treaties.

More than 40 free nations, including the United States, have allied themselves in regional defense arrangements.

Collectively our allies are stronger today than ever.

The philosophy of our Government within this framework of alliances is to confront the world at all times with a willingness to deal in good faith, but to do so from a realistic position of strength, rather than weakness.

The best hope this Nation has for peace, along with its allies, is to maintain such a position of strength from which it can work to reduce world tensions.

For this we require a stable and predictable military-defense program free of the feast-and-famine expediency of other years, and providing a solid foundation for balance in all our service branches.

The alternative is to court fatal weaknesses which might some day mean an-

other, and far worse, Pearl Harbor right at our own front doorstep.

We must look at America's defense program today with a realistic and sensible eye to our world commitments, the nature of the times, and the uncertainties of the future.

The President has recommended the maintenance of an active-forces strength of approximately 2,850,000 at an annual budget cost of around $34 billion.

Within this framework, he has put emphasis on the existence of those forces and facilities for which the United States, uniquely among free nations, is best suited.

The proposed strength levels are based on world conditions at present.

They are based on the improved military preparedness of our allies, the end of fighting in Korea and Indochina, improved weapons, better use of our manpower, expected improvements in the future, the continuing Communist threat and a host of other factors.

With all these factors in mind, our preparedness picture will be incomplete without a revitalized and stimulated Reserve program which will serve as a ready backstop to our active forces, providing us with a swiftly mobilizable strength for either emergency situations or the long haul of a protracted cold war.

The reason why a national Reserve plan is being offered to Congress today is that the present situation of our reserves requires corrective action in accordance with the valid military requirements of this Nation.

Generally speaking, this involves the correction of six broad problems which currently prevent our reserve program from being all that it could be.

I should like to discuss these problems, and indicate how the national reserve plan will afford constructive action.

The first problem in need of correction lies in the area of the reserve structure.

The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 established two principal reserve categories, the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve, designating liability for service during emergencies.

As conceived, the Ready Reserve, within a 1.5 million strength ceiling, was to contain the units and individuals to be employed in an emergency proclaimed by the President, and to be mobilized first in a general emergency.

The Standby Reserve was to contain units and individuals which, together with those of the Ready Reserve, would constitute the reserve mobilization base for a general emergency or war.

But this Reserve structure has not functioned in practice in the way it was intended.

In practice as opposed to theory, the strength of the Ready Reserve has increased far in excess of its statutory limit, yet it does not contain those organized forces which it is supposed to have for its mobilization duties.

The Standby Reserve, on the other hand, has experienced a shortage of personnel, so that it has not been feasible to organize units in it.

It is interesting to note the reasons why this particular situation has developed.

Transfer from the Ready Reserve to the Standby Reserve is accomplished at the request of the individual.

Members serving in the Reserve under a statutory obligation are eligible for transfer only as a result of satisfactory participation in a Reserve training program.

But the great bulk of individuals who have moved into the Ready Reserve upon release from active duty to complete their obligation, have simply chosen to sit it out rather than join a training program.

The Ready Reserve has become in large part a Reserve pool increasing in size, but becoming relatively less ready from the standpoint of containing organized and trained forces.

Recent strength figures show that the Ready Reserve contains 2,546,000, including 330,000 on active duty, while the Standby Reserve contains only about 200,000 members, of whom 140,000, or 67 percent, are on the inactive status list.

In the event of mobilization, the task of determining which of these millions of reservists should be ordered to service, and which would be essential in civilian pursuits, would fall on the military, and would constitute dangerous delay in event of mobilization.

The national Reserve plan would see the Ready Reserve become an organized force of trained units and individuals.

It would be of size and composition to constitute the reserve base for initial phases of a general mobilization, and would meet Presidentially proclaimed emergencies as well.

The Standby Reserve would become a nonorganized reserve pool from which experienced personnel would be selected for those forces to be developed in the secondary phases of a general mobilization.

On the basis of current planned strengths of 2.88 million for the active forces, Ready Reserve requirements have been determined to be 2.9 million men.

The goal for meeting these requirements is the end of fiscal year 1959.

It is expected that the Standby Reserve will reach a strength of 2 million by that time, but since they will be subject to selective recall, not all of this 2 million will be utilized in a mobilization.

To assure that the Ready Reserve will in fact be available in the event of mobilization, and to make certain of the least impact on the civilian economy as well, members of the Ready Reserve will be subject to a continuous screening process.

Under this process, men with civilian skills excess to military requirements, men with jobs in essential civilian activities or government, and those with excess military requirements will be transferred from Ready Reserve to Standby Reserve.

First consideration for such transfer will go to combat veterans.

Under the terms of this bill, the President may summon up to 1 million of the Ready Reservists in an emergency which he proclaims.

Any larger number will require congressional action.

The Standby Reserve will be called on a selective basis only in an emergency declared by the Congress.

With these changes, it is plain that the overall Reserve structure will be vastly improved, and placed upon a more functional and ready-to-go basis.

Problem No. 2 involves the fact that under present law there is no effective and practicable means to assure participation in Reserve training programs, and the incentives to participate have not alone achieved the desired result.

Of the 2.2 million members of the Ready Reserve not on active duty, only 700,000, or, roughly, 1 out of 3, are participating in paid training.

And within the approximately 700,000 in training, there is an imbalance in grade structure and a disproportionate ratio of officers to enlisted men.

Much discussion has attended this question of compliance with the proposed Reserve program, but in the last analysis the question is one of achieving an adequate and worthwhile Reserve program, or none at all.

The national Reserve plan provides reasonable compliance measures, involving one basic change by the committee.

This was the rejection of discharge under conditions other than honorable for noncomplying trainees, and the substitution of a required training period in its place.

Thus, those individuals who fail to attend required minimum drills and training may be involuntarily ordered to active training for as much as 45 days annually.

Experience has shown that a purely voluntary Reserve program will prove inadequate to our needs today.

What the national Reserve plan provides is a means whereby men who have a statutory obligation to serve a period of training in the Reserves will actually do so, rather than ignore that obligation entirely.

A third problem area centers around the requirement for a supply of initially trained young men to the Reserves or the National Guard.

The national Reserve plan proposes a limited 6 months' active duty program, followed by 7½ years of Ready Reserve or National Guard service.

The program will be carefully regulated by Presidential quota to avoid any adverse effect on Active Forces volunteer programs.

H. R. 5297 provides that this quota shall have a net minimum goal of 100,000 annually and a maximum of 250,000 net annually.

Under present law, men below the age of 18½ may voluntarily enter the National Guard and be deferred from induction for active service—so long as their service is satisfactory.

But the problem centers around the fact that these men come into the guard with no prior training whatsoever; consequently, their entry into National Guard units means giving them such training.

One result is a general lowering of the unit training level, as officers and experienced men concentrate on providing them with basic training.

A high percentage of National Guard enlisted personnel have not had the benefit of basic training.

Add to this a well-nigh prohibitive turnover rate among such personnel and the constant problem of combat officers drilling green recruits becomes even clearer.

H. R. 5297 includes a statutory requirement that National Guard strength must be maintained.

This leads to the fourth major problem area which is the fact that the National Guard does not presently have an assured supply of trained men.

The bill departs somewhat from previous practices, and the exclusively volunteer character of the guard, to meet this requirement.

It is desirable to keep this volunteer character to the greatest possible extent, but if strength levels are to be maintained, some kind of insurance must be provided to accomplish this purpose.

There is provision in the bill, as the President recommended last January, to assure a supply of trained personnel to the guard either by transfer of obligated reservists or by voluntary participation under the 6-month program.

H. R. 5297 would, therefore, make it possible to transfer men with Ready Reserve obligations to the National Guard, for the duration of their service period.

Such transfer, however, can be accomplished only upon request or approval of the governor.

In addition to this provision, young men before age 18 may enlist directly into the National Guard, take 6 months' training with the active forces, and serve the remainder of a 7½-year obligation in the National Guard.

H. R. 5297 will provide the National Guard with two things: First, a supply of initially trained young men able to join units and proceed at once with advanced training, and second, insurance that if volunteer methods fail to provide adequate numbers to meet required strength levels, men leaving the active services may be transferred to guard units for the remainder of their Ready Reserve obligation.

Provisions of this kind are in the all-round interest of the National Guard and the general defense structure.

They will, in my opinion, provide us with a greatly strengthened and more appropriately trained guard organization.

The fifth problem with which H. R. 5297 deals, relates to the possibility of an attack against the United States coming at a time when National Guard units are required for duty away from their States.

Under present law States may not maintain troops in peacetime in addition to the National Guard.

Thus there is a period between the ordering of the National Guard into Federal service and the organizing of State militia, or home guard, when the State would have no troops available for internal security missions or support of civil defense.

The bill, accordingly, provides for the establishment of State defense forces in peacetime, in addition to the National Guard.

Here the bill clearly states that such State defense forces will be authorized in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and as provided by the laws of the State.

Their numbers will be determined under defense regulations.

H. R. 5297 provides further that in peacetime such forces will be on an adequate basis for planning and organization, capable of rapid expansion in the event the Army or Air National Guard are ordered to Federal duty, or in emergencies declared by the Congress or the President.

These forces, composed principally of men ineligible for other service, could render great community service in the event of an attack, and in the absence of the guard.

The last problem considered under the new reserve program is that of the ROTC in the schools and colleges where it applies.

Basically, this involves providing an answer to the fact that current production of the ROTC program for mobilization requirements is greater than our active force requirements.

Equity considerations rule out deferment of ROTC graduates from military service when other draft-liable persons have been and must continue to be inducted for 24 months of active service.

Under H. R. 5297, all qualified ROTC graduates will receive their commissions.

The Department of Defense proposed to handle this administratively.

The committee did not accept this view and instead wrote into the bill a guaranty to commission all qualified Army and Air Force ROTC graduates.

On graduation, those excess to requirements of the active forces will be given 6 months of active training duty, after which they will be in the Reserves for the remainder of their service obligation.

As the committee has noted in the report, "excess to requirements" refers to numbers, and not to quality.

Provision of this kind with respect to the ROTC program, in the opinion of the committee, will greatly stimulate interest in this program, and improve its value to the overall defense effort.

These, then, are the 6 broad problems which are corrected by the program legislation offered in H. R. 5297.

There are, of course, many other aspects of this legislation which are not covered in my remarks, but I have wanted to talk about these problems in particular as a means of showing the positive features of the national Reserve plan.

It is a corrective plan, not something wild-eyed and new, and not something totally at variance with past experience.

It seeks to make certain needed improvements within the general framework of existing legislation, with the ultimate single objective of providing this country with a real Reserve, instead of one which merely exists on paper.

I believe the new Reserve program is going to deal fairly and competently with the manpower needs of all component services, including the National Guard in its State and Federal status.

I believe it will greatly strengthen our country and place the Reserves in each State across the Nation in a strong position—well equipped and trained in extensive facilities.

A realistic Reserve program to back up our active forces has become a simple commonsense necessity in this day of danger and tension.

The national Reserve plan has been evolved after better than 1 year of hard work and consultation on all levels of Government and after 3 months additional study and revision in the Armed Services Committee.

I believe we shall be taking one of the most shortsighted views in the history of this body if we do not give our full support to this measure.

It will provide our Nation with a very sizable increase in necessary strength, and what is more it will serve notice on potential enemies that we are determined to maintain all areas of our military readiness on an up-to-date and strengthened basis.

It will reinforce our basic philosophy of going forward to reduce world tensions from a position of strength.

DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC-FUELED ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and State and of the entire New England region are vitally concerned with the speedy development of atomic-fueled electric generating plants commercially competitive with plants which depend on water, gas, and coal as a source of fuel. The people of my district and State also recognize that an expanding economy in New England and in the Nation depends upon the availability of electric energy, from whatever source it may be generated. In New England especially, because of the lack of such fuels as coal, oil, and gas, we are anxious to encourage in every way consistent with the public interest the development of atomic power as a new source of energy. The Congress in 1946 under a Democratic administration and in 1954 under a Republican administration declared that it was the policy of the United States to promote the peacetime development of atomic energy within the framework of our free competitive economy.

In accordance with these basic concepts and considerations I have today introduced a bill, which is designed to remove a technical impediment to the expeditious prosecution of the program for the development of atomic or nuclear powered electric generators. As the Members of this House know, hundreds of millions of dollars must be spent in further experimentation and research before atomic fueled electric generating stations can be made commercially competitive with generating stations which depend on other types of fuels. Primarily because of the large sums which must be spent in research and on pilot

plants, groups of electric energy distributors, both public and private, as well as industrial companies have, with the encouragement of the Atomic Energy Commission, formed study groups to explore the commercial feasibility of producing electric energy with atomic power as the source of fuel. Some groups have applied to the Atomic Energy Commission for licenses for the construction and operation of dual-purpose nuclear reactors. As this House also knows, all nuclear material will, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, remain at all times the property of the United States. That act provides, however, that public and private agencies may, if they meet the standards and requirements of the Commission, in effect, lease, for a consideration determined by the Commission, a supply of special nuclear material. The special nuclear material would then be used to supply the heat to operate an electric steam generating station.

Under the pooling arrangement to which I have referred, the prospective applicant for a license for a supply of special nuclear material and for a license to construct facilities for its use in the generation of electric energy would be a specially organized entity acting on behalf of the members of the pool or group. It is at this point that the program's speed is deterred by the requirements of a law enacted 20 years ago to meet an entirely different situation but which because of its wording applies to the program of having one entity act on behalf of several companies or public agencies—such companies and agencies to share the financial burden and other risks. The law to which I refer is one for which I have the greatest respect and which, in my judgment, has been productive of a financially sound and independent electric utility industry. That law is the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. That act was properly enacted to break up scattered holding-company empires and to return the operating companies to the control of the State commissions representing the people served by such companies. These empires have now been broken up and most of the holding-company systems of the twenties and thirties have gone out of existence. The only ones now remaining are those which were able to meet the rigid geographical integration and corporate simplification standards imposed by section 11 of that act. As was intended by the framers of the 1935 act, the various States following the pattern established under the Holding Company Act extended the jurisdiction of their respective public service commissions until today almost every State has a commission which has jurisdiction over electric and gas utility operating companies in such matters as accounts, rates, standards of service, acquisition and disposition of assets, mergers, dealings with affiliates, service contracts, the issuance of securities, and the many other matters over which the Securities and Exchange Commission has jurisdiction with respect to holding companies and their subsidiaries. In addition to State regulation, electric utility companies which have facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce are subject to the broad jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

I have touched briefly on the objectives of the Holding Company Act and have indicated that its principal objectives have, as intended by the framers of that act, been accomplished. The holding company systems have been broken up and the control and regulation of the local operating companies has been returned to the States. However, under the Holding Company Act, an electric utility is, in general, defined as any company which owns facilities for the generation, transmission, or sale of electric energy. A holding company is defined as any company which owns 10 or more percent of the voting securities of an electric or gas utility. Thus every company which participates in the pooling device for the development of an atomic-powered electric generating station may under the act become a holding company. Thus, under the law as it now stands, a company participating in the atomic energy program for the development of low-cost electric power could be subjected to regulation by one or more State commissions, by the Federal Power Commission, by the Atomic Energy Commission, and by the Securities and Exchange Commission. At the time the holding company act was enacted the pyramiding device was often referred to in the debates and reports. It seems to me that we have gone to the opposite extreme and are now in a period where there is a pyramiding of regulation.

I think we can all agree that because of the great public interest involved, every electric utility should be regulated by an appropriate agency of the State it serves; and that when it engages in interstate transmission or electric energy or operates facilities under license from either the Federal Power Commission or the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Government should effectively regulate such companies. On the other hand, I believe we can agree that duplicate regulation is expensive to the Government and to the ratepayers. Regulation can be carried to the point where, when as in the atomic energy program, speed is of vital importance the purpose of regulation—that is, the advancement and protection of the public interest—is not served but thwarted.

Make no mistake about this—the bill I have introduced today does not do away with regulation—it requires regulation. It does not free any holding company now registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission from regulation. It does not apply to any of the situations or abuses the Holding Company Act was designed to meet. It does not free any company from any of the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933. It merely says that any company not otherwise a holding company shall not be deemed to be a holding company under that act solely by reason of the ownership of 10 or more percent of the voting securities of a generating company if it meets these tests: First, all of the outstanding voting securities of the generating company are owned by 2 or more electric utility or holding companies whose facilities are interconnected and whose other utility assets are located within economical transmission distance of the generating company; second, all of the electric energy generated and sold by the generating company is sold to a public agency or to one or more of the companies owning its voting securities; and third, the issuance of securities by the generating company and by each of the electric utility or holding companies owning its voting securities is subject to the jurisdiction of a State commission or of any agency or instrumentality of the United States.

Under the definitions of "electric utility company" and "holding company" contained in the present act it is probable that many industrial companies which have no connection with the generation, distribution, or sale of electric energy would nevertheless, by participating in a pooling arrangement for the development of a dual purpose nuclear reactor, through a subsidiary, also become holding companies. To clarify the status of these companies another section of my bill provides that if a company's only connection with generation, distribution, or sale of electric energy is the ownership, directly or indirectly, of a nuclear reactor for the production of heat to fire an electric generator boiler, such company shall not be deemed to be an electric utility company within the meaning of the act and consequently industrial companies organizing subsidiary companies to own nuclear reactors would not become holding companies.

A final section of my bill provides that no other provision of the Holding Company Act is to be affected and that nothing contained in the bill is to be construed as relieving any company from any obligations imposed by the Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Mr. Speaker, according to Atomic Energy Commission officials, atomic powerplants in order to be made commercially competitive with large central steam-generating stations using conventional fuels, must be brought down to a boiler cost of from $40 to $70 per kilowatt—the cost of conventional boilers of the same size. The Atomic Energy Commission estimates that its first full-scale nuclear powerplant—the pressurized water reactor now under construction at Shippingport, Pa.—will have a reactor boiler cost of $37,500,000 for 60,000 kilowatts of electrical capability—over $600 per kilowatt. Public and private agencies should be given every encouragement to invest their funds to bring these costs down. It is probable that the hundreds of millions of dollars to be invested in the first several years will produce no return and will be in the nature of research. Duplicate regulation under the Holding Company Act will cost these companies hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Delays inevitable result from the mere fact of filing applications and clearing each step with several regulatory agencies. Perhaps other duplications in regulation should be removed. I am, however, at this time proposing only a technical

modification or clarification of the Holding Company Act because I am convinced that insofar as that act is concerned it was never intended when it was drafted and passed 20 years ago to meet a situation of the kind we face today.

I have called my bill the Electric Energy Development Act of 1955. While it is designed primarily to meet the situation which has arisen with respect to the need for the pooling of the resources of several companies, through subsidiaries, to speedily develop electric energy from atomic power there are other situations to which it will apply. On April 15, 1955, the Office of Defense Mobilization announced an upward revision of its electric power expansion goal, in suspension since December 3, 1953.

The revised goal is for a total domestic capacity capable of producing 150 million kilowatts of electric energy by the end of 1958. This is an increase of about 46 million kilowatts over the capacity scheduled to have been in place on December 31, 1954. In their announcement ODM officials noted that utilities have expanded their capacity tremendously over the past several years to meet the country's ever-growing need for electric energy, but encouragement of further expansion is necessary. They stated that at the end of 1954 the capacity total in the United States was approximately 103 million kilowatts and that in 1944, at the height of World War II, capacity total was only 49 million kilowatts.

The expansion of electric generating capacity by Federal Government encouragement was commenced through tax concession under President Roosevelt, continued under President Truman, and is going forward under President Eisenhower. Thus the dependence of an expanding economy upon an adequate supply of electric energy can properly be said to be nonpartisan and one which the members of all parties can work to promote. My bill would at no cost to the Federal Government—in fact there would be savings to the Government and to the rate payers—encourage further development of the Nation's electric energy resources from atomic energy, water, coal, oil, and gas. It would do this by recognizing that during the past 20 years the advancement in the art have been such that today the most efficient and lowest cost generating stations are ones costing in many cases hundreds of millions of dollars. In many areas the development of such large-scale plants are beyond the financial resources of any one company. My bill recognizes this fact and permits a pooling of financial resources by two or more companies in those cases where the public interest requires it. At the same time it preserves intact all existing regulation exercised by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the various State commissions.

Great Britain, as many Members know, has announced that it proposes to spend $840 million to build 12 nuclear power stations with a capacity of between 1½ and 2 million kilowatts. Russia boasts that it already has a nuclear power station in operation. Many other foreign countries are said to be going forward with programs for nuclear reactors. I believe that we in the United States must stay ahead in this race. We can do it through legislation of the kind I have introduced today at no cost to overburdened taxpayers. I ask the support of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee; and

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances and to include an article in each.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.

Mr. SIKES and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include an article, notwithstanding that it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $300.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. CELLER on two subjects.

Mrs. HARDEN and to include an article by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mrs. KNUTSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

807. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, involving an increase of $3,734,735 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

808. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment for the fiscal year 1956 for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization (H. Doc. No. 164); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

809. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

810. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

811. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

812. A letter from the Assistant to the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration and the regulation of the practice of architects and professional engineers"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

813. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 29, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Bad River, Wis., for flood control with particular reference to Mellen and Odanah and vicinities. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on April 6, 1946. It is also submitted in partial response to a preliminary examination and survey of all streams and rivers and tributaries flowing into Lake Superior in Ashland, Bayfield, or Douglas Counties, Wis., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 165), and ordered to be printed with three illustrations; to the Committee on Public Works.

814. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

815. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 246. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5715, a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4630. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 296. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the Winter Olympic Games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. Senate Joint Resolution 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2973. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education; with amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4576. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema; without amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6286. A bill to protect the public health by providing for grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6287. A bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 6288. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 6289. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6290. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6291. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 6292. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6293. A bill to continue and extend Federal oil and gas lease No. 03607 under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 6294. A bill to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States by encouraging maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources of power, including atomic energy, coal, oil, natural gas, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6295. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 6296. A bill to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6297. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6298. A bill to amend section 601 (g) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes" approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit transfer of war housing projects to the City of Moses Lake, Wash., and to other communities similarly situated; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 6299. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 6300. A bill to amend section 1231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6301. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 6302. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6303. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain real property by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6304. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make loans to assist students in pursuing courses at colleges and universities in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PROUTY (by request):

H. R. 6305. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1888, entitled "An act to aid to State or Territorial homes" (title 24, sec. 134, U. S. C., as amended); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6306. A bill to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 6307. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 6308. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study the effect on the private shipbuilding industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in Government shipyards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6309. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6310. A bill to increase the income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6311. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6312. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 247. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the advisability and feasibility of a governmental lottery; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6315. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Andreas Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 6316. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomye Kawase Macy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 6317. A bill for the relief of the Memphis Stone & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6318. A bill to authorize Col. Jay P. Thomas, United States Air Force, to accept the Military Medal and Air Force Wings awarded him by the Republic of Chile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6319. A bill for the relief of Jean Taylor Wandish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6320. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Sook Chur Chiang, alias Sook Chur York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6322. A bill for the relief of Millard F. Blanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 6323. A bill for the relief of Friedel Fraas and her daughter, Shirley Ila Maria Fraas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6324. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kit Ling Wong Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6325. A bill for the relief of Lino Aguilon Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

266. By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON: Petition of Charles B. Pritchard, president, Local No. 201, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, and 140 employees of the Cleveland Worsted Mills Co., Annevar plant, Ravenna, Ohio, urging the establishment of Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and labor.

267. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 141 residents of the State of Washington to exercise the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

268. By Mr. McVEY: Petition of F. H. White and 273 residents of Fourth District of Illinois who are desirous of seeing early enactment by the Congress of H. R. 3087 and H. R. 757, relative to railroad retirement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

269. By Mr. METCALF: Petition of citizens of Montana requesting an investigation of the administration of the Bankhead-Jones land; to the Committee on Agriculture.

270. By Mr. WATTS: Petition of various citizens of Lancaster, Ky., in support of legislation prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

271. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, St. Matthew's Holy Name Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

272. Also, petition of the recording secretary general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution pertaining to the Bricker amendment, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

273. Also, petition of Leodegario M. Radaza, Poblacion, La Paz, Leyte, Philippines, requesting that service by his father in the Native Volunteers be considered as service in the United States Army, and that he be entitled to death claim compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

274. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Texas Medical Association, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted by the Texas Medical Association at its 88th annual session at Fort Worth, Tex., April 24–27, expressing its strong opposition to the compulsory extension of the social-security system of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Immigration and Naturalization Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, over the week-end, May 6 to 8, the executive board of the American Jewish Committee, a very fine and reputable organization, of which I am privileged to be an officer, held a meeting in Washington, D. C.

On the evening of May 7, the executive board sponsored a dinner at which Mr. Irving Engel, president of the American Jewish Committee, made a report on the current status of various public issues, and at which I, too, made a few remarks. A major portion of Mr. Engel's report dealt with our immigration and naturalization policies, which was also the subject of my remarks on that occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Engel's address dealing with immigration be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the remarks I made on the same subject.

There being no objection, the address and the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY IRVING M. ENGEL

America's immigration policies—as reflected in the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act and the operation of the Refugee Relief Act—cannot escape indictment as hurtful to the security of the free world. A 2-year review of their impact demonstrates that both have had the net effect of crippling our cold-war effort against communism.

The most hopeful sight in this dark picture is the fact that the Corsi affair has aroused nationwide concern that is shared by the administration and both political parties. Corsi's ouster should be understood as a final dramatic warning lest our so-called immigration and refugee relief acts be woven into a redtape curtain around the United States. Among the very people we should be welcoming to our side in the cold war are thousands of anti-Communists who have risked their lives to escape. Communist minefields could not stop them but the heartlessness of some American bureaucrats and lawmakers is preventing those would-be allies of the free world from joining us. Our own policies may thus prove the greatest boon to communism by setting up conditions that are practically impossible for refugees and escapees to meet. Communists are exploiting this opportunity militantly. With alarming success, they are propagandizing the thousands of people who fled from their rule but have been languishing in limbo for months and even years because we are denying them entry. The magnitude of this defeat cannot be underestimated because it will deter countless others behind the Iron Curtain from seeking asylum.

For its services in alerting America to these facts, the New York Times is to be commended. Its special reports from Munich on the plight of tens of thousands of refugees from the Soviet Union and its satellites should be studied by the Congress.

When Corsi sought to cut down the redtape curtain he not only encountered resistance, but was ousted as a reward for his efforts to bring about a long overdue liberalization of the law's operation.

Equally harmful is the McCarran-Walter Act which continues to deny us the benefits of a desirable flow of immigrants from the free world. Its racist and other repressive features are denying America fresh opportunities to attract people who will continue the process of enrichment just as has been done by immigrants in decades past. Apart from humanitarian reasons which urge us to admit these people, we should do so because it will be to our national interest. History proves how much of our well-being this Nation owes to immigrants and their descendants for their contributions to our economic and cultural progress and to our scientific preeminence in the fields of medicine, atomic research, electronics, etc.

Despite the fact that the President and members of both political parties have repeatedly emphasized the need to revise these harsh and unreasoning statutes and their administration, they remain unchanged. The American Jewish Committee believes that when the Senate Judiciary Committee opens hearings on measures to improve our immi-

gration policies, it will have the opportunity to emphasize the grave threats to American security that have resulted from these policies.

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT DINNER MEETING OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE BOARD, SHOREHAM HOTEL, MAY 7, 1955

I am glad to be able to be here tonight with you, Irving, and with so many old and true friends.

I had not expected to have this pleasure, but events arranged themselves so that I could.

There are many subjects I would like to discuss with you tonight, but unscheduled as I am, I am only going to discuss briefly one matter close to my heart, in which I know the AJC has a deep interest, too.

It is now 3 years since the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act, a bill which was passed over President Truman's veto in the summer of 1952.

Our experience with this dreadful law has fully justified the opposition which the American Jewish Committee and which I, and other Members of the Senate, expressed at the time of passage.

I will always remember one of the last appearances in the Senate of the late beloved Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut—perhaps it was the last one before his untimely death—when he spoke out and voted against the McCarran-Walter Act. How true was his vision and that of your own organization which fought valiantly against that law.

Under the McCarran-Walter Act, the name of the United States has been besmirched abroad. And here at home, we have seen numberless cases of injustice and heartbreak.

Distinguished visitors, scholars, scientists, and even plain tourists from abroad, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, and saboteurs.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle here are treated. It is harder for them to be admitted into the United States than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle—that is, unless they are Basque sheepherders.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of illegal immigrants have streamed across the Mexican and Canadian borders, unchecked and unscreened—without arousing major protest from the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act.

It is unnecessary for me to prove my point, although I wish I had time to tell you about some of the heartbreaking cases which come to my attention almost every day as a result of the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act—cases not only of aliens, but of American citizens—and not only of naturalized American citizens, but of native-born American citizens.

The victims of the McCarran-Walter Act are legion. But grant as the injury to individuals has been, the injury to the United States has been greater. That damage has been incalculable. We have given the Communists a club to beat us with.

We passed the Refugee Relief Act in 1953. We had to pass that act because the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act was obstructing the foreign policy of the United States. We were encouraging people to flee from behind the Iron Curtain, but could not admit any of them into the United States after they had escaped from tyranny.

When the Refugee Relief Act was signed, we told the world that we were going to do our part in providing asylum for the escapees from Soviet slavery. I need not tell you what happened after that. If a Nation could blush we should blush with shame, although there were some few of us who predicted what was going to happen under the Refugee Relief Act. It was a bad law, badly administered.

After the refugee relief program was shown to be a fiasco, the administration tried to cover up by hiring Mr. Edward Corsi, who was a known friend of immigration. Mr. Corsi didn't last very long. He lasted long enough to be disillusioned.

The refugee relief program has been a fiasco as far as bringing in refugees and escapees is concerned. In about two years, approximately 1,000 refugees and escapees have been actually admitted. Some relatives have been admitted, but they could have been admitted even under the McCarran-Walter Act if they waited long enough.

It is a scandal—a scandal at home and a scandal abroad. We should all be ashamed for our country.

But to be ashamed is not enough. We must act. There is still some time to salvage the refugee relief program by the enactment of appropriate amendments.

We can, and should intensify our efforts to overhaul the McCarran-Walter Act and to cut out the cancerous national origins quota system and to abolish the incredible encroachments upon the status of American citizenship.

I hope the American-Jewish Committee and all organizations will join with me in insisting on appropriate hearings on this legislation, and on congressional action. We can and should insist that the administration make good its pledges on this front. Noble sentiments by the President are no substitute for effective leadership on his part to get Congress to act—and to act now.

But I have no illusions. We have some chance of getting some minor amendments to both the Refugee Relief Act and the McCarran-Walter Act approved during this Congress.

We have very little chance—practically none—of getting to the heart of the matter during this Congress. And when I say the heart of the matter, I mean the national origins quota system and the second-class citizenship status for naturalized citizens.

Before we succeed in getting legislation which will remedy these defects in present law, we will need a long and intensive period of public education.

Members of the Congress will need to hear from the people back home; and the people back home—in the West, the Midwest, the South, and the Southwest—will need to know the facts.

I am sure that the American Jewish Committee will continue to do its part in this process of nationwide education and will join other organizations in furthering this vital cause.

This is imperative for us, not as Jews, but as Americans—Americans concerned above all for the principles of justice, equity, and humanitarianism at home and abroad.

Address Delivered by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before the Cleveland Engineering Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address I delivered last evening before the Cleveland Engineering Society, at Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE CLEVELAND ENGINEERING SOCIETY, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 16, 1955

Mr. Chairman, members of the Cleveland Engineering Society, and fellow Americans, Secretary of State Dulles has returned from Europe with a report of substantial progress of the free world as a result of recent conferences he attended. There have also been active and continuing Communist countermoves.

During the 2 years this administration has been in power much has been accomplished toward building an effective collective security system in Asia and in strengthening the defense of Europe.

On January 26, 1954, the Korean Mutual Defense Pact was added to the already existing Philippine, Japanese, and Anzus (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Pacts which were ratified in 1952. This year the gap was filled by ratification of the Southeast Asian Pact at Manila and by the Mutual Defense Pact with the Republic of China.

The effort of the Soviet Union will be the neutralization of Austria (already accomplished) and the same status for Yugoslavia, Germany, Norway, and Denmark.

The Soviet Union, in order to gain the neutralization of Austria, was willing to pay the price of having Soviet forces removed from that country simultaneously with the removal of United States, British, and French forces. The people of Austria are pleased to be free of Soviet occupation, even though they recognize their proximity to Communist satellite territory.

It appears that the Soviet Union intends to avoid the treaty requirement to get their "line of communication" forces out of Rumania and Hungary once the Austrian treaty has been signed by the simple expedient of having incorporated those countries into an eastern alliance as an offset to NATO.

Late this month Khrushchev and Bulganin will go to Belgrade. Their effort will be directed, I believe, toward the full neutralization of Yugoslavia. That country has never been a member of NATO but it has had a Balkan defense pact with Greece and Turkey which are members of the North Atlantic Alliance. If the Soviet Union could pull Yugoslavia away from this pact it would free Communist divisions from duty opposite the Yugoslavian frontier and make them available for other missions.

These two moves are only in preparation for the grand design of keeping Germany out of the western defense grouping. This would be considered a major Soviet victory, if accomplished. They are in a position to offer the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Germany if United States forces will move back to the United States. The Austrian example was and is expected to encourage Western Germany to follow the same example.

Soon we may expect a major Soviet diplomatic move to make a completely neutralized Scandinavian bloc. Sweden and Finland are not members of NATO while Norway and Denmark are allied with the West. If they could be induced to pull out it would weaken NATO (from a morale, if not a military viewpoint) and be considered a diplomatic coup to the credit of the Soviet Union.

These moves by the Communist world and our countereefforts will occupy much public attention during the balance of 1955 which may turn out to be one of the most decisive dates in world history.

Last Wednesday the Soviet Union proposed three United Nations resolutions as part of their effort to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

When the veneer of propaganda is removed and the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and obstruct

rather than to clarify and expedite is taken into consideration, the Soviet proposal is a fraud.

Their so-called disarmament proposal would:

1. Destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. It claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. The proposals provide for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have), their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would also contemplate two Germanys (like divided Korea and Viet-Nam) each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the western NATO defense alliance.

4. Under the proposal our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a "requisite for discontinuing the arms race." We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. It contemplates that our industrial and scientific atomic know-how will be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal would result in yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, and removal of the provocative Seventh Fleet from the Far East, all of which contribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

8. All the above steps are to be carried out prior to getting down to the problems of an effective disarmament with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954.

Since the free world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not it sets as the starting point for future moves a top-heavy Communist base.

In free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations is subject to debate and vote in parliament and Congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely on their "official figures" 1 month after the convention enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a "permanent member of the security council" the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Since without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon Communist power could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of the same works to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5 wherein it states "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces * * * the States * * * assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

In the first phase of 1956, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad, and return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific whereas the Soviet Union pulls back 600 miles at the most.

The production of all atomic weapons to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Soviet locations are not known and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

The second assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals of the United States in the atomic and conventional weapon field is still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then sets up a limited type of inspection and control similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

For the past quarter of a century the Soviet Union has violated 50 out of 52 international agreements it has entered into.

The $64 question is, "Has the Communist leopard changed its spots and carnivorous appetite and now becomes a milk-fed pussycat?"

I believe not. They now zag instead of zig, but their long-term strategic concept of the destruction of human freedom remains the same.

One of the most forthright statements of Soviet policy was made in 1930 by Dmitry Z. Manuilski in a speech to the international students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

By coincidence or otherwise, their present activities fit into this doctrinaire teaching of 25 years ago.

Just recently I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote, and I want to share it with you:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances, as well as those of my country and the entire free world, rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

We must not let our guard down. Our survival and that of the entire free world may depend upon how alert we remain to the fundamental strategy of world communism.

Early Returns in Registered Voters' Poll of Ohio Sentiment Concerning Formosa and the Coastal Islands of Quemoy and Matsu

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD results of a poll which I am conducting concerning the sentiment of Ohio registered voters with reference to defending Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENDER POLL SHOWS OVERWHELMING VOTE TO DEFEND COASTAL ISLANDS OF FORMOSA

Early returns in my 55,000 registered voters' poll of Ohio sentiment records an overwhelming majority in favor of defending both Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

My purpose in taking this poll is to ascertain the viewpoint of the people of Ohio on the three questions which are uppermost in everyone's mind today. First, should the United States defend the island of Formosa itself? Second, should we use American forces to defend the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu? Third, should we employ atomic weapons if necessary to repel any Communist attack on these islands?

To date, I have received responses from the first group to whom my questionnaire has been sent. This group includes approximately 19,000 Republican precinct committeemen, women and workers from all over Ohio. Their answers show that by a margin of approximately 10 to 1 they believe that our Government should defend Formosa. By only a slightly smaller margin, the same overwhelming opinion prevails with respect to the defense of the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

There is a substantial decline in the numbers of those who believe that we should use atomic weapons, if necessary, in defending these areas of the Pacific. Nevertheless, even here the opinion is over 4 to 1 in favor of using such weapons if we find it necessary to defend Formosa and the coastal islands.

The questions asked in the poll and responses received:

	Yes	*No*
Question No. 1: The United States should defend Formosa	13,723	1,282
Question No. 2: The United States should defend Matsu and Quemoy if Red China attacks these islands	11,425	2,829
Question No. 3: We should use atomic weapons, if necessary in repelling any Red Chinese attack upon Matsu and Quemoy	12,121	2,670

Here are some observations made by persons replying to poll:

"I cannot answer these questions as I feel that no ordinary person is in a position to do so correctly. I am perfectly willing to leave these decisions to our great President. If you and BRICKER will back Ike to the hilt, you won't go wrong."

Nos. 1 and 2: "Yes, if we have promised to do so."

"Please do all in your power to pass the Bricker amendment."

No. 3: "Tell them we will and if they continue, then do it. For once, let them know we mean what we say."

"We must make a stand—strike at military installations and save as much of population as possible."

"Give them the works."

"Supply Nationalist China with every weapon possible to defend themselves. We should use jets, atomic artillery—not atomic bombs."

No. 1: "Reason—Yes, for security and national honor."

"On Formosa, give all we got."

No. 2: "If necessary, for the safety of Formosa, use what is needed to do the job."

"I do not feel we should confer with Chinese Communists."

No. 2: "If necessary to defend Formosa."

No. 3: "We should use whatever necessary to save the lives of American soldiers."

No. 2: "Yes, if their loss would make Formosa indefensible."

No. 3: "Yes, if we are to defend them at all."

"We need the Bricker amendment. Please work for it."

"Thanks for listening to the public opinions."

"We have backed up so much now that no one is afraid of the United States any longer."

"We have given the Nationalists the cold shoulder too long now. Russia will use atomic weapons, if they have it, to help Commies."

"Kick h—— out of them."

"We've got to draw a definite line someplace."

"We must protect our interests. Protecting is not making war."

No. 2: "If deemed necessary for Formosa."

"Leave this up to Ike. He has access to important information which the layman does not."

"Unless a very good trade can be made"—No. 2.

"Only as a last desperate means"—No. 3.

"I don't know. I think I will trust our President and his advisers."

No. 2: "Might be sacrificed for cease-fire agreement."

No. 3: "Use for Formosa defense—not for Matsu or Quemoy."

"We should honorably avoid war if possible."

"No, we should never be first to use atomic weapons. Atomic warfare should be outlawed by all nations as barbarous."

"The real troubles of the world are economic and ideological."

"We appreciate your efforts to get the opinions of the public."

No. 2: "Think, depends on developments—leave it to Ike—with military intelligence."

No. 3: "Not unless they use them."

Nos. 1 and 2: "If it is part of our defense for the United States of America."

No. 3: "By all means, and with full force and effect."

"Whichever our President decides. He has the safety of United States in mind."

"Why wait until they use them on us first?"

No. 2: "It depends—did we agree to?"

No. 3: "If we're going to fight, let's use atomic weapons."

No. 1: "Yes, and the Pescadores."

No. 2: "But a negotiated transfer O. K. Not strategically located or important to defense."

No. 3: "Bad for propaganda in Asia."

"President's judgment should prevail."

"I will let the President decide."

"Sooner or later it will have to be done."

"Absolutely—we are committed."

"To destroy military positions."

"Let's go along with the President's decisions. I trust him, don't you?"

"Whatever the administration decides is necessary for the defense of Formosa. If we take part in defending the islands, we should use all weapons at our disposal."

"I do not think the necessity will arise, if we stop quibbling and let them know we mean business."

"Let's stop pussy-footing."

"Let's have more backbone in the administration."

"Yes, if it endangers protection of Formosa. Yes, if necessary."

"Atomic weapons—and use quickly."

"Defend islands if it endangers protection of Formosa."

"If not, they will soon take over the United States. I talk and meet a lot of people and they all think the Reds must be stopped."

"By all means, at all cost."

"Can't afford to back down again."

"I have complete faith in President Eisenhower and his administration to take action as they see fit in dealing with the Formosa situation. They have so many more facts and information at their disposal than I do that I frankly would be inadequate in expressing an opinion on these matters."

"Can't afford to back down now."

"It is about time we keep some promises we make. I think we should get out of the United Nations and get them out of here."

"I always sign my name. If I were ashamed to sign, I would not send it anonymously."

"Too big a question for a layman."

"Yes, if we must defend it."

"Atomic weapons only to protect our country."

"Atomic weapons if attack on Formosa or United States."

"The only thing I wish the United States to give the Reds is the atomic bomb by plane."

"Atomic weapons, but only if the military thinks this necessary, only on military targets."

"There is greater risk in doing nothing than in taking a firm stand."

"Referring to your communication, I certainly feel that Formosa should be our first line of defense in the Far East."

"Should pass Bricker amendment with 'which' clause."

"Use atomic weapons on Red bases, wherever they are. Fight the enemy wherever you find them."

"Pray to God that it won't be."

"Let's not ask our boys to fight with one or both hands tied behind their backs as Truman did. Sometimes I think Hoover's original plan might prove to have been the best for America."

"Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinions."

No. 2: "If they are of great value for protection of Formosa."

No. 3: "If it takes atomic power to stop them, yes."

"To let them win here only means they will have confidence to go further. God gave us the atomic weapons to use; let's use them before they destroy the whole civilization."

"Let's let Ike alone. Certainly believe in democratic expression, but we elected a capable man as President."

No. 1: "Yes."

No. 2: "Whatever President Eisenhower decided."

No. 3: "I believe we not only should use A-weapons, but H-weapons if we defend these islands."

"Why debate about it? Haven't we become convinced by now that a leopard doesn't change his spots?"

"Our first defeat was when we supported Russia instead of Finland."

"You have the information, I don't. Use your own judgment."

No. 3: "Yes, if we defend Matsu and Quemoy."

No. 3: "Not unless the Reds start to use it first. I hope that atomic power bombs are never again used."

"God gave us atomic weapons. Let's use them with much forethought."

"Leave this to military leaders."

"I don't feel competent to answer these questions."

"Glad you are doing this."

"I feel a firm stand for our policy will prevent allout war. Communists cannot understand kindly consideration or gentlemanly conduct."

"Ike knows best. Only he knows about these people and what to do. If we go into this, let's win with bombs, not boys alone."

No. 2: "With reservations."

No. 3: "If the best military strategy says yes, then do it."

"How much longer do we have to put up with this treatment?"

"Communism must be stopped somewhere."

"We should be through playing."

"We have done too much appeasing, including that of our so-called allies."

"I voted for Ike believing him to be the man we as Americans need most for President and up to this day I still feel and I know I was right. So I have complete confidence in the decisions of Ike and Mr. Dulles. I thank God that they are in their respective positions. Success to you and Ike's administration."

"There is no possible compromise with communism, be it Russian or Chinese."

"We must draw a line somewhere and the loss of these islands could have a very serious effect on our allies. Atomic weapons as a last resort only and then only if it can be done without too many civilian casualties."

"Let's let them know who is boss, and quit fooling."

"They dictated first, second, and Korean wars; when are we going to say 'No' to them and dictate a little ourselves?"

"It is time United States does what she says she will do or else get out and stay out."

"Whatever the President thinks best—I agree with him."

"Are we committed to defend these islands? If so, yes."

"I have the confidence in you to make the decisions as the facts present themselves."

"Not qualified to answer."

"I am not a military expert—so do not know the problems involved. I hate war and do not know whether we could save Asia even if we did defend Formosa and the other islands. Let the President decide."

"If we do not intend to do this we had better withdraw from the Orient."

"Let us not lose any more of our world prestige, and we have done this the last 20 years."

"If we would all work for peace through prayer as much as war wouldn't that solve the problem?"

"Leave it as it now stands—in the hands of the President."

"Atomic weapons—yes, it would be a better proving ground than Nevada, and Ike should run for reelection. Show the world we mean what we say. Use some Teddy Roosevelt diplomacy."

"I certainly do not believe in wars to settle things, because wars never have, and our only son is now in the Navy, but what else is left to do?"

"As long as we did not have sense enough to stay out of this Asian territory we should keep what we already have."

"I do not feel as if I have enough information to decide such an important issue."

"Atomic weapons and anything else we can use."

"If we don't, we better quit and keep our mouth shut."

"Defend islands if it's necessary for the defense of Formosa. Atomic weapons upon military installations only."

"Atomic weapons—yes, if it is necessary. Especially V 4, I think we promised."

"Not with United States soldiers. Give them arms and ammunition. We had one nephew killed in service—we don't want any more."

"Would not trust Chou En-lai. Defend islands to have Formosa saved. Atomic weapons after opinion of Chief Radford and Secretary Robertson are given."

The Rights We Seek To Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Members of this House to the receipt by one of our colleagues—the Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER, of Indiana—of a Freedom Foundation award. The award was granted for an article, The Rights We Seek To Save, which I am sure will prove worthwhile reading for all of us. I might mention, also, that Congressman BEAMER, in winning the 1955 Freedom Foundation award, finds himself in very distinguished company. Among other winners were General Ridgway, former President Hoover, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.; Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and Secretary of Interior McKay. The award-winning article follows:

THE RIGHTS WE SEEK TO SAVE
(By Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER, of Fifth District of Indiana)

Recently I spoke at a meeting honoring the Korean war veterans and it was a natural impulse to praise the valiant deeds of the soldiers of that conflict. At the same time, there was a realization of the honor that was due the more than one and one-half million battle casualties that have been spent by Americans since this Nation began defending its free way of life some 178 years ago. Many words have been spoken and many eulogies have been paid to these heroic sacrifices.

The impelling question thus posed is one that undoubtedly has been asked by each generation in each age of history. Why fight? And the answers have varied in different ages and in different countries. In some instances and, in fact, in far too many cases wars have been instigated by rulers with uncontrolled ambition to extend their authority, to enlarge their empire, and eventually to become world rulers.

The causes of conflict are varied even in our own history but, underlying the motives that appear only on the surface, there is one motive of a determination to fight for the rights we seek to save. Then, we wonder how we fight for these rights and which means of combat is the most important.

The struggle on the battlefield is the one method to which most and perhaps even first consideration is given. Those who serve in the legislative halls of the State general assemblies and in the Federal Congress are deeply conscious of the fact that we wage a continuous fight to retain the freedoms that have been our inheritance. The efforts of the soldier and the statesman are vitally important but the most important fight is in the minds of the people for the American state of mind.

Armed forces, perforce, must always be on guard. Men and women must be trained and be alert in their respective branches of the Armed Services to be ready to defend our land. The people who serve in the three constituted branches of our Government must be equally prepared to carry on a cold war against an enemy philosophy. This kind of preparedness requires planning, nerve and loyalty.

It has been stated very appropriately that the present time is not one to be devoted to a contemplation of the past nor an attempt to fathom the future. Today more properly is an occasion upon which we should repledge and rededicate ourselves to those enduring principles upon which our society is founded. It should be a time for a search of knowledge and free exchange of ideas in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence.

This planning concept of legislation should be surveyed briefly. The original concept of law making and, especially of Federal legislation in the United States was that there should be a minimum of laws; all laws should be fair, rigidly and impartially enforced, and that they should apply equally to all citizens. The concept that laws should be made for the benefit of any minority group—rich or poor; business groups or labor unions; white, black or yellow race; for any religious creed—has been resisted since the beginning of the history of lawmaking. When laws are made for individuals with an understanding that all have an equal responsibility under the law to look after themselves and their own property and family, and to respect the same right of others, then the signed concept will be retained to the improvement and the benefit of all.

The struggle for freedom thus is fairly definitely defined on the battlefield and in the legislative halls. But can we be assured of the same degree of certainty in the minds of people? Freedom has been classified in 5 phases: (1) a free mind; (2) free schools; (3) a free economy; (4) a free value system; and (5) free elections.

The earlier school systems developed and maintained a free mind when the schools were primarily concerned with the important proposition of teaching the elements of educating and developing the mind instead of attempting to build a new society. The free schools remain free only when they are public schools instead of being government schools designed to promote a special political philosophy that may be planned and plotted to perpetuate some particular group in power. Free schools are more nearly possible if conducted on a local level than on a national scale. Freedom of worship likewise is an important phase of this same freedom of education.

A free economy and a free value system in the current age are the complete antithesis of a totalitarian or authoritarian form of government. A controlled economy, especially in peacetime, conceivably is a determined and calculated step toward the abolition of man's freedom in production, conversion, and trade of commodities. It is apparent that national socialism and communism has as its first objective, the abolition of a free economy and free value system.

A realization of this condition and of the continuing fight for freedom raises the question—how can our Nation best defend itself? Armies and legislators may do valiant work but they cannot carry the entire load. The minds of the people well may be the strongest defense. After all, can our Nation afford to pauperize itself by maintaining enormously expensive armies and keeping the youth of our Nation constantly poised to enter conflicts against the forces of socialism and communism abroad while permitting the socialistic practices to be legislated into our economy? Of what value is the bravest and strongest American army on a foreign battlefield fighting against Communist aggression, if we continue to not only permit, but require, the Federal Government to interfere and force socialistic doctrines and practices on the economic and social lives of our people?

The conscience, the good sense, the minds of people must be awakened to the encroachments of these planners who would trade our freedoms for glamorous words, gaudy promises, and the ultimate slavery of complete Government controls.

Norway's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the "Fourth of July" in Norway. Minnesota is noted for its high proportion of descendants of Nordic people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call your attention to the significance of this Independence Day celebrated by citizens of Norway in the Norwegian Embassy and around the world.

There is no national holiday in the world that is celebrated and honored more enthusiastically and sincerely than May 17, Norway's Constitution Day. And so it is this year, too. The day is marked by Americans of Norwegian descent at rallies in Brooklyn, Chicago, Minneapolis, and other United States cities as it is elsewhere in the world.

On this morning, every schoolboy and girl in Norway hops out of bed at the crack of dawn to look at the sky, hoping for a sunny day. But even if the winds are chill and the rain falls, they will march all morning in the school parade, to tunes played by the boys' brass bands, to celebrate Norway's greatest national holiday—the day in 1814 on which its constitution was signed.

The largest school parade is in Oslo, the capital city of Norway. Every year, at the end of their long 3-hour march, Oslo schoolboys and girls, pass under the balcony of the Royal Palace. Among the paraders are also students about to graduate from the secondary gymnasium school to enter the university. As the students march by, they cheer and spin their red and blue tasseled caps up in the air on the traditional bamboo canes.

Every May 17 from early morning on, the Palace grounds and the parade streets are packed with people. By 7 a. m. the churches open and crowds gather to listen to the choirs. Children from hospitals sit in special places

in front of the Palace. Everyone brings a package lunch, and grownups and children alike are excited and happy. Freedom and independence, celebrated this day, mean as much to Norwegians as they do to Americans.

In the afternoon, each neighborhood has a celebration of its own so that the children who are too little to join in the school parades may march near their homes. Everyone joins in the fun—waving the red, white, and blue Norwegian flag, leading dogs, pushing baby carriages—all heading for the place where they will listen to patriotic speeches and play games.

The Eidsvol mansion near Oslo, where the Constitution was signed, is now a national shrine. This neat, gray house with its rust-colored trim still stands as it was on that memorable day in 1814. Even the furniture is the same.

Freedom, independence, and self-government have long traditions in Norway. An ancient Norse statute proclaims:

> No one shall lay hands on another in his home, neither the King nor anyone else. If, nevertheless, the King does so, the summons shall pass through all the land and men shall advance against him and strike him. If he eludes them, he shall never be allowed to return to the land.

This and many other ancient rights were reaffirmed at Eidsvold. Four hundred years under foreign kings has not quenched the love of freedom. It was expressed in the nationwide call for a return to the law and to self-government.

The constitution of 1814 is one of the few charters of freedom of that era still remaining in force. Twenty years after its enactment, at a time when the tide of reaction was sweeping away all liberal constitutions on the European continent, a contemporary British writer and politician explained its lasting success in these words:

> All the essential parts of liberty were already in the country. The property was in the hands of the whole people. The ancient laws and institutions affecting property were in full operation, and they were conceived and administered in the very spirit of liberty. There was nothing in the condition of the people, the state of property, the civil or religious establishments which did not fit in with a free constitution. The new constitution was but a superstructure of a building of which the foundations had been laid and the lower walls constructed, 8 centuries before, by the ancestors of the present generation.

The Norwegian Constitution of 1814 provides for clearly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. Inspired by the ideals of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution, the Norwegian Constitution lays down the following important rules: First, no person can be imprisoned without trial; second, freedom of speech, publication and assembly must be protected; and third, no law may be given retroactive effect. Norway is a free, independent, indivisible, and inalienable kingdom. Its form of government is a limited and hereditary monarchy.

Michigan Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to draw to the attention of my colleagues and the entire Nation an important civic celebration now in progress this week in my home State of Michigan.

As proclaimed in a concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature, Michigan Week is designed to focus the attention of Michigan citizens on past achievements and to instill a greater civic pride in our State and its people.

Michigan is proud of its achievements both in war and peace as America's industrial center. But Michigan Week affords an opportunity to outline some of our other activities equally important in providing a richer, fuller life for our people and the Nation as a whole.

The Nation's first regularly scheduled air service was started in 1926 between Detroit and Grand Rapids by the Stout Air Services.

In addition to automobiles Michigan ranks first in boatbuilding, auto trailers, gray iron, cutting tools, woodworking machinery, breakfast foods, and refrigerators. Eighty-one percent of all types of industry are found in Michigan.

The town of Colon is the "magic capital of the world," and Kalamazoo is known for its large paper mills. Midland and Wyandotte are leaders in the production of chemicals and at Fremont is located the Gerber Food Products Co., the Nation's largest maker of baby foods.

The only wooden shoe factory in the United States is located at Holland, Mich., which is also famous as a center of furnace production. Grayling houses the world's largest producer of quality archery equipment, and the largest packer of live bait is located in Port Huron.

Michigan ranks 10th or higher in the production of the Nation's 20 leading crops.

Michigan ranks first in the production of tart cherries, navy beans, cantaloups, celery, cucumber pickles, strawberries, and gladiolus for bulbs.

Michigan farmers have won the International Wheat King title in 2 of the last 4 years.

Cash sales of Michigan farmers topped $700 million in recent years, making agriculture one of the State's leading activities.

Michigan is proud of its record in education. Michigan State University at East Lansing is now celebrating its centennial year. MSU was the first land-grant college established under an act of Congress.

Michigan was the first State in the Union to provide for public libraries in its constitution. Michigan State Normal College in Ypsilanti was the first teachers' training school west of the Alleghenies. It was set up in 1849.

This enumeration is far from complete but it gives you a number of reasons why we in Michigan find satisfaction in marking Michigan Week.

But we are not living in the past. We look forward to the future with confidence. Our goal is to provide an ever-increasing abundance for more and more people so that our State may go forward with the Nation.

Following is the concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature proclaiming Michigan Week:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION URGING THE PEOPLE OF MICHIGAN TO TAKE PART IN THE OBSERVANCE OF MICHIGAN WEEK FROM MAY 15 TO MAY 21, 1955, PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ON APRIL 28, 1955

Whereas Michigan Week is a period set aside annually for citizens of this State to turn their attention to the social and economic resources of their State and examine thoughtfully the things that make it a good place in which to live and work; and

Whereas Michigan is abundant in the things which develop a great pride and loyalty in our State; and

Whereas Michigan workers have put Michigan at the top in skills and productivity, and Michigan has 365 of the 451 different kinds of manufacturing in the United States and the diversity of Michigan's manufacturing makes the State a leader in the production of gray-iron, cutting tools, jigs and fixtures, products of machine shops operating on a job or order basis, plating and polishing, automobile trailers, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparations, and salt; and

Whereas many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit, Pontiac, Flint, and Lansing—autos and parts; Battle Creek—cereals; Holland—furnaces; Grand Rapids— furniture; Kalamazoo—paper products and drugs; Midland and Wyandotte—chemicals; and

Whereas Michigan has in its Upper Peninsula one of the world's greatest iron ore producing regions and leads the Nation in the production of calcium-magnesium chlorides, gypsum and salt, ranks high in the production of numerous other important minerals and has the world's largest supply of fresh water for industry; and

Whereas Michigan's farmers have made our State the most self-sufficient food producer in the Nation, placing Michigan in the top 15 States in production of the 46 of the country's 50 major crops, giving Michigan an amazing diversification of quality agricultural products and an annual farm income of three-quarters of a billion dollars; and

Whereas Michigan produces the greatest amount of lumber of any major industrial State and consequently boasts of such great wood-dependent industries as the paper and the furniture industries; and

Whereas Michigan, bordered by 4 of the 5 Great Lakes, has the country's longest shoreline, contains more than 11,000 inland lakes, and more than 36,000 miles of streams, enjoys forests of unspoiled beauty, possesses an unparalleled number of State parks and excellent resort facilities, and offers visitors from other States and countries an ideal place for recreation and vacations; and

Whereas Michigan is the only State in the East North Central census district predicted by the United States Census Bureau to have a greater share of the country's population in 1960 and 1965 than today; and

Whereas Michigan residents are blessed with unusual opportunities to enjoy a vigorous cultural, intellectual, and religious life, with thousands of fine churches, schools, colleges, and libraries located within the State; and

Whereas Michigan possesses a long and illustrious history which began only 14 years after the landing of the Pilgrims; a history during which both war and peace Michigan's agricultural and industrial might and the industriousness and ingenuity of its people have stood in the ready service of our country; a history marked by a strong tradition of courage, freedom of spirit, and firm endeavor displayed by Michigan people; and

Whereas Michigan's residents should know and appreciate their State's unlimited advantages and opportunities in industry, natural resources, agriculture, recreation, and culture, and their State's fine historical background: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature urge all people of Michigan to take part in the observance of Michigan Week, May 15 to May 21, 1955, a period in which residents of our State may become better acquainted with the boundless opportunities present in Michigan, as well as all sides of Michigan's past and present greatness which may help bring about a deeper pride in our State's many accomplishments and an increased feeling of unity among its peoples.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower spoke the other day of an easing of international tensions, it was, of course, good news to everyone to have the President's encouraging analysis of the situation.

But there is nothing in the President's words to lead anyone to think that the danger of war is now over. While there is room for optimism, there is no room for complacency.

Responsible officials of the Government—in the military services, in the intelligence agencies, in the State Department, and in the various mobilization bureaus—are proceeding on the assumption that war is an ever-present danger. It is their job to act accordingly, and to base their decisions on policies which will assure maximum safety for our country under any circumstances.

This sense of preparedness, however, does not seem to carry over into the field of civilian defense. We are not prepared. We seem to have a phobia about civilian defense—a reluctance even to think about it.

Somehow this attitude reminds me of some folks we know who refuse to consider the purchase of insurance. They feel that if they buy life insurance, this will in some way cause their death—that the purchase of fire insurance will likely lead to a fire, and so on. Do you not know some people who seem to feel the same way about writing a will?

But I think most of us recognize that sensible preparation is still the best policy—that the Boy Scout slogan "Be prepared" is about as good as any we can devise as individuals or as a Nation.

But in the realm of civilian defense, our slogan seems to be "Be unprepared and maybe the danger will go away."

In our own West Virginia, we have learned through experience the value of disaster training. The coal companies and the Mine Workers Union have cooperated over the years on mine safety and mine disaster training which have been of invaluable help to the local communities not only in case of mine disasters but of any type of local emergency. It has meant saving hundreds of lives.

The Red Cross has also done magnificent work over the years in rescue and first-aid training.

The national civilian defense program, instead of concentrating on the development and expansion of this kind of work, however—training work which would help to prepare a community for any kind of emergency—seems to have been more concerned about developing some magic formula. First it was mass air-raid shelters; then it was mass evacuation of cities. Neither scheme seems to be practical.

In case of danger from attack, most of us would have to know how to assure our own survival. Our communities would have to know how to keep on functioning.

This kind of training has a big plus in its favor. It is this: No matter what happens internationally—whether there is war or enduring peace—it is information and skill which is always helpful to the local community—training for peace as well as for war. In other words, it is training for a better community no matter what happens.

New Merger Efforts Made by Bethlehem and Youngstown; Action by Brownell Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Brownell on September 30, 1954, disapproved a proposed merger between Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. on the ground that it would violate the Celler Antimerger Act. Bethlehem and Youngstown now propose to get around that ruling by suggesting that they would increase their combined capacity by 12 percent—adding 2 million tons of capacity in the Chicago district and 1 million tons in the Youngstown area—if the Attorney General will immunize their merger from antitrust prosecution.

How can the augmentation of a wrong excuse that wrong? It is to be hoped that the Attorney General will assert that such a transparent subterfuge gives no basis for reversal of his stand thus far.

The officials of Bethlehem and Youngstown have the temerity to say that unless their merger is approved and a violation of law condoned, the public will not get additional steel capacity. That must not be sanctioned by the Attorney General. Although the public needs more steel, the price proposed—immunity from antitrust prosecution—cannot be paid.

To allow this merger on the basis now suggested would decrease competition in the steel industry all the more, and would exacerbate the evil.

I urge Attorney General Brownell to make known immediately his condemnation of this proposal to get around his ruling.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, an excellent and stirring address on the subject of the free enterprise system of business, delivered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], on May 12, 1955, before the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce, prompts me to ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ARIZONA, BEFORE THE BALTIMORE JUNIOR ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 12, 1955.

Your invitation to address the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce this evening honors me deeply, for in doing so I am once again able to come to this State which figured so prominently in the establishment of the freedoms of our Republic.

While it is an impossibility ever to convey to you, to whom the State of Maryland is home, the immensity of the debt that we of the other States feel toward the valiant and successful efforts of your forefathers in the cause of liberty, the theme of my remarks tonight is such that they can be most appropriately delivered in this citadel of man's freedom.

I am honored, also, to have the opportunity to pay tribute, publicly and before their friends and neighbors, to your two outstanding Senators, JOHN BUTLER and GLENN BEALL. Last year, it was my pleasure to have worked with Senator BUTLER during his successful efforts to establish legislation which would give labor unions the mechanism with which to rid themselves of Communist domination, and I have long admired, as well, his tireless efforts on behalf of his State of Maryland.

The fact that Senator BEALL and I both belong to the same college fraternity—we are Sigma Chis—establishes an immediate bond, but my observation of his sincere work on the Banking and Currency Committee has nurtured the added element of respect for a job well done.

As I have already indicated, my remarks tonight will be directed toward an important aspect of our basic freedom: the freedom of enterprise—our economic system. My choice of that subject has been prompted by several years of concern over the attitude of the American businessman toward that system which has made this Nation prosper, and which has provided our citizens with the highest standards of living ever known by any people.

In fact, it was primarily because of this concern that I ventured on to the rough sea of politics; and the more I travel that sea, the more I am convinced that the bland and careless acceptance of this system as something that will go on and on, without due diligence on the part of the business community, is the one thing that might ultimately destroy it.

It has been said that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. That not only applies to our everyday freedoms, but also to the freedom under which our business system operates. This is not to say that either one segment or one or two groups can maintain this vigilance in the protection of these economic freedoms; rather it means that you young businessmen gathered here in Baltimore tonight, and the millions like you across this land, must be constantly standing guard lest the soldiers of socialism overcome our fortress.

You might well ask at this point just why the Senator is so disturbed this fair evening. Is not the economy running at its highest rate in history? Are not the ranks of the unemployed extremely small? Is not the national income and the gross national production at a new all-time high? Why, then, should the Senator be disturbed to the point of berating you concerning your attitude toward the system which has produced this situation?

If that question exists, I can answer it by telling you that I am concerned because we, as a people, always seem to be relaxed in our vigilance when the going is the easiest. It is easy now to feel safe, to be complacent, but I assure you that those forces who would replace this free system of ours with the system of socialism are not relaxed or complacent. Theirs is a constant and persistent effort to lull the business minds into the acceptance of Government domination and regulation of our method of doing business.

Perhaps you have already so much accepted the extent to which Government has crept into your daily business lives that you now feel that nothing can be done about it. Perhaps you have forgotten the regulations, the edicts, the forms, and the reports of Government that now affect your daily business activities. If you have, then I suggest that you have been slightly brain-washed either by complacency or, worse yet, by an idea that we can be half socialistic and half free enterprise.

Still, I cannot bring myself to believe that you businessmen, living in this State which is part of the bedrock of freedom, actually feel that way. I know that businessmen from across the length and breadth of this land share your concern—and mine—and for that reason I feel that you and I should take the time to discuss our freedom of business tonight, and to discuss, also, the alternative to it.

Of course, businessmen across this Nation share your concern. As we in the Senate sit, day after day, through committee hearings, we listen to this concern and to the anxious queries of these brothers of yours from elsewhere in America. Listening to a series of witnesses appearing before the Labor Committee last week testifying as to their concern over various changes proposed in a law, I couldn't help but note the oneness with which they spoke. There was the crisp and clean accent of the New Englander; the slow and broad accent of our friends from the South; and, then, from across the mountains and the plains, came the voices of westerners. They all spoke of one concern: What would these proposed changes do to them and to the daily conduct of their businesses?

The law on which they were testifying was one of the many that, while originally intended to serve a good and laudable purpose, offers subtle inroads to the very vitals of our system. Almost inevitably, laws that have been enacted with lofty purposes, directed at correcting known evils of the moment, have to be changed time and again in order to justify their continuation, and, in so doing, in so trying to make corrections to corrections that are no longer needed, the laws become confusing and their effects on the business of this country become sharply evident.

One witness that appeared expressed this confusion and concern so well that I want to read now what he said. Mind you, this was a businessman of this country, speaking before a committee of the United States Senate. He said:

"However, where do I stand under this act? Where do these contractors stand under it? I asked my lawyer. He doesn't know. I could conceivably be the employer of the contractors and their employees. If I am, I'd at least like to get their names, because I'd like to know who's working for me. But, I may not need their names either, because maybe I am an employee of the paper mill. But, in that case, I'd like to know which mill, because I want to know where to look for my check. If it weren't so serious, it might be amusing to be an employee, who is also an employer of individuals who would be my employees."

That, remember, was an individual American businessman, who came to the Congress because he didn't know where he stood under the law, and because his lawyer was unable to tell him. It was never intended, under our system of government, that government should so inject itself into the daily lives of its business and professional people that such confusion and question would arise. It was never intended that government should inject itself into our business structure at all, except as outlined by the Constitution.

Yet, it has, and this example is only one of hundreds that I could recite. You, as business and professional men, know that Washington must enter into many of your economic decisions. You know that a safari to Washington is not an unknown activity, either by you personally, or by a lawyer representing you. We in the Congress know that a great amount of your time is spent trying to solve the puzzles that are bound to occur when the Federal Government oversteps its bounds, regardless of the purpose, and gets into the daily lives of the States and their business activities.

This is only a sample of the dependence the business of this country would have on the Federal Government if our free enterprise system were to be replaced by that system we know as socialism.

You may ask why worry about it. You may say that it can't happen here; that things are better than ever; that we will take care of socialism when the time comes. But let me tell you, the time has come; for there will never be a time when it isn't imperative that we defend and extoll this economic system of ours.

I suggest to you that Fabianism, which later became socialism, took a long time to take over in England; but when it did, it all but wrecked that once great force in the world's markets. It took from the 1870's to the 1940's, and all the time English businessmen said there was nothing to fear from those crackpots. What they didn't realize, of course, was that those crackpots were dedicated to one cause, that of replacing England's free system of business with socialism, and, being dedicated to that, they never let up in their efforts.

Why must it be that people who have, as we have, the greatest personal freedoms in the world, and the most productive free business system in all history, are so bland in our acceptance of these precious possessions?

These highly prosperous times in which we live today have come about because of our economic freedom, and it was the loosening of the shackles which bound this freedom that stimulated investment and confidence in our business structure. "What shackles?" you might ask. I would answer: the shackles of wage and price controls, and the overburdening load of taxation which was lightened somewhat a year ago, but which still needs more of its bulk pared off. These are but two of the shackles. There are others which, though less tangible, are in their own right, productive of profound effects on the economy.

One of the important things that has happened in the years since Korea is that American capital has been put to work, and American labor has responded with increased output, to the end that we are growing economically at a proper and safe rate today. Another—and, to my mind, this is equally as important—has been the realization that we are not dependent on a beneficent government which, by taxing away our potential future, has been trying to suggest that it, and only it, is the source of our economic muscles. We must never lose sight of this proven fact: the normal and free operation of our enterprise system has produced and will produce an increasingly higher standard of living for all of our people.

Now, let us compare the nebulous suggestions of those who would replace our business system with one that they suggest might be new, but which, to me, has all the old earmarks of socialism, with that proven fact which I have just mentioned. Mind you, I am called a reactionary for wanting to cling to our proven methods of government and business; but let's see who the real reactionaries are in this country of ours today.

I hold that they are those who profess to be liberals. They are the ones who want to go back to the days of bureaucratic government and a big central government with full control over our lives. These are the reactionaries. They want to return to what was discarded when your glorious pioneering grandfathers came to these shores seeking relief from the tyranny of big government.

No, I am not a reactionary; but I am a conservative, because I recognize that, after over 5,000 years of man's efforts to govern himself and to run his business, there have developed some fundamental truths. These are that the dignity of man and his freedom, which comes from God, are the ultimate ideals of any government, and that this dignity and freedom can best be expressed in the economy of the country when that economy runs as free from Government edict and regulations as it can. Being of that mind, therefore, all of us who would prefer progress under our proven system are conservatives; and I reiterate that the true reactionaries are the eggheads and the socialists who want to go back to the dark ages.

Remember that these people who advocate Government intervention in our business either wittingly or unwittingly go along with a large bureaucracy, because it is not possible to inject Federal monies into our business life without corresponding Federal regulation and control. In fact, it is not improper to emphasize here that whenever the Federal Government gives money to people in the form of subsidies, it is only giving back to

them, at a greatly reduced proportion, money which it took from them in the first place in the form of taxes; and with that same money goes the inevitable regulation and control by the Government.

Now who are these people who advocate a radical change in our economic system, and what, specifically, do they suggest as a substitute? We can best identify them as those who have gathered together under the banner of the Americans for Democratic Action, the ADA, although I will be the first to admit that there are others of their kind to be found in each of the two major political parties, and among a few of the national leaders of organized labor.

Business Week, in 1952, said of this clique: "ADA is too well organized to be called merely a group, too loose to be called a real organization. It is not a political party, but has backed men in political elections. It is left-wing but anti-Communist."

Now, ignoring their political manifestos, directed toward the social or the international scenes, I want to call your attention to that phase of their philosophy which applies directly to your business—to our economic system. One of the leaders of the movement, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., said in the ADA World, in 1948: "When ADA came upon the scene a year ago, it struck the American liberals with the impact of a new idea. The idea was simply this: That a liberal movement should properly devote itself to the maintenance of individual liberties and to the democratic control of economic life."

To further develop the philosophy contained in this suggestion of the "democratic control of economic life," let's turn to a statement in this organization's program as adopted by its second annual convention in April of 1949, and I quote: "Government action is also required to eliminate bottlenecks of increased production. Government subsidies and financing and, if necessary, Government plants must be used to provide more steel, more power, and other vital necessary raw materials."

In short, what is proposed by the ADA is socialism, on the one hand, with the pious suggestion, at the same time, that they have some as yet undisclosed formula whereby this socialism can "devote itself to the maintenance of individual liberties."

The failure of socialism has been not only in the fields of economy but, by the very nature of its requirement of Government controls, it has also denied to the individual the freedom that our system guarantees as the dominant feature of both our Government and our economic life.

Certainly these facts are not news, as any student of history well knows. We have all read of the controls imposed by the nations of history on their economies and the resultant collapse of those governments. Babylon, Egypt, and the Roman Empire, of the days long gone, are glaring examples of the dangers involved in following the siren call of the Socialist, who promises everything to everybody. Modern England, who, thank God, saw her mistake in time, is graphic proof, at close hand, of the catastrophic impact of socialism on the economy of a country.

Despite these urgent pleas of mine, however, you may still be inclined to say tonight, as we gather here in this festive mood: "It can't happen here." If I were sure of that, and if I were not certain that great inroads have already been made into the thinking of not only our business fraternity but, more importantly, into that of our children, I would not be addressing you on this subject, nor would I be so personally alarmed.

I have seen enough, though, of the dependence of businessmen on the bureaus in Washington, and I have read the writings of too many businessmen who would accept part or all of these doctrines, not to be concerned.

Recently, I read a report of Opinion Research of Princeton, N. J., which gives me the greatest reason to pause and ponder. It is a report that I want to pass on to you at this time. Opinion Research Corp. conducted a poll of high school seniors in 83 communities throughout the country. When asked the question, "Is the theory, from each according to his ability to each according to need a valid basis for an economic system?" 55 percent replied, "Yes." Thus, over half of the high school seniors, the citizens of tomorrow, accepted the very theory that is the basis of Marxism.

Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system. Sixty percent said that the owners get too much of the profits. Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business. Seventy-six percent believe that owners get most of the gains from machinery. Sixty percent said that a worker should not produce all he can.

This, gentlemen, will give you some indication of what we are up against, of how fertile the soil is for the Reuther-Keyserling propaganda.

How, then, shall we counterattack? Let's steal a page from the enemy's book. Let's live our convictions in everyday life. The enemies of freedom seize every opportunity to discredit our system. Let us seize every opportunity to lambast theirs. Indeed, not only to lambast theirs, but—and this is more important—to extol ours. It is far better to be for something than merely to be against something without offering a positive alternative; and by ardently advocating our own proven and successful system, we can drown out the lilting song of the sirens of socialism who would wreck our good ship on the dark rocks of their philosophy.

We must tell our employees and the public how our system operates—how they fit into the scheme, and how they benefit when capital benefits—how investment is the lifeblood of the system, and how investment creates purchasing power.

We must insist upon private capital developing the resources of the Nation, without reliance upon the Federal Government to accomplish this.

We must, as businessmen, become concerned with the problems of our communities, and with their politics, and with the politics of the National Government.

We must continue to demonstrate that free enterprise, when operating in its full and proper sense, contributes the most to the workingman, to the investor, to the public, and to management, and that all four are a team, each dependent upon the other for the success of all.

Profit is a necessary element in this operation; not only profit in terms of money, but the profit of advancement, and the profit of the maintenance of man's dignity through his ability to achieve for himself those things which need to be accomplished.

Deny Americans this reward, try to place all Americans on a basis of "from each according to his ability to each according to his need," and I suggest to you that the dignity of man will vanish from the American dream; and those noble aspirations of liberty, for which the famous men of Maryland's history gave their blood, will become another page in the history books of tomorrow—a page reminding men again, as they have been reminded in the past, that time and experience have given us the things on which we should hang our faith—that man does have freedom and dignity, and that these come to him because he is a child of God, and not through the directives of a bureau of the Federal Government in Washington.

Albert Woolson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay certain hospital and medical expenses incurred by Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., the last surviving member of the Union Army, resulting from his recent illness, and future expenses for his care and treatment. The committee report accompanying this bill points out that no precedent whatever will be set inasmuch as Mr. Woolson is the last survivor of the Union Army and the passage of this legislation is necessary and should be expedited.

Mr. Speaker, the beneficiary of this bill is a grand old man. I have always admired him. He is the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic. Today, at the age of 108 years, he lives with his daughter and son-in-law in Duluth, Minn. The closest VA hospital is in Minneapolis, 165 miles away. It is a long trip for an old man in an ambulance. Mr. Woolson's recent illness was a lung congestion, a dangerous condition in a man his age. When it became evident that his condition warranted hospitalization there was no time to go through the usual VA channels to enter the hospital at Minneapolis plus making the long trip by ambulance, about a 3½-hour drive. Considering Mr. Woolson's age and the gravity of his condition, the only thing to do was admit him to a non-VA hospital in Duluth. There is serious doubt that he would have survived the trip to Minneapolis, and it seems unreasonable to say of a man of Mr. Woolson's age and condition that he should have taken that long trip to Minneapolis thereby endangering his very life so he could take advantage of VA hospital care.

Under these circumstances special provision should be made to take care of the hospitalization and medical expenses incurred by Mr. Woolson during his recent illness and subsequent illness he may suffer. For instance, because of his age and condition, special nurses, oxygen, and other extraordinary hospital and medical expenses were incurred. The hospital bill for his last two illnesses is estimated not to exceed $1,200. Mr. Woolson will have to pay this large amount out of his own resources, or will have to rely upon friends, neighbors, and relatives, unless special provision is made under this bill. Inasmuch as VA services were unavailable to Mr. Woolson because of his great age and the distance involved, such special provision should be forthcoming in his case.

I think it appropriate to call to the attention of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Mr. Woolson is the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic. He is the last of an era—of an Army, and if for no other reason that that he

alone represents a whole era of American history, we should make some special consideration in his case. He should not be forced into the position of forfeiting his veteran's privileges merely because he is too old and sick to travel all the way to Minneapolis—nor should he be taken away from his home and friends in the sunset years of his life.

Mr. Speaker, we always honor Albert Woolson on Memorial Day and on his birthday with speeches and words of acclaim. He asks for nothing more. But this is our opportunity to provide more than words, but rather a real helping hand in time of need to this grand old gentleman, the last representative of a grand old army.

A Brief Survey of Some Early Roots of the Agricultural Extension Service in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

I. THE FARMERS' SOCIETIES, FAIRS, CLUBS, ETC.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the beginning of agricultural extension work, broadly defined as the popular education of farming people, has been set as early as 1785, with the organization of the Philadelphia Society.[1] As might be expected, these early attempts to reach dirt farmers included discussions, exhibits, and fairs. They were more or less indigenous and local in keeping with the facilities of the period. Some attained more than local status, becoming in name at least a State society, board, and so forth. Several such groups existed before 1800. By the eve of the Civil War, some 900 local and county agricultural societies, and so forth, were more or less active.

In our State of Iowa, the Iowa State Agricultural Society was organized in December 1853 at Fairfield, Iowa, and held its first annual State fair at that place in October 1854.[2] The State fair was permanently located at Des Moines in 1879. It represents, according to Morgan, a step leading to the development of the present Extension Service:

> The education of the adult farmer and his wife was organized on a Statewide basis and received tax money for its support.

In addition to the direct education which may have been derived by the participating members and others in attendance at the several types of events sponsored, there were still other results, expressed by Dr. True:

> * * * brought a considerable and growing body of the most intelligent and progressive farmers into active relations with a nationwide movement for the advancement of agriculture. Through meetings, fairs, correspondence, publications, and articles in the agricultural and other papers they sought to make the public feel that the interests of agriculture and farming population were entitled to more consideration by Congress and the State legislatures. They were increasingly active and influential in the efforts to establish State boards of agriculture, a national Department of Agriculture, the teaching of agriculture in schools and colleges, the carrying on of experiments and scientific investigations for the improvement of agriculture, and the building up of agricultural journals and books.[3]

It is not perhaps surprising to find that public funds in modest amount were in some places appropriated for these groups, or that they sometimes were allowed part of the proceeds from the fairs and proceeds of sales of escheated lands.

II. THE STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND THE OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Other developments which contributed greatly to the later emergence of the Extension Service were the State colleges and the associated experiment stations. Early education was not always wilthout its agricultural aspects, even a strong agricultural core, witness the Gardiner Lyceum established in Maine in 1821 and the Agricultural School of Josiah Holbrook in 1824 at Derby, Conn. Private colleges, such as Rensselaer Institute at Troy, N. Y., and Washington College—now Trinity—at Hartford, Conn., were in part agricultural establishments as early as 1824. These and other such developments were not highly successful. The movement toward public support for agricultural colleges continued to develop slowly. Ideas involving an integrated agricultural college and experimental farm are credited to Elkanah Watson as early as 1819.[4]

It is not the purpose of this paper to cover the history of the developments which preceded—the Iowa State Agricultural College and Farm was established by law on March 22, 1858, and followed the establishment of the land-grant colleges under the Morrill Land Grant Act of July 2, 1862. That is in itself a long and interesting story. What we are interested in here is that these colleges strongly nurtured the experiment stations as well as agricultural education.

Agricultural experiment stations had been established at several or most of the land-grant colleges prior to the Hatch Act of 1887. Professor Hilgard organized such a station as soon as he went to the University of California; in 1875 he equipped a laboratory for research in agricultural chemistry and began field experiments on deep and shallow plowing for cereals. It was the staff of such colleges with their associated experiment stations, together with a portion of their trainees who were in due course to carry education by extension to the dirt farmer.

The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations was formally organized in October 1887. Departments of agricultural extension work were organized in some of the State agricultural colleges in the early nineties. Extension leaders in the State agricultural colleges who had been appointed to assist in farmers' institutes and other early forms of extension work attended the meetings of the college section—organized in 1890—but as their numbers and influence increased in the early 1900's, it became necessary to give them recognition by appointing a special extension committee in 1905 and by creating a separate extension division in 1908. By 1907 State agricultural colleges in 39 States were carrying on some form of agricultural extension work.[5]

The Smith-Lever Extension Act of May 8, 1914, which we will not discuss here, has an interesting history beginning at least as early as 1908, when a rising demand was indicated for Federal appropriations for extension work, partly to stimulate increased State appropriations for the same. An early voice in the discussion was that of the committee on extension work of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Sations which made such recommendations in November 1908. However, only the recommendation: "That each institution represented in this association organize as soon as possible a definite scheme of extension work in agriculture" was approved.[6] Much debate and delay followed before the Smith-Lever Act itself came into existence.

III. THE COUNTY AGENT AND DEMONSTRATION FARMS

In one fashion or another experiment station farms no doubt served as early demonstration farms. Even secondary schools sometimes had major farm enterprises. Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1903 report mentions that the Mount Hermon School, near Northfield, Mass., founded by the late D. L. Moody, had decided to establish an agricultural department and to offer courses of instruction in agriculture. It already had a farm of about 1,000 acres, a dairy of 200 cows, fruit orchards and a cannery for putting up vegetables.[7]

It remained for a transplanted upstate New Yorker to inaugurate what came to be recognized as a new and significant departure in agricultural education. Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, who after wide public agricultural experience in the East and Midwest had turned to a private agricultural venture in the South in 1886, used demonstration farms, about

[1] Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, USDA miscellaneous publication No. 15, October 1928. He also mentions that a group of South Carolina planters interested in indigo began to hold meetings about 1740. Agricultural fairs were held as early as 1644 in New Haven, Conn.

[2] Barton Morgan, A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, Ames, 1934, p. 3.

[3] Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, USDA miscellaneous publication No. 36, July 1929, p. 24.

[4] True, op. cit., p. 47.

[5] See Gladys Baker, The County Agent, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1939, p. 4.

[6] See True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., pp. 100–101.

[7] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1903, USDA Rept. No. 76, Washington, 1903, p. 72.

one per township in southwestern Louisiana to show not only that the area was suited to general farming but how it could be done.

Later, in Federal service working with the Bureau of Plant Industry, he set up several demonstration farms in the Gulf States to show that diversified agriculture could be feasible. All of this experience, both public and private, was basic to his new efforts, beginning perhaps about 1901 but clearly underway in 1903, to rehabilitate cotton areas which had been devastated by the boll weevil. Burritt says of Knapp's educational system:

To aid in securing local cooperation from the farmers themselves, Dr. Knapp established districts with local agents in charge, the district agents being lieutenants for the State agents. These local agents were preferably and usually local farmers in good repute with the people who had been practically successful with the control methods (for the cotton boll weevil) advocated by the Department and who had local knowledge of the problems and the methods of the people with whom they worked. They traveled from farm to farm and gave personal instruction to farmers who by actual demonstrations showed that cotton could be profitably grown in spite of the weevil.[8]

Another statement, by Dr. True, on this development is:

Professor Knapp established headquarters at Houston, Tex., in January 1904 and took counsel with farmers, bankers, merchants, railroad presidents, and other businessmen. Contributions of money, railroad trains, passes, and other aids were received. On February 19, 1904, W. D. Bentley was appointed as agent and served on an agricultural train of the Fort Worth & Denver Railroad for 2 weeks. Meetings were held in towns along the route, and lectures were delivered on cotton, corn, fruit, and forage, and other crops. At first farmers were unwilling to agree to undertake demonstrations, but after Mr. Bentley joined the farmers' union he had better success and gave demonstrations in about 10 counties in the northwest part of the cotton section in Texas. W. F. Procter and James A. Evans were appointed February 12, 1904. The latter has remained in the Government service in prominent positions in connection with demonstration and extension work and at present is assistant chief of the Office of Cooperative Extension Work. Over 20 agents were employed in Texas in 1904, 3 in Louisiana, and 1 in Arkansas. That year over 1,000 meetings were held, and 7,000 farmers agreed to demonstrate. In the fall a meeting of agents and more than 200 representatives of farmers was held at Houston. Profits from the demonstrations were reported, and the benefits of pure seed, deep plowing, frequent shallow cultivation, and the growing of home supplies were the chief topics discussed. In general, getting ahead of the weevil with early planting, early-maturing varieties, and treatment of the soil to promote rapid growth was the secret of success.

In 1905 the work was expanded to include Oklahoma and Mississippi.

In the early days agents worked in districts of 10 to 20 counties, and the demonstrations were carried on largely along the lines of railroads. The agents visited representative farmers, obtained their cooperation as demonstrators, furnished them with working plans, and instructed them in keeping records and making weekly reports. Each demonstrator was expected to grow from 5 to 20 acres of cotton under direction of the agent, who visited him at least once a month. Farmers met to see the demonstrations, and many of those present agreed to manage a part or the whole of their land under directions sent out by the department. Such farmers were called "cooperators," to distinguish them from the "demonstrators." A "demonstration" was the growing of a single crop under direction of the agent on a portion of the farm. The term "demonstration farm" was at first used to designate a farm on which there was a demonstration, but later was applied to a farm wholly worked according to the department's instructions.[9]

Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1904 report called atention to this cooperation with farmers:

With a view to bringing directly home to farmers of Texas and Louisiana, especially those in the boll-weevil districts, the advantages of better methods of cultivation, the value of early maturing seed, etc., the Bureau organized an extensive line of propaganda work. The farmers in the various counties were organized and were brought into cooperation in such a way that large plantings were made under the direct supervision of the Department. Tracts of 5, 10, 15, and 20 acres were handled by individual farmers, under working plans furnished by the Bureau, the object being in all cases to demonstrate the practicability of growing cotton despite the presence of the weevil.

More than 5,000 farmers were engaged in this work, and the results have been highly satisfactory. At a recent meeting held in Houston, where more than 200 representative farmers from all parts of the State were present, records were presented showing the yields of cotton under the plans of the Department compared with old methods. The increased yields, ranging all the way from 25 percent to 100 percent in districts badly infested by the weevil, show that by proper methods of culture, the use of early maturing varieties of seed, and the application of proper fertilizers, excellent results may be obtained. A complete record of the yields from the various farms conducted under the direction of the Bureau has been kept, and a report embodying these data will soon be published.

As another feature of the work in the South, plans were made and put into operation establishing diversification farms at various places. The object of these farms was to show the value and importance of diversified agriculture. It was found unnecessary for the Bureau to expend any funds in the development of these farms, except in minor ways for the purchase of certain special seeds, and sometimes for special fertilizers where such were to be used. In all cases the business interests of the respective communities gladly cooperated with the Bureau to the end not only of securing a desirable farm for the purpose, but assuming all responsibility for its support. In every instance efforts have been made in organizing these farms to make them not only self-supporting but profitable. The main object of the work is to show that by diversified agriculture the lands may not only be improved, but more money can be made than in farming with a single crop.

Thirty-two of these farms have been or are about to be established, of which 16 are in Texas, 5 in Louisiana, 3 in Georgia, 2 in Alabama, 3 in Mississippi, 2 in South Carolina, and 1 in Florida. The general method employed in locating, organizing, and conducting these farms is to first determine in what section of the State the various farms are to be located. An effort is then made to find a progressive farmer who is desirous of encouraging diversified farming in his section, and who is willing to permit the Department to aid him in doing it. When a suitable arrangement has been made, a representative of the Department and the State experiment station make a thorough study of local conditions with reference to cropping possibilities, markets, advantages, etc. A system of records is instituted, which enables the Department to secure detailed information regarding every phase of the management of the farm and the results secured. After the farms are established, other farmers are encouraged to visit them, this being done largely through the cooperation of the State experiment station.[10]

A somewhat coordinated but not wholly distinct branch of the work was inaugurated under W. J. Spillman. The Secretary in his report for 1902 said:

As the work of reorganizing this Bureau developed, the need was felt for properly coordinating all the varied lines of plant work in such a way that they could be brought directly home to the practical farmer and fruitgrower in all parts of the country. To this end, I have approved the establishment within the Bureau of an office of Farm Management, which shall have for its object the bringing together in concrete form of all the facts developed in the Bureau as a whole, sifting the results, and applying them in a practical way where they will do the most good. To enhance the value of this work general studies have been inaugurated in the matter of securing facts regarding the way in which the best paying farms in the country are being managed, and what are the relationships of surrounding conditions, such as proximity to markets, ways of leasing or controlling the lands, soils, and climate, and the methods of farming followed. With the knowledge thus secured it will be practicable to lay out a working plan for a particular farm in a particular region, the object being in all cases to have such plans serve as object lessons for type regions rather than for individuals. In line with this plan there is now being undertaken in different parts of the South demonstration experiments for the purpose of showing the possibilities of more diversified farming.

With the cooperation of farmers, working plans are being devised whereby the present system of growing only one crop will be changed so as to secure more diversification, thus insuring greater profits and the building up of the fertility of the land. There are many thousands of acres in the South where the same system of farming has been carried on for years and where it would be a great advantage to inaugurate changes which would lead to the building up of the fertility of the soil and give broader opportunities to those handling the same. As a specific example of this work there is now being developed in the South, as object lessons, a system of what will be called "one-man" farms. These are small areas of land in the pine woods region upon which a system of farming is being developed of such a nature as to appear directly to the class of farmers who must necessarily handle such land. Instead of a single crop, simple systems of rotation are being put into operation, and the question of the proper stock to keep is being considered, all being of such a nature that the work can be handled by one individual. In other regions, where the conditions are different, more elaborate plans are underway whereby considerable tracts of land which have for years been cropped to cotton are being arranged for a regular rotation, introducing stock as an element for the purpose of showing the possibilities of

[8] M. C. Burritt, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1922, pp. 154–155.

[9] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., pp. 60–61.

[10] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1904, USDA Rept. No. 79, Washington, 1904, pp. 27, 23.

such diversification and its bearing on the welfare of the different communities.[11]

The county agent in any form approximating the present was long missing. Nevertheless, his future place and function in the education of farmers was slowly but certainly evolving.

Burritt[12] states that the first county agent in the South was W. C. Stallings in Smith County, Tex. True dates this as of November 12, 1906, and indicates that the appointment resulted from a local demand for more demonstrations and more information than could be given by agents whose territory included several counties.[13] Burritt further states:

It was in Broome County, at Binghamton, N. Y., on March 1, 1911, that the first county agent in the northern and western States was permanently established; and this was by the chamber of commerce.[14]

The man was John H. Barron.

IV. THE FARMERS' INSTITUTES AND SIMILAR ACTIVITIES

Farmers' institutes were a major root from which the Extension Service eventually developed. They appear to have evolved at an early date. The duties of the secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture, established in 1852, included visiting the various agricultural districts of the State and delivering lectures on the practice and science of agriculture. The idea was to have meetings rather similar to teachers' institutes, but upon agricultural subjects. The purpose of such early group meeting appears to have included at least the following:

First. To discuss agricultural matters among themselves.

Second. Establish a series of lectures on agriculture, agricultural chemistry, and geology.

Third. Conduct classes, especially for young farmers and women.

Fourth. Purchase agricultural books, to be read and commented on at meetings.

This early period may perhaps be best characterized as one of modest beginnings but one fecund with ideas foreshadowing much which was to come later. Consider the suggestions of George Boutwell in 1857 that six professors be appointed, representing different branches of agriculture, and assigned on rotation to districts, to visit farms, institute experiments, advise farmers, give lectures, and hold institute meetings. Some farm papers drew special attention to information regarding the institutes, among them the Farmers Institute, published at Mason City, Iowa.

Some statements by Dr. True perhaps provide a general summary.

The extension work of the agricultural colleges was an outgrowth of the addresses delivered at meetings of agricultural societies, at fairs, and at other gatherings of farmers during all the 19th century. From the beginning these addresses included some on the more technical phases of agriculture and its relations to the sciences, delivered by college teachers or persons having special knowledge of the subjects they treated. In 1861 the Michigan Legislature passed an act which contained a provision that "the professors of the college may give lectures to farmers away from the college."

About 1870 meetings called farmers' institutes began to be held in Iowa and Kansas, and these were gradually developed into a regular system of meetings under public control, organized and managed by the agricultural colleges or State boards or departments of agriculture, and supported by public funds. Whatever authority controlled the institutes, the officers of the agricultural colleges quite generally participated in them in the several States. The experiment stations made large use of the institutes for the dissemination of the practical results of their investigations. The Office of Experiment Stations therefore promoted the institutes and in 1903 under a special appropriation by Congress established a division for its work relating to them.

Following the decline of the lyceum movement, partly as a result of the Civil War, there began in 1874 the more systematic Chautauqua movement. This was not connected with educational institutions but consisted largely of literary and scientific circles, which were to a certain extent assisted by summer schools and correspondence courses managed by university professors. * * *

In 1896 the extension work was expanded in the State of New York to include (1) itinerant or local experiments as a means of teaching, (2) readable expository bulletins, (3) itinerant horticultural schools, (4) elementary instruction in nature study in rural schools, and (5) instruction by means of correspondence and reading courses. This plan was so successful that the legislature in 1897 broadened the scope of the work to include the whole State and agriculture in general. The appropriation was increased to $25,000, to be spent under the supervision of the director of the New York College of Agriculture.

That year, besides the horticultural investigations, 200 local experiments with various crops were conducted, 10,000 teachers were reached through visits to schools, lectures at teachers' institutes, and distribution of nature-study leaflets, 15,000 pupils were enrolled for nature study, and 1,600 young farmers took correspondence courses.[15]

By the end of the century institutes were held in all of the then existing States. Financial contribution from public funds were substantial, about $150,000 in 1899. In 19 States, mostly in the South and West, the institutes were directly under the auspices of the agricultural colleges or experiment stations, but in 16 States were connected with the State Department of Agriculture; and in 3, including Iowa, with county organizations.

Farmers' institutes were not initiated in Iowa until relatively late—1870—and then by the State Agricultural College as a more practicable method of meeting an urgent demand from outside the institution for a winter session. Thus the policy of disseminating information by means of lectures and demonstrations was early established. Farmers' institutes at Cedar Falls, Council Bluffs, Muscatine, and Washington were conducted during the winter of 1870–71. However, at a later period the sponsoring organization was the Iowa Association of Agriculture and Industrial Instruction.[16]

The Secretary in his 1903 report summarized the situation and the support which the Federal Government had been able to provide.

In my last annual report I recommended that an appropriation of $5,000 be given to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to undertake work connected with the promotion of the farmers' institute system in this country. The appropriation was to be used in employing an officer who would devote his time and energy to this work, visit institute workers and advise them regarding the ways in which the Department might help the institutes, study the problems of institute management at home and abroad, and seek to shape the Department's work for the institutes so that it might be most helpful to this enterprise. As the matter was finally fixed in the appropriation act, only about $2,000 of the income of the Office of Experiment Stations for the current fiscal year can be used for this purpose. This is entirely inadequate for the work planned, but will be used in gathering statistics of the institute movement and in employing, during a part of the year, an officer who will be retained as farmers' institute specialist, if Congress shall provide sufficient means for continuing the work.

Farmers' institutes are now held in 44 States and Territories, including Hawaii. Nearly complete returns from 40 States and Territories show that in the areas reported about 2,300 institutes are held annually; that the funds expended by the different States and Territories in support of these institutes (not including expenses incurred by local authorities) amounted to about $196,000 per annum, and that about 709,000 people attended the institutes. The number of students taking the agricultural course at the agricultural colleges in the same States and Territories during the year ended June 30, 1901, was 9,623, including those who are recorded as attending courses in household economy, dairying, and veterinary science.

The total number of persons reached by the farmers' institutes and the agricultural colleges (about 720,000) is, however, only a small percentage (7.2 percent) of those actually engaged in agricultural pursuits (about 10 million). The publications of the experiment stations are sent to about 500,000 farmers. A great need of our educational system is, therefore, wider dissemination of the results of agricultural study and research among those now actually engaged in farming.

I recommend that an appropriation of $6,000 be made by Congress to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to aid the farmers' institutes during the fiscal year 1904.[17]

Early in 1903 occurred an event which has been called the beginning of the county farm demonstration work. It is of interest to all those dealing with agricultural education but of very special and peculiar interest to Iowans. But before we plunge into it we must lay some groundwork. Iowa in 1902 had the great

[11] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, Washington, 1902, pp. 8–9.

[12] M. C. Burritt, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, op. cit., p. 154.

[13] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., p. 63.

[14] Burritt, op. cit., p. 160.

[15] True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, op. cit., pp. 276, 277.

[16] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., p. 14.

In his other work, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, p. 119, he indicates 1871–72 as the beginning date but p. 158 says 1870–71.

[17] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, op. cit., pp. 78–79.

fortune to acquire Perry G. Holden from the neighboring State of Illinois.

Of him, Russell Lord has said:

That a man of science, a promoter, a politician, and a stimulating teacher can dwell and labor within one mind and body is illustrated by the extension career of Perry G. Holden, whom "Uncle Henry" Wallace attracted to Iowa from Illinois in 1902. Iowa State College had no adequate appropriation for a professor of agronomy. Wallace's Farmer put up part of the money for Holden's salary for the first 2 years. At the end of that time Holden had 5 counties cooperating in the growing of corn, oats, and alfalfa and in the eradication of quack grass, and he had launched his famous "seed corn Gospel Trains." By 1906 his demonstrations, made on the farms of county poorhouses, were put on in 10 counties; and his corn-gospel trains touched every county in Iowa.[18]

But to return to 1903 and the origin of county farm demonstration work in our fair State. The Sioux County Farmers' Institute met in Hull, Iowa, on February 16, 17, and 18, 1903. On the final day, its assembly passed the following resolution urging the county board of supervisors to establish an experimental—demonstration—farm.

The resolution adopted reads as follows:

Whereas it has been proposed (proposal made by Professor Holden of Iowa State College who was present and participated during 2 of the 3-day sessions) to the members of the Sioux County Farmers' Institute now in session at Hull this 18th day of February 1903 to establish an experimental farm in Sioux County; and

Whereas it is believed that the board of supervisors upon request will set aside a portion of the poor farm for such experimental farm and appropriate money to purchase seed and to pay the extra expense incurred in carrying on such experiments as may be deemed best to be made; and

Whereas Mr. Harry McKee, the present superintendent of the poor farm, has kindly offered his services as far as possible without any extra compensation; and

Whereas it is believed that such experimental farm will be of great value to the farmers of Sioux County: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor such an experimental farm provided that:

1. The poor farm or a portion of it can be secured for the purpose.

2. That the money necessary for carrying on experiments can be secured.

3. That the experiments for the first year be limited to the growing of cereals, grasses, and vegetables.

4. That the amount of money to be expended be limited to $250; and

Resolved further, That upon the adoption of this resolution, a committee of two be appointed to present this matter with a copy of these resolutions to the board of supervisors together with a plan of action.

The Board of Supervisors of Sioux County did comply with the request of the Farmers' Institute as recorded in the county auditor's office, as follows:

April 8, 1903: On motion the board made an appropriation of $150 to be used for an experiment station at the County Poor Farm. The committee appointed to superintend this work is: J. C. Emery, H. J. Vander Waa, and H. H. McKee, county farm superintendent. John Boeyink, auditor; William Dealy, chairman of the board; Charles Harmelink, member of the board; William Shimp, member of the Board; J. H. Blatherwick, member of the board; John Smith, member of the board.

In the conduct of county demonstration farms the county furnished the land, labor, storage space, travel necessary in getting samples of corn and living expenses of college people while in the county and in addition the cash fund for incidentals.

We should perhaps note that Barton Morgan in his history of the extension service of Iowa State College, discussing the official creation of the extension service and its early development under Holden, says:

In 1903 Holden started the county farm demonstration work near Orange City in Sioux County. In 1904, 5 counties cooperated; and in 1906, 10 counties cooperated. The projects were with oats, alfalfa, corn, and quack-grass eradication. This county farm demonstration work, according to Holden, was the beginning of county agricultural agent work.[19]

But perhaps we should supply the story of that major event as Morgan was able to reconstruct it:

The county farm demonstration plots, or experiment stations as they were sometimes called, seem to have grown out of a discussion at a farmers' institute in Sioux County, at Hull, in the winter of 1903. The farmers were in the midst of a sharp argument when Holden entered the meeting. A Mr. Hawkins called upon Holden to give his opinion on the question of whether or not Ames was too far away and conditions too different for the experiments of the college to be of value in Sioux County.

Holden replied (Morgan, Barton, Notes on a Personal Interview with P. G. Holden. Ames, Iowa, May 23, 1932.), "Mr. Hawkins, you are discussing one of the biggest things in the world." Holden took the view that every county should put on demonstrations and have someone in the county to direct the demonstration projects. He would have this man advise the farmers as to the best solution of their problems and also to work with the boys and girls.

As a result of this discussion, county farm demonstration work was started on the county farm in Sioux County in the spring of 1903. County farms were chosen because they belonged to all the people and were centrally located. Field demonstrations and simple experiments were conducted with oats, alfalfa, corn, and the eradication of quack grass. Corn, however, received the chief emphasis. Holden was often called the Corn Man because he stressed corn so much.

In the fall of the year, large gatherings, or picnics, were held at each of the county farms to view the results of the work. From 400 to 3,500 people usually attended these gatherings. The plan followed was for those interested to visit the plots in the forenoon and listen to an explanation of the work by some member of the extension department. At noon the people gathered for a picnic dinner, in family or neighborhood groups. After the dinner, programs of general interest were held in which some local people and 1 or 2 from the college took part. (Data Regarding the Organization of the Agricultural Extension Department, op. cit., pp. 37–38.) Data from these plots were published in circular form up to 1915.

From a beginning in Sioux County in 1903, the work grew rapidly for a number of years. In 1904, there were 5 counties; in 1906, there were 10 counties; in 1908 there were 14 counties; and in 1910 there were 16 counties. (Iowa State College. Annual Reports, Superintendent and Specialists of the Extension Department, 1911. Unpublished, Ames, Iowa.)

While section 2 of the first extension act in Iowa made provision for experimental ork, the college trustees decided against experimentation in the extension department as it was otherwise provided for in the experiment station setup. The county farm demonstrations had in them an element of the experimental, but this work was finally discontinued in 1915. The county demonstration farms were however, a forerunner of the county agent plan of extension work which a little later came to occupy such an important place in Iowa.[20]

Thus, not only Professor Holden but J. C. Emery, president; G. A. Sheldon, secretary; B. F. Hawkins, N. E. Williams, and E. S. Boomer, of the program committee, and others, including substantial attendance from the Dutch population of that area, initiated a much larger "wave of the future" than they could have realized.

For it appears that Sioux County in cooperation with Iowa State College established more than 50 years ago the fundamental basis of support that is now being carried out in cooperative extension work throughout the United States. The Sioux County demonstration in 1903 was a significant event in the development of extension work.

The Sioux County Demonstration Farm of 1903 qualifies for the high national honor of beginning county farm demonstration work because it was:

First. Organized at the request and on the initiative of a group of farmers—Sioux County Farmers' Institute.

Second. Supported by county appropriations and land at the request of farmers.

Third. Conducted in full cooperation with Iowa State College and this cooperation also included support from the United States Department of Agriculture.

[18] Russell Lord, The Agrarian Revival, American Association for Adult Education, New York, 1939, p. 49.

[19] Barton Morgan, A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, June 1934, p. 24. Inasmuch as Morgan says "according to Holden," rather than taking a stand on the matter himself, we should note that the reference he gives is: Data Regarding the Organization of the Agricultural Extension Department, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. Unpublished notes, Extension Service files, 54 pp., no date.

[20] Morgan, ibid., pp. 32–33.

Marketing of Midwestern Fluid Milk in Eastern Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I noted an article in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune for May 11, on the editorial page, in a column headed "Minnesota Editors Say" which quotes from an article by Mr. W. F. Schilling of the Northfield (Minn.) Independent.

Bill Schilling, as he is known to all of us in the Midwest, is one of the pioneers

in the dairy cooperative movement, and in the development of the splendid processing plants these farm cooperatives have.

Bill Schilling was attending meetings throughout all of the Midwest and oftentimes speaking to dairy producers' groups in the New England area when I was a very young man. I always admired his ability to present to any audience, in an understandable manner, the problems with which the farmer was confronted. He strove to improve the farmers' produce marketing. He was a great influence in the development of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, which is one of the largest cooperatives in the Midwest, supplying approximately 90 percent of all the fluid milk consumed in the Twin Cities.

W. F. Schilling's article has referred to the question of breaking into the eastern markets by Minnesota dairymen, and I commend attention to this article because Mr. Schilling has spent many, many years observing the question herein involved, "Can midwestern fluid milk be marketed in these eastern markets?"

This is a question requiring most careful study. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should make a very careful study of this very involved question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

But W. F. Schilling, of the Northfield Independent, is confident the best display of unthinking legislators in Minnesota was their vote of $30,000 for attorney hire to break into eastern markets with Minnesota dairy products. After paying $1.20 in transportation costs to New York, this veteran in building Minnesota's dairy industry says our farmers would have lost 77 cents on all their milk.

Although this proposal was simply political "bunk" Schilling heard no legislator raise his voice against it, although it would disturb the market and pit one group of farmers against the other and that spells disaster. If the country would spend a few millions making farmers get together instead of trying to keep them apart we would not hear so much about parity and farm relief, Schilling concludes.

The Precarious Status of Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Struggle for Survival," pertaining to the precarious status of our merchant marine, which I prepared for the May 1955 issue of Marine News magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

(By Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

That the privately owned American merchant fleet is engaged in a fight-to-the-death struggle for continued participation in the transportation of the world's ocean cargoes is a fact too clearly discernible to admit of any question.

Even the most cursory consideration of the possible outcome of that struggle immediately brings to mind a number of questions, the answers to which would shed a great deal of light upon the matter.

In somewhat logical order, these are some of the more urgent questions:

Why, basically, is it that United States-flag vessels, particularly in the so-called "tramp" trades, are at such a competitive disadvantage in their ceaseless quest for ocean tonnage?

Why are the coastal and intercoastal shipping lines, which do not have to face foreign competition, unable to achieve the prosperity they enjoyed in prewar days?

Are wage and overtime rates on United States-flag vessels the prime reason that our merchant fleet is being priced out of business, as has been alleged?

If wages are a factor in the difficulties of our shipping, is it the only differential, or are there other contributing reasons of importance to explain why United States flag vessels are unable to operate, much less operate profitably, without Government aid?

Once these salient points are brought into focus, other queries naturally follow. For instance—

If American shipping cannot make its own way unaided, is there justification for Federal financial participation, when there is an abundance of foreign bottoms available to serve our Nation's needs?

Will Government be willing continuingly to spend millions of dollars each year for shipbuilding and shipping, to equalize costs of constructing and operating vessels of the American merchant fleet?

Will these Government aids diminish in amount, or are they likely to increase over the years ahead?

Or—is the American Fleet of such importance to the Nation's interests, in peace and war, that it must be maintained on an adequate basis, cost what it may?

Exploring this matter of costs further, it might reasonably be inquired at this point—

Just how much has shipping cost the Government in the period since the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 enunciated the broad policy of Government participation to assure, in the national interests, development and maintenance of a privately-owned merchant fleet adequate to transport "a substantial portion of its waterborne * * * foreign commerce * * * and capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency"?

Is Government itself guilty of helping to depress the shipping industry by competing, through its Military Sea Transportation Service, for the commercial cargoes which the privately-owned vessels should be carrying?

What return have the Nation, and the Federal Treasury, received from the contributions made to the maintenance of the shipping fleet?

If you are somewhat groggy by now, as a result of all these questions, it is perfectly understandable. Maritime operations are most complicated. The problems are so varied, and their implications run so deep into every phase of American life, that one can readily rationalize the lack of appreciation of those problems on the part of the Congress and citizens alike.

Make no mistake about it, however, all the questions listed above and many others will have to be considered, and answered, if our privately-owned merchant marine is to survive.

If each of the foregoing problems could be resolved satisfactorily, one huge obstacle to survival would still project itself into the shipping picture. It is simply this—

Four-fifths of the merchant ships presently operating under American registry will have to be replaced within the next 10- to 12-year period.

At today's inflated prices, such replacement will cost 5, 6, or possibly even 8 billions of dollars, of which the Federal Government, under the provisions of the 1936 act, will normally subscribe between 2 and 4 billions.

A considerable sum of money indeed for the Government to pay. However, it is no more than Government spent to build a fleet of useless ships in World War I. And it is far, far less than the fantastic $13 billion expended for ship construction in World War II.

Orderly replacement of the present fleet, likewise, would prevent another recurrence of the obsolescence problem that plagued our Nation after World War I, and that hangs like an oppressive storm cloud even today.

There, as briefly as I could summarize, are the urgent questions that must be considered in any discussion of the American Merchant Marine and its chances for survival.

Now let's review some of these points more fully.

First, why are American ships at such a competitive disadvantage with respect to foreign vessels? The reason is simple. Because of higher wages and greater benefits to our seamen, and because of higher costs of supplies of all kinds and types used in shipping; and because, too, in great measure, of loading and unloading costs at American ports. Even in the case of American tankers, where stevedoring is not a factor, I am told that operating costs average approximately $1,000 per day higher than foreign costs on similar tankers.

A comparison of wage costs on American and foreign ships is most revealing. Data compiled for the year 1953 shows all too clearly the disadvantage under which United States-flag ships were operating in the world transportation field.

The monthly cost for wages on an American-flag ship, with a crew of 48, the report shows, averaged $29,426 during 1953. This was almost 6 times the cost on a British ship with a mixed crew of 80 men; it was almost 5 times the cost on a British ship with a white crew, or on a Japanese ship carrying 56 men; it was about 4 times the costs on similar ships of Norwegian, Netherlands, Italian or Danish registry, with crews of 41 to 55 men; and it was almost 3 times the costs on a French vessel, with a crew of 47.

On no foreign vessels were monthly costs for wages anything like the costs on American ships.

The coastal and intercoastal lines, while not faced with foreign shipping competition, run into bitter competition from all types of surface transportation, and are particularly burdened with high port costs, because of their many calling points. A promising development in this field is the roll-on-roll-off type of vessel, capable of transporting loaded tractor trucks and freight cars. The lessened labor costs, and greater security of such shipments, help to accelerate turnover and reduce port charges. But, of course, the initial cost of vessels and of the necessary adjustments in terminal facilities are factors that may prevent rapid adoption of this concept.

Recent conferences on coastal shipping problems, staged by the Maritime Administration, may help to bring this segment of this industry "out of the doldrums" of recent years. Certainly these conferences illuminated the basic problems in this field. That

is the initial step in any effort towards improvement—knowing the nature and extent of the problems.

Coming to Government aids and attitudes toward shipping, I would express several firm personal convictions which, if more widely held, would definitely clear the atmosphere. These are, first, that the majority of those who refuse to give reasonable support to shipping, or who do so reluctantly, are simply not conversant with the true facts in the matter.

Secondly, many of these persons, while champions of shipping or any other phase of our economy that is useful in war or emergency, promptly forget such service once the emergency ends. In the case of shipping, particularly, they will applaud the building of 5,000 vessels to win a war, but refuse to consider the harm they've done to the shipping industry by completely upsetting the normal supply and demand, and normal replacement procedures.

Our shipbuilding plants, so vital in war, have been reduced to an irreducible minimum since 1945. Their irreplaceable skilled workers have been scattered to the four winds. Ship construction expenses have "sky-rocketed," because, in the pressure of wartime, we were forced to build, and build, and build, regardless of cost. Now, with all those ships on hand, many of them anything but modern, we have been unable to carry on a gradual modernization of the merchant fleet, and the other maritime nations have far outstripped us. Our ships, the great bulk of them, are slow of speed, costly to load, costly to maintain—all of which adds to the competitive burden of wages, and so on, already cited.

In justice to the maritime industry, and for the information of our taxpayers whose tax payments are involved, the Government should revamp its fiscal accounting so that it could be determined precisely the extent of maritime operating differential payments.

As it is, there is much clamor each year over budget appropriations of funds to cover the operating differential payments due to the various subsidized lines. The House cut these funds last year, and the Senate restored the cuts. Now the House has cut them again. It has chopped $25 million from the $60 million requested in the supplemental budget to put these accounts on a current basis.

The basic reason for this reduction—which merely defers the payment of the $25 million debt to the lines—is that it holds the total payments for the year to exactly $100 million. Some of the committee members apparently felt that $100 million was enough to pay in 1 year.

Not a very businesslike or even fair manner for the Government to transact business, it seems to me. And it must seem so to the ship operators who must carry that $25 million of accounts receivable for an additional period, paying interest to the banks all the while.

One reason why so many people, in and out of Congress, question and sometimes vigorously oppose such payments to the ship operators is that they simply do not understand the complete procedure. A man who makes watches, perhaps, or bicycles, or any one of many other items affected by competing imports, will think it perfectly reasonable to request imposition of a tax on similar foreign items, to protect his company or his industry. Members of Congress oftimes will join in such efforts, to serve their constituents.

Farm groups demand, and secure, parity payments to equalize their net incomes with those of other groups. Operating differential payments to ship operators are in exactly the same veing as parity payments to farmers, or protective tariffs. They make it possible for American shipping lines to compete with foreign shipping whose costs are vastly lower than those of American vessels.

There has been a most regrettable lack of understanding among our people, and even in the Congress, as to the actual operation of the so-called subsidies by which the Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and other maritime nations.

I am sure it was news to many, many people when I made public in the Senate recently the results of an audit by one major shipping line showing the favorable results to Government of this particular subsidized operation. Over the 1936 to 1953 period, from the very initiation of the subsidy program, this shipping line actually has paid back to Government $31 million more than it received in subsidies. This profit to Government was in the form of subsidy recapture, charter hire for use of Government-owned vessels, and corporation income taxes.

In addition to this direct return of the Government's "investment" in that line, there was a huge indirect return stemming from the continued operations of the line—the millions of dollars paid to its officials and employees, the millions of dollars paid to other firms for supplies, ship repairs, and so on, and the many subsidiary businesses wholly or partially supported by these payments.

While on the subject of subsidies, it would be an omission of importance if I were to pass over the question of ship construction differential payments. Over the 20-year period, such payments have totaled $105 million to shipyards in the United States, to equalize construction costs here with those abroad.

The Government has profited from these payments also, but no one has ever been told about it. Of the 107 vessels for which construction subsidies were authorized, more than two-thirds—74 to be exact—were taken over by the Government for use in World War II. Some were requisitioned during construction; others were purchased under the terms of the subsidy contract.

The actual savings in money, I venture to say, resulting from such requisitioning and purchase, would equal or far surpass the net cost of the subsidies, for wartime costs on such vessel were vastly higher. Even more important was the fact that the Government made use of these vessels many months earlier in the war than they could have, had it been necessary to build them.

Always overlooked also is the fact that the owners from whom these ships were taken must replace these vessels at premium costs and values.

One significant difference between so-called ship "subsidies" and subsidies paid directly to agriculture or, indirectly by tariffs, to many businesses, is little known or completely unrealized generally. The payments made by Government to the shipping lines are subject to recapture and actually are recaptured in large measure.

A little known fact unfortunately, for while all operating differential payments must be budgeted, and appropriated—usually after much discussion and occasional loud howls—the amounts recaptured are never publicized. They simply revert to the Federal Treasury as "miscellaneous" receipts.

Take the example as cited above; of $50 million paid to shipping for operating purposes from the inception of this procedure in 1937, through 1942, a total of $31 million was paid back into the Treasury by the shipping lines, through the "recapture" provision of the law.

From the time when such payments were resumed, following the war shipping boom through 1951, a total of $96 million additionaly has been recaptured, but again, without pubicity. Few Members of the Congress, I am confident, and almost no one outside the Congress, realize this state of affairs. And that is partly why there is so much resistance to these payments which have helped so tremendously to keep our American ships operating.

Nor is there any general awareness, in the Congress or among our citizenry, of another vast recovery of funds through the operations of American shipping. Because of previous neglect of shipping, our Government found it necessary to expend more than $13 billion for new ship construction during World War II. More than 5,000 vessels were launched, of which approximately 40 percent later were sold to citizens and to foreign nationals. The remaining 3,000 vessels went into the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

In the years since World War II, more than $500 million have been paid into the Federal Treasury by American shipping companies for charter hire of vessels from this fleet—whose only purpose, otherwise, is to serve in case of war or emergency. Again, most of these payments went into the Federal Treasury unpublicized. Only the payments to the ship operators were given prominence.

Which returns us to the thought expressed earlier, that our people should be furnished the full information on the net cost of Government participation in the financing of ship operations. Now they hear only half the story—the bad side, as far as America's shipping is concerned.

The basic shipping law, the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, authorizes a reasonable method of providing this information, and at the same time providing a continuingly replenished fund for Government's participation in the financing of new vessel construction. It is the ship construction revolving fund, which has been inoperative in recent years, but which should be reactivated as one positive step to aid in the tremendous vessel replacement program now confronting all shipowners. This revolving fund, once again in operation, would remove one great obstacle now hindering new construction: It would make it unnecessary to include construction subsidy funds in the budget.

Legislation which is proposed to reestablish this revolving fund would provide for deposits to be made therein of (1) appropriations for ship construction, (2) receipts from sale of ship mortgages (now totaling several hundred million dollars), (3) interest and principal payments on ship mortgages, and (4) charter receipts. Thus, as mortgages on new ships are repaid, the funds would go back into the revolving fund, instead of into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, and there would be a continually available source of funds for new construction, with full information always available as to the net cost of Government aid to the industry.

Is the answer to all our martime problems, as has been suggested, even by some leaders who should have known better, to rely on foreign vessels to carry our commerce? I say, "No," on many counts. First, the allegiance of their owners and crews would always be elsewhere—as past experience has shown only too clearly. Once they had the field to themselves, they could, and would, charge us whatever the traffic would bear.

Remember when ocean freight rates were increased as much as 2,000 percent, and American docks everywhere were piled with rotting cargoes? And in war, these vessels would go dashing back to serve their own countries—possibly to be used against us.

Many a husband, father, son, and brother would be alive and with their families today, I am sure, if the United States had been reasonably well prepared with ships to supply our military forces throughout the world in the early months of World War II. We not only did not have the ships but we did not have the shipyards or skilled workers with which to build the ships so vital to our security.

No; it would be tragic to make that mistake a third time. Even though the total of operating and construction differential pay-

ments to shipping should continue to increase—as I suppose they will. Everything else has. And a point to bear in mind is that if we take all the alleged subsidies that have been paid to shipping since 1936—say $400 million in all, net—and if we were to add an equal sum annually for construction and operation aids each year during the next 10-year ship replacement period, it would not equal the amount we wasted through hasty, inefficient vessel design and construction in World War II alone.

Again, I am confident that the benefits to our peacetime economy during this next 10-year period—in jobs for shipyard, steel, and countless other workers, as well as the taxes that would be paid by the plants and their employees—would equal or come close to matching the funds paid out.

And we could look forward with confidence to any shipping needs the future might bring—competition to our foreign commerce in peacetime, logistic demands of our Military Establishment in war or emergency.

The struggle for survival will not be lost by the American maritime industry if our people can be given the full truth about the need for, and the needs of, the American privately owned merchant fleet.

And if management and labor in the industry, appreciative of their separate and joint responsibilities, will work hand in hand with Government in a planned program based on efficient operation and honest devotion to the interests of all.

Lack of Adequate Detention Facilities for Juvenile Delinquents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in my work as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I am in an advantageous position to view the accomplishments of civic groups all across the country in their fight to control the growth of juvenile delinquency.

During the subcommittee's hearings last year, we found that one of the worst situations was lack of adequate detention facilities for juvenile delinquents. Recognizing the situation, the May 1955 issue of Woman's Home Companion has named Mrs. Nellie Maze Broderson, of Palo Alto, Calif., as clubwoman of the year for her work in leading a fight for better facilities in Santa Clara County, Calif.

Through her work with the women's clubs, she has been able to complete a program which would stagger the imagination of most people. Mrs. Broderson discovered a situation at the Santa Clara Juvenile Detention Home that needed correcting. There, she found delinquent children herded like animals, crowded together with criminals and perverts. Some officials shrugged off her complaints about the conditions, branding her as another "do-gooder."

But Mrs. Broderson would not tolerate this complacency. Instead, she went forth and rallied the people of Palo Alto. A minor miracle was wrought through the help and cooperation of the women's clubs, and of worthy citizens like Mrs. Albert Bonnell, Mrs. Frank Johnson, and Mrs. Jack Tuomy, presidents of the Palo Alto Women's Club; Mrs. Harry Larmour and Mrs. Harry Cox, presidents of the Santa Clara County Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Harold Kay, secretary of the federation; Mrs. James Corcoran and Mrs. Charles Burr, the Rev. Joyce Farr and the Rev. R. Marvin Stuart, Attorney Norman Stoner, Novelist Kathleen Norris and Manufacturer John Crummey.

Santa Clara officials recently set aside $750,000 for the construction of new facilities. It was a victory for Mrs. Broderson and a victory for all the women's clubs of Santa Clara County who coordinated their efforts to insure better facilities for wayward youngsters, in trouble with the law.

Mrs. Broderson has shown what an aroused citizenry can do to help solve the very complex and serious problem of juvenile delinquency. She has shown the way to thousands of other Americans who face similar situations in their own community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part of the article published in the Woman's Home Companion.

There being no objection, the portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"KIDS ARE BETTER THAN PIGS"

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

Nellie Maze Broderson, unanimously elected the Companion's clubwoman of the year, is a gray-haired grandmother of 65. But don't let her age, nor her gentle—almost fragile—appearance fool you.

Complacent officials in California's Santa Clara County made that mistake 3 years ago—when she began to ask questions about the overcrowded juvenile detention home, the dungeon that passes for a county jail and the tax millions being siphoned off into the county fair—they dismissed her as "just another do-gooder." Today, sadder men but wiser, they know that—for energy, judgment, insight, and sheer bulldog perseverance—Nellie Broderson can outmatch most men and women half her age.

When she asks for the floor at a meeting she may seem merely a small unostentatious, shy woman with a trim, 5-foot-3 figure that belies her years. But as she puts on her spectacles and backs up her words with facts and figures, the room becomes hushed. Everyone in the region knows that her quiet, measured, persuasive voice echoes the consciences of thousands of aroused Santa Clara mothers.

Her persistence has proved catching. Dozens of women, hesitant and timid at first, have followed her example and emerged as leaders in a struggle to put the welfare of troubled teen-agers ahead of providing luxurious county-fair pens for prize hogs. Tens of thousands more, who joined the battle last fall forced through a $750,000 appropriation to replace the worst jail in California with a modern structure.

By a 2-to-1 vote they scotched an almost accomplished plan to install pari-mutuel racing at the local fair and thus prevented big-time gambling from capturing Santa Clara County.

* * * * *

Nellie Broderson is the first to insist that despite last November's victories, the women of Santa Clara County still have a long way to go. "The project for a new jail seems to be moving ahead," she told me. "The county has actually hired an architect. If we keep after it, we may yet see plans for a new building. And after that, if we maintain the pressure, the structure itself may actually materialize.

"But that," she continued, "will still be only a first step. We've got to win an appropriation for the new juvenile detention home. To retain or remodel the obsolete home is unthinkable. As we put it in a letter to the board of supervisors: as many as 10 boys must share 1 small room, sleeping in tier bunks. If a child has a cold there is no possible way in which he can be segregated for observation. Boys from 9 to 18 are kept in the juvenile home. Should a teenager be brought in under the influence of liquor there is no room where he can be isolated.

"The only play space available for 25 to 50 boys is a tiny yard. On rainy days these boys must remain in a small room 14 by 16, which also doubles for a dining room. Boys of this age have a superabundance of energy. Can you imagine the problem of supervising 50 boys in such a small area through 7 days of inclement weather—as has happened?

"We've got to move those neglected children out of their crowded warren, out into the country where they will have space to play and classrooms and all the other things that make for reformation, instead of hardening any delinquent tendencies.

"We women have got to recognize that our real problem, here and everywhere else, is the kind of complacency that locks kids up for months in iron-barred prison cells and converts neglected youngsters into permanent enemies of society.

"The greatest joy I've gotten out of this whole campaign has been that, here at least, thousands of men and women have learned that we adults are really responsible for our juvenile delinquency problems."

Statehood Vote Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES J. DELANEY, which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times on Tuesday, May 17, 1955. I believe it to be a very satisfactory and comprehensive explanation of the vote on the Alaska-Hawaii Statehood bill:

STATEHOOD VOTE EXPLAINED—HAWAII AND ALASKA'S ENTRY OPPOSED BECAUSE OF THEIR NONCONTIGUITY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of May 12, Statehood Will Come, seems to infer that I voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska on the grounds of opposition to civil rights legislation. Certainly my record in support of civil rights is clear enough, and I cannot believe that this inference was intended.

Among the many reasons for my opposition to statehood for these 2 territories at this time is that of their noncontiguity.

On July 15, 1947, the New York Times published a letter from the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in which he said: "It is my judgment that to admit one or more of these distant territories to statehood would be the beginning of the end of our historic United States of America. We should soon be pressed to admit the Philippine Islands,

Cuba and possibly even Australia. We now have a solid, compact territorial Nation."

On March 17, 1954, Walter Lippmann wrote in the New York Herald Tribune: "* * * the admission of outlying territories to statehood would mean a radical change in the structure of the Union and of our external relations."

PART OF LAND MASS

The argument is often made, as in your editorial, that in the past various States were admitted to the Union which, at the time of admission, were not contiguous with the other States. However, no Territory was ever admitted as a State which was not part of the land mass which is now the United States, thus making possible the compact and contiguous aspect of our country as it now exists. No present State is noncontiguous.

To an appreciable extent our economic strength has resulted from contiguity. While air transportation is an important modern development, our highways, railroad systems and inland waterways carry the load of most of our commerce. Being noncontiguous even with itself, Hawaii will never have the advantages of these means of transportation, and Alaska not for many years to come.

As Dr. Butler pointed out, the admission of noncontiguous territory might well give rise to certain future problems. If the classic pattern of our country is violated, there is no reason why other noncontiguous commonwealths and possessions should not petition for statehood. To be sure there is the precedent that only incorporated Territories have heretofore been admitted as States.

FUTURE PETITIONS

However, that is not a constitutional provision and if the precedent of contiguity is broken in favor of Hawaii and Alaska, then Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa could well maintain that they would be discriminated against if denied statehood. Indeed, if the principle of contiguity is abandoned, it is not at all certain that future petitions for statehood would be confined to areas now under the United States flag.

Statehood is irrevocable—once granted it cannot be rescinded. Considering the present state of the world I do not believe that this is a propitious time to experiment with the basic structure of our country.

JAMES J. DELANEY, M. C.

WASHINGTON, *May 12, 1955.*

The Future: Sound as a Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Future—Sound as a Dollar," written by Hon. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, and published in Fortune magazine for April 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE: SOUND AS A DOLLAR

(By George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury)

It is easy to be too conservative when we think about the kind of world we will be living in 25 years from now. If we project recent trends, we are likely to picture 1980 merely as a "souped-up" version of 1955. This can be misleading. For the really significant features of 1980 are likely to be the unpredictable contrasts with the present rather than the similarities. If we picture ourselves back in 1930 trying to form an idea of the world of 1955, we can readily see how a conservative approach would have led us astray. Who, 25 years ago, could possibly have predicated the vast changes that have taken place in the world's political and economic structures; who could have foreseen the fantastic developments in electronics, antibiotics, or atomic energy?

I have always been skeptical about flat economic predictions; our economy is a sensitive and complex mechanism and any one of a thousand factors can affect its behavior. So I would like to base this look at the coming quarter-century on certain assumptions. There are, after all, some factors in the outlook that seem reasonably predictable even though they can't be projected exactly—the growth of population, the quickening rate of technological development, the rise in productivity and employment, the stead improvement in living standards. Assuming these basic trends, we should give them every encouragement in the years ahead. We must aim not just to maintain but to accelerate the favorable trends of the present. We can't possibly control all the factors bearing of the future, but we can work toward helping the world of 1980 become the kind of world we would like to see.

CHECKLIST FOR CONFIDENCE

A goal that may overshadow all others in importance to our Nation is the maintenance of confidence—living, enthusiastic confidence both for today and for the future. It must be shared by everyone—businessmen, workers, investors, and consumers alike. It must be contagious confidence and it must also be practical and justifiable. With such confidence, our Nation can move to new heights of production and services, create new and better jobs, and constantly push ahead on a sound basis to an ever finer future.

The confidence displayed last year by American citizens was a main reason the economic readjustment was not more serious. Consumers ignored the gloomy predictions of some economic forecasters and went on to spend more money than ever before. Investors kept making risk capital available. Businessmen went boldly ahead with development and expansion plans. They put large sums in plant, equipment, and research with the firm objective of improving their competitive positions in future years.

All of this helped to create new jobs, to raise incomes, and to advance the Nation's productive capacity. It enabled the economy to meet the needs of our growing population and was an eloquent demonstration of the life-giving role confidence can play in a free-enterprise economy.

How can this essential confidence be maintained and strengthened during the next 25 years? We shall have to keep working at it all the time. What is required most of all, I believe, is that people develop assurance on the following five major points. They must be convinced:

1. That their Government is working fervently—and successfully—for the blessings of lasting peace.

2. That the management of Government is in the hands of men of integrity and high moral purpose.

3. That the value of the dollar, with which all transactions are made, will be preserved.

4. That the dynamics of a free competitive economy will be stimulated by Government encouragement of private enterprise.

5. That future business declines can and will be held within moderate limits.

I would like to discuss the prospects for the coming quarter century largely in terms of these basic objectives.

A LESSON TO LEARN

The present high degree of national confidence derives in large part, of course, from the belief that business readjustments now can be kept within tolerably narrow limits, and that, in the future, serious recessions can be avoided. Certainly, events of the past 6 months have given people new faith in the ability of the Government to help moderate economic fluctuations. The fear of a reserve recession that was prevalent a year ago has disappeared, and for this the Government's monetary and fiscal policies can take partial credit. Will the next 25 years justify the belief that economic adjustments can be kept within reasonable bounds? I happen to believe that if we continue to pursue flexible and sensible financial policies the current optimism may prove to be warranted.

One major lesson concerning recessions is still too little understood, however. We have learned that when business begins to slacken—as a result of excessive inventory accumulation, overbuying by consumers, or for any other reason—an easy credit policy is helpful. The lesson that still needs learning is that credit restraint is equally necessary during periods of expansion, when the seeds of future troubles are sown.

If we are to reach 1980 with our confidence undiminished, and with the economy continuing to operate at highest efficiency, restraints on credit may be needed just as often as easings of credit. This is something to be expected, to live with, and to take into account in making business plans. In this way the Government can help diminish the maladjustments and excesses responsible for serious recessions.

A major factor in the maintenance of national confidence is people's confidence in what the dollar is worth. During the decade prior to 1953, the severe decline in the purchasing power of the dollar robbed people of nearly half the value of their savings. This inflation has been brought to a virtual halt, and during the past 2 years consumers' prices have remained practically unchanged.

We must make sure that the inflationary trends do not reappear. We must work to insure that the dollar of 1980 will buy at least as much food and clothing as the dollar will buy today—preferably and properly more. If that is done, all will share the benefits of increased productivity, and the saver who puts away a dollar for his retirement, to buy a house, to educate his children, for an emergency, or for any other purpose, will still have a dollar that is worth a dollar when he needs it.

THE STAKE IN STABILITY

This goal of a sound dollar has gained tremendously in importance during the past half-century. This Nation, since 1900, has gone through an economic transformation that far exceeds any other in the long history of man's efforts to achieve a better life. The United States today is a nation made up, overwhelmingly, of small-to-medium savers and investors. It is a nation of "haves" rather than a nation of "have-nots."

Since the turn of the century real income per man, woman, and child in the United States has tripled. And the lower and middle income groups have received the greatest share of this increased income. Early in the century, only 10 out of every 100 American families earned as much as $4,000 a year in terms of today's prices; now 55 do. Most families now have enough money not only to live adequately, but to save besides. That is the basic economic development that has enabled this country to reach fantastic heights of material prosperity as compared with the rest of the world.

The flow of small savings into an ever broadening investment stream during the past 50 years has been truly remarkable. Ownership by individuals in life-insurance policies has increased from under $2 billion in 1900 to more than $80 billion today. Small investors' holdings of United States savings bonds now total nearly $50 billion. More than 10 percent of all families today own stock in American corporations. Whereas in 1900 individuals had liquid savings amounting to less than $10 billion, now such savings total more than $225 billion.

You can see from these few examples what has been happening to the individual and the family in our wonderland economy. The "average" man in America has acquired a financial stake in the future such as no other "average" citizen anywhere ever had before. We need a completely new set of standards in thinking about ourselves and in defining the "general interest." This Nation's economy only has grown right over, and left in the dust, both socialism and communism.

FROM THE BOTTOM UP

We all want the great beneficial development of the past half century continued in the next quarter century, and in many quarter centuries beyond that. But the progress won't be continued unless we follow national policies that allow the healthy advance of the day-to-day process of "betterment from the bottom up." By this I mean not only policies that will safeguard individual savings against the corroding effect of inflation but also policies that will encourage investment in job-creating plant and equipment and insure rising production and employment, and so prosperity for our ever-growing population.

Confidence that the value of the dollar will be maintained in the next quarter century will encourage the investment necessary to finance the power and tools for the economic development of the next 25 years. The total of the small sums deposited in savings banks, insurance companies, investment trusts, savings and loan associations, pension funds, and other financial institutions will become the large investment to build America.

UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

To maintain a sound dollar in the years ahead we must continue the sound and flexible monetary and fiscal policies the Eisenhower administration has been following during the past 2 years. Our methods of strengthening confidence in the dollar have been simple. We are steadily curtailing unessential Federal spending. And we are increasing the efficiency of Government operations.

Cuts in Federal expenditures enabled us to travel two-thirds of the way toward a balanced budget in fiscal 1954. And in the coming 1956 fiscal year, net budget expenditures will be an estimated $11.9 billion below the postwar peak spending of 1953.

We have cooperated with the Federal Reserve Board to assure a smooth meshing of the Government's debt-management and monetary policies. While the Federal Reserve Board has used flexible credit and monetary actions to see that the Nation's supply of money and credit was kept in line with the needs of the economy, the Treasury has worked toward making the $278 billion Federal debt less inflationary and less of a threat to the soundness of the currency.

The Eisenhower administration inherited a public debt heavily weighted in short-term obligations (the average maturity of the debt in January 1953 was less than 4 years). Since short-term debt can add substantially to inflationary pressures (even at times approaching the liquidity of printed money), we have taken action at every appropriate time during the last 2 years to extend the maturity of the debt by issuing intermediate and long-term securities.

Last February the Treasury offered a 40-year 3-percent bond, the longest-term security offered by the Treasury since 1911. The 1995 maturity date was chosen to give the bond wide appeal to such long-term investors as pension trusts and insurance companies. It was designed to supply a real need for a Treasury issue in an area beyond the primary demand for mortgage funds. Long-term investment money was available, and the economic situation permitted long-term refunding of this essentially neutral type without danger of unsettling the economy.

If in the next 25 years we use proper opportunities to lengthen the average maturity of the Federal debt when we can do so without disrupting the money markets unduly, we can hope that 1980 will find us with a Federal debt better balanced than at present as between short, intermediate, and long-term issues, and widely distributed among various classes of investors. We can devoutly hope also that the total amount of the Federal debt will be somewhat smaller than at present.

A SMALLER TAX BITE

What about Federal tax policy? Within the next 25 years it is possible that the threat of Communist imperialism will be reduced to such an extent that we can substantially reduce national security spending. This would give us a long-sought opportunity to lighten substantially the Federal tax burden that today consumes nearly a quarter of the total national income. This objective is continually before us. For a cut in the tax share of each income dollar—the maximum cut consistent with the requirements of national defense—would do much to encourage individual initiative and economic growth.

In spite of heavy defense spending, we have already been able to reduce taxes. Sizable cuts in Government expenditures made possible a tax reduction last year of $7.4 billion, the largest dollar cut in our history. Moreover, the broad revision of the Internal Revenue Code last year brought long-needed improvements in the Federal tax structure. Much remains to be done, but the 1954 Revenue Act removed many of the inequities and hardships for individuals that had crept into the tax laws over the years, and reduced some of the worst tax hindrances to business incentive. Thus our tax program to date has not only smoothed the 1954 transition from a high to a lower level of Government spending but has helped provide a more favorable climate for economic growth over the long run.

In the next quarter-century we must continue working in the direction of reduced taxation. And we must do so in ways that will not only take a smaller percentage of our total national income but in ways that will most encourage the initiative and enterprise which are the very foundation of our economic progress.

GLOBAL GOALS

Another important goal for the next quarter century should be the strengthening of our economic relationships with other free countries, that we may all prosper together and together build increasingly strong barriers against Communist imperialism.

Efforts to improve economic output here and in other free countries have particular significance in view of the prospect for a rapid increase in world population. By 1980 the United States population of 164 million may be increased to well over 200 million; the population of the world, now about 2.5 billion, will exceed 3 billion at the present rate of increase. The United States population growth will affect our entire economic life. It will require more plants and homes and stores and may change the whole face of urban and rural America.

A 20-percent rise in world population will press increasingly upon the world's land resources and food supplies, and will influence many foreign economic and political problems. It will undoubtedly bring increasing demands for more efficient methods of providing food and other necessities for the people of the world and will provide exceptional opportunities for the application of modern technical knowledge and methods to the production of food, clothing, and other consumer goods.

WHOSE ALLY IS TIME?

Contrary to the popular view, I believe time is working in our favor in the cold war against communism. As we build up the strength of free people throughout the world, we are erecting barriers to the spread of Communist doctrine. As the free nations are able progressively to improve the welfare of their people, to promote individual freedom and initiative, to raise living standards, improve transportation and communication, encourage international trade, the Communist countries will find themselves operating under increasingly severe handicaps.

The present and future of free-world people in this year of 1955 look good. An America of confidence, prudence, and imagination will mean that free men of 1980 will see a present—and a future—finer than our minds of today can even dream.

Reemployment Rights for the Disabled Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted herein an article appearing in the April 1955 issue of Performance, a monthly publication distributed by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the Chairman of which is my very good friend Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, retired.

The Committee is a voluntary citizens' committee which seeks to create a proper climate in which physically handicapped men and women workers can seek and find gainful employment suited to their skills and abilities. Under the able leadership of Chairman Maas, a native of my home State of Minnesota, the Committee is making an invaluable contribution in the field of the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. We are all deeply grateful to Mel Maas for his many contributions to the betterment of his fellow man.

I also want to call my colleagues' attention to the article below, inasmuch as it tells the very heartwarming story of how the people of Cloquet and Carlton, Minn., both situated in my district, are helping a blind Korean war hero and his blind wife toward a normal and self-sufficient life.

Jack Thornton, of Carlton, Minn., who became a hero when he tried to save his foxhole buddies from an exploding hand grenade, and was blinded permanently, married Joyce Ann Campbell, who is also blind, last year and the community built a home for them. Today Jack Thornton

is learning a new job at the Wood Conversion Co. plant in Cloquet, Minn., thanks to the work of Mr. Maas' committee and the farsightedness of the management of the Wood Conversion Co. Jack has memorized the specially built control panel which enables him to operate a shredder at the plant. Signals from other parts of the production, normally relayed by flashing lights, will reach him via horn system.

The article is as follows:

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR THE DISABLED VETERAN

(By Adelbert C. Long, liaison officer, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, U. S. Department of Labor)

History will look back on section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act as a significant milepost in the long history of veterans' benefits and rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

It took the medical profession hundreds of years to progress from the pegleg of Long John Silver and the iron claw of Captain Hook to the ingenious prosthetic appliance of my fellow worker who, unknown to most of his close friends, lost a leg in northern Africa. And it took society equally as long to accept any real change in its concept of veterans' benefits from the land-grant reward that Rome gave Horatius:

"They gave him of the cornland,
That was of public right,
As much as two strong oxen
Could plow from morn till night."

to the right that Napoleon gave his old veterans to live out the rest of their lives at the Hotel Des Invalides. For it was not until Congress passed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 that there developed a brandnew philosophy that a government which could constitutionally compel a person to leave his employment to enter military service could also require his employer to reemploy him upon his release from service, "since the life and property of the employer as well as the lives and property of everyone in the United States are defended by such service."

It took Congress only 8 short years to take the next epoch-making step and add these important words to the reemployment rights section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act: "If not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case."

But it is not enough to just pass a law to fulfill the intent of Congress and really assist the thousands of ex-servicemen who come under the protection of the reemployment rights statutes. The Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights in the United States Department of Labor is faced with the difficult task of the day-by-day administration of this important law.

The significance of this bread-and-butter veterans' benefit to the entire field of industrial relations was recognized when Congress in 1947 placed the responsibility for administration of the program with the Secretary of Labor through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.

Reemployment rights encompass much in the field of industrial relations, involving the management practices of business and the professions, wage and salary structures, and the collective bargaining agreements between management and labor; also, they are defined, clarified, and sometimes muddled by several hundred court decisions. Thus, the task of assisting a nonhandicapped veteran often ranges from simple compliance actions, such as providing correct and applicable information, to roundtable conciliatory negotiations or referral of the cases to the Department of Justice for court action. But this is relatively simple and easy compared to the efforts often expended on restoring a disabled veteran to "such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case."

Such situations often require a review of his Veterans' Administration medical history (with the veteran's permission, of course), consultation with other medical authorities, a study of jobs in the plant, conferences with vocational and rehabilitation specialists and job analysts, and the utilization of many other community facilities to try and find a suitable job for such handicapped ex-servicemen. But while this section of the law taxes the ingenuity and experience of the Bureau's staff, they are repaid many times in their personal satisfaction of finally placing a handicapped veteran in a job which will put him once more in the labor market as a full-fledged, self-supporting member of his home community.

Vincent McCoy, the Bureau's area representative in Minneapolis, simply glows with Minnesota pride when he tells how a veteran's hometown, his employer, the Veterans' Administration, two veterans' service officers, the newspaper and, in fact, everybody, all worked together to welcome a totally blind Korean veteran home with a wife, a job, and a new house. Jack Thornton was fighting with the Thunderbird Division (the 45th Infantry) in Korea when he seized a hand grenade thrown by the Reds and attempted to hurl it back to save himself and three other soldiers in his foxhole. It exploded and Jack Thornton won the Distinguished Service Cross but lost his sight.

When Jack got back home there was no reluctance on the part of G. F. Allen, personnel director of the Wood Conversion Co., to give him his full reemployment rights. It was only a question of finding the right job, converting a machine so he could handle it, clarifying his seniority rights to a different job classification, and other little details of a similar nature.

Mr. K. S. Rondesvedt, Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation training officer, surveyed all the jobs in the plant and suggested necessary technical changes and a machine conversion so that Jack could operate it. Mr. Allen had some of his engineers get busy on this. Meanwhile, Carlton County Veterans' Service officer, Charles Buehre, and Veterans of Foreign War Post Service officer, Howard Melde, kept a close eye on all the efforts to put Jack back on the job. "Vince" McCoy, the Bureau's area representative, clarified the industrial relations problems of seniority and job classification.

While this was all going on, Harry Lawrence of the Carlton County News Graphic and the Pine Knot, local weekly newspapers, sparkplugged a community drive to provide a new house. Because Jack Thornton wasn't just loafing around all this time, he was busy courting and finally marrying pretty Joyce Campbell. To top it all off, Pope Pius XII sent a scroll with his personal blessings.

Of course, all reemployment rights cases don't have the glamorous trimmings of a blind hero, a romantic wedding, a good boss, and a charming new home in a wonderful town like Cloquet, Minn.

Harvey Driscoll, the Bureau's regional representative in Atlanta, spent a lot of time and effort in reinstating a veteran who had lost his left hand and couldn't perform the heavy duties of his former job. With the employer's cooperation, however, the veteran is once again employed and with the protection of his full seniority.

V. J. Meyl, the Bureau's regional representative in the Washington, D. C., office, became quite familiar with workmen's compensation laws and second injury claims before he got a veteran with defective vision back to work in a steel mill.

Jack Warshaw, in the Cleveland office, had lengthy negotiations with company officials and two different unions before he was able to restore a veteran who had lost the use of his left hand.

And sometimes employers don't cooperate. Jim Higgins, regional representative in Kansas City, insisted upon the reemployment of a diabetic veteran whose employer was most reluctant to reemploy him. The veteran thanked him for his efforts, and wrote, "They (the employer) said they would have to put me back to work or face a court fight, so the next day, November 18, I was called back to work. I again wish to thank you for all your help."

And so it goes in all 17 offices of the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights every day throughout the country. A good law on the books and the earnest, sincere efforts of these specialists in reemployment rights spell self-respect and gainful employment for hundreds of returning handicapped veterans.

Putting the Blame Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many requests I have had for transcripts of what I said before the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 13, 1955, on the subject of who has bungled the Salk vaccine distribution problem, I am inserting that statement in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Mr. MULTER. Dr. Scheele, there isn't any confusion in my mind as Mr. Widnall indicated there may be in his mind. I can see a clear division here of the overall problem into two different problems. One problem is to make sure that we have a safe vaccine that can be used for the purpose intended. The other problem is one of distribution of the vaccine. I wish you would correct me as I go along, if I am wrong in anything I say.

I have taken the trouble to send for the United States Government Organization Manual, the current manual, which sets forth the purposes and duties of the various departments in the executive branch of our Government, including all of the Cabinet officers, and under Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have the Office of the Secretary, a member of the Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby, and she is charged with the overall management of that Department, and the purpose of that Department is, and I quote "to improve the administration of those agencies of Government, the major responsibilities of which are to promote the general welfare in the fields of health, education, and social security." That Department breaks down into various subdivisions, one of which is the Office of the Surgeon General, which you so ably and competently head, as the Surgeon General.

Your office, under your jurisdiction, is charged with the duty of making sure that whatever new is developed involving the

health of the public can be safely used. I haven't any doubt that as long as you are the Surgeon General and you are given the right to perform your duties as required of you by law, you will make sure, within the realm of possibility, and within that degree of certainty that a human being can have, that only safe vaccines will be used, as well as serums and everything else that come within the jurisdiction of your department, and that the minute you discover something is wrong, either in a plant or a laboratory or with a product, you will stop its use until you are sure it is safe. I think you have been doing that.

But there is another problem involved here, and that problem was pointed up by the introduction of bills in this Congress as early as April 18. That was 6 days after the vaccine was released for use throughout the country, and I think, in accordance with the requirements of the law, there has been consultation back and forth between our health officials, headed by yourself, and others, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Canadian Health Department, because simultaneously on the same day, April 12, both the Canadian Government and our Government released this vaccine for public use.

With this difference, however—and I won't pull any punches—I join with every last one of my colleagues in this Congress in laying the fault right in the lap of Mrs. Hobby. If she has been preoccupied with other things, including Cabinet meetings, I don't think any of them were so important as giving her attention to this problem. It was certainly more important that she attended to this problem rather than to making so many speeches, whether to political organizations or otherwise. She is your superior, so I don't ask you to comment on that, but I join my colleagues in saying that she is primarily responsible for this situation.

The Canadians love their children no more and no less than we Americans, and I am sure the Canadian Government has no more and no less interest in the health of their children and their people than our American Government has. They were able, the day they released it as we did on April 12, at the same time to put into effect governmental regulations as to the distribution of the product. They made sure that they wouldn't have to wait for the head of the Government to say that "if and when"—and the statement doesn't impress me one bit—"he hears that some child can't get this vaccine because they haven't the money with which to pay for the inoculation, he will make people listen."

The time for this Congress to make people listen is in advance of that. And as long as I am a Member of this Congress I am going to fight for the enactment of laws in advance of the happening of the contingency, and that is what should have been done here.

Mrs. Hobby, I charge, was derelict in her duty in 1 of 2 respects: Either she has the power under the law to act, in which event she was derelict in not acting, or she doesn't have the power under the law to act, in which event she was derelict in her duty in not coming before this Congress and saying, "Members of the Congress, we need a law so that we can regulate this thing."

That is where all the confusion and confounding of the public has come in.

As early as April 18 Mr. RAINS, of this committee, and other Members since, have introduced bills, not trying to tell you, Dr. Scheele, or your Department, how to operate to determine whether this vaccine is safe, or who should make it, but to make sure that there be no black market at any time, to make sure that this went into the channels of distribution properly, in accordance with the way the medical men, the scientific men, think it should go, and there should be no ifs, ands, or buts about that.

We have been trying, our chairman has three times invited Mrs. Hobby to come here, and she has found it impossible to be here.

Yesterday this committee adopted a resolution requesting her to come here, but the vote was declared out of order because it was taken while the House was having a quorum call. I am sure she knows about that. She still has not been able to find the time to come in and tell this committee whether she has the authority to act, and will act, or she needs a law under which to act.

Now, I think you have made it very clear, Dr. Scheele, that within your jurisdiction you are doing everything you and the men under you can do to make sure the public will be protected.

But we, as Members of the Congress, have a duty to perform, too, and I say the first duty of this Congress is to hear the responsible official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary, to have her come in here and tell us why she wasn't ready with some plan, on the day this was released, on April 12, just as the Canadian authorities were, and to tell us why she is not ready with some plan now.

No one can blame the National Foundation. They have done a good job, and they will continue to do a good job. But I think you indicated to us when Congressman DAVIDSON last week read to you a section of the law which he thought gave you the authority to control the distribution, and you very properly pointed out that that law does not apply. Now, whether the law does or does not apply, somebody—and that somebody is Mrs. Hobby—should be in here to tell this Congress, in no uncertain terms—let us forget about why she didn't do it up to April 12—she should come in here now and tell us, "This is the way we are going to distribute this and make sure there is proper and equal distribution throughout the country to those who should get the vaccine in accordance with the best scientific and medical thinking and direction." It is time she had such a plan. If she doesn't have one, then this Congress should work one out for her.

With reference to that very matter—and I hope, Dr. Scheele, that you won't think that I am taking this out on you. I have the highest respect for you. I don't mean any of this as being critical of you. I can't say too frequently or in too many places how good a job you have done in the years that you have given yourself to this service. But this matter needs attention, and needs attention now.

Delegating it on a voluntary basis to the 48 States, in my opinion, cannot possibly solve the problem. We have already been told that there are State governments which do not have any funds. We know they can get the vaccine for nothing. They don't have the funds with which to employ the technicians, the doctors, or the nurses to do the inoculating. You, yourself, told us that your Department does not have the funds with which to do that kind of work. It is not supposed to be your job. But somebody has to do it. And if my State has the funds with which to do it I am not going to be very proud, if an adjoining State, or a State a thousand miles away, hasn't the funds to do it. It is my duty as a Congressman to see that the children of every State get these inoculations as fast as it is available.

With your releasing the product in the manner you indicate it is going to be released, it necessarily is going to be in short supply. I can see how you must decide that the vaccine is going to be released in small quantities as each batch is found safe. But somebody must decide who is going to get it. Is it going to go into New York State because we have the money, and another State that doesn't have the funds must wait? That is not my idea of how to treat our children. I think it is Mrs. Mobby's duty to come here and tell us how she is going to handle that. You have enough to do. You are doing a good job to make sure that this vaccine is going to be safe, and that is a full-time job in itself.

As I say, I have tried to take you off the hot spot that you are sitting upon, Dr. Scheele. You can or cannot comment as you please on what I have said, and if you wish to correct any statement that I have made that you think is wrong, I will be happy to have you do it.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Aluminum Companies Refusal To Sell to Independent Aluminum Fabricators Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Government's recent cutback of 150 million pounds of aluminum from the quota previously designated for the defense stockpile was to assist the independent users of aluminum, many of which face business disaster because of current shortages and the aluminum producers' retention of most of their output for their own plants. In spite of this, Reynolds Metals Co., as well as Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., have refused to make their shares of the cutback available in full to the independents.

The Government entered into contracts a few years ago with both Reynolds and Kaiser whereby those companies promised to sell to the independents certain amounts of aluminum produced from new plants and facilities to be established with Government assistance. One intent behind those contracts was to protect the independent segment of the aluminum industry. Instead of complying with this intent the companies are now claiming in effect that they are not required to sell the contract amounts to the independents if their normal pattern of sales to them equals or exceeds those amounts. This specious rationalization is in direct conflict with what is commonly known to have been the intent and purpose of both the contracts and the cutback.

The refusal of Reynolds to perform its duty will have a serious adverse effect upon the independents. Its policy is an anomalous one indeed in view of the fact that the Government enabled Reynolds after World War II to get started in the aluminum business by financial assistance, and, it should be noted, for the purpose of establishing competitive conditions in that industry. Yet, Reynolds now pursues policies which increase its control over the fabricating segment of the industry and thereby lessen appreciably free competitive conditions. If such control as now exercised by Reynolds, and the other primary producers as well, in aluminum fabrication is not altered, antitrust action must inevitably be the consequence.

I have advised the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Administrator of the General Services Administration of my concern in this matter and have requested them to take such action as will protect the nonintegrated users of aluminum and insure their receipt of the amount of aluminum intended by the cutback.

My letter to the Reynolds Co. reads as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

Mr. MARION M. CASKIE,
Executive Vice President,
Reynolds Metals Co.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASKIE: I am writing with reference to your letter to me of May 2, 1955, and particularly with reference to the refusal of the Reynolds Co. to sell to nonintegrated or independent users of primary aluminum the full increased supply of aluminum to be made available by the Government's recent cutback of 150 million pounds in its stockpile requirements.

Unquestionably, a paramount consideration in the proposed stockpile cutback was an alleviation of the very serious shortages in primary aluminum facing the nonintegrated users. The Antitrust Subcommittee has received numerous complaints from the nonintegrated users and it is apparent that many in that independent segment of the aluminum industry face financial ruin if they are not to have greater access to the aluminum production of this country.

Reynolds' contracts with the Government require you to sell to the independents up to two-thirds of the aluminum produced from the expansion facilities recently developed by the company in cooperation with the General Services Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization. These contracts quite obviously contemplated that the independents would be benefited to the extent the Government did not take Reynolds' production from the expanded facilities for stockpiling. It is equally obvious that the independents would be little benefited if you were to discontinue your pattern of sales to them prior to the expansion and substitute sales only in the amounts that were left after Government stockpiling. Thus, even if there were to be no stockpile demands during a particular period, two-thirds of your expanded facilities could hardly equal the amount formerly sold to the independents. And if the Government took the full amount of stockpiling, the independents, under your theory, would be entitled to nothing at all.

You state in the penultimate paragraph of your letter that Reynolds has planned to sell to the independents an amount in excess of its contract requirements. An examination of available data indicates the illusory nature of your position and the inequitable effect on the independents if it were to be accepted. In 1954, Reynolds sold to the independents over 144 million pounds, or 72 million for a 6-month average. Reynolds has sold or plans to sell for the first 6 months of 1955 a total of roughly 80 million, including the 41 million cutback amount allotted your company. Therefore, if there had been no cutback, you would sell to the independents at the rate of 39 million for a period of 6 months, appreciably less than the 1954 amounts.

Whatever the precise data may be there can be no doubt that Reynolds is not selling to the independents at the 1954 rate plus the recent cutbacks. Thus a paramount purpose of the proposed cutback will be defeated and Reynolds will use for its own purposes a substantial share of the released amount.

It is my opinion that the action of Reynolds is most unwise in view of the effect which will result to the independent nonintegrated users of aluminum and is a rather shortsighted policy, in which not all of the primary producers are in accord. The Aluminum Co. of America, I understand, has agreed to sell the amount of the cutback applicable to them to the independents in addition to the amount they already had planned to sell.

I have no alternative but to advise the proper representatives of the General Services Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization of my feelings in the matter.

My letter of May 31, 1955, to the Office of Defense Mobilization, as well as to General Services Administration, was as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I am enclosing a copy of a recent letter I wrote as chairman of the House Antitrust Subcommittee to the Reynolds Metals Co.

The attitude of both Reynolds and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. with respect to the recent cutbacks from aluminum stockpiling is, of course, fully apparent to you, as are the theories by which they rationalize this attitude. I wish to emphasize to you my concern in this matter. These companies should not be permitted to relegate to their own uses the aluminum cutback of 150 million pounds as proposed last April. If the Government's needs for defense purposes do not necessitate the stockpiling of that amount, then measures should be adopted to insure that the nonintegrated users get it. Reynolds and Kaiser should not be permitted by a jumbling of statistics and technicalities to acquire the metal for their own purposes to the detriment of an important segment of the aluminum industry.

I trust that the Office of Defense Mobilization will see to it that the assistance and protection intended for the independents by the contracts with the producers and by the proposed cutbacks will not be frustrated as will be the effect if Reynolds and Kaiser are not abruptly checked in their present actions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in whose divine wisdom, righteousness, and love we trust, we beseech Thee to lead us by Thy Spirit in our halting and stumbling quest for the right solution to our many difficult national and international problems.

We humbly confess that, in the tumult and confusion of our time, we do not know where and how to find that solution. Our diplomats and statesmen assemble in conclave and counsel but there seems to be so little of real concord.

Help us to see that perhaps the rancor and misunderstanding, the misconceptions and the failure to find that right and satisfactory solution may be because we talk so much and take so little time for prayer to listen to Thy voice of gentle stillness.

May we continue to be full of hope and courage, and grant that the leaders of all the nations may have in their minds and hearts the spirit of good will and consideration, of sympathetic patience and interpretive understanding as they sincerely strive for peace on earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–16.

CHRONIC LOW INCOME AND ITS EFFECT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Government announced this week that the American economy in the first 3 months of 1955 had broken all records in the value of output of goods and services, or gross national product. The figure for the first quarter of this year was at a rate of $370 billion a year.

This is a slight increase over the previous record rate of $369 billion a year reached in mid-1953, and a very substantial increase over the levels in effect during the last part of 1953 and through most of 1954 when we had recession.

What it all means is that we have now bounced back to where we were 2 years ago. We are producing goods and services in the same amount—but we are doing it with fewer people in many manufacturing processes, which is why we still have such large unemployment.

Under normal circumstances—if the expansion previously accomplished in the economy had continued through 1953 and 1954 instead of being interrupted by the recession we went through—our rate

of output today would be much, much higher than it is. And there would be more jobs. Therefore, while we have recovered a lot of lost ground, we have not gone forward. So there is no room for smug complacency about our economy.

For we must experience a steady expansion in our whole economy year after year if we are to approach our national goals of full employment.

Under the best of circumstances—even when prosperity is widespread and the economy is expanding in a healthy manner—we have millions of Americans who, for one reason or another, are underemployed or unemployed. The low-income group, which becomes alarmingly large in periods of recession, is too large in this country even under the best of circumstances.

A subcommittee of three of us who serve on the Joint House-Senate Committee on the Economic Report—Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman; Senator RALPH FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont; and I—is now launching a new congressional study of this perennial and persistent problem of the low-income family. Most of the work on this between now and the fall will be of a basic factfinding nature performed by the economics staff of the joint committee; following that, however, we will then undertake a series of hearings to get at the underlying causes of this problem. And the areas of possible corrective action.

Leaving out entirely the occasional individual who does not want to work, we want to find out whether, in individual cases of chronic low income, it is a problem arising primarily out of lack of education, or perhaps out of limited training in skills for which there is a decreasing demand.

Are people who lose their jobs to machines unable to find—or unequipped to hold—other well-paying jobs? Do they need retraining?

How big a factor does age play in the relegation of workers to poor-paying jobs which give them less-than-adequate incomes? How seriously do pension factors enter into that problem?

What about the problem of the disabled worker—a phase of this study which has been a matter of great concern to me in the Congress over many years?

What can people in depressed areas do to help make ends meet when the community's job opportunities shrink or disappear? How mobile is the average worker who loses his job? Can he pick up readily and go elsewhere? Should he?

These are just some of the problems our subcommittee intends to look into. With the increase in automation, the problem becomes increasingly more serious. In the mining areas, we know well about the tragedies of the skilled workers who have spent years learning their craft, only to have the jobs disappear overnight.

No matter how prosperous our country, these individual situations are tragic, indeed. I hope we can do some effective work in this field.

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE ON IDENTIFICATION TAGS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with a number of other Members of the House who have introduced bills to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags. There are some dozen bills which have been filed in this session of Congress to accomplish the desired purpose of the resolution that directs the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to authorize the inclusion of the Eastern Orthodox religious faith as one of the religious faiths authorized to be designated as a religious preference on identification tags issued to members of the Armed Forces. The capital letters "E. O." shall be used on such tags to indicate the designation of such faith.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of the religious of this faith have written me asking that the Congress take action in this session of Congress on these resolutions. I sincerely trust that the House Committee on Armed Services will set down hearings on this matter in the very near future. It is my understanding that the Senate Committee on Armed Services is to hold hearings on a similar bill.

BOROUGH OF LEMOYNE, CUMBERLAND COUNTY, PA.: 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Borough of Lemoyne, in eastern Cumberland County, Pa., is celebrating its 50th anniversary. Although the borough, as such, is only 50 years old, the history of the area goes back to French and Indian days. The pageant, which is being staged nightly on the Lemoyne High School Athletic Field, is staged by local talent, and is reigned over by one of Lemoyne's lovely young ladies, Miss Shirley Willis.

Lemoyne is directly across the Susquehanna River from Harrisburg and is the gateway to what is known as the West Shore, a growing and expanding residential and industrial area.

Lemoyne is the location of Fort Washington, which marked the northernmost point of Confederate invasion during the Civil War. In 1863 General Lee's advancing army created panic, and embankments were thrown up along the western and southern sides of the eminence known as Washington Heights. The site is now occupied by houses, but in places the trenches are visible as faint overgrown depressions. Here on June 29, 1863, Confederate cavalry under Col. A. G. Jenkins, while reconnoitering the southwestern approach to the State capital, exchanged shots with Union defenders. Before and during the Gettysburg engagement all of the Harrisburg district was in a fever of apprehension.

This was not the only occasion history touched the area now embraced by Lemoyne. The first white settlement on the west shore was Kelso's Ferry, named for the man who operated the ferry service. Gen. George Washington crossed this ferry en route to Carlisle and stopped to pay his respects on October 4, 1794. The first locomotive to cross the Susquehanna cautiously made its way over the first railroad bridge in 1839. The first station on the old Cumberland Valley Railroad west of Harrisburg was Bridgeport, at the end of the railroad bridge. This settlement, which in 1883 had 5 or 6 dwellings and 1 warehouse is now a part of Lemoyne.

All civic groups in Lemoyne are participating in the week-long celebration. City officials and those organizing the celebration have received messages of greetings and congratulations from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and other high Federal and State officials.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues join me in congratulating this alert community and wishing it well.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 65]

Albert	Doyle	Miller, N. Y.
Avery	Eberharter	Morrison
Bolton, Oliver P.	Evins	Mumma
	Fjare	O'Konski
Buckley	Gamble	Pillion
Burdick	Gray	Radwan
Burleson	Green, Oreg.	Reed, N. Y.
Canfield	Green, Pa.	Scherer
Christopher	Herlong	Shelley
Corbett	Heselton	Tollefson
Dingell	Hiestand	Vursell
Dorn, S. C.	King, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5297, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, any program which calls for a lengthy period of military training inevitably brings in its wake feelings of deep distress and concern. Distress, because in our hearts, all of us yearn for peace, and the thought of training calls forth the image of war. Concern, because our culture is eminently directed toward the freedom of the individual, to live his life in the pursuit of happiness according to his own choosing, and any bar to this right creates fear for our way of life. But it is indeed our way of life to which we must address ourselves in consideration of the bill before us. The realities of the age in which we live point to the fact that our way of life is being threatened—and vitally so—by forces indomitable in their strength and purpose—forces anxious to superimpose their tyranny on all parts of the globe, eager to press forward at the first sign of weakness and unpreparedness.

To be prepared against this background, brings with it enormous demands on our patience, understanding and ability. Enormous, because they are so alien to our belief in the general good of man. Enormous, because we could, out of an unwillingness to believe, permit ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security. We demobilized as quickly as possible after World War II. We believed that everyone wanted peace as much as we did. We then found ourselves so short of Reserves in the Korean war that our manpower had to come either from World War II veterans or from ill-trained recruits. Through this bill, we can be assured of an active Reserve ready to be called upon should an emergency arise, and ready also to serve as a deterrent to those who question our stamina to maintain our preparedness on a long-term basis.

There has been criticism of the Reserve Force program which is now in operation. The present program has been called feeble, aimless, and poor. The bill before us would provide for a Reserve in which draft-eligble young men who serve 2 years or less in uniform, would be active part-time citizen soldiers in Reserve units. The period a man would have to spend in the Reserves would range up to 7½ years, and all this time, he would be regarded as combat ready. If he shirked his weekly drills or summer training, he could be put back into uniform for as long as 2 years. This might sound drastic, and indeed it is, but the only way to create an Active Reseve is to make it active.

We must remember that the 900,000 World War II veterans who were called back for Korean war service, had to be called because we had no large Reserve of peacetime trainees ready. In many parts of the country, the present Reserve training program has been looked upon as a joke. Obsolete weapons have been issued, boring meetings held with no concrete program planned, all of which caused many Reserves to drop out in sheer disgust.

Of course, many Reserve units function very well indeed, engaging the reservists in skills and study, useful and productive both in combat and in civilian life as well. For example, the Air Force Reserves in New York include in their program the following courses:

Project management for research and development organizations.

Executive development for administrative and staff duties.

Weather as it affects flight operations.

Intelligence studies, by strategic areas, that have already covered some 30 different parts of the world in as many exercises.

Communications using post-World War II equipment.

Rapid and comprehended reading.

The Reserve program envisaged in this bill is designed to create a national Reserve plan that is productive and vigorous. It is designed to permit our economy to continue to function without complete disruption, yet keep our forces strong enough to be prepared for any emergency or disaster which might face our Nation.

This Reserve plan before us has defects. It has merits. On balance I am for it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from Louisiana for graciously permitting me to speak out of order for 1 minute.

On last Thursday, May 12, in Singapore an American, Gene Symonds, was beaten to death by the Communists of Singapore. I probably am the last person in this room today who saw Gene Symonds. I was with him for 10 days at the Asian-African Conference in Bandung and at Singapore. When I left Singapore Gene came to the airport to say goodbye to me.

Gene Symonds was born August 18, 1926, in Dayton, Ohio. He had prep school training in Dayton and Lima, Ohio. He served in the Army during World War II, during which time he was on the staff of the Mediterranean edition of the Stars and Stripes. He was the special news editor of the Armed Forces radio station in Gorizia and for a time reported for the Rome Daily American in Italy. He was discharged from the Army in 1946 and went to Ohio State University in Columbus. He joined the United Press staff in Columbus in the fall of 1947. He covered the Ohio State Legislature in Columbus and then transferred to New York where he worked in UP's foreign department. He was alerted for Korean war coverage on the day it started. Five days later he was in Tokyo. He was among the first foreign correspondents to arrive in Korea, where he served as a war correspondent. He became chief correspondent and manager for the Philippines in 1951. He was transferred to Singapore and became United Press manager for southeast Asia last year. He was in Bangkok, Thailand, for southeast Asia Treaty Organization meeting and in Bandung, Indonesia, for recent Asian-African Conference coverage.

Surviving Mr. Symonds are an uncle, Mr. Harold A. Moore, 2524 Rugby Road, Dayton 6, Ohio; half-brothers, Dover and Gary Symonds, Greenleaf Drive, Dayton, Ohio, and a grandmother.

I hope that here today Gene Symonds' death may shock us out of our smug complacency.

I want you to know that Gene and I discussed many things in Bandung and in Singapore; one was that Singapore could go to the Communists any time they made up their minds to take it. It should be a warning to us that we cannot afford to continue officially as a body, or through other official bodies in which we are members, such as the United Nations, to stay on the side of colonialism or racialism.

Colonialism is definitely finished in Asia and Africa. Bandung stepped up the timetable on freedom. People like Gene Symonds and the other 70 American journalists who covered that conference know far more what is happening out there than even our Department of State.

We can stop communism in Singapore, in Asia, and in Africa only through making the idea of democracy work at home and abroad.

Gene Symonds believed in democracy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I often wonder if talking about this bill really produces results. I appreciate very much the time that the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] gave me to comment on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in August 1946 the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and I flew right over the tops of the damaged and ruined buildings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Very few people within a year of that holocaust had that experience; an experience which leaves an impression that you never can get out of your mind. At that time it seemed incredible to me that just 2 small bombs could ruin 2 large cities, 1 of them bigger than the capital of my State, and kill and maim and wound hundreds of thousands of people. I realized then that the world had arrived at a very dangerous and destructive period. The atomic age was here, and I need not tell you that since that day down to the present time we have been engaged in an atomic-arms race with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, along with this race in the development and production of atomic weapons we have had continual pressure from the Soviet Union. They have pressed on every single front in the world where free people can be intimidated and dominated. Bit by bit they have taken more and more territory. The very place—Singapore—that the first gentleman—the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]—who spoke today mentioned is practically under their control, as some of us found in 1953 when we visited that part of the world. We are naturally groping to find ways to solve this situation. We cannot permit the world to commit suicide by getting into an atomic war.

There are several approaches that might be made to reduce the aggression and tensions generated by the Soviet Union. One approach is through the civilian processes, negotiations, real disarmament with adequate inspections, utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and other similar steps. But in many of these efforts we have been stymied time and time again. I know that our President is groping desperately to find a way to bring about a solution of the tensions that harass the world today. Another approach is to maintain a high posture of military strength, and that, in my opinion, is the most essential of all, particularly today, in the uneasy world of today with its many trouble spots. Dictators respect military power. They cannot stand defeat. They cannot stand to get into a war in which they would lose their possessions and maybe lose their country.

Now, what is the purpose of this bill today?

Why did we draft the bill? The purpose of this bill is to develop a strong military posture. This means that we must have men trained right up to the minute. We will not have time to get ready when the attack comes. We must be ready for any sort of attack, which could be devastating. Our part of the country in California, your part of the country here, and other parts are equally vulnerable and under the same cloud.

New techniques of warfare are continually cropping up. Since 1949 we have had 107 new techniques used by the Army alone. New weapons, new programs require the learning of new skills to carry out the mission of the Army. More and more training is required to have our men prepared and ready and efficient if the event comes when they are needed to defend the country.

There is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of this committee. This bill follows specifically the recommendations of the President of the United States, one of the most noted authorities on military problems in the entire history of the world.

Mr. Chairman, if you will read page 4 of the report, you will see that our bill follows right straight down the line, what the President recommended with one minor exception, cutting down the 10-year obligation to 8 years. Our committee was practically unanimous in sending the bill to the floor for consideration.

I cannot understand what is going on in the minds of some of my colleagues. In this Chamber 61 percent of the Members here served in war. In the other Chamber the ratio is just about the same. Do you mean to tell me that without having shown us any alternative to the plan that we have, this body is going to turn down the request of the Committee on Armed Services for the enactment of this bill? Are you going to herald to the world that we are not willing to stand up and support our President? That is what we will be doing if we fail to enact this bill. Are you going to tell the hundreds of thousands of men who are now in training, the one and a half million men, that we are going to cut off this training, and that they are not going to be afforded these opportunities to help develop our defense situation to give our people more security?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Do I understand from the gentleman when he says we are going to tell the world that we are not following the leadership of the President, that we are to assume that he has an infinite mind and cannot be wrong?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not claim that. But the point is he has recommended certain specific steps which he says will increase our security and I am willing to follow his suggestions. We have heard continual criticism of the military. You cannot build anything just by criticizing.

Mr. Chairman, can you not see what an awkward position we will be in if we turn this bill down? We will be virtually saying to the world, we do not believe in developing our military posture; we do not believe in having our men trained. It will also be an announcement that we are not willing to support the President of the United States.

No reasonable alternative has been offered to date, and I do not expect that any one will be offered, that will have any real merit from the national defense and security standpoint.

Therefore I recommend that we pass this bill in the interest of the safety and security of our country and our people.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, since I have been 23 years of age, I have been either in the active armed services, or on the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. I have served as an apprentice seaman and as an officer; as a regular and as a reservist. I think I know something about this problem that we are considering here today.

This is the second time since I have been in the Congress that a bill of this general nature has been presented for consideration. Yet the measures are vastly different. The bill formerly offered was entitled "Universal Military Training" and in essence it was that for all practical purposes, although its aim was to establish a strong Reserve. On that occasion, those of you who are still here will recall, the atmosphere was charged with strong feelings and two philosophies emerged. There were those who were unalterably opposed to universal military training, and those who violently supported it.

While preferences and philosophies might have their place, my thinking was not in consonance with either group. There are those who believe that military service is good for young men and, therefore, they should serve. Regardless of what merits military service might possess, certainly our authority and responsibility under the Constitution was not granted as a consequence of such reasoning. Yet my thinking is far apart from those who believe even the draft is unnecessary.

It is my belief that we should have men in the Armed Forces and their components only in such numbers and such categories as are necessary for the military security of the Nation. I believe we must accept, during these perilous times, the establishment of a large armed force in being, or the alternative of a smaller force in being supplemented by a strong effective Reserve.

There must be much done, I must admit, before this measure here can be called a blueprint for security. If and when it becomes law, much must be done in the administration of the Reserve forces to make it really effective. I am not sure that any bill which can be presented to this Congress would have overwhelming acceptance. The problem is complex. It deals with the lives of our young men and the views and approaches to it are varied; but I believe it is only through the empirical method, through the test of experience, that a suitable program will ever evolve.

Many changes have already been made by the subcommittee and by the full committee. Let us not make it ineffective by a lot of amendments. Let us not whittle down Teddy Roosevelt's "big stick" to a mere splinter. If this bill is recommitted, this will be the end of it. I believe that even in its formative stages this bill is far superior to the universal military training bill we considered 4 years ago and which I opposed. I would oppose that same bill if it were here today. I believe the Members should understand the differences between that bill and the one we presently consider.

The old bill called for universal military training and was to be used by all of the Armed Forces. The measure before us today will provide a 6 months' training period and candidates so inducted will be strictly volunteers. The Navy and the Air Force do not expect to participate in this part of the program.

Under the UMT bill those who were compelled to participate in the program took their training and returned home without any enforced obligation to participate in additional drills. It is my judgment, and the real reason I opposed that bill is that because of its very nature it would have placed the security of our country in a paper reserve.

Under the measure before us today, the volunteers who enter the short training period also agree to attend drills for 7½ years. Certainly nothing could be more in the American tradition than this type of voluntary program. It is not universal military training. The gentleman from Missouri said it is not a universal military training program, and the gentleman would recognize universal military training no matter how it was colored or in what corner it might be covered up.

Under the old bill, even if it was required to attend drills the armories throughout the country were inadequate both in numbers and in equipment to house and train the seven or eight million men who were to be in the Reserve program.

Under the new measure, the number in the Ready Reserve program will be limited to 2,900,000.

I think it is especially important and necessary to note in our discussion today that in the last 4 years, armories costing approximately a quarter of a billion dollars have been built, and an authorization in an equal amount has just passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not fair to say that if this bill presently under consideration is enacted into law, any young man coming into military age thereafter faces a far easier picture than he faces right now under existing law?

Mr. BATES. I do not think there is any question about it. It gives the young man an alternative. It is easier on him. The young men can do more planning than they can do under present legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman not agree with me that if this legislation is not enacted, an additional drive will be made to increase the appropriation for the armed services in the Regular Establishment that might very well meet with success?

Mr. BATES. That is the very purpose of this bill. Here today we must make our choice—either maintaining a large, expensive armed force where young men will be brought into the service and sent to the four corners of the world, which will be more expensive, or, which is my hope, if this legislation passes, that we can have a smaller armed force in being, and supplement it by a strong and effective Reserve.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Will the gentleman tell us whether this is in any way going to change the status of the draftee, that is, the men who are drafted for 2 years? My understanding is that at present when a draftee is through serving his 2 years, he goes into the Inactive Reserves, but that under this legislation, he will go into the Active Reserve; is that correct?

Mr. BATES. That is correct in practice. I will be glad to go into that a little more thoroughly.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Will the gentleman not agree with me that that is going to make quite a difference?

Mr. BATES. Let me answer the gentlewoman a little more specifically. Under present legislation, the statement which the gentlewoman makes is not technically correct. Today they still have that obligation of 8 years even though it is not enforced. I am going to cover that point in just a moment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. The question of the gentlewoman from New York comes at just the particular time that I was going to bring it out. At this point in my consideration, the problem became more weighty. Has not an individual who has completed 4 years on active duty done his part under present world conditions? Has not he done his share? The answer seems to me to be in the affirmative. Yet, I want to establish a strong and effective Reserve, and how can we possibly do that if we are going to set aside the men who are so well trained and who are so necessary for training and for leadership.

We must ask ourselves this question. Do we really want an effective Reserve? If we do, then the unhappy choice must be made. I certainly regret that the draft is necessary, but support that legislation because the national security demands it.

We must ask ourselves one more question. If, God forbid, war breaks out in the future and we meditate on our action here today, is there one of us who would say "I am glad I voted against the Reserve bill?" I think not. None of us wants to have our country undermanned and our boys improperly trained or recall Korean veterans first. We do have an alternative—the establishment of a large, expensive armed force in being. The choice is yours to make. I will support this legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, I am not going to quarrel with any Member of this House as to how he votes on this particular measure. I am going to continue to respect and love everyone in this body. I do want to say, however, that regardless of what happens to this bill, we will never have an effective, potent Reserve until the men in the Pentagon make up their mind that they really want one. The volunteer Reserve system has been sadly neglected. Between the end of World War II and the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, we spent almost $1 billion a year on the armed Reserves. We are spending today $700 million a year on the armed Reserves, but with the exception of the Navy they amount to very little. Unless the men who are going to have charge of this program do far better in the future than they have in the past, God pity not only the Reserves but all of the American people.

In 1948, when General Evans, the head of the Reserve Officers' Association, appeared before our Committee on Armed Services, I said to him:

> My contention, General, is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the guard and the Reserves, and had made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up, we would not have this UMT (at that time), or we would not have the present bill before us today.
>
> General EVANS. I agree with you completely.
>
> Representative SHORT. There would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else.
>
> General EVANS. I agree with you entirely.

Then in 1951 when A. B. McMullen, executive director of the Air Reserve Association, appeared before our committee he stated:

> Had the will-to-do existed in the Military Establishment both prior to and subsequent to June 25, 1950, this country could have a strong, well-organized, well-trained Reserve force under existing laws.

We all know that Congress has not been stingy. We have voted not only the authority but also the funds for the military to build up a highly trained and well-equipped Reserve force in this country.

Then, if I may quote from the Washington Daily News editorial of March 29, this year:

> Let's face it. For years, the Reserve training program has been a joke in many parts of the country.
>
> And let's further face it.
>
> Those long-faced generals who have been begging Congress for bigger Reserve forces are the same military leaders who, in the last 10 years, have made a mess out of the Reserve program they already had.

Three years ago, Mr. Chairman, I stated that rich as America is we are not wealthy enough to afford the luxury of UMT and the Reserve program at the same time we had the draft in effect.

I want to quote in closing from a speech made by the President of the United States, then General Eisenhower, candidate, at Baltimore, Md., September 25, 1952:

> It seems clear that so long as we are forced to employ the draft, because of actual combat requirements, we cannot at the same time establish any form of training for our young men. To attempt this would create more difficulty and injustice than now exists.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to our very distinguished and well-beloved minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Missouri deplores the past failure to build up the Reserves. I agree with him. But might I say we are not going to build up the Reserves unless we pass this legislation and give encouragement and provide the means to do it.

I might say that the President of the United States also realizes the necessity of building up the Reserves. Only recently I heard him say that if he gets this legislation, which is dear to his heart, he will make certain the Pentagon goes about the job of building up these Reserves, because they are essential to our country.

This legislation before us is a vital part of the Eisenhower program for peace; it is the price we must pay for liberty and security.

Let us face the facts.

Either America is strong or it is weak. The age we live in, the weapons which may be hurled against us, leave no middle ground upon which we can rest our security with halfway measures. We must be one or the other. It is up to us to choose, today.

I am not an advocate of all-out militarism; my record speaks for that. No man who loves this country as I do could be. I do, however, support with all my conviction the proposal embodied in the military Reserve bill.

As simply as I can, let me say that we need this protection as a nation.

We need it for the freedom and security of other nations as well, now relying

on us for the muscles of defense in an era of international uncertainty.

This Congress, this administration—the American people—are not responsible for the situation as it exists today. Communist aggression has forced upon us a real appraisal of our future.

We are asking that the youth of America bear its share of the burden, as it always has in the past, and as it will in the years ahead.

Now, however, we have an opportunity to make each young man's share more equitable; more reasonable and at the same time it will make our country more secure.

A vast standing army is not the answer. In the long pull ahead our economy could not stand the strain.

The answer lies in a trained Reserve, trained in the use of the weapons they may be called upon to carry in the common defense.

The question has been asked if this National Reserve Plan is universal military training. The answer is that it is not. Nor is it any kind of a subterfuge by which UMT can be brought in under some other name or title.

I have always opposed UMT and still do.

The Congress, by separate legislative action, would have to adopt entirely new legislation specifically calling for universal military training to bring such a system into being.

UMT is a permanent military program, while the legislation before us today is strictly a temporary program requiring renewal action by Congress within the next 4 years. We need the legislation to insure our safety in a troublesome period.

UMT would induct every young man when he reaches the age of 18. In contrast, the pending legislation is not universal because it imposes a ceiling of 250,000 in the 6 months' voluntary program. Every boy who is inducted in this classification must do so of his own accord. No one is forced to join.

The value of the strong Reserve force is that in modern warfare the danger comes from overhead attacks. It would be extremely protective for a well-trained Reserve force to be in your own neighborhood if there should be an unexpected attack. As long as we are faced with a possible attack from the Soviets, we dare not neglect our defenses. We dare not risk our freedom.

There is no one more qualified to advocate military legislation than President Eisenhower. He says the Reserve bill before us today will best do the job of keeping us strong without providing for a big standing army. He certainly should know. He is charged with the awful responsibility of keeping us safe from Soviet aggression.

No one wants a young man's career interrupted in a time of peace, least of all the youngster himself. But the choice is not our own or his. The choice rested in the hands of the Communist leaders, who at the close of World War II set forth once again upon the road of conquest and destruction.

They could have walked with us down the pathways of peace. They have not done so.

The threat to our security will not vanish overnight if we approve the military reserve bill. It will not vanish overnight if communism suddenly turns on the spigot of cooperation and seemingly peaceful intent.

The threat to our security will only disappear when we are stronger than we have ever been in the history of this Nation. For we are faced now and will be in the foreseeable future with the most formidable aggression-bent dictatorship in history, one with tentacles reaching into many nations.

American history is replete with instances of volunteers rising to oppose external threats to our freedom. So, too, can our young men of today volunteer under this plan, with a minimum dislocation in their careers and with a maximum of individual protection at their disposal if in the future they are ever ordered to the colors.

In recent years our defenses have been modernized, strengthened, redesigned, and reoriented to the capabilities and intent of those who seek to harm us. All accept our military reserve program as necessary in the overall, long-haul planning as the strategy and tactics of an atomic cannon or an H-bomb squadron.

Communism understands and fears strength. It uses every weapon at its disposal short of war to halt freemen from becoming strong. We need only recall recent events when every diplomatic, propaganda, and subversive device known to Communist aggressors was tried in an effort to halt the rearming of Western Germany and, even earlier, the formation of alliances to add to our strength. Such is the threat we face.

Let us face it unburdened with the lingering thought that we may not have done enough for our own security. Let us face it in the traditional American way—an equality of duty to God and country, in the common good and in the heritage of a free people.

Dare we take chances with the security of the Nation? Shall we vote the military Reserves which President Eisenhower, the General Staff, and the military experts say are necessary? I hope so.

Let me tell you a story of the past. When the Eighth Army was desperately seeking to fight its way to the Korean coast, there was only one division available for relief in this country and this could not be dispatched for the fear it would be needed elsewhere. More than 60 days would be needed before another division could be raised.

What a deplorable condition. What a tragic situation. We must never let that happen again.

I do not believe the young men want this. They are just as intensely patriotic as those who fought, sacrificed, and died to build up this great American dream. I do not believe the country wants this situation either.

A strong America, strong in its fighting forces and strong in its Reserves, is the best guarantee of peace.

We all speak boldly out of our defense from communism and its threat. Let us show with our votes that we believe in putting America in a position that it can successfully resist these forces which threaten us. Let us uphold President Eisenhower in his noble efforts to stop the onward march of communism. Let us keep America strong and free.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State will soon enter a big power conference from which we hope the peace of the world will be solidified. The free world, as opposed to the Communist orbit, is today in the strongest position it has enjoyed in many years. In Europe, we have recently achieved outstanding diplomatic triumphs. West Germany has taken its place in NATO. Austria has been freed. We shall be negotiating from strength; communism from the weakness of its position.

Let us not now weaken the hands of our leaders, who are working for peace, by defeating this bill. Make no mistake about it—we will be weakening our position if we do defeat it.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, we will shortly have a meeting of the Big Four. Are we going to send our representatives to this great conference with the vote of an American Congress to the effect they will not support adequate reserves? I hope not, and I do not think so. These men should go to that conference and talk from strength, a strong America, a mighty America, a country which fears no nation on earth. If we do that, there will be no war. A free America must be a strong America. Only the strong can be free, and we must keep strong. We submit this legislation at the request of President Eisenhower, the General Staff, and all those who are charged with our national defense. As Members of this House, we can have the satisfaction, by supporting this bill, of contributing to the safety of America. My friends, we have a great choice today, and I beg of you to make that choice for America. I beg of you to make that choice for those whom you have entrusted with the responsibility of guiding this country. If we do, we need not fear the future. We shall go forward and meet the great challenges that have been given to the people of America and lead this free world along the pathway of peace to finer and better days.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, my friends, to support this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to follow my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who is the leader of the Republican Party, in the remarks that I am about to make. I am not going to undertake any oratorical journey, if I were capable of such a journey, but I am going to speak to my colleagues from the heart, as I feel about the present situation and the present bill in connection with the world situation warrants.

Mr. Chairman, my mind goes back to 3 months before Pearl Harbor, when I was down here in the well pleading for the passage of a bill calling for the extension of the Selective Service Act which passed this House by a vote of 202 to 201.

Three months later Pearl Harbor happened. I have often thought what would have been on the conscience of those who voted against that bill if it had been defeated, instead of having been passed by one vote.

I remember the talks I had with the late immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt on many occasions in connection with the passage of that bill; how important it was to our country. So I hope we will not have another such exhibition today.

Only a few weeks ago, in Bandung, a conference took place. What amazed me was the fact that representatives of small countries gathered there—Mr. Romulo from the Philippines, and others from other small countries—who challenged the big boss from Red China right to his face. When I read about that, through my mind went the history of countless of generations of men and women who wanted to be free under God and under law; their feelings crystallized by the famous saying of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death," and famous sayings of other men in the past who were fighting for liberty under God and under law.

Through my mind runs the memory of great speeches made in this Chamber in the past by men, human beings, subject to hopes, subject to influences, who lifted themselves above those things where the national interest of the country was involved. In the national interest of our country there is no middle aisle. There is no Republican or Democrat or Independent. We are all Americans.

There are a few other views I want to express. Is there any evidence that the Soviet Union has changed its intent of world revolution and world domination? No. Despite the soft talk that is going on, is there anyone here who is deceived, who does not believe that it is based purely upon expediency? Is there anyone who feels that they have changed their original intent of world revolution and world domination? Remember, when we are dealing with the Communists and their leaders, we are dealing with persons who are possessed of the minds of world killers.

Let us remember that we are subject to the law of self-preservation, and they are subject to it. Remember, we cannot deal with them on a spiritual plane, because they deny God and they are fighting Him, and they are fighting all of those of us on earth who believe in Him and His word, and who apply it to our everyday life.

We cannot deal with them on an idealistic level, because they have no ideals. But there is one level on which we can deal with them, and that is on the level of the law of self-preservation; because even the Communists cannot deny that the law of self-preservation applies to them and their country as it does to you and to me and our country, and to the other peoples and their countries.

It is only under a policy of strength that those who represent our country and the other free countries of the world can negotiate with those who represent the Soviet Union and the dominated countries; not the peoples, but those in control of those dominated countries.

Another observation: The most dangerous period in a democracy is when danger is imminent. Danger is certainly imminent today. No one can deny that. That is when we have got to have fortitude. Under peaceful conditions, corruption and crime may come, bad as they are, but the people can take care of that at the ballot box. Under peaceful conditions we can blunder along and struggle through. But not when danger is imminent. When war is on we have got to back our Government. We have to win. The law of self-preservation compels it, if nothing else.

But there is that period in between peace and actual war when danger is imminent that is the most dangerous period in a democracy, because public opinion operates violently and oftentimes erroneously.

Mr. Chairman, if I am going to err, in any vote that I cast in this crisis, I am going to err on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness. I know if there is another sneak attack we are not going to make it. I am not going to argue whether we should or not, but the democracies do not make such an attack. We know if there is such an attack it will come from the potential enemy we know exists.

A great man in New York, Cardinal Spellman, said in an address before the American Legion a year or so ago, and I am going to engage in a little plagiarism of what he said, because I think he made one of the most pointed observations I have read. It is that it is far better in the world of today—and I am interpreting what he said and using some of his words—it is far better to have too much military strength and not need it than to have too little military strength and need it.

This bill is not strong enough for me but I am supporting it because it represents the best that could come out of the committee. It represents compromises, which are healthy in a democracy, and I recognize that fact. But from my own individual angle it is not strong enough for me.

This bill is the best that could come out of the committee. It is a fair bill. It is a bill that distributes equitably the sacrifices in the interest of our country. Certainly the present system is inequitable, under which a man is drafted or served in Korea or World War II and then put into the Reserve. This bill is an equitable one. There is no compulsion involved. Probably indirectly there is some, but you have to have some, to some extent, in order to have a ready reserve that will be trained and capable of use if necessary.

Mr. Chairman, each and every one of us is charged directly with responsibility. We are elected as the Representatives of the people of our districts, and we represent our districts, our States, and our Nation. We are charged with a grave responsibility. I recognize the thoughts that run through your mind because they run through my mind.

I submit that we should lift ourselves above the human emotions, the human thoughts, and consider the world situation, its impact, what it means, whether or not the leaders of the Kremlin are sincere, and you know they are not. They are only engaging in a form of cooing and loving because expediency dictates it. We cannot eliminate that thought and suspicion from our minds, having in mind the world situation and their desire for world revolution and world domination.

It seems to me clear that each and every one of us, living up to the responsibilities and following the great heritage we have in this body from those who served in it in the past, should with courage vote for this bill, because it represents strength in the world of today, when we and other free peoples and free countries certainly need strength.

I hope my colleagues will recognize the paramount problem in the situation that confronts us, steel our minds against the human emotions, and simply steel our minds in one direction, what in the light of the conditions today is for the national interest of our country.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. May I say to my colleague that whenever I am in doubt on a bill of this kind that has to do with our national defense, if perchance my memory gets hazy or my thinking becomes unrealistic or unsound then I refer to a news clipping that I always carry in my pocket right here in my wallet, and which I want to read to you. It is a quotation from Lenin, the so-called Russian bible. Yes, if ever I have any doubts about the tune they are playing in Moscow—and just what they really intend to do, this never fails to clear the air and my thinking. Lenin says:

> We are living not merely in a state, but in a sytem of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. * * * Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgoise (democratic) states is inevitable.

That is a blueprint of their plans and their dreams of world conquest. In order to stop them from taking over the free world and ourselves we must remain strong. This bill is not perfect but I feel it a duty to my country to support it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct; and they will never change. They might, for reasons of expedience, do this or that. But only the other day, I asked Secretary of State Dulles if he has any evidence of any change on the part of the Soviet leaders as to their intent for world revolution and world domination. He said, "No."

Mr. Chairman, let us rise to the responsibility which is ours. Let us pass this bill today.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there is little I can say after you have just listened to two very strong and forceful statements by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader. I want to publicly commend them for the forcible manner in which they have made the issue clear and the unanswerable argument that they have set forth as to why this bill should be enacted into law. I want to say, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said, this is one of the most important bills this administration is going to send to the Congress during this year. We just cannot afford to have this bill recommitted or to have this bill defeated.

Now what is the objective of this bill? I might say whenever we enact any law, we have an objective, otherwise we would not seek to write it on the statute books. The objective of this bill, and it is interwoven with other laws, is to have within the next 4 years 2,900,000 Ready Reservists. We have extended the draft law for a period of 4 years. I want you to bear in mind how this dovetails with that law. This bill is for a period of 4 years. It is the hope of this administration that in the next 4 years, by bringing in the new class of Reservists referred to, we can have 2,900,000 Ready Reservists when the draft law expires. Of course, we all recognize the fact that it is absolutely necessary in wartime to have a draft, but no one wants a draft in peacetime. How are you going to get rid of the draft? There is only one way in the world to get rid of the draft, and that is to have somebody to take the place of the draftee. Who is going to take the place? There is nobody to take the place, no one to take the place unless you have Reservists. That is one of the objectives of this bill—to have a Reserve force built up within a 4-year period so that when the draft expires there will not be as compelling a reason to maintain the draft as there would be if you do not have a Reserve.

What is another objective of this bill? We all know it is against the policy of this Government from time immemorial to have large standing armies in peacetime. We do not want to see the day ever come in this great Republic when we will be beggars at barracks' doors. It costs something to maintain an Army. It costs $5,000 a year to keep a man on active duty, and a few days ago we passed an appropriation bill providing at the end of fiscal year 1956 1,027,000 men in the active forces.

In normal times and in peacetimes that is a large number of men under arms in America, perhaps the largest number ever in the history of the Nation in peacetime.

What is another objective of this bill? One of the objectives of this bill is that it will not be necessary, when you have a virile, large Reserve of 2,900,000 men, to keep as large a standing force as you have today. What would be the effect of that? All you have to do is just follow out the plans that are running through the mind of this administration. What is the effect of that?

You save $4,000 on every man. The result would be a reduction of the enormous expenditure for national defense which today costs 65 cents of every dollar spent by the Government. In other words, you begin to go down the highway toward a balanced budget.

It is my hope, if you pass this bill today and it is not emasculated by amendments, that it will enable this administration to embark on a sound program, a program which will put them in position where they might not have to come back here for an extension of the draft unless conditions are abnormal.

It will place them in position where they will have a sufficient Reserve so they can reduce the strength of the standing Army.

It will place them in a position where they can effect a great savings in the appropriations for the Department of National Defense.

Is not that worth while? It cannot happen, of course, if you do not have a Reserve. If you do not have a Reserve as provided for in this bill, what do you do? You must continue to extend the draft, you must continually maintain a large standing army, because we are all committed to the proposition that we are going to remain strong, just as the distinguished minority leader pointed out. We learned our lesson from experience, the lesson of what it means to be weak; we are not going to get weak again.

We have an alternative method here today. We can stay strong; we can stay strong through a proper Reserve.

If you do not permit us to maintain a Reserve to remain strong, we are forced to do but one other thing: Keep a large standing force that is costing $5,000 a year per man, and keep the draft law on the statute books.

As I have told you, it costs only $1,000 a year for a reservist. In the appropriation bill we passed the other day was an item of $700 million for reservists. We have 700,000 men in the Reserve Force. On the other hand, to keep a man in the regular service under arms all the time costs $5,000 a year.

A great deal was said by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in regard to opening up this new program.

What does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] propose to you? He says he is opposed to this bill.

Whenever I present an indictment I feel it is incumbent upon me to also present a remedy. Even my friend from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], who I think is just as wrong in his proposed amendment as he possibly can be, recognizes the fact that when he is criticizing a bill he must offer some alternative. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and my good friend from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and a few others, all in opposition to this measure, do not propose anything. What do they propose as an alternative? Not a thing.

Let us see what happens if you would follow their line of logic. Who is subject to service in the Reserves today? It is the boy who served in World War II and it is the boy who served on the bleak hills out in Korea. They are your reservists. There are some 700,000 of them scattered throughout the length and breadth of the Nation. They have by your very vote an obligation of a total military service of 8 years. If you do not pass this bill, if you follow the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and their position, who would you call in case of a national emergency? You would call, first, those boys who have already fought 2 or 3 years on the field of battle and who still have a statutory obligation in the Ready Reserve. Let us be fair. Is that the proper thing to do?

What do we propose here? We propose to put in a new class who have never faced combat, and that is all the bill does. We say that we want a new class. Today's Ready reservists are the same boys who have been shot at before and they have served their country bravely and heroically.

It is the law that we voted here imposing a Reserve obligation for 8 years. And, if the boys should be called tomorrow in a national emergency, who would respond? It would be the boy who served in Korea and it would be the boy who served in World War II, because that is your Reserve. Now, I say, do not call those boys any more until at least we get a new class in here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman from Missouri knows, he has no closer friend than I, but there is one matter that I would like to clear up, while there are present here Members who heard the statement read just a little while ago. The gentleman from Missouri referred to a statement made in the campaign in 1952 by the then candidate, General Eisenhower. In that campaign Mr. Eisenhower referred to the fact that with the selective service going as it was then going, why, it would be difficult to integrate a universal military training program. Now, the gentleman from Georgia, I am sure, understands what he meant by that.

But, let us get at the real facts. At that time the shooting was on in Korea. We were drafting 50,000 to 60,000 men a month, almost all the available men. Now, what is the situation today? The draft is down to 10,000 a month. So, all we are trying to do—and I am glad the gentleman pointed it out—is to integrate a volunteer Reserve program in which men will discharge their obligation to their country along with a selective-service program that we still have to have because of the size of the Regular Establishment.

Mr. VINSON. The statement conveyed to my mind that the President would have to use the draft as long as he did not have a Reserve, and if there was a large Reserve force, it might not be necessary except in case of war to maintain a draft.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I know that many of us have argued—and I think with great force—that as long as you have a selective-service system and a state of war exists, and under that selective-service system, subject to necessary deferments which we provided, you are taking substantially every able-bodied young man. Then to give a man an opportunity to go into the Reserve for limited training and service would be discrimination against the man who had to serve for the longer period. But, again I want to point out that the shooting has stopped in Korea and we are in a transition from war to peace, and that is what we are dealing with now.

Mr. VINSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course, I do not want to hurt anyone's feelings, and under no conditions would I hurt the feelings of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri. But, the sum and substance of what would happen if you continue the present policy under existing law is simply that you must continue to call back to active duty those that have already served. Now, I do not think that is fair. I do not think any additional obligation should be put upon them until we have a new class, and this bill is merely trying to bring in a new class under the 6-month provision. Now, if you do not do that, the result of your failure to do it, is to continue to call back, in case of national emergency, those that have already served their country in time of war.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is the very thing that every one of our subcommittee insisted that those men be taken out of the bill. We are not going to have anybody in this program who received an honorable discharge in another war, unless he volunteers to serve in a Reserve unit.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would that go for volunteers in the Reserve as well as those who were in the Reserve by compulsion?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say this, that this bill carries out the recommendations that we made in committee, and in that we sharply criticized the military for the manner in which they had called back those men with prior combat service.

Mr. VINSON. We all know that nobody can be called except the man who has previously served. There is no doubt about that in the minds of any single man on the floor of the House. He is the only reservist we have. Then if we have an emergency, we do not have anyone except him to call. Whom do you call? You call the fellow who served in World War II and you call the fellow who served in Korea.

We are trying to offer this opportunity to the Congress so that ultimately, when we have a proper Reserve force, we can reduce our large standing forces and may be able to do away with the draft. This, in turn, will lessen the expenditures for the support of the armed services by the difference between $5,000 per capita and $1,000 per capita.

Also, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], we want to bring in a new class and not put this Ready Reserve obligation entirely upon the soldiers of that brave and patriotic group who served in World War II and in Korea.

I certainly trust that after the Members have had an opportunity to think about this, and after having listened to all the statements that have been made, the House will support this program, will back up this administration in its desire to create a strong, worthwhile Reserve force.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Reserve Plan."

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, although I am a newcomer to this honorable House and cannot hope to have the deep wisdom that comes of long years in its service, I do hope that you Members will consider the material I am going to present.

I believe this bill is probably the most important and the most controversial bill that we will vote upon in this session. I also believe, with all of my heart, that in matters of national defense there is no half-and-half sentiment in the American people. They want an adequate national defense—period. The question is: What defense is adequate? I know the depth of sincerity of the Members, and I, for one, will never question the sincerity of any Member who may vote against this bill.

For my part, I shall vote for it.

I come from Chicago, the Nation's second largest city, and the first city on the airline over the Polar Cap.

If there were to be an atomic attack on the United States, Chicago is in the forefront of the air route. Take my own congressional district, for example—Chicago's great Midway Airport is located there. So is the Ford Aircraft Engine Plant. All of the arterial railroads to the great Midwest and West pass through or at the edge of my district. Adjacent of my district are the great steel plants which comprise one of the largest manufacturing areas in the world; the great University of Chicago; the Argonne atomic laboratories.

An atomic attack on Chicago would not only constitute an attack upon our second largest city, it would be a blow to destroy one of our greatest manufacturing centers and to sever the great East and West by knocking out the vital lines of communication, all of which for the most part pass through Chicago.

With this thought in mind, I have asked the Nation's top atomic scientists, one of our greatest military generals, and civilian atomic authorities for their opinion on this bill—persons whose opinions on this most important legislation I feel would be entirely objective.

Their answers—well-reasoned, deeply sincere—would produce the most prayerful thought in even a person given to frivolity. Their answers have opened up areas of thought that will, I am sure, occupy the Members, and certainly will keep me thinking harder and harder for years to come.

To great men such as General Bradley and former Atomic Energy Chairman Gordon Dean, and others whom I shall mention, I directed four very fundamental questions:

First. Does the developing of atomic science make universal military training imperative or not?

Second. Would universal military training be of benefit in meeting an atomic attack?

Third. Does atomic hydrogen development, in your opinion, lend any additional substance to arguments made for universal military training? and

Fourth. How would universal military training help in meeting atomic attack, if, in your opinion, it would help?

I do not regard the present bill as universal military training; I think it is the best possible substitute for UMT, and I congratulate the committee for its excellent work on this bill.

Before making up my mind on this bill, I sought the opinions of the following men: Gen. Omar Bradley; Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was our wartime chief of scientific research and development, a world-renowned scientist; Hon. Gordon Dean, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission when the H-bomb was perfected and tested; Dr. Harold Urey, Nobel prize winner and atomic scientist, University of Chicago; Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, atomic scientist, now associated with the Nuclear Science Service; and Hon. William W. Waymack, of Iowa, one of our first Atomic Energy Commissioners.

I believe that, through these men, one would obtain the wisest military and civilian judgments.

General Bradley, certainly one of our most brilliant and distinguished military leaders, replied to my inquiries as follows:

Referring to your telegram of May 11, answer to question No. 1: In my opinion, the development of atomic weapons together with the steadily improving methods of delivering them makes universal military training even more desirable. Question No. 2: An atomic or hydrogen attack on our cities will wreak destruction and disorder creating an emergency demand for trained and informed people best filled by those possessing military training.

OMAR BRADLEY.

Dr. Bush stated that we also need sufficient men in uniform, but he was foremost in emphasizing the need, regardless of any military manpower policy, of training a sufficient number of atomic

scientists, physicists, chemists, and others among our young college students each year. Knowing the enormous problems of maintaining an adequate and growing scientific personnel, and understanding perhaps better than any other one man, the importance of trained scientists to a defense program, Dr. Bush understandably puts the major emphasis on science.

But, please note this: He does not minimize the need for trained manpower in uniform.

Here is his opinion:

The difficulty in answering your question lies in the definition of universal military training. If I assume this to mean putting every boy through standard training, thus cramping the progress of scientific research in this country, I would answer that neither atomic matters nor any other matters render universal military training imperative. On the other hand, if I assume it to mean that every young man of scientific talents and promise would be utilized fully, in uniform or out, in matters where he would expedite scientific progress and advance himself professionally, the answers would be quite different. Under these circumstances, universal military training would not impede our efforts to defend ourselves, in an atomic war or any other kind of war. Among many other essentials for our security we must not injure our scientific progress as long as we are in competition with Russia, whether the subject is atomic science or other methods of waging war. We also need sufficient men in uniform, and trained men to call on in emergency. But this is not to say that universal military training is imperative and atomic science does not make it so.

V. BUSH.

Dr. Urey has this to say:

United States should maintain sufficient strength in nonatomic weapons to resist aggression in such places as Korea, Indochina, and Formosa without using atomic weapons. We should not be in a position where such developments may force us to use atomic weapons or be completely impotent. Defensive military forces are very important. My technical knowledge on military matters is not sufficient to answer your questions authoritatively. However, I believe that development of atomic weapons has not changed problem of UMT essentially. Atomic attack would lead to great internal disorder. Reluctantly, I think UMT may be desirable. Have shown this telegram to five colleagues who agree substantially.

HAROLD C. UREY.

Former Atomic Energy Chairman Gordon Dean and Dr. Lapp, both men of recognized outstanding ability and competence in the atomic field, place primary emphasis on a highly trained, competent civilian defense corps. In connection with their letters, I should like to point out that the Chicago Sun-Times early this year published a tremendously enlightening series of articles on atomic warfare, written by a distinguished reporter, Mr. Carl Larsen. The basic theme of these articles, which Mr. Larsen arrived at after months of the most painstaking study and interviews, was that civilian defense is laggard, unemphasized, lacks money, organization, drive, and direction. It is the real stepchild of national security. Mr. Larsen proved that there is lacking a real civil defense against atomic attack. The Sun-Times did a great public service in publishing his reports. They coincide, in great part, with the conclusions of Mr. Dean and Dr. Lapp.

Here is what Chairman Dean has to say:

Reference is made to your wire of yesterday asking four questions and requesting my answers:

1. Does the developing of atomic science make universal military training imperative or not?

Frankly, I see very little relationship between universal military training and the development of atomic science. If anything, there is perhaps a negative one. Many extremely competent chemists, physicists, and metallurgists are today being drafted into the armed services. They frequently receive no deferment because of their skills—skills badly needed in the building of a strong atomic energy industry in this country. A recent announcement by the War Manpower Commission indicates that no special consideration will be given to highly trained young scientists. As you know, we are falling behind the Russians in the training of engineers and scientists.

2. Would universal military training be of benefit in meeting an atomic attack?

Frankly, I see no connection between universal military training and our capacity to meet an attack. The elements most necessary for resisting an attack or preventing one are:

(a) Highly trained intelligence officers abroad who can give us warning of an impending attack.

(b) Trained technical men on picket ships, aerial reconnaissance planes, and at radar stations.

(c) Pilots of all-weather interceptors.

(d) Antiaircraft units.

(e) Trained civilian defense workers who can bring some order out of the chaos, in the event we are hit.

3. Does atomic hydrogen development, in your opinion lend any additional substance to arguments made for universal military training?

I think these developments, emphasizing, as they do, the very severe effects of atomic attack, argue for much more emphasis on trained civilians at home who can mitigate the disaster. I see no evidence that universal military training helps the situation.

4. How would universal military training help in meeting atomic attack, if, in your opinion, it would help?

I believe I have covered this in the answers to the previous questions.

Respectfully,

GORDON DEAN.

Dr. Lapp makes the following observations:

In response to your telegram of yesterday, may I say that I have not read the new UMT bill and base my remarks upon a general understanding of universal military training.

It would seem to me that all four questions which you ask boil down to a single query: "What is the relation of UMT to national defense involving the threat of nuclear attack?" My opinion is that UMT is not critical to nuclear defense, although, of course, it does bear upon the overall defense posture. My impression is that there are many things more vital to atomic preparedness than UMT.

My basic philosophy is that UMT goes hand in hand with old concepts of mobilization after attack. This, it seems to me, is a dated concept. Should an attack come, we would not be granted the luxury of mobilization, but would rather have to fight out of inventory. Moreover, my feeling is that the very magnitude of the destruction which is now packed into a single weapon is so great that even a small-scale attack upon our continent would achieve such vast injury that we would have to concentrate our energies upon the fundamental issue of human survival at home. Under these conditions, I conceive of soldiers fighting on foreign soil as being off the main line of our principal problem, which would be survival at home.

The issues involved in what I have tried to say are admittedly highly complex. Yet it appears to me that our real dilemma should war come to our shores will be basically civilian in nature, not military. I strongly believe that the continued failure to provide an adequate home-defense program constitutes a very severe liability in our national security.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. LAPP.

William W. Waymack, one of the first members of the Atomic Energy Commission, in his telegram pointed out the distaste that all of us have concerning anything like universal military training, but pointed out our dislike for any type of conscription must give way to the hard realities of the world in which we live. Mr. Waymack stated:

I have not been immersed in these things for several years, do not pose as an authority, and can only give as requested my honest opinions as of now: First, I am convinced that all the complex new weaponry, which represents an accelerating and irreversible trend, makes more highly trained military manpower essential. Developments of atomic science are, of course, a major part of this. I have been forced rather painfully to the judgment that some form of universal training is the surest and fairest method.

Second. The degree to which UMT would be of benefit in meeting an atomic attack depends on the nature, the place, and other conditions. In theory, though heaven only knows whether we can achieve it in practice, trained manpower not part of Military Establishment could deal with consequences of long-range bombing for mass destruction in continental United States. The possibility, not too fantastic, of hostile landings in such an attack, if only of spies and saboteurs to profit by the demoralization, reinforces to some extent the argument for instantly available trained military units. If we think of meeting an atomic attack in terms of tactical use of atomic weapons against our defenses anywhere on earth, then trained military manpower is, of course, vital.

Third. I do not think the hydrogen development adds much to the case for UMT that had not already been added by fission weapons.

Fourth. How would UMT help in meeting atomic attack? My personal answer is partly given in comments above. The rest of it boils down to the question as to how we can best, surely and fairly, provide adequate, highly trained military manpower available whenever needed. These forces must, in the world's present state, be ready, not just a potential. We are not likely again to have time to mobilize while other nations hold the line. Some form of UMT must be considered. I think, not in a vacuum but in direct comparison with specific other methods that may be advocated, such as Selective Service. Selective Service saw us through in the Korean conflict, but, in my judgment, it was full of regrettable inequities.

Finally, in response to your request for "any other points," I shall say that any free society can well be concerned about the long-run risks involved in UMT as a permanent institution, or about the permanent maintenance of huge Armed Forces and trained Reserves, however raised. These risks, foreseen and as far as possible guarded against, I think we have to take. I repeat, that as of now, I think our traditional and proper national distaste for anything resembling UMT should give way to the hard realities. I would personally favor preserving, in

relevant legislation, the principle of no permanence. Though the crystal ball is certainly opaque as to how long temporary will be, congressional reconsideration from time to time, implicit in our system anyhow, would well be recognized explicitly, I think, as legislative intent.

W. W. WAYMACK.

Neither Chairman Dean, Dr. Bush, or Dr. Lapp touch directly upon a point that was brought out in Dr. Urey's telegram, namely that atomic attack would lead to great internal disorder, and that for that reason—which Dr. Urey implied rather than stated directly—a widely trained citizenry would be essential. As a veteran, I know that the essentials of military training and organization would be vital in case of atomic attack; the more widely this training were spread among our civilian population, the more quickly and adequately we could meet the conditions of attack. Dr. Bush also makes the point, I should like to emphasize, that "we also need trained men to call on in emergency."

These opinions, while not unanimous, and while some emphasize one point and one another, all weigh up to a compelling conclusion. We must have an adequately trained citizenry in our Reserves.

We cannot wait until we are attacked, for survival in the atomic age depends upon preparedness in advance of an attack.

If we are prepared in advance, the attack is less apt to materialize.

If we are unprepared, the attack is more apt to materialize.

Under such conditions and such a burden of military and atomic advice, to my mind, there is only one decision left.

That is to vote for the present bill.

That I shall do.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I very seldom speak in the House on bills that do not come from the Committee on Appropriations. But I have had experience serving upon the Navy subcommittee in the old days and on the Army subcommittee in the old days and in the Defense Department committee currently where I have had a very considerable opportunity to study the situation what the United States is up against. I come to this conclusion. Unless the United States adopts this bill, we are going to be set adrift. We are going to have to maintain a tremendous standing army, and we are going to have a tremendous defense bill to pay. Frankly, I believe we can have just as good defense with this bill and the reserve that it will create as we could if we had a larger standing army. I believe that, because I believe they can be integrated into the Army in a very short period, if they have the kind of training provided for in this bill. It is a different bill from that which was recommitted a couple of years ago, because it had a special-privilege clause set up in it. It is a bill that is designed to meet the situation that exists today, and I hope the House of Representatives will use its good judgment and vote for the bill and not permit any amendments that are designed to wreck it or prevent the bill from being effective.

If it is effective, unquestionably in the days to come we are going to be able to get along with a smaller standing army and be able to get along with less expense, and we need to get along with less expense, because we have so many things that we really need to do for national defense, such as maintaining our ammunition, and our munitions in order and building up our airplanes. This is going to cost a whale of a lot of money, and unless we are prepared to meet that without running behind, the liberties and the successes of our people are seriously endangered.

I cannot see how voting for this bill should be any embarrassment to anyone. For my own part, I was one of the 203 who voted for the extension of the draft just before World War II, and no one ever questioned me about it. I have always voted for what I believed to be in the interest of national defense. To my mind this is in the interest of national defense, and it is also in the interest of an intelligent, forward-looking economical approach to the problem we have to face.

I hope the membership will support this bill wholeheartedly, that we can have a solution to our military situation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this legislation, many fearful specters have been called up, including the dismal vision of this country—through passage of this bill—embarking on a goosestep march toward military dictatorship.

But among these specters facing us today, there can be no veiling thick enough to hide nor cloud large enough to cover the simple, concrete fact that in this world, at the absolute bidding of 6 or 7 despots, there are millions of armed men and that these armed men are threatening today to commit aggression against the free world.

I am as opposed as anyone in this Chamber to any legislation that compels any American citizen to do anything other than to respect the legitimate rights and freedoms of his fellows. But I also am convinced that during this period of tension, we in Congress cannot afford to ignore the existence of our enemies abroad or their strength of arms and size of their standing armies.

The program that will be brought into being under this legislation is, I believe, the best answer available to the situation now confronting us.

If this measure were compulsive in the sense of requiring all of our youth to serve long months in the Regular Army, I would probably be against it even with the current threats from abroad. Fortunately, it is not compulsive. This bill gives us a democratic answer to a situation that some military extremists believe can only be met by a larger standing army.

Some of my mail in opposition to this measure has cited the rise of military cliques in nations having compulsory military training. The same letters have cited the temptation a large army creates for war. But we must always remember that a defenseless nation also presents an overwhelming temptation to war to the warlike.

We do not want that to happen here and I think this legislation is designed to prevent that happening here.

In the first place, the entire program is voluntary at the outset. A youth has his choice of taking this program requiring 6 months' training and 7 months of Reserve obligation or he can take his chances—about 1 in 8—of being drafted for 2 years into active service.

I am not fearful of a Reserve force, subject to the nominal training requirements this legislation sets up, becoming the political weapon of a military clique or a self-propelled weapon of aggression. On the contrary, by this method we utilize the vast manpower reserves of our civilian population, a population that—except for short training periods—is engaged in civilian activities, raising families, buying homes, preparing for the future.

A Reserve made up of men engaged in civilian activities is not fertile ground in which to plant the seeds of militarism. Such a Reserve force is not likely to be talked into waging an unnecessary war.

If one 6-month period of training under the military, plus another 7 months scattered over a 7-year period can make an American the subject of the military and a willing victim for the most warlike among them, then I have sadly overestimated the independence of our citizenry.

This legislation is a good American answer to a situation that, through no fault of ours, has required us to maintain a military strength we hope and pray to our Heavenly Father, we may never be called upon to use.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, somebody said that if you stay around here long enough you can observe quite a variety of things. We are witnessing a good example of that right now. Last week, without quibbling, the House passed a $30 billion appropriation for the armed services. That is a lot of money, but the spending of it—and much more—is imperative in order to prepare ourselves for the grave and real dangers that confront us and the free world today.

Yet, while a week ago we proudly approved $30 billion for national defense, this week we hear all manner of quibbling over a bill which we are assured is the very minimum in the way of necessary Reserve training legislation. Like the $30 billion, this, too, is to make America stronger and better able to wage a quick, effective, and decisive war, if one should be forced upon us. The great American Legion says this bill is a minimum requirement. The Veterans of Foreign Wars assures us this measure constitutes a minimum, if we are to have a real Army Reserve program, and not just a paper Reserve as we now have.

Mr. Chairman, surely we have learned some lessons in recent years in regard to preparedness, and that vital time element that is involved.

In World War I, 14 months passed before the first United States division was put into action.

In World War II, 8 months elapsed before the Marines invaded Guadalcanal, and it was 11 months after Pearl Harbor before our troops landed in North Africa.

In Korea, because of shortage of available troops, it was some months before we were able to fight, except for delaying actions. The delay that time was almost disastrous.

In the past, circumstances gave us time to prepare, to train and to equip. But gradually that time allowance has been reduced, and as Assistant Secretary of Defense Burgess has said, where we reckoned lead time by months in those wars, in the future we may have to think in terms of weeks, days, and even hours.

Mr. Chairman, let us recall for a moment our shortsightedness after World War II—and we all share the blame for it. We disarmed in the face of the mounting Communist threat. We discontinued the draft. Peacetime training, in which some of us believed, was condemned from the pulpits, the housetops, and from the well of this House. So, when the fire broke out in Korea we found ourselves with nearly 2 million young men, with no military training whatever, who had come of military age following World War II. In the dark hour of the emergency, as our troops were being pushed ever closer to that little ring around Pusan, General MacArthur called desperately for more men, more trained men. There was no time to train green recruits. Days and even hours meant everything. Nearly a million veterans of World War II were called to duty, almost overnight.

Tears were shed here yesterday because of the inconvenience that would result if a comparatively small group of young men should be subjected, under the terms of the pending bill, to the hardships and inconvenience of a little peacetime training. Somebody thought it might possibly interfere with a month or two of their schooling. Somebody else thought it might possibly upset their plans because they as reservists could in an emergency be called to active duty after they are married and settled down and perhaps engaged in business.

But it would seem much more appropriate for these harbingers of inconvenience to a few in the future to take time out to say a few words about the hardships to hundreds of thousands in the past—perhaps caused directly because of the failure of the Congress in the past to do precisely the thing that we are requested to do here today.

Those men—most of them—who went away to fight in the Korean war left wives and children and homes and businesses behind them. Although they had fought in one war for their country, they were called upon to go away to fight in another one—leaving behind them some 2 million young men of military age who could not be made ready for the emergency because there was not enough time to train them. Do you want to perpetuate that sort of condition?

The question before us today is simple, Do you really want an effective Army Reserve program? There is nothing drastic about this bill we are considering. It implements the present program, and gives young men several alternatives in their Reserve training. It fills a very essential need if we are to have a real and not a paper Army Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, if our freedom is challenged today to the extent that last week we were justified in voting, in one fell swoop, $30 billion of the taxpayers' hard-earned money to help protect America and the free world, surely that challenge is serious enough this week to justify this legislation. The strength and security of this country are involved in the vote that is cast here today.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And the mistakes that were made at that time should not be charged against the people in charge of this program today. It is claimed that the people today will not do a good job, but they are talking about mistakes made in the past.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to our good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and I have also listened to our very good friend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I have also listened to other speakers on this proposed legislation with a great deal of interest. This legislation has given me great concern and I presume every Member of the House is greatly concerned as to what position he should take on this measure. Everybody is asking one another, "How are you going to vote?" So there is a bit of concern and skepticism in the minds of the Members as to what position they should take on this proposed legislation.

Now, I might say that there are times when I have to part with my good friend from Missouri, whom I admire greatly, a man of outstanding and unusual ability; also, I think that my chairman will agree with me that I do not always concur with him, either. I have listened to many hours and days of debate and discussion of this proposed legislation in committee and on the floor of the House, and it is my opinion that the committee has turned in a very fine performance with a very difficult problem. We all agree that this legislation is going to require some refinement, but under the circumstances I think it is the best possible legislation that could be brought to the Members of this House as a basis to initiate the much-needed Reserve program.

Let me say to the Members of the House that I think we should be practical realists. We have left our guards down on a number of occasions on our defense programs, and at times found ourselves in great difficulty with the result that American youths, who usually know nothing whatsoever about these situations, are plunged into a cataclysm of war without being properly trained. After World War I we listened to the pacifists, and we sank our battleships and we destroyed our fortifications and we put our trust in treaties with people that we thought were as rightminded as ourselves. What happened? We paved the way for the dictators and the tyrants of Europe that followed, the Trotskys, the Lenins, the Stalins, the Hitlers, the Himmlers, the Goerings, the Heinrichs, the Mussolinis, and the Tojos. We sat complacently by while they built up great military strength in Europe and Asia, and we were catapulted into World War II totally unprepared. So, what happened then? America went all out building planes and tanks and ships and guns, training the youth of America to develop a mechanized military strength to meet the demands to save the world from the tyranny of the dictatorships of Europe. So I thought after that that we would exhibit some good, sound commonsense; that we had learned the hard way, the practical, realistic lessons of war. But no. The Members on the floor of this House demanded that we skeletonize our Army, that we skeletonize our Navy, that we skeletonize our Air Force; bring the boys back home; get them out of the service. And we did.

I remember going over to the Congressional Library to listen to General Marshall, when he was trying to explain that we had 13 to 15 million men going ahead and that it was quite a difficult task to make an about-face, stop this war mechanism in its tracks, and bring the boys back home, and asking that they be patient and give consideration to the difficult problems that confronted them. But the Members were hearing from back home and the drive was on to get the men out of the service.

The Russians were sitting on the sidelines watching the position we would take and watched us demobilize our Army, Navy, and Air Corps. And we did. We skeletonized our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force and immediately the Russians got tough with us.

Then, back in 1949, we cut back a $17 billion defense program to $14 billion. Then a new Secretary came in and he cut it back a couple of billion more from $14 billion. And when we got through we had a skeletonized Army, Navy, and Air Force and in no position to make any kind of a defense. Again, we had not learned the practical and realistic lessons of war.

The Communist dictators were rampant and watching us on the sidelines. They realized that we again would go down the line of demobilization and that they would catch us unprepared. Once again we skeletonized our defenses. And what happened? The Communists started to harass us and to haunt us, around the vast perimeters of the world. Then suddenly, with no warning, there was an outbreak of war in Korea. We were caught with our guard down again,

totally unprepared in manpower and equipment.

So again we rushed into a program of building up a great national defense strength. We shipped our boys to Korea, with but little basic training. We had but few troops in the Far East. We had nothing but a few obsolete tanks and bazookas in Japan. And those boys were sent in to fight a highly developed mechanized enemy. You know the results.

They nearly drove us back into the sea at Pusan, the most humiliating incident in the military history of this great Nation of ours.

Now again the Communists are sitting on the sidelines watching patiently and we are again hearing talk about a peaceful and stabilized world. We all want a peaceful and stabilized world. But let me say to the Members of the House that I want our Nation to have the greatest military strength that this country has ever known to meet any and all demands that may be made upon us any time, any place in the world, so if an emergency should arise or if we are catapulted into another war we will be set to meet it.

So in the Committee on Armed Services we have been trying to come up with some kind of a program to build up our Reserve corps. Do you think it is fair that we should build up our Reserves from World War II and Korean war veterans and then, if we are suddenly found in another emergency, to again call back these same combat veterans to do the fighting? That does not make sense. They played their part in World War II and Korea and played it well.

We are now trying to develop a program to build up the Reserves, to give us strength, so that these boys will not again have to be taken away from their places of business, their professions; their very lives and families disrupted. We can do it with this bill.

I do not say it is a perfect bill. But I do say it is a basis upon which we can work to build up our national strength and build up our Reserve corps.

Certainly these training programs build fine Americans. They teach boys discipline, love of country, devotion to duty, and those fundamentals and ideals and principles of our Government. And we can do it with the kind of a program proposed in this legislation.

So today let us look at this whole program from the standpoint of what it means to America, what it means to the people of the world, what it means to returning a war-torn world to stability and peace. I am satisfied that if we vote for this program, we will have the basis upon which to build a great Reserve corps and give great strength to our national defense program.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I just went back to my seat, and somebody said, "How are you going to vote on the bill?" So permit me to make myself clear, I am supporting the bill. I thought I had already made myself clear. I thank the gentleman for giving me this time.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman for that interruption. So that I will not have the same experience, I will say at the outset that I am going to support this bill, and I sincerely hope that the great majority of the Members of this House will support it.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said a moment ago, I can see nothing in this legislation that would embarrass anyone or cause anyone not to give his support to this legislation.

The Reserve program which is embodied in H. R. 5297, otherwise referred to as the national Reserve plan, is an essential ingredient in our national defense.

I believe there are two basic facts in the present world situation which make stronger Reserves for the United States an absolute necessity. These are:

First. We need far larger forces to deter potential aggressors than it is possible for us to maintain on a permanent basis without seriously crippling our economy.

Second. We need a trained Reserve, organized and ready, that can react swiftly in event of an enemy attack. Under the hard conditions of modern warfare time is no longer on our side in equipping and training military forces. Distance and ocean barriers are no protection.

We are faced with potential enemies who can afford to support enormous concentrations of military personnel by the simple expedient of forcing subhuman standards of living upon the ordinary citizen.

Three months ago the Chinese Reds ordered a sweeping overhaul of their armed forces, and instituted a compulsory active and Reserve training program for every man from his 18th to his 40th birthday. In Soviet Russia every emphasis continues to be given to the heavy industrial production upon which military machines depend. Nobody today seriously discounts the Russian capacity to wage intercontinental war with nuclear weapons.

Thus the Communist powers of the world stand today—armed to the teeth and determined to grow ever stronger in military capacity. From their position of massive armed might they support their worldwide program of infiltration and subversion, espionage, pressure, and outright intimidation of peoples in free countries.

Their leaders may change and their slogan may vary from time to time, but they have never given any true evidence of a change in their basically hostile outlook.

The people of the United States represent the greatest single deterrent to a total engulfment of freedom by the Communist bloc of nations. Our problem is to find an adequate means of coping with the hostility of these potential foes without either regimenting our people or bankrupting our national economy.

In this connection let us bear in mind the President's serious warning that the cold war may last for another 50 years—always barring the possibility of a hot war, or the miracle of a change in attitude by the Communist dictators.

Now, how are we going to maintain a suitable strength on such a long-term basis, without serious injury to our economy and the living standard which it supports, unless we rely upon trained Reserves? Obviously, a powerful Reserve has now become mandatory.

We are spending billions of dollars today upon the maintenance of our defenses. We unquestionably have high quality and sound training in our Active Forces. For an additional ultimate expenditure of approximately $1 billion a year we can have a well-organized and properly trained military Reserve to back up our Regular Forces.

Nobody would suggest that this is a negligible sum of money. But when we reflect upon the tremendous costs of a war, and when we further reflect upon the well-nigh unbelievable destructive power of nuclear weapons, then it seems to me that we shall be pennywise and pound foolish if we do not give ourselves the protection which a Ready Reserve will provide. I do not believe that any kind of monetary argument can be used in opposition to this Reserve plan.

H. R. 5297 authorizes a flexible program which strikes a proper balance between the demands of our national security and the capacity of a healthy and expanding economy to support it. Furthermore, in providing definite plans for the efficient utilization of manpower it provides our military forces and the industrial structure of the country with a better working partnership.

There are a number of provisions in the National Reserve plan which are primarily concerned with equitable and intelligent manpower utilization. These include:

First. Continuance of present student and occupational deferments and exemptions.

Second. Institution of a screening process continually in operation in peacetime.

Third. The selective recall of standby reservists in the event of mobilization.

Fourth. Statutory prohibition on involuntary Reserve training participation by men who were on active service prior to July 27, 1953—the Korean truce date.

Fifth. The provision, under Presidential authorization, for the selection of persons with critical skills engaged in defense-supporting industries and research who may be allowed to fulfill their military obligation by 6 months' training and a 7½-year Reserve obligation.

Taken in the aggregate, these provisions define the numbers of men who might be called in an emergency, as well as assuring that injustices of the past will be avoided.

Screening criteria are designed to assure that reservists in the Ready Reserve are really available for recall, and that Ready reservists who have critical skills and are in excess of the military requirements for those skills may be screened and transferred to the Standby Reserve. The Standby Reserve is subject to recall only in an emergency declared by the Congress.

The screening process, therefore, is expected to work toward a fair allocation

of skilled and technical personnel between the military and civilian economy.

Provision for selective recall of the Standby Reserve in the event of a mobilization is a further insurance that men will not again be indiscriminately returned to service. The National Reserve plan provides a rather radical departure from the present process of recall by installing this "buffer" provision to ascertain that personnel in great demand for a community or economy requirement are not abruptly taken from such positions.

On the recommendation of the Office of Defense Mobilization, this recall method will be under the administration of the Selective Service System. Existing appeal rights will be maintained.

In the past when war has unavoidably come to us, we have been fortunate in having a grace period of as high as 2 years in coming to our full peak of mobilized manpower and industrial production. Today we have neither time nor space advantages, and we would be totally involved in a war from its outset.

The National Reserve plan provides means whereby we can do much of our military-industrial planning in advance of any conceivable conflict. It allows us to do so, not in anticipation of a war, but in a good common sense attitude of being prepared.

We require manpower policies which will give our industrial planners some clear idea of the numbers of men who would be called to service immediately, and those who would be called later. We need policies which allow employers to know definitely and absolutely which of their key men would be taken, and which would be retained in their jobs.

The new Reserve program provides for these needs. In return, employers have a clear and mandatory obligation to cooperate fully with the Reserve program, and to encourage those men who take part in it.

The National Reserve plan will work in harmony with other industrial mobilization policies which are currently being studied. It would bring an element of stability into the mobilization picture which has been sadly absent in the past.

I know of no military authority in the country who would claim that in the event of war we will have no need for a smoothly functioning mobilization program, in which the total resources of our manpower and industrial might could be brought swiftly to bear. On the contrary, all of our military experts have pointed to the essentiality of having such a program.

The national Reserve plan will go a long way toward providing us with exactly such a program. We must have timely protection such as this if we are to face the future with any degree of confidence whatsoever.

When the Department of Defense presented the national Reserve plan to the subcommittee of which I am a member, the plan contained several features to which I was opposed.

These were:

First. A 10-year military obligation for personnel entering the 6-month training program.

Second. The discharge under conditions less than honorable for reservists who fail to participate in reserve training programs.

Third. No limit as to the size of the Ready Reserves, and no restriction on the numbers to be ordered by the President during a presidentially proclaimed emergency.

In addition, there were several features not covered in the plan which I considered essential. These are—

First. There was no assurance that all ROTC graduates would be commissioned.

Second. There was no assurance that the National Guard would be provided with personnel to maintain the guard at its approved strength.

Third. There was no limits as to the minimum or maximum number to be enlisted in the 6-month training program.

All of the above features—both those to which I was opposed and those which were not properly taken care of have been resolved by your committee and are amply provided for in the bill now being considered.

I endorse this bill and recommend its full support to you. I assure you that it provides the legislation which the President requested in his special message of January 13.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have mentioned this before to the gentleman who is speaking. Yesterday someone brought to the attention of the House a statement that the Naval Reserve Association was not supporting this measure. They were highly incensed, and sent me this telegram and asked me to read it in the RECORD this morning. It is as follows:

> Naval Reserve Association quoted as against H. R. 5297. NRA was against original administration bill H. R. 2667 because of compulsory features. NRA is in favor of H. R. 5297 and urges its passage.
>
> CLAYTON BURWELL.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman just said, or at least I understood him to say, that he did not know of any reason why anyone should oppose the bill.

Mr. PRICE. I did not say it exactly that way. I said I could not see, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said, how anyone could be embarrassed in giving his full support to this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for the correction. If the members of the Armed Services Committee will give some of us an opportunity, we will try to tell you why some of us cannot support it.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman. That is what makes this a great country. We all express our own opinions here in the well of the House.

I may as well say at the outset that when this legislation was first proposed and came down to our committee I had some misgivings about it. I made some noise in opposition to the plan originally. But I sat day in and day out, weeks and weeks, on this legislation, and I know that this is a Reserve plan written by Congress itself, by a congressional committee. It is true that the original proposal came down from the military, from the Pentagon, but I know of no other piece of legislation that has been gone over more thoroughly by a congressional committee than this Reserve plan. I think we have a plan here that the great majority of the Members of this House can conscientiously support, and I am convinced they will do so, because I know we are all interested in national security. I know we want a Reserve plan that will work. I think this plan will work.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said that this was only for 4 years. Does the gentleman believe that after 4 years we could do away with the draft law and this emergency law, too?

Mr. PRICE. Of course, I am not a prophet, but I will say this, that another Congress when that time comes will be in a position to make that decision. It is not permanent legislation, it is legislation with a time limit, with an expiration date, that can be reconsidered at an appropriate time. I would not want to speak for the Congress 4 years from now because I, like many others, may not be here at that time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Since there is a termination date in the legislation of 1959, I believe, would it be wise to make a termination date say of 4 years, perhaps, in the time that they are in the Reserve to correspond with the termination date in the legislation?

Mr. PRICE. Not for the completion of the Reserve obligation, otherwise you would not have much of a plan to develop a Reserve. The idea of the Reserve is to produce a back-up force for your military organization. One of the main ideas of this plan is to help us to reduce the standing military force.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Does not the gentleman remember that the gentleman from Maryland in the subcommittee moved that we write our own bill, and we have done that very thing?

Mr. PRICE. That is exactly what we did.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that we, as a subcommittee had the assistance of the spokesman for all of the reserves of the country as they sat around the table and assisted writing this bill?

Mr. PRICE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have all listened with more than considerable interest for almost 2 days to the arguments which have been propounded by many of my colleagues who are obviously working to build up the proper frame of mind to give this measure a better chance to pass. It is the old story wherein psychology is used in an effort to scare us into acquiescence. To follow the thinking which has been advanced by some of the proponents of this measure would no doubt cause many of us to leave the Congress in a state of fright. It is the same argument which has been repeated time and time again when this type measure is before the Congress. We are told that we are on the brink of war; we are told that we may be annihilated immediately if some form of universal military training bill is not passed. An attempt is made to cause those who are not stampeded into this line of thought to feel as if the hour of doom is about to strike and they are responsible because of their reticence to go along with the military.

Take a look at Germany. She imposed universal military training on her citizens with the thought that she would become invincible but today she is nonexistent as a military power. What nation under the sun which has practiced universal military training has been able to continue in existence as a military power? They have all gone the same way. We are told that we are missing the point, and while my time is short, I do hope to be able to get over a few basic fundamentals in what I have to say. There is a lot of talk about the fairness of universal military training. To me this is grossly unfair. What fairness is there in the idea of picking a young boy before he has time to receive the full guidance or training of his parents at home, taking him from his mother's knee and the parental counsel of his father, and placing him in a military organization? You may say this is not universal military training but it certainly leaves the door wide open for military training. Who can dispute that the time to build character in our youth is from 14 to 19 years of age? Who can dispute that the best place to build character is at home under the guidance, the care, the love, and the interest of a mother and father? One of our Nation's foremost problems today lies in the large proportions of juvenile delinquency that exists and that is a fact we deplore but here today not one word has been said about the spiritual factor of this measure. Not one word is said which would enable the fathers and mothers of these boys and girls to teach them to worship God in the way they saw fit. We come to the cause of why we have won our wars. Some say that it is because of preparedness but we must not lose sight of a factor which is equally as powerful. May I say on this floor today that the most powerful force in the whole world and something we are inclined to omit too much of the time is the power of prayer and humility before God Almighty.

Yes, we have won our wars but countless thousands of fathers and mothers have spent nights in prayer for their sons who were engaged in war on foreign battlefields. None can deny that this has had its effect. Let us not say we are doing one thing and do something else. Let us not give the impression that what is proposed is for only a few years. Let it be clearly understood at the outset that what is proposed is for a period of 8 long years and not just a short time.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that we here today will not be swayed by the words of those who clatter the swords. Without a doubt the military want this bill, and the people who are getting ready for war want this bill; yes, Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that we get ready for something else, too. We must be ready to give the youth of our Nation a chance for their fathers and mothers to prepare them mentally, morally, and spiritually, for by so doing our Nation will surely be a stronger, better place in which to live.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition as a member of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been recognized; he does not need to offer a preferential motion.

OUR YOUNG MEN ARE NOT COWARDS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment—and that is all anyone can express—the present bill, with somewhat similar legislation previously enacted, with legislation which will certainly follow, will more grievously affect the lives of more people than any legislation which has been enacted in the last 20 years. This bill and legislation designed to accomplish the same purpose will order and rule the lives of our young women and young men, affect the ability of our future citizens to pay the taxes which must be levied and collected if we are to have a national defense, if the Armed Forces are to continue to exist. A man in the armed services is not primarily a taxpayer.

Certainly, a young man whose plans for a future existence are rendered impossible of accomplishment by forced military service will never be able to contribute as generously through tax dollars as he would if left free to plan and order his own future. A man in the armed services is a liability rather than an asset if considered solely from the position of the tax collector.

I have heard the statement made that this bill does not impose universal military training. That I know, but I know that it is but the beginning. When we have this law and what is sure to come after it, it will mean UMT, and I want no part of it.

Why is the bill here? In my judgment, it is here because of our present and past foreign policy. We are trying to do something we just cannot do: extend our activities all over the world, throughout the world, to teach other people by one means or another what they shall think, what they shall do. How they shall live. What they shall eat and wear. In what type of houses they shall dwell. What form of government they shall have. That task, whether we seek to accomplish it by education, by peaceful persuasion, or whether we attempt to do it by force, is beyond our ability to accomplish. We have, as we have had ever since the beginning of the New Deal, an unsound, unworkable foreign policy.

It is my understanding that the Navy does not ask for this bill. The Marines do not ask for it. But the Army wants it. If my information is correct, men and women in sufficient number volunteer for the Navy and for the Marines. But they want no part of the Army. I wonder if it ever occurred to those who control the activities and the procedures of the Army that there might be something wrong with their system? Perhaps a little quiet, thoughtful self-examination by some of the so-called Army brass might be helpful in solving some of their problems.

This bill carries with it the implication that the young men—and I might add the young women, because if Anna Rosenberg had her way they would be in the armed services as well as the young men—that the present generation lacks the courage or ability to fight battles which are necessary for the preservation of home and country. I challenge that thought, idea, or statement. Firmly convinced am I that no matter what happens succeeding generations will carry on and that under the good Lord this country will not be wiped off the face of the earth—the world left without a Nation where there is freedom, where there is progress, where there is opportunity. If we will give our young people something that is dear to their hearts, that affects their welfare—to fight for, if we have an issue where this country is endangered, where the safety of the Republic or the welfare of our people is at stake, I am thoroughly convinced we have plenty of volunteers. What then is the trouble? In my judgment the trouble lies in the fact that we have a foreign policy in which a majority of our people do not believe. It is a foreign policy which they do not think is necessary to either preserve the independence of the citizen, his liberty, his opportunities or the security of the Republic. This is the greatest country in the world, so we are told by those who should know.

But we have a foreign policy which not only seems designed to aid every other people, every other nation, in every possible way, regardless of the wants, the thinking, or the desires of those upon whom we would impose our generosity, our will, a policy which if continued will in the end—and this no one questions—strip us of our national resources, destroy our manpower, undermine the allegiance of our people to our Nation, destroy their faith in the soundness of judgment and the patriotism of those they elect to office.

We have all seen the young people come here during the last few weeks—young men, young women, boys, and girls, thousands of them. They have been here day after day. I wonder what they think of us when we by legislation of this type just wipe out all the freedoms, all of the liberties, all of the op-

portunities for which our revolutionary forefathers fought, impose upon these young people the same sort of military servitude which their ancestors came here to escape.

I wonder what they think when we take out of their lives the 8 most formative years.

Do they wish to go to school, to college, to take special training? "Wait," says the Army—"wait 8 long years until we are through with you."

Has nature had its way with them? Do they want to get married? "Wait," says the Army.

Do they want homes? "Never mind," says the Army—"wait until we are through with you."

Do they wish to have a family, children, boys, and girls, with an opportunity to be educated to carry on, to keep in existence this great and glorious Republic? "Oh, wait," says the Army.

John, or Bill, or Henry, or Mike may be required to fight on foreign soil not for the preservation of the Union but to implement a foreign policy established by United Nations. And "Oh, yes," says the Army, "perhaps Roger, David, or Phil, while fighting abroad—not under the Stars and Stripes but under the United Nations—may pick up a wife, a Jap, a Chink, and bring her home."

Well, perhaps the originators of our foreign policy have a thought for the girl who has been left behind—maybe she can get a refugee or a displaced person to marry and father children.

By legislation of this type we just slam shut the door of opportunity to all of the young folks of today and tomorrow. We give back to this country the system of military training, of military conscription, which the Pilgrim Fathers and all those who came to this country seeking freedom and opportunity fought so long, so successfully to escape.

I want no part of any such program.

What we need is a foreign policy tailored to our ability to successfully maintain—a policy which will protect the interests of our country, of our people.

To such a policy the traditional American way of national defense can successfully be fitted without destroying either freedom of the individual or impairing the security of the Nation.

Rather than attempt to shape and fit a military policy to an unsound foreign policy, let us start at the fountainhead and give to this country a foreign policy tailored to our ability, to the preservation of the interests of our Nation and its people.

The statesmen of every other nation keep the welfare of their own country and their own people always in mind. I know of no reason why we should not do likewise.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 5297, a bill which, in my opinion, will provide the Nation with an adequate Reserve. It appears that to qualify for the purpose of discussing this bill one should mention his military background. With this in mind, I should like to point out that on April 29, 1955, I finished 38 years as a member of the United States Naval Reserve. I now command a brigade of Naval Reserves; 60 divisions, 3,000 men. I attend drills regularly, and tonight if any of you want to visit our unit, if you will come down to the auditorium on Constitution Avenue you will see one of the units in action. Therefore, I feel qualified to talk about the Reserves.

After World War I I joined the Reserves. I recall when the Congress took away from us our drill pay in 1925. I recall when World War II broke out. Those of us who were in the Reserves quit our jobs. I resigned my seat in the Congress and took up my commission as an officer aboard a destroyer in the North Atlantic. A lot of us oldtimers in the Reserves have worried about the future of the Reserves and, in my opinion, we are in favor of this legislation almost unanimously.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. There has been a good deal of discussion about the weaknesses and the evils of the Reserve system. In spite of that fact, and the merits of the contention that all has not been as well as it should have been for the Reserves, does not the gentleman think that the Reserves, for better or for worse, contributed a very vital and almost necessary role in the defense of the country in the last two wars?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. You are absolutely right. With reference to the 7th Fleet in the far Pacific, 95 percent of the personnel were Reserve officers and enlisted men. In Korea the Marine Corps called up practically every Reserve they had in their air and land Reserve units. In addition, the Army, Navy, and Air Force did likewise. In addition, let us not forget the National Guard divisions that served in Korea because they were all Reserves.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Am I correct in saying that the gentleman was talking about the Naval Reserve?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman means my membership?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Am I correct in saying that this bill does not have anything to do with the Naval Reserve?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It has a lot to do with the Naval Reserve.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does the Navy take part?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Navy participates. All branches of the armed services participate, and the hearings will substantiate that fact.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think I can show the gentleman that that is not so. The word "Navy" is not mentioned once in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I call to the attention of the gentleman a letter dated May 18 from Admiral Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, addressed to me, received this morning. Will the gentleman permit me to read what it says?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. The letter reads in part as follows:

> I support this bill not only as Chief of Naval Operations, but also from my position as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and believe that it strengthens the Navy's position with respect to its Reserves and will also improve the overall national military posture. * * * The provisions of the bill, H. R. 5297, include measures which we do not now possess which will improve further the quality of the Navy's Reserve forces.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. The spokesmen for the Navy and also the Air Force appeared before the committee and they said they hoped to get the necessary number of enlisted men through their program that they have in effect and is in effect at the present time, and if they were not successful, then they would call upon the 6-month trainees to fill vacancies in their Reserve units.

Mr. Chairman, many of us on the Committee on Armed Services remember what took place during the Korean war, and it was my privilege to serve on a subcommittee that released this report titled "Recall and Release of Reservists."

Let me read to you just a few of the paragraphs:

> To accomplish an immediate expansion, as contrasted with a phased enlargement, it was necessary to involuntarily order to active duty members and units of the Reserve components and the National Guard.

Let me continue to read:

> As a result of this administrative failure on the part of the Armed Forces the Nation has been treated to the spectacle of serious inequities being perpetrated daily throughout the country. Inactive reservists who were grandfathers with grown children were involuntarily called to duty while nonveteran youngsters remained at home * * *. Enlisted men with multiple dependents, 1 with 10 children, were involuntarily ordered to duty while single men remained behind because of their membership in an organized unit. Reservists were picked out of college and ordered to report for active duty in a matter of days while their draft-protected nonveteran schoolmates continued to safely lounge on the campus.

Continuing to read, the report says:

> Inactive reservists who were employed in essential industries were not allowed cancellation of orders. Homes were broken, businesses lost, and, because of service negligence, we have the unpleasant picture of some reservists being left behind who should have been called first, some being called first who should have been called last, many being called who, because of the national interest, should never have been called, and still others attempting to volunteer for active duty and not being accepted.

Mr. Chairman, these Reserves that I have been reading about had been separated from the Armed Forces following World War II and they were recalled for active duty in the Korean war when those who had never performed any military service should have been used.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the picture today. Much has been said about the Reserves of today and especially the Navy and the Marine Corps. In 1952 the

Navy, according to budget allowances, were authorized 194,000 men and they were able to muster 123,000; that is, officers and men. In 1953, according to the budget, they were allowed 179,000 officers and men and they were only able to get 135,000. In June 1954 they were allowed 152,000 officers and men and they only were able to recruit 139,000 officers and men.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the Army. In 1952 the Army was allowed 205,000 by the budget but were able to muster only 134,000. On June 30, 1954, the Army was allowed 210,000 and they could recruit only 136,000. These figures prove that the Reserve units of the Army and Navy have not been recruited to their authorized strength during the fiscal years of 1952, 1953, and 1954. May I add the same condition applies as far as the Marine Corps and Air Force units are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, of all the men in the Reserves today, 76.1 percent had from 12 to 24 months of active duty, or in other words, nearly three-fourths of all the Reserves today are veterans with 12 or more months of active duty.

To be more specific: 75 percent of the men in the Army Reserve today are former servicemen; the Naval Reserve, 52.8 percent; the Marine Corps Reserve, 89.1 percent; and the Air Force Reserve, 82.8 percent.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That all adds up to this. If we have another grave emergency, we are going to have to take the same men who bore the brunt of battle in World War II and in Korea.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. You are definitely right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They will be called up a third time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; and in the next war there may be some of us oldtimers from World War I called to active duty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that these men who volunteer for the Reserve ought to be called up? How many of the men included in the figures the gentleman quoted are in the volunteer Reserves?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They are all Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. GROSS. Why should they not be called up if they volunteer for it?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is our problem. Our Reserve is composed of volunteers but not enough of them and we have to depend upon this bill to build up the authorized strength of each unit. The figures I cited prove that you cannot do it by volunteers who are already veterans.

Mr. GROSS. A compulsory Reserve.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. No, not necessarily. Much has been said about there having been no effort made to recruit young men for the Reserves. In Pennsylvania we conducted what was known as Operation Penn Test. It was designed to swell the ranks of the State Army Reserve and National Guard units, and it is described today as a complete flop by the Pennsylvania Army Reserve commander.

Let me read from an article by International News Service dated Friday, May 6, 1955.

The article says in part—quoting Gen. Albert Stackpole, of Harrisburg, Pa.:

> Penn Test was started by the Defense Department shortly after the Korean war and was aimed at men being released from military service.

Mr. Chairman, reading further from the INS article, let me cite some of the experiences Penn Test faced as young men were interviewed in an effort to recruit them for the National Guard and the Army Reserve.

The INS article says:

> When Penn Test was inaugurated in Philadelphia, Gen. Albert Stackpole, who commands a Reserve division reported that Reserve units sent recruiters to homes of prospective members.
>
> "In at least one case," he said, "the team was given the heave-ho off the front porch."

The response to Reserve recruiting has been better in rural areas than in metropolitan centers, according to General Stackpole.

Therefore, an effort was made to recruit boys for the Reserves but they have not responded. Today the Naval Reserve is in fair condition. So is the Marine Reserves. The Air Force Reserve is coming along nicely. But the Army has thousands of commissioned and noncommissioned officers, but they are sadly lacking in enlisted personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us have very deep feelings about this proposed legislation when it involves the lives and the future of our children. But I think it is no time to let sentiment control our thinking. It is a time to take seriously our obligations imposed upon us to provide for the national defense of this Nation.

I want to make only two comments about this bill. The first is that if we are ever to balance the budget of this Nation we must somehow find a way to reduce spending for national defense. Only on yesterday I helped write a report on an appropriation bill cutting from the budget estimates over $200 million. But even so, it has no effect on the total budget requested by the administration because the majority of that is in the field of national defense. The only way to cut national defense spending is to provide a strong Reserve, an Active Reserve, a well trained Reserve, one that is ready to be mobilized on a moment's notice. And that is exactly what this bill is designed to do.

So I do not think we can afford to let sentiment enter into this picture at all. The wonderful objective sought by my friend from North Carolina is most laudable. But it is so weak in principle that I absolutely deplore the proposition that he has made here.

The idea of trying to train soldiers on the installment plan is reprehensible to me. You have to train them on a continuous basis and plan the basis to make the soldier a finished product. The idea of sending him out for 3 months to a summer camp and bringing him back and sending him out for 3 months longer, when the military objectives have changed.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I wonder if the plan in the bill, which provides for the 6 months' training and 1 night a week for 48 weeks, is good enough? It certainly does not comply with the gentleman's remark just made—"you have to train them on a continuous basis."

Mr. PRESTON. There is a big difference between the 3 months and the 6 months.

Mr. BARDEN. Is not this the practical objective, that we seek to make our Nation strong mentally as well as militarily?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, indeed it is, but by your very plan you are going to make it weaker. The idea of trying to train soldiers 3 months at a time and have a strong Reserve is unthinkable to me. I say that as a man who served in World War II and had the responsibility for training soldiers. I know it takes at least 6 months to make a good, well-trained, hardened man. You cannot do it in 3 months.

We might as well face up to our responsibility on this bill. It is a very popular idea to say, "Yes, let them go to school, send them 3 months and bring them back home. Mothers will be happy and fathers will be happy." Of course they will. It is not easy to legislate on this proposition of national defense.

You remember in 1941 when the Selective Service was extended by one vote? Think of what happened. Almost half of this body sat here and quibbled about extending Selective Service in 1941, right before the terrible holocaust broke out. It may well break out again next month, or within 2 weeks. We must rise to our responsibility. We must pass this bill. We must provide for an adequate Reserve and try to reduce the budget that we are laboring under.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is the hope of the representative from the Second District of Illinois that there will be no limitation on the debate of this bill under the 5-minute rule. In this Chamber today a momentous decision is in the process of formation. The minds of many Members with whom I have talked are still open. The manner of the voting is still to be determined. In such a situation, when what is said here is not for the record, but for the real purpose of debate in influencing by reason the nature of the momentous decision we are about to make, every Member should be encouraged to say freely and fully what is on his mind and in his conscience.

On Tuesday the general debate was limited to 4 hours. It was a sincere and a brilliant debate, participated in by

those who fortunately have been in a position closer to the issue. Necessarily time could not be given to those not members of the committee or who had lesser prestige in this body. The debate now has reached the stage under which we are proceeding under the 5-minute rule. Rather than limit the debate at this stage I think it is better that we should prepare to remain here, if necessary, into the late hours of the day and then if Members still desire to be heard we should continue the discussion into the second day.

What we are determining is the pattern of the lives of our children. It will be the pattern for the lives of generations that have not yet come upon the stage of American life. It may be that with our ascendancy to world power it may become necessary to discard an old pattern and to fix a new pattern. But let us not deceive ourselves as to the significance and the substance of what we are doing.

I come from a generation when the stream of a new and rich immigration was fleeing from the compulsory military service of Europe to find in our land the opportunity to participate in the pursuit of happiness in a climate of peaceful intentions. Many of that period came to our shores from Germany. Much as they loved the land of their birth, and the associations with dear friends with whom they had been reared, their desire to live normal lives in a climate of peace led to the severance of old ties and the joining of their lots with our lot.

Germany then was strong. She was engaged in a rivalry with France and with England. The system of compulsory military training and service was fixed upon the Germans under the argument that Germany had potential enemies and that to combat them and their designs it was necessary for the lives of all German youths to be mortgaged to the military service of the nation. From the sidelines, we, in a happier America, looked and wondered. We saw the beginning and the development of a race of armaments and we asked ourselves how could people be so foolish as not to know the logical end.

There is no truer saying than this: "He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword." He who places a chip upon his shoulder will find someone who will try to knock it off. He who is smitten on one cheek and turns the other in the end will find that he has made a friend, the sort of friend that comes only when the avenue to friendship is love.

What came to Germany? What was the price of compulsory military service? What was the end of her race of armaments? One war after another until Germany was in the grave nationally.

Now we are asked to accept that pattern.

During the debate on the defense appropriation bill last week, the great chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] said:

> Heaven help us if we ever have to depend on foot soldiers to win the war * * * the Soviets can overrun Europe and Asia within 30 to 60 days. * * * The war will be determined in the first 10 days or 2 weeks * * * if our cities are bombed, and they are certain to be if war is declared, chaos will follow * * * we could not bury our dead * * * the decisive stage of the war would be over before the Reserves could fire a shot.

The great chairman from Missouri, whose long and distinguished service in this body places him in position of towering prestige, was arguing for air power. He was opposing an amendment to increase the appropriation for more infantrymen, and the gist of his argument was that the war would be over before they get into the fighting.

But today we are told that everything that stands between our country and annihilation is the creation of a reserve force of some 200,000 men.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time of the Committee today because of the depth of my feeling. I do not want the door opened to any path that can lead my country by each succeeding step away from our cherished ways of peace to a new and dangerous pattern.

There is no immediate need. Only recently the House passed an extension of the Draft Act for another 4 years. The passage of this measure, which provides only for a handful of reservists, neither can add nor detract to our measure of security. It may be that by next year circumstances beyond our wish and contrary to our prayers may force us to the consideration of legislation much more stringent, much more inclusive. Or it may be, with the blessing of Heaven, that when we convene in the 2d session of the 84th Congress the present clouds will have lifted and again we can start back to the old ways of peace and of normal lives. Let us not be hasty. Let us not change the pattern of life for our children and for future generations until there is no alternative.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to second very heartily the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]. I, too, have had some experience in training troops, Reserves, and other groups.

There is no substitute for at least 6 consecutive months' training, in my opinion, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia on that score.

I think also it is desirable to call the attention of the committee to one phase of this matter that has altered the situation as it has confronted our country in the past. As my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. TABER], said earlier, one of the important elements of national defense is to be able to pay the bill. The economy of the country is directly affected; and, as has been pointed out again and again, we can spend ourselves into defeat just as well as we might be defeated by not being prepared. The purpose of this legislation, as I understand, is to meet a very serious need right at that point.

In the past the Reserves, in spite of criticism, have filled a very important role in our country's defense. I cannot imagine where we might have been in World War II had it not been for Reserves, inadequate though they may have been, compared with what we would have like to have had, but they represented a backlog of trained men, a pool of trained men, and that is about all they have ever represented up to this time because, while we have fine organizations of officers and in some cases NCO's, as of today our Reserve units lack enlisted men.

Because of the speed with which danger can come upon us in this supersonic age we must have more than the Reserve has been able to supply us in the past. It is not sufficient to have a backlog of trained, experienced veterans who can be filled into vacant spaces in existing units and who can be organized into new units. That is all desirable, and it is essential, but there is still one other thing we must have if we are not to have an overwhelmingly large and overcostly standing Army, and that is units that can be put in the field within a relatively short space of time. The only way a unit can be put in the field is to have it trained as such. Under the provisions of this bill one of the important things it will accomplish is to supply the necessary young men who will be identified with a particular organization to fill the ranks of units, companies, battalions, and divisions, long enough so that unit training can be given and the time in which the unit can take the field in time of need cut down immeasurably.

Anyone can understand that no matter how well trained the individuals may be, the teamwork necessary in modern military activity is such that you just cannot take the proper number of individually trained men and put them successfully in a new unit any more than you can gather up football players over the country, put them on a field and expect them to play as a team without having practiced together. Unit training is extremely important.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWNSON. I think we were told today that we had 2½ million men in the Reserves, yet they are not able to put a unit in the field. I am wondering whether, this being the case, that the men in charge of that program could do any more under this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think so. At least if the object they are aiming at is not carried out we will have to reassess the program. The program at least provides machinery under which those in charge can, if they will, organize the Reserves on a ready unit basis.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman has hit the point when he said we do not have the machinery, that it is not sufficient just to have large numbers of men in the Reserves for they are not organized and there is no machinery whereby they must attend drills and whereby they must drill in units and that sort of thing. This bill provides for that.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Yes; that is right. Further than that, up until very recently membership in the Reserves was entirely voluntary.

I think there has been a great deal of unnecessary talk about the hardships of

the men in the Reserves. They were volunteers and they would not have stayed in the Reserves had they not been patriots. What many of them did not anticipate was being used in so-called brush-fire warfare under which some might be called again and again while others never served.

Those who entered the Reserves expected to serve in an all-out war, but many did not want to be put in the position where they might be called out to fight in these limited wars before those who had made no previous sacrifices served. That was what happened following the Korean emergency, and it did grievous damage to the Reserve program. In a major emergency the reservists expect to take the field regardless of how many times they have been shot at before.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when I became a Member of this body and when I became a member of the legislature of my own State, I took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. I do not think I am supporting the Constitution of the United States when I take the life, the liberty, and the happiness of any individual in it. I do not think we have any right, except in time of war, to go into a man's family and take him out of it for 6 months or 6 years or 8 years as this bill would do. We have on the books today a draft law that can take care of this situation, if necessary. All they have to do is to take a man under the draft and say, "You will do your time, 2 years," then put him in the Reserves.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to one thing. The things that we are talking about today are temporary. Everybody is telling us what Russia is going to do to us. Well, I am not afraid of Russia and I do not believe anybody around here is. I do not think that anyone seriously expects that Russia is going to drop a bomb on us or that we are going to drop a bomb on anybody else. We went through the last war, the Korean war, without using gas that was used in 1917–18.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was asked by the gentleman from Iowa why it was not all right for these men, these volunteer reservists, to fight. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that they should, but that they had to put through this measure to compel them to go under this new law that is proposed. If that is not unconstitutional then I do not know what is.

Mr. Chairman, in time of peace every man is entitled to the same thing in this country, and he ought to have it. We have an example in England, for instance, a country that wanted to build an empire and did build one. They had to maintain armies in Egypt, Africa, Europe, Asia, and everywhere else. The people in England had to pay for that and they paid for it right through the nose. England today is a weak country and getting weaker by the day. The reason is they are trying to maintain power in every part of the globe. I do not want my country to be an empire. I am satisfied with the 48 States we have. I am satisfied everybody in here if the time comes and they have to, will stand up and protect their country, whether he is young or old.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, talked about this great Reserve system and about making skeleton forces out of the Army. But when the war was over in 1918—I assume he was in that war, I was in it—I was glad to get out of it and so was everyone else. They were sick and tired of it.

These scaremongers, and that is what I call them, talk about the defense of this country. Why, we are in better shape in this country today than we ever were in its history. As long as we are able to appropriate like we did last week $31 billion for its defense, we will get all the material in the world to stave off anybody that wants to come and see us.

England is about 25 miles from the continent of Europe, yet nobody has been able to get into England in a thousand years, since William of Normandy. That was around the year 1000. I would like to know how they are going to come 3,500 or 4,000 miles to attack us when they could not do that to little England over in Europe. I refuse to listen to these people who try to scare you to death.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see the family life of the United States maintained and I want the State Department, every State Department, regardless of whether it is Republican or Democrat, to keep their nose out of the affairs of other countries that might lead us into war.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this legislation have told us how terrible it is that the young boys cannot plan for their future so long as the possibility of the draft and the Reserve service hangs over their heads. If you will pardon me, my heart refuses to bleed. I was 38 years old when World War II came along. I did not question whether or not the President was right or whether our foreign policy was right. My country was in danger, and I volunteered for service and served 4 years, 2 of them overseas. As the result I lost my business; I lost my home; and I lost my wife. But I did not lose my life like many others did. Before you start feeling sorry for me, may I say that I got a better business, a better home, and a better wife, and above all I have my self respect for having discharged my obligation to my country in time of need. And, I will say something else: my father was in Congress at the time, and I experienced a lot of very unhappy situations in the Army, but not one single time did I ask my daddy to speak to the mean old War Department about the way they were treating his sonny boy.

Now, what I have been hoping for over the years is that we would find some way to spread the military obligation of this Nation equitably among all the boys. It is a beautiful theory that all men will respond to their country's call when needed, but we have found from sad experience that a great many do not. And, I came back from World War II and found that too many of my friends had stayed behind and had the automobiles, the white shirts, and all of those nice things, which were not available for me as an honorably discharged soldier. But I repeat, I had my self respect, and many of them do not.

This bill proposes, as I understand it, to try to spread out the military obligation of our Nation among all of our young men, because too much of the obligation for winning this country and preserving it in the past has fallen on too few, and that is a good reason why we should support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that enough of our young men will recognize the wonderful opportunity they have to live in this great country and will voluntarily accept their military obligation without being forced into the military or the naval service. But if that is what it takes to insure sufficient manpower for our defense and to preserve this country, then I am for whatever compulsion it may take. And, I do not believe we can afford to let the young people or their parents decide whether we have a proper or an improper foreign policy or whether the President is right or wrong in his military judgment. We must submit to the country an adequate military defense program, and I think this is a part of it. And, if the boys will not voluntarily accept their duty then it is up to us to see that they are required to do so.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I intend to support this bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any debate that I have followed with more interest than the one in which we are now engaged. I have made up my mind, with some trepidation, that I am going to support this bill as written. I certainly do understand that when I go back home maybe there are going to be some things in this bill that I cannot completely explain to my people, but I should rather undergo trying to make explanations about voting for this bill than to be confronted with having to make an explanation why I did not vote for this bill; that I did not make some kind of provision for the defense of our country, though not in absolute accord with my feelings.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said here about these boys who are 17 and 18 years old wanting to marry, and not being able to do so. The desire to marry is a most laudable ambition. I know they will want to, and we want them to. But I have the idea that if we pass this bill, even in its present form, perhaps we will make it a little more certain that even if they do not get married when they are 17 or 18, the chances are better that they might be living later on and might have a better opportunity of getting married.

In other words, what I am trying to say is this. Something has been said here about our being in peacetime. I do not think we could say that. It is true we are not shooting now. But certainly all of us must admit that we are in a cold war and we are trying to do our dead level best to prevent its becoming a

hot war. And the best way on earth to do that is to be strong and to be able to defend ourselves.

I will tell you what kind of a war we are in. We are in a struggle for the minds of men, and the sooner we match up to that responsibility, the better it is going to be.

In the little time that I have to speak, let me say this. We have to put an obligation on our boys, and we cannot avoid that. I wish we could. But I want to remind the people of this country that they also have an obligation, and we Members of Congress have a tremendous obligation. I would not say that war with communism is inevitable. Even if I felt that I would not say that, because I would not want Russia to be able to say that we said that no matter what they did war was inevitable. But this I do say, that maybe if we had been a little firmer and a little more serious and a little more realistic a few years ago, we could have wiped out communism as easily as you can extinguish the flame of a candle by passing your hand over it. But we would not.

I want to call the attention of the people of America to the fact that we older people have not been making the fight on communism that we ought to make. I heard with dismay last Sunday night that the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of this Congress would be picketed at his hotel this week in a State of the United States. That chairman is a great American, and to be picketed because he is trying to ferret out Communists should not be tolerated. I saw 7,000 Communists picket the White House of the United States in behalf of the Rosenbergs. I have seen bad things occur in this country and done in this country by people who ought to know better, that have made my blood run cold. And if these things had not been allowed, maybe we would not be confronted with the necessity of considering the present bill.

One of the saddest things I can think of now is that the United States Supreme Court is seriously considering the question whether or not a person who worked for his Government and was paid by loyal taxpayers' money and was fired on the ground that he was a security risk is entitled to be confronted with his accusers. If we follow that line of thought in this country we cannot win. No Army that you can grow or develop will ever win this fight for us, though we make cannon fodder of all of our children.

As a matter of fact, the Constitution of the United States guarantees the right to be confronted with witnesses only in a criminal case. If we keep up this foolishness that if a man is working for his Government and thereby having a privilege that 165 million people who never ate at the public trough never had, and if you say we cannot get rid of that skunk until he is confronted by witnesses, you might as well surrender now. If a loyal American has to confront that kind of person, knowing he will be sued in court for damages, we will have no right to expect him to furnish information.

What I am saying to you is, Yes, we are in a cold war. We want to keep it from being a hot war, but we have to measure up to our responsibilities, too. We take these boys in. Let us take ourselves in. Let us see if we cannot mold public opinion to where the people will understand that this is a ruthless war that we are engaged in, and that the one who wins this conflict will be the one who gives his heart, his soul, and all that is in him in order that the things that are precious shall be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, I hope all of us will bring our heads to our knees today and resolve that we are going to stand up and be counted, and that we are going to fight communism in the Halls of Congress and in the courts and everywhere we encounter it, because if we do not do that, then we are cowards when we ask our boys to fight communism on the battlefields and to wage that fight alone.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the conviction of the Congress that the best interests of the national security demand a well-trained and well-disciplined Reserve, and further that honorable service includes fulfillment of service obligation in the Reserve Forces as well as the Active Forces. It is the intent of the Congress to provide sufficient Reserve Forces which, in conjunction with the Active Forces, will be able to preserve the security, and provide for the defense of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (3) of subsection 4 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Each person who, after the enactment of this amendatory act, is inducted into, or initially enlisted or appointed in, the Armed Forces, including the reserve components thereof, or in the National Security Training Corps, before his 35th birthday, shall serve on active training and service or active duty for training in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of 8 years, unless sooner discharged. Each such person, on release from active training and service or active duty for training in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if qualified, be retained in or transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph or under section 6 (c) (2) (A). To the maximum extent practicable, the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard shall continue to consist of members of the militia voluntarily enlisting therein. However, when recruitment efforts by the several States procure less than the necessary numbers and quality of volunteer personnel, and upon request or approval of the Governor or other appropriate authority of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, such a person may be transferred to the Army National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph or under section 6 (c) (2) (A) unless sooner discharged or transferred. A person transferred under this paragraph to the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard shall concurrently become a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate. Persons having an obligated period of service under this act shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) for satisfactory performance of that service obligation. However, any person while subject to such reserve obligation who in good faith becomes a regular or duly ordained minister of religion or a student preparing therefore, as defined in sections 6 (g) and 16 (g) of this act, shall, at his request, not be required to serve on active training and service or active duty for training or inactive duty training while in such status. In addition to their obligation to perform the duties provided for in this act, such persons shall be subject to such orders, directives, and regulations relating to their administration (including the rendering of prescribed reports on personal status) as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). This subsection does not prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force. The appropriate Secretary of a military department, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) may provide, by regulations which shall be as uniform as practicable, for the release of any person from active training and service or active duty for training in the Armed Forces before serving the period of active training and service or active duty for training for which he was enlisted, appointed, or inducted. The amendment made by this amendatory act does not change or revoke any Reserve obligation imposed on any person under this section before the enactment of this amendatory act."

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) is amended to read as follows:

"Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may, within quotas fixed by the President with the advice of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, enlist in the Army National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or the Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or in the Reserve or in any unit of the Reserve of any armed force. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and service in the Armed Forces and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years; any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years. Such persons who enlist to serve on active duty for training and service and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years, shall, within 2 years of such enlistment, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, be ordered to active duty to perform a minimum of 24 consecutive months of active training and service, unless sooner released, except that the commencement of such active training and service may be deferred under the same conditions and for the same period that induction for training and service may be deferred under subsections (d) or (i) (1) of this section. Such persons who enlist to serve on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years shall, upon enlistment, be ordered to active duty for training for a period of

6 months. The Army National Guard and Air National Guard shall be provided sufficient personnel, under sections 4 (d) (3) and 6 (c) (2) (A) to meet the approved program strengths of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard. Notwithstanding the quotas fixed by the President under this section, a minimum of 100,000 persons net and not more than 250,000 persons net shall be enlisted annually to serve on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years for the purposes of this subsection. The National Security Training Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of Defense and the President, as Commander in Chief, with respect to the welfare of persons while serving on active duty for training for 6 months under this subsection. The National Security Training Commission shall report with respect to the welfare of such persons annually to the Congress. The advice and reports rendered by the National Security Training Commission pursuant to this section shall be with reference to the welfare of the persons involved and not with respect to the military training required. Upon a specific finding by the President, persons with critical skills engaged in critical defense supporting industries may be allowed to fulfill their military obligation by serving on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years under the terms of this subsection. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years shall—

"(i) be entitled to pay in the amount of $50 a month for his initial 6 months of active duty for training and for any period of hospitalization incident thereto;

"(ii) for the purposes of subsistence and travel and transportation allowances and title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be treated as if he were serving in pay grade E–1 (under 4 months);

"(iii) be entitled to the benefits authorized for reservists by Public Law 108, 81st Congress, approved June 20, 1949 (63 Stat. 201) (for the purposes of which the term 'active duty for training' as used herein shall be considered to be 'extended naval or military service'), except that he shall not be entitled to the benefits of section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and the automatic indemnity coverage under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended, shall be limited to 30 days after separation or release from the initial 6 months of active duty training; and

"(iv) during his period of obligated service, be deferred from training and service under this act, after completing his initial 6 months of active duty for training, for so long as he serves satisfactorily as a member of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, or a reserve component, but he shall be liable for active duty in accordance with law. However, if after completing his initial 6 months of active duty for training he does not thereafter, during any part of his obligated period of service, serve satisfactorily as a member of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, or a reserve component, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), his deferment shall be canceled, and he shall be liable to be inducted into the Armed Force in which he has been trained for a period of training and service of not more than 24 months. In addition to enlistments authorized by this subsection, persons selected for enrollment in an officer training program under section 6 (d) of this title may be enlisted in a reserve component of the Armed Force concerned. For the purposes of this act the words 'active duty for training' mean full-time duty in the active military service of the United States for training purposes; and in respect to members of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard means, for the purposes of this act only, the performance of such duty in a Federal status."

(3) Subsection 6 (d) (1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Upon graduation persons who successfully complete the Army or Air Force ROTC course and are qualified shall be commissioned in the Reserve of the appropriate service. Thereafter, such persons in excess of the active forces requirements existing at that time, shall be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 6 months with the service in which commissioned. Upon the completion of such active duty for training such person shall be returned to inactive duty and assigned to an appropriate reserve component for a period of 7½ years additional service. The Secretary of Defense shall develop standards and regulations to require satisfactory participation by such a person. Failure to meet these standards may result in his commission in the Reserve being revoked."

(4) Section 9 (g) (3) is amended to read as follows:

"Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in the Armed Forces of the United States or while a member of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard. Upon his release from training duty (other than training in the National Security Training Corps) or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within 30 days following his release or rejection, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(5) Section 9 (g) is amended by adding the following new paragraph, to be known as paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"Any person who performs 6 months of active duty for training pursuant to, and as defined in section 6 (c) (2) (A) of the national Reserve plan shall be entitled, upon application for reemployment within 60 days after (a) release following satisfactory completion of required training or (b) from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 6 months, to all reemployment rights and benefits provided by section 9 of this title in the case of persons enlisted under the provisions of this title, except that any person so restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of this title shall not be discharged from such position without cause, within 6 months after such restoration."

Mr. VINSON (during the reading of the section). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section be considered as read and open to amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that section 3 be considered as read and open to amendments?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 11, strike out the words "or in the National Security Training Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 14, strike out the words "or in training in the National Security Training Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "or from training in the National Security Training Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 18, after the word "minimum", insert the word "goal."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 18, strike out "and" and insert the word "but."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, lines 16 and 17, strike out "(other than training in the National Security Training Corps)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 5, line 3, strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any male person 17 years of age or older who has not received notice to report for induction under this act, but who is enrolled in a full-time course of instruction at a high school, college, university, or similar institution, may, by filing a notice with the appropriate local draft board, elect to receive training and service, and serve in a reserve component, under this paragraph in lieu of performing active duty for training and service in a Reserve component under any other provision of this act or any other law. No person less than 18 years of age may make such election unless he has the written consent of his parents or guardian. After such person has made such election, if he continues to attend such an institution, he shall, on or after the 1st day but before the 11th day of June in each of the next succeeding years in which he is physically able to serve on active duty for training, be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 91 consecutive days during each such year for not more than 4 summers. Such person and his dependents shall be entitled, with respect to all such periods of active duty for training, and necessary travel to and from such duty, to all the pay, allowances, and other benefits to which enlisted members of the uniformed services in pay grade E–1 (and their dependents) are entitled with respect to periods of active duty or authorized travel, as the case may be. If, before completing four annual periods of active duty for training under this paragraph, any such person ceases to attend an educational institution under circumstances (other than by transfer or graduation) which indicate that his enrollment in such institution may reasonably be considered to have been voluntarily terminated, or if his en-

rollment is terminated (other than by transfer or graduation), his election to receive training and service under this paragraph shall be deemed irrevocably cancelled, and he shall thereafter be liable for induction for training and service under the remaining provisions of this act; however, full credit shall be given him toward completion of his required period of active duty for training and service, and service in a Reserve component, for all active duty for training performed by him under this paragraph (4). Where such person graduates from an educational institution and enrolls in another educational institution, or where he transfers from one educational institution to another educational institution, he shall not thereby become liable for induction for training and service under any other provision of this act if he otherwise meets all requirements of this paragraph (4). After such person has been ordered to active duty for training under this paragraph (4) during 4 years, he shall be placed in the Standby Reserve for 1 year. After he has been a members of the Standby Reserve for 1 year, such person shall be released from all liability for training and service under this act and any other law. If any such person is not permitted to serve on active duty for training under this paragraph (4) by reason of a disease or disability of a permanent nature which would afford a basis for deferring him from induction for training and service under this act, he shall thereafter be deferred from training and service under this act, unless he volunteers for induction for such training and service. This paragraph (4) shall not be operative in time of war or during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday you heard me discuss the amendment just read. I have been impressed with the fact that no attack has been made on this amendment except a few moments ago when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] paid his respects to the bill by just saying it was horrible to train on the installment plan but that he was a hundred percent for the bill. I have refrained from criticizing the bill. My amendment does not take away one thing from the bill. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] should have at least thought of the fact that the other options contained in the bill are installment training. Why it should be so objectionable to him that we should make an effort to encourage education in this country I am unable to understand. He may have developed a superpoint of view while commanding his troops that he referred to. Well, I have never developed that complex. It is just a little strange though to see such men who not only want more and more privates in the Army but apparently want them uneducated.

Seriously, let me call this to the attention of the membership of the House. The reason we are not suffering a tremendous deficit in the field of education right now is because the Federal Government under the GI bill of rights has been spending over $2 billion a year educating those boys under that bill, paying every bit of the cost involved. So, when we are dealing with a problem such as this I do not think it is bad judgment, bad financing or bad patriotism to have an additional option in the bill providing for at least a way these boys can go through school uninterrupted. Why should we not encourage them? This is another option.

As I said, I have no criticism to offer now to the bill—but in these options that are set out in the bill, some of them are much more practicable than others. They do not discriminate against anyone—my amendment certainly does not discriminate against anyone. Anybody can see that if he wants to. But bear in mind the 6 months' requirement will interrupt any school year that you can figure out. It looks as if any bill receiving the blessings of the Pentagon and the Armed Services Committee must be designed so as to interfere with them in some way. Over the past years many of them have attended under the fingertip control finger of the military according to the rules and regulations laid down by them and it has been a rather unsatisfactory existence to the parents of those boys as well as to the boys themselves. I guess the average 17- or 18-year-old boy is about as frustrated as we were at that age, and as probably some of us are now. How is the father or the mother going to advise or encourage if we let the situation remain as it is now or will be if this bill passes without my amendment? If we go along and make it impossible in some instances and awfully hard in others for these boys to go through the educational institutions, where are we going to get our scientists? Where are we going to get our experts in electronics? Where are we going to get our doctors?

Let us quit relying on so much force and see if we cannot produce enough doctors in this country to take care of the situation. I cannot resist expressing the wish that our fine officers and soldiers of the Pentagon would content themselves with running our Military Establishment and keep their noses out of the legislative branch of this Government. When you have to wrestle with the military, to educate a son and have to go through it about 10 or 11 years if he attempts to study medicine, then you will find out just how troublesome the military can be, if they have the authority and the opportunity. It is an awfully hard job for the average individual, an awfully tough proposition to present to the boys of America and say, "O. K. Go scramble through if you can."

Well, now, I believe there is a better system. Why is not this practical? If they can be freshly trained under one of these provisions calling for 30 days a year, if that is a trained boy, then what is wrong when we say this boy will take 91 days 1 summer, return to school—it is not funny for them to give up their vacation—return to school, train the next 90 days, return to school, and that goes on for 4 years, and he is freshly trained for 4 years; he is available for 4 years. No, they say, nothing will do but 2 years straight, or some of these proposals here which do not provide as good training as the 3-month period. Let me say this: If the Army cannot do a pretty good case of training in 12 weeks each summer, they better get in touch with the Marine Corps. They do a darn good job in 8 weeks. If you do not believe it, go look them over.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Did I understand the gentleman's amendment properly when I received the impression that the obligation of a college student, if he went in under your plan, would be not in the Ready Reserve but in the Standby Reserve and limited to 1 year?

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman mean after he has trained for 3 months each year for 4 years and graduated?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. During the time he is in the Active Reserve, he is taking his 3 months' training every summer, whether he is in high school, prep school, college, or similar institution.

Mr. HALLECK. We have heard a lot of argument—and I believe it is sound—that we are trying to build a Reserve. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, the obligation of the student upon his graduation to serve in the Reserve would be in the Standby Reserve, not the Ready Reserve, and at the end of that 1 year he would be out of the Reserve, so he would not be under any obligation so far as being called in the service is concerned.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not so fussy about the Standby Reserve. All of us are in the Standby Reserve so far as that is concerned. I am trying to provide for a trained and educated soldier which I think is better for the country in war or peace whether it is better for the Pentagon or not.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me just ask this further question.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I have every sympathy for one of these boys going through school, and the gentleman's personal problem that he has just recounted is very parallel to mine.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, you know it was not pleasant, either.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that. On the other hand, I cannot understand why, if you make this provision, you do not say to that young man who elects this program to serve in the Ready Reserve for 5, 6, 7, or 8 years or something that I think would make it comparable to the 2, 3, and 4 years active service or to the 7½ years in the Standby Reserve that will be required under this volunteer program.

Mr. BARDEN. First the gentleman talks like we cannot do anything that is not now written in the bill. But I will say this: The gentleman is a very practical legislator. Let me say to the gentleman, there were many people and there are now many in this House that feel that 8 years is too long, because the 22-year-old boy you are dealing with now will be the 30-year-old man then with

a family, engaged in essential work, in business, and so forth. Eight years from now the whole proposition will have to be gone into. I am not injecting that in my discussion, but I do think this: If the 8 years were cut down, it would meet this situation. If it is not cut down and this bill is passed, it will not only go to the Senate but it will go to the conferees, and personally I have no objection in balancing up the Standby Reserve. I am not fussy about that. I just do not want to drag in an additional conflict that is unnecessary. So that is the practical way it will work out. And the gentleman has proposed so many times to this House that we do things just that way, and they work out all right. So I was not just fussing with the Standby Reserve. I did think that there should be at least 1 year, because that would follow the last 3 months' training that they had. The trouble with the present situation is that anything suggested, that was not suggested first by the Pentagon or the Armed Services Committee, is an attempt to either avoid service or helping our enemies. Let me say here they have no monopoly on patriotism or intelligence, or at least that is my conclusion after over 20 years' service in this House.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman explain, how, under the bill proposed by the committee, a college student could perform 48 drills a year if he is not at home but is off somewhere at college? As a practical matter, is not the college student precluded from making the first election as proposed by the committee?

Mr. BARDEN. It will either preclude or make it very difficult for him. I will say this; the 6 months' period precludes the first year of college.

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. And then after that he has a problem on his hands.

Mr. JONAS. The point that I am making is, after he is back in college, how can he attend 48 drills a year at home?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think he can. But if he did that would only be for about 2 hours for 48 nights. But apparently some are willing to accept 48 2-hour night drills instead of 91 consecutive days and nights in a military camp. If they can just keep the boys out of school.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this. I am not trying to take care of any particular group. I am trying to build a little stronger foundation upon which we must put our national defense if we expect to defend ourselves or survive. We know now that we must have a way by which these men when they finish college can go into the higher educational institutions. Do you realize that it takes 10 years to finish schooling for a doctor? Do you realize that men who are experts in the field of electronics, and other such fields, cannot learn the techniques and get the scientific knowledge that they must have, in a short time, if they are to guide, direct, and channel us through the wicked world we are in? So I say shame on those who cry "discrimination." If and when I get sick, I want one of these 10-year-trained doctors, and when my country gets in trouble I want my country to have the world's best scientist available and plenty of them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman's colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] asked about the young man who was a member of a Naval Reserve unit and was unable to perform 48 drills per year if he went to college. Of course, if he were a member of the ROTC, that would suffice. But if he were not a member of the ROTC, then he could affiliate himself with a Reserve unit in that community.

Mr. BARDEN. Of course that poses the question. If there was a unit there. I would say that the gentleman is a very fine officer, as well as a fine Member of Congress, but I think if I were to say he is a little bit prejudiced in favor of the Reserve, I would be putting it very mildly. I try to look at it squarely in the face. I think it is a fine organization. I am with the gentleman and will work with him and help to promote it and encourage it in every possible way. But in the final analysis, let me say to the gentleman, he will not have a better prepared man by bothering him for drill every week, whether it is the night before examinations or not. Let us say once a week for 48 weeks in the year. I believe that 90 days of training in a camp, in the summertime under officers 24 hours per day, will produce a better prepared man than 48 individual drills for an hour or so at night. That is just my opinion.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Actually, if the young man going to college found that he could not participate in the ROTC or in a Reserve unit or a National Guard unit close to the college, he could meet his Reserve obligation, Ready Reserve obligation, by going to camp 30 days, not 90 days.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman think 30 days in a camp is time enough?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Does it pretty well prepare him?

Mr. DEVEREUX. After 6 months of training.

Mr. BARDEN. Then 90 days ought to be fine.

Mr. DEVEREUX. No, no.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, that is where we part. Again I say all you have to do to start trouble is to say you want to help a boy get an education.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I do not want to speak with an air of dogmatic finality or absolute authority. But I tried for 4 long years to pound a little philosophy, as the professor of one of our colleges in the State of Kansas, into the heads of over 500 students in my department. I think the gentleman addressing the House is absolutely on sound ground when he says that to take a 3 months' period of training between college semesters or from the time college has its commencement in the spring until it convenes in the fall, is far better than taking an hour of weekly drill for 48 weeks out of the year, plus 17 days in a summer camp.

Let me say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, let us not worry too much about the problems of these boys who have had their 6 months' training, and perhaps 2 or 3 years of service in the Guard or in the Reserve. Their problems will be solved if this bill becomes law without the gentleman's amendment by having some hard-boiled top sergeant send them to 2 full years' service in the Army because he does not like the way they part their hair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish to thank the gentleman.

As I said yesterday, I am very much disturbed over the fact that I cannot get any encouragement or any helpful suggestions from a single human being attached to the Pentagon. Everything that is suggested here they will come up with this proposal and that proposal. Have you heard a single man, any single person, say anything for education? And here we are right now stopping the benefits under the GI bill. What is going on around here? If you say 90 days' training to help boys get an education, up go the yells. But if you say 17 days or 30 days and do not mention education all the military and the Pentagon purr like a kitten.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] mentioned money today. He knows that under the GI bill it has been running close to $3 billion a year. All I am asking is not to put that $3 billion on the backs of the taxpayers. Let us let the mothers and fathers take care of that. Let the boy save his money in the summer, and pay his way through school. Then we will not have the $3 billion expense that has been placed on the backs of the taxpayers. It is economical, and somebody should advocate that.

I had a suggestion here by the War Department, written out in a letter from the gentleman from Louisiana and sent to the entire membership of the House, that this program would cost $2 billion, and it deplores that they have but 2 years. My heavens, if this would cost $2 billion, what would the other program cost? Here is the letter from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

MAY 13, 1955.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Recently the Honorable GRAHAM BARDEN wrote you a letter indicating his intention to offer an amendment on the floor to H. R. 5297, the national Reserve plan, when it is considered.

Mr. BARDEN'S amendment would permit high school and college students over age 17 to satisfy their military obligation through 4 consecutive 91-day summer training pe-

riods, followed by 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

I know that all Members will want to study the proposed amendment, and in order to be of assistance, I am pointing out some of the effects its enactment would produce.

1. The amendment would permit exemption from the 2-year draft of such students. When the 4-year cycle is in full operation, this might amount to as many as 1,800,000 militarily eligible men.

2. The amendment would seriously reduce the source of long-term volunteer enlisted men for the active forces.

3. The amendment would deprive the Armed Forces of their primary sources of young officers as well as medical and dental officers.

4. Since all training would be concentrated in the summer, new facilities would have to be opened and the active forces stripped of training instructors to meet this periodic peak demand.

5. At full operation, the annual cost of the training could be almost $2 billion, not including the costs of opening required facilities and of moving the active force instructor personnel.

6. The amendment would discriminate in favor of a special class by requiring only 12 months total active duty compared with 24 consecutive months for draftees; 1 year of Standby Reserve duty compared with a maximum of 6 years Ready Reserve duty for draftees; and no obligation to participate as a reservist compared with possible required Reserve participation for draftees.

In my opinion, the amendment would do great harm to both Active and Reserve forces. The Department of Defense shares this view.

Sincerely,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1,
House Armed Services Committee.

I now propose to answer everyone of his objections briefly.

Objection No. 1 raised by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the Defense Department reads as follows:

The amendment would permit exemption from the 2-year draft of such students. When the 4-year cycle is in full operation, this might amount to as many as 1,800,000 militarily eligible men.

If we assume all of these men will be attending schools, colleges, or universities, and receiving 3 months of active military training each year, if 1,800,000 men every 4 years are being educated and receiving active military training at the same time, the country will have a stronger defense in modern warfare than if these men are not educated. A man with 1 year of military duty and a college education, it seems to me, is of more value to the country, in war or peace, than a man without the college education and 2 years of military training.

Objection No. 2 raised by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the Defense Department reads as follows:

The amendment would seriously reduce the source of long-term volunteer enlisted men for the Active Forces.

This implies that if a boy is educated he will not volunteer as an enlisted man. If so, are we to deny them the chance for an education just to swell our military ranks with boys whom we deliberately keep out of school, in the face of a desperate need for highly educated personnel?

Objection No. 3 raised by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the Defense Department reads as follows:

The amendment would deprive the Armed Forces of their primary sources of young officers as well as medical and dental officers.

It seems to me that just the opposite would occur.

If more are educated in colleges, we have more available men qualified to be officers. This amendment increases the source in numbers and in qualifications. Let the armed services make it more attractive for young men to become officers, or for doctors and dentists to serve, and we will have an infinitely smaller problem in these areas under this amendment than we have today—or would have under the committee bill.

Objection No. 4 raised by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the Defense Department reads as follows:

Since all training would be concentrated in the summer, new facilities would have to be opened and the active forces stripped of training instructors to meet this periodic peak demand.

The program would require just about the same number of facilities and instructor personnel, with or without the amendment. The only problem involved is one of scheduling and assignments. It could, in fact, result in more efficient use of fewer facilities than would otherwise have to be established.

Objection No. 5 raised by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the Defense Department reads as follows:

At full operation, the annual cost of the training could be almost $2 billion, not including the costs of opening required facilities and of moving the active force instructor personnel.

Does this mean they would be trained for nothing under the committee bill? I am sure it does not.

I am also very sure that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] does not mean it would cost an extra $2 billion to train boys under this program than it would under the committee bill.

This amendment would mean a very substantial saving in money—and would give us men better trained and better educated for the defense of our country in the age of science and electronics we are now entering.

Objection No. 6 raised by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the Defense Department reads as follows:

The amendment would discriminate in favor of a special class by requiring only 12 months total active duty compared with 24 consecutive months for draftees; 1 year of Standby Reserve duty compared with a maximum of 6 years Ready Reserve duty for draftees; and no obligation to participate as a reservist compared with possible required Reserve participation for draftees.

The committee contends that this program is not universal military training, yet argues that my amendment would discriminate in favor of a special class. The committee bill provides for special treatment of certain groups, such as persons who prior to the age of 19 enlist in the National Guard or the Reserve, to undergo 6 months of active duty and serve the remainder of an 8-year obligation in Reserve status. The committee bill also provides that upon specific finding by the President, persons with critical skills engaged in critical defense-supporting industries, may fulfill their military obligation by serving 6 months on active duty and the remainder of an 8-year obligation in Reserve status.

Under my amendment, boys would receive a total of 12 months active training between college terms, which is double the active training that some groups would receive under the provisions of the committee bill. And, under my amendment, in the process of receiving the 12 months of active training the boys would be obtaining 4 years of higher education, which in the long run is of more value to the defense of the country than longer periods of active duty, the value of which diminishes with time.

The committee and the Defense Department apparently place all their stress on the mechanical, physical training of soldiers. Do they think this physical prowess will last indefinitely, or would they concede the greater value as years go by of a fully educated citizen who could do a better job in any scientific war we may have to wage for our defense in the future?

The whole program proposed in my amendment is bound to be cheaper. It cannot help but be cheaper, so far as that is concerned. I am not trying to be pennywise and pound foolish. I am as anxious to defend my Nation as any human being on this earth. I am as convinced as I am that I am living that an educated soldier is more benefit to his country in time of war and he is more benefit to his country in time of peace. Do not tell me that if you take these boys and get them imbued with the idea of being educated, instead of throwing every obstacle in front of them, that they will not go along and recognize their responsibility to this country. Sometimes I think we act as though we thought we would be the last generation of loyal Americans to be born.

Then suppose war did break out after they had had 3 years and maybe 9 months of active training, do you not think their mental ability, their brains, would make them more valuable soldiers in defense of this Nation than they would be if they had been out of school? But no; the gentleman from Georgia says that is abominable. He should stop to think—he might not have been an officer as described by him—who knows, he might not even be a Congressman today if somebody had not helped him along and encouraged him to get an education.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman is making a splendid argument for this voluntary Reserve program. Under this program, if we adopt it—and I certainly hope we do—a young man or boy who wants to go to college can start in the summer, when he gets out of high school, and go on and take his 6 months. Now, you do not have to start in the fall.

That used to be the usual thing to start then, but since we have had these wars and the boys going into military service, the boys start in the second semester. So, under this program, we would do exactly the thing for which the gentleman argues. The boy could go to camp for 6 months, meet his obligation in the Reserve, and be through when he finishes that time.

Mr. BARDEN. You know, if I ever see a proposition that my friend from Indiana cannot explain, I am going to run from it. The gentleman can make his proposition plausible any time. I, as a freshman entering college, had enough trouble entering in September. I do not know what would have happened had I waited until January. You know the system you mention was put in operation for the GI's. You are not saying anything against this, but you say we can do that.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman wants me to comment on his amendment, I will do so.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not want a speech from the gentleman, but I am saying you are just adopting the reasoning of the Pentagon to see if we cannot find some other way of doing the job. That is the answer to that.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has characterized me, and I always appreciate it. I am sure he means it. I am as good a friend of his as I know he is of mine.

Mr. BARDEN. You are one of the best guys that ever came out of the State of Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Then let me say to the gentleman, if he wants me to comment on his amendment, in all of these various programs that we have been hearing about, we have sought to bring about an equality of obligation. I do not think, by reason of the shortness of the gentleman's requirements for service in the Reserve, that his program does spell out any equality of obligation.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me tell the gentleman adding 1 more option to the 3 or 4 in the bill is simply broadening opportunity for equality of obligation, not restricting it. Equality of obligation is here, but you are still going to need some scientific gadgets if you ever get into a war—and then you want some educated scientists, doctors, and so forth, who can come up with the answer. And let us not forget that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Barden amendment. I do so with a full knowledge of the details and procedure that we set forth in the bill which has been presented to the Congress. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] just said, we tried to give you a bill which equalized the Reserve responsibility as closely as we could. Under the terms of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] certain things would happen and I want to try to bring you, if I may, along the natural procedure which a young man arriving at the age of 17 would follow under this amendment. Let us take a boy 17 years of age. He is in high school now and is about to graduate. Under the terms of the bill, which has been presented to you, he would be offered an opportunity for 6 months' training plus a Reserve service, and he could make the decision at the time he finished high school or before he went into college. So there would be the least and the smallest disruption in his educational career. Under the Barden amendment, however, here is where that young man would find himself. At a time that he reached the age of 17, he could elect instead of the other options presented by the bill, the option of signing up for training for four periods of training at 91 days each—one each year in midsummer following the end of his school term, I suppose. That would give him the choice at that time: Will I or will I not go under the terms of the Barden amendment?

I think the average young fellow would decide it in this way if he planned to go to college: He would say, "Yes, I like the Barden amendment; I will come in under that; I will train in the summer because I will go to college in the winter and I will train for 4 consecutive summers, then I will go in the Reserve for 1 year and be out of my obligation for military services in the United States Military Establishment after 1 year in the Standby Reserve."

If he is a young man who perhaps is not planning to go to college he is going to resolve it the other way. He is going to say, "I will not accept that because how can I meet the terms and the obligations? I am a poor boy; I am not able to go to college and I cannot arrange every year for 4 consecutive years to go to a 91-day period of training." Therefore, the man who is planning to complete his education by going to college, I think will accept the Barden amendment; but the man who cannot afford to go to college or who is not interested in going to college will refuse to accept it because he cannot meet its terms.

What, then, are you going to have? You are going to have the college men—there are about 220,000 a year entering colleges from high schools. There are 1,250,000 coming out of high schools every year, and out of that 1,250,000 coming out of high school each year, you will have about 220,000 who will say they are going to college and will take training under the Barden amendment to get rid of their military obligation and have none of this training in the Reserves. But the poor boy who does not go to college, either because he lacks ambition or means, will not go under the program because he cannot meet its terms. You then will have class legislation. You will then have in training, under the Barden amendment, men from the colleges and no men who do not go to college.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on that point?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. On that point, yes.

Mr. KEATING. I am of exactly the same opinion as the gentleman, that this amendment would create one situation for those who could afford to go to college and take further education and another situation for those who cannot. There will be those two groups.

In addition to what the gentleman has pointed out, it seems to me this would be an unwise selection for those young people who do want to go to college, but who have to work every summer to pay their way through college in the winter.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another observation on that point?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. For a quick observation.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. One section of this bill provides for ready units as well as Ready Reserves.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is right.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Under the Barden amendment there would be no such thing as a ready unit, because unless men keep training they go into the standbys.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Nobody from college would be in the ready units.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; but I am going to finish my explanation, then I will yield. The gentleman used about 20 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. But I would like the gentleman's explanation to be right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

The Barden amendment is even worse than that. College men completing the course would have no further obligation for military service beyond 1 year, whereas the poor boys without college education who come in under it are in for a much longer period, so you would have one Reserve of rich boys with college education and another of boys who do not go to college.

But worse than that, of the 220,000 who go to college they would have the election of whether or not they would wish to go into the ROTC which most of the large colleges and many of the smaller colleges have. We have something like 260,000 ROTC men in the colleges of the United States. Under the Barden amendment would those men become part of the ROTC? Or would they be separated from the ROTC. Would the Barden amendment cut into the ROTC?

Here is what you would have in reference to the ROTC. You would have these young men in school, under the Barden amendment, who would finish their obligation while in school. Why should he turn around and go into the ROTC? The ROTC is the organization that furnishes a large percentage of the officers, especially junior officers in our Military Establishment. It is the organization that brings the Military Establishment close to the people of the United States because it is our people who are going in from the colleges to serve in the capacity of leadership in the Military Establishment. But a man in ROTC would not want to continue

there because the ROTC requires him to go to classes every week during his whole 4-year college career, then between the junior and senior years he has, I think it is 60 days, to go to summer camp. After he gets out of college and gets his diploma he is required to go into service for 2 years in the Military Establishment, after which he comes back and enters the Reserves. A man who wants to avoid military service will go to college, under the Barden amendment, then he will be through. A man in the ROTC, which is one of our finest programs in the whole establishment, will simply not continue in ROTC, will not continue his study and 4 years in school, go to summer camp between the junior and senior years, 2 years of training after they get out of college, then go into the Reserves after that. He will not do it and you will not have an ROTC program. You better forget about the ROTC because it will be a thing of the past as far as the Reserves are concerned.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not possible that every young man upon reaching the age of 17 years could go into a program, if the Barden amendment is adopted, and it would completely wreck the other Reserve establishments of the country?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, there is another feature to this: Under the Barden amendment, the college boys would have the duty of attending a 91-day camp every summer. Are we going to have the same drill training each summer for each student or are you going to progress them through the freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years? I would assume you would make it progressive. Why would you send the college boy to a training camp to learn the same thing summer after summer? It would be ridiculous. Under the Barden amendment, you would have to have a school for each one of the years—1, 2, 3, and 4—that is, freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would it not be equally ridiculous to require them to drill once a week for 48 weeks—the same drill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because it shows he has thought about it. Under the 6 months' program he will receive his basic training. We will not give him drill; we will give him advance training. That is a part of the program. We want him to have technical training, advance Reserve training, not simply "squads east and west." I went through "squads east and west," like the gentleman probably did. You do not want to duplicate that. But when you send the college boys out you will have to have one school each year. You will have to have a school for the Navy boys; you will have to have a school for the Air Force boys and all the others. So I can see tremendous difficulty in the operation of the Barden amendment.

Furthermore, the instructors under the Barden amendment will have to hold themselves available every summer. You cannot use them the year around, for 9 months of the year they are going to have other duties. Under the Barden amendment, they will work 91 days. Under our program in the bill, the training will be staged regularly throughout the whole year, so you will use them all the year around.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Has the gentleman any information as to the cost of this type of program?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is hard to figure the cost. You would have to call the officer instructors in especially for 91 days during the summer. You will have to call them in not for 1 class but for 4 classes and perhaps for 4 classes for each service. I do not know how he intends to work that under his amendment. I do know that the cost would be terrific.

We asked for a report on that and we were told that the cost might run up to $2 billion. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I can tell you the cost of training them under the Barden amendment is going to be far out of proportion to what the cost is under the bill we submit to you.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Supposing a young man elects to take the Barden amendment. At the end of the second year he has taken two 3-month training periods and then is unable to go to college. What will happen during the next training period?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Under the Barden amendment, he starts all over again. He is not given credit for that.

Mr. BARDEN. Correction, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will let the gentleman correct that in his own time. Now, that is pretty much the idea set forth under the Barden amendment.

Let me say one thing in conclusion. I am just as much concerned as is the gentleman from North Carolina in the progress of education of our people. I have supported every bit of legislation that would help the colleges, and the Congress has done a great deal to help the colleges. I do not know of any finer course than the ROTC to help the colleges and the universities of the United States. And, if you have seen the applications we have had from colleges that now do not have ROTC, that missed the boat when there was an opportunity to get ROTC, you would know that they value ROTC as one of the finest bits of training that they have in their whole curriculum. I do not want to see anything done, and I do not think the Congress wants to see anything done to hurt the ROTC program in the colleges and the universities throughout the United States.

Again I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that under the Barden amendment the college boys are going to avoid their full responsibility; there is going to be no further training, no opportunity to use them in an emergency declared by the Congress or the President of the United States. The men that are going to carry the load and fight the battle are the men that did not have the money to go to college.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 3 and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. POWELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to inject myself at this stage of the discussion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] but I was unable to obtain recognition earlier. I would like to speak for a moment about the parliamentary situation which we face. I hope that all Members of this House will remember that this House constitutes only one-half of the Congress, as it seems to me that that is extremely important in considering this legislation. As you will recall, several months ago we passed a draft act calling for a 4-year extension of the National Selective Service System. Now, this particular piece of legislation has been resting in the other body ever since that time. No action has been taken. Why not? I would like to have someone explain that to me. It seems rather apparent that they are holding that piece of legislation in the other body until such time as this House acts on the Reserve plan, now before us.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can reply to the gentleman by pointing out that the Senate and its Armed Services Committee usually await House action. Many times they take the House hearings in order to hurry the bill to the floor of the Senate for consideration.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I was speaking of the Selective Service Act, not the Reserve Act. The Selective Service Act passed this House months ago. It seems quite apparent that they are holding it over there with the intention of wrapping this pending bill into it, after rewriting the Reserve plan the way the Pentagon wants it and then handing it back to us on a conference report, either to accept the changes that they have made in the Reserve plan or else voting against the whole thing including the extension of the draft. This is a very clever maneuver.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy the gentleman from Indiana is bringing out a most significant and important point and I wish Members on the floor would listen to him long enough to know what he is talking about.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Four years ago we had this same parliamentary maneuver demonstrated to us. At that time the National Reserve training plan was wrapped into the extension of the draft. We discussed it at some length on this floor and amended it somewhat. Then it went to the other body. The House amendments were knocked out and eventually we were presented with a conference report in which we had either to accept proposals that had already been rejected on the floor of the House or else vote against the extension of the Draft Act—which most Members recognized as essential.

We are again going to be presented with that same situation. The Committee on Armed Services, I think, has done a good job of amending the bill which was presented by the Pentagon and removing some of the more objectionable features. But let us not delude ourselves into thinking that the language now before us will become the final form of the bill. On the basis of past experience and on the past record, you may depend upon the other body to come up with something much closer to what the Pentagon originally asked for. Then they will tie it into the extension of the Draft Act. Eventually, if you approve this bill today, you will then have to vote either against the extension of the Draft Act or for measures which you would vote against if presented as a separate issue today.

I say to you that if you want to consider this subject separately from the Draft Act, the only way you can do it is to vote for the motion to recommit and keep this measure off the floor until the other body has acted on the extension of the Draft Act, or else you ultimately will be presented with a single package embodying both propositions.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken any time on this measure up to now. It is not a very pleasant task I find myself faced with, opposing one of my closest friends and a member of my own State delegation on his amendment.

In discussing the matter of defense, I am sure that every Member of this House wants to cast what he feels is a vote for security of our Nation, one that will give this country full security. We have had crocodile tears shed here for the last 24 hours, as usual, on this measure. But I think the one thing that secures the peace of the world today has been much of the legislation that has come out of this great Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

I think the record of our committee will show that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has contributed perhaps as much to the national defense as any member of the committee.

Mr. DURHAM. I think that today, as the President said yesterday, we are closer to peace than we have been at any time recently. It is not due to any Member of this House, it is due to all Members of the House, including DEWEY SHORT, because he has rendered fine service. He has been serving here now for 20 years or more, and his service has been outstanding in trying to develop the weapons that were necessary to carry out the defense of this country, as well as providing the manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the amendment offered by my friend from North Carolina because I do not see that it will add anything to our educational system or permit more boys to graduate from high school. Does this House know that in 1944, in the midst of the war, we graduated more high school students than we did in 1950 or 1951? If someone can answer that, that the services have been detrimental to our securing high school graduates, I would like to have it.

Another thing that disturbs me, I do not believe the gentleman from North Carolina can tell me what number he will have at the end of his 4 years of training. I am not sure if he can find any figures to give me the number, whether it is a million and a half or 2 million, he will have at the end of 4 years.

How many will you have at the end of your 4-year program to put in the 1-year Reserve?

We know exactly how many we will have. We limit it to not more than 250,000.

Is that the way to handle national defense?

If you are building a Reserve you have to know your numbers and how you will finance them. We would not know whether to put up $1 billion or $2 billion.

The gentleman has not answered my question. The gentleman has had plenty of time to speak on his amendment, and I want to speak to the committee on some of these points.

In 1951 we had 562,000 graduate from high school in this country. In 1953 we had 608,500. In 1954 we had 640,200. In 1950 we had 329,800 graduate from college, in 1951 we had 279,000, in 1952 we had 227,000, in 1953 we had 200,800, and in 1954 we had 187,500.

Now, I wish any educator in this country could tell me why you had more high school graduates in 1954, 640,200, and you had only 187,500 college graduates, whereas in 1950 you had 507,000 high school graduates and came out with 329,800 college graduates.

Someone will say that was due primarily to the GI bill, to which probably a part of it was. Now we are faced with a situation with the enrollment in college and the institutions of higher education in 1954 of 1,602,000.

The main argument the gentleman from North Carolina is making is that this is going to provide higher education, that is, by taking these boys and putting them in a 91-day training period for 4 years you are going to get more physicists and more chemists at the end of approximately 6, 7, or 8 years than you would get by the other method. Personally, I have not been satisfied with the other method. I do not think we went far enough in trying to solve this problem because our problem in the matter of shortage of scientists is not at the bottom of this barrel, but at the top. Some day this House is going to be realistic and adopt a real manpower program. Until we do that, we are endangering the science and the scientific progress of this country. It is just as plain as that. There is no way in the world to solve it. Today we are deferring boys in college for 4 years. We deferred a large number of the 1,421,000 this year. Think of that. Most of them are deferred for 4 years. They come out of college and then we draft them and put them in the Army for 2 years. How in the world are you going to get a master's degree or doctor's degree with any such program as that? But that is what is happening. We have to approach this thing realistically by going down to the bottom of this barrel and trying to solve it by some formula that will make sense. As I said, I do not fully agree with what we have in the bill, but I think it is better than nothing. At least it is something that we can try. The primary thing which this measure does is to try the best way we know to solve this problem because if you do not build up a Reserve, you will never get out from under this draft as long as this country exists. Because there will always be some sort of emergency. But if you can build up a Reserve which can be done as this chart shows you, as anybody can understand, then if we do get into an emergency, and we have to call them out, they will be capable of defending our country.

Mr. Chairman, I could say much more than I have. I have many more objections to this amendment because I do not think it anywhere near solves the problem in the field of education. I could give you many other reasons why it is objectionable. It is objectionable, too, from the standpoint of trying to write legislation as complicated as this on the floor of the House. This committee has spent months on this measure. It is not perfect by any means and it will not be perfect, but you simply cannot write a manpower formula on the floor of the House. That is something that must be done in committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that a young man who did not have the means of going to college would have to shoulder the burden of not only active duty but ready service in the Reserves?

Mr. DURHAM. Here is the situation we are in today. Either we must adopt a measure like this or if, as has been stated on the floor many times, we happen to get into an emergency which can happen and, of course, we hope that it will not—but, if we do get into an emergency, we are going to have to go back and call up these Reserves who have already seen service. There is no other way to do it under the present system. We either adopt this system or we continue with our old system which will compel the veterans with service to go into service in case of an emergency.

The Barden amendment provides that any person, upon reaching the age of 17—with his parents' consent—or upon reaching the age of 18, by his own consent, if he is enrolled in a high school, college, or university, may file a notice with his draft board whereby he may elect to receive active duty for training for 91 days each summer for four summers. If he makes this election he will not be subject to the draft.

Under the amendment, after making such election, between the 1st and 11th day of June he would be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 91 days. While in this training status he would be in pay grade E–1.

If, before completing his four annual periods of active duty for training, he ceases to attend his educational institution, his election to receive the active duty for training would be canceled and he would then be liable for the draft.

After receiving the summer training for 4 years he would be placed in the Standby Reserve for 1 year and, at the conclusion of that year, he would be released from all liability for training and service.

The amendment would not be operative in time of war or any period of national emergency proclaimed by the Congress.

In my opinion, this is an impossible amendment which could not be accepted by the committee.

The amendment is extremely discriminatory and inequitable inasmuch as this election is only given to persons who are able to attend high school and college. It certainly, in that sense, would be considered to be a "rich man's" amendment. Any person not able to attend college would have to volunteer to serve in the Armed Forces under one of the enlistment programs or would be drafted.

It should be noted that a person making this election spends no time in the Ready Reserve whatsoever because, under the terms of the amendment he goes directly into the Standby Reserve and then only spends 1 year in the Standby Reserve, after which he is released from his military obligation.

It is further discriminatory because, in effect, it lowers this person's military obligation to 5 years, with no time spent in the Ready Reserve whereas draftees and all voluntary enlistees are required to assume an 8-year obligation with time spent in the Ready Reserve where they are required to participate in training. Thus, it places a premium on the man who elects to take summer training only.

In my opinion, there is no doubt that this amendment, if adopted, would ruin the long-term volunteer-enlistment program because, unless a person was enlisting in order to make the service a career, he would be foolish to spend 3 or 4 years on active duty plus a period of required service in the Ready Reserve, and also assume a total 8-year obligation when he could spend four summers on active duty for training to be followed by no Ready Reserve and only 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

Of course, it would go without saying that such an amendment would if adopted completely kill the ROTC program because, again, it is difficult to imagine a young man spending 4 years in college ROTC, plus 2 years on active duty, plus 6 years in the Reserve components, when he could satisfy his entire military obligation by going to summer camps for 4 years and thereafter spending 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

Such an amendment would have the effect of lowering the input of junior officers into the active service to the point where the only junior officers entering on active duty would be graduates of the service Academies.

It should be noted that, under the amendment, all persons would be trained at one time; that is, they would be called to active duty for training between the 1st and 11th day of June of each year. This would certainly overload training facilities and the result would most likely be that new camps and training stations would have to be opened for the summer to accommodate the trainees and then closed again for the balance of the year.

Furthermore, trainers would have to be diverted from the operating forces only in the summer and then have to be assigned to other duties for the other 9 months of the year.

Under the terms of the amendment, a person is placed in pay grade E–1. There are no provisions that he can be promoted and, consequently, he would stay in that pay grade for the 5 years he would spend in performing active duty for training and serving in the Standby Reserve.

It would seem that attempting to administer the amendment, if enacted, would be extremely difficult because persons would be coming to the same camps with no prior service, some with 1, 2, or 3 previous encampments, and training programs would have to be devised and carried on at the same camps to get different types of training to each such group.

At this time I have not been able to secure information from the departments as to the additional cost which would be entailed in attempting to work out this type of program, but this is being worked on and I expect to have it soon.

In my opinion, the Barden amendment has four major objections.

First, it envisions a program of indeterminate size—there is no limitation contained in the amendment—which would function only in the summer months. This would require facilities and personnel for at least 4 months out of each year—even though the training is for 91 days there would be additional time required for readying the camps and training the personnel who would be used as trainers. This would require a large dislocation of regular forces for this period of time, interrupting other training programs and possibly having a very adverse effect upon combat units. The number of personnel required to conduct such a program might well preclude the assignment of personnel overseas which would tend to greatly retard the rotation program.

The 6 months' training program contemplated by the national Reserve plan envisions a continuing flow of personnel integrated into regular training establishments and units. There is a maximum of 250,000 trainees permitted annually under the national Reserve plan, but no limitation in the Barden amendment.

The second objection is that the amendment, if adopted, could only add confusion to the whole problem. Young men would then have to decide upon (a) the 6 months' program, (b) the Barden program, (c) induction, (d) volunteering, (e) doing nothing. If all young men under the draft age should adopt the Barden program, then we would have all trainees, some trainers, and relatively no standing force since we have learned from experience that we cannot maintain a volunteer force of more than 1,500,000 men.

The third objection is that the 91 days of training is separated from the next period of training by 9 months. It appears to me that Mr. BARDEN's program is based on the theory that 4 periods of 91 days each is equivalent to 6 months of continuous training. The theory of a minimum basic training period of 6 months is based upon intensive training and indoctrination over a continuous 6 months' period. Anything of a continuous nature for a lesser period will not provide the training necessary to equip men for service in the Reserve and eventually combat assignment, should the occasion arise.

The fourth and major objection to the Barden program is that it overlooks entirely the whole purpose of the national Reserve plan—namely, the establishment of a Ready Reserve ready to fight if called upon. Under Mr. BARDEN's amendment young men who have completed their training would be under no obligation in the Ready Reserve. The purpose of the 6 months' program is to provide a Ready Reserve of individuals who know their responsibility and their obligation.

Under the Barden amendment, in the event of emergency, individuals who would be available for service would be in 1 of 4 categories:

First. Those about to enter their fourth year of summer training.

Second. Those about to enter their third year of summer training.

Third. Those about to enter their second year of summer training.

Fourth. Those about to enter their first year of summer training.

It is possible that there would be practically no Ready Reserve in being.

The situation would be dependent upon when the emergency arose insofar as the time of year is concerned.

Years	Male high-school graduates	Male college graduates
1950	570,700	329,800
1951	562,500	279,000
1952	569,200	227,000
1953	608,500	200,800
1954	640,200	187,500

In 1944 the number of high school graduates—male—was 576,700.

The number of college graduates includes graduates receiving initial degrees only.

The numbers of college graduates in the earlier years listed above are higher

than those coming later because the earlier period included World War II veterans.

The number of men enrolled in colleges and other higher educational institutions in the fall of 1954 is 1,602,000, of whom 1,421,000 were undergraduates according to estimates of the Office of Education.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of trying to see if we cannot reach some agreement to limit debate on section 3. We have been discussing the Barden amendment for almost an hour and a quarter. Of course, it is not our desire to cut anyone off, but at the same time we must make progress. From the number of gentlemen I see on their feet who want to talk on the Barden amendment, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia inform us whether his objective is to try to act on the amendment and conclude consideration of the bill today?

Mr. VINSON. I am hopeful that when we get through the Barden amendment we will then take up the amendment which the gentleman from California suggested he proposed to offer. There are some amendments at the desk. I hope we may have a rollcall vote on the bill at least by 6 o'clock.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That may be possible but——

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has listed the names of those seeking recognition on the amendment. Without objection each gentleman will be recognized for 3 minutes.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object; and I will object to any relinquishing of time by anyone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be called later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, this proposal before us has been designated as the same lady we have been asked to embrace several times in the last 15 years, only the lady wears a different kimono today.

I do not care for that parallel or simile. I say that this is the same disreputable, obnoxious wench we have been asked to embrace many times in the last 12 years, only that wench has been clothed with silk habiliments, and if she were examined closely you would find that she probably was wearing falsies to make her more glamorous and give her more sex appeal. As for me, I am against embracing that kind of a wench.

Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago, to be exact in June 1945, I proposed in this House something similar to the Barden amendment. This is the language I used at that time:

> If the bill provided that a major portion of the training might be given as a part of our high-school and college courses, we would be inclined to support the measure. We believe that much of our military-training program could be and should be given under the supervision of the high schools and colleges with Regular Army instructors assigned for the work.
>
> Like the ROTC.
>
> If this were done, every high-school boy that did not go on to college could finish his full year of training by attending an Army camp for 1 or 2 summer sessions—
>
> Like proposed here—
>
> making it unnecessary for him to lose a full year of school to complete the required military-training program. The boy that goes on to college should have no difficulty in completing the full year's requirement of military training during his college course.

That was a proposal I made 10 years ago. The Barden proposal comes somewhat near that proposal and I think it should be worked out.

I hope that this House will adopt the Barden proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, to what extent the members of the Armed Services Manpower Subcommittee have considered the personal situations of these boys who will be affected by the pending legislation, I do not know. I do know though, that every time I talk with some member of the Armed Services Committee to suggest that they write in some kind of provision which would prevent service in the Armed Forces from completely interrupting these young men's lives, and ask him why that is not done, I am told that the military will not go along.

I have heard the chairman of the subcommittee ask members speaking in opposition to the bill if they could suggest any alternative to it. As to alternatives, I hold in my hand House Resolution 591, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] which has been before this subcommittee since January 5, 1955. The Teague bill is at least one reasonable alternative.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I know what the gentleman is driving at and I talked to him about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct. He did speak to me about it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. My recollection is the gentleman said he would not make a point of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not making a point of it, and if the gentleman will let me finish what I want to say, he will see I am not making a point of it. I think it fair, though, to show that this bill has been before the subcommittee since January, which would indicate that the subcommittee had not looked very searchingly for alternatives.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is the point I was getting at. The subcommittee did consider it, and the subcommittee invited the distinguished gentleman from Texas, author of the bill—in fact, I personally invited him—to appear before the committee in support of that bill. He indicated he wanted the committee to consider it. The committee considered the very point in that measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not know what transpired between the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Texas, but the record shows that the bill was introduced in January and referred to the gentleman's subcommittee. About 2 weeks ago I found out about it and asked a member of the gentleman's subcommittee—in fact, I asked two members of his subcommittee—if that bill had been considered. They did not even know it had been introduced.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. I am aware that the amendment may have technical imperfections, but at least it offers an opportunity for our young men to discharge their service obligation without having to interrupt their schooling.

From my limited experience in the service, both in training and as an officer, I found this to be true: It matters little how much time is put in training, but rather how that time is used. As has been pointed out in previous debate, thousands of American boys were sent overseas in the last war with but a few months' training, and in most cases acquitted themselves like veteran soldiers. While I would never want to see untrained soldiers sent into combat, of course, the fact is that a soldier's fitness cannot be measured solely in terms of time spent in training. If they can receive the necessary training by going to camp during summer school recess, what possible objection could be raised?

We need reserves, and we must have a workable program in order to get and keep them. The Barden amendment approach is at least a step in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago my very distinguished and good friend from Missouri, whom I greatly admire, a great American, who has contributed much to our defense program, made some reference to the Army sergeants. At times I think the Members become a bit excited by the exuberance of their own verbosity.

Now let me say a word in the short time allotted on behalf of the Army sergeants. The sergeant works hard for his rank. He puts in long hours. He is charged with many responsibilities. He takes his work seriously. He is highly regarded. He is the man who trains the troops and he is the man who leads the troops, and he is the man who builds up

and holds up their morale under combat conditions. He is the man who builds up the esprit de corps. He is always on the alert. So let me say to the Members, he is a highly respected member of the military group, as he is the man charged with getting things done and objectives reached, so I feel that some word should be said on behalf of him. I just want to say that I am mighty proud to have held the rank of sergeant. I never had any further military ambitions after I reached the rank of sergeant. I am mighty proud of the sergeants. They turn in an outstanding performance of which they can be proud. They really need no defense from me; they can take care of themselves.

Now, coming back to the Barden amendment, if you said to a boy, "Now, son, do you want to take 6 months in the service and get this training program over with, or do you want to take 3 months each year for 4 years and stretch it out," the average boy would take the 6 months and that would be the end of it, and he would be glad to have the opportunity. That is the opportunity we are giving him under this bill. Now, adding any amendment such as Barden amendment is just going to confuse the issue, and we will not get the kind of legislation we need to develop this Reserve program, and we certainly need it. So I say to you that, if I had a boy who was coming along, I would say, "Take the 6 months, son, and have your training program over with. The other way it is 3 months a year for 4 years." If we have to take a boy every year and bring him back home each year, you would not know what stage of training he would get to in the first year; what he would get in the second, third, or fourth year. The cost of this kind of program would be prohibitive. I recently visited Fort Bragg where I saw them train the Infantry. They were doing a magnificent training job with the 82d Airborne. They train them well in 6 months and they are real troopers. I am proud of them and of the fine training program at Fort Bragg.

So, Mr. Chairman, as we have spent hours and days and weeks considering and debating this legislation, I think it is sound. It is a basis on which we can build a Reserve program. Let us turn down this amendment and get on with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, there are two things in which I have always had a deep and abiding interest, and I am sure in those I am no different than any other Member of this body. One is the education of the youth and the adults of our Nation. The other is the defense of our country. Here we have a plan presented by the proponents of this bill which they tell you, and which says on its face, is a voluntary plan. It is not a piece of compulsion. The boy will volunteer for any part in which he participates.

The Barden amendment does exactly the same thing. It offers him another alternative from which to choose. Now let us think just a moment about the distinction that some are trying to draw between the boy who is not able to go to college—and I was one of those a few years ago—and the boy who is able to go to college. That one who does not go to college has the opportunity, if he wants to, to volunteer and participate in this Reserve plan. If he does not want to, he stays at home until his draft board calls him, or until he volunteers for service. The same thing is true with the boy going to college. But, if he wants to, he can choose the plan offered under the Barden amendment.

I submit that there are probably weaknesses in this amendment as there are weaknesses throughout the legislation we have been discussing in these last 2 days. But they are weaknesses that can be ironed out once we have adopted a basic plan.

We are interested in two main objectives: First, the defense of our country, and second, educating the boys and the girls of this country. If we are not interested in education, then we may as well recognize the fact that we are weakening the defense of this country, because an uneducated soldier or an uneducated leader is not going to be the kind of soldier or the kind of a leader to save this country from destruction in this atomic age.

Give us a program that will permit impressionable youth an opportunity to stay close to their instructors, close to their fathers and mothers, and then mingle a little with the professional military, too; get a little of all of it, and then out of the program we will have as an end result a well-rounded man who will make a strong soldier and a strong leader. Let us have a strong, balanced defense.

As I say, there are weaknesses in the Barden amendment, but they can be ironed out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will be necessary for me to take 3 minutes, but I would like to assure the committee, if the Members will read the bill and study it, they will see that we have recognized the need for educating the people. We have made ample provision to allow people to continue with their education. We want that class of people in our country.

I suggest that the Barden amendment as it has been presented is the worst type of class legislation that we have had on the floor of the House in many, many days. It will not produce the leaders that we need for our services.

I personally shall, and I hope the other Members will, vote against the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the danger of this amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina—and I highly respect his motives—is that it would have the effect of annihilating the unit readiness program, which, as I see it, is one of the most important parts of this bill and about which I have spoken before. There are several different alternatives in the bill as presented by the committee, and it has sought to present a balanced program, where there was a reasonable selectivity, but where there was not one road which, if selected, would allow a young man to get out of a large part of his service obligation.

Under this amendment, if a boy served in college for 4 years and then in the Standby Reserve for only 1 year, he could wipe out his entire obligation in the matter of 5 years without ever having been in a ready unit, which would undermine the whole program and negative much of the gains that might be had in the other phases of the bill.

That is why I think that when my colleague from Maryland referred to the amendment as vicious, I am sure he never had any thought but that the gentleman from North Carolina is a very gracious gentleman, but I do think the provision would torpedo one of the fundamental purposes of this act. Therefore, it should be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that it would completely destroy our ROTC program?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It would seem to me it would. I am afraid that would be the effect. And it would tend to produce inequalities not only of class but it would greatly reduce those available in the younger rolls for these ready units.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What about the young man who does not go to college, what is the burden going to be on his shoulders?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. He would be more disrupted than if he took 6 months at the outset.

One thing I think many do not pause to consider in evaluating the 6-month program is that a great deal of time is necessary to get a young man in physical condition. Years of experience has taught our Armed Forces that it takes about 20 to 24 weeks before a man is trained to the point where he is really ready for unit training where he can go into a larger organization and be of benefit to his country.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I have noticed in the briefings we have had in the last 3 weeks that the Armed Forces provide for only 3 weeks of basic training and 8 weeks of advanced training before they make a paratrooper out of a man.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It takes a good many weeks to make a paratrooper. You will find that the Armed Forces conduct a constant educational program almost from the time the recruit enters the service until he is discharged or retired after many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia Mr. [BAILEY].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this moment to correct something the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] said. He made the flat statement that a boy serving the 3-month period between school terms would not get credit on his service if he stopped and was drafted. That is absolutely incorrect. I called it to his attention. I now read from the amendment, and this is after the boy has quit school and before he has completed his training:

However, full credit shall be given him toward completion of his required period of active duty for training.

This, of course, applies if and when he is drafted later. I just wanted to correct that much.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, as the father of a family in which 4 of the 5 male members are now in the active service of our country, I think I can express somewhat the feelings of the fathers and mothers of this Nation on this legislation that is pending before us.

I have always had a feeling, whenever I have attempted to get their reaction to it, that they would like to see as much of this military training as possible be done in connection with the educational training. Then, too, let me say to you that as a former school administrator and as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am interested in seeing to it that no roadblock is thrown in the way of the young men of this country who want to get an education. It is absolutely necessary in this atomic age that we be highly educated. I remember, and for the benefit of some of our colleagues who were not Members of the House 4 years ago, I was present when we debated the UMT bill. I recall that the Brownson amendment was designed to provide that some of this training would be taken in the high schools and colleges of the country. The Brownson amendment was defeated. And what happened to your bill? It was recommitted. Let us keep that in mind. From the beginning, this piece of legislation has borne a Pentagon label. For heaven's sake, that term to the average American family means military dictatorship. Let us put a congressional label on it one time. Let us assert the independence of the Congress and write in some kind of assurance to the fathers and mothers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am for the bill and opposed to the Barden amendment. In these 3 minutes I will try to tell you why. I feel that the committee has compromised this bill to start with. I think it has taken out of the bill some of the compulsion that I would like to see in it, and it has left practically no compulsion in the bill. As one who has participated in the training program of the ROTC, in the National Guard, and in the Reserve program, I think I know something about the training that the young men receive in each of those programs. I believe that the Barden amendment, if adopted, would be a gross discrimination against the boy who is not fortunate enough to attend college. If we leave the bill as it is, the objection of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], will be met in that the boy can go to college and be deferred for all of that time and still continue to get the military training, which I believe is necessary for this Nation. I believe in an active, ready military Reserve. I think we must maintain that because that is the only way we can cut down on the huge cost of defense which now amounts to the major portion of our budget. I know that in the past, the Pentagon has not acted as favorably as they could with our National Guard and with our Reserve forces. I am still hopeful that if we pass this bill, we can have greater cooperation. At this point, I would like to impress the fact upon the Members, particularly as the Barden amendment refers to it, that as far as the Standby Reserve is concerned, it does not mean one earthly thing. Every able-bodied man is in the Standby Reserve as long as he is able to walk. So the Standby Reserve does not mean anything. And after you let the boy go through college, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] proposes, then we try to say we put him in the Standby Reserve. It does not mean one iota. With respect to what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] said a minute ago, talking about the poor boy volunteering, he goes on and volunteers—that is true. But his obligation continues and continues to last through this 8-year period whereas the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] takes a boy who can go to college and take that training and then his obligation is over at the end of his college career and we have actually lost the service of the man who is most capable and should be the best trained. Most of our colleges through the ROTC programs do put out good officer material, and I want those boys who have been deferred while receiving their college education kept in the military Ready Reserve, as most of them are anxious to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] to close debate.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Barden amendment primarily because it is definitely class legislation. The young man who cannot go to college would then be shouldered with the burden of either enlisting in the Regular service or joining a Reserve unit and attending drills as a member of the Ready Reserve.

Under the provisions of H. R. 5297 it will cost the taxpayers of this country about $2,620 to train a volunteer for 6 months. After he has been trained it will then cost the taxpayers about $1,000 a year to continue his training in a manner that would continue his efficiency should he be called up for active duty in the event of an emergency.

The Barden amendment is in addition to the 6-month-training program provided for by H. R. 5297. Therefore, there will be an additional expense, estimated to run somewhere between $1,200,000,000 and $2 billion a year.

Therefore, if you want to add to the cost of our military and especially the Reserve program, vote for the Barden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 77, noes 113.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BARDEN and Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 145.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was vitally interested in the Barden amendment to H. R. 5297. Had it passed, I would have filed an amendment so that the provisions of the bill would not only apply to college students, but to any boy who might wish to take advantage of it. Since Mr. Barden's amendment did not pass, it seemed useless to press for my amendment to H. R. 5297.

Therefore, under leave to extend and revise my remarks at this point I include the aforesaid amendment:

Strike out the quotation mark at the end of the last line, and insert the following:

"(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any male person 17 years of age or older who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may, by filing a notice with the appropriate local draft board, elect to receive training and service, and serve in a reserve component, under this paragraph in lieu of performing active duty for training and service in a reserve component under any other provision of this act or any other law. No person less than 18 years of age may make such election unless he has the written consent of his parents or guardian. After such person has made such election he shall, in each of the next succeeding years in which he is physically able to serve on active duty for training, be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 91 consecutive days during each such year, but not for more than four such periods. No person shall be ordered to active duty for training under the preceding sentence on a day which would cause such 91-day period of active duty for training to begin during the period beginning June 1 and ending September 30, both dates inclusive, in any year, or to cause such 91-day period to extend into the month of June in any year. Such person and his dependents shall be entitled, with respect to all such periods of active duty for training, and necessary travel to and from such duty, to all the pay, allowances, and other benefits to which enlisted members of the uniformed services in pay grade E-1 (and their dependents) are entitled with respect to periods of active duty or authorized travel, as the case may be. After such person has been ordered to active duty for training under this paragraph (5) during four years, he shall be placed in the Standby Reserve for one year. After he has been a member of the Standby Reserve for one year, such person shall be released from all liability for training and service under this act and any other law. If any such person is not permitted to serve on active duty for training under this paragraph (5) by reason of a disease or disability of a permanent nature which would afford a basis for deferring him from induction for training and service under this act, he shall

thereafter be deferred from training and service under this act, unless he volunteers for induction for such training and service. This paragraph (5) shall not be operative in time of war or during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the Congress."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Beginning after the period on page 3, line 24, delete through the period on page 4, line 5.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, that simply transposes the language which was adopted by the committee. It puts it in a different place. It slightly alters the language, but the effect is the same; that is, to grant deferment to ministers of the Gospel, priests, and ministerial students.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the hour is late, and I am as anxious as anyone to conclude the consideration of this bill. Except for asking a few questions, I have not burdened the membership, and I shall not burden you at any great length now.

First of all, let me say with respect to this program when it was first presented as a bipartisan measure at the White House I got the very definite impression that it was all a part of an integrated, carefully worked out manpower program to build a better defense for our country. Now, as far as this voluntary Reserve program is concerned, it is an arrangement by which a limited number of young men, if they want to, can undertake to meet their obligations to their country by signing up for a 6-month training period followed by service in the Reserve for 7½ years. As I say, it is simply an integrated part of the program. There is nothing compulsory about it. It is not UMT by any stretch of the imagination. It sets no pattern and its sets no precedent. It undertakes to create a functioning, effective Reserve that will provide the necessary manpower requirements in the event another great war comes.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I shall not take the responsibility of destroying at the outset a plan to build that kind of Reserve and have another situation where, as in World War II and in the Korean war, we had to call back the boys who had already served their time. I address my remarks particularly to my colleagues on my side of the aisle. I realize that when you get ready to provide for national defense in a troubled time like this there is nothing pleasant about it. We are not a militaristic Nation. We do not like to draft men into the service. We do not like the necessity of an organized Reserve. But unless you are ready to write off the Communist threat—and I am not going to—then the only thing for us to do is to build our own national defense.

Now, how do we go about doing it? The men in the Armed Forces, in the Regular service, are but the cutting edge of the great machine that is America.

We must build for the long pull. No one knows whether war is going to come. I hope it does not, and I do not believe it is going to. But we cannot overlook the possibilities. That means that the cost must be kept down to the point where we can maintain a strong functioning economy at home.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] pointed out great savings that are involved in this program. That should certainly commend it to our attention. We train a soldier; yes, we teach him to use an implement of war, we condition him physically, we condition him psychologically. That is what it takes to make a soldier. That is what distinguishes him from a civilian. But in this program I think we will more nearly reach the balance that we must maintain between the civilian and the soldier to have a man there ready for duty at any time.

As has been said so many times, we want to build a Reserve that will provide men other than those who have already served their time. And secondly, in the event of a disastrous attack on the cities of this great land of ours, there is the absolute necessity of having organized, trained people, ready to restore order, ready to restore production, ready to help rebuild the cities. We all recognize that possibility. That is involved in this program.

So, in the final analysis, it sets no precedent; It is not a compulsory program; it is not a universal program; it is a voluntary Reserve program integrated with the idea of equality of obligation. And it runs concurrently with the Selective Service which we have already voted, for 4 years. This runs with it, because now we are drafting but approximately 10,000 men a month. It leaves a great pool outside of those who are being drafted.

The President, I can say to you, is sincerely and definitely interestsd in the passage of this proposed legislation. Compromises galore have already been made. I sincerely hope that we will go on to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, if I have the time.

Mr. LANHAM. Several times the statement has been made that if we adopt this bill we will not have to recall those who have served previously. Are they not still subject to recall?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say to the gentleman, of course the minute this is passed you would still need to call the other men. But as this program progresses and goes into effect, goes into operation, we can look to the day, which we hope will be in the not too far distant future, when these boys would be the real Reserve. And to prove my point, already in the other body it is being suggested that the cuts that we made, which would save hundreds of millions of dollars, in the Armed Forces of the country, will be restored in that body if this program is not adopted. A drive will even be made, as I understand, because they are afraid the program will not get into operation soon enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not unfriendly to the bill and I am going to support it. But should it not be written into this bill here or in the Senate that the boys in this program should be called before the boys who have already served 5 years are recalled?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me respond to that, because I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I raised that very question at the White House when this program was first outlined. The chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee undoubtedly will recall it. I think that they should by all means be called first. But, as we pointed out in the debate that we have already had on this bill—and I might say that I raised the question here on the floor—it would be difficult to write precise language, because you might have certain categories or certain types of skills needed which would make it necessary to call someone who was in the Reserve who had already served his time. But certainly it should be abundantly clear from the record—and I said this in the debate—that it is our intention that the men who come into this 6-month program to be a part of the Reserve should be the first ones called in the event of an emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had the proposition of strengthening the Reserves before us on many occasions. We have had it in several different programs. Most of them have been opposed on the ground that they went too far. Now we find ourselves opposed because they do not go far enough.

I am anxious to see how those persons will vote who with such great enthusiasm this last week voted to endorse the cut in the standing forces recommended by the President, and made the very strong argument that he was the best informed of all our people on military matters.

This is another portion of the program which he has recommended. This is a portion to strengthen the Reserve and to have a Ready Reserve available.

I agree that those men who have heretofore served in time of combat should be relieved of the danger of a future call or another call. Unless you pass this bill you have no law which will accomplish that, because under this bill those who served prior to the termination of hostilities in Korea in 1953 are to be screened into the Standby Reserve out of the active Reserve or Ready Reserve. Therefore, unless we have this bill, you

are going to have those who have heretofore served in combat still subject to call.

The only fear I have as to this bill is that it might lead us to believe that we have more than we have. At the present time it is not necessary that you be called for 2 years. That is the maximum. At the present time it is possible to call every man registered for a period of 6 months, then place him in the Reserve. This bill places legislative approval on such a program and limits the number who can be called, so that rather than being a granting of power this bill is essentially a curbing of the power already in existence in the executive department and in the armed services. This reduces that power.

It does very frankly do two things affirmatively. It grants two powers that do not now exist. One is the power to assign the person who has completed his active duty for training to a Reserve component. That is one.

Second, it requires him to attend drills of the component to which assigned. These men who are to be assigned under the law which exists today have a Reserve obligation. They are subject to being called. Is it not only just and proper that if we are going to call men to active duty in time of combat we do something to give them an opportunity to be trained?

Yes, they have the right to go into a Reserve component or National Guard unit now, but it is something like going to the dentist or having a checkup: You are not going to do it unless there is somebody giving you a little push to make you go. So that under this you have the opportunity and the compulsion necessary for that training.

I would feel a great deal better today about those men who were recalled during the time of Korea from the Inactive Reserve and sent into combat if I could feel now that those who were grievously hurt or killed if I could know it happened to them not solely because they were not trained. I think we assume a great responsibility when we permit the obligation for call to remain on these men and do nothing to see to it that they are trained. I think we owe them the obligation to provide the machinery by which they will receive some training, and that when we impose the obligation on them to go into the active forces and go into combat we see to it that they have had a minimum of training.

I sincerely hope this bill will be adopted. I have been concerned in the past and I am still concerned that whenever we begin consideration of Reserve legislation we spend more time, more talk about the 10 percent of our boys who go to college, who are financially able to go to college, the ones who have had the better break all along, than we do on the 90 percent who never have that opportunity, who never get to go to college. We have constantly spent more time on the 10 percent than we have on the 90 percent. Fortunately, that amendment has been eliminated from the bill. But to those who supported that amendment, and I respect your position, I say, let us remember that we are talking there about the 10 percent. Let us legislate realistically for the 90 percent, the ones who did not get the better break in life, the 90 percent upon whom the heavy obligation falls in time of war.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments at the Clerk's desk, which I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "of", strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 5, line 20, strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 5, line 23, after the word "of", strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 6, line 1, after the word "of", strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 6, line 11, strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 7, line 11, after the word "of", strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 7, line 15, after the word "of", strike out the word "eight" and insert the word "four."

Page 10, line 2, after the word "of", strike out the word "seven" and insert the word "three."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from California have any objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc, because the effect of them is to reduce the service from 8 years to 4 years? Is that not what the amendments do?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendments and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me every speech, which has been made before this House in the last 2 days, has emphasized two things—one the imperfections which exist in this bill, and the volume of the RECORD admits on the part of many members of the committee itself that there are flaws in this bill and the second thing that has been brought out here is that we should all be patriotic enough to realize we need a strong Reserve. I would like to say on behalf of many of my colleagues that we do not yield in our patriotism to anybody. We believe, however, that when you lay down a bill which tries to look into the future for 8 years and when you give the military the control that this bill puts into their hands for 8 years, I think you should think very carefully about it. It seems to me we can turn now immediately and make it concurrent with the life of this bill which is 4 years. Then the inequities which will be created because of the operation of the present law with respect to those who have already been inducted by the Selective Service should be corrected, and the Committee on Armed Services should bring out legislation to conform so that there are no inequities between the various services demanded of young people of our country. But if we have this for 4 years, we can know whether or not the Army is doing a job of training. We can then know whether it is performing the job of creating a Ready Reserve. Let me emphasize at this time about a unit ready to move, and those of you have had experience, I think, know that the opportunity of any unit to stay as a unit in any conflict of the past or of the foreseeable future just does not exist. People will be moved from one unit to another. Therefore, the main thing and the important thing here is the training. I submit to you that after you have had 6 months' training and then you go into a program that requires you to go once a week and for 17 days each year for 7½ years, you are not going to be ready. If I am wrong, I would be glad to be shown that I am wrong 4 years from now. But I would like, if I am lucky enough to get reelected to come back here and have an opportunity at the end of 4 years to pass on this again with the assurance that it would not be possible for the Pentagon to again put the pressure on the Committee on Armed Services to keep the bodies that this legislation gives them for a full 8-year period. Therefore I ask that this committee now consider changing the 8-year period and make it 4 in order that we may make it more realistic all the way around.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We considered this amendment and others of a similar nature when the bill was before the subcommittee. Subsequently I think we considered very similar amendments in the full committee and voted them down.

In considering the bill we carefully tried to balance one item against another; we tried to work out an equitable situation. It is complicated and it is sometimes confusing to try to understand exactly how a measure works. We do not set up in this bill the obligation of 8 years for service; that is set up by the present law; that has been the law of the land since 1941 with the exception of 2 years and it will probably be the law of the land long after this bill runs off the books and the Congress provides otherwise.

The important thing I think about the amendment which the gentleman has offered is that it vitally affects the Navy. The gentleman has shown a special solicitude for the Navy, and I commend him for his solicitude, but his amendment hurts the Navy as far as the Reserves are concerned.

If you have a copy of the committee report and turn to page 22 you will find a small chart, a copy of the larger chart we had here earlier in the debate on this bill. Under that small chart you will notice column 3. That column 3 was put in for the benefit of the Navy and the Air Force. Under that column 3 a man may be enlisted voluntarily into the Reserves in the Navy or the Air Force and then 2 years after he has enlisted he may be sent to active duty for 2 years. The Navy and the Air Force have found that very effective. They can go into a

high school and say to the youngster: "We would like to have you in the Navy. If you will enlist in the Reserves, immediately following graduation from high school we will call you to active duty."

If you adopt the amendment suggested by my esteemed and patriotic friend from California, you are going to knock out that part of the Navy program completely; it will no longer be able to enlist young men into the Reserves with the understanding that they may be called within 2 years to active duty for a period of 2 years. If you do that while they can be called and trained for 2 years, then after their training they have no obligation whatsoever, so there is no reason to train them for the Naval Reserves, for the amendment offered by the gentleman would close out that obligation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman misunderstood the amendment. If they enlisted for 2 years they would still have the obligation to remain.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. What I am trying to explain to the gentleman is that under column 3 the Navy enlists someone into the Reserves but they do not train him perhaps for 2 years after they enlist him. Then, having completed a 2-year training period, under the gentleman's amendment they would have served 4 years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman, I think, is talking about people who enlist and serve in the Navy for 4 years. We are talking about the Reserve program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is exactly the point I am talking about. I am talking about the young man who has just signed up for the Reserve program while he is in high school, then 2 years later is called for 2 years of active duty. He would have been in the Reserve program 4 years, the length of time required by the gentleman's amendment.

Let me tell you another thing I want to talk about before my time expires. In signing up men for 4 years active duty the Navy places strong reliance, heavy reliance upon 3- and 4-year enlistments. If the gentleman wants a time limit of 4 years, then there will be no Reserve obligation to those men who have completed their enlistment of 4 years, and the 3-year enlistees will have only 1 year's obligation. It wipes out that effective type of Reserve.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I want merely to observe that the Navy is the only branch of the armed services that has a really effective Reserve outside of the Air Force. The proposed amendment would certainly interfere with it. They enlist in the Navy Reserve; then they must serve 2 years when the draft call comes under the present law. At the present time, as much credit as we give to the Navy for its Reserves, 60 percent of their boys have never had a day's service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 85, noes 127.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Powell:

At the end of line 10, page 3, insert a comma and add *"Provided,* That said State, Territorial, or District National Guard or Air National Guard does not exclude or segregate against any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin."

In line 12, page 5, replace the period with a comma and add *"Provided,* That said State, Territorial, or District National Guard or Air National Guard or Reserve or Reserve unit does not exclude or segregate against any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am loathe to introduce these amendments, but it so happens that, on page 3 of this bill, there has been written in some language, from line 4 through line 12, which compels me to do this. The language is as follows:

However, when recruitment efforts by the several States procure less than the necessary numbers and quality of volunteer personnel, and upon request or approval of the Governor or other appropriate authority of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, such a person may be transferred to the Army National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph or under section—

Now, this means that we are in danger of turning back the clock.

We are serving the best interests of democracy and the free world through an integrated Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—serving without any incidents, serving with great efficiency.

The issue here in America and throughout the world is the black and the brown and the white and the yellow men marching together on an integrated basis. I was able to say what I did say to the Communists in Bandung because we had an integrated Army and because we have an integrated Capital here in this democracy. I could not have said that if we had a Jim Crow Army or if Washington was a Jim Crow city, which it was until a year ago.

The issue of patriotism has been raised here today by many speakers. That is just what I am talking about. I am asking you, "Is sectionalism more important than national loyalty?"

If this language stays in the bill, without my amendment, it will mean that the governors of States where there are now segregated National Guard units—and there are segregated National Guard units in 21 States—will be able to force into the National Guards of their States Jim Crow and segregated battalions, regiments, companies, or whatever the unit might be. There is no language in this bill that will prevent this from occurring.

Do you want to turn back the timetable of the forward march of democracy?

We have been very slow and laggard in this body. The things that we have done in America have been due to our Supreme Court and to our President, Mr. Eisenhower, and before him Mr. Truman, and before him, Mr. Roosevelt. They are the two branches—the judicial and the executive—that have given the impetus and leadership to the onward surge of democracy. We, the Congress, have been backward. Now here is an opportunity for us to stand up and take our place in the forward march.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] said that this is a war of ideas. He is so correct. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said this is a spiritual war. This is so true.

Are we going to turn our backs on the things of the spirit?

Are we going to turn our backs on the ideas of democracy?

I tell you that if you do not accept this amendment, you will be playing directly into the hands of Communist propagandists. I know that it is a hard question for many of you Members who come from certain areas to adopt this amendment. I know it is difficult, but this is the test of patriotism: "Shall sectionalism be more important than national loyalty?" That is the question. I know that some of you cannot vote for this amendment. If so, I ask you to abstain from the vote. But, I do ask here this afternoon that the United States House of Representatives serve notice on Chou En-lai in the East and Khrushchev in the West that this is a democracy, a democracy in which men and women are going to march together, fight together, and never go back to the age of segregation.

I see some of you scratching your head, some of you wiping your eyes. I know it is hard, but that is what democracy is: it is a hard thing. Anything that is worthwhile costs something. Things that come easy are not worth much.

So I ask you this afternoon to reaffirm your faith in the President of the United States and reaffirm your faith in the idea of democracy. While Khrushchev and Chou En-lai are waving the white flags of peace, bloodstained and dirty as they are, may we raise our hearts and prayers and our Stars and Stripes today and say that these United States, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, shall never perish from the face of the earth and then no idea will be ever able to stand up against us.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and really rise in explanation of the fact that the committee considered the ideas so ably advanced by my colleague from New York and disposed of them, and I think correctly, too. The National Guard is simply the child of the colonial militia.

The colonial militia, which was the volunteer militia, was organized before the birth of this Republic, and when we formed the central Government and the Nation, the National Guard still remained in the States, in the 13 colonies, as a State military force.

Since the very birth of this Government, the National Guard has been a State institution, and in all of the legislation that this Congress has enacted since the very foundation of this Republic, we have recognized one thing and that is that the National Guard is a State institution. All through this bill we have made reference to the fact that the States are to have control of the guard, except during times of national emergency when the guard is federalized. Then, for the emergency, it becomes a Federal institution. Every group representing the guard and every group that appeared before us took the same position that the guard is a State institution and should remain a State institution.

To my way of thinking, and I think one of the most wholesome things in our national defense, is that we have a system of checks and balances. Sure, we have a very fine national Defense Establishment. But on the other hand, we have got, as a counterpart, a State military establishment which is, in a sense, a check and a balance against the national establishment. And we seek still to maintain the National Guard as a State institution and to give the governor of each State—yes, including the State of New York—full authority to handle the guard, except in times of emergency, as he thinks it should be handled.

With that in mind, the committee wrote nothing into the act other than to give the State the authority to handle the guard as it should be handled.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with everything the gentleman has said except now in this bill they give the governor the power to call into the National Guard whoever he selects from out of the Reserve.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; the governor may enlist into the guard, he may permit the enlistment in the guard. If the full quota of the guard is not obtained, the governor may permit the assignment of people into the guard from other organizations. In that event, the governor of the State passes on whether he wishes or does not wish them. I think it is a good law under our Constitution.

I think it is laudable to praise our form of government and our Constitution. It is a great thing. I think one of the most important things in our Constitution is our system of checks and balances that prohibits too much of a centralized military organization in the United States and gives your States—yes, humble sometimes as I think they are, and modest as I think they are in their demands, gives them a State military force which is their own and is not part of the United States of America.

I give that in explanation, against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 126, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 5, strike out line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AMENDATORY ACT

"(4) No person who, after the enactment of the National Reserve Plan is inducted into, or initially enlisted or appointed in, the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, shall at any time be assigned for duty at any installation located in a foreign country with which (at such time) the United States has in effect a treaty or international agreement containing provisions permitting such country to exercise in any way jurisdiciton over American personnel stationed within its boundaries."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to place a limitation upon the assignment of men drafted into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act as amended. Similar limitations already exist in the 1951 law. The Congress very wisely wrote into the law that no person could be assigned to any overseas installation until he had completed 4 months of training at a base within the United States. My amendment provides that no person inducted after the date of the amendments to the act, which we are discussing today, may be assigned to any overseas installation until such time as we may be assured that his constitutional rights as an American citizen are fully protected. I trust that time may come soon. I have also introduced today a resolution directing the President to proceed immediately with negotiations to eliminate or modify those sections of international treaties and agreements which today deny American military personnel the protection of the United States while they are stationed abroad.

The limitation I propose in this amendment will automatically be lifted with regard to any foreign country as soon as the President is successful in eliminating, modifying, or abrogating those provisions of international agreements that deny our Armed Forces the full protection of our Constitution.

It is my contention, supported I believe by the overwhelming weight of legal principle and by popular sentiment throughout the United States, that an American soldier drafted into service against his will and sent to a foreign nation without his consent should not be turned over to the authorities of that foreign nation and deprived of his American constitutional rights for infractions of the laws of that foreign nation.

With rare exceptions throughout modern history it has been recognized that the invitation of a host country for a foreign force to enter its territory carries with it immunity of the visiting forces personnel from the jurisdiction of the local courts.

Under this doctrine the courts of many nations have ruled repeatedly that the troops of any nation stationed in any other by consent of the host are under the exclusive jurisdiction of their own military courts.

I will never understand why the United States, to the great disadvantage of American citizens, should have agreed to a reversal of this doctrine.

Yet that is exactly what we have done in article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement with the NATO nations, in the amendments of September 29, 1953, to the Japanese Security Treaty, and in other treaties and executive agreements entered into since World War II.

Under these agreements members of our Armed Forces charged with the violation of the law of the country in which they are stationed are turned over to the police authorities and the courts of that country for trial. They are not guaranteed the right to have a public trial. There is no guaranty against cruel or unusual punishment before or after trial. There is no prohibition against a demand for excessive bail. In many countries there is no presumption of innocence. There is no guaranty of conviction only on proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. There is no guaranty of right to trial by jury and, of course, no possibility of trial by a jury of one's fellow citizens. There is a possibility of conviction by a mere majority vote. The President of the United States cannot exercise his right to pardon.

These rights and guaranties which are the heritage of every American are denied the men who are sent overseas to defend America.

And to this list, we may add the very real possibility that our American soldier may be tried by a Communist judge or convicted by a jury composed of nationals who envy, resent, and dislike the American troops quartered in their land. The attitude of the citizenry in many nations toward our American personnel is well known to all who have talked with returning servicemen. Our presence in many areas is not greeted with affection, respect, or even friendliness.

Like so many treaties and international agreements in which we are involved, all of the advantage under article VII and similar understandings accrues to others. We have Americans stationed in almost 40 countries around the world. We have few foreign troops stationed within our own country. Forty other nations have gained the power of life and death over tens of thousands of American men.

Our partners in these agreements are taking full advantage of the unusual privileges we have conferred upon them.

Several hundred Americans have been tried by foreign courts. The Defense Department reports to me that as of February 10 there were 58 serving sentences ranging up to 15 years for various alleged infractions of the laws of the nations in which they are stationed.

They have been subject to all sorts of indignities, to unusually long and severe sentences for offenses which we consider minor, and they are held under conditions which we would not toler-

ate in any penal institution in the United States. The RECORD of July 14 and 15, 1953, when the Senate was debating ratification of the Status of Forces Treaty, is replete with examples. Life in an American jail is no bed of roses. For an American, life in the prisons of Turkey, Yugoslavia, Japan, or France would be a hell on earth.

One of the young Americans now serving a sentence in Japan is my constituent. With two other marines, he was in a Japanese town on a night off and had too much to drink. He commandeered the taxi in which he was riding and drove it around town for several hours, leaving it parked in the street when he returned to the base. He has no recollection of the events of that night. When the cabdriver accused the marine of taking 1,400 yen, he voluntarily gave the man that amount. There is still no evidence that he actually took the money, other than the cabdriver's allegation. This young American was then released to the Japanese authorities and tried by a Japanese judge. He did not have a jury, as there are no jury trials in Japan. He was sentenced to 3 years at hard labor, and the appeal court upheld the sentence.

I hold no brief for this young man. He violated the law. But he should have been tried and punished by his own fellow citizens under the rules of our own system of military justice. And I daresay the sentence would not have been as severe.

By way of comparison, 2 American soldiers who committed a similar offense recently in Alexandria were sentenced to 90 days.

The case of Private Keefe, who was sentenced to 5 years at solitary confinement by a French court for the same offense of joyriding, is well known to the American people. His own counsel has been denied the right to visit Private Keefe in France.

The tragedy for the relatives of these men is difficult to exaggerate. Mrs. Keefe and her children are left without support. The lad from my own district leaves a widowed mother and sister without support. Their grief at his long confinement in prison in Japan is shared by all their friends in Canton.

Mrs. Robert Vogeler, who knows something about foreign jails as a result of her husband's terrible experience, has been quoted as saying that she would rather have her sons go to jail as draft evaders in America rather than permit them to be stationed abroad while these treaties are in effect.

My amendment would make it unnecessary for any American parent to make this hard choice.

I do not believe that any young man should be deprived of his constitutional rights while serving far from home in defense of those rights. I do not believe we should ask any American to do so. Certainly we should not compel him to place himself in jeopardy against his will and without his consent. This is exactly what we are doing today. I urge upon you the adoption of this amendment to protect the lives and liberties of those who are ready to give their lives in our behalf.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, the minority members of our committee will accept this amendment. I do not know how the chairman may feel about it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, of course, the language of the amendment would prohibit the use of drafted men in many countries throughout the world—Japan, for instance. We have a treaty with Japan. I did not agree with that treaty. The gentleman did not. Nevertheless, we have a treaty and, of course, you understand we have treaties with other countries. If we would have occupying troops, it means that we would not be able to use the draftees in those countries at all, but that the draftees will remain at home and only the enlisted men and the volunteer men would be the ones to be sent overseas under the amendment. Of course, there is nothing that we can do about rescinding a treaty.

The House of Representatives does not have control of the treatymaking power. I do not like the provisions of the treaties that have been accepted by the Senate, nonetheless, they are the fundamental and paramount law of the land and I do not think that this stipulation in the bill would make any difference.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it not also true that it would prevent this country's sending any troops into any NATO country?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is substantially correct. Under such a provision you could only use draftees in countries where we had no treaty agreed to by the other body—not by this body.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Is it not a fact that if we adopt this amendment we will serve notice on the other body and on the Nation that we are not in favor, as the gentleman said, of treaties of that kind?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is true. I am not in favor of them either.

Mr. BOW. And that this is another case where treaty law is depriving American citizens of their constitutional rights, a treaty taking the place of the Constitution of the United States and its protection of American citizens?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would be an idle gesture on our part to adopt this amendment, because I do not think it would have any effect under our Constitution. It is null and void.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not a fact that the only place in the world where we could send troops and be assured that we could take complete control over their jurisdiction under any sort of criminal charge is Spain? In all the rest of the nations where we have occupation troops they are subject to the local authorities.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know everybody is impatient to get through with this legislation, but when the members of the committee take all the time under general debate it leaves none for many of us who want to be heard. I do not know why we are staying this long. I do not know why we could not have gone over until tomorrow and had a decent opportunity to discuss these amendments. If we are going to amend this bill, let us do it right.

I think this is an entirely valid amendment, an amendment well worthy of our most careful consideration.

I remember being in Europe and sitting in a trial court. I had read in law school and in the law books about the differences of jurisdiction, but it was not until I actually came face to face with these situations that I was ever completely aware of the differences that exist in the world in the administration of justice.

There are many countries where our boys and men are serving where a public hearing is simply a public confirmation of a conclusion already reached in secret.

It is a fact that the presumption of innocence does not exist.

It is also a fact, as the gentleman from Ohio has well said, that many of these youngsters if they are to be hauled before foreign tribunals will rot in jails on charges that would never stand up in any court in the United States. We are asking these boys to do enough. For heaven's sake, let us lift this burden from their backs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I associate myself completely with the statement the gentleman has made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRESTON) there were—ayes 174, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct particular attention to paragraph 7 of the pending bill, which calls for the submission to Congress of legislative recommendations by the National Security Training Commission which shall include—and I quote:

(B) Measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps.

This is all the more essential because under present armed services regulations beer is still freely available in post exchanges and servicemen's lounges. The Secretary of Defense has authorized the sale of liquor in officers and noncom clubs on armed services premises, and, while a provision allowing package liquor stores on such premises was rescinded after violent protests by the public, a provision was retained giving the Secretary power to use his discretion in remote areas, whereupon he authorized such package liquor stores wherever the nearest package liquor store was more

than 10 miles away. The Air Force has a voluntary program by which all officers and noncoms are automatically drafted into their officers and noncom clubs on joining the Air Force and have to send in written resignations, giving reasons, in order to get out. Airmen have complained that these written resignations have to be cleared by the squadron commander before they can be sent to the base commander, and in at least some instances the squadron commander has refused to approve them.

I am bringing these matters to the attention of the committee at this time because of the many complaints I have received, not only from parents of those serving in the Armed Forces but from members of the Armed Forces themselves, with respect to the laxity of restrictions with respect to the use and sale of beer and other liquors in and around our training camps throughout the country.

Of course, some are worse than others, depending largely upon the attitude of the commanding officer of the installation, together with those who are in charge of administering the rules and regulations relating to the use of intoxicating liquors.

This bill should include legislation that would prohibit the use and sale of intoxicating liquors in or near all military installations. In other words, write it in the law and not depend upon rules and regulations administered by those in charge of the defense installations. Why wait for the Training Commission to make recommendations?

H. R. 5927 IS NOT UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to all of the debate on H. R. 5927 and my particular concern has been as to the extent this bill would establish a universal military training system to make military training compulsory if it was adopted.

I have concluded that this bill is not a compulsory military training bill, and in support of my belief, I read from the committee report on the bill the following which makes very clear the difference between the provisions of H. R. 5927 and universal military training:

In view of the erroneous conception held by some that the national Reserve plan is universal military training, the report would not be complete without pointing out the essential differences between the two.

The national Reserve plan gives recognition to the need for a military manpower pool to meet Active force requirements for long-term volunteers, and to protect the manpower sources of the ROTC program. Universal military training does not recognize this need fully.

The 6 months' training program proposed in the national Reserve plan is geared to valid Reserve forces requirements and will be controlled within the limits set forth in H. R. 5297 of 100,000 to 250,000 annually. Universal military training is not specifically related to requirements, but is concerned primarily with the equal sharing of the military obligation and with creating a training populace.

The 6 months' training program under the national Reserve plan is a volunteer program, whereas universal military training is a compulsory program which personnel would enter by induction only. Universal military training would thus require the simultaneous operation of 2 induction systems at different age levels, one for the Active forces and one for the Reserve forces.

In the national Reserve plan, the 6 months' trainees receive their training as members of the Armed Forces. Under universal training, the training would be conducted under a separate corps with a distinctive shoulder patch.

The national Reserve plan is a 4-year program and is subject to periodic review and further continuance by the Congress in 1959. Universal military training is a permanent manpower program.

The national Reserve plan recognizes the need for maintaining military strength-in-being. The size of the Active and Reserve Forces are based on national security requirements. Universal military training would reduce the Active force strength in specific relation to number of trainees entering Reserve forces.

The national Reserve plan recognizes the need for prior-service personnel as the hard core of the Reserve forces, and provides means to insure their participation in Reserve training programs. Universal military training would have a completely volunteer provision as regards such personnel, so that upon completing 2 or more years active service they would be eligible to go directly to the Standby Reserve.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a division.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 151, noes 39.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why come in at 10 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we dispose of this bill tomorrow and the District of Columbia appropriation bill, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn until Monday.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since the gentleman from Missouri has to fly out to Missouri tonight and will be compelled to miss the rollcall anyway, I do not care whether you meet at that time or not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be a record vote on the Powell amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION TO CLOSE MARINE CORPS DEPOT

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the Hoover Commission to close the Army Quartermaster Depot and the Marine Corps Depot culminates years of activity on the part of big business interests to close Government establishments which have cost the taxpayers billions of dollars and which have rendered efficient service at a minimum of cost.

For the past 10 or 15 years there has been a concerted effort on the part of certain people to prevent the United States Government from carrying on its operations at various installations. Once the Government discontinues these operations there will be no yardstick to gage the costs which are charged the Government on outside contracts, and this is as much the aim of the Hoover Commission as anything else. It follows the policy of the present administration to turn everything over to big business, without regard for the best interests of the Government or the people.

Curiously enough, it comes at a time when Congress is preparing to investigate charges of bribery, graft, and corruption on the part of outside business concerns in connection with the manufacture of Army and Navy uniforms. The very situation which is under scrutiny at the present time emphasizes the need for the retention and continued operation not only of these installations in Philadelphia but throughout the entire country.

If these establishments are closed it will not only result in increased costs to the Government, but it will also occasion further unemployment. Because, despite the increased costs to the Government, private companies, with their nerve-racking speedup systems generally use fewer employees in their operations. If the savings from the speedup methods resulted in savings to the Government, there would be some justification, but the only result is higher profits to the private contractor. In addition to this, the loss of the yardstick would be disastrous and would lead to unchecked exploitation of the Government by private contractors.

I feel certain Congress will act to protect not only the Philadelphia Army Quartermaster Depot, the Marine Corps Depot at the navy yard, and other installations in Philadelphia, but throughout the entire country.

I intend to discuss the whole situation with Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, and enlist his aid in preventing this plan from developing.

LOWELL, MASS., SPELLING BEE WINNER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Frederic Framley, the 13-year-old winner of the spelling bee contest at Lowell, Mass., which was promulgated by the Lowell Sun, came to luncheon with me here at the Capitol. I was delighted with the boy's dignity, his courtesy, and his intelligent interest in the proceedings of the Congress of the United States. I know the boy, and I appreciate very deeply the courtesy of the Members to him. His father and mother, and the city of Lowell may well be proud of him. He is young America at its best, and I hope so much that he will be successful not only in tomorrow's national spelling contest but all through his life. There are 62 other children representing other States. He is the lone representative from Massachusetts.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow and I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on several bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANOTHER SMEAR EFFORT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail, May 18, 1955, in a plain envelope postmarked New York, N. Y., came an unsigned, single-spaced, three-page, mimeographed attack on Joseph Peter Kamp. With it came a printed statement captioned "The Facts—Reported Monthly by the Civil Rights Division, Arnold Forster, National Director; Arnold L. Schuer, Editor—Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.," containing what purported to be a list of the contributors to the Constitutional Educational League—see exhibit A.

This appears to be one of the later efforts to destroy the Constitutional Educational League and Kamp.

I have personally known Kamp for something like 15 years. I have known of many of his activities, and while naturally I have not always endorsed all of his statements, nor do I subscribe to all of his thinking, I am thoroughly convinced that he is a sincere foe not only of communism, but of those who are dissatisfied with our form of government and who for it would substitute some kind of a one-world organization.

From my knowledge of Kamp's activities, I am sure that he has never personally profited financially. He has never had sufficient funds to properly circulate his writings, to finance meetings at which he desired to speak. He is always "broke" because his efforts are so intense.

He has many times been charged with being anti-Semitic, but I have never been able to find any evidence to justify that charge. It is a charge usually made by those who seek to destroy any individual or organization who advocates patriotism and adherence to constitutional principles and procedures.

I am personally familiar with the congressional committee hearings and report which recommended contempt proceedings against Kamp to the Congress in 1944, when he refused to disclose to the committee information which would have identified those who contributed to his efforts.

Kamp was convicted of contempt and as I recall, served something like 4 months in jail because he asserted his constitutional right to free speech, refused to disclose his private business to a congressional committee when it was none of their business.

The demand of the committee that Kamp disclose the names of those who contributed to his efforts was, in my opinion, unjustified. The criticism of the committee and the Congress was not of what Kamp said or wrote, but of his refusal to disclose the sources from which he received support, that is, the identity of those who purchased his publications.

Later, in June 1950, the Buchanan committee was created, and again when Rumely and Kamp refused to disclose the sources of the income of the organization which each represented, both were cited for contempt, both were convicted.

Rumely was convicted by the United States district court, the conviction was reversed by the United States circuit court of appeals, and the reversal was affirmed and Rumely ordered discharged by the United States Supreme Court on March 9, 1953—Case No. 87, October term, 1952.

The decision in the Rumely case shows that the previous conviction of Kamp was unjustified. Had his case been properly presented to the courts, he would not have been convicted or required to serve the jail sentence.

The efforts of the Buchanan committee were directed by a lawyer who represented gangsters and crooks—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 21, 1950, volume 96, part 7, page 9037.

The efforts to destroy Kamp, Rumely, and others who have attempted to defend constitutional government, who have fought subversive efforts, are seldom, if ever, an attempt to answer what has been said or written, but to destroy the confidence of those who have contributed to their efforts.

However patriotic or sincere may be those who seek to destroy Kamp's present efforts and the efforts of individuals or organizations who hold like views, the sad fact is that those efforts further the cause of Communists, of subversive groups, of those who would now repudiate our constitutional form of government.

Kamp, because of his aggressiveness, because of his ability, is again being subjected to the same kind of treatment by the same type of individuals and groups which, over the years, have sought to destroy everyone who successfully was fighting communism. Many others, including Gene Cox, Martin Dies, Vice President Nixon, Jenner, Welker, McCarthy—oh, yes, a long list of patriotic citizens—have received the same kind of treatment in varying degrees.

I have no financial or personal interest in Kamp or the Constitutional Educational League, but it is certainly encouraging to note that many contributed to his patriotic efforts. Had I a million dollars, Kamp and other individuals and organizations similar to the Constitutional Educational League and the Rumely organization would get a substantial part of it.

It is significant that the Anti-Defamation League has never, at least to my knowledge, challenged any of Kamp's statements in the courts. It is significant that when Kamp challenged the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 8, 1950, volume 96, part 6, page 8343—to hear him in Washington, that committee failed to accept the challenge.

Those who sent out the material which is attached hereto and made a part hereof—see exhibit A—and above referred to, evidently belong in that group which presently are characterized as "hatemongers." Continually they vilify individuals, every organization which has the ability and the courage to speak out or to write in favor of constitutional government.

At present, through the press, some are engaged in the studied, well-financed effort to add new vigor to the campaign to discredit everyone and everything which tends to promote the welfare of our people or the security of the Republic.

EXHIBIT A

JOSEPH PETER KAMP: A BRIEF REPORT ON HIS ACTIVITIES

Joseph P. Kamp lives at 135 East 38 Street, New York City. His unlisted telephone number is Lexington 2-4494. His apartment is a

luxuriously furnished duplex. He is 55 years old, a man of expensive tastes. He is married. He runs the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York City. He publishes Headlines, a newsletter of varying length. Volumes 1 and 2 were published in 1938–39. Volume 3 was not published until 1951, a lapse of 12 years.

Kamp calls himself a patriot. He is not. He is a cold-blooded professional who poses as an anti-Semite to those patriots who support him, while at the same time he supports and praises various Jews and Jewish organizations. He is in close contact with false "anticommunists" who in turn work with and for various Jewish organizations. He is, in fact, a secret and deadly enemy of all genuine patriots. Here is the proof:

Kamp's office is large and well equipped. The building in which it is located contains many Jewish organizations (such as the Zionist Emergency Council). Over a period of many years he has had no difficulty in renewing his lease, although the common experience of all other patriots has been expulsion from such office buildings the moment they attacked or offended any Jew or Jewish organization. He has never complained of difficulty in having his publications printed. All other patriotic publications have tremendous difficulty.

In his Open Letter to Congress (February 22, 1948) he printed a eulogy of himself by Lambert Fairchild, chairman of the league:

"You should know the truth about Mr. Kamp.

"Mr. Kamp was an active foe of intolerance, bigotry, and anti-Semitism way back when the Ku Klux Klan was in its heyday, when it was a power to reckon with.

"In the early twenties his magazine Our Neighbor fought racial and religious discrimination.

"In the early twenties (1924 and 1925) his national newspaper Toleration conducted a fearless campaign against persecution of minorities—Negroes, Catholics, and Jews."

Anyone with the remotest knowledge of communism knows that this approach is basically that of the Communist Party.

In the same pamphlet on page 14: "Our files were ransacked, our telephones were tapped, our employees were shadowed."

On page 27: "Throughout the hearing I was confronted with photostats of some of my private letters. These letters had been stolen from our offices by a Dr. Walter Peck, an agent of the Jewish Gestapo."

A third example of Kamp's protection of his contributors, correspondents, and coworkers may be found on page 39: "No Gestapo spy ever got planted in our offices, yet somebody did steal some of our records last year."

A fourth case is detailed in Exposé (June 1952), on page 4: "Sanford Griffith is an agent of the Anti-Defamation League. One of his agents was Harold Grimes, of 550 H Grant Street, New York City. Grimes operated under the name H. Gunther Grimes and later simply Gunther Grimes. After months of deft maneuvering he managed to become a volunteer worker in the offices of Joe Kamp. Here he remained for nearly a year, possessing a key to the office, working late.

"It was his mission to discover who Kamp's contributors were * * * and to see that Griffith received photostats of important letters and documents."

So we see that for 1 year an agent worked for Kamp after Kamp himself had admitted at least (there were probably more) three previous raids had taken place. Could Kamp have possibly been so stupid? Every contributor, every subscriber, every correspondent, every visitor Kamp had was known to the ADL. Kamp has never denied this nor has he made the slightest effort to warn these people who were grossly betrayed by his negligence.

A fifth case is given on the same page of Exposé. H. McAllister Griffith, another agent of Sanford Griffith, worked at a high salary for a close friend of Kamp's. There is no doubt that he, too, was automatically in Kamp's confidence.

Finally, and most recently, Kamp has complained to close associates that an affluent seeming lady had come to him and gained his confidence. She mentioned giving him money and Kamp lost his head again. He opened his files wide and the ADL was up to date for the sixth time. After several visits the nice lady disappeared along with all of Kamp's latest confidential information. Is this the procedure that the great nationalist leader uses to protect his financial contributors and those who trust him?

Kamp, however, on page 57 of his Open Letter writes:

"Honestly now: Would any of you be insane enough, disloyal enough, or un-American enough to turn over the names of good Americans, directly or indirectly, to an aggregation of aliens, subversives, smearers, blackmailers, thieves, perjurers, lunatics, liars, dope fiends, and convicted and unconvicted criminals? I wasn't." As to the truth of this, see the enclosed photostatic reprints of the ADL publication Facts for corroborating evidence of the charges made in this report.

An example of Kamp's anticommunism may be seen in this statement on page 19 of his Open Letter:

"In my booklet Fifth Column in Washington (1940), which was dedicated to the leader of my party, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in appreciation of his vigorous denunciation of the fifth column in America."

One of the most fantastic and disreputable lies Kamp has ever written he has repeated over and over in his bulletins and pamphlets. It is most significant and may explain a great deal. On page 29 he quotes himself before the Anderson Committee on Campaign Expenditures (1944):

"I would like to interject here that the B'nai B'rith is a reputable fraternal organization which numbers many outstanding Americans among its members, good Americans, who know nothing about the vicious racket being run by the ADL."

This is an incredible lie. The B'nai B'rith is the parent of the ADL. The ADL is known as the ADL of B'nai B'rith. Funds from the B'nai B'rith help support the ADL. All members of ADL are also members of B'nai B'rith. The leaders and members of B'nai B'rith have just as many Communist-front citations, if not more than the leaders of the ADL. The literature of the B'nai B'rith faithfully reflects ADL policy and findings. Kamp's reason for this vicious lie is either utter cowardice or more likely he is protecting himself (also cowardice) for he knows the ADL welcomes attack, if not too damaging, but that the B'nai B'rith does not like to be attacked, as it is the foundation of ADL.

Kamp's "Will Eisenhower Join the ADL Book Burners?" contains direct evidence of just whom he depends on to divert full-scale attack from himself. On page 2 he refers to Eisenhower as an "innocent dupe" of the ADL. (Ike is far from being an innocent dupe.) On page 3 he again states B'nai B'rith is "reputable", etc. On page 4 he writes:

"George Sokolsky, an outstanding figure on the patriotic scene."

Kamp knows full well that Sokolsky has written virulent attacks against John Beaty, Robert Williams, Conde McGinley, and just about every other leading patriot; that he has praised and supported David Dubinsky and Jay Lovestone over and over again; that he is a very close friend of Bernard Baruch; etc., etc. Nor is this all. On January 24, 1951, Sokolsky wrote in his column a list of anti-Communists. The list, a highly revealing one, included, of course, David Dubinsky and Norman Thomas and most interesting of all Joseph P. Kamp. There is an unholy alliance here. Sokolsky's hellish doctrine is revealed in his Marxists Aren't All Communists column of April 1, 1954.

This hidden and unholy alliance can be traced. At a dinner in honor of J. B. Matthews held on February 13, 1953, at the Waldorf in New York, a carefully screened group of guests gathered. It included George Sokolsky, Roy Cohn, Harvey Matusow, Arnold Forster, of the ADL (table 12), Alfred Kohlberg, Howard Rushmore (who had attacked Kamp in his column), Jacob Spolansky (chief agent of the American Jewish Committee), Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, Stuart W. Symington, and Allen Zoll (table 23, a friend of Kamp's who had also rifled his files for his own purposes), and Joseph P. Kamp (table 6 (see Exposé, March 1953)).

At a dinner in honor of Roy M. Cohn, July 28, 1954, which included Sokolsky, Schultz, Kohlberg, and Spolansky (again carefully screened), there appeared Lambert Fairchild as a guest (table 27). Fairchild is chairman of Kamp's League. Lastly, Fairchild appeared as a guest at the dinner in honor of Rabbi Schultz held the night before this report was prepared (April 20). How is it possible for Kamp, the anti-Semite, and his chairman, to appear openly at such functions and among such people?

The following is but a part of the article quoted above.

[From the Facts, reported monthly by the civil rights division, Arnold Forster, national director, Arnold L. Scheuer, editor, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 5th Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.]

WHO BACKS JOSEPH P. KAMP?

On June 16, 1950, Joe Kamp, "patriotic" pamphleteer and vice chairman of the notorious Constitutional Educational League, appeared before District Judge Alexander Holtzoff, in Washington, D. C. and surrendered himself "for execution and sentence." Thus ended 6 years of legal maneuvering by Kamp to avoid serving a 4-month sentence for contempt of Congress. Kamp's conviction resulted from an indictment handed down December 1944 by a Federal grand jury for his refusal to reveal the officers and contributors to his Constitutional Educational League.

Kamp has stubbornly continued to defy Congress. Ten days previous to his imprisonment for the 1944 indictment, he refused to give another congressional group—the House Lobby Investigating Committee (Buchanan committee)—financial data regarding his organization, claiming that the committee had no right to demand it.

Despite strong support from friends in and out of Congress, the House, on August 31, 1950, again cited Kamp for contempt; thus creating an obligation upon the Department of Justice to present the contempt citation to the Federal grand jury for action.

Kamp's consistent reluctance to reveal the sources of his funds is understandable. A substantial part of his League's income comes from subsidies and contributions which he promotes from large industrial organizations and wealthy individuals apparently interested in aiding the dissemination of his antilabor, antidemocratic propaganda.

Kamp has a working list of 500 such contributors. The large donors are reached by Kamp personally; lesser fry are handled by a small number of glib, high-powered sales-

men who work on a 25-percent commission basis. Following is a partial list of individuals and organizations who have either supported Kamp by direct contributions or by purchasing his "patriotic literature" in bulk. Kamp preferred to go to jail rather than reveal his contributors to the House investigating committee. Here are some of them:

Name	Date	Total amount
Charles H. Abbot (president, Hartford Steel Ball Co.) 12 Jefferson Ave., West Hartford, Conn.	1949	$50.00
Alan Wood Steel Co. (Charles E. Dorworth), Conshohocken, Pa.	1949	15.00
Walter E. Baker, 621 Chestnut St., Bridgeville, Pa.	1949	15.00
Bard Parker Co., Inc. (James H. White, vice president), Danbury, Conn.	1949	50.00
Bead Chain Manufacturing Co. (W. B. Bryant), Bridgeport, Conn.	1947–49	800.00
The Bead Chain Manufacturing Co. (A. J. DeFrank, treasurer), Bridgeport, Conn.	1949	200.00
R. A. Beers (First National Bank & Trust Co.), Bridgeport, Conn.	1946–49	125.00
Beloit Iron Works (H. F. Forbes, assistant treasurer), Beloit, Wis.	1949	200.00
Beloit State Bank (H. A. Mathews, cashier), Beloit, Wis.	1949	100.00
Frank Belz (vice president, Pfister & Vogel Tanning Co.), Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	200.00
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., 40 Central St., Boston, Mass.	1947	250.00
John W. Blodgett, 1103–06 Peoples National Bank Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.	1946–47	1,500.00
John W. Blodgett, Jr., 914 Public Service Bldg., Portland, Oreg.	1946, 1948	1,500.00
C. G. Boothby (Jahn & Ollies Engineering Co.), 817 West Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.	1945, 1947–49	400.00
Brown and Sharpe (Henry D. Sharpe), Providence, R. I.	1948–49	1,000.00
Avery Brundage (Roanoke Real Estate Co.), Syracuse, N. Y.	1949	50.00
W. Burg (Torrington Co.), Torrington, Conn.	1946–49	800.00
Harold Camp (Pitney Bowes Postage Meter, Inc.), Stamford, Conn.	1949	100.00
R. U. Carr (Ushco Manufacturing Co.), Buffalo, N. Y.	1949	50.00
I. J. Case Co. (Theodore Johnson, president), Racine, Wis.	1948–49	2,500.00
Stephen Chadwick (Perfection Stove Co.), 7609 Platt Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.	1947	549.00
Ernest W. Clark (Sigournez Tool Co.), Hartford, Conn.	1946–49	200.00
C. B. Cottrell & Sons (Carl Stillman, treasurer), Westerly, R. I.	1945–47	500.00
Arthur P. Day (chairman, Hartford, Conn., Trust Co.)	1948–49	100.00
The Deforest & Hotchkiss Co. (J. S. Venter), 115 Water St., New Haven, Conn.	1949	25.00
William J. Dempsey (the Sidney B. Roby Co.), 208 South Ave., Rochester, N. Y.	1949	25.00
Doran Bros., Inc. (Robert Doran, vice president), Danbury, Conn.	1949	25.00
Robert Driscoll, 39 Indian Hill Rd., Winnetka, Ill.	1949	500.00
Harold Falk (president, Falk Co.), Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	250.00
Fletcher Terry Co. (Fred S. Fletcher, treasurer), Forestville, Conn.	1949	25.00
Howard Flint (Howard Flint Ink Co.), 2546 Clark Ave., Detroit, Mich.	1946	700.00
Andrew Fruehauf, Hotel Statler, Detroit, Mich.	1947–48	2,200.00
Harvey Fruehauf (Fruehauf Trailer Co.), Detroit, Mich.	1948	1,000.00
A. F. Gallum & Sons (Albert F. Gallum, Jr.), 1818 North Water St., Milwaukee, Wis.	1946–49	400.00
Grede Foundries, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	200.00
William J. Grede (Grede Foundries, Inc.), Milwaukee, Wis.	1946, 1948	400.00
Greyhound Bus Lines (Robert Driscoll, president), Chicago, Ill.	1947–49	1,500.00
Gulf Life Insurance Co. (Mrs. S. Kendrick Guernsey, vice president), Jacksonville, Fla.	1949	225.00
Gunite Foundries (N. J. Schmitt, treasurer), Rockford, Ill.	1949	50.00
Hannifin Corp., 1101 South Kilbourne Ave., Chicago 24, Ill.	1949	100.00
Thomas Hawks (treasurer, Wollensak Optical Co.), Rochester, N. Y.	1949	125.00
Addison E. Holton (Essex Wire Corp.), 14310 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich.	1946–47	600.00
Hudson Worsted Co. (H. T. Dyson, president; R. H. Whiteway, assistant treasurer), 43 Broad St., Hudson, Mass.	1949	25.00
Thomas H. Hume (T. Fitzjohn Coach Co.), 1221 Kenting Ave., Muskegon, Mich.	1947–49	350.00
W. A. Hyde (treasurer, Jewett City Savings Bank), Jewett City, Conn.	1947–48	50.00
Hugo A. Jarret (treasurer, Cherry Brook Worsted Mills, Inc.), Woonsocket, R. I.	1949	100.00
B. M. Jeffries (vice president, Parker Pen Co.), Janesville, Wis.	1948	500.00
The Kent Co., Inc., Rome, N. Y.	1949	$30.00
T. L. J. Klapp, Jr. (Allen Klapp Co.), 360 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.	1946–48	250.00
Lakeside Bridge & Steel Co. (Paul Coddington, president), 3200 West Villars Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	100.00
M. S. Little (president, Smyth Manufacturing Co.), Hartford, Conn.	1946, 1948, 1949	175.00
Hugh MacArthur, (president, The Connecticut Coke Co.)	1949	50.00
Clara L. Macheth, 120 Broadway, New York City	1946–48	600.00
Helen B. McCormick, (Armco Steel Corp.), 120 Broadway, New York City.	1949	45.00
R. A. Mitchell, (treasurer, Cyril Johnson Woolen Co.), Stafford Springs, Conn.	1948–49	50.00
Richard F. Moore, Sr., (president, Moore Special Tool Co., Inc.), 740 Union Ave., Bridgeport, Conn.	1946–49	277.00
Philip E. Morill, (Bemis Bros. Bag Co.), 40 Central St., Boston, Mass.	1948	250.00
Jacob Nilson, (president, H. A. Nilson Machine Co.), Bridgeport, Conn.	1946–49	1,400.00
Northwestern Steel & Wire Co., (V. E. Casele), Sterling, Ill.	1949	15.00
Scott Osgood, (president, Curtis Screw Co.), Buffalo, N. Y.	1946, 1948	255.00
Joseph M. P. Ott (treasurer, Joseph M. P. Ott Co.), Pawtucket, R. I.	1949	62.50
Lloyd C. Partridge (Partridge Anderson Co.), 712 South Federal St., Chicago, Ill.	1946–48	450.00
Pittsburgh Steel & Bolt Co. (J. P. Hoelgel), Pittsburgh, Pa.	1949	15.00
Andrew B. Rathbone (treasurer, Rathbone Corp.), 26 King St., Palmer, Mass.	1949	150.00
Joseph F. Rioux (Bliss Bros. Co.), County St., Attleboro, Mass.	1949	100.00
T. G. Sadler, Jr. (Sadler Bros.), South Attleboro, Mass.	1949	100.00
Antoinette Scudder (Paper Mill Playhouse), New Jersey.	1949	500.00
T. T. Scudder, 1 Wall St., New York City	1947, 1948	75.00
Sears Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.	1947	2,500.00
Harrison H. Smith, 1524 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.	1946–47	150.00
P. S. Smith (secretary-treasurer, Perfection Stove Co.), Cleveland, Ohio.	1947–48	998.00
The Standard Screw Co. (C. A. Post, treasurer), Hartford, Conn.	1949	25.00
Stanky Oil Co., 480 Mount Pleasant St., New Bedford, Mass.	1949	125.00
Charles J. Stilwell (Warner Swasey Co.), 5701 Carnegie Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.	1946–47	450.00
Stratton Grain Co., 745 Milwaukee St., Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	200.00
Chester M. Sylvester (Lloyd Perkins & Son), 57 Wareham St., Middleboro, Mass.	1949	75.00
James B. Tait (president, Rock Rilver Woolen Mills), Janesville, Wis.	1946, 1948, 1949	150.00
Charles G. Taylor, Jr. (Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.), New York City.	1947, 1949	200.00
Merritt D. Vanderbilt (president, the Greist Manufacturing Co.), 446 Blake St., New Haven, Conn.	1949	100.00
Charles P. Vogel (Elmwood Co.), 647 West Virginia St., Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	100.00
Bernard J. Voll (Sibley Machine & Foundry Co.), South Bend, Ind.	1947–48	200.00
Frederick A. Vollbrecht (president, Industrial Wire Cloth Products Corp.), Wayne, Mich.	1949	750.00
W. R. Wadowitz (vice president, Western Printing & Lithographing Co.), Racine, Wis.	1948–49	500.00
Asline Ward, 26 Whiting Rd., Wellesley Hills, Mass.	1949	200.00
H. S. Washburn (president, Plainville Casting Co.), Plainville, Conn.	1948–49	150.00
Joseph D. A. Whalen (president and treasurer, Boston Wire Stitcher, Inc.), East Greenwich, R. I.	1946–47	715.00
A. A. Wickland (president, A. A. Wickland Co.), Chicago, Ill.	1948–49	75.00
Woodall Industries, Inc. (president, H. J. Woodall), 7565 East McNichols Rd., Detroit 5, Mich.	1947–48	1,000.00
Worden Allen Co. (president, E. W. Krueger), 4100 North 3d St., Milwaukee, Wis.	1949	100.00
Farny R. Wurlitzer (the Rudolph Wurlitzer Co.), North Tonawanda, N. Y.	1949	100.00
Mrs. Richalie W. Wyatt (president, Paragon Gear Works, Inc.), Taunton, Mass.	1949	100.00
Youngstown Steel & Tube Co., Indian Harbor Works, East Chicago, Ind.	1949	15.00

The number of Kamp's contributors who will withdraw their support in view of the exposures of the Buchanan committee is still a matter of conjecture, but there is already evidence of a falling off of contributions to his league. Several of Kamp's backers—now aware of the real intent behind his "patriotic propaganda"—have already repudiated him. Particularly significant is the disavowal of Kamp by Frank H. Lee, Jr., of the Frank H. Lee Hat Manufacturing Co., of Danbury, Conn., who has publicly denounced Kamp in a letter written to the Anti-Defamation League. Said Mr. Lee:

"I note that I have been named in your book, A Measure of Freedom, as a supporter of Joseph P. Kamp's Constitutional Educational League.

"It is true that on past occasions I have supported Joseph P. Kamp in the belief that his sole activity was in combating communism. Now that I have been informed more fully of Kamp's activities and background, I will certainly withdraw my support. He stands for many things that I do not stand for."

Although Lee's repudiation was a bitter blow, Kamp's career is far from ended. As was anticipated, he has fully exploited his brief term of imprisonment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. RODINO, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $200.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. FINE).

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. LANE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER, for 6 days, commencing May 19, 1955, on account of official business of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. HOSMER), for 6 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife, Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children, George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly;

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas;

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 17, 1955:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chiu-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Harnandes Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Buildeath and Lenora Patricia Buildeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek.

On May 18, 1955:

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

816. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting an amendment to the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (Public Law 598, 83d Cong.) as follows: "That the third proviso of section 7 (d) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 is hereby repealed"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama. This interim report is submitted in response to resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on May 2, 1939, requesting a review of report on Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. It is also submitted in final response to eight other resolutions listed in the report (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5188. A bill to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices; with amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 3758. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3882. A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage

service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 6326. A bill to abolish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 6327. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 6328. A bill to exempt from duty under paragraph 1551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 certain motion-picture film imported into Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6329. A bill to continue and extend Federal oil and gas lease No. 03607 under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE (by request):

H. R. 6330. A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6331. A bill authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6332. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States Commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 6333. A bill to amend the Air Force Academy Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 6334. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6335. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 6336. A bill to provide that the district and regional offices of the Veterans' Administration shall continue to be maintained and operated at Fort Snelling, Minn.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (by request):

H. R. 6337. A bill relating to the accumulated earnings tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on corporations improperly accumulating surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 6338. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 6339. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide that the annuities of certain officers and employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States may be based on not to exceed 40 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6340. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for mortgage-redemption insurance with respect to loans guaranteed, insured, or made by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6341. A bill to encourage the provision of housing for families of low and moderate income by means of special incentives relating to income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 6342. A bill to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 6343. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 6344. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to liberalize the retirement benefits of female officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 6345. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6346. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6347. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6348. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution condemning the violations committed by the Soviet Government of its agreements with the United States, and declaring that measures should be taken to inform the peoples of the world of such violations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for immediate completion of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam and certain other projects on the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6349. A bill for the relief of Miss Sara Salcer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 6350. A bill for the relief of William Ochier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 6351. A bill for the relief of Lin, Tsung-min (T. M. Lin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6352. A bill for the relief of Lum Yet Ken (Wong Lum Yet-Gan or Wong Lum Shee), Wong Jen Toy, Don Fong (Wong Don Fong), and Boy-Mon (Wong Boy-Mon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 6353. A bill for the relief of Maj. John P. Ruppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 6354. A bill for the relief of Constantine Salmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6355. A bill for the relief of Jose Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 6356. A bill for the relief of Sitta Kurkjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 6357. A bill for the relief of Kyu Yawp Lee and Mrs. Hyung Sook Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 6358. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hertha Irmgard Hentsdel Barrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 6360. A bill for the relief of Maria Campaiola Falone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6361. A bill for the relief of Adam M. Macielinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 6362. A bill for the relief of Jaime H. Salva and Fred H. Salva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 6363. A bill for the relief of Edward Barnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6364. A bill for the relief of Joao Maria Vieira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of Edward R. Maher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

275. By Mr. GATHINGS: Petition of Mrs. Oscar Barksdale, teacher, and 30 members of Gleaners Sunday School class of the First Baptist Church of West Memphis, Ark., favoring H. R. 4627 and S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

276. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 142 residents of the State of Washington to exercise the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

277. By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming: Petition of Mrs. Belva E. Rice, Greybull, Wyo., and 53 others, to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

278. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 55 members of Local 2005, Transport Workers Union of America, urging Congress to act on legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

279. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George J. Koontz, Lilly, Pa., relative to transmitting a copy of a letter written by him dated May 2, 1955, accusing the Eisenhower administration of certain charges in regard to the United States mails; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Joint Committee on the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the power of the purse is the constitutional birthright of Congress. But the efforts of Congress to control expenditures have been repeatedly frustrated in recent years. Recurring Treasury deficits, huge Federal outlays for defense and civilian purposes, and the rising burden of the public debt, are fundamental factors in inflation and jeopardize the fiscal solvency of the Nation.

There is growing recognition that Congress is poorly organized and equipped to perform its fiscal control function, that is, the function of reviewing and passing on the Federal budget and determining the fiscal policies of the Government. No substantial change has been made in the process of congressional review of the budget since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was adopted. Legislative procedures which may have been adequate 35 years ago in reviewing annual budgets of less than $4 billion seem ill-designed to cope with the $65 billion budgets of today.

In the simpler days of earlier decades members of the appropriations subcommittees could intelligently review the smaller budget requests of executive agencies. But today the activities of the Federal Government have become so vast in scope and size, extending not only throughout this country but throughout the world, and the Federal budget has become so big and complex that Congress is no longer able to cope with it effectively.

There is an insistent and growing demand both in Congress and among the taxpayers that we develop a more efficient and effective system of handling the annual appropriation bills. Critics say that the existing fiscal machinery and procedures of Congress are fragmented and dispersive, affording little or no coordination in the consideration of revenue and spending measures. The appropriation process is piecemeal in nature, each supply bill being separately considered by different subcommittees in each chamber, but without consideration of their interrelationships or of the overall aspects of expenditure and revenue programs.

The recurring logjam of appropriation bills at the end of recent sessions of Congress has required the passage of a series of continuing resolutions in order to keep the Government going. This has handicapped the planning of public programs and delayed the adjournment of Congress. The public business cannot be operated successfully or economically when its policies and programs are held in suspense for several weeks or months of the new fiscal year.

For many years congressional review of the President's budget estimates has failed to achieve a balanced budget or substantial economies. Reductions voted by the House of Representatives have been largely restored by the Senate. In many cases the cuts ordered by Congress have merely postponed the necessary appropriations which were subsequently made up by deficiency measures. Sometimes reductions voted by Congress have been arbitrary, such as flat-percentage cuts or rigid limitations on personnel or other items. Arbitrary or meat-ax reductions, flat-percentage cuts, and rule-of-thumb restrictions raise a question concerning the ability of Congress intelligently to review the President's budget.

Congressional control of public spending is affected by the stake which various organized interest and sectional groups have acquired in particular appropriations such as subsidies to farmers and shippers and appropriations for public improvements. Responsibility for Federal finances is diffused in Congress between various legislative committees which authorize expenditure programs and the Committees on Appropriations which appropriate funds to carry on these programs. The budget submitted by the President is broken into bits and pieces and considered piecemeal by 10 subcommittees in each House, each acting independently of the others.

A true budget includes income as well as expenditures, but for almost a century separate committees in Congress have passed on tax legislation and expenditure programs. The revenue program is not regarded as a part of the budget and hence over-all consideration of fiscal policy is never achieved. As a result of these conditions there is a growing belief in Congress and among students of public finance that basic reforms need to be made in our Federal budget system.

Numerous proposals for improving the budgetary procedures of Congress have been made in recent years. The most promising among them, I believe, is that for the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. A Joint Budget Committee was created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—section 138—but it has failed to function since 1949. There is strong sentiment in Congress, however, for its revival. Bills to recreate a Joint Committee on the Budget have been introduced in both Houses in the last three Congresses. And the McClellan bill has twice passed the Senate, first on April 8, 1952, by a vote of 55 to 8, and second on May 23, 1953, under unanimous consent. Senator MCCLELLAN has again introduced his bill, S. 1805, in the current Congress.

CASE FOR A JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

First. A Joint Committee on the Budget would give Congress that overall, coordinated view of Federal revenues and expenditures which the existing fiscal machinery of Congress fails to furnish. The revenue committees are tax-minded; the appropriating committees are expenditure-minded; what is now needed is a budget-minded committee that will look at both the income and outgo sides of the fiscal picture in their interrelationships.

Second. The Joint Budget Committee would inform and advise, but not supersede or trespass upon the jurisdiction of, the separate standing Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. It would have functions on the spending side similar to those performed on the revenue side since 1926 by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The latter committee with a competent staff has rendered invaluable assistance to the taxing committees of Congress for a quarter of a century. Similar results may well be expected from a joint budget committee.

Third. Under the existing system of separate appropriating committees, the whole complex problem of considering the expenditure needs of the Government is considered twice by two bodies acting independently. Apart from the additional work thereby entailed, this system provokes differences of opinion that often threaten to deadlock the two Houses and cause long delays in conference. At best, these differences can only be adjusted through resort to conference committees, whose action is

rarely satisfactory to either House. The proposed joint budget committee would facilitate agreement between the two Houses in the formulative stages of the appropriation process, and thus tend to minimize later differences and avoid the disadvantages and delays of the conference committee system.

Fourth. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 set up a procedure for the orderly formulation by the Executive of fiscal proposals and for their submission to the Congress as a unified budget. No comparable procedure has been set up in Congress for considering revenues and expenditures together as two interrelated aspects of a single problem. Some such innovation would improve the efficiency of the Government and allow better coordination between the executive and legislative branches in the fiscal field. Broadly conceived, the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would in effect be a lens through which all appropriation and revenue measures could be viewed in relationship both to what the Nation needs and to what the Nation can afford.

Fifth. With the great growth of the Federal Government and its functions, some method of reducing the burdens of bicameralism in the appropriation process seems advisable. A joint committee to coordinate the action of both chambers is obviously better suited to the survival of soundly conceived executive budget programs or to the substitution of legislative plans than are separate committees in each chamber acting entirely independently of each other.

Sixth. The joint committee would concern itself largely with major categories of both sides of the budget program, would endeavor to correlate all fiscal and economic implications, and would, with its avowed interest in the balancing problem, express its views on maximum limits for revenues and expenditures.

Seventh. It is contemplated that the joint committee would deal chiefly with the broad aspects of the budget and would not supplant the other fiscal committees of Congress. A budget reviewed on the basis of conferences between the members and staff of the joint committee on the one side, and Budget Bureau officials on the other, would be presented to Congress with added prestige, since it would represent not only the opinion of the President, but also, to a greater or lesser extent, that of key Members of Congress.

Eighth. Such a joint committee would be a definite, permanent, and continuously available agency to which Congress would look for the development and maintenance of a systematic fiscal program, and which would be in a position to indicate limits on both revenues and expenditures.

Ninth. The desirability of increased expert staff aids for the Appropriations Committees has been long felt and frequently advocated by their own members. With annual budgets now running around $65 billion, a larger and more expert appropriation staff is obviously needed to make a much more intensive scrutiny and screening of the President's budget requests than the present small staffs of those committees are able to make. Economy can be gained only by detailed knowledge of every request for funds and the actual need for them.

Economic Growth Comparison of Western Powers and Soviet Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WORL, Boston, Mass., on Sunday, May 15, 1955, the first program in the rotation series "Your Congressman Reports":

Which system is more productive—that of free enterprise or that of Communist regimentation?

The facts on our side are available for all to see. It is difficult, however, to penetrate the censorship, secrecy, and the isolation of the Communist world to get at the economic truth as to the progress or failures of the Reds.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in cooperation with the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the United States Congress, has made a thoroughgoing study of trends in economic growth—a comparison of the Western Powers and the Soviet bloc.

In the struggle between communism and freedom the factor of relative economic strength is fundamental.

Neither morale, nor political stability, nor a firm military posture can long be sustained in its absence.

That is why we enacted the Marshall plan and other measures to rebuild the war-shattered economies of our friends, particularly those in Europe.

These efforts have cost the American people many billions of dollars and have aroused resentment among some taxpayers, but the fact is that this help from us has sparked an economic revival in most of independent Europe and in a number of other areas.

Without this aid they would have been tempted in desperation to try the Communist way.

The Soviet Union is making an intense effort to spur production within its own borders and within those of the captive countries of Europe.

Recovery by the free world is not enough. It must have dynamic growth to keep ahead of the Communist bloc.

Underdeveloped countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are watching and comparing the two systems.

As medical advances have increased the rate of population growth in these backward countries, they must have greater output from farm and factory. It is not surprising that some of these nations are fascinated by the rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union, even though this is paid for at a frightful cost of human lives and human freedoms. To show that economic progress can be achieved without recourse to slavery is a moral and practical obligation of the West.

The well-being of the United States, apart from the conflict with communism, is tied up with the rest of the world. Only an expanding world economy can provide the raw materials and the markets which we will need, with greater population and less balanced resources, in future years.

Bearing in mind the difficulty of getting all the facts of the Soviet economy, and the Communist custom of juggling figures to serve propaganda purposes, the committee came to the following conclusions:

Although the population of the Soviet bloc may gain on us in the years ahead, the output per worker in the United States and Western Europe will probably retain its lead.

The Communists are having real troubles with their agriculture because, under the collective system, the farmers have no incentive to produce.

Although the Soviet Union has increased its steel capacity, its tonnage of steel produced is growing at a rate that prevailed in the United States 40 years ago.

Western Europe may be faced with a power shortage as generating capacity lags behind increasing demand. Atomic power, if it were developed at low cost by either area, could shift the economic balance quickly.

In transportation, the Soviet bloc is far behind. Due to the great distances separating resources, factories, and markets it has little chance of catching up with the West.

The Soviet Union during World War II suffered far heavier losses in terms of human life and capital resources than the West. Between 7 and 10 million persons were killed, or died, in the armed forces alone. The metal industry was hit with special severity, with 60 percent of the prewar steel and aluminum capacities destroyed or damaged. In agriculture, nearly half the horses and one-seventh of the cattle were lost.

Counterbalancing these losses, to a varying degree, was the territorial expansion of the Soviet Union. It increased its labor input by lengthening the workweek from a prewar 40 hours, to a postwar 48 hours by employing more women, by the conscription of 14-to-17-year olds, and by the slave labor of political prisoners whose number run in the millions.

The Soviets gained through the free access of thousands of engineers to American industrial know-how. It has enjoyed large capital and raw material transfers through lend-lease, and through booty or tribute taken from its captive states.

An examination of the various factors of production (growth of labor input, agriculture, housing, etc.) in the United States and in the Soviet Union today, gives strong grounds for expecting that the absolute gap in the size of the 2 economies will widen over the next 2 decades. Even though the rate of growth in the Soviet Union might be somewhat higher than in the United States.

As to Western Europe, if its rate of growth is not to fall further behind that of the Soviet Union, certain bottlenecks must be eliminated. Western Europe is a deficit area with regard to many raw materials. For this reason, its industries must be centered upon imports, fabrication, and reexports. It is greatly dependent, therefore, upon international trade. Lacking economic union, the separate countries of Western Europe, suffer from inefficient use of labor, capital, and natural resources. Some countries have a shortage of labor; others have a surplus. Where labor is abundant, there is a shortage of capital, and vice versa.

The captive countries have made very little progress because of the tremendous confiscation of their resources by the Russian Communists. The economic future of the captive countries will be influenced by the extent of continuing Soviet exactions, the character and pace of industrial expansion required by Russia, the degree to which economic cooperation between the captive states may be permitted, the morale of the labor

force, and even the existence of, say, Poland, in its present boundaries.

All in all, the captive countries, in the long run, may prove to be an economic drag on the Soviet Union.

Per capita personal consumption in the United States is more than 40 percent higher than it was before the war, while in independent Europe it has risen, on an average, by 11 percent. In contrast, per capita personal consumption in the Soviet Union and Poland is barely above the prewar level; in other captive countries, especially East Germany, it is still below that level. Thus, differences in living standards between the East and the West have widened over the past 15 years.

Before the war, Eastern Europe was more dependent, tradewise, upon Western Europe, than Western Europe was dependent upon it. Since the war, trade between these two regions has contracted greatly.

This shrinkage in trade has been caused, in large measure, by distortions in economic relationships caused by the Iron Curtain which the Soviet has drawn around its empire.

The West has retaliated by refusing to export the strategic goods that the Soviet bloc needs and wants.

The contraction of East-West trade means that the Reds are cut off from access to capital goods and iron ore, while free Europe is deprived of some foodstuffs, timber, and coal.

Meanwhile, free Europe has been making substantial progress in the lowering of many of its trade barriers.

Careful consideration should be given, on the one hand, to the restraints on East-West trade that are important for direct military reasons, and, on the other, to the desirability of cultivating friendship with the people in Communist countries via trade in nonstrategic goods.

At one extreme is the possibility of cutting off all trade between the free world and the Communist bloc. At the other is the possibility of encouraging the importation of needed raw materials from Communist countries in exchange for consumer, as opposed to producer, goods.

The West has tremendous economic power whereas the Soviet bloc, through propaganda and false promises, has been hiding its lesser economic growth. It is in the interest of the United States that these facts be made known throughout the world, particularly in underdeveloped areas.

The leaders of the Soviet Union are trying to sell the idea that the economies of the West are in decay. In pursuit of this goal, they circulate the most fantastic lies.

Careful cross checking is always needed before accepting their statistics.

The Communist bloc will continue intense efforts to increase its output, especially heavy industry, with little regard for human costs. In view of this fact, appreciation of the substantial successes of the United States and independent Europe, acting in close cooperation, in achieving both industrial expansion and better living, is essential. Such cooperation, continued in the future, can serve as a basic weapon in the East-West struggle.

Utilization of United States foreign trade policy as a positive means for strengthening the free world versus the Communist bloc, should be considered.

In Europe, the main task of aiding economic recovery has been accomplished.

It is important that the Western countries intensify their efforts in the field of education. The more immediate need is to train adequate numbers of scientists, engineers, and technicians. In the longer run, it is essential to keep raising the general level of education.

Superiority in economic strength and economic growth are desirable ends in themselves, but they do not assure political and military security. In fact, an economy that is already mobilized for war can operate with greater effectiveness, and for some time, against a considerably stronger economy that is not so mobilized.

The quality of economic goods in the Soviet Union varies greatly, being at its best in military and war-supporting goods, and at its poorest in consumer goods. However, under a regimented economy, like that of the Soviet Union, poorer grade goods can be kept in use much longer than they would be under a competitive economy.

Such a state, by virtue of the fact that it is a dictatorship, can act quickly, without having to engage in extended internal debate and discussion. For a time, at least, this power to utilize surprise tactics, might counterbalance relative economic weakness.

Although the deciding factor in a long war usually is economic superiority, a strong economy can be held at bay for some time, by a country whose economy is less strong, but is mobilized for military action, especially where new types of military weapons are available. Peacetime economic strength, in and of itself, therefore, is not a measure of military posture.

I have brought you the summary and conclusions of the committee's report.

In the hope and belief that only a well-informed public, able to grasp all the economic, political, military, and psychological factors involved, can decide the best policy for the free world to follow in winning the cold war against communism.

The Norwegians on Their Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, across the Atlantic in Norway today there is a spirit of general celebration and festivity. Norwegians are looking back across the pages of their country's history to a spring day in 1814. In April of that year a constituent assembly met at Eidsvold to draw up a new constitution. Representatives had been elected by the people for the purpose of drafting and adopting a constitution. The observation has since been made by historians that it is doubtful if there has been an assembly of men more sincerely and wholeheartedly devoted to the welfare of their country. They were in unanimous agreement that Norway must have a government based upon the sovereign will of the people. Within 6 weeks of their first meeting the assembly had adopted the new constitution and elected their new king.

This Constitution of Norway is in many ways similar to our own, in its provisions for personal and individual liberty and in the clauses which have to do with justice and equality. If these similarities are traced back to their origin, we can see that the ideas and traditions of these two nations, Norway and the United States, have much in common. The people of both countries have the same devotion for the rights of man and his personal dignity, and both believe in government founded on a proper balance between freedom and law.

Since May 17, 1814, the day when the Constitution of Norway was finally signed and became the law of the land, the going has not always been easy for Norway, by any means. Within our own generation we have seen Norway conquered and occupied by the ruthless Nazis. Norwegian forces at first struggled against overwhelming odds. Finally they were forced to surrender, but during the remainder of the war years the exploits of the Norwegian underground were daring and heroic, and in this way they were able to make a great contribution to the war effort.

Since the war Norway has been mainly concerned with reconstruction, recovery, and new economic gains for her people. The task at first seemed staggering. The demand for new housing was a particularly perplexing problem. But with new development in industry, with aid from our own country, with new vistas opening up for cooperation with other countries, Norway today finds herself on a sound economic footing and in a position to compete with other nations in selling her goods to the world.

On the international scene, Norway has shown remarkable interest in participating in many international organizations. Norway is a member of the United Nations, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Together with the leaders of other Western democracies Norway's leaders have given unstintingly of their time and energy to work for world peace and for improved cultural and economic relations between nations.

This day of celebration in Norway gives us in America an opportunity to send across the sea our own hearty greetings and congratulations. May the spirit of brotherhood which already binds us together continue to grow not only in our international life but also in a more personal way, in our own hearts.

Pride of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lakewood, Ohio, has just observed one of the most unique celebrations in modern American history—the observance of a "pride of progress."

These peerless American citizens of Lakewood are justifiably elated over their accomplishments during this past decade, for without State or Federal assistance this city, with a population of approximately 70,000, has spent $50 million in civic improvements.

This decade of advancement has marked the construction of a new municipal swimming pool, the expenditures of millions for the development of Lakewood Hospital, thousands for the devel-

opment of off-street parking, $5,215,000 in new apartment construction, and more millions for parochial schools and new churches. Millions have been spent in the last 10 years improving and adding to Lakewood's public schools, and thousands more have been spent in general revitalization of a community which many people said reached its peak 25 or 30 years ago.

Uppermost in this sense of pride is the completion of the $1,200,000 Lakewood Civic Auditorium, the last word in modern amphitheaters with acoustical design employing the best features known to audio engineering. Its one floor design with seating for 2,000 people provides an atmosphere of informality and a feeling of belonging.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lakewood are rightly proud of their accomplishments. It is indeed unique for a community of this size without both hands in Uncle Sam's pockets to embark upon such a tremendous building program. I am proud to represent these true Americans in the Congress. Their spirit and energy could well serve as an example for all America. "Pride of progress" would be a fitting motto and guide for us all. We in Washington point with the utmost pride to Lakewood, Ohio.

Strength and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Addressing the members of the Parent-Teachers Association at St. Joseph's Hall, Fitchburg, Sunday night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of Clinton stated that, "despite present gigantic world problems, there has been a distinct improvement recently in the entire international situation and that the prospects for something more than a nervous peace could be regarded as brighter than at any time since the end of the Korean conflict."

Pointing to the admission of Germany into NATO, the Austrian peace treaty and the happenings of the recent Bandung conference as most encouraging signs of the vitality of the free world, the Clinton Congressman declared that "while it is too early to predict complete success with current negotiations, that all these developments indicate that we can take a more optimistic view of international problems pending the outcome of the Big Four conference.

"I would not venture to predict at this time," said the Congressman, "that we can or that we will be able to forge in the near future the just peace which all the peoples of the world so ardently yearn for. But it is becoming increasingly clear that the attitude of the Soviet toward peace proposals is more conciliatory and more rational. If this Nation continues to make it clear to the Kremlin leaders that we will not compromise our basic principles and ideals and that we will not tolerate international banditry designed to permit communism to destroy free institutions, I sincerely believe that great progress can be made, by proposals for disarmament and control of atomic and hydrogen energy, toward the goals of peace and freedom which we seek and which must underlie any lasting settlement of world problems."

"It is the time for us, not only to sympathize with, but stanchly to support the intensified efforts which this Government is making to try to avert the unspeakable calamity of a third world war, and every true American must be and will be prepared, I am sure, to cooperate toward these great ends.

"In the meantime," he said, "it behooves us to keep our own house in order—to build our defenses and to establish our striking forces on a firm and invincible basis—to develop our economic resources—promote the national prosperity—so as to insure that our great economic machine is kept healthy and dynamic and so that employment opportunities are furnished to all our fellow citizens.

"Economic strength is the basis of our military power as the Soviet well knows. But there is another kind of strength most essential, and that is the kind represented here tonight—our spiritual strength, our spiritual devotion to the principles of freedom and an unyielding determination to uphold them. That is the real strength of America. If properly preserved and nourished that strength will enable us, not only to build a greater America, but in time to secure a peaceful world."

The Congressman declared that organizations like PTA were making invaluable contributions to the solution of our educational problems and the well-being of our youth who will be the future leaders of our national life.

A Program of Great Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday this House passed H. R. 2126, which would expand and extend our wise program of research in the development and utilization of saline waters. I note with great pleasure that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs yesterday reported favorably S. 516, a bill which is intended to accomplish the same purpose of continuing and enlarging this program.

This is highly encouraging news, not only to our citizens living in coastal areas, but also to those residing in inland areas and suffering from drought and water shortages. Research along the lines provided for in this program could well make available billions of gallons of potable water to noncoastal areas suffering a critical shortage, since there are tremendous quantities of water within States located all over the United States which are not now usable because of high saline content. Development of a successful process of purification could aid these States immeasurably, as well as those bordering on the seacoasts.

The potentialities of this research are almost limitless. It can be of tremendous importance to the entire world, and could be one of the most fruitful developments of all times, virtually revolutionary in scope. Discovery of a cheap and easy way of converting saline water into a form which would be palatable to mankind, to domesticated animals, and to the plant life which provides so much of our food and other necessities of life, could transform countless regions of the world. It could be the most effective and inexpensive economic-aid program ever conceived. It might be a point 4 program without a peer in the annals of history.

Too, in the event of an atomic war, and the bombing of municipal water supplies, development of this process might save countless lives.

As one who is deeply concerned at the terrible impact of the drought upon the face of the Nation, it is highly encouraging to me to see the Congress well on its way toward taking another step which may eventually do much to bring some relief to so many citizens and so many wasting millions of acres of our land.

Let us hope that this bill speedily becomes law, and that the prospects held out by this farseeing research come to an early and triumphant conclusion.

Veterans' Administration Hospital, East Orange, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to spend Hospital Day, May 15, at the splendid Veterans' Administration hospital at East Orange, N. J., and I was deeply impressed with the fine care that is being provided for our hospitalized veterans by the able manager, Dr. A. P. Upshur and his fine staff. They are aided by faithful regular volunteers who were honored at the ceremonies on Sunday. Awards were presented to 200 volunteers, 6 of whom have served well over 1,000 hours; 1, Mrs. Helen Seidenberg, has served 2,902 hours. She travels almost 2 hours each way to perform her duties at the hospital. This spirit of devotion and sacrifice animates these good citizens who give so generously of their time.

The following organizations compose the Veterans' Administration voluntary services hospital advisory committee: American Gold Star Mothers; American Legion; American Legion Auxiliary; American National Red Cross; American Veterans Committee; American Veterans of World War II; American Veterans of World War II Auxiliary; American War Dads; American War Mothers; American Women's Voluntary Services, Inc.; Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States; B'nai B'rith; B'nai B'rith Women's Supreme Council; Catholic War Veterans; Catholic War Veterans, Ladies Auxiliary, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War; Disabled American Veterans; Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary; Eastern

Paralyzed Veterans Association; 52 Association; Garden Club of New Jersey; Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Jewish War Veterans, Ladies Auxiliary; Marine Corps League; Marine Corps League Auxiliary; Masonic Service Association of the United States; Military Order of the Cootie; Military Order of the Purple Heart; Military Order of the Purple Heart, Ladies Auxiliary; National Catholic Community Service; National Jewish Welfare Board; National Jewish Welfare Board, Women's Organization Division; National Woman's Relief Corps; Navy Mothers Clubs of America, Inc.; New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs; New Jersey Tuberculosis League, Inc.; Order of the Eastern Star of New Jersey; Supreme Cootiette Club of the United States; United Spanish War Veterans; United Spanish War Veterans Auxiliary; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Veterans of Foreign Wars, Auxiliary; Women's Overseas Service League; Young Women's Christian Association.

They render splendid cooperation to the competent chief of social services, Mr. Joseph V. McLoone.

My remarks at the ceremonies follow:

It is a privilege to celebrate National Hospital Day in this great veterans' facility and your kindness in inviting me to participate is deeply appreciated. It is fitting that we proclaim the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people. It is especially fitting that we observe the magnificent work being carried on in our veterans hospitals to provide the highest quality care to the valiant defenders of our beloved Nation.

On this peaceful May day in 1955, even in this spot where the ravages of war are close by, V–J Day of September 2, 1945, seems a long way off. That memorable day signaled the end of the most terrible war in all history, which had involved almost every nation in the world.

No prepared summary of statistics can properly tell the story of our loss. Of no moment is the financial cost when compared to the cost in suffering and sorrow, in disabled men and heartbroken women, orphaned children and broken homes.

Many of you here remember very well the tremendous tide of emotional jubilation that ran throughout our country on V–J Day. Think how the relatives of our prisoners of war felt, for now their men would be released from prison camps; inhabitants of the horrible concentration camps holding the civilian survivors of these years of hatred would be able to walk again with the God-given dignity of free men; the medical profession relieved of the tremendous demands of military medicine could now devote their time to repairing the physical and mental ravages of war; soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen would recuperate from the rigors of combat and attempt to pick up the threads of a disturbed life. I recall the great surge of relief and joy which V–J Day brought to me and my comrades serving in the European theater. Like so many others, probably some of whom are here today, I had gone through the war from the landings in North Africa to the surrender in Germany and was preparing to go to the Far East when the thrilling news of the final surrender of the Japanese came.

At that time the American people were deeply aware of their debt of honor to their countrymen who had endured so much and of their duty to the disabled, to those who had given their health and strength in battle. Congress acted with great wisdom in carrying out the will of the American people. It was recognized that, no matter how beautiful or elaborate, a monument fashioned out of masonry would still be a lifeless, useless momento to the men and women in World War II. In its place was erected something much better, much more fitting—the GI bill. Congress also passed legislation which provided for the construction of these beautiful modern Veterans' Administration hospitals. These indeed are living memorials, dedicated in great part to the dead but of service to the living. The American people were fortunate that men of the caliber of Dr. Upshur were available to assume the exacting, wearing and demanding job of managing these great hospitals and that highly trained personnel were eager to devote their talents and skills to this public service.

In 1945 and 1946 there was started another memorial founded not on legislation but on the great love of the veteran that exists in the hearts of so many wonderful Americans. While volunteers had been serving in service and veterans hospitals for many years prior to World War II, it was after this war that they were organized into one group under the Special Services of the Veterans' Administration. Forty national organizations have joined together to coordinate their services, eliminate duplication, and deliver to the hospitalized veteran the full support of the people in the community.

While maintaining their own organizational individuality they work in close cooperation with each other and the result is of tremendous service to the Administrator for Veterans' Affairs and the Chief Medical Director on the national level and the hospital manager in the local community. These organizations may be veteran, service, religious, or fraternal but they all have one common goal—service to the veteran.

The proof that they are doing their job well sits right here before us today. You 200 volunteers are to receive certificates honoring you for the faithful performance of your duties. Your service has been so outstanding that in some cases there is no certificate yet authorized to equal the number of hours that you have served.

I understand that you serve in virtually every service of the hospital bringing with you the true spirit of service. It is particularly appropriate that we should honor you on the same day in which we honor the nursing profession for your service so closely resembles and, in many cases, becomes a part of theirs. You are here to give comfort and solace to people who are sick and disabled. You do it willingly, unselfishly, and, for the most part, anonymously. It is on rare occasions such as this one that the other people in your community are afforded the privilege of viewing you in public and receiving from you the same inspiration which comes to me now.

You may ask how I know so much about the volunteers. I hear about you in letters from my constituents. In their praise of the care which they receive in this fine institution they invariably make mention of the smiling face, cheerful hello, or helping hand of the volunteers.

Be proud of your certificates. They are your remembrance of the part you play in building and maintaining this living monument to the men and women who served their country in time of war. This is an example of America at its greatest for it shows that we can mix the power and strength required to win a war with the sincerity and gratitude required to maintain a just peace.

Like the professional staff, yours is a service to America that cannot be measured. It is my privilege to salute you and it gives me great comfort to know that you serve the men and women hospitalized in this institution. Between your efforts and those of the professional staff I know they are in good hands. I shall go back to Washington heartened by that knowledge and I pledge you my best efforts to insure that the Congress, just as it did in 1945, will stand by our Nation's obligations to the VA hospital program.

Members of Congress Engage in a Forum Discussion With United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge at United Nations Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional tour to New York City one of the highlights was a visit to the United Nations where the party was greeted by United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his staff.

After inspecting the United Nations Building, Ambassador Lodge conducted a forum at which time he answered questions from Members of Congress. Following is a transcript of the question-and-answer period:

UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS—CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS, MAY 7, 1955

Congressman VAN ZANDT. The purpose of this gathering is to permit Ambassador Lodge to make a brief opening statement and to answer questions. If there should be a question that he feels should be answered in executive session, he reserves that right. Each Member of Congress, as he puts his question, should rise and state his name and State for the benefit of the record. Ambassador Lodge will now make a brief opening statement.

Ambassador LODGE. Let me first say that it is quite inspiring to see that the competition of the gift shop wasn't very heavy.

In response to a question that I could not answer upstairs, the auditorium seats a little more than 2,000 people.

Now, the United Nations has not worked out in the way that the founders thought it would 10 years ago. You know this year the United Nations is celebrating its 10th anniversary with a week's celebration in San Francisco.

Here is how it has worked out:

The Soviet Union, as I said upstairs, has paralyzed the Security Council by its abuse of the veto. But, it has not destroyed the power of collective international action. We now have a system whereby we can go to the General Assembly in cases of aggression and thereby bypass the veto. Also, under the United Nations Charter we can set up regional organizations. We have done this in the case of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has a good deal of force back of it. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is just beginning. We also have the Organization of American States which goes back to the Monroe Doctrine and, of course, is much older than the United Nations. And the Organization of American States I think is a model of what an international organization can be. We follow the policy here of not having disputes come to the United Nations unless the Organization of American States has proved that it cannot deal with them; and since I have been here that has never happened.

So there is some power of collective security in the United Nations although not through the Security Council.

Secondly, the United Nations has developed into a remarkable center of information. When a very difficult question is about to come up for a vote, a day or two before that, it is just surprising how much you can find out about what the real attitudes

of these governments are. There is nothing like having to vote on a thing, as you gentlemen well know, to make you come to grips with the realities of the subject.

We learn a great deal here about the thinking of other nations. And the file that I send every night to Washington on that, I am told, is of great interest in Washington.

The United Nations is a center for harmonizing disputes. That, of course, is one of its original purposes and it has lived up to it. That often is not very spectacular. If you harmonize disputes you do not attract as much attention as when you have a dispute. For example, the Berlin blockade was brought to an end as a result of a meeting in the delegates' lounge between a United States representative and a Soviet representative.

These contacts can be made without loss of prestige, loss of face, or anything like that.

Then the United Nations has developed into the only truly world forum. It is the most powerful single engine that there is for influencing world opinion. And I believe that only by influencing world opinion will you develop a world sense of justice, and only on the basis of justice can you have dependable peace. You can have periods of peace such as we are having now. But if you are going to organize peace dependably, there has got to be a world sense of justice. And, of course, there isn't any such world sense of justice today with communism thinking the way it does. Communism is a disease which is afflicting the world, and this is one place where we are trying to cure the world of the propensity to go to war.

When you have a forum you have to use it. It is like a man in a boat on a river in front of a boathouse. He doesn't stay still. He goes either forward or backward. When you have a forum you have to have the material, the aggressiveness and skill to use it in debate, and you have to be prepared to use it.

We use it all the time and I think we have gotten a great deal of advantage out of it. I have a rule here, which I never deviate from, always to speak on the day that the Communists speak, so that something about the viewpoint of the United States of America goes out to the world in the news dispatches.

Finally, the United Nations is a place where countries can learn about each other. At the recent Bandung Conference, which I know you have all followed with interest, it was interesting that many of the most prominent figures there were men who had served here at the United Nations for many years. They had come here to New York to live. They brought their wives and children. They put their children into schools and colleges here. They had traveled around the country and gone to our colleges and service clubs. They know this country. So when somebody gets up and says that we are nothing but a bunch of Wall Street plotters with icewater in our veins, these fellows just know it isn't true. That came out, I think, very markedly at the Bandung Conference.

When you think that that conference adopted a resolution which condemned Communist colonialism in the very same breath with the old-fashioned colonialism, which is what most of these countries had actually known, you realize what a great center of learning the United Nations is—and what intelligent and fair-minded men many of these leaders are. I think this is a recent interesting example of what that United Nations can accomplish.

Now, since it has been founded, the United Nations has played a decisive part in the following situations any one of which could have led to war:

The removal of Soviet troops from Iran in 1946.

Ending the Communist encroachment of Greece in 1947.

Bringing about the independence of Israel and ending a bloody war in Palestine, although the situation, of course, is still delicate.

Bringing about the independence of Indonesia, a country of more than 70 million people in which there was a great deal of unrest at that time.

Ending the fighting between Pakistan and India over the Valley of Kashmir.

And, of course, finally in repelling the aggression in Korea.

Now, of course, the United States played the overwhelming part in Korea. I think on a typical day at the front, out of every 100 troops, 38 were United States, 52 were Republic of Korea, and 10 were of other United Nations members. In other words, the United Nations members other than the United States put up the equivalent of two divisions. It would have been obviously better if they had put up 4 or 6 divisions, but 2 divisions at World War II costs is $600 million, which does not compare so badly with the $13 million which we pay here to the U. N. And, of course, measured by the graver arithmetic of human life, there were many less casualties—3,000 deaths, I believe—which otherwise might have been borne by the United States.

Let me also say that if we ever have another Korea, which God forbid, we would get a still better performance because I do not think the United States would adhere to the policy which we had at that time of requiring countries to put up their own logistic support, their own shipping, their own dollars and their own supplies. We would take troops that were militarily effective even if they could not supply that logistic support.

So in Korea we had for the first time in history an aggression repelled by collective security under the auspices of an international organization. It is like the first time that the Wright brothers were able to make an airplane fly 31 miles an hour for 17 seconds—but it flew—and they did not go out and destroy it, but they proceeded to try to make it better. That, I think, is what we should try to do with the United Nations.

That is a brief summary of what the United Nations has done and what it has evolved into in the last 10 years.

Let me say, as I conclude, that I think it is a wonderful thing for you Members of Congress who are the elected lawmakers and policymakers of the United States Government to come here and see the United Nations with your own eyes, to take time out from what after all is a personal vacation for all of you, and to do this rather serious errand. The United States belongs to many international organizations but this is the one that has the most comprehensive character; and I think it is a fine public service for you to come here and give it your precious time and get a firsthand picture of the United Nations.

Thank you.

Congressman JAMES I. DOLLIVER (Iowa). Last fall, a committee, of which I am a member on interstate and foreign commerce, made a trip to Africa, and we did not quite get into the Gold Coast but we heard a good deal about it. I would like to hear any elaboration of what you said upstairs about independence for the Gold Coast and any racial tensions that may or may not exist there.

Ambassador LODGE. Well, that is a matter that is in the Trusteeship Council, where our representative is Mr. Sears, and I could only answer it in a general way. As I understand it, they are moving toward self-government and making real progress. But just when they expect to achieve it, I can't say. The actual date of independence has not been established. I know that our United States representative has been there and I only wish he was here today. That is all I can give you of a general nature. However, I will get Mason Sears to write you a letter about it.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE (California). The form of my question does not necessarily reveal my thinking. I have heard on the floor of the House, within the last 3 months, at least 1 or 2 or 3 Members of the House say it is time for the United States to withdraw from the United Nations. Shouldn't we do that, Mr. Ambassador? If not, why not?

Ambassador LODGE. No. I don't think we should. In fact, I think it would be about the most imprudent thing we could do. If we withdrew, of course, the Soviet Union would not, and then the Soviet Union would do everything in its power to turn this organization into something directed at us. I think that even if the United Nations were not doing a good job, we could not afford to withdraw and leave the Soviet Union in. I do not think we can afford to withdraw from any of the international organizations that we belong to and leave the Soviet Union in. The United Nations is doing a good job; it has accomplished something on the plus side all the time in the quest for peace. So there are two reasons why we should not get out: First, it would end the constructive work the United Nations is doing, and second, it would leave the Soviet Union in control and turn this against us. Of course, thirdly, I think it would probably mean world war III.

Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK (Washington). Is there any feasible way in which the veto could be abolished and, in your opinion, should it be abolished?

Ambassador LODGE. I think the veto should be abolished on the admission of new members. I do not think the veto should be abolished on questions which might involve the use of American troops. I think that all questions of that kind I should always refer back to Washington. I do not think we can ever give up that right. But I do favor abolishing the veto on the admission of new members. At the present time there are 14 countries, including such large countries as Japan and Italy, and, of course, the Federal Republic of Germany, which joined NATO yesterday, and Spain when and if they apply. Then a host of small countries, democratic, peace-loving countries among whom are Finland, Ireland, Portugal, and Austria in the Western World. Then you have Ceylon, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Nepal, Libya, Jordan, and Japan. Those are the countries that ought to be in that are being kept out by the Soviet veto. I believe that we ougnt to eliminate the veto on the admission of new members, but we should not eliminate the veto on matters that might involve the use of American troops.

Congressman ED EDMONDSON (Oklahoma). Mr. Ambassador, can you tell us anything new about the prospects for release of our imprisoned airman in China?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, I can just say that I am optimistic, that I have faith that it is going to come about. The reaction here, I think, has been about as good as you can want. As soon as this became known last November and December, I introduced a resolution condemning their imprisonment and instructing the Secretary General to use every means within his power to seek their release. That resolution passed by a vote of 47 to 5. The only people against it were the Communist bloc. The Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjold, went to Peking. He has just been to Stockholm recently where he conferred with the Chinese Communist ambassador. I have had frequent talks with him. He is leaving no stone unturned. I just have faith that it is going to happen. I can't say much more than that. It is not the kind of thing you can spell out all the details in public, but I have faith it is going to happen.

Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR. (Virginia). Mr. Ambassador, I understood a while ago that you felt that if we had another situation like Korea we would have more help from the United Nations than we did in Korea.

Ambassador LODGE. Yes.

Congressman HARDY. Would you apply that or would you expect we would have more help from the United Nations if we become involved in trouble in the Formosa Straits, including Matsu and Quemoy?

Ambassador LODGE. I will take that question off the record later on.

Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL (Maryland). Mr. Ambassador, I heard on the news report that Red China is manufacturing a lot of narcotics and shipping great quantities to the United States. What are we doing about it?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, that is a matter that comes up quite often. Mr. Anslinger, the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, has had a good deal to say about that here before the International Narcotics Commission, and I know they have it under advisement. But I am not aware that they have come out with any specific recommendation. However, I will have that looked into and write you about it. I will give you a detailed answer in writing.

Congressman EDITH GREEN (Oregon). Ambassador Lodge, do you think it would be advisable to put Formosa under United Nations trusteeship, and what would be the advantages and disadvantages?

Ambassador LODGE. That question also I will take off the record.

Congressman W. PAT JENNINGS (Virginia). I believe the original United Nations Charter provided for the revision of the charter at the end of a 10-year period. What is being done at present toward that end?

Ambassador LODGE. There will be a resolution on the agenda this fall of the General Assembly for the calling of a charter review conference. The United States has not yet developed an official position. As a matter of fact, the executive branch is waiting for the advice of the Senate. The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee has been taking testimony all over the country on the subject. My own view as an individual official is that there should be a charter review conference but not before we have developed an American position and had time to develop an interallied position.

My view is, as I told this gentleman, that one thing we ought to be for is the elimination of the veto on the admission of new members.

That is where we stand now. It will be on the agenda again this autumn and it is a question first whether you have a charter review conference and second, when.

Congressman PAUL C. JONES (Missouri). Mr. Ambassador, relative to the operation of the financial affairs of the United Nations, who makes the determination or sets the allocation of contributions from the various members?

Ambassador LODGE. There is a contributions committee that works that out in accordance with statistics of national productivity, wealth, and so forth. Their recommendations, of course, are subject to appraisal by the General Assembly.

Congressman JONES. Pardon me, one other question. Have you had any incidents where some nation has had an assessment made and felt that that was too much and declined to make that payment?

Ambassador LODGE. No, I don't think that has ever happened. We have had some nations object but not refuse to pay. We have some nations in arrears, but they haven't been in arrears long enough to lose their General Assembly vote. You have to be in arrears for 2 years to lose your vote. When we started in here, it was proposed that we pay about 50 percent. Now we have got it down to 33⅓.

Congressman JONES. When you first started we paid much more than that even.

Ambassador LODGE. Originally it was suggested we pay 50 percent. But we never paid even that 50 percent; now we pay a third.

Congressman JONES. That was on the floor of the House and it was indicated that we had paid much more, and for the building——

Ambassador LODGE. The building is a separate proposition. I am talking about the operating expenses. The operating expenses we now pay 33⅓, which I think is about right. I don't think it ought to go any lower.

Congressman JONES. The Soviet Union, how much do they pay?

Ambassador LODGE. They are up from 14 to 17.

Congressman LESTER R. JOHNSON (Wisconsin). My question is in line somewhat with EDITH GREEN's of Oregon. We hear much about trusteeship for Formosa. By what rights is Chiang Kai-shek governing Formosa at the present time?

Ambassador LODGE. I am going to take all the Formosa questions off the record.

Congressman STEWART UDALL (Arizona). Mr. Ambassador, one area where our work impinges directly on the work of your organization here is in the field of appropriating money that is requested, and we had a vote 6 weeks or so ago with regard to the appropriation for the technical assistance program of the United Nations. I believe that $8 million was requested and we voted in the House $4 million. I don't know whether the Senate has passed on it as yet. I want to know if you feel that that work is important, and you might educate us a little bit on that if you would.

Ambassador LODGE. I think that work is very important, and I think it is very advantageous to us. It is another way for us to do something that we want to do anyway.

We have bilateral technical assistance in which we make an agreement with one country and go in and help it. When you do it through the United Nations you have certain advantages over that.

The fact that you do it under the auspices of the United Nations means that the charge of American imperialism, which while it is completely specious, is nevertheless made, falls absolutely flat at an activity which is made under the auspices of the United Nations. That is one advantage.

Another advantage is that you get a great many more countries in on the act, so that increases the percentage of participation by countries other than the United States. It is a good will builder for the United States. It is a thing that does a lot of good in eliminating disease, and improving basic living standards, in countries that are today in a very primitive state.

A man here once said to me that a hungry man is more interested in 4 sandwiches than he is in 4 freedoms. And until people have a certain minimum to live on, you can't expect them to get very much excited about ideals and ideas, whereas once they do have that minimum standard then you can expect them to stand up and fight for themselves in case they have to.

So I think the United Nations technical assistance is a good thing and it is something we should support.

Congressman UDALL. Is our contribution in that field somewhat similar—in a similar ratio—to our contribution to the operation fund of the organization?

Ambassador LODGE. No, it is bigger. We contribute 33⅓ to running this United Nations organization. The contribution to the United Nations technical-assistance program is more than that; it is over 50 percent.

Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN (Iowa). I have been following the activities of the United Nations in the field of trade, in commodity agreements, in the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices, and I have been very pleased with the statements of Mr. Hotchkis in stating our position in refusing to go along with some of those world-wide movements in the direction of what you might call governmental cartel. I wonder whether Mr. Hotchkis' statements in those two fields have resulted in United Nations backing away from further dealings in that direction? Are they still determined to go along without us in this matter of Ad Hoc Committee of Restrictive Business Practices?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, I can't answer that question specifically, although I will get the answer for you. Our position is still the same, and the question of restrictive business practices is coming up in the Economic and Social Council next week.

Senator MARTIN. Our position has been very well stated by Mr. Hotchkis and very well done. I am just wondering about the rest of the United Nations.

Ambassador LODGE. It is coming up in the Economic and Social Council next week. Our position has not changed.

Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL (Colorado). Mr. Ambassador, 2 years ago I was a member of the delegation to the FAO. My question is along the line that someone asked a while ago regarding our assistance, technical assistance. Now, the question is this: I couldn't help but feel the lack of technical staff that our leadership lacked in that great conference of 71 nations—older than the United Nations, according to their testimony. Now, what sort of a staff do you have, and how do you come about your staff? In other words, is the United States Congress and the executive department furnishing you with the assistance to do the right kind of a job you should do in an organization like this? That is my question.

Ambassador LODGE. Well, the Congress treats me all right. I have no complaints.

I have a miniature State Department, you might say, here in New York. I have to have it, because when I come over here every day I have to deal with 60 different countries and I have to have advisers who keep me posted. I have quarters in a commercial office building over at 2 Park Avenue, 2 floors. I have 103 people. They involve communications personnel, because I have cryptographic equipment and telegraphic equipment to Washington and tie lines and telephone lines. You can always get me direct from Washington on the State Department tie line. And I have stenographers and research people, and then I have about a dozen political officers. It is adequate for what I have to do. The quarters are not satisfactory to me, from a security standpoint. Frankly, I am trying to do something about that. But as far as personnel is concerned, I have enough to do the job I need to do.

Congressman LEROY JOHNSON (California). I would like to find out what the State Department thinks of the efforts of the military-assistance groups. I have visited pretty nearly every one in the whole world, and I have a high regard for what they are doing. Are they helping develop peace plans along the lines of building up strength in that direction with the State Department?

Ambassador LODGE. I think, in general, yes. In general, it is an extremely sound policy and I think they contribute to the security of the world and to the chances of peace.

Congressman VAN ZANDT. Thank you, Ambassador Lodge. The Members of Congress will proceed to conference room 8 for a short off-the-record conference with the Ambassador, and the remainder of the group should remain here, and you will be guided from this auditorium.

Address of Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, to the Construction and Civic Department Luncheon at the Annual Meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address before the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce by a former colleague in the House and now Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Honorable Albert M. Cole:

ADDRESS BY ALBERT M. COLE, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TO THE CONSTRUCTION AND CIVIC DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955

I like the title, "The New City," that Stuart Fitzpatrick of the United States Chamber of Commerce has asked me to talk about here today. It has the ring of real change in it. And it is change we want in our urban patterns.

But just to keep things entirely clear, I'd like to enlarge on that title a bit. Let's make it "The New and Better City."

We have a habit of thinking that anything new—or different—is also better. When we buy anything new we assume it's better. Well, maybe it is.

But let me ask you this. "When your wife gets a new hat—and note I said your wife, not mine—can you honestly tell me it is always a better hat?"

No; just new things aren't necessarily better things. A new home isn't always a better home, nor a new neighborhood a better neighborhood a better neighborhood—just because it's new.

What we want in the new city is a really better city—better suited to our needs and times, better planned for our future growth, better designed for the way our people want to live.

We don't want change in order to have something different but in order to get something better. We're not out just to destroy everything we've built in the past.

On the contrary, we are seeking to preserve and revitalize the good we have built into our cities at the same time that we replace what we have outgrown and worn out. This is what we mean by the renewed city, and by "urban renewal" as it is conceived in President Eisenhower's new program and the Housing Act of 1954 which so many of those here in this room helped formulate.

As a result we can honestly say that we are approaching the new and better city we've talked and dreamed about for a good many years. In a way, it still seems to be something we hope for in the distant future, a kind of castle in the air.

But I have news for you. This new city is no longer a distant dream. It is materializing before our eyes—it is developing from coast to coast under the driving force of private enterprise with local, State, and Federal help. It is what our public wants.

I doubt if you realize how great and rapid a change is being wrought today all across the Nation. I have been in numerous cities and towns. It is my job to go and see—and tell you what I have seen.

In more than 100 communities, ranging from small towns to our largest metropolitan areas, 185 clearance and redevelopment projects are either in work or soon to start. One way to grasp the scope of this activity is to assume for the moment that all this work is concentrated in one place.

Here is what it adds up to:

The removal of substandard housing in these areas is the equivalent to clearing all the slum housing in the cities of Detroit and Boston combined or, if you prefer, of Baltimore and Atlanta.

It is equal to eliminating all the slum units in the cities of Buffalo, Denver, and San Francisco.

Or, to spread it out more, it amounts to getting rid of the slum housing in all of the following six cities: Dallas, Tex.; Toledo, Ohio; Omaha, Nebr.; San Diego, Calif.; Providence, R. I., and Little Rock, Ark.

And that's not all.

These projects involve the clearance, replanning, and redevelopment of more than 7,000 acres—or 11 square miles.

This means clearing and rebuilding an area the size of Raleigh, N. C., or Schenectady, N. Y., or Atlantic City, N. J.

What about people? These undertakings will mean decent housing in place of slum and blighted homes for more than a quarter of a million people—nearly 80,000 families. This amounts to rehousing the total population of such cities as Miami, Fla.—or Oklahoma City—or Long Beach, Calif.

In addition, another 100 such projects, more than half again as many, are in earlier planning stages.

Of even more far-reaching importance, however, are 100 communities that are developing, or have completed, community-wide workable programs, not only to clear slums, but also to undertake full-scale rehabilitation, preventive, and conservation measures to eradicate the effects of blight. Many of these will have broad-scale action under way this year to upgrade neighborhoods, revamp obsolete street patterns, open up deficit areas to greatly increased and productive use, and to expand the clearance and reuse of wornout high-tax-low-revenue sections.

This is the box score 9 months since the broad urban renewal program became law in the Housing Act of 1954. Slum clearance work, of course, has been going on for several years, but there has been a tremendous intensification of the activity under the stimulus of the new program. It is now reaching out all over the Nation. A revitalized private industry in communities everywhere is now giving vigorous support to planning programs and social responsibilities, once thought to be the bailiwick of long-haired dreamers. Today the businessman presses the President's program on to practical solutions.

Already this is potentially a billion-dollar business in redevelopment and reconstruction, the great bulk of it by private investment. This represents, in fact, a national ground swell of major proportions in our economic and in our urban life.

The new city, the better city, is no longer a myth and a dream. It has come into being throughout the Nation.

You here today, as spokesmen and leaders for American business, can take real satisfaction in what is being done in urban renewal. In no small part it represents the force of progress that motivates American private enterprise. Without business support in the community, working through your chambers of commerce and other professional, trade, and civic groups, it wouldn't be happening.

This new city will be your city. It will be of your design and construction. We are handing down no blueprints from Washington.

We are offering you Federal assistance to carry out your plans. All we ask is that the new city shall be a better city—that it shall serve the needs and interests of the whole community, not just special or privileged segments.

The urban renewal program is off to a successful and gratifying start. But there are dangers in early success—many of them hidden dangers.

I see some rough times ahead as we begin to feel the impact of the changes wrought on our own particular fields of interest. And there is always danger in losing sight of the fact that we owe our progress to common agreement and common purpose among many groups and interests and to the coordinated use of all our resources.

Either of these dangers could derail the urban renewal program and wreck our hopes for the new and better city. Business enterprise will need to exert strong moral and civic leadership for cohesive action if these dangers are to be avoided.

Officials in many of our cities today are trying to bring about effective enforcement of local codes. But most of them are having a tough time.

The slums die hard because slum proprietors hate to see them go. Few of them really care how the people in the slum live, and fewer still, apparently, really care if you and I as taxpayers have to pay a subsidy to the municipal services to keep their rent collections level. I am no "do-gooder" in the satirical sense of the name, but I get sore seeing so much tax money supporting the contempt of the slum owners. They employ every available device of noncompliance and legal obstruction to thwart the efforts of the city and the citizens.

Enforcement is the city's job. But compliance with the law and improvement of the property is the owner's responsibility. We can't piously demand that the city enforce its codes and clean up the town, and then add in the next breath, "But you'll have to catch us first."

Strong business support of the city's efforts to compel correction of unfit dwellings and the moral force of business to bring about willing compliance by individual property interests is essential. And businessmen see this. Few of America's slums are owned by businessmen who are worthy of the name. This is not a matter of equity or just treatment—to which the Republican Party believes every citizen is entitled. It is a question of whether any private interest can assert and maintain a vested right to profit from the degradation and financial loss of the community as a whole.

The business community is relied upon to meet the private development requirements in these renewal areas that are now coming on the market. We recognize that this is a new field of investment, with a number of imponderables to be worked out. For that reason, the new Housing Act provides for special Government mortgage insurance through the FHA for new and rehabilitated housing in renewal projects.

This is also a field of new investment opportunity in prime properties with built-in security and protection.

Now, frankly, I am not seriously concerned about how business enterprise will measure up to these responsibilities. As a matter of good conscience and good sense, I am confident it will assume its full role of leadership.

A more subtle danger, as the program moves ahead, is whether we will maintain the high degree of coordinated and cooperative interest we have been able to achieve. More

important than the projects we have under way is the mutual understanding and common effort that has been developed among all interests concerned.

A few years ago, housing was in danger of becoming a Tower of Babel. The men responsible for its progress were shouting at each other in foreign and hostile tongues. Today you will find these same interests sitting about a common conference table, in the community, and in the Nation. They talk the same language, and basically they seek the same things. They have learned that no one of them has the whole answer, but each has a contribution to make, and there is much they can do by working together.

This concert of effort has been matched and fostered by better coordination and consistency in the Federal Government's housing activities and policies. That coordination is effectuated, on behalf of the President, through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Most responsible people in the housing and community field have strong feelings that coordinated Agency effort is essential in the administration of the Federal program in housing and its financing. Those who have studied the matter, including the Congress, the first Hoover Commission, and the President's Advisory Committee on Housing Policies and Programs, have all concluded that such coordination is necessary, and some have even recommended that it be strengthened more than it is. There are also, sadly, a few who would like to profit from the chaos caused by the very disunity we all fought so hard to overcome.

Under the President's new program for community renewal, consistency of policy and coordinated action is now more important than ever. It has been carefully provided for in the law—and as long as I can fight, it will stay there. Five of the HHFA's seven major divisions, for example, are directly involved in most intricately related operations to help the community carry out its local urban renewal program. The functions of the other two, though somewhat more indirect, are also important to the whole. Failure to integrate these aids at the Federal level could lead only to discouragement and complete frustration of the communities throughout the country, to which you gentlemen owe so grave a responsibility.

But there are still some partisans who don't like it that way. Even guerrilla warfare goes on in some quarters. Sharpshooting is heard in the bushes and potshots are taken at coordination in the Federal Government. I have traced some of these down and found nothing but muddy tracks leading nowhere. Confusion of direction seems as common among them as their confusion about the ideals and the responsibilities of this administration to best serve the Nation with heart—and with efficiency.

These dissenters have redoubled their efforts to drive a wedge into the housing agency, break it into fragments, and insulate their particular sector against governmental coordination or responsibility. They would rather go it alone for they believe that their partisan interests would be better served by a return to the philosophy of every man for himself.

With this I do not—nor will I ever—concur.

Some of this kind of thinking was insinuated into early reports prepared for, not by, the new Hoover Commission as part of its study of Government-lending functions. But the Hoover Commission, as usual, took it out. I do not know what they did with it.

The Commission, however, did not adopt these proposals—nor did it recommend that the housing agency be broken up into free-wheeling components. The Commission's own review was thorough and responsible. With most of the Commission's recommendations we would not argue, since they largely represent policies that the Agency and the administration has already adopted.

A few we question. On one in particular, after full study, we have some dissent. This one—although I don't think the Commission so intended it—would, if applied to its full extent, remove a keystone from the very structure of Federal housing policy itself, and render inoperative a vital part of the President's program.

This was the Commission's recommendation that the FHA be reorganized so that it would not have to call on the Government for funds, possibly along the lines of the Home Loan Bank Board.

What does this mean? And what effect would it have?

The FHA has always operated without calling on the Government for funds. Its costs and reserves are provided from mutually owned funds obtained through premiums and fees. If the proposal means—as I think it probably does—that study should be given to further perfecting this mutualized system, consistent with FHA's public responsibilities, I would agree, for we are doing that.

But if it means—as some would like to interpret it—that the FHA should be reconstituted as a separate privately owned corporation, with or without authority to borrow from the Government, and that it should operate on its own corporate resources and under its own policies, subject only to distant Federal regulation, then I strongly disagree.

If this were to be done, it would mean much more than just changing its organizational structure, and removing the Government as its financial godfather. It would mean a basic change in the character and purpose of the FHA as it now exists—a strong bulwark in our economy. Furthermore, it would, in effect, accomplish the fragmentation of the Agency and destroy the basis for the coordinated use of Federal programs in the housing and community development field.

The real question here is whether the FHA should continue to serve a public purpose, as it has done in the past, or whether it should become simply a Government-regulated instrument to provide greater security for private mortgage investments on their own terms.

To be sure, the FHA mortgage insurance program has provided valuable security to private lenders. This has been important to the economy—but it has also been a means to a much larger end. The FHA has done a great deal more to further economic progress and serve the public need.

Because of the Government credit behind its debentures and reserves, the FHA has been able to provide a mortgage instrument to private lenders that has enabled them to make low-cost home loans on a secure basis to a great mass market of homebuyers who could not have been financed on the basis of normal private credit alone. It has enabled millions of our American families to obtain homes—millions of new homes to be built—and many special and emergency requirements to be met in the national and public interest. It has accomplished this through the belief of our Government in the integrity—and thus the insurability—of our people and our businessmen.

The FHA, in fact, has provided a great example of how the Government—without using its own funds and without injecting itself into the private market—can accomplish a public purpose through the established channels of private enterprise.

But if the FHA were to be converted to a privately owned corporation, without Government credit behind its debentures, then it could no longer serve a truly public purpose. The FHA mortgage would become quite a different credit instrument, that could not match the scope of its present function, either in the general mass market or for special needs.

Today, however, the need for its present service is even greater, particularly to further local redevelopment or rehabilitation. Under the new section 220, special FHA mortgage insurance is extended for housing redevelopment and rehabilitation in renewal areas on the basis of the values to be generated by the area's redevelopment. Under section 221, special FHA mortgage insurance is extended for low-cost housing for lower income families displaced from slums, as a means of bringing more private capital into this field and reducing passing needs for straight, subsidized public housing.

I have asked various partisans, but I have received no affirmative answer, who would, or could, provide this and other needed types of home financing if the FHA were converted to private corporate ownership.

But we cannot expect to continue the great advances we are making toward the building of the new city without these measures. We cannot expect private enterprise to assume the full burden of public improvement if the Government fails to back up its efforts to renew and redevelop these areas and to rehouse these families.

Coordination, within Government or between Government and business, is not just an empty word. It is a word of action, of concerted, common action with all our resources along the whole front.

To clear and replan a blighted area is not enough. The real test comes in our capacity to redevelop and rehabilitate these areas for the kind of use, the kind of living, and the kind of business growth on which the future of the new city depends.

That is the job the FHA can and should help to get done. That is the job for the coordinated efforts of all the housing agencies in the field and in Washington. It provides the means by which Government makes it possible for private enterprise, without sacrifice of sound business principles, to undertake this rebuilding responsibility.

If we are to realize our dream of the new city, the FHA must continue to serve that purpose. To change its basic character could only result in unmet public problems and needs to be provided for in some other, and probably more, direct way. To paraphrase the philosopher, Voltaire: "If there were no FHA, it would be necessary to invent it." For the FHA is an indispensable part of the magnetic core which holds together and vitalizes—gives meaning to—each of the great constituents in Government housing operations today.

Fragmentation of this core is not, as I see it, a proposal to achieve the laudable purpose of getting the Government out of private business.

It is a proposal to get the Government out of government.

Eliminating the public purpose underlying the housing program would have a destructive effect on the whole Government housing structure. It would make any question of comprehensive or coordinated activity toward the new city purely academic.

Most of the industry and, I feel sure, most of the country don't want it that way. We have gone too far, we are moving ahead too fast, to turn back now, or to allow our program to be splintered into useless bits.

We have too great a future ahead, too real a prospect in that great new city we are building.

And you, as business leaders, are among the builders.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, very great yet very near, in whom we live and move and have our being, let not our callousness make Thy presence unreal to us. Wherever goodness is, or truth, or beauty, there Thou art. Make sensitive our spirits that, knowing Thy grace and power, we may be cleansed and strengthened.

We thank Thee for human love which at its best bears witness to Thee and evermore keeps faith and hope alive in the world. With all our imperfections and fallible judgments, grant unto us a compassion for others which understands and pities and forgives. Strengthen and steady us by the memory of men who have gone on to certain defeat, and even to certain destruction, with causes which deserved and were destined to triumph. Undergird us, we pray, with that glorious vision of eternal values which have supported men who were seeking ends too great to be reached in their own lifetime.

We ask it, O Father of our spirits, who hath been our dwelling place in all generations, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom Thou hast freely given us all things. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 13, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

REPORTS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third annual report of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1955.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 163. An act for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos);

S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry;

S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha;

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay idemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts; and

S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv; and

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; and

H. J. Res. 211. A joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 603. An act to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska;

H. R. 625. An act to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland special road district No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Saint Francisville, Mo.:

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1405 An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Helen E. Cox;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H. R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eufemia Bencich;

H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;

H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;

H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2768. An act for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson;

H. R. 3786. An act to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America;

H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

H. R. 3825. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray;

H. R. 4294. An act to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces;

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 4753. An act to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations;

H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade;

H. R. 5224. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits;

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;

H. R. 5494. An act for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame, and others;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

H. R. 5635. An act for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak and others;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5809. An act for the relief of A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms;

H. R. 5907. An act for the relief of Albert Woolson; and

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens;

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly; and

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 603. An act to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska;

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation;

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; and

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 625. An act to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.; and

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1405. An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Helen E. Cox;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eugemia Bencich;

H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;

H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;

H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;

H. R. 2768. An act for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3786. An act to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America;

H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg;

H. R. 4753. An act to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations;

H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;

H. R. 5494. An act for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame and others;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

H. R. 5635. An act for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, and others;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5809. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 5907. An act for the relief of Albert Woolson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State; and

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson; and

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 3825. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H. R. 4294. An act to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces; and

H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade;

H. R. 5224. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits;

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-7118684, Chen, Jeanne Kuo-Cheng.
A-7790096, Chou, I-Kua.
A-6958664, Hsi, Eugene Yu-Cheng.
A-6848000, Hsi, Eugenia Min-I (nee Huang).
A-6965690, Keh, Shou-bing (Alfred).
A-6845060, Lee, Kui-Lung (Cecelia).
A-6703299, Lee, Tsai Hwa.
A-6967575, Liu, Yung-Szi (Frances).
A-6589958, Tsien, Vee Chang.
E-079901, Chong, Kwai or Kwai Chong Chung.
E-092370, Tan, Tommy Sie-Chang.
A-6620717, Dunn, Lily Wen-Yuen Fong.
A-6564145, Fok, Ruth Louise (nee Shen Hsun-Lan) also known as Ruth Louise Hsun-Lan Sung.
A-6851384, Hsia, Chih Tsing or Hsia Chih Tsing.
A-6403564, Hu, Shengen.
T-1144534, Shew, Jimmie Chu Ting.
A-6457337, Tchou, Montchen Tu-Tsang
0300-217753, Ting, Anna.
A-6008482, Ting, Sheng.
A-6760595, Wen, Richard Yutze.
A-4468478, Chiu, Katherine Yu (nee Tseng).
A-6435876, Chu, Esme Yun-Yun.
A-6691415, Nieh, Eunice Chen Yu.
A-6623014, Ying, Lu Lan.
A-6171334, Chiang, Pang Sun.
A-6851604, Chung, William Y.
A-6457476, Pan, Chi-Hsun.
A-6847923, Pan, Kay.
A-6403565, Shen, Constance Ming Chung.
A-6699858, Tai, Hsia Tao or Tao Tay Hsia.
A-6148143, Tang, Harry Kong Hung also known as Kong-Hung Tang.
0300-455922, Tung, Cheng Yu.
A-6847794, Woo, Dah-Cheng.
A-6848709, Young, Frank Kuankiang.
A-7414876, Chang, Che-Tyan.
A-6844259, Chu, Power Young Chao.
A-6769936, Bittar, Evelyn Edward or Bittar, E. Edward.
A-6522835, Chu, John Wen-djang aka Chu, Wen Djung.
0200-130593, Hsia, David Yi-Yung.
0200-130594, Hsia, Hsio-Hsuan (nee Shih).
A-6421076, Jung, Angela Chih-Ying.
E-5755, Kaasik, Harald.
A-6688266, Teitelbaum, Tauba Raca.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7125281, Berend, Peter Mihaly, or Peter Michael Berend.
0300/370564, Boon, Lim Jew.
A-7849663, Brieze, Roberts Martins.
A-7849664, Brieze, Milda Hermine.
A-9555132, Chan, Si Heung.
0300/43030, Chen, Chen Ah.
A-6052568, Chen, Lin or Chen Lin.
0300-27496, Chen, Mrs. Susie or Cheng Shun Fan.
A-9766040, Chit, Ho Fung.
A-8031725, Chiu, Teng Hoik or Ting Hsieh Chow or Chow Ting-Hsieh or Hsieh Ting Chiu.
A-6851319, Chow, Marie Patrice or Kwang Hua Chow.
A-7073707, Chow, Tseng Kam.
A-9658660, Dong, Ng Eng.
0300/387990, Fong, Ho Wah.
A-8057994, Foo, Sin or Foo Sin.

A–6779040, Frankel, Edwin Nessim.
A–6819141, Hajduszewski, Tadeusz.
A–6970000, Hayya, Jacob.
A–6962959, Ho, Frank Hung Fai.
A–9661887, Ho, Lim Gat.
0300/390670, Huen, Kwai Chuen.
A–7863034, Kadegis, Arvids Gustavs.
A–7863033, Kiss, Eduard.
0300–402141, Kok, He Schiek or Schiek He Kok.
A–6788959, Kringelis, Teodors Andrejs.
A–6788960, Kringelis, Austra.
A–6788961, Kringelis, Daina.
A–6788962, Kringelis, Imants.
A–6634875, Krol, Kazimierz Julian.
A–9669192, Kum, Lay.
A–6843498, Lee, Mary Min Chen.
0300/30416, Lee, Yee Kow.
A–7249066, Liepa, Janis.
A–9682636, Man, Seid.
0300–134639, Mao, Henry Shu-Tsing.
A–6379854, Mei, Chu Chow Ah.
A–6794934, Mitri, Moise Hanna.
A–6971771, Pikkel, Miralda (see Piht).
A–7204903, Rod, Anna Agnes (nee Kukol).
A–6848225, Shen, Frederick Albert.
A–8196650, Shim, Chong.
0300–420528, Siang, Sung Chan.
A–7249064, Sturmanis, Karlis.
A–6965379, Tashkovich, Gligor Tashko.
A–6848676, Ting, Lu.
A–7129774, Tsai, Poo Hubbert.
A–7863001, Ulmanis, Ludvigs.
A–7249880, Valm, Mihkel.
A–7250165, Valm, Aleksei.
A–7249882, Valm, Theodor.
A–9802613, Yick, Tong.
A–6967695, Yin, Huo-Bing.
0300–83569, Ying, Chan.
A–9542543, Yu, Ling Tao or Lum Tow EE.
A–8082386, Yuen, Chan Kam or Chan Hong Kow.
A–6703490, Zee, Robin Joseph or Zee Yao-Shun.
0300–397560, Cheung, Wah or Cheung Wah.
0300–427936, Chow, Chung Shan.
0300–390908, Hon, Kong or Hon Kong.
A–8082075, Kwan, Wu Sing.
A–6971768, Sooaar, Voldemar.
A–6971757, Sooaar, Hela (nee Feder).
A–6910014, Lokiec, Majer.
A–8039688, Tsai, Sung Chu.
0300/29659, Chan, Ah Hoe.
0300–418043 Chan, Cheung Yuk or Chan Yuk Cheung.
A–9687373, Chan, Tim.
0300–370929, Cheng, Bou Ching or Mu Bou Cheng Ching.
A–6972945, Cheng, Pauline Ming-Hung.
174/736, Cheong, Mong.
A–9533428, Ching, Mark.
A–9687173, Chiu, Loo or Lo Chin.
A–8039173, Fok, Lam.
0300–400335, Fong, Lee.
A–6936267, Geiger, George.
A–6936268, Geiger, Ella (nee Spielman).
0300–423621, Hin, Wong Sui or Wong Kin.
A–6965180, Hsu, Chien Hwai or Jay Hsu.
A–6965179, Hsu, Jiu Hwai or Mai Hsu.
A–6958731, Janovitz, Serena (nee Simon).
A–6971749, Kaevando, Roman.
A–6971748, Kaevando, Helmi (nee Lents).
A–8015625, Kam, Cheung or Cheung Wuen.
A–6692899, Kramar, Branko.
A–6910269, Kramar, Maria.
A–6985975, Kulp, Karel.
A–6971798, Lepp, Aleksei.
A–6971759, Lepp, Agathe (nee Hanslep).
A–6888878, Lien, Din Shiang.
0300–66727, Linic, Vladimir.
A–9782777, Loo, Sam Teer.
A–6772581, Maksimovs, Eriks or Maximovs.
A–6917065, Maksimovs, Michelis or Mikels Maksimovs.
A–6670578, Pang, Yee.
A–7135610, Perl, Lazar.
A–9765644, Piccini, Francesco.
A–6955590, Pulauskas, Matas.
A–7809727, Shak, To or Doo Sat.
0300–400854, Shing, Lo Kam.
A–7849428, Silins, Adolfs Janis.
A–7849429, Silins, Maija Alexandra.
A–7849430, Silinis, Junior, Adolfs.
A–7084938, Sipos, Marianne Margaret Kertesz.
A–9804295, Suurna, Mihkel.
A–9561923, Tee, Toon Hue.
A–6307394, Tom, Gong or Tom Gong or Tom Shing.
A–9533429, Tong, Shing or Chung Shing or Tom Shing or Chung Chuen.
A–8258584, Too, Fung or Too Fung.
A–8082014, Toong, Cha Chiang or Toong Chue Ching or Peter Chue Ching Toong.
A–8091339, Tuum, Aleksander Villem.
A–6967364, Wang, John Y.
A–6851357, Wang, Richard I-Hsiang.
A–7476304, Yao, Ting Hui or Michael T. H. Yao.
A–9507456, Yow, Choy or Choy You.
A–7292642, Boldyreff, Antonina (nee Zhigmanovsky).
A–7292641, Boldyreff, Helen or Helene.
A–8082841, Chen, Yen or Chen Yi Shi or Yi Shi Chen.
0300–24950, Chojnaki, Eugeniusz.
A–7210403, Christopoulos, Yoanna Khamis or Jeanette Christou Christopoulos.
A–6971650, Erdi, Anthony or Antal.
A–9647005, Fang, Pow Foo.
0300–97188, Fook, Tsang Koon.
0300–424088, Fu, Quo or Pang Choy.
A–6775569, Hlavac, Frantisek Josef.
A–7073610, Hlavac, Marta.
A–8082037, Huang, Mary Sei Mei.
A–6830536, Irani, Joseph Isaac or Joseph Irani.
A–6899364, Kazimierski, Stanley.
A–7863216, Kesteris, Mikelis.
A–7863217, Kesteris, Ilze.
A–7863218, Kesteris, Andres.
A–9836636, Lian, Shin Ah.
A–6851636, Lin, Julius Yun-I.
0300/408693, Moy, Young.
A–7084232, Petraitis, Juczas or Joseph Petraitis.
A–7243875, Stenclavs, Krists.
A–7244305, Stenclavs, Augusts.
A–6704110T, Sun, Pao-Chih or Paulette Pao-Chi Sun.
0300–402447, Teng, Wong Gee or Wong Kee.
A–6851366, Tien-Jan, John Paul Ly.
175/651, Wan, Lam.
A–9778441, Wei, Toh Chung.
A–8065346, Wei, Wang Ah or Wang Ah Vee.
A–6851523, Yang, Thomas Meng Ping.
A–9731090, Ching, Pang.
A–7863027, Eidok, Walter.
A–9644600, Fai, Cheung.
A–7087608, Fasko, Daniel.
A–9764648, Lewandowski, Julian.
0300–399882, Ng. Tou.
A–6986534, Odelia, Sister Mary (li Feng-yu).
A–7863008, Ritums, Janis.
A–7248809, Salme, Karli.
A–9633107, Skkratic, Dragutin Pranjo.
A–7863203, Stendzis, Janis.
A–7863204, Stendzis Ilze Pusaudze.
A–7863205, Stendzis, Imants Arvids.
A–6929742, Tam, Dianalihue Kao.
0300–373583, Wong, Ah King or Wang Ken Sing.
A–6044499, Woo, Sze Lu Hsiang.
A–8078864, Yao, King Fah.
A–8050321, Blascovich, Attilio.
A–7095908, Bogacki, Waclaw Zdzislaw.
A–8082842, Bors, Tibor Eugen.
A–7975432, Boucher, Arsene Andre.
A–6967730, Chen Wen Pin.
A–6904310, Cheng, Chang Sin.
0300–417793, Chong, Fong or Chong Fong.
A–6986509, Chu, Sister Mary Dulcia.
A–6522833, Chu, Wei Liang.
A–7863026, Eizis, Aleksandrs.
A–7356380, Frankel, Maurice Solomon.
A–7863031, Galvans, Peteris.
A–8091397, Gega, Anthony John.
A–7863032, Gorbants, Imants.
A–9782690, Hee, Wong.
A–7354351, Huang, Shao Chi.
A–9703852, Kam, Mak or James Mak.
A–6848646, Kao, Rose Tse Ching.
0300–403722, Kee, Shum.
A–7095531, Kersna, Johannes Maks.
A–7095532, Kersna, Salme.
A–9573456, King, Ho Ah.
A–9196442, Kirs, Alexander.
A–7204900, Krno, Ladislav Gejza.
A–7204901, Krno, Katherine.
T–1144870, Krno, Katherine Tatiana.
A–7873848, Kum, Chow.
A–7048906, Laupa, Armas.
A–6812186, Lenart, Leslie Oscar.
A–7863225, Lidums, Rudolf.
A–7863227, Lidum, Olaf Rudolf.
A–5971242, Liu, San Koon or Liu San Koon.
A–6854454, Luca, George or Gheorghe.
A–6854456, Luca, Elena.
A–9684344, Lung, Shung Sin or Chung Sin Lung.
A–9825451, Magic, Zdenko.
A–7138009, Matusoff, Ethel.
A–7223209, Mejzr, Miroslav.
A–7223210, Mejzr, Ruzena.
T–2645007, Mejzr, Miroslava Marie.
A–7193990, Mejzr, Ivanka.
A–7802065, Petersons, Karlis.
A–6971770, Piht, Eduard.
A–6971772, Piht, Liidia.
A–9765057, Polushin, Walter John or Viacheslav Ivanovitch Polushin.
A–6405622, Rashin, Louis Nathan.
A–6703361, Shie, Wei Wu.
A–6855586, Shie, Susan Ding Neh (nee Wang).
A–7193991, Spitz, Ruzena.
0300–396920, Sufich, Giovanna.
A–9554379, Sui, Lui or Liu.
A–7975174, Surian, Luca.
T–1144528, Velcich, John.
0300–289791, Vlacich, Ferruccio.
A–6851354, Wang, Chou-Chiu or Gordon Wang.
A–6881707, Yang, Chi.
A–8065847, Yau, Loo.
A–6949354, Zee, Tsong Ngo or Ah Neng.
A–6589294, Aboody, Reuben Moshi.
A–9948302, Canaletich, Mario Giorgio.
A–6709262, Chang, Yuan Chun.
A–6171208, Chen, Kwei Sen.
0300–280451, Chen, Mes Chih Ping.
A–7879678, Chen, Thomas.
A–6970307, Chen, David.
0300–424485, Chen, Peter.
A–7955258, Chmielewska, Maria.
A–6988894, Chuck, Lou Yuen or Low Yean Choe.
A–7243252, Creglia, Giordano.
A–6971766, Esberg, Adele.
A–6971765, Esberg, Juta.
A–8021324, Fatutta, Marco.
A–8065726, Fong, Wong or Fong Wong.
A–7249077, Freimanis, Teodore Genrichs.
A–7249076, Freimanis, Anna Elena Olga.
A–6263402, Gartenszteig, Israel.
A–8031589, Ha, Tsong Tong or Tsong Tung Ha.
A–6971758, Hiiesalu, Endel.
A–7366483, Hsueh-Yung, Shu or Evan Hsueh-Yung Shu.
A–6660388, Hu, Tsei Suan.
A–7283198, Inwentarz, Izak.
1100–29956, Kao, Yun-Chen or Mary Yun-Chen Kao or Mary Kao.
A–8082033, Kenul, Marcello.
A–8031384, Kow, Ng Kung.
A–6966542, Kuty, Frances.
A–6978177, Lederman, Pejsach or Pejsach Lederman Grezelak or Paul Lederman.
A–6690537, Lee, Han Duck or Henry Lee.
A–6690619, Lee, Tom Shee or Tom Kim Hing.
A–7056802, Loh, Tsau Yueh or Thomas Y. Lowe.
V–305539, Mih, Alexander Wei-Shan.
A–9782737, Ming, Tung.
A–6971802, Oja, Harry.
A–6971796, Oja, Ruth.
A–8065366, Pomasan, Stefano.
A–2823761, Radulich, Mate.
A–7178411, Reinvald, Manivald.
A–8001335, Rubinich, Joseph.
A–7873098, Runco, Anthony.
A–7095534, Savisaar, Elmar Johannes.

A-7095535, Savisaar, Armilda Kolk.
A-7095536, Savisaar, Atso.
03000-418127, Sepcich, John.
A-9770642, Shi, Chang or Fred San.
A-6904332, Sipajlo, Jiri.
A-7809912, Strmecki, Josip.
A-7941177, Szubert, Konrad Joseph.
A-9765493, Tamme, Heinar.
A-6887270, Tang, Michael Tsin-Chien.
A-6448741, Tsu, John Bosco or Bing Ming Tsu.
A-9245758, Yiu, Young.
A-6704228, Zak, Helena or Sister Mercita Evita.
A-7095021, Brody, Alexander.
A-6712046, Fok, Dso Yun.
A-9559819, For, Leung or Leung Kai.
A-9799220, Hop, Chu or Chew Hop.
A-8039680, Jurasic, Angelo or Iurasich.
0300-387739, Kam, Sheh.
0300-245055, Kasser, Elizabeth Aranyi.
0300-245055, Kasser, Ivan.
0300-245055, Kasser, Mary.
A-9623303, Ko, Lee King or Lee Kam Ho.
0300-12942, Leong, Sing To.
A-7483853, Simcha, Helene (nee Rosenberger).
T-666654, Soo, John Yun-Chun.
A-6816885, Spitzka, Aloisia.
A-4039059, Toll, Friedrich Alexander.
A-8106037, Tong, Tsang.
0300-409250, Tsai, Ah San.
A-6694159, Weissbart, Esther Vera (nee Blinchevsky).
A-6847895, Chow, Ho.
0300-405869, Foo, Lee or Lee Wai Foo.
0300-408016, Fook, Lee.
A-6938801, Grive, Ansis.
A-9553994, Hing, Lee Ah.
A-9544110, Koel, Valdemar.
A-7126610, Lee, Ted Teh-Yuan.
A-9684355, Liu, Huo Shin or Fok Lau.
A-9529877, Mai, Lee-Shing.
A-7052332, Markovits, Salamon.
A-7138329, Markovits, Ilona (nee Weisz).
A-6974328, Meisels, Martin.
A-7139340, Shaw, Julia Chang.
A-7297278, Steinmetz, Abraham.
A-6933818, Stern, Tibor.
A-6953157, Sulyok, Dezso Karoly.
A-6970438, Sulyok, Etelka.
A-9571956, Tak, Lee.
A-8091549, Vosilla, Angelo, Otavio.
A-6858256, Wen, Peter Liang.
A-6694209, Wen, Amy Tang.
A-6028252, Wong, Yun Jee.
A-7074880, Yeh, Te Fung.
A-7874913, Celich, Frank.
A-9765153, Donatich, Giuseppe.
0300-429047, Fong, Lee Tsi.
A-6735483, Hallac, Joseph Paul.
0300-413098, Hing, Lo.
A-6578981, Kozarski, Danilo Zivko.
A-6640338, Szor, Leopold.
A-6345116, Szor, Irena Philipp.
A-8039682, Tsai, Hong Ping or Ping Tsai Hong.
A-8021319, Babenko, Gennady Konstantinovitch.
0300-387987, Chan, Hong Kong or Chan Pui.
A-9231941, Chew, Tan Sing.
A-7366302, Chu, Pan.
A-7383067, Garbin, Luka Eduard.
A-6499962, Hirsch, Nathan Alfred.
A-7128158, Ilich, Sofia.
A-6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.
A-7128158, Ilich, Sofia.
A-6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.
A-7849673, Kleinbergs, Mile Anete.
A-8082060, Lubicich, Mario.
A-7849671, Ozolins, Armins.
0501-19752, Pe-Kuang, Patrick or Pe-Kuang Tseng.
A-6971769, Peters, Juuli.
A-8065425, Shih, Shio Nia or Shia Nia Shih.
0300-421797, Sing, Wang or Wong Park.
A-6848091, Tan, Ying Chun.
A-6938807, Tipans, Valija (nee Ievins).
A-6887732, Tsao, Shu Yun Tseng (nee Shu Yun Tseng).
A-7056816, Tuzar, Jaroslav.
A-7358945, Tuzar, Jirina.
A-8015056, Tuzar, Jana.
0500-33535, Wimmer, Katalin.
A-6986573, Wong, Kau Sau or Kai Sau Wong.
A-7383351, Yang, Samuel Hsueh-Lun.
A-7383352, Yang, Hsiu-Hwa.
A-7283009, Borsic, Aladar.
A-6371814, Choi, Ho Liang.
0300-405913, Chong, Yun or Cheung Wan.
A-7350611, Chow, Chung Lee or Ven Sih Chow.
A-6320011, Chu, Choy.
A-7189791, Dambos, Kostas.
A-7243855, Fridmanis, Imants Egons.
A-7243067, Fridmanis, Erika Upite.
A-7138432, Grabowski, Bronislaw.
A-9501262, Grandke, Telesfor.
A-6952325, Grunfeld, Juda.
A-6857659, Habbab, Abdulghani Joseph.
0300-379350, Hah, Ng.
A-9686792, Kin, Chan.
A-7061800, Koci, Vaclav.
A-6971809, Kukk, Verner Reinhold.
A-6971810, Kukk, Fronelly Franziska.
A-6971777, Kukk, Harald.
A-5951611, Lung, Ben or Long.
A-8091360, Mon, Lum.
A-7244196, Nagy, Ivan Gabor.
0400/54441, Raicovich, Giuseppe.
0300-92577, San, Lum Hong or Chow King Fen.
0300-410615, Sang, Tsang.
A-8082091, Scaliordick, John or Giovanni Sgaliordich.
A-9560203, Sing, Foo Wah or Foo Wah Teng.
A-7138246, Sturm, Jolana Judita.
A-6381281, Tien, Sheue Fung or Arthur Whitfield or Stanley Tien.
A-9513949, Wai, Nam.
A-6624918, Woo, Henry Kyi-Oen.
A-6971805, Wosa, Aino Adele or Aino Adele Riks or Aino Adele Edal.
A-7961771, Wosa, Oscar Adolf.
A-9705521, Yee, Ho or Yee Ho.
A-8091322, Yee, Sang Fon or Yee Sing or Yu Hsing.
0300-422039, Yow, Ng or Ng Yin.
A-7244303, Akmans, Marta Emiolia.
A-7992859, Chew, Chan formerly Chan Shing Jow.
A-7457745, Foo, William Er Chen.
A-7249874, Kermon, Rudolf.
A-9733412, Kong, Ngo Ying.
A-6958636, Lin, Chao-Han.
A-6849918, Liu, Chia-Lo.
A-1903522, Liu, I. Hsin.
A-9744381, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7138447, Winternitz, Jenta.
A-7120716, Balassa, Bela.
A-7173016, Balassa, Ida Bogyor.
A-6301049, Cerven, George.
A-6792244, Chang, Sing Chen or Sing Chen Chang.
A-7197313, Chang, Chien Wei Lan or Chien Wei Lan or Chang Lah Chien Wei.
A-7197314, Chang, Chung Yung or Judy Yung Chang or Judy Chung Yung Chang.
A-9635195, Che, Leong.
A-6163714, Ho, Lien Yu.
A-7395257, Ho, Yin Hwa Cheng.
A-7395258, Ho, Henry Nieuhan.
A-7395259, Ho, Stephen Shianoling.
A-7395260, Ho, Barbara Beeyuan.
A-7395261, Ho, Margaret Yustang.
A-6674633, Komarek, Vit.
A-7398466, Krizanova, Maria.
0300-416920, Li, Sheng Sen.
A-6026376, Lo, Arthur Wu-Nien.
A-6403589, Lo, Elizabeth Heng-Hui Shen.
T-1892157, Loy, Too.
A-6935169, Mok, Charlie or Mak Wee.
A-8282626, Sung, Zee Hu.
A-6847853, Tyau, Louise (nee Shu-Chiu Luan).
A-6847962, Wang, Yu Chiang or Richard Y. C. Wang.
A-6453829, Albrecht, Marie Neumannova.
A-7210188, Barta, Tibor.
A-6798984, Briedis, Arturs.
A-7087346, Chuh, Sharlin or Sharlin Charlie Chuh.
A-9569306, Foo, Wong Kia.
A-6849448, Guang, Mann-Lo or Michael Kan.
A-6971789, Hyvonen, Alice Uustalu.
A-6851462, Kiang, Lu Yu.
A-7171983, Knauer, Eugenie formerly Strakaty (nee Petersen) or Indra Devi.
0400/47451, San, Yao Chin.
A-7202554, San, Vera.
A-7202882, San, Sio Chu.
A-7205703, Wong, Sio Yu San.
A-7202553, San, Yu Lan.
0400/54495, San, Yu Lin.
A-7178373, Sarapik, Evart.
A-9825044, Splawinski, Franciszek.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-9540876, Andra, Ervin Rudolf.
A-8057219, Bacchia, Ermanno.
T-2786643, Bain, Hong Yuan.
A-9512692, Bang, Cheung or Cheung Ping.
A-9825169, Barulich, Antonio.
A-7186356, Basch, Marton.
A-6207921, Bistreff, Stanu Salvov.
A-6207920, Bistreff, Eugenia.
A-7538670, Chang, Yi-An Rosita.
0300/419969, Ching, Ah.
A-8082325, Chung, Cheng.
0300-396020, Chung, Shin or Shiu Chung.
E-094561, Ding, Sing Yoh.
A-6969986, Fabian, George Stephen.
A-9678368, Fat, Wong or Wong Man.
176/484, Foo, Yee King.
A-8082056, Fook, Lo.
A-7351309, Gruenberg, Dora.
A-9749483, Heinsar, Meinhard or Heinsaar.
A-9686736, Hop, Leung.
A-7779095, Hung, Chung Shu or Francis C. S. Hung.
A-6971746, Huva, Walter.
A-6971747, Huva, Leili.
A-4191741, Kaminski, Kazmer or Kazimierz.
A-7863018, Kancans, Edgar Arnolds.
A-9575626, Kaneps, Peter Voldemars or Peteris Voldemars Kaneps.
A-6967285, Kao, Evelina Tse-Ven.
A-9139291, King, Chin or Chan Kin.
0300-396806, Koo, Lee Yong.
A-7133274, Ku, Min-Chuan.
A-4760478, Lee, Ching-Ye (nee Ling).
A-8117995, Lee, Tong.
A-7064133, Li, Ching Po.
A-6017699, Liang, Vi Kang or Wei Kang Liang.
0300-405868, Ling, Ah Fook.
A-6849848, Ling, Linda Chiu Huang.
A-6703496, Lo, Yu-Cheng.
A-6703484, Lo, Woo-Lih Lena Dunn.
A-6962954, Loh, Arthur Tsung Yuan.
A-6041575, Lowe, Donald Ming-Dah.
A-7046279, Marton, Tibor William or Mayer or Tibor Marton or M. T. Marton.
A-7200780, Mascitelli, Teresa (nee Tobolik).
A-9731869, Ming, Chan Choy.
A-7879331, Mintz, Samson or Szymszon Minc.
A-9825225, Morin, Silvestro.
0300-18256, Nee, Kai Sung.
A-9518299, Neng, Tan Jee or Tan Gee Ning.
A-9577665, Olman, Karl.
A-7371655, Paczosa, Marja.
A-7975173, Pien, Pao Chi.

0501–19744, Hu, Yu Ming.
A–8031504, Ping, Lai or Lai Pyee.
A–9290467, Poa, Tan Ki.
A–6756976, Potasz, Judithe.
0300–304535, Raczynski, Waclaw.
A–6393475, Rajczyk, Szmul Dawid.
A–9554180, Sai, Leong Kee.
A–5869957, Sang, Tsang.
A–6887953, Sefcik, Ludvik Tom or Louis H. Sefcik.
A–8091316, Sen, Tek or Fu Theh Shin.
A–8082001, Shah, Victor Stephen.
A–8091356, Sing, Leung.
A–8106036, Song, Lim Shi.
A–9609271, Soon, Jong.
A–7849432, Steinbergs, Juris.
A–7849433, Steinbergs, Velta (nee Brieze).
A–7849427, Steinbergs, Marija (nee Labonovsky).
A–7074013, Straka, Marie.
A–7886251, Straka, Karel Alex.
A–7061816, Sununu, Alfred Saleh.
A–7991591, Szabo, Senior, Thomas P.
A–7991592, Szabo, Eva Agres (nee Vicenty).
A–7991593, Szabo, Thomas, Jr.
A–7991594, Szabo, Adam.
A–9561964, Sze, Chen Tek.
A–7095904, Szonyi, Giselle.
A–6971787, Tischler, Albert.
A–6971783, Tischler, Vilma.
A–8001228, Tom, Hay or Og Tom or Toy Loo or Choy Loo.
A–9529438, Tsou, Fong Shi.
A–6938806, Virdzenieks, Niklavs.
A–9810517, Virkebau, Uno or Wirkebau.
A–8082068, Wai, Lee.
A–6041703, Wu, Nelson Ikon.
E–094562, Wun, Choy or Won Sang or Wan Sang.
A–8039752, Yang, Lee Ah.
A–9677800, Yap, Lee Eng or Yap Eng Lee.
A–9571659, Yeh, Lau.
A–6952737, Yuen, Yee Sin.
A–6967543, Liu, Chin Po.
A–6967507, Liu, Dah Wen.
A–9525198, Kovacevic, Mitar.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on May 18, 1955, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 18, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Farm Credit Administration Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEATH OF GUY E. IVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with extreme regret that I announce to the Senate the death of a Senate official who has served this body faithfully and loyally for 43 years.

Guy E. Ives, the Senate printing clerk, passed away at his home last night from a heart attack. Thus ended a career in the Senate that started April 9, 1912, when Guy Ives began as an elevator operator.

I believe that all of us knew Mr. Ives personally and respected him deeply. Since April 20, 1921, he has been the Senate printing clerk, and whole generations of Senators have found the path smoothed before them by Guy Ives' willingness to use his skill and his experience in the Senate's service.

His hard, painstaking work has meant greater efficiency and greater effectiveness. It has speeded the preparation of the reports and the documents which afford the basis of Senate action.

I knew Guy Ives very well. I first became acquainted with him during my previous service as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. He was willing to go to any lengths to meet the difficult task of preparing the printing of our reports—as we wanted them, how we wanted them, and when we wanted them.

The passing of such an able Senate official leaves us all with a feeling of deep sorrow. But it can truly be said in consolation for the loved ones he left behind that he earned the gratitude of all of us, and that he was a loyal and faithful servant of his country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to join in the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader regarding the passing of a veteran Senate employee, Mr. Guy Ives. All of us have recognized the service he has given to the Senate, faithfully and well, over many years. I am sure the majority leader was speaking for the entire Senate and for Members on both sides of the aisle when he made the remarks he just uttered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of 6,109 routine nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in grades from second lieutenant and ensign to lieutenant colonel and lieutenant commander. Included in the Air Force group are 140 West Point cadets and 185 Annapolis midshipmen for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. From the Committee on Armed Services, I also report favorably the nomination of Lt. Gen. Williston B. Palmer for promotion to four-star general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act. General Palmer will occupy the position of Vice Chief of Staff, replacing General Bolte, and I ask that his nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Marvin B. Miller to be commissioned ensign.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (Public Law 598, 83d Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RENEWAL OF LEASE OF ANNETTE ISLAND AIRPORT TO THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorializing Congress to appropriate funds necessary to carry out the contracts between generating and transmission cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration and to do all in its power to encourage and further public power in the area served by Southwestern Power Administration

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the House that there is growing pressure in Washington, D. C., seemingly emanating from the Interior Department, to discontinue the use of the Southwestern Power Association by using economic pressures to force the generating and transmission cooperatives to deal with private utilities instead of the Southwestern Power Administration; and

"Whereas the proposed new rate schedule of the Southwestern Power Administration is said to be undermining the very purpose of public power by making it impossible for the generating and transmission cooperatives to negotiate economical contracts for peaking power; and

"Whereas the original idea of the Southwestern Power Administration was to make available the maximum quantities of energy to cooperative and other preference customers and ultimately to make power available to the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest rate consistent with good business policy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate money for the furtherance of the Southwestern Power Administration, and to enact any and all laws consistent with the public-power policy of the United States to make power available to all who need and demand it; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from the State of Missouri, and to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted May 16, 1955.

"AUSTIN HILL,
"Chief Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for immediate completion of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam and certain other projects on the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized a public works project to improve the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama; and

"Whereas two phases of this project are now under construction: the Jim Woodruff lock and dam on the Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, Fla., and the Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River at Buford, Ga.; and

"Whereas there are three additional phases of the project for which construction funds have not been provided; namely, the channel in the Apalachicola River between the Intracoastal Waterway near Apalachicola, Fla., and the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Columbia lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Columbia, Ala., and the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Fort Gaines, Ga.; and

"Whereas each phase must be completed in its entirety before maximum use can be realized and the cost-benefit ratio be obtained as established by the United States Engineers; and

"Whereas the 2 million Americans living in the tririver valley will be greatly benefited if an accelerated construction program is adopted whereby all approved phases of the authorized project are placed on a simultaneous construction status: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide sufficient construction moneys to continue construction of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Buford Dam and to commence construction on the Apalachicola River channel, the Columbia lock and dam, and the Fort Gaines lock and dam, during the next fiscal year, July 1, 1955, to July 1, 1956; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; to each of the ablest congressional delegation in the United States Congress, the Alabama delegation; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D. C.; to each of the Governors of the States of Florida, Alabama and Georgia; and to the president of the Three Rivers Development Association, the Honorable Jim Woodruff, Sr., Columbus, Ga.

"J. E. SPEIGHT,
"Secretary of Senate."

A resolution adopted by the city court of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., relating to Polish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the St. Matthew's Holy Name Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Legislature memorializing the Congress to enact legislation that will secure to the States their right to collect certain sales taxes on purchases of private contractors executing Government contracts.

The case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.,* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) appears to preclude the States from collecting such taxes in the future. To give such sweeping immunity to this revenue source of the States will work a tremendous hardship on at least 32 States having a sales tax. In certain States the effect of this decision might be to cause them, under their present tax structure, to operate at a deficit.

This is another Supreme Court decision that is not to be taken lightly. The implications of this decision can have grave consequences to our States and to our Nation. Let us act now to halt this process. Congress has the authority and the responsibility to act so as to preserve a healthful balance between the rights and functions of the State governments and the Federal Government. I sincerely urge this body to give early consideration to the enactment of legislation which will preserve this necessary balance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will secure to the States the right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax with certain exceptions thereto

Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.,* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with a Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule now complained of; and

Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union or

any portion of their power to tax Government contractors, there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in balance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, as speedily as possible, legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the laws of any State in the Union, except such taxes which the direct incidence shall be upon the United States.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution which was adopted by the State Legislature of Minnesota memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union. My colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], has submitted such a resolution, and this particular memorial from the State legislature encourages the adoption of that resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union

Whereas by act of Congress Minnesota was admitted to the Union May 11, 1858; and

Whereas plans are being made for a statewide celebration of this centennial in the year 1958; and

Whereas Congress has many times previously authorized the issuance by the United States Treasury of commemorative coins for other States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (by the senate, the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress be requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary to authorize and direct the United States Treasury to issue 150,000 commemorative half dollar coins, of appropriate design, dated 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That said coins be delivered to the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission upon payment therefor and that said commission be, and it hereby is, authorized to sell and distribute such coins; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

KARL ROLVAAG,
President of the Senate.
ALFRED D. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

HY SERRING,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 10th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved April 23, 1955.

ORVILLE J. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

MINIMUM WAGE AND HOUR LAW—RESOLUTION OF DICKINSON (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Dickinson, N. Dak., Chamber of Commerce, opposing any change in the present minimum wage and hour law.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DICKINSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Dickinson, N. Dak., May 9, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the regular April meeting of the board of directors of the Dickinson Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was passed unanimously and is forwarded to you for your consideration:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is, in bills S. 662, S. 770, and the Smith bill, and others, which would increase the minimum wage and extend the coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, considering the problem of wage legislation; and

"Whereas it is the opinion and belief of the Board of Directors of the Dickinson Chamber of Commerce that the question of wages and hours is a private problem of the free competitive system, and that any extension of Government control is interfering with private business, and that the competitive enterprise system itself will control the question of minimum wages and laws: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, that the Members of Congress from North Dakota be requested to lend their support to congressional action to defeat any measure intended to change the present minimum wage and hour law, or extend coverage into classifications of business; further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate representing North Dakota, and to the governor of the State."

ROBERT A. STRANIK,
President, Dickinson Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

JOHN W. JOHNSON,
Manager.

FUNDS FOR OPERATION OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2, of the American Legion, Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for the operation of the crippled children's program, for the fiscal year 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion since its founding in 1919 has had as one of its four main objectives, care for the children of America; and

Whereas the Social Security Act, as amended, authorized the appropriation of $15 million a year for the United States program for Crippled Children; and

Whereas the 1956 appropriations bill passed the House of Representatives March 21 with only $10,800,000 included in it for the crippled children's program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2, of the American Legion meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., May 3, 1955, That we favor the full appropriation of the authorized $15 million for the fiscal year 1956 in the operation of the crippled children's program and request Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to support action to amend the House passed bill to that extent; and be it further

Resolved, That Post Adjutant Glen W. Rott be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Senators YOUNG and LANGER.

JOHN J. PREBASKE,
Post Commander.
GLEN W. ROTT,
Post Adjutant.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF A NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Greater North Dakota Association–North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, at Fargo, N. Dak., on April 27, 1955, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY

Whereas a national seed storage facility is badly needed in this country to provide a germ plasm bank which will insure protection of the widely diversified sources of breeding material in our national and State programs for developing superior varieties of plants; and

Whereas agriculture, the backbone of North Dakota's economy, could be greatly aided by the establishment of such a national seed storage facility; and

Whereas a third of all the grains introduced from all over the world in the past 50 years have been destroyed because of the loss of germination due largely to improper storage facilities; and

Whereas due to this loss of breeding lines research work has been seriously handicapped in many cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Greater North Dakota Association, North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, in session at Fargo this 27th day of April 1955, That all help possible be given to secure necessary Federal funds to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility suitable to provide proper storage for a germ plasm bank for our grain.

HOMER W. LUDWICK,
Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 922. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; with amendments:

S. 1464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-

way and timber access roads (Rept. No. 364); and

S. 1747. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 365).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; with amendments (Rept. No. 361); and

H. R. 103. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 362).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1755. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; without amendment (Rept. No. 363).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 367).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3885. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, and I submit a report (No. 360) thereon.

The report relates to a joint resolution submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and pertains to the so-called Lodge-Gossett bill passed by the Senate 3 or 4 years ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services this morning approved a report of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense which had held hearings to study the problems of civil defense. I believe the report will be of interest to those who are concerned with administering civil defense, and also to the people of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short summary of the report.

There being no objection, the summary of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This subcommittee, consisting of myself (chairman), Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, SALTONSTALL, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, has held extensive hearings for the purpose of examining the policies and operations of the present civil defense program. The subcommittee issued its interim report in order to summarize its finding and recommendations at an appropriate interval during its examination.

In the report the subcommittee found that:

1. Due to lack of progress, the country is presently unprepared to deal with a successful H-bomb attack, with the result that millions of lives possibly could be lost due to the inability to evacuate the cities and care for evacuees.

2. The United States is becoming increasingly vulnerable to an H-bomb attack due to the Russian development of thermonuclear weapons and of heavy jet bombers which are aimed in the direction of the United States.

3. Despite the fact that evacuation of target areas is the only alternative in case of attack, there are presently no adequate evacuation plans for such areas. The report notes that if a 20-megaton weapon were dropped on a city containing a million people in a central area 10 miles across, about 900,000 would be killed if they remained in that area. If they could all move outward 15 miles, probably fewer than 10,000 would be casualties from a direct strike of the weapon.

4. No present plans exist for feeding the evacuated populations.

5. The Nation is medically unprepared to meet an attack. No adequate plans exist for mass medical care or for organizing the vast medical resources of the country.

6. The knowledge concerning radioactive fallout creates an added dimension to the civil-defense problem, requiring erection of protective shelters, research on fallout patterns, and the effect of radiation on all living things.

7. The roads and highways from our large cities are not adequate for civil-defense evacuation. The Federal Government should bear the principal burden for additional evacuation highways. The current road bill should be amended for this purpose.

8. The FCDA has an advisory committee of outstanding citizens who are acutely interested and well versed in problems of civil defense. The FCDA Administrator should call this committee into session for consultation more frequently.

9. The present weakness in the civil-defense program should not be aimed solely at the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The relatively insignificant place occupied by the Federal Civil Defense Administration in the Federal Government, together with its relatively small staff and its physical location, create basic difficulties which, unless resolved, could make unlikely any successful operation of the agency.

The subcommittee in its report recommended that:

1. The President assume the personal responsibility for providing the leadership which will develop an adequate civil-defense program—that he frankly tell the American people what would happen to our target areas in the event of a successful H-bomb attack, and then state in plain terms what the Federal Government intends to do to meet this possibility.

2. The Federal Government assume the responsibility for developing plans for evacuation, mass feeding, and for the medical care of people in case of an attack.

3. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown commendable initiative in carrying out the delegations given to this Department. Secretary Hobby, in addition to placing responsibilities with her capable Assistant Secretaries, has personally taken an active interest in the whole problem of civil defense. Secretary Hobby's activities, however, are handicapped because of the lack of policy decisions as to who is responsible for sheltering, feeding, and clothing evacuees from target areas. These problems are beyond the capacities of the States alone to meet. The report emphasized that these problems would also require at the same time full utilization of State and local resources.

4. The Federal Government utilize more extensively its authority to delegate civil-defense responsibilities to the various Federal agencies.

5. The question be resolved and clarified in the executive branch as to what responsibilities, if any, the military services should assume in the civil-defense program.

6. The Federal Civil Defense Administration should assume the responsibility for coordination of planning in target areas which overlap several State boundaries.

7. Highway program.

8. Civil-defense advisory committee.

9. Among the broad policy questions, the subcommittee noted the need for: (a) Clarifying the matter of proper division of fiscal responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government; (b) a policy on the sharing of resources in case of attack; and (c) reconsideration of a revised policy on dispersal. It was noted that the subcommittee intends to recommend the formation of a commission to study the dispersal matter.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 2009. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Jose dos Santos Soares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Andonios Demetrios Dilbois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2013. A bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2014. A bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2015. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2016. A bill for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2017. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; and

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of certain individuals whose land was flooded by action of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2019. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2020. A bill for the relief of Carmen Aguado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2021. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; and

S. 2023. A bill for the relief of Panayiotis (John) Foradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO REMOVAL OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus. I ask unanimous consent that a statement accompanying the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2009) to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania is as follows:

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY S. 2009

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill will provide for certain minor technical amendments to the administrative provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the Federal manufacturers' excise taxes imposed by chapter 32.

Under existing law and administrative practice, repair and replacement parts for automobiles, household-type refrigerators, etc., may be sold tax-free for use by the vendee in the further manufacture of other articles, whether or not these other articles are subject to manufacturers' excise taxes. Section 1 of the bill codifies these provisions and makes them uniformly applicable to all repair and replacement parts, including parts for radio and television receivers and camera lenses.

Section 2 of the bill supplies a needed clarification of the original intent of Congress to confine the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television receiving sets to apparatus of the entertainment type. It would also remove the tax from chassis, speakers, amplifiers, power-supply units, antenna of the built-in type and phonograph mechanisms where the cost of compliance and enforcement is not warranted by the negligible revenues produced.

The enactment of the bill will—

1. Considerably ease excise administrative and compliance problems;

2. Avoid indirect taxation of articles which Congress has not deemed it desirable to subject to direct taxation;

3. Eliminate discrimination against manufacturers of repair and replacement parts where there are substitute parts not subject to tax; and,

4. Remove indirect tax now imposed upon States and municipalities and exports where taxable parts are bought for use by the vendee in the further manufacture of a nontaxable end article.

The enactment of the bill will result in a revenue loss of less than $2 million, a very substantial portion of which will be recouped from major savings in cost of compliance and enforcement.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF BILL

Section 1. Sales of certain taxable component parts for use in other manufactured articles

Section 1 of the bill is identical (except with respect to effective dates) to section 12 (b) of H. R. 6440, 83d Congress, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee in Senate Report No. 2038. The statement of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to this provision is as follows:

"This section, which was added by your committee, provides that parts, accessories or components subject to manufacturers' excise taxes may be sold free of tax (or a refund or credit provided to the vendee where not so sold) if the vendee uses, or resells, them as material in the manufacture or production of, or as a component part of other articles, whether or not the other articles are subject to a manufacturers' excise tax. Parts, accessories or components presently subject to manufacturers' excise tax are automotive parts or accessories, refrigeration components, radio or television components, and camera lenses. Presently most of these parts or components are taxable if sold to a manufacturer for incorporation in an article not subject to a manufacturers' excise tax, or if sold for resale to such a manufacturer. This is true of radio and television components and camera lenses. Refrigerator components, however, are not taxable if sold for incorporation in, or as components of, refrigeration equipment whether or not such equipment is subject to manufacturers' excise tax. (This provision is eliminated by this bill as no longer necessary.) Under a ruling of the Internal Revenue Service issued in 1932, automotive parts and accessories (other than spark plugs, storage batteries, leaf springs, coils, timers, and tire chains), may be sold free of tax by one manufacturer to another manufacturer even though they are to be used in the manufacture of nontaxable articles. On the other hand, if such parts and accessories are sold taxpaid, no credit or refund may be claimed if they are used in the manufacture of nontaxable articles.

"The adoption of a single rule for these parts or components exempting them from tax where they are sold for incorporation in other end articles, whether or not the end articles are taxable, will result in a uniform application of these taxes and thereby provide greater equity and simplify administration and compliance. Providing for tax-free sales where the end products are not taxable also will prevent the indirect taxation of articles which Congress has not deemed it desirable to subject to direct excise taxation. Furthermore, where there are substitute components for these end articles which are not subject to tax, this removes the discrimination against the manufacturers of the taxable parts or components. Moreover, this will remove the indirect tax paid by States and municipalities, or with respect to articles produced for export, where these parts or components are purchased by manufacturers for incorporation in other articles. It is believed that the effect of this provision on revenues will be negligible."

Section 2. Radio and television receiving sets and component parts

Section 2 of the bill is identical (except with respect to effective dates) to section 8 (b) of H. R. 6440, 83d Congress. The statement of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to this provision is as follows:

"This section, which was added by your committee, provides that the 10 percent excise tax on radios, television sets, phonographs, automobile radio or television sets, and combination radio, television or phonograph sets, is to apply only if the article is of the entertainment type. It also limits to cabinets and tubes, the radio and television components which are to be taxable when sold separately from a set. Under the amendment the following items are exempt from tax: chassis, speakers, amplifiers, power supply units, antennas of the built-in type and phonograph mechanisms. The definition of radio and television components has also been changed so as to tax components for taxable sets, in lieu of components which are suitable for use on or in connection with, as component parts of taxable sets. The word for in this case is to be interpreted in the same manner as in the case of the excise tax on automobile parts and accessories, where it has been interpreted as taxing parts and accessories the primary use of which is in taxable motor vehicles. The above changes also make it possible to remove several provisions in present law relating to the special exemption for communication, detection and navigation receivers when sold to the United States Government, as these receivers will in any case be exempt under the new provisions since they are not of the entertainment type. This exemption, however, is preserved for any article with respect to which the tax is paid under section 3404 (a) or (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 as in effect

prior to the effective date of the amendments to such section. Therefore, any manufacturer, producer, or importer who has sold a receiver to the United States may still claim a credit or refund for the tax paid under section 3404 (a) or (b) for any article incorporated in such receiver.

"This excise tax has been limited to items of the entertainment type because your committee sees no reason for singling out special communication and navigation equipment used by businesses for special excise-tax levies. This is in conformance with similar actions taken by Congress in recent years in revising the tax bases of the excise taxes on photographic apparatus and film and electric, gas and oil appliances. Moreover, this change and the narrowing of taxable components to cabinets and tubes will considerably ease administrative and compliance problems under this tax. The revenue loss of the provisions in a full year of operation is estimated at $2 million."

EMERGENCY WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop. Wheat producers will be asked to vote on the question of quotas on June 25.

Under the current law, producers have little choice in their vote. Simply stated, they choose between strict acreage controls at the minimum of 55 million acres with a price support of 80 to 82½ percent of parity or the same restricted acreage, 55 million, and a price support of 50 percent of parity. This is, in fact, no choice.

One of the most serious problems facing wheat producers, particularly in the quality wheat area, is that their acreages have been decreased to such an extent that they no longer have real economic units.

I believe the wheat producers, if given a choice of continuing under the minimum acreage—55 million—at a relatively high Government guaranteed price support, or a slightly relaxed acreage of 62 million for 1956, with a lower support, 70 percent Government guaranty, they will have a realistic choice to make.

The bill simply proposes that wheat producers be given a choice as described above in the referendum on June 25; and the program they choose will be in effect in 1956.

There is every indication that unless wheat farmers are given a realistic choice that the present market quota program may be disapproved. This means that the level of price support for wheat will be at only 50 percent of parity, roughly $1.19 a bushel. Under the program that I am proposing, if the producers should choose the higher acreage and a less Government guaranty, wheat would be supported at an average of about $1.66.

I believe that the Congress owes it to itself actually to find out through a referendum what producers think with regard to variable price supports. This will give Congress that opportunity.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act on this measure in time for it to be placed on the ballot. Failing to do this, I am sure that we must have this or some measure ready to put into effect should the farmers disapprove quotas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2013) to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STRENGTHENING THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO BRIBERY AND GRAFT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2014) to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft.

In brief, it will discourage the questionable practice which has been constantly called to our attention by congressional committees whereby Government employees who held positions either in the procurement, lending, or revenue collecting agencies of the Government subsequently obtained rather lucrative positions with the same corporations they favored in negotiating contracts or loans.

This proposed legislation would not prevent the bona fide employment of a Government official by any company with whom he wished to become associated. It simply provides that when such employee accepts a position with a company with whom his agency did business during his period of Government service, the agency with whom he worked would be officially put on notice of his intentions to enter the employment of the company. With the Government properly on notice, the agency involved would have ample opportunity to discover those few cases wherein such employment could be questioned.

This proposed legislation was worked out with the cooperation of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the former Comptroller General of the United States.

In a letter to me under date of August 18, 1950, Mr. Warren says, and I quote:

"The broad subject of Government officers and employees going to work for Government contractors long has been of deep concern to the General Accounting Office. Certainly there can be no objection to any legitimate efforts of such people to obtain employment in private industry, or to efforts of private industry to secure the services of qualified employees. But it is equally certain that arrangements of this kind must be consistent with the public interest. I think you will agree that there is inherent in the public service and in dealings with the Government, the requirements for exceptionally high standards of conduct.

"The real danger lies in the illicit inducement of Federal personnel by Government contractors, and solicitation by those personnel of an advantage from the contractor. As shown in my reports to the Congress and testimony before its committees, this may take the form of highly remunerative positions, or expensive entertainment, or other things of value, in return for special favors or privileges for the contractors. Often it originates or is implemented by veiled or outright connivance on the part of the Government people involved. Whether consummated or not, such dealings are inimical to the interests of the United States. They are nothing less than plain bribery."

The former Comptroller General then suggested certain amendments to strengthen those sections of the criminal statutes, Nos. 201 and 202, dealing with the bribery of Government officers and employees, and they are contained in the first part of my bill.

A new section is added at the end of chapter 11. It is designed to provide information which will form the basis for more effective action to implement the criminal statutes as well as the present safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

The mere existence of these provisions on the statute books would have a powerful deterrent effect. The intent and the overt act to defeat the public interest or defraud the United States, by connivance between Government employees and contractors for future employment, would be punishable. Yet those whose arrangements are entirely legal and ethical would not be penalized. They would have ample protection to do what the honest businessman does in the everyday course of business. At the same time the Government, through information given to the agencies, would have effective means to check on the legality of the dealings with special reference to established safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

This bill has been recommended by the Comptroller General as being necessary and I cannot urge too strongly, in view of the extensive Government procurement, that it be given favorable consideration.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has sent to the Vice President suggestions for changes in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954—Public Law 598.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 83d Congress, it was my privilege to sponsor the legislation. It has been well received by the Federal employees. Experience under the act has demonstrated that some changes would improve the act. I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2019) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third proviso of section 7 (d) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 7 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The companies eligible to participate as reinsurers and the amount of insurance under the policy or policies to be allocated to each issuing company or reinsurer may be redetermined by the Commission for and in advance of any policy year after the first, on a basic consistent with subsections (c) and (d) of this section, with any modifications thereof it deems appropriate to carry out the intent of such subsections, and based on each participating company's group life insurance in force, excluding that under any policy or policies purchased under this act, in the United States on the most recent December 31 for which information is available to it, and shall be so redetermined in a similar manner not less often than every 3 years or at any time that any participating company withdraws from participation: *Provided*, That if, upon any such redetermination, in the case of any issuing company or reinsurer which insured employees of the Federal Government on December 31, 1953, under policies issued to an association of Federal employees, the amount which results from the application of the formula referred to in subsection (d) of this section is less than the total decrease, if any, since December 31, 1953, in the amount of each company's insurance under such policies, the amount allocated to such company shall be increased to the amount of such decrease."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10 (a) The Commission is authorized to arrange with any nonprofit association of Federal employees for the assumption by the fund of any existing life insurance agreements of such association with, or for the benefit of, those of its members retired or otherwise separated from the Federal service who consent to the transfer and deposit required by subsections (c) and (d) of this section, and the Commission is further authorized to insure the obligations assumed with any company or companies meeting the requirements of section 7 (a).

"(b) Any such arrangement shall provide that premium payments by such insured members shall thereafter be made at the same rates to the fund, under such conditions as the Commission may prescribe.

"(c) Any such arrangement shall further provide that, upon the termination of the association's life insurance agreements under subsection (d) and the distribution of its assets, there be transferred to and deposited in the fund the shares of the total assets of the life insurance fund of such association that would otherwise actually be due to those retired or separated members who consent to have their shares so transferred: *Provided*, That the transfer of assets of any association hereunder shall be accomplished in accordance with the procedures and conditions prescribed by the Commission, and in accordance with the requirements of any applicable law of a State of the United States or of the District of Columbia.

"(d) The arrangements authorized by this section shall be made only with those associations which terminte all life insurance agreements with, or for the benefit of, their insured members within 6 calendar months following the date of enactment of this amending act, or such later date as the Commission may agree when there are extenuating circumstances, but not later than August 17, 1957, and such arrangements shall apply only to life insurance grants to any insured member before January 1, 1954.

"(e) The fund shall not assume liability for life insurance as provided in this section in respect to a person who is insured under other provisions of this act, and the liability for life insurance assumed by the fund as provided in this section shall terminate with respect to any person who becomes insured under other provisions of this act."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the creation by the Congress of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives, a bipartisan joint committee, to serve as a watchdog group to protect the public's interest in developing sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguarding the execution of those policies.

Last year, I introduced a joint resolution calling for creation of such a joint committee. A similar joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives. While no action was taken last year, considerable interest has been evidenced in this proposal by sportsmen of America and conservationists generally. For that reason, I am again introducing the joint resolution this year, and urging active support for its adoption.

Every study pertaining to resource development has pointed to the need for greater policy coordination within the executive branch. New recommendations toward that objective are expected to be forthcoming soon from the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I feel very strongly we in the Congress should put our own house in order and provide the proper mechanism for similar policy coordination within the legislative branch.

My views about the urgent need for some such action were outlined recently in an article entitled "Protecting America's Natural Resources," which appeared in the winter issue of Heartland, the United States-Canadian Quarterly of Inland America. Because it explains the proposal in detail, I ask unanimous consent for the article to be published at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

PROTECTING AMERICA'S NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Senator HUBERT M. HUMPHREY)

The American people are quite properly concerned over indications that we as a nation may be slipping backward from some of the great conservation policies established since the days of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Much of our Nation's strength and progress has been made possible by our abundance of great natural resources—land, water, timber, oil, and minerals—and the wisdom with which we have developed and used them.

We who are from the great heartland of America, so rich in the abundance of such resources, are particularly concerned with their wise use and preservation for generations yet unborn.

But we have long ago learned the dangers of exploiting and wasting these valuable resources.

We know they are not unlimited. We know that they must be carefully safeguarded from exhaustion.

We have seen what happened down through history to other civilizations, when they exploited their resources beyond replenishment.

We cannot let that happen in our country.

We have tried to make certain it will not happen, as a matter of public policy.

For years we have responded to the will of the people by establishing safeguards over the uses of these resources, and sought to protect them for future generations to share.

Yet, shortsighted pressures still exist for raids on these great national treasures. There are those who would be willing to exploit them for whatever immediate profit they could obtain, regardless of the consequences in the future.

We have seen those forces at work in virtually every field of natural resources; we have seen develop a growing demand for abrupt turnabout in public policy that would cause Gifford Pinchot to roll over in his grave.

Now, if never before, we need a strong revival of a crusading spirit for the protection of our vast forests; for protection and proper development of our water resources; for protection of our soil fertility on our farms; for the safeguarding of our petroleum resources.

We need firm national conservation policies, embracing all forms of natural resources, and putting foremost the public's stake in preservation of such resources for useful purposes in generations to come.

One of our great weaknesses in development of national conservation policies has been the multitude of agencies and groups concerned with different phases of the conservation problem.

We have conservation responsibilities and problems in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Army engineers.

We have conservation policies being passed upon in various forms by the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on Public Works.

Often we in the legislative branch of government have protested and objected to overlapping or duplicating authorities in the executive branch; we have also protested lack of effective coordination where divided responsibility exists.

There seem to be sound grounds for creation of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives—a bipartisan joint committee.

Last year, I introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for creation of such a joint committee. A similar resolution was introduced in the House. While no action was taken last year, considerable interest has been evidenced in this proposal by sportsmen of America, and conservationists generally. For that reason, I am again introducing the resolution in Congress this year, and urging active support for its adoption.

It would be a watchdog committee to help develop sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguard the execution of those policies.

It is not the purpose of the resolution to interfere with or curtail existing functions of any congressional committees with reference to conservation of national resources; rather, it would create supplemental functions that should be helpful to all of the existing committees.

The purpose of the joint committee would be to investigate the operations and effects of all Federal statutes dealing with natural resources, to investigate the administration of such statutes by the executive depart-

ments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments and instrumentalities of the Government charged with their administration, and to make such other investigations with respect to conservation of natural resources as the joint committee should deem necessary.

The committee would be required to make reports to the Senate and House from time to time concerning the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The resolution calls for a Joint Committee on Natural Resources consisting of 16 members, 8 from each of the 2 Houses of Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with not more than 8 of the members being from any one political party.

In the meantime, there is much that the executive branch of our Government can and should do toward developing a more forward-looking resource development program before the Congress.

Circumstances of world or domestic conditions may be the controlling factor in deciding when some of the greatly needed improvements can be carried out. But the advance planning for what must eventually be done can and should be started now.

During the sharp dip in employment last summer and fall, much talk was heard about having a shelf of available public-works projects to create employment and maintain purchasing power.

Many of us hope our great natural resources are not overlooked in the development of any such backlog or shelf of potentially desirable projects. All of us know of the great and lasting contributions made to our country by the Civilian Conservation Corps in years gone by, both in physical improvements to our parks and forests and in the rehabilitation of young men who might have become wandering derelicts and delinquents had it not been for useful, healthful, outdoor employment.

We need to be thinking about a similar program for the future—having it ready to go into action immediately if ever again we suffer a sharp slump in our domestic economy that deprives young people of jobs and hope and a future.

We need imaginative thinking—looking into the future.

The demand on these resources is going to be greater and greater as our population soars. We need soon to take stock and prepare for the future.

Nearly a year ago I called on the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service to start thinking about future public-works projects that would make productive contributions to our country's future, as well as provide temporary employment in rural as well as urban areas. I hope it stimulated some constructive thinking. From the letters I have received from these important agencies charged with the responsibility of protecting our resources, they are eager to undertake such efforts—if only there is a public awakening to the need.

Let me quote from a portion of my reply from the United States Forest Service:

"Your suggestion for development of a backlog of public-works projects in forestry is an excellent one. * * *

"We are very much in accord with your views that such a program can make substantial contributions in forest and related resource developments, as well as providing rural and urban employment in productive work. This fact is too little recognized by many of the advocates of public-work programs who have considered them as exclusively construction of large dams, buildings, highways, and projects of that type. Forest and forest-range land treatment have often been omitted from public-works programs—despite the importance that proper forest land treatment and protection can have on minimizing construction needs for downstream flood-control structures."

What are we waiting for, America?

Sooner or later we are going to need a more comprehensive program of protecting and improving our great national treasures—the timber, range, recreation, water, and wildlife resources of our land.

The idea of a watchdog committee in the Congress on natural resources is a step in that direction.

It is a call to protect the public's interests that should not be ignored.

It is an opportunity to aid, not raid, our natural resources.

I hope conservationists of our country will rally to its support.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "Winning the Cold War," delivered by Senator JOHNSON of Texas at a dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on May 15, 1955.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement made by him on his own behalf and for Senators HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, and WILEY, introducing leaders of the Mayors' Committee to members of the press on May 18.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1256, TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES, AND OTHER RELATED BILLS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled to commence on Thursday, May 26, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1256, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and other related bills. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 972 BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Banking of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on S. 972 relating to the regulation of branches of Federal savings and loan associations. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 31, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8–3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Thursday, May 26, 1955.

THE CREDO OF THE LATE SENATOR CLYDE R. HOEY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, May 12, 1955, marked the first anniversary of the passing of my beloved predecessor, Senator Clyde Roark Hoey, who rightly merited and enjoyed to an unsurpassed degree the affection, the admiration, and the confidence of the people of North Carolina. Senator Hoey met with complete courage the trying problems which confronted him as citizen, churchman, advocate, State legislator, Representative in Congress, governor and Senator. He was able to do this because of his personal credo, which he entitled, "This I Believe." Senator Hoey's credo contains inspiration for all who will read it. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the credo was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe in faith. I have always had faith. As an adolescent I pondered the full-orbed canopy of the far-extended skyline and believed that there was a great first cause—God. To me there was no other explanation of the universe and no other assurance of protection and guidance. When 12 years of age I was privileged to work in a printing office for long hours daily and many times far into the night. After concluding the labors of the day and night, I would walk along a dark and lonely road, through woods and uninhabited sections for a long mile to my home. Scared of the dark, yes; afraid, to be sure; but armed with a heavy hickory walking stick, I looked up into a starlit sky and thought of my free heritage and believed in a Father God and would not admit my fears to even my colaborers. From the standpoint of the world I was unafraid. I am still unafraid.

Growing into manhood, with manifold responsibilities and perplexing problems, requiring all the resources of which I was capable, there was the constant and increasing need for some reservoir of power that could be tapped in periods of emergencies and hours of crises. In my faith I discovered that reservoir.

I found matrimony a happy estate. Blessed with a radiant and lovely life companion, the establishment and maintenance of a home was a high adventure, and the coming of children into that home brought the full realization of the joy and happiness possible only in this most honored and ancient of earth's institutions. Ten years ago, after 42 years of happy married life, my wife and the mother of my children passed to her reward. My faith in her and her faith in God linger as a blessed heritage in the sanctuary of holy memories. Faith has been indispensable amid the sorrows and sadnesses of life, and has been exhilarating and sustaining in periods of joy and triumph. The experience gained through the years, and whatever learning or knowledge I have acquired, have not lessened, but rather increased, my faith in a God who guides the destiny of nations and individuals and who even marks the falling of a sparrow.

Conscious of my own shortcomings and sins, ashamed of my failures and omissions of duty, and fully mindful of the unfaithfulness which has marked my life, I have never doubted the wisdom and goodness,

the might and the mercy of a gracious, loving Heavenly Father—God.

I join the late great Kansas editor, William Allen White, when he said in a period of crisis, "I am not afraid of tomorrow. I have seen yesterday. I love today, and I face tomorrow unafraid." There are many clouds on the horizon of America. I have had and shall have many dark nights, but there has never yet been a night dark enough to put out the stars—and there shall not be. This is still "my Father's world." And my faith abides.

STEPS TAKEN TO COMBAT PUBLICATION OF COMMUNIST LITERATURE IN JAPAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently it has been my privilege to have had some contact and communication with the Director of the United States Information Agency, Mr. Theodore C. Streibert, as well as with his very able and competent deputy, Mr. Abbott Washburn. I have written to the United States Information Agency and the respective officials of that organization concerning certain developments in the field of information; and I have received, in reply, a letter dated April 4, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, April 4, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR HUBERT: This is a preliminary acknowledgment of your good letter to Ted Streibert of March 29 about the overseas information program. Ted is currently out of the city.

With regard to the Communists' cheap-book program in Japan, we are attempting as best we can to meet this with activities about which Dr. Franklin Burdette, Chief of our Information Center Service, will shortly write you. It presents a difficult, complex problem of which money is only a part.

The Neue Zeitung, in West Berlin, was closed not for financial reasons but because German-owned West Berlin newspapers are now fully able to bring complete news from the free world viewpoint to their readers. In the opinion of Ambassador Conant and ourselves, there was no longer any necessity or desirability of a United States Government-owned newspaper in Berlin. Our Berlin Radio Station RIAS, however, continues in full operation as it is the primary source of truthful news for the people of East Berlin and East Germany.

Short-wave voice programs to Finland did not appear to be fully effective at the time they were discontinued—months ago. Accordingly they were sacrificed in the overall 37 percent congressional slash in budget for this work. (Final Truman year: $122.5 million; fiscal 1954: $76 million (net); fiscal 1955: $77.1 million.)

We have requested increases for the work in Burma and India for fiscal 1956, and will know our chances when the House subcommittee markup becomes public on April 13. Are the reports you mention receiving from these countries something you would care to pass along to us? If so, I would like to have them studied by our assistant directors for these areas.

General Gruenther is, of course, right about the enormous jamming capability of the Soviet. Our signals do, however, get through and the evidence shows they are eagerly listened to. The Soviet bloc is currently beaming to foreign peoples some 1,675 hours of broadcasting weekly (Soviet Union, 623 hours; satellites, 812 hours; Red China, 88 hours; clandestine and other sources 152 hours). The Voice transmits some 894 hours weekly (as of March 1, 1955). And we, of course, do no jamming. For us to try to match the Soviet operation, program for program and transmitter for transmitter, would involve tremendous additional appropriations. I am not sure that such a course would be as productive as other avenues of information work.

We are asking Congress for an increase of $1.5 million for radio in fiscal '56. Our total requested increase for USIA amounts to roughly $12 million, which is just about what we asked last year—of which we finally got a little over $1 million. Sincerely hope we do better this year.

With great appreciation for your continued active interest and help.

Sincerely,

ABBOTT WASHBURN,
Deputy Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I called to the attention of Mr. Streibert a very serious problem developing in Japan, where the Red Chinese Government has been literally flooding the Japanese market with cheap literature, the price being so cheap as to make such publications readily available to any of the persons in Japan who would wish to purchase such books.

I called this matter to the attention of the United States Information Agency. I am pleased to note that in a letter dated April 12, Mr. Franklin L. Burdette, Chief of the Information Center Service, informed me, in reply, that the United States Government, in cooperation with certain private institutions, is taking very effective steps to combat this flood of cheap literature—and I mean "cheap" as to both text and price—which is coming upon the Japanese market.

I think the Senate will be interested to know that about 90 Japanese publishers issue translations of American books, as compared to about 1 dozen Japanese publishers who now issue Communist or pro-Communist books.

Mr. President, I commend this matter to the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 29, 1955.

THEODORE C. STREIBERT,
Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STREIBERT: It seems that I have been burdening you a great deal of late with requests for information and suggestions that have been sent along from constituents. I hope you will permit me to continue to do this, because I do so in the spirit of being helpful and not critical. Again let me assure you that I have a high regard for the United States Information Agency and the work that it is doing. I only regret that it is not permitted to do more due to what I believe to be inadequate appropriations.

Just the other day I received a letter from a friend of mine in Japan. This friend has been in Japan for several years and has a fairly good understanding of what goes on. My informant stated as follows:

"There is one thing that you ought to do something about. We understand that tons of cheap literature is brought into Japan from Red China and/or Russia. The price is only 20 or 50 yen so that anyone can afford to read it. Japan is a nation that reads. You can be sure that nothing favorable about America will be found in these books. Why cannot similar material to promote good will for America be placed in Japanese bookshops? True, there are probaby hundreds of free pamphlets. That is just the point. How can a bookshop dealer make any profit on free books? The books or pamphlets should be priced cheap enough for the consumer and high enough to give the bookshop owner a small profit."

Just what is the situation concerning American books and periodicals in Japanese bookshops? I am becoming ever increasingly concerned about the insufficiency and inadequacies of our information services. The closing down of the American-sponsored newspaper in Berlin last month, then our Voice of America program in Finland, along with reports that I continue to receive from Burma and India alarm me. What are we going to do about these developments? Surely this rich country can afford to tell its story to the world. General Gruenther testifying in executive session before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee told us only last Saturday that the Soviet Union was spending hundreds of millions of dollars every year just to jam or block reception of Voice of America broadcasts in the Soviet. I believe the record will reveal that he stated the Soviet spends more money to jam our broadcasts than we spend on our entire Voice of America program. Surely our America can match the Soviet, or are we about to confess that the dictatorship of the proletariat has more capital and finance than the Republic of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, April 12, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Streibert has requested that I write to you about the activities we are conducting to meet the Communists' cheap book program in Japan, which you mentioned in your letter of March 29 addressed to him.

According to information supplied by the National Diet Library in Tokyo, there are now published in Japan more books translated from American than from Soviet Russian sources. In 1952 the opposite situation prevailed. The two major factors responsible for this reversal appear to be the extended activities of commercial agents, particularly Charles E. Tuttle & Co., representing United States publishers, and the expanded atcivity of USIS Tokyo. USIS activity is focused chiefly upon increasing the general knowledge of American books among Japanese publishers and intellectuals—through the issuance of a monthly Japanese-language book review, Beisho Dayori—and upon encouraging the publication of important American books by Japanese publishers with various means of USIS assistance. As a result, our competitive standing with Japanese book publishers is better than that of the Russians.

About 90 Japanese publishers issue translations of American books compared to about a dozen who put out Communist or pro-Communist books.

The Japanese book situation is more serious, however, when our books are compared with those coming from Communist China. Since 1953 cheap translations of books from Peking and Shanghai have become noticeably more plentiful. In order to meet this situation, we added last month to the staff of USIS Tokyo an officer who will be mainly concerned with developing large Japanese editions of American books which will sell

at the equivalent of 10 cents. The distribution of these books, beyond the usual bookstore outlets, and in our lack of a disciplined volunteer organized sales force similar to that of the Communists, will also require the attention of this officer. We aim to get these books particularly into the hands of Japanese students.

I should also like to mention the influence of the libraries in the cultural centers which we support in Japan. More than 300,000 American books are contained in these libraries and they are constantly used and highly regarded by Japanese students and intellectuals.

I deeply appreciate your interest in the overseas book program.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE,
Chief, Information Center Service.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as all of us know, on last Tuesday night, at 7 p. m., the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, made his report to the President and to the American people, by means of television, on his recent trip to Europe. His report is of such importance that I believe it should be read by all of us. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the report and colloquy on that occasion with the President be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and colloquy were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. Foster, it is good to have you here to tell us something of the significant events that took place during your recent visit to Europe. You realize that through the cameras in this room your report will go to the entire Nation. And so I hope that in addition to the details of that trip, you will tell us something about the developing scene in the international field as you see it, and something of the prospects for real progress in our incessant search for peace.

Mr. DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I am delighted to have a chance to report to you and to my Cabinet associates, and as you say, the American people, on what took place, particularly during this last week, a week so crowded with events that I hardly know how to start. But you might——

The PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you, Foster, I think that it might be well to go clear back to 2 years ago. Then you will remember with our colleagues in the legislative branch on both parties the administration was developing the policies intended to produce, and basic to that policy was the belief—the conviction—that only through cooperative strength developed in the free world could we really face up to this threat that the Communist dictatorship posed to all free men. We believed, as you know, that until Western Europe had been united, until there were some German forces joining the NATO organization, and until we had some confidence in the Russian word through deeds rather than mere protestation, that it would do little good to have talks with them. And you will realize that you and I finally decided that I should make some pronouncement along this line, and did so, on April 16 of 1953.

Now we agreed at that time that if we could, through the kind of steps I have just mentioned, arrive at the point where we had a real basis for going ahead, even if only with faint hope of real progress, that we might finally develop between ourselves and with the Soviets a new relationship that would at least allow some hope of progress toward this great goal of peace that is of course the great dream of every American.

So, against that kind of backdrop, I think you could relate the events of recent times and on your—just your recent trip to Europe, to tell us about the story as you see it

Mr. DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I certainly remember that speech that you refer to. It has been a kind of bible for us in the State Department in the 2 years and some months that have elapsed since then

What happened last week is to a very large extent a coming true of the things that we hoped for and planned at that time. And indeed I think now one can say that what happened may really mark a turning in the tide of history.

The first thing—the thing that you talked about at that time as of utmost importance—was this consolidation of Western Europe and the bringing into NATO of the Federal Republic of Germany as a free and independent, sovereign state. Well, you recall, and probably some of the television audience will recall, because I reported on it at the Cabinet meeting, you remember last October, we signed up at that time the treaties that were to bring this to pass.

But as we have learned through hard experience, there is quite a lot of difference, sometimes, between signing treaties and having treaties ratified and come into force. And in this case there was a terrific battle to bring about, of course, the coming into being of those treaties. And it was a hard battle because the Soviet Union went all-out with everything it had to prevent those ratifications, and there had to be ratifications in 15 countries. Many of them had to act through 2 legislative bodies. And if any one had slipped up, the whole scheme would have collapsed.

And the Soviet Union threatened, and it promised, and it used the Communist Party machinery in these different countries to threaten anybody who voted for these things that they would never be reelected again. That was a pretty tough battle, which was won by the forces of freedom and it involved the greatest diplomatic defeat that the Soviet Union has suffered, I would say, certainly since the war.

And the treaties came into force 12 days ago, exactly. Instruments of ratification were deposited. A week ago Monday we met together in Paris to mark the actual coming into being of what had then been planned—the meeting of the Western European Union, and the meeting of NATO into which Germany walked—in the presence of their great Chancellor Adenauer, whom you know so well and we all admire so much. It was a very significant and historic occasion. We all had little speeches prepared which we made when Adenauer came in, and then when we had finished, Adenauer himself spoke with great dignity and statesmanship. And when he had finished, the NATO Ministerial Council—I think for the first time in history—burst into applause. It is a pretty stuffy and formalistic body, and it was not as I say, I think the first time it ever happened.

But there was a sense of a great event as the free German Republic took its place there. And when you say—because, you see, F and G come together in the alphabet—France and Germany sat side by side, and you saw these two countries sitting there side by side as allies, you felt that a new page had been opened on European history, and that the vision which so many people have had for so many years of a United Europe had actually started to come to pass.

This Western civilization, you know, almost committed suicide with its incessant wars of the last hundred years and more. And it bled itself in man and treasure. But I think now the thing has been put together in such a way that Western civilization took a new lease on life and is going to add strength and vigor for itself and for the benefit of all humanity.

That was the thing we saw happening in Europe. As you said, this unity of purpose and action we had to have. Now I think that is an accomplished fact.

Now I was in Europe and we dealt mostly with European problems, but I never forget the fact that we have got Asian problems as well as European problems, and I took advantage of this NATO Council to talk a bit to them about our Asian problems, because there is a considerable failure to understand the motivation of our Asian policies. And I said to these Ministers there, I said to them, if you like the United States as you see it manifested in Europe, you should understand what we are doing in Asia, because we are doing precisely the same thing in Asia that we want to do here. What are we doing? We are defending freedom where there are freemen who want to defend their own freedom. We believe in collective security to help them do that. We believe in being loyal to our friends and allies. And I said you seem to like those policies when you find them in Europe, and you ought also to recognize that those are the same policies motivating us in Asia, because I said, we don't have a double personality, we are just one nation, and the reason we are acting this way in Europe is because we really believe in these things, and if we believe in them we are going to act the same way in Asia.

The PRESIDENT. That is a wonderful way to tell them.

Mr. DULLES. I think they began to understand, perhaps, for the first time, what was back of our Asian policies. And then I took the opportunity to talk a good deal with the French Prime Minister, Edgar Faure, and the Foreign Minister, Monsieur Pinay, about the situation in Indochina. And the British Foreign Minister, Harold Macmillan, sat in on some of our talks. It was hard to get them in. Our days were busy. We mostly met at night. We had 3 or 4 meetings at night that lasted until 1 o'clock or more in the morning.

The main point I made there was that we had to accept the fact that Vietnam is now a free nation—at least the southern half of it is—and it has not got a puppet government, it has not got a government that we can give orders to, and tell what we want it to do, or we want it to refrain from doing. If it was that kind of government, we wouldn't be justified in supporting it——

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. Because that kind of government is not going to last there. One can only hold free Vietnam with a government that is nationalistic and has a purpose of its own and responsive to the will of its own people, and doesn't take orders from anybody outside, whether it be from Paris—or Cannes for that matter—or from Washington. And that we have got to coordinate our policies to the acceptance of the fact that it is really a free and independent country.

We talked that over in its various implications and ramifications, hour after hour, during almost every day for the 4 days I was in Paris. And I think we came to a better understanding and that there is more chance of coordination of French policies with ours along sound lines than has been the case heretofore. The government of Diem which seemed to be almost on the ropes a few weeks ago, I think is reestablished with strength. It has been through a hard experience and I think it is going to have more support, within and without, than it has had before. And I look to that situation with more hope than we have had before. That is a byproduct of this trip which was designed primarily for European matters. We did, I think, make a considerable accomplishment in relation both to our China policy and in relation to Vietnam.

Well, then, came on to what was in a sense the highspot of the trip, I suppose, which was the signing of the Austrian treaty. Well, that is something that the United States has been working for for a long, long time. I myself first started to work on it in Moscow in 1947, where I went as adviser to George Marshall who was the Secretary of State. And they tell me—Mr. Hoover gave me the figures just a minute or two ago, he dug up in the State Department—that during these 8 years, we have had no less than 379, I think it was, Herbert, 379 meetings at one level or another with the Soviet representatives about this Austrian treaty. And oftentimes we would be just so close to getting it through that we would think it was just around the corner; but the corner seemed to be an interminable series of corners.

The PRESIDENT. It proves in this business you must not be easily discouraged.

Mr. DULLES. Well, we just kept sticking to it——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And all of a sudden—well, the heart of the difficulty was that the Soviet Union just couldn't bring themselves to take their Red Army troops out of their zone of Austria; and last year at the Berlin meeting we had agreed on all the terms of the treaty substantially except that at the last minute the Soviets said, "well, we will sign the treaty but with the understanding we can keep our troops on in there indefinitely." Well, of course, that would have been no effective treaty at all. So we turned it down, and we just kept on.

And the Austrian people, incidentally, kept their nerve in a wonderful way in this affair, and they never caved at all. For they knew their independence would not be worth anything if the Red Army was still around.

And all of a sudden, a few weeks ago, out of the blue, came this announcement that the Russians were willing to take their troops out of Austria. I don't think anybody yet knows fully just the significance—the full significance of that. It is just one of these breaks that come, if you keep on steadily, steadily, keeping the pressure on. And all of a sudden you get a break—and this break came. And it seemed to make possible, after all these long years of work, the consummation of this Austrian state treaty.

Now there were several features of the treaty that were still unsettled and where we wanted to get some improvements. And we got the Ambassadors at work in Vienna, while I was in Paris, working on the final details of the treaties, and there were some features, particularly about the economic clauses, which we were very anxious to get changed, and the Russians were very sticky about them.

Well, I said I would not go to Vienna until this thing was all closed up in a way I thought was reasonably satisfactory to the United States. So I planned—you gave me your plane, and it was delightful—that part of it was pretty nice—but I was going to take it on Thursday to go to Vienna, and I just wouldn't go. So we just postponed our plans. And I said I wasn't going to go to Vienna until the Ambassadors had agreed on this treaty in its final form because I felt once I got there in Vienna I would be hooked. So I just put it off. And then on Friday everything was closed up and I got the word that they had agreed. So on Friday I flew down to Vienna. And on Saturday we had a 5-power meeting; that is, the 4 occupying powers and the Austrians, at which we perfected the arrangement of protocol and the like for the carrying out of the treaty signature on Sunday.

And then we had the actual signature of the treaty on Sunday, about 11:30 o'clock I think it was. And that was a real occasion which those who saw it I think will never forget: The tremendous joy of the Austrian people who had waited—because really their occupation goes back to the Hitler time——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. In 1938, 17 years, been waiting for liberation. And the thing that particularly struck me as I went through the streets was the joy on the part of the older people, particularly the older people who had known the liberties of the past——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And had lived through these 17 years of occupation, now at last saw their liberation apparently at hand. And the older people just jumping up and down with joy—wrinkled faces—it just made your heart feel warm at the thought that we had been able to make some contribution to this spirit of joy which animated the whole Austrian people, particularly those that were in the Soviet zone of occupation.

Now a lot of people are trying to find mysterious reasons why the Soviets changed their policy, and that is something that, of course, deserves the very careful thought that we are giving it. As you know, Mr. President, we are studying all this very, very carefully, to discover the implications of it. But there are certainly implications of it that we can be quite sure of, as far as we ourselves are concerned, and which I think we can take great satisfaction from. In the first place, it marks the first time that the Red armies will have turned their face in the other direction and gone back, since 1945, when you were over there effecting the liberation of Europe from our side, and they had moved in from the other side, as you know.

This is the first time a segment of the Red army will have turned around and started to go back. Now that is bound to have a tremendous impact in the other countries where the Red armies are in occupation. It is going to create a desire—a mounting desire—on the part of those people to get the same freedom from that type of occupation that the Austrians have got. And furthermore, this joy at their freedom which was so manifest by the Austrian people, that is going to be contagious and it is going to spread, surely, through the neighboring countries, such as Czechoslovakia. For the first time there will be an open door to freedom on the part of Hungary. These things are bound to have an effect. And the Soviet Union, of course, they know they are going to have an effect. They thought about these things long ago. When they drew their zone of occupation in Austria, you remember, they drew it in a queer line, so as to be sure that they would block the borders to Czechoslovakia and to Hungary.

The PRESIDENT. That's right—that's right.

Mr. DULLES. Now they are giving that up. They know that there are going to be implications there, and that the peoples of these satellite countries are going to want to be getting for themselves the thing that they see the Austrians get. They want to dance in the streets with joy, too, sometime.

The Soviets are accepting those consequences. Why they are doing it, we are not quite sure. Except that we can be quite certain that the policies of strength and firmness that we are adopting, in partnership with the other free countries of Europe, are beginning to pay off. And the people of Austria are the first to say—and all of them did say to me—this is the first dividend from the creation of Western European unity and the bringing of Germany into NATO.

At the time when that was under debate, the Soviet Union was threatening terrible things would happen if we went through with this. But we and the other free countries of Europe did go through with it. And we find that the pay-off is not a terrible disaster, but for the first time an apparent softening of the Soviet policy, a willingness to give greater freedom and liberty to the captive satellite peoples. So I think we can say that those policies are actually beginning to pay off—the policy of strength and firmness, and the standard of moral principle.

I said to a group I was talking to in Vienna Sunday, I said it is not worth much to speculate, really, as to who is winning, whether the Soviet Union is winning or the United States is winning, I said the important thing is that sound principles have won. And in the long run these high moral principles——

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. Are going to be what are going to prevail. If we are behind them then we will automatically get the benefit of prevailing. But that is the important thing to bear in mind, that we had been standing, I think, for good, sound moral principle—with firmness, determination, with strength in the right; and if you do that long enough without weakening, the thing is going to come your way. And I think from that standpoint that time is working for us—as long as we work on these great moral principles.

Now I am going to turn to the thing that I know most people are most interested in, and I guess you have a special interest in, and that is——

The PRESIDENT. The four-power talks.

Mr. DULLES. The four-power talks, because this time, if they come off, you will be in them yourself. Now you said, Mr. President, in recalling what had happened, what you said in your speech of April 1953, that it has always been your resolution not to get yourself into any talks of that sort until and unless certain things had happened, things that made in a sense untouchable—irreversible—the solidity of the West, the freedom of Western Germany as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Council, and some deeds by the Soviet Union in replacement of just these vague words that they had been talking.

Well, these things have happened, so you felt—as indeed did our allies and a great volume of world opinion feel—that the time had come, perhaps, for a further testing of the Soviet Union through a meeting at the level of the heads of government.

Now, nobody knows better than you that such a meeting has dangers as well as——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES Opportunities. And the biggest danger of all is the danger that hopes will be raised so high that they can't possibly be realized. And then, either of two things will happen, either there will be an open disillusionment and a feeling of dismay on the part of the people, and a feeling that after all nothing can be done, and that the only alternative is war, because the last good chance will have been tried and failed; or, then, there is the possibility that in an effort to avoid that danger the heads of government meeting might arrive at a sort of an appearance of agreement, under ambiguous words where there was no real agreement. And I also—

The PRESIDENT. Foster, I don't believe that danger is quite so great as it was once, because my mail shows this: That the American people are really pretty well aware of what is going on. They realize this is merely a beginning and not an end. I have taken tremendous hope——

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

The PRESIDENT. And confidence from the tenor of the remarks I have seen in our newspapers, and commentators, and everybody else—I am sure that there is greater maturity than we would have expected several years ago.

Mr. DULLES. I do think the American people have become pretty sophisticated on this matter——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And they are not easily going to be fooled. I don't think they are going to get their——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Expectations too high. There is, perhaps, rather more danger in some of

the other countries than there is in the United States.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. But you and I worked out the form of invitation to this meeting, in agreement with our allies, in a way which I think makes it crystal clear that that danger will not be incurred. Because, as you recall, the definition of the purpose is that we are to meet to try to find new paths, a new approach, new procedures, for solving some of these problems——

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. And you will not attempt yourself to solve then. Now the heads of Government, great as they are, are not going to be able to get together for 3 or 4 days, and find a substantial solution for some of these problems that have defied solution for so many years, or even for so many generations.

The PRESIDENT. They couldn't even build Rome in 1 day.

Mr. DULLES. But therefore I think it is quite important to keep it clear, as the invitation did, that it is just for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Now we weren't at all sure that the Soviet would accept that limited meeting. But I had a dinner in Vienna Saturday night, which was attended by the British and French Foreign Ministers and also by Mr. Molotov who is the Soviet Foreign Minister. And we sat around after dinner for several hours talking about this whole business, the philosophy of the approach, the limited scope that the meeting would have, and so far as I could judge, the Soviet Union accepted it, at least they said they did, and that would be on the record. Other details we have not worked out yet. But on the whole, it looks as though the kind of meeting that you are willing to have will also be the kind of meeting that they will be willing to have. And I think that will be a meeting which can be held safely, without running these great risks, and which may open up new opportunity.

Now, everybody wonders why the Soviets may be willing to change their practices. And I have thought about it quite a lot. Nobody can be sure. But I thought of this, Mr. President, that in every one of our well-ordered communities there are a lot of people who don't believe in their hearts in the rules and the laws that are there, but they find it more convenient to conform and not always to be bucking these things. Therefore, in any well-ordered community there are a lot of people who live up to the rules and the ordinances, and so on, even though they don't, perhaps, believe in them for themselves.

And it may possibly be the case that the Soviet Union, after this experience of trying to buck everything, may be feeling that it may be more convenient for them to conform to some of the rules and practices of a civilized community.

I don't think for a minute that they have got religion, or have been converted, but it just may be, as a practical matter, they may think they can get along better by conforming to some of these rules and practices which normally govern——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. A civilized community. And I think that is a possibility which is at least worth exploring and that this meeting will give a further chance to explore it. And it may at least set up new processes for a solution of some of these great problems—problems like the unification of Germany, the problem of levels of armament, the problem of atomic weapons, the problem of the satellite countries, the problems created by international communism, which is such a pest around the world. If we can begin to think about how those problems can be solved, by a new spirit and a new purpose to their solution, then I think that something of good can come out of this meeting. And I just do feel that we can face the future with new confidence, because these policies that we have adhered to, which have involved sacrifice, been supported by the American people on a bipartisan basis, they are beginning to pay off. And I think if we stick to those policies we are going to be all right.

The danger is that we relax and think that these policies have served their purpose, therefore let's switch to something different.

The proper thing is, these policies work, therefore let's stick to them. If we do that, then I think we can face the future with new confidence.

The PRESIDENT. In a word, we want to stay strong and will stay vigilant, but we are not going to extinguish the hope that a new dawn may be coming, even if it rises—the sun rises very, very slowly.

Thank you very much, Foster. It has been a real privilege to hear such a brilliant report on a very significant 2 weeks.

Mr. DULLES. Well, it has been a great opportunity for me, Mr. President, to have this chance to tell you these things.

JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join those who earlier paid tribute to Justice Owen J. Roberts. With his passing, I have lost a valued friend of many years. He was a great Justice of the Supreme Court, and a steadfast worker for many worthy international causes.

Born on May 2, 1875, in Philadelphia, Owen Roberts obtained his law degree from the University of Pennsylvania at the age of 20. He gained considerable attention as assistant district attorney of Philadelphia County, as a teacher of law at the University of Pennsylvania, and as a special United States Attorney General under President Coolidge.

In 1930, President Herbert Hoover appointed him to the Supreme Court, where he served with great distinction until his retirement in 1945. A lifelong Republican and a conservative, Owen Roberts never permitted any label to govern his decisions on the Court. During the 1930's his vote often was the deciding one. His vote upheld the Wagner Act and the unemployment provisions of the Social Security Act. He was strongly opposed to the famous Court-packing plan. As a bridge between conservative and liberal thinking in the Court, Justice Roberts' position was a vital one.

In 1942, he was appointed Chairman of the Commission To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack.

After his retirement from the Court, Justice Roberts continued to contribute his great talents and energies to many activities. For a time he served as dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania. As president of the Atlantic Union Committee, Justice Roberts worked long and hard for peace and for a stronger unity between the United States and the nations of Western Europe.

His was indeed a full and profitable life. His many contributions to a better America and a better world will not soon be forgotten.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing deepest sympathies to Mrs. Roberts and to their daughter and two grandchildren.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks editorials on Owen J. Roberts, from the New York Herald Tribune and from the New York Times of May 18.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OWEN J. ROBERTS

Justice Owen J. Roberts was one of those stalwart, independent characters that in every generation come along to put their special mark on the Supreme Court. A lifelong Republican, appointed by President Hoover in 1930, he eluded classification in any narrow terms. His decisions frequently determined which side of the Court should have the majority, and they could rarely be predicted in advance. His general views seemed to shift as the broad popular thinking of the country came to accept the social legislation of the thirties. He was a judge who upheld precedent and principle; but he was also one of those statesmen who have kept the Supreme Court from falling into a position of sterile obstruction.

Justice Roberts' early career had been marked by brilliance in his studies and by a rapid rise in the fields of both business and education. His experience as a professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania gave him not only the exact legal knowledge which served him in good stead on the Nation's highest court. It also left him with the ability to deliver his opinions clearly, usually from memory, in a style that even the layman could understand. His robust physical energy, lasting into old age, enabled him to accept a heavy load of opinion writing.

The possession by any nation of men of Justice Roberts' independent stripe, whose sound judgment is instinctively trusted, is an invaluable asset. To such as he, when a supreme controversy rages, men can look with confidence for an unbiased appraisal of the facts. And so it was that Justice Roberts was chosen to head the Commission which investigated the disaster at Pearl Harbor. He continued to work after his retirement, promoting causes he believed in, particularly a more effective form of international government than he felt was provided by the United Nations. He died yesterday after a full life, a man whose efforts had won him great success and whose qualities had won the universal respect of his fellow countrymen.

OWEN J. ROBERTS

The career of Justice Owen J. Roberts as a member of the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States for 15 years, as a successful lawyer in Philadelphia before and after his judicial service, as a prosecutor in connection with the Teapot Dome scandal, as chairman of the commission to investigate what happened at Pearl Harbor, and as a leading figure in many public, educational, and communal causes, was one in which the bench and bar of this country may well take pride. He possessed complete intellectual integrity and was a most conscientious workman.

His service on the bench encompassed the era which dealt with much of the early New Deal legislation of the Roosevelt administration. Although Justice Roberts had always been a conservative Republican, it soon became evident that his conclusions on the bench resulted from independent judgment in each instance, with a minimum of political or philosophical prejudice.

After Justice Roberts retired from the Supreme Court bench, he served for a while as dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, and his subsequent activities identified him with causes which in his judgment would advance the cause of peace

in the world and benefit his native land. His was a broad and a full life, in which he attained the pinnacle of his profession and maintained always the respect and confidence of those with whom he worked and lived. Dying yesterday at the ripe age of 80, he still leaves a void.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in common with my colleagues in the Senate I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of Owen J. Roberts, a great American, and a distinguished son of Pennsylvania, who served for 15 years as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Justice Roberts passed away Tuesday, May 17, at the age of 80.

Owen Roberts possessed one of the most brilliant legal minds of our country. In addition to his distinguished career on the bench and at the bar, he achieved outstanding distinction as an educator, as a leader in religious affairs, and as the author of many books and articles dealing with the Constitution.

He was a life trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, where he served for 20 years as a teacher of law, and later as dean of the law school.

In 1946, he was elected president of the house of deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the first layman ever to achieve that high honor.

He took an active part in many civic and charitable activities, in which his able leadership was an inspiration to all who were associated with him.

Justice Roberts retired from the Supreme Court bench in 1945, after participating in decisions which had tremendous importance in shaping the course of our Nation.

In recent years Justice Roberts directed his talents to the field of international affairs, working to promote peace and better understanding among the free nations of the world.

To the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

ALLEGATIONS OF IMPROPER ADVERTISING OF OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the Federal taxes and certain restrictions on oleomargarine colored to resemble butter were removed, many of us were greatly concerned, not only because of the effect on our great dairy industry, but also because of the danger of violations of fair-trade practices on the part of an industry which has sought to invade the dairy markets and trade on the age-long public acceptance of butter as an essential food in the human diet.

There have been many reports of such practices, which we foresaw if oleomargarine was allowed to be manufactured and sold in a form made artificially to resemble butter in color, texture, and taste.

We are confronted at this time with depressed prices in dairy products, so serious as to present a national problem in our farm economy.

Certainly a very large contributing factor has been the fact that the dairy producer, who is entirely dependent on the income from a dairy herd, has been forced into competition with a product which may taste the same and look the same, but is not the same as butter.

No one proposes prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine as a food product; but it should stand on its own, as such, and should not masquerade as butter.

In three recent cases, where violations of the limited restrictions placed on oleomargarine were alleged, the Federal Trade Commission, for the first time, has noted that certain oleomargarine manufacturers are using advertising which implies that their brands are dairy products. Two of these manufacturers were ordered to stop these practices. A third case was sent back to the examiners, for new hearings.

These decisions of the Federal Trade Commission, announced Monday, are significant and important. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the press announcement of the Federal Trade Commission, outlining the action taken with reference to the three cases of alleged improper advertising of oleomargarine, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

For the first time, the Federal Trade Commission today issued decisions under the new oleomargarine amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Two oleomargarine manufacturers were ordered to stop using advertising which, by the use of dairy terms, conveys that their brands are dairy products within the meaning of the act. In a third action, the Commission concluded that the advertising by another company may be unlawful, and remanded the case to the hearing examiner for further proceedings.

In opinions by Chairman Edward F. Howrey accompanying two of the decisions, the Commission explored in detail the legislative history of the oleomargarine amendment and concluded that "It was intended, we believe, to reach a form of advertising which through suggestion, the association of ideas, and the use of dairy terms may lead the consumer to believe that the oleomargarine in question is a dairy product." All three of the decisions were reached by a unanimous Commission.

Cease and desist orders were issued against the maker of Farm Queen, E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., 15 East 26th Street, New York City, and the maker of Reddi-Spred, Reddi-Spred Corp., 311 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. In the third case the Commission reversed a hearing examiner's initial decision dismissing a complaint against the Blanton Co., 3400 North Wharf, St. Louis, Mo., which sells Creamo.

In the case involving Farm Queen the Commission found that such statements in advertising as "Churned to delicate, sweet creamy goodness," "The same day-to-day freshness which characterizes our other dairy products," represented or suggested that Farm Queen is a dairy product. In the case of Reddi-Spred, the Commission found misleading the emphasis in advertising on the unknown percentage of butter in this oleo coupled with the statement that it shouldn't be confused with ordinary margarine because of its butter content.

In remanding the Creamo product case for further proceedings, the Commission stated that certain advertising, as well as the name Creamo, standing alone, might lead people to believe this oleomargarine is a dairy product.

Involved in each of these cases is the 1950 oleomargarine amendment of the FTC act. This amendment, section 15 (a) (2) of the FTC act, declares misleading any representation, "made or suggested by statement, word, grade designation, design, device, symbol, sound, or any combination thereof," that oleomargarine is a dairy product.

Discussing this law in the Commission's opinion in the Drew Co. case, Chairman Howrey said, "The real purpose of the amendment seems to be * * * to stop the practice of suggesting that oleomargarine is a dairy product by associating it with dairy terms * * *. It was intended, we believe, to reach a form of advertising, which, through suggestion and the association of ideas, leads or may lead the customer to believe that the particular oleomargarine in question is a dairy product."

Referring to the Blanton Co. case, the Chairman stated, "We are not dealing here with the usual misrepresentation case, that is, with false and misleading advertising which may have the tendency or capacity to deceive in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act, but solely with the question whether or not the respondent has through the use of any [of the methods named in the oleomargarine amendment] suggested that the oleomargarine sold by it is a 'dairy product'."

In the Drew Co. case, the Commission affirmed with modification an initial decision by Examiner Everett F. Haycraft, issued July 29, 1954. Granting an appeal from that decision by counsel supporting the complaint, the Commission included among the prohibitions in the order the use of the phrase "country fresh."

This phrase, among others prohibited by today's order, is contained in handbills, leaflets, and other advertising devices. Among the statements made are these:

"Farm Queen margarine * * * is always country fresh * * *."

"Starting now our drivers will have it for you with the same day-to-day freshness which characterizes our other dairy products."

"* * * Churned to delicate sweet creamy goodness."

In the case of Reddi-Spred Corp., the Commission reversed an initial decision by Examiner Abner E. Lipscomb dated October 29, 1954, which dismissed the complaint.

In that case the Commission found that certain statements in the firm's advertising suggest "that while it is technically oleomargarine it is actually a dairy product." Typical of the challenged advertisements used in newspapers, on television, and through other channels is the claim:

"Reddi-Spred Brand * * * a premium oleomargarine containing not only vegetable fats but also real fresh butter * * *. Yes; it's the butter that makes it taste better * * * that's why we say, 'Don't confuse ordinary margarine with Reddi-Spred. Compare it with any spread at any price * * *.' Compare, but don't confuse Reddi-Spred with ordinary margarine."

The Commission concluded that the fact Reddi-Spred is called oleomargarine in these ads does not preclude the suggestion that it is a dairy product.

On this point Chairman Howrey, in the Drew case, after reviewing legislative debate on the oleomargarine amendment, stated: "The whole controversy leading up to amended section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act seems to be based on the assumption that the word 'oleomargarine' is not by itself a sufficient negation; in other words, Congress seems to have conclusively presumed that many people think that the product, even when described by its correct name, is a dairy product and that the use of the name 'oleomargarine' does not prevent it from being palmed off to the public as such."

Reversing Examiner Haycraft's decision of November 8, 1954, in the Blanton Co. case which dismissed the complaint after the close of the case in chief of counsel supporting the complaint, the Commission held that such statements as "better tasting because

it's made better with sweet fresh milk plus pure cream," standing alone without qualification "might well lead some people to believe that the product is a dairy product."

In this case Chairman Howrey observed: "If all the advertising under scrutiny which used the name 'Creamo' or the terms 'milk' and 'cream' had clearly and conspicuously stated the percentages of cream and milk contained in the product, then they would have been sufficiently informative and would adequately have negated any suggestion that respondent's 'oleomargarine * * * is a dairy product'."

The chairman noted that some advertisements and radio continuity did include the statement, "contains 5 percent light cream."

According to the Oleomargarine Act its prohibitions do not "prevent a truthful, accurate, and full statement in * * * advertisement of all the ingredients contained in * * * oleomargarine * * *."

This case was remanded to Hearing Examiner Haycraft "for further consideration in accordance with this opinion and [the opinion in the Drew Co. case].

The orders in the Drew Co. case and the Reddi-Spred Co. case in addition to containing the prohibition against representing or suggesting that margarine is a dairy product provide:

"That nothing contained in this order shall prevent the use in advertisements of a truthful, accurate, and full statement of all the ingredients contained in said product, or of a truthful statement that said product contains butter or any other dairy product provided the percentage thereof contained is clearly and conspicuously set forth."

The complaint against E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., was issued October 19, 1953; the complaint against Blanton Co., March 18, 1954; the complaint against Reddi-Spred, June 30, 1954.

RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL JUDGE ALBERT L. WATSON, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, 26 years ago, when I served as Republican State chairman of Pennsylvania, I had the pleasure of recommending Albert L. Watson, an able and distinguished jurist, for appointment to the Federal bench in the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Judge Watson has just submitted his resignation as Chief Judge to President Eisenhower. I call his retirement to the attention of the Senate because his outstanding service to his State and the Nation is deserving of the greatest praise.

His unswerving devotion to the highest principles of his profession honored the bench on which he served. Pennsylvania is proud of Judge Watson. I am happy to join the citizens of the Keystone State in extending to him our wholehearted and sincere appreciation and our best wishes for many years of health and happiness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks an article from the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune which reviews Judge Watson's brilliant career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JURIST USED FRANK, HAPPY PHILOSOPHY

Federal Judge Albert L. Watson has the happy faculty of being able to blend cracker-barrel philosophy with the candor of a prize-fighter.

When he addressed a class of 34 new citizens January 12, 1949, in his court, here, he told them, in effect, to punch any Red on the jaw if they heard him run down the United States Government.

His recommendation to "use physical force" hit the headlines and made the Russian press, drawing a bitter reply from Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper in Moscow.

By the same token, he can be mild and mellow, as when he made this statement, December 20, 1954: "Being happy is not only a right, as held by the Declaration of Independence, it is also a duty which we owe to ourselves and to others."

At each yearly milestone, he usually had a statement for news reporters on his outlook on life.

On December 5, 1951, when Scranton was in the throes of major industrial rehabilitation, he declared: "Scranton will never die because its people have faith and courage and the will to do things."

On November 20, 1952, when reports buzzed he was ready to retire, he said this: "My health is perfect, I enjoy my work, and I have given no thought whatsoever to stepping down."

Perhaps he best exemplified his philosophy when he said on December 1, 1953: "I believe that nowadays the things to put aside for one's old age is all thoughts of retirement."

Then he said this was his "code," called "Things to Remember"—"The belief in God beyond everything, the value of hope, the virtue of tolerance, the spiritual quality of true courtesy, the sound of laughter, the pleasure of work, the God-given beauty of flowers, the challenge of life, the good fortune of having good friends, the thrill of seeing justice done, the responsibility of citizenship, and the preservation of freedom."

Judge Watson has been an indefatigable worker. He once told a reporter the first case he tried when he became a Federal jurist already had been on the books for 12 years.

In one year, he also remarked, he turned out 83 opinions, including those of former Judge Albert W. Johnson, one-time colleague on the bench, who was off sick.

During 1954, for example, he handled 57 out of 151 cases, several of them major crime cases. From July 1953, to July 1954, he wrote 18 out of 40 opinions handed down by himself, and Judges John W. Murphy and Frederick V. Follmer.

He says there is no backlog of cases in this district. "It's current, and I'm glad," he remarked.

Judge Watson was born December 6, 1876, at Montrose, the son of Willoughby W. Watson, a lawyer, and Annie Marie Kemmerer. He was reared in the Mauch Chunk area, went to the School of Lackawanna here, and later to Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J., where he was editor of the school paper and literary magazine, was in the Banjo Club and Dramatic Club.

He was a debater and a letter winner in baseball and football and was captain of the Dickinson House Championship football team.

He went to Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., earned his B. S. degree in 1901, and joined Psi Upsilon fraternity. There, too, he was a debater and was on the declamation team, also winning his letter in baseball and football.

He studied law with the firm of Watson, Diehl, Hall & Kemmerer and later joined the firm.

Judge Watson was admitted to the Lackawanna County courts December 15, 1902, to Orphans Court, on motion of his father, in the same month, and to the United States District Court, March 31, 1905.

On March 3, 1908, he was admitted to the Superior Court; May 4, 1908, to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and March 31, 1909, to the circuit court of appeals.

In 1917 he was named to a Commission On Investigation of Various Systems of Recording Deeds, Mortgages, etc., for the State of Pennsylvania. In 1923 he was counsel for the Workmen's Compensation Bureau, and the same year was a trustee and president of the Board at Scranton State Hospital.

Judge Watson was named to the Lackawanna County bench in 1926 by the late Gov. Gifford Pinchot, and in 1929 was appointed by former President Hoover to the Federal bench in this Middle District.

He is a member of Westminster Presbyterian Church and was a deacon of Second Presbyterian Church before its merger into the present congregation. He is a member of the American Bar Association, the Pennsylvania bar and Lackawanna bar.

Judge Watson is a 32d degree Mason, a member of Peter Williamson Lodge of Masons, Irem Temple of the Shrine, and of the Alumni Council of Lawrenceville School.

He is also a member of the University Club of New York City and the Waverly Country Club.

His first wife, Mabel E. Watson, whom he married in 1902, died in 1923, and in 1930 he married Effie Woodville Watson, who was socially prominent in New Orleans, where Judge Watson frequently has held court.

He has two sons, Albert Leisenring Watson, Jr., and Righter Watson, and a stepson, Navy Capt. J. L. Warren Woodville, Jr., who is stationed near Paris, with Supreme Headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces (SHEAF).

DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is high time that a number of misapprehensions about the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and the activities of the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are clarified.

It would be a matter of regret to me, and to many millions of American parents, if this subject should become involved in partisan politics.

If this were to happen, it would create and foster needless uncertainty with respect to the vaccine's value and safety.

Moreover, it would make the efforts of all who are working with the problem—scientists, manufacturers, and public administrators—doubly difficult. Is it not time to reassess the situation and take a calm look at it?

In the first place, let me say that I have the assurance of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that there is no new ban on the vaccine, the headline of a local morning newspaper to the contrary withstanding.

In her report to the President last Monday, Secretary Hobby clearly stated:

> Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration; and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.

Furthermore, Surgeon General Scheele has repeatedly laid emphasis on safety.

What are the facts? On April 27, after 6 cases of paralytic polio appeared following vaccination with the product of 1 manufacturer, the Public Health Service acted swiftly and decisively. In

the interests of the children of America, it banned use of further lots of that company's vaccine.

After long and careful consultations with the most eminent medical and scientific experts in America, including the discoverer of the vaccine himself, Dr. Jonas Salk, the Public Health Service concluded—again in the interest of safety—that a doublecheck of the manufacturing and testing processes of all manufacturers should be undertaken.

The inspections of two manufacturers have been completed and vaccine released. The Surgeon General has said that the study of other manufacturers is proceeding as rapidly as possible. In the interest of the children of America, again, the Surgeon General has emphasized that this process will move as rapidly as is necessary to get the job done properly, but no more rapidly.

I am sure I speak for millions of Americans in applauding this decision.

With respect to the vaccine of the Cutter Laboratories which is under suspension, I am advised by the Surgeon General that samples of the finished vaccine and samples from key stages in the production are now undergoing exhaustive testing at the National Institutes of Health. I have every faith that this study will be completed as rapidly as possible.

Here are some further facts about this reappraisal:

The Public Health Service staff has held extensive consultations with experts in virology and immunology, both before and after April 12. It has also conferred with the technical personnel of vaccine manufacturers to explore all steps in the manufacturing and testing process to evaluate recent experiences. Surely this is in the tradition of reasoned, scientific caution.

As of May 13, announcement had been made that the Public Health Service had cleared 4,250,000 cubic centimeters of Parke Davis Co. vaccine. After a team visit to the Eli Lily Co. plant, it was announced that all previously cleared lots of their vaccine, amounting to 3,600,000 cubic centimeters, were cleared. Both these clearances were immediately made known to the public.

Earlier this week a team from the National Institutes of Health and a consultant visited the Wyeth Laboratories, Inc., in Marietta, Pa., and a team is now at the Pittman-Moore Co. in Zionsville, Ind.

The Public Health Service has announced, following press inquiries yesterday, that it intends to complete its visit to Pittman-Moore and to await further information on Wyeth vaccine before it makes any announcement of further clearances.

It is difficult for me to understand why some individuals seek to create public confusion by not accepting these facts and letting the Public Health Service continue its review in accordance with the high scientific principles which have traditionally guided it.

Let me make this clear. I am advised by the Surgeon General that the Public Health Service has not called a halt in the vaccination program. It has not banned vaccine again. These are the facts.

Headlines and political speeches do not change them. It is difficult for me, as it must be for millions of parents, to understand why, at a time like this, anyone should attempt to play upon the emotions of American mothers and fathers for partisan reasons or in careless disregard of the facts, and in so doing, discredit this wonderful vaccine.

I have faith in the conscientiousness and integrity of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and his professional staff. I accept his counsel and judgment on poliomyelitis problems. I am willing to accept delays, in the interests of sound scientific decisions. We need caution rather than headstrong action, calm and objective thinking rather than hysteria, rational scientific advice rather than political propaganda. Any injection of politics into this situation is not only unwarranted, but it is contemptuous of the high art and science of medicine. It serves to hinder and obstruct the careful analysis which is necessary to safeguard the health and safety of American children. That is the first consideration of the Surgeon General. I submit that it is the only consideration which we, as Members of Congress, can countenance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me say to the Senator that it was my privilege to attend the hearings at which this subject matter was discussed. I also believe that it is of the utmost importance that this vital issue, pertaining to the health of the American people, particularly children, be considered carefully, prudently, and in a thoroughly objective manner.

However, I should like to ask the Senator 1 or 2 questions. I have hesitated to ask these questions, but I think they are called for.

Why was it that, in respect to this vaccine, the United States Public Health Service did not institute early the kind of tests which it subsequently instituted?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not have all the scientific reasons. However, as I understand, tests were conducted, not only by the Public Health Service, but also by the Institute of Poliomyelitis, which has done such effective work in this field, as well as by Dr. Salk himself.

As I recall, the data finally released indicated that the vaccine would not necessarily be 100 percent effective. In fact, the very first report indicated that it might not be 100 percent effective. In other words, until further inoculations were made, a certain number of cases of poliomyelitis might develop, but scientifically, they would not be any greater than the apparent possibilities indicated by the tests made by Dr. Salk and other doctors. It may be that if a person who had contracted poliomyelitis was given a shot of vaccine, the shot could act as a booster, as I understand. I am told that there is a possibility of such a thing happening. I do not mean that poliomyelitis might develop from the shot alone, but the shot might expedite the development of the disease.

However, whatever the reason may be, when additional cases of polio developed, I believe the Public Health Service was on sound ground in taking the extra precaution of retesting the vaccine and reexamining the situation, to determine whether additional precautionary steps should be taken.

I am told that in the development of vaccines, it is not an unusual situation for vaccine to be reexamined and retested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I concur with that statement of the Senator from California. However, I respectfully suggest to him that in the tests of 1954 every batch of vaccine was tested three times, in the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health, at the Salk laboratory, and at the manufacturer's laboratory. Extensive tests were made at those three laboratories.

I further respectfully suggest that in 1955, so I have been informed, one test is made, and that test is conducted at the manufacturer's laboratory. Nothing further was done until the Cutter Laboratory vaccine was found to be defective. That discovery alerted the Public Health Service to the necessity of further tests.

I also respectfully suggest that the Public Health Service now feels compelled to institute a much more intensive testing procedure than it had originally planned to undertake at the beginning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota may be more scientifically capable than the Public Health Service. However, I remind the Senator that the Public Health Service has not been built up on any partisan basis. It has been built up under both Republican and Democratic administrations. Certainly the Service has competent and efficient men on its staff. I will not quarrel with the Public Health Service if it believes that out of a super abundance of caution it wishes to retest or reexamine its processes with relation to the polio vaccine.

As the Senator knows, the first and most important thing to consider is the effect of the vaccine on the children of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no more time to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 2 more minutes, so that we may conclude this colloquy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from California that what the junior Senator from Minnesota is talking about is the procedure being followed to assure the efficacy and the safety of the vaccine. That is the most important factor.

I am sure our laboratories are doing everything they can to assure safety and

efficacy. I feel, however, that there has not been, on the part of our Government laboratories, the fullest followthrough in terms of testing the vaccine that we had a right to expect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel very keenly about this matter. I have a 7-year-old son who has already been inoculated. He is supposed to have his second inoculation on the 27th of May. Judging by press reports, it is apparent that there is a great deal of uncertainty about this whole matter. Certainty should have been established on the day of the release of the vaccine. We have had far too much "in and out" and "up and down," and "release and holding back" on this very important subject, to the point where it has caused grave public concern.

All I am asking is that there be the fullest examination and the fullest testing of the vaccine so that the American people may be reassured.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is precisely what Dr. Scheele and other Public Health officers are endeavoring to do. But, as I understand, a scientist in the medical profession never freezes his thinking. I do not believe he should.

If after what appeared to be adequate tests—and I do not believe that the Public Health officials would have released any vaccine if they had not felt the tests of it had been adequate—there was even the remotest possibility of room for improvement by further tests of the vaccine, it was proper that such further tests be made, rather than that Public Health officials should freeze their thought on the subject. Accordingly, I believe the Public Health Service did precisely the right thing by calling a halt to the distribution and, in effect, saying, "We want to doublecheck the vaccine."

I can find no quarrel with that procedure or point of view. I would rather have the Public Health Service do that than to say that there is no room for improvement. That line of thinking would not be in keeping with the principle of scientific research. I hope that we shall continue to improve the vaccine over the years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us not have any charges made of politics. I have three children within the age group of the vaccination. When I express my legitimate concern as to the efficacy and safety of the vaccine I do not want anyone to say that I am playing politics.

The best way to keep politics out of the matter is to make sure that every statement which comes from the Public Health Service and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will not be retracted within 24 hours. There has been too much up and down and in and out on this matter.

I respectfully suggest further that a sufficient explanation has not been given. I should like to know whether the vaccine which is now being used is exactly the same vaccine which was previously tested.

I shall have further conversations and discussions in regard to this subject. I have been delving into this matter, as Dr. Scheele knows. I shall have further conferences with leading officials of the Public Health Service. I know a little bit about vaccine control. I desire to make clear, too, that I am not speaking only as a Senator but also as a father of 3 boys aged 7, 11, and 13 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, the reason I was concerned with this matter was that I read an article published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. I immediately contacted the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to get the facts. I have stated the facts as they have been made known to me. The newspaper article is not an accurate presentation, and it may very well cause a great deal of alarm among parents. I fully agree with the Senator from Minnesota that we are entitled to have the facts. We should have only the facts. Certainly we should not have, for whatever the purpose may be—either because of misinformation or because of politics—a disturbing of the situation when the whole subject is in the competent hands of the Public Health Service.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in his remarks on this very important subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, before presenting the material which I intend to submit, I should like to say to the distinguished minority leader that I agree with his recent remarks that politics should not be introduced into the vital issue of the Salk vaccine. I have been corresponding with an official of the nation to the north, Canada, which also has been considering this problem; and, following the morning hour, I expect to make some very brief comments on how we can learn from Canada's methods of developing and distributing the Salk vaccine. I hope the distinguished minority leader will not have any business to call him elsewhere, because I should like him to hear how Canada handles the problem.

THE ARMY'S NEW COMMAND MANAGEMENT SCHOOL AT FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted 2 minutes beyond the regular allotment of time to speak with reference to the Army's new Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed for 4 minutes.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, recently it was my pleasure to participate in the program of the Army's new Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va. I should like to share with the Senate some of my thoughts and observations on this stimulating and encouraging experience.

As civilians we have in the past tended to regard the function of our Armed Forces as essentially limited to their activities in the event of war and quite ignored their responsibility for our continuing defense in peacetime. In recent years, however, this dual attitude has been abandoned, for the world situation demands that we maintain effective and coordinated military forces. Even a country so magnificently endowed as is ours does not have unlimited resources at its disposal. Therefore, economy of resources, both material and human, is a most important requisite for our national security.

We in the Senate have recognized this fact, and once again the Army has demonstrated clearly and practically its understanding of, and concern for, this elemental truth. With the establishment of the Command Management School, the Army is looking forward to the same success in the handling of its resources in nontactical missions as it has achieved in combat on so many battlefields scattered throughout the world. To insure this accomplishment and its related contribution to the combat effectiveness of our ground forces, the school has been placed under the jurisdiction of Gen. John E. Dahlquist, commanding general of the Continental Army Command, with the technical assistance and advice of Lt. Gen. Laurin L. Williams, comptroller of the Army.

At the Command Management School the Army makes available to its senior officers and key civilian officials, and indeed to selected representatives of all the Armed Forces, advanced business management trends, techniques and training which will assist them considerably in fulfilling their increasingly complex and vital responsibilities.

Today the Army finds itself engaged in the operation of many large scale business type activities; indeed, the Army and its activities constitute our country's largest business. This means that our military leaders must be familiar with business management as well as military strategy and tactics. The Command Management School was established to fill this real need.

Fort Belvoir, with its excellent facilities and proximity to the seat of government, was selected as the site for the Command Management School, which, I am sure, will enhance the already splendid reputation of that efficient installation. Fort Belvoir, as Senators know, is the Army's engineer center. Also located there under the fine leadership of Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss and his capable Chief of Staff Brig. Gen. Max S. Johnson are the Engineer School, the Army's oldest school, and the Engineer Research and Development Laboratories. Because of the availability of suitable academic and administrative accommodations and the warm personal support of General Prentiss and General Johnson, the Command Management School has a fine opportunity to grow and to develop to the utmost its great potential.

A native of the great State of Connecticut, Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., is commandant of the school. He and his

carefully selected staff and faculty have performed their duties in such an exemplary fashion that in the short space of 7 months, the Command Management School has proved its worth so significantly that it has been established as a permanent activity with the Army school system.

Every 4 weeks a new class of about 50 senior officers and ranking civilian officials, each with many years of valuable experience, is assembled at the school for the 3-week course. Under the guidance of the faculty, they pool their knowledge and experience to enlarge their comprehension of the nontactical management problems that are so much a part of our Armed Forces. Their discussions and the problems considered are practical and realistic and so are the solutions presented by the class members. Efficiency, economy, increased production constitute the omnipresent theme in their work, a theme that we in the Senate can readily appreciate.

The keen interest and enthusiasm of the class participants, their willing acceptance of new procedures and techniques clearly indicate that for these men the learning process has not yet ended. The test for ideas is not their conformity to the traditional approach to Army management but rather whether or not they will work.

As a result of the advanced instruction they receive, graduates of the Command Management School are equipped positively to assist in the elimination of the extraneous and wasteful, while, at the same time, substantially contributing to the fighting effectiveness of our Armed Forces. The motto of the Command Management School has living meaning for this new contribution to our national security and might well be accepted by all of us: From knowledge the power of decision.

I am very greatly honored, Mr. President, by being given an opportunity to present this statement.

MISS MARGARET PERRY, OF MONMOUTH, OREG., HONORED AS TEACHER OF THE YEAR FOR 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of the State of Oregon are justifiably proud of Margaret Perry, of Monmouth, Oreg., who has been selected as the 1955 teacher of the year by McCall's magazine. Our country is only going to be as good as the next generation of Americans can make it. Miss Perry is one of those unselfish individuals who are helping to prepare the coming generation for citizenship and a useful life ahead.

Margaret Perry, who is a personal friend of both Mrs. Neuberger and myself, has been accompanied to Washington by two pupils selected by vote of her fourth-grade class. They are Sue Mull and Frank Richard (Dickie) Peterson. The editors of McCall's have arranged a high honor in behalf of Miss Perry and her students, for they were received at the White House today by the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Recognizing the great importance of teachers to the Nation, McCall's magazine has honored an outstanding teacher each year for the past decade. I am happy to report that another teacher mentioned this year is likewise from Oregon, Miss Elsie May Cimino of the Union High School of Hillsboro.

When we contemplate the public service of teachers like Margaret Perry and Elsie May Cimino, it should help to enlighten us toward further popular support of education. It also should serve to convince us that such unjust impositions as special test oaths for schoolteachers are not necessary to assure patriotism in our schools.

My wife and I are proud of the fact that, during our tenure in the Oregon State Legislature, we fought for adequate financial support of education, for special pilot courses for retarded children, for basic school support from State funds for each pupil and against oaths singling out teachers and setting them apart from the rest of the population.

Teachers like Margaret Perry help to justify an unselfish interest in education on the part of every citizen. The June issue of McCall's says:

> Margaret Perry is an extraordinary teacher. She is, furthermore, a dedicated teacher. She devotes hours to the education of student teachers.

Knowing Margaret Perry as I do, Mr. President, I am fully aware that she has accepted this high honor as teacher of the year principally because she realizes that she is a symbol of thousands of other teachers who share her devotion to learning, to the ideals of our country and to the future welfare of America's boys and girls.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article about Margaret Perry, entitled "McCall's Teacher of the Year," from the issue of McCall's magazine for June 1955, be reprinted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCALL'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR—FOR 23 YEARS MARGARET PERRY'S CAREER HAS BEEN OTHER PEOPLE'S CHILDREN

The fourth-grade students of the Monmouth Elementary School in Oregon staged a protest at the end of the last school year because their teacher, Miss Margaret Perry, couldn't be promoted to fifth grade along with them. The demonstration wasn't very effective—Miss Perry is still teaching fourth grade—but it was gratifying proof of the affection her pupils have for the woman who has been named McCall's teacher of the year.

This affection and respect is shared by Miss Perry's principal, Dr. William F. Wagner, who says with a broad smile, "If all teachers were like Miss Perry there would be no need for principals." Mothers of the fourth-graders are equally enthusiastic. "I don't know how Miss Perry does it," says a parent who moved to Monmouth last fall, "but this year Ginny likes school. That never happened before." And a student teacher who worked with Miss Perry last year is still talking about her as "the greatest influence for good in my short life."

There seems to be no question about it in Monmouth or among professional educators anywhere else in Oregon: Margaret Perry is an extraordinary teacher. She is, furthermore, a dedicated teacher. Such time as she can spare away from the classroom she gives to a dozen or more organizations which are aimed at improving the standards of the profession and widening public interest in it. She devotes hours to the education of student teachers. Her conversation and her reading are primarily about education, and most of her close friends are teachers. "But the most important thing I do," says Miss Perry, "is to teach children."

What is it that makes Margaret Perry so unusual a teacher? One factor is certainly her personality. She has an infectious warmth that has a way of spreading over to other people. She has friendly eyes, and a smile that brightens her face and brings an immediate response from those with whom she is speaking. Always calm and apparently easygoing, she has a fine sense of humor and a pleasant, hearty laugh. Her superintendent, Henry Tetz, says, "If Margaret were standing in a group of people you wouldn't notice her particularly. But put her in front of a class of pupils or a gathering of teachers and everyone immediately responds to her."

Anyone watching her class in action can see that response. She has taught her boys and girls to like reading, and because they like it they read well. Enjoy these stories, rather than read them, is her assignment to her students. They can, and often do, get up on their feet and address the class. They know how to work with others. They can originate ideas.

A child arriving in class the first thing in the morning may find a book on his desk that Miss Perry has selected for him. Because Miss Perry is so interested in him the child feels a comfortable self-confidence. The fourth-grader may have something very personal to relate to Miss Perry—about the violin he has with him, a recent visit to the dentist, his haircut, a new rock for the science table collection, a Walt Disney television show. The teacher is genuinely interested.

She listens to troubles, keeps confidences. And she remembers throughout the day that Susie's thoughts may be wandering off to her mother, who is ill, or her father, who's off on a business trip. She makes each one feel that being there makes a difference to the teacher and the class.

This sense of belonging is increased by Miss Perry's emphasis on participation. There are a pupil president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, host and hostess, and these offices are filled each month by different children elected by the class. Those who hold office, as well as those who don't, have daily functions and responsibilities.

In every subject ("I teach everything from physical education to music," she says), Miss Perry proceeds on the theory that children are eager to learn. There's no satisfaction she knows that quite equals the expression on a child's face when he realizes he has learned something. For this reason she never tires of the children's questions, and she tries painstakingly to answer them. She will work over a subject with a class until she is confident that everyone understands it. "I thought I had a lot of patience," one of her student teachers confessed, "until I saw Miss Perry at work."

Her success in making school a lively experience for her pupils is borne out by the pupils themselves. They love school, and, as any observer in their classroom can see, are in no hurry whatsoever to leave at the end of the school day. One guest was amazed, when he walked into Miss Perry's classroom recently, to find the students actually playing school during a recreation period.

Almost as long as she can remember Margaret Perry, who is now 41, has had the ambition to be a good teacher herself and to help others become good teachers. It started when she entered the first grade in a rural school near Winner, S. Dak., and continued as she began to teach 23 years ago—when she was 18 years old—in a two-

room rural school. Here she had every age and every subject from the 4th through 8th grades. In 1945 she went to Hillsboro, Oreg., to accept an elementary-school job offered by her former superintendent in Winner. Five years later she moved to Monmouth.

One remarkable feature about the Monmouth Elementary School is that it is in one of the few school districts in the country where a teacher may earn more than the majority of her pupils' parents. Miss Perry is paid $5,000 a year. The average income in this farm community of 5,000 is somewhere in the neighborhood of $3,500.

The school, which takes its pupils both from Monmouth and the neighboring town of Independence, is affiliated with the Oregon College of Education, and its buildings are right on the college campus. In addition to her fourth-grade duties Miss Perry, along with the majority of her 14 colleagues, teaches student teachers. All the teachers at the school, with one very youthful exception, have a master's degree, and they average 5.3 years of training in education.

Miss Perry cherishes especially two mementos of her career. One is from a 9-year-old named Sammy who arrived very early at school one morning and left a rose on her desk with a note: "To Miss Perry." He suddenly remembered there were two Miss Perrys in the school, so he added a second line: "To big Miss Perry with love from Sammy."

The other is a letter from a former student teacher. "I want to thank you," the letter reads, "for demonstrating to me so clearly what a really good teacher is like. I have gathered a world of materials, but I don't believe they will mean as much to me as your lesson in how a teacher can bring out the good in a class. You have been so human and lovable, and when I get to be a bright light in teaching you will know that you had quite a share in the doing."

POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent article from America, an eminent national weekly magazine. The author, Father Mark J. Fitzgerald is a distinguished economist and a professor at the University of Notre Dame.

Father Fitzgerald has presented the Hells Canyon controversy in a nutshell. Since his deadline, a Federal Power Commission examiner has found that the high dam is the better project. For various dubious reasons based on a rather strange construction of the Federal Power Act, he recommended a license for only one of the Idaho Power Co. dams and dismissal of the applications for the other two small company dams. So when this article is read, it should be noted that the company plan has been rejected in large measure by the FPC examiner. The dam for which a license was recommended would have an installed capacity of only 360,000 kilowatts.

I recommend this article to the Members of the Senate and all citizens concerned about full and wise development of the Nation's natural resources.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

(By Mark J. Fitzgerald)

Congress now has before it legislation (S. 1333) to authorize Federal construction of a high dam on the Snake River in famed Hells Canyon, Idaho, the deepest gorge in North America. Yet for many months the Federal Power Commission has been weighing arguments, presented in a year-long hearing, for and against the request of a license by a private power company to build three small dams in place of this large Federal dam.

THE QUEST FOR KILOWATTS

The Pacific Northwest's hope for freedom from the status of an economic colony controlled by the East lies in its largely untapped resource, falling water. Apart from a declining, seasonal timber industry, and some minerals, there is not much else on which to build an industrial economy. Though the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, which includes Hells Canyon, has 42 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric power, it is only about one-seventh developed. Thirty million kilowatts of low-priced power could actually be drawn from the rivers of this area, and low-cost kilowatts are the key to increased industrial growth.

If the water resources in the Columbia Basin remain only fractionally developed, over one-tenth of the country's land area will be retarded economically. Already expansion of the electro-process industry, which was hardly known in the Northwest before Grand Coulee Dam was built, has come to a halt because new starts for power dams have not been forthcoming. Industry fears a serious kilowatt shortage within the next decade. The electro-process industry now accounts for over one-third of the total regular consumption of electric power in the Columbia region and is the means by which the area hopes to attain leadership in the production of phosphates, aluminum, and its lighter and stronger rival, titanium.

Present power requirements in the Northwest are expanding every 10 years at over twice the national average. In 1953 it was estimated that energy supplied the Northwestern States by the Bonneville Power Administration was 438 percent above the amount supplied in 1940. The power needs for the entire Nation during that time increased only 212 percent. Since World War II, population has increased almost one-third in the Northwest as against half that percentage for the country. Despite lagging industrial expansion, heavy requirements for electric service by farm and residential users have steadily increased the power consumption in this area since 1945.

To meet the future demand for electric power in the Northwest, almost 11 million kilowatt-hours will have to be available by 1963. Without new construction starts, however, capacity in 1963 will be short of requirements by more than 1 million kilowatt-hours. Moreover, nonindustrial needs will consume all the scheduled power increases during that time. On this basis, the prospect for industrial expansion in the Columbia Basin is a bleak one.

TWO PROPOSALS

Consistent with his far-sighted belief that every river should serve the public in as many different ways as possible, President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 ordered that the Hells Canyon powersite, as part of the forest reserves, be placed under the protection of the Federal Government. It was Theodore Roosevelt's firm conviction that a river system from its headwaters to the sea is a single unit and should be treated as such. The entire Columbia River Basin, of which the Snake River is an important tributary, well illustrates the many purposes which can be served by treating a river as a single system. Hydro-power, flood control, irrigation, and navigation, all can be developed on a vast scale if the water resources of the area are properly balanced and coordinated.

After years of study by the Corps of Army Engineers it became evident to this agency that a high dam at Hells Canyon would be an essential part of a comprehensive plan of water storage for the Columbia River Basin. This dam would provide maximum storage to impound the high river flow each spring, both to prevent flood damage and to harvest an ample supply of water for the heavy power demands each winter.

Army engineers consider Hells Canyon the strategic site to help avert a recurrence of the disastrous flood of 1894, which, if repeated in our time, would cause damage estimated at $350 million. Without a coordinated system of storage dams in the Columbia River Basin, the area will remain subject to such divergent calamities as the 1948 flood, which took 50 lives and caused $100 million in damage, or the fall and winter drought of 1952, which ruined crops and caused industrial unemployment because of the low supply of hydropower.

In the Columbia Basin it is becoming evident that water must be harvested as carefully as any life-giving crop so that it can be used for a variety of purposes before finally reaching the Pacific. Water is wealth, and fortunately can be stored in the mountains by building dams. Otherwise the Northwest could not be sanguine about facing its mounting dependence on this precious commodity.

As an alternative project to the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, the Idaho Power Co., largely owned in the East, seeks authorization to build three private low dams on the Snake River. If all three of these dams were actually built, they would provide only one-fourth the water storage of 4.4 million acre-feet projected for the Federal dam. Moreover, the three low dams would generate no more than 885,000 kilowatts of power as compared with 1.46 million kilowatts possible with the high dam at Hells Canyon.

These points of difference on storage and power serve to challenge the entire policy of river development laid down by Theodore Roosevelt when he first set down the Nation's conservation program. Multipurpose use of the Snake River for power, irrigation, and flood control would be forever restricted under the three-dam plan. Each year there would be 575,000 kilowatts less power than with the high dam.

To gage the significance of this loss, it may be noted that the economic impact of electric power from Grand Coulee Dam has enabled its operator, the Bonneville Power Administration, to estimate accurately the number of new jobs and households, the value of new investment and tax revenue which can be expected from each additional million of kilowatts added to the Northwest power pool. Using this guide, 575,000 less kilowatts each year would mean 26,000 fewer jobs in industry and about the same number lost in the service trades. Payrolls would fail to expand by $180 million, and future production would lag by more than one-half billion dollars each year.

The reduction in stored water from the use of the three dams would lower by 570,000 kilowatts the power potential of other dams in the Columbia Basin below Hells Canyon, since water for power production can be used repeatedly as it flows downstream. The yearly value of this amount of power loss has been estimated at over $11 million. This permanent block to power expansion in the Hells Canyon area would intensify the already predicted power shortage and serve to make power a high-cost commodity, thereby further hampering industrial development.

MULTIPURPOSE DEVELOPMENT

The somewhat more than a million acre-feet of water storage possible with the three-dam project would be insufficient as an aid to flood control. In contrast, the Hells Canyon Dam, since it could store over 4 times this amount of water, is listed as 1 of the 5 major reservoirs projected under

the main flood-control plan for the Columbia Basin.

Opponents of the Hells Canyon project have argued that its vastly greater storage capacity would take more water from the Snake River than can be spared in view of the irrigation necessary in southern Idaho. On this point the records of the United States Geological Survey show that there is enough water in the Snake River, in the driest years and after all irrigation diversion, to fill two reservoirs of the size proposed for Hells Canyon.

Studies by independent experts confirm the position that there will be enough water in the Snake River to provide for all demands of irrigation and for the economical operation of Hells Canyon Dam as well. Further, Senate bill 1333 declares that all present and future irrigation rights on the Snake River are safeguarded in the Hells Canyon project, since storage will begin only after irrigation needs are met. Besides irrigation, it is estimated that the reservoir at Hells Canyon, coordinated with other storage dams on the Columbia and the Snake Rivers, will make available in the Columbia Basin 500 miles of low-cost water transportation, a boon to manufacturers and farmers.

LONG-RANGE ECONOMY

Estimates by consulting engineer John S. Cotton place the outlay for the Federal Hells Canyon Dam at about $534 million, compared with approximately $340 million for the 3-dam project. Mr. Cotton emphasizes, however, that the lower cost of the 3-dam scheme is more than offset by the permanent loss to the Northwest each year of 575,000 kilowatts of regular power with an annual value of $5.9 million. Judging the 2 projects for economic feasibility, he approves the high dam because it assures full development of power resources.

At the Hells Canyon Dam, the cost per kilowatt-year would be under $21, compared to almost $40 with the 3-dam construction. This big difference of $19 in rates would be a lasting barrier to extensive industrial and irrigation development under the Idaho Power Company plan. Factors helping to explain the lower rate for Hells Canyon power are the superior engineering design, more economical power loads, better pooling of power and long-range planning of transmission service. The oft-cited tax return of almost $10 million per year predicted from the 3-dam project appears small compared to the loss of tax revenue of 4½ times that amount on income and investment from private enterprise which would be excluded from the area because of the high power rates.

The low power rates under the Federal project, by promoting private investment and employment, assure payment within 50 years of the cost of Hells Canyon Dam plus interest. For similar reasons, other Federal dams in the Northwest such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee are years ahead on their payment schedules, with an interest charge of 5 percent and ample reserves in addition.

Mindful of the long-range benefits at stake, the issue of Hells Canyon should be judged on the basis of whether public authority or a private power concern can better serve the country's interest here. Included in that broad consideration are the many private utility companies themselves, whose low-head dams stand to gain from falling water which would be sent them from the reservoir at Hells Canyon. For private enterprise in general, it should not be forgotten that Grand Coulee, a public project comparable to the Hells Canyon Dam, has done more to encourage expansion of private industry than numbers of small, single-purpose dams privately owned.

Key questions posed about the whole issue of Hells Canyon are whether there shall be maximum or merely fractional development of our water resources; whether the recommendations in the exhaustive No. 308 Report on the Coumbia Basin brought out by the Corps of Army Engineers after years of research shall be followed or scrapped; whether the Pacific Northwest is to expand economically with low-cost power or be hamstrung industrially because of the high price of kilowatts.

Much more is in question than just Hells Canyon itself. If this power source fails of realization, a number of other dams projected in the Columbia Basin may face Congressional rejection because their economic feasibility depends on coordination with Hells Canyon. In a larger sense the national conservation policy first set forth over 50 years ago is facing serious danger. Invaluable power sites throughout the Nation, which have long been under public protection as part of the Federal conservation program, may become easy prizes for private exploitation at public expense.

Should the Federal Power Commission rule in favor of the 3-dam project it would be tantamount to discarding the historic principle laid down by Theodore Roosevelt, and later made part of the Federal Power Act. This states that for successful development of our waterways we should follow a general plan prepared by the best experts in the field and providing for every potential use of a river. Congress could still set aside an FPC ruling for the 3-dam project by directly authorizing construction of Hells Canyon Dam. In the same legislation it could, for future guidance of the Commission, reaffirm in even more emphatic language what is meant by a full and comprehensive development of water resources.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH NATO CONCERNING ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on May 4 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy filed its report (No. 267) with the Senate on the proposed Agreement for Cooperation with NATO. This proposed agreement was to be signed on NATO's behalf by 14 countries.

On May 12, 1955, Secretary Wilson informed our committee that Germany would also sign this document since it had been admitted to NATO on May 6. In the opinion of Mr. Wilson, this makes no change in the proposed agreement requiring resubmission to the Joint Committee.

I request unanimous consent to have Secretary Wilson's letter printed in the RECORD at this point in order to complete the public record with respect to this proposed agreement for cooperation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 12, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: On April 13, 1955, the President, pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement for cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization regarding atomic information. This agreement will be with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the text provides that it will be signed on behalf of the Organization by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

After the proposed agreement, as submitted by the President, has been before the joint committee for the 30-day statutory period, the agreement should be signed by all of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. On this basis, it will come into effect when all of the parties to the Treaty have given notification to the United States that they are bound by the terms of the agreement as is required by paragraph 1 of article VI of the agreement.

On April 1, the Senate gave its advice and consent to German accession to the North Atlantic Treaty, and on May 6, 1955, the Federal Republic became the 15th member of NATO.

In view of the foregoing, and after consideration of the legal aspects of this situation, the Acting Secretary of State and I have determined that Germany should sign the proposed agreement at the end of this month along with the other 14 NATO members.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

ENDORSEMENT OF POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a telegram relating to the postal pay increase bill. The letter was sent to President Eisenhower by Donald S. Leonard, who was the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan last year. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to me by Mr. W. C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President, Washington, D. C.:

I am confident that your approval of S. 1, providing for a long overdue and much deserved pay increase for postal employees will receive the overwhelming endorsement of Michigan citizens who are in sympathy with the plight of the postman and favor a realistic consideration of his wage problem consistent with other governmental and industry pay advances.

As the 1954 Republican nominee for governor, I feel that the national administration should support the action of the Congress especially when it is considered that the percentage differential of this bill over other proposals only amounts to the cost of one quart of milk daily per employee.

DONALD S. LEONARD.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Attached hereto is a copy of a very interesting telegram sent to President Eisenhower under date of May 14. You had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Donald S. Leonard in the Senate reception room today.

Mr. Leonard, the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan last year, is very sincere in his support of the postal-pay measure presently in the White House. The thought occurs that it would be wholesome indeed if you could possibly insert the telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your convenience.

With kind regards and all good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

THE PRESIDENT'S ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials commenting on the President's road plan.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of February 28, 1955]

LET'S KNOW WHERE WE ARE GOING ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some of President Eisenhower's enthusiasm for a giant highway-construction program seems to have drained away.

Last July the administration's $50 billion "grand plan" set the Governors of the 48 States back on their heels when it was presented by Vice President NIXON at their annual conference. But last week the President's message to Congress was a mild recitation of highway needs and a hesitant endorsement of the controversial financing scheme proposed by the Presidential Highway Study Committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

Mr. Eisenhower accepted the Clay committee's estimate that Federal, State, and local governments should spend $101 billion in the next 10 years on highway construction. He accepted the further recommendation that Federal spending of $31 billion be concentrated primarily on the key 40,000-mile interstate highway system. But then he dumped into the lap of Congress the most important problem of all—how the Federal share should be financed.

The Clay committee had recommended a Federal highway corporation to float $20 billion in 30-year bonds. These bonds would be outside the Federal debt—yet would have to be paid off by annual appropriations from Congress.

The president didn't wholly embrace this scheme, perhaps because it had been denounced by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and other Democrats. His message said only that he was "inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues. * * *" Yet Congress was offered no alternative guidance.

Since the problem is so largely back where it started, the most searching study of the whole program is warranted. Few will deny that our highways are in bad shape. The Federal Government has a primary interest in the interstate system which links 90 percent of the population centers of 50,000 or more and carries 20 percent of the rural traffic. But with demands for defense, education, and other needs so pressing, dare we go overboard on highway construction?

Rebuilding our highways is not going to be cheap and easy for the Federal, State, or local governments. Hocus-pocus financing, such as the Clay committee recommended and the President is "inclined to," won't solve the money problem by trying to cover it up.

Let's first make absolutely certain what our legitimate needs are, then build soundly and economically for both present and future.

[From the Portland (Maine) Express of February 24, 1955]

SOMETHING SMELLY HERE

To finance the Federal Government's share of a proposed multi-billion-dollar highway building program, the Eisenhower administration proposes establishing a Federal Highway Corporation. The corporation would be empowered to issue bonds. The bonds would not be considered a part of the national debt, for some reason. The debt limitation law would therefore not apply in this case.

Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, cites a danger inherent in this type of spending. He sees it as a scheme establishing a precedent that might cause Congress to lose all control over the Federal budget.

The Virginian calls the program inflationary, moreover, at a time when the economy is booming. And it seems to him that the administration "is proposing deficit spending—and I don't know why."

Neither do we. There is a remarkable fishy smell about this whole proposal to take control away from the people's representatives in Congress and vest it in a new corporate authority. What is the big idea?

Why was Congress empowered to set a ceiling over the Federal debt if the Government can set up corporations which borrow money outside of the budget, corporations whose debts are not included in the national total?

Says Senator BYRD:

"If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything."

The Senator is right. Once the precedent were established, the Government could set up independent corporations to borrow money for defense plants, housing, airports, collective farms, or projects similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Once the corporations were formed, Congress—the elected representatives of the taxpayers—would have little or no control over them. And it would be silly to say the borrowings of such corporations did not constitute a very real part of the public debt.

A big new network of highways would certainly be beneficial, for defense purposes as well as to meet the Nation's growing traffic needs. But it could be argued that we are making fairly good progress in that direction right now—and doing it without Federal pump priming. Gasoline taxes, State and Federal, are bringing in huge sums annually. There is no desperate need to borrow against the future for a Federal superhighway network.

Certainly, if Federal bonds are issued, they should be issued as a part of the Federal budget and included as part of the Federal debt.

Thoughtful Americans will not take kindly to any tricky financial schemes to evade the intent of our budget laws. Such trickery does not square with Mr. Eisenhower's earlier pledges of integrity, economy, and a balanced national budget.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 26, 1955]

PRESIDENT'S HIGHWAY PROPOSAL IS RUNNING INTO ROUGH SLEDDING

President Eisenhower's $100 billion Federal highway program is running into all sorts of complications, as could be expected of so ill-advised a measure. One of the Senators who introduced the bill, Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican of South Dakota, announced that he will not support the bill in its present form. CASE said he hadn't read the bill when he introduced it.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, Senate economy leader and one of the financial experts of the Federal Government, termed sections of the bill "pork barrel" legislation.

On the other side of the fence, some of the New Deal Democrats are blasting the proposal because they say it doesn't go far enough. They contend that while the President calls it a $100 billion Federal program, it actually would provide only $25 billion during the next 10 years. Only $25 billion.

The New Dealers can't let the Eisenhower administration get away with bigger promises and bigger give-aways, so they'd like to top his fantasy with a superfantasy.

The divergence of congressional opinion on the Eisenhower program is revealing. It shows how difficult it is, seemingly impossible even, to get Congress back into a frame of mind to live within the Nation's income. In this respect, the American people obviously are far ahead of congressional thinking. Millions who voted for President Eisenhower in 1952 thought they were voting for a balanced budget and an end to reckless spending by the Federal Government. They have not realized their hopes.

The Eisenhower highway proposal is perhaps the greatest deviation from the Republican campaign promises of 1952. Not only because of the enormous amount of money involved; not only because it further centralizes power in Washington and catapults the Federal Government closer to national socialism, but also because it proposes a dangerous new way for financing Federal give-aways, is the highway measure an ill-advised thing. The Federal Government would raise the money through the issuance of bonds of some authority to be set up, thus circumventing the national debt limit.

Obviously, the bill will be warmly debated in the Senate and House. It is to be hoped that one of the bodies will kill it.

[From the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald of February 25, 1955]

Senator BYRD and others have already had something to say about this bookkeeping. The proposal is for the Federal Government to borrow some $25 billion from the public, spend it on roads, but then pretend that it has added not one penny to the Federal debt. It would do this by setting up a highway authority which would do the actual borrowing but whose debts would be guaranteed by the Treasury, just like any other Federal debt.

This would simply be a bit of shenanigans to get around the legal limit on the Government's debt. And if it can be done for highways, then, of course it can be done for those other things—schools, hospitals, and the like. This would open the way for a Federal bookkeeping system that would be essentially dishonest, because it would offer the pretense that a debt isn't a debt.

Yet there is more to this program that ought to be looked at than the bookkeeping. For this is not simply a program for increasing Federal assistance to State highway commissions; it would begin to make the planning and paying for the Nation's roads a Federal responsibility.

[From the Hendersonville (N. C.) Times-News of February 26, 1955]

BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES CHARGED WITH PORK-BARREL TACTICS

Senator HARRY BYRD brands the President's $101 billion highway program a clever pork-barrel political maneuver. Similar criticism comes from other sources, including the press and some political leaders.

On the other hand, similar charges of engaging in "pork" production are lodged against the Democratic plan for tax reduction. David Lawrence views this plan as "the cheapest form of demagogery."

Thus, the stage setting seems to be emerging for a couple of violent contests.

The Charlotte Observer views the road plan as a pork-barrel move and says the tax-cut plan is "pure politics." This newspaper approves the road plan if it is confined to what the President called a strategic network. If it extends to secondary and feeder roads and streets, the Observer is against it.

President Eisenhower has already announced that he will ask for tax reduction in 1956, shortly before the next election. Ike opened a big hole in his position by

making that admission; but it seems clear that the Democrats are planning to beat him by way of walking through the breach before 1956.

David Lawrence's summary in a heavy assault on the tax-reduction plan is here quoted:

"The Democratic majority in Congress has apparently decided to constitute itself a 'wrecking crew,' with the obvious purpose of wrecking the Eisenhower administration even if it means wrecking the Nation's economy at the same time.

"The party that promised the electorate in the congressional campaign last autumn that it would uphold the hands of the President and support his measures now has turned on him, and on the country, too, and has embarked upon a course of irresponsibility which cannot be justified even on the ground of partisan benefit. For the new proposal to buy the American voters by giving everybody $20 off his tax bill and also freeing nearly 5 million voters from paying any taxes at all is the cheapest form of demagogery."

These and many other attacks on the taxing and road construction proposals indicate the extent to which the people have lost confidence in the integrity of party leadership. If the charges are basically sound the indictments are justified; if the proposals are honest suggestions as to national policies, the persons in the Government responsible for them are due credit for honesty of purpose. President Eisenhower and the Republicans, or the Democratic leaders, in these cases, may be wrong; if they are wrong and these plans are adopted and fail, great will be the tragic aspects of these policies.

In that case the people would be the chief sufferers from the mistakes in government.

Highway planning and construction must continue in order to meet the needs of a growing and expanding Nation. This problem can only be ignored at great inconvenience and cost to highway users. The country must try to keep pace with the demands of adequate highway construction and maintenance.

Good business judgment should be applied in this department of national and State spending of public money, as in all other departments. Doubtless all intelligent citizens are agreed at this point—the division of opinion occurs when determination of what is needed, what is financially possible, and what is politically expedient, must be made.

The Republican campaign promises made in the last national contest were summed up in promises to wipe out extravagance and irresponsible management in government and to balance the national budget and stop inflation.

The country is expecting the administration to make good that promise. Newspaper readers who have closely watched the procedure of the administration are justified in doubting that steps being taken will achieve the ends promised.

The same conditions which apply to national highway problems are true of the other large and important business problems which are directly connected with the operations of government.

If the Eisenhower administration spends as much or more cash than the previous "Dealer" administrations expended, how can inflation be stopped and the budget balanced?

Some progress in that direction can be made by eliminating extravagance in Government management and unnecessary spending. Much progress can be made by eliminating politically expedient spending.

To contend that Government expenses cannot be reduced is an assertion which cannot be successfully supported by the facts. Senator BYRD and other conservative businessmen, including the Hoover Commission, have pointed out in factual order how the Federal budget can be balanced. Balanced—not in a few months, but within reasonable time. This cannot be done, however, by increasing expenditures daily, weekly or annually.

The only way to practice economy is to economize. The only way to balance a budget is to reduce the expense account to a point within the income.

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican of February 24, 1955]

ADEQUATE HIGHWAYS WILL COME SOME DAY

President Eisenhower's $10 billion highway-construction program is being assailed by some United States Senators. Senator BYRD, Virginia Democrat, calls it "pork barrel"—meaning that it is purely for political purposes in the areas where the funds would be spent. Senator GORE, Tennessee Democrat, calls the President's idea to have a portion of Federal gas tax funds earmarked for 30 years for construction of superhighways as irresponsible financing.

Ten billion dollars sounds like a lot of money—and it is. Senator BYRD, for whom we have considerable respect as a watchdog of the Treasury, was probably shocked at mention of the amount. We pour out billions of dollars every year because of the Communist threat. Why can't we spend a few billions on roads which are badly needed in many States? And why should a long-range financing program for adequate highways be termed irresponsible financing?

The motorists of this Nation—and they are increasing in number every year—have long thought that they are not getting a fair return in new roads for the huge amount of money they are paying in local, county, State, and Federal taxes. Much of the motorists' dollar is going into general funds.

If it would become necessary to quickly evacuate big metropolitan areas, it would soon be discovered how inadequate the highways are. There have been instances when a few inches of snow caused traffic jams that virtually tied up a big city for hours. Imagine what a sudden rush of panic-stricken people would do to highways leading out of a large city.

A few Senators can indulge in loose talk about the Eisenhower road program, but it is something that must, of necessity, come some day. The increasing number of automobiles on the streets and highways is causing serious business complications all over the country by the reason of the resulting congestion. Eventually, every community will wake up to the realization that something must be done about it.

[From the Newburyport (Mass.) News, March 2, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of March 1, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

President Eisenhower presented his highway construction program to Congress without emphasis on the means of financing it. He said merely that he was inclined to favor the financing plan recommended by the President's Committee on a National Highway Program.

The committee's recommendations, as described by Senator BYRD, fall generally into 2 parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for an interstate highway system. BYRD estimated the Federal expenditures for the 2 programs in 10 years would amount to $31 billion.

The $25 billion of Federal expenditures would be financed by the collection of $5 billion from filling stations, motels, and restaurants operated along the new highways and by selling $20 billions in 30-year 3-percent taxable bonds.

Legislation to provide for carrying out the committee's recommendations was introduced coincident with the presentation of the President's plan.

Previously another highway construction bill had been introduced by Senator GORE and hearings on it have been started by the Senate Public Works Committee. This bill would authorize Federal appropriations of $1.6 billion a year for the next 5 years. The States would have to match $1.1 billion of this amount dollar for dollar. The rest of it they would have to match on a basis of $1 for every $2 advanced by Washington. If the States matched the Federal money, the Gore bill would mean an annual expenditure of about $3 billion a year for 5 years.

BYRD has another plan which has not yet been formally expressed in legislation. He would amend the recommendations of the President's committee to provide:

"1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

"2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, which for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

"3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

"4. A one-half-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax be asssessed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax shortly will be enough to compensate the Federal Treasury for this program."

There is a fundamental difference between the Gore and Byrd plans, on the one hand, and the Eisenhower plan, on the other. BYRD and GORE propose a pay-as-you-go method of financing Federal aid on highway construction. The Eisenhower plan advances what BYRD calls procedures that "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." Let us quote BYRD further on the Eisenhower plan:

"The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time. * * *

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. * * *

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, it to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs. * * *"

It is no wonder, we think, that Senator SALTONSTALL'S comment on the President's program was:

"We have got to build roads, but I want to know a little more about the method of financing."

The Senator is right. We must build roads and Federal assistance in financing construction is sound, both because of the interstate nature of highways and because of the need to weld the highway system to the requirements of the national defense. But the need is not so urgent that it requires either a departure from sound financial practice or from Eisenhower's devotion to decentralization of Federal authority. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that BYRD's proposals call for greater States responsibility in a highway building program.

[From the Bradford (Pa.) Era of March 3, 1955]

HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending $101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about $25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. We in Pennsylvania are very familiar with the trick.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an all-out highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized nation in the world. They are falling further below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.—Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

[From the Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer, February 26, 1955]

IKE'S ROAD PLAN: IS IT NECESSARY IN ATOM AGE?

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, the Nation's foremost apostle of economy, has branded President Eisenhower's $101 billion road-construction program as a "pork-barrel" scheme. His views concerning this proposed measure are reminiscent of his attitude toward some of President Roosevelt's pump-priming legislation back in the 1930's.

Mr. Eisenhower, however, uses the atomic age rather than pump-priming, as an argument for his road program. He points out that the Nation must possess an excellent system of roads for use in evacuations in event of atomic attacks.

There is some question of just how much value a system of super highways would be in event an A-bomb or an H-bomb splattered upon them. One theory is that the best defense against atomic attack this country can devise is a mighty buildup of weapons for retaliation.

The President's road-building program would cover a 10-year period and about a third of the cost would be borne by the Federal Government with the State and local governments paying the balance. It must be noted that North Carolina now is considering a $97 million primary road program for the next 2 years. Additional appropriations, which would be necessary under the Eisenhower program, would create new and more perplexing taxation problems.

It must be admitted, however, that an adequate national highway system must be maintained if the Nation is to be in readiness for war, whether that war be atomic or otherwise, since the Nation cannot gird itself for defense without a workable system of land communication.

Main question raised by the Eisenhower proposal is whether it is too ambitious, especially since the Government is operating in the red despite monumental taxation.

A compromise would seem appropriate as to the $101 billion highway proposal. From a political standpoint, it will be interesting to note how those anti-Eisenhower political elements, which have been pressing for more "made work" governmental projects, will view the proposition. If they oppose the President on this, their position is likely to be rather inconsistent.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of February 23, 1955]

STRUGGLE OVER ROAD BILLS

Congress is wrestling mightily over the Eisenhower highway program. Formal dissent to the administration measure, listed as a $101 billion affair, is found in the Gore bill, which differs materially in the matter of State-Federal partnership in road-building.

That the President's bill, as drawn up by Gen. Lucius Clay and others, is in for a rough time is putting it mildly. The objections piled up fast, even before the measure was sent to Congress. The most bitter fight will probably be upon financing. The official bill has been itemized this way:

Interstate network, joining 50 percent of all cities over 50,000 population, $23 billion; primary system, connecting all principal cities and manufacturing areas, $30 billion; secondary system, including farm-to-market roads, $15 billion; other streets and roads, including urban feeder streets, $33 billion. The proposal covers 10 years of activity. The Federal Government would put up $25 billion for the interstate system and proportionate amounts for the other items.

To finance this program, there is proposed a 30-year bond issue, to be paid off by gasoline and diesel taxes and taxes upon motels along the right-of-way. To this plan, the influential Senator HARRY BYRD has made stiff objections; it would dry up gasoline as a source of general revenue. These taxes, according to a late statement from the White House, would be earmarked for debt retirement. The aggregated interest, according to Senator BYRD, would be $11,500,000,000. The Byrd proposal is to cut the Federal gasoline tax from 2 mills to one-half mill and leave much of the road program to the States; they would be enabled to use their own gasoline taxes to a great extent and thus cut down the Federal expenditures.

The measure wil be fired upon from many angles. Western Congressmen are not quite happy over it; they say it refers to thick populations rather than distances. The official bill provides for continuation of the matching program between States and the Nation.

There is, however, one general agreement: We must have more and better highways. The big fight has some undoubted political phases, but the struggle is not over the desirability of a big program but upon financing it and preserving the balance between the State and Federal Governments and dealing equitably with diverse areas.

[From the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier of February 21, 1955]

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

Everyone realizes that the huge number of motor vehicles being operated daily by the people of the United States calls for huge outlays of funds with which to provide more and better highways.

Thus one may sympathize with the objective of the President's $101 billion Federal highway program.

However, the President's proposal contains a provision which sets up a precedent which is so dangerous that we believe the method should not be used under any circumstances.

We refer to the proposal to set up a Government-owned corporation, without assets, which would be authorized to borrow $20 billion, this debt not to be included in the national debt, but still a financial obligation of the Government.

This method of increasing the national indebtedness without running afoul of the statutory debt limitation was worked out by the President's highway commission, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

Probably there is no greater authority on tax matters in the United States today than Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia.

BYRD is a Democrat but he fought Truman spending policies year after year. Today, he is doing what he can to warn the Nation of the danger in the President's road program.

Here is a statement from Senator BYRD on the subject:

"Actually the committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60–40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are unique so far as I know, and thoroughly unsound.

"The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation, with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

"Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction.

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs.

"When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition. The obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens will still remain."

We agree with BYRD's position that adoption of the President's program would do away with any national debt control and, ultimately, lead to highly dangerous inflation.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of February 24, 1955]

FINANCING ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower has presented compelling argument in support of his national roadbuilding program. Few question the necessity of improving and expanding our highway system.

Opposition centers chiefly on tentative proposals for financing the Federal Government's share of the $101 billion project. Though he leans to the idea of a bond issue, the President has not taken a hard and fast position but apparently is ready to consider any reasonable plan.

Senator BYRD has served as a useful watchdog over Federal finances, but he goes too far when he puts the pork-barrel label on the President's program on the ground that it would reimburse States like New Jersey for some of the funds they have already invested in superhighways.

He overlooks the fact that these States have not yet completed road programs that are highly important to interstate, even transcontinental, commerce.

There is plenty of room for discussion of the financing. State interests have suggested in the past that the gasoline tax be a source of revenue left wholly to the States, which will have to provide the greatest share of the funds invested in this roadbuilding effort.

This would argue for tolls, rather than gas taxes, to liquidate the debt. Tolls are working out very well in the large turnpike projects already completed and might be less objectionable politically.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 16, 1955]

IKE'S WAY OUT

It is becoming more and more evident that the administration acted without thinking through when it plunked for that multi-billion-dollar Federal highway-construction program on which the Clay Commission recently reported, and, which, it is announced, will go to the Congress next week.

First was the mistake of underestimating the strength of the opposition to the plan itself, both in theory and in practice. It has been denounced as unsound governmental philosophy and as a fiscal crime. Opposition has been vocally vigorous and weighty in argument. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, as chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, is the most influential opponent, but he is not alone. The program faces what appears to be an almost insuperable barrier. It is hardly probable that the administration had anticipated running into anything like it.

Now, we are informed by Roscoe Drummond, writing on this page today, that the delay in presenting the program to the Congress has been due to the second mistake the administration made in this matter. It endorsed the program without first deciding upon the method of financing the program, whether to pay out that huge sum annually from taxes or whether to issue bonds to mature under the Clay plan, in 30 years. Opposition to the bond issue feature is not confined to those who oppose the whole program from principle. The fiscally sound are, as Drummond described Senator BYRD's state of mind, horrified at its unsoundness. Why not, then, abandon that proposal and turn to a pay-as-you-go plan? The answer is simple: To do that would mean to forfeit all hope of reducing the national debt, of balancing the budget and reducing taxes next year or for years to come, even if sweet peace descends to envelop the world. It is a poor choice that is presented, and it still is not announced which the President has made or will make.

There is, of course, a way out. A few days ago in response to a question as to why he had changed his mind radically about the advisability of a decision he had made previously, President Eisenhower remarked simply that he had discovered that he had made an error and naturally moved to correct it. He has made two errors with his highway-construction program, a program that is out of line with the Federal Union which this Government was intended to be and which by the terms of the compact, known as the Constitution, it is, a program that cannot be financed by any method with any pretentions to soundness. His way out is to admit the mistake, pigeonhole the Clay report, and forget all about the thing. There are so many important questions to give him headaches that he would be wise to get rid of this one while he can. And while about it he might take a quick look at his school-construction program with its bribe to localities to go head over heels into debt. We say a quick look because that ought to be sufficient to lead him to discard this migraine provocative, too.

AIR FORCE POLICY OF PROCUREMENT DISPERSAL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last February, before a House of Representatives Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Harold E. Talbott, made some comments with respect to the policy of dispersal in the overall policy of aircraft procurement.

Mr. President, I think you are undoubtedly acquainted with the fact that a great segment of the economy of southern California is geared to aircraft production for the United States Air Force. By reason of the comments which the Secretary made, there was considerable concern and no little apprehension among the people connected with the industry and generally throughout the State of California regarding the status of the industry, and, indeed, doubt of what the policy of dispersal meant. That apprehension was shared in Washington by my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], by the members of the House delegation from California, and by myself.

My colleague and I prepared a letter, addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force, in which we asked, as carefully as we could, a number of pertinent questions, and we requested the Secretary of the Air Force to give us answers to those questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which my colleague and I sent to the Secretary of the Air Force, and a copy of the letter which the Secretary made to us by way of reply.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 11, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the apprehension which has developed in our State—particularly in southern California—following testimony you and General Twining gave in the House Appropriations Subcommittee recently, concerning the Air Force policy of procurement dispersal we appreciated the opportunity to confer with you.

Management, labor and local government officials in California have voiced serious concern as to what may be intended. We wish, therefore, to ask several specific questions relative to the Air Force procurement policy as it affects the relationship of the Air Force with contractors on the west coast and we shall appreciate very much an answer from you to each of the following questions:

1. What is the dispersal policy of the Air Force in connection with procurement?

2. Is it the same as for the Army and Navy?

3. How long has the present policy been in existence?

4. What, if any, is the difference in your policy from that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy?

5. Within congressional limitations of appropriations, your obligational authority, and the requirements of national defense, will Air Force dispersal policy permit the continued placing of contracts with California manufacturers? As far as can be foreseen, will Air Force purchases under your dispersal policy result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels?

6. Does the dispersal policy preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under the present contracts?

7. Is it contemplated that reorders of aircraft currently being produced in southern California will be awarded present contractors on a basis that will assure continued operations at southern California plants presently working on Air Force contracts?

8. Since there are tremendous numbers of small concerns in California engaged in subcontracting and supplying prime contractors, will the Air Force desire for dispersal affect their participation in future procurement?

9. Is the policy of dispersal limited to bringing about erection of any required new production facilities in other locations of the United States? Or, will the policy lead to curtailment of production by existing west coast contractors and the transfer of present production to other areas of the country?

The phenomenal population and production growth of California in the past decade shows no signs of tapering off. As we are sure you appreciate, a substantal degree of the economy of the southern California area is directly related to military aircarft manufacture and Air Force procurement policy. The people of southern California, both workers and management, have set astounding records for efficient performance both in war and in peace. In justice to this great industry, and to the communities in which it is situated, we earnestly feel that the matter of Air Force procurement policy as it involves dispersal of producing facilities should be clarified.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, May 16, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This will reply to your letter of May 11, in which you ask several specific questions relative to the Air Force procurement policy as it affects the relationship of the Air Force with contractors on the west coast.

I am pleased with the opportunity this provides to discuss with you this very vital national military problem. The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. What is the dispersal policy of the Air Force in connection with procurement?

Answer: Basically, our policy with respect to dispersal is to place our orders in such a way that we will avoid increasing the heavy concentrations of key defense industries in single locations. Our best method of bringing about dispersal is to make certain that the new organizations and new facilities which the Government must finance directly or indirectly are steered away from areas of concentration. Our real concern is the tendency of these concentrations to increase.

2. Is it the same as for the Army and Navy?

Answer: This policy is the same for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps. It is also a defense policy and an Office of Defense Mobilization policy.

3. How long has the present policy been in existence?

Answer: This general policy has been in existence since the start of heavy aircraft expenditures during World War II.

4. What, if any, is the difference in your policy from that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy?

Answer: This policy is the same as that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy—the Finletter Committee. The following quotation from this report deals with this policy:

"At the end of World War II, the aircraft and aircraft engine plants were well dispersed, as shown on the map elsewhere in this section. A large part of our total production of military aircraft is now concentrated in the Los Angeles area, on Long Island, and at Seattle.

"It is regrettable that the wartime-plant dispersion was not maintained. Our reserve plants (i. e., Government-owned plants not now in operation) are still well dispersed. If, in response to a mobilization order, reserve plants are brought into production, the total aircraft manufacturing plant pattern would represent an effective geographical dispersal. If, on the other hand, an attack should precede activation of the reserve plants, the industry will offer highly concentrated targets. We recommend that, in future plant expansion, the services avoid further concentration in these areas as far as possible."

5. Within congressional limitations of appropriations your obligational authority, and the requirements of national defense, will Air Force dispersal policy permit the continued placing of contracts with California manufacturers? As far as can be foreseen, will Air Force purchases under your dispersal policy result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels?

Answer: The Air Force will definitely continue to place large contracts with California manufacturers. It is here that we have many of our most important engineering organizations and production facilities, and we definitely plan to use them. Procurement of military equipment of the highest quality in the shortest time and at the lowest cost is our primary objective, and to attain it we must use existing facilities and know-how to the fullest extent possible.

This will not necessarily result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels. However, as our total requirements for aircraft and other equipment go up or down, as they have in the past, we would expect that part manufactured in California would go up or down also. Actually, as we complete the aircraft for the 137-wing Air Force, we expect that there will be a general decrease in aircraft production, and that there will be some decrease in employment in California. This is not the result of the dispersal policy, however.

6. Does the dispersal policy preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under the present contracts?

Answer: The dispersal policy does not preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under present contracts. However, the most important factor to bear in mind is the fact that as certain models are completed and other models started, that employment will go up in some plants and down in others.

7. Is it contemplated that reorders of aircraft currently being produced in southern California will be awarded present contractors on a basis that will assure continued operations at southern California plants presently working on Air Force contracts?

Answer: We are continually reordering aircraft from southern California plants and expect to continue to do so. In addition, we expect to place orders for new designs with these firms in cases where the work can be done with existing facilities.

8. Since there are tremendous numbers of small concerns in California engaged in subcontracting and supplying prime contractors, will the Air Force desire for dispersal affect their participation in future procurement?

Answer: Generally speaking we are not as concerned about the concentration of small suppliers as we are about the larger companies since the type of work they perform is generally already broadly dispersed. Most of this work is placed by the prime manufacturers who like to have at least two sources of supply in different locations, and we are not as worried as we are in the case of the manufacturers of our major items where it is too costly to establish multiple sources except in special cases. We would not, however, give Government support to the creation of a new organization or the establishment of new facilities if we thought there was an undesirable tendency to concentrate a critical item in a given area.

9. Is the policy of dispersal limited to bringing about erection of any required new production facilities in other locations of the United States? Or, will the policy lead to curtailment of production by existing west coast contractors and the transfer of present production to other areas of the country?

Answer: We have no intention of curtailing production by existing west coast contractors by the transfer of present production to other areas of the country. It is, however, definitely our intention to implement this policy by controlling the location of new facilities.

I hope that the answers to these questions will permit you and your constituents to better understand the dispersal policy of the Air Force and the Defense Department.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that my colleague and the House of Representatives delegation from California and I do not propose to see any policy of dispersal upon the part of the Military Establishment applied in such a way as to do an injustice to our State or to any other part of the country.

The answers which were given by the Secretary of the Air Force allay, I think, to an extent, much of the apprehension which has arisen in California. However, we propose to pursue the matter further.

MINING CLAIMS AND FISHING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, sportsmen and other conservationists are greatly concerned over some of the legislation pending before the Congress involving changes in policies toward use of our public lands.

One of the serious questions arising has been abuse of the mining claim privilege of "weekend miners" to place out of bounds to the public, thousands of acres of choice fishing streams, timber stands, home sites, scenic camping grounds, and lake frontages.

I regret that the House of Representatives has passed a bill to throw the door open even wider to these spurious "prospectors."

However, I note that all conservationists are pleased that a new amendment to the mining law is being considered by

both the House and Senate to correct many of the abuses resulting from the old law of 1872, and at the same time protect legitimate mining.

No one is opposing bonafide mining claims; all sportsmen ask is that we recognize the facts that exist about spurious mining claims.

I want to commend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for introducing S. 1713 to accomplish this purpose of protecting future fishing on our western public lands, and urge its support. Hearings are now in progress.

I have had the privilege of reading an advance copy of an article on this subject to appear in the June issue of the Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin. Because it is a sound explanation of the issue, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Mining Claims and Fishing," be printed in the body of the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues for consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINING CLAIMS AND FISHING

The public lands in our 12 Western States furnish some of America's finest fishing. Of our 30 million anglers, most of those who have never had a try at catching wild fish in these highly scenic surroundings are undoubtedly looking forward to the day when they can have this pleasant and exciting experience.

If you are one of the many anglers bent on realizing this long-time ambition, you might be in for a rude awakening when you reach your destination. In one of the national forests, or on some of the extensive tracts managed by the United States Bureau of Land Management, you should have no trouble in finding just the sort of stream you have dreamed about—a clear, unpolluted mountain stream, well supplied with wild trout. But, you might also find something else. Stretched across the trail may be a barbed-wire fence or a locked gate, or there may simply be a conspicuous sign, telling you to keep out.

It's quite possible that someone may have staked out a mining claim on 20 acres of land. This would cost him $1.25. By staking this claim across the canyon, the person who owns the claim can keep you out of many miles of stream simply by making access to the water above the claim virtually impossible.

Someone may keep you from fishing on a stream flowing through land which belongs to all of us, simply by forking over $1.25. He can have his own private fishing stream, at your expense.

All this can happen because of a mining law adopted 83 years ago.

Actually, all a person has to do to stake a claim is to mark off the four corners of a 20-acre tract and record it in the county office. Any number of claims may be located so long as the mineral deposits discovered are sufficient to justify development by a prudent man. Along with the more valuable minerals, deposits of all the common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and pumicite may be the basis for claims locations.

In all too many cases the claimants are "weekend miners" and under their spurious operations thousands of acres of choice fishing streams, timber stands, homesites, scenic camping grounds, and lake frontages have been placed out of bounds to the public.

As of January 1952, there were 36,000 mining patents on the national forests involving 918,000 acres of land. Although these had gone to patent under the mining laws, only 15 percent are commercially successful mines.

According to reports, there are 84,000 mining claims on these same forests involving 2,100,000 acres, with only 2 percent producing minerals in commercial quantities. Probably no more than 40 percent would be valid even under the weak provisions of the law. What's more, the timber tied up on these lands is worth more than $100 million and would build about 800,000 5-room houses. Since there is no time limit for claims to be brought to patent, the land is tied up indefinitely.

All rights to the surface uses go with the claims. The claimant has the trump card. Access to nearby lands and waters may be cut off, fishing prohibited along previously open streams, lake frontages, picnic and campsites taken over, timber products and grazing rights usurped.

These statutes tie the hands of the Federal land administering agencies. It would cost about $20 million to examine existing claims and protest those that are invalid. Three thousand man-years of work would be required. More than 16,000 claims are filed each year, and nothing would prevent the claimant from refiling once his application for patent is rejected.

Back in 1872, when the present law was passed, there were only a few people in the West to stake out claims. There were few users of our public lands. The law at that time was a good one.

But conditions have changed. Thousands of people have filed spurious claims to get a chunk of public land, and the waters and timber on it, for their own exclusive use. Now the uranium prospecting craze is really pointing out the need for a change in the law.

Fortunately, some of the streams have been withdrawn or reserved for possible power development. But even these may be opened to the undesirable practices which exist elsewhere. The House of Representatives has passed a bill (H. R. 100) which would throw these remaining lands open to the "prospectors." Several times in the past the House has passed such a bill, but each time it has died in the Senate.

Fortunately, a new amendment to the mining law is being considered by both House and Senate. It's a bill which would correct many of the abuses resulting from the law of 1872. At the same time, it would protect legitimate mining. Incidentally, some of these public lands support extensive mining. We object to the abuses—not to mining.

Our objection is to the spurious mining claims, not to the bona fide ones.

Under these proposed amendments, access to, and use of, fishing streams covered by unpatented claims appears to be assured.

The new bill in the House was introduced independently by several Representatives. The first was H. R. 5561, by Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Utah. In the Senate the bill is S. 1713, introduced by Senator Anderson in behalf of himself and several other Senators. What happens to this introduced bill may have a very decided effect on future fishing on our western public lands.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1945—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a veto message from the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say, for the information of the Senate, I have consulted with the able minority leader. He has consulted with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have consulted with the able chairman of that committee. On behalf of myself and the minority leader, I ask that the reading of the message be deferred until a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which is now at the desk, can be read and acted on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed unanimous consent agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, May 24, 1955, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the reconsideration of the bill S 1, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, returned by the President of the United States to the Senate without his approval, and that on the question—"Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?"—and all motions, if any be made, relating thereto, debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said bill and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and the minority leader (May 19, 1955.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will now read the message from the President of the United States.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1, to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I take this action for three reasons. First, the bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees. Second, the bill creates grave administrative problems such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates. It forces awkward and unfair administrative practices in a Government department whose operations affect every person, every enterprise, every community in the country. Third, the bill imposes a heavier burden upon the taxpayer than is necessary to establish salary rates throughout the Department which will compare favorably with rates for similar work elsewhere in Government and in private industry.

At the outset of this administration, the Postmaster General began a comprehensive study of the entire postal system.

The principal purpose was to discover effective ways and means by which the American people could be assured more speedy, certain, economical, and efficient handling of their mail. Obviously, this purpose can be achieved only if, first, postal employees are dedicated and satisfied in career service because of fair compensation, good working conditions, adequate benefits in vacations, insurance, sick leave, and old-age security; and second, the Department's administrative structure, incorporating the best management practices, is so designed

that merit and responsibility are recognized and rewarded.

In accordance with the findings of the comprehensive study, on January 11, 1955, by special message to the Congress, I recommended an increase in the salaries of postal employees which would be composed of two elements—a general increase in postal pay and a reclassification of postal positions that would eliminate inequities. To accomplish these purposes I recommended a 5-percent pay raise and adjustments in classification to bring about proper wage relationships among the various jobs in postal service. The cost of the reclassification proposals would have brought the total increase to 6½ percent, with an aggregate annual cost of $129 million.

Those recommendations, if adopted, would have placed the salaries of postal employees in proper relationship to the salaries paid for similar work in nearly all the larger cities. The pay raises recommended were substantially greater than the increase in the cost of living since the last adjustment in postal wages.

Subsequently, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, by a substantial bipartisan majority, reported a bill—H. R. 4644—which, although approximately $30 million a year more costly than my recommendations, embodied the essential elements of a reclassification system. In the matter of reclassification, that bill, as reported by the committee, could have been, and still can be, with certain corrections, the basis for legislation which would establish fair relationships between the salaries of various positions in the postal service on the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work.

It has always been recognized that in the consideration of pay legislation, there can be a reasonabl difference of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. But there can be no compromise with the principle of fairness, and any pay legislation must be fair to all to whom it applies. It must be workable administratively and not be excessive in cost.

The bill before me fails to meet these criteria. Specifically:

First. It discriminates against large groups of postal employees such as rural letter carriers, special-delivery messengers, and many supervisors and postmasters. These total tens of thouands.

Second. Aside from creating new and serious administrative problems, the total cost of the bill, approximately $180 million a year, is substantially greater than is necessary to adjust postal salaries to a fair level, either from the standpoint of pay for comparable work or from the standpoint of increase in the cost of living.

I regret the necessity of the action which I am taking. It is my earnest hope and recommendation that the Congress will quickly consider and enact postal pay legislation that will be in the public interest and fair to all of the half million employees who man the postal service. To meet this test, such legislation should provide a reasonable increase in pay for all postal field-service employees. It should provide for reclassification of postal positions to bring about proper wage relationships so as to eliminate inequities. It should not discriminate against some groups in favor of others, and it should be administratively workable.

Because the enactment of such legislation will substantially increase the postal deficit, I wish again to emphasize the imperative need for postal rates that will make the postal service self-supporting and be based on service rendered to the user. We can no longer afford to continue a costly deficit operation paid for by millions of taxpayers in amounts out of all proportion to the postal services that they as individuals receive.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1955.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The message, with the accompanying bill, will be printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the veto by the President of S. 1, a bill providing an 8.6-percent increase in the salaries of the postal employees, is shameful.

This action indicates to me that President Eisenhower is more concerned with soothing the easily ruffled feelings and bruised pride of Postmaster General Summerfield than he is in the economic problems of our postal employees.

It is shameful that these employees should be denied for a second time by Presidential action a pay raise which they justly deserve. First, they were denied an increase in pay last August because the President wanted Congress to increase the price of postage stamps. Now it seems to be denied because the President feels that Congress increased their pay per week by an amount equal to the cost of a bottle of milk above the amount the President's arrogant and unyielding Postmaster General would agree to.

The charge that the conference committee agreement created a number of new inequities should be dismissed as pure hokum. The Senate has been skeptical all along of the position classification plan proposed by the Post Office Department, for the reason that it provided increases of up to 58 percent to the higher-paid employee, as contrasted with increases of only 5 or 6 percent to the rank-and-file employee. In spite of this skepticism, the Senate reluctantly adopted, with some changes, the administration's classification plan, in the hope that such a compromise would result in an immediate pay increase for the postal employee. Apparently a military dictatorship does not recognize compromise, or the prerogative of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, we can only conclude that President Eisenhower and his Cabinet of millionaires do not embrace the workingman with the same warmth of feeling that they do the Dixons and the Yates.

I fail to understand how the President can justify his position of requesting billions and billions of additional dollars to squander abroad, while, at the same time, denying a decent wage to our own employees here at home.

Let me assure the good postal employees of the Nation that our fight in their behalf will continue.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate received the veto message from the President on Senate bill 1, the postal pay bill. The President used his constitutional privilege and prerogative in connection with that measure. The leadership has set next Tuesday as the time when the veto message will be taken up and considered by the Senate. I wish to make the statement that if the President's veto shall be sustained by the Senate, I shall have ready for introduction a bill providing for a 7.6 percent increase in pay. It is my hope that if the veto shall be sustained the Senate will give early consideration to the measure I shall introduce, in order that the postal workers may have the benefit of an increase in pay.

Second, Mr. President, if such a bill is passed by the Senate, I am in position to introduce a bill providing for an increase of 6 percent for the classified workers.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as Senators are aware, it is planned to consider today Senate bill 153, proposing amendment of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. We hope an early vote may be reached on that bill.

I desire to make an announcement, so the Senate will be upon notice, that conferences have been held with regard to other bills on the calendar, and the minority leader has gone over them and approved them for consideration by the Senate. I should like to have Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation know of the possibility that these bills will be brought before the Senate at any time which may be convenient.

First, Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government. The bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Next, Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, the so-called roads bill. We plan to make it the unfinished business tomorrow; to have no votes taken on it tomorrow; and to debate the bill on Monday. I doubt that there will be any votes on the bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, following the morning hour, we shall have 3 hours of debate—with one and one-half hours to each side—on the President's veto message of the postal pay bill. I assume that at some time between 3:15 and 4:15 p. m. on that day we are likely to have the yea and nay vote on the question of passing the bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. Then we shall resume consideration of the roads bill, and shall take as much time as may be necessary to obtain action.

We wish to give notice, next, regarding Calendar No. 355, House bill 3322, which relates to the utilization of surplus property for education and public health purposes. That bill was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr McCLELLAN].

Next, Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 1805, providing for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government. The bill was also reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Next, Calendar No. 357, Senate bill 1795, providing an increased allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. The bill was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Next, Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co. That resolution was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Next, Calendar 359, Senate bill 4052, continuing in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941. That bill was also reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Next, Calendar No. 360, Senate bill 33, relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation. The bill was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Next, Calendar No. 362, Senate Joint Resolution 67, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines. The bill was reported by the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. President, it is my understanding that most of the measures I have enumerated will not require any great amount of time. There will be an explanation of each of them, and there will be some discussion of them; but I understand there is no great controversy about any of them.

In the case of every measure I have listed, I have consulted the minority leader. I have asked the staff to notify the Senators who are interested in the measures referred to, and when time permits, we wish to have the Senate proceed to their consideration. I should like all Senators to be aware of the contemplated program.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as a substitute for the bill, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is now present in the Chamber. During the period when the Senate was in recess I was informed that an agreement had been reached in connection with the amendment offered by him a few days ago. I should like to have the junior Senator from Minnesota make a statement for the RECORD. In the meantime, we shall notify other Senators. It is somewhat difficult to get all Senators who are for or against an amendment and Senators who agree on an amendment in the Chamber at the same time. If the Senator from Minnesota will make a statement about what has happened, and what the amendment as modified now provides, perhaps my colleagues can reach other Senators who are interested. I want the Senator from Minnesota to give the Senate assurances with respect to certain conversations he has had with other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like at this time to read for the purpose of the RECORD and for general discussion and understanding a letter which I have received this morning from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, dated May 19. This letter follows a conversation which I had last evening with the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Mr. Ancher Nelsen, in which Mr. Nelsen agreed to support the amendment which has been offered, with a certain clarifying modification.

The proposed modification of the amendment does not change the substance of the amendment which I offered on Tuesday. It merely clarifies the language and transposes certain language to a more appropriate place within the amendment. I shall send to the desk the amendment which I should like to have made the pending question, to replace the amendment previously offered by me, designated "5–17–55–A." I repeat that the modification or clarification does not in any sense change the substance of the amendment which I offered on Tuesday, but merely realines the language and makes it much more clear and understandable.

I now withdraw the pending amendment and offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment previously offered by the Senator from Minnesota is withdrawn. The amendment now offered will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That subsections (c), (d), and (e) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903 (c), (d), and (e)) are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service: *Provided*, That if any part of such sums are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such part shall thereafter be available for loans by the Administrator without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories.

"The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service.

"(d) The remaining 75 percent of such annual sums shall be available for rural electrification loans in the several States and in the Territories, without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as, in the opinion of the Administrator, may be effectively employed for the purposes of this act, and to carry out the provisions of section 7: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said unallotted annual sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories.

"(e) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "10 percent" and inserting "25 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduced S. 153 because it was recognized that there was no need for earmarking funds. The only question now is with reference to areas or communities where there is need for rural electrification and for REA associations; and once a community can justify its ability to pay back, the funds are always made available. There is no question today about whether funds should be earmarked.

I discussed the amendment offered by my colleague with the Director of REA, Ancher Nelsen, last evening, and today I received a letter from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, dated May 19.

I understand an identical letter was received by my junior colleague. I was

informed that both of us received the same letter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The Rural Electrification Administration does not materially object to the amendment. It feels it would be far better than the restrictions imposed on REA in the present administrative act. Therefore, in order that we may obtain action on the question without lengthy debate, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Every one of us has uppermost in his mind the welfare of REA. All of us are trying to make it function 100 percent in every State and in every community. If there is a fear on the part of some that certain communities may be placed in jeopardy because of lack of funds, and if that fear is allayed by the proposed amendment, I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment, and as the author of S. 153 I accept the amendment. I have discussed it with the cosponsors of the bill, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I know that REA will be improved by the adoption of this amendment. I am sure that at some future time that all restrictions on REA funds will be removed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague. I join with him in saying that the whole purpose of the amendment and of the bill introduced by my senior colleague is to improve and to strengthen rural electrification. It is the feeling of the junior Senator from Minnesota that the pending amendment upon which the Senate will shortly vote, will meet the requirements of the rural electrification program.

As the senior Senator from Minnesota has stated his desire, it is my hope also that at a later date, when the States which have not progressed as far as other States have with their initial REA development have caught up, we will be able to remove all restrictions. The objective of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], is deserving and worthy. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would be on the floor at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I discussed the matter with the Senator from Mississippi. He is agreeable to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. I discussed the matter with the Senator from Mississippi on the floor earlier today. I told him that I was prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, dated May 19, 1955, printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your request for our views on the revision of S. 153 which was offered in the Senate on May 17.

As we understand it, it is now proposed to modify the State allotment formula as it now appears in the Rural Electrification Act so that 25 (in place of 50) percent of the annual electrification loan funds shall be allotted among the States in proportion to the number of unelectrified farms. The remaining 75 percent could be loaned without allotment, subject to the limitation that not more than 25 (in place of 10) percent thereof may be employed in any one State. The effect of the proposed amendment of subsection (e) would be to release that part of the funds subject to State allotment which had not been obligated or loaned during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available so that they may be loaned in any State subject only to the 25-percent limitation. All funds not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available would be carried over and be available for loan in subsequent years in any State without allotment subject only to the 25-percent limitation.

The proposed revision will afford greater flexibility in the administration of the electrification loan program than is possible under the existing State allotment formula. Applying the revised allotment formula to the electrification loan funds carried in the 1956 appropriations, and using electrified farms as of July 1, 1954, as the formula base, we believe that the revised formula will permit the making of any loans for which applications are now on hand or which to our knowledge are being worked upon in the field.

We would prefer, for the reasons presented to the subcommittee which conducted hearings on S. 153, that the administration of the loan program be placed on the basis of actual needs for funds to carry out the purposes of the act rather than on a formula which is based on the ratio of unelectrified farms, a factor which is not determinative of needs today. We shall, of course, carry out to the best of our ability any statutory directive received from the Congress.

It would help to clarify the intent of the proposed amendment if it were revised to read as follows:

(c) "Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service: *Provided*, That if any part of such sums are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such part shall thereafter be available for loans by the Administrator without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories. The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service."

(d) No change.

(e) "If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or all of the Territories."

It would be helpful, if, during the discussion of the bill, attention is drawn to the effect of the formula on the reserve or contingency authorizations such as have been included in the REA loan items in recent years. In the event S. 153 is enacted prior to June 30, 1955, with the allotment formula revised as proposed, we would interpret the amendment as freeing the current reserve authorization of $35 million, if it is drawn upon, as well as to any other unobligated funds, from the State allotment restrictions, since the first 6 months of fiscal 1955 have already elapsed. Further, with respect to the reserve loan authorization of $100 million provided for fiscal 1956, in the event these funds are not drawn upon until after December 31, 1955, we would consider them available for loan free of the State allotment formula and subject only to the 25-percent limitation.

We believe this is a reasonable interpretation of the effect of the proposed language with respect to these funds under the applicable language of the appropriation acts. However, if it is questioned, we would prefer that it be clarified now for our guidance in administering the act.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the amendment will be agreed to and the bill passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am happy to see that a solution of the difficulty has been reached. I have felt for some time that there was need for greater leeway in the handling of REA funds in the discretion of the Administrator.

A year ago, when we had before us the question of voting additional funds for loans by REA, I voted for the additional $35 million for the discretionary fund because I felt the additional sum was needed. My reason for so voting is the same reason which leads me to vote for the bill at this time. It is to permit the Administrator to place the greatest emphasis where the greatest need exists. Therefore, I am glad to vote for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have agreed with the point made by the Senator from South Dakota that the REA formula needed some modifications to meet the realities. However, I have never agreed, and do not agree now, that the formula ought to be abolished. In fact, I believe that would be a serious mistake, from the standpoint of the REA associations. It is unfortunate that those who undertook to abolish the formula did not, instead, undertake to revise it according to the realities. However, the REA associations agree on that course of action, except the association in the State of Mississippi. I understand that the associations voted unanimously in favor of it at their national convention.

The REA Administrator has seen fit to ask Congress to abolish the formula entirely. The Senate committee at one time agreed. I am not being critical of the members of the committee, but I wish to point out that no legislative committee has ever undertaken a review of the formula so as to bring it into line with present needs from the standpoint of electrification, replacements, transmission lines, and a number of other electrical items with which I am not too

familiar, but which have to do with increasing the amount of electricity to the people who are now being served. I believe that such a review was essential in order to obtain a really practical formula under which Congress could appropriate money. Perhaps the House committee will hold some hearings on the subject and develop facts along that line.

However, we are face to face with the proposition of retaining a part of the formula, and the amendment is worked out along that line. The members of the Committee on Appropriations have been greatly interested in having some kind of a formula retained. I believe that if no formula is provided with reference to these matters, trouble will soon develop for the REA's, popular and powerful as they may be. So I am certainly glad that some measure of the formula is being retained. I think it will serve a good purpose. I think the bill as amended will be stronger.

I wish to thank the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Minnesota for their patient consideration of the matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I recognize that the Senator from Mississippi has been greatly concerned because he wished to be certain that no farm or community in his State would be placed in a position of jeopardy because of lack of funds. I can fully understand his concern. For that reason I was most anxious that there should be a meeting of minds and the best solution of the problem should be reached, so that the Administrator of the REA program would be unshackled and could make available, in his discretion, as much of the funds as might be possible, and that every year the appropriation could be reviewed.

I was speaking for the cosponsors of the bill when I stated that we would accept the amendment and permit action to be taken on the bill. I also stated that the Senator from Mississippi and I had discussed it since the Senate reconvened today.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks. It is my opinion, as an individual Senator, that we should have gone a little further into the matter of actual need. So far as my State is concerned, I think the conditions will be taken care of under the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I would assure every citizen of the State of Mississippi that so long as the distinguished Senator is a Member of this body they will have no need to worry about whether they will receive the necessary funds, because the Senator will see that they get the funds. That I can say without any question.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Minnesota. He is overgenerous, indeed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been interested in the colloquy between the Senator from Mississippi and the Senators from Minnesota. I want to be sure that the citizens of the State of Kansas will be protected by the amendment on which the Senators have agreed. Are the allocations such that the citizens of Kansas will be protected?

Mr. STENNIS. I think I can assure the Senator from Kansas that his State will be taken care of under this amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to include in my remarks the Senator from Kansas. I know of no two Members of the Senate who have greater concern for the farming or rural areas of their respective States than the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Mississippi have. Both of them work for the interests of their citizens.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota disarms me, of course. I had in mind some rewriting of the present language so as to provide such a reallocation of funds as would enable as many persons as possible to be served with electricity. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, he is rather insisting that Congress shall have some control over the funds. Therefore, does the Senator from Mississippi feel that under this new provision all the States will be properly cared for?

Mr. STENNIS. I do. The money is to be released to the Administrator to use in his discretion, with the limitation that he cannot use more than 25 percent of the other 75 percent of the funds in any one State. I think that will take care of the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think there is no doubt that the State of Kansas and the other States are most generously taken care of. I have the personal assurance of the REA Administrator to that effect.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this colloquy has convinced me that good work has been done in trying to draft an amendment which will protect the citizens of all the States. I appreciate what has been done.

Mr. STENNIS. At the same time, it protects the legislative viewpoint. I have always insisted that there should be some kind of a formula.

Mr. President, under the circumstances as they have been stated, I shall support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the taking of the vote on Senate bill 153 a statement prepared by me, and also a letter from Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT IN BEHALF OF THE PASSAGE OF S. 153, AS AMENDED

I have listened carefully to the debate and read much of the RECORD concerning this matter and I would like to compliment all the Senators who took part in the debate on the objective manner in which this most important subject has been handled.

I should like to also compliment the distinguished majority leader and my able colleague, the distinguished minority leader, for their part in the presentation of this proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate.

The passage of S. 153 is most essential to the rural areas of Colorado and I am informed by Mr. Ancher Nelsen, the capable Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, that Colorado is the only State in which the operation of the State allotment formula contained in the Rural Electrification Act is presently preventing prompt action on approval of loans.

I am informed that the processing of four loans in Colorado, totaling in amount approximately $13,300,000, is nearing completion. These loans are for generation, transmission, and distribution requirements. However, under the present State allotment formula of the Rural Electrification Administration, the funds remaining available for loan purposes in Colorado are approximately $7,200,000. This indicates that the amount required is $6,100,000 short of being able to meet the legitimate applications. This shortage exists because of the allotment formula not because of the money, which is now available in the loan fund. As has been said before, there remains in the national fund available for loans at this time $108,000,000.

On the anniversary of REA many laudatory statements were most justifiably made by my colleagues in the Senate but I should like to add one paragraph as a tribute to the sound business philosophy behind the Rural Electrification program when properly managed. As an example, and to show that Rural Electrification is no give-away program, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the Morgan County Rural Electrification Association in northeastern Colorado. This Rural Electification Association is paying off the first portion of their system indebtedness 17 years ahead of schedule and, in addition, have been able to refund $127,000 to their consumers in their 1954 electrical bills. This is a patronage dividend equal to 13 percent of their gross electric bills for that year. Rural Colorado is now more than 93.8 percent electrified but additional work must be done. I am sure that, if time permitted, I could cite other examples of good business management in county rural electrification associations in Colorado. At the same time I am pleased to say that generally the cooperation has been good between the rural electric associations and the private power utilities that supply the municipal areas of our State. At the present time, they each seem to recognize the legitimate function of the other and I believe there is no intention of either to jeopardize the other's rightful and lawful function.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: This is in response to your request for information on the status of pending electric loans in Colorado and on any matters that may delay their approval.

Colorado is the only State in which the operation of the State allotment formula contained in the Rural Electrification Act is working to prevent the prompt meeting of loan needs. Processing of 4 loans in Colorado, totaling in amount approximately $13,300,000, is nearing completion. These loans are for generation, transmission, and distribution needs. Funds remaining available for loan purposes in Colorado under the

limitations of the allotment formula approximate $7,200,000. This reflects a shortage from the amount required of more than $6,100,000.

This shortage exists because of the allotment formula and in spite of a national remaining availability of loan funds approximating $108 million.

Following the appropriations hearings, we estimated that our needs for Colorado in excess of the State ceiling would amount to approximately $5,500,000. However, we pointed out that the loans for this amount would be processed in May or June and probably would be approved after July 1. Since that time, however, the situation has become more urgent in view of recent developments. First, as work has progressed on the processing of the applications the figure needed for the State has had to be somewhat increased. Second, the situation requiring prompt action on the loans has intensified. The area is critically in need of additional facilities for generation, transmission, and distribution of power.

The Department is giving exhaustive study to every possible avenue of relief to meet this situation. We deplore the possibility of being forced to delay action on these loans until the new fiscal year—a delay which, in view of the short construction period in Colorado, could be harmful to the satisfactory progress of the electrification effort. A supplemental authorization of about $115 million would be required in order to obtain the $6,100,000 needed, by reason of the operation of the allotment formula. Enactment of legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act by eliminating the formula, now before both Houses of the Congress, seems to offer the most orderly and expeditious way of meeting this urgent need.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 153) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS CAUSED BY DISASTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 234, Senate Joint Resolution 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. J. Res. 8) to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the membership of the Senate, particularly the able minority leader, to the fact that this is a joint resolution to amend the Constitution, and, in accordance with our general practice and our agreement ever since the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has been in a leadership position, and I have occupied a similar position, we expect to have a yea-and-nay vote on a joint resolution of this kind.

Therefore, I should like to give notice to the Senate that at the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my remarks will be addressed to Senate Joint Resolution 8, which is now the unfinished business.

During the past 9 or 10 years we have all been aware of the tremendous scientific progress in nuclear fission and of its potentialities for both good and evil. While we have the greatest hope that this tremendous new development will eventually be directed toward peaceful ends, it is still the better part of prudence for a nation, as well as individuals, to insure as far as possible, against all eventualities.

At the outset, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for being one of the first among us to take note of the constitutional problems I am about to discuss. I shall have more to say later about the part he has played in the development of the proposal now under consideration.

The Senator from California first introduced a joint resolution on this subject in the 81st Congress, and reintroduced similar proposals in the 82d and 83d Congresses. I also introduced a similar measure in the 83d Congress.

The resolution offered by the senior Senator from California in the 83d Congress was adopted by a vote of 70 to 1.

The Senator from California did not introduce such a resolution at this session. If he had, his measure would have been reported, instead of the one which is now before the Senate.

I hardly need remind the Senate of what would happen if 1 of the 20 megaton thermonuclear weapons were exploded on the Nation's Capitol. This weapon, which is already in existence, is the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT and is about 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima, according to a statement by Admiral Strauss and Dr. Libby in official information issued by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Following a surface burst of this weapon, it could be expected that a crater perhaps a mile and a half across and 200 feet deep would be blasted out of the earth.

The explosion of a similar weapon in the Pacific was sufficient to have buried 14 Pentagon buildings, and to have caused damage to a large additional area.

The fireball would blanket an area about 4 miles across. Blast pressures would cause the complete destruction of all structures and installations within a radius of 5 miles from the point of burst; in other words, an area 10 miles across.

Within this area of complete destruction we could expect fatal casualties of about 90 percent of the people, and there would be casualties of lesser magnitude throughout concentric circles for the next 15 miles. I use the word "lesser" advisedly—depending, of course, on the question of whether warning might be sufficient to secure shelter against radioactive fallout.

The question with which the Senate is concerned, in the measure before us today, is what would happen to the Government of the United States, from a constitutional viewpoint, under such conditions as I have outlined.

There is no question that government of a sort would survive, but what we want to assure is that representative, constitutional democracy could be reconstituted.

In providing for a method of government which would best reflect the public will the constitutional drafters produced a tripartite authority, composed of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. They designed the Constitution as not simply a fair-weather document, but a document to function during war as well as peace. It is no reflection on the framers of the Constitution, however, that they could not possibly foresee a 20-megaton weapon when they met in Philadelphia to draft this Nation's most basic document.

Considering first the executive branch of the Government, the Constitution authorized the Congress to provide for any sudden vacancy occurring in the office of the President after the succession of the Vice President to that position. Public Law 199, passed by the 80th Congress, provided that the line of succession after the President and Vice President should be the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, and the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, in that order.

Members of the judiciary are, of course, appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate, and the functioning and perpetuating of that office presents no great difficulties.

In the legislative branch we have two equal houses. Under the Constitution, as expanded by the 17th amendment, the State executives are authorized to fill vacancies in the Senate temporarily by appointment pending the next election. There is no such authority, however, in connection with vacancies occurring in the House of Representatives. Thus there would be no way of immediately reconstituting the House should there be a disaster to the Capitol.

As I mentioned earlier, one of the first to recognize this potential danger to our constitutional democracy was the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He introduced measures in the last three Congresses proposing an amendment to the Constitution. As I also said earlier, if he had introduced a similar bill at this session, I believe his proposal would have been the one to be reported at this time.

I was first made aware of this problem a number of years ago by a letter from the President of the Board of Trustees of the McCallie School of Chattanooga, Dr. J. P. McCallie, which is set forth on pages 10 and 11 of the record of hearings. I submitted a proposed amendment in the last Congress and again in this Congress.

During the study of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and the hearings on this proposal we found a great difficulty in the original proposal introduced by me and in the one the Senator from California had introduced. Both of these proposals predicated the appointive power on the existence of a national disaster or emergency. During the hearings it became evident that certain problems would arise if the power conferred could be invoked only in the event of a disaster causing a given number of vacancies. For instance, it would become necessary to decide what officer of the Government should proclaim the existence of a disaster and then to determine which of the vacancies were actually caused by the disaster or which were occasioned by natural causes. The proposal now before the Senate avoids these problems by eliminating reference to disasters.

The subcommittee was helped greatly in its consideration of the problem by letters received from a number of distinguished constitutional lawyers, including Dr. Edward S. Corwin, Dr. Noel T. Dowling, William W. Crosskey, and Harold G. Gallagher, all of which are printed in the appendix to the hearings which were held on March 15 of this year. It was largely as a result of their points of view and their statements of what they believe should be done that the resolution now under consideration was recast so as to avoid the confusion, possible litigation, and uncertainty which would arise, first, in determining what a disaster was, and also in setting forth in a constitutional amendment who should proclaim a disaster.

The resolution now before the Senate provides that on any date the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds one-half of the authorized membership, that is 218, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies then present or which may occur during that period in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy is permitted to serve only until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided by article I, section 2, of the Constitution. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], a member of the subcommittee, was very helpful in perfecting this language, and it has been approved by both the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee.

As Senators will observe from the language of the proposal, it does in fact permit the invocation of this extraordinary power only when this country is in a period of national emergency or disaster, but avoids the language which was so troublesome. A commonsense interpretation would dictate that whenever vacancies in the House of Representatives exceed one-half of the authorized membership, the Nation would be confronted by a national emergency or disaster in the ordinary sense of those terms. Consequently, it is clear that this extraordinary power will rarely be used, if ever—and we can all hope that it will never be used. If it must be used, however, the period within which governors may exercise their authority is limited by the terms of the resolution to 60 days after the last date on which the vacancies in the House exceed one-half of the membership.

The terms of the appointment are likewise limited by direct reference in the resolution to article I, section 2, of the Constitution. Article I, section 2, contains two provisions which limit the term of these temporary appointees. First, there is the provision requiring the Governors of the States to issue writs of election to fill vacancies as they happen in the House of Representatives. Secondly, there is the constitutional requirement that elections for Members of the House of Representatives shall take place every 2 years. Thus the terms of these appointees may be limited by either the holding of a general or special election. As I see it, special elections would likely be held within 60 days or 90 days following the creation of the vacancies, but no such time limit has been established on the terms of the appointees for the reason that an atomic attack on other cities might have impaired the election machinery within the States so that elections could not be held within that period. Nevertheless, it is clearly the sense of those who have thus far approved the proposed legislation that the appointments shall be temporary and that the Governors of the States shall be obliged to fill the vacancies by election as soon as possible and practicable. The requirements of article I, section 2, of the Constitution on the Governors are mandatory, and if they should unreasonably delay calling elections, they would be subject to writs of mandamus.

Mr. President, I am glad we are considering this proposal at a moment when tension is somewhat relaxed. That, I believe, is exactly the time when we should be considering an amendment such as this. I hope that we are making lasting progress toward a peaceful world. But the fact is that we have had two wars in 37 years, and if another should unfortunately come, then it might be too late for the consideration of such a measure as this.

I call attention to the hearings, which show that the agencies of the executive directly concerned with civil defense and the continuity of the Government approve the proposed amendment. These executive agencies approved a similar proposal during the last Congress, when the joint resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was before the Committee on the Judiciary. The State governors who responded to the committee's invitation to submit views during this year likewise approved of its purpose.

With some knowledge of the tremendous destructive power of thermonuclear weapons, it would, in my judgment, be the height of folly to delay submitting this amendment. The proposed constitutional amendment would require at least 2 years for ratification, since it must be approved by a two-thirds vote both here and in the House, and ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures, many of which meet only every 2 years.

In considering this proposed amendment, I ask the Senators to think of the institution it seeks to preserve. If a situation such as this resolution foresees should arise, then we can be sure that the Chief Executive, whoever he might be, would act promptly so that chaos would not develop. But aside from that consideration, a situation of this type would be replete with historic and far-reaching consequences. A President in such times would welcome the counsel and legislative assistance of Congress. And the people, whose rights would be so vitally affected by these decisions, would require participation in them through their representatives.

I hope, Mr. President, that the joint resolution will be approved, as one containing a similar idea was approved by the Senate last year.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and fully endorse the proposed constitutional amendment, provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 8, which is before the Senate at this time. I commend the Senator for having introduced and shepherded the proposal through the committee.

As has been so generously indicated by the distinguished Senator, this has been a matter which has caused me some concern ever since I was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and members of the committee gained additional knowledge as to what possibility might happen to our constitutional processes.

I may also say to the Senator from Tennessee I had proposed a joint resolution for introduction in this session, but when the Senator from Tennessee very promptly introduced his joint resolution on the 6th of January, so far as I was concerned I deferred to him, as I had no pride of authorship in the matter. I knew we were both interested in the end result, and I was very happy to see the joint resolution of the Senator from Tennessee. Therefore, I did not introduce my joint resolution which was similar to the one which had been debated on the floor.

I think the resolution in its present form is an improvement over the one the Senate acted on last year and overwhelmingly approved by a vote, I believe, of 70 to 1.

While it is not within our province either to predict or to suggest what the other House of Congress may do, I hope it will promptly be able to act on the joint resolution so that the proposed amendment can be submitted speedily to the several States. As the Senator from Tennessee has so ably pointed out, it is a form of insurance which we hope we shall never be called upon to use, but it seeks to correct what certainly is a weakness in our constitutional system.

While in the event a disaster of such great magnitude should befall, the Government of the United States would be able to function, because the President of the United States, or whoever his successor might be, would see to it that the processes of government were carried on, I think we have a responsibility to see to it that the processes of constitutional government are adequately safeguarded. Constitutional government under our system requires the ability of both the House of Representatives and the Senate to act.

Under the situation which existed at the time the Constitution was drafted there was no likelihood of the occurrence of a disaster of the magnitude which is now possible, whereby a majority of the Members of the House might be wiped out in a single instant. Science has progressed considerably since that time.

So far as the Senate is concerned, there would be no problem, because if we were to be obliterated today, the governors of our respective States could, if the need were sufficiently urgent, make appointments immediately thereafter, and new Senators could be on their way to wherever the seat of government might be, and could function as the Senate of the United States. But that is not true of the House of Representatives. Because of the delay which would result under the processes of writs of election, and particularly if we visualize the disturbed conditions which would exist in the country in such an emergency, and the difficulty of holding normal elections, a gap might be left in which that great body could not function. It is the House of Congress in which tax legislation originates, and where, as a custom, appropriation bills have originated, and the House has other clearly defined constitutional functions. If the House could not act, it would handicap the proper functioning of the Government under our constitutional processes.

So I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee, and to join with him in urging prompt and overwhelming approval of Senate Joint Resolution 8.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from California very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee in yielding to me, Mr. President.

The brief remarks I wish to make will be made with great deference to the present author and the prior author of the proposed constitutional amendment. Last year, when the joint resolution proposing this amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 70 to 1, I was the 1 Senator who voted against it. Later I received a very good letter, the author of which said he did not know whether I stated my reasons for voting against the proposed constitutional amendment, but that if I had not, he suggested that I not give them, because he admired the idea of having 1 Member stand against the rest of the membership of the Senate, whereas if I gave my reason for doing so, he might not agree with me. [Laughter.] Mr. President, I think that was a splendid letter, and perhaps today I should follow that advice.

However, I shall briefly state my reasons for believing we are getting the cart before the horse in reference to matters of this kind. I think it is a very serious thing to amend the Constitution in any way; but, in the first place, I think the proposed amendment would be evidence that we would be legislating in an atmosphere of fear.

This morning I read a news item to the effect that an Air Force general had said Russia has air superiority or air equality with us. I do not think he was correct in making that statement; but I believe that such statements instill a sense of fear in the minds of our people.

Somewhere else I read that someone advised the people that they should apply for FHA loans in order to build shelters to protect themselves from atomic attacks. I do not agree with that recommendation, because I do not think any attack is imminent; and I believe that such statements tend to instill a false sense of fear in the minds of the people.

Mr. President, if we pass the pending joint resolution, I believe we shall be sending to the people another message to the effect that we believe an attack is either imminent or probable, and that we are afraid of what might happen. This is merely another instance which demonstrates, I believe, that we could not give the Russians a better series of propaganda points, to be used throughout the world as evidence that we are afraid of them, that we think we are going to be attacked, and soon. I think we have overdone this thing, Mr. President.

I believe that by such means we help create a sense of fear in the minds of ourselves and in the minds of all the people of the Nation, instead of giving them sound assurance that we shall carry on and shall strengthen our defenses. By giving such assurance we shall bring about calmness and abiding faith that we shall continue to be the leading Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I believe it is one of the great heritages of the House of Representatives that no person has ever taken a seat or cast a vote in that body except by virtue of election by the people. That is a great pillar in our form of government, and it is one which I do not wish to have destroyed on the mere possibility that a way off yonder, somewhere, at some time, the Russians may attempt to attack us. Even if such an attack were probable, I think the physical facts are such that we certainly shall have a fair warning of a few hours or a few minutes, and certainly sufficient time for the Members of Congress to leave this building.

If that great heritage of the House of Representatives is to be destroyed, let the suggestion come first from the House of Representatives, Mr. President. The House did not even take up this proposal last year, as I understand, after the joint resolution was passed by this body by a vote of 70 to 1.

So I submit that if any change is to be made in the constitutional provision regarding the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, that great institution—and it is great; it is perhaps the greatest of the legislative branches of the Government—in the event fate should decree that steps should be taken to replace its Members, at least we can in good countenance await a suggestion from the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 2 years ago, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and later as chairman of its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I presided at long and extended hearings on this subject.

This year, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has devoted very long and, I may say, very weary hours not only in going over the testimony which was adduced last year, but also in listening to a group of new witnesses. In considering the proposed constitutional amendment, he called many meetings of the subcommittee, at which he presided as chairman; and I wish to say that he went into the matter with great interest, and in the most minute detail.

Mr. President, it is not often that a body such as ours has a Member who will devote such long hours to a task. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has devoted many, many hours to the proposed constitutional amendment. It is very natural, and often occurs, that the Senator who presides at such hearings will ask another Senator to preside over them at least for a part of the time. However, in this instance, the Senator from Tennessee sat through all the hearings and all the interrogations, except in the case of a few questions which some of us asked on the side. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee had, of course, the assistance of an able staff, which in my opinion did an extremely fine job; and in that connection I desire to pay tribute especially to Wayne Smithey, who has helped the committee immeasurably in its consideration of the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that the proposed constitutional amendment provided for by the pending joint resolution is an improvement over the one for which the Senate voted a year ago; and I hope the joint resolution will be unanimously passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on some of the observations which have been

made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

In the first place, this matter is not one relating only to the succession of the Members of the House of Representatives. If it involved only matters affecting the House of Representatives, there might be some validity to the argument that we should not be concerned with the proposal until after the House of Representatives had acted on it. However, this joint resolution relates to the preservation of constitutional government, a matter in which this body and every person in the Nation has a great interest. Not only do we wish to be sure that the Government of the United States will continue, in the event of an emergency, but we wish to have constitutional government continue. The 17th amendment, which was ratified in 1913, affects the election of Members of the Senate. I remember that at that time many of those who were particularly interested in having Senators elected by the people were Members of the House of Representatives. So in both these matters, which relate to carrying on our constitutional government and giving the people more "say" about it, all of us have an interest.

As to the question of alarming the people, Mr. President, let me say I have always felt that we follow the best course of action when we tell the people the facts. If the people know the facts, they do not become unduly alarmed. They form calm judgments.

So far as concerns the possibility of alarming the people because of a civil-defense program, in that event it might be that the making of any appropriations for civil defense would tend to alarm the people. However, the people need to know the facts. I am sure they wish to know that the situation is in such shape that they will be represented in the Congress of the United States, no matter what emergency may arise.

If we accede to this argument, we might as well say a husband should refrain from buying insurance for fear of alarming his wife or a parent should refrain from having his child vaccinated for fear of alarming the child.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I note that the preliminary section of the amendment embraces a cut-off date, which is a departure from any draftsmanship I have ever seen in the case of constitutional amendments. I am always concerned about submitting proposed amendments to the Constitution unless there is some definite date which will determine whether or not the amendment is to be approved by the requisite three-fourths of the States. This amendment does not specifically say that it shall be inoperative if it is not ratified within 7 years. How does the Senator from Tennessee construe this language? It provides that it shall be valid if it is ratified within 7 years, but it does not say that it shall not be effective if it is not ratified within 7 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That question was discussed with some of the witnesses who appeared before our committee. The general idea was that it was better not to make the 7-year provision a part of the proposed constitutional amendment itself. It was felt that that would clutter up the Constitution. Sometimes that is done. We wanted to put the 7-year limitation in the preamble. So the intention of the preamble is that it must be ratified within 7 years in order to be effective. I think that is what the preamble means. It provides:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress.

Article V of the present Constitution contains approximately the same language. It provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States—

And so forth. So I believe the language of the joint resolution follows almost exactly the language prescribed for amending the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not concerned about the fact that the proposed amendment would be a legal and appropriate part of the Constitution if ratified within 7 years. What troubles me is that if it is not ratified within 7 years, there is the likelihood that it will be circulating in space. At the present time a number of proposed amendments to the Constitution which have been submitted are floating around in space. Some of them have been ratified by 1 State, and some by 10 or 15 States. It seems to me that there should be a cutoff date in proposed constitutional amendments, if they possess sufficient merit to commend themselves to the legislatures within a given period of time.

Let me say that I heartily approve the Senator's proposed amendment to the Constitution. But there should be no question about the termination date. I wonder if the Senator would object to inserting, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Constitution", the word "only."

Mr. KEFAUVER. So as to read—"to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified—" and so forth?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should have no objection to such an amendment. I am advised by Mr. Smithey, of our staff, that he discussed with the legislative counsel's office the question the Senator has raised, and it was their opinion that the proposed amendment would not be floating around in space. However, I do not want the contingency mentioned by the Senator from Georgia to occur, anymore than he does. I think the insertion of the word "only" would make clear the intent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Constitution," to insert the word "only."

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the suggestion, and I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the joint resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays. The majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has already indicated that there should be a yea-and-nay vote on all proposed amendments to the Constitution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 8. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE],

the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—76

Aiken	Ervin	Martin, Pa
Allott	Frear	McClellan
Anderson	Green	McNamara
Barkley	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bender	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bricker	Hruska	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey	Payne
Bush	Ives	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Thurmond
Daniel	Lehman	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Douglas	Magnuson	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Eastland	Mansfield	
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	

NAYS—3

Byrd	George	Stennis

NOT VOTING—17

Bible	Jenner	Scott
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Flanders	McCarthy	Symington
Fulbright	Morse	Welker
Goldwater	Neely	Wiley
Gore	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives."

DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday we learned that once again it has been decided to hold up distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine because of confusion—the term used in the official explanation—confusion about the reports of tests of vaccine produced by another one of the private firms licensed to make Salk vaccine. Once again parents are left in doubt as to when their children may have the benefit of adequate, properly safeguarded inoculations with the wonderful new medicine.

Mr. President, when it comes to the proper handling of problems vitally affecting the health of the Nation's children, the present national administration could learn much from the example of our northern neighbors in Canada. This is not a political issue, and we must study what Canada has done in this program.

During the period of the development and the nationwide trials of the Salk vaccine, there has been close cooperation between our Canadian friends and those in charge of our own polio research. Canada suffered its own worst polio epidemic 2 years ago, and Canadians were glad to be able to make important contributions to the development of a means of eliminating this dread disease. For example, much of the fluid for growing the polio virus cultures was produced in the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories at the University of Toronto, and Canadian children participated in the statistical testing program.

CANADA HAD VACCINE PROGRAM READY EARLY

But on top of this valuable cooperation toward the final success of the vaccine, there has also been one important difference:

The announcement, on April 12, 1955, of that long-sought success found the Government of Canada prepared. On April 12, the Government of Canada had a national program. The Government of the great United States had none.

Canada has undertaken the distribution of Salk vaccine in accordance with a strict and orderly program which can command the confidence of Canadian parents, and which stands in sharp contrast to chaotic confusion which has developed in the United States in the 6 weeks since the vaccine was heralded as the answer to the dreaded infantile paralysis.

On April 12, 1955, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Honorable Paul Martin, was able to announce a comprehensive national program which had been developed in anticipation of the success of the vaccine. I think it is worthwhile to quote to the Senate an excerpt from his statement, because it speaks for itself in demonstrating the contrast with the unpreparedness of the Eisenhower administration. The Canadian minister referred to the need to complete vaccination of children before the beginning of the potential polio season on July 1. He then said:

> Because of these considerations and the fact that the production and testing of the vaccine is a long and complicated process extending over several months, the Government (that is, the Government of Canada), decided last fall that, although effectiveness of the vaccine had not yet been conclusively established, no time should be lost in making plans for the production of vaccine so that substantial quantities might be available in time for this year's polio season.

I invite special attention to the two following paragraphs from the statement of Canada's Minister of National Health and Welfare:

> Accordingly, arrangements were worked out, in cooperation with the ten provincial governments, under which the federal and provincial governments would share on a 50–50 basis the cost of underwriting the production of the vaccine at the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories. As a result, sufficient supplies are already available in Canada to immunize more than 500,000 children in selected early school-age groups under the active direction and supervision of provincial and local departments of health.
>
> For this production program and for related research carried out at the Connaught Laboratories, the Institute of Microbiology and Hygiene in Montreal, and other institutions, the Federal Government has provided grants exceeding $500,000.

Has any Senator heard any convincing explanations why our own Secretary of Health and Welfare could not have made such a statement on April 12, 1955?

COST: $1.50 IN CANADA, $4.20 IN UNITED STATES

Is there any convincing explanation why, 6 weeks after that date, our own Department of Health and Welfare should be once again stopping the already hopelessly delayed distribution of Salk vaccine, while they look into what they call "this whole very confused picture?"

Mr. President, there is another facet of the Canadian program which will be of interest to the American people. The Canadian Government obtains the supplies for its program of distributing the vaccine by purchasing the entire output of the Connaught Laboratories. The cost of the vaccine—of enough carefully tested vaccine for three immunizing inoculations—is $1.50. One dollar and a half, not for each shot, but for the vaccine for all three shots. That is the cost of the vaccine for the Canadian Government's program. There is no other price for private purchasers—because the government contracted for the entire output, no supplies from these laboratories are available through private channels in Canada.

I think the Senate will recall, Mr. President, that an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently told the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the cost to the United States Government of privately produced vaccine would be about $3.00 for a 3 cubic centimeter vial, and that through private channels 3 cubic centimeters would cost wholesalers from $3 to $3.60, and physicians from $4.20 to $4.50. I leave it to your imagination what the cost of shots may be to the children who

are able to gain access to immunization through these channels—after, that is, the "very confused picture" has been cleared up and distribution begins once again. But the children of Canada get the same vaccine, without the confusion, at a cost to their government of $1.50 for three vaccinations.

DEEDS MUST SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

I repeat, Mr. President, the accomplishment of our northern neighbors in preparing and carrying out this program contrasts tellingly with the confusion resulting from our own lack of a program. I think the American people are entitled to know the Canadian story, to learn that such problems can be handled rightly by a government which, when the public interest demands it, is not afraid to govern.

I should like to digress for a moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I am sure the Senator from Oregon is familiar with the fact that the 1951 census of Canada, according to the World Almanac, shows that the population of Canada is 14 million. That is slightly larger than the population of the State of California, and it is considerably smaller than the population of the State of New York. I am sure the Senator is also familiar with the fact that the so-called polio season varies considerably between the United States and Canada. Polio apparently is encouraged by warm weather. Figures show that the States in the northern areas had proportionately fewer cases of polio than States in the dry and more southern areas.

As I understand from testimony which I have read, the polio season seems to start in the southern portion of the United States and then gradually works northward.

Is it not possible that Canada is not faced with the same problem of a changing polio season, as we are in the United States, and that practically all of Canada is in the general area of States in the northernmost part of our country, with the exception perhaps of some of the New England States?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his observation. The Senator is correct when he says that Canada has approximately 10 percent of the population of the United States, and perhaps even less than that.

However, I do not understand how that fact has anything to do with the basic policy of whether our Government should have been as prepared as the Canadian Government was prepared for the distribution of the vaccine. One of our States has a population of no more than 150,000 people, and another of our States, with 16 million people, has a population that is greater than the population of Canada. Although there is that great difference in the population in various States of the Union, the basic principles of government within those States do not differ at all.

With respect to what the distinguished minority leader said about the polio season, it is true that the polio season during the spring prevails more in the southern area of our country than in the northern area. However, I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that one of the States in which the children have suffered most from inoculation with serum made by the Cutter Laboratory is the State of Idaho, one of the most northerly States of the Union and just across the border from the Canadian Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, in which the Canadian children have also received inoculations of vaccine. There is hardly any difference in climate between the northern section of the State of Idaho, on the one hand, and the extreme southern part of the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia on the other hand. Most of the people in those Provinces live along the southern border of Canada, along the railway belt. Nevertheless, it is in Idaho that children have suffered most from the distribution of defective vaccine.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Can the Senator from Oregon inform the Senate how many cc.'s have been used in Canada in the vaccination of Canadian children?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know.

Mr. PURTELL. In other words, the Senator has no knowledge of the number of children in Canada who have been vaccinated?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know the exact number of children who have been vaccinated in Canada.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator know of any number of children in our country who have been denied the use of the vaccine because of the lack of a distribution plan?

Mr. NEUBERGER. In this country?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have seen repeated announcements to the effect that there will not be a sufficient quantity of vaccine to go around.

Mr. PURTELL. We are talking about a distribution problem, not a production problem.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is obvious that there is a distribution problem, if there is not enough vaccine to go around.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator feel that there will not be a sufficient amount to go around and that therefore a distribution problem is presented? Does he feel that there will not be enough vaccine to go around because of a distribution problem? Is not the problem one of making sure that the vaccine which will be distributed will be the type which will give immunity, or at least not cause polio?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what our Government has not done. By its own admission, the vaccine which perhaps has caused polio in some children has already been distributed and has been used.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator from Oregon tell me in what respect our Government has failed to act in that regard?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course I shall tell the Senator. Our Government has failed, in my opinion, to give the slightest support to a governmental control program that should have been applied to a serum as new as this is, before there was wholesale licensing of manufacturers to produce it.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator inform the Senate whether he believes Canada is preparing its vaccine in a way which will guarantee that there will be complete immunization with its use?

Mr. NEUBERGER. When a vaccine is as new in its application and in its production as polio vaccine is, I should say that Canada, by licensing only one public laboratory at the University of Canada to produce it, and by testing each batch of vaccine, is following a wiser public policy than is being followed by this country in its wholesale granting of licenses to a vast and diverse number of private manufacturers.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that there is not a vast and diverse number of manufacturers who are making the serum, but only six manufacturers? Does he not further realize that in a Nation the size of the United States, with a population of 163 million people, not 14 million, as is the case with Canada, it would be many months before children in the first to third grades of our schools could be inoculated if the manufacture of the serum were limited to one producer?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say that if tests of the serum were necessary in 1954, similar tests should have been made in 1955. Such tests were not made in 1955. There has been entirely too much "on again, off again" in connection with this whole subject. First the vaccine is distributed, then it is recalled. Physicians are advised to give the shots, then they are advised not to give the shots.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator advising the Senate that Canada has a better way, a surer way, and that we lack the knowledge Canada possesses, which would enable us to go forward in a like manner?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We do not lack the knowledge. Our scientists have the knowledge. What we have lacked is a governmental program to provide for the testing of all the vaccine used, and a governmental program to see to it that the first batches available go only to those children in the most susceptible age brackets and to pregnant mothers—

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that the National Foundation has an order for 18 million cc's of the Salk vaccine?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from Connecticut doubt the statements appearing in the press and magazines of the United States? For example, in Time magazine, which is certainly partial to the administration, it is stated that in many instances the vaccine has gone not to doctors who have patients who are most susceptible, but to the doctors who have the most business with the drug houses.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Can the Senator refer the Senate to any material which upholds the statement he has just made?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I asked the Senator from Connecticut if he had seen the statement made in Time magazine and if he doubted it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I doubt it.

Mr. PURTELL. I have not seen the statement, and I am not in the habit of either denying or confirming statements which I have not read.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am quoting to the Senator a statement appearing in Time magazine, a magazine which is very partial to this administration, that drug houses are distributing vaccine to doctors of their own choosing, rather than to those most entitled to receive it. If that statement is incorrect, I should be very happy to know it, because I think the national welfare is the most important consideration.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Did the Senator take the time to check to see whether the statement was or was not correct before quoting it in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I presumed that if Time magazine, which is so friendly to the administration, makes a statement of that kind, it must have checked it. Does the Senator doubt that drug manufacturing firms are producing vaccine which, unfortunately, has been defective, and that it is going to doctors to whom they wish to sell it?

Mr. PURTELL. I doubt it. Eighteen million cc.'s of vaccine have been ordered by and will be delivered to the foundation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator from Oregon know that there have been no deliveries since April 21?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If that be true, I am very glad of it. During the period between the announcement of the discovery of the vaccine and April 21, there was strong protest on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere because of the completely chaotic situation which prevailed in those weeks. If what was being done up to April 21 was all right, why was it necessary to stop it?

Some of us may remember, Mr. President, a phrase President Eisenhower used in trying to illuminate the progressive moderation, or the dynamic conservatism, supposedly guiding the policies of his administration. As I recall, President Eisenhower said that he was a conservative in financial affairs, but a liberal in human affairs. Those are fine phrases, Mr. President. But phrases alone will not guide a great Nation. Deeds, too, are essential. In the crisis of the Salk vaccine, the national administration has tried to substitute words for deeds.

This is particularly distressing when we consider that, across the frontier to the north, our closest neighboring land, the Dominion of Canada, has put into effect a program for governing the distribution and the manufacture of antipolio vaccine in the interest and welfare of every Canadian child and parent. Deeds speak louder than words. When will the Eisenhower administration follow Canada's constructive leadership in this vital field of child health?

Mr. President, I wish to say, in conclusion, that I was much interested in the question asked me by the junior Senator from Colorado. I want to ask if the policy followed by the administration prior to April 21 was a wise one, why did the administration change its policy on April 21? It seems to me that April 21, 1955, was not the time to be ready with a program, but that last fall, perhaps, when the news of the Salk vaccine was available to the Departments of Health of both Canada and the United States, was the time to be ready with a program. The Canadian Minister pointed out that Canada was getting ready in the fall of 1954. If we have any program at all it dates only from April 21, 1955, which is certainly a vastly important time to the parents and children of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to comment very briefly on the colloquy I had this afternoon with several Members across the aisle on the question of the distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine. During that discussion I was citing the program worked out by the Department of Health and Welfare, of the Government of Canada, for an orderly production, testing, and distribution of the Salk vaccine in that great nation across the border to the north. During the discussion, several Members across the aisle took exception to my statement that the Salk vaccine had been distributed by drug houses in the United States not necessarily to doctors who have patients who are children, and who thus are most susceptible to polio, but to doctors who have favorable relationships with those drug companies.

Since the discussion occurred, I have had an opportunity to check with the Library of Congress; and at this time I should like to quote exactly from several issues of Time magazine, and from the New York Times.

The following is an exact quotation from the issue of Time magazine for May 2, 1955; and the article from which I shall quote discussed the production and distribution of the Salk vaccine:

> The situation was further complicated when, weeks ago, "detail men" for drug companies called on doctors and asked how much vaccine they wanted. How much they actually got depended less on how far ahead the company was with its production program than on how the salesmen liked individual doctors.

Mr. President, if that statement in Time magazine was not accurate—and the Senator from Connecticut said he doubted its accuracy—then it seems to me that a serious charge of that nature should have been denied at the time, which was May 2, either by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by the six drug companies which have been licensed to produce the Salk vaccine. That was a serious statement in a nationally circulated magazine.

It is passing strange, indeed, that members of the political party representing the administration have waited until May 19—more than 2 weeks later—to deny that charge, if indeed the charge was inaccurate.

The issue of Time magazine for May 9, 1955, carried an article entitled "Vaccine Gray Market." I shall not read into the RECORD or quote the entire article; but one of the statements in the article, which is about the Salk vaccine, reads as follows—and I am now quoting from the article in Time magazine:

> Moreover, 80 packages had been handed out as largesse to employees of the drug houses and their friends and relatives.

Mr. President, that was over 1 week ago. If packages of the Salk vaccine are being given out as "booty" to persons who work for the drug houses and their personal friends and favorites, that is also, indeed, a serious charge; and if the charge, as published in Time magazine, is not true, why was the charge never denied by the proper Government department and by the drug houses?

Perhaps the Members of the Senate remember when the public first learned, in the news, of the defective vaccine from the Cutter Laboratory. I have before me a clipping from the New York Times, and the headline reads as follows:

> MISUSE OF VACCINE LAID TO FIVE DOCTORS

The article in the New York Times goes on to point out that a number of adults in the city of New York received innoculations of the antipolio vaccine, although everyone knows that children are infinitely more susceptible to the disease, and therefore are far more entitled to receive the "shots."

Mr. President, let me say that these are not pleasant things to relate. For the past week, I have been communicating with Canadian officials, in an effort to learn how Canada has handled the program, so that perhaps our country can benefit by Canada's example and by studying what Canada has done.

I regret that the Members across the aisle doubted what I said in reference to the lack of a program in the United States. They questioned my comments about the fact that in this country the vaccine had gone to doctors favored by the drug companies, rather than to doctors with the patients who are the most susceptible to the disease.

All I can say in conclusion, Mr. President, is that perhaps these magazines and newspapers may have been in error—although they are among the leading publications in the country—but if they were in error in what they printed, that should have been pointed out at the time of publication, and not today, on the floor of the Senate, a considerable number of weeks later.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, particularly those Members who desire to make their plans for today, I should like to announce that for the remainder of the evening the plan is to consider 4 or 5 bills on the calendar which have been previously cleared with the minority leader, and which the Senate has been informed were expected to be considered when action was concluded on the joint

resolution which was passed earlier in the afternoon.

No rollcalls are expected, Mr. President. I do not think there is any thing controversial in the measures to be considered.

It is hoped to have the road bill, S. 1048, made the unfinished business, to have just general discussion of it on Friday, then recess until Monday, and have further discussion of the road bill on Monday. Under the agreement reached today, action on the President's veto of the postal pay bill will be taken on Tuesday, and we shall then proceed with the road bill as far as possible.

Mr. President, I now desire to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 355, House bill 3322, and I call the attention of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3322) which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "(a)"; in line 8, after the word "following", to strike out "No property shall be transferred under this subsection until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State."; on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No property shall be transferred (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) of this subsection), until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State, and no property shall be transferred pursuant to this paragraph until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such agency or official has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property."

On page 3, line 4, after the word "under", to insert "paragraph (2) of"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "for", to strike out "educational purposes or" and insert "educational"; in line 5, after the word "health", to insert "or memorial"; in line 13, after the word "restriction", to insert "which occurred prior to the enactment of this act"; in line 14, after the word "is", to insert "pending at the time of, or"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "if", to insert "(1) such violation occurred prior to the expiration of such one-year period and (2)"; in line 3, after the word "is", to insert "pending at the time of enactment of this Act or is"; in line 4, after the word "commenced", to strike out "within" and insert "not later than"; in line 16, after the word "property", to strike out "donated" and insert "disposed of"; in line 21, after the word "donated", to insert "or disposed of", and after line 22 to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the words "Federal Security Administrator" and "Federal Security Agency" wherever they appear in subsection (j) or (k) of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare", and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare", respectively.

(b) Section 203 of such act, as amended by this act, is further amended (1) by striking out in paragraph (1) of subsection (j) thereof the words "the States, Territories, and possessions" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any State", and (2) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(5) The term 'State', as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(c) Clause (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after "District of Columbia" a comma and the words "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, H. R. 3322, which was passed by the House, came to the Senate and was considered by the Committee on Government Operations, which made some minor amendments to the bill.

The bill provides that surplus personal property carried in a working capital or similar fund in any Federal agency is to be considered for donation to educational or health institutions on the same basis as surplus personal property which is not carried in such a fund. The purpose of the bill is to make clear that the Congress does not intend, and has never intended, to exempt surplus personal property from the donation program merely because it is carried in a working capital fund managed by the Department of Defense or any other agency, regardless of the time it was procured or the accounting classification under which procured or carried on the books of the owning agency.

Mr. President, there has been quite a loophole in the act affecting surplus property, which is intended, under existing law, to be made available for health and educational purposes. The purpose of the bill is to close that loophole and to make all Government personal property which may become surplus available for donation, where suitable, for educational or health uses, by having the property designated as surplus, rather than sold and disposed of by the agency wherein the excess or surplus arises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 1805, amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1805) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, bills similar to the pending bill have previously been passed twice by the Senate.

The bill provides the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in connection with the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government.

I may say that the bill seeks to accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of Members of the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

In 1952 a similar bill, in substantially the form of the pending bill, was passed by the Senate by a vote of 55 to 8, but failed of passage in the House. Thereafter, the bill was reintroduced in the 83d Congress, as Senate bill 833; and at that time it was cosponsored by 54 Members of the Senate. In that Congress the bill was passed unanimously by the Senate, but likewise failed of passage in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1805) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the

Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and to be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grant-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a 10-year period.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or

resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102; and if the Senator from Utah will yield, since he has been recognized, I should like to make that motion and have the resolution brought before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The resolution relates to conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

Mr. WATKINS. The resolution has no relationship to the Kempner estate, has it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, none whatever, nor to the State of Utah, nor to any particular church, nor to any particular day of the month. The resolution is simply a private resolution coming from the Senator's own committee.

Mr. WATKINS. I wished to be sure the resolution came from the Judiciary Committee.

Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

GEORGE D. EMERY CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in connection with the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 102) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution is to refer the bill (S. 427) for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co., to the Court of Claims. The claim involves difficult questions of fact and law, including compensation for services performed by this company on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies, in connection with establishing an abaca plantation in Ecuador, in accordance with the Abaca Production Act of 1950—Public Law 683, 81st Congress.

The procedure involves a hearing by the Court, with a report back to Congress, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States.

Mr. President, I am informed by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, from which this measure comes, that this formula has been used many times by the Congress in connection with complex claims brought to the attention of the committee.

It is the intent of the Judiciary Committee that the Court of Claims consider only equitable or legal rights to unrecovered expenses, not any claim to profits.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 427) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a representative of the arid West, which has been helped immeasurably by the Bureau of Reclamation in the development of its limited water resources, I am gratified that Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer has come out in a frank and forthright statement to set the record straight on the soundness of the Colorado River storage project and the reclamation program generally.

Commissioner Dexheimer has shown great forbearance and patience in keeping silent during the past several months when individuals and propaganda-pressure groups have been directing one of the most unfair and untruthful attacks ever unleashed at a public-works program.

Commissioner Dexheimer is a highly respected engineer who participated in planning and construction of Hoover Dam, Shasta Dam, and other great engineering works. His statement will carry great weight among engineering people and reasonable people who respect fair play and consideration of all the facts.

In view of the importance of giving these facts on the Colorado River storage project and the Government's reclamation program a public airing to counteract some of the untruthful propaganda which is being poured out by people who seek to prevent water development in the arid West, I hereby request unanimous consent to have Mr. Dexheimer's statement of May 13, 1955, printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I desire to point out to my good friend the Senator from Utah that I do not believe I took an unreasonable position regarding the proposed Colorado storage project legislation; nor do I believe that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now occupies the chair, took an unreasonable position on the measure.

Let me say to the Senator from Utah that reasonable men may disagree about questions which are subject to debate, and I do not assert that my friend the Senator from Utah should be classified as unreasonable.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from California thought I was referring to him. I do not know that the statement which I mentioned refers to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. WATKINS. However, if Mr. Dexheimer's statement applies to the Senator from California rather than to Mr. Moley and the magazine Newsweek, it will have to apply; I cannot help it.

Let me say I have no disrespect for the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now is presiding over the Senate. However, I wish to have the statement to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer said today that critics are attempting, by unwarranted distortion and omission of facts, to discredit and bring to a halt efforts to help meet the West's critical water shortages.

His statement follows:

"The Bureau of Reclamation expects and welcomes thoughtful and constructive criticism which is based on solid facts and knowl-

edge of what has been accomplished in the past half century and what is proposed for the future.

"However, it is time to take a close look at the indiscriminate attack of those critics who are attempting, by every means at their command, to destroy public confidence in our efforts to assist the arid Western States in meeting their water needs. The attacks are currently centering on the proposed upper Colorado River storage project which was worked out under the terms of the Colorado River compact and in cooperation between the Federal Government and the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, to enable the States to utilize their apportioned share of Colorado River water. These critics are much less careful in their handling of the facts than those individuals and groups who have opposed virtually every major project ever undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Yet, who is there today who will challenge the worth of such facilities as the lower Colorado River development, Hoover Dam, Imperial Valley, the Central Valley project, Grand Coulee Dam, Boise Valley, Salt River project, or the Colorado Big Thompson project.

"Leslie A. Miller, who is a former governor of Wyoming and who should be aware of the importance of reclamation work in that State as well as elsewhere in the West, has repeatedly cited the increased cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as a reason it should not have been built and why other projects, such as the upper Colorado River storage project, should not be undertaken.

"Let Mr. Miller repeat his accusations, as made in the Reader's Digest and other periodicals, in front of any group of Colorado farmers who were saved from almost total drought disaster last summer by the successful functioning of this project. Or let him put his accusation in proper perspective by quoting the correct original estimate of costs and then point out that World War II intervened between the time this estimate was given and the time the bulk of the project was constructed. He conveniently neglected to mention the 250 percent increase in the construction cost index during the 18 years between authorization and completion of construction.

"Like Raymond A. Moley, in his multitudinous dissections of reclamation in Newsweek magazine, Mr. Miller neglects to mention that reclamation, unlike other water resources work undertaken by the Federal Government, is on a hard-cash repayment basis. They choose to ignore the fact that out of a total reclamation expenditure of $2,850,146,288 in the last half century, $577,822,640 has been repaid and that $60 million is flowing into the Treasury annually at the present time. This includes interest on the Federal investment in hydroelectric and municipal water facilities.

"It should be remembered that more than half of Reclamation's annual appropriation is now coming from the revolving Reclamation Fund which was established by the Congress by the Reclamation Act of 1902. This same Congress established the principle that funds for irrigation development should be loaned without interest as a means of advancing the national economy. The same principle has been followed by every Congress since 1902.

"The facts are that this investment is paying off, not only in the cash repayment to the Treasury but in its positive contributions to the national economy and well-being.

"The records are replete with instances of reclamation project areas pouring into the Federal Treasury in income taxes alone, more each year than the total Federal investment in project facilities. Buying power of more than $750 million annually is contained in the crops the farmers take from their irrigated fields on Federal reclamation projects.

"The Federal Government, over the years, has spent millions and billions for flood control, navigation, transportation subsidies, drought relief, crop support, and crop insurance without expectation or hope of reimbursement. But these areas of disaster continue to plague us while the irrigated oases in the arid West remain solid units of stabilized agricultural production. I have no quarrel with the Federal policy, but why pick on western irrigation?

"It was interesting to note in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, an editorial supporting an increased appropriation of $18 million for a channel-deepening project in the Delaware River which would benefit particularly the United States Steel Corp. by permitting oceangoing ore boats to unload at dockside for the new Fairless plant. Will this investment be paid back by local beneficiaries? The Saturday Evening Post editorial is proposing a writeoff of this local harbor improvement in the Delaware River. Reclamation investments will be returned to the Treasury. The West only asks for a loan and a reasonable time to repay.

"Specific criticism of the proposed upper Colorado River storage project by Mr. Miller, Mr. Moley, et al., concerns three main points: (1) An incredible bill from the nonpayment of interest on irrigation features of the project; (2) compounding of the crop surplus problem by the addition of new irrigated lands; (3) the construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument would be an opening wedge in the desecration of our national park system.

"Mr. Moley's description of an incredible bill for interest is just that—totally incredible. The facts are that 63½ percent of costs are chargeable to power and municipal and industrial water and will be repaid with interest at 2½ percent which is the same interest paid by the United States Treasury.

"The upper Colorado River project report, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, proposes an expenditure of about $300 million for irrigation phases of the project. These funds will be spent over a period of more than 25 years and repayment on each irrigation unit will start soon after it is completed. A few years are allowed before repayment begins to permit the farmer to establish himself on the land.

"Current national troubles with crop surpluses have been used to becloud the reclamation picture and particularly to delay the authorization of several projects which are now before Congress. Completely ignored by the critics is the fact that most products of western irrigated farms are not under price support or acreage control and are not surplus. Seventy-five percent of land irrigated by the upper Colorado River projects would be for livestock production.

"More important in the agricultural production picture is the long-range population estimate. The Bureau of the Census fixes our national population at 200 million in 1975. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, is authority for the statement that, 'If the average American is to continue to have as much meat to eat as he did last year, all acreage that is currently idle will have to be put back to work by 1950. By 1975, even if all marginal lands are used, there might be a deficit of more than 100 million acres. To meet this, livestock production alone will have to be doubled on the land at hand.' Few new lands in the upper Colorado River Basin would receive water before 1975 if the project was authorized tomorrow.

"The Bureau of Reclamation makes no pretense of expecting to solve this approaching national food-production crisis by the construction of reclamation projects alone. We believe that in the decades ahead there will be a continued increase in per acre production and also in total acreage under production, both by irrigation and the drainage of present swampland. However, at the present time, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, we are fighting a losing battle to maintain our present cultivated acreage.

"Urban inroads are claiming more acreage than we are placing in production by irrigation. We must plan now for the future. To do otherwise would be criminally shortsighted.

"The so-called invasion of national parks should be considered in the light of a careful documentation of dam sites and reservoir areas withdrawn specifically for power and reclamation purposes along the Green and Yampa Rivers and events leading to the subsequent enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument to encompass the same area by Presidential order on July 14, 1938.

"One reclamation and 10 power-site withdrawals (land and dam sites set aside by Federal action) were made along these rivers between 1904 and 1925 covering, among other areas, the Echo Park and Split Mountain dam and reservoir sites. The National Park Service, by letter dated August 9, 1934, to the Federal Power Commission, observed that the proposed proclamation (to enlarge Dinosaur Monument) would protect all existing rights, and inquired as to whether the Echo Park and Blue Mountain sites might be released. The Federal Power Commission replied on December 13, 1934, that the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

"The request was renewed in a letter dated November 6, 1935, over the signature of Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior. The Federal Power Commission again rejected the request on January 6, 1936, quoting the identical language of the previous letter to the National Park Service. The Presidential proclamation of 1938 made the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument subject to all existing rights. Therefore, it would appear that there is actually no invasion of the national park system but merely the exercise of a previously established reservation. The original 80-acre Dinosaur Monument contains all known fossils and is 20 miles downstream from any proposed reservoir. It would not be disturbed.

"Despite this previous withdrawal of the Echo Park and other multipurpose dam sites for reclamation purposes, we are not anxious to construct a reclamation structure in this area if alternate sites are feasible. Conclusive investigations over 20 years have ruled out any of the suggested alternates because they would provide less storage space, involve greater evaporation losses and reduce the power output from the upper Colorado Basin system. The large reservoir storage is essential to hold floodwaters in years of excess runoff for use in drier years and seasons of low-river flow. Maximum power output is essential because power revenue will repay the bulk of project costs.

"Development and conservation of a maximum supply of water and power is essential to the continued economic growth of the area. There is and will continue to be a market for the 6-mill power which will be produced. All 10 private utility companies serving the area have testified before the committees of Congress that they would take all available power at the 6-mill rate. Preference agencies have also expressed a need for the power output.

"Reclamation engineers have established a worldwide reputation in water conservation by the investigation, design, construction, and operation of the numerous reclamation projects which now dot the western scene. We do not take lightly the challenge to our integrity by those critics who prefer the scattergun attack to a careful adherence to the facts."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, both Mr. Dexheimer's statement and the Tribune editorial are clear and forthright, and need no explanation. In view of the liberties which have been and are being taken with the truth in regard to the reclamation program, it is both timely and refreshing to have the Reclamation Commissioner and a great newspaper speak out so firmly in defense of accuracy and fair play.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial referred to, which was published in the Salt Lake Tribune on Sunday, May 15, 1955, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWERING MOLEY-MILLER PROPAGANDA BLAST

"Why pick on western irrigation?"

With this question, Reclamation Commissioner Wilbur A. Dexheimer last week-end pointed up a brilliant defense of the upper Colorado River project against the published attacks of ex-New Dealers Leslie A. Miller, of Cheyenne, and Raymond A. Moley, Newsweek columnist.

Mr. Dexheimer is no wild-eyed promoter of big dams. His record is one of stanch conservatism. Before a reclamation project is submitted to Congress he insists that its engineering and economic feasibility be proved. The Bureau of Reclamation has refused to go ahead on a number of projects in recent years, despite terrific local pressure, because of doubts as to feasibility.

Mr. Dexheimer pulled the rug out from under the Moley-Miller team by pointing out that their attacks on economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project fail to give credit for reimbursable features of reclamation loans or the corollary benefits in increased taxes and new markets. And he pointed out that some enemies of reclamation projects are thumping for huge harbor and dredging projects which would return not a cent directly to the taxpayer, notably the proposed $18 million Delaware River Channel deepening project.

Unlike many other water resources projects undertaken by the Federal Government, reclamation is on a hard cash repayment basis. Of the $2,850,146,238 expended for reclamation in the last half century, $577,822,640 has been repaid and $60 million is flowing back into the treasury each year.

Other studies show that reclamation projects will repay more than construction costs over the years through increased tax yields. Some areas developed through reclamation in 20 years have paid $2.75 into the Federal Treasury in taxes for every dollar spent on construction.

Glib opponents of reclamation—or their ghost writers—are constantly warning taxpayers as to their share of the total cost of such projects as the upper Colorado. Actually, sound studies show the upper Colorado project would be self-liquidating. Moreover it would open up vast storehouses of raw materials and provide job opportunities for many people. It would accelerate the decentralization of industry and create new wealth markets and defensive materials for all the country.

The attack on the economic and engineering feasibility of the upper Colorado program has gained momentum since the phony cries of "national park invasion" failed to block the program. Facts and figures showing that both Federal water and power withdrawals antedated extension of the national monument to include Echo Park have greatly weakened the invasion arguments. Mr. Dexheimer likened Echo Park's relation to the overall project to one wheel of a wagon. It might still run without the wheel but not very far.

The calamity howlers will continue to try to stir up opposition throughout the country, just as they did before the building of Hoover Dam, the Colorado-Big Thompson, and other western reclamation projects. But it was one of the most violent of the critics who, in a more temperate article quoted a western hydrologist as giving the "last word" on the matter of water costs: "There is no price for water and so there can be no ceiling price."

EXTENDING TITLE II, FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 359, House bill 4052, which would continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4052) to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill is part of legislative program of the Department of Defense for 1955, and was introduced at that Department's request. Its purpose is to extend for 2 years, or until June 30, 1957, title II of the First War Powers Act. The existing law provides that the extension may be terminated at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress, and this proposal would in no way change that provision.

The basic purpose of the statute is to permit the President to authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the national defense effort to enter into contracts and into amendments of modifications of contracts, and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, whenever he deems such action would facilitate the national defense, subject, however, to certain safeguards set forth in title II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4052) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN SHIPS TO CITIZENS OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 362, Senate Joint Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1946," to strike out "two" and insert "five"; on page 2, line 1, after the colon, to insert *"Carrick Bend, Masthead Knot, Snug Hitch";* in line 3, after the colon, to strike out *"Provided,* That with respect to vessels under charter on the date of enactment of this act, and which have been continuously under charter for a period of 5 years or more, there shall be subtracted from the sales price, as depreciation, $95.05 per day per vessel for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel" and insert in lieu thereof *"Provided,* That with respect to each of the said vessels one-half of the charter line paid to the United States shall be subtracted from the sales price as additional depreciation for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States. ", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong.), as amended, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to sell to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, five vessels named herein: *Carrick Bend, Masthead Knot, Snug Hitch, Boatswains Hitch,* and *Turks Head,* which at present are in the Philippines: *Provided,* That with respect to each of the said vessels one-half of the charter line paid to the United States shall be subtracted from the sales price as additional depreciation for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.

In determining the order of preference between applicants for the purchase of such

vessels, first preference shall be given to the applicants who are charterers of such vessels under the terms of the aforesaid act of April 30, 1946, as amended, at the time of making application to purchase vessels under the terms of this act; second preference shall be given to applicants who suffered losses of interisland tonnage in the interests of the Allied war effort: *Provided*, That applications for the purchase of said vessels are received by the Secretary of Commerce within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

Except with the prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce, any vessel sold under this joint resolution shall, for a period of 10 years from the date of sale of the vessel, be operated only in the interisland commerce of the Philippines.

Delivery of the vessels for the purposes of sale shall be made at a port in the Philippines designated by the Secretary of Commerce.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the said vessels shall continue to operate in the Philippines under existing charters until such time as the agreements of sale are executed and deliveries of the vessels thereunder are accomplished.

For the purposes of this act, the term "citizen" includes any individual, corporation, partnership, association, or other form of business entity authorized to do business under the laws of the Republic of the Philippines.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 67, as amended, would authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to sell in accordance with the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, five vessels named in the resolution which are presently under charter to shipping companies in the Philippines. First preference between applicants for the purchase of the vessels would be given to the present charterers, the Philippine Steam Navigation Co.—charterers of the SS. *Boatswain Hitch* and the SS. *Turks Head*—and the Compania Maritima—charterers of the SS. *Carrick Bend*, the SS. *Masthead Knot*, and the SS. *Snug Hitch*. Second preference would be given to applicants who suffered losses of interisland tonnage in the interest of the Allied war effort. Applications for purchase must be received by the Secretary of Commerce within a year after enactment of the resolution.

In line with the views expressed by the conferees on Senate Joint Resolution 72, 83d Congress, 2d session, the joint resolution as amended would subtract from the sales price of each of the vessels one-half of the charter hire paid to the United States Government from July 1, 1954, to the date of execution of the contracts for each vessel. And, in line with the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary would be directed to fix the terms of payment on the unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.

Unless the purchaser is given prior approval by the Secretary of Commerce, any vessel sold under this joint resolution must be operated only in the interisland commerce of the Philippines for a period of 10 years from the date of sale. The existing charters are authorized to be continued until such times as the vessels are sold and delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 360, Senate bill 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 33) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I am waiting for certain information, I shall make a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of S. 33 is to repeal the provisions of the Executive order of February 1, 1917, which created the Papago Indian Reservation, the act of February 21, 1931, the act of June 18, 1934, and the act of August 26, 1937, insofar as they refer to location and entry under the mining laws of lands within the Papago Reservation. The bill provides that all tribal lands within the reservation are withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under the above laws, and that minerals underlying the reservation are made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe.

The reservation includes 2,700,000 acres of which, according to the latest available figures—as of December 1953—only 12,360 acres are included in mining claims, and only approximately 3,600 acres have been covered by mineral patent. A savings clause preserves all valid rights established heretofore under the mineral laws, but the enactment of the bill will protect the Papago Indians from further diminution of their reservation. Recent accelerated uranium prospecting has further increased tribal concern that the surface of large areas of land may later be lost to tribal utilization. The loss of further surface resources of the Papago Indian Reservation will increase the problem of administering Indian affairs on this reservation.

The committee believes that this reservation should be closed to all forms of mineral entry, that the Papago Tribe should be given fee title to the tribal lands, and that mining operations should be carried on under leases issued under the Tribal Leasing Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 25 U. S. C. 396a–f) as provided in S. 33.

The author of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], reported it from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I understand that he is detained from the Chamber. However, the report from the committee is unanimous, and I hope the bill may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions with respect to subjection of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation to exploration, location, and entry under the mining laws of the United States in the Executive order dated February 1, 1917, creating the Papago Indian Reservation, and in the third proviso in section 1 of the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1202), and the provisions of subsection (b) (1) and (2) of the remainder, following the word "purposes," of subsection (b) (4) of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U. S. C. 461–479), as amended by the act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 862, 863; 25 U. S. C. 463), are hereby repealed, all tribal lands within the Papago Indian Reservation are hereby withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under such laws, the minerals underlying such lands are hereby made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe, and such minerals shall be subject to lease for mining purposes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347): *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not be applicable to lands within the Papago Indian Reservation for which a mineral patent has heretofore been issued or to a claim that has been validly initiated before the date of this act and thereafter maintained under the mining laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 348; 25 U. S. C. 396f), is amended by deleting therefrom "the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona."

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The bill was introduced by the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr.

GORE]. In accordance with the statement previously made to the Senate, I assure the Senate that no votes will be taken on this measure today or tomorrow, except upon the motion to proceed to consider the bill, and certainly none will be taken before Monday of next week.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COST OF DEFENSE—FARM INCOME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under date of Friday, May 6, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, there was published a press story from the United Press, under the headline "Wilson Sees 3.5 Billions Arms Rise."

The article reads as folows:

WILSON SEES 3.5 BILLIONS ARMS RISE

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson indicated yesterday that future annual defense appropriations may have to be $3.5 billion more than the amount Congress is expected to provide for the year starting July 1.

Even with the "strict austerity" he is enforcing, Wilson said military spending will continue at the "high rate" of $35 billion a year for a long time. The House Appropriations Committee yesterday approved appropriations of $31.5 billion for the fiscal year starting July 1.

Wilson said when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, "requests for new obligational authority" will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

He made the forecast in an annual report submitted to the President and sent by the White House to Congress. It covered the year which ended last June 30.

The report included these highlights:

Wilson cited guided missiles as the one area where deliveries and spending are rising.

Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens said there is "aggressive" research on weapons "to meet the threat of low altitude air attack and the possible danger of intercontinental missiles."

Air Secretary Harold E. Talbott said that hydrogen bomb training has been made part of the regular courses in Air Training Command and the Air Force Academy because of the "rapidly growing demand" for personnel in the thermonuclear program.

Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas dealt at length with the "startling strength" of the Russian navy and urged "very substantial" new United States shipbuilding. Otherwise, he said, "the day may not be too far distant when we shall find Soviet warships freely cruising in every ocean, bringing the Red flag into every port and lying with their guns and guided missiles off our very shores."

I call attention to the second paragraph of the article:

Wilson said when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, "requests for new obligational authority" will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the chief spokesman of the administration for the Department of Defense is belatedly saying to the American people that the administration has been able to reduce some of the defense appropriation requests because, Mr. Wilson says now, in 1955, when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, requests for new obligational authority will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

I believe the facts are becoming ever more clear, namely, that the administration in many of these areas has lived on some borrowed time, if not on some borrowed capital, and has lived off the fat of more lush and profitable days.

I merely wanted to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate because when we examine the cash expenditures of this administration, we find that the situation is not any different than it has been during the past 10 years.

AGRICULTURAL INCOME

I should like to call attention to another item published in one of the newspapers. The headline of the article reads, "Farm Income Boost of 40 Percent Seen by 1975."

That headline would give one the impression that everything will be rosy in American agriculture in 1975. It predicts a 40 percent increase in agriculture income.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME BOOST OF 40 PERCENT SEEN BY 1975

An Agriculture Department economist predicted yesterday that the needs of an expanding population may boost the income of American farmers at least 40 percent by 1975.

Nathan Koffsky, Chief of the Farm Income Branch, told a meeting of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association that the income of the Nation as a whole will be 50 to 60 percent higher 20 years from now if present trends continue.

To meet the needs of a larger population and its prospective larger buying power, he said, farmers must increase their output of food and fiber products at least 40 percent.

"I am not worried about the possibility of American farmers being able to meet this increased demand," he said. "But I can't say the same about some other areas of the world."

Koffsky said a general economic boom now in progress should do much to stabilize farm returns this year near last year's level.

He said consumers are spending 3 percent more than a year ago, a development which Koffsky said should contribute heavily toward halting a postwar decline in farm income.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, greeting the visiting editors, said much progress has been made by agriculture during the last 2 years in adjusting from wartime to peacetime conditions.

He said there have been fewer dislocations and hardships than ever before in a like period. But the Nation still faces a serious problem in adjusting wheat production and surpluses to their normal levels, Benson added.

The editors heard discussions of other phases of the Department by officials.

Those attending the meeting included: Robert C. Bjorklund, Wisconsin State Journal; Rex B. Conn, Cedar Rapids Gazette; Bill Durham, Star-Telegram, Fort Worth, Tex.; Hal M. Herd, Nashville Tennessean; Dave Hess, Cincinnati Enquirer; Bill Humphries, News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.; and others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting to note that the same story which predicts a 40-percent rise in farm income also states:

Nathan Koffsky, chief of the farm income branch, told a meeting of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association that the income of the Nation as a whole will be 50 to 60 percent higher 20 years from now if present trends continue.

I want that particular statistical fact to be clear in our minds. The total income in the Nation will be from 50 to 60 percent higher, but the agricultural income will be about 40 percent higher. What does that indicate? It indicates clearly and unmistakably that there is a continuing falling off of agricultural income. That is one of the reasons the junior Senator from Minnesota has believed, and continues to believe, that we must take a brandnew look—to use some good administration phraseology—at the critical agricultural problem, and particularly at the problem of low farm income. We must not only take a new look, but we must also take some action.

I am pleased to be able to report to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has now decided to hold hearings on proposed price-support legislation and other proposed legislation affecting the price level of agricultural commodities.

It ought to be crystal clear that no one seems to be very happy or satisfied with the present agricultural act. The act is not doing what it was supposed to do, namely, raise prices and balance production. Production is still out of balance and prices are going down.

The only area of our economy which is suffering today, despite the so-called boom times in which we live, is the agricultural area of the American economy. While one should not ever pose as a prophet—and I do not pose as one—I believe it is fair to say that what we see today in terms of agriculture as related to the rest of the economy is very much what we saw some 25 years ago pertaining to agriculture and its relationship to the rest of the economy.

I repeat that the administration's farm program is having two results. It is aggravating the problems of production and reducing the price levels in the

market place for agricultural commodities. I am pleased that the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, is concerning itself with this question. I predict, with a reasonable degree of certainty, that as a result of the hearings which now will be held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we will hear the views of the American farmer and those associated with him, and that they will tell the sad story of the breakdown in agricultural price levels and in the net income of the American farmer.

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that one of the most disappointing developments of this year has been the failure of the Department of Agriculture and of the State Department to move the agricultural surpluses. Surely there is enough creative thinking in the United States and in our Government to figure out a way by which we can utilize the abundance of food and fiber in this Nation on a good, sound, economic, and humane basis. We have vast quantities of feed grains and vast quantities of wheat on hand. The people of the world need those surpluses, and the world markets are available. I regret to say that the food and the fiber are not being moved in the amounts they should be moved. We see example after example of that fact.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that within the past 6 months the fine little country of Norway has purchased 3 million tons of wheat from the Soviet Union primarily because our law provides that our surplus commodities must be shipped in American bottoms.

That fact has literally frustrated the entire movement of surplus commodities. Recently, Denmark, where there is a real need for American feed grains, which we have in abundance, found itself in the same situation. Unless we open up the present agricultural legislation and adopt a remedial amendment to the act, we will find that our program of disposal and sale of surplus commodities will be for all practical purposes obviated and denied.

If our merchant marine needs help—and I believe it does—we should give it help directly, not tie down a worthy program with an unworkable provision.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are literally losing the world markets for agricultural commodities because of the restrictive provisions in the law which make it literally unworkable.

Some of us in the Senate have suggested that immediate action be taken to remove from the market the pressures of the so-called surpluses of food and fiber. These surpluses hang over the market like the sword of Damocles. It is ready to fall and strike at any moment and it causes the market to be in economic uncertainty and to have the jitters.

One effective procedure would be to take some of the wheat, for example, and to process it into feed. I am referring to the low-grade wheat. Feed from that source should be made available to the drought areas of the United States. That wheat could be processed into feed. I find that if approximately 3 million tons of wheat, which is a small amount for a great economy like ours, were so processed, we would literally remove the excess production from the American wheat market.

Furthermore, if we took a certain amount of the wheat and placed it in an international food arrangement, such as has been recommended by a number of Senators, we could stabilize the domestic market and add a degree of security and stability to the international market.

I have spoken on this subject today because for some reason or other there seems to be a note of silence on this crucial issue. I do not intend to stand idly by or to hush my tongue on a matter so important as this as long as there is human suffering in the world, about which we are not doing anything, so long as there are markets in the world into which we are not selling, and so long as there is a depressed economic market at home, about which we are doing little or nothing.

RELAXATION OF INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS

From all I can read and hear, we are going to enter into a period where there may be some relaxation of international tensions. We are looking forward to what we call the meeting of the Big Four, the heads of state of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. The American people are hoping and praying that this meeting will result in some constructive act for peace and tranquility; at least, that it will bring about an easing of the international tension. I also am looking forward to such a result, and I have faith in those representing our country who are going to attend the meeting. I am not one who feels that the President of the United States, or whomever he may take with him, would knowingly, willingly, or in any other way do anything that would not protect the honor of the United States. I am happy that there are people in high places who are desirous of seeking peace on sensible terms.

But the truth is, Mr. President, that we have now entered upon a period in which the strategy of great powers is involved. I think we must be sure of several things. First of all, we must be sure that we are strong militarily, without talking about it and without brandishing a club, without frightening friend and foe alike. Let us be calm in our courage and in our strength. In so doing, I think we will present to the world a Nation that is fearless. I think we sometimes exhibit too much concern and too much fear of the Soviet Union.

Let us realize our own strength and realize it with calm assurance of the power of our great productive system and the world's finest political and economic system. When we realize these things we will not enter into any conference with a spirit of fear. Fear always has a way of destroying one's strength and of immobilizing one's effectiveness.

So I hope, Mr. President, that we shall enter upon every negotiation in a spirit of confidence supported by facts.

Furthermore, I am convinced that for a period of time we are going to be called upon to test our system, our heritage, and our principles. For the past 10 years we have had to build up our armed strength again. We have been confronted with threats of violence and open warfare. The United States of America is not a warrior at heart. We are essentially soldiers of peace. We are essentially citizens in the best sense of that term. I think we are now going to have an opportunity really to demonstrate what our way of life means, if we are willing to apply ourselves to it.

I have said a number of times that we may well be in for a period of free time, so to speak, or extra time, in which to reevaluate the world scene. But time is a meaningless word unless we use it. The real issue is: Who will use this time and for what purpose? If there should be a relaxation of world tensions, will world communism use the time to promote its diabolical system of conspiracy, or will we use the time more effectively to wage a successful political offensive, telling the true story of democratic life, and will we use the time to strengthen the areas of the world which are still struggling for their independence? Will we use the time for training students among the free nations of the world, and to promote world trade, and strengthen the basic foundation of commerce in the world? Will we use the time that may be available to us to set a new high moral standard in international politics around which men and women of good faith can rally? Will we use the time to strengthen the United Nations? Will we use the time to find new friends in the areas of Asia and Africa? That is the issue. What will we do with the time which may be made available, God's will permitting, if the conferences are successful?

Surely, Mr. President, the Soviet Union is much weaker than we are, if we truly appraise the facts. I think we have a tendency to overestimate her power. At least, we have had a tendency to overestimate the attractiveness of what she has to offer. I think the time is now at hand for a great political, economic, and psychological offensive on the part of the United States and our allies. Let us strengthen and firm up the great Nation that is ours. Let us be very, very careful that we do not in any way relinquish the principles in which we believe—self-determination, independence, freedom, and equality for peoples everywhere in the world where our programs and policies may be placed into effect.

Mr. President, I listened with keen attention to the report of the Secretary of State, presented on television and radio, following his visit to Paris and to Vienna. I commended the Secretary of State on that report, because I thought it was temperate; I thought it was moderate; and I am happy to state from my own observation that I think the Secretary was careful in his reference to hopes he had that might not be realized. In other words, he was a cautious diplomat, and he gave a cautious and prudent report.

If I have any observation to make—and I do not wish it to be critical, but

I make it merely as an observation—it is that for 5 months the American people have had their eyes focused upon the Far East, and now, literally, as if we turned off the lights in one room and turned them on in another room, our attention is focused entirely on Central and Western Europe. Strange as it may seem, the Soviet Union was able to divert our attention almost instantly from the Far East, from Formosa, Asia, the Bandung conference, to Vienna, Austria. The Soviet did seize the initiative, but we are delighted that there is a treaty of independence with Austria. The Senate will have an opportunity to examine it, and, I am convinced, will ratify it. From all I have heard, at least, the treaty is reasonable and fair to the Austrians and in no way violates the principles to which this country adheres.

But, Mr. President, I wish to warn my colleagues—and I say this from personal conviction and personal observation—that communism is a worldwide apparatus which works all dimensions, all areas, at the same time. We Americans are prone to look at one area at a time. We are prone to examine one room of the world, so to speak, at a time. I suggest that we must not have a parochial or provincial attitude. We must be willing to look at the total world scene at one time and be able to make value judgments as we go along.

Let us not have our attention entirely focused on the European area now as we had it entirely focused for a while on the Asian areas a few months ago. Let us keep an eye on both the east and the west. Let us keep our eye on Formosa, Indochina, Afghanistan, India, Vietnam, and remember that those areas are of crucial importance. It may very well be that the Communists are hoping that by political action, with no violence and no war, we will relax and lull ourselves into a false sense of security, and that those areas will fall into the Soviet sphere. Let us see to it that those areas of the world remain within the area of freedom.

Mr. President, as I conclude this message, may I sound this note of warning, that the crucial issue in Western Europe is still Germany. I have stated on this floor not once but a dozen times that we must never forget that what the Soviet Union has in its mind most of all is a neutral Germany which will not participate in the Western defense collective security system. We must have the courage to make certain that that does not happen. I am hopeful that the comment which was made by our Chief Executive in a recent press conference—I believe it was on yesterday—will not be interpreted to mean that the United States of America would settle for a kind of neutral Germany.

I recall that the President was asked about the so-called neutrality of Austria, and he remarked that Austria is not a neutral in the sense of having no armed strength; but that Austria is a neutral like Sweden and Switzerland; a neutral which has armament to protect itself, and a nation which will protect itself.

The Soviet Union was very careful to let that happen. The Soviet Union could have prevented it from happening. I say that if that is the principle which is to be applied to a unified Germany, it will mean that Germany will be in a central position to play off the East from the West.

Mr. President, we must make certain that Germany remains within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We must make certain that Germany's orientation is to the areas of freedom. We cannot run the risk of having a powerful Germany, in the role of a neutral, play off the East from the West.

I serve a solemn note of warning that in any negotiations which may occur in the months ahead, what happens in Germany will be of crucial importance to the American people. Therefore, let us strengthen in every way we can the ties of friendship between ourselves and the Federal Republic of West Germany. Let us make it crystal clear that we will not bargain away Western European collective security in the name of some kind of newfangled neutralism. This could be the issue which might well determine the developments of the future.

I rise to say this today because it is on my heart. I think we ought to speak aloud and use every opportunity to discuss these matters while there is still time for reasonable men to have honest discussion and even honest dissent.

REGULATION OF SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES AND MILEAGE ALLOWANCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1580) to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on line 7, to strike out "$13" and to insert in lieu thereof "$12."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$13" and to insert in lieu thereof "$12."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In justification of the amendment, I may say that the military pay bill, which has been previously acted upon by Congress, provided a maximum of $12. It is the belief of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and of other members of the committee which handled the proposed legislation that there should be a uniform per diem allowance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 348) is as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1580) to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

S. 1580 would amend sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 836–837) to raise the maximum allowable per diem rate for travel within the Continental United States from $9 to $13, and the maximum mileage rates, for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, from 4 and 7 cents to 6 and 10 cents, respectively.

JUSTIFICATION

The existing maximum per diem allowance for civilian employees while traveling within the limits of the United States is limited to $9 by the Travel Expense Act of 1949. The rate of $13 provided by this enactment is based on an allowance of $7.30 for hotel room, $4.50 for meals, and $1.20 for incidental expenses. These amounts are based upon the following:

Hotel costs: A large hotel accounting firm found, upon a study of room rates of 375 hotels used by businessmen in traveling, that the average room rate for a single room during 1954 was $7.30.

Cost of meals: The allowance of $4.50 is based upon a similar study and allocates $1 for breakfast, $1.25 for luncheon, and $2.25 for dinner. Two hotel accounting firms report that the price of hotel and restaurant meals has increased not less than 20 percent since 1949.

Incidental expenses: The $1.20 for incidentals is intended to cover such items of expense as tips and fees while traveling, hotel tips, tips to waiters, laundry, cleaning and pressing, telegrams for room reservations, etc.

COST

The Bureau of the Budget estimates the total additional cost of this bill will not exceed a maximum of $30 million a year and its actual cost may be several million dollars a year less.

AGENCY REPORTS

Following are agency reports on S. 1580 as introduced and reported:

EXECUTIVE OFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 1, 1955, inviting the Bureau of the Budget to comment on S. 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

In his message to the Congress on Federal personnel management the President stated that a legislative proposal would be submitted for an appropriate increase in the per diem allowance for civilian employees who travel on official business. On March 8 the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House a draft bill which would carry out the President's recommendation. Copies of this correspondence, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, are enclosed for your information.

Briefly, the Bureau's bill proposes that the maximum per diem travel allowance be increased from $9 to $13; that special provision be made for unusual types of travel where

the maximum rate would be much less than the necessary actual expenses incurred; that present mileage allowances remain unchanged; that the maximum per diem allowance for civilians performing work for the Government without compensation be increased from $10 to $15; and that the travel rates for civilian employees who travel as witnesses on behalf of the United States be governed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, rather than by separate legislation.

These proposed amendments were developed after extensive study and consultation with the major agencies of the Government. It is suggested that if your committee plans to take up legislation amending the Travel Expense Act, consideration be given to the changes proposed by the Bureau's bill.

Sincerely yours,

PERCIVAL F. BRUNDAGE,
Acting Director.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This is in further reply to your letter of April 1, 1955, requesting the views of the Civil Service Commission on S. 1580, a bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Section 2 of the bill would increase the maximum per diem allowance from $9 to $13 for Federal civilian employees who travel on official business within the limits of the continental United States. Section 3 would increase from 4 cents per mile to 6 cents per mile the allowance to employees for use of their privately owned motorcycles, and from 7 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile for use of their privately owned automobiles or airplanes, when traveling on official business.

On March 8, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Congress a legislative proposal which, among other things, would increase the maximum per diem allowance from $9 to $13 for civilian employees who travel on official business within the limits of the continental United States. A study by the Bureau of the Budget indicated such an increase was warranted on the basis of average hotel room rates, the increased price of hotel restaurant meals, and the increased cost of incidental expenses. The Commission endorses this provision of S. 1580.

The administration's legislative proposal recommends against any increase in mileage allowances to employees for use of privately owned vehicles while traveling on official business. No change in the present allowances was found to be justified on the basis of cost figures for the operation of automobiles, and the average mileage allowances most commonly used by private companies which compensate their employees on a flat mileage basis for use of personal cars on company business. The Commission does not favor section 3 of S. 1580.

The administration's legislative proposal also recommends three other changes in the present travel allowances. They are: (1) a special provision for unusual types of travel where the maximum rate would be much less than the necessary actual expenses incurred; (2) an increase from $10 to $15 in the maximum per diem allowance for employees serving without compensation; and (3) that travel rates for civilian employees who travel as witnesses on behalf of the United States be governed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, rather than by separate legislation.

Because S. 1580 does not carry out all the recommendations contained in the administration's legislative proposal, we strongly recommend favorable action on the draft bill submitted to the Congress on March 8, 1955, instead of S. 1580.

We are advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG, *Chairman.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 19, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 1, 1955, acknowledged by telephone April 6, enclosing copies of S. 1580, 84th Congress, and requesting our report and comments thereon.

The bill would amend sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166). Specifically, the maximum allowable per diem rate for travel within the continental United States would be raised from $9 to $13, and the maximum mileage rates, for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, from 4 and 7 cents to 6 and 10 cents, respectively.

With respect to the maximum per diem rate contemplated by the bill, upon the basis of recent experiences by employees of our Office the existing maximum rate of $9 is inadequate. We have found generally that our employees are required to expend approximately $12 per day for suitable lodging, meals, and additional necessary subsistence expenses incident to official travel. We recognize, however, that governmentwide experience may reflect a need for a maximum per diem of $13. Accordingly, it is recommended that section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be amended by eliminating the figure "$9" and substituting either "$12" or "$13" in lieu thereof, as the overall facts presented to your committee may warrant.

Concerning the proposed increased mileage rates for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, there is no information available here relative to the necessity therefor.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"SECTIONS 3 AND 4 OF THE TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

"SEC. 3. Civilian officers and employees of the departments and establishments (except justices and judges covered by section 456 of title 28 of the United States Code), while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed, in lieu of their actual expenses for subsistence and all fees or tips to porters and stewards, a per diem allowance to be prescribed by the department or establishment concerned, not to exceed the rate of [$9] *$13* within the limits of the continental United States and in case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States not to exceed rates established by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the locality in which the travel is performed: *Provided,* That such civilian officers and employees who become incapacitated due to illness or injury, not due to their own misconduct, while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed such per diem allowances, and transportation expenses to their designated posts of duty, in accordance with regulations promulgated and approved under this act.

"SEC. 4. Civilian officers or employees of departments and establishments or others rendering service to the Government shall, under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and whenever such mode of transportation is authorized or approved as more advantageous to the Government (except that no determination of advantage is required where payment on a mileage basis is limited to the cost of travel by common carrier, including per diem), be paid in lieu of actual expenses of transportation not to exceed [4] *6* cents per mile for the use of privately owned motorcycles, or [7] *10* cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles or airplanes, when engaged on official business within or outside their designated posts of duty or places of service. In addition to the mileage allowances provided for in this section, there may be allowed reimbursement for the actual cost of ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I understand why the reduction has been made from $13 to $12. So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the committee, and only as the chairman—I have not had time to discuss the matter with all the members of the committee—it is perfectly agreeable to reduce the amount, so as to make it uniform throughout the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1580) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Travel Expense Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of June 9, 1949 [5 U. S. C. 836–837] is amended by striking the figure "$9" and inserting "$12" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of said act is amended by striking the figures "4 cents" and "7 cents" and inserting "6 cents" and "10 cents", respectively, in lieu thereof.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect no later than 30 days following its enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the action taken on Senate bill 1580, Calendar No. 352, I ask that Calendar No. 357, Senate bill 1795, which treats with the same subject, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1795 is indefinitely postponed.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that Senate bill 1048, the Federal-aid road bill, is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 1048 is the unfinished business; it was not displaced by the bill just passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS IN THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, fewer than 10 bills are on the Legislative Calendar. As a result of the cooperation of all Members of the Senate, it has been possible to pass promptly measures which have been thoroughly considered and recommended to the Senate by the committees.

If the chairmen of committees have any important or necessary measures ready for consideration and will report them to the Senate, the Senate will be in a position to consider them.

All the bills which are still on the calendar are there because certain Members did not care to have them acted on at this time.

I hope the committees will take notice of the status of the calendar and, when possible, will make prompt reports on items of proposed legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF STATEMENTS BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND ROBERT SCHUMANN APPROVING THE PROPOSAL FOR A CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the excellent address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I agree with him fully on the two principal points he made, namely, that it is necessary for the United States to strengthen and firm up the great alliance which is ours, and also that all means, political and economic, which are feasible and proper for the purpose of keeping the Federal Republic of West Germany in the orbit of the West should be adopted by the United States Government. It is in connection with those general matters that I also wish to speak this afternoon.

I want to advise the Senate of statements made yesterday and today by two of the world's most honored men—men who during their lifetime have made monumental contributions to the Western alliance which seeks to preserve freedom and individual liberty.

I have here the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, who led this Nation in war, and then, as Secretary of State, gave to the world the great and imaginative program known as the Marshall plan. I shall read General Marshall's words:

> A few days before the death of Justice Owen J. Roberts, I accepted his invitation of May 5 to become a member of the Council of the Atlantic Union Committee which he has headed since its foundation in 1949. In accepting I wrote him May 12:
>
> "I am honored to be counted among those who support the unity of free nations."
>
> Justice Roberts' services to defense as well as to the judiciary were manifold, but perhaps the finest thing he did was the sacrifice he made in resigning from the Supreme Court to devote himself to the cause of Atlantic Union.
>
> The subject today is vitally important and the period fateful. All probably agree to the importance of Atlantic unity but few act.
>
> Recently a resolution calling for action was introduced in Congress by a distinguished bipartisan group from both Houses. It proposes that delegates from the United States and other NATO democracies meet in a convention "to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union." This prudent proposal, which commits us only to exploration, deserves support.
>
> Thinking back on the development of our own Federal Union—on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the Colonies, on the remarkable advance in freedom, invention, production, and living standards which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to maintain their individual personality and institutions—Americans should have a sympathetic understanding of this effort to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common problems.
>
> What I said when I addressed the Conference of Governors on July 14, 1947, I would repeat today: "There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the old world."
>
> Either it must finish the task of assisting these countries to adjust themselves politically to the changed demands of a new age, or it must reconcile itself to seeing them move in directions which are consistent neither with their own traditions nor with those of this country. Whatever course is adopted will affect the lives and fortunes of people in every State of the Union.

I have just received the text of a statement made today by Robert Schumann, Minister of Justice in the present French Cabinet, who gave the world the Schumann plan for European Union. This is Mr. Schumann's statement in full:

> The setting up of an exploratory committee (Comité d'Etude) regarding Atlantic union which is advocated at present in the United States Congress by so many distinguished Senators and Representatives, is of the highest importance to all nations belonging to NATO.
>
> I have long been an ardent partisan of a European federation to be integrated itself in the Atlantic community. But certain European nations have hesitated to advance far in this direction so long as the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were not disposed to explore in common with them an eventual political, economic, and military union.
>
> If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a study commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union, in which each of the member nations would be attributed an equitable voting right protecting it from any eventual domination by a single nation—which would be contrary to the democratic ideal of the union—we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity.

In connection with these two statements by leaders on both sides of the Atlantic, I want to make it quite plain that they are entirely independent statements. Neither General Marshall nor Mr. Schumann knew of the other's action.

What we see here, Mr. President, at this great moment in world history, is a remarkable coincidence of events and views on both sides of the Atlantic, as we have previously seen in history an awakening to great events which foreshadow a new progress in men's ability to live together in liberty and peace.

It seems to me that events are moving very rapidly in that direction today. On last February 9, along with 14 of my colleagues in the Senate, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, the resolution which both General Marshall and Mr. Schumann discussed. That resolution requested the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to an exploratory convention to explore and report "to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

Since I offered that resolution, we have seen Germany added to NATO. We have seen the Paris agreements ratified. We have seen an Austrian treaty move much closer to adoption. We have seen scheduled a four-power conference, and we have noted the exchanges of armament control plans.

While I know of no reason now for delaying action on this resolution, it does seem to me that there are several reasons why there should be hearings, followed by favorable action. And I would observe that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] has informed me that he hopes the committee can give consideration to this resolution when the mutual-security program has been disposed of.

The Soviet treaty proposal to Austria is interpreted by many as a move toward neutralizing the Germans. To offset it, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, we need to make this move toward closer Atlantic unity, which will reassure both French and Germans that their future lies in the Atlantic community. The fact that the administration feared the earlier action on the Atlantic resolution would lead the French and Germans to defer ratification of the London-Paris accords, because they would much prefer an Atlantic union, speaks for itself as to the great hope that this resolution can rouse, and of the timely service it can perform in speeding German rearmament and binding all Western Europe firmly to us.

Furthermore, as a result of the Paris agreements, we are allowing the rearming of the Germans without taking the precaution of at least trying to unite the West into an economic and political community which would make remote the possibility of a rise of another Hitler. The Germans have made great progress in rebuilding their nation, and it is apparent that the hope of their distinguished leaders and of the people themselves is to become a contributing and permanent part of the West. They cannot take the position of which they are

capable, however, by a military alliance alone, just as none of the other nations can contribute fully by military alliances alone. There must be means of economic, political, and foreign policy consultations and unity. If we can make this possible, then we will have achieved the dreams of peace-loving men for centuries.

Moreover, I believe it will be agreed that the Kremlin's strategy in the Big Four talks will be to try to divide us from the British and French. It would seem wise to guard now against this by having the proposed nondiplomatic convention called to explore strong Atlantic unity. The United States hand at the Big Four meeting would be greatly strengthened by this display of unity and by the knowledge Moscow would have that its efforts at division were doomed to frustration.

Mr. President, conventions such as the one I have proposed, outside of diplomatic channels, have an impressive record of achievement. It is not unlike the procedure followed by our Government in 1947 in naming committees of distinguished citizens to advise us freely on the problems that we faced then—a procedure that resulted in the establishment of the Marshall plan. We should never be loath to encourage meeting of representative citizens.

There is nothing revolutionary about my proposal. It is simply in the best traditions of our Nation. I sincerely hope that with the support of such distinguished world leaders as General Marshall and Mr. Schumann, and with the support of thousands of our own fellow citizens, this resolution will receive the Senate's blessing, and the President will call the convention.

CROOKED RIVER PROJECT NEEDED BY CENTRAL OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last week the Bureau of Reclamation proposed construction of a new irrigation project in the State of Oregon. The new unit—called the Crooked River project—calls for the use of power revenues from the Dalles Dam, an unrelated Federal project, to pay part of the construction costs.

I support the Bureau's plan for use of power revenues to help finance the Crooked River project, despite the opposition voiced recently by Gov. Paul Patterson, of Oregon.

Despite the objections of Oregon's Governor, I will make every effort to hasten legislative action on this proposal, which will create new farming opportunities in my home State and will improve the water supply of farmers now facing shortages.

Opposition by the Oregon Governor to using power revenues as an aid to irrigation reflects an extremely shortsighted viewpoint. Farmers cannot carry the full burden of repayment for the remaining undeveloped reclamation projects in Oregon. Only high-cost projects remain, and unless assistance is obtained from power revenues, agricultural expansion in Oregon has about reached the end of the line.

The Oregon Governor's opposition first became known to me at the hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in Portland, Oreg., last April 6. At that time, Governor Patterson said he was opposed to use of power revenues from dams to help pay for irrigation projects to which they are not physically related. I asked Governor Patterson specifically about power-revenue assistance for the Crooked River project, and he replied that he was opposed to such aid to irrigation.

I was amazed that the chief executive of my home State would take such a position. Adoption of the Oregon Governor's policy would end our hopes for more irrigation in eastern Oregon.

The timing of the Governor's statement was noteworthy because a concerted drive is now on to discredit full use of water resources for additional irrigation in the West. I believe that the enemies of irrigation are not taking sufficient note of our rising birth rate, and the problem it poses in relation to future food supplies. It appears likely that our population will reach 200 million by 1975. Today we farm about 365 million acres of land. This is about 40 million acres more than is needed to feed our Nation without exporting part of the farm output. The increased population by 1975 will require cultivation of a minimum additional eighty to one hundred million acres of new land to feed the hungry mouths of the expanded population.

I should like to point out that new irrigated land cannot be brought under cultivation overnight. The Crooked River project is not a project of vast proportions. It involves the investment of about $6 million of Federal funds, and will irrigate about 10,000 acres of new land and provide additional water for 10,220 acres now inadequately irrigated. But it will require nearly 5 years from start of construction until water is delivered to the land.

History of reclamation in the West shows that it has come about as a result of joint development of water for irrigation and for hydroelectric power. Use of power revenues to aid irrigation goes back to the earliest projects of the Federal reclamation program. A financing method similar to that proposed for the Crooked River project was approved at the last session of Congress in connection with the Foster Creek irrigation project in the State of Washington. The same principle is proposed in our Hells Canyon bill to provide financial support for the Mountain Home project, if authorized by Congress. It is my belief that Governor Patterson's opposition represents a complete reversal of the tried and tested formula for development of the arid West.

I was glad to join with Oregon reclamation advocates in urging the Interior Department to approve use of some power revenues from the Dalles Dam for helping to support the Crooked River development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks portions of the report of Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, on the Crooked River project, which was approved by Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, and a resolution from the Crook County Farm Bureau, indicating the approval of members of that organization, many of whom own lands under the proposed project.

There being no objection, the report and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1955.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

SIR: This is my proposed report on the potential Crooked River project, Oregan. It includes the accompanying February 12, 1953, report of the Regional Director, Boise, Idaho.

The physical plan presented in the regional director's report remains essentially unchanged. New information on costs, allocation of costs, and on repayment has been developed since completion of the regional director's report and is presented in an attachment to this letter.

The Crooked River project surrounds and is adjacent to the town of Pineville in Crook County of central Oregon. It would utilize the water resources of Ochoco Creek and the Crooked River, a tributary of the Deschutes River. A stable irrigation water supply would be provided for 9,990 acres of dry land and 10,220 acres of land now inadequately irrigated. These areas include 7,230 new acres and 7,660 presently inadequately irrigated acres within the Ochoco irrigation district and 5,320 acres of nondistrict land of which 2,760 would be classed as dry land and 2,560 as inadequately irrigated. In addition, 51,200 acre-feet of water annually would be available for future use on other acreage in the Deschutes River Basin. Flood control, drainage, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits also would result from construction of the project works. Preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife are included among project purposes.

Normal annual precipitation for the project area is a little over 9 inches, about half of which falls from April through October. This semiarid condition restricts the agricultural use of land without irrigation. Since agriculture is one of the two main industries of the area it is most important that it be strengthened and expanded to assure an adequate economy especially if the other industry, lumbering, remains static or declines. Also, the project would afford a number of part-time farming opportunities for workers employed in local industries.

Frequently, as a result of rapid melting of snow, agricultural bottom lands and part of Prineville and its surrounding area are flooded and sometimes damaged seriously. The recently rehabilitated Ochoco Reservoir and the proposed Prineville Reservoir when operated in conjunction with each other would develop the available water resources for irrigation and would provide significant control of the floodwaters of Ochoco Creek and the Crooked River. Proposed drainage would greatly improve agricultural bottom lands.

The local people, recognizing these problems, have shown a great deal of interest in securing additional irrigation water and protection from spring floods, and are favorable to a Federal project. Construction of the project is economically justified in that the evaluated annual benefits exceed the estimated annual costs by the ratio of better than 2 to 1 based on a 50-year period of analysis. This benefit-cost ratio is based on the use of all water made available by the project. Considering direct benefits only, the ratio would be 1.25 to 1.

* * * * *

The estimated cost, based on October 1954 prices, of the new facilities that would

actually be constructed is $6,339,000. This amount includes $200,000 which represents costs of investigations up to the estimated date of initial construction and $570,000 for drainage costs which reflect an increase of $312,000 over the amount shown in the regional director's report. The new and additional annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs which would be necessary as a result of the new works are estimated at about $38,800.

* * * * *

Tentative allocations of the $6,598,000 based upon the separable costs—remaining benefits method, are as follows: reimbursable-irrigation $5,903,000; nonreimbursable-flood control $653,000. Specific costs, which would also be considered nonreimbursable, allocated to fish and wildlife and recreation are respectively $29,000 and $13,000. The latter amount is the cost of minimum recreation facilities at Prineville Reservoir which I recommend be constructed by the Federal Government on a nonreimbursable basis provided that a responsible State or local agency agrees to operate and maintain the completed facilities.

* * * * *

The annual amortization capacity of the Ochoco irrigation district lands is approximately $39,600. This is the net amount available for repayment purposes after deducting the annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of $45,600, which includes about $19,100 for existing works, from the annual payment capacity. In 50 years the water users could return $1,980,000. This would repay the cost of the bonds, cost of Ochoco Dam rehabilitation, and $1,363,000 toward the cost of new works and the Cove Powerplant installation. This would leave unpaid a balance of $2,171,000 of the costs allocated to the Ochoco irrigation district lands.

The annual repayment ability or amortization capacity of nondistrict lands is estimated to be about $15,500 which is more than adequate to repay the $515,000 allocated to these lands in 50 years.

Investigations to date indicate that the potential uses of water in the Deschutes River Basin far exceed available supply. The excess water of the Crooked River project could be used in several localities within the basin and full development of the Prineville Reservoir site is considered fully justified.

For purposes of demonstrating repayment it was assumed that the excess water would be utilized by lands of the north unit of the Deschutes project. A pumping plant at the point on the Crooked River where the north unit main canal crosses, via a flume, would be necessary to furnish Crooked River water to the canal for delivery to the north unit lands. Such pumping plant would not actually be constructed as part of the Crooked River project but its estimated cost of $777,000 is utilized in the studies to derive the total reimbursable cost that would be involved in applying the excess water to the north unit lands.

The total cost ($2,631,000) would be the sum of the project cost ($1,854,000) allocated to deferred acreage and the $777,000 for the flume crossing pumping plant. Water users on the north unit could repay $1,198,000 in 50 years in addition to meeting necessary additional annual O. M. & R. costs of $37,500 leaving an unpaid balance of $1,433,000. It is emphasized that the north unit lands are used for demonstrative purposes only and it is not intended to imply that the excess water would be committed to such lands.

The $2,171,000 balance for the Ochoco irrigation district lands and the $1,433,000 balance for the north unit lands, which are beyond the repayment ability of the respective water users, could be repaid by utilizing net surplus power revenues from one of the Federal dams on the Columbia River under provisions similar to those applicable to the Foster Creek division, Chief Joseph irrigation project, as authorized by act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 568). It is estimated that it would take only about 123 days (74 days for the district lands and 49 days for the nonproject lands) for the net surplus power revenues of The Dalles project to repay these costs. With this aid all project costs allocated to the Ochoco irrigation district lands would be repaid within a 50-year period. Also, the costs allocated to lands to utilize the excess project water could be returned in 50 years after such water is put to beneficial use. I recommend, therefore, that the Crooked River project be authorized on the basis that net surplus power revenues from The Dalles project of the Corps of Engineers be utilized to return the reimbursable costs beyond the water users' ability to repay.

* * * * *

I recommend that you approve and adopt this report as your proposed report on the Crooked River project and that you authorize me, in your behalf, to transmit copies to the States of the Columbia River Basin and to the Secretary of the Army in accordance with requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), to the State of Oregon for the views and recommendations of the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of the State in accordance with provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), and to other interested Federal agencies for their comments.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

CROOK COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Prineville, Oreg., May 13, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: The Crook County Farm Bureau requests that favorable legislative action be enacted to authorize the Crooked River project, providing the final Bureau of Reclamation Crooked River project report contains the approximate below outlined provisions. We submit our recently enacted resolutions as follows:

"Whereas the possibility for early authorization of the Crooked River project seems possible, it appears reasonable that we, who own lands under this proposed project should make known our attitude.

"We would favor a contract under the following approximate conditions:

"Proposed dam to furnish all the irrigation water necessary to adequately irrigate all the irrigable lands under the proposed dam.

"The original plans to provide adequate facilities for doing this.

"The Ochoco project: The Ochoco Irrigation District management to continue with board of directors and manager as is now operated.

"Annual yearly repayment, including operation and maintenance, not to exceed approximately $5.72 per acre per year.

"A sliding scale repayment contract, with less payment in poor income years. Farmers paying within their ability to pay, but not to exceed the approximate $5.72 per acre per year. Payments to be for a period of 50 years, after which revenues from the Dalles Dam be applied to pay the balance.

"Lands now receiving Crooked River water—

"To retain their project's identities, water rights, and present methods of distribution and operation if they so choose.

"To purchase Crooked River stored water on a sliding-scale contract at a cost not to exceed approximately $3.19 per acre per year.

"New lands not receiving either Ochoco or Crooked River water: To be included wherever economically feasible under a sliding scale repayment contract with the repayment period of 50 years, as shown above.

"Upstream rights and uses: The principles as outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation Crooked River report of February 1953, recognizing upstream water rights and potential requirements must be retained in line with the policy of looking toward ultimate basin development."

CROOK COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
By ELDRED BREESE, *Secretary.*

HELLS CANYON DAM ON OREGON-IDAHO BORDER NEEDED BY NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the recent ruling by the Federal Power Commissioner examiner to turn over a portion of the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River to Idaho Power Co. has alarmed one of America's leading newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I ask unanimous consent that a very cogent editorial from the Post-Dispatch of May 9, 1955, be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELLS CANYON'S NEW LOOK

The results of a year's hearings are in, and they give Secretary McKay ample cause for an agonizing reappraisal of his duty at Hells Canyon.

This waterpower site on the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, on the Idaho-Oregon border, is one of the richest remaining undeveloped in the Nation. It is situated in a region which has been held back by inadequate supplies of electric power, and which needs its waterpower potential developed to the maximum.

A high dam at Hells Canyon to achieve maximum development there was planned by the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior until Mr. McKay became Secretary. He then announced that he was relinquishing the site in favor of the Idaho Power Co. That private utility had applied to build two low dams, Brownlee and Hells Canyon, along the same stretch of river, with the possibility of building a third, Oxbow, at some later date.

It is this three-dam system whose merits a Federal Power Commission examiner has gone into, and compared with the originally proposed Bureau of Reclamation project, in hearings extending over a year.

Examiner William J. Costello now concludes in effect that the Federal project would be preferable if it were going to be built, but that it is not going to be built and therefore the Idaho power dam project is preferable.

On this line of reasoning, Henry Ford's plan for private exploitation of Muscle Shoals would have been preferable to TVA. But is it the FPC's job to estimate the political prospects of controversial projects? The real question for the FPC to decide is whether this finding follows the mandate laid by Congress upon the FPC to issue licenses only for projects best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway.

Of the three dams in the proposed Idaho Power System, the examiner recommends that the FPC license only Brownlee. FPC's legal staff had earlier recommended licensing of all three projects. Examiner Costello says the cost of producing power would be raised to more than 6 mills a kilowatt-hour if Ox-

bow and Hells Canyon were added to the Brownlee project. No market could reasonably be predicted for the power at so high a price, he says, and construction of the second and third dams is therefore "clearly not in the public interest." This despite the fact that "there is a crying need for firm-power additions in the Northwest."

Secretary McKay himself 2 years ago observed that the Northwest was "critically short of power." Arguing that the Idaho Power Co. project could begin overcoming that shortage sooner than the public project, he contended that the power generated at 3 low dams would be 87 percent of that generated at 1 high dam.

Now, however, Idaho Power's 3 low dams have shrunk to 1 low dam. And if only Brownlee Dam were built, in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, the amount of power realized from the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River would be only 40 percent of what 1 high-public dam would supply. If Brownlee were built, moreover, it would forever foreclose the high dam, by standing in the area which the latter's reservoir would have to occupy.

Is the Pacific Northwest—is the Nation—going to be content with less than halfway development of the rich and much-needed power potential at Hells Canyon?

Now that the allegations of fact on which Secretary McKay sought to justify his relinquishment of the site no longer apply, will the Secretary reinstate the Federal project, or will he insist on an extravagant waste of over half the usefulness of this great natural resource?

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the conferees on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill are meeting; and I understand that it is quite possible that the conference report will be ready for consideration by the Senate either on tomorrow, Friday, or Monday. A conference report of course is a highly privileged matter; and I wish to state for the RECORD that it will be my purpose to notify the minority leader whenever the conference report is ready; and if the report is a unanimous one, I am sure he will concur in having it brought promptly before the Senate.

So I should like to have the Members of the Senate on notice that the Senate will consider the conference report on either the first or the second calendar day the Senate is in session, following today.

Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair knows of nothing.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, May 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Marvin B. Miller to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective May 12, 1955, subject to qualifications provided by law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom we are daily compelled and constrained to bring our finite minds and fallible judgments, and our sinful hearts to be pardoned and purified, may we enter upon the tasks of the day with confidence and courage.

Grant that in this time of darkness and shadows, when we wish that we might be able to see more clearly the events impending, may we surrender ourselves solely and supremely to the leading of Thy Spirit.

Inspire us with new ventures of faith and larger vistas of outlook as we labor together to break down the barriers that divide mankind and seek to build not only a world that is safe for democracy but a democracy that is safe for the world.

Help us to believe in the coming of a new social order, made nobler by the suffering and sacrifice and wiser by its folly and stupidity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ACTION OF STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH DAKOTA ON POLIO VACCINE

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the medical associations of the 47 other States would do well to follow the example of the State medical association of South Dakota, who have pledged to the people of South Dakota and to the Nation that no needy child in that State will go without polio vaccine, whether the Federal Government intervenes or not.

A telegram addressed to me under date of May 18, 1955, from Dr. A. W. Spiry, president, and John C. Foster, secretary of the SDMA, reads as follows:

No needy child in South Dakota will go without polio vaccine, whether Federal Government intervenes or not. Our doctors always have and will continue to care for all patients and needs. Polio hysteria is sometimes greater cause for alarm than polio itself. We urge careful consideration of procedure as to how Federal funds are allocated to needy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to the membership of this Congress that this is a challenge to the medical associations of the other States. I hope they will follow the leadership of South Dakota.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Albert	Dondero	Macdonald
Avery	Doyle	Miller, N. Y.
Ayres	Eberharter	Morgan
Barrett	Edmondson	Morrison
Boggs	Fjare	Moulder
Bolton, Frances P.	Gamble	Mumma
	Gathings	O'Konski
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gray	Pillion
	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hébert	Scherer
Burleson	Herlong	Short
Canfield	Heselton	Tollefson
Celler	Hillings	Walter
Christopher	Kearney	Williams, N. Y.
Colmer	Kearns	
Dingell	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5297, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, section 3 of the bill had been read.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 3, line 4, after the period, strike out all

of the following language down to and including the word "years" in line 24, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Persons having an obligated period of service under this act shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) for satisfactory performance of that service obligation. However, any person while subject to such reserve obligation who in good faith becomes a regular or duly ordained minister of religion or a student preparing therefor, as defined in sections 6 (g) and 16 (g) of this act, shall, at his request, not be required to serve on active training and service or active duty for training or inactive duty training while in such status. In addition to their obligation to perform the duties provided for in this act such persons shall be subject to such orders, directives, and regulations relating to their administration (including the rendering of prescribed reports on personal status) as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard). This subsection does not prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force. The appropriate Secretary of a military department, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) may provide, by regulations which shall be as uniform as practicable, for the release of any person from active training and service or active duty for training in the Armed Forces before serving the period of active training and service or active duty for training for which he was enlisted, appointed, or inducted. The amendment made by this amendatory act does not change or revoke any reserve obligation imposed on any person under this section before the enactment of this amendatory act.

"No person who, after the enactment of the National Reserve Plan is inducted into, or initially enlisted or appointed in, the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, shall at any time be assigned for duty at any installation located in a foreign country with which (at such time) the United States has in effect a treaty or international agreement containing provisions permitting such country to exercise in any way jurisdiction over American personnel stationed within its boundaries.

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) is amended to read as follows:

"'Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may, within quotas fixed by the President with the advice of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, enlist in the Army National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or the Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or in the Reserve or in any unit of the Reserve of any armed force. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and service in the Armed Forces and in a reserve component for a total of 8 years; any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a reserve component for a total of 8 years'."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take out of the bill the two amendments that were agreed to yesterday, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, is not this amendment designed to take out the language in the bill to which the gentleman from New York objected?

Mr. VINSON. I am going to call attention to that right now.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman says the primary purpose is to knock out an amendment that this House put in the bill yesterday?

Mr. VINSON. The purpose that will be accomplished by this amendment will be to eliminate two amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. BARDEN. Maybe it would be in order, then, since we have a full Chamber of Members here, for us to reconsider my amendment, and we will chew on that a while.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman for that parliamentary inquiry, but I must proceed.

The amendment removes the two amendments proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and adopted yesterday. It is also an additional elimination of the authority of the Department of Defense to involuntarily assign a man to a National Guard unit from the Reserve. My amendment includes, however, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Why do I do this? At the outset the gentleman from New York said:

I am loathe to introduce this amendment, but it so happens that, on page 3 of this bill, there has been written in some language, from line 4 through line 12, which compels me to do this.

He stated yesterday that if that language had not been in the bill he would not have offered his amendment. I am therefore offering to take that language out, so I think the gentleman has no grounds for complaint because the language which he criticizes will not be in there. I think, however, it is highly important that we all understand the legal effect of the amendment by the gentleman from New York. We all know that when amendments are offered we try to get as much information about the effect of the amendments as possible. A short time after this amendment was offered yesterday the Committee rose. We went into conference with the Department of Defense, its legal advisers, and the Assistant Secretary, to analyze exactly what these amendments did. They prepared and submitted to me this morning a brief analysis of exactly what would be accomplished by the Powell amendment.

Bear this in mind, you have two amendments offered by the gentleman from New York. One is on page 3 of the bill. That amendment would prevent the Department of Defense from transferring a reservist to a National Guard unit when a governor of a State had requested such transfer.

The second amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is on page 5. That amendment provided that any State, Territory, District National Guard, or National Guard or Reserve unit shall not exclude or segregate any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. There you have two amendments dealing with entirely different subject matters. Let us analyze them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. VINSON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. VINSON. The first amendment prevents the transfer of any reservist having a Reserve obligation to the National Guard in any State in which the National Guard excludes or segregates any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. Therefore—now listen to this, because it applies to every State in the Union—therefore, even though a governor has failed to recruit enough men for his guard and requests the transfer of reservists to fill up his guard, this amendment would prevent the Department of Defense from transferring any reservists to the National Guard.

It is true that even though that State's National Guard already had integrated units to which a person could be transferred, transfers would be prohibited if there is still only one segregated unit remaining in the entire State. That is the accomplishment of the first limitation of the amendment. Let us see the second.

The second amendment relates to enlistments. It prevents enlistment of anyone in any National Guard units so long as any guard unit in the State remains segregated.

Bear in mind that throughout the Nation there are a great many integrated units in different States, and in those same States there are some segregated units. By this amendment no one could enlist in the National Guard in that State. All of us know that in certain States some integration has already taken place. This amendment would prevent all further input in the National Guard either by transfer or on a voluntary enlistment basis if there were 1 unit or indeed 1 person who was subjected to segregation in the unit in the State.

That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment, and that is the reason why we would accomplish what he sought to obtain when he offered his amendment to language which was objectionable to him. He said if it were not in the bill he would not offer his amendment. I think he can see the weaknesses of his second amendment.

I am asking the Committee to adopt this amendment which will have parliamentary effect of taking the objectionable language out of the bill and, having done so, deleting the Powell amendments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as you have already heard during the course of the debate, the great Committee on the Armed Services has spent weeks and weeks in the development of the pending legislation. It was reported by that committee by a vote of 31 to 5 with 1 voting present, which indicates a very high degree of unanimity of opinion.

We have carried along to this point in the consideration of the matter. Many of us are anxious that the legislation go on to passage. I know how the game is played around here. Sometimes if we are against a measure, anything that makes it more unpalatable is approved. I would want to exempt from any such category, certainly in this particular instance, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] who offered these amendments in the first place, because, in my experience with him here I have never seen him resort to any sort of trick maneuvers for the purpose of defeating legislation. It may well be that he is against this legislation, but I would not want to impute to him in any degree a desire to kill the legislation by offering something in which he did not wholeheartedly believe.

I have checked around enough to be completely convinced that if this solution of the difficulty as advocated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is not adopted, and if these amendments should stay in the bill as they were tentatively adopted in the Committee of the Whole yesterday, it would mean the defeat of, or the recommittal of this legislation. So we are confronted with a very practical situation.

I would like to say, and I imagine he would permit me, as I have already said to the gentleman from New York, the adoption of the amendment presently before us represents for the gentleman from New York a victory in respect to his position.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] referred to the opening paragraph of the statement of the gentleman from New York yesterday. There is a further paragraph which I would like to read because I think it shows his attitude:

If this language stays in the bill—

That is the language which was quoted and which this amendment takes out—

without my amendment, it will mean that the governors of States where there are now segregated National Guard units—and there are segregated National Guard units in 21 States—will be able to force into the National Guards of their States Jim Crow and segregated battalions, regiments, companies, or whatever the unit might be. There is no language in this bill that will prevent this from occurring.

In other words, again, and I think very properly, the gentleman from New York makes the point that by the language to which he objected on page 3 of the bill and which the pending amendment takes out, the Federal Government intervenes with compulsion to force men into the National Guard units upon certification by the governor or request by the governor or other State authority. Of course, that is a departure from our original concept of the National Guard. The National Guard has come down from the old military State militia. In many places they still refer to the guard as the State militia. But it has been on a voluntary basis. So I think the gentleman from New York was on very sound ground when he urged the necessity of his amendment, the first part of his amendment, insofar as it qualifies the language originally placed in the bill.

The second part of the amendment does not fall within that category because there it refers not only to the original situation but to the completely voluntary enlistments in the several States. As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, probably it is so broad as to practically wreck the guard in many of the States where integration has progressed by great leaps and bounds but where there is yet some small bit of segregation left.

Now, as the gentleman from New York pointed out, tremendous strides have been made in our Government with respect to integration. Tremendous strides have been made in the National Guard units. I say that is all to the good. Our Army now, under Executive orders, is integrated.

The only reason I rise at this time is to try to point out that what is here sought to be done is fair. The gentleman from Georgia puts first among the objectives of his amendment the elimination of the two Powell amendments. But, I think the first objective of his pending amendment is to take out the language to which objection was originally raised—and I think very properly—and then, of course, that language, being the basis for the offering of the amendments in the first place, the necessity for the amendments is no longer with us, because the objectionable language will be removed by this pending amendment.

As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, the so-called Bow amendment is retained in the bill. Now, I did not vote for the Bow amendment. I know there are many ideas about it, but in any event this legislation will go to the other body if it is adopted here. Of course, if it is not, that is the end of it, but certainly any adjustments that would need to be made could there be considered.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that I do not want to happen is that this bill be recommitted or rejected so that this whole program that has been so carefully worked out by the committee, so carefully gone over by the Members of the Committee of the Whole, and, I think, a clear majority believing in the program, wanting to have it adopted—I just do not want the legislation to fail at this point, and that is the reason I have risen in support of this amendment. I sincerely hope that this amendment which is now pending will be adopted and that we can go on with the passage of the legislation.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I think it is fine that we do have a gentleman who says he understands his way around. It so happens that I do not. Maybe I am slowly learning. But, regardless of that, I have a vote that will be riding upon one question which I want to ask the gentleman to answer for me, and that question is: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is adopted, will States' rights be protected and the governors of all of our 48 States have control over their militia and their National Guard as provided by the Constitution and the laws of this country; is that correct? I do not intend to surrender a single State's rights.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, if the Vinson amendment is approved, the guard will continue to be on a voluntary basis and will be operated as the people in the State determine, subject only, of course, to other considerations that are involved.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will answer the gentleman's question. The answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is in the affirmative. If this amendment is agreed to, then the National Guard enlistment control remains just like it is under the law today. It covers it all. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me from the debate on this subject yesterday, the various amendments that were offered, the strong support that many of them received though not accepted, that the membership of this House must be thinking along the lines of a bill that I offered in the early stages of the subcommittee hearings which, in my opinion, is by far the best suggestion to provide a real Reserve program in view of present problems.

May I say to you that I attended every session of the subcommittee. I almost became obnoxious, I am sure, to the military leaders and to certain members of our subcommittee who disagreed with my opinion. The simplest way, in my opinion, to eliminate this confusion about yesterday's amendments would be to adopt H. R. 4848 as a substitute for this bill, and then we will have no controversy about it. There are, at the desk, copies of H. R. 4848 over on my right and also over on my left.

H. R. 4848 would reduce the present 8 obligation to 6 years. Those enlisting in the active forces for 3 or more years would completely fulfill their obligation at the end of their active service. There is no requirement that prior-service personnel shall participate in an active Reserve program, although it is provided that those who do so can materially shorten their remaining military obligation. I am hopeful that the military departments would institute other inducements to persuade prior-service personnel to participate in Reserve programs.

Other than prior-service personnel who volunteered to serve in active units

of the Reserve, the Reserves would be composed of young men who voluntarily enlisted therein with the agreement that they would be ordered to active duty for basic training for a period not less than 4 months. I used 4 months in my bill rather than 6 months, since the normal recruit-training period of all services is from 11 to 13 weeks, that more persons could be trained in the same period, and that this period would better fit into educational programs. If the military services believe this period should be longer, I would have no objection. At the end of 5 years' satisfactory service in the Reserves an individual would have fulfilled his military obligation. Young men would be authorized to enter the Reserves in this manner up until they received an order to report for induction, and the only limitations on the numbers would be up to the limit of the appropriations provided.

The remainder of the bill generally follows the bill under consideration.

It seems to me that the advantages of my bill are these:

First. The military obligation provided better fits present manpower and draft conditions.

Second. It adheres to our traditional volunteer system.

Third. Young men can fulfill their military obligation in shorter periods of time.

Fourth. More persons will be trained than under H. R. 5297.

As I stated earlier, I have no pride of authorship in my bill, and would be willing to make such revisions as deemed advisable.

I have enough faith in the young men of the Nation to believe that with the right inducements, they will volunteer to perform their fair share of the military obligation. If after a trial this system does not produce sufficient members for our Reserves, I would be willing to support legislation which would provide for the induction into the Reserves. It seems to me that there is more equity in inducting a person with no previous military experience into a Reserve force than there is in requiring prior service personnel to participate in Reserve training.

H. R. 4848 would eliminate the compulsion of 45 days against a prior service man.

Let me tell you about the subcommittee action to show you that we were not unanimous on all of these provisions in the Committee bill.

Even though I did not fully agree with all the provisions, I voted for the Committee bill in both the subcommittee and in the full committee. The full committee did adopt an amendment to the subcommittee bill that permitted the President of the United States to call, without congressional approval, 1 million reservists. My bill does not provide that.

My bill will largely take care of the objective of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. The amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT of California, called for 4 years, but that could impair the regular enlistment of the Navy and Air Force in their regular establishments and in their Reserve program. But H. R. 4848 requires 5 years instead of 8, and there is no compulsion.

I have heard a lot of talk about the Committee on Armed Services. I never fought harder in my life for 8 weeks, trying to eliminate what I considered undesirable features of the original bill, as submitted by the Pentagon; which I am sure the membership of this House would not approve. Universal Military Training under proper provisions, could be much better than compulsion in the original bill, which would compel probably 60 to 75 percent of the youth to serve 8 or 10 years while the remainder go free with no service whatsoever.

I submit to you that the way to eliminate and correct the amendments that were adopted yesterday and to meet the objectives of many who supported other amendments, would be to adopt H. R. 4848, my bill, as a substitute for the pending measure, send it to the Senate, for the further consideration of that body. I believe they will agree. If they do this Congress will pass a sound bill which will provide a real Reserve program, which is so greatly needed at this time.

I want to tell you about the differences of opinion on our subcommittee. I admire the chairman and those who shared his views. But I was equally strong in my views. I wanted no compulsion in this bill. I believe there was probably only one vote against that general objective. But when the second bill was written, compulsion on the trainee for 6 months was left out, but the 45-day compulsion on prior servicemen, irrespective of our agreement, was written into the bill. The motion of the chairman of the subcommittee to provide compulsion on the 6 months' trainee lost by a tie vote of 6 to 6. On our motion to take from the bill the 45-day compulsion, we lost that 6 to 6. But if that had been eliminated in the second draft, as previously agreed, the motion to reinstate it would have also lost by the same vote.

May I say that General Walsh of the National Guard Bureau stated that the National Guard not only agrees with the principles of H. R. 4848, but they believe it to be in the interests of the Nation.

Under our cross-examination, it was admitted before our committee by Regular Army and Regular Air Force officials that the strongest arm of our Reserve program for the Army and Air Force is the National Guard and the Air National Guard.

If you start weakening, or interfering with the National Guard of this country you will wreck the strongest Reserve we have at the present time for the Army and the Air Force. No legislation passed can replace the strength of our National Guard. Not only that but Reserves and Reserve programs are dependent upon public support. You cannot have public support on any measure which weakens the National Guard.

I submit to you that somebody will argue that my proposition will provide too many young men. I leave it in the hands of the military itself to set the ceiling. According to General Hershey's testimony before our committee, we have approximately 1,500,000 young men in this country subject to I–A classification today. We will have approximately 1 million each year for the next 4 years. We have sufficient manpower.

Let us make this Reserve program attractive. Give the boys 4 months' training, and I say to you many of them will go from that to the Regular Establishment, just as they go from the National Guard today to the Regular Establishment. Approximately 30,000 men a year go from the National Guard after they receive that training into the Regular Military Establishment.

H. R. 4848, irrespective of what or anyone says will, in my opinion, furnish the necessary number of reservists, encourage young men with special abilities to go into the Regular Military Forces and reduce the number of draftees needed.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. The gentleman said this bill would wreck the National Guard?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I do not say the pending bill will wreck the National Guard, but the gentleman knows and I know there has been a move on foot from the Pentagon and high places for many years to federalize the National Guard. If you can come in here and start fooling with an established concern that has been in the hands of the States for all these years, and you saw the vote yesterday, you can talk all you want to but you will find there is not a governor in the United States of America who would not oppose the Federal Government's interference with the National Guard.

Mr. WILSON of California. Does the gentleman think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia wrecks or in any way interferes with the National Guard?

Mr. WINSTEAD. No; but the amendments adopted yesterday do.

Mr. VINSON. My amendment eliminates the language to which the gentleman from New York offered an amendment. If the language is eliminated, then there is no need nor necessity for the amendment. My amendment preserves the National Guard just as they are under the law today, does it not?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I take the gentleman's word for it. I will vote for his amendment. My substitute I know will do it and improve the bill considerably in many other respects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can reach some agreement as to the time for debate on this amendment. We all understand the amendment. I desire to have the gen-

tleman from Louisiana the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BROOKS] speak on the amendment, and, of course, we want the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to speak on it. I want the gentleman from New York to have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if he will explain the necessity for the original language, and what happens to the bill by its elimination?

Mr. VINSON. That will all be explained. That is what I am trying to do. I explained the whole thing. If the Committee will bear with me, let us get a little agreement on the time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, did I correctly understand the gentleman from Georgia to state that the gentleman from New York was to have 10 minutes?

Mr. VINSON. I hope he will have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That should be understood.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in that hour the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Vinson amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] be allowed 10 minutes of that time. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for some time I have had on the desk an amendment to the bill which affects the last language of this amendment. If I understand correctly, unless my amendment is acted on before the Vinson amendment is acted on, and should the Vinson amendment carry, I would be precluded from offering it. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think even the members of the committee understand this amendment. I would like to know how much time each man would have under the proposed request.

The CHAIRMAN. At the moment the Chair cannot say.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order, to see if there is objection to the request.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the so-called Vinson amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] shall have 10 minutes of that hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I believe a matter of that kind can be handled only by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. I withdraw that part.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the Vinson amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] already has 5 minutes in his own right, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Will the committee have the right to close the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has the right to close the debate, especially under the rule.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in his own right.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the stark, cold, naked truth, about the issue before us. The effort of the distinguished chairman, my friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], to get support for his amendment has but one objective, to destroy the action the Committee took yesterday; that is all, nothing else. And the reason why, as I was told all yesterday evening, last night, and this morning is because if the action of this House yesterday stands, then UMT or the reservist bill will not be passed.

Why? I ask. I am told by my friends on both sides of the aisle, by my friends in the White House, that if this action which the Committee took yesterday stands there will be a large group of men and women of this body who would vote for this bill but who will not, men and women who believe their sectional point of view is more important than the national loyalty.

Then I was asked, and it was mentioned on the floor by my distinguished friend from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, that I have been opposed to UMT through the years and that probably this is a gimmick of mine to destroy the bill. Probably he did not say exactly that, but I mention it because it has been said to me off the floor.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the membership that if the amendment they adopted yesterday stands I will vote for the reservist bill. I will vote for the UMT bill even though it is against my conscience and against my spiritual belief, so that no one can say that I used the amendment of yesterday as a gimmick to destroy this bill. I am putting my patriotism up against your patriotism. My patriotism is influenced by my spiritual belief. That is why I have been against the reservist program all along, with my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. Are you willing to put your patriotism upon the same high level that I put mine?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman, as he said, listened to me when I said very clearly that he was not using this as a gimmick, that he was not doing it as a gimmick. I believe that. I did not say that to gain any advantage. I actually, and sincerely believe that.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman. We both came to the same conclusion based upon the same statement, that is correct, but there are others here that might think I have introduced this amendment in order to destroy the bill. At great expense to my conscience, I will vote for the reservist bill if the amendments stand.

Now, my esteemed friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has brought forward this new amendment and he states that it is to eliminate my amendments. That is what it is for, to eliminate the language that my amendments applied to. He said that I said I would not have introduced the amendment if the language was not in the bill. That is not true. I have introduced amendments of this nature for 12 years, and all during this century other Members have introduced amendments of this nature. I will continue to do so to the best of my ability when I think it is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say also that the statement the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] read to you analyzing my amendment was a statement prepared by the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense is going to prepare a statement one way—their way. You cannot blame them, but nevertheless that is true. Now, my amendment does not say that if a State segregates in one unit and integrates in others that they are a State operating on a segregated pattern. My amendment does not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Messrs. BROWNSON, SAYLOR, and DAWSON of Illinois was yielded to Mr. POWELL.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment of yesterday provides that any State, Territorial, or District National Guard or Air National Guard that excludes or segregates any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin shall not have the power to go into the Reserve and take men out of the Reserve and put them in the National Guard. That is the amendment.

Under the language here the National Guard has the power to go into the Reserve and put men in their National Guard, whether it is segregated or integrated. I say by my amendment they cannot do it as long as they are segregated, and that is all.

Mr. Chairman, that is not only my position; that is the position that 126 Members of this House took yesterday voting on the basis of their conscience.

The issue of patriotism was raised yesterday, and that is the issue we raise again today. The question I asked yesterday afternoon was: Is sectionalism more important than national loyalty?

You know, all the years that Negro men marched in Jim Crow regiments, and sailed in Jim Crow ships, and fought in Jim Crow branches of our Armed Forces, the question of patriotism was never questioned. When George Washington's ragged troops of the Continental Army marched across the snows of Valley Forge you will find the bleeding footprints of Negro men who marched with them in that Army. They were segregated, but their patriotism was not in doubt. And later when Black Jack Pershing went after Pancho Villa in Mexico, Negroes rode in segregated artillery units by his side. Their patriotism was not questioned even though they were Jim Crowed. When Teddy Roosevelt went up San Juan Hill, Negroes were by his side fighting and dying in the Spanish-American War. Call the roll of World War I and World War II. They were there. Second-class citizens, but dying the same as anyone else. They never questioned their loyalty. In all the years since Benedict Arnold until recent days, not a Negro has ever been convicted of being a fifth columnist, a subversive, or agent against our Government. Our patriotism is up here, clear, untarnished, for anyone to see. Now that the world is changing, now that the world is in ferment, now that the idea of democracy must stand up against a sea of communism or we all go down, they come now and raise the queston of patriotism. I say that the only patriotism is the patriotism of loyalty to the Stars and Stripes, regardless of whether you come from Mississippi or Maine, regardless of what color your skin is or what God you believe in or do not believe in; one loyalty, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is the United States of America.

So, my friends, I ask you to support what you did yesterday, to continue giving witness as men and women, not as puppets, but as individual men and women, giving bold witness in this hour when the acids of criticism by our friends and our enemies are being poured on the United States, realizing that only an America of pure, unalloyed metal will be able to stand up against these acids and that no test of metals of discrimination or segregation will stand up in this testing time. This is the moment of truth toward which we have been marching since the days of our forefathers who fought at the bridge at Lexington and Concord. The hour of decision has come. It is here now. The days that you can waste are gone. Blows must be struck now, and when a blow is struck for freedom, there courses through the chests and hearts a joy prophetic from East to West, and slaves wherever they cower feel the souls within them climb.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: In the last clause of the amendment after "any person who" strike out "is under the age of 19" and insert in lieu thereof "has satisfactorily completed high school or has reached the age of 19 years and is under the age of 20."

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to review the why or wherefore but I well appreciate the advisability and desirability of an adequate and well-trained Reserve force.

With five Thompsons in the House, I knew that eventually there would be confusion. Since the speech of the gentleman from New Jersey, I have had some telegrams congratulating me on my opposition to the bill. I think I should set the record straight.

I intend to support the bill. I have doubts as to several features of the bill. I am willing to accept these features on faith. This amendment is, however, as I believe, required to put the bill in acceptable form.

The bill without the amendment provides:

Any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years.

The theory of this 6-month training program as I have heard it explained is to provide for a voluntary Reserve program. The 6-month program is therefore made so attractive as to encourage individuals to volunteer. We also limit the number who can be accepted. I am advised that selection will most probably be on a basis of first come, first served.

If the clause just read is retained in the bill in that form, the Members of the House are placing themselves on record as encouraging our young men to quit high school to enter the program. I do not believe this to be the position of a majority of the House and have therefore submitted the amendment.

The tendency in our States is to require a child to be 6 years of age before he can enter the first grade. Such a child cannot possibly finish high school until he is 17¾ years of age. Most will be over 18. Statistics bear this out. The vast majority are over 18 before graduation, and a substantial portion are over 19. By providing that a person must be under 19 to enlist in this program, we are saying to the large segment who do not finish high school until after they are past the age of 19, "You must quit high school if you wish to participate in this attractive program." By limiting the number who can enter the program, we are encouraging the vast majority who are over 18 before they graduate from high school to interrupt their education.

This would produce a very bad result. Experience proves the vast majority who quit high school to enter the service do not go back to school. If they did go back I believe difficult problems would develop. By the time these young men return to school at the beginning of the next school year, they would be a year older. They would have been absent in the Army, and to a large extent on their own. They would enter school with young people approximately 14 years of age who are just beginning high school. This, we all realize, would not be a desirable situation.

This amendment, if adopted, would cause the section to read:

Any person who has satisfactorily completed high school or has reached the age of 19 years and who is under the age of 20 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a reserve component for a total of 8 years.

This would mean that any boy could enter the program after his graduation from high school. If he quit high school for other reasons, he could enlist at 19. The program would remain open to him until he reached 20 years, thus preventing the person who does not graduate until 19 from being precluded without interrupting his high-school education.

The only arguments I have heard against my proposed amendment are two. The first is that the boy must have his parents consent if he enters the program before reaching the age of 18 years. The fact is that unless this amendment is adopted, this House will still be in the position of encouraging the boy to seek his parents consent, and furthermore, of encouraging the parents to give their consent.

The second argument is that the services will discourage boys from enlisting before they have finished high school. I have never been one to believe that any legislative body can justify poor legislation on the hope that it will be administered so as to prevent undesirable results. By adopting this amendment, this House will make sure that our youth are encouraged to finish high school.

From my experience in the Army and in the Reserve program, I believe that this amendment is in the best interests of the service and the Reserve program. By the 6-month program provided in this act we expect a man to qualify himself as a well-trained reservist with only 6 months' active duty, followed by a 2-hour drill period once a week. Certainly, if we encourage men to complete high school before they enter this program, they will be better qualified to assimilate the material and we will have better Reserve units. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with the chairman of the subcommittee and consulted with the staff. I do not see much harm in this amendment, and so far as I am concerned per-

sonally, we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia and the members of the committee for their acceptance of this amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MADDEN yielded the time allotted to him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois yielded the time allotted to him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].)

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, early yesterday afternoon I stood on the floor of this House and said that I had decided to support this pending bill, as brought out by the committee. I made that statement, believing that this bill would bolster our Reserve forces and our defense, and that, although there were things in the bill that I did not like, I was of the opinion that the good outweighed the bad. I was convinced that no politics was in the bill, and that the committee bill reflected the committee's desire to do the best job it could under the circumstances and was working for America.

Late yesterday afternoon I was surprised and shocked over an amendment that this House accepted. That amendment cut the heart out of the defense idea and theory of States rights. The thought had never occurred to me that this House would consent, or think of consenting, to the depriving of the governors' powers in their respective States to control the State militia or National Guard, but the House did that very thing.

My State will never agree to surrender the right of our governor to control the militia and National Guard willingly. I doubt that the people of the other 47 States will willingly agree to any such movement. Anyway, it is my duty and privilege, as one of my State's servants, to retain that right, if possible. Freedom can, and has been, lost through legislation and by centralization more often than on the battlefield.

If that amendment remains in the bill, then the bill becomes one that I have not endorsed and will not endorse, and I will vote in favor of recommittal, and if the bill is not recommitted I will vote against the bill.

I assure you, however, that when the exigencies are such that this House wants a Reserve bill without surrender of States rights, I can be counted on to support that kind of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with the proposition of legislating from the floor and in a technical bill such as this, this procedure is very impractical. This matter was studied by the committee for 7 long weeks, practically every day and often 2 sessions a day. I only missed 1 of these many sessions. I want a good bill. This bill is already defective, but this amendment will make it worse.

Everyone recognizes that the National Guard is the really strong operating Reserve that we have today. It is not perfect, but it is good and getting better.

This bill provided two methods whereby a person could become a member of the guard, either he could take the 6 months' training before becoming a member, or if a veteran, he could volunteer or by compulsion become a member. There is great doubt that many will be willing to take the 6-month method. This amendment before us prevents the assignment of veterans by the Army into the National Guard. Today a man can enlist in the guard. If this bill is passed he must take 6 months' training before becoming a member of the guard. So this amendment will further cut the strength of the National Guard.

I raised the question of this bill depleting the guard time after time, and the head of the National Guard Association met with us for many hours in regard to that very question. In order to take care of this situation the proponents of this bill promised that the Army would give the guard sufficient men to keep the units up to strength.

Two days ago in debate on this bill, while I was speaking, I stated that I had serious doubts that the National Guard could get sufficient enlistments if the enlistees were forced to take this 6 months' training; the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, stated that the Army would transfer the veterans to the guard to keep up their strength. This amendment before us would prevent such transfers.

The pending amendment takes away that opportunity. I am against this amendment because it will certainly take away any opportunity the guard has to get men by that method.

Before this matter is voted on, before the committee adopts this amendment the Armed Services Committee should go into consultation with officials of the National Guard and the National Guard Association. We met many hours on this very question. Yet today here, in a moment, we are changing the whole plan.

I believe I understand this bill as well as anyone on the floor of this House. I do not know how this is going to affect the guard, but I know it will affect them adversely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to Mr. BRAY.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has made a very important statement. I obtained 2½ minutes of this time in order to address a question to the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, to ascertain if it was not true that the amendment he has just offered here would seriously and adversely affect the National Guard by virtue of the fact that it would eliminate assignments into the National Guard, which would then have to compete for men that it could not possibly get under the 6-month-enlistment provision in the bil' he wants to put over. It is my opinion that the gentleman from Georgia would now settle for the enacting clause in this bill in order to get something over to the Senate.

Mr. BRAY. I do not want to comment on that because I have the highest respect and regard for the gentleman from Georgia, but I will say that if this bill does not already ruin the guard this clause certainly will give it the final blow.

Mr. GROSS. This clause certainly will do the job.

Mr. BRAY. This matter could be recommitted to the Armed Services Committee, and if certain people outside of the Congress would stop interfering we could work out a good Reserve bill that would give us a good Reserve. That is something I have been interested in personally and directly since I was 18 years old.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman make the statement that the Vinson amendment ruins the National Guard?

Mr. BRAY. I certainly do, and for this reason: First, we have taken away the ordinary method of enlistment in the guard. It has been a job to keep the guard up to enlisted strength. We have been able to do it because young men were willing to enlist in the National Guard. However, this bill adds 6 months' training before a youth can be a member of the National Guard. The proponents of the bill said we could take care of that by the Army's assigning members to the guard. How can they make this assignment if this amendment is passed? I believe it needs close study, and it can only be studied in committee, not on the floor.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman know that the only thing with reference to the National Guard my amendment does is to prohibit involuntary assignment? Does he not also know it preserves the National Guard enlistment and controls just as they are today?

Mr. BRAY. No, that is not the case. It does exactly the opposite of that. Today a man can enlist in the National Guard. If this bill becomes law, he cannot do so. Today a boy between 18 and 19½ can go down and enlist in the National Guard, but under this bill he cannot. He must serve 6 months before he can become a guardsman. This 6 months' training at that age will take a year out of his life.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true the only reason the National Guard gets him

in is because the captains locally go out to the boys and sell them on the job and get them in the National Guard?

Mr. BRAY. The way it is done today is that the captains in the National Guard companies or batteries go into the homes and the schools and talk to the young men, and they sign up. If you pass this bill into law, that will not be possible, because then the boy will have to take 6 months' training before he can become a member of the guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the issues on this bill have been discussed pretty thoroughly. I asked for this time just to ask the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee a couple of questions in the hope I might be able to clarify the matter.

Under the provisions of the Vinson amendment, can any of the volunteers be assigned to the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The provisions of the bill, as amended, will permit a man to enlist in the National Guard under the 6-month plan. He would not be assigned to the National Guard. He would enlist in the guard under the 6-month plan and be trained.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman mean by that that a man would enlist for 6 months' training designating the National Guard as his choice?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Vinson amendment restore to the National Guard the incentive to people to enlist by being deferred from the draft?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It does. It still preserves the guard as an independent organization under the States, but permits the individual to select the guard, if he wishes to enlist in it. Then he goes into service operating under the 6-month training plan, if he enlists in it.

Mr. NELSON. So that under the Vinson amendment, anyone who enlists in the National Guard and does not go in under this plan for 6 months' training, does not get any deferment from the draft?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He is not draft proof, if that is what the gentleman's question is.

Mr. NELSON. In other words, he can be called up at any time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, no. Under the 6-month training plan.

Mr. NELSON. I qualified my question, if the gentleman from Louisiana will permit me—I said, any man who enlists in the National Guard not under the 6-month plan is subject to the draft.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We take out the provisions of the law that permit the guard to enlist individuals without prior training and protect them from the draft.

Mr. NELSON. So that the only way a man can now enlist in the National Guard, if he is to be deferred from the draft, is to go in under the 6-month training plan.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He can go in under the 6-month plan and he would be deferred, and also under the 2-year plan of enlistment.

Mr. NELSON. So the only men that the National Guard can get is if a man enlists for 6 months' training designating the National Guard as his choice?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Plus any enlistments under the 2-year plan, which the guard now has available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, as some of you may have heard, I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I have not spoken on this bill or attempted to speak. The reason I am in favor of the Vinson amendment is that it attempts to save what is left of the National Guard. I do not know whether you are impatient with the Constitution of the United States. To those of you who want to kill this bill, I say I am not talking to you. And I am not talking to those who get goose bumps when ADAM CLAYTON POWELL gets up in the well of the House and makes a speech. I am not talking to you people. I am addressing my remarks to those who still believe that those powers which are not delegated to the Central Government were retained in the States. That is my position. Among those powers was the sanctity of the National Guard and the sovereignty of the several States. That is my position, for which I do not apologize. I have not tried to speak here, and what I say will pass over you so fast, it will make your head swim. But what you do here, somebody somewhere is going to remember. That is my position. What have the National Guards of the several States done that you should do this to them? That is the question I pose to you. Wherein have they been unpatriotic? I know the question has been put to you. There comes a time in the life of every man and of every nation when a decision must be made. That is the question I ask you today. What have the National Guards at home done that you want to gut them here today under the guise of the Powell amendment? That is the question you have to resolve. I want to tell you here and now, the National Guard was here before any Member of this Congress from the several States. You do not have the right, I submit here, to summarily pass over that fine outfit and under the guise of the Powell ultimatum strip them lock, stock, and barrel of their sacred mission. What about a disaster in your State? Does the Central Government send soldiers to your States? They cannot do that and they do not do that. The National Guard serves many missions and among them was service in the last war. Wherein was there a National Guard unit more highly decorated than the Oklahoma Guard, for instance? You do not have the right here and now to do this to the National Guard. The Vinson amendment attempts to save what is left of it. You do not have the right to gut and hang, draw and quarter what is left of that great patriotic organization known as the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if even the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] as a member of the Committee on Armed Services admits that he is confused about this bill, perhaps there will be justifiable sympathy for me when I say that I am also confused. I think indeed that 95 percent of the Members present are confused about the details or the actual plan embodied in this newly presented amendment on which we are about to vote.

I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina, however, that I am one of those who always listens attentively and with respect to the gentleman from New York and to his proposed amendments. I think indeed that the fact that this Member was able to rise at Bandung and proclaim that although his grandparents were slaves, he himself has risen to be a Member of Congress, is something glorious to think about. This equality of opportunity, so uniquely American, is one of our greatest national assets.

I have just two points to make. I do not know—nor does anyone else—exactly what the Vinson amendment will do, but I know very well what the 126 people in the Committee, of which I was one, who voted yesterday for the Powell amendment, meant to do. They meant to say to this country and to the world that the freedom we talk about, the freedom we are spending billions of dollars over the world to uphold, the freedom we are now enjoying in our way of life, the freedom which you say we must now protect by inducting into 8 years of military service the whole youth of this country—that such freedom is real and not just on paper; and that such freedom permits no second-class citizenship. That is what the Powell amendment says to the House.

I would like to add in the 2½ minutes allotted to me that I have little regard for the effort to force a decision on legislation, in the midst of such confusion. Perhaps it would be a good thing to recommit this bill to the Committee on Armed Services and get necessary protection for the National Guard at the same time that we are still insisting on American principles. I am one of those who would want no weakening, through legislation or otherwise, of our National Guard.

I am not moved by the argument that it is so necessary to get a bill out today that to do it we must give up everything we stand for, waive our principles, deny our beliefs. No legislation in the world is that important, and no plan can ever succeed if in its purpose and entity it denies the basic principles that underlie the life, the happiness, and the safety of every single person in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I asked for time to support the Thomson amendment. I just want to thank the committee for including this amendment in their recommendations.

If the bill is recommitted I hope this amendment will be included also. This amendment encourages every American

youth to take advantage of his birthright and that is the right to finish high school. It embodies the policy and exact idea which I proposed on the floor of the House Tuesday. I like Herbert Hoover's statement that "the United States has only one-sixth of the population of the world, yet we have 40 percent of the college graduates. Therein lies America's might, and let no one, Delilahlike, shear us of that strength."

At the outset let me state that I shall vote for H. R. 5297 because it is a real contribution to our military program. The amendment of my colleague from Wyoming will make the bill still stronger.

The offer of 6 months' active service instead of the present provision of 2 years to the boy who enlists will be very attractive and according to America's high-school principals, there will be a rush into it. They favor encouraging all high-school graduates to enter the program, but they oppose the provision which induces boys who have not graduated to interrupt their education to enlist.

The Thomson amendment provides that a high-school graduate may enlist at any time between 17 years and 20 years of age, but a non-high-school graduate must wait until he is 19 years of age to enlist.

Under H. R. 5297 any boy over 17 may enlist provided the quota of 100 million to 250 million has not been filled. There will be 660,000 boys graduate from high school this year, only 7 percent of whom are under 17 years of age, and 30 percent are under 18 years of age. This means that 70 percent would have been eligible to enlist before they had completed high school.

Now suppose one of these 17-year-old boys who has not completed high school enlists this June. His 6 months' stint will be finished in December. If he lives in a metropolitan area possibly he could enter high school at midyear, but in most areas there is no midyear entering class, and no midyear graduation classes. This boy would then have to go to work or loaf until fall. If he goes to work, which is likely, the chances are that he will stay at his work and become obligated for a car, and will not return to school.

A representative of the Defense Department told me yesterday that the Department of Defense will make it a policy to discourage all men from enlisting in the Reserve, which enlistment would interrupt their high-school work.

Furthermore, I was told that the Defense Department wants the boys to complete high school before entering the service. The Defense Department, however, will accept the boys for enlistment if H. R. 5297 is passed, other things being equal, in the order of the date of their application.

According to the representative, the Defense Department will counsel non-high-school graduates to wait until they have graduated. If that is their policy, which is a commendable policy, why not put that policy into effect by supporting the Thomson amendment? If the Thomson amendment prevails the Defense Department will not be faced with the embarrassing situation of advising boys against enlisting when the Reserve plan itself offers them such inducement to enlist.

Again it is said that non-high-school graduates over 17 will be deterred from enlisting because they will be required to receive their parents' consent. I do not think so much of this argument because parents have their problems just the same as do Congressmen. If Congress through the national Reserve plan holds out such a strong inducement to non-high-school graduates to enlist, Congress will be placing all parents who have educational plans for their boys in a most embarrassing position. After a parent has ingrained patriotism, as all good parents will do, it is difficult to say "No" to their boy when he wants to enlist, especially if the boy proved to the parent that at a particular time he will be accepted while if he waits the quota will be filled, and he will not be accepted, and as a consequence will have to serve 2 years instead of 6 months.

A democracy is characterized quite largely by the fact that those who rule are sensitive to the feelings and needs of those who obey. I was the first one to advocate on the floor of the House the idea embodied in the Thomson amendment. In my opinion it is our obligation to support the Thomson amendment.

First, because I think it will prevent the disruption of the educational career of the majority of our high-school boys;

Second, it will prevent the parents from being placed in an embarrassing position;

Third, it will strengthen the Armed Forces by providing them with more high-school graduates;

Fourth, it will induce the boys to complete their high school in order to be eligible to enlist rather than offer a premium to the boy who quits high school before graduation;

Fifth, it will secure the unqualified support of all of the high-school principals in America, whereas the unamended bill will be only reluctantly accepted, if not violently opposed.

In conclusion, Herbert Hoover struck the keynote of America's power when he said:

> The United States has only one-sixth of the world's population; yet the United States has 40 percent of all the college graduates. Therein lies America's strength. Let no man shear her Delilah-like this strength.

I am for a strong America. I am of the opinion that H. R. 5297 is a splendid measure and shall support it under any circumstances, but that section which permits 17-year-old non-high-school graduates to enlist will shear us of some of our power.

It should be amended to hold them in school until they have completed their high-school education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is rather unfortunate that whenever we inject a racial issue into our proceedings it generates a great deal of heat. Honestly and frankly, I have no feeling against any human being, no matter what his color or origin may be. Perhaps that is something not to be bragged about, and it is not said to make people believe that I am more solicitous of the underdog than others. However, I lived as a boy and I live now in a community where there exists none of that kind of feeling. We mingle with Chinese, Negroes, and others of varying colors and races and get along with all of them.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated here several times that the National Guard will be ruined if this bill is enacted into law. But nothing could be further from the truth. General Walsh, Director of the National Guard Association in Washington, agrees to this bill and agrees to the longer training period beyond the 4 months' period, 8 months in all. The adjutant general of the State of California, General Jones, wired me that he wants this bill passed. The chief of the National Guard of the State of New Jersey was present at our hearings and agreed that this bill is a good one.

Mr. Chairman, it must be realized that in a bill that is as complicated as this one there are bound to be differences of opinion. I think we have found the middle ground which will result in our having a very strong Reserve system There was no acrimony in our subcommittee. We talked these matters over frankly and we tried to arrive at what would be the best kind of a bill to report. That resulted in the bill that we bring to you today. Most of the members of the Committee on Armed Services have had experience in warfare, too, so they know what they are talking about when the subject of national defense is being discussed. We believe that this bill is the best we could get under the circumstances.

If this bill is recommitted, perhaps the committee may improve it. I do not know about that, but I rather doubt it. There are so many and diverse opinions that unanimity of opinion could not be secured on any one issue. I should like to repeat that this bill does not by any manner or means ruin or injure the National Guard of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am for universal military training. I have always been for it. In World War I replacements were sent up to the front lines consisting of young boys who had been called to duty from civilian life, boys who had not even had practice on the rifle range. It was criminal. We should learn a lesson from that experience.

Mr. Chairman, living in a troubled world as we do today we would not be smart if we did not prepare ourselves to meet any emergency. I wish that I possessed the eloquence of the gentlewoman from Illinois who addressed you just a few moments ago so that I might call your attention to the real issues at stake here.

On yesterday you did the American thing. You did the big thing. You refused to recognize second-class citizenship in that military establishment, and

today my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], whom I love, tells you frankly that the purpose of his amendment is to do away with the Powell amendments of yesterday, which did not keep any governor from having a National Guard but prescribed that there should not be segregation in the National Guard. Why should there be? Why should not a black boy join the National Guard in any State? When are you going to stop distinguishing between citizens first class and citizens second class? Certainly the place to begin to remove that distinction, and to make the Constitution that some have talked of here today a real thing, a living thing, is right here on the floor of the Congress. Certainly the Vinson amendment should be defeated. It should be defeated for the very reason he gave why he introduced it, and that was to do away with the effect of the Powell amendments.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. The reason I offered it was prompted by the first utterance of the gentleman from New York in which he was complaining about the language. He said this:

> I am loath to introduce these amendments, but it so happens that on page 3 of this bill there has been written in some language from line 4 to line 12 which compels me to do so.

Now, I have sought to take that language out, and the taking out of the language is in accordance with the wishes of the gentleman from New York. Therefore, there is no necessity for his amendments.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I appreciate the words of my distinguished friend, but he misinterprets the opening statement made by the gentleman from New York. I, too, am loath to ever have to stand in the well of this House and ever raise a question of discrimination between American citizens because of race, because it should not be done here. But, whenever the occasion arises to do it, then those who feel it most keenly, those who do it have to do it because of the consciences within them and the patriotism within them as they rise to answer. Otherwise they would remain silent.

Now, there is no question about what is sought to be done here. There is no question about why the Vinson amendment is introduced here today. The Vinson amendment is introduced here today to do but one thing, and he stated it, as I said in the beginning, to undo what you did yesterday. What has occurred since yesterday that you have changed your mind? Yesterday you passed certain amendments, and in order to do away with your action of yesterday, you have this hurried provision which is brought here today. Who dictated it? Did the Pentagon dictate it? Since when are the Members of Congress bound by the dictation of the Pentagon? Why, that is a prerogative we, the Congress, occupy in this Nation in the scheme of things. We are a check on the executive departments when they go beyond their boundaries where the rights of people are concerned. I am asking you to do the decent thing today. I am asking you in the light of the spirit that prompted you yesterday, I am asking you in the light of the Constitution that you have sworn to uphold, to defeat the Vinson amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read the motion, as follows:

> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I hear that the President of the United States intends to meet with top officials of other nations, including those who represent Communist Russia. If the President can do that—and I know of no objection, if the interests of our Nation are safeguarded—I know of no reason why the Members of the House should not try to get together, talk over their differences, and if we are to have a bill similar to the one which was introduced, bring out a Powell-Vinson bill.

It is perfectly obvious that there is a wide divergence of opinion here as to what should go into this bill. That old theory that a bill brought out by the Committee on Armed Services cannot be improved upon has been disproved by the fact that today we have the Vinson amendment, which I assume is intended to at least modify the Powell amendments which we adopted yesterday, and if possible make it acceptable to the States rights advocates. Apparently—and, of course, I can only judge by what I hear and see—apparently the Vinson amendment will be voted down. It is my understanding—I did not eavesdrop, but I heard this, sitting in the House, that if the Vinson amendment is voted down and the Powell amendments stay in the bill, then the Committee will be asked to rise and postpone action.

This bill has been before us for 3 days. It was long in the committee. Some know it is not what it seems to be. Some are sure a bill will not come out of committee unless it carries the foundation of UMT as desired by the Army.

The gentleman who opposed the bill most vigorously, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], had to leave on other business; he had made a prior commitment. He relied upon statements of the leadership that the bill would be disposed of yesterday. But as we are in such wide disagreement, why should not the Committee rise now, strike out the enacting clause, let the bill go back to the Committee on Armed Services, where perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] can get together and bring in a bill which will protect the well-being of our future taxpayers and the Nation which a majority may support? Why is not that a sensible, practical way of handling this situation? It seems to me that is the obvious thing to do. The Vinson amendment apparently will be rejected, the Powell amendment is in the bill, and will today remain there. There are sufficient votes to kill the bill as it is now written.

In order to save time—get a bill which will receive the approval of the House.

If this motion to rise and strike the enacting clause is voted down my opinion is that the Vinson amendment will be voted down, and then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will make a motion that the Committee rise. That motion prevailing, as it probably will, consideration of the measure will probably be postponed indefinitely and until pressure has secured the votes necessary to give the Pentagon what it desires—regardless of the wishes of our constituents.

Why not take the obvious, constructive, short way?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I regret to find myself in disagreement with the Congresswoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] in her recommendation that this bill be recommitted. The Committee on Armed Services has spent hours, days, and weeks on this bill. There is not any question that we need an alert Reserve Corps in our national defense setup. We need a program to build up the Reserve Corps. Regardless of what your opinion may be on the Powell amendment or the Vinson amendment, I sincerely hope that you have the courage of your convictions to stand up and vote one way or the other and meet this issue at this time so that this proposed National Reserve legislation can be considered.

I know you have all heard from the folks back home, pro and con, for and against. Many of you are trying to find a way out and the way out, I fully realize, would be to recommit the bill so that it would not be necessary to take a position on this legislation. You are all anxious for some development which will relieve you from taking a definite stand one way or the other.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I want to advise the House of Representatives that the Reserves need some legislative help and need it badly. If the House wants to shirk its responsibility and let our guards down, it is up to them.

Mr. GAVIN. Why, certainly. What are we going to do? If we do not build up the Reserve Corps and we are suddenly catapulted into another emergency, then we are going to ask that the boys who did the combat fighting in World War II and the boys who did the combat fighting in Korea be called back again, to move in and take over another job. They should be relieved of the responsibility and the National Reserve Corps be built up into an alert, hard hitting, well-trained Reserve to meet any demands if an emergency should arise.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The question before the House is whether to strike out the en-

acting clause. That is not the question the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. GAVIN. It will produce the same result. You will reach the same objective. It may be a different technique, but the results will be the same.

If the motion to strike out all after the enacting clause carries, that would kill the bill. It would have to be reconsidered by the committee; and completely new legislation from the beginning would have to be considered by the committee.

The committee would have to start all over again. And many are hoping that it will never see daylight again because of the fact you do not wish to take a position on this legislation because of the thinking of the folks back home. You are trying to find a way out, so that you can reconcile your conscience and are hoping that no action will be taken on this bill today.

It would be a grave mistake to send this bill back to the committee. With the critical and chaotic conditions in the world today it would be a grave mistake to recommit it. I say now is the time to have the courage of your convictions, to stand on principle and vote your convictions. You are going to be given the opportunity to be so recorded, as to whether you are for a Reserve bill or you are against a Reserve bill. If this bill is passed today it will go to conference. If it goes to conference between the House and Senate the differences may be ironed out, and in any event you would be given another opportunity to vote on it before any final action is taken on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I gladly yield to my very good and able friend, who has spent hours on this proposed legislation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It might be well to state again, what was mentioned during debate yesterday, that as a subcommittee we sat for 8 weeks, morning, afternoon, and evening, listening to 115 witnesses, who filled 2,500 printed pages with testimony. The subcommittee chairman asked those present, "Does anyone present wish to make a statement?" And no one accepted the offer. In addition, the chairman of the subcommittee came to the floor of the House and invited interested Members to appear before our committee and only 2 or 3 Members appeared.

Mr. GAVIN. Not alone any Member of the House but any organization that desired to be heard was given the opportunity to present their views when the bill was under consideration.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me remind the House, too, that practically every patriotic organization of any consequence has come before the committee and endorsed this bill. Every one of the military Reserve organizations has endorsed the bill. The American Legion has endorsed the bill. So many other organizations have endorsed the bill that you could not count them here in the limited time the gentleman has.

Mr. GAVIN. What you are trying to do here today is to find a way out, to relieve yourselves of the responsibility of taking a position. Therefore, I sincerely hope there will be no further attempts to recommit the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just correct the RECORD to show that I did appear before the subcommittee and the printed report of the committee will so show.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS].

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly take no pleasure in airing here on the floor of the Congress of the United States the discrepancies which exist between what we preach and what we practice in this great country of ours. Such discussions give comfort to the enemies of democracy and alienate many of our present and potential friends. History has proven, however, that the improvement of intergroup relationships and recognition of the equality of all men has been principally fostered by the periodic enactment of legislative mandates.

We have arrived at such a period today as we stand on the threshold of a basic change in our National Guard and Armed Forces Reserve system. It is appropriate, therefore, that we give favorable consideration to the proposal of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] that segregation and discrimination in said units be eliminated. Involved in this deliberation is not only the moral issue of human equality as exemplified in the Constitution and the Ten Commandments, but the practical issue of winning the war for the minds of men.

The matter which has culminated before us today represents the last stage in the long historical struggle for integration in the armed services. I know of no better description of this problem than that which appeared in a recent series of articles in the Pittsburgh Courier, one of America's leading weekly newspapers, which pointed out dramatically the partnership in prejudice which exists between the Federal Government and the National Guard and Armed Forces Reserve units. These articles, which were written by the able correspondent, A. M. Rivera, Jr., state that the National Guard is the South's ace in the hole to defeat the effect of the United States Supreme Court's order to banish racial segregation in education, as reflected in ex-Governor Talmadge's, of Georgia, threatened such use of troops. We have just passed the appropriation bill for the Defense Department, which calls for the allocation of huge sums of Federal money to support the National Guard, even though in the South, where two-thirds of the Nation's 15 million Negroes live, the guard will remain lily white by law and custom.

A typical Southern State, the article points out, is North Carolina, where Negroes are denied training and membership in the guard by a 1917 State statute, which reads:

> The white and colored militia shall be separately enrolled, and shall never be compelled to serve in the same organization. No organization of colored troops shall be permitted where white troops are available, and while permitted to be organized, colored troops shall be under command of white officers.

For the fiscal year 1954, 13 Southern States, which deliberately and systematically exclude Negroes from the National Guard and the Air National Guard received $10,749,231.38 directly appropriated from the Federal Government for the operation of the National Guard and Air National Guard. These States participated and received benefits in another $25 million which was not appropriated as to States.

The article further points out that—

> The denial of Negroes means much more than a chance to parade down main street whistling Dixie with a group of white lads. The denial means:
>
> (1) The loss of an opportunity to choose from a list of 450 technical courses; (2) the loss of a chance to learn many new skills; (3) young men of draft age are denied a chance to start their military training while they are still going to school and living at home; (4) they lose the opportunity to earn extra income while training with the guard; (5) the rejection of Negro veterans with Reserve obligations means that they must serve the required full Reserve status, while white veterans may cut this time by as much as 2 years by serving in the National Guard; and (6) Negroes lose valuable retirement benefits.
>
> The most significant loss appears to be the denial of unlimited educational opportunities to Negroes. According to the recruiting literature of the service, guardsmen are privileged to attend Regular Army and Air Force technical schools with pay. Many of the 450 technical courses may be taken through correspondence. These courses can mean a better job with better pay in civilian life because they increase technical skills and earning power. They cover a wide variety of fields, from personnel administration to radio, radar, and motor mechanics. Guardsmen pay no tuition and earn while they learn.

The denial of a chance to qualify for these technical courses penalizes the region which needs most to upgrade all of its human resources and points up the high cost of segregation to the Nation.

In view of all these facts, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the members of the Committee to reject the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, of Georgia, which, by his own admission, is designed to preserve one of the most flagrantly undemocratic practices in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I am not clear about this amendment. One thing I want to be more clear about, entirely clear, is this: Does the amendment in any respect affect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] that was carried yesterday?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, it includes it. It is reproduced in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] to close debate.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well in the closing moments of this debate to go back to the fundamental matter to be voted upon here in a few minutes. When my colleague from New York introduced his 2 amendments yesterday, or perhaps the 1 amendment in 2 parts, as has been said here already, he began his remarks by referring to certain objectionable words in the bill now before you. Those objectionable words are shown on page 3 beginning at line 4 of the bill, H. R. 5297, of which you have a copy. The objectionable part of the bill to which he referred begins with the statement:

> When recruitment efforts by the several States procure less than the necessary numbers and quality of volunteer personnel, and upon request or approval of the Governor or other appropriate authority of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, such a person may be transferred to the Army National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph or under section 6 (c) (2) (A).

When I studied his remarks after the conclusion of our debate yesterday and the adjournment of the House, I made up my mind that what he had in mind was that this part of the bill which permitted the Federal Government to assign to the National Guard men who had been trained was objectionable to him unless there were certain provisos. Frankly, if the guard can operate without any Federal assignments, I would rather see the guard operate without any Federal assignments. I think of the National Guard as a great and glorious organization. It is an organization that has participated in every one of our wars since the War of 1812. It has a magnificent record behind it and we are all proud of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman was a member of the National Guard in World War I. I was a member of the National Guard 15 years after World War I ended. Does the gentleman know of any single adjutant general in the United States of America who does not favor this bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The National Guard Association endorsed the bill. You will find it in the printed record on the last page where I asked everyone sitting around the table in the subcommittee and I asked each one whether or not he favored the bill. Those men had made a study of the bill—not for 1 day or 1 hour but for weeks and months. They were in favor of the bill, including General Walsh who was there and who headed the National Guard Association organization.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiania. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that General Walsh read the bill paragraph by paragraph with the committee? In many instances he offered suggestions which the subcommittee accepted in an effort to protect the interest of the National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He did that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I just wonder if the gentleman has heard from the National Guard on the Vinson amendment, which has been proposed to us here this morning.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will ask the gentleman whether he has made an inquiry as to this matter? I have not had time to do so and such action would involve contact with people from distant areas.

Mr. LONG. The gentleman will not find any expression of approval from the National Guard in the record of the hearings with reference to the Vinson amendment, and that is what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They were interrogated regarding the bill as it was presented to the Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not the effect of the Vinson amendment in removing certain language from the bill would have a tendency to weaken the National Guard in that it would deprive them of one source of recruits. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It depends on the way you look at it. It would put the guard back on its own as a State institution and put it in a position where they would have to go out and continue to fight to enlist their membership. The easy way for the guard would be for the Federal Government to draft personnel into the Federal service and assign them to the guard.

I myself much prefer to have the guard as an organization resting on its own merits, its own history, and its own patriotic background. With that it can go out into the highways and the byways, into the villages and hamlets and recruit its own membership on a voluntary basis. I think the record of the National Guard is such that it can do that, and under the Vinson amendment we will simply strike out that portion of the bill which permits the Federal Government to assign troops from the Federal service to the guard. We then would let the guard go on its own and enlist its own personnel on a voluntary basis, and if a young man down in your State or in my State wishes to enlist in the guard he will not have to come to Washington and ask permission to do it, he will do it on his own. I do not have any objection to it, and the guard will go ahead, make its enlistments, fill up its ranks, and carry on as it has done for the 165 years of this country's history.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think the record should show that at least for the past 3 years when the National Guard has had a volunteer program the guard has reached their authorized limits. In fact the National Guard has repeatedly asked for additional funds to bring in more than was originally permitted them by the Department of the Army under authorized strength.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Witnesses testified before the committee that the guard now has 350,000 members, and the authorized strength as allowed by the Appropriations Committee is for 375,000. The guard will reach that number, 375,000, before the end of this fiscal year. If that is the case then the guard is all right on a purely voluntary basis and does not need any Federal assignments.

Another situation is that the governors of none of the States want the Government of the United States to tell them how to handle the National Guard. That applies to the State of New York and it applies likewise to the State of California and every other State in the Union. I, for one, am in favor of the governors of the States managing their own guard.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the completion of the question I asked before?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. For the completion of the question, yes.

Mr. MEADER. Would not the adoption of this amendment make the voluntary recruitment program of the National Guard more difficult?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would put them on their own, as I said. This does not hurt voluntary enlistment. In case they would not get voluntary enlistment, this bill as originally written would permit the transfer from Federal training to the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 116, noes 143.

Messrs. VINSON of Georgia and WILLIAMS of Mississippi demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 143, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this is a question where we try to eat our cake and have it too.

It would be folly not to have a well-trained and well-disciplined Reserve in this fast-moving age when a major war could explode at any moment, and we would not be given a year's grace in which to train millions of civilians into an effective fighting force.

At the same time, we must consider the American people's opposition to anything resembling universal military training with the regimentation it would impose on all young men.

How to reconcile these positions is most difficult.

We recall the men who served long and gallantly in World War II, and, having done their duty, returned to civilian life to resume their careers, to marry, and raise their families. When they were called back for double duty in the Korean war there was much resentment, and rightly so, when they thought of others around their age who had never given 1 day of military service to defend their country.

To correct this inequality, it is necessary that practically all young men be required to give some service. If, because of inability to measure up to physical or mental standards, or because of a family hardship, or because they are engaged in essential occupations, nevertheless they could be trained on a part-time basis. In the event of war, the best of them would add to the strength of our fighting units. The rest could serve in support. Even during World War II, we had millions of men in uniform who never saw combat but were essential in supporting roles, even though many of them never left this country. This is the type of service that every young man should be able to give his country in the event of war, no matter what his limitations, or reasons for deferment may be. For these purposes, every man who may ever wear a uniform, needs a basic military training in fundamentals, and in discipline.

From Regulars to Ready Reserve to Standby Reserve, there is a need and a place for many, in diminishing order of importance, but nonetheless necessary.

As on any team, we must have replacements, and, in the parlance of baseball, "a good bench" of relief pitchers and pinch hitters and substitute fielders and coaches.

As Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, testified on February 9 of this year, quoting from the report of the National Security Training Commission:

> During the period of July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1953, there was built up a group of 1,600,000 physically qualified young men whose ages came within the draft law, who saw no service and incurred and have no Reserve obligation.

This put all the burden on the Regulars, the "retreads" and the draftees, which was a dangerous imbalance from the viewpoint of national security, and was manifestly unfair to those who did serve.

Under this bill, all available young men will not be reached.

Human nature being what it is, the Regulars who put in 20 or more years of service as volunteers, are carrying the ball for those who have no sense of any obligation to their country. But this is not enough for our national security, even with the help of draftees who are on active duty for 2 years.

If we are going to have a Reserve, it should start with qualified young men from 17 to 19, restricted to once-a-week armory drills and instruction plus 2 weeks field training each summer over a long period and in lieu of 2 or more years of active service.

We are trying our best to put this on a voluntary basis, with the prospect of being called up for 2 years active duty by selective service as an inducement. But, no matter how you figure this out, some will be trained as Reserves, while others will completely evade service of any kind whatsoever.

This is unjust to Regulars, draftees, volunteers, for the Reserve, and men with prior service.

Perhaps we should have supplementary legislation to provide that any man, otherwise qualified, who has never had any kind of military service, should, up to the age of 50, be required to give some time to our national security, perhaps in a part-time civilian defense work. But that, too, would be compulsion.

Coming back to this National Reserve plan, which involves youngsters in their last year of high school, or just a year or 2 out of high, we are faced with problems that are of much concern to their parents.

Six months' active duty at that age subjects them to influences which they are not ready to cope with. Perhaps a civilian advisory board composed of parents, clergymen, and educators, could assist the Army in working out a program to protect the moral welfare of these teen-agers.

Frankly, I would much prefer maintaining the prestrength of our Armed Forces; supplemented by a voluntary Reserve program, providing safeguards against arbitrary call up, and one that is based upon realistic training with adequate pay.

By giving the program prestige and building up pride in its members, I believe we can make it succeed on a voluntary basis.

And eliminate the objections that H. R. 5297 in its present form is universal military training in disguise.

We need a genuine Reserve, but without coercion.

I believe that this bill should first be amended to make it attractive to teen-agers, so that they will want to join because they have confidence in it.

Considering all factors, this is the American way to meet the issue. I am sure that our younger men will respond, if we provide them with the right incentives.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, noes 124.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 5, 1955:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California.

On May 13, 1955:

H. R. 1602. An act to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States;

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; and

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations.

On May 19, 1955:

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third annual reports of the Panama Canal Company

and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1955.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. PRESTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 603), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1955, during debate on H. R. 12, the farm price-support bill, I read into the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan, and myself, appearing on page 5775 of the RECORD. I pointed out that the Governor had an inaccurate understanding of the underlying facts and reasons in arriving at his position on this Federal question.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, the Jackson Citizen Patriot, of Jackson, Mich., in my district, took me to task for my naivete in thinking that Governor Williams would be influenced by facts and logic. The editorial was in the form of an open letter to me which I insert at this point in the RECORD.

IT'S NO GOOD, GEORGE

An open letter to Representative GEORGE MEADER, who represents the Jackson district in Congress:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You're too subtle, GEORGE.

"Your phrasing is clever and the point is clear. But if you think any of the Democratic farm bloc spokesmen, much less our own Governor Williams, are going to be deterred by words, you've got another think coming.

"We're speaking, of course, of your own recent letter to Governor Williams in reply to one he sent to you. The Governor was prodding for action on the Democrat-backed bill to reestablish rigid 90 percent of parity price supports for farm products, and he made the statement that agricultural income in Michigan has dropped as a result of the administration-backed program for flexible supports.

"You caught him up neatly, that's for sure. The Governor was trapped with his facts down, but like the now historic case where he claimed credit for balancing Michigan's budget when actually he refused to sign the bill that raised the money to do that and, in fact, used some pretty bitter language about what a lousy law it was, little things like facts simply don't bother our Soapy.

"With him it's words that count, the more of them the better.

"Take this farm bill business. He said the Republican flexible-support plan was to blame for the decline in farm prices.

"You showed him that this program hasn't even taken effect yet.

"He went on to argue about the price of milk to Michigan dairymen, and again charged the dirty old Republicans with being responsible for a decline.

"You showed him how that, too, occurred before the Republican bill ever took effect, that since the GOP system governing dairy supports was put into practice, the price actually has risen.

"And, like we said back a ways, your final paragraph was a pretty biting bit of phraseology, one that's even worth repeating. 'Since you have undertaken to instruct the Michigan congressional delegation on this most important Federal problem,' you wrote Soapy, 'I suggest that you take the additional time from your difficult and manifold duties as Michigan's Governor to make the necessary factual inquiries and policy decisions which would render your advice helpful rather than misleading.'

"That's real clever, but we'll be happy to put up odds that not only Governor Williams but a good many other rigid-price-support boys will be making at least one more speech using the same arguments he did in his letter.

"Fact is, he probably didn't even read your reply.

"Now don't ask us what you should have done—we're stumped, we confess. He never pays any attention to our corrections either, though heaven knows he sure reads the ones where we say he's right. Maybe you could organize a nonpartisan committee to study the whole problem. We've got at least 10 committees studying every other issue before the city, State, and Nation—so why not this?"

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes. This bill is identical with H. R. 5877, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object.

S. 1727 provides basic statutory authority for certain administrative functions of the Department of the Treasury which have been authorized from year to year in appropriation acts. The bill will simplify the appropriation procedure, and I understand that the Committee on Appropriations has suggested the enactment of the basic authority provided in this bill. The bill is identical to H. R. 5877, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and agree to the matter offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury may make the following expenditures:

(a) Expenditures for arms and ammunition required by civilian employees of the Department of the Treasury in the performance of their official duties.

(b) Expenditures to reimburse Federal Reserve banks and branches for necessary expenses for services performed as Government depositaries and as fiscal agents of the United States.

(c) Expenditures not to exceed $10,000 per annum for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic law violators who are fugitives from justice.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept services without compensation in connection with the program for the sale of United States public-debt obligations.

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (40 Stat. 292; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 760), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "During any period for which a definite appropriation has been made for expenses for which this section makes an indefinite appropriation, the definite appropriation shall be available under the terms of this section and the indefinite appropriation shall not be available for obligation.".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5877) was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, S. 1727 is identical to H. R. 5877. The latter bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on May 9, 1955.

S. 1727 was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations on May 5, 1955, and passed by the Senate on May 9, 1955. In view of the fact that the 2 bills are identical, and in the interest of parliamentary convenience, I have presented to the House for favorable consideration S. 1727, and requested that H. R. 5877 be laid on the table.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide basic statutory authority for certain functions of the Department of the Treasury which have in the past been authorized from year to year in Treasury Department appropriation acts. These legislative provisions that have been annually included in the appropriation acts for the Treasury Department might be subject to points of order that might be raised with respect to an appropriation bill authorizing such functions. The Committee on Ways and Means was informed that the House Committee on Appropriations had suggested that the

Treasury Department obtain the basic authority provided in this legislation.

Enactment of this legislation is recommended to the Congress by the Department of the Treasury and by the Bureau of the Budget.

The functions authorized in S. 1727 relate to administrative practices in the Treasury Department. These functions include the procurement of arms and ammunition necessary to carry out the Treasury Department's law-enforcement activities, reimbursement of Federal Reserve banks for fiscal services, informer rewards in regard to narcotic-law violations, acceptance of volunteer services for savings-bond promotion, and financing public-debt operations.

PROCUREMENT OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION

Subsection 1 (a) of S. 1727 would authorize expenditures for arms and ammunition required by civilian employees of the Treasury Department in the performance of their official duties. Provisions in the Treasury Department appropriation acts relating to the various Treasury enforcement agencies have for many years made appropriations available for such purchases. The procurement of arms and ammunition is necessary for these enforcement agencies in carrying out their law-enforcement functions. The inclusion of the reference to arms and ammunition in appropriation language has been necessary because of a requirement in the act of March 3, 1879, as amended—title 50, United States Code, page 61—that procurement of arms and ammunition by executive agencies be from the Army, unless it is shown that the Army cannot meet the need for such items. Experience has shown that the Army does not usually have the type of arms and ammunition required for law enforcement. Thus, arms and ammunition needed for law enforcement by the Treasury can be obtained more expeditiously and at the same or less cost through purchase in the open market or through contract with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, rather than by clearing each request through the Army.

REIMBURSEMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS FOR FISCAL SERVICES

Subsection 1 (b) would authorize expenditures to reimburse Federal Reserve banks and branches for necessary expenses for services performed as Government depositaries and as fiscal agents of the United States. Language in Treasury Department appropriation acts for constituent units of the fiscal service have authorized the payment of expenses of Federal Reserve banks incident to the deposit of withheld taxes, expenses on account of public-debt transactions for the account of the Secretary of the Treasury, and expenses for the verification and destruction of unfit United States paper currency. While section 15 of the Federal Reserve Act—title 12, United States Code, section 391—authorizes Federal Reserve banks to act as Government depositaries and fiscal agents, no provision is made for reimbursing the banks for rendering such services, and subsection 1 (b) would provide permanent authority for reimbursement of expenses of the foregoing nature.

INFORMER REWARDS IN REGARD TO NARCOTIC-LAW VIOLATIONS

Subsection 1 (c) would authorize expenditures of not to exceed $10,000 per annum for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic-law violators who are fugitives from justice. Language of this nature has appeared for many years in the Bureau of Narcotics appropriation. These funds have been used for the payment of rewards to informers and the authority has served a very useful purpose in the apprehension of notorious narcotic-law violators who are fugitives from justice.

ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES FOR SAVINGS-BOND PROMOTION

Section 2 would authorize the acceptance of services without compensation in connection with the Treasury Department program for the sale of United States public-debt obligations. This authority has appeared in the Bureau of the Public Debt appropriation and has been utilized to accept the services of volunteers in connection with the savings-bond program. The provision has been necessary because of the prohibition contained in section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665 (b)), against the acceptance of voluntary services, except in cases of emergency, involving the safety of human life or the protection of property. The success of the savings-bond program has depended primarily on the unstinting effort of thousands of volunteers throughout the country.

FINANCING PUBLIC-DEBT OPERATIONS

Section 3 would provide that during any period for which a definite appropriation has been made for expenses under section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 760), the indefinite appropriation under that section shall not be available for obligation. Section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act appropriates a certain percentage of the amount of obligations issued under the act for the payment of necessary expenses connected with any operations under it. That provision in effect constitutes a permanent indefinite appropriation. However, the Congress has for many years appropriated a definite dollar amount for expenses of public-debt operations, in lieu of the indefinite appropriation, and section 3 of the bill would continue the present practice of providing a definite dollar amount for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5223) to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House to read a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5223 merely continues the existing exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes until June 30, 1956. As has similar legislation in the past, the bill contains the proviso that the suspension shall not apply to lead scrap or to zinc scrap.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. I would also like the record to show that the substance of this bill was first introduced by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] on February 2, 1955, as H. R. 3412. The same bill, H. R. 3932, was also introduced on February 10, 1955, by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. Speaker, I may state at this time that all members of the committee on the Republican side favor this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956": *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lead scrap or zinc scrap (other than zinc scrap purchased under a written contract entered into before July 1, 1955).

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall not be construed to affect in any way the application of Public Law 38, 82d Congress, to copper scrap.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "scrap", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5223 would continue through June 30, 1956, the present suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, with provision for the exclusion from the suspension of lead scrap and zinc scrap. The present suspension of these duties and import taxes is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 1955.

These duties and import taxes have generally been suspended by the Congress since 1942, except for a brief period at the end of 1949 and at the beginning of 1950.

Therefore, the enactment of H. R. 5223 will result in the continued suspension until June 30, 1956, of the duties and taxes on those types of metal scrap

presently exempted from duties and taxes under Public Law 869 of the 81st Congress, as amended, with the additional exclusion of all zinc scrap. The rates of duty and import taxes on the principal types of ferrous and nonferrous metal scrap, the suspension of which will be continued by the bill, are set forth on page 2 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means—House Report No. 545—accompanying this legislation.

For some years following World War II, United States imports of metal scrap were many times greater than in prewar years. After 1949 imports of iron and steel scrap and after 1950 scrap of most of the nonferrous metals declined sharply. In the period 1952–54, only in the case of aluminum have imports of scrap represented over 1 percent of total domestic consumption in any year of the metals on which the duties and taxes would be suspended by this bill.

The fact that there have regularly been significant United States exports of scrap of the nonferrous metals as well as of iron and steel scrap would indicate that even when the duties are suspended, the United States is not likely to provide a distinctly better outlet than foreign countries for scrap metals originating abroad.

The interested executive departments supported the enactment of this legislation. The Department of Commerce in reporting to the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of the enactment of H. R. 5223 stated that the commodities on which the duties and taxes would be suspended are in short supply.

The Committee on Ways and Means amendment strikes out the language in parentheses which reads as follows: "(other than zinc scrap purchased under a written contract entered into before July 1, 1955)."

The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the exception provided for in the parenthetical language is no longer necessary.

This amendment means that under H. R. 5223 lead scrap will continue to be excluded from the suspension and zinc scrap will be completely excluded from the suspension.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF FREE ENTRY OF GIFTS PURCHASED ABROAD BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I ask the privilege of the House to read a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5559 provides for the free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad. Similar legislation has been provided continuously since 1942 through periodic renewals of this privilege on a temporary basis. The pending legislation makes this privilege permanent.

The bill was reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of December 5, 1942, entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," as amended (U. S. C., title 50 App., sec. 847), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5559 would make permanent the temporary privilege which has been available continuously since 1942 to members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad which allows for the entry of so much of any shipment of bona fide gifts as does not exceed $50 in value without the payment of import taxes and customs duties.

This legislation was introduced at the request of the Department of Defense following clearance by the Bureau of the Budget.

The act of December 5, 1942 (Public Law 790, 77th Cong.), as amended, provides the basic authority for this free entry privilege.

The Department of Defense in urging the enactment of this legislation expressed the opinion that favorable consideration of this legislation would make a definite contribution to the morale of our Armed Forces. It is extremely important to a serviceman on a tour of duty overseas that he be able to send small gifts and remembrances from the region in which he is serving to his family and friends in this country. If such articles were made subject to duty the administrative problems involved in sending gifts home would serve to discourage this practice.

In view of the continued presence in many parts of the world of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the free entry privileges for the specified gifts should be made permanent. Permanent legislation would also relieve the Department of Defense from having to request, and the Congress from having to enact, periodic extensions of the free-entry privileges.

During the consideration of this legislation in executive session, the Committee on Ways and Means was assured that the legislation is safeguarded from abuse not only by the restrictions contained in the act, but also by appropriate regulations issued by the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Defense.

The committee was also advised by the Bureau of Customs that the Bureau has encountered no serious administrative difficulties in administering this law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE INTERIOR

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate in the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6239) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed 2½ hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Albert	Boggs	Burleson
Andrews	Bolton, Oliver P.	Byrnes, Wis.
Avery	Buckley	Canfield
Ayres	Burdick	Christopher
Barrett		Colmer

Dondero	Hosmer	Osmers
Donovan	Ikard	Pilcher
Doyle	Kearney	Pillion
Eberharter	Knutson	Powell
Edmondson	McCarthy	Preston
Engle	McDowell	Reed, N. Y.
Fjare	Madden	Rogers, Colo.
Gathings	Mollohan	Rutherford
Gregory	Morgan	Scherer
Griffiths	Morrison	Short
Hays, Ohio	Moulder	Thomson, Wyo.
Hébert	Mumma	Thornberry
Herlong	Norblad	Tollefson
Heselton	Norrell	Utt
Hillings	O'Konski	Walter

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit during general debate while the House is in session the rest of this week and next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6239, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking of the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956. The subcommittee first had this bill before it on April 14. The committee was faithful to its task, and I pay tribute to my colleagues for their diligent work, to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], to the ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES], and to our colleague from Illinois, Mr. VURSELL, for the 2 days that he substituted on the committee. The hearings comprise some 800 pages. There were two evening sessions in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building that there might be extended to the people of the District an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present to hear this important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, as I said, we had between 70 and 80 people from the District testify in 2 evening sessions, and we proceeded with those evening sessions under the 5-minute rule. I personally received in excess of 175 letters and many, many invitations to social functions in the District, which regretfully I declined. Over and above that, the press of the District suddenly discovered the presence of the members of the subcommittee in Congress. They wrote items about us that at times made us smile and at other times caused us to frown.

As one who was elected to this body back in 1934 I have learned to take criticism in its stride. Regardless of what is done, you never can satisfy everyone. It is well to proceed according to your duty as you see it.

If you will take up the report on this bill you will find on the opening page that the committee has approved $163,547,509 for the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, and that includes $34,306,500 for capital outlay.

This is a decrease of $4,225,290 in the amount of appropriations for fiscal 1955 and $8,857,791 under the budget estimate.

Federal funds represent approximately 11.5 percent of the total budget, and the District's share is 88.5 percent. However, the Congress has responsibility for the fiscal management of the District of Columbia and as the "keeper of the purse" is compelled to state that fiscal irresponsibility seems to be the keynote of the 1956 budget.

The budget presented to the Congress is $4,632,501 above the 1955 appropriation, but still does not include the customary reserve of $1 million for supplemental estimates which are normally presented later in the fiscal year.

One or both of my colleagues will touch upon the real estate assessment problem in the District of Columbia. The committee obtained ads from the local papers offering certain property for sale and, correspondingly, has checked the assessed valuations of those properties, and those figures are available to any Member who is interested in the problem.

It is the feeling of the committee that the District of Columbia is "dragging its feet" as far as its own needs are concerned, sort of basking in the sunlight of the reflected glory of the Federal Government.

I would like to say a word about the reduced Federal payment. The committee recommended for 1956 $16 million, which is $4 million under the budget estimate of $20 million which was the figure appropriated last year. All kinds of statements have been expressed in the press, and by individuals about this $20 million figure, that it should be raised to even a larger sum—I read in one instance $40 million. So there is nothing stationary about this sum of $20 million. When a suggestion is made that it should be raised that is all right, but when the Federal payment is lowered then the committee or Congress welches on its responsibility. That was the word, I think, I read. That fund of $20 million is no different from other authorizations by this body for projects in the individual districts of the Members of this House.

As of today there are over $3 billion of authorized Federal projects; however, the Congress has not appropriated any funds for either planning or construction. Where does this authorization differ from that? It does not differ from it one iota. So there is every right of the Congress to give shock treatment to the patient to bring him out of his lethargy and to the consideration of that which is best for it, namely, to look after its own assessments.

In the District there is very little of a debt service charge. I think it amounts to approximately one-tenth of 1 percent. Consider the debt service in your respective cities, counties, and States in its relationship to the spending dollar. In Detroit it is 10 cents out of every dollar. In this city, thanks to the wise guidance of the Congress of the United States throughout the years, this debt service is approximately one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. GROSS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 1, noes 102.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is the popularity or the unpopularity of the speaker or the unpopularity or the popularity of the subject that is causing all these interruptions in my address.

But, it has been reported in the Washington newspapers that the District of Columbia functions will be seriously curtailed as a result of this committee's action. There are 28 departments, only 9 of which are below the 1955 appropriations. Of the 9 that are below 5 are above the 1955 appropriations after deduction of nonrecurring items of expense. Of the other 4 that are below the 1955 appropriations 1 is in the amount of $339; another is $2,589. The Department of Occupations and Professions is $24,000 below, but they have an unobligated balance of $10,000. Civil Defense is the largest item below, but that is not a clear item to the committee.

There were certain increases made over and above those recommended by the Commissioners of the District. I am happy to announce that for the public schools we gave 21 teachers, at $96,810, for handicapped children; for the Public Welfare Department, we allowed 37 social workers in the amount of $129,500, to apprehend the "galloping pappies" who leave their families here and take off for other parts and let the District pick up the check for $2,700,000. Some of this money that is used for these neglected families can be regained if we can apprehend these fathers who fail to recognize their own responsibilities.

We have an amendment we are going to submit today for an increase of $354,271 which will still leave the item, however, $432,000 below the 1956 estimate.

We said something in the committee report concerning the markets—the

eastern market and the western market. Those markets represent an annual loss to the District. Originally they were established so that the farmers of the area could come in and use 60 stalls. The latest report is that they use about six stalls in the markets daily. One of the chainstores thought of going into the market, if the committee would approve an item for air conditioning and a new heating system. The District of Columbia has to get out of the landlord business. We have people who want to pay taxes and who want to stay in the landlord business. Therefore, the committee recommended the sale of the markets. But if those people occupying the markets at the present time want to pay a just rent for what it will cost to keep the markets going and to fix them as they should be, and that they will not be an operating deficit for the District, we are very favorable to the markets being retained, but only in so much as they will pay their way. I hope nobody will quarrel with that.

With reference to capital outlay, we have approved urgently needed items; new schools, children's center buildings, and highways. We deferred some of the highways around the Capitol, for those we must have some action by Congress; we need a law.

We deleted the proposed Potomac River bridge. We cannot appropriate money when they do not know whether they want a bridge or a tunnel. I suggested that they make up their minds and the committee would be here to listen to them. We are favorable to giving them access to Virginia. Virginia gets a lot of benefits from the District. It has grown to be a great State close to the District line and in other areas. But we are not going to approve a bridge if we do not know whether the item will call for $38 million or $7 million. The committee has to know. As long as I have served on the Committee on Appropriations, which dates from the beginning of my service, that committee has never acted when in doubt. That is the teaching that I received under both the distinguished chairmen of the committee, Mr. CANNON and Mr. TABER.

I think the items we have approved for the District will enable them to proceed in an orderly way with their capital-outlay program.

What are the benefits that they receive in the Federal District? What would the respective towns of the various Members offer if you were to go home and say to your people, "The Federal Government wants to move and is considering moving to your town; what is your bid?"

I tell you that you would see some colossal figures submitted. You would see some colossal offerings, if your cities were bidding for the District of Columbia.

In the first place, the annual volume of the tourist trade is estimated by the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia at $250 million a year. The monthly Federal payroll is somewhere between $86 and $99 million, or $1,092,000,000 a year.

This is some town. Federal projects are forever springing up here, but to know what we have done, just look about you and see the beauty of this city. What other city has a Rock Creek Park running right through the center of the town? What other city has Washington's Monument, the Lincoln Memorial? I do not want to mention everything, it would take me too long, but what other city has in excess of 60 parks? What other city has seen the national labor unions coming to its doors and building their central offices in this town, and has seen industry with its top representatives here for no other reason than that this is the site of the Federal Government?

Yes, right now we have in the making a new Senate Office Building costing $22 million, a new House Office Building of comparable size and I presume of comparable price, and a new addition to the Capitol costing probably $7 or $8 million, all necessary, but built right here in the District of Columbia.

If the new Federal pay raise goes into effect, the increase is estimated to amount to $1 million a day. What percentage of that money will come into the economy of the District of Columbia?

This is a nice town, but every time something is done is it a reason for a new increase in the Federal contribution. They do not go together at all. One is an allocation.

Mr. Chairman, there are always those here that meet with others. We have many parties here now, attended by many Members of both bodies.

I found I had so many invitations I did not take any of them. I did not want to have any pressure. Sometimes the pressure is great, and it is so nice and it is under such splendid circumstances that it is very difficult to say no.

No one wants to do anything unjust. It would be my prayer not to do an injustice to a soul. This is a great city. It is a city I have had the pleasure of serving actively in for a long time, and I am now in my 10th term. But we also have our responsibility to the districts from which we come, for every part of America is intertwined in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. If I may, I would like to ask two questions of the gentleman for information only because I think the Members would like to be informed on them. It is my understanding that later today there will be an amendment offered which would add approximately $4 million to the present appropriation. Could the gentleman inform the membership as to what that money would be used for?

Mr. RABAUT. It is just a part of the Federal fund. The income of the District of Columbia comes from several sources.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was my understanding that $4 million was to be added to the appropriation.

Mr. RABAUT. No; if there is going to be an amendment for $4 million, I do not know what it would be for except that it might be to return the $4 million that the committee cut from the Federal payment to the District.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman explain what that $4 million cut was? What services was that $4 million cut off of?

Mr. RABAUT. That $4 million reduction was in the general revenues the District of Columbia had and whatever uses they put all of the money to that they take into the District of Columbia fund—just like the money the District itself receives.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, there is no specific assignment of that $4 million to any particular service?

Mr. RABAUT. No. The money just goes to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that you are talking about the Federal contribution?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And that the $4 million reduction was from the Federal contribution? The budget requested $20 million of Federal contribution and, as I understand it, the action of the committee was to provide $16 million of Federal contribution.

Mr. SPRINGER. And the District may use that $4 million and decide what service it should be used for as it sees fit?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the point I wanted to raise and inquire about of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. The $16 million recommended for Federal contribution would go into the general fund, is that not true?

Mr. RABAUT. Correct, that is true.

Mr. HARRIS. The capital improvement under the Public Works Act of 1954 comes from the general fund, does it not?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. The thing that disturbs me about the action, and which I would like to have cleared up, referring to the bill the Congress passed providing for the public works program of 1954, at which time $20 million was authorized, which was an increase of about $9 million. I proposed an amendment at that time to that legislation of the $20 million increase, making $11 million authorized for Federal contribution, that so much of the aggregate annual payment by the United States appropriated under this article to the credit of the general fund, as is in excess of $13 million shall be available for capital outlay only. In other words, we were increasing taxes at that time and increasing the Federal contribution for one purpose principally although there were some other purposes. If the gentleman would take more time to clear this point up, I wish he would because I think it is important, in other words, that any amount over $13 million which was appropriated from the general fund had to be used for capital outlay. As I construe the action of the committee, the $4 million reduction or cut from the Federal fund here must then result in taking that from the capital outlay, and it would come from the funds that are supposed to build schools and provide for certain other capital outlays here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. As to the schools we have allowed the full request for new construction and we have allowed practically everything they have asked for

except these two highway projects around the Capitol here and the Potomac River bridge. The bridge is a separate item.

Mr. HARRIS. But the highway fund is separate from the other, the capital outlay fund, which this applies to.

Mr. RABAUT. Is it the gentleman's idea to let the District drag its own feet as to getting its own funds? This is a shock treatment for the District of Columbia to wake up and start getting something and doing something on their own.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly, I appreciate that, but the point I want to clear up in my mind today, and if I can get the information, it would be very helpful to me because I am fearful that in view of the provisions of section 2 of the public works bill of 1954, it would result in taking the $4 million from our capital outlay which comes out of the general fund which is for our schools and things of that kind. The highway moneys are in a separate fund.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. The report reads as follows: "which includes $34,306,500 for capital outlay."

The $4 million would come from the general fund and could be offset by some economy in the District government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that question?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Here is the picture as I see it and I think it should be understood: The District of Columbia is appropriated certain funds in this bill. It is the obligation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to raise by taxation the amount necessary to provide that money—after the Federal contribution which is given by the Congress—through the income taxes and other taxes that are receivable. That is the fiscal picture with which we are confronted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. RABAUT. My personal time has expired and the committee time is all allotted.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 2 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. There has been a great deal of comment lately both in the newspapers and by Members of Congress on the question of whether or not property within the District of Columbia is being properly assessed. I know that subject has been before the committee. Would the gentleman inform the House as to the feeling of the committee on that particular point at this time?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I will give a few examples. That is the best answer I can give. Then I will ask the gentleman what his thought is.

We took the newspaper advertisements of property for sale, took the asking price of representative properties and then got the assessed valuation on those properties with the following results: On one the asking price was $20,000, the assessment $7,000. On one the asking price was $41,000, the assessment $15,000. Asking price $16,000, assessment $8,000. Asking price $29,000, assessment $12,000. Asking price $15,000, assessment $5,000. You can go all the way down. On the last one the asking price is $10,000 and the assessment $4,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I point out to the gentleman that I happen to know what assessments are in Montgomery County, Md., adjoining the District. They are considerably higher than in the District of Columbia. I am not trying to find fault or point out what should be done, but may I ask if the committee is making any recommendation to the District as to what should be done in the matter?

Mr. RABAUT. The committee is doing just one thing to the District: We are curtailing the Federal funds to the District with the idea that they will recognize some of their own responsibility.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to Congress, in 1941, one of the first men I called on was John Nance Garner, of Texas. I found Mr. Garner sitting in the middle of his office floor in a swivel chair sorting papers. He had them stacked all around him. After visiting for a while, he said: "Well, young man, let me tell you one thing: To get along well over here just sit back and listen." He said, "You know when you are not learning you are not listening."

So I have followed that policy this year in committee and in the House, and I do not intend to have too much to say today.

First, I would like to compliment our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], on his grasp of the problems of the District government in so short a time; also other members of the committee for their diligent efforts on the bill we have before us at this time.

I have had the pleasure, and I say so in all sincerity, of serving on the District Appropriations Subcommittee for several years. I served under one of the greatest men in the House of Representatives and one of the finest men I ever knew as chairman of that committee, Joe Bates, of Kentucky. While Joe Bates was from the Democratic side of the House during the liberal days, I never knew a man more conservative with the taxpayers' money than he. There were many times when we on our side suggested that we would like to have 2 or 3 Joe Bateses. There were times when I felt maybe Mr. Bates was a little too conservative, especially in view of the fact that the District was growing. We were going through a war period, and the problems of the District were increasing in proportion as the population increased. It was during times when the needs of the District had to be set aside and laid aside because of the war effort. After the war was over, of course, we had quite a backlog of projects and a backlog of work to do, and we proceeded to try to bring the District up to proper standards.

I inherited the chairmanship of the District Subcommittee on Appropriations during the last Congress. I am very much interested in the Nation's Capital, our Nation's Capital. Our Capital City belongs to the State of Indiana, the State of Kentucky, the State of Michigan, and the other States, and not to the people of the District. I am proud of it, and God forbid the day may ever come when we relinquish our authority over the District of Columbia. I shall never be a party to giving so-called home rule to the District of Columbia.

However, along with the authority that I am demanding, I think I owe it to the people of the District of Columbia to accept responsibility commensurate with that authority. We in the House of Representatives demand the authority to control the District of Columbia. We are holding on to that authority but I think along with that authority we owe it to the people to exercise responsibility commensurate with that authority and to see that the District of Columbia is adequately financed and adequately cared for.

We might say that our position in the District of Columbia is somewhat of a necessary evil; we have to hang on to that authority, but we must be willing to exercise the responsibility that goes with it. Two years ago I visited with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee at that time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I suggested at that time that perhaps the Congress needed a man to represent the Congress, a man of the city-manager type to act as liaison man between the legislative, the Appropriations Committees of the House, and the District Commissioners, to work with the budget directors and department heads for the District, to go out and make investigations and to report back to us. I can think only of a man with the city-manager type of qualifications to do that. If we had such a man to report directly and to be responsible directly to us, we would be in better position to decide what the needs of the District of Columbia are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There are officials representing the District of Columbia government, are there not?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. We do not have the type of person I am referring to.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying the present officials are incompetent?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. GROSS. Why then a city manager?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred

and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed? While serving as chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations I made a very sincere effort to get out and study the problems of the District as they were presented to us by the various department heads. I do not hesitate to admit that I found some legpulling in many instances. While I want them to have the facilities necessary to give our children as fine an education as anywhere in the land, I also expect them to use those facilities as economically and as wisely as we use them in other places. In some instances I found where they were a little selfish in the use of those facilities. However, we did, on the whole, last year, give the District of Columbia more money than they had ever had before to help bring them up to date with their plant facilities and other departments of government. Now, they are not getting as much this year. I do not think that necessarily means that their government should fall apart in any way. I think the committee weighed and evaluated their needs pretty carefully. We did not give them as much as they wanted, but I believe with the proper type of economy they will be able to get along.

The growth in the public schools has been tremendous. We have increased the appropriations over the past years by a considerable amount for school facilities—a little less than last year but still much more than they had prior to that.

Recreation department. I am a great believer in giving boys and girls plenty of ripe apples so that they will not be inclined to eat green ones. I do think we have a lot more recreational facilities in the District of Columbia for children than are being utilized, and that may be because we are not providing for adequate supervision.

Police department. The police department has done a marvelous job under the appropriations we have given them. There has been a 23 percent decrease in the number of serious crimes committed in the District of Columbia since 1954 while it has been growing in most other places. We gave them money to carry on and they have used it wisely.

Fire department. We gave them practically what they asked for.

Veterans' Service Center got the same as last year.

Office of Civil Defense, which has never come before us with a clear-cut issue, was cut as usual.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take more of the Committee's time now.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 26 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling funds for the Government of the District of Columbia.

A member of the Appropriations Committee who has not been privileged to serve under the very able chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has indeed missed something worthwhile. Mr. RABAUT is an able legislator; he is devoted to his work and goes into minute detail on every item regardless of how insignificant it may appear on the surface.

My distinguished friend from Indiana, the former chairman [Mr. WILSON], is also a tireless worker who understands the problems of the District. All of my colleagues on this subcommittee are hard workers and are attentive to their difficult assignments.

After working with and observing the sincerity of my colleagues of the District Subcommittee on Appropriations, I am thoroughly convinced that the members of the subcommittee exert every effort to satisfy the citizens of the District of Columbia, and this is especially true on account of the citizens' nonvoting status. I doubt if there is a congressional district in the Nation that gets better representation in the Congress than the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the appropriation bill now under consideration is a good bill. I believe the budget request could have reasonably been reduced more than the committee has reduced it. For the fiscal year 1947, my first year in the Congress, the Congress appropriated only $72,584,000 to operate the District government. The United States contributed $8 million of the amount. In the bill before you, your committee has recommended $166,547,000, with the United States contribution to be $16 million. In other words, in a period of 9 years, the annual appropriation for the District government has more than doubled. Yet, we still are not satisfying all of the citizens of the District of Columbia, neither are we satisfying all Members of the House with this greatly increased appropriation.

Some will argue that the increased budget was brought about by the suspension of capital outlay during World War II. It is true that capital outlay was greatly curtailed during World War II, but may I point out that the largest appropriation made for the operation of the District of Columbia government prior to World War II, including capital outlay, was only $43,136,000. For details see page 22 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the trend not only for the District of Columbia government, but also for the many Federal agencies, is to spend, spend, spend. When, if ever, will the Congress call a halt to this wild spending spree that appears to be completely out from under control?

Is it not true that in this day of uneasy peace, but in a period of great prosperity, we are continuing to spend, year in and year out, far in excess of our very high revenues? Where, may I ask, will such a policy lead us?

Now, with respect to the United States Government's contribution to the District of Columbia. The Congress was appropriating United States funds for the District of Columbia before I came to Congress and, in all probability, will be doing so long after I leave the Congress. Even so, I have my own opinion on the subject, therefore may I comment briefly in relation thereto.

The District of Columbia, according to information furnished to me, has the highest per capita income of any city of the Nation. Prosperity in the District is flourishing. This high per capita income and prosperity is a reality only because the National Government is domiciled here. If it were left up to me, the Federal Government would not contribute one dime of the taxpayers' money to the District of Columbia government until such time as legislation is enacted placing the District tax rates on a par with tax rates in many other cities of the Nation.

Is it not true that with few exceptions, if any, when the Federal Government gets ready to build a new building or a new military installation, almost every State and community starts clamoring to get the installation in their community?

A few years ago, the Congress authorized an air base for Monroe, La. Before the sun set, I received an urgent call to return to Monroe for the purpose of meeting with the business people of that city. Upon my arrival in Monroe, we called a meeting of the businessmen and in one day we raised in excess of a quarter of a million dollars to be used to purchase the land needed for the air base. After the purchase, we made the Air Force a present of the land so as to get them to locate the installation in Monroe. This gesture was termed patriotism. Also, it may well have been a desire for profits. To say the least, to hear a cash register ring is sweet music to a businessman. Do you know of any group of businessmen in the District of Columbia who have purchased land and made the Government a present of it so as to get a new building located in the District?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEARNS. Does that supersede my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It does. The motion to rise does not require a quorum.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. KEARNS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 1, noes 73.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. This motion does not require a quorum. However, the gentleman has made a point of order that a quorum is not present and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield at this time.

When I was assigned to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, I was warned to be careful about what I had to say. It was pointed out that if I advocated equalization of taxes, not only would the citizens of the District of Columbia be critical of my recommendations, but that the local press would tear me apart. I did not heed the advice because I wanted facts brought out in the open, and I am still determined to bring them out in the open, regardless of how hard the local press attempts to discredit my work.

It was somewhat amusing to observe that only a few hours after I pointed out the difference in the tax structure in the District compared to that of many other cities, the press jumped on me with both feet. One local paper accused me of being sanctimonious, using the derogatary definition. The editorial was headed "Hot Air." A subsequent editorial was captioned "Hog Wash." Another paper did a very poor job in attempting to discredit my statistics. In my opinion, the local press makes it very difficult for the Congress to do the best job for the citizens of the District because their misrepresentation confuses the District citizens.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman not feel that more Members in Congress should be here to listen to the discussion on this important legislation?

Mr. PASSMAN. Inasmuch as this is not national legislation, and inasmuch as we have three times the number of Members present this afternon that we have had in prior years, I am elated at the large number present who are listening.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman that this may not be national legislation, but the dollars that we are appropriating come from the Nation at large.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I would like to have one good and substantial reason why the taxpayers of the 48 States should contribute to the citizens of the District of Columbia until these citizens with the highest per capita income of any city in the Nation, through legislation, bring their tax burden up to a par with that of other cities of this Nation.

Regardless of the opinion, the analysis and the abuse of the press, I state that my analysis is substantially correct, that the citizens of the District of Columbia are bearing a much lower tax burden than citizens of many other cities of the Nation. I am not going to use a lot of high-falluting, misleading statistics, rather I shall be factual in comparing the District tax program in specific instances with that of other cities.

First, let us consider Los Angeles, Calif. The total ad valorem tax is $6.74 per $100 per year against $2.20 for the District of Columbia. According to my mathematics, the Los Angeles citizens pay three times as much ad valorem. Furthermore, in Los Angeles, personal property includes household furniture, stocks of goods, warehouse and manufactured stocks. On everything that is subject to ownership they pay an ad valorem of $6.74 per $100 per year against $2 per $100 per year in the District, which is almost 4 times what they pay in the District.

I spoke with the mayor of San Francisco who stated that the ad valorem tax on real and personal property in that city was $6.85 per $100 per year. Is this not more than 3 times as much as the ad valorem tax in the District of Columbia?

Furthermore, the mayor told me that his constituents pay a 3 percent California sales tax plus a one-half cent use tax. Is this not almost double what they pay in the District of Columbia?

I spoke with the county commissioner of Sacramento, Calif., and he stated that the citizens of that city pay $8.10 per $100 per year ad valorem tax. Is that not almost 4 times as much as the citizens of the District pay? These citizens also pay a 50 percent higher sales tax.

Let us consider Grand Junction, Colo. The ad valorem tax is $6.85 per $100 per year. Is this not slightly more than 3 times what the citizens of the District pay?

Inquiry would surely reveal that these are typical of prevailing tax rates in most cities of the country.

For further illustration, let us consider the city of New Orleans, La. The real and personal property tax is $4.10 per $100 per year. Is that not almost double what the citizens of the District pay? In addition, in the city of New Orleans, there is a very high occupational tax, in many instances almost equal to the real property tax.

Let us take my hometown of Monroe, La. On May 11, in a special election, the property tax was again increased. We are now paying ad valorem tax of $4.75 per $100 per year on real and personal property. Is that not more than double what the citizens of the District are paying, with my constituents in Monroe having a much lower per capita income?

My constituents pay 8 cents State tax on a package of cigarettes against 2 cents per package in the District of Columbia. Is that not exactly 4 times higher? My constituents pay $10 tax on a barrel of beer against $1.25 in the District of Columbia. Is that not eight times what the citizens of the District pay?

Mr. Chairman, in considering taxes in the District of Columbia, we must keep in mind that it is a single tax. As a citizen of Monroe, when I pay my city tax, I have not discharged my duties as a taxpayer because I must then pay the county and State tax. For a clear-cut example, may I cite the following:

Louisiana is a State with a small, or average population. Listen to this: In 1954, after the citizens of towns and cities in my State paid their city and county taxes, they then paid to the State $272,609,000 in taxes. So, I say again, why should the citizens of the District of Columbia who enjoy the highest per capita income of any city of the Nation not pay a tax on a par with many other cities of the Nation?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Albert	Fallon	Mollohan
Andrews	Fascell	Morgan
Anfuso	Fernandez	Morrison
Avery	Fjare	Moulder
Ayres	Gathings	Mumma
Barden	Gregory	Norblad
Blatnik	Gubser	O'Konski
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Pillion
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Powell
	Hébert	Preston
Buckley	Heselton	Reece, Tenn.
Burleson	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hillings	Riehlman
Canfield	Holifield	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Hosmer	Scherer
Chase	Jackson	Shelley
Chiperfield	Kearney	Short
Cole	Kelly, N. Y.	Taylor
Colmer	Kilburn	Tollefson
Dingell	Kirwan	Utt
Dondero	Krueger	Van Zandt
Doyle	McDowell	Walter
Eberharter	McVey	Watts
Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6239) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 360 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. It is obvious that a filibuster is on. It will save time if the Committee rises.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has the floor. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has 7 minutes remaining.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, here is one for the book. In the District of Columbia, if a citizen or a Congressman wants to know the assessment on personal property, such as inventories, manufactured goods or plant equipment, he would have to get a court order permitting access to the information. I bet it would make a good story if some of us

were given the right to have a look at the assessment on the inventory of many of the Washington merchants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to the people of the State of Louisiana, and its hundreds of fine public officials, I must answer the very unfair, slanderous, and largely impertinent editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of Monday, May 2, 1955.

If the Members of this body and the citizens of the District of Columbia want to know just how far this paper goes to misrepresent facts, please listen to the following very carefully:

Charge 1. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

Louisiana has higher taxes than practically any other State—but, we feel this is not altogether a virtue. A great percentage of one major revenue source, the sales tax, admittedly never gets to Government but is admittedly diverted into private hands. Louisiana's tax law is so written that it is impossible to ever tell how much money is due the Government.

I give you the certified facts as follows:

Estimated retail sales volume for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, $3,172,957,000.

Amount of sales tax paid into the State of Louisiana for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, $63,458,000.

Charge 2. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

Louisiana has a State income tax which the majority of its citizens simply ignore. No real attempt is made to collect it.

I give you the certified facts:

Number of citizens filing a State income tax form in Louisiana in 1954, 135,126, of which 59,201 were taxable returns. In addition, 8,430 were filed by nonresident individuals.

Furthermore, the Louisiana income-tax law is copied after the Federal income-tax law; also, there is a reciprocal agreement between the Federal Government and the State of Louisiana that all citizens paying Federal income tax must file a copy of their Federal returns with the State returns.

The total State income tax paid by the citizens of Louisiana in 1954 was $17,027,000.

For the information of the Washington Daily News, may I state that the tax collector of the State of Louisiana is none other than the Honorable Rufus W. Fontenot, who was in Federal service for 22 years and was Federal collector of internal revenue for the State of Louisiana for a period of 10 years. I might further add that we have a modern tax-collecting system that is being copied by many other States and cities of the Nation.

May I say that assessments in the State of Louisiana have increased by 70 percent during the past 10 years. May I further point out that most property in the District of Columbia is not assessed at anywhere near its true value. Much of the property carries the same low assessment that it carried 20 years ago.

Charge 3. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

The New Orleans Levee Board has an accumulated fortune in tax money, although it has long since lost its only reason for existence—maintenance of the levee system. The levees were taken over years ago by the Federal Government. The board, which has nothing else to do with the money, uses it in real-estate speculation, making more money. It has long been a political truism in Louisiana that if you ever get on the New Orleans Levee Board you're set financially for life.

I give you the certified facts:

The levee boards of the State of Louisiana, numbering 21, are out of our most essential segments of government. How do they function? The Governor appoints the levee board members and they are men of high caliber from all walks of life—bankers, ministers, farmers, and businessmen. The New Orleans Levee Board is responsible for 109 miles of levees, 26 miles of which are main-line levees along the Mississippi River. The board also maintains the Bohemia spillway. The levee board is charged with maintenance of local drainage canals and repairs. In 1954 the New Orleans Levee Board spent $300,000 for new levees, and in 1955 will spend $1 million for new levees. Furthermore, the maintenance costs of the New Orleans Levee Board for levees will for many years run into hundreds of thousands of dollars per year.

Charge 4. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

In spite of the high State taxes, Louisiana over the years has received more in Federal grants and allotments than it has paid in Federal taxes.

I give you the certified facts:

In the years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, the citizens of Louisiana paid into the Federal Government $2,340,000,000. What did the total Federal grants made to the State during the same period amount to? Only $780 million.

For the year 1954, the citizens of Louisiana paid to the Federal Government $544,661,000, and the total grants and aid amounted to only $124,548,000.

Now, may I point out to the editorial writer of the Washington Daily News that the information I have furnished to refute his slanderous charges is certified, and it may be verified by contacting the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Or he may send me his name and address, and I will furnish him with certified copies of the information which I have obtained from officials of the State of Louisiana.

Before I form a definite opinion of the character of the personnel of the Washington Daily News, I shall wait and see whether or not that newspaper publishes these facts, and retracts the untrue statements made in the editorial.

But regardless of its attitude, I shall continue working in my own way to be helpful to the citizens of the District. I am going to say what I want to say as long as I believe I am correct. And may I say here and now that if the local press will approach the problems of the District with an open mind, as I intend to, then we can work together for the benefit of the District. I have no desire to quarrel with the press, but on the other hand, I must be frank and say that I am not going to be bluffed or swayed by anything that the local press may have to say about me or my committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak in a vein of criticism, but rather to discuss another matter that should have the attention of the legislative committee, and which has a direct bearing on revenues that the District Government is being deprived of. It is a matter with which I have had much experience, and that is the need for legitimate finance companies in a community. I have been reliably informed that on account of what I shall refer to as an antiquated law of the District of Columbia, there is only one legitimate small-loan finance company operating in the District. There are five companies that refer to themselves as automobile finance companies; 1 listed as financing home improvements, 1 insurance company making some types of loans; and 2 discount companies.

Now, here is a peculiar situation brought about by an antiquated law. On the perimeter of the District there are 151 legitimate finance companies, and I am reliably informed that they make approximately 89 percent of all loans made to citizens of the District of Columbia—banks excluded, as they do not cater to small loans.

It would be most interesting if Members of the Congress would cross the District line and see these legitimate finance companies in operation and observe the many modern appliance stores located in the vicinity.

If you have laws in all, or at least a majority, of the 48 States authorizing finance companies to handle personal and installment loans, why would it not be sound for the District of Columbia?

If these 151 finance companies on the perimeter of the District should be allowed to operate in the District, think of the additional personnel who would be employed in the District; think of the additional profits that would be derived from income taxes of the companies, and occupational or privilege taxes. Furthermore, think of the millions of dollars in sales of appliances and automobiles that would go to District businesses. Now, by the absence of legitimate automobile finance companies and small loan finance companies, here is what the citizens of the District must contend with.

Scattered all over the District are pawnbroker exchanges. Licenses issued to these exchanges list them as dealers in secondhand merchandise. I am reliably informed that there are 542 such licenses in effect, 70 of them doing business as pawnbroker exchanges. The license fee is only $50 per year, and I am informed that some of these operations do an annual volume of millions.

Let us discuss the interest rates that they charge and how they handle the loans to get around the law. When you go into one of these so-called pawnbroker exchanges, they take title to the article you offer as security. They sell it back to you in 15 days and charge 25 percent interest. This interest rate amounts to approximately 650 percent per year.

In one other section of the city there are stores which offer bargain rates. It

is only 10 percent each 15 days, or approximately 120 percent per year.

In practically every place where merchants have goods to sell on terms they are very clever in ascertaining whether you are a cash buyer or a credit buyer. On a used automobile, if you are a cash buyer, the price may be $500, but if they suspect that you are a credit buyer, the same automobile may have the retail price of $800.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and without fear of successful contradiction, that a deplorable condition exists in the District of Columbia on account of the absence of legitimate small loan and automobile finance companies. This condition is brought about by the antiquated law limiting the maximum amount of interest that can be charged, an interest rate so low that legitimate finance companies handling household appliances and automobiles or small loans cannot operate profitably, and the same is true on personal or moral loans.

This can be corrected only by legislation, and I am of the opinion that when the facts are made known, the legislative committee will recommend legislation to correct this injustice to the taxpaying citizens and the workers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to function as a member of this subcommittee according to my understanding of my responsibilities. I hope that the House will approve the committee's recommendations, taking into account that the committee held extensive hearings and deliberated at length with the Commissioners and other members of the Appropriations Committee before making the recommendations for your consideration.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention in any way to prolong this legislation, I am sure. However, I do wish to pay my respects and to pay my tribute to the members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations. I think they have done an outstanding job, because, after all, they cannot appropriate more money than they have to appropriate. They have considered the financial situation of the Federal city here very carefully. I think they have combed through this legislation in a very, very meticulous way, and I think they are all to be congratulated that they are so minded.

I would like to remind the committee today, however, that this is the seat of the Federal Government of the United States. This is the one and only Federal city in the United States of America. It is my opinion that each and every Member of Congress certainly has a responsibility toward the District of Columbia where we have the privilege of sitting under this great dome in this Capitol. And, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], and then I will relinquish the balance of my time.

I do not feel that we can let the District of Columbia down at this time. I feel certain that we have legislation pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia that will increase the revenues here to a degree whereby we can guarantee our Commissioners and those who are running this great District of ours that they will have the money available. I would like to say that I think we should support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and let the Federal seat of our great Government survive financially. I know that every person who dwells here will be most appreciative, and I can assure you also that we will do everything in our power in the Committee on the District of Columbia to try to get extra revenue to meet the demands.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, it seems that we are engaged today in what might be called an annual hassle, as to how much money the Federal Government should contribute toward the upkeep of its Capital. I, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], have a very high regard for the members of this committee and believe that they are sincere in what they have done. But quite often people do things sincerely but may be mistaken in what they are doing. One impression I think should be corrected. The argument is made—and I am afraid it is rather a specious one—about how much other cities in the Nation would be willing to pay to have the large Federal establishments that are here in Washington, D. C. It is probably true that many, if not all of them, would like to have those establishments that are here. But it must be borne in mind that this is not a city which existed here and which then the Federal Government decided they would put their Federal establishments in. This city was actually created by the Founding Fathers who created the Constitution of the United States. Later it was provided for by acts of Congress. The territory was here before there was any Federal establishment here at all. In those days, as all of the Members know, the Government was at one time in New York and at another time in Philadelphia. So this city itself is a creation of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is not here by virtue of having been given to the city or of having given the Federal establishments to the city. That argument is specious, I submit. It is specious to argue that because the establishments are here the city should be so glad to have them that it should not ask the Government for anything.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. There are a number of things that are surprising here in the District. The Statue of Freedom on the dome of the Capitol has its back toward the city. It was expected by those who erected the building that the city would be built in front of the statue, whereas the city developed behind the statue. So many surprising things have happened here over a period of years.

Mr. HYDE. The way the Statue of Freedom faces may be one of the few mistakes that the grand founders and planners of this city originally made. That mistake was probably made by the people who moved here, and after they got here moved out toward the west instead of toward the east, as L'Enfant and others expected when they placed the Statue of Freedom on the dome.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was just wondering, if our good friend from Michigan, Mr. RABAUT, would let us have what we ought to have in this bill, we might have enough money to turn the statue around.

Mr. HYDE. We well might. It would almost seem that not only has the Statue of Freedom turned its back on the city but the chairman of the committee has temporarily turned his back on the city, too.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wonder if the Statue of Freedom perhaps is not looking to the entire country for a little consideration once in a while.

Mr. HYDE. However the Statue of Freedom faces, and for whatever reason it may be facing that way, we here today are faced with a little more practical problem than the direction in which the statue is facing.

I grant that the assessments in the District, as the chairman of the committee has said, are not what they should be. I recognize the great need for reassessment, but is not that a fault common to most every city and county in the United States? There is hardly a community in the United States where the real estate assessments are realistic and fair and what they should be. I am sure there is no one on this floor who will claim that they are. The mistake that the governing fathers of the District have made in that respect is a mistake that has been made in almost all communities.

There is one fact I would like to point out to the committee. Your chairman has told you that the Federal funds provided in this bill are approximately 11.5 percent of the budget. Approximately 50 years or more ago the percentage of the Federal Government's contribution was approximately 50 percent. In that 50 years the extent of the Federal holdings and their value has increased so greatly that it is unnecessary to call it to the attention of the Members of the House.

One of the reasons why the Federal Government should certainly come closer to the proportionate payment that was made in those days is the protection that these growing Federal establishments need. It must be recognized that the police protection, fire protection, streets, roads, water, sewage, drainage, and other things that are provided for the benefit of this huge Federal establishment here have to be provided out of the District of Columbia budget.

The gentleman from Louisiana mentioned the staggering total of the amount being appropriated here for the District. I do not know whether many Members of the House are aware of the fact that all of this amount that is in the budget for the District except the seventeen-some-odd-million dollars that are in this bill by way of Federal contributions comes from the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. Under the method by which our fiscal affairs are handled here, the taxes from the District of Columbia go into the Treasury, into the general fund. All we are doing here is appropriating back the money that is paid in taxes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], my colleague on the committee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

I have enjoyed my assignment to this particular subcommittee, and, at this time, desire to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the able and distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for giving me the opportunity of serving on this subcommittee.

It has been a pleasure working with our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the other members of this committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES].

We were ably assisted by Francis Merrell and Homer Skarin, our executive secretaries.

Mr. Chairman, the problems confronting the District of Columbia are serious and must be squarely faced. The city of Washington is today one of the great cities in the world, and, as our capital respect. Every Member of Congress of the United States should take pride in the advancement and accomplishments of our capital city.

The District of Columbia has changed considerably since April 15, 1791, when the cornerstone for the District of Columbia was laid on Jones Point, which, by the way, is now a part of the State of Virginia, by the first commissioners, Daniel Carroll and Dr. David Stuart, and Maj. Andrew Ellicott, the surveyor.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five separate funds—a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor-vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary-sewerage fund.

The District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1956 contains a Federal contribution of $16 million to the general fund, $1,302,000 to the water fund, and $590,700 to the sanitary-sewerage-works fund, making a total Federal payment of $17,892,700. The District's Appropriations Act of 1955 contained a total Federal contribution of $21,890,000. Twenty million dollars of the Federal payment in 1955 to the District of Columbia was for the general fund, $1,298,000 was for the water fund, and $592,000 was for the sanitary-sewerage-works fund.

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act for 1956 provides for operating expenses in the sum of $132,241,009. The budget estimates for 1956 call for the sum of $134,925,600, and the District of Columbia Appropriations Act of 1955 provided for a total operating-expense appropriation of $130,347,299. The bill before us today calls for an increase in appropriations for operating expenses in the sum of $1,893,710 over the 1955 appropriations and $2,684,591 less than the 1956 estimates. The total of $132,241,009 is composed of the following items: Executive Office $300,000; Department of General Administration, $3,021,850; Office of Corporation Council, $427,000; compensation and retirement-fund expenses, $9,936,000; regulatory agencies, $958,000; Department of Occupations and Professions, $240,000; public schools, $27,996,810; Public Library, $1,620,000; Recreation Department, $1,678,000; Metropolitan Police, $12,781,000; Fire Department, $6,257,900; Veterans' Service Center, $90,000; Office of Civil Defense, $75,000; Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, $140,000; courts, $3,300,000; Department of Public Health, $23,492,000; Department of Corrections, $4,520,000; Department of Public Welfare, $9,245,729; Department of Buildings and Grounds, $1,687,000; Office of Surveyor, $148,920; Department of Licenses and Inspections, $1,482,000; Department of Highways, $5,876,000; Department of Vehicles and Traffic, $1,094,000; Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, $350,000; Department of Sanitary Engineering, $10,255,000; Washington aqueduct, $2,120,000; National Guard, $115,800; National Capital Parks, $2,389,000; National Zoological Park, $645,000.

For capital outlay the bill before you contains a total of $34,306,500. This amount plus the total for operating expenses of $132,241,009 makes the amount recommended in this bill total $166,547,509.

The District of Columbia program will be financed by the Federal contribution and payments of $17,892,700; Federal loan authorizations of $9,700,000; District of Columbia revenue amounting to $137,933,000; and surplus from fiscal year 1955 and prior years of $7,313,818 for a grand total of $172,739,518. The estimated surplus as of June 30, 1956, will be $6,192,009 and with this amount deducted from the $172,739,518 results in the amount recommended in the present bill of $166,547,509.

The 1950 census shows the population of our Capital City to be 802,178. The present-day population probably exceeds 830,000. Here we have the ninth largest city in the United States, and it has the highest per capita income of any city in the world. Our hearings began on April 14, 1955, and subsequent thereto, from time to time, we received information to the effect that notwithstanding the fact that in certain areas of the District permanent schools could not be built fast enough to take care of the increased school population, which in October of last year totaled 115,430, residents were rapidly moving out of the District with this fact evidenced by a drop in automobile registrations amounting to some 10,000. However, just before we completed our hearings on this bill one of the newspapers carried an article stating that Washington had not lost 10,000 automobile registrations, as was reported approximately a month prior thereto, but actually had gained 2,222 over last year. According to the traffic director, this was simply an accumulation of errors which caused the erroneous registration figure.

During our hearings statements were made that the Federal Government owned and controlled so much of the land in the District that additional duties should be placed upon the Federal Treasury. In one instance we were informed that the Federal Government owned and controlled 58 percent of the real estate in the District of Columbia. I discovered, upon investigating this matter through the General Services Administration, that the General Services Administration's report on Federal real property shows 11,297 acres of land owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, or 28.9 percent of the total 39,040 acres in the District. This information was obtained by me from the Comptroller of General Services Administration on April 25, 1955.

It is now agreed by the District officials that the real-estate assessments should be brought up to date and the local press has recently pointed out that several untapped sources of tax revenue previously closed by Congress should be reexamined and reopened; that the city tax rate amounted to $22 per thousand; that the income-tax laws of the District provided for an exemption of $4,000 for each taxpayer, and that said $4,000 exemption should probably be lowered. Title 47, section 1567a of the District of Columbia Code, provides for the $4,000 income-tax exemption. Title 47, section 501a of the District of Columbia Code, provides that the rate of taxation on real property in the District of Columbia shall not be less than $22 per thousand of the assessed value of such property.

Public Law 364, passed during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, authorizes an annual payment by the United States to the District of Columbia in an amount not exceeding $20 million. We find this provision set forth in title 47, section 2501b. The question has been raised recently as to whether or not this law should be amended increasing the amount of the authorization to be able to meet the present emergency confronting the District of Columbia. The budget under investigation is in balance, but with all the requests for additional governmental functions and improvements, plus a contemplated pay increase for the District of Columbia employees, this budget may be several million dollars out of balance before the end of fiscal year 1956.

In the year 1922 the total appropriations for the District of Columbia amounted to $22,977,411.07. The District's share was $13,784,647.70, and the share of the United States was $9,192,763.37. Here we have a Federal contribution of 40 percent of the total. In the year 1946 the United States share

amounted to 9.2 percent of the total of $64,728,422.75. The District's share during this particular year amounted to $58,728,422.75 and the United States share amounted to $6 million. From 1922 to 1955 the lowest amount contributed by the United States was $4,539,295, which took place in the year 1935. Here we have the United States share amounting to 13.11 percent of the total. In 1947 the total appropriations amounted to $72,548,313.66, with the District's share being $64,584,313.66 and the United States share amounting to $8 million, or 11.2 percent of the total. In 1948 the percentage of the United States share was 13.46 percent; in 1949 it amounted to 12.79 percent; in 1950 it amounted to 11.19 percent; in 1953 it amounted to 8.80 percent; in 1954 it amounted to 8.52 percent; and in 1955 it amounted to 14.44 percent with the total appropriations amounting to $138,498,386. The District of Columbia's share amounted to $118,498,386, the share of the United States jumping up to the total amount of the authorization as provided for under Public Law 364, which was $20 million. From 1922 to 1955 the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia has ranged from $4,539,295 to the maximum authorized under the present law of $20 million.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the present assessment situation here in the District of Columbia. Under the District of Columbia Code, title 47, section 713, the law provides that real estate shall be listed and assessed at not less than the full and true value thereof. That is the law in the District of Columbia.

Our investigation discloses the absolute necessity of a thorough and immediate study of the tax structure of the District of Columbia. As a result of our hearings, we find that a reassessment of all real estate in the District of Columbia should be made as soon as possible. A reassessment of the real property in the District does not necessarily mean that more revenue will be raised, but it does mean that many inequities will be removed. Those property owners assessed too high will be decreased accordingly and those property owners whose property is not properly assessed will have same assessed accordingly.

When we started our hearings on the District of Columbia appropriations I made inquiry the first day of the President of the Board of Commissioners, Mr. Spencer, as to the true condition concerning real estate assessments here in the District of Columbia. My question was answered by the assessor of the District, who stated that there were many areas of the District which had not been reassessed for 20, 25, or 30 years. This may be found on page 30 of the hearings. Further inquiry was made of the assessor as to how long it would take to equalize the real-property assessments in the District, and in answer to this question the assessor stated that to properly equalize the entire District of Columbia it would take up to 10 years. This question and answer may also be found on page 30 of the hearings. The assessor informed our committee that in the year 1929 there were 3 assistant assessors for the District, and in that year the number was increased to 5. This same number was authorized down to and including October 1, 1951, when the present assessor assumed the duties of his office. Here we have the assessor stating that since he was not satisfied with the conditions he found concerning real-estate assessments, he advocated an increase in the staff of assistant assessors, with the Commissioners going along with this suggestion, which was accepted by the Congress, thereby resulting in the number of assistant assessors being raised to seven in the year 1954. Notwithstanding the authorization for an increase of 2 assistant assessors, the assessor testified that positions of at least 5 assistant assessors were filled. This testimony may be found on page 36 of the hearings. Last year three additional assistant assessors were requested, and same were approved by the Congress. Here we have authorization for 10 assistant assessors, but the assessor testified that only 8 positions were filled, and that this is the situation as it stands today. It was pointed out to the committee that the residence restriction of 5 years in the District has hampered the assessor in filling these vacancies, and I call this matter to the attention of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. Our examination further discloses the fact that the assessor has a total of 257 employees in his office. Notwithstanding the fact that 257 employees are employed in the assessor's office and authorization has heretofore been granted for 10 assistant assessors, we still need a complete reassessment of real property in the District of Columbia. A request was made for 3 additional assistant assessors, and in order to make every effort in securing a reassessment of the real property in the District, our committee now recommends that 3 additional assistant assessors be authorized. This brings the total to 13 assistant assessors. Under this setup the assessor is of the opinion that within a period of 10 years proper reassessment of all real estate can be made in the District of Columbia. The city's need for more revenue is acute, and the current inequities should be remedied as soon as possible, and a period of from 5 to 10 years is simply too long a time to wait for the proper adjustment of the real-estate assessments in the District.

As I have heretofore stated, a general reappraisal of real estate is not to provide in every instance a means for increasing the revenue, but is sound procedure to be used in correcting inequities due to wide price variations in order to equalize to a reasonable degree the real estate tax burden of the property owners of the District. You might be interested in knowing that the District of Columbia was forced to condemn certain property for schools within the past few years and it was found that the court awards amounted to 200 percent and 300 percent of the assessed value of the improved property, with an average of 250 percent. The following examples indicate the trend:

Site for the Dunbar school acquired in 1952

Square 554	Assessed value	Court award
Lot 44	$4,230	$12,000
Lot 83	6,507	17,000
Lot 84	4,317	15,000
Lot 85	4,317	12,000
Lot 814	4,793	11,500
Lot 147	3,881	12,500
Lot 815	3,810	14,000
Lot 820	2,756	7,000
Lot 853	4,230	12,000

Site for the Van Ness School acquired in 1954

Square north of 853	Assessed value	Court award
Lot 13	$2,375	$8,000
Lot 14	2,203	6,900
Lots 23–26, inclusive	14,818	33,000
Lots 5–9, inclusive	9,354	27,000

An examination of the assessment records in the District of Columbia certainly does not give you a true picture of the new housing activity for the period 1946 to 1954. The United States Department of Labor Statistics has furnished me with the following information concerning new housing activity. In Washington, D. C., in the year 1946 we had 4,000 new dwelling units; in 1947 we had 4,303 new units; in 1950 we had 4,857 new units; in 1951 we had 4,494 new units; in 1952 we had 4,761 new units; in 1953 we had 5,384 new units, and in 1954 we had 2,984 new units. The District of Columbia as pointed out heretofore under the 1950 census had a total population of 802,178. By way of comparison Boston, Mass., with a population in 1950 of 801,444 had 1,023 new housing units in the year 1946; 975 new housing units in 1947; 1,642 new housing units in 1948; 1,598 new housing units in 1949; 2,353 new housing units in 1950; 3,686 new housing units in 1951; 1,390 new housing units in 1952; 1,273 new housing units in 1953; and 647 new housing units in 1954.

During our investigation concerning the reassessment of real property in the District of Columbia, I was informed that the Division of Audits of the United States General Accounting Office made an audit of the real-estate tax revenue of the District of Columbia and on January 20, 1955, delivered a copy of the report to the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The transmittal letter accompanying the report provides as follows:

Our audit of the real-estate tax revenues of the District of Columbia has disclosed a situation which we believe is of such importance as to merit prompt consideration and action. Our findings are summarized below and, together with our recommendations, are presented in greater detail in the accompanying report.

There have been no general overall reappraisals of real properties within the District as required by law (44 Stat. 834) since 1940, and it is entirely possible that such reappraisals have never been made. The purpose of the general reappraisal is not to provide the means for increasing general real-estate tax revenues as a whole, but is to

correct inequities due to wide price variations in order to equalize to a reasonable degree the real-estate tax burden of the individual property owners. District officials have attempted at various times to equalize assessments through the reassessment of limited areas, the application of an arbitrary adjustment on all new or reappraised properties, and a general increase in assessed valuation of improvements only. Such adjustments have tended to confuse and to amplify the discrepancies.

Perhaps the principal reason for the District's failure to perform periodic general reappraisals was the lack of adequate property description and valuation records upon which such reappraisals could be based. It is impracticable to perform periodic general reappraisals through physical inspections alone, and records of this type, together with definite written policies with respect to valuations, are therefore essential for the periodic equalization of assessments and for their reconstruction and verification in connection with appeals.

We realize that the present situation resulted from the failure, over a period of years, to develop adequate records and policies, and is becoming more difficult with the growth of the District, and the rapid changes in economic conditions. We believe that further delay in establishing the basic records and definite assessment policies will serve only to increase the problems.

We should like very much to receive your comments on the enclosed report. Members of my staff will be available for consultation at your convenience if you desire.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. LONG,
Director of Audits.

On pages 463–466 of the hearings we find Mr. Spencer, the President of the Board of Commissioners, testifying that, in his opinion, the present law should be changed removing the residence restriction of 5 years for District assessors, and he quite frankly stated that the assessor's proposal for a reassessment program continuing over a 10-year period was not sound.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, Samuel Spencer, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, R. F. Camalier, District Commissioner, and Brigadier General Lane, Engineer Commissioner of the District, are all conscientious public servants, and are attempting to carry out the duties of their offices in such a way as to make our Capital City a model city, and one of which we can all be proud. These men are all well-qualified for their present positions. I have not met the new Commissioner who, within the near future, will take Mr. Camalier's place, but I presume that he, too, is well qualified for the position of Commissioner of the District of Columbia. It is true that as a result of our hearings we found the assessment system in the District obsolete and totally inadequate and other matters were brought to the attention of the Commissioners which should be corrected at the present time, but this certainly does not mean that all of the blame should be placed upon the present Commissioners. Their attention is now called to the defects in the tax structure of the District, and I for one believe that immediate action will be taken to solve these problems. These men should receive the full support of the Congress of the United States and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

We recommend an appropriation of $12,781,000 for the Metropolitan Police Department. This is a net increase of $23,480 over last year, and only $24,520 less than budget estimates for 1956. The Metropolitan Police Force has an authorized strength of 2,278 men, and as of the present time 2,250 men are employed. This is an alltime high. According to the FBI the number of crimes in every category, except one, declined in the District of Columbia in 1954 despite a continuing rising trend throughout the Nation. The total number of serious crimes committed in the District during the past 12 months numbered 19,115, a decrease of 22.3 percent under the peak of serious crime reached in January 1953, and a decrease of 3.8 percent under the lowest crime rate existent prior to 1954. Upon being questioned concerning the further reduction of crime in the District, Maj. Robert V. Murray, Chief of Police, informed me that, in his opinion, such reduction would necessitate the employment of some 200 to 300 additional officers. He further stated that it has been proven time and time again that the best deterrent to crime is a uniformed policeman out on the street where he can be seen. I certainly agree with this statement. At the time of our hearings we called attention to the use of one-man patrol cars which are now in use in Kansas City, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Major Murray informs our committee that the use of 1-man patrol cars should be given consideration at the present time for use in the residential and noncongested sections of the District. A further study will be given this suggestion. In my opinion, Major Murray and the police department generally are doing a fine job and should be commended by the Congress of the United States and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Juvenile delinquency is one of the serious problems confronting the law-enforcement section of the District of Columbia government. In the year 1950 the Juvenile Court record shows 3,836 juvenile complaints; for 1951, the record shows 3,373 complaints; in 1952 the record shows 4,427 complaints; in 1953 the record shows 5,351 complaints; and in 1954 the record shows 5,514 complaints.

In addition to receiving testimony from the District of Columbia officials, our committee held night sessions at which time citizens of the District were heard. Representatives of parent-teacher associations, civic organizations, and other organizations interested in the welfare of the District appeared. We were informed that special teachers were required at the present time for slow-learning, emotionally disturbed, and severely retarded children. Budget proposals submitted to our committee failed to include an appropriation for such teachers. I sincerely believe that superior and average students unnecessarily suffer, and their learning process is retarded when they are placed in the same classroom with children falling into the categories listed above. A thorough investigation of this matter was made, and in the proposed budget for 1956 we incorporated the sum of $96,810 for 21 additional teachers, with 9 of said teachers for atypical children, 4 for speech correction, 2 for visiting instruction corps, 4 for remedial reading, and 2 for mentally retarded children.

Before we place additional tax burdens on the residents of the District, a thorough study should be made of the present tax structure. I sincerely believe that the United States should pay its fair share of the cost of maintaining our Capital City. We now have a sales tax in the District of Columbia, and with a $4,000 income-tax exemption allowed it would be unjust for the Congress of the United States to further burden the residents of the District with a payroll tax. A payroll tax should come as the last resort.

Notwithstanding the fact that the problems confronting our Capital City are serious and require thorough study and immediate action, they will be successfully solved as the result of the complete cooperation of the District officials, the citizens of the District, and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in order to propound an inquiry of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. Would the gentleman be in a position to yield some time to me?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 25 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, could he advise some of us as to how much longer the general debate will continue?

Mr. RABAUT. I have two more speakers who will consume about 20 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at the present time I have two requests for time, for 5 minutes each, and a tentative request for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, each year when we consider the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia many people get all worked up about it. It seems to me we often overlook some of the fundamentals that are involved. Too often the people of the District of Columbia feel that the Congress is interfering with their business. They forget that this city was established for the benefit of the Federal Government and not necessarily for the benefit of the people who are fortunate enough to be living here at the time. They forget that every man and woman who pays Federal taxes in this country contributes something to the upkeep of Washington. They forget that we have in this city the best streets, the best parks—it is the best city in the United States, as it should

be. And to a considerable extent it is such a beautiful city because of what the taxpayers of Louisville, Ky., and of other States over the years have done to make it so.

I personally favor, and I believe that most of the Members of this Congress favor, adequate Federal participation; although at times there may be honest disagreement as to what that should be. But may I point out today that it takes something more than money to make a wonderful city; because if it took only money, you would not have so many people moving out of this city into nearby areas. You would not have persons coming here to take Government positions, looking around and saying, "No, I do not think I want to raise my family in the city; let us look at some other place in this area."

There is something else that must be considered in addition to money. My personal experience in this city goes back some 35 or 36 years. I regret to say that I have witnessed a tremendous deterioration in the Capital of the Nation, even though we have spent millions and millions of dollars to make it the finest city in the country. Although we are trying to restore a few small areas, at the same time great sections of this city are rapidly becoming slum areas. Why? Buildings do not make slums; people make slums.

Over the years, somehow or other, we have attracted a great many of the wrong kind of people to the Capital, the shrine of the Nation. You may inquire, What do you mean the wrong kind of people? It is obvious. The wrong kind of people to whom I refer are those who do not recognize the responsibilities which go with residence in the Capital of the Nation and do not behave themselves and do not take care of their property.

I am very happy to say that there has been considerable progress made in reversing the trend in the last 2 years. For example, 2 years ago Washington was one of the most lawless cities of the country, and while the crime rate nationally during the past 2 years has increased by 8 percent, it has dropped 24 percent in Washington. You have new governmental leadership in Washington, and they are not going to put up with a lot of foolishness such as occurred in the Capital of the Nation during the last 15 or 20 years.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I concur in what the gentleman says, and I compliment the Police Department of the city of Washington on the fine job it has done over the last 2 years in creating the figures to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman. I agree that the credit for this must go to the chief of police, Robert Murray, the courts, and all of the other officials who are connected with law enforcement.

I read in the paper where some of the businessmen of this town are not satisfied that this city and its people have the greatest per capita income in the United States. They want more. They want to attract additional business here so our streets and bridges will be even more inadequate and it will cost even more money in the future. Why cannot they be satisfied with the present size of the city and try to improve it instead of creating new problems just to make more money? I should think they would be satisfied, being businessmen in an area that has the highest per capita income in the United States.

The people of Washington should realize that we in the Congress do have an interest in this city. We are trying to work with them to make this the finest city in the world. We ask only that they behave themselves, take care of their property, pay their fair share of the cost of operating the city, and show some appreciation for the opportunity of living in a beautiful city where the tax rate is $2.20, whereas in Louisville it is $4.05 per $100 on real estate.

May I also point out the differences in the rate of assessment. My property here is assessed from 75 to 80 percent of its marketable value, while in Louisville my property is assessed at 50 percent of its market value. For that reason, I do not have the advantage of the low tax rate in the District of Columbia. The assessment rate is very important in addition to the tax rate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Some here are overassessed. There is no fairness in the assessment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the point I am trying to bring out. I am very glad the gentleman mentions it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to raise one more point.

In every city, including this one, you have a great many persons who make their money in the city and spend it in the other areas in which they live. We took care of that in Louisville by putting on those persons, as well as the other folks who live there, what we call an occupational tax. If persons who work in Washington are going to use the city streets; if they are going to use the various facilities and the opportunities to make money in Washington, and prefer to live in Maryland and Virginia, let them pay at least a part of the cost of the upkeep of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have to go through this about once every year, and we always have the same story. It is a little difficult to get along with. I happen to be a member of the District of Columbia Committee. I live close to the District and I have always been interested in Washington. It is more or less my home city. So with some inconvenience to myself, I remained on the District of Columbia Committee, and at the same time I am chairman of the finance subcommittee of the District Committee. Last year, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], was chairman of the subcommittee on fiscal affairs. In other words, it became our duty to find the sources of taxation for the people of the District. It is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the necessary money. I do not think the people of Washington ought to be unmindful of the long hours, the diligent and sincere work that was put in by the District of Columbia subcommittee on appropriations. It is not a pleasant task to have to sit in the committee room and many of these gentlemen come from a long distance away where they have no local interest in Washington, and the only reason they put in their time and energy on this is as a patriotic duty to try to have a fine capital city here for all of the people in the United States.

Certainly, as one of those very much interested in Washington, I appreciate their efforts, even when I find it necessary to disagree, as I sometimes but very seldom do. I do not think we can settle all of the problems of the District of Columbia in an appropriation bill. So my only purpose in talking to you this afternoon is that I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], who is chairman of the committee to which I am going to refer, and I, who served as ranking member on that committee, can remind this House of some of the things that may have been overlooked, and which I am sure have been overlooked. I expect to offer an amendment, and, if I do, someone else will to restore the budget figure of $20 million to this appropriation bill, which would be a raise of $4 million over and above what the committee did. I want to tell you the reasons why I am going to do that. I think the Members who are here who know me know that I have not been a wild spender in my record here. I have generally been on the side of cutting appropriations, but I think I can point out to the House that this is not the right thing to do by telling you the circumstances by which this $20 million got into the budget this year and how it got into the budget last year. It became apparent to everybody that this city was deteriorating. The water system of this city was in critical shape. The sewer system was in bad shape. You needed, as every other community needs, schools—many of them. You needed many public works that are essential to any city and which should be the pride of the District of Columbia and of the Congress which rules the District of Columbia. So this subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] was chairman, that is the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, you understand, sat down with a similar committee of the other body and for weeks and months that joint committee of the Senate and the House undertook to find sources of revenue which would bring this city up to what it should be and to halt this deterioration of the city. We did not do what the District Commissioners asked us to do. We did not push this burden off on the Federal Government. But what we did was to find sources of taxation to meet what

was needed, to match a reasonable increase in the funds of the District for capital improvements.

Now do not forget about capital improvements because that is what this is all about. We found those sources of revenue. Many of them did not suit the people of Washington. They would protest against nearly every one of them. But, we said we thought the District of Columbia ought to raise $10 million more and that the Federal contribution ought to be increased by $9 million during the time that these capital improvements were under construction. And that was done. That committee brought that bill back to the House and we submitted to you here in the House just a year ago in this very Chamber, and every Member of the House had a chance to vote for it or vote against it, and we explained to you just what it did do, that we were, so to speak, making a bargain as between the people of Washington and the Federal Government, and that we proposed to impose $10 million of those additional taxes and we increased taxes on nearly every sort of property in the District.

In return for that we were going to propose an additional sum of $9 million in the Federal budget, and every Member of this House had the opportunity to stand on his legs and say: "No, I do not think we ought to do that." But that bill was passed and the Congress agreed to that bargain, yet not 3 months elapsed before an appropriation bill came in here in defiance of what the Congress had done in the past 90 days with a cut of this same $4 million.

We appeal to the fairness of the Members of the House. Congress imposed these taxes upon the people of Washington on the condition named in the bill, and the House had accepted the bill, we had voted for it, yet here in 90 days the effort was made to repudiate it. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I would like for you to consider those circumstances.

Nobody will undertake to dispute the statements which I have just made. Is that the proper thing to do? Do you think it is the right thing to do, for this House to enter into that sort of bargain which is entirely different from other authorizations? Because here is an authorization conditioned upon the imposition of taxes of an equal amount on the District of Columbia, and they have paid those taxes. Now, we are just asking that if you do not think that is the right way to meet our obligation that you stand up and vote for the amendment which I propose to offer to restore the budget amount to this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would like to suggest to my colleague that we increased the taxes upon the residents of the District of Columbia by $15 million annually and increased the contribution by the Federal Government, as the gentleman said, an additional $9 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to be corrected because I did not have the exact figure in mind. This committee did a great deal of work, but our committee was unanimous and the Senate committee was unanimous, and as far as I can recall this House was unanimous in feeling that the scheme we had worked out was a proper and honest scheme by which this city could be saved from further deterioration in its essential facilities.

Now, you hear a lot of talk about the people of the District of Columbia and their government; the people should do this and the people should do that; that the people should run the government. The fact is that they do not run this government; they are run by this government. There are bills pending over in the committee now, for instance, to raise the salaries of the school teachers—something that probably should be done. We have just passed a bill in this House raising the salary by a substantial amount of every judge, district judges, appeals court judges, municipal judges, every judge in this District. It costs a lot of money. Did the people of Washington do that themselves? Oh, no; we did it to them. They have to pay whatever you say they shall pay, and then we are expected to raise taxes here, and we have been doing that.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Gladly.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I want to compliment the gentleman on an excellent statement, as usual; and I want to associate myself with everything he has said. I am familiar with the actions of the joint committee. It was a very thorough study of the whole fiscal situation here in the District and I certainly will support the amendment the gentleman is going to offer.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman, because he is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, a very valuable member and has put in a great deal of time and study on this very question.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is always pleasant to follow my good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have been associated here for many years. Perhaps we have both been considered rather conservative when it comes to the matter of appropriations. I want to say to you that we had this tremendous problem that was facing the District and the deterioration which was obvious and which was the responsibility of the Congress to make every attempt to correct. It involved not only schools, but it involved the health of the people of Washington, it involved transportation, it involved every avenue which we use and which we oftentimes think so little about.

The Joint Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Senate and House, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said, spent many, many days going over this problem. The Commissioners recommended a public-works program of slightly in excess of $305 million to be spread over a period of 10 years. There were some pretty bitter criticisms of our committee when we rewrote the proposals. We did not accept that which was requested as a Federal payment. We cut it down. We increased it $9 million to a $20 million annual Federal appropriation. Our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] offered an amendment which earmarked a certain proportion of those funds which would have to be used on the long term public-works program for the improvement of our Capital City.

Let me say that I share also the highest respect for the gentlemen who sit on the fiscal appropriations subcommittee for the District of Columbia. Sometimes our good friends in the newspaper field do their good intentions no good in some of their criticisms of people who have earnestly tried to do a good job. I think it is unfortunate sometimes that some things are said and it is also unfortunate that some things are written, because even though I differ with their views in connection with one particular phase of this bill, I recognize it is the responsibility and the duty of this fiscal affairs subcommittee to carefully go over item by item the justifications for the amounts requested in this bill.

It is a rather anomalous situation when you come to think of the District of Columbia. We are charged as the governing body. We pass on what they are going to spend. The total budget for the District of Columbia this year is less than the cost of the aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that this $4 million cut is going to create a very serious situation so far as the entire program of the District of Columbia is concerned. May I say that you will find there were some errors in certain figures and that instead of there being any surplus there will be a deficiency. I want to say to you very frankly that I think it will be most disastrous to eliminate this $4 million. Certainly I want to make it as strong as I can that I think we should support, on both sides of the aisle, the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to restore that $4 million cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something that has not been brought out here but which was referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Last year, when a small surplus was left over, it was obvious there were going to be possible other emergencies, and there were, one of which totaled over $1 million of additional cost imposed on the District of Columbia for St. Elizabeths Hospital. There are bound to be increases in salaries of the various employees of the government of the District during the course of this year. Frankly, the legislative committee has a tremendous problem in trying to arrive at finding other taxes. I do not think anyone enjoys voting for taxes or increasing taxes upon people. I certainly do not. I did not last year. But it had to be done. I do not think it is going to break the Federal Government if we put back in the $4 million which are so badly needed for the operation of your Capital and my Capital in the District of Columbia, which is a city in itself, a little State, a small area of which 42 percent is occupied by the Federal Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this is another situation where people are for economy but not when they are interested in a project. How does this project differ from projects all over this country where there have been authorizations to the extent of $3 billion and no funds have been allowed to date for either planning or construction? If you want to put money in here, why not put money in every place where they are demanding it? Is it because there is no interest there, or is it because all the interest centers here?

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said something about sewers. In this bill there is $2 million above that appropriated in 1955 for sewers. Under the $20 million, out of that there is $7 million for capital outlay. Under the $16 million there is $5.5 million for capital outlay, and there is $1.5 million held back for the bridge because there is no decision as to building it.

Now, you can appropriate anything you want, but I see no reason for encouraging the District of Columbia year after year in its government when it fails itself to do the work it should do to pull its own self out of the mud by the bootstraps. We talk about increased expenses. Is there any reason that every time the District of Columbia has an increase in expenses that there should be a corresponding increase in the Federal grant? None whatever. As a matter of fact, some of the very money that the Federal Government spends results in a shot in the arm for the District of Columbia. For instance, the new proposed pay raise will bring $1 million a day into the Federal pay scale, and a certain percentage of that will go into the District of Columbia. I cannot go along with the idea that every time the District of Columbia needs something the Federal Government has got to jump.

It is high time that the District of Columbia, as a city of its size, should take cognizance of its own responsibility. I say the Federal Government should make some sort of a contribution, but I am of the opinion that it might be of a diminishing nature from this time on.

Another thing: The District of Columbia inherits some of its expenses from adjacent territory where payments to those in need are much below what they are in the District of Columbia. If I were down and out I would move to the District, too, because I would want to keep body and soul together.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, I am not criticizing the gentleman for the uncertainty of the bridge situation. I agree there was uncertainty there, and I agree with the gentleman that it is the duty of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District to see that there is justification made for all these items. But the gentleman well knows that if we keep whittling away, as has been done here, on the Federal contribution to the public works program, soon we are not going to have any; that is very obvious.

Mr. RABAUT. That is not a new argument.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would like to call attention to one fact, if I may. I have in my hand the authorization bill passed a year ago which provided $9 million. It says:

> For the fiscal year 1955 and for each fiscal year thereafter there is hereby authorized, to be appropriated in addition to the sums appropriated under section 1 of this article, an annual payment by the United States for defraying the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia in the sum of $9 million.

That is no contract, no agreement. It is simply an authorization, and the amount of the appropriation has to be determined after hearings and after the situation has been evaluated.

Mr. RABAUT. And the amount that is really in question is $1,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened wth great interest to this debate this afternoon. I want to take this time to congratulate the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the fine work he and his committee have done in the past few weeks in threshing out this difficult problem of making appropriations for the District of Columbia.

I have been a member of the District of Columbia Committee for 17 years. This is the third time I have been chairman. Never has there been a subcommittee on appropriations that has cooperated with the legislative committee as well as the present subcommittee.

The main trouble with the District of Columbia is that they have been spending millions and millions of dollars without authorization. I think this committee has made a thorough check to see that the funds that are to be spent from here on out are authorized by the proper committee of this House. Millions of dollars have been squandered in the District of Columbia in the past 15 years which no committee authorized.

I take great pleasure in congratulating this committee on its fine work. I know all about the opposition last year to the $9 million. I was one that voted for that $9 million, making the appropriation for the Federal Government $20 million, but I did not say I would vote that amount forever. I do not think the District of Columbia has done its part towards collecting taxes on improved property or getting funds where they should to help operate this city.

I can give one instance. Just last year I made an effort to secure legislation permitting an oil company to rebuild a filling station, which would at least give the District of Columbia $1,000 more income by improving that one building. No; they rejected that. I can think of numerous other similar occasions where they could have collected revenue if certain people in the District had cooperated with the House District Committee. And I don't mean the Commissioners.

We are receiving cooperation from this committee and I am going to back them to the limit. I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with some of the members of my committee, but this is a free country and everyone can vote according to his conscience.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman referred to the Authorization Act of 1954.

Mr. MCMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. May I refer to the question I asked the distinguished chairman of this committee a moment ago with reference to the language of the bill which was read by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. However, he failed to mention the proviso that followed, and that is the part that disturbs me and which has not been cleared up yet. It states:

> *Provided,* That so much of the aggregate annual payment by the United States appropriated under this article to the credit of the general fund as is in excess of $13 million shall be available for capital outlay only.

In other words, $13 million of the $16 million of the Federal funds appropriated here to the general fund is going for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

The theory behind the additional $9 million was to provide this 10-year capital-outlay program. I was one member of that committee who insisted on the limitation that if it went beyond $13 million of Federal funds, the additional amount would have to be for capital improvements. On that basis there was $7 million that could be reached, up to the $20 million. You have reduced the capital-outlay program of the 10-year program, which means schools, and we need rooms for 13,000 additional students in the District of Columbia to meet these needs in the 10-year program. If the gentleman can explain to me how that works, it will clarify my mind.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield, I refer the gentleman to line 7 on page 2 of the bill in which this bill itself specifically earmarks $5½ million to be available for capital outlay only. That is the bill we are writing today. That supersedes the authorization before.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Here in the District of Columbia we have a multi-billion-dollar payroll. If you give that payroll to my State, I guarantee you we will give the United States Government $120 million a year rather than asking a grant of $28,000. I get rather tired of hearing people complain about what the Federal Government is receiving out of the District of Columbia. Believe me, one of these days there will be a time when there will be a settlement with the taxpayers throughout the country as to whether they will pay a dime toward the District when we are making a payroll available here to the people of $3 or $4 billion a year.

At the present time, the Committee on Appropriations contemplated an appropriation of $150 million for building in the District of Columbia. I have been trying to get a post-office building for my district for 17 years and I have been unable to get one. We just recently completed an $18 million courthouse in the District of Columbia. I do not think a Member here has been able to have a public building erected in his district in the past 15 years, at least not since World War II, to my knowledge. I am glad to have the opportunity to get up here and say a word in support of this grand Committee on Appropriations that has worked morning, noon, and night. I know personally that they have worked until 11 o'clock several evenings trying to solve this problem. I know also that they have had roadblocks thrown in their way by certain people. I have had them thrown in my way as chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. But I am glad to see that they came through with flying colors and have brought you a bill which, I think, will take care of the District's affairs. Before this session of the Congress is out, we expect to pass a small-loan bill and several other bills which, I think, will assist the District in securing additional funds.

I want to congratulate the District Commissioners for trying to cooperate with my committee and the subcommittee on fiscal affairs. I also think they have a fine Chief of Police, but I do think we should call to his attention that they should discontinue placing tickets on these school buses and other cars of people visiting the District. These people go back home and get a subpena or a warrant is served on them to come back to Washington and face court proceedings just because they overparked a few minutes. I think we will straighten that situation out in my committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, since we have been talking for the last 30 or 35 minutes about an amendment to be offered rather than an amendment which is now before us for our consideration, I would like to rise in support of that amendment, the amendment which I understand will be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to increase the Federal payment to the District of Columbia from $16 million to $20 million. Of course, I doubt that anything I say here will be anything that has not been mentioned before, but if it is repetition, it serves to emphasize the importance of this matter. This is a perennial argument and a perennial disagreement as to what the so-called contribution or gift or subsidy of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia should be. We have argued a great deal here or rather discussed a great deal whether or not the citizens of the District of Columbia were paying their proper share of the taxes and whether the tax laws are being properly enforced and whether the assessments are being properly levied and whether the tax-collecting procedures are being properly conducted. Well, if those things are not being handled properly, it is still the responsibility of the Congress to see that they are carried out properly. It is our responsibility to see that the citizens of the District of Columbia pay their fair share of the taxes. Yet, by the same token, that does not excuse the Federal Government or the Congress of the United States from their responsibility to pay their share of the cost of financing our Nation's Capital. The Members of this body who have had experience in managing local governments and the fiscal affairs of local communities know that you have to obtain a large portion of their revenue to finance that community from industry in that community. The revenue derived from the taxing of homes and local business will not support the community. We must derive a part of the revenue from industry. The base from which we receive that payroll in the community, namely, industry must pay its share of that burden just like the citizens of Louisville no doubt receive a certain amount of revenue from Churchill Downs operating there. No doubt they pay taxes. Here in the District of Columbia you must understand that the Federal property amounts to between 40 and 50 percent of our assessed valuation, and the base from which that payroll comes is off of the tax rolls entirely. Certainly, we must have industry in every community, and that includes the Federal Government here in the District of Columbia, and they should pay a portion of the operating expenses of that community. The Federal Government is the only exception I know of.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the same rule should be applied to all those communities in my territory where Federal activities take up over 50 percent of the assessable property?

Mr. BROYHILL. I most certainly do. I do not mean national parks, wasteland or desert, but wherever the Federal Government is actually operating an industry or creating a payroll I think they should make some return to the community.

In one of my communities across the river one-sixth of the assessed value is owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Virginia and his knowledge of this whole situation in the District of Columbia. Will the gentleman admit that even though he comes from Virginia——

Mr. BROYHILL. I admit I come from Virginia, yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Does not the gentleman feel that his first obligation is to the United States of America and also that we as Members of Congress are dedicated to the Federal city where we have the privilege to sit as a legislative body?

Mr. BROYHILL. I most certainly do. It is our responsibility to see that the activities of the Nation's Capital are properly carried out and properly financed. We recognized that last year, recognized that the Capital facilities here in the District of Columbia had deteriorated and that something had to be done, and we did something about it. We consider this as the Nation's Capital and the best interest of all the people of the Nation requires that the city be well managed. That is why we passed the public works bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that in most communities where the Government is planning to spend money the businessmen will actually raise the money, buy the land and make the Government a present of it just to get the payroll in their community?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is true. There must be a proper ratio between taxes from industry and from real estate and incomes, and we do not have a proper ratio here in the District of Columbia.

The gentleman from New York was reading from the legislative bill. Of course, in making this agreement last year the Congress of the United States was not making an agreement with the citizens of the District of Columbia; the Congress was the judge, the jury, the prosecuting attorney, and the defense attorney. They agreed with themselves that they would increase the Federal appropriation by $9 million, but at the same time they agreed they would place an additional tax upon all citizens of the District of Columbia without their consent, a tax of $15 million. Now, call it welshing, or reneging, or whatnot, last year within 3 months and again now a year later we refused and are refusing to live up to our obligation, certainly making it exasperating for the people of the District of Columbia who likewise have their responsibility to carry out in this program.

I hope you will vote this amendment out by an overwhelming majority and put a stop to this foolishness in years to come.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. The distinguished gentleman is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. How does he feel we can get additional revenue whereby to meet this need?

Mr. BROYHILL. I have no objection whatever to raising the revenue needed. The Federal Government should pay its proportionate share. As I said before, they own about 50 percent of the assessed value of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he has any further requests for time.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by saying that those who

wish to add this $4 million should think of the following facts:

The estimated annual volume of business, an estimate by the Board of Trade, from tourist groups alone in the District of Columbia, is $250 million.

The annual average Federal payroll in the District of Columbia is $1,092,000,000.

Federal projects in the District of Columbia in the course of construction or planning—these are the new ones giving you an idea of the impetus in trade that the Federal Government causes to the District of Columbia are as follows:

The Senate Office Building, $22 million; a similar building for the House of Representatives; the east front of the Capitol, seven or eight million dollars; the new Jones Point development, $14 million; and all of the other buildings that are planned here. Then there is the new Teamsters' Building, $3,400,000, that is being built here for no other reason than that this is the seat of the Federal Government, and they want to give $4 million on top of that. You would think the District was struggling.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, out of (1) the general fund of the District of Columbia (unless otherwise herein specifically provided), hereinafter known as the general fund, such fund being composed of the revenues of the District of Columbia other than those applied by law to special funds, and $16,000,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1955, and of which $5,500,000 shall be available for capital outlay only), (2) the highway fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D. C. Code, title 47, ch. 19), (3) the water fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), and $1,302,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1955), (4) the sanitary sewage works fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (Public Law 364, 83d Cong.), and $590,700, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1955), and (5) the motor vehicle parking fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D. C. Code, title 40, ch. 8), sums as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 4, strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000"; and on page 2, line 7, strike out "$5,500,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late and I do not want to consume any more time than is necessary to call your attention to the fact that this is the amendment which I discussed in general debate just a little bit ago.

The purpose of the amendment is to restore the appropriation to the amount recommended in the budget and to the amount of last year's appropriation, to the amount authorized by the public works bill for the District of Columbia.

I again think I must emphasize, because it apparently did not get over to my good friend from Michigan, the difference between this kind of an authorization and an ordinary authorization of which there are many billions of dollars outstanding. Let me emphasize to you again that this authorization bill came in yesterday after thorough consideration by the District of Columbia Fiscal Affairs Committee, by the full Committee, acquiesced in by the distinguished chairman of that Committee, presented by the distinguished chairman of that Committee and passed by this House. There is a difference between that authorization and the usual authorization, in that that authorization carried with it also an obligation which we imposed upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia to increase their taxes $15 million a year, which has been done. So that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia have been required by this Congress to put $15 million a year in the pot on condition that the Federal Government by your pledge was going to put $9 million additional in the pot. The District of Columbia has put theirs in.

Now, the Congress is asked to repudiate what we did a year ago. That is the story, that is the way it is. It is up to you whether we are going to carry out this contract or bargain which in all propriety we made with the people of the District of Columbia under which we raised their taxes $15 million a year with the understanding and the authorization that it would be matched by $9 million from the Government.

Do we stand by our bargain or do we repudiate it?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, first off, I just want to call the attention of my friends—and all of those who have spoken on this bill so far have been my friends—to the language of the bill that made this authorization, and after I have read it, I wonder if any one of them would imagine that it was a contract. This is section (b) on page 13 of that law:

If in any fiscal year or years a deficiency exists between the amount appropriated and the amount of $20 million authorized by this article to be appropriated, additional appropriations are authorized for subsequent fiscal years to pay such deficiency or deficiencies.

Do you suppose they would have put that in if it had been a contract to pay $20 million a year? We all know they would not and that there was no contract and that this is an authorization permitting the Committee on Appropriations to go over the job and see what they think is the right thing to do.

Now, all over this land of ours there are military installations; there are other Federal public buildings and activities, and the fact of the matter is that in a great many of those communities they take up, as they do in one particular town in my territory, more than 50 percent of the assessed valuation of the whole town. We cannot get and we cannot expect to get an appropriation from the Federal Government for the activities that the town has to maintain. It has to be borne by a heavy local tax rate.

What is the picture here in Washington? In almost every community in this land the tax rate is something in the neighborhood of $40 to $50 a thousand or $4 to $5 a hundred on real estate. Now, the tax rate here in the District of Columbia is $2.22 a hundred or about half of what it is in other places. On top of that there is the question of assessments. If we are to believe the stories concerning the sales, reference to which has been made here, assessments here are on the basis of about 30 percent of value. In my own community I bought a lot for $1,125 a year ago. This year it is already assessed for $1,260, or 10 percent above what I paid for it. I figure I paid every dollar it was worth. That is a sample of the way the assessment picture runs.

In other words, out in our home territories, assessments are well up toward 100 percent. Here in Washington they run 30 percent and 35 percent. What is the right thing for us to do? That is the problem that confronts us. It is not a question of any contract, because there is no contract.

I hope that this amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the proposal to add to the Federal contribution to the District budget.

The gentleman from Virginia has pointed out that Congress has a moral commitment, made last year, to appropriate $20 million instead of the $16 million recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

But even without such a commitment, we ought to restore this $4 million. Because unless this is restored, and unless some of the $8,857,791 cut from the budget estimate of expenditures is restored, essential services will be denied. May I cite two examples:

First. The committee deleted funds that would have provided for the hiring of 14 clerks for elementary school administrators, clerks who could relieve harried school administrators of much detail work and free them to perform the kind of creative supervisory work for which they were trained. Today there are some 89 elementary schools in the District, and only 63 clerks. This means that in at least 26 of the District schools the principal has no regular clerical help whatsoever.

Second. Another example of what the cut in Federal contribution to the District will mean may be found in the paring down of the budget requests for building repair funds. The District

public-school administrators originally asked for a $559,000 increase to provide for building upkeep. The Budget Bureau trimmed this figure down to $200,000. The House committee further reduced this figure to an increase of $55,000. At the present time there is $1,100,000 in the building-maintenance fund. District officials estimate that this amount will suffice for 8 months out of the 12-month period. What all of this means is that building maintenance on an $85-million plant will have to be slowed down so that, for example, buildings which should be painted every 5 years for best service can now be painted only once every 7 years. Both of these illustrations would seem to be extensions of the pennywise pound-foolish approach.

The $20 million figure—the $16 million recommended plus an additional $4 million—is not something plucked out of the air. It is a recognition that the District of Columbia, as the Nation's Capital, cannot raise the funds it needs out of its own tax base, for reasons that are inherent in the nature of the Capital District.

First, unlike any other great city in America, a great proportion, something like 42.8 percent of the total, of District of Columbia land and improvements are tax free because they are owned by the Government. If subjected to real estate taxes at the regular rate, this would yield the District an additional $20 million annually; if business taxes in addition to the real estate tax are included, it would yield approximately $40 million annually. The existence of tax-free embassies and other foreign and charitable establishments further narrows the tax base.

But this is not all. Zoning restrictions, and the fact that annexation is impossible, rule out skyscrapers and industrial establishments which could have added millions to the District's tax base. And the nature of Federal employment means that hundreds of thousands of District residents and workers maintain their domicile elsewhere and thus escape in large measure all District taxation, although they add to the District's burdens.

To all this, there must be added the millions of additional costs to the District by reason of being the Nation's Capital. To maintain the trees that line our broad avenues costs $325,000 this year; the national zoo which the District pays for costs another $650,000.

If the cost to the District of being the Federal Capital could be computed, payments by Congress could be justified at the rate of not $20 million a year, not $40 million, but several times that figure. For years Congress attempted a 50–50 sharing of the burdens of District government. If this were done in 1956, Congress would be asked to contribute one-half of $175 million, or $87 million. In the last 25 years preceding 1955, the share Congress has been willing to contribute to the District has steadily declined from 40 percent in 1922 to 8.52 percent in 1954.

In the 1955 fiscal year, Congress adopted a policy of contributing $20 million annually, some improvement over what has gone before. This practice should be continued.

In the light of all this, what are the committee's grounds for wielding the ax on the District budget? Largely, according to the report, because the District officials have been found guilty of fiscal irresponsibility and a lackadaisical attitude toward tapping additional sources of revenue. I shall not attempt to pass judgment on whether these charges are justified. But even if they are, we of the Congress should not take out our wrath on the 802,000 citizens of the District. These citizens, if they lived in any other city in America, could go to the polls at the next election and turn out of office any officials who had proved to be irresponsible or lackadaisical.

But in Washington, the Capital City of the land of the free, the people cannot. And they cannot because we, the Congress, will not let them. Let us not punish the 802,000 citizens for a world they never made. Let us not condemn them because of the acts or omissions of commissioners they did not commission.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the distinguished gentleman believe this should be the site of the Federal Government and that we as Members of the Congress have that responsibility?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I think that is entirely true.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Today we are not referring to him as chairman of the Committee on Rules, we are referring to him as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C. In the years I have been privileged to serve on the committee with HOWARD SMITH he has made a contribution that is out of this world to the District of Columbia.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I also will support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, our good friend [Mr. SMITH]. I feel that it has real merit. We do owe the responsibility the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned. We Members of Congress also receive some of the benefits that derive from this type of program.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that this is no reflection on the Committee on Appropriations. As I have said before, I feel that we on the District Committee can enact legislation to make up this deficit. I think the Appropriations Subcommittee and their distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the gentleman from Indiana, EARL WILSON, the ranking minority member, did a commendable job. All I want to happen here today is that we acknowledge and respect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to restore the full District budget, and then let us, the members of the District Committee, work out the problem of enacting legislation to produce the revenue needed for the Federal city.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to the distinguished chairman and other Members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, and his fine colleagues, the members of that committee. It is a very rare thing that you find me on the floor of the House disagreeing with the work of the Appropriations Committee, because I realize your difficult task.

I recall that the first year I came to Congress the annual budget of the District of Columbia was about $50 million. Now, as you notice here, it runs into a lot of money, $175 million, which means that your task has become more difficult and complicated each year.

I think the committee have done a good job, as you always do, and as you should, in scrutinizing the budget and the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia. I regret that I do not agree with the distinguished chairman of our legislative committee. Ordinarily, we see eye to eye on matters affecting the District of Columbia.

I was a member of the fiscal affairs subcommittee which, after lengthy hearings, brought about the 1954 public works bill. We went into the tax problems of the District and we labored long in an effort to bring about increased taxes to meet these needs. When it came to the question of the Federal contribution, we had extensive discussions in approving a $305 million public-works program which was needed in the District of Columbia and that was for schools and various other things.

Yet, here it is proposed to reduce the Federal payment by $4 million; we reduce the capital outlay by that amount, which provides for schools and other needed public-works buildings for the District of Columbia.

I have inquired of both the chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations and the chairman of our Legislative Committee for an explanation of the effect of this reduction on capital expenditures. I have not received yet a satisfactory explanation.

When we increased the taxes on the people of the District of Columbia by $15 million per year under the public works program and tax adjustment of 1954, we increased the Federal contribution from $11 million to $20 million. Experience had shown and it is understandable that the city officials meet administrative expenses of the District out of the general fund first. Capital outlays or construction programs follow with what might be left. Realizing this, I took the position that if we were to increase the Federal contribution that most of it should apply

to capital construction so badly needed to meet actual requirements of the District. This means schools, and how badly we need additional school facilities. As I said before, 13,000 students need additional school facilities. This means libraries, parks, recreation, and so forth.

Consequently, I was responsible for an amendment which provided that the first $13 million of Federal contribution could be utilized for administrative expenses of the District. That was an increase of only $2 million heretofore authorized and appropriated. All above $13 million up to the authorized $20 million had to go for needed capital expenditures.

Now you would reduce the budget request of $20 million to $16 million.

Of course, the District Commissioners are going to use $13 million of that for expenses in the operation of the District government. Therefore, under the provisions of the law, you leave only $3 million that can be spent for new and needed construction. I repeat, this reduction applies to needed new construction for schoolroom facilities, and so forth.

Now, had you made the reduction apply to the $13 million available for expenses of the District, I would not be complaining, because I think it could work out.

I invite you to visit some of these schools. I have been there. I would like to show you some of the conditions and you would have a feeling of shame, as I did, that your Nation's Capital was so derelict in providing for the kind of facilities for our children that they should have in so many instances.

Now, the committee says that you have $5,500,000 for capital outlays. This means the total capital outlay. A little over $4 million is provided for our schools. Under the proviso that I previously referred to, the amount above $13 million that must go for capital outlay must be matched.

Now, this means, as I interpret that, you cannot even spend all of the $16 million that you appropriate here for Federal contribution. Therefore the action of the committee in actuality is to make available even a lesser amount than the $16 million.

I do not quarrel with the continuing controversy as to how much Federal contribution should be appropriated for the District budget. That is a matter which the Appropriations Committee, I think, should rightfully inquire into and determine. My disappointment is that your action here does not go to that point, but, in my opinion, to the faith and credit which this Congress gave for these needed capital programs. I say we did commit ourselves to this needed long-term program, and it is our duty and responsibility to carry it out. Let us not lose faith with those on whom we imposed higher taxes for a specific and needed program.

This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I call your attention to the fact I think, perhaps, my distinguished friend from New York and I could at least prepare a record of some kind so that the same arguments which we made last year would not have to be repeated this year. I do think in fairness that we had exactly the same argument this year that we had last year. We had the same old arguments about the assessed valuations. We had the old argument that there was not any commitment. In calling attention, as our distinguished friend from New York did, to the language of the bill, I think being a member of the legislative committee, if he wants an interpretation of that language, I can give him an interpretation. Subsection (b) was written in in the event the public works program reached the point where the money appropriated could not be used. There was no question about it. It was not a situation with an "if" in it. Now that is my interpretation of the language as a member of the legislative committee.

I am going to say to you very frankly here today, and I especially call this to the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee, that you are going to find yourself in a very sorry situation so far as the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia are concerned before the adjournment of this Congress.

I am to say to you, as my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas said, these $4 million come out of your public works program. There cannot be any question about it. If you do not want these schools and these additions which are so badly needed in the District, then you might as well know that you could not more effectively cut them off in any other way than by doing exactly what you are doing. I am sorry to say we have to come here year after year and fight over this little sum of $4 million when we can spend billions and billions of dollars all over the world, which we do not know whether we get a dime's worth of good out of, and yet people think they get a great deal of satisfaction from it. But when you bring it home to our Nation's Capital, why then it is another story.

I say to you again, and I hate to be repetitious, that you have here in this little area of the District of Columbia which under our Constitution we are charged with managing, a situation where 42 percent of the taxable area is owned by the Federal Government and, therefore, not assessable for tax purposes. I do not think it is going to break the Federal Government, I think their contribution on an area basis is terribly low, and it is to be regretted that each year we have to come in and fuss and stew over whether it will be $8 million or $11 million or $15 million or $20 million. It is unfortunate.

I, too, urge the House to support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not often I indulge in debate in the House. It is a rather difficult assignment to be on the District Subcommittee, but I think it should again be pointed out at the expense of being repetitious that not only do you have a very low assessment on real estate in the city of Washington, and on inventories and on personal property, but you also have one of the lowest ad valorem tax rates of any city in the country.

I think the able gentleman from New York brought out the fact that the assessment here is about 50 percent of what it is in many cities in his State and the ad valorem tax is less than half.

It is my understanding that under the law the Commissioners are directed to raise tax rates to offset any operating deficit. May I again direct to the attention of the committee that your committee is recommending $166 million to operate the city government for fiscal year 1956.

If you will refer to page 22 of the hearings you will observe that this appropriation has mushroomed each year since the end of World War II. I believe after looking at the facts that you will feel the committee has done a good job in recommending funds. You do have a very wealthy city, great prosperity, and the greatest per capita income of any city in the Nation. So I think that by making this small cut it will prove to be an impetus to encourage the Commissioners to raise taxes to offset any deficit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that the District Commissioners are directed by the statute—not authorized, but directed—to levy a tax upon real estate sufficient to meet the requirements that are set up in the budget that is presented to us and that we appropriate for?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding. You know and I know they are not doing it and they are not going to do it as long as this Congress appropriates funds out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the surest road to favorable publicity to social advancement here in Washington is to do what the local newspapers say should be done. The Members of the House are an alien group in a hostile land. There is no question about that. We who are sent here by the people of our districts are tolerated—hardly welcome. The editors of the papers seem to know more about what the Members should know, what they should think, what they should do than either the Members themselves or the people who send them here. There is no question about that. Not if you follow the editorials closely. The Members of the House do not need to do any thinking, do not need to give any consideration to anything that is coming up in the House. All we need do is to read

the editorials in the local papers and you cannot go wrong—in their opinion—that is—if you take their views.

No doubt they mean well, have superior intelligence, better information—or have they?

If I understand the situation, certainly, none of them were ever elected to represent the people, they just come along and tell the people's Representatives what to do on almost every issue. And if the Members do not follow their views—well, he gets a scolding—and sometimes abuse. The payroll here in Washington is a constant one; there are no closing of factories, few are laid off, once in a while, one and then if it is a Federal employee there is a howl that goes to high heaven that would make even the stars weep. This city is fortunate. The average income here is higher than in any other city of the country, yet they are always crying, always squawking, ridiculing the dumb Congressman from the sticks. But they will accept our money for merchandise and service. And the gentleman from Virginia gets more for his district and his State and city than anyone else unless it be another gentleman from the same State, Mr. BROYHILL—and that is proper, and I refer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], my good friend, Mr. SMITH, Judge SMITH. He has boosted the appropriations for the city and the price of milk sold by his dairymen over there in Virginia for as long as I have been here. And that is for 20 years. Higher prices for the milk purchased by Washington people—more money for city folk so they can buy more milk.

I am not critical. I just admire his ability, but that is no reason to add this $4 million to this bill.

Not only do they, the people of the city and District, have that payroll from sums contributed by everyone in the country, but they have these hundreds of thousands of visitors who come here and leave their dollars—more than a few in number. They charge our visitors plenty. That money all goes into the District here. Not only that, but when a schoolboy comes down from Michigan these local boys beat him up and he is sent to the hospital. Of course that is exceptional, a gross exaggeration of what some seem to feel toward Congressmen when we do not follow their wishes. Now I get from the papers that the authorities intend to let the boys off on a charge of simple assault and battery, although they admit facts which show they are thieves or robbers and cowards. They might well be taken into the woodshed. That is the Washington way.

Why, with all those blessings which come to the people who live here, with the valuation of the real estate as has been shown here by speaker after speaker, the valuation of the real estate down all the time as compared with the valuation of the real estate back home, we should go ahead and give them more and more money every year, I cannot understand.

The Appropriations Committee says so much. Some on the District Committee demand more. Why not follow the Committee on Appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Arkansas, I refer to page 2, line 7 of the bill which contains the following language: "of which $5,500,000 shall be available for capital outlay only." That supersedes the law to which the gentleman refers.

Regarding the $4 million item, the reduction in capital outlay is $1,500,000. That is exactly the allotment made this year for the bridge we held up because they cannot decide whether it is to be a bridge or tunnel. Out of the general fund it is $2,500,000. The two figures added together make $4 million.

The District got all of the schools it requested, it got an increase in the amount of money over 1955 for the sewers, it got teachers in excess of the request that was made by the Commissioners for the children that needed teachers. The amount of $4 million, if allowed, will give the general fund an excess of over $3 million. Now, if you want to hand to the District that much money and take it away from projects in other parts of the country, all right, for, after all, there is a limit even to the expenditures of the United States Government.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 59, noes 71.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. RABAUT.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 85, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 19, line 21, strike out "$9,245,729" and insert "$9,600,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, to explain the purpose of this amendment, which comes under Public Welfare, it is for the purpose of keeping the grants at the present level.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think our colleagues made a mistake in turning down the amendment providing for an increased appropriation for the District. I understand a motion will be made to recommit the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman is not speaking on the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. My request was to be recognized and I was recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must confine his remarks to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] asked for recognition to speak on the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then I shall speak on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment, of course, is for old-age assistance, to add some additional funds for that purpose. If old-age assistance is going to be provided, more funds will be needed.

I have been on the Committee for the District of Columbia for 11 out of the 13 years that I have been here. If we are going to treat the old people in the District as they should be treated, additional money will have to be provided. These people do not have a vote here in the District of Columbia. They have no way of voting on these appropriations. Members of the House are their councilmen, their mayor. We act to raise the pay of their judges, to provide compensation for the old folks, for the widows and children, and others who would qualify under this amendment. Unless we furnish the money the assistance cannot be provided.

That process applies all through and affects the matter of raising the money for old-age assistance and other activities. It makes no difference whether the money is raised through the Assessor's Office or not. Perhaps some of the assessments have not been right.

In my own city, part of the money collected on cigarette and gasoline taxes is funneled into old-age assistance. I have thought that in the District perhaps another 1-cent tax on gasoline or a raise in the tax on cigarettes or perhaps a slightly larger sales tax might be advisable. Such money could be funneled into the old-age assistance fund. It might be the answer to get sufficient funds to do some of this more important work.

I hope that a motion will be made to recommit and the amendment that was voted down by a margin of one vote will be favorably acted on so that we may give the District the amount of money that this Congress last year promised to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 42, line 15, after *"Provided"*, insert a comma.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is just a perfecting amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 8, line 18, strike out "$27,996,810" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,264,309."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the amount in this section by an amount of $267,499, which is distributed in the following manner: $81,199 for 18 additional special teaching positions for remedial special work for retarded children; $41,300 for 14 additional clerks for elementary schools; and $145,000 for increasing the funds for repairs and maintenance in the schools.

I know it would be a great deal better to offer this amendment in three separate parts, but for parliamentary expediency I have grouped them together. However, they all have to do with increasing the amount of the appropriation for school facilities in order to bring them up to the absolute minimum requirements, the amount requested by the Superintendent of Schools and also by the Commissioners.

As to the $81,199 for special teaching positions, I would like to commend the committee for appropriating sufficient funds for 21 additional teachers. The School Board has requested 50 additional teaching positions. The committee restored 21. However, this amendment asks for 18 more, making a total of 39 additional teaching positions for the special teachers of retarded children.

It is completely unfair to the other students in the school as well as the retarded children to attempt to keep both groups in the same classes. I understand many of these elementary classes have 46 students, and it is almost impossible for the teachers to give the necessary attention to those who are unable to keep up with the average students in the class. Any efforts to drop back and take care of the retarded students would necessarily hold back the progress of the entire class. I think the subcommittee will agree that permitting the 21 additional positions would have a great deal to do with preventing juvenile delinquency in the future.

As far as the 14 additional clerks are concerned, of the 89 elementary schools in the District of Columbia 63 have clerks at this time. We are asking for 14 clerks, 1 for each of 14 schools. Actually, if these clerks are not installed, the clerical work, which I understand is very extensive, for many of these elementary schools have 1,300 students, will have to be performed by the principals and the teachers themselves, thereby taking their time away from the duties they are supposed to perform.

As far as the $145,000 additional for maintenance is concerned, the Superintendent of Schools asked for $1,600,000, approximately 2 percent of the total value of the school buildings here in the District of Columbia, which I understand is approximately $86 million. The District of Columbia Commissioners cut down that amount. They asked for $200,000 more than what had been granted over the period of the last few years, but the subcommittee cut that amount down to $55,000. This amount is merely bringing the appropriation for maintenance and repairs up to the amount the Commissioners originally asked.

Again, if that amount is not appropriated for maintenance and repairs, I do not believe it will save anything in the long run; in fact, it is something like being pennywise and pound foolish. We are going to have to maintain and repair these buildings, we are going to have to keep them up. If we do not do it sufficiently, as time goes on it will cost a great deal more in the long run.

I have here some examples, getting back to the special teachers that are needed, of some of the conditions which exist in the District of Columbia schools today.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes, and I ask to be recognized for the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, with all respect to the gentleman from Virginia, on the item of repairs and maintenance, the amount in the bill was $1,100,700. We added $55,000 bringing it to a total of $1,155,700. So much for that.

The committee expressed its great interest in deficient children of every kind. We provided money in this bill which was not even allowed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. We do not want to be outdone in our generosity to the District, but I want to tell you exactly, and I think you will all be interested in knowing what we have accomplished. We allowed the amount of $96,810 for 21 additional teachers. That is 9 positions for teachers of atypical children, 9 positions for teachers for speech correction and 2 positions for the visiting instruction corps and 4 positions for remedial reading and 2 positions for the mentally retarded children. We did not approve 3 positions for music classes as much as I like music, as all of you know, nor 3 positions for the art classes. And also there were 5 positions for the science classes. I feel that the committee has done well in its study of this problem, and that we are making progress in trying to help where help is needed. We want them to show what progress is going to be made with the expenditure of roughly $100,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6239) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am opposed as to the size of the Federal contribution, Mr. Speaker. It is too much, in my opinion. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman a member of this committee?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am a member of the full Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the District Committee of Washington, D. C., I have a motion for recommital on the bill.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Minnesota is a member of the Committee on Appropriations his motion would take precedence.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. KEARNS. As representing the District Committee may I have the privilege of collaborating with the gentleman in the motion?

The SPEAKER. Debate is out of order. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may within that period extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 310, making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would explain the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is in the nature of an urgent deficiency appropriation. It provides additional funds for two agencies, one the so-called Hoover Commission in the amount of $263,475, and the other the Veterans' Administration in the amount of $25 million for readjustment benefits. These two agencies find themselves without funds which must be provided before the next payday, and for that reason we have combined them and introduced this as a joint resolution. The Congress in S. 1763 has just extended the life of the Hoover Commission to June 30, 1955, with additional 90 days in which to wind up its business. The $25 million is required to meet an unanticipated increase in the number of veterans in training.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the veterans' item is one about which I think no one will have the slightest trouble. It is for education and training. We gave them one deficiency in March for $155 million. Unfortunately, there was an increase in enrollment. The month of May is the largest month for enrollments during the whole calendar year. They sent a budget estimate over for $28 million. We figured every angle, and could not figure they needed any more than $19,600,000; but since this is a no-year appropriation and it will go over until next year if the money is not used, and it is a debt that we have to pay, the committee recommended $25 million.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has the floor under a reservation of objection.

Mr. TABER. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the item for the Hoover Commission, this House just a few days ago extended the life of the Hoover Commission for 30 days. It would have expired on May 30. We extended it to June 30 and gave them 90 days to liquidate after that expiration date. For this additional month and the 90 days' liquidation period they asked for $263,475. The committee, however, put language in the bill tying this appropriation up with the authorization of the House so that the appropriation will expire with the Commission on June 30 plus the 90 days for liquidation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this all about?

Mr. GARY. This is for the investigations by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. An investigation of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. GARY. The Hoover Commission has been making studies for the past year. The House acted on a bill just a short time ago extending their expiration date for making such investigations, which would have been on May 30. They asked for additional time, they were given 30 days additional time by this House and now to meet that action of the House they need these additional funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Hoover Commission needs more money to do some more investigating or the House is investigating the Hoover Commission?

Mr. GARY. The Hoover Commission is asking for these funds to complete its investigations and its reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply additional appropriations (this act may be cited as the "Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1955") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, namely:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," to complete the operations of the Commission as provided by Public Law — (S. 1763), 84th Congress, $263,475.

Veterans' Administration

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits," $25 million, to remain available until expended.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask our distinguished majority leader what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of my friend from Massachusetts, Monday is District day. There are five bills on the calendar: S. 727, the judges salary bill, H. R. 6063, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, H. R. 191, election of delegates to political conventions, H. R. 2406, to exempt gift taxes without District of Columbia, and H. R. 3908 to regulate fares for the transportation of school children.

On Tuesday we will take up H. R. 6367, the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1956, consideration to continue until final action on the bill.

For Wednesday, Thursday and Friday: House Resolution 244, Select Committee White County Bridge Commission, H. R. 2851, the agricultural farm commodity bill, which is a relief measure and H. R. 5881, involving the Federal reclamation law.

There is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts said that if we finished the conscription bill and the District of Columbia appropriation bill he would then ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn until Monday next. I do not believe we have finished the conscription bill this afternoon. Can the gentleman tell us whether that could not be brought up tomorrow and action on it completed tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is that the bill is not coming up tomorrow and will not come up next week. That is a matter for the chairman, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the

Whole House on the State of the Union. There is no such intention. So, that is a situation I have no control over. I am keeping my promise so far as the business of the week is concerned, and the business of the week has been completed.

Mr. GROSS. I think we all came in here this morning at 10 o'clock under the unanimous-consent agreement yesterday to come in at 10 o'clock this morning to finish that bill, and in 2 days we have been running up the bill and down again and wasting all kinds of time doing that very thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to get into any discussion with the gentleman from Iowa, because that would be unnecessary and would serve neither one of us any good. The fact is that the Committee rose. That was the action of the Committee of the Whole. And there is going to be no motion made to go back into the Committee of the Whole next week. That is the answer to the gentleman's inquiry. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, there is no more business for the remainder of the week.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that the gentleman would say that this bill could be brought up tomorrow and be disposed of. It was brought up under the assumption it was urgently needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over that situation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over the programing of legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts announces the program after consultation with chairmen of committees on bills that are reported out and where rules are in order, but the gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over a committee that is considering a bill and resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill. My friend from Iowa knows that is so, so why argue about it? I say the gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over that, and that is a correct statement.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the bill can be brought in and disposed of. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my motives are pure, I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, and my intentions innocent.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad my friend said that.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman imply that my motives were not pure?

Mr. McCORMACK. He does. I do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am just seeking information and it is this: Can the gentleman tell us whether that bill that we were considering yesterday and earlier today will come up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, it will not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on H. R. 6227, H. R. 619, H. R. 5512, and S. 755.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tomorrow to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLIFIELD ASKS PRESIDENT TO EXPLAIN ADMINISTRATION POLICY DILEMMA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks two tables listing names of organizations which have approved the subject of my remarks and to include certain tables pertaining to that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propound a number of significant questions which require answers from the highest level of the administration.

They are questions important to all of us. They involve matters bearing upon our national economy. They are directly associated with policies enunciated by President Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has created a crossroads which has brought about an unhappy situation, especially unhappy for the White House policymakers.

At this crossroads there are two signs. Pointing to one road is a sign which says: "Go this way to lower price supports and decreased acreage allotments for farmers."

Pointing to the other road is a sign: "Go this way to spend billions for two reclamation projects which will grow more farm products to be supported."

As far as I can determine, the administration has not yet achieved the miracle of going in two directions at the same time.

And I should like Mr. Eisenhower to explain if he expects Congress to achieve such a feat in formulating legislation that will benefit the national economy.

Here we are confronted with two conflicting policies, both endorsed by the President. One policy calls for sharp reductions in farm-price supports and a decrease in agricultural acreage. The other policy calls for spending enormous sums of public money to build two extremely costly desert reclamation projects which would produce more farm products to be supported by the Nation's taxpayers.

I feel sure that the administration leaders realize they have created a dilemma that can lead to serious difficulties for them. I also feel that the Nation is entitled to an explanation as to how this conflict is to be resolved.

I wish to make it plain that my remarks must not be construed as an attack on all reclamation policies. I am attempting to understand the program of the administration, which is my business, and I am also striving to make these issues clear to the American people.

I believe it is the right of every farmer, all of whom will be injured by such a conflict, to demand an explanation. Equally it is to the advantage of every Federal taxpayer in our cities to ask how the administration expects him to travel simultaneously along two different roads.

SUPPORT PROGRAM

The administration's present program provides for flexible price supports on a scale ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity. Acreage allotments have been drastically curtailed.

Ostensibly this program was devised by administration policy makers with the hope of decreasing the enormous surplus of agricultural products which now bulge our warehouses throughout the country. The flood from the farms continues to pour in on the Commodity Credit Corporation, which informs me that as of February 28, 1955, their total assets amounted to $7,096,490,858.

I do not know whether they are assets or not.

But I do know that almost daily we read of desperate attempts by the Department of Agriculture to find ways and means of disposing of some of this gigantic hoard of food and fiber. Scheme after scheme is devised in the hope of relieving the taxpayer of this gigantic burden.

It costs the Government about three-quarters of a million dollars a day to store these mountains of grains, cottons, fats, and dairy products. Acreages are being restricted and parity levels lowered. With few insignificant exceptions it can not even be given away or sold at below market prices, and what has been done so far has not permitted the taxpayers to escape heavy losses.

A MILLION NEW ACRES

Now let us look at another program of the administration. It has given its blessing to the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project and to the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project, both in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin—Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

Together these two projects would provide irrigation water for approximately a million acres of land. That

means that a million acres of dry and mountainous land in these States would grow some kind of crops.

The cost of bringing water to these arid lands would run as high as $5,000 an acre, and the subsidy which the taxpayers of the United States would be forced to provide for these two projects would be at least $4.5 billion, and possibly much more.

Here are two brief tables based on Bureau of Reclamation reports to House and Senate Interior Committees on these two projects:

Upper Colorado River storage project

Estimated initial construction cost	$1,600,000,000
Hidden subsidy cost to taxpayers	$4,000,000,000
Subsidy cost per acre	$5,000
Subsidy cost per 150-acre farm	$750,000
Number of 150-acre farms	5,066
Number of acres to receive water	760,000

Fryingpan-Arkansas project

Estimated initial construction cost	[1] $156,541,000
Hidden subsidy cost to taxpayers	$500,000,000
Subsidy cost per acre	$1,600
Subsidy cost per 160-acre farm	$256,000
Number of 160-acre farms	1,900
Number of acres to receive water	309,000

[1] The Reclamation Bureau's construction estimates on this project have been revised several times; repayment periods have been changed; power rates have been changed. The above construction estimate is entirely unrealistic. One item alone will illustrate this: Involved are several score miles of open canals at an altitude of seven to ten thousand feet. Engineers have testified that these canals will have to be covered, to prevent them from freezing and to operate them efficiently, and the Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that to cover the canals and make conduits out of them would cost an additional $64 million. That very thing had to be done on the Colorado-Big Thompson project, greatly increasing construction costs, and Congress was obliged to appropriate additional money. Adding $64 million for the covered conduits would increase the estimated construction cost of the Fryingpan project to more than $200 million. In such case, repayment periods would have to be lengthened, and subsidy costs would greatly increase.

Now, the matter to which I am directing my remarks is this conflict between two promulgated policies of the administration, policies endorsed and vigorously supported by President Eisenhower.

In 1954, the President signed the agricultural act which cut price supports. Acreage allotments were decreased. In 1954, the President endorsed the proposed upper Colorado River project in a statement to the press issued at the White House. In September 1954, the President wrote to Senator BENNETT again placing his stamp of approval on the project. Then in his State of the Union message delivered on January 6 of this year, the President urged approval of the upper Colorado River development.

All during this period, the Chief Executive had given his unqualified endorsement to Secretary Benson's proposals and the decreasing of price supports and the curtailment of acreage allotments on supported crops.

Also, all during this period—and continuing to the present time—Secretary McKay had been traveling through the land voicing his approval of, and asking support for, the upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. The Bureau of Reclamation sent experts to testify before congressional committees in favor of both projects.

Here, indeed, we have a strange situation. We have two programs, both advertised as being designed to aid the economy of the Nation, and each in direct conflict with the other.

With one hand the administration is cutting price supports and decreasing acreage allotments. With the other hand the administration is asking Congress for billions of dollars to grow more crops to be supported and to increase agricultural acreage.

WHAT KIND OF CROPS?

Among the crops now being supported by the Nation's taxpayers are the following: Corn; cotton; wheat; butter; oats; butter oil; cheese; milk, dried; wool; rye; barley; beans, dry; cottonseed oil; grain sorghum; seeds, hay, and pasture; soybeans.

The upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would supply irrigation water for more than a million acres of land. In the light of the present discussion, it is very important to consider what crops would be grown on this land.

For this information, I turned to the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is so ardently supporting the projects before Congress.

FRYINGPAN GROWS SUPPORTED CROPS

The Bureau has this to say about the kind of crops that would be grown on the Fryingpan-Arkansas project—House Document No. 187, 83d Congress, 1st session, July 1953:

> The principal irrigated crops are alfalfa, corn, grain, sorghum, sugar beets, barley, wheat, truck crops, and dry beans. Dairying and poultry raising are enterprises near market outlets.

Of the principal crops which the Bureau says the Fryingpan project would grow, corn, grain, sorghum, barley, wheat, and dry beans are now supported. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

A few days ago—April 18, 1955—during debate in the Senate on the upper Colorado River project bill, S. 500, Senator WATKINS, of Utah, said to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois:

> Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not the types that are in surplus supply?

UPPER COLORADO CROPS SUPPORTED

There seems to be some difference of opinion between Senator WATKINS and the Bureau of Reclamation. For information about the kind of crops which the upper Colorado River project would produce, I again turn to the official reports of the Bureau.

In the upper Colorado River bill—S. 500—recently approved by the Senate, there are 6 proposed storage and power dams and 34 participating irrigation projects.

Now before the House are five upper Colorado River project bills—H. R. 3383, H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3384, and H. R. 4488. They contain between 13 and 34 participating irrigation projects.

From Reclamation Bureau reports, I have compiled a table showing the type of crops which would be grown on each of the 34 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops.

The table follows:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge	7,970	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Seedskadee	60,720	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
Lyman	40,600	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Silt	7,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Potatoes	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Smith Fork	10,430	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Paonia	17,040	Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Florida	18,950	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Alfalfa	
Pine River	15,150	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
Emery County	24,080	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sheep	Yes.
Central Utah	60,380	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Hammond	3,670	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beans	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Eden	20,200	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Gooseberry	16,400	Alfalfa	
		Pasture	
		Grain	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Navaho	137,240	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Vegetables	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
San Juan-Chama	225,000	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
Rabbit Ear	19,190	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Troublesome	13,640	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
West Divide	65,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook	31,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Dolores	66,000	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beans	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Sublette	84,000	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitgrowers	3,850	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Bostwick Park	6,870	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Dallas Creek	21,940	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
East River	2,750	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa	19,400	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Grand Mesa	25,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Ohio Creek	16,910	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Tomichi Creek	27,580	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Battlement Mesa	6,830	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Bluestone	10,875	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Vegetables	
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Eagle Divide	10,875	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Parshall	27,510	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Woody Creek	2,965	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

SUPPORTED PROJECT CROPS

An analysis of the above table on the principal crops to be produced on these projects shows:

Thirty-one out of the thirty-four projects would grow grains. On February 28, 1955, the Federal Government owned or had agreed to purchase 2,147,000,000 bushels of surplus major grains valued at $4,332,000,000.

Thirty-one out of thirty-four projects would produce dairy products. Latest figures show the Federal Government owned 391 million pounds of surplus butter valued at $254 million; 417 million pounds of surplus cheese valued at $168 million, and 212 million pounds of surplus dried milk valued at $34 million.

Twenty-seven out of thirty-four projects would grow sheep to produce wool. The Federal Government owned in February of this year 147 million pounds of surplus wool valued at $99 million.

Every one of these irrigation crops would produce hay and pasture. Five thousand dollars an acre is somewhat expensive for grasslands, especially grasslands lying at altitudes up to 7,000 feet, some of which suffers from frost the year round.

The point is, that the administration is asking that the taxpayers of the Nation be forced to cough up this enormous amount of money to bring into production at an almost unbelievable cost these arid lands to grow more surplus crops, and if not surplus crops, then more grasslands for cows to graze on and produce more butter, cheese, and milk to add to the towering piles of surpluses.

In the very States where the administration is proposing to build these unneeded and unjustified irrigation projects, agricultural acreage for other farmers has been restricted.

This year we have seen the spectacle of farmers on Federal irrigation projects in the West coming to Washington to protest the acreage restrictions. Under their present acreage allotments, these farmers say, they cannot earn enough money to meet their annual payments to the Government for the projects. This has happened in a number of places, notably in the immense Columbia Basin project of Washington with regard to sugarbeets, and in the Wellton-Mohawk project of *Arizona*, with regard to cotton.

What was the administration's answer to these farmers? It was: no more acreage.

The sugarbeet acreage is strictly limited and set, as I pointed out. In February of this year the Federal Government owned 8,500,000 bales of surplus cotton valued at $1,487,000,000, and enough cottonseed oil to flood out all the irrigation projects in the West.

Well, the administration set the acreage limitations and the support prices for these projects. Now the administration is faced with the problem of getting its money out of them. If the farmers cannot raise enough cash crops to meet payments for irrigation water and other annual project expenses, how are they to make their payments to the Government?

In the face of this situation, the administration is asking Congress to approve the upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project to grow more agricultural surpluses.

HARM TO PRESENT MARKETS

Nobody knows what we are going to do with all the butter we have hoarded away. But here we have the administration trying to bring greater injury to what markets we have. Butter from the Midwest, for instance, is shipped to the other parts of the country. Yet, the ad- Rocky Mountain areas, as well as to ministration wants to create a new and greater butter production in the Rocky Mountain area with these projects, thus cutting down the chances of the Midwest producers to sell their product.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the administration would solve this dilemma. I wish that President Eisenhower would explain to us his reasons for lowering price supports, cutting acreage allotments, and at the same time asking Congress to approve two projects in the upper Colorado River Basin which would grow more surplus crops at enormous cost to the taxpayers.

The income of farmers has decreased, yet the administration is attempting to grow more agricultural products which can only aid in cutting farm income more.

I would like to have the Chief Executive tell the Nation how he reconciles these two policies—if he can.

The following Government bodies and organizations in California are officially on record in opposition to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, S. 300 and H. R. 412:

1. Imperial Irrigation District.
2. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
3. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
4. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
5. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
6. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
7. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
8. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
9. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
10. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
11. Railway Employees Department—AFL.
12. Colorado River Board of California.
13. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
14. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.
15. Anaheim City Council.
16. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.
17. Calexico City Council.
18. El Centro City Council.
19. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.
20. Holtville City Council.
21. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.
22. Imperial City Council.
23. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
24. Imperial County Farmer Bureau.
25. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.
26. Burbank City Council.
27. Chula Vista City Council.
28. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.
29. Otay Municipal Water District.
30. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.
31. Property Owners Association of California.
32. Glendale City Council.
33. Hemet City Council.
34. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.
35. Los Angeles City Council.
36. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

37. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
38. Orange County Board of Supervisors.
39. San Diego City Council.
40. San Diego County Water Authority.
41. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.
42. San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.
43. San Marino City Council.
44. Agricultural Council of California.
45. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
46. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield, Calif.
47. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
48. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.
49. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.
50. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.
51. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
52. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.
53. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.
54. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
55. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
56. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.
57. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.
58. California Prune & Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
59. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
60. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.
61. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
62. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
63. Challenge Cream & Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
64. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
65. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.
66. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.
67. Fontana Producers Egg & Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.
68. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.
69. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.
70. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
71. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
72. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.
73. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.
74. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.
75. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.
76. San Diego Cooperative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.
77. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.
78. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.
79. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
80. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.
81. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.
82. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.
83. Coachella Valley County Water District.
84. Brawley City Council.
85. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.
86. City of Calipatria.
87. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.
88. City of Beverly Hills.
89. Westmorland City Council.
90. San Jacinto City Council.
91. Torrance City Council.
92. Costa Mesa City Council.
93. Laguna Beach City Council.
94. City of Chino.
95. City of Compton.
96. Newport Beach City Council.
97. County Supervisors Association of California.
98. City of Fontana.
99. City of Fullerton.
100. City of Long Beach.
101. City of Ontario.
102. City of Pomona.
103. Santa Monica City Council.
104. Upland City Council.
105. Citizens Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
106. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.
107. Whittier City Council.
108. City of Gardena, Calif.
109. City of Lakewood, Calif.
110. City Council of the City of El Segundo, Calif.
111. Seal Beach City Council, Calif.
112. City of La Habra, Calif.
113. National Avenue Businessmen's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.
114. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
115. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
116. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
117. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
118. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
119. National City Chamber of Commerce.
120. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
121. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
122. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
123. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
124. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
125. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
126. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
127. California Taxpayers Association.
128. City Council of the City of San Clements, Calif.
129. City Council of the City of Brea.
130. City Council of the City of Claremont.
131. City Council of the City of Signal Hill, Calif.
132. City Council of the City of Coachella.
133. San Jacinto Valley Chamber of Commerce.
134. City Council of the City of Maywood.
135. Oceanside Chamber of Commerce.
136. City of Huntington Park.
137. Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce.
138. City Council of the City of Buena Park.
139. City Council of the City of Indio.
140. Lemon Grove Chamber of Commerce.
141. Carlsbad City Council.
142. Long Beach Chamber of Commerce.
143. City of South Gate.
144. City Council of the City of Glendora.
145. City Council of the City of Vernon.
146. City Council of the City of Placentia.
147. City of Huntington Beach.
148. City Council of the City of Culver City.
149. City Council of the City of Perris.
150. City Council of the City of Tustin.
151. City of Redondo Beach.
152. City Council of the City of La Verne.
153. Chula Vista Downtown Third Avenue Businessmen's Association.
154. City Council of the City of Corona.
155. City of Inglewood.
156. Montrose Chamber of Commerce.
157. Lincoln Avenue Water Company.
158. Rubio Canon Land and Water Association.
159. Crescenta Valley County Water District.
160. Foothill Municipal Water District.
161. City of Bell.
162. City Council of City of Elsinore.
163. City Council of City of Hermosa Beach.
164. City of Montebello.
165. City Council of City of Orange.
166. Thermal Chamber of Commerce.
167. Board of Directors of Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County, California.
168. Pomona Chamber of Commerce.
169. City of Hawthorne.
170. City of Palos Verdes Estates.
171. City of Riverside, Calif.
172. Lakeside Chamber of Commerce.
173. The Mountain Water Co. of La Crescenta.
174. La Crescenta Chamber of Commerce.
175. La Mesa City Council.

MAY 16, 1955.

The following government bodies and organizations are officially on record in opposition to the upper Colorado River project, S. 500 and H. R. 270:

1. Engineers Joint Council.
2. American Society of Civil Engineers.
3. American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
4. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
5. The American Water Works Association.
6. American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
7. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
8. American Society for Engineering Education.
9. American Institute of Chemical Engineers.
10. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
11. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
12. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
13. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
14. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
15. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
16. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
17. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
18. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
19. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
20. Railway Employees Department—AFL.
21. American Public Power Association.
22. Izaak Walton League.
23. National Parks Association.
24. The Wilderness Society.
25. Sierra Club.
26. The American Planning and Civic Association.
27. Wildlife Management Institute.
28. Colorado River Board of California.
29. Imperial Irrigation District.
30. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
31. Wildlife Management Institute.
32. Los Angeles City Council.
33. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.
34. Anaheim City Council.
35. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.
36. Calexico City Council.
37. Calexico Chamber of Commerce.
38. El Centro City Council.
39. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.
40. Holtville City Council.
41. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.
42. Imperial City Council.
43. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
44. Imperial County Farm Bureau.
45. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.
46. Burbank City Council.
47. Los Angeles Clearing House Association.
48. Chula Vista City Council.
49. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.
50. Otay Municipal Water District.
52. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.
52. Property Owners Association of California.
53. California State Grange.

54. Glendale City Council.
55. Hemet City Council.
56. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.
57. Los Angeles City Council.
58. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.
59. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
60. Orange County Board of Supervisors.
61. Pasadena Board of Directors.
62. Riverside County Board of Supervisors.
63. Santa Ana City Council.
64. San Diego County Board of Supervisors.
65. San Diego City Council.
66. San Diego County Water Authority.
67. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.
68. San Bernadino County Board of Supervisors.
69. San Marino City Council.
70. Agricultural Council of California.
71. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
72. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield. Calif.
73. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
74. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.
75. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.
76. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.
77. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
78. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.
79. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.
80. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
81. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
82. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.
83. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.
84. California Prune and Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
85. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
86. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.
87. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
88. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
89. Challenge Cream and Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
90. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
91. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.
92. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.
93. Fontana Producers Egg and Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.
94. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.
95. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc.. Brawley, Calif.
96. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
97. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
98. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.
99. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.
100. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.
101. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.
102. San Diego Cooperative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.
103. La Mesa City Council.
104. Pomona Valley Municipal Water District.
105. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.
106. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.
107. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
108. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.
109. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.
110. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.
111. Coachella Valley County Water District.
112. California State Chamber of Commerce.
113. Brawley City Council.
114. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.
115. City of Calipatria.
116. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.
117. City of Beverly Hills.
118. Westmorland City Council.
119. San Jacinto City Council.
120. Torrance City Council.
121. Costa Mesa City Council.
122. Laguna Beach City Council.
123. City of Chino.
124. City of Compton.
125. Newport Beach City Council.
126. County Supervisors Association of California.
127. City of Fontana.
128. City of Fullerton.
129. City of Long Beach.
130. City of Ontario.
131. Parris City Council.
132. City of Pomona.
133. Santa Monica City Council.
134. Upland City Council.
135. California Academy of Sciences.
136. Citizens' Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
137. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.
138. Whittier City Council.
139. City of Gardena, Calif.
140. City of Lakewood, Calif.
141. City Council of the City of El Segunda, Calif.
142. Seal Beach City Council, California.
143. City of La Habra, Calif.
144. National Avenue Businessmen's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.
145. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
146. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
147. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
148. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
149. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
150. National City Chamber of Commerce.
151. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
152. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
153. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
154. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
155. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
156. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
157. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
158. California Taxpayers Association.
159. City Council of the City of San Clements, Calif.
160. City Council of the City of Brea.
161. City Council of the City of Claremont.
162. City Council of the City of Signal Hill, Calif.
163. City Council of the City of Coachella.
164. San Jacinto Valley Chamber of Commerce.
165. City Council of the City of Maywood.
166. Oceanside Chamber of Commerce.
167. City of Huntington Park.
168. Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce.
169. City Council of the City of Buena Park.
170. City Council of the City of Indio.
171. Lemon Grove Chamber of Commerce.
172. Carlsbad City Council.
173. Long Beach Chamber of Commerce.
174. City of South Gate.
175. City Council of the City of Glendora.
176. City Council of the City of Vernon.
177. City Council of the City of Placentia.
178. City of Huntington Beach.
179. City Council of the City of Culver City.
180. City Council of the City of Perris.
181. City Council of the City of Tustin.
182. City of Redondo Beach.
183. City Council of the City of La Verne.
184. Chula Vista Downtown Third Avenue Businessmen's Association.
185. City Council of the City of Corona.
186. City of Inglewood.
187. Montrose Chamber of Commerce.
188. Lincoln Avenue Water Co.
189. Rubio Canon Land & Water Association.
190. Crescenta Valley County Water District.
191. Foothill Municipal Water District.
192. City of Bell.
193. City Council of City of Elsimore.
194. City Council of City of Hermosa Beach.
195. City of Montebello.
196. City Council of City of Orange.
197. Thermal Chamber of Commerce.
198. Board of directors of Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County, Calif.
199. Pomona Chamber of Commerce.
200. City of Hawthorne.
201. City of Palos Verdes Estates.
202. City of Riverside, Calif.
203. Lakeside Chamber of Commerce.
204. The Mountain Water Company of La Crescenta.
205. La Crescenta Chamber of Commerce.

MAY 16, 1955.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman support these administration-supported reclamation projects?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I am not in support of these reclamation projects.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What particular reclamation projects is the gentleman opposed to?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Specifically, the administration has given its blessing to the proposed multi-million-dollar upper Colorado River project.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the Echo Dam?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Also to the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project, both in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, and they comprise 6 storage dams and 33 reclamation projects, as passed by the other body in the bill S. 500. It does include, I might say, the Echo Park Dam, along with these other projects. It is because I believe that there is a conflict in the administration policy in advocating price supports and a decrease in acreage allotments and, at the same time, advocating projects which will bring into existence over a million acres of agricultural land at an estimated cost of $5,000 an acre that I am asking for this explanation of the conflicting policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman, that is inconsistent. Personally, I cannot understand it, either, but that is only a continuation of the policy which the two previous administrations had supported for years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that there are certain differences.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Differences in administration, I will admit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will read my remarks tomorrow, he will see those differences.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman that they cannot have it both ways.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Are not those projects the gentleman enumerated the projects they used in their log-rolling tactics to get votes for the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman will not get from me response to a question like that, because I will not impute log rolling to any Member.

Mr. BAILEY. I did on the floor of the House, and I have no apology.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not here for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] said something about there being logrolling on it. He stated there was logrolling. I understood from the statement of the gentleman who had that agricultural bill here, the chairman, Mr. COOLEY, that there was no logrolling. I agree with the gentleman from California that logrolling is a most reprehensible practice.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] put words in the mouth of the gentleman from California because I did not say anything about such an accusation being reprehensible. I will let the gentleman from West Virginia stand behind his own words. But I did not say that the remarks of the gentleman or the practice was reprehensible.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those are my words, perhaps, I was not referring to the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia as being reprehensible but expressing an opinion that the practice of logrolling or the trading of votes was reprehensible, and I should not have used them in reference to the gentleman from West Virginia. I was referring to the practice to which he referred, but did I understand that the gentleman from California does approve of polite, effective logrolling?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman from California is not speaking on that subject at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman declines to answer, then?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I decline to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Fifth amendment or first?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I decline to answer the gentleman. Under the rules of the House I would not want to impugn the motives of one of my colleagues.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am just asking for his own.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I am only a freshman in Congress but if I can obtain some time on the floor I should like to address myself to this question of whether the President's position is inconsistent on this matter of surplus.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure that the gentleman, although a freshman, has the full right to every prerogative of the House that any other Member of the House has, and I will look forward with a great deal of anticipation to his remarks. I hope the gentleman will study my speech, which I planned to put into the RECORD at this point in order to save the time of the House. However, if there seems to be enough interest involved I will ask the forbearance of the Members and will proceed and give the whole speech.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman. I will study it during the week end.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, I too shall look forward with anticipation to the remarks of the gentleman from Utah as to how you can increase agricultural production in the West and decrease it in the Middle West.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think there is a conflict here and I am sure that my remarks on this subject will create interest in the minds of Members of the House who are friends of agriculture and friends of reclamation, but who want to see a balanced program in both instances.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the balance of my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields the floor, will he permit me to answer the short question asked by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman for any courtesy he may wish to accord the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is my deep desire to be courteous to him and to explain that the difficulty which he seems to think exists does not exist at all. He asked how are you going to increase acreage in the Midwest and increase it in the West. It is simple. All you do is cut down the acreage on the Midwest farmers and put in reclamation projects with Federal money in the Far West. That is the way you do it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, I was not aware that I asked the gentleman a question. I thought I had made an observation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman did make an observation.

Mr. Speaker, as long as there is so much interest in this matter, I would like to say here are 2 brief tables which I will have included in my remarks which are based on the Bureau of Reclamation reports to the House and Senate Interior committtees on these 2 projects. And when I say these 2 projects, I am speaking in a broad sense because I am speaking of projects contained in Senate bill (S. 500) which includes 6 storage dams and 33 or 34, I am not sure which, reclamation projects. But the estimated initial construction costs of the upper Colorado River storage project is $1.6 billion. Hidden subsidy costs to the taxpayers is $4 billion. Subsidy costs per acre is estimated to be around $5,000. Subsidy costs for a 150-acre farm with this formula would be $750,000 and the number of 150-acre farms which would be comprised would amount to 5,066. The number of acres to receive water would be around 750,000 acres.

In the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, the estimated initial construction cost is $156,541,000. Hidden subsidy costs to the taxpayers is $500 million. Subsidy cost per acre is $1,600. Subsidy cost per 160-acre farm is $256,000 and the number of 160-acre farms is 1,900. The number of acres to receive water under these projects amounts to 309,000.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman referred to 6 storage dams. Did the administration recommend those or are they the ones which were added by the Members of the other body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They include the ones which were contained in the Senate bill, as it passed the other body. The original recommendation, as I understand it, and the gentleman will correct me if I am wrong, was for 2 storage dams and for 11 reclamation and irrigation projects. As I understand it, the Members of the other body passed by a very large vote a bill which contained 4 additional storage dams and something like 22 or 23 additional reclamation projects.

Mr. HAGEN. If I may ask the gentleman another question—did any representative of the executive branch of the Government or of the Bureau of Reclamation appear before the House committee and oppose the inclusion of these additional dams and projects?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As far as I know, they have not. I would not be able to speak with authority because I have not examined the hearings of the House. Some of them have taken place within the last few days and some of them have not been printed as yet, as I understand it. Would the gentleman enlighten me on that point, if he has some knowledge with reference to that?

Mr. HAGEN. I do not have any knowledge, but I was going to ask would it not be fair to say that if they failed to appear before the House committee after the action by the other body, they impliedly endorsed all of these projects?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That, of course, is the position I would take, that if there was no objection by the administration, and I know of no objection, when the bill was under consideration in the other body, on the additional projects which were placed in the legislation, and if there has been no objection by the administration before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, then I would assume that the administration must be behind this program.

Mr. HAGEN. If that is true, that means there has been a change of position on the part of the administration since their original recommendation to the Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would seem to me that there would be an enlargement or a more comprehensive position taken by the administration.

Mr. HAGEN. Does the gentleman know any reason for that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I have no knowledge on that point.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, on the life and character of the late Honorable Pete Jarman.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once more I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to remind my colleagues in the House of the many pitfalls and the inherent danger in the extension and enlargement of our trade policies contained in H R. 1, as amended by the United States Senate and now in conference.

I am reminded of the old saying "He who laughs last laughs the loudest." I am not shedding crocodile tears when I say my heart goes out to my Democratic floor leadership that labored so diligently for H. R. 1. Their injured pride and loss of dignity is something to behold when they are told by the White House that their idol among the Internationalists shows signs of returning to good old American doctrine by favoring the Senate version of this legislation.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the other body did go part way toward removing the rank discrimination against some American producers. Their version is a decided improvement over the House version. I insist they did not go far enough. The so-called compromise on oil imports is both vague and meaningless. Their failure to adequately safeguard the decisions of the Tariff Commission from interference from the State Department and the President is indeed regretable.

As an outright opponent of H. R. 1, what the other body did might well be considered a victory in defeat for those of my colleagues who joined me in opposing the Cooper bill on the floor of the House. I am not quite so gullible. We got little if any relief for small industries harassed by mounting foreign imports.

The most significant things in what the Senate did was to block the object surrender by the House of the constitutional authority of Congress to control and regulate trade and tariffs. Outside the field of national security, the Senate and the House, under the Senate version, will still be the final arbiter of the Tariff Commission's findings.

May I say, in all frankness to colleagues who support my views on our trade policies, I shall vote for the Senate proposals. I do this solely because it is the lesser of the two evils. The basic differences are still unresolved and I shall vote to recommit the amended legislation and if this fails I shall vote "no" on final passage.

If the situation we face, which involves a stable American economy with profits for capital and jobs for our workers were not so serious, I could well get a chuckle out of the spectacle of one native-born Texan pulling, not only the rug but the whole carpet out from under another native-born Texan.

I have no desire to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a solution to our present predicament. I might remind him that Davy Crockett, idol of all Tennesseans, once "patched a crack in our Liberty Bell."

My continued opposition to this unfair trade policy stems from many sources. The major one being the danger inherent in a policy that makes every American producer a pawn in the game of international politics with the State Department playing our hand. Seldom do we win any of the jackpots for America.

As an evidence of the rooking we are getting in what is supposed to be a reciprocal policy, let me read into the RECORD a total of 40 separate instances of rank discrimination by other nations, most of whom are members of the General Agreements on Trade and Treaties at Geneva.

These are taken from the Foreign Commerce Weekly and cover the 6-month period from November 1954 through April 1955. They follow:

[November 29, 1954]

SOUTH AFRICA ADDS NEW TEXTILE DUTIES

The Union of South Africa has imposed additional import duties on specified textile items.

[November 29, 1954]

IRELAND RAISES DUTY ON WOVEN LABELS

Ireland on December 24, 1954, increased the full rate of customs duty on imports of woven labels from 33⅓ percent to 60 percent ad valorem and the preferential duty on imports from the United Kingdom and Canada from 33⅓ percent to 40 percent ad valorem.

Printed labels remain dutiable at 33⅓ percent ad valorem upon importation from any country, and labels which form part of another article remain exempt from duty.

[December 27, 1954]

ITALY LEVIES NEW TAX ON IMPORTED GOODS

The Italian Government has levied a new tax, ranging from 1 percent to 4 percent ad valorem, c. i. f., on imports of a variety of commodities, payable wher the goods clear customs in Italy.

This tax is in addition to the general turnover and transactions tax (IGE), which is also payable at importation and which remains at its former rate—usually 3 percent ad valorem, c. i. f.

The new tax in effect since August 20, is called a compensatory import tax.

[December 27, 1954]

IRELAND SETS QUOTAS FOR VARIOUS IMPORTS

The Irish Government will permit import under global quotas in 1955 of the following goods in the quantities shown:

Completely or substantially assembled mechanically propelled vehicles, 26.

Road vehicle bodies or road vehicle body shells not attached to chassis, 50.

Motor vehicle chassis without body or shell attached, 50.

Motor car chassis with bodies or body shells attached, 64.

Motor car body balloons, 10.

Leather footwear, 20,000 pairs.

Rubberproofed clothing, 1,000 articles.

Women's felt hats, caps, hoods, and shapes, 20,000 articles.

Metal screws with slotted heads, and tapered threads, 20,000 gross in January 1–June 30, 1955.

[November 29, 1954]

COLOMBIAN DUTIES UP ON COTTON IMPORTS

In an effort to reduce cotton imports to a minimum the Colombian Government on November 17 provided for increased duties on raw cotton, cotton yarns, and cotton thread.

[February 14, 1955]

GUATEMALA IMPOSES GASOLINE IMPORT DUTY

The Guatemalan Government has imposed a new import duty of $0.10 per gallon or fraction thereof on all gasoline and naphthas imported under tariff item No. 335–2–0–2. Products under this item number formerly were duty free.

[November 1, 1954]

LEBANON REVISES CUSTOMS DUTIES ON ANIMAL GLUE

The Lebanon High Council of Customs has increased the customs duty on animal glue with a view to protecting the domestic glue production. Rates on casein glue, which is not produced in Lebanon, have been reduced.

[November 5, 1954]

PERU RAISES IMPORT DUTIES ON PHONOGRAPH RECORDS

Peruvian import duties on phonograph records have been increased heavily, and the tariff item has been subdivided, by a supreme resolution published October 15, to become effective 90 days thereafter.

[November 5, 1954]

INDIA RAISES DUTIES, LIBERALIZES QUOTAS

Increased rates of duty and more liberal quotas characterize the Indian Government's new policy of regulating imports by tariffs rather than quotas.

Higher import duties became effective September 11 on 27 commodities. Of principal interest to United States exporters are the following old and new rates, respectively, with percentages representing ad valorem rates.

[November 5, 1954]

COLOMBIA RESTRICTS IMPORTS—TAXES UP

Severe import restrictions were imposed in Colombia and the issuance of import licenses was tightened by decree No. 3077, of October 23.

Group II imports, on the prohibited list prior to its abolishment on February 19 (Foreign Commerce Weekly, March 15, 1954, p. 14) and since then subject to a 40-percent ad valorem import tax, now are subject to an 80-percent import tax, in addition to the regular 3-percent stamp tax, making a total of 83 percent.

[December 6, 1954]

LEBANON INCREASES IMPORT DUTIES ON COTTON CLOTH

The Lebanese import duties on pure cotton cloth were raised on December 21, 1954, by 7.69 percent to 20 percent according to its weight by square meter.

[January 31, 1955]

VARIOUS AUSTRALIAN IMPORT DUTIES RAISED

A number of Austrialian customs tariffs were changed effective October 29, 1954, as announced by the Minister for Trade and Customs.

Increases in import duty rates range from 5 to 20 percent for British preferential, 2½ to 20 percent for most-favored nations, and 2½ to 27½ percent under the general tariff.

Principal items affected by these increases are:

Cotton cord tire fabric; viscose rayon tire yarn, cord, and fabric; hand and breast drills; carpenters' braces; forged table, dessert, grill, or steak knives; forged carving knives, forks, and steels; plain safety pins; methyl chloride; plastics of the styrene type; and wristlet watch cases of steel.

[January 31, 1955]

PERU RAISES IMPORT DUTIES ON SOME TYPES OF HOSIERY

Peruvian import duties on stockings and socks of silk and synthetic fibers are greatly increased, and a special tariff subitem is created for nylon stockings and socks, by a Supreme resolution published on January 7, to become effective 90 days thereafter.

[January 31, 1955]

CANADA RAISES DUTIES ON SOME UNITED STATES ITEMS

Canadian duties on imports from the United States and other most favored nations of coin-operated soft drink machines designed for vending filled paper cups of cold beverages and power-operated vertical deep-well pumps capable of raising water 30 feet or more have been increased from 7½ percent ad valorem under tariff item No. 427a to 22½ percent under tariff item No. 427 effective from January 27 and 28, respectively.

[December 6, 1954]

MEXICO REVISES IMPORT TARIFF

Import duties for the greater part of the Mexican import tariff have been modified, by a decree published on November 18, apparently for the purpose of incorporating directly into the tariff the 25-percent general duty increase of February 15, 1954.

[February 1955]

MEXICO BANS PRODUCTS FROM SEVERAL STATES

The Mexican Government, because of the existence of the Khapra weevil in the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, has established effective January 29, quarantines on import of the following items from those States:

Peas; sorghum; barley; soybeans; nuts; corn; oats, natural or elaborated; wheat; alfalfa and alfalfa seed; castor beans; cottonseed; wool; corn and wheat flour; bread; processed cereals; crackers; processed rice; raisins; dry milk; dry blood; meat scraps; and bags and vehicles used to transport these products.

[February 1955]

PANAMA BANS POWDERED MILK IMPORTS

Panama now prohibits import of powdered whole milk, effective February 11, 1955, under resolution No. 34 of the Panama Office of Price Control of the same date.

Shipments in transit on the effective date are not affected.—Embassy, Panama City.

[February 1955]

FRANCE MODIFIES VARIOUS IMPORT DUTIES

France has modified its import tariffs on various items, effective January 11.

Duties, previously temporarily suspended, are restored, as follows:

Polyvinyl carbides (polystyrol, etc.), import tariff No. 700 I, 30 percent; unworked axles, straight or crank, and tires, hoops, and centers for wheels, No. 73–16 bis, 18 percent.

[February 1955]

INDIA RAISES TEA DUTY, EXPORT QUOTA

The Indian duty on tea exports has been increased, effective January 7, from 7 annas to 10 annas a pound (1 anna equals U. S. $0.013125).

On the same date an additional allotment of 11 million pounds of tea was released for export, bringing the total amount released since April 1, 1954, to 468.9 million pounds.

A duty of 7 annas a pound had been in effect since October 3, 1954, on which date it was increased from 4 annas.

[February 1955]

CUBA SETS UP IMPORT QUOTAS FOR POTATOES

Cuba has instituted a system of quotas to regulate import of potatoes, for consumption as well as for seed.

The basic annual import quota is established at 680,000 quintals for consumption potatoes and 175,000 quintals for seed potatoes (1 quintal equals 101.43 pounds).

[March 1955]

GERMANY TO TIGHTEN HONEY IMPORT RULES

The Federal German "Ordinance Concerning Honey," of 1930, prohibiting import of honey in which the diastatic ferments are heavily weakened or spoiled, now is expected to be enforced more strictly, as steps have been taken to secure uniformity in interpretation of its provision and in testing methods.

[March 1955]

BRITAIN TO LICENSE UNITED STATES LARD IMPORT

The United Kingdom has made new arrangements for licensing import of lard from all countries, including the United States, the British Government has announced.

Lard originating in and consigned from the sterling area is permitted import freely without licensing.

[March 1955]

RAISES DUTY ON SPARK PLUGS

The Indian import duty on 14 mm. and 18 mm. spark plugs for motorcars, including resistor types, but excluding integrally screened types, has been increased to 95½ percent ad valorem.

The former rate was 31½ percent.

The higher rate of duty does not apply to spark plugs for motorcycles or motorscooters.

[March 1955]

LEBANON RAISES DUTY ON OPTICAL GOODS

Lebanese customs duties on optical glasses, apparatus, and instruments were increased on January 18 by two-thirds.

[March 1955]

JAPAN CHANGES TARIFF STATUS OF MACHINERY

Various items have been deleted from the list of machinery exempt from Japanese customs duties and a duty of 15 percent automatically reimposed thereon; two items have been added to the list; and the tariff terminology of other items eligible for duty-free treatment has been revised.

Also, items removed from the duty-free machinery list by notification No. 1267 of July 31, 1954, were to continue free of duties until January 31, 1955.

These changes in the Japanese duty-free list of machinery were put into effect by Ministry of Finance notification No. 2196, on January 1 of this year.

[March 1955]

LIBYA ESTABLISHES IMPORT SURTAX

A surtax of 5 percent of the regular duty assessed is now imposed on all Libyan imports by a royal decree effective February 25.

The new levy is to support a children's welfare fund set up to finance one free meal for each child attending public school.—Embassy, Tripoli.

[March 1955]

COLOMBIA REQUIRES APPROVAL FOR IMPORTS

Colombia now requires approval by its Ministry of Development for import of raw materials falling under the following tariff clasifications:

83. Oleaginous seeds and fruits, even though crushed or ground: (b) Copra.

109. Fatty acids.

111. Hydrogenated fats and oils.

183. Marble, alabaster, and serpentine, even though sawn in blocks or slabs, in the rough, or trimmed only.

224. Rayon-type caustic soda.

629. Manufactures of stone not elsewhere specified.

[March 1955]

PHILIPPINE TOBACCO IMPORT QUOTA SET

The Philippines has allocated to qualified tobacco manufacturers foreign exchange for import in 1955 of approximately 7 million pounds of Virginia-type leaf tobacco.

This reduction in quota for Virginia-type leaf tobacco from 40 percent of 1950 imports in 1954 to 25 percent in 1955 is made under legislation, Republic Act 1194 of August 25, 1954, designed primarily to foster domestic tobacco growing in the Philippines.

[April 1955]

INDIA RAISES DUTIES ON SUGAR, DYES

The customs duty on sugar imported into India was increased on March 1 to 13 rupees a hundredweight (112 pounds) from a rate of 11 rupees (1 rupee=US$0.21; 1 anna=one-sixteenth of a rupee, or US$0.013125).

On the same date the excise duty on domestic sugar was increased from 3 rupees 12 annas to 5 rupees 10 annas a hundredweight.

Also effective March 1, the Government raised the price of imported sugar by 1 rupee a maund (82.28 pounds).

Import duties have also been increased on a number of dyes, as a result of an Indian Tariff Commission investigation. Acid azo dyes, including acid fast red A; direct azo dyes, including congo red and sulfur black, are now dutiable at 20 percent ad valorem, increased from 12 percent.

[April 1955]

LEBANON BANS IMPORT OF APPLES, CITRUS

Import into Lebanon of apples and citrus fruit of all kinds is now prohibited, effective March 16, by the Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture.

The ban does not, however, affect shipments of apples in transit to Syria.—Embassy, Beirut.

[April 1955]

ECUADOR MAKES MORE IMPORT DUTY CHANGES

Ecuador has further revised its import duties or commodity listings, by decree No. 1558, published October 21 (see Foreign Commerce Weekly, April 19 and October 18, 1954, for previous revisions).

SOME DUTIES INCREASED

Import duties have been substantially increased on some of these items.

[April 1955]

CHANGES, DUTIES, CLASSIFICATIONS

Mexican import duties on wheelbarrow parts have been increased and the tariff classification covering deep-well pumps with nonsubmersible motors has been broadened to include pumps with an interior diameter of up to 610 millimeters, effective April 8, 1955.

[April 1955]

ECUADOR RAISES DUTY ON PASSENGER CARS

Ecuadoran import duties on passenger automobiles have been increased, and the method of assessment and computation of duties has been changed.

[April 1955]

LIBERIA LEVIES SURTAX ON IMPORTS

The Government of Liberia has levied, effective February 11, a 5-percent surtax on the value of all goods and materials imported into the country.

[April 1955]

NEW TAIWAN TARIFF DROPS GATT RATES

The most recent revision of the Republic of China's import tariff, published on January 15, cancels preferential rates for imports of certain commodities from member countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It also changes duty rates on a number of items.

[May 2, 1955]

DENMARK RAISES COFFEE, TEA DUTIES

Denmark, in order to reduce public consumption and conserve foreign exchange, has sharply increased its import duties, effective March 15, on coffee and tea.

The new duties, in crowns per kilogram, with former rates shown in parentheses, are as follows: Green coffee, 1.87 (0.87); roasted coffee, whole or ground, 2.30 (1.07); coffee extract, 6.25 (2); tea, 2.70 (0.70).

[May 1955]

PAKISTAN ACTS TO AID PLASTICS INDUSTRY

The Government of Pakistan has adopted measures assuring protection to the local plastics industry for 3 years, ending March 1958.

Additional duties have been levied on various plastic items. These and total duties, shown in parentheses, in percent ad valorem, are as follows:

Ceiling roses and pendant holders made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 5 (50).

Switches, excluding switchboards, made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 24 (60).

Plugs and cutouts made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 14 (50).

To assure local industry that existing duties will not be lowered in the next 3 years, the tariff classifications of a number of products have been changed from revenue to protective. These include combs, hair slides, and grips made of plastic material; complete fountain pens; ballpoint pens; bangles made of plastic material; all kinds of brushes; and soapboxes, buttons, and conical tubes made of plastic material.

Other measures have also been taken to assist the industry.

[May 2, 1955]

PHILIPPINES PUTS BAN ON READY-MIXED PAINT

The Central Bank of the Philippines has banned import of ready-mixed paints by canceling allocations of foreign exchange assigned importers of this commodity.

Simultaneously, ready-mixed paints were reclassified by the bank from the nonessential consumer goods category to the unclassified category—a change which in effect suspends imports of the commodity, inasmuch as foreign exchange is not allocated for import of goods in the latter category.

[May 2, 1955]

EL SALVADOR CONTROLS IMPORT OF SACKS

Import into El Salvador of sacks or bags of jute or similar coarse fibers has been made subject to prior approval of the Ministry of Economy.

This action, put into effect by decree No. 2 published on January 25 and effective the same date, was taken as a protection to the domestic henequen bag industry. It is complemented by other provisions establishing ceiling prices and standards of quality for henequen bags of domestic manufacture.—Diario Oficial, January 25, 1955.

In March, the United States Department of Commerce released the United States balance of payments for 1954 which pointed to the continued strong financial position enjoyed by foreign countries in their international trade transactions last year—ATL Topics, March 1955. The United States balance of payments indicated that in 1954 foreign nations had augmented their gold and dollar reserves by $1.7 billion, in addition to the $2.3 billion in gold and dollar assets netted in 1953.

Commenting on the continued foreign dollar and gold accumulations, the Department of Commerce, in its February 1955 issue of Survey of Current Business, stated that the "rise in foreign gold and dollar assets in 1954 as well as during the preceding years accrued mainly to Western Europe. The rising strength in the financial position of nearly all countries in that area facilitated further relaxations of controls on their international transactions and a continued rise in their production and incomes."

Further confirmation of the economic well-being of the Western European community now appears in the recently published sixth annual report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation—OEEC. Released in two volumes in March, the OEEC report's title, "From Recovery Towards Economic Strength," reflects the optimistic conclusions on the European economy contained therein.

Formed in 1948, the OEEC comprises the following 17 members: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Although not members of OEEC, both the United States and Canada are represented on its committees and participate in its meetings.

Between 1938 and 1954, the volume of Western Europe's exports increased by some 70 percent, while the volume of imports increased by only 12 percent. The growth in volume of imports from the dollar area was similarly moderate, while the volume of exports to the dollar area more than doubled—

The OEEC reports—

Industrial production increased over the period by more than half, and agricultural production by almost 30 percent. The volume of intra-European trade grew even more than production; in 1953 it was half as great again as in 1938. instead of the same, as the recovery program had envisaged; and in 1954, it grew again by more than 10 percent.

Pertinent conclusions on the extent of Western Europe economic recovery as noted in the sixth OEEC report include the following:

On employment:

There has not only been a significant increase in the labor force in member countries since before the war, but in nearly all cases a reduction in unemployment. In many member countries, very high levels of employment have prevailed throughout the whole postwar period.

On productivity:

Between 1938 and 1954, the gross national product of member countries combined rose by 34 percent at constant prices.

On personal savings:

Personal savings have risen appreciably in Western Europe from 1952 onward. This rise reflects both the growth of personal disposable incomes, due partly to lower taxation and higher distribution of corporate profits, and the greater confidence of the public in the stability of money.

On gold and dollar reserves:

The most striking feature of the situation * * * is the magnitude of member countries' gold and dollar receipts in 1953 and 1954. Gold and dollar reserves began to rise as early as the second half of 1952, and the total increase between July 1, 1952, and December 31, 1954, amounted to $4.6 billion. These results certainly exceeded expectations.

According to estimates in the OEEC report, total gold and dollar reserves of OEEC countries amounted to $12.5 billion for the period ending December 1954.

On United States tariff policy:

The height of the tariff rates enacted in 1930 has been drastically reduced—largely by tariff concessions negotiated under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, but also in part by the substantial rise in prices since the original rates were set which has lessened the ad valorem incidence of a number of specific duties. The combined effect of negotiated reductions and of the price rise has been such that the import duties collected in 1952 were only one-fourth of what they would have been under the 1930 tariff on the same amount of dutiable imports. A number of commodities not produced in the United States, or produced in limited quantities—amounting to more than half of the total imports—are duty free.

But the restrictions that remain are still extensive; and they are largely discriminatory. Their main impact is on imports of manufactured goods from the United States and Canada.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue a trade policy so patently unfair to the American producers who are in the export business.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue a trade policy that discriminates so heavily against American producers who are being made bankrupt by their inability to meet foreign imports.

It is my intention to carry on this fight as I have for the past 10 years, to safeguard our economy and preserve the jobs of our workmen.

ALARMING CEMENT SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reports published by the Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior, and by businessmen engaged in the sale and distribution and in the use of cement in construction projects, agree on the point that cement is in short supply and that the prospect is that the situation will become worse before it is relieved.

In the press of May 16, 1955—and I quote from one of the lead articles appearing on the first page of the Journal of Commerce of that date—it is stated:

Cement industry's big expansion program is running a losing race with the increased demand. Cement is in tight supply in several parts of the country, particularly in Texas and Michigan. And the seasonal peak of the demand is yet to come in September and October. * * *

Right now it looks as though the cement industry will be able to ship about 280 million barrels this year, compared with the recordbreaking 274 million barrels shipped last year.

Theoretical capacity at the end of last year was about 293 million barrels, but the industry's actual shipments have never been able to come within about 20 million barrels of capacity, owing to strikes, breakdowns of equipment, and other interruptions. * * *

The construction boom * * * will probably continue for some years to come. And if Congress approves a stepped-up Federal highway program, the need for cement will continue to rise. * * *

The cement makers say they are prepared to expand capacity further if the road program materializes.

A survey of individual producers made by the Bureau of Mines late last year showed that if President Eisenhower's $50 billion, 10-year program were approved by Congress, the cement industry would be ready to increase its capacity to 400 million barrels by 1959, to take care of the demand for cement for highways and other uses.

Now, all of those reports confirm the knowledge I have acquired through my own observations. Cement is in short supply in Texas. The demand is on the increase there, according to a report by the Bureau of Mines for the month of February 1955.

WHAT ABOUT PLANS FOR EXPANSION?

What are the plans for meeting this increased demand? I do not hear of any plans on the part of the leaders of the industry to provide an adequate supply of cement to meet that increasing demand in Texas. Any failure to plan for increasing the supply does not depend upon any lack of raw materials, because a cement-producing plant can be built in almost any part of the United States. In the First Congressional District of Texas, which I am privileged to represent, there are many locations where cement plants could be constructed, particularly in Red River County near Clarksville, and where plentiful available supplies of raw materials can be had.

INDUSTRY FALLING DOWN ON JOB

This shortage of cement and the failure of the leaders of the industry to expand by immediately increasing their productive capacity presents an interesting situation. One would think that with the prospect of an increasing market coupled with other profitable aspects that lie ahead, these leaders of the industry would have so expanded their productive facilities that no shortage of cement would exist today.

AGREEMENT TO PREVENT EXPANSION

Perhaps the situation is little different today from what it was when the Federal Trade Commission investigated the cement industry a few years ago. In the course of its proceeding against the Cement Institute and most of the manufacturers of Portland cement in this country, the Commission found that the leaders of the industry had entered into an agreement to avoid increases in productive capacity. The Federal Trade Commission found that the leaders of the industry had combined to prevent others from building cement plants. In that connection, I refer to the record of the hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, regarding monopolistic and unfair trade practices on November 17, 1948. At page 1119 of the record, there is set forth a portion of the Federal Trade Commission's findings of facts in its proceeding in the Cement Institute case. Included in those findings are the following statements:

At a meeting of the trustees of the Institute on December 7, 1933, it was moved that—"* * * it is the position of this Board that there should not be any increase of productive capacity in any area."

In those findings of the Federal Trade Commission, reference was also made to a public relations expert, Col. John B. Reynolds, who was hired by the leaders of the cement industry to assist them in their campaign to keep new cement plants from being constructed. In that connection, it was stated that Colonel Reynolds had appeared before the Resolutions Committee of the Cement Institute for the purpose of presenting and discussing a resolution, which he had been requested by officials of the National Association of Manufacturers to draft in regard to the policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in extending loans to units of industries already in a state of excess capacity of production. You see, at that time, the leaders of the cement industry were complaining about some price competition that had crept into the industry and they were claiming that their plight was due to the fact that demand had fallen off some and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should not lend money to build new plants. According to the findings of the Federal Trade Commission:

The resolutions committee recommended the insertion of a resolution in opposition to "this harmful practice."

Also quoted from page 1121 of the record of the hearings before the House Small Business Committee on November 17, 1948, are the following statements from the findings of the Federal Trade Commission in its Cement Institute case:

On February 11, 1936, the manager of the Washington office of the Portland Cement Association wrote the institute in part:

"Sorry to be delayed in thanking you for the material which you so promptly sent to us regarding the proposed RFC loan to the American Portland Cement Co., at Foreman, Ark."

This and other correspondence in the record indicates that the assistance of the Portland Cement Association, composed largely of members of the institute, was enlisted in the opposition to the completion of the Foreman plant. This plant was not put into operation.

In its findings in the Cement Institute case, the Commission also quoted from a memorandum to the Board of Directors of the TVA, dated February 28, 1934, in which Dr. Morgan, Chairman of the TVA, dealt in detail with a conference he had had with leaders of the Cement Institute. Dr. Morgan had conferred with those leaders for the purpose of listening to their objections to a proposal that TVA build a cement plant. The proposal for building that plant had been made after TVA had long been unable to obtain either competitive or reasonable bids on the cement, which it was purchasing for its building program.

In connection with that conference with leaders of the Cement Institute, Dr. Morgan reported as follows:

The personal impression I received from listening to them is that, in their opinion, uncontrolled price competition in a stable industry will tend to destroy that industry, that some kind of control is necessary for stabilization, and that the cement industry has sought to bring about such control; that the problem is a difficult one and has not been completely worked out, especially in its relation to the public.

MORE CEMENT NOW

A program should be started at once for a substantial increase in cement production. Otherwise, the progress and expansion of our country will be retarded.

We should also consider at least 3 national superhighways, paid for by the Federal Government, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, and at least 5 such highways north and south. Any debt created for these purposes should not bypass the national debt.

NO TOLL ROADS

Toll roads must not be permitted. It would take 100 years to get rid of them. Besides, they create additional unregulated monopolies within their restricted areas and rights-of-way.

WHOSE CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT?—THE RUSSIANS OR FREE PEOPLE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a good part of our work this week in Congress has been devoted to consideration of the manpower bill. The reason we have given such careful consideration to this measure is that we are alert to the imminent threat of Russian communism. We know that communism has as its unchanging goal the complete domination of the entire world and we are equally certain that there has been no change whatsoever in their objective. Since we must be ever alert for a Russian sneak attack against the United States, I would like to review with you and to analyze some of the events which have taken place in the world during this past week, which have a vital bearing on the need for a realistic and adequate manpower measure.

This week it was announced that Marshal Tito, the Red dictator of Yugoslavia,

would entertain in Belgrade some of the top dictators from the Kremlin. Marshal Bulganin and Khrushchev, the secretary of the Communist Party of Russia, will lead the Russian delegation. While both the Russians and the Tito gang plead that this is just a social visit, it is clear that the purpose of this visit is to tighten the bond between Moscow and Tito, a bond which has never been broken despite the loud protestations of the faker, Tito. For the past several years, I have on many occasions attempted to warn the American people against giving any aid or assistance to Tito because he was and always will be a Russian agent. Over and over again I have said that any aid we give to Tito is nothing more than assisting him to hold the anti-Communist Croatians, Serbs, Slovenes and Montenegrans in the slavery of communism. It will not be long before those who have played a part in giving aid to the Red dictator, Tito, will learn the full folly of their acts. Tito will soon demonstrate openly his unbroken loyalty to the tyrants of the Kremlin.

No doubt you listened to Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower on the television on Tuesday evening when they discussed the Austrian Treaty and its effects on the prospects of peace. I listened to that program and felt the American people were being misled. The Secretary and the President painted what most people took to mean a very rosy picture on the meaning of the Austrian Treaty as well as showing undue optimism on the future prospects for a just and lasting peace.

I would like to discuss with you some elements of the so-called Austrian Treaty of Independence which were not brought out in the television program by Secretary Dulles and the President on Tuesday night. They failed to tell the American people that the Austrian Treaty, by specific sections of it, legalized the looting by the Russians of over $2 billion from the Austrian people over the past 10 years. While the treaty improperly refers to former German assets in Austria, the facts are that these assets were Austrian assets which were first looted by the Nazis. So now it is a case of the Russians looting what the Nazis originally looted from the Austrian people. In other words it is a clear case of a thief stealing from another thief.

The Austrian Treaty also gives the Russians the right by treaty to continue a blood-drawing operation on the Austrian people for many years to come. It authorizes the Russians to maintain control over certain basic economic enterprises in Austria which indeed comprise a large portion of the economic bloodstream of Austria.

The treaty also authorizes the Russians to maintain colonies on Austrian soil. It allows the Russians to maintain a very large contingent of engineers and economic specialists who, of course, have their families and relatives with them living off the fat of the land.

The very nature of the treaty declares Austria as a neutral state, that is, a nation supposedly with no attachments to either the United States and the rest of the free world or to Russia and its international Communist conspiracy. President Eisenhower has gone out of his way to emphasize that the treaty provides Austria with a neutral status very much like that which Switzerland has maintained over very many years.

I would like to point out for you in connection with the so-called neutral status which is now claimed by the administration for Austria, a few facts which indicate the contrary is likely to be the case in the end. Austria geographically sits in the heart of the Danubian Basin. Because this is true, Austria depends upon the Danube River for its commerce, trade, and a large part of its revenue. But unfortunately the Danube Basin is now occupied mostly by the Communists—for example, Tito and the Communist rump regimes in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. Moreover, the Russians have absolute control over all trade and commerce plying the Danube River and reaching any of the river ports in that part of Europe. It is clear to me, therefore, that the Austrian people are economic prisoners of the Russians. It is only a matter of time before the Russians will make the Austrian people their political prisoners. The entire history of the Russian Communist conspiracy bears evidence to that conclusion.

In his press conference this week, President Eisenhower again discussed the prospects of arriving at a modus vivendi with the Russian Communists. In that connection, he stated that trade "is the greatest weapon in the hands of the diplomat." He also states that as long as we are not helping the Communists' war-making powers directly we should keep an open mind on trade with the Russians. What President Eisenhower fails to understand is that trade of any materials and commodities with the Russians is, in fact, trading in war materials. That is so because the Russians regard all types of materials and commodities or trade in all types of materials and commodities as strategic, from their point of view. More specifically, the Russians regard food as one of their most strategic weapons in their never-ending fight against the forces of freedom. For those who doubt this fact, I strongly recommend that they read the story of the Russian manmade famine in the Ukraine in the years 1932–33 in which approximately 5 million patriotic Ukrainians were put to death by starvation by their Russian occupiers. I also suggest that the doubting Thomases look up the facts on the Russian manmade famine in Turkestan during the period between the great wars. As an additional point, I remind President Eisenhower of certain facts he should never forget in connection with the East German uprising against the Russians on June 17, 1953. I ask, Mr. President, Why did the Russians refuse to permit us to distribute badly needed food among the heroic and patriotic people of East Germany, who the whole world knew needed this food? There is only one answer and that is that the Russians have always regarded food as a political weapon—a weapon to subjugate people and a weapon to keep the subjugated in chains. Since the Russians attach such primary significance to commodities such as food, anyone can well understand the importance they would attach to any other types of materials or commodities whether they be in surplus supply in the United States or for whatever reasons may be advanced for developing trade with the Kremlin.

There has also been a great deal of talk here in Washington during the past week about the conference at the summit. Secretary of State Dulles has informed us of the likelihood of this conference taking place late in the forthcoming summer. Here again the administration has misled the American people into believing that it is possible to do business with the Russian Communists, and that a conference of this type holds possibilities of developing a formula for a just and lasting peace. The entire record of any type of conference with the Russians as well as any treaties or pacts entered into with the Russians indicate that both conferences and treaties are used by Russians simply as weapons to attain the never-changing goal of world domination which motivates the Kremlin. No honest and well-informed person can dispute my statement. President Truman recognized these to be the facts and consequently took the position that if the Russians had anything to contribute to the goal of peace and freedom, they knew where Washington was and he was willing to see them in this connection at any time. The Republican administration is certainly doing an all-out job to prove the wisdom of Truman's policy with respect to the Russians.

If President Eisenhower feels he has to have a meeting with the Russians at which he may possibly meet his old friend, Zhukov, I would strongly suggest the following as guidance for that conference:

First, we must regard such a conference as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Secondly, a logical follow-up to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist-enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania,

Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind and a sellout of all those moral and political principles which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Thirdly, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machine-gunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must agree without reservation that the Iron Curtain is the basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourthly, we must abide by the proven principle of "open covenants openly arrived at." There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis, covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

If the administration does engage in such a conference as is now contemplated and if it does act within the spirit of these recommendations, I would have no reservations on our entering into such a conference because the possibility of a sell-out will have been eliminated. Moreover, such a formula as I have here outlined would assure us an outstanding success in putting across to all the people of the world those principles for which we stand and those evils we are dedicated to fight against. Such a victory as would be ours by pursuing the course of action I strongly urge, would provide a badly needed stimulant and well-deserved encouragement for the forces of freedom which exist in every nation of the world today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 1 week, on account of official business.

Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania), on account of official business.

Mr. FALLON, from May 19 to 24, on account of official business.

Mr. EDMONDSON, from May 19 to 31, on account of official business.

Mr. FJARE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business in district.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include the text of an amendment at that point in the RECORD following the vote on the Barden amendment.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children, George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly; and

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

818. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $28 million for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

819. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

820. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

821. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the study made pursuant to its resolution of October 21, 1954, entitled "Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRESTON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6367. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6295. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6366. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 6367. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6368. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain individuals who become blind shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6369. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 6370. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Foreign Affairs Strategic Advisory Board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 6371. A bill to provide that the price at which feed and seed is furnished under the drought program shall not exceed the price at which it is sold abroad under programs for developing foreign trade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6372. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6373. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6374. A bill to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6375. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 6376. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 6377. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6378. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6379. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 6380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to grant a perpetual easement to the Wheatland Water District, California, for establishment of a dam and reservoir, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6381. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6382. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6383. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6384. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Senate Resolution No. 52 of the 69th General Assembly, State of Illinois, adding their approval to the endorsement of President Eisenhower's proposed highway program by Governor Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts, to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for the furtherance of the Southwestern Power Administration, and to enact any and all laws consistent with the public power policy of the United States to make power available to all who need and demand it; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as it relates to the special school milk program, to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Dr. Husham Mofakham Payan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6386. A bill for the relief of Stephanos J. Cotsoradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 6387. A bill for the relief of Maria Gounari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6388. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Bursztyn, Mrs. Czarma Bursztyn, and Ber Bursztyn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6389. A bill for the relief of Gordon Victor Currie and his wife, Evelyn Edith Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 6390. A bill for the relief of Koriku Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6391. A bill for the relief of Yee Loy Foo, also known as Loy Foo Yee, or Ted Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6392. A bill for the relief of the last three surviving members of the Confederate States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6393. A bill for the relief of Clare F. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6394. A bill for the relief of Filippo Alcolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6395. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6396. A bill for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6397. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zbigniew Blichewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6398. A bill for the relief of George Petrolekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6399. A bill for the relief of the last three surviving members of the Confederate States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6400. A bill for the relief of Oscar O. Wolfe, Jr., et al.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6401. A bill for the relief of Georgia Kaolin Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

280. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 145 residents of the State of Washington urging the exercising of the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

281. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wisconsin State Dental Society adopted by the house of delegates of the Wisconsin society at its meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., on April 26, 1955, urging the President and the Congress to take appropriate steps to carry out the recommendations of the new Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Opposition by Mayors' Committee to Proposed Legislation to Destroy Federal Regulatory Power Over Interstate Gas Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, although they have not received much attention in the competition with the well-financed publicity drive of the natural gas producing industry, the activities of the mayors' committee to oppose legislation which would destroy Federal regulatory power over interstate gas sales deserve careful attention of all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement which I made for myself and for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in introducing the leaders of this mayors' committee to members of the press yesterday, May 18. I also ask unanimous consent that the original statement of the mayors' committee on the Harris bill and released on April 25, made by Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., on behalf of the committee, rejecting recently reported, so-called compromises, and a list of the members of the mayors' committee, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, IN BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND SENATORS HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ESTES KEFAUVER, AND ALEXANDER WILEY, MAY 18, 1955

The 60 million gas users in America are greatly indebted to the city and State officials who have been leading the drive against exemption legislation that would add hundreds of millions of dollars annually to America's gas bills.

I refer particularly to the mayors' committee to oppose H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills, under the able leadership of Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, the Wisconsin and Michigan officials who carried through the successful battles in the Phillips case to compel the Federal Power Commission to do its regulatory duty, including the Honorable James R. Durfee, chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, and Hon. James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel of Detroit, Mich., and the leaders and members of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

These officials have helped to bring the facts in the situation and the growing public concern over exemption proposals to the attention of Congress. They have also helped to inform the public of the big new raid that is being attempted on the consumers' pocketbook.

In the face of the well-financed propaganda drive of the oil and natural gas production industry, the people are fortunate to have such able defenders.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE ON NATURAL GAS, MAY 18, 1955

In fighting to protect the consumer interest on natural gas rates, we believe it is absolutely necessary to retain Federal jurisdiction over the rates charged in the field for the major sources of supply of our interstate pipelines. Otherwise, a continual rise in field prices, such as has already occurred over the past 10 years, and which will certainly be renewed in the absence of effective Federal regulation, will push the consumers' monthly gas bills ever higher and higher.

It is our position that no legislation is presently necessary to permit Federal regulation fair to both consumer and producer. We believe the Federal Power Commission should be given a reasonable opportunity to administer the powers of regulation over the nontransporting producers which the Supreme Court upheld last year.

While there is a great deal of talk on the part of gas and oil industry spokesmen that they want to find a reasonable compromise on the basic issues involved in this matter, we find that all of the so-called compromises put forward by the industry spokesmen would result in stripping the consumer of any effective Federal protection against steady and continuing increases in the field price of gas. All of the compromising would be in one direction—in favor of the producers and against the consumers, for all such compromise proposals call for elimination of direct regulation of producer sales. We reject such compromises.

STATEMENT OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE THE HARRIS BILL REMOVING POWER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO REGULATE NATURAL GAS SALES BY PRODUCERS

On behalf of the committee, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, made the following statement at the close of an all-day conference held in the Jefferson Room of the Mayflower Hotel:

"This group here today represents most of the natural gas consumers of the United States.

"Representatives of mayors of more than 50 cities having a total population of over 30 million people have been meeting with the chief city attorneys and representatives of mayors of many other cities, large and small. Our purpose has been to organize presentation of the consumers' case against the Harris bill and similar legislation now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of these bills is to remove the authority presently vested in the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers to pipeline companies which transmit gas to our city borders.

"Protests against this legislation are national in scope. Cities from Oregon to Alabama, from Louisiana to Massachusetts, have joined our committee to oppose this legislation. The interests of all gas consumers require that it be defeated.

"Huge increases in the price of natural gas during the last few years are largely due to the fact that the Federal Power Commission has heretofore failed to exercise the powers given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case. If this legislation passes, the power of the Federal Power Commission to exercise its obvious duty in the consumer interest will be removed. Gas bills all over the country will inevitably increase in an aggregate of hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Experience has amply demonstrated that the unregulated operation of the law of supply and demand with respect to a national resource in as short supply as natural gas, whose ownership is monopolistic in character, results in one thing only: higher prices to consumers and unwarranted profits to the big oil companies of the country who control over a third of the supply of natural gas.

"It is clear that regulation of the profits of pipeline companies and retail distributors of natural gas is not enough. The weak link in the armor of consumer protection is failure to regulate the initial sale from producer or gatherer to pipeline company.

"A priceless national resource such as natural gas affected as it is with a public interest and in increasingly short supply must be subject to effective regulation from wellhead to the tip of the burner if the interest of the average American consumer is to be adequately protected.

"We are accordingly united in our opposition to legislation which would remove this key protection to the consumer which exists in the present law."

MEMBERS OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS (CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000)

Philadelphia, Pa., Joseph S. Clark, Jr.
Pittsburgh, Pa., David L. Lawrence.
New York, N. Y., Robert F. Wagner.
Akron, Ohio, Leo Berg.
Baltimore, Md., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.
Birmingham, Ala., J. W. Morgan.
Boston, Mass., John B. Hynes.
Bridgeport, Conn., Jasper McLevy.
Buffalo, N. Y., Steven Pankow.
Cambridge, Mass., John J. Foley.
Camden, N. J., George E. Brunner.
Chicago, Ill., Richard J. Daley.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Carl W. Rich.
Cleveland, Ohio, Anthony J. Celebrezze.
Columbus, Ohio, Maynard E. Sensenbrenner.
Denver, Colo., Quigg Newton.
Detroit, Mich., Albert E. Cobo.
Duluth, Minn., George D. Johnson.
Elizabeth, N. J., Nicholas Sylvester LaCorte.
Erie, Pa., Arthur J. Gardner.
Fall River, Mass., John F. Kane.
Flint, Mich., George M. Algoe.
Gary, Ind., Peter Mandich.
Grand Rapids, Mich., George W. Welsh (city manager).
Jersey City, N. J., Bernard Berry.
Kansas City, Kans., Paul F. Mitchum.
Knoxville, Tenn., George R. Dempster.
Louisville, Ky., Andrew Broaddus.
Milwaukee, Wis., Frank P. Zeidler.
Minneapolis, Minn., Eric G. Hoyer.
Montgomery, Ala., W. A. Gayle.
Nashville, Tenn., Ben West.
Newark, N. J., Leo P. Carlin.
New Bedford, Mass., Arthur N. Harriman.
New Haven, Conn., Richard C. Lee.
New Orleans, La., deLesseps S. Morrison.
Paterson, N. J., Lester F. Titus.
Portland, Oreg., Fred L. Peterson.
Providence, R. I., Walter H. Reynolds.
Richmond, Va., Thomas P. Bryan.
Rockford, Ill., Milton Lundstrom.
Sacramento, Calif., H. H. Hendren.
Springfield, Mass., Daniel Brunton.
St. Louis, Mo., Raymond R. Tucker.
St. Paul, Minn., Joseph E. Dillon.
Syracuse, N. Y., Donald H. Mead.
Tampa, Fla., Curtis Hixon.
Toledo, Ohio, Ollie Czelusta.
Utica, N. Y., Boyd E. Golder.
Waterbury, Conn., Raymond E. Snyder.
Yonkers, N. Y., Kristen Kristensen.
Youngstown, Ohio, Frank X. Kryzan.

Winning the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, May 15, the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], delivered the main address at a dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff in New York.

The majority leader directed his remarks not only in tribute to a very distinguished American, General Sarnoff, but also to the great issue of foreign policy and national security. Taking appropriate note of General Sarnoff's recent document concerning a program for winning the cold war, the majority leader stated a philosophy and program which merit the immediate attention of the executive branch of our Government, as well as the attention of the Congress.

I consider the address by the Senator from Texas one of the most important public pronouncements in recent years. It calls for a new dimension in our efforts to check and roll back Communist imperialism, namely, a political offensive directed and guided by competent experts in the field of political strategy and psychology.

The Senator's speech is must reading. It is a priority policy document. It lays the basis for a reevaluation of our national security policy. I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING THE COLD WAR

(Address by Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, at dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, N. Y., May 15, 1955)

General Sarnoff, Mr. Baruch, Mr. Swope, Dr. Bunche, honored guests, in a very real sense we are here tonight to pay tribute to America.

The strength of a country lies in its people. A country that can list Gen. David Sarnoff among its leaders need not fear the future.

It is difficult for me to think of America without General Sarnoff. He is one man who has given as much to his country as he has received.

A DEBT REPAID

He may owe a part of his eminence to the opportunities which this land afforded. But whatever the debt, it has been repaid—unstintingly, ungrudgingly, and with compound interest.

No man feels a greater sense of obligation. And no man is more willing to serve; more eager to sacrifice; more anxious to set aside his personal affairs when duty calls, in war or in peace.

His industrial leadership has been vital in bringing electronics from the laboratory into our daily lives.

His company is almost as fully engaged in defense work as the Defense Department itself.

He has been the adviser of Presidents, and he has never withheld his talent because of partisan motives.

This is the record of a man who has risen to the top through his own unaided efforts. He asked only for opportunity. He supplied his own brains, his own efforts, his own muscles.

THE REAL TEST

I feel humble tonight that I have the privilege of paying tribute to such a man. I feel even more humble because I find myself in the company of some of our greatest Americans.

Here tonight is Herbert Bayard Swope, a towering figure of journalism, and one of the most forceful thinkers of our times; Bernard Baruch, America's financial genius, and adviser to Presidents; Dr. Ralph Bunche, who brought to diplomacy the very finest of the heart and soul of America.

It is the real test of General Sarnoff that such men are not only willing but eager to appear tonight to honor him.

COLD-WAR BLUEPRINT

Over the years, I have drawn freely upon General Sarnoff for ideas. He has never been lacking, never failed to be stimulating. But his greatest effort may be the cold-war blueprint published last Tuesday, a blueprint which has been endorsed in its basic elements by the President.

It points the way to a solution of the greatest problem before our people.

We are living in a great crisis period of freedom. The decisions of the next few years, possibly of the next few months, may decide our fate for centuries.

It is nothing new in history for freedom to be threatened. But the magnitude of the present threat has no precedent.

Never before has there been a time when so many people were mobilized and dedicated to one objective, the overthrow of liberty.

A PARTIAL RESPONSE

In part, we have responded to this threat capably and well. We have constructed a military machine to devastate an attacking enemy. We have built military alliances that, at least since the Paris accords, are strong and enduring.

But in other respects, we are still groping. We have prepared for hot war. But we have failed to grasp the essential nature of the cold war and to form the strategy to conduct it.

Our resources have been mobilized primarily against military aggression. We cannot, and should not, relax such efforts.

But the method of cold war is political aggression, and in this field atomic bombs and jet planes are scant protection.

DEADLY AND DECISIVE

A cold war is just as deadly, just as decisive, as hot war. But it is fought on different battlefields and with different weapons. Even when cold war turns hot, on a local scale, we find the terrifying weapons of modern science almost useless.

Atomic bombs did not shield the free Republic of Korea. Hydrogen warfare did not save Northern Vietnam, and may not save the balance of southeast Asia.

And all the powers of nuclear physics will not recover for freedom the vast territory of China.

THE SOURCE OF POWER

Somewhere along the line, we have forgotten a fundamental. It is that power ultimately rests with the people. Unless we win them to our side, we are lost.

In recent months, we have been preoccupied with the problem of Asia. We have awakened to the fact that this great continent—which many think was humanity's cradle—may also be humanity's grave.

We have argued the military problems of this huge land mass. We have discussed bases and soldiers as though the issue were a tactical exercise at a military war college.

But we did not awaken to the true key to Asiatic victory until the Bandung Conference. It was there that we learned that the ultimate decision will be made by the people themselves.

We discovered that freedom in Asia had friends—and able, forceful leaders. It is to our discredit that we did not know this earlier. It will be to our destruction if we fail to move on their side.

A SNARL OR A SMILE

In recent weeks, the Soviet Union has astounded the world by moving—at least in words—to ease some of the tensions building up to world war III.

We would be soft minded to accept those words at face value. They must be tested to the last degree to determine whether fair words will be backed by fair deeds.

It is possible that they are not in good faith—that they do not want to abandon the threat of military aggression.

But there is an even more subtle possibility. It is that the Communists have decided to ease world tensions so they can concentrate on the purely political struggle at which they are so adept.

Could it be that they have set aside the weapons of hot war—which must be hurled with a snarl—in favor of the weapons of cold war—which can be delivered with a smile?

Could it be that they have decided that nothing can emerge from hydrogen war except the total destruction of both capitalism and communism?

If that is the case, we must be prepared for a full-scale cold war—admittedly more desirable than hot war. We must be as fully armed for the ideological as for the thermonuclear struggle.

THE PRIZE OF VICTORY

We must launch the greatest political offensive in history. And we must mobilize all our people behind it.

The objectives of that offensive should be peace and the preservation of freedom. The only alternatives are hot war and the destruction of liberty.

The prize is the good will of the vast multitude of people not only in Asia but throughout the world who are still uncommitted. They are the great jury who will decide the fate of this planet.

A PLANNED OFFENSIVE

The offensive itself can take many forms.

We must get out in the marketplace of ideas and compete for the minds of men.

We must be ready to help those who will fight for freedom and build for freedom both inside and outside the Iron Curtain.

We must be as fearless in accepting the realities of peace as we should be in accepting the realities of war.

And at no time should we be afraid to explore any step which will bring us closer to peace and dignity.

It is not enough to say that Communists are treacherous. We must demonstrate their treachery by contrast—in deeds—to our own good faith.

It is not enough to say that Communists seek to enslave humanity. We must hold forth an alternative—freedom, not under our rule, but with our help.

It is not enough to say that Communists are driving the world to war. We must show that we are trying to lead the world to peace.

There is nothing new in these ideas. There would be something new if they were carried into action on the necessary scale.

THE FIRST STEP

The first step must be the formation of a general staff for the cold war—a general staff that would have the same role in our political offensive that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would play in a military offensive.

It should be more than just a collection of department heads meeting to discuss their individual problems.

This staff could direct and coordinate the weapons of cold war—diplomatic, economic, propaganda. It could advise the President directly on the many questions upon which he now receives a bewildering number of estimates and advice.

It could help him decide whether Matsu and Quemoy are worth the risk of losing our allies.

It could help him decide the extent to which our country should participate in such meetings as the Bandung Conference.

It could help him to decide when and where we should encourage resistance and how we can help captured people stave off the assault on their minds.

AN OVERBURDENED MAN

These issues are now discussed far too much in a vacuum. The burden of decision is loaded entirely on the shoulders of one man—the President—and he has little help in weighing the many factors against each other.

It may be that atomic and hydrogen war will never come to this earth. We would be foolish to assume that it will not happen. But we would be equally foolish to ignore the other possibility.

Our atomic and hydrogen muscles are strong and growing stronger. But they do not defend against infiltration and political aggression.

MUCH TO PRESERVE

We have much to save, much to preserve. It would be folly if we failed to save and failed to preserve because we had placed our faith in military strength alone.

If David Sarnoff has provided us with a clue to the answer—and I believe he has—he will have demonstrated once again that free men can always conquer tyranny.

From the brains of such men we can always draw vital ideas. This world, which is so precious, can and will be saved, and this Nation will enjoy a new lease on life.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe Chemical Progress Week. I would like to congratulate the men and women of the chemical industry whose contributions to the increased standard of living enjoyed by their fellowmen cannot be overestimated. The growth of the manufacture of chemicals and allied products has been phenomenal. Since 1939 it has increased fourfold and is now our sixth largest industry. The development of products and research during the past 25 years has been inspiring.

The welfare of the people of the world is evidenced in many, many dramatic ways through the progress of the chemical industry. Chemicals have made possible the increased production of food at lower costs through the use of fertilizers and insecticides. Better ways of preserving foods through packaging and freezing have been found. The progress of the chemical industry in the field of wearing apparel has helped make the people in America the best dressed in the world. The manmade fibers are in greater and greater use. Its great contribution in the field of medicine is called to our attention through the successful use of antibiotics, drugs, and methods of disease prevention. Modern means of transportation and communication are dependent upon the chemical industry for the parts that make up this technical equipment are made from chemical derivatives. And more and more each day the building materials used in housing America and the world benefit by the genius of the chemical world.

This industry plays a great part in the economy and welfare of my district. Wilmington, Del., often called the chemical capital of the world, is justly proud of such concerns as E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Hercules Powder Co., the Atlas Powder Co., and others. The same 11,000 chemical producers throughout the broad expanse of our Nation are doing their part to make the chemical industry a most important part of our lives.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that this week has been designated by the chemical industry as Chemical Progress Week, which is sponsored by the Manufacturing Chemists' Association in an endeavor to emphasize the importance of this industry to our national welfare.

This week has been emphasized in various parts of the country by the chemical industry and is the second annual observance.

The educational program is being carried out at the community level by people of the industry in plants, laboratories, and sales offices within the communities having chemical industries. This represents the largest single educational program ever attempted by the chemical industry.

I am particularly interested in the observance of this week due to the location within my district of a number of important chemical plants which serve the country by the production of many useful products. Virginia has a particularly eventful history in relation to the chemical industry. The industry is a part of Virginia's heritage. In 1608, the year following the founding of Jamestown, the first chemical plant went into operation in Virginia. This was a glass factory. Virginia's first exports that year included glass, pitch, tar, and potash—all products of the infant chemical industry.

Today the chemical industry in Virginia is one of the most important industrial developments in our State. In 1953 all chemical-industry employers in Virginia gave employment to 42,012 men and women and paid about $175 million in wages and salaries. The industry produced during 1953 chemical products valued at nearly $1 billion. Virginia is ranked ninth among chemical-producing States and gives evidence of continued progress along this line. In November of last year, according to a survey, Virginia during the preceding 12 months had completed $36,400,000 in new chemical construction and had another $38,500,000 worth of construction underway and $13 million more being planned. Today the chemical industry is the Nation's fourth largest in terms of assets; employs approximately 800,000 persons at over 11,000 plant locations; and averages approximately $21 billion in annual sales.

In connection with the observance of Chemical Progress Week, I wish to pay particular tribute to the splendid programs of development in the plants located at Hopewell, Va., which is in my congressional district. The production carried on by the Hercules Powder Co., Continental Can Co., Celanese Corporation of America, and the national aniline division of the Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. is of tremendous value to the economic stability of our State. In addition to the tremendous economic advantages brought about by the employment of more than 5,000 people in the Hopewell area, these plants and their leadership have rendered a commendable service in the way of community relationships in that section of the State. The men and women associated with these firms have not only contributed of their time and effort in the promotion of the industrial development of Virginia, but have also stepped into various other walks of life to make a valuable contribution to the welfare of our people. I feel that their efforts are typical of those put forth by the chemical industry as a whole.

A Regrettable Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I deeply regret the decision of the President to veto the postal pay bill reported by the conference committee and approved by overwhelming vote both in the Senate and the House.

Anyone can take some artificial date and say that, compared with that date, the pay of postal and of other Government workers has been raised adequately, and that an 8.8 percent pay rise now is too much.

Across the past 20 years, however, the pay scales of Government employees, whether postal or classified, have fallen proportionately behind the pay scales of industry and other private employment. It is not just a matter of juggling figures and job descriptions and saying, as the veto message said, that the 8.8

percent bill was not "necessary either from the standpoint of pay for comparable work or from the standpoint of increase in the cost of living."

From the standpoint of maintaining proper relations between the rising scales in private employment and the pay of postal workers, the 8.8 percent bill was fully justified. A 10 percent bill would have been justified, and there are no figures available to the Post Office Department to refute it.

We have often heard the President proclaim as his philosophy the doctrine that the Government should be conservative in economic and fiscal matters but liberal in its attitude toward people. Where was the liberalism, or the liberality if that is the word, toward postal workers, and toward the classified workers of the Federal Government who wait in turn?

I repeat, I regret the veto. I think it was unwise and ungenerous, that it imposes a continuing inequity on postal and classified workers. A philosophy proclaiming itself as liberal toward people is all very well, but it ought to be more than a slogan.

Robinson-Patman Act Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, I am told, are receiving a lot of letters about H. R. 11 and S. 11, which provides for an amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act.

This bill is now receiving consideration in the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. It is very important that this bill become law at the earliest possible date. Independent business and small businesses in particular need this bill enacted into law more than any other one time at this particular time. It will determine whether many of them stay in business or go out of business.

In the House the following Members are coauthors and cosponsors of the bill: Hon. CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma; Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Louisiana; Hon. USHER BURDICK, North Dakota; Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia; Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut; Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, California; Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland; Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland. Hon. DON HAYWORTH, Michigan; Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, California; Hon. LESTER JOHNSON, Wisconsin; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; Hon. CECIL R. KING, California; Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan; Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, Louisiana Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; Hon. DON MAGNUSON, Washington; Hon. LEE METCALF, Montana; Hon. GEORGE MILLER, California; Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., California; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; Hon. JAMES G. POLK, Ohio; Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., New York; Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; Hon. HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Alabama; Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado; Hon. WALTER ROGERS, Texas; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; Hon. BOB SIKES, Florida; Hon. B. F. SISK, California; Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana; Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY, Texas; Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey; Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Mississippi; and Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin.

In addition, the following Members have introduced bills of their own, identical with H. R. 11: Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, California, H. R. 2850; Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, H. R. 2690; and Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan, H. R. 2611.

It is my suggestion that any Member who desires to do so may become a coauthor of the bill by allowing his name to be used for that purpose or he may introduce a bill himself.

Insurance Against Blindness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in the House of Representatives which I have entitled the "Insurance Against Blindness Act." The measure seeks to amend title II of the Social Security Act to aid the blind.

Specifically, the bill provides that any individual working in an industry which is covered by old-age and survivors insurance would, upon the onset of blindness, be deemed fully insured and to have reached retirement age. Under these circumstances, a person losing his sight from any cause and in any way while employed in a so-called covered occupation shall be entitled to full benefits and eligible to receive monthly payments under the social security system from the time such blindness occurred.

I am informed that approximately 12,000 persons in the United States go blind each year due to various reasons and causes. This means that under my bill approximately that number of persons would start receiving "insurance against blindness" benefits in any one year. At the same time, it must be emphasized that these payments would not be in the nature of a grant; they would constitute an annuity which the individual bought and paid for, and which would be payable without any restrictions in the event the individual becomes blind. In other words, it would be an insurance proposition similar to that of the individual who is paying premiums toward a paid-up policy.

Under my bill, anyone who has four quarters or more of coverage under the Social Security Act and then becomes blind would be entitled to this insurance. The four quarters need not necessarily be of continuous service in 1 year, but may be acquired over a period of years. Where an individual ceases to be blind and becomes rehabilitated, no benefits shall be paid until he reaches the regular retirement age of 65.

A blinded person, particularly a newly blinded person, should be given every encouragement to become employed and to attempt to become self-sufficient. In order to lend such encouragement, the bill provides that the individual would not lose any benefits under the social-security system due to the earning capacity which he might develop in time.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals contained in my bill have been endorsed by the American Foundation for the Blind and also by the American Association of Workers for the Blind, an organization composed of individuals serving the blind. Miss Helen Keller is associated with the aforementioned foundation as counselor of the Bureau of National and International Relations.

Incidentally, I am sure all my colleagues will be interested to learn that Miss Keller, who is one of the great pioneers in the world for the blind, will be 75 years old on June 27 of this year. She has just completed a long tour throughout the Orient and is known to the whole world as a "good will ambassador" for the cause of the blind.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no finer birthday greeting and gift to Miss Keller than the adoption of my bill to provide insurance against blindness for those who will be needing it in the years ahead. I urge you to take early and favorable action on this measure.

Revision and Codification of the Military Laws of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill to revise, codify, and enact title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32, entitled "National Guard," H. R. 6366, which I have just introduced, codifies the great bulk of the statutory law dealing with the military aspects of national defense. This bill grew out of a project initiated by the Department of the Army and

launched in March 1948 under the initial leadership of Col. Alfred C. Bowman of the Judge Advocate General's Corps. As part of a larger undertaking began by Congress in 1946 to revise and enact each of the 50 titles of the United States Code, the work has gone forward under the close supervision of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and in particular under its Subcommittee on the Revision of the Laws. Of immeasurable help to the Subcommittee on the Revision of the Laws in its work was its Law Revision Counsel, Dr. Charles J. Zinn. The bill has been submitted as an executive proposal of the Department of Defense and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed text of the new titles is a thorough rearrangement and restatement, in simpler and clearer form, of existing military law of general significance. Perhaps its biggest contribution is to eliminate a great mass of dead, executed, and obsolete law. The result of this codification will be the elimination of countless hours and the great expense which would otherwise continue to be necessary to search and interpret the existing mass of military laws.

However, the bill is not intended to change, in any respect, the substance of the law now in force. All suggested substantive improvements in existing law have been faithfully reserved for future consideration by the particular committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over the subject matter concerned.

The military codification bill was prepared by a group of very capable legal draftsmen in the Department of Defense. Special, high commendation is owed to the following:

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense: Dr. F. Reed Dickerson, LL. B., Harvard, J. S. D., Columbia, former Assistant Counsel, Office of the Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, and author of the recent book, Legislative Drafting.

For the Department of the Army: Col. Archibald King, LL. B., Harvard, LL. D., Boston University; Lt. Col. Joseph P. Ramsay, LL. B., Harvard.

For the Department of the Navy: Lt. Col. George M. Lhamon, United States Marine Corps, LL. B., George Washington; Comdr. Enser W. Cole, LL. B., North Carolina, LL. M., George Washington; Comdr. Katherine E. Shilling, LL. B., George Washington; Lt. Comdr. Charles J. Murphy, LL. B., Fordham.

For the Department of the Air Force: Mr. James B. Minor, LL. B., George Washington, former Assistant Counsel, Office of Legislative Counsel of the Senate, former Legislative Counsel, War Assets Administration; Mr. Allan J. Morrison, LL. B., Boston College.

During their long period of intensive and painstaking participation, these attorneys have devoted their efforts exclusively to the preparation of this bill. In this endeavor they received valuable assistance from a number of other attorneys from the three military departments and from the National Guard. Although it is not practicable to mention them all by name at this time, their contribution is gratefully acknowledged.

I certainly hope that this proposed legislation will receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

A Tribute to Dr. Philip A. Traynor, Former Member of Congress and Distinguished Citizen of the State of Delaware, Upon the Occasion of the Celebration of His 81st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I join with the members of the Santa Maria Council, Knights of Columbus, Wilmington, Del., in paying tribute to Dr. Philip A. Traynor, a former Member of this great body, on the occasion of his 81st birthday.

Dr. Traynor was born in Wilmington, May 31, 1874. As a youth he gained recognition as an athlete of considerable merit, and rode and trained horses for his father. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree in dental surgery, and has since been a very highly skilled and kindly dentist.

He is the oldest living and continuous member of St. Peter's Cathedral Parish from which he has never moved. He will long be remembered for his unselfish devotion to the poor and in his charity has administered to the dental needs of the schoolchildren of St. Peter's without charge for over 40 years.

He was a member of the Delaware State Militia for 3 years and served in the Spanish-American War.

In 1940 he was elected Representative at Large from Delaware to the 77th Congress. In 1942, seeking reelection, he was defeated. However, in 1944 he was reelected to the 79th Congress, but was again defeated in 1946 for the 80th Congress. Among his many achievements while serving the people of his State was his great effort in securing the passage of a bill for the construction of the Delaware River Bridge. He served on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and introduced the bill for the first postal increase. During the housing shortage in Washington Dr. Traynor commuted daily from Wilmington and continued to do so in spite of a painful accident in which he suffered a broken shoulder.

Dr. Traynor is considered the father of Columbianism in Delaware, since he signed the Santa Maria charter on December 13, 1896, and thus formed the first council of the Knights of Columbus in Delaware. He is the lone surviving signer of the charter, and his interest in this organization has never faltered. Dr. Traynor is also a 50-year member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and is still an active Democrat.

It has been my good fortune to have known Dr. Traynor for a number of years. He has been a good friend and loyal citizen of his State and Nation. As a lifelong and ardent Democrat, he has always given of his time and effort for the best interests of his party; however, he has never allowed his partisanship to becloud his good judgment in supporting legislation in the Congress of the United States that was for the best interests of all of the people. Dr. Traynor was well equipped to use his good judgment when questions of public welfare were to be decided. He has been one of the people, and his life is a living example of dedication to the welfare of his fellowmen.

Protect the Family Farm Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON] has recently had published in Better Farming magazine for June 1955, a most interesting and heart-searching article containing the views of farm women around the country who are concerned about the survival of family type farming.

In our attempts in Congress to arrive at a comprehensive farm program that will conserve the best elements of agriculture, uppermost of which is the farm family, I recommend this article Protect the Family Farm Now to the Members of this body.

I also call your attention to a prize-winning letter from Mrs. John Goldmark of Double J Ranch, Okanagan, Wash., which was inspired by the election to Congress of the Farm Woman's Congresswoman and the first woman to sit on the House Agriculture Committee, Mrs. KNUTSON:

FARM WOMEN TELL WHY WE MUST FIGHT TO PROTECT THE FAMILY FARM NOW

(By Representative COYA KNUTSON, Member, House Committee on Agriculture)

The invitation, extended through Better Farming, to the farm women of America to write to me about their problems and their ideas for making farm living a better living, brought a response that has fairly overwhelmed me. Letters have come from farm homes in 45 different States.

I have read all of them. They tell a story I wish every public official and every Member of Congress could know and feel as I do now. The spirit and courage they reflect, the brave struggle to stay in farming during these difficult times, make me prouder than ever that I have the opportunity to represent the farm women of this country. They show clearly why we must take up the fight to protect the family-type farm. Some excerpts from the letters tell all this better than I can.

"I washed today," wrote Mrs. Jerry Urbanek of Lusk, Wyo. "With the aid of an electric washing machine and REA power I washed quickly, but my washing machine is a secondhand model and so ancient that I catch the oil which drips from the motor in a can.

I hold the wringer together with one hand while I feed in the clothes with the other. Dangerous, perhaps, but it will be a long time before I can afford another.

"My husband and I have been farming for 25 years. I do a man's work in the fields because we cannot afford hired labor. We have a capital outlay of $45,000 invested in 900 acres of land, a full set of machinery and 44 head of cattle. Until 2 years ago we were out of debt. Last year we planted 200 acres of grain and harvested enough to get our seed back because of drought. We cut enough hay for our cattle and we're more fortunate than others, who have been buying hay at $40 a ton to keep their foundation stock.

"I like farming, but my husband and I worked 4,800 hours at farm work last year, for which we cannot show 1 cent of remuneration. While we were working we were also wearing out high-priced machinery and receiving less than 2 percent on the capital we had invested. We could have taken the loss of our grain crop without going into debt if the prices of the cattle we sold had been in line with the prices we had to pay for the necessities we bought."

Mrs. John E. Allen, of Mobeetie, Tex., tells of the situation from another angle of farming.

"We have 200 acres, 75 seeded to improved pasture. We raise and put up our own silage, raise our own grain, have a 50-cow herd and raise our own replacements. We are working hard to organize and establish a producer association to protect us against the big handlers. As it is now they can test and weigh our milk any way they like. A number of dairymen have had to take what they could get for their investments and quit. On our own herd we received $2,000 less money in 1954 for more milk shipped than in 1953. But the consumer paid the same price for what he bought, and our feed, groceries, and clothing were even higher."

The same experience is told in a letter from Mrs. Floyd Waldo, Route 3, Winona, in my own State of Minnesota:

"On our farm we produced 65,717 pounds more milk last year and received $204 less. Our costs remained inflexible while our markets were unstable. But consumers have not benefited from this farm price cut."

To this Mrs. Burnis Brigham, route 1, Genesee, Idaho, adds:

"It's bad enough to see farm returns go steadily lower but it's even worse to know that consumers never benefit. * * * Last fall the processors of our grade A milk made a big thing of a cent a quart price reduction—made possible by producers getting that much less. The reduction in our price was very hard for us to absorb but we did feel good that milk would cost townfolk less. In exactly 2 weeks the consumer price went back up, but, of course, the producer price did not. This is the type of price usury that farmers are generally as helpless as babes to cope with."

Another phase of the low-price, high-cost situation is described by Mrs. Mildred Reinhardt, of Palisade, Minn.: "One of the most unjust and disheartening circumstances facing farm women today is the exorbitant cost of establishing and maintaining a laying flock as compared with the infinitesimal net profit eked out from egg sales." What this means is told by Mrs. Waymon Wood, of Spiro, Okla.: "On most small farms, such as ours, the wife takes charge of the laying flock and expects the profits to be her part of the family's spending money. How can she make any spending money when feed costs remain high while eggs go down to from 20 to 30 cents a dozen?" And Mrs. Sara E. Demaree, of Malden, Mo., wrote: "Feed prices remain the same while eggs have gone down, down until farmers feel compelled to sell their flocks, keeping only enough for home consumption. So went the farm woman's income, thereby robbing her of her independence in helping out the family income."

Many, as did Mrs. Reinhardt, blame the indiscriminate grading of eggs, or lack of it, and the costly and backward system of egg distribution. As Mrs. Mary B. Brinson, route 2, Gosport, Ind., wrote: "If we had a good graded egg market, as we do for grade A milk or livestock, I feel that egg prices to farmers would be much better, at least fairer. In our locality all eggs, regardless of how good or bad, bring the same price." Many pointed out that, with the inadequate grading methods in vogue, the dealers stood to reap the profits from better-quality eggs.

How this sometimes affects the farm family's life is told by Mrs. Elmer Whitney, of Oregon, Ill.: "The thing that hurts me most is that many of our rural women are taking town jobs to provide needed requirements of the farm family * * *. In the past farm families have all taken deep interest in mother's poultry and garden because they knew the surplus sold meant a new rug, new clothes, or perhaps a family trip. After continued disappointments, because there was no surplus profit, these ventures have been abandoned. In search for a way to provide these things the wife takes a town job. The brave little family tells her 'We'll do our best to keep things going at home.' But their best falls far short without mother. It can mean a crippled family life and a weakening of family unity, which is a vital and precious part of our way of life."

Oh, so often the letters tell of such sacrifices. One Fountain Run, Ky., farm woman told of traveling 25 miles from home each day to work in a store to help her husband hold their farm. But she added, "I had to give up my job. It was just too much." And, as Mrs. Albert H. Holtz, Route 1, Holden, Mo., wrote: "In our community we have had falling prices, drought, grasshoppers, feed shortages until in nearly every family the husband or wife has had to get an outside job. This makes it difficult to farm efficiently. My husband has worked in town for the past 3 years and I handle all the chores alone. Why do families stay on farms under such circumstances? You would be surprised at how many of our neighbors (and ourselves) have given up much better livelihoods in the city because they believe they can bring up their children better on a farm, and are willing to make the physical sacrifices necessary for this."

The situation is forcing some hard decisions upon many, as this letter from Mrs. Dorothy Biggs, route 1, Potwin, Kans., tells: "I am a Kansas farm wife with 3 children, ages 10, 7, and 3. I think being a homemaker is the most challenging and interesting career any woman can have. But I am facing a crossroad, which I imagine other farm women also face.

"I have much to be thankful for—a good home, a good husband, plenty of food, and the ordinary comforts. But, like many other farm women, I'd like to be able to save a little or purchase a few bonds as I go along to help with the children's higher education that will eventually come. We raise and sell livestock and do make a profit each year; but after taxes, repair and maintenance, insurance, new machinery, and immediate living costs, there is nothing left to save. I work hard, sew, mend and make over garments, can, raise chickens, etc., to help make ends meet. This all takes time and does not leave enough time or energy to help train the children in stronger spiritual lives, which they need now, not later. This work, however, as a farm homemaker I must do.

"The crossroad I mentioned is this: As soon as our youngest is in school, I intend to go to work outside the home. I have had considerable business experience before marriage, plus training and hours for teaching. I would much rather stay in the home doing my own work and be a true homemaker. My choice is not my own, for I want our children to have an opportunity to receive a higher schooling so that sometime they may not be placed in the same position. While I do not want to raise all the funds (if that were possible) I do want to help so that each one can get a start and then they can go on for themselves from there."

The pressure of these conditions means extra burdens on all members of the family, sometimes to the heartache of the parents. This letter from Mrs. Elsie H. Bechtel, Manor Farm, Adams, N. Y., is expressive of that fact: "There is certainly something wrong in Washington and it is good to know that a real farm wife is working on it. * * * The greater part of the income of farmers in this district consists of proceeds from the sale of dairy and poultry products. Everyone in this section is feeling the price squeeze on farmers now.

"Many small farmers and some larger ones around here have been auctioning off their places and are being forced into terrific losses. Others, like ourselves, have had to see their wives go to work and have been forced to put small children to work beyond their years because the income from the place will not bear paying wages to hired labor. Our 11-year-old girl is doing more work than we would like to see her do, but she does it willingly and we don't know what we would do without her. It sounds terrible, like you are dependent on a child, but my husband and I are doing all we can (we have over 50 cows in the barn) and the help she gives us is the difference between being able to go on and quitting. A man does reach a stage where he can't add any more to his burdens."

Scores of other letters tell the same story of struggle and sacrifice, of a determination not to be forced out of farming and a feeling that something is terribly wrong at present. They reveal, too, how little consideration our policymakers have given to farm women and the farm home. They "do not want sympathy," as one after another wrote, only that "after all our labor and expense there will be something left for the needs of the family." Many letters contained useful ideas and suggestions for improving the situation. Some of these will be reported in the pages of Better Farming next month.

A Ranchwoman's Remedy for What Ails Agriculture

Okanogan, Wash.

Double J Ranch, February 26, 1955, before noon—temperature, 10 above.

Dear Mrs. Knutson: Early this morning, my husband brought in a calf. We were too late. It died, frozen. I then made up my mind that I would, in some way, have to make up the cost of that calf, for it meant a lot to us. Braving a bitter north wind to feed and water the chickens, I came back in the kitchen to drink hot coffee and sat down to see if Better Farming would cheer my heart. It did with news of your election and the possibility of making up for that calf just lost. So while the men are out feeding the cattle and trying to solve the problem of watering them, I will write to you. Water is a touchy problem for most farmers. We had a dry fall, the lake was low, and now the ice has frozen solid and there is no water beneath. I shall not go into this detail as I realize that you cannot legislate about wind and weather.

You can, however, legislate about water, and while I am a firm believer in voluntary associations and agreements, I truly feel that the time is coming when we shall no longer be wealthy enough to be easy and casual about soil and water. I say to myself, we must not only conserve, but increase our water resources and the must is so urgent in my mind that I am no longer tolerant of the man who allows water to flow off his

land in deep gullies, lets his topsoil blow away, overgrazes the grass, cuts down the timber without replenishing the forests, wastes the heritage of this country.

I am a firm believer in the family-size farm not only because I am presently devoted to one but because in the back reaches of my mind (or is it just a romantic notion?) I believe that the type of life and economy typified by the American family farm is a bulwark to the kind of democratic society we wish to preserve. It may be that large corporate farming would fill the Nation's shopping basket, but would it fill the heart of the man who produced it and the man who consumes it? Would a large corporate farm economy assist in making our national economy vigorous, expanding, and democratic? I think the answer is "No." But this question is one which many people, legislators like yourself, must not only answer but must be firm about. If the family-size farm is what we really wish to preserve, then all of our thinking, planning, and agricultural legislation should assist in nurturing and protecting it.

It becomes harder and harder for an individual, while youth and vigor are with him, to "buy in" to many types of farming. This is due to the price of machinery, stock, available land. Unless he falls heir to a farm or money, a young man can seldom enter the field. One of the results is that the old experts in the Department of Agriculture grew up on farms and know their problems. The young experts have no experience outside of books and summer jobs at experiment stations or nurseries. This is not good.

Another result is that, unless a farmer has good luck with weather or outside fortune, he is unable to expand his first holdings. There is nothing like an RFC for the farmer-entrepreneur so that he could extend his investment to meet competition or operate on a more equitable scale. The family-size farm is in competition with large corporate and city-controlled financing. Money made in Hollywood, on Wall Street, or in industry is mighty hard competition for the lone farmer.

I also confess to a great dissatisfaction in thinking of the Halls of Congress being battered down by tobacco men, wheat men, cotton men, peanut vendors and the like. Our agricultural economy must be looked at as a whole—production, distribution, price, freight, advertising, perishables, livestock. Unless economists and right-thinking men sit down and think about the whole future—land, water, products, and the increasing populations of our own country and the world, and our Nation's economy that needs to get out of the "fix" we seem to be in, whether it be parity price or interest rate—it doesn't seem to me that we shall get very far. I do not believe that the top-flight men of farm organizations or of farm production groups should be consulted in building the first basic agricultural policies. They all have special interests and they are there to protect them.

We do need disinterested social economists and planners to grapple with the larger issues at stake. Somewhere along the line the farmer has to grapple with these problems too. He should be able to do so without feeling that he will lose his status in the community because he does not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture or the righteousness of the sugarbeet growers. He should be able to do so without being caught in a vise which is his vote to cut his acreage or get a lower price for his product. He needs straight thinking without pressure. This last item I know is hard, for the American people, including the farmer, are getting to the point where they can't act or react unless the radio and newspapers scream and the face on the screen threatens.

I must go and feed three hungry, cold, tired men a large noon dinner, so I close with these suggestions:

1. The formation of a nonpolitical, non-ax-grinding agricultural planning board. Such a group should look backward as well as forward to see if this country really wants to preserve the family-size farm as part of our national life and livelihood; and if they do, to consider if and how it can be best subsidized and protected, and set up penalties for those who are not interested in doing it in such a way as to conserve our resources.

2. The creation of a Government agency, such as the RFC, to protect the small-size farm from being grabbed by the mortgage holder or corporation; to permit the small farm to grow and expand to the best economical operating capacity; to subsidize the man who wants to enter into the farm business.

3. To get the Department of Agriculture and farm organizations of all types to stop talking so much and scaring people and putting on pressure; to listen for a change and encourage people to think rather than carry a banner.

I feel as if I had been standing on top of a soapbox and now need to get down and put dinner on and see to the children. It was a pleasure to take off time and to write to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN GOLDMARK.

The Role of the American Merchant Marine in the Atomic Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Propeller Club, port of Washington, D. C., as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

(Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Propeller Club, port of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of National Maritime Day, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday, May 19, 1955)

I am very grateful for the opportunity of speaking to this audience in anticipation of National Maritime Day. Following closely the observance of Armed Forces Day on May 21, the celebration of National Maritime Day on May 23 is particularly timely and appropriate. For the American merchant marine is as much a part of our defense system as the combat elements of the Armed Forces themselves. Quite accurately, the American merchant marine is referred to as our fourth arm of defense.

There is little doubt that we have come a great distance down the road into the atomic era. We have seen dozens of atomic weapons tested in a variety of forms in all their awesome power. We have seen the first combat naval ship under way on atomic power and progress has been made in the field of atomic propulsion for aircraft.

In the peaceful applications of atomic energy, we are seeing increased use of atomic and nuclear physics in medicine, in research, in science, and in industry. Early this month an agreement between the United States and Turkey was announced whereby we will lease 6 kilograms of uranium to Turkey for the construction of a small-sized reactor which will be used for scientific research activity. We have seen the initial steps taken in our own country and Great Britain to adopt atomic power to industry and commerce, and just a few days ago President Eisenhower made his historic announcement recommending that the American merchant marine have an atom-powered ship.

In this era of bewildering progress, when one advance leapfrogs another, and as science gives us new creations and inventions, we are apt to conclude that everything old is to be replaced. While this is often true, it is not always so. The automobile replaced the buggy, and the electric light the gas lamp; but more often than not, a new development of achievement supplements or improves the old and makes it better, rather than replaces it. For example, we see jet engines supplementing diesel and piston engines. We know now that atomic power will only supplement other types of ship propulsion in selected applications. In these cases, the trend will be to increase the efficiency of our merchant ships rather than replace them.

The advent of the atomic age does not lessen our need for a strong and adequate merchant marine; for it is a fundamental truth that the United States cannot get along without merchant vessels. Without our own ships, we cannot be assured of obtaining the necessary raw materials we need. Without our own ships, we cannot defend ourselves. Without ships, we cannot assist our allies. Without ships, we cannot grow and prosper. The advent of the atom does not alter our dependence upon the need of workaday merchant ships crossing the seven seas. The merchant marine remains as indispensable to our prosperity as it ever was, and fully as important to our defense as the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marines. It may be said that victory in World War II was assured on the day when our merchant ship construction exceeded our losses.

Our American merchant marine does not serve the interests of just the coastal States and the Great Lakes area. It reaches into every inland pasture, field, factory, and workshop. The farmer in Kansas, Illinois, or Iowa may never have seen an ocean or a merchant ship, but his livelihood is directly related to this Nation's maritime strength. Millions of tons of his products are sent across the seas by ships. The dairy farmer of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri is likewise affected. Ships carry his products around the world. The auto worker in Detroit is also concerned. Ships take overseas millions of dollars worth of the automotive equipment that he makes. More than ever, no segment of our population is self-sufficient and no part of this Nation is unaffected by affairs of the sea. Farmer, laborer, industrialist, stenographer, housewife—whatever the trade, occupation, or livelihood, it is connected to and affected by our maritime industry. Accessibility to foreign markets enriches our lives and supplies our needs.

Living as we do at a time when creature comforts and household labor-saving devices are commonplace, and in a bountiful country which enjoys the highest living standard the world has ever known, it is hard to convince the average American that his country is a "have not" nation. But this fact is nothing new. We were a "have not" nation in 1776 and have been ever since. In colonial days we had to trade to expand and to prosper just as we do now. We were as dependent on the sea then as we are today. We imported most of our metals and many of our luxuries, such as tea, pepper, sugar, spices. As America has grown and prospered, our "have not" status has widened. As recently as 1940, we had lumber and petroleum

to export and we were almost self-sufficient in copper, zinc, and lead. Now we must import all of them in increasing quantities. Advancing science has hastened and enlarged our needs. At one time in our history, iron used to be good enough; then we started adding to it other minerals to make it lighter, stronger, resistant to stain, to heat, to sea water, and vibration. We have alloyed manganese, cobalt, and chromium and other rare metals with steel to make it do more necessary tasks and these special ores must come from abroad.

Thus, the automobile you own is not entirely made in Detroit, but partly in India, from whence we get manganese to make its steel. It is partly made in Bolivia from from whence we get manganese to make its bearings. Your refrigerator and your washing machine are not entirely made in New York or Cleveland but partly in Africa and South America from whence we get many of the raw materials that go into them. Your television set is not entirely made in Schenectady, but partly in Korea and India from whence we get the tungsten and mica.

The list of strategic and critical materials which are essential to our economy numbers 77 items. Yet, of these 77, the United States is sufficient in only 11. As far as our defense production is concerned (and we are still the free world's arsenal), one example will suffice to show how dependent we are on the overseas sources of raw materials which can be supplied in the quantities needed only by ships. Essential to the manufacture of our combatant aircraft are such raw materials as aluminum, chromium, titanium, antimony, tin, cobalt, mica, and tungsten. The largest percentage of these materials must be brought by merchant ships from overseas. Even such prosaic but necessary items such as coffee, sugar, tea, and many vegetable oils must be carried from overseas by ships to our ports.

The atomic age, therefore, has not changed this fundamental fact: that no matter who you are, where you live, or upon what your livelihood depends, your prosperity in peacetime and your security in wartime are definitely related to the oceans and to the merchant ships which cross them to take our products overseas and to bring back essential raw materials. The answer, then, as to why we must have a strong merchant marine in this atomic age is, first, that it is essential to our continuing prosperity; and second, that it is vital to our security in time of war. Thomas Jefferson's conclusion about the American merchant marine is as true today as it was in 1793: "As a branch of industry it is valuable; but as a resource of defense essential."

The United States Navy and the merchant marine have always been inseparably bound together. Since the very beginning of American history, the United States Navy has been closely related to the merchant marine. John Paul Jones was a merchant mariner for 16 years before he became famous in our Continental Navy. Stephen Decatur commenced his naval career as a privateer. The American Navy of the Revolutionary War, in fact, was entirely created from the American merchant marine.

One of our early Congress' first acts was to establish a merchant marine. Our forefathers foresaw that if our country was to grow and to prosper, it was necessary for us to have a first-class merchant marine. Our rugged and talented merchant mariners gave us this with the succession of the fast packets, the legendary New Bedford whalers, and our world-famous Clipper ships.

In every war, the American merchant marine has played a vital and indispensable though, sometimes, an unpublicized role. It has been the vital determinant of whether we fought a war on our homeland or beyond our own shores. This was demonstrated beyond question in World War II when the vital importance of sea transportation as an element in the logistic support of our military forces was so positively shown.

The military movements incident to the recent war in Korea furnish an excellent example of the logistic problems which overseas military operations entail. Every fighting man sent to Korea was accompanied by 5 tons of supplies, and it required 64 pounds of supplies and equipment every day to keep him there. The support of that war involved the sea transportation of 54 million tons of dry cargo and 22 million tons of petroleum products from and within the Korean theater. In the performance of this task the privately operated American merchant marine devoted itself unstintingly and was quick to respond to every demand made upon it. More recently, in Indochina, the American merchant marine participated in the little-publicized Operation Passage to Freedom conducted by the Navy, which involved the evacuation by sea of some 300,000 anti-Communist refugees and 200,000 tons of cargo from North to South Indochina.

Despite the fact that the merchant marine is essential to our personal prosperity in peacetime and vital to our security in wartime, it is unfortunately true that our shipbuilding industry is currently in a distressed condition. Eight-tenths of our present merchant ships will be obsolete in another 10 years. Nine-tenths of them are too slow for wartime use against the modern submarine. We are still short of tanker tonnage sufficient to meet our mobilization needs. There is very little merchant shipping now under construction in our yards. Within the past year the United States has fallen from 7th to 12th amongst shipbuilding nations. Countries such as Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Norway, Germany, Italy, and Japan outbuild us in terms of modern ships. A great many of these foreign-built ships are of the highest quality, having air-conditioning, modern fireproofing, safety equipment, and, in most cases, could comply fully with the high standards traditionally demanded by our United States Coast Guard regulations and the American Bureau of Shipping. It is worthy of comment also that since 1939 13 nations which did not even have merchant fleets have entered the maritime scene. Even landlocked Switzerland now has a 30-ship merchant marine.

We cannot allow our merchant marine to approach disuse and decay on the ground that we can trust to luck and improvise to meet our next emergency as we did both in World War I and World War II. In this atomic age if general war should unfortunately ever occur, despite our patient and intense efforts to prevent it, there will not be time to resurrect a merchant marine. Our survival in a global war will be largely dependent upon the merchant shipping which is available during the critical initial period. It is also my candid opinion that it would be folly for us to depend on the shipping and the shipbuilding facilities of other nations in the event of war. We must have our own American merchant marine, and it must be strong and adequate.

While there are many troubles and problems which beset our maritime industry (and none of them is of quick and easy solution), there have been some recent encouraging developments recently. First of all, the St. Lawrence seaway project has been approved. Since the beginning of this year, seven new shipping lines (unfortunately all of them flying foreign flags) have announced their plans to commence Great Lakes operations. I earnestly hope we may soon learn of similar plans on the part of some of our American-flag operators. Commerce on the St. Lawrence will inevitably increase as the seaway project approaches its completion. I disagree with those who believe this project will mean only a shift of ocean traffic from our coastal areas into the Great Lakes. It is my opinion that this development will not only increase trade into the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Buffalo, and Cleveland, but as the years go by it will also increase the overall marine traffic on our seaboards. The seaway, in my opinion, will result in greater trade and traffic for all; and not just for marine traffic, but for railroads and truckers as well.

The second encouraging development has been the Congress' approval of a project to deepen the upper Delaware River above Philadelphia and open it to ocean traffic. This is going to mean a great deal to that great industrial area of the East. It will relieve congestion in Philadelphia Harbor, it will enable full use of the terminals at Camden and Trenton, and it will mean a steady increase and expansion of marine traffic in the Delaware.

A third encouraging factor in our maritime affairs is the vigor and foresight which our Maritime Administration is showing. In conjuncture with industry, they have developed several new designs of merchant ships for the replacement of our aging fleets largely built during World War II. These new designs not only incorporate maximum commercial utility, but at the same time, assure the Department of Defense of the availability of acceptable auxiliary vessels in times of emergency. The Maritime Administration has also been conducting extensive research and development activity in the atomic propulsion field as well as in the field of gas turbines, free piston engines, diesels, and improved steam turbines. These programs being vigorously pursued by our Maritime Administration cannot do other than help our maritime position.

Another encouraging development is, of course, the President's very recent proposal to build an atomic-powered merchant ship. The construction of such a ship has a larger purpose than maritime gain. It will demonstrate to the world in a tangible way that we intend to use the power of the atom for peaceful use and for nothing else, if we have our way. The President mentioned the construction of this atomic merchant ship in these words:

"We have added to the United States program for peaceful uses of atomic energy an atomic-powered merchant ship. * * * The new ship, powered with an atomic reactor, will not require refueling for scores of thousands of miles of operation. Visiting the ports of the world, it will demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living. In part, also, the ship will be an atomic exhibit; carrying to all people practical knowledge of the usefulness of this new science in such fields as medicine, agriculture, and power production."

This first atomic-powered merchant ship will have large exhibit space, and perhaps a large theater, so that as it travels the trade routes of the globe and stops in major ports of the world, it can exhibit our American system of liberty and free enterprise.

Obviously, a great deal of hard work in research and development is necessary before marine atomic power can be produced at a cost equal to power from fossil fuels. A great amount of such work is now being carried on in connection with both military and civilian power projects in atomic energy. As the necessary techniques are developed, they will be applied to merchant shipping exactly as were techniques of using iron and steel for hulls, welding in lieu of riveting, and very high versus low steam pressure. As the United States Navy took the lead in those developments, which were later taken over, modified and used with great success by the merchant marine, so the United States Navy has led and will continue to show the way in marine atomic propulsion.

The first two plants to produce significant quantities of useful atomic energy in the United States were naval developments—the *Nautilus* powerplant and its land-based prototype in Idaho. The technology developed in these plants is being adopted as the basis for the first United States civilian powerplant at Shippingport, Pa., and will be used for the atomic-powered merchant vessel which the President recommended.

As you all know, the Navy has now been operating the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus* for many weeks and we are very pleased with the progress and the performance which this vessel has shown. We feel that the future of atomic propulsion in the marine field holds immense promise. Our experience and research, of course, will contribute greatly to the building and operation of the atomic-powered merchant ship. The Navy will cooperate fully to assist the American merchant marine to produce and sail this atom peace ship as quickly as possible. No one appreciates better than the American Navy the need for a strong and adequate American merchant marine.

In summary, I believe that the prospects of our maritime affairs in the future are brighter. The American people, when aware of the facts, always act promptly, resolutely, and intelligently, and I am sure they want and will support the strong and adequate American merchant marine for which your Navy had consistently been in the forefront as its stanchest champion.

Price Discrimination Destructive to Small and Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if a small merchant can buy right, he can meet any competition, big or little. The grocery business is about the most competitive business in the United States. If the local groceryman can buy under the same terms and conditions as his competitor across the street, regardless of how big the competitor is, he cannot only remain in business but he can make a good living and a good profit. It is only when the small man is discriminated against that he is injured.

The Robinson-Patman Act provides that a manufacturer or supplier of goods and merchandise to the retail merchant shall not discriminate in price between customers in competition with one another. In other words, a supplier, whether a wholesaler or manufacturer, does not have to select any particular person or firm to sell its goods. The law does not compel a supplier to sell to anyone.

The Robinson-Patman Act, however, provides that the supplier, after selecting two or more customers in an area to retail its products, must treat these customers—the retailers—fairly and not give special privileges to one and deny equal benefits to another.

If a supplier has 2 customers in a town—one is a big customer and the other a little one, being a big retail store and a little retail store—it is all right for the supplier to give the big man a more favorable price representing a difference only in the difference in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery to the big man. This difference is so small that it is not enough to substantially injure the little man. This difference of cost is recognized in the Robinson-Patman Act, which may be given to the big one over the little one. No one objects to the little difference being given to the big man. That little difference does not injure the little man at all. The injury to the little man comes about by the supplier giving to its big customer a special price or a special discount, which represents a lower price to the big man than is justified by the differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. All the Robinson-Patman Act does is to guarantee equality of opportunity among retailers. It guarantees to the little man the right to buy his goods at comparable prices paid by the big man, his competitor. It is a fair law. If properly enforced, it gives the little man and the independent merchant security. It does not take anything away from the big man that should not be taken away from him. No one can condone a rule, which permits a supplier to give a big customer an unfair advantage over its little customer.

I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Colorado Grocer, Denver, Colo., which appeared recently, concerning a speech delivered by Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers. It is as follows:

PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS

Harmful price discriminations in the food industry have reached an alarming state, requiring specific action to stop them before they plunge the industry into the same kind of chaotic and corrupt practices that prevailed in the early 1930's, according to Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers.

Mrs. Kiefer addressed the annual convention of the National Association of Food Brokers on Saturday, February 19, in the Palmer House, Chicago, on the subject of "The Robinson-Patman Act and Food Distribution."

"A few of you in this audience managed to live through those days (before the Robinson-Patman Anti-Discrimination Act was adopted in 1936)," Mrs. Kiefer said. "Those of us who saw the destruction, dishonesty, and discrimination that prevailed will never forget it."

NARGUS spokesman for the Nation's independent food retailers and one of the original and consistent supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act, has come out strongly in support of the "equality of opportunity" bill to strengthen the act for the effectual prevention of harmful price discriminations.

Mrs. Kiefer pointed out that many discriminations today are not direct price preferences. There are all types of promotion schemes which give one group of stores preference in both allowances and facilities over competing retailers," she said. "Free goods for store openings, manpower for stocking shelves, consignment sales, and so on, are very frequently offered on a preferential basis to buyers who have no scruples about making illegal demands on suppliers."

Although the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits discriminations in allowances and facilities, a number of people in the industry either do not know this or else chose to ignore it, Mrs. Kiefer said.

"Let us not underestimate the amount of money involved in discriminations of all kinds," she cautioned. "The public record shows that in 1 year a larger buyer received, in what the court termed 'headquarters allowances,' $6,400,000, which constituted 24.59 percent of their total profits from all operations in that year. These headquarters allowances were the largest single source of profit for that organization."

Mrs. Kiefer continued:

"The overwhelming majority of business people do not desire to stoop to injurious discriminatory and unfair practices, but if the willful few, who choose this way of doing business, are allowed to pursue their evil conduct then many will feel they must adopt similar tactics to meet unfair and unethical competition. If this is permitted, the ethical standards of the industry will sink to the lowest level followed by the most unscrupulous. Two decades of effort to wipe out discriminations and to preserve equality of opportunity for all are now threatened by a resurgence of this old enemy."

The Robinson-Patman Act is now structurally weaker than ever before in its history, Mrs. Kiefer said, citing instances in which the law is not being enforced or has been weakened by judicial and administrative opinion.

In urging support for the equality of opportunity bill, Mrs. Kiefer also stressed the importance of individual responsibility to foster fair competitive opportunities by refusing to countenance harmful practices known to be taking place. She suggested that brokers report known violations to the Federal Trade Commission.

Without brokers and the great advances they have made in expanding their sales volume, the situation in the industry today would be much worse, Mrs. Kiefer said. She asked the brokers to help lead a crusade to recapture the lost territory. "Food brokers can become the greatest constructive force for fair play there is in the industry," she declared.

The Carolina Food Dealer, in a recent editorial, discussed a letter written by the president of the National Association of Retail Grocers to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana. It is as follows:

NARGUS PRESIDENT SEEKS ROBINSON-PATMAN SUPPORT

Large and small businesses alike have a stake in the battle to preserve the Robinson-Patman law for fair competitive practices, Alvin V. Hokanson, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, declared in a letter directed to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Business, without regard to size, has the important common interest to protect basic individual and economic freedoms, Hokanson said, "for if distribution ever becomes concentrated in the hands of a few powerful corporations, Government control of business will inevitably follow."

Hokanson, who comes from Porter, Ind., wrote to the senior Senator from his home State about his concern to keep open the door of opportunity for more than 350,000 independent food retailers under the free-enterprise system by preserving intact the Robinson-Patman antidiscrimination law.

In describing recurrent attacks upon the Robinson-Patman Act, the NARGUS president stated:

"For the past several years there has been a concerted drive to obtain legislation which would grant large business interests the right to strangle their competitors by getting unfair price discriminations regardless of the competitive effect. Those who are promoting this drive want to make it lawful for a manufacturer to sell the same goods, at the same time, and in the same quantity to a large favored distributor at a low price, while selling to competing smaller distributors at a higher price."

Pointing out that small business believes strongly in the necessity for keeping competition strong and vigorous, Hokanson said: "The competition small business believes in is fair competition as opposed to the 'anything goes' type of contest in which a smaller rival can be crushed without restraint, so long as so-called competitive methods are used to accomplish this purpose."

Since the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, in 1936, Hokanson wrote Senator CAPEHART, its purpose has been to protect competition by encouraging price cuts to small as well as large business. For this reason, he added, it is disturbing to independent distributors that those who are attacking the Robinson-Patman Act are attempting to stigmatize the act as preventing competition, although the act has never prohibited anyone from competing or from meeting competition. "It does require, however, that when a price cut is given to a big mass distributor it also be given on equal terms to merchants who are competing with him," Hokanson said.

He asserted that, in view of the economic issues involved in the current assault on the Robinson-Patman Act, "it is clear that what is at stake is not freedom to compete but elemental justice and equality of opportunity for business, regardless of size. We have seen time and time again that a competitive balance between big business and small business is not possible unless both are on equal footing so that efficiency and not size or financial power will determine success or failure."

It has been fortunate for our economy, Hokanson continued, that the Robinson-Patman Act has helped to keep the field of food distribution open for small firms to enter, prosper and grow.

Resulting from the fact that equality of opportunity has prevailed since the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, consumers have benefited from substantial progress in improved distribution techniques and other advancements, he said, notable among these being the modern self-service supermarket pioneered by independent food retailers.

"The retail food business is one segment of our economy where independent distributors have been given a fair chance to show what they can do and they have 'delivered the goods,'" the NARGUS president declared.

Warning of the threat of persistent efforts to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to legalize systematic price discriminations, Hokanson wrote: "If permitted, we will once again return to the two-price system under which a few very large distributors will get a low price from manufacturers while small distributors will be left with a serious competitive disadvantage from which they can never escape."

Hokanson requested Senator CAPEHART's considered opinion on this grave problem. "It is my hope you will agree with me that efforts to legalize injurious price discrimination should be resisted by all who support free competitive enterprise in this country," he concluded.

Michigan Week: Michigan State Society White Pine Tree Planting Southeast Lawn, United States Capitol, May 17, 1955, 9:30 a. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, buttressed by four lovely Michigan princesses, I have been honored in responding to the commanding invitation from Col. I. D. Brent, the distinguished president of the Michigan State Society, to plant upon these magnificent Capitol Grounds a virile and beautiful white pine sapling of great prospect and future promise. By what right, other than seniority, I was chosen to do the honors on the southeast lawn this morning matters naught. The thing that is important is that Michigan's symbolic tree, the great white pine, was planted here in connection with Michigan Week simultaneously being observed throughout our great State. It is important to note that this sapling is not only symbolic of the great strength, spaciousness and wealth of Michigan, but it is the same white pine at which at one time served as nature's covering for Michigan terrain from the southeast corner to the very tip of the Upper Peninsula some eight or nine hundred miles away. It was this great blanket of wealth-producing vegetation that created some of the greatest, most lasting and prodigiously expansive fortunes which developed and today underlay the great industries centered in Michigan, the Peninsular State.

A brief but significant and hopeful program was laid out surrounding the planting ceremonies, a copy of which I shall attach to these remarks. The program quite properly included an invocation and a benediction, together with the historic Michigan State song which wafted melodiously over the breeze upon the silver tones emanating from the throat of my gifted colleague and friend of the 14 District, Congressman LOUIS RABAUT. All of those assembled for this short but impressive ceremony prayed silently in their hearts that this little white pine tree proffered by a Home State Association would, under these auspicious circumstances, take root, grow great and strong, lifting its head ever higher and higher toward heaven and God to pay its Creator the homage we all owe Him, and that in the far distant future the white pine sapling grown to the unbelievable heights of its mighty possibilities might give inspiration to the wayfarer and the tourist, and cast its comforting shadow in the heat of the summer's day upon the statesmen and lawmakers, whom God grant shall continue successfully to struggle with the problems of our beloved Nation, and to aid in the maintenance and preservation of universal peace throughout the world.

The program follows:

MICHIGAN WEEK: MICHIGAN STATE SOCIETY WHITE PINE TREE PLANTING, SOUTHEAST LAWN, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MAY 17, 1955, 9:30 A. M.

Music---------- Bolling Air Force Band
Lieutenant Meuser, leader
Invocation---------- Father Quinn
Archdiocese of Washington
Master of ceremonies---------- Col. I. D. Brent
Michigan State Society
Singing---------- Michigan, My Michigan
Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, Member of Congress, Grosse Point Park, Mich.
Address---------- Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER
United States Senator, Cheboygan, Mich.
Presentation of white pine tree----------
Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA
United States Senator, Detroit, Mich.
Official pages---- The Michigan Agricultural Princesses
Planting---------- Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL
Member of Congress, Detroit, Mich.
Acceptance of white pine tree----------
Hon. J. George Stewart
Architect of the Capitol
National Anthem---- Bolling Air Force Band
Benediction-- Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D.
Chaplain, United States House of Representatives (University of Michigan, 1908)

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast revealed Thyself to the ever-changing lives of men, in the word made flesh which stands fast forever, speak now to our hearts as we wait upon Thee. Remind us of all Thy mercies which have shown forth Thy love in the past, and in that love make us on the holy ground of each present day steadfast and sure. Hold steadily before our eyes that pure will of Thine for us until we learn to choose it above all earthly allurements and the esteem of men. Make our timorous faith more sure, and our high, if bewildered, loyalties firm. Knowing that out of the travail of many a violent age a great birth has come, by Thy providence keep our faith steady, lest for the lack of it we lose what Thou dost intend in this prophetic day. We ask it in the name of that One whose coming broke the ages in two and who is now reverenced and adored while the violent are forgotten. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis;

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5559. An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 6239. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5559. An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6239. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the chairmanship of Mr. HOLLAND was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES MISSION TO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer for assignment in the rank of general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read 6,109 routine nominations in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, which were on the desk, but not printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the confirmation, en bloc, of these nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the conferees on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill have reached an agreement. The report is available. I have discussed it with the acting minority leader [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the representatives on the minority side. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROBERTSON] has the report. He has an understanding with the House that it is agreeable for the Senate to proceed with its consideration, and I should like to have him submit it at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed, insert "one hundred and seventy-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$282,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,870,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$661,620,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$157,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOE MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the concessions made by the Senate conferees in the report.

I am happy to submit to the Senate the report, which was unanimously adopted by the conferees. Under the report, neither the Treasury Department nor the Post Office Department will receive all the appropriations which had been recommended for them in the budget message. Yet in the opinion of the conferees, in the report those Departments were allowed sufficient funds to enable them to function successfully, if they practice strict economy.

The bill now contains a total of $3,322,488,500, an increase of $39,935,500 over the amount of the bill as it passed the House, and a decrease of $36,133,500 under the amount passed by the Senate. The bill is $37,896,500 under the budget estimate of $3,360,385,000.

For the Treasury Department the bill now provides $599,598,000; for the Post Office Department, $2,721,720,500; for the Tax Court of the United States, $1,170,000.

On amendments Nos. 1 and 4, the House receded, permitting the office of a third Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to be continued, and supplying $30,000 for the salaries of that Assistant Secretary and his assistants.

In regard to amendment No. 2, the House had allowed 50 of the 100 additional automobiles requested by the Internal Revenue Service for Alcohol and Tobacco Tax investigators. The Senate had recommended 100. The conferees agreed on 75, thus providing needed transportation for the investigators enforcing these provisions of law.

The conferees agreed on a total of $282,250,000 for the Internal Revenue Service, thus enabling the Service to hire needed additional tax enforcement agents to its staff during the coming year. This is a reduction of $3,750,000 from the amount recommended by the Senate, and an increase of the same amount over that provided by the House.

The Senate receded on amendment No. 5, "Payments for Special Services" in the Post Office Department. This item was requested in the budget, was deleted by the House, and was restored by the Senate. It would have permitted the Post Office Department to credit to postal revenues $10,362,000 from the general fund of the Treasury for items which by law are mailed free of charge, at less than cost, or, in the case of the transportation of United States mail by foreign carriers, the excess of the Universal Postal Union rate over the rate prescribed for United States carriers. It would not have increased the appropriation. However, there was some thought that this might better be considered by the proper legislative committees, and so I recommend to the Post Office Department that avenue of approach.

For amendment No. 6, Post Office "Operations," the House had granted $1,850,000,000; and the Senate, $1,886,363,000. The conferees agreed on $1,870,000,000—a figure $20 million over the House figure and $16,363,000 under the Senate figure.

For amendment No. 7, Post Office "Transportation," the House had recommended $648 million, and the Senate $675,241,000. The conferees agreed on $661,620,500. This is $13,620,500 under the Senate figure and the same amount over the House figure.

For amendment No. 8, the conferees agreed on an amount of $157,400,000. This is $2,400,000 over the House figure and the same amount under the Senate figure.

The principal question involved in the last three amendments was one of mail volume. The House believed that the Post Office Department's estimate of contemplated mail volume was likely to be overstated. The Senate's position was that recent experience, according to the Post Office Department, indicated that mail volume might well be understated, rather than overstated, and that important expansions and improvements in service might be placed in jeopardy if these cuts were maintained. The compromise arrived at will certainly alleviate this situation.

Amendment No. 9, as provided by the Senate, granted the United States Tax Court an additional $135,000, and was a supplemental budget estimate, not considered previously by the House. The House conferees agreed to this amendment, which would provide salary increases for members of the Tax Court, as provided by Public Law 9, which this Congress passed.

I believe that the conference report is a reasonable compromise between the Senate and House positions, and I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he remembers the amount voted for the item providing for the improvement of buildings and quarters in which the postal employees work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The House conferees and Senate conferees compromised 50–50 on that "Facilities" item.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from Virginia remember the amount?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The original budgeted amount was $159,800,000 for "Facilities," of which $9,500,000 was for the building-improvement program. The House cut "Facilities" by $4,800,000, which the Senate restored. The conferees split the total difference.

Mr. CARLSON. As I remember, the House voted a total of $4,800,000 less than the amount requested for "Facilities," and the modernization program might therefore have been affected.

Regardless of that, the amount agreed to in the conference report for the appropriation is, as I understand, a 50–50 compromise between the amount voted by the House and the amount voted by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that is correct.

The postal authorities were not too much disturbed over the compromise to which we agreed. We feel that suitable progress in respect to better lighting facilities, and so forth, can be made with the amount agreed upon. The conferees on the part of the Senate were not able to have the report include the increased amount voted by the Senate, but were able to include half of that amount. We thought we had better compromise on that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that I think the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia has done an excellent job in connection with the report. I know some of the difficulties connected with it.

I have mentioned this item because there are post offices which certainly need improvement in respect to the working conditions of the employees; and I am happy to have funds for that purpose made available.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate as a whole fully agreed with the distinguished Senator from Kansas; and in the conference the conferees on the part of the Senate voted for the full amount of the budget estimate; we did not think it too much. But the amount which we were able to have the House conferees accept, and which is contained in the conference report, will enable the Post Office Department to take care of the most urgent cases. We shall certainly consider the matter again next year.

The large increase in the bill, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas knows, is the $20 million-plus for operations, and another large item was for the uniforms for which Congress had made provision. Of course, if an employee is promised a uniform, it cannot be said, "Let us cut it in half."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, under the customary 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS IN THE CASE OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EQUALIZATION OF CERTAIN RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the borrowing authority, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

STUDY ENTITLED "CORPORATE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Commission's study entitled "Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers on the files of the Veterans' Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposal (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as it relates to the special school milk program, to the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has enacted legislation to increase milk consumption in the schools of the Nation; and

"Whereas the benefits of this legislation have been extended to all States without regard to milk production within the States; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has been excluded from participation in this program and thereby denied the benefits enjoyed by the States of improved child health through the stimulation of milk consumption and the development of milk drinking habits; and

"Whereas the exclusion of the Territory of Hawaii from participation in the national school milk program is discriminatory to Hawaii: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to extend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as it relates to the special school milk program, to the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 33

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation permitting the conveyance of public lands at Weliweli, Kona, Island of Kauai, T. H., to certain claimants

"Whereas for over 25 years there has existed a dispute between the Territory of Hawaii and various private parties as to the legal ownership of a tract of land situate at Weliweli, Kona, Island of Kauai; and

"Whereas the Territory contends that the land is now and always has been government land; and

"Whereas a number of persons have heretofore purchased in good faith and for adequate consideration from private sources lots in said tract of land; and

"Whereas the sale of these lots to such persons was made upon the assumption that said lots were private property and not government land; and

"Whereas it is just and equitable that the government quitclaim its title to said lands for a fair consideration to those person or persons claiming under color of title: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested, any provision of the laws of Hawaii relating to public lands and section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary notwithstanding, to enact legislation permitting the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the governor, and two-thirds of the members of the board of public lands to convey by quitclaim deeds to the person or persons claiming under color of title any lot in the tract of land described as follows:

" 'PORTION OF THE GOVERNMENT LAND OF WELIWELI AT WELIWELI, KONA, KAUAI

" 'Being portion of the government land of Weliweli occupied and claimed by various persons as portions of grant 1408 to Kauiahewa and grant 1416 to Eke Opunui.

" 'Beginning at a pipe in ahu at the northwest corner of this parcel of land and on the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli, said pipe in ahu marking the end of course 40 of land Court Application 956 and being the initial point of lot A of Land Court Application 1188, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23298.80 feet south and 2361.40 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

" '1. 261° 57' 30" 328.40 feet along Land Court Application 1188 to a pipe;

" '2. 14° 22' 00" 573.10 feet along grant 1408 to Kauiahewa to a pipe set in top of stone wall.

" '3. 117° 30' 00" 46.10 feet along R. P. 3750 L. C. Aw. 3359, Apana 1 to Niihau to a pipe;

" '4. 348° 30' 00" 102.90 feet along R. P. 3750, L. C. Aw. 3359, Apana 1 to Niihau to a pipe;

" '5. 14° 22' 00" 86.36 feet along grant 1408 to Kauiahewa and grant 1416 to Eke Opunui;

" '6. 105° 35' 00" 21.81 feet along Land Court Application, 1373;

" '7. 8° 38' 00" 112.00 feet along Land Court Application 1373 to seashore at high-water mark;

" 'Thence along seashore at highwater mark for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seashore being:

" '8. 68° 56' 30" 117.28 feet;

" '9. 74° 53' 00" 54.75 feet;

" '10. 65° 18' 00" 173.90 feet; thence

" '11. 193° 27' 932.00 feet along the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli to the point of beginning and containing a Gross Area of 260,335 Square Feet after deducting and excluding therefrom the following-described parcel of land being the present Kuai and Poipu Roads and additional areas required for widening said roads to a width of 50 feet:

" 'Beginning at the west corner of this parcel of land, on the new south side of Poipu Road and on the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23902.35 feet south and 2217.06 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

" '1. 193° 27' 00" 50.03 feet along the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli;

" '2. 285° 33' 00" 96.98 feet along the new north side of Poipu Road;

"'3. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 239° 55' 30" 28.59 feet;

"'4. 194° 18' 00" 565.43 feet along the new west side of Kuai Road;

"'5. Thence along the west side of Kuai Road, on a curve to the left with a radius of 329.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 192° 58' 04" 38.55 feet;

"'6. 261° 57' 30" 52.91 feet along Land Court Application 1188;

"'7. Thence along the new east side of Kuai Road, on a curve to the right with a radius of 879.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 12° 23' 13" 58.69 feet;

"'8. 14° 18' 00" 567.39 feet along the new east side of Kuai Road;

"'9. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 329° 55' 30" 27.97 feet;

"'10. 285° 33' 00" 107.56 feet along the new north side of Poipu Road;

"'11. 14° 22' 00" 39.81 feet along grant 1416 to Eke Opunui;

"'12. 105° 33' 00" 21.81 feet along Land Court Application 1373;

"'13. 8° 33' 00" 10.28 feet along Land Court Application 1373;

"'14. 105° 33' 00" 272.98 feet along the new south side of Poipu Road to the point of beginning and containing an area of 46410 square feet.

"'Reserving also to the Territory of Hawaii in perpetuity an easement fifteen (15) feet wide for storm drain purposes upon and across that portion of the government land of Weliweli occupied by the B. D. Baldwin Trust Estate, running from the new south side of Poipu Road to the sea, described as follows:

"'Being a strip of land 15.00 feet wide, extending for 7.50 feet on each side of the centerline described as follows:

"'Beginning at the north end of this right-of-way on the new south side of Poipu Road, at a point which is 105° 33' 00" 131.49 feet from the end of Course is of the road exclusion as described above, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAAU-KAHI" being 23940.28 feet south and 2353.37 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 359° 19' 00" 178.00 feet to seashore at highwater mark.'

"SEC. 2. The lots shall be conveyed for a fair and reasonable price, which price shall be determined by a disinterested appraiser or appraisers, but not more than three to be appointed by the Governor of Hawaii, and all improvements thereon shall be valued at $1.00.

"SEC. 3. Before the commissioner executes quitclaim deeds, the respective claimants shall quitclaim to the Territory any claim they may have in and to the roadways hereinabove described, and confirm the easement hereinabove referred to.

"SEC. 4. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 5. The joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved the 13th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 35

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation granting the status of public lands to certain tidal reef lands and authorizing the Commissioner of Public Lands to lease same for a period of 55 years

"Whereas that certain tidal reef lying off the Ala Moana Park in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., and being bounded by the Kewalo Channel, the Kewalo Basin, the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor Channel, and the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor, is not devoted to any beneficial or economic use; and

"Whereas said tidal reef is capable of being developed as a resort and recreation area to the great advantage of the people of Hawaii and the enhancement of the tourist industry provided the Territory is able to lease the same for a term of years sufficient to permit the expense of such development to be capitalized; and

"Whereas to effect such a long-term lease of said tidal reef congressional authority is required: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands with the consent of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands, Territory of Hawaii, to lease certain tidal reef lands for a term not to exceed 55 years; and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested and urged to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"'A bill granting the status of public lands to certain tidal reef lands and authorizing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to lease same for a term not to exceed 55 years

"*'Be it enacted, etc.—*

"'SECTION 1. The tidal reef lands described in section 2 of this act are hereby given the status of public lands within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141) and placed under the control of the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, interposes no objection thereto, the Commissioner of Public Lands with the consent of the Board of Harbor Commissioners and the approval of two-thirds of the Board of Public Lands, Territory of Hawaii, is authorized to lease all or any portion of said tidal reef lands for terms not to exceed 55 years and to permit or require the filling of said tidal reef lands and the use thereof for private or public purposes. Any such lease shall be sold at public auction and may contain such terms, covenants, and conditions as the Commissioner of Public Lands may deem proper and as are approved by the said Board of Public Lands.

"'SEC. 2. The tidal reef lands to which this act refers are more particularly described as follows:

"'Portion of Ala Moana Reef area.

"'Kukuluaeo and Kalia, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.

"'Beginning at the northeast corner of this parcel of land and on the south boundary of Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928), the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station 'Punchbowl' being 8,958.47 feet south and 1,669.86 feet east, as shown on Government survey registered map 1986, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 18°15'30" 2,048.55 feet;

"'2. 45°00' 325.31 feet along area transferred to the Territory of Hawaii by Presidential proclamation 1856, dated October 27, 1928;

"'3. 117°32'05" 5,391.68 feet along line of breakers;

"'4. 214°00' 940.98 feet;

"'5. 276°52'30" 1,029.97 feet;

"'6. 212°55' 520.00 feet to the south corner of addition to Kewalo Basin (Governor's Executive Order 1330);

"'7. 307°55' 496.30 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'8. 291°44' 437.70 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'9. 286°37' 173.30 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'10. 278°56' 412.60 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'11. 287°07' 718.00 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'12. 292°09' 476.80 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'13. 297°52' 359.40 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928);

"'14. 285°05' 1,040.00 feet along Ala Moana Park (Governor's proclamation dated January 16, 1928) to the point of beginning and containing an area of 222.684 acres.

"'SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 36

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the restrictive covenant in land patent No. 10,410

"Whereas land patent No. 10,410, covering certain lands at Ponahawai, South Hilo, Island of Hawaii, contains a restrictive covenant requiring that said lands be used for school purposes only; and

"Whereas the owners and users of said lands desire to have their premises usable for both religious and school purposes: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"'A bill to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs and assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.

"*'Be it enacted, etc.,* That the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the consent of the Governor of said Territory of Hawaii, be authorized to amend the restrictive covenant set forth in land patent No. 10,410, so that said restrictive covenant will read as follows:

"'"The land herein described and conveyed is granted and conveyed upon the covenant running with the land, that said land is to be used for religious and/or school purposes only, and in the event of its being used for other than religious and/or school purposes, this patent shall become void, and the whole of said land, together with the fee thereof, and the improvements thereon, shall, without warrant or other legal process, immediately revert to and revest in the Territory of Hawaii."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to place under control of the Territory lands held but not in use by the Armed Forces

"Whereas large areas of the lands in the Territory of Hawaii held by the Armed Forces of the United States are not being used by the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the use of these lands by the Territory would prove of great benefit to the people of Hawaii: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be requested to place under the control of the Territory all lands held by the United States Armed Forces and not being used by them as determined by the duly authorized and empowered agencies or departments of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 13th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by Bushwick Council, No. 132, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of the Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1718. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954; with an amendment (Rept. No. 368).

JURISDICTION OVER CRIMINAL OFFENSES ARISING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS TO CERTAIN STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. 357)

Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 51) to amend the act entitled "To confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2025. A bill for the relief of Filippo Alcolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2026. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with and among the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of tung oil and of those engaged in the domestic tung nut and tung oil producing industry, to promote the export trade of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 2028. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2029. A bill to change the name of Hulah Dam and Hulah Reservoir, located on Caney River, a tributary of Verdigris River, to Lake O' the Osages Dam and Lake O' the Osages, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2030. A bill for the relief of Chuzo Tamotzu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2031. A bill for the relief of Gurli Thovtrup Putnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2032. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered the adopted child of a deceased individual where such individual, before his death, had filed an appropriate petition for the adoption of such child; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 2033. A bill to provide for the creation of an Office of Administrator for Legal Assignments for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 2034. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2035. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Hernandez-Valencia;

S. 2036. A bill for the relief of Rosa Roppo; and

S. 2037. A bill for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child Hans Knoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1048, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON NEW YORK HARBOR, ENTRANCE CHANNELS, AND ANCHORAGE AREA (S. DOC. NO. 45)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated February 16, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the New York harbor, entrance channels, and anchorage area, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, June 9, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the report was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson, reassigned; and

Richard Lee Jones, of Illinois, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to Liberia, vice Jesse D. Locker, deceased.

I wish to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there was published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star an article by an able columnist, Mr. Gould Lincoln, which bears directly on the report which was made to the President by Secretary Dulles with respect to his accomplishments on his last trip to Europe. This article is such a worthy tribute to Mr. Dulles and the President, in connection with our foreign policy, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES BRINGS HOME THE BACON

(By Gould Lincoln)

For 2½ years two steadfast men—President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles—have followed a policy and program they believed would make war less certain and peace a better prospect. It has been tough going. But over the last weekend the Secretary of State brought home the bacon—a large slice, any way you look at it. Finally, the way was cleared for a united Western Europe, with the German republic integrated. It becomes a member of NATO and is able to rearm. The Austrian treaty of peace was signed, making that country an independent nation again after 17 years. A neutral nation—but neutral along the lines of a neutral Switzerland. It can rearm for its own defense.

AT THE SUMMIT

The President and his Secretary of State, with these successes in sight, recently agreed to engage in a four-power conference "at the summit"—the heads of governments taking part—which would involve the United States, Britain, France, and Soviet Russia. The purpose: To explore the world situation. Immediately there arose a clatter—such a conference, it was shouted, would mean appeasement of the Communists; it could result only in loss by the United States and the other nations of the free world. It came principally from Republican throats. Eisenhower and Dulles, it was implied, if not actually predicted, would sell us down the river. The answer is simple and easy to make—Eisenhower and Dulles have never appeased the Reds in any item. Why, therefore, should they appease them now—particularly when the situation of the free world has vastly improved?

While President Eisenhower has had strong and able support of the Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and other Democrats, in and out of Congress, in his conduct of foreign policy, there have been plenty of Democrats to charge, not that the President and the Secretary of State were engaged in appeasement, but that they were insulting our close friends abroad, and bringing about hatred for America and loss of prestige abroad. These charges were made no longer ago than April 16—when Democrats gathered here from all parts of the country to honor Speaker SAM RAYBURN. But what is the real truth? Our allies are closer than ever before, first, because they see the results of our program, and second, because they understand our aims better—and the principal aim is peace. Further, the prestige of the United States abroad, instead of being diminished, has mounted.

APPEASEMENT OUT

President Eisenhower, when questioned at his most recent press conference, flatly rejected any idea of appeasement of the Communists as a possible result of the coming four-power conference. Rightly or wrongly, the President and his Secretary of State have come to the conclusion that out of a conference of heads of Government, including the President himself, some good may come. Fulfilling his promise to go anywhere, any time, to help the cause of international peace, the President has joined in the invitation to the Russian Communists for a conference—an invitation which has now been accepted. He has warned the American people, however, against too sanguine hopes. No Communist wool has been pulled over the President's eyes. He understands today—just as he did yesterday and the day before—that the goal of the Communists is world domination. Nevertheless, he is willing now to sit down with the Soviet Russians to review the world situation, on the chance that the latter are willing to take another look before they force hot war upon the world.

Mr. Dulles has been the butt of partisan jokes as the greatest traveler since the Sphinx sat itself down in the Libyan Desert. He has been the greatest traveler. He has shuttled back and forth across the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. In 1 week he flew twice across the Atlantic. He has been indefatigable. The laugh, however, is his. For he has succeeded far beyond the imagination of his detractors.

FLOOD THREATS IN BRADY CREEK WATERSHED, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday morning radio and television programs in the Washington area carried alarming reports of flood threats in the Brady, Tex., area. Heavy, concentrated rainfall in the Brady Creek watershed, an area of 846 square miles, sent water pouring into Brady Creek, which has flooded frequently in the past.

The first reports indicated that this flood would be a repetition of past disaster. People were being evacuated from the town of Brady. Sandbag barriers were erected in the downtown area. Store windows were boarded up. The National Guard was called out, and the Red Cross ordered cots and blankets sent into the area.

As a Senator from Texas I was greatly concerned. As soon as I could get through a telephone call I talked with my friend, Bob Bray, publisher of the Brady Herald, to obtain an up-to-the-minute report on the situation.

Mr. Bray told me that measures had been taken to meet the danger of a flood, but that he believed Brady Creek would not reach flood stage.

Later in the day I received the following telegram from Mr. Bray:

> Your telephone call offering assistance in our emergency strongly appreciated. Dick Winters credits structures completed on Brady Creek watershed project with preventing disastrous flood. Strongly urge your continued support in speedy completion of this project.

I knew exactly what the telegram meant.

The Brady Creek watershed project is a project authorized by the Congress of the United States, calling for the building of 46 water-retarding structures on the creek. That project has been proceeding slowly because of inadequate appropriations. But 4 of the dams already have been completed.

Mr. President, those four dams are credited with saving the Brady area from a disastrous flood this week.

That fact, in my judgment, emphasizes the importance of going forward with this project—and similar authorized projects, wherever they may be located—with as much speed as possible.

The Dick Winters mentioned in Mr. Bray's telegram is president of the Brady Creek Watershed Association. Mr. Winters has led the far-sighted effort on behalf of this upstream flood-control and water-conservation project. He has been joined by numerous other progressive citizens—Mr. Joe T. Ogden; Mr. Bray; Mr. L. B. Smith, publisher of the Brady Standard; Mr. Earl Rudder, of Brady, Texas land commissioner; Mr. A. H. Floyd, principal of the Brady Junior High School; and others who have been instrumental in securing substantial local cash participation in this project.

Mr. President, I am proud of the part I have had in forwarding the Brady Creek watershed project. I am deeply gratified that I am able to give this report to the Senate of the beneficial results already obtained from completion of a fractional part of the work.

This is American Government at its best—cooperation between Washington and a Texas community in the interest of all the people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I was present in the sessions of the Committee on Appropriations when the items involving this particular project were under consideration. It is most gratifying to me, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to see that the moneys appropriated and expended have brought such great benefits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it was 179 years ago that the American people declared themselves free and independent. With the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, the people of America started building the greatest country on earth.

Today, Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Senate an event that took place more than 1 full year prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

It is an event to which the people of North Carolina point with a great deal of pride. On May 20, 1775, the people of Mecklenburg County met and adopted the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. That declaration—adopted more than a year prior to July 4, 1776, mind you—gave notice to the New World that the people of Mecklenburg County were a free and independent people.

Over the years since that great event, the people of Mecklenburg County have joined in colorful celebration each May 20 to pause and take notice of the action of their forefathers. At this very moment, this event is being celebrated again in the city of Charlotte.

Through the years there has been some controversy among historians over the Mecklenburg Declaration. It seems that the actual records of the meeting at which the declaration was adopted were destroyed in a fire.

Whether or not actual records exist of the historic meeting is unimportant. The important thing is the fact that the people of North Carolina took determined action to satisfy their hunger for freedom long before the Declaration of Independence was signed.

It is fitting, Mr. President, that today there sits in the diplomatic gallery a scholar who is intimately connected with Mecklenburg County and the events surrounding the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. He is Dr. Archibald Henderson, one of the outstanding scientists, historians, biographers, and philosophers of our time. His great-great-grandfather settled in Mecklenburg County and was the county's first high sheriff. Throughout America, Dr. Henderson is known as one of the most learned scholars in the field of North Carolina history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Henderson be permitted to rise and be recognized.

The President pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

(Thereupon, Dr. Henderson rose from his place in the gallery, and was greeted with applause.)

Mr. SCOTT. The Mecklenburg Historical Association has just published a booklet by Dr. Henderson entitled "Cradle of Liberty," which I plan to put into the hands of each Member of Congress. The book is the latest work on the Mecklenburg Declaration and is a fine account of that historic event.

Today, Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate the five resolves of the Mecklenburg Declaration. They contain stirring words, and reflect the hopes and dreams of a freedom-loving people. In every sense of the word, they speak for themselves.

The Mecklenburg Declaration reads as follows:

1. That whosoever directly or indirectly abetted, or in any way, form, or manner, countenanced the unchartered and dangerous invasion of our rights, as claimed by Great Britain is an enemy to this country, to America, and to the inherent and inalienable rights of man.

2. We, the citizens of Mecklenburg County, do hereby desolve the political bands which have connected us to the mother country, and hereby absolve ourselves from all allegiance to the British Crown, and abjure all political connection, contract, or association with that nation, who have wantonly trampled on our rights and liberties—and inhumanly shed the innocent blood of American patriots at Lexington.

3. We do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people, are, and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing association, under the control of no power other than that of our God and the general government of the Congress to the maintenance of which independence, civil and religious, we solemnly pledge to each other, our mutual cooperation, our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honor.

4. As we now acknowledge the existence and control of no law or legal officer, civil or military, within this county. We do hereby ordain and adopt, as rules of life, all, each, and every of our former laws—wherein, nevertheless, the Crown of Great Britain never can be considered as holding rights, privileges, immunities, or authority therein.

5. It is also further decreed that all, each, and every militia officer in this county is hereby reinstated in his former command and authority; he acting conformable to these regulations. And also, that every member present of this delegation, shall henceforth be a civil officer, viz a justice of the peace in the character of a committeeman to preserve peace, union, and harmony in said county and to use every exertion to spread the love of country and fire of freedom throughout America, until a more general organized government be established in the province.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to commend my distinguished colleague for calling the attention of the Senate to the historic fact that the people of Mecklenburg County in North Carolina declared themselves to be free and independent of England long before the National Declaration of Independence was written.

MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that we note the death of Mary McLeod Bethune, a woman whose outstanding ability and warm sense of humanity have contributed so much to our country.

Dr. Bethune was the founder of the National Council of Negro Women and served for many years as its president. She was also a cofounder and president of Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Fla. Her public service included the directorship of the Division of Negro Affairs in the National Youth Administration and special adviser to the President on minority affairs. She also served as a consultant to the American delegation at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. Among her many other activities, Dr. Bethune made an outstanding contribution as vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

But a simple recounting of her many offices does not convey the full sense of Mary Bethune's forceful though gentle influence as educator, public servant, and inspirational leader. Anyone who ever heard her speak knows what vigor and understanding she brought to these undertakings. Her wisdom and strength of personality moved others to follow her example, and her guidance was always in the direction of tolerance and good will.

While her presence will no longer be felt among us, her work and her spirit remain. The story is told that when Dr. Bethune brought a benefactor around to the small shack in which she started her college he asked, "Where is this school of which you wish me to be a trustee?" And Mary Bethune replied, "In my mind and in my soul." That is where Mary McLeod Bethune continues to live—in our minds and in our souls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news item datelined Daytona Beach, Fla., May 18, concerning the death of Dr. Bethune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARY BETHUNE, 79, EDUCATOR, IS DEAD—FOUNDER AND EX-PRESIDENT OF BETHUNE-COOKMAN COLLEGE AIDED MANY UNITED STATES AGENCIES

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., May 18.—Dr. Mary McLoed Bethune, president emeritus and cofounder of Bethune-Cookman College here, died Wednesday night at her home of a heart attack. She was 79 years old.

She was president of Bethune-Cookman College from its founding in 1904 to 1942.

During the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt the educator was director of the Division of Negro Affairs in the National Youth Administration and special adviser to the President on minority affairs.

In World War II she was special assistant to the Secretary of War for selection of the first officers candidate schools for WACs.

AIDED INTERRACIAL GOODWILL

Dr. Bethune had been called "one of the most potent factors in the growth of interracial good will in America." She was considered a dynamic speaker.

She was born at Mayesville, S. C., a daughter of Samuel and Mrs. Patsy McIntosh McLeod, and graduated from Scotia Seminary, Concord, N. C., and Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. Dr. Bethune won in 1910 an honorary A. M. from the State College at Orangeburg, S. C., and also held degrees from many other educational institutions, including Humanities and Science Doctorates, the latter from Tuskeegee Institute.

The educator started her career in 1897 as an instructor at Haines Institute, Augusta, Ga., and served in the same capacity at the Palatka (Fla.) Mission School from 1899 to 1903. In 1904 she founded the Daytona Normal and Industrial School for Girls (now Bethune-Cookman College).

At its founding the college consisted of a tiny house in a lot used for dumping, where five little girls used ink made from elderberry juice and charcoal for pencils. Last year's enrollment was 794 students, with a faculty of 42.

STARTED WITH $1.50

At the outset Dr. Bethune had $1.50. To obtain more funds, she went from door to door selling fried fish and sweet potato pies. She invited James N. Gamble, son of the founder of Procter & Gamble, who had a winter home in Daytona Beach, to visit the place.

When Mr. Gamble looked at the shack he asked: "Where is this school of which you wish me to be a trustee?"

"In my mind," she said. "And my soul."

He gave her financial aid, became chairman of the schoolboard, and was credited by Dr. Bethune with having greatly aided in the school's development.

Dr. Bethune was associate consultant to the American delegation at the original United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

Several stories were told of persons who tried to humiliate Dr. Bethune by calling her "Auntie." She always replied with great solemnity, "Which one of my sister's children are you?" She was a close friend of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and served as former President Truman's personal representative at a presidential inauguration in Liberia.

BELONG TO NEA

The National Educational Association, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, the International Council of Women of Darker Races, and the National Council of Church Women were among other groups of which Dr. Bethune had been an official and member.

Dr. Bethune founded the National Council of Negro Women and served for many years as its president. A vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, she was one of that organization's oustanding figures.

She also served as vice president of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation of the National Urban League.

The educator won the Spingarn medal and the Francis A. Drexel award for her services to the Negro race. Many other awards and medals, including the Haitian Medal of Honor, were also bestowed upon her.

She was married in 1899 to Albert Bethune. He died in 1919. They had a son, Albert.

ALLEGED ATTEMPT ON PART OF OIL AND GAS INTERESTS TO INFLUENCE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask permission to speak briefly to draw to the attention of the Senate a new and scurrilous and slanderous attempt to influence a subcommittee of the Senate by the oil and gas interests of this country.

On Wednesday last, when Mr. James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel of the city of Detroit, was beginning to give his testimony before the subcommittee holding hearings on the natural-gas bill, a slanderous mimeographed sheet was circulated at that moment in the committee room. It bore the notation at its top: "From Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association," and was circulated by a man who later described himself as an employee of that group.

Mr. Lee has been for many years a highly respected public servant in Detroit. He has earned his high place in the affections and esteem of the people of my home city by his dedicated and effective service in their behalf. I doubt if there is another man in the field of relations between a city and its utilities of his stature in these United States. For almost half a century he has spoken out for the people of Detroit and of Michigan, and he has spoken effectively and always in the highest traditions of honor.

Yet this scandal sheet, financed no doubt from the million-and-a-half-dollar slush fund the oil and gas people have thrown into this fight as a preliminary installment on the tens of millions of dollars they are prepared to spend to gain their immoral ends, accused Jimmy Lee of being "an unwitting victim of Fabian Socialist tactics." The statement was made by Mr. R. F. Windfohr, head of the oil and gas lobby.

It is slanderous on two counts: First, that Mr. Lee, an attorney of national stature, is "unwitting" in his considered opposition to the bill which proposes to give the natural gas interests a blank check to raid the bank accounts of the gas consumers of the Nation; and, second, that Mr. Lee's opposition to the bill is some sort of a socialistic tactic. On just what grounds Mr. Windfohr in his windy eloquence reaches this conclusion I do not quite know, but anyway that is what the mimeographed scandal sheet says.

The sheet, I submit, was an attempt to influence the subcommittee improperly. I am told that this invasion of the senatorial dignity is something new. I say it is something very bad.

Let me quote a little further from Mr. Windfohr's remarks. He wrote:

> Mr. Lee, in his testimony * * * apparently swallows whole the salami tactics by which socialism has been sold to many European countries—slice by slice.

I will leave it to the good judgment of my colleagues and of the American people if this is not a sly attempt to put a sinister, an alien, overtone into the present controversy.

The oil and gas association, trying to bolster a bad case, is attempting to confuse the subcommittee and the American people by these tactics. I fear we are heading to a new low in attempts to influence deliberations of Members of the United States Senate in a matter in which a few great corporations are attempting to extract hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of unearned increment from the consumers of our country.

THE ABERDEEN ANGUS CALF PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday two distinguished citizens of Texas, the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, presented to the President of the United States an Aberdeen Angus calf. They expressed the hope that the President would soon give the calf his own personal care and attention.

I understand that a survey of the White House grounds shows that there is sufficient grass on the grounds to support this beautiful Texas heifer in a manner not usually enjoyed by Aberdeen Angus calves, but in a manner which the distinguished sons of Texas would certainly like this soon-to-be famous calf to enjoy.

Therefore it seems for the next 5 years at least the calf will not only be cared for in a manner not usually enjoyed by an Aberdeen Angus calf but will also be where she can receive the personal attention of the President.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the able Senator from Vermont. As an Aberdeen-Angus breeder in Tennessee, I admire the breed. I am a lover of animals. Since it would appear that there is room on the White House grounds for only one calf, I believe it would be cruelty to the animal to leave the calf there all by herself.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume the Senator from Tennessee has in mind the $4,000 gentleman calf which is soon to find a home on the rolling pastures owned by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Since the Senator has brought up that point, I would be happy to supply the young lady with gentleman companionship.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the worst that can be said is that it was thoughtless and an oversight on the part of the distinguished gentlemen from Texas in giving the President only a heifer.

Mr. GORE. I wish to compliment those distinguished citizens of Texas in recognizing a great breed of cattle. I venture to offer to each of them a young male from my herd who will give lustrous black coats to the calves of those critters on their ranches down in Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee is indeed an expert on cattle. He knows the cattle business very well, particularly the Aberdeen-Angus breed. I should like to ask him a question. How long is a calf a calf? Would this calf be a calf in 1956, or would it by that time have become something else and be in a different category.

Mr. GORE. With proper care she might be more than a calf by then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator feel that the White House grounds under a Republican administration are sufficiently lush to make that calf a little more than a calf by 1956?

Mr. GORE. I believe that by natural processes it would be more than a calf by 1956 and would be extremely lonesome all alone on the White House lawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Vermont said that he had had the White House lawn measured and found that it would support the calf. I was wondering whether after 1956 this fine specie of beef cattle which has been presented to the President would have outgrown the facilities of the White House lawn and that it might have to go to Gettysburg.

Mr. GORE. There might be other reasons for which it would have to go to Gettysburg.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee has convinced me that that is where it belongs.

Mr. GORE. A migration entirely involuntary might be underway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator does not believe that the calf might wish to go to Texas, does he?

Mr. GORE. Of course, the calf might not be all alone in that Gettysburg migration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if morning business has been concluded, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that I hope the Senate may be able to sit rather late next week, perhaps to 7, 7:30, or even 8 o'clock in the evening, during the consideration of the road bill. In addition, some conference reports may be ready for consideration by the Senate. Among them will be the conference report on the foreign-trade bill and on the Interior Department appropriations bill. I want Senators to be on notice that the conference reports will receive prompt consideration by the Senate.

On Tuesday about 4 hours will be taken for the consideration of the President's veto message on the postal-pay bill. So far as our plans are now made, we shall

continue with the consideration of the unfinished business, the road bill, throughout the week until a vote on it is reached. I hope that Senators who plan to speak on that measure will take note of this information and prepare their statements. I hope that the Senate may be able to reach a decision on the road bill before the end of next week.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before the Senate gets down to the pending business, which is the bill to extend the Federal Aid to Highways Act, I should like to make a few remarks to the Senate by way of background and perhaps to outline to the Senate what may be coming up in the debate.

Since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works in 1948, the committee has brought to the Senate four bills proposing extensions of the Federal Aid to Highways Act. Of the four, I believe the one before us today has been the most carefully prepared and the one most geared to the conditions of tomorrow as well as of today. For instance, this year the committee proposes to establish the Federal aid to highways program on a 5-year basis instead of the customary 2 years. We do this so that we can have a firm and continuing highway program in the Nation. We do this so that the States may have a firm long commitment with which to plan and construct. This is one of the modernizing features the Senators will find in Senate bill 1048.

I would be remiss if I did not tell the Senate that the members of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works have done a magnificent job. In particular, a very fine job was done by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. For 21 days the subcommittee listened to witnesses and took enough testimony to make 1,072 pages in the hearings. I say, advisedly, that the committee heard much advice and carefully prepared its recommendations to the Senate. What we bring to the Senate today is not merely another Federal-aid-to-highways bill. It is not merely another bill to continue a program which has expired. It is a pioneering act in the field of highways and roads designed to chart a new Federal policy and an entirely new concept of highway construction.

One of the things the committee had to determine before submitting its recommendations to the Senate was how serious is the need for accelerated construction on the present 40,000 miles of interstate highways. The committee decided that the Nation is behind the times so far as interstate highways are concerned, and, accordingly, the Senate will find a new emphasis on this system in the bill.

I do not presume, on the Senate's time, to go into all the features of the bill. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is well informed and well prepared, and the members of the subcommittee are equally so, on the various aspects of the bill. I know of several members of the full committee who faithfully attended the hearings although they are not members of the Roads Subcommittee, and I daresay they are equally as well prepared.

I believe many Senators know that both in the hearings and in executive sessions the committee had to face the question of financing the program. The committee looked at one plan which called for the borrowing of $20 billion for a 10-year construction program. There was no doubt in the committee's mind that $20 billion would have built and rebuilt many, many miles of roads, but the committee was also concerned that such a proposal would have required the $20 billion to be paid back over a period of 30 years. This meant that after the 10-year building program had been completed we would still be in hock in the succeeding 20 years. The committee wondered what we might do with building highways and financing them during that 20-year period. It occurred to some of us that this would be heavy borrowing. I say "heavy," because we would have to pay nearly $11½ billion in interest on the borrowed money. This meant we would lose $1 out of every $3 for construction. The committee felt that if the highway program was really pressing, 100 cents worth of construction should be obtained for every dollar expended. I understood it was proposed that all the proceeds of the highway gasoline tax would go to pay off the $30½ billion which would be involved. This meant, of course, that the idea of no additional debt or revenue was absurd if we earmarked now all the highway gasoline tax for 30 years. In that event we would have to find a new source of revenue at the end of 10 years or stop all Federal aid entirely for the succeeding 20 years. The committee preferred to pay as you go. This matter will be more fully discussed by the junior Senator from Tennessee.

This is only one of the many problems we had to face. There is a growing national problem with which Senators and Members of the House have flirted from time to time. Many of the States have also flirted with the problem. Some Members of the Senate began to feel that the States had gone a little far with their flirtation and married the taxpayer's dollar to a destructive force. The problem to which I refer is the growing size and weight of vehicles traveling roads built to passenger-car standards. Different States for years have been conducting tests to learn what damage and wear oversized vehicles cause to our highways. During the hearings the committee was shown some pictures and some tests as to the damage done in the State of Maryland, in the nearby area, by overloaded trucks.

The various State highway departments have long been aware of this destructive force. In fact, the American Association of State Highway Officials, which is made up of the State highway engineers and State highway commissioners and highway bodies of the States, have prescribed standards of vehicle sizes and weights and most States respect them. In several cases, however, including my own State of New Mexico, the sizes of commercial vehicles have been steadily increased.

The committee thought this was the time to recognize the exhaustive tests conducted in Maryland and Idaho and the conclusive findings gleaned from those tests and try to establish a firm national policy for the highways on which taxpayers' money is used.

We are not trying to be arbitrary and we are not acting hastily. But the committee has become concerned with what we think is an accelerated practice and we felt the Congress should declare a policy with the idea of making the highway money go as far as it can and to bring this national problem somewhere into line and to establish some kind of uniformity. We do not presume to invade States' rights or to tell the States what to do. As a matter of fact, all the committee is doing in this bill is recognizing and making firm the policy the States have already recommended to the Bureau of Public Roads and to the Congress itself. This again is another problem I will leave to members of the committee for further discussion.

We have incorporated into the highway bill another feature which has been made a part of so many Federal construction laws in recent years. I refer to the Davis-Bacon Act. The committee proposes that where Federal money is used for highway construction in the interstate system the contractors be protected in one sense and that the workingman be protected in another.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that under this bill as it concerns the interstate system, the American taxpayer is going to pay 90 cents out of every dollar.

The committee recommends to the Senate the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provisions. I believe a more complete justification and discussion of this will be made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I should like to say to the Senate that I think the Davis-Bacon provisions would be most helpful to the States. When we put the Davis-Bacon provision into the law, we insured against Federal money being used to depress wages in an area. It simply means that a less conscientious and perhaps more unscrupulous contractor cannot move into an area and through his contract create local pressure for lower wages. In each of the States there are large groups of men of integrity and ability who 12 months a year regularly carry forward our highway programs. These contractors have regular crews and we know the kind of work they do and that we can depend upon them. I think these men are entitled to some protection.

The committee has established a new matching formula for the special interstate highway system. It is proposed that the Federal Government pay 90 percent of the cost, with the States paying 10 percent. This seemed to be generally desired by the States and by the President. We did not accept all the

recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Roads, although, of course, the findings of that advisory committee were known to us. We objected seriously to one feature of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, and that was the one which would have frozen the construction level of farm-to-market roads and urban developments at their present level. The freeze would have lasted for 30 years. I am quite sure that the Senators know that our farm-to-market program is still growing, and we cannot shut it off at this point.

Senate bill 1048 provides the following construction program authorization:

First. Four hundred million dollars for the primary system, which is a part of the interstate system; $300 million for the secondary system; and $200 million for the urban system for the fiscal years 1957 through 1961.

Second. It provides $1 billion for fiscal year 1957; $1.250 billion for fiscal year 1958; $1.5 billion for the fiscal year 1959; $2 billion for fiscal year 1960; and $2 billion for fiscal year 1961 for the interstate system.

Third. It provides $22 million for forest highways for fiscal year 1958 through 1961 and $24 million for forest development roads and trails for the same period.

Fourth. It provides $12 million for construction, reconstruction, and improvements of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks, monuments, and so forth, for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961.

Fifth. It provides $11 million for construction and maintenance of parkways for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961.

Sixth. It provides $10 million for construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges for Indian lands and reservations for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961.

Seventh. It authorizes $2 million for the completion of sections of important Federal-aid highways lying entirely within the public domain for each of the fiscal years 1956 through 1961.

Eighth. And it would grant the Secretary of Commerce contractual authority to acquire rights-of-way for Federal-aid highway projects in the amount of $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

In all, Senate bill 1048 would provide a grand total of $7,750,000,000 for the interstate highway system; $4½ billion for the primary, secondary, and urban systems; and $405 million for forest highways, forest development, roads and trails, and lesser roads on Government lands, over a 5-year period.

Mr. President, this is the only statement I wish to make at this particular time, unless there are some questions to be asked.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, has just outlined in a summary way the provisions of Senate bill 1048. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico was very generous in his references to the work of and the part which the junior Senator from Tennessee played in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to work with my colleagues on the Public Works Committee in the drafting of this Federal highway bill, S. 1048. The experience has been not only enjoyable, but enlightening and encouraging.

After long public hearings, which began on February 21, followed by extended executive sessions involving careful, detailed examination and differing opinions, our committee sessions ended with utmost good fellowship and genuine mutual regard. I am grateful for the opportunity I have had to work with this group of great Senators and distinguished gentlemen. Not only to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the committee, but to other Senators, too, am I grateful—the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], ranking minority member, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I shall ever be grateful for their patience and understanding in moments of trial and strain.

Our public hearings were exhaustive of the subject matter under consideration. We accorded all who desired to be heard an opportunity to appear before the committee. Each member of the committee was invited to suggest additional helpful witnesses who they thought might prove of aid. Every such suggestion was followed. So, I believe, Mr. President, that we had not only a full hearing, but an entirely fair public hearing.

Then, in executive session the entire bill was read, word for word, line for line. Many amendments were offered. Some were rejected; others accepted. Through all this, encompassing several weeks, never an unkind word, never an intolerant or even an impatient expression was heard. Though arduous, this has been a joyful work. So you can see, Mr. President, that though this work has been arduous, it has really been a work of joy. I am proud of the record of comaraderie, mutual respect, and esteem we have established. I am proud, too, Mr. President, of our handiwork.

The bill, which was finally reported from the committee, is truly a committee bill. Every member contributed to its drafting. Even the members who were finally conscientiously unable to vote to report the bill from committee contributed very substantially to the drafting of the final version.

I acknowledge that perhaps no Member was more often on the losing side, so far as amendments were concerned, than I. Though the basic framework of the bill remains, it has been materially changed and amended as a result of committee consideration and action. This is as it should be, Mr. President. A group of men can bring to bear upon a subject not only more wisdom than can one man, but a greater representation of the viewpoints of the various sections and areas of this great country, and also a greater diversity of needs.

Senate bill 1048 then, as I have said, is truly the product of group action. I think the bill embodies principles that are basically sound, principles which for the most part have been tested in a crucible of experience.

The committee became convinced that the national need for a vigorous highway improvement program was urgent. We believe that there is tremendous public interest in the development of a highway program to meet the requirements of national defense and the needs of our expanding economy.

It is obvious that our existing highways are inadequate to meet the demands of today, to say nothing of the future. Although overall expenditures for highway construction have increased consistently since World War II, we have been unable even to maintain the status quo.

We have been losing ground, Mr. President. In other words, highway deterioration has been more rapid than have been highway improvements. Little or no progress has been made in overcoming existing and prospective deficiencies caused by a constant increase in the volume of traffic and in the size and speed of the vehicles using the Nation's highways.

The increased volume of traffic is not something about which we should be fearful. The volume of motor vehicle traffic is an index to the prosperity and economic activity of the country. As the country grows, as our national economy expands, so will motor-vehicle traffic.

The committee feels that our national economic development will be seriously impaired unless our highway system—and I mean by this all our Federal-aid highway systems—is brought to a state of adequacy.

The constant death toll on our highways is appalling. It amounts to approximately 36,000 persons every year; and many, many thousands more are maimed and crippled. In addition, there is a loss of property and a loss of time from slowed-up traffic. To meet this challenge, bold action on the part of the Nation and on the part of the 48 States is required.

Mr. President, I feel indebted to President Eisenhower and to Gen. Lucius Clay for their fine contribution in dramatizing this need and in alerting Congress and the Nation to the urgency of making provision for our present highway deficiencies and for those which are in prospect.

The members of the Clay committee served, I am informed, without salary and, in some cases, without even reimbursement of expenses. All American should be grateful for the selfless efforts and magnificent contribution of General Clay and his committee. The Clay committee report and the President's message to the Congress had a profound impact not only upon your committee, but upon the country. I think it fair to say that without the President's message and the work of the Clay committee, the Congress would not have considered major highway legislation during this present session.

As the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has pointed out, we have traditionally enacted highway legislation on a biennial basis. The fact that the Senate Committee on Public Works has found unacceptable the proposed legislation recommended by President Eisenhower and General Clay should not detract from the fine public service they have rendered in this regard.

Mr. President, deeply impressed as we were, with the urgent need for a vigorous highway-improvement program, your committee has undertaken to develop a sound, constructive program which will meet the national need for better highways. We sincerely believe we have done so. At least we have tried earnestly.

The committee bill preserves and builds upon the national relationship between the Bureau of Public Roads and the various State highway departments. This relationship has been forged through years of experience and successful cooperation. We have preserved, too, the apportionment principle by which each State can be assured in advance of the amount of funds available to it. We have recommended the authorization of additional Federal funds to improve all our system of Federal-aid highways—interstate, primary, urban, and farm to market, sometimes called secondary. Your committee regards Senate bill 1048 as the embodiment of a balanced highway-improvement program, a fair program, a sound program, a constructive program, commensurate with national needs.

In the 1954 Highway Act, Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a comprehensive study, and to report to the Congress on the cost of completing all our roads and streets to standards adequate to meet our needs. The Secretary submitted this report on March 25, 1955. The contents of the report had, in the main, previously been available to General Clay and his committee; and he made generous reference to it in his report. It was published as House Document No. 120, 84th Congress. This study was the most exhaustive of its type ever made. Some of the estimates, as the Clay committee points out, may be overly optimistic. Some of the estimates may be lower than a realistic appraisal would indicate. But the report was exhaustive. It was essentially a compilation of the needs table and requirements submitted by the various State highway departments. Its conclusions were staggering. The Secretary reported that to bring all our roads and streets to a desired state of completion would require the expenditure of $101 billion during a period of 10 years.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss for a moment the figure to which I have referred, namely, $101 billion. I believe that figure has caused more confusion about proposed highway legislation than has any other single factor. The Clay committee had before it the figures Secretary Weeks subsequently supplied to our committee. In its report the Clay committee cited the compelling need, and offered certain recommendations for a solution of a part of the problem. From the very outset the figure $101 billion has been misunderstood. It has frequently been used in connection with the phrase "grand plan"; and certain proposals growing out of the Clay committee report have become known as the $101 billion highway program, when, in fact, the proposals in question constituted nothing of the sort.

In brief, Mr. President, the sum $101 billion is the estimated amount which would be spent by all levels of government—Federal, State, local, county, and municipal—if all our highways, roads, trails, and city streets were to be completed to adequate standards in 10 years. There never has been a proposal that any such sum be spent by the Federal Government, nor has there been a proposal that any such sum be spent by both Federal and State Governments on the highways known as Federal-aid highways. Furthermore, Mr. President, insofar as I know, no one has proposed a plan under which it would be guaranteed that $101 billion would be available within the next 10 years from all sources or from any source, nor has there been advanced any plan which would assure that these desirable objectives would be achieved.

At this point I wish to compliment the members of the executive branch for their cooperation with the committee in its deliberations. The Bureau of Public Roads, the Secretary of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, in fact, all the agencies from which the committee requested information and cooperation, have supplied them in full measure.

I wish particularly to express my appreciation to Mr. C. D. Curtis, Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, and to Mr. Francis V. du Pont, former Commissioner, who now is consultant to the Secretary of Commerce, for their untiring and very generous assistance to our committee.

The bill reported by the committee authorizes a program whose magnitude has perhaps been unequaled in our history, with the exception of programs for the prosecution of war and measures for the preservation of the national security. It received the most searching examination in committee. It deserves equally careful consideration by all Members of the Senate. I have the feeling that its full significance may not yet have been fully realized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend, with whom I served in the other body, and also on committees of the other body. He has contributed greatly to the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. The kindness of the Senator's remarks in yielding almost makes it embarrassing to me to say what I was about to say.

Mr. GORE. That was not the purpose of the kindness.

Mr. COTTON. One might be led to think that this exchange has been rehearsed, which, of course, is not the case.

However, I wished to interrupt the Senator for a moment at this time to say that his remarks so far have been characteristically fair and generous on his part. The credit which he has given to the executive department, to the President, and to the Clay committee is typical of the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

As one of the minority members of the committee who were unable to go along with the majority, I wish the RECORD to show—and my colleagues feel the same way—that no one could have been more fair and generous than the distinguished Senator from Tennessee or the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the full committee, in dealing with an extremely difficult and complicated problem.

Full opportunity was afforded for the expression of opinions of all members of the subcommittee, and we would like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the fine, fair, able, and masterly way in which he conducted all the hearings and all the proceedings in the subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the generosity of the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire is overwhelming. Were not one word of the proposed legislation ever to find its way into laws, the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague would be ample compensation for the weeks of labor. I thank him very sincerely.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I would not want my remarks at this point, as the only other Republican in the Chamber, to indicate any possible disagreement with the excellent comments made by our distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I have in mind making some remarks of a similar nature on my own time a little later, but until then I wish to associate myself completely with what the junior Senator from New Hampshire has said concerning the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and other Senators.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, silence on the part of the senior Senator from Connecticut is never indicative of anything. Still water runs deep.

I thank my able friend. It does not come as a surprise that he feels kindly toward me. I recall that during our first year in this body we had a minor clash or two. Out of those clashes came what I believe is truly a mutual respect, esteem, and affection. It is fully shared by me. I do not think any single member of the subcommittee, with the possible exception of the chairman, attended

more sessions of the committee than did the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut. He contributed magnificently to the bill which is now before the Senate.

Of course, it is a matter of regret that all of us cannot unanimously support the bill. But, Mr. President, that is not to be expected in the case of a bill of such magnitude as this.

As I have just said, perhaps no bill in the history of the Congress, other than those dealing with war for the preservation of the country, has encompassed a program of the magnitude envisioned in the pending bill. Therefore, it is not strange that there should be differences of opinion. Such differences of opinion are sincerely held. I wish to say, for the world to know, that even though some Members of the minority were finally unable to support the bill, they did not let that deter them one iota from contributing, in the masterly fashion in which they have contributed, toward the final result; and their contribution was great.

The committee concluded, on the basis of the evidence before it, that the question of the necessity for such a program is no longer at issue. We came to the unanimous conclusion that the need was great, and that it was urgent. Though no formal vote was taken, I believe it is fair to say that on the question of need, the committee was unanimous. I believe that a record vote on that question would have been unanimous.

Having agreed upon the necessity for an accelerated program, there remained before the committee the task of perfecting a bill best designed to discharge the Federal Government's responsibility in the field of highway construction.

Essentially, we were faced with the problem of deciding how much money should be authorized, how it should be allocated and how the program should be administered. On these questions, or some of them, there was a difference of opinion among members of the committee, as is reflected in the filing of minority views and individual views. In fact, I will say to my distinguished friend from Connecticut that he and I voted differently on certain amendments which are in the bill. There are a number of amendments in the bill for which he voted and against which I voted. As I previously stated, the bill is the product of the work of 13 men. I thank the Senator from Connecticut very genuinely for his generosity.

The committee had before it two basically conflicting methods of approach, both sincerely advocated. The first involved retention of the basic framework of our existing program with increased authorizations to meet the need and with appropriate modifications designed to insure a dollar's worth of road for every dollar of the taxpayer's money. The second method involved a radical departure from the existing program with drastic changes in emphasis and with what appeared to me to be a highly unorthodox approach to the problems of financing and administration. I acknowledge that it did not appear to some members of the committee to be an orthodox approach. That was one of the points on which there was a difference of opinion.

The majority of the committee concluded that our existing program is basically sound. It permits maximum flexibility to meet the varying needs of States, at the same time permitting coordination at the national level so as to insure proper integration of our highway network and the maintenance of adequate standards of construction. The apportionment formulas, that is, the formulas by which Federal highway funds are apportioned to the respective States as developed over the years, insure equitable distribution of Federal funds, as Congress interprets equitable distribution. Only last year we made some modification of the apportionment formula with respect to interstate highways. It may well be that it will require additional modification. I point out to my colleagues from New Hampshire and Connecticut that it was I who cast the deciding vote last year in the Public Works Committee to give added emphasis in the apportionment formula to population. Furthermore, under this program, the people, through their representatives in the Congress, retain full control of the highway program and the expenditure of Federal funds.

It may well be that as we progress with this program we shall need to review again the apportionment formula and give still more emphasis to the concentration of population. Essentially, the biggest traffic patterns appear where the most people live. Of course, there are circumstances which affect and modify that situation, such as the location of industry and the volume of through traffic from one production center to another.

Under this program, the people, through their representatives in Congress, retain full control of the highway program and the expenditure of Federal funds.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss in detail the provisions of S. 1160, known as the administration's highway bill. I daresay that further reference to it will be made before the debate is concluded. I believe it has been said that the administration bill will later be offered as an amendment. Therefore, it can then be debated at length. The majority of the committee was unable to accept the philosophy of that bill.

Mr. President, I should now like to make brief reference to S. 1160. That bill proposed that Federal contributions to the construction of primary, secondary, and urban segments of our Federal-aid system be frozen at a level of $100 million less than that provided by existing authorizations. The same amounts were permitted to stand for primary and secondary roads. That is, the amounts contained in the present law were permitted to remain for secondary roads and for primary roads. However, the authorization for urban highways was reduced by the administration bill by $100 million from its present level. The bill proposed that the entire amount of increased Federal aid be concentrated on the national system of interstate highways. The committee was disturbed by the feature of the plan which provided for the expenditure within 10 years of all the increased funds expected to be available for a period extending for at least 30 years. I refer to the funds expected to be available from fuel and lubricating-oil taxes.

Efforts on the part of the committee to elicit information as to the source of funds for improvement and extension of the interstate system after the passage of 10 years brought only the answer: "That is something that will have to be determined at that time." No specific apportionment of these funds to the States was contemplated. In fact, the apportionment formula for the interstate system would be repealed.

The expenditure of these funds was to be subject to such annual allocations as might be made periodically by the Secretary of Commerce. The majority of the committee concluded that such a program would inevitably lead to further deterioration of our primary, urban, and farm-to-market roads, which are so vital to our economy.

Still more disturbing to the committee was the method of financing suggested by S. 1160. An ingenious corporate device was proposed. This Federal corporation would be authorized to borrow money which somehow would not be national debt. It was said that the corporate bonds would be self-liquidating, yet the corporation would have no assets and no source of funds other than an indefinite appropriation at the hands of the Congress from the general revenues of the United States Treasury.

While the committee did not accept the method of approach outlined by S. 1160, there are a number of similar features in that bill and in S. 1048, the bill reported by the committee.

I say in all fairness that not only did the members of the executive branch—the President and General Clay—make a contribution to the proposed legislation now before the Senate, but the terms of S. 1160 were used in a constructive manner in developing this program. I know that I offered, as an amendment to the bill which I introduced, almost verbatim the right-of-way acquisition authority for the Secretary of Commerce as it was proposed in S. 1160. That amendment was adopted by the committee.

It might be helpful to some if the points of similarity and the points of difference between the two bills were briefly stated. In the hope that it will contribute to careful consideration, I shall now do so.

The two bills—S. 1048 and S. 1160—contain the following similar provisions:

A. The present 50–50 matching formula for primary, urban, and secondary highway projects is continued in both bills.

B. Both bills contain provisions authorizing the Federal Government to acquire highway rights-of-way when requested to do so by a State.

C. Both bills authorize greatly increased Federal expenditures for highway improvement.

D. In total amounts the 2 bills are roughly comparable, if a 10-year period is assumed for both.

E. Neither bill provides any additional revenue.

F. Neither bill has self-liquidating features, except as additional revenue will be realized from greater fuel consumption on better roads. This is inherent and substantial.

G. Both bills place major emphasis on construction of a national system of interstate highways.

Having pointed out a number of similarities between the 2 bills, I should like to list a few of the differing points of view embodied in the 2 bills.

Principal points of difference between the committee bill and the administration bill are as follows:

First. The committee bill provides increased funds for the construction and improvement of all types of Federal-aid highways.

The administration bill would place every single dollar of additional aid on the interstate highways, which, important though they are, carry only one-seventh of the traffic.

Second. The committee bill continues the apportionment formula in existing law by which each State is assured its pro rata part.

The administration bill proposes to abolish the apportionment formula and leave to the Secretary of Commerce the decision as to where, when, how, and in what amounts all funds would be spent on the interstate highways.

Third. The committee bill proposes to finance highway construction by annual appropriations from Congress, as provided by existing law.

The administration bill is an indefinite appropriation bill, proposing to appropriate an indefinite amount for an indefinite time, a minimum of 30 years, to a highway corporation, the members of which would serve without term and at the will of the President.

Fourth. Under the committee bill, if it is necessary to sell bonds to finance a highway improvement program, the taxpayers will have the advantage of the lowest possible interest rate.

The administration bill proposes the issuance of special bonds in the sum of $21 billion by the proposed Highway Corporation, said corporation being without assets or sources of revenue. These bonds, according to Secretary Humphrey, would sell at a rate of interest considerably higher than United States Government bonds.

Fifth. The committee bill provides a 90–10 matching basis for interstate highways.

The administration bill provides an approximate 95–5 matching basis for interstate highways.

I am not sure, Mr. President, that the 95–5 matching ratio is exactly correct, so I used the word "approximate." That is as near as it can be calculated by the staff of the committee.

There are certain additional provisions in the committee bill which are not contained in the administration bill some of which I wish to point out:

(a) A move to bring uniformity in vehicle weights and dimensions, as well as to place an effective stop sign against unreasonable increases in weights and sizes of trucks and buses.

(b) Some limited authority to combat obstructive and dangerous advertising along highway rights-of-way.

(c) Extends the Davis-Bacon Act to interstate highway projects in which the Federal Government, under the committee bill, would make the principal investment. The bill does not extend the act to primary, secondary, or urban projects.

So, Mr. President, I have indicated a number of points of similarity and a number of points of difference between the two bills. I have also mentioned some provisions contained in the committee bill which are not contained in the administration bill. I would not claim that I have listed every single item of similarity, or disparity, or all of the added provisions of the committee bill, but I think I have related the principal points of similarity, of difference, and the points of addition.

The bill reported by the committee proposes no major changes in the administration of the existing program. We think the present program has worked well over the years.

A detailed section-by-section analysis of the bill is contained in the committee report. It shall be my purpose to explain briefly the major provisions of the bill, and I shall be glad to undertake as best I can, to answer any questions which Senators may have about its phraseology.

Historically, highway authorizations have been enacted on a 2-year basis with sufficient lead time to permit apportionment of the funds and adequate planning and to afford the States an opportunity to take appropriate action to so arrange their finances as to be in a position to discharge their responsibilities under the program. The Highway Act of 1954 contained authorizations for fiscal 1956 and 1957. There was considerable evidence before the committee that authorizations for a longer period would permit better long-range planning, both by the Federal Government and by the States.

The funds authorized in the 1954 act will actually be used in building highways beginning on July 1 next. A highway system requires that much lead time. The funds were apportioned in June of last year. The States will start spending them on July 1 of this year. It takes time, Mr. President, for engineers to make designs for bridges and grades, and to make drawings and surveys for new highways, relocations, and improvements of existing highways. The committee felt there was some merit to extending the period from 2 years to 5 years. It was suggested that the construction industry and material suppliers would be in a better position to plan for an accelerated program if they were assured of a definite program extending for a period longer than 2 years. These arguments were persuasive to the committee.

Accordingly, the bill contains authorizations for 5 years. We considered extending the authorizations for 10 years but concluded that a 5-year period would provide a stable program and, at the same time, insure automatic review by the Congress with an opportunity to make such modifications and revisions as might appear advisable at that time. In order to provide essential lead time for necessary planning, the accelerated program will begin in fiscal 1957.

The administration bill proposed a 10-year program. Members of the subcommittee considered amending S. 1048 and making it a 10-year program. However, the committee finally concluded that a longer-term program could be accomplished by writing into the bill a statement of policy and by placing in the report a statement of policy, a determination, expressing the sense of the Congress that it was the policy and purpose to bring all Federal-aid highways into a state of adequacy, a condition adequate to handle the traffic pattern of the future. But the committee felt that there was much to be said for having a 5-year program actually authorized, with the intention of having additional programs to follow. This would preserve to Congress, as I have said, the very valuable opportunity of making a necessary review of the program 3 or 4 years from now.

The bill authorizes the expenditure of approximately $12¾ billion of Federal funds during the 5-year period. Of this amount, $12¼ billion are authorized for projects on the Federal-aid system with participation by the States. The remainder is authorized for projects located in national forests, national parks, and other areas within the public domain upon which the Federal Government assumes the entire cost of highway construction.

In arriving at the amounts contained in the bill, the committee was guided by certain principles. It was cognizant of the fact that the Federal Government has a greater interest in and a greater responsibility for highways located on the interstate system. But, at the same time, we felt that any sound program must recognize the necessity for accelerated construction on all segments of the Federal-aid system, particularly since six-sevenths of the traffic is on the systems other than interstate.

Secondly, the committee concluded that a progressive increase in total authorizations would permit an orderly acceleration of the program without disrupting the construction industry to the extent of inflating the cost of highways.

We felt that we were limited by the availability of building materials and construction facilities. Representatives of the highway-construction and building-supplies industries testified before the committee.

A bill has been reported proposing the maximum amounts which the committee believed could be expended without inflating the cost of highway construction. Had the committee thought it advisable to recommend a more vigorous program than that which is contained in S. 1048, I am sure it would have done so. The sentiment in the committee, if I interpreted it correctly, was to act as fast and as energetically as we could, while still insuring the taxpayer of receiving a dollar's worth of road for his tax dollar.

The bill contains authorizations for Federal contributions to construction on the primary, secondary, and urban systems in the total amount of $900 million

per year for each of the 5 years. This figure compares with $700 million per year provided by existing law. The cost of projects on these systems will continue to be borne 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the State governments.

While the increases provided for the primary, secondary, and urban systems are substantial, by far the largest increase is provided for the interstate system. The existing authorization for exclusive use on the interstate highway system is $175 million per year. The committee bill provides $1 billion for fiscal 1957.

To illustrate how greatly and how vigorously the committee bill steps up the Federal expenditures on the national system of interstate highways, there is available for the present fiscal year $25 million of Federal funds for interstate highways. The 1954 act, as I have said, raised that amount to $175 million a year. I recall the debate in the Senate on that law. It was referred to as the biggest highway program in the history of the United States.

Those funds, as I have previously pointed out, will become available for expenditure on July 1 of this year.

What does S. 1048 provide? Not $25 million; not $175 million; but $1 billion a year for the first year; $1,250,000,000 for the second year; $1,500,000,000 for the third year; and then, for the fourth and fifth years, $2 billion each year.

Yet some persons say the amount is still inadequate. I believe sincerely that the bill contains about as much money as the United States Government can spend on highways in the next 5 years without disrupting the cost factor, not only of the construction facilities, but also cost of supplies.

In further recognition of the greater Federal responsibility for the interstate system and in recognition of the limitations on the ability of some of the States to provide matching funds, the Federal share of the cost of projects on the interstate system is increased to 90 percent, with State participation limited to 10 percent.

I should like to review briefly the history of that provision. Until the 1954 act the States were required to match all Federal-aid highway funds on a 50–50 basis. The interstate funds were treated according to the same matching formula as were the funds for primary, secondary, and urban highways.

Last year that formula was changed for the interstate system. The Federal share was raised to 60 percent, leaving 40 percent as the share to be paid by the States. There was a close contest in the Senate Committee on Public Works on that issue. The difference in the vote was only one. I voted to raise the Federal share to 60 percent.

When S. 1048 was originally introduced it authorized use of Federal funds for interstate highways to pay 66⅔ percent of the cost, while requiring the States to contribute only 33⅓ percent.

After long hearings, the committee became convinced that the national interest in the interstate highways was paramount. The subcommittee recommended an amendment providing that the Federal Government should supply 75 percent of interstate highways funds, leaving 25 percent to be paid by the States.

The full committee considered the question further. After considering the ability of the States to match, in view of the necessities of the national economy and the national defense, the full committee felt that the early construction of the interstate highway system was so urgent that the matching formula was changed to a 90–10 percent basis.

I wish to say, in candor, that I believe the bill might still be a sounder one if the 75–25 percent basis had been retained.

I do not think it breaks any rule to say that is how I voted in the committee. However, Mr. President, I support the bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I stand here representing this product of the committee, which I declare to be good. There are other minor points in the bill as to which I found myself differing from the majority. But what of it? We did the best we could. The bill represents the composite thinking of the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate. I am proud, I repeat, of its handiwork.

It is perhaps interesting to note that in the fourth year of operation under the committee bill, the total Federal outlay on the Federal-aid system reaches two and nine-tenths billion per year. This is slightly less than the annual average of three and one-tenth billion proposed under S. 1160. The significant difference is that the committee bill, while emphasizing the interstate system, also provides increases in funds available for matching by the States for use on the primary, secondary, and urban systems. S. 1160, on the other hand, not only limited the authorization for these systems to an amount $100 million less than that now authorized, but effectively forestalled any increase whatsoever in these authorizations at any time in the foreseeable future, if there was to be any relationship between revenue from fuel oil and lubricating oil taxes and the expenditures for highways.

The bill extends the various authorizations for projects on which the Federal Government bears the full cost of construction through fiscal 1961 to conform, in period of time, to the authorization for the Federal-aid systems. The amounts authorized are the same as those provided by existing law, except in the case of funds for projects on public lands as described in section 8 of the bill, which were increased from $1 million per year to $2 million per year.

In addition to providing increased authorization, the committee added several provisions to existing law which it believes will improve the program, I shall discuss these briefly in the order in which they appear in the bill. I shall do so in the hope that it will be of assistance to Members of the Senate, and to others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in considering this vital legislative proposal.

The committee has for some time been disturbed by continued increases in the weights and dimensions of vehicles operated over highways constructed in part with Federal funds. In many instances, the size and weight of vehicles far exceed those for which our highways were designed. In such cases, rapid deterioration of the highways is inevitable. The committee did not feel that the Federal Government should seek to invade the jurisdiction of States in the exercise of their police power by entering the field of regulating or enforcing provisions relative to the size and weight of vehicles. It did feel, however, if the Federal Government was to enter into a vastly accelerated construction program, involving the payment of 90 percent of the cost of interstate projects, that, in the interest of preserving the taxpayers investment, some action to encourage the States to do a better job in this field is appropriate.

The States themselves have long recognized the desirability of uniformity of maximum weights and dimensions of motor vehicles. The American Association of State Highway Officials in 1946 adopted and published its policy in this matter, including desirable maximum weights and dimensions, and recommended that they be incorporated into State law. Many of the States have done so. In fact, some States have maximum weight and dimensional limitations which are lower than those recommended by the association. Unfortunately, however, some States have acted to permit sizes and weights in excess of the recommended standards, and in excess of the standards for design and construction even now recommended and endorsed by the Federal Bureau of Roads.

The committee did not feel that it was practicable to seek to encourage any State to roll back its laws in this respect. It was the sense of the committee, however, that some action should be taken to maintain the status quo—or, rather, to prevent further increases above the standards of design and construction of the highways to be built under this program.

To achieve this objective, the bill provides that apportionment of interstate funds shall be withheld from any State which permits the use of its highway by vehicles with weights or dimensions in excess of the larger of first, those permitted under State law in effect on May 1, 1955, or second, those recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials in their policy statement adopted in 1946. Under this provision, any State having laws imposing maximum weights or dimensions lower than the recommended standards will be free to raise them to the recommended standards. However, those States which now permit maximum weights or dimensions equal to, or in excess of, the recommended standards, cannot further increase them without jeopardizing their entitlement to interstate funds authorized by the bill.

The bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to proceed as expeditiously as possible with certain road tests now planned or in progress under the auspices of the Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials, and at the conclusion thereof to report to the Congress his recommendations on this subject. The committee feels that upon receipt of the Secretary's

report, the Congress will be in a position to appraise this matter further. In the meantime, the committee feels that this effort to restrain further increases in sizes and weights will have a salutary effect.

Mr. President, let me repeat: We are undertaking a program larger than any program ever inaugurated in the history of this Government other than those for the protection and preservation of the Republic under threat of war. We are undertaking a program to build expeditiously a national system of interstate highways in which the Federal Government will make the principal investment—90 percent. Since the Federal Government is to make the principal investment, the committee felt that the Congress not only had the right, but also the responsibility, to protect the people's investment in those highways.

The Bureau of Public Roads recommends the construction of highways to carry an axleload of 18,000 pounds. Mr. President, at this time, I shall not refer in detail to various other specific recommendations of the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway officials; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the maximum standards recommended by the State highway officials in their publication in 1946.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the recommendations was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Width: No vehicle, unladen or with load, shall have a total outside width in excess of 96 inches.

(NOTE.—It is recognized that certain conditions inherent in the design of vehicles suggest the desirability of 102 inches as a standard of maximum width. The existence of numerous bridges and a large mileage of highways too narrow for the safe accommodation of vehicles of such width precludes the present adoption of the higher standard of width. The State highway departments and Public Roads Administration are urged to give consideration to the desirability of eventual provision for the accommodation of vehicles 102 inches in width in planning the reconstruction of Federal-aid and State highways.)

2. Height: No vehicle, unladen or with load, shall exceed a height of 12 feet, 6 inches.

3. Length: (a) No single truck, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 35 feet.

(b) No single bus, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 40 feet, provided that a bus in excess of 35 feet in overall length shall not have less than 3 axles.

(c) No combination of truck-tractor and semitrailer, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 50 feet.

(d) No other combination of vehicles shall consist of more than 2 units, and no such combination of vehicles, unladen or with load, shall have an overall length, inclusive of front and rear bumpers, in excess of 60 feet.

4. Speed: (a) Minimum speed. No motor vehicles shall be unnecessarily driven at such slow speed as to impede or block the normal and reasonable movement of traffic. Exception to this requirement shall be recognized when reduced speed is necessary for safe operation or when a vehicle or combination of vehicles is necessarily or in compliance with law or police direction proceeding at reduced speed.

(b) Maximum speed. No truck shall be operated at a speed greater than 45 miles per hour. Passenger vehicles may be operated at such speeds as shall be consistent at all times with safety and the proper use of the roads.

(c) Vehicles equipped with solid rubber or cushion tires shall be operated at a speed not in excess of 10 miles per hour.

5. Permissible loads: (a) No axle shall carry a load in excess of 18,000 pounds.

(NOTE.—An axle load shall be defined as the total load transmitted to the road by all wheels whose centers may be included between two parallel transverse vertical planes 40 inches apart, extending across the full width of the vehicle.)

(b) No group of axles shall carry a load in pounds in excess of the value given in the following table corresponding to the distance in feet between the extreme axles of the group, measured longitudinally to the nearest foot:

Maximum load in pounds carried on any group of axles

Distance in feet between the extremes of any group of axles:	
4	32,000
5	32,000
6	32,000
7	32,000
8	32,610
9	33,580
10	34,550
11	35,510
12	36,470
13	37,420
14	38,360
15	39,300
16	40,230
17	41,160
18	42,080
19	42,990
20	43,900
21	44,800
22	45,700
23	46,590
24	47,470
25	48,350
26	49,220
27	50,090
28	50,950
29	51,800
30	52,650
31	53,490
32	54,330
33	55,160
34	55,980
35	56,800
36	57,610
37	58,420
38	59,220
39	60,010
40	60,800
41	61,580
42	62,360
43	63,130
44	63,890
45	64,650
46	65,400
47	66,150
48	66,890
49	67,620
50	68,350
51	69,070
52	69,790
53	70,500
54	71,200
55	71,900
56	72,590
57	73,280

(c) The maximum axle and axle-group loads recommended in paragraphs (a) and (b) above are subject to reasonable reduction in the discretion of the appropriate highway authorities during periods when road subgrades have been weakened by water saturation or other cause.

(d) The operation of vehicles or combinations of vehicles having dimensions or weights in excess of the maximum limits herein recommended shall be permitted only if authorized by special certificate issued by an appropriate State authority.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for a number of years the States and the Bureau of Public Roads have suggested that greater flexibility will be possible if permission is granted that a limited amount of funds apportioned to the States for use on one segment of the Federal-aid system may be transferred to one of the other segments of the system upon which the needs in that particular State might be more urgent. The 1954 act provides that not to exceed 10 percent of the funds apportioned to either the primary, secondary, or urban systems may be transferred to either of the other. The act contains a provision which further limits the amount transferable, so as to prohibit any transfer which would increase by more than 10 percent the amount originally apportioned to any one of the systems. The committee has been advised that this feature of the 1954 act has worked well, and has facilitated the prosecution in a more orderly manner of the program in a number of States.

Mr. President, any program dealing with the magnificent, broad thoroughfares which are called the interstate highways, and with the urban highways and primary highways, and down to the farm-to-market highways in 48 States and some of the Territories must have flexibility. It must have written into it, inherent in it, the capacity of modification to meet the demands of the respective States and communities. The committee was prepared to provide for that. We were pleased with the reports we had from the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, on the working of this provision. Representatives of the States have suggested that transfer authority up to 25 percent would be desirable. The committee was not prepared to go that far, but does recommend that this authority be increased from 10 percent to 20 percent.

The committee also visualizes that there might be some instances in which it would be desirable to transfer interstate funds to primary, secondary, or urban projects, or vice versa. Accordingly, transfer authority was extended to interstate funds. In view of the difference in matching ratio in interstate funds, however, the bill further provides that the Federal Government's share of the cost of any project financed with transfer funds shall not exceed 50 percent.

If the proposed new interstate system is to attain maximum usefulness by serving the large volume of traffic for which it is designed, it is essential that authority for control of access be provided to the extent required in the area in which the highway is located. The committee does not expect absolute uniformity in this regard, but expects that interstate traffic shall be accorded consideration equal to that accorded intrastate traffic, and vice versa. The committee was impressed with statistics presented, which not only indicated that highways with

controlled access are able to accommodate a larger volume of traffic, but also showed that the incidence of accidents thereon is much lower than on highways without access control. I acknowledge that on this subject my own thinking underwent considerable modification.

Some States, because of a lack of statutory or congressional authority, do not have legal means of acquiring and maintaining a controlled access right-of-way. That problem faced the committee, which decided to deal with it in the manner recommended in the administration bill. Section 4 of the bill provides that in such cases, and upon request of the State, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to acquire within the State a controlled access right-of-way, provided the Secretary determines that the State is unable to secure such right-of-way with reasonable promptness, and provided the State agrees to reimburse the Federal Government its pro rata share of the cost. It is the intent of the bill that in instances in which the provisions of section 4 are used, the Federal Government is, in practical effect, acting as the agent of the State, and can act in that manner only upon the request of the State. Upon acquisition of such rights-of-way at the request of the State, the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey the right-of-way to the State, retaining only the outside 5 feet, so as to permit control of access. Whenever the State is in a position to maintain control of access, the remaining 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

In the same section of the bill, there is language relating to outdoor advertising adjacent to the right-of-way. Some of our States have acted to regulate or control such advertising. The committee feels that the State is the proper agency to regulate such matters. It appeared to the committee that in instances in which the State requests the Secretary of Commerce to acquire a right-of-way, it would be advisable to grant the Secretary permissive authority to purchase the exclusive advertising rights along a strip of land adjacent to the right-of-way. Mr. President, before the committee there was testimony that in the State of New York, where a new highway had been constructed, the advertising rights along or within a strip adjacent to the right-of-way had been acquired for the nominal sum of approximately only $100 a mile. The bill provides, however, that in the event any such rights are so acquired, they shall be conveyed to the State, without restrictions, at the same time when the right-of-way is conveyed, thus insuring that State jurisdiction over such matters is preserved without question.

In order to expedite initiation of interstate projects, section 5 of the bill grants to the Secretary of Commerce contract authority to the extent of $100 million, to be used for the acquisition of rights-of-way for the proposed interstate system during the fiscal year 1956. In other words, Mr. President, the committee has included a provision by means of which this program, if enacted, can get under way on July 1, 1955.

Construction funds would not be apportioned until July 1, 1956, for the fiscal year 1957, but if this program were enacted, the Secretary of Commerce could begin on July 1 a vigorous program of right-of-way acquisition. The funds could be apportioned, surveys could be made, designs prepared, blueprints drawn, and the program vastly accelerated.

This provision does not constitute an additional authorization of funds. Any funds unexpended pursuant to this authorization are to be charged against subsequent apportionments to the States in which expended. The committee believes that this provision will permit actual initiation of construction during the fiscal year 1957, without the necessity of delays occasioned by the acquisition of rights-of-way.

The estimate of $100 million was supplied to the committee by the Bureau of Public Roads. The committee accepted the recommendation of the Bureau of Public Roads in that respect.

For a number of years, the committee has had under consideration the problems faced by utilities who are forced to relocate their facilities as a result of highway construction or reconstruction. In many instances, the utilities concerned, particularly the small ones, find it almost impossible to finance the capital outlay required for such relocation. Under an accelerated construction program such as is provided for under the bill, the problem will become even more acute. The utilities point out that in most instances they receive no benefit whatsoever from such relocation and they urge that, to the extent they are not benefited, the cost of such relocation should be considered as a normal part of the cost of highway construction, with appropriate reimbursement to the utilities. This has been a troublesome problem to the committee. For one, I have resisted the payment of reimbursement of these costs, but the problem remains without solution. As I have stated, it becomes more pressing particularly as a result of the unprecedented highway construction and improvement program which is proposed.

The seriousness of this problem was recognized last year by the committee. The 1954 act directed the Secretary of Commerce to study the subject and to report to the Congress. This study, filed this year, indicates that the utilities are, in fact, subjected to considerable financial burdens as a result of relocations. Some States have recognized the equity of the relocation problem and already, by law or practice, reimburse utilities for costs properly attributable to relocations necessitated by highway construction. In such cases, the Federal law provides that Federal funds may be used to pay the Federal Government's pro rata share of any such reimbursement with respect to a Federal-aid project. In many of the States, however, the entire cost must be borne by the utilities.

Thus, the Federal Government was in the incongruous position of paying 50 percent, or even up to 60 percent, of the cost of relocation of utilities in some States, and paying no part of the cost in other States. I believe it is fair to say that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was most persuasive in this regard, and more effective, perhaps, than any other member of the subcommittee. Perhaps I should not make comparisons, but I believe it is fair to say that no member of the subcommittee was more effective in working out a formula acceptable to the committee, which we hope will provide a solution for this problem. In the end I supported the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The committee believes there is merit in the position taken by the utilities. Section 11 of the bill authorizes the use of Federal funds to pay 50 percent of such relocation costs occasioned by the construction of a Federal-aid project, without regard to whether reimbursement is made by the State. In other words, this provision now places the Federal Government in the position of treating alike all utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, no matter in what State they may be. This provision does not affect or limit the right of the utilities to receive reimbursement in excess of 50 percent from both the Federal Government and the States in those States in which reimbursement is already made.

The bill specifically limits the amount of funds that may be used for this purpose to 2 percent of the State's apportionment. Should relocation costs, otherwise reimbursable, exceed this amount, pro rata distribution will be effected.

Section 11 specifically provides that such reimbursement shall be available to any utility, whether publicly, privately, or cooperatively owned. Care is taken to insure that in arriving at the cost upon which reimbursement is to be based, full consideration is to be given to any betterment accruing to the utility as a result of relocation, and to the salvage value of the old facility.

Existing law authorizes the designation of 40,000 miles of the primary highway system as a national system of interstate highways. Of this total authorization, some 37,600 have been designated. The remaining 2,400 miles have been reserved to permit designation of circumferential routes and connecting links in urban areas. The Bureau of Public Roads indicated to the committee that it has already received requests for such designations in urban areas far in excess of 2,400 miles, and it appears to the committee that this 2,400 miles will be insufficient for the purposes for which they were reserved. In addition, witnesses appeared before the committee to urge designation of additional important routes as a part of the interstate system.

Individual members of the committee suggested other routes, with respect to which meritorious considerations were offered warranting their inclusion in the interstate system. Under these circumstances, the committee considered it advisable to increase the maximum authorization from 40,000 miles to 42,500 miles for the interstate system. That provision will be found in section 12 of the bill. The additional interstate mileage is to be designated in accordance with the same procedures and in accordance with the same criteria applicable to the original 40,000 miles. The committee did not

undertake to designate a particular road as an interstate highway. The committee felt that decision of that question should properly be reserved to the Department of Commerce. As a safeguard the committee went so far as to request the Bureau of Public Roads, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to submit the criteria and indices by which the additional interstate mileage will be designated. With 2,400 miles of the existing 40,000 limitation still remaining undesignated, plus 2,500 included in the bill, there would be available to the Department of Commerce 4,900 miles, approximately, which could be used in designating interstate highways. That is important.

In view of the fact that under this bill the Federal Government will henceforth pay 90 percent of the cost of the interstate highways, and 50 percent of the cost of the other Federal-aid highways, the committee felt that it needed to have in the record the criteria and indices and guideposts the Department would use in making further designations.

The committee considered most carefully the role of toll roads as related to the Federal-aid highway system. A number of toll roads already constructed have been highly successful from a financial standpoint. Evidence presented to the committee, however, indicates that the total prospective mileage of economically feasible toll roads is indeed limited. The committee questioned the advisability of the toll method of financing of segments of the interstate system. Basically, the interstate system is viewed and envisioned as a magnificent system of free interstate highways connecting all principal cities.

Under present law, Federal funds cannot be applied to the cost of constructing a toll road. The committee believes this provision of law is sound and should be retained. There is no question, however, that where economically feasible, toll roads may make important contributions as a supplement to our system of free highways.

The committee believes that the economic feasibility of such toll roads might be strengthened and broadened if they are constructed on an integrated basis through the medium of interstate compacts. Sections 15 and 16 of the bill are designated to encourage the States to explore the possible use of interstate compacts for this purpose.

There was testimony before the committee by competent authorities that a toll road from Boston to Miami would likely be economically feasible if all the States would cooperate and enter into a compact to integrate the system into one economic unit.

Section 17 of the bill extends the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to all construction projects on the national system of interstate highways. As the Members of the Senate know, the provisions of this act apply to construction contracts paid for in full with Federal funds. Action has already been taken by the Congress to extend the provisions of the act to certain construction contracts which are paid for in part by Federal funds made available through grants-in-aid. For example, the provisions of the act have been made applicable to hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act and to the construction of airport projects involving Federal-aid funds. In view of the fact that the Federal Government is to pay 90 percent of the cost of projects on the Interstate system, the committee recommends that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act should apply to such projects. The committee was of the opinion that it would not be practicable to extend the provisions of the act to projects on the primary and secondary systems, many of which are located in predominately rural and isolated areas and on which the States contribute 50 percent of the cost. Accordingly, the provisions of section 17 of the bill limit application of the Davis-Bacon Act to interstate projects.

Section 13 of the bill contains a declaration of legislative policy and intent. By the terms of this section, it is declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway system should be improved to standards of adequacy to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The committee report refers to the 5-year authorization contained in the bill as the first installment of a vigorous program to meet this objective.

Section 13 declares that one of the most important objectives of this act is the prompt completion of the National System of Interstate Highways. The national interest is paramount in this system of interstate highways. As I understand the provisions and the intent of this bill, its primary purpose is to bring to a condition of adequacy all of our Federal-aid highways, but with particular emphasis upon the objective of building magnificent highways connecting all of our principal cities and State capitals. We envisioned this grand system of national interstate highways as being, for the most part, four-lane highways. In some cases, of course, two lanes will suffice for the time being in sparsely settled areas, but for the most part, it is the intent to build four-lane highways designed to standards to serve the growing national traffic needs. Four-lane highways will not suffice in many other instances. Six and eight-lane highways will be necessary in many instances to accommodate traffic.

Section 13 also states that, insofar as possible, in consonance with this objective of a magnificent national highway system, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible. It also declares it to be the legislative intent of this bill that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate travel and commerce.

Mr. President, I believe I have alluded to the principal features of S. 1048. The program embodied in this bill envisions a magnificent highway system for America, the like of which no other nation has ever dreamed. Your committee believes that such a system of highways is essential for the continued growth and prosperity of our national economy and vital to national defense.

The committee recommends passage of the bill; and I personally commend the bill to the Members of the Senate and solicit its careful consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by us jointly, for the bill S. 1048.

I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed. It is my intention to call it up at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I feel this is a proper occasion to commend the President of the United States for his outstanding service in centering attention upon the vital need of bringing the highways of the Nation as rapidly as possible up to the standards demanded by present and future traffic requirements.

Through his initiative and the effective measures he has taken, there is virtually unanimous agreement that an accelerated program of highway construction and modernization is of paramount importance to insure a sound and expanding economy, to cut down the tragic toll of death and injury on our congested and inadequate highways, and to serve the national defense.

It may be safely said that every section of our country is highway conscious today. The people of every State look to Congress to provide the means by which we can complete the construction of the largest number of miles of modern highway in the shortest time and at the lowest cost to the taxpayers.

Those objectives are no longer a matter of controversy. It is universally recognized that we are paying a high price in money and lives because we have not kept pace with the vastly increased traffic needs. The Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that 3,500 lives could be saved every year by modernizing the national system of interstate highways. The Automobile Manufacturers Association has estimated that an annual saving of more than $2 billion could be accomplished by the modernization of that vitally important network of roads. Other authorities have placed the annual cost of our inadequate system of highways as high as $3 billion a year.

The savings I have mentioned, let me point out, are in addition to the tremendous benefits that would be derived from strengthening the national and civilian defense and the peacetime economy.

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that we are fortunate to have before us today a plan for highway development and expansion based on the most exhaustive and most comprehensive studies ever made of our Nation's needs.

For the first time in our history we have a program that points the way to orderly progress and gives assurance of successful completion. The time has come when it is absolutely essential to have such a program in order to avoid

the haphazard methods by which many of our roads were developed in the past.

For many years roads were built, not where they were needed most, but where the strongest political pressure was exerted. I need not elaborate on the folly of continuing that kind of costly blundering and bungling in road construction.

It is obvious, therefore, that a completely new approach must be found if we are to solve the complex problems involved in this great undertaking; and let me impress upon my colleagues that this is the biggest and most expensive project ever undertaken by the United States outside of war.

The most careful consideration must be given to the method of financing, so that the desired objective can be reached without imposing new and heavier taxes, and without adding more billions to our already staggering burden of national debt.

Under any plan that may be enacted, the American people will be called upon to pay the bill. We must see to it that they get full value for their money.

Every study which has been made points clearly to the conclusion that a project of such magnitude cannot be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis from current revenues. It therefore seems to me that a pay-as-you-use financing plan offers the best and most practical method for the liquidation of the debt that will be incurred. By that method the cost is paid primarily by those who receive the benefits of an improved highway system.

In this connection I call attention to a most significant statement by the Honorable Robert F. Kennon, the distinguished Governor of the State of Louisiana and chairman of the governors' conference.

In a recent discussion of the Nation's highway needs, Governor Kennon said:

> If the billions collected in Federal excises on highway users since 1917 had been put on roads instead of general operations it would have meant roads built and in being that you couldn't buy today for $50 billion.

I submit, Mr. President, that the pay-as-you-use plan, based on Federal gasoline and special fuel tax revenues, offers a sound basis for complete liquidation of the indebtedness, which cannot be avoided if we are to go forward without delay on a highway program that is vital to the welfare of every American.

In concluding these brief remarks, I desire to express my praise and appreciation of the splendid manner in which the hearings on the highway bills were conducted by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Never in my experience has any legislation been examined more thoroughly or with greater care. Every interested group or individual who desired to do so was given full opportunity to present his views or recommendations. The hearings extended over a period of 8 weeks, and at all times there was a good attendance of Senators, not only of the subcommittee but also of the full committee.

I am happy to take this opportunity to thank my good friend, the able Senator from Tennessee, for his patience, his impartiality, and his generous helpfulness to members of the Public Works Committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I am deeply grateful for the very complimentary and generous remarks of the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I say to him, however, that, try hard as I might, I could not match the fairness, generosity, and ability with which the able Senator presided over the committee during the previous 2 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the very kind remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee are sincerely appreciated.

I observe on the floor now the able chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I have been a member of that committee since coming to the Senate, and I have admired greatly the impartial way in which the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico has presided over the committee's proceedings.

We have prided ourselves, as a committee, on being nonpartisan. We have attempted to report to the Senate bills which would be for the general good of the Nation.

I think at this session a splendid job has been done in having appear before the committee persons from all parts of the country to testify relative to the road situation of the Nation.

Again, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his impartiality and the excellent way in which he conducted the hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his kindness and his complimentary words. I have served on the Committee on Public Works both under the Senator from West Virginia and under the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I can say, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania, that there never has been in that committee any politics. We felt it was a constructive committee, and that the building of adequate roads had nothing to do with politics; that good roads were necessary in Republican Pennsylvania and were equally necessary in Democratic New Mexico. We felt that floods were causing damage in the Republican States of Nebraska and South Dakota just as they were causing damage in Democratic Mississippi. So the bill the Senate is now considering is not partisan. If the bill is examined carefully, it will be found that some of the provisions suggested by the administration are contained in the bill, or, anyway, that was the intention of the majority which reported the bill.

It will be found that while at times we did have differences of opinion in the committee as to how certain objectives should be attained, there was never any politics involved.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have a few very brief remarks to make about the bill today, but shall have more to say about it next week. Before I comment on the pending bill, and the ultimate plan which we discussed so long in the committee, I wish to associate myself again with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and also the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. MARTIN], who has just complimented the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] very highly for the way the business of the committee has been conducted.

I feel that the Senator from Tennessee, who conducted the long hearings of the subcommittee, did a very remarkable job, and expedited the business of the committee substantially. It was very difficult to do that, because there was so much to be said, but he performed the task skillfully and fairly. He won the admiration of the entire committee for the way he presided over its deliberations. I am delighted to compliment him, and also the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, for the manner in which he conducted the proceedings when the bill came before the full committee. Nobody can say that everyone did not have a fair chance to press his views and influence the thinking of the committee, to the extent of his ability. So I am delighted to make those acknowledgments.

Mr. President, one of the principal issues regarding the bill is the question of financing this great, expanded road program. I think everyone agrees that an interstate system is needed, and it should be completed as soon as possible. The question is, How are we to get it and how are we to pay for it?

I will admit that last December, when I first read the comments of the Clay Committee, I had some doubts as to the financing scheme which was proposed; but I have spent a great deal of time in the last 6 months thinking about and studying that plan, and also studying the testimony concerning it, which has been given by distinguished members of the administration, as well as by Senators who are both for and against this type of financing plan. I am now satisfied completely that the plan is sound. It is legally, practically, and morally sound.

There is nothing new about the plan in principle. It is a plan which has been heretofore used very effectively by States and by creatures of the States, greatly to the benefit of the people, and particularly the motoring public.

I have come to the conclusion that, far from being a dangerous or an undesirable plan, it is really the only desirable plan which has been proposed, and provides the only satisfactory way by which we can finance such a gigantic proposition as the proposed interstate highway system.

The importance of the interstate highway system is so great that it has to be provided for now; it must be completed within 10 years, and must be put in effect as a whole, and not piecemeal.

One of the chief arguments against the Gore bill is that it does not insure continuity in the progress of the work. If there ever was a time when long-range planning was essential in connection

with a road program, this is most assuredly the time.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] said, the plan contained in S. 1160, the Clay bill, or the Martin bill, or whatever one may choose to call it, is a pay-as-you-use plan. Nobody who has been in business would say that it is not good business to borrow money to build productive assets. That is the only purpose of borrowing money in the field of commerce and industry. It should be likewise in government.

Where we have had toll roads, which, in effect, have been pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-use assets, they have paid very well, indeed far better than it was estimated they would pay. Nobody has ever said they were not sound.

What is sounder than to take the additional taxes which will come from additional assets and using such taxes to discharge liabilities which have been created in order to develop those assets, especially when at this time, as never before, the assets are absolutely necessary to the national defense, to interstate commerce, and to safe travel for the citizens of our country?

Mr. President, I think the debate on this issue is apt to center around the points which we have set forth at the beginning of the minority views which Senators have on their desks. I venture the hope that over the weekend Senators will give both the majority report and the minority views their close attention, so that next week we can save as much time as possible in the course of this debate. I should like to outline our views as to why we oppose S. 1048 and why we favor S. 1160. I read the following from the minority views:

We oppose S. 1048 because:

1. It will not build within 10 years, or any other given period, the National System of Interstate Highways, essential in peacetime to the growth of our prosperity, and in time of war vital to survival.

2. It offers no plan to finance construction of the interstate system, except through higher taxes and increased general debt.

3. It creates an illusion of roads which will not be there.

4. It places burdensome and expensive Federal controls over highway construction and operation which heretofore have been left exclusively to the States.

5. It discriminates against States which have had the initiative to go forward with highways, both free and toll, serving the interstate system.

We favor S. 1160 because:

1. It builds the interstate system within a period of 10 years, thus (a) reducing the terrible toll in automobile deaths and injuries, (b) promoting commerce between the States, the lifeblood of our economy, and (c) strengthening our military and civilian defense.

2. It guides Federal dollars so that they follow and serve Federal responsibilities and greatest Federal needs.

3. It permits the orderly development of other highway systems—primary, secondary, and urban—while making certain that the most important from the national standpoint—the Interstate System of Defense Highways—is built for use now, instead of 20 or 30 years from now, or perhaps never.

4. It does not impair States' rights.

5. It offers a sound pay-as-you-use financing plan which does not require increased taxes, but which does provide for liquidation of the debt to be incurred and for its payment primarily by those who most benefit.

6. It deals fairly with those States which have progressed with modern free and toll highways serving the interstate system.

Mr. President, in the interests of saving the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the minority views, beginning with the last two paragraphs on page 33, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remainder of the minority views of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON on S. 1048 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY

S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss. These widely scattered dollars will not build those roads having the greatest national interest. They will not bring about the completion of the National System of Interstate Highways so vitally needed for the safety of our citizens, our national and civil defense, and our economy. They may affect votes, but they do not solve this country's road problem.

In contrast to S. 1048, the so-called Clay or administration bill, S. 1160, accomplishes the clear-cut objective of building the interstate system within a 10-year period and financing it on a debt-liquidating basis without raising taxes. It faces the vexing problems involved and solves them. It blazes a new trail in Federal road legislation demanded by present-day conditions.

This country needs adequate highways now, not 20 years from now. Everyone admits, and the hearings prove, that our present highways are entirely inadequate. The backbone of our highways is the 40,000 miles of the interstate system. This system is relatively the most inadequate. This system involves the greatest national interest and responsibility, and should receive top priority. Its completion is a military and economic necessity.

The majority are going on the theory that dollars alone will solve all problems. They fail to follow the advice of most of our experts, and so fail to guide the use of those dollars to a definite objective. They fail to take into account the fact that a number of States will be unable to match the Federal dollars authorized. They fail to provide any definite plan for the completion of the interstate system, and thereby utterly disregard the national- and civil-defense needs of this country during this most critical period of its history. They leave this system unfinished even though the Federal participation is 90 percent of the cost.

Not only do the majority fail to directly tackle our greatest needs, but they blindly refuse to be concerned with the fact that the people of this country have been taxed, and taxed, and taxed, and that the public debt has mounted to staggering proportions. They ignore the administration's solution of building the interstate system without any increase in taxes and on a sound debt-liquidating basis (pay-as-you-use). They refuse to take into account the fact that roads are a capital asset which generate their own revenues.

In reporting out S. 1048 the majority are not merely guilty of legerdemain. S. 1048 exemplifies legislative deception run wild. S. 1048 will pull no roads out of a hat on a pay-as-you-use basis. It will keep many roads so well under the hat that they will never be constructed, but the general debt will rise and the taxpayers will be burdened with interest charges indefinitely.

We are not alone in our opposition to S. 1048, or in our wholehearted approval of S. 1160. In addition to the Clay Committee and the national governor's conference, the American Municipal Association, consisting of upward of 12,000 municipalities in 44 States, the American trucking associations, and others vitally concerned with highway transportation, have indicated their approval of S. 1160. The American Association of State Highway Officials has gone on record that it is in accord with the provisions of S. 1160, which require the completion of the interstate system within 10 years. Thus many of the persons and organizations most interested, or expert, in road problems endorse S. 1160, and therefore must either actually oppose S. 1048, or at least have a substantial preference for S. 1160.

The contrast between the well-planned and carefully considered S. 1160 and S. 1048 is striking. The following points need serious consideration:

S. 1048 WILL NOT BUILD THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM WITHIN 10 YEARS, OR ANY OTHER GIVEN PERIOD

S. 1048 lacks a realistic approach to the objective of prompt completion of the interstate system, and under it, in our opinion, the system will not be completed. The majority emphasize the importance of the interstate system in their large authorizations for it relative to the other systems, but they have in fact authorized only 30 percent of the funds necessary to complete it.

(a) *The apportionment of the interstate funds under S. 1048 is not based on actual needs*

Section 2 (a) of S. 1048 provides for the apportionment of the interstate-system funds in the same manner as the 1954 act; namely, one-half in the manner now provided for funds on the primary system, and one-half in the ratio which the population of a particular State bears to the total population of all States. Calculations made on this basis of apportionment indicate clearly that some States will not receive sufficient funds to construct the portion of the interstate system lying within their boundaries, while other States will receive more funds than they can use on the interstate system.

It is obvious that this situation is bound to exist when the facts are taken into account. Primary system funds are apportioned on the basis of a State's area, population, and mileage of rural-delivery routes and star routes. Accordingly, one-half of the interstate funds are being apportioned under an old formula developed for an entirely different purpose. The apportionment of the other one-half is based on population. The interstate system was designated so as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers to serve the national defense. Any similarity to the amount of the actual cost of construction of the interstate system in a particular State and the funds apportioned to that State under S. 1048 must necessarily be purely coincidental.

The result of this lack of legislative realism will be that the interstate system will not be constructed, for it is entirely unlikely that those States which do not receive sufficient funds will complete their portions of the system. On the other hand, those States which receive more than they need will, undoubtedly, take advantage of the provision of S. 1048 which permits the transfer of 20 percent of their interstate funds to other systems, and so they would receive an inequitable windfall.

This is one of a number of instances which evidence the failure of the majority to grasp the fundamental concept of the Clay report and S. 1160. This concept involves a complete departure from the 1921 pattern of road legislation in that it has for its purpose the completion of a particular system of roads within a given period. This

purpose cannot be accomplished without paying for the construction of such a system on the basis of its cost. This concept is the only one which will build the system.

(b) Insufficient funds authorized

S. 1048 authorizes the appropriation of Federal funds for the interstate system for the next 5 years in the total amount of $7,750 million. Estimates indicate that the total cost of the interstate system will approximate $27 billion. The authorization of less than 30 percent of the entire cost obviously will not build the system.

S. 1160 WILL BUILD THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM WITHIN A PERIOD OF 10 YEARS AND WILL PROVIDE ADEQUATE STANDARDS AND PERMIT LONG-RANGE PLANNING

The objective of S. 1160 is the completion of the construction of the interstate system within the next 10 years. This system undoubtedly is the country's most important system, both from an economic and also a national- and civil-defense viewpoint. The Department of Defense strongly endorsed S. 1160. This system is the backbone of our entire highway system. The other systems are complementary to this system and more readily lend themselves to gradual improvement. The interstate system, though it embraces only 1.2 percent of total road mileage, joins 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. It carries more than a seventh of all traffic. The completion of this system with control of access will provide the means for movement of military men and material in time of war and will substantially promote interstate commerce in time of peace. The completion of this system is a Federal responsibility.

In considering the importance of this system should war be thrust upon us, the need for evacuating target areas must never be forgotten. As the President of the United States said in his message on the highway program:

"In case of an atomic attack on our key cities, the road net must permit quick evacuation of target areas, mobilization of defense forces, and maintenance of every essential economic function. But the present system in critical areas would be the breeder of a deadly congestion within hours of an attack."

S. 1160 recognizes this problem. An element of its plan is the provision for urban connections to the interstate system which are so urgently needed.

(a) The allocation of Federal funds is based on actual needs

S. 1160 recognizes the indisputable fact that the way to get the interstate system is to pay for it. Therefore, it permits the allocation of funds to the various States on the basis of their actual needs. It recognizes that the cost of construction substantially varies from State to State because of the differences in mileage, terrain, traffic, and various other factors.

In the past, formulas were developed seeking to permit an equitable distribution of Federal dollars to the States. The objective of S. 1160 is not the apportionment of Federal dollars, but rather the construction of a nationally important system of highways. Accordingly, a formula merely distributing dollars is neither warranted nor workable. The absence of such a formula affords no basis for a charge of favoritism of one State over another, since the 37,600 miles of the system were designated many years ago pursuant to legislative mandate, and long before there was any thought of a plan such as the present one. The system is laid out from a national viewpoint and on a basis of the economic and defense needs of the entire country.

(b) Sufficient funds authorized for completion of interstate system

The Bureau of Public Roads received estimates from all of the States as to the cost of construction of the interstate system. These estimates formed the basis for the estimate by the Clay Committee that the cost of the whole interstate system would approximate $27 billion. S. 1160 provides for Federal participation to the extent of $25 billion. It requires dollar payments by the States equaling those to be made by them for the interstate system under the 1954 act. Thus, S. 1160 authorizes all of the funds estimated to be needed for the completion of the whole interstate system.

(c) Long-range planning

In providing for the entire cost, S. 1160 makes possible a continuing program over a 10-year period. This permits long-range planning. In any major construction project, long-range planning is essential. The Panama Canal and the St. Lawrence Seaway are examples of projects authorized by Congress where long-range planning was provided. If we are to have an interstate system constructed within 10 years, the same type of approach is necessary. Advance planning is particularly important today to make possible prompt acquisition of rights-of-way. It is also important in that it permits the acquisition and use of machinery and materials on a more economical basis. S. 1048 does not permit advance planning because it provides only 30 percent of the necessary funds.

(d) Standards required

It is further the objective of S. 1160 to build the interstate system up to such standards as will produce safe highways adequate to handle traffic needs for at least the next 20 years. There is no question but that the interstate system must be built to the highest standards. The standards set out in S. 1160 have been carefully considered and are generally acceptable to the American Association of State Highway Officials and others who have a primary interest in roads. If we are to have a safe and efficient interstate system of highways, it is essential that they be built to adequate standards. This not only makes the highways safer but also tends to make them permanent and so protects the Nation's capital investment.

S. 1048 AUTHORIZES FEDERAL DOLLARS A NUMBER OF THE STATES CANNOT MATCH

During the past 30 years it has been customary for Congress to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds for roads on a biennial basis. In 1954 this Congress passed the largest road act from the point of view of Federal dollars in the history of the country. The authorizations almost doubled the authorizations contained in the 1948 act. The authorizations contained in S. 1048 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, more than double the authorizations contained in the 1954 act. Even with this tremendous increase in authorizations, the emphasis in S. 1048 is upon distributing dollars, instead of building roads where they are most urgently needed. S. 1048 gives the States more and more Federal dollars without a target for the expenditure of such dollars. It also authorizes Federal dollars that a number of the States cannot match.

In contrast, S. 1160 plans the construction of the interstate system within a 10-year period. It aims at this single objective, and no other. Today's demands on the Federal Treasury are enormous. The Federal Government cannot fully meet every such demand. Congress must decide which are the most urgent demands. Most of the road experts agree that the interstate system is the most important and should be given top priority. S. 1160 follows this expert opinion and aims the available Federal dollars where they will be most productive. S. 1048 scatters them so that they will not only be less productive, but some of them will not produce at all.

Ever since 1916, when the first modern-road legislation was enacted, the States have matched their Federal-aid apportionments with but two minor exceptions. Despite this precedent, the present record contains a survey made by the American Association of State Highway Officials indicating that 26 of the 48 States would have been unable to match their Federal-aid apportionments under S. 1048 as originally introduced. While the amendments to S. 1048 would probably reduce this number, unquestionably there will still be a number of States that cannot match. In addition, some of the States, in order to meet matching requirements, will have to divert funds that they would ordinarily spend entirely on their own local needs and not on Federal-aid highways. The authorizations to States which cannot match are illusory and tend to prevent larger authorizations for the more important interstate system.

PROVISIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM PERMIT ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT OF OTHER SYSTEMS

The charge has been made that S. 1160 would hamper development of the other Federal-aid systems, primary, urban, and secondary. This is based upon a misconception and is totally erroneous. On the contrary, S. 1160 would encourage the orderly development of these systems by (a) releasing to the States huge sums which they have heretofore had to use as matching funds for the Interstate System, and (b) permitting periodic review by the Congress of highway needs. Traditionally, the Congress has considered highway legislation in the even-numbered years. If this practice is continued, as would be the case if S. 1160 were adopted, the needs for the other systems could be carefully considered on a current basis and with full recognition of the ability of the States to raise the required matching funds.

The authorizations in the 1954 act are the largest in history for all of the systems. This act authorized $175 million for the Interstate System for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957. The 1952 act authorized $25 million for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955. Prior to the 1952 act there were no authorizations for the Interstate System as such. Routes of the 40,000-mile Interstate System coincide to a great extent with those on the 235,000-mile primary system. As a result, the States up to the present time have been expending substantial portions of their primary and urban funds on routes of the Interstate System.

The following table graphically illustrates the substantial amounts of primary and urban funds allotted to Interstate System projects in the past 2 calendar years. These averaged about $140 million in each of these years. This sum constituted about one-third of the total Federal primary and urban funds allotted for these years.

Primary and urban funds used on interstate projects

	Primary		Urban		Total	
	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Federal funds allotted to Interstate System projects	$70,719,411	$69,516,787	$64,506,792	$76,769,222	$135,226,203	$146,286,009
Federal funds alloted to all projects	$224,113,039	$300,129,879	$154,983,174	$178,132,203	$379,096,213	$478,262,082
Percent allotted to interstate projects	31.6	23.2	41.6	43.1	35.7	30.6

The tremendously increased allocations for the interstate system, together with the much more favorable matching ratio, will undoubtedly relieve the States of their obligations in connection with the Interstate System which they have heretofore fulfilled out of primary and uruban funds. From now on the States will be relieved of spending primary money on the more costly portions of the primary system that coincide with the Interstate System. If this had been true in 1953 and 1954, the States would have had about $140 million more Federal funds in each of those years to spend on those portions of the primary system which do not coincide with the interstate system. This will produce roads equivalent to an additional authorization of this sum. When this fact is taken into account it becomes clear how unnecessary additional primary and urban authorizations are at this time.

S. 1160 DOES NOT FREEZE OTHER SYSTEM AUTHORIZATIONS

Criticism has been leveled at S. 1160 on the erroneous ground that authorizations for the other systems are frozen at their present level. We wish to make it clear that S. 1160 does not purport to, nor does it in fact, make provision for other systems. S. 1160 is a bill relating solely to the Interstate System. There is nothing in S. 1160 that would prevent Congress from increasing the present authorizations for other systems at such times as the need arises and the States are able to match the authorizations.

This confusion may have arisen from the fact that the Clay Committee recommends Federal authorizations for other systems totaling $622,500,000, and that section 105 (b) of S. 1160 uses this figure as a measure in connection with the taxes to be available for financing the interstate system. This is not legislation specifically authorizing these amounts for the other systems. Absolutely no provision is contained in S. 1160 which authorizes or freezes amounts for the other systems. Under the 1954 act, these authorizations have been made through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. S. 1160 is properly limited solely to the Interstate System.

S. 1048 IN CONTRAST TO S. 1160 PLACES SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION, WHICH UP TO NOW HAVE BEEN LEFT EXCLUSIVELY TO THE STATES

Section 17 of S. 1048 provides that any State desiring to accept the benefits of the interstate highway apportionments must come within the Davis-Bacon Act. Section 2 (d) in effect freezes the minimum State requirements for weight and size standards for trucks. These two provisions override a long-established precedent that highway construction shall be carried out under State law, and that States shall have the sole responsibility for the operation and maintenance of highways.

When these provisions are compared with the provisions of S. 1160, the charges that S. 1160 will bring about increases in Federal controls are rendered almost ludicrous. The tremendous increase in Federal control that the above two measures would give are not comparable with the simple provision of S. 1160 which permits the corporation to settle disputes between the Secretary of Commerce and the States if such disputes shall arise. How any proponent of S. 1048 in the light of its very real controls can seriously criticize S. 1160 on the ground that it adds to Federal controls is difficult to understand.

The undersigned firmly endorse the principle of fair labor standards legislation, and believe that its application in some fields by the Federal Government is proper and desirable. However, its proposed application to Federal-aid highways raises many problems which require the most thoughtful study. We believe this matter should be fully and carefully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, since serious questions concerning labor relations are involved. However, since it was before this committee, we feel that we must point out some of the considerations which lead us to suggest a cautious approach.

The Davis-Bacon Act was enacted by Congress during the early stages of the depression of the 1930's. At that time very few, if any, of the States had minimum-wage laws on their statute books, nor had the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act been passed. Today, two-thirds of the States have minimum-wage laws or are operating under general labor-management areawide wage rate agreements covering highway construction. Indications are that about one-half of the States have minimum-wage laws based on prevailing rates being paid in the locality of the work. Labor classifications in those States follow in most cases the general pattern set in union-employer agreements, and in some areas are parallel to those used in the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act is now applicable to highway work performed under direct Federal contract. It requires, prior to the advertising for bids, that minimum-wage rates be determined for all laborers and mechanics employed on the project. These minimum rates are based on prevailing rates in the area. The boundaries of the area and the methods for determining prevailing rates are determined by the Secretary of Labor. There is no appeal from his decision.

The regulations further require that copies of all payrolls be received and checked by the Bureau of Public Roads for compliance with labor standards, including rates of wages paid, overtime, and classification or reclassification of employees of the contractor or subcontractor, conformable to the labor classes set forth in the Labor Secretary's decision of minimum wage rates to be paid on the project. It has been estimated that some 4,000 contracts would be involved annually under section 17. This would require the checking of upwards of 10 million payroll items for compliance with labor standards provisions. In addition, there would be involved investigations and hearings on wages or other labor disputes growing out of the performance of the contract, and surveys of wage levels.

One only has to glance at the above procedures and figures to understand the vastly increased burden of Federal administrative work involved. Whenever this amount of paperwork becomes involved, delays are bound to occur. Accordingly, the enactment of this section would result in serious delays to the completion of the Interstate System. The procedure indicates the centralized control and vast power which this section would place in the Secretary of Labor.

Those who use the analogy of other Federal legislation, such as the building of a housing project, or an airport, or a hospital, do not take into account the magnitude of the construction work contemplated. Nor do they take into account the fact that roads stretch throughout all parts of the land and affect all communities small and large. It is so vast that other precedents are not appropriate.

The employment of labor is generally recognized as a local matter, affected many times by conditions that do not apply universally. Rates in rural areas frequently are less than those in cities because of living costs and reduced hazards involved in the performance of the work. For example, a laborer on a rural project would be subject to less hazard than one in a downtown locality. A contractor having a large building or housing contract would pay his laborers the same rates whether working on the building itself or on a street or alley to serve a new development. When such a rate is extended to all highway work in the area, both rural and urban, then the highway rate would be entirely unrealistic and the fixing of such an arbitrary level might have a serious disruptive effect on highway construction.

Such conditions are intensified where it becomes necessary to fix prevailing levels of wage rates based on scattered information received in Washington, often thousands of miles away from the area in question. Such information may not only represent the highest rates in the area but may actually be paid under competitive economic or other conditions of special application only.

It should be noted, finally, that the fact that S. 1048 purports to limit this Federal control to the interstate system is illusory. It will gradually spread vast Federal controls to all Federal-aid highways, including farm-to-market roads. Its effect will also spread to purely local road construction and maintenance in every city, town, village, and hamlet throughout the Nation.

Since these highways will be designed and contracted for by the States, will be built by the States, will belong to the States, and will be maintained and policed by the States, we believe that very careful thought should be given before the Federal Government takes on the heavy burdens of expense involved in checking millions of payroll items for compliance, holding hearings, making investigations, and otherwise extending its activity into areas heretofore universally recognized as responsibilities of the States.

S. 1048 IN CONTRAST TO S. 1160 OFFERS NO PLAN TO FINANCE CONSTRUCTION OF THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

For many years the taxpayers of this country have been subjected to a large number of taxes which have taken a very substantial slice out of their annual wages or income. In spite of this very severe taxation our national debt has mounted to the staggering sum of approximately $275 billion, and our total incurred indebtedness is perhaps $95 billion above this figure. We are now paying interest on our debt at the rate of approximately $7 billion a year. If this interest continued for 30 years, the total interest charges during this period would amount to $210 billion or 75 percent of the present national debt.

Under these conditions no one desires to increase taxes nor to increase the country's national debt if such increases can be avoided. However, we are faced today with an urgent need from every angle for a greatly accelerated highway-construction program. The question presented is whether or not there is some way to meet this urgent need without raising taxes and without increasing the national debt.

S. 1048 makes no attempt whatsoever to solve this problem. Under S. 1048 there would be a substantial increase in our national debt. We understand that the majority have recommended that taxes should be increased to cover a portion—but only a portion—of the estimated cost. If the House should follow this recommendation we would have both increased taxes and an increase in the national debt.

S. 1160 attempts to solve this problem. It neither increases nor recommends the increase of taxes. It provides that the Corporation may borrow maximum amounts estimated to be sufficient to construct the interstate system. The principal and interest on these borrowings is to be repaid out of amounts equivalent to annual gasoline and special fuel tax revenues in excess of $622,500,000. It has been estimated that these amounts will be sufficient over a 30-year period to pay for the interstate system. In addition these tax revenues will provide $622,500,000 annually for other systems.

S. 1160 does not increase the national debt through Treasury borrowings in the conventional manner. Such national debt is a general debt payable out of general revenues. S. 1160 provides a plan for the liquidation,

from gasoline and special fuel tax revenues, of the indebtedness to be incurred by reason of the construction of the Interstate System. Our national debt has mounted alarmingly without any program for its liquidation. While this cannot always be avoided, we do feel where a liquidating program is possible as provided by S. 1160, it should be followed rather than criticized because it is unconventional.

No harmful precedent is established by S. 1160. Government expenditures for highways can be distinguished from nearly all other Government expenditures. A road is a productive asset generating revenues; a bomber or tank is not, nor is a school or a hospital. There can be no question but that a portion of the funds put into the construction of highways represents a capital investment, particularly in the case of the interstate system which will be built to the highest standards. Furthermore, there is no question but that the capital invested in these roads will develop and produce additional income in the form of increased gasoline and other road-user revenues. Intangible revenues are produced in the contribution made to our general economic development. The financing plan proposed by S. 1160 is sound when applied to a capital investment which will produce its own revenues.

Some of the criticisms of the financing plan of S. 1160 are discussed below.

(a) "Pay-as-you-go"

In view of the fact that S. 1048 would require substantial borrowing by the United States Government, the majority no longer can contend that a pay-as-you-go basis for road construction is necessary. However, we do wish to point out that it is a common practice in many of the States to issue bonds for highway construction. The Federal Government has recognized this practice by permitting within certain limitations the use of Federal funds to reimburse the States, which pay off highway bonds. The criticism against borrowing is unwarranted, and in any event the majority also contemplate borrowing.

(b) Interest payments

There is little substance, when carefully analyzed, in the criticism leveled at the payment of interest under S. 1160. This interest has been estimated to average $360 million per year, or a total of $11 billion over a 30-year period. It is impossible to calculate the interest charges under S. 1048. Obviously, under S. 1048 interest will be paid for many years into the future, and will eventually amount to a far higher figure than the interest payments called for under S. 1160. We wish to emphasize again that S. 1160 provides for a complete liquidation of the indebtedness, and so the total amount of the required interest payments can be determined. When the portion of our national debt, that would be created by S. 1048, would be liquidated is not subject to a clear-cut determination and so is necessarily a guess. However, if the past two decades are used as precedents, interest payments under S. 1048 will far exceed those under S. 1160.

(c) Gasoline and special fuel taxes as a measure

S. 1160 has also been criticized because it uses the entire Federal gasoline and special fuel-tax revenues for highway purposes. In 1934 Congress wrote into section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act the following:

"Since it is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways, after June 30, 1935, Federal aid for highway construction shall be extended only to those States that use at least the amounts now provided by law for such purposes."

Under this act, Congress penalized those States which did not employ their highway user revenues to highway purposes. This law has been on the books for over 20 years, and it would seem inappropriate at this time to criticize the Federal Government for the expenditure of its entire highway revenues for highway purposes. Twenty-five States have constitutional provisions dedicating highway user taxes to highway purposes.

It is a common practice in the States to pledge highway revenues for the payment of indebtedness instead of using them directly on a pay-as-you-go basis. If they are to be used, it does not seem material whether they are used for direct payments, or whether they are used as a pledge to secure the payment of bonds. While S. 1160 does not in fact pledge these revenues directly for the payment of the proposed highway bonds, it is used as a measure of payment to the corporation which issued the bonds, and so to some extent is analogous to a pledge. We fail to see any objection whatsoever to this procedure.

(d) S. 1160 does not come within section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act—the debt limitations statute

We do not agree for one moment with the final criticism of the financing plan of S. 1160 which seems to be that the creation of a corporation and the issuance of bonds by it is a device which is not only bad policy, but which in effect is deceptive. There are a substantial number of agencies and corporations of one sort or another which are authorized to borrow money for their corporate purposes either directly or through the Treasury. (See appendix C.) We are not aware that deception was charged on the formation of these corporations, and see no reason why it should be in connection with the proposed Federal Highway Corporation.

Possibly the reason for the charge is that it contemplates borrowing the money without coming within the terms of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. The Attorney General has testified before this committee with respect to the legality of the Federal Highway Corporation and has completely refuted statements as to the illegality or deception in this financing plan. Section 21 contains provisions covering Treasury borrowing, and borrowing where the principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States. If these bonds are salable without a Government guaranty, and in fact do not legally come within the terms of the statute—and the Attorney General said that they do not—there is no basis whatsoever for the criticism.

We might add that the United States owes large sums that are not within section 21. Some of these are bonds which were issued before section 21 was enacted. Others are monetary obligations; others are contingent obligations; others are unpaid bills; and others are unobligated authorizations. All in all, the United States is liable for obligations in the above categories, actually incurred or authorized, in an amount approximating $150 billion. S. 1160 clearly limits the Corporation's public borrowing authority to $21 billion. In the opinion of the Attorney General, this borrowing is not within the debt limit statute. It is specifically provided in S. 1160 that this borrowing is not to be a guaranteed debt, nor an obligation to which the full faith and credit of the United States is pledged. The entire financing plan is clearly set out, and there is no basis whatsoever for the charge of deception or legerdemain.

S. 1048 IN CONTRAST TO S. 1160 DOES NOT DEAL EQUITABLY WITH STATES WHICH HAVE GONE FORWARD WITH FREE OR TOLL HIGHWAYS SERVING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

S. 1048 discriminates against those States which have made progress with highways, free or toll, serving the interstate system. In contrast, S. 1160 attempts to make an equitable disposition of funds to those States which have already constructed free or toll roads adequate to be included in this vital system which serves the Nation. S. 1160 also permits the reimbursement to States for toll roads to be constructed in the future.

The problem created by the development of toll roads is one which demands solution. S. 1048 dodges this problem; S. 1160 would solve it.

The Congress must face the facts and realities squarely. The original Federal highway legislation of 1916 contained a provision that all roads constructed under the provisions of that act should be free from tolls of all kinds. This provision has continued unchanged since 1916 and has been deemed by many to be a definite policy statement on the part of Congress that we should have free systems of roads.

Since World War II the demand for roads has increased so rapidly that the State and Federal Governments have not furnished sufficient funds to keep construction in pace with demand. The American public has generally succeeded in getting what it wants. Since the governments have not furnished the funds, the public has partially satisfied its demand for better roads by supporting the construction of toll roads. In the past few years, these roads have been constructed at an increasing rate.

Accordingly, we are today dealing with facts and realities, not theories. Some 2,000 miles of toll roads are actually constructed, and several more thousand are in the process of construction. It is our opinion that Congress should face the problems posed by toll roads and not leave the matter to administrative discretion.

S. 1048 is silent on the question as to whether or not toll roads may be included in the interstate system. S. 1160 in section 202 expressly permits the inclusion of toll roads which meet the standards of the interstate system. Without such permission the interstate system will either be a system that is not connected, and so not a system, or there will be economic waste by reason of the necessity of constructing competing parallel roads in order to have a connected system. If a State desires toll roads and has the population that will support a toll road, equities do exist for permitting a State to receive a credit when that toll road contributes to, and becomes a part of, the interstate system.

The provisions relating to credits contained in section 207 of S. 1160 are premised on the concept that the Federal Government is primarily responsible for the building of the interstate system. Both bills recognize this concept. It is a new concept. If the Federal Government has this responsibility, how can it equitably permit one State to contribute portions of the interstate system with the total cost being borne by that State, while another State receives its portion of the interstate system for 5 percent of the total cost? Suppose one State has already constructed its entire system. Should the Federal Government get the benefit without any cost to it, while it pays another State 95 percent of the cost? We subscribe to the premise that the construction of the interstate system is primarily the Federal Government's responsibility. Once this premise is accepted, equity requires the inclusion of section 207 in S. 1160.

CONCLUSION

We want the interstate system to be built. We need it for our citizens' safety, for our economy, and for our national and civil defense needs. We want to start building it now, and to complete it within a period of 10 years. S. 1160 assures, as well as any legislation can assure anything, that the interstate system will be started now and completed within a period of 10 years. It is based on a realistic appraisal of the States'

needs and ability to pay. S. 1048 assures nothing and does not guide the Federal dollars to their most effective use. Therefore, we strongly oppose S. 1048, and heartily recommend and endorse S. 1160.

EDWARD MARTIN.
PRESCOTT BUSH.
NORRIS COTTON.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall comment briefly on one point which came up this afternoon, although I had not previously intended to do so. I refer to the suggestion that confidence is needed. When it is proposed to undertake a project of such tremendous size, certainly it is necessary to establish confidence. We are dependent upon the contractors who will build the roads, and to some extent we are dependent upon the manufacturers of the machinery which will be used in building the roads. If we establish the program on a long-range, planning basis, and if it is generally known that the program is to be conducted on a 10-year basis, rather than a 5-year basis, and there is certainty that the program wil be continued for the 10 years, we shall establish some confidence in the trade or the industry upon which we are dependent for the construction and completion of the roads. The establishment of such confidence will enable the contractors to purchase modern machinery, and will enable the manufacturers to develop more modern machinery and to spend more money on research and the development of improved equipment and generally to conduct themselves in a manner which will be conducive to the reduction of costs for both the State governments and the Federal Government in connection with this gigantic program.

So far as the State of Connecticut is concerned, I may say we have a completely nonpartisan approach to this issue. The able Governor of our State, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, of the Democratic Party, testified before the House committee on Senate bill 1160. He testified in favor of the President's plan and the Clay plan; and he testified on behalf of all the New England governors, 3 of whom are Republicans; and 3 of whom are Democrats. So I think it is clear that in New England, and particularly in the State of Connecticut, the views of the people are not influenced in any manner whatsoever by partisan considerations. On the contrary, their views are influenced by what seems to be in the interest of the entire area and the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram signed by Newman Argraves, State highway commissioner, and Warren Craemer, chief engineer, of the State of Connecticut. I shall read the telegram into the RECORD at this point, as follows:

HARTFORD, CONN., *May 19, 1955.*

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

A review has been made by this department of the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1955 (S. 1048, amended; Rept. No. 350).

This bill is more favorable to Connecticut than the original S. 1048. Connecticut will probably be able to match the apportionments indicated by the revised bill. This department has previously, and does now, favor the passage of the administration bill as opposed to the bill presented by Senator GORE.

Section 13B of this proposed bill declares that one of the most important objectives of the act is the prompt completion of the national system of the interstate highways. Connecticut, for many years, has recognized the desirability of improving this system of highways and has since its designation expended on the interstate system over $15 million of the $26 million of Federal-aid funds programed for primary and urban highways.

The passage of Federal-aid highway legislation which provides for greater Federal participation in the construction of the interstate system is highly desirable. It is noted that no clause is included in S. 1048 permitting reimbursement of prior expenditures on the interstate system. A program of increased Federal participation in the cost of improving the interstate system which does not provide for reimbursement of prior State expenditures on this system would be equivalent to imposing a penalty on those States which have recognized the need and have had the initiative to proceed with the improvement of the system.

Section 13D requires transcription of public hearings on projects involving a bypass of any community. It has not been the policy of the Connecticut Highway Department to hold formal hearings or keep transcripts of such hearings, if held. The department does not construct bypasses to any great extent. However, the question might readily be raised as to what constitutes a bypass of any community.

The department also objects to section 17 of the proposed bill as it appears to constitute an invasion of State rights in this field. This department's contracts require the payment of at least the minimum labor rates as established by the State labor department and it appears that there is no reason for the Federal Government entering into the determination of wage scales on highway projects.

Similar telegram has been sent to Senator PURTELL.

NEWMAN E. ARGRAVES,
State Highway Commissioner.
By WARREN M. CREAMER,
Chief Engineer.

Mr. President, this concludes my remarks for today on the bill. The process incident to considering and reporting the bill has been a long and arduous one, as the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who now is the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and who is a member of the committee, knows very well. We are very glad that the bill is now before the Senate.

I consider this issue to be one of the most important which will be before the Congress at this session. I hope all Senators who may not have had a chance thus far to study it will do so within the next few days, for I am satisfied that a program involving from $21 billion to $25 billion of the funds of the United States Government deserves the closest possible attention and scrutiny by all Members of the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it a fact that both bills—that is to say, the bill now before the Senate, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the minority Senators are sponsoring—go in the same direction, namely, toward greater development of the highway system, but that the difference between the two measures is mainly in the method proposed?

Mr. BUSH. I have already said there are two major differences between them.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber to hear the first part of the Senator's speech.

Mr. BUSH. The Gore bill, which is now before the Senate, provides for a 5-year program and substantially increased Federal contributions to the interstate system. Under present legislation, we are now spending $175 million a year on the interstate system. The Gore bill proposes a 5-year program on the interstate system, the amounts for each year being, respectively, $1 billion, $1,225,000,000, $1,500,000,000, and then $2 billion for the last 2 years, or a total of $7,725,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. That amount is for a 5-year period, is it not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes; for a 5-year period; and that will be the end of it.

It also proposes substantial increases in the amounts for primary, secondary, and urban roads. Those amounts, now approximating $700 million, would be stepped up under the Gore bill to $900 million, namely, $400 million for primary roads, $300 million for secondary roads, and $200 million for urban roads. That is a total of $900 million. That is a large increase, and there is serious question in the minds of officials of the Bureau of Public Roads and others whether such increases could be matched with funds by the States. They must be matched on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. WATKINS. That is under the regular road program, which has been in effect for many years.

Mr. BUSH. Yes, except that it would be stepped up under the Gore bill.

Mr. WATKINS. The States would have to match the funds, would they not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes. They would have to match the Federal funds on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the old program a State such as Utah would have to put up only 24 or 25 percent of the matching funds.

Mr. BUSH. I think the large area of public lands may enter into the calculation in the case of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true, because 77 percent or more of the acreage of Utah is owned by the United States.

Mr. BUSH. I venture to say that that accounts for the discrepancy in favor of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I wonder if that formula has been changed.

Mr. BUSH. No; that formula has not been changed. The formula remains the same as under the 1954 act, the existing legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. But the Federal expenditures which would be authorized under this bill would be stepped up.

Mr. BUSH. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. Which would require, of course, a corresponding increase in

the amounts to be contributed by the States.

Mr. BUSH. It would require an increase in the matching funds from the States. However, the participation of a State with a very high percentage of Federal lands would be reduced.

The Senator will find in Appendix A of the report, on page 47, the figures which I believe will give him the information he desires in connection with the State of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I come back to the original question. Under either of these proposals there would be a greatly stepped-up building program, largely in accordance with the recommendations of the President, at least so far as interstate road construction is concerned.

Mr. BUSH. That is true. I gave a very brief outline of the so-called Gore bill. The difference between that bill and the so-called Martin bill, which the Senator from Pennsylvania will later offer as a substitute, is that under the Martin bill, which is the President's plan, or the recommendation of the Clay committee, the proposed legislation deals only with the interstate system. It would provide a $25 billion contribution by the Federal Government for the interstate system. It would arrange for a financing plan which would include the establishment of a Federal Highway Corporation, into which would go the gas-tax revenues of the Nation over and above $622 million. The sum so derived from the gas tax is estimated—and the figures have not been challenged—to be sufficient to retire the $21 billion bond issue over a period of 30 years, both as to principal and interest, the idea being that the increased mileage of roads will provide increased gas-tax revenues in sufficient amount to make the retirement of those bonds certain.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the bill provide for toll roads?

Mr. BUSH. It does not provide for any Federal toll roads. The Martin bill, as it now stands, does provide a basis whereby toll roads which are being planned or which are in existence meet the requirements of the interstate system, which are very severe—and I may say that the former Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads stated only a few days ago that he thought hardly any toll roads would meet the requirements of the system—may be incorporated into the interstate system, payment being made by the Federal Government through its Federal Highway Authority.

Mr. WATKINS. Would they then cease to be toll roads?

Mr. BUSH. They would have to cease to be toll roads. Under the present law it is impossible to charge tolls on federally aided highways.

Mr. WATKINS. That would be the ultimate objective if the toll roads were taken over.

Mr. BUSH. It would be one of the effects which must be taken into account. However, the real object would be to put into the interstate system those roads which are ready to be incorporated into it without penalizing a State which had gone ahead and built such roads with its own funds. Such roads would be taken into the interstate system and the State would be compensated for its expenditures. A formula is provided for such compensation. The State would not be paid 100 percent. The formula takes into consideration depreciation. The fairness of the formula has not been questioned. There has been some objection to that phase of the bill which provides reimbursement to States for any toll roads which might be accepted into the interstate system.

Mr. WATKINS. Where do such objections come from?

Mr. BUSH. Such objections come from States which have no toll roads.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot understand why they should object. The system would take over roads already finished and probably not at a figure which would entirely reimburse the States but at a figure somewhat below the construction cost. I cannot understand the philosophy of the objection.

Mr. BUSH. Neither can many of us. At the governors conference, Governor Kennon, of Louisiana, and Governor Kohler, of Wisconsin, said that it was a matter of simple equity, if the Government were to take over such roads, not to penalize a State for having gone ahead in a forward-looking and progressive manner and developed its highways. Many persons feel that it is essential, in fairness, to make arrangements to take over such roads, but there is opposition to it in the committee. I do not know whether the proposal will stand up.

Mr. WATKINS. Comparing the two proposals, under which would we get the most roads?

Mr. BUSH. We would get the most roads, in my judgment, under Senate bill 1160, which is the Martin bill, because it provides a 10-year program for the completion of the interstate highway system, and also provides for raising and setting aside the money to pay for such a system. So we would be adopting a long-range plan and a system to pay for it. Thus, I think we would insure the completion of the system. One of my chief objections to the bill of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is that it would not insure the completion of the interstate system.

Mr. WATKINS. Would there be a large difference between the mileage which would be built under the Martin proposal and the mileage under the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BUSH. The interstate system calls for approximately 40,000 miles of modern highway.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the present plan of authorization.

Mr. BUSH. That is the present plan for the interstate system. It would provide 40,000 miles of highway. I believe the Gore bill would step that figure up to 42,500, the idea being to have a little more leeway in case it were needed for any presently unforeseen necessities.

Mr. WATKINS. How about the Martin bill? Does it provide for additional mileage?

Mr. BUSH. The Martin bill provides 40,000 miles. In the opinion of officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, in the Martin bill there is a sufficient cushion, at 40,000 miles, to take care of contingencies which may arise. There is a difference of opinion on that point.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that, aside from the money provided for the Federal-aid system, section 6 of the Gore bill would authorize an appropriation of $22,500,000 for forest highways for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, and $24 million for forest development roads and trails for the same period.

Section 7 (a) provides an authorization of $12,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks.

Section 7 (b) would also authorize the sum of $11 million for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, for construction and maintenance of authorized parkways.

Section 7 (c) would authorize $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1958 through 1961, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations, and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands.

I know the Senator will be interested in section 8, which provides an authorization of $2 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 through 1961, for completing sections of important Federal-aid highways lying entirely within the public domain.

Mr. WATKINS. I remember that a number of years ago Congress passed a bill which permitted the completion of Highway No. 6 through one area in Utah which consisted entirely of public lands, so that it would tie in with the already constructed portion through Nevada and California. It completed the highway as a national highway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was to take care of that kind of situation that authorization was provided in the pending bill. I would say to the Senator from Utah that the philosophy of the bill is to carry on exactly as we have heretofore.

Since 1916 we have tried to accelerate the program. That is why there have been increases in the authorization. The difference between the so-called Martin bill and the pending bill is that the Martin bill emphasizes completely the interstate system, while the Gore bill accelerates that system greatly by authorizing the expenditure of money to develop it. We realize its importance, especially since it is now a part of the national defense system highways. However, the committee did not wish to forget that there are other roads which are just as important to the American people and to national defense. Those roads are the farm-to-market, the primary, and the urban roads.

Mr. BUSH. I have the floor. Does the Senator from Utah wish to ask further questions?

Mr. WATKINS. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, made these comments, I

thought I would like to ask him another question or two. However, I do not wish to ask him the questions on the Senator's time. I thank both Senators for their courtesy.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to correct a statement which I made regarding the toll road situation. Under the Martin bill, a State has the option of either taking the money which it may get for its toll road and retiring the debt, in which case the road would become a free road, or the State may continue to operate it as a toll road and use the money for the construction of other roads in the State, under State supervision, and so forth. That is a new feature in the Martin bill which is not included in the committee bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that I was intrigued by the question which arose over the 40,000-mile limitation. I believe the Senator from Utah asked whether it would take care of additions, and the Senator from Connecticut stated that the testimony was to the effect that it would take care of contingencies.

Is it not a fact that the testimony of the representative of the Bureau of Public Roads was to the effect that there are presently designated 37,600 miles; that 2,400 miles would be largely required for taking care of urban connections, and that if there were to be any major extensions of the interstate system by the designation of addition mileage of any substance, the 2,400 miles could not be counted upon to take care of it?

Mr. BUSH. In the last discussion I had with Mr. du Pont, the special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce on road matters, and former Commissioner of the Bureau, he said he thought that there was some give and take in the cushion and that he believed it would take care of not only the urban connection situation, which the Senator mentioned, but of the additional extensions which might be necessary. For instance, the Governor of Colorado made a very interesting case for a new connection on the interstate system. I have forgotten how many miles it involves.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Utah may be able to tell us about that.

Mr. WATKINS. The Governor of Colorado proposed that an east-west highway be built from Denver, Colo., to Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. BUSH. How many miles would that be?

Mr. WATKINS. That would be more than 500 miles, as I remember.

Mr. BUSH. I am surprised that it would be that many miles.

Mr. WATKINS. I wonder whether there is any leeway for that type of mileage on an interstate highway. Can such a road get into the interstate system under either proposal?

Mr. BUSH. The Utah-Colorado road, concerning which the Senator from Utah, as well as the Governor of Colorado, Mr. Johnson, testified, is not on the interstate system.

Mr. WATKINS. How could it be incorporated into that system.

Mr. BUSH. As I am at present advised, the Senator would have to offer an amendment to accomplish that objective.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall offer an amendment to whichever proposal will make that highway possible.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Utah has confirmed my suggestion that it is time for all Senators to study very closely the issue which is now before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. That is why I am asking these questions.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the Senator for doing so.

Mr. WATKINS. I apologize for asking so many questions, the answers to which I would probably be able to obtain by studying the bill. However, as the Senator from Connecticut has so well propounded the issues involved, I thought I would ask some questions for my own information.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Utah is always welcome to ask questions whenever I have the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know what Mr. du Pont may have said in private conversation to the Senator from Connecticut. All I know is what was testified before the committee. I have before me page 677 of the hearings, at which point a quotation was placed in the record from page 72 of the report entitled "Highway Needs of the National Defense."

I read from that report:

> The balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limitation is still reserved mainly to be comprised, after further detailed study, of essential circumferential and distributing routes in urban areas.

I believe the general consensus of the testimony was that the 2,400-mile cushion of the 40,000-mile authorization would largely be required for the urban connections.

Mr. BUSH. That was the intention, and the Senator is correct. I recall that. However, I shall try to have corroborated the statement with regard to the additional cushion which seems to have been found since the statement was made for the record.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to state for the benefit of the Senator from Utah that it is true that the cushion in the reported bill is exactly as the Senator from South Dakota has stated it, and the only possibility of getting extra interstate roads, and the only possibility of getting the road the Governor of Colorado thought was so much needed, would be under the extra 2,500 miles which are included in the authorization of the Gore bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that is correct.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the bill, S. 1048, change the distribution of the highway funds from the system established by the present law?

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator refer to primary, secondary, and urban highways?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To any system. Does the bill as reported by the committee change the distribution of funds allocated to any system from that provided in the present law, the act of 1954? I refer to the formula.

Mr. BUSH. No; the formula is not changed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator know whether there has been any change in the formula since the Highway Act of 1921 was adopted?

Mr. BUSH. My recollection is that a change was made by the 1954 act. However, the Senator probably knows more about that than I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The change in the 1954 act related to the interstate system. Prior to the act of 1954, the funds for the interstate system were distributed in the same way the funds for the primary system were distributed in prior years. I see the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] nodding his head. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for asking my question is that I was a bit chagrined or disappointed to find the minority views carrying this sentence:

> S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss.

I think that is a very unfortunate statement to appear in the minority views, because, from the statement which the Senator has made, there has been no change in the formula or the pattern of distribution of highway funds since 1921, except last year when half of the interstate system money was put on a population basis instead of under the old formula. If the sentence is true that—

> S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss.

the committee members who signed minority views containing that sentence are indicting the formula or method of fund distribution since the creation of the Highway Act of 1921. They are applying that statement to the formula which has been in effect under Republican and Democratic administrations for 30 years or more. I think it is unfortunate to have that kind of an impression spread abroad. I hope the support for the bill is not founded upon any such contention as that.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Of course, that statement is a simile. Unfortunately, we have not had a laid-out road program for the entire United States. There has been an enormous

amount of logrolling relative to it. My own State of Pennsylvania proceeded for many years without any road plan. Roads were built where there was the greatest political influence. We finally adopted the plan of connecting the county seats in Pennsylvania. Then we built lateral roads, and, as a result, we now have more paved roads than has any other State in the Union.

When I was Governor of Pennsylvania, I used to come to Washington and urge that a certain road for military purposes or economic purposes be built. Whether that was political influence I do not know, but, nevertheless, that is the way roads were built.

This bill provides a plan whereby the interstate road system as established in 1946 or 1947 will be completed in 10 years. There is no politics involved. It will actually be done. Ours is a political country, and it is pretty difficult to get away from political influences. If the governor of a State, with his highway secretary or commissioner comes to Washington, he has considerable influence; there is no question about that.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has been so helpful in connection with all road legislation, that I do not think the language he quoted was intended as an indictment. Sometimes in the rush of getting things done we make some assertions, which, if taken literally, would amount to an indictment. But the statement quoted was not intended to be an indictment of the work which has been done. I think we have done very well in the United States without a definite road plan, but I believe the time has come when we must have a plan for building interstate roads, because interstate roads connecting 42 of the 48 State capitals, will serve more than 90 percent of all the communities over 50,000 population in the Nation. It is a real plan, and is the first one we have ever had.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to comment to my friend from South Dakota, than whom I know of no more conscientious legislator, on the statement in the minority views from which he quoted. I wish to read what he has already read, and then to continue the quotation, because I think the following language explains the sentence which the Senator read. I shall amplify it a little bit.

The statement says:

S. 1048 scatters billions of politically guided Federal dollars over the country for the next 5 years as though they were shot from a blunderbuss. These widely scattered dollars will not build those roads having the greatest national interest. They will not bring about the completion of the national system of interstate highways so vitally needed for the safety of our citizens, our national and civil defense, and our economy. They may affect votes, but they do not solve this country's road problem.

In contrast to S. 1948, the so-called Clay or administration bill, S. 1160—

Which we call the Martin bill—

accomplishes the clear-cut objective of building the interstate system within a 10-year period and financing it on a debt-liquidating basis without raising taxes. It faces vexing problems involved and solves them. It blazes a new trail in Federal road legislation demanded by present-day conditions.

This country needs adequate highways now, not 20 years from now.

Again, the language regarding the "blunderbuss" has to do with the authorizations suggested for the primary, secondary, and urban roads which, in our opinion, the States will not be able to match. As of today, the reports from the governors of the different States indicate that so far as S. 1048 is concerned, of the States which have expressed their views, 20 say they can do it, but 10 say they cannot do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me in the way he has for comments as well as for questions, and I should like to say that I think a formula provides the only way whereby we can avoid having funds spent on a political basis. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] referred to the distribution of funds when they are once received by the States. I think it is true that in my State and in other States political pressures have determined in which of the counties road money should be spent, but the fact that the Federal Government has had a precise formula during the past 30 years that has meant that a certain amount of money has gone to roadbuilding under a Republican administration under precisely the same conditions as it would have gone under a Democratic administration. The money has gone to South Dakota under a Democratic administration precisely as it would have gone under a Republican administration. Now we have a precise formula under which funds are allocated to all the States on the same fixed basis; but if we change that and make the allocation of funds available in the discretion of and according to the whims of a corporate board which is not responsible to the Congress, pressures and politics can and may creep into the distribution of highway funds. Then we would have Federal dollars scattered over the country as though shot from a blunderbuss. The guaranty against having highway dollars spent on a blunderbuss political basis is a precise formula written into the law under which road funds are distributed among the several States.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think anyone objects to a formula for distributing funds to the primary, secondary, and urban road systems as it has been the case in the past. I think the point is whether we are going to have an interstate highway system and whether it is essential to adopt a plan which will assure the completion of the system as soon as is possible. That is the basic difference in the philosophies of the two bills.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think possibly that interpretation has suggested itself to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut because the Gore bill was limited to 5 years.

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that the Gore bill has so substantially stepped up the primary, secondary, and urban authorizations that I do not believe it will be practical, for the States will be unable to match the payments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill I introduced, S. 1573, was based upon a 10-year authorization program, but it also proposed that at the end of 5 years the distribution of funds for the interstate system would possibly be subject to change on the basis of need, in order that the system might be completed. So far as I am concerned, I think it might be a desirable change in the committee bill as reported to add the other 5 years, and to provide that during the second 5 years the distribution shall be upon the ratio of uncompleted mileage of the interstate system. That would insure the completion of the system, as the Senator from Connecticut seems to desire.

But I think all who feel that the interstate system should be stepped up ought to take note of the fact that until 1952 there was no regular authorization for the interstate system. The act of 1952 provided for a $25 million annual authorization for the interstate system. In the act of 1954, that amount was stepped up 7 times. It was increased from $25 million to $175 million.

Under the committee bill, it is proposed to step up the amount to $1 billion in the first year, to $1,250,000,000 in the second year, to $1,500,000,000 in the third year, and to $2 billion in the fourth year and $2 billion in the fifth year.

The rate of expenditure for the interstate system, under the committee bill, is substantially that which is outlined on the annual basis in the report of the Clay Committee.

So I do not see that there is so much difference, so far as the building of the interstate system is concerned, provided we extend or project the plan for 10 years, the same as was done in the previous act.

It may be that we should plan for 10 years; but a majority of the committee thought that after 5 years the program should be examined to see where we were. Personally, I would have been glad to see a 10-year authorization for the interstate program from the start, along the lines of the bill I introduced, and have the second 5 years based upon the ratio of uncompleted mileage in the system.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to read, from the middle of page 36, a portion of the minority views, as follows:

(a) The allocation of Federal funds is based on actual needs.

S. 1160 recognizes the indisputable fact that the way to get the interstate system is to pay for it. Therefore, it permits the allocation of funds to the various States on the basis of their actual needs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Who will determine the actual needs?

Mr. BUSH. The statement continues:

It recognizes that the cost of construction substantially varies from State to State because of the differences in mileage, terrain, traffic, and various other factors.

In the past, formulas were developed seeking to permit an equitable distribution of Federal dollars to the States. The objective of S. 1160 is not the apportionment of Federal dollars, but rather the construction of a nationally important system of highways. Accordingly, a formula merely distributing dollars is neither warranted nor workable. The absence of such a formula affords no

basis for a charge of favoritism of one State over another, since the 37,600 miles of the system were designated many years ago pursuant to legislative mandate, and long before there was any thought of a plan such as the present one. The system is laid out from a national viewpoint and on a basis of the economic and defense needs of the entire country.

That is the philosophy behind Senate bill 1160.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to make an additional point? I certainly appreciate his courtesy in yielding. He has been very generous, because I am not asking questions.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator from South Dakota is helping to develop the points which all of us are seeking to develop. I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If there were ever a better prescription offered for setting up and distributing highway funds in such a way as to permit political pressures to operate, I have never seen it better stated than in the sentence which the Senator read, as follows:

S. 1160 * * * recognizes that the cost of construction substantially varies from State to State because of the differences in mileage, terrain, traffic, and various other factors.

In other words, the allocation of funds would be left to the discretion of persons who had the money to distribute. It is always possible for politically potent persons to say that "It costs more to build roads in my district"; or "This is the most important mileage to have constructed."

That is where we see the basis for the political distribution of highway funds. That is the blunderbuss distribution.

To be sure, the terrain, traffic, and mileage differ in various localities; but if the distribution is left to discretion, then the way is opened to personal presentation; and personal presentation means an opportunity for favoritism.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from South Dakota has had more experience in these matters, I think, than has the Senator from Connecticut; but I believe he will agree that the interstate system was laid out on a basis that was not political. It was laid out with the cooperation of the States in an effort to create a system which would be in the national interest.

So far as I have been able to learn, no great political pressures have been exercised as to which States were to be included in the interstate system. That system was planned in an earnest desire to provide a network of roads which would connect the principal centers of population, and also to promote interstate commerce and safe travel.

Furthermore, since that system was laid out, we now have to consider the very important items of national defense and civil defense, especially with reference to the evacuation of our cities in the event of an attack. That is one of the most considerable factors in connection with the whole question, and is one of the reasons why it is desirable to adopt a plan which will result in the development of an interstate system which will be in the interest of everybody.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I agree that the interstate system calls for a somewhat different approach than do the other systems when it comes to a distribution of funds. The RECORD will show that a year ago, when the Federal Highway Act of 1954 was being debated, I was one of those who supported changing the formula so that 50 percent would be allotted on a population basis, because it seemed to me that that would bring about the completion of the interstate system. But there, again, a definite formula was provided. Half the money was to be distributed on the basis of population. The formula was precise. It did not come within the discretion of any person to allot the money. The Bureau of Public Roads had a precise formula.

I have been told by Mr. duPont—or at least I think I got the impression from him in conversation, but I do not want to hold him to this—that the population formula would not be too bad for the apportionment of funds for the interstate system. It may be that the allotment should be 100 percent on that basis. But Congress made that one change last year, and it was precise. It did not leave the distribution of the funds to the discretion of individual persons in Democratic States or Republican States. The States retained their apportionment regardless of which party was in power.

Mr. BUSH. During the hearings and during the committee's deliberations on the bill, was any question raised about the validity of the interstate system?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know that there was, although I think I made reference to the fact that when provision was made for the interstate system, a great many States tried to have too many miles designated in the interstate system, the reason being that the allotments for the interstate system were so much higher than they were for the other roads of the primary system, and the States did not want to be called upon to put up too much money, because they had too many roads to build. That was when the formula was on a 50–50 matching basis, and the States would have had to use too much of their own money to build roads to the interstate standard.

So the selection of roads for the interstate system was not made on the basis of the best interests of the country or of the needs of national defense. No designation was made on the basis of national defense.

The designation was made upon the requests of State highway commissions. Those commissions made requests of the Federal Works Agency, which was headed by General Fleming. I believe the certification of the routes for the interstate system, as published in that year, will show the signature of General Fleming as head of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. BUSH. I simply comment that during the hearings the committee heard the testimony of representatives of the governors' conference and the American Municipal Association, whose membership includes some 12,000 of the principal cities of the United States, and all of them seemed to have endorsed the principle of the interstate highway system and favored its development as soon as possible. I know of no evidence or testimony which was offered to the contrary during the hearings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Connecticut does remember, does he not, that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and I think also the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]——

Mr. BUSH. And Governor Johnson.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And Governor Johnson, were all before the committee urging the designation of some additional mileage?

Mr. BUSH. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure that had it been generally thought there would be some additional mileage, there would have been officials from other States making representations on that score, too. That would have been because they felt there was some deficiency in the designation of 1947.

Mr. BUSH. I shall certainly accept the Senator's correction, if it is a correction, that they wanted an addendum to the interstate system between Utah and Colorado, and made a very stirring appeal for that particular extension; but so far as the interstate system as a whole was concerned, the desirability of the policy was not brought into question. On the contrary, it seemed to be very widely endorsed by representatives of the governments of all the States who came to talk with the committee about it. I thought the desirability of an interstate system as such received unqualified endorsement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly agree with the Senator from Connecticut that there was strong endorsement of the need of the system and the desirability of expediting its completion. I merely submit that under either of the proposals the interstate system would be expanded far out of proportion to anything previously proposed. It went from nothing to $25 million; from $25 million to $175 million; from $175 million up to a minimum of $1 billion. I call attention to the fact that the $1 billion which S. 1048 proposes for the interstate system in the first year is the equivalent of what the Federal Government provided for all categories of roads under the act of 1954, which itself was a vast step up from 1952.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: I should like to add to the remarks I made earlier when I was interrogating the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. I did not know he was going to conclude his remarks at the time he did. A former Member of the Senate stopped at my desk and diverted my attention momentarily. To the Senator from Connecticut is due a great deal of credit for the attitude in the committee that greater emphasis should be on the interstate system. I believe that the interest, the argument, the questions, and the study which the Senator from Connecticut devoted to this subject were in large part responsible for the decision of the com-

mittee to increase the funds proposed for the interstate system under S. 1048. The bill as originally introduced proposed $500 million for the interstate system. The committee increased that amount to $1 billion in the first 3 years and to $2 billion in the fourth and fifth years.

I may disagree with the Senator from Connecticut on some of the methods of arriving at the goal I have in mind, but it is a common goal.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to acknowledge most gratefully the very generous comments made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that my name appears as one of the signers of the minority views on the pending bill, reported by the Committee on Public Works, I would not be taking any of the time of the Senate to discuss it today.

As a comparatively new Member of this body, I have been very sparing of words in what I have had to say in the Senate, and I shall continue to be in the future for a considerable period of time.

Furthermore, I was not a member of the subcommittee which considered the highway bill, but the full committee, of which I am a member, deliberated long and seriously upon it. As one of the three Senators whose names appear on the minority views, I desire to make a brief statement to the Senate at this time, so that it may appear in the RECORD along with the very able statements made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. President, in his very able speech to the Senate this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was, as I observed earlier today, very fair and very generous not only in admittting but in emphasizing that, whatever legislation may finally result from the pending measure proposing a new and ambitous and far-reaching national highway system, it will have been in large part caused by the work, the study, and the report of the Clay Committee, and by the insistent request and message of the President of the United States, which served to arouse the country and direct the attention of the Congress to the need of approaching this great problem in a new and far more sweeping and thorough manner than in the past.

I think, Mr. President, that those of us who in some measure disagree with the report of a majority of the Committee on Public Works should emulate the spirit which has been exemplified by the able Senator from Tennessee and other Senators. So far as I am concerned—and I am quite confident it is true of my associates—there is no pride of authorship. When, after the regular legislative process of this body and the other body in the Capitol, and of the committees of the Congress, it makes little difference whether the final result is the Gore bill or the administration bill, whether it bears the number S. 1048 or S. 1160. What we are all interested in is the development of a plan for a highway system which will meet new and widespread conditions in a thoroughgoing manner and not by halfway measures.

That being the case, Mr. President, it occurs to me that the first determination which the Senate has to make, and which every individual Senator must make in his own mind in considering this question is, How urgent is the need from the standpoint of national defense, from the standpoint of national safety, and from the standpoint of dealing with the ever-increasing traffic problems in this country.

If the conclusions of the Clay Committee, which have been endorsed by a message from the President of the United States, overemphasize or overstate the problem, then our whole attitude should of necessity be changed. In other words, Mr. President, if it be true that the United States is now faced with a new and serious and dreadful danger of atomic war and of massive attack which makes it necessary to have means of transportation and communication and escape on a scale we have never even contemplated before, then we must lay all the emphasis, or at least a great part of the emphasis, on the proposal for a national system of interstate highways, even though in the case of many States it may entail—and let us face the fact that, of course, it does entail—some sacrifice on their part in dealing with their own secondary systems and country roads.

If it be true that the death rate on our highways has so increased that the number is 36,000 a year, and that the construction of limited-access arteries of communication throughout the country is necessary to solve that problem, at least to the extent of holding down the casualties which seem to be mounting year by year, then again we must face this question with a certain determination in our own minds that we shall devote a large part of our activities to the interstate system, even at some sacrifice.

Mr. President, if it also be true that the traffic situation has become so complex that our economy cannot expand sufficiently to enable our country, which we love so much, to grow, and to permit the standard of living of every American citizen to continue to improve, unless we provide the roads upon which the wheels of commerce may move, then we are called upon to face this issue in a very definite manner.

Mr. President, if those conclusions are overdrawn, and if the situation is not quite so imperative from the standpoint of national defense and civil defense as we have been led to believe, then obviously we would prefer to continue to have the emphasis placed upon permitting the States to continue to build their highways with whatever Federal aid we can give them, and to leave in the hands of the States the determination of the matter. It is not a question of politics, in my opinion, Mr. President. It is not a question of shooting dollars from a blunderbuss. On the contrary, the question is, What shall be the underlying, motivating factor in connection with our highway system in the next few years?

Mr. President, let me speak for a moment—as I assume other Senators do occasionally—with some attention to my own section of the country. The first civil-defense district of the United States includes New England, New York, and New Jersey. In that civil-defense district reside 30 million Americans at the present time. Twenty-two million of them live in areas which have been designated as critical areas, areas of defense production, areas which will be targets for attack in case of war. It is highly imperative that means of escape, means of moving that population, should it become necessary to move them, be provided, and be provided as rapidly and as completely as possible. It is equally important that sufficient highways and main arteries of the proper type be constructed, so that not only may the population be moved out, but also that troops, guns, and other equipment may be moved in in case of attack on the eastern seaboard. I use that as an example to indicate that my reason for signing my name to the minority views and for joining my associates in the minority views and in endorsing Senate bill 1160 is, not that I think that bill is perfect, or not that I think Senate bill 1048 is not a good measure, but that I have reached the conclusion that the underlying theory necessary to be followed at this time is better exemplified in Senate bill 1160 than in Senate bill 1048, which has been endorsed by a majority of the committee.

Mr. President, I am very fond of reading the philosophy of a Chinese writer or philosopher whose writings some of my colleagues have likewise read, I am sure. His name is Lin Yutang, and he has made some very humble and very interesting observations, which he has illustrated very well, indeed. One which has lingered in my mind is as follows: In one of his writings, he contrasts how things are done in America with how things are done in China. He says, "In America, when you build a tunnel beneath a river, you have one crew begin to dig from one side of the river, and you have another crew begin to dig from the other side of the river. They follow plans which are laid down and charted by the best engineering skill you can produce. At some time the two tunnels meet. If, when they meet, they fail to meet squarely, even by a fraction of a foot, you Americans regard it as a disgrace and as an engineering failure. But," says he, "in China, if we are to dig a tunnel under a river, we have one crew begin on one bank of the river, and we have another crew begin on the other bank. Sometimes they meet, but sometimes they do not meet at all. If they do not meet at all, they simply continue their work, and then we have two good tunnels." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not think there is need for heat regarding the statement about the use of a blunderbuss. If we are living in an age when we do not need to be alert and ready for every possible emergency which may develop, then it would be far better that neither of these bills pass, and it would be far better that the Federal Government surrender to the States some of the gasoline taxes the Federal Government now is taking from the States, and thus let the States

build their own highways in the way they wish to build them.

But if we are facing a situation in which it is highly necessary that the "tunnels," so to speak, meet; if we are facing a situation in which it is highly necessary not to have one plan in one State and a different plan in another State; if we are facing a situation in which it is highly necessary that, even at some sacrifice, there be an integrated, coordinated national system of interstate highways for defense purposes, then, regardless of whether we amend the Gore bill or whether we substitute the so-called administration bill, or whether we combine the two, it is my belief that we must place the emphasis squarely on the interstate highways. By doing so, we shall release and relinquish certain assets to the States, because the Federal Government will then be building the most expensive highways with which the States have to cope, and thus the resources of the States will be left, at least in greater proportion for use in solving their other highway problems.

So, Mr. President, I say that the first question we must ask ourselves is whether we need a national system of interstate highways for national defense and national safety and national traffic.

The next question we should ask ourselves is whether we wish to have that system completed.

As a matter of fact, the bill reported by the committee is ably conceived, and is directed toward that objective. But, Mr. President, in reaching my own decision, I was greatly swayed by the facts which have been brought out so well by my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who has pointed out that a 10-year program, carefully rounded out, one which begins somewhere and finishes somewhere, one which not only is based on a national system, but also provides for its ultimate completion, or at least for its substantial completion, is imperative. Not only is it imperative from the standpoint of defense, from the standpoint of permitting the States to anticipate and to plan in advance, and for the purpose of making it possible for machinery to be bought and for the tools to be provided with which to carry on highway work over an extended period, but it is even more necessary because the added revenue to be derived from the rising tide of traffic on these national arteries will not be tapped, nor will it be available, unless we finish them. If we build only a part of the system, it is like throwing a stout rope to a drowning man, but a rope not quite long enough to reach him. When we base our hope of financing this project without breaking the backs of the American people largely on the carefully estimated and carefully calculated increased returns which would come from this kind of national system, it is a condition precedent that we must finish the system. Otherwise we shall not get even a substantial part of the benefit of the increased income.

Of course, there is involved the practical question as to whether the States can match the funds required for the system contemplated by the committee bill. One of the gratifying things about this entire issue in the committee—and I am sure the same situation will prevail on the floor of the Senate—was that we dealt frankly and honestly with this subject, and in entire frankness with one another. I know that my colleagues are entirely sincere when they say that many States would not be able to match the funds provided for in the committee bill. I think many States feel at the present moment that they would not be able to match those funds. It is my own guess—and it is based entirely upon personal conjecture, after having served many years in the State legislature, and knowing something of the way things work in the States, as do all Senators—that when the time comes very few States will fail to find the means, somehow, to match the Federal funds provided in the committee bill.

But, Mr. President, if they do it, many States will do it at such sacrifice, and will tie up so many of their resources, that they will feel the pinch in every last State activity, including public education, and other demands upon the States.

It is always argued in the States, no matter what kind of goal is set, that "we must match all these funds. We must get our full share, because if we do not, we shall be paying taxes for the entire program, and some other State will get a greater share than we get unless we take advantage of the entire program." That is true. So, even though States do so at a sacrifice, even though it may mean the issuing of bonds, even though it may mean going further into debt, even though it may mean slighting some of the other necessary services, the States strain every nerve to meet the burden involved in matching Federal funds.

That is why I feel, as a practical matter, that a less accelerated plan, definitely spreading over 10 years, without the matching requirements of the committee bill, would in the long run be fairer and better for the States, and, by the same token, for the country as a whole.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his frank statement in regard to the probable situation so far as concerns the States matching the proposed allocations under Senate bill 1048, which are larger than those under the present law.

I point out that, as Senate bill 1048 was originally introduced, it proposed a total of $1,100,000,000 for the categories of primary, secondary, and urban roads. The responses which the committee received from its inquiry as to whether or not the States could match were based, of course, upon the prospective allocations under a total for those categories of $1,100,000,000. The bill as reported provides $900 million for those categories, which represents a drop of $200 million from the original figure in Senate bill 1048.

I may state, if the Senator will permit, that in offering the amendment which I offered to reduce the figure from $1,100,000,000 to $900 million, I used the argument that a jump from the present level of $700 million up to $1,100,000,000 was too great a jump. The $70 million under the present law represents a jump from $550 million under the 1952 act. I thought that if we encouraged the States to go up to $900 million, that would be about as much as they could do. But I thought we were warranted in giving them some encouragement, because, as I read the report of the Clay Committee, it did not confine itself to urging completion of the interstate system. It contemplated a program of $101 billion to complete all the systems. The recommendation of the Clay Committee was that we seek to complete the secondary system, the primary system, and the urban system, although the bill which was introduced would impliedly leave such completion to the States. Senate bill 1048, as proposed to be amended by the committee, provides some leadership, some incentive, some encouragement to the States, to do something in the other categories.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distintinguished Senator from South Dakota for his contribution. I thoroughly agree with nearly everything he has said. I thought his amendment was a good amendment, a valuable amendment, and that it improved the bill as originally introduced.

I cannot quite admit that his statements are complete. When we talk about providing incentive and encouragement to the States, I am reminded that over the years I have heard the words "incentive" and "encouragement" used again and again. Usually, when it is all boiled down and reduced to the least common denominator, in addition to the incentive and encouragement, which are very harmless and sweet-sounding words, there is a little spurt, a little element of forcing the States into a situation in which they must match the funds of the Federal Government or face the fact that they are relinquishing some right which some other States enjoy, partly at their expense. That is fundamental. I believe in matching funds. I think great good has been acplished by that system. I am not condemning it. There is no great good without some evil. But holding out funds to the States for them to match is a weak point in this program, because it usually results—particularly in the poorer States, or the States which have no great financial resources—in unbalanced budgets, because of pressure from the Federal Government.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that I have suggested, first, that in deciding what our attitude should be on this question we should ask ourselves: Do we need a national system of highways for national defense, for national safety, and for the solution of the national traffic problem? Secondly, we should ask ourselves: Do we need the system to be coordinated and made complete and joint as between the States? Third, we should ask ourselves: Do we want this system completed?

Now I should like to suggest one more question, which I believe is perhaps the most important and most practical question of all. We should ask ourselves: Do we want this system started?

Mr. President, as a practical proposition—and this is the main reason I have affixed my signature to the minority view—the so-called administration bill, S. 1160, does provide a method of financing the project.

Let us again be perfectly frank. Certainly I, with my limited knowledge of the subject—and I believe other Senators also, with a great deal more knowledge than I have of the subject—would hesitate to assert or predict or guarantee that the financing will work out just as it has been calculated to do.

Furthermore, I have a good deal of sympathy for some Members of the Senate who do not like the provision creating a special corporation which would issue special bonds. They have the feeling that in so doing, as we say in New England, we would be beating the Devil around the bush or trying to run the country into debt without extending the debt limit. I can understand and appreciate the feelings of some Senators whom I have admired during my service in the other body.

However, first, I should like to say that when the Government expends money for a national system of highways it is different from almost any other Federal expenditure. When we build a veterans' hospital or when we build a housing project or when we expend money for many of the activities which the Federal Government supports, it is a grant, it is assistance to a worthy cause, but it is not a business investment. On the other hand, when we expend money on a national system of highways which will enable our expanding economy further to develop, it is a business investment. I, for one, do not regard it as either legally or morally dishonest to create a special bond issue to be paid off by the users of the system of highways.

Secondly, I suggest that S. 1160, the bill which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I are sponsoring, certainly prescribes definite methods of financing the system. The committee bill does not attempt in any way to suggest the financing.

All of us who have served in Congress, in either House, know what happens as a practical proposition when a legislative committee authorizes an expenditure, particularly an expenditure so vast as this one, and then drops the matter in the lap of the Committee on Appropriations and says, "Gentlemen, you find the money."

I venture to suggest—and this is my greatest objection to the committee bill and the most impelling reason why I am supporting S. 1160—that if we go through all the motions and all the fanfare and adopt the committee bill, and then send word to the country that we have embarked on a great and ambitious system of national highways, and drop it in the lap of the committee which must recommend appropriations for it, without even suggesting how it is to be done—and this is no reflection on the Committee on Appropriations but rather a compliment to them—when we get all through we will come out the same hole we went in. We will have only a slightly accelerated highway program such as we have been having all the time.

Therefore, it is my deep conviction that the passage of the committee bill in its present form is a beautiful gesture, but it will not build highways.

I wish to leave a quotation with the Senate. It is from Daniel H. Burnham, the famous architect who designed the Columbian Exposition, the Marshall Field store in Chicago, and the Union Station in Washington. He said:

> Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-glowing insistency.

Mr. President, let us not merely make a gesture, which may soon prove to be futile and idle; but, facing as we are the emergency of our generation, let us meet this challenge head on and make big plans and embark upon an ambitious program designed to meet the requirements which must be met. I believe that S. 1160, which embodies the plan advocated by the President of the United States and is based on the definite recommendations of the Clay Committee, more nearly meets the challenge than does the committee bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, my attention was attracted by what the Senator said regarding what might happen to the authorizations proposed in S. 1048 and the implied suggestion that in some way S. 1160 would meet the situation by assuring that funds would be available. How does the Senator suggest that S. 1160 would assure that funds would be available, while S. 1048 would not?

Mr. COTTON. I think I very carefully said that I could not, would not, and did not guarantee that the method of financing suggested in Senate bill 1160 would be adopted, or, if adopted, would work to the queen's taste. What I tried to say was that it presents a definite program which I have faith to believe will commend itself to the Congress, and which I am inclined to believe will be successful. The other bill presents nothing. I do not guarantee that it will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May it not be an illusory hope?

Mr. COTTON. It could be an illusory hope, but I happen to be one who believes it would not be. I would rather have some hope than no hope at all. Even though the committee bill is a good bill—and I agree with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, with whom I served on the Appropriations Committee of the House, and who has a fine grasp of these matters, that in some respects it is a good bill—I still believe, for myself, that when we drop into the hopper a great highway program with no suggestion of how to finance it, there is not as much hope as there would be if there were a definite means of financing it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I suggest to the very able Senator that under the Highway Authorization Act for a number of years, when apportionment is made, the law provides that that constitutes a commitment, and the States can proceed under the apportionment. The fear I have with respect to S. 1160 is that it insures something more than a hope only if we take over the functions of the Appropriations Committee.

If there is no guaranty of appropriations under either bill, that is one thing; but if the Senator from New Hampshire is suggesting that S. 1160 provides some plan, he is suggesting that the Senate consider a bill under which, if passed, we would have to take over the functions of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not take any more time than to say this in reply to the distinguished Senator: I grant that when we pass a bill which authorizes a certain commitment—and we are taught in New England, where the Yankees live, that we cannot get blood out of a stone—when we launch ourselves on a new program with such vast expenditures as are required by this program, there comes a time when they may not be met, and that would cause an expansion of the Federal debt.

This is not an attempt, as I understand, of the Committee on Public Works to usurp the functions of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is an attempt, following a plan of which great study has been made, to point the way, to find the means to meet the problems which the bill attempts to meet.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield on that point?

Mr. COTTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator from New Hampshire ever heard of any authorization bill or legislation suggesting to the Committee on Ways and Means or to the Committee on Finance of the Senate as to how the authorization is to be carried out?

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have heard of many instances of corporations—and we have a long line of Government corporations—having been established by action of the Congress on recommendation of committees. I do not consider that is either a recommendation or an attempt to dictate to the Committee on Ways and Means or to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator knows as well as I do that the suggestion was made that we recommend to the Committee on Finance how this was to be done, but because of precedent and because it would be unfair for the committee to recommend any legislation to another outstanding committee, we did not do it.

Mr. COTTON. And rightly so. But I still say that our bill provides through the creation of a corporation a self-liquidating plan.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. And it also provides that of the $21 billion to be spent by the corporation, $11 billion will be paid in interest.

SELECTION OF DR. PAUL S. WRIGHT, OF OREGON, AS LEADER OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of Oregon take great pride in the fact that the Reverend Dr. Paul S. Wright, himself the son of a missionary, has been named the spiritual leader of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. Dr. Wright is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Porland, Oreg., where I live.

Dr. Wright is a humanitarian, a man of liberal views, a religious leader broad in vision. I have heard Dr. Wright speak many times. His personality and magnetism are instantly evident. He does not deal in cliches and generalities. He applies the great teachings of the Scriptures to the day-to-day problems confronting our Nation and the world.

Although I am not of Dr. Wright's faith, I should like to congratulate his church upon selecting as its leader in the country a man so qualified from the standpoint of citizenship, ideals, and religious training.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1955, describing the choice of Dr. Paul S. Wright to be leader of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESBYTERIANS PICK WRIGHT AS CHURCH MODERATOR

LOS ANGELES, May 19.—Dr. Paul S. Wright, of Portland, Oreg., son of a missionary, was elected today to lead the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Dr. Wright, 59, takes over the highest honorary position in the church of more than 2½ million members, 1 of 3 Presbyterian groups.

He leads the week-long 167th general assembly which opened this morning.

Dr. Wright was chosen over Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. The vote was 510 to 393.

The new moderator was born in Tabriz, Iran, and came to America when he was 15. He attended Wooster College in Ohio and the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, graduating in 1922. Since 1941 he has been pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Portland.

Dr. Wright's predecessor, Dr. Ralph Waldo Lloyd, president of Maryville (Tenn.) College, asked the general assembly to approve entry of women into the ministry and to press harder for its nonsegregation doctrines.

In 1929 and 1946 the assembly approved admitting women as ministers but the local churches, which have the final word, overruled the action.

Dr. Lloyd also called for an increase in church pioneering throughout the world and in higher education.

On nonsegregation, Dr. Lloyd observed: "Our official pronouncements calling for a nonsegregated society and a nonsegregated church are strong and right. But our practice is weaker than our pronouncements. It is time for every congregation to become a true Christian pioneer. There should be no church whose doors and hearts are closed to any sincere seeker after Christ.

FLEXIBLE VERSUS RIGID PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the basic legislation for the stabilization of farm prices and incomes which was passed by the 83d Congress is the Agricultural Act of 1954, which provides for a flexible price-support program on the basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts. This law, which became effective on January 1, 1955, will become operative with the 1955 crops which have not yet been harvested.

In light of the action taken in the House of Representatives some 2 weeks ago to repeal the flexible price-support program, and the pressure being brought to get the Senate Agriculture Committee to hold hearings and report a 90-percent price-support bill, I feel obliged to bring to the Senate's attention, Mr. President, a few matters with respect to the results of the 90-percent rigid price program now in operation. In this respect, my remarks are based upon the detailed statement on agricultural policies and programs contained in my supplemental views on the report of the Joint Committee on the 1955 Economic Report of the President, in which I was joined by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and Representative WOLCOTT.

It should be recognized that the price-support levels now in effect for the 1954 crops of basic commodities, which are now still being marketed, are based on the rigid 90-percent price-support law. Quite to the contrary to what some proponents of the 90-percent rigid price-support program have been telling the public, therefore, the present difficulties cannot be attributed to the flexible price-support provision of the Agricultural Act of 1954, but to the rigid 90-percent price-support legislation which has been in effect since the early years of World War II. This 90-percent rigid price-support legislation has utterly failed to prevent the decline in farm prices for which its proponents are now attempting to hold Secretary Benson and the Eisenhower administration responsible.

As Martin Gainsbrugh, Chief Economist, National Industrial Conference Board, told the joint committee:

> I would say the ills and evils of agriculture now are directly attributable to the policies that were pursued in terms of rigid support, in terms of overexpansion of agriculture in the earlier years. * * * We gave them a while to readjust postwar levels of consumption. We also gave them rigid supports for the basic commodities. We recognized that the prices of agricultural commodities would be driven up in World War II. We wanted maximum production for the farms, and we pledged for a period of years after World War II we would continue to support agricultural prices at levels above their warrant relative to the current market. Production did not come down to market levels. It did not adjust to existing levels of demand (hearings, pp. 69–70).

During World War II, abnormal domestic and foreign demand for these agricultural commodities gave American farmers prices the likes of which they had never before enjoyed. Under the impact of postwar inflation and a still strong export demand, farm income rose from the wartime peak of $12 billion in 1944 to a postwar peak of $15.6 billion in 1948. But during the period 1945–49, agricultural production outside the United States had almost completely regained prewar production levels and actually exceeded them in many areas. The result was a sharp drop in American exports of agricultural commodities, accompanied by a sharp decline in farm income in 1949 to $13.6 billion and $12.4 billion in 1950.

But then along came the Korean war in 1950, which, as did World War II, provided an abnormal market demand for agricultural commodities, and farm income rose to $14.5 billion in 1951. From 1951 on, there was a steady decline in farm income to $13.6 billion in 1952, $13.3 billion in 1953, and $12 billion in 1954.

The conclusions to be drawn from these historical facts are simply these:

First. The increase in farm income during World War II was due to the tremendous increase in the market demand for agricultural commodities. This is evidenced by the fact that in most cases the parity price for farm commodities was over 100 percent of parity while the price-support guaranty was only 90 percent. This was the work of the law of supply and demand, since increased demand resulted in high prices and brought forth an increase in production, which meant that both farm prices and incomes increased.

Second. Except at the very early stages of World War II, rigid 90-percent price support, therefore, was not responsible for increased production. Neither have rigid 90-percent price supports been able to stop the decline in farm prices, and, therefore, farm income since the abnormal wartime demand disappeared. Since with a decrease in demand 90-percent rigid supports have induced farmers to produce more than could be consumed and as a result the parity prices of farm commodities have dropped consistently below parity and with them farm income.

Third. Rigid 90-percent price supports, therefore, have caused American farmers to produce largely for Government storage, not consumption. For example, we have on hand for the current marketing year an alltime record supply of 1,872 million bushels of wheat. At the present rate of consumption, this unprecedented supply is enough to meet our domestic and export requirements for more than 2 full years. As of February 15, 1955, 43.8 percent of the 1954 wheat crop had been placed under loan. If, for example, mandatory rigid price support at 90 percent of parity were the solution to our wheat problem, we would have no problem. But the fact is we have a serious wheat problem, and it was under the 90-percent rigid price-support law that the present difficulties developed.

The August 1, 1954, carryover of cotton was 9.7 million bales. The 1954 crop produced 13.5 million bales, giving us a total supply for the 1954 marketing year of 23.2 million bales. This is enough cotton to meet our domestic needs and foreseeable exports for 1¾ years.

The August 1, 1954, carryover of rice was 7.5 million hundredweight. The 1954 crop produced 59 million hundred-

weight, giving us a total supply for the 1954 marketing year of 66.5 million hundredweight. This is enough rice to meet our domestic needs and foreseeable exports for 1½ years.

Another argument being continually advanced in favor of 90-percent rigid price supports these days runs something like this: Since the average per capita income of the farm population is but one-half that of the nonfarm population, it is imperative that the total income aggregate of the farm population not be permitted to decline further, and that a 90-percent rigid price-support program will not only prevent such a decline but also will increase the total income going to the farm population.

However, as further analysis will show, this argument will not stand up under critical examination.

From the above discussion, it is already evident that following both World War II and the Korean war 90-percent rigid price-support programs did not prevent a decline in the total income going to the farm population, when as in each case an abnormal wartime demand returned to prewar levels plus the natural increase due to population increases. According to the Farm Income Situation, released by the Department of Agriculture on March 4, 1955, the average income per capita of the farm population for 1954 was $918 compared with the average income per capita income of the nonfarm population of $1,836. It is obvious that the per capita income of the farm population is exactly one-half that of the nonfarm population, and, at first glance, these statistics would seem to support the position of those who earnestly believe that a rigid 90-percent price-support program will improve this ratio between the per capita income of farm and nonfarm people. However, there are several basic reasons why 90-percent rigid price-support programs have not and will not improve this relationship.

The latest figures indicate that we have a farm population of some 21.9 million persons—about 13.5 percent of the total population of 162 million—actively engaged in farming as a vocation. These people live on approximately 5¼ million farms of which more than two-thirds are tenant operated.

In 1940 there were more than 3 million farms—more than half of all the farms in the country—from which the average value of products produced was only $700. In 1945, 80 percent of our marketable crop value was produced by one-third of our farms, 16 percent by the middle third, and the remaining 4 percent by the lowest one-third. If adjustments are made for inflationary effects, the position on this score has not altered very much during the past 10 years. In 1948 almost 43 percent, or over 2½ million farms, were too small to yield a satisfactory level of living for their occupants, producing only 6 percent of the gross farm income. This, mind you, in a year which saw the total farm income aggregate at the postwar peak of $15,600,000,000.

What significant conclusions can be drawn from these figures? Every witness who appeared before the joint committee with respect to agricultural policy drew the same conclusions. In this respect, for example, Dr. William S. Nicholls, professor of agricultural economics, Vanderbilt University, concluded:

Unfortunately, given the unsatisfactory nature of national employment statistics, such people are considered fully employed although at best their employment is part time and very unproductive. Their inclusion among America's farmworkers also pulls down the farm income per worker or per capita to levels which compare very unfavorably with nonfarm income, lending support to public farm policies which help them hardly at all while concealing the need for a positive public program, largely nonagricultural in nature, to alleviate their low state of productivity and income.

The magnitude and difficulties of the low-income rural problem in the United States almost staggers the imagination * * *.

In tackling the problem of rural poverty, we must first recognize that there are far more American families trying to make a living from farming than our agricultural resources can possibly support at a level of living comparable with that afforded by similar nonfarm occupations. Second, we must at long last recognize that, while primarily benefiting those farm families which are least in need of public financial aid, our agricultural price-support policies can contribute practically nothing to a solution of rural poverty (hearings, p. 598).

Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago, told the committee:

But we have really now for a decade just been talking and talking around and not coming to grips with this low-income group in agriculture. We have thought we could do it with price supports, but the problem is deeper. * * * This means you have to do more than parity prices. I am not afraid of having prices on a head 100 percent or some fraction of real values which can be put before the farmer so he can make plans accordingly. * * * Therefore, I am not against parity prices if these prices have meaning, if they have long-run value. Then we can bring much greater certainty to farming as it deserves and there will be much greater efficiency. But let me repeat, the really small poor farmer, 1 million and more, we do not get at in prices (hearings, p. 629).

Plainly, here is not only the answer as to why 90-percent rigid price support will not narrow the gap between the average per capita incomes of the farm and nonfarm populations, but also a very clear and astounding presentation of the basic or No. 1 problem confronting American agriculture: Too many small, inefficient farming units and too many people in agriculture. It is plain that its cause does not have one thing to do with whether farm prices are supported or not, or whether they are supported at 75 percent of parity, 90 percent of parity, or 100 percent of parity.

It is evident then that the chief beneficiaries of the $5,000,400,000 of actual or reflected payments to farmers under the price-support programs on basic commodities have been the upper one-third of our farmers—some 9 million who live on 2 million of the most efficient and well-operated farms.

On February 17, 1955, Secretary Benson in his testimony on H. R. 12 before the House Agriculture Committee gave a detailed statement to the effect that the costs of these programs had been $5,000,400,000.

So that there will be no confusion on this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent part of his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES—HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ON H. R. 12

STATEMENT OF EZRA TAFT BENSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Explanatory comments on statement of realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income, fiscal years 1932–54

The above statement is designed to show, on a factual and objective basis, the realized costs of the programs of the Department of Agriculture which by various means have operated to strengthen and protect the price of farm commodities and the income of farmers. Such programs have been operated in accordance with, and in the manner prescribed by, authorizing legislation. The terminology used to designate the programs is governed by legislative and expenditure authorizations. The amounts are consistent with the accounting records of this Department and of the United States Treasury. * * *

Of the $8,469.2 million realized costs of these programs, $5,077.1 million is attributable to the basic commodities, as follows:

	Millions
Corn	$1,228.2
Cotton	1,581.4
Peanuts	163.0
Rice	35.3
Tobacco	97.0
Wheat	1,972.2
Total	5,077.1

These realized costs for basic commodities are attributable to the following programs:

	Millions
CCC nonrecourse loan, purchase and payment programs	$198.1
CCC supply, commodity export, and other activities	59.6
International Wheat Agreement	602.4
Emergency assistance to Pakistan and other friendly peoples	73.1
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	556.3
Federal crop insurance	71.6
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program	1,666.3
Agricultural adjustment programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas)	76.7
Parity payments	967.1
Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	1.3
Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	505.6
Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred	286.4
Distribution costs on CCC stocks for emergency feed program	12.6
Total	5,077.1

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Dr. Nicholls also told the joint committee:

Nine percent of the farms produced 51 percent also of the total value of farm products sold, and 22 percent produced 74 percent of the total value of farm products sold.

Obviously, price-support programs, as we now know them, primarily benefit those

larger farmers, and I would probably agree with you that they are the ones who need financial aid from the Government least, because they are large and efficient and have rather high incomes.

On the other hand, I think that at the lower end of the scale, the end of the scale that you are speaking of, price support will simply not do much good. Let me give an example. You know, we have minimum tobacco allotments in burley of, I believe, about seven-tenths of an acre now, and this is the minimum, as far as the small farmer is concerned. He cannot be cut below that, as I understand it, but what does this mean in terms of income? Seven-tenths of an acre would produce, let us say, a thousand pounds of tobacco; that is $500 gross income per year, and that is certainly not going to make any small farmer very well off, it seems to me—especially after he has paid for his seed, fertilizer, and other expenses.

In other words, I think the solution to the low-income farmer's problem really lies largely outside of agriculture (hearings, pp. 629–630).

For every dollar that the small farmer receives through price support many more dollars go to the big operator, and the competitive advantage of the big operator is thereby increased.

For example, in Kansas, for the 1953 crop, the average wheat loan was $1,525, and the average of the 5 largest loans was $106,963. In Mississippi the average cotton loan was $372, and the average of the 5 largest loans was $479,535. In Iowa, the average corn loan was $2,154, while the average of the 5 largest loans was $98,535.

For wheat, corn, and cotton in the above States, the 5 largest loans averaged 25, 46, and 1,290 times as great, respectively, as the State averages.

Mr. President, in this respect, I want to call attention to the fact that last year 1.9 percent of the American farmers got 25 percent of the money farmers received under the price-support program. With respect to the 1953 crop of wheat, corn, and cotton, USDA figures reveal that 64 farmers received nonrecourse loans which were over $100,000, while 2 of them were over $1 million apiece.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Producers with largest quantity of corn, wheat, and cotton under loan, 1953 crop

Name and address of producer	Quantity under loan	Amount of loan
ALABAMA		
Cotton:		
J. B. Hain & Co., Sardis ... bales	989	$178,171.35
J. A. Minter & Sons, Tyler ... do	816	146,525.75
ARIZONA		
Cotton:		
Bogle Farms, Chandler ... do	1,870	503,908.11
B. F. Yongeker, Buckeye ... do	1,911	298,129.46
J. G. Boswell, Litchfield Park ... do	406	198,972.82
ARKANSAS		
Wheat: Wesson Farms, Inc., Victoria ... bushels	88,756	209,034.31
Cotton:		
B. C. Land Co., Leachville ... bales	2,291	412,361.10
St. Francis Valley Farms, Marked Tree ... do	1,067	192,072.15
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson ... do	875	152,462.98
Roy Chaney, Coy ... do	581	103,499.10
L. W. Rodgers, West Memphis ... do	577	102,191.50
COLORADO		
Wheat:		
J. H. & N. M. Monaghan Farms Co., Derby ... bushels	157,443	338,535.55
Box Elder Farms Co., Denver ... do	71,939	171,801.82
IDAHO		
Wheat:		
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culdesac ... do	85,842	172,677.00
A. E. Bott, Newdale ... do	66,294	109,158.00
Ira McIntosh and Sons, Lewiston ... do	55,978	112,401.00
ILLINOIS		
Corn: Lester Pfister, El Paso ... do	71,712	116,173.44
INDIANA		
Corn: Emil Savich, Rensselaer ... do	102,648	166,289.76
IOWA		
Corn: Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt ... do	124,800	190,944.00
KANSAS		
Wheat:		
Carl Smith, Goodland ... do	64,277	139,237.00
Fred Schields, Goodland ... do	57,669	125,198.00
Garvey Farms, Colby ... do	43,132	104,263.00
LOUISIANA		
Cotton: Ray P. Oden, Shreveport ... bales	876	153,339.43
MISSISSIPPI		
Cotton:		
Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott ... do	7,220	1,269,492.66
O. F. Bledsoe Plantation, Greenwood ... do	2,328	394,351.03
B. F. Harbert & Co., Robinsonville ... do	1,889	359,204.39
Sturdivant, Yandell & Wilburn, Vance ... do	1,061	191,256.48
Circle X Plantation, Indianola ... do	1,127	183,371.69
MISSOURI		
Cotton: E. P. Coleman, Sikeston ... do	3,655	643,993.37
MONTANA		
Wheat:		
United States Wheat Corp., Hardin ... bushels	184,516	$348,646
H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester ... do	116,118	232,527
J. R. Katzenberger, Highwood ... do	50,875	101,982
Roy Killenbeck, Scobey ... do	48,639	101,675
NEW MEXICO		
Cotton:		
Hayner Ranch, Las Cruces ... bales	1,080	177,836
Thigpen & Funk, Lake Arthur ... do	890	149,009
J. P. White, Jr., Roswell ... do	764	139,704
Hal Bogle, Dexter ... do	801	131,510
Bowman & Son, Artesia ... do	761	126,112
NORTH DAKOTA		
Wheat: Witteman Co., Mohal ... bushels	58,850	127,281
CALIFORNIA		
Wheat: Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles ... do	68,471	147,007
Cotton:		
Giffen, Inc., Huron ... bales	7,314	1,246,516
Charles Schwartz, Stratford ... do	3,947	604,321
Wheller Farms, Bakersfield ... do	3,373	499,008
Roberts Farms, McFarland ... do	2,910	456,133
A. Shrier & Sons, Delano ... do	2,785	440,695
OREGON		
Wheat:		
Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton ... bushels	124,002	270,607
Hill Ranches, Pendleton ... do	85,858	178,070
Marion T. Weatherford, Arlington ... do	84,304	197,939
E. R. McCanse, La Grande ... do	57,184	116,631
H. A. Miller, Bond ... do	51,756	119,445
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Cotton: McColl Realty Co., Bennettsville ... bales	1,293	208,475
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Wheat: J. E. Cheek, Pierre ... bushels	46,150	101,530
TENNESSEE		
Cotton: H. S. Mitchell, Millington ... bales	597	109,277
TEXAS		
Wheat: W. T. Waggoner Trust Estate, Box 2130, Vernon ... bushels	73,087	175,660
Cotton:		
Ralph Farms, San Elizario ... bales	1,096	323,686
J. E. Porter, Caldwell ... do	1,293	208,139
Carl Clawson, Lubbock ... do	1,209	201,492
Dooley & Hendricks, Roscoe ... do	1,210	201,007
Claude Collins, Jr., and S. Y. Wilson, 3135 Wheeling Street, El Paso ... bales	694	162,875
WASHINGTON		
Wheat:		
Horrigan Farms, Prosser ... bushels	152,840	354,339
Horrigan Investment Co., 1411 4th Ave. Bldg., Seattle ... bushels	92,382	201,832
E. C. Hay, Tekoa ... do	87,376	178,196
The Sheffels Co., Govan ... do	86,294	182,756
Don Damon, Cunningham ... do	85,262	182,717

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it should immediately become obvious that the problems associated with lifting the levels of living of about two-thirds of our farm people who live on farms which, for one reason or another are uneconomic units, and the problems have not been and can never be solved through price-support programs.

It helps a farmer very little to have prices go up if he has little or nothing to sell, which is just about the size of it for two-thirds of our farmers.

From the foregoing, therefore, it is evident that the average "family-sized farm"—which we hear so much about the need for preserving these days—is really not much of a farm at all.

Under these circumstances, as I stated in my remarks last August during the debate on the price support program, it is not too difficult to understand why agricultural spokesmen have exhibited little awareness of basic agricultural problems outside the two orbits of price and credit. From a practical point of view, it is only being realistic to recog-

nize that we can help only a small number of farmers to find their niche in agriculture. As our economy grows, agriculture's part will become relatively smaller; that is, a smaller percentage of the total population will be needed to produce our food. Our conclusion, based upon cold economic fact, is not that we should have less agricultural policy, but rather that in speeding the improvement of productivity, marketing and consumption through basic research, we must also make adequate provision for expediting the migration out of agriculture which that improvement necessitates.

One of the proposals of the Republican farm program last year was to study this situation and make recommendations for actions to be taken to assist our low-income families. During 1954, the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission gave paramount attention to this problem, as did an interagency task force of the Council of Economic Advisors. The special report has now been made public, and it contains, in my opinion, much valuable information with which every Member of Congress could well afford to acquaint himself.

These two problems and their interrelationship are ably discussed in an article by Mr. Holmes Alexander entitled, "Agriculture's Upper Crust Gets Most Farm Benefits," which appeared in the May 5 issue of the Salt Lake Tribune. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE'S UPPER CRUST GETS MOST FARM BENEFITS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, who got rigid price-support laws off the books, is trying for another miracle—to get the low-income farmer off the land.

The Secretary, a genuine humanitarian, doesn't go in for planning people's lives. His new program, he says, "has no goals other than those voluntarily chosen. * * * People will make wise decisions if informed."

All the same, Mr. Benson knows what's wrong with the American farm economy. It's this:

The rich get rich, and the poor don't get their share of income or subsidies.

Can he do anything about it? Well, he's giving it a mighty try.

First, he must hold the gains of the last congressional session in substituting flexible supports for rigid ones on the six basic farm crops. There is a well-backed bill (H. R. 12) in the House of Representatives to restore fixed subsidies. If it passes the House, Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, says he'll bury it in the Senate Agriculture Committee. If it should be wrenched from ELLENDER's drawer and shoved through the Senate, Mr. Eisenhower will veto it. But it's mortally certain to be a mammoth issue in the Presidential election next year.

Price support is closely related to poverty and overpopulation on the farm. We are now spending about $8 billion a year on farm benefits, about 80 percent of which goes to the upper-income crust—those who do commercial farming on the so-called basics. Very little money trickles down to the dirt farmers who try to live off the soil and characteristically raise big families. In these days of lush prosperity it's almost incredible to find that 1½ million farm families make less than $1,000 a year. Since they send very little to market from their meager acreage, they get almost no benefit from the high prices.

Although Mr. Benson hasn't said so in plain words, it's an educated guess that he looks upon a fixed price system as a system for keeping poor farmers poor and rich farmers rich.

When the Secretary took over in the Agriculture Department in 1953, he brought from his home State of Utah a young economist, Reed L. Frischknecht, Ph. D., author of a University of Utah thesis on price supports. The heart of the thesis is the well-buttressed conclusion that, based on 1933–50 figures, price supports never have and never can solve the problem of agricultural income. The majority of farmers are merely sentenced to penury in order that the minority get parity.

Price support can be justly charged with another sin—that of weighting down the low-income farmer with unfair conditions of labor. He may be a man without the ability or inclination to commercialize his wares. Or he may not raise the six subsidized crops. But what of that? These crops account for only 23 percent of the national farm income. There is nothing sacred about wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and cotton—except that their raisers keep a trained herd of subservient Congressmen.

Mr. Benson hopes that if the flexible support program lasts another 2 years it will have the effect of redistributing the land.

Some of the "suitcase farmers," as he calls them, will pack off to the city when sure and easy profits are gone from raising crops for Government storage. It's logical to expect that some of the vacated real estate will reach people who still like to raise their families on the land.

The Secretary wants to see more Federal money go into research, into retraining of part-time farmers for off-the-farm jobs, into inducements for attracting industries to build out-in-the-country factories. The Secretary wants a reactivation of county planning groups which were set up in 1933–34 before agriculture came to Washington. He thinks that many surpluses can be sold right in the r on where they're raised. He believes that the way to abolish poverty is to increase opportunity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Richard Lee Jones, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1960.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

John W. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Francis L. Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Guy K. Bard, resigned.

Herbert P. Sorg, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice Timothy T. Cronin, term expired.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be captains

Crudo, Frank S., Jr., MC, O4014207.
Grega, Steven J., MC, O1746834.
Hogan, Thomas F., Jr., MC, O2203511.
Koptik, George F., Jr., MC, O1934608.
MacAulay, Malcolm G., MC, O1938468.

To be first lieutenants

Bergan, Robert D., DC.
Busse, Norma V., WAC, L1020603.
Clarke, Mary E., WAC, L1010079.
Dobson, Charles W., DC, O2267564.
Gault, James L., JAGC, O2270289.
Holmes, Beatrice V., ANC, N900453.
Jaggers, Joe H., DC, O548301.
McKim, Betty J., ANC, N900346.
Meengs, Philip G., JAGC, O2268633.
Paul, Geraldine, WAC, L1010205.
Peterson, Dorothy J., WMSC, M2309.
Reeves, Joseph, MSC, O997238.

To be second lieutenants

Accountius, Patricia L., WMSC, R2644.
Dotts, Eloise M., WAC, L1010758.
Fisher, Audrey A., WAC, L1020628.
Mykleby, Phyllis R., WAC, L1010638.
Schmerling, Doris M., WAC, L1020646.
Smith, Ann B., WAC, L1010669.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Baker, George I., O2200788.
DuBois, James J., O4030405.
Castellot, John J., O2273734.
Einarson, John, O4033369.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grade specified:

To be first lieutenants

Sudderth, David H., Jr., O70519.
Welch, Paul B., Jr., O70062.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Hogsten, Edward M., O1876715.

To be second lieutenants

Burke, John M. M., O4009322.
Goss, Ephraim M., O4006837.
Himmel, Daniel L., O4010011.
Johnson, Richard T., O4006534.
Mann, William M., Jr., O4006577.
Masters, Barrie P., O4006095.
Nodland, Stanley K., O4010076.
Philbrick, Donald F., O4011156.
Rathburn, Vinton L., O4021115.
Thompson, Lonnie E., O4010275.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Babiak, Paul L.
Burba, Joseph W., Jr.
Dubovick, Richard R.
Gooch, Charles L.
Kafonek, Richard H., O4040283
Miller, Raymond H., O4041218
Pearson, Roger C., O4042863
Pryor, James M., Jr., O4025673
Stansell, William J.
Tandy, Donald F., O4025723

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Dettor, Charles M.
Dowery, Gordon K.
Keolanui, Lawrence K., Jr.
Sisk, Leonard C.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Adams, Tom, Jr.
Albers, James J.
Arnzen, Chester L., O4026952
Bady, Raymond L.
Beatty, Donald B.
Beeler, Samuel L.
Bell, Charles H.
Blakeburn, Dave L.
Britten, Samuel L.
Brooks, George W.
Burgess, Garnet O.
Burkett, Seth W.
Caplice John M.
Carlisle, Alan R.
Carnes, Julian H., Jr.
Caster, Robert W.
Casto, Philip C.
Chisolm, Patrick D., Jr.
Clark, Richard D.
Clayberg, Richard P.
Crawford, Theodore A.
DeFatta, Vincent P.
Detyens, Joseph W.
Dorough, Philip E.
Duggan, Daniel E.
Farris, Robert I.
Fauss, George H., Jr.
Frazier, Kenneth M.
Freeman, Donald J.
Garrison, Melvyn V.
Gibson, Mack L., Jr.
Gomes, Lloyd E.
Gooding, Eugene O.
Gould, Frank O.
Grabiak, Richard W.
Grivna, Lawrence F.
Gunning, Edward G.
Halsey, Milton B., Jr.
Hammond, Walter L., Jr.
Haltiwanger, Marion E.
Harrington, William V., Jr.
Hayes, John T.
Hazelip, Albert C., Jr.
Helm, Gunther A., O4018431
Hensley, William R.
Hesse, Richard P.
Hayde, Jay A.
Hill, Vernon B., Jr.
Hollowell, Emmett P., Jr.
Howell, Thomas R.
Hudman, George D.
Hutchinson, Hugh F., Jr.
Jones, J. L.
Karr, Don E.
Knight, John K.
Kreidel, Morris K.
Labinski, Raymond J., Jr.
Leatherwood, Frank B., Jr.
LeVieux, Larry J.
Levine, Seymour
Link, Thomas H.
Littlejohn, Roy
Longacre, David H.
Love, James R.
MacPhail, William, Jr.
Martin, Thurman O.
Masters, Robert D.
Millard, Stephens F.
Miller, Jake
Moore, Herbert W.
Morris, Glenn S.
Nave, Billy J.
Newman, Jesse K.
Owen, David T.
Parrish, Glenwood N.
Peyton, Edwin B.
Poarch, Henry H., Jr.
Rampmeier, John K.
Ramsey, John D.
Robbins, Edwin E., Jr.
Robinson, Benjamin F., Jr.
Roby, Robert L.
Schmale, William O.
Seelinger, John A.
Shockley, Henry A.
Sieminski, Edmund J.
Sinclair, Waldo G., Jr.
Smiley, Ronald H.
Snow, James A.
Stephens, James G.
Tanner, Walter D.
Thorpe, Marvin, Jr.
Turner, Gary L.
Van Horn, Jonathan S.
Walker, John G., Jr.
Walker, Robert L., O4033422
Ware, Gilbert
Webber, Paul R., III
Wemmering, Fred A., Jr.
Woodward, J. Troy
Zittrain, Lawrence O.
Zwahlen, Robert J.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

Major to lieutenant colonel

CHAPLAIN

Griffin, James Clarke, 18740A.
Hughes, John Michael, 18742A.
Warner, Verne Henry, 18743A.

Captain to major

CHAPLAIN

×Hammon, Wilson C., 18805A.

First lieutenant to captain

AIR FORCE

Barentine, Herbert B., 17870A.
Knotts, Ulysses Simeon, Jr., 17874A.
×Bloodgood, Donal Dilley, 17863A.
Stokes, Francis Rudolph, 17867A.
Tucker, James Scott, 17861A.
Petree, Lennox Irwin, 17865A.
×Frear, Carl Robert, Jr., 17869A.
×Bost, John Herbert, 17875A.
×Poland, LaVerne William, 17868A.
×Wytock, Harry Louis, 17872A.
×Thompson, John Carl, 17871A.
Tetrick, Jacques Kelley, 17977A.
Pasenhofer, Arlo Harding, 20696A.
×King, Welton Roger, 21465A.
×Casey, James Francis, 23729A.
×Nichols, Joseph Carl, Jr., 20699A.
McBride, Clyde DeWitt, 20698A.
×St. Clair, Eugene Christian, 20697A.
×Ford, James Juner, 24350A.
×Briand, Paul Louis, Jr., 17882A.
Hofacker, William Allen, 17880A.
Foster, Richard, 17878A.
×Davis, Victor Monroe, Jr., 17884A.
Burkholder, Richard W., 17883A.
Sturgill, Stanley Lewis, 17879A.
Zollinger, Joe Edward, 17877A.
Schmal, Gordon William, 20700A.
×Schauwecker, Paul Gard, 21466A.
Disharoon, John Franklin, Jr., 22727A.
Teague, Charles Edward, 22728A.
Paup, John Wilbur, 24352A.
Jagitsch, Robert Frederick, 24351A.
×Higgins, William McNamara, 22729A.
Voynich, John Joseph, 24713A.
Catts, William George, 23189A.
Ware, Ivan, 22730A.
Renick, Ned Weldin, 20701A.
×Sorge, Marlowe Benson, 17885A.
×Ballard, Carl Welch, 17886A.
Trowbridge, Lee Myron, 20702A.
Lane, Edward Eugene, 22731A.
Miller, Ollie Dee, 24715A.
Russell, Marvin Wesley, Jr., 22732A.
×Marvin, Marion Arnold, Jr., 20704A.
×McCarthy, Giles Justin, 25620A.
×Brinson, Pat Davis, 17887A.
Hoxie, Lloyd Eugene, 20705A.
×Fowler, Norman John, Jr., 23730A.
×Monier, Robert Burton, 17889A.
×Longwell, Frank Carl, 17890A.
Bressler, Ray Bloom, Jr., 17891A.
Hobart, Charles Franklin, 20706A.
Johnson, James Calvin, 24716A.
Tighe, Leo Joseph, 20707A.
Crane, George Arthur, Jr., 17893A.
×Donlon, William Edward, Jr., 17895A.
Harlow, Raymon Willis, 17892A.
×Schlapper, Robert Alfred, 17894A.
Dobbs, Charles Edward, 20708A.
×Leaon, James Sylvester, 23731A.
×Thorpe, Willam Joseph, 17896A.
×Swofford, Ralph Jackson, 22733A.
Ryan, Thomas Peter, Jr., 24717A.
Turbyfill, Carl Mitchell, Jr., 25518A.
Doyle, Lawrence Altair, 17897A.
Eckerlin, Robert Carl, 17917A.
×McCollum, Ernest Leland, 17898A.
×Martin, James Clarence, Jr., 17909A.
Allen, Ralph Gordan, Jr., 17911A.
McPherson, Daniel Edward, Jr., 17907A.
×Latham, Donald Rising, 17904A.
×Buckley, Ernest Lynn, 17912A.
Humphreys, Charles Baldwin, 17913A.
×Brown, George Gardner, Jr., 17914A.
Carlson, Donald Delton, 17916A.
Lyon, Herbert Arthur, 17905A.
×Barnard, John Ross, 17920A.
Delaune, Herman Louis, 17915A.
Kvamme, Orville James, 17918A.
Cusworth, Charles, 17901A.
×Dick, James Liggett, 17906A.
×McElmurry, Thomas Uriel, 17908A.
×Hickey, John King, 17902A.
Miller, William Field, 17910A.
Schiele, Joe Scott, 17921A.
×O'Clock, Robert, 17899A.
Stockhouse, Robert Erland, 17922A.
×Steele, Donald Franklin, 17966A.
×Sizemore, Robert Emmett, 17970A.
Shipp, John Bonney, Jr., 17975A.
×Barnes, George Wise, Jr., 21467A.
Jones, Ralph Frederick, 22734A.
×Wood, R. L., 23732A.
×Young, Rush Lawrence, 25621A.
Daniel, John Ira, 3d, 17923A.
×McGee, Robert Eugene, 17924A.
Tooley, Bobby Jose, 17925A.
×Malone, William Riley, Jr., 18307A.
×MacPherson, Stephen Joseph, 20710A.
Hess, Alfred Sidney, 24353A.
Thompson, William David, 20711A.
×Detrick, William Robert, 23733A.
Boyette, Albert Wellons, 20712A.
Yawn, Henry Clay, 3d, 22735A.
Balch, Clayton Leeman, Jr., 23734A.
Castle, Arnold Conrad, 26681A.
Baird, Jacob Cletus, 22736A.
Burleigh, Albert Henry, 20714A.
Morris, Jean Elyse, 26682W.
×Korpanty, Leo Stanley, 24354A.
×Rindy, Dean Robert, 17927A.
Hooker, Malcolm Patterson, 20715A.
×Maxwell, John Wade, 24355A.
×Blanding, Charles Briggs, 21468A.
×Counts, Dave, 24718A.
Kelly, Eugene Edward, 25622A.
×Moseley, Elwyn Albert, 20716A.
×Parker, Michael Neal, 17929A.
×Adams, Robert Leslie, 17928A.
×Dyer, Kenneth Layton, Jr., 20717A.
Blandin, Robert Wallace, 23735A.
Calmes, William Pratt, 25519A.
Sherman, Clayton Clifford, 22738A.
×Rizer, Virgil Hugh, 23736A.
×Crumpton, Lloyd Alfred, 20718A.
×Northcott, Clyde Andrew, Jr., 22739A.
Czekaj, Walter Adam, 24356A.
×Ihrig, Maxwell Junior, 20719A.
Oliphant, John Houston, 25520A.
Steinhardt, Charles Sidney, 25623A.
×Norris, Basil Stanley, 25624A.
×Burdette, James Miles, Jr., 17930A.
Kilpatrick, Albert Raymond, 20720A.
Myers, Naaman Lee, 22740A.
Baumann, Kenneth Whitmore, 23737A.
×Gornall, John Lowell, 20721A.
Evely, Clyde Preston, 23738A.
×Mueller, Norman Fred, 18308A.
×Mashburn, Mayo Lewis, 25625A.
×McCracken, David Lawrence, Jr., 23740A.
Doughty, David Hamilton, 20722A.
Morris, Julian Bernard, 23741A.
Mann, Lyle Eugene, 24357A.
Hardy, Carl Eldred, Jr., 23742A.
Cattrell, Harry Roscoe, 24358A.
Dunlap, John Verdier, 20723A.

×Allen, Ledewey Ellis, Jr., 22742A.
Prieve, Donald George, 23743A.
Townsend, Jesse Frederick, Jr., 20724A.

MEDICAL

×Di Giovanni, Anthony John, 25477A.
×Dettinger, Garth Bryant, 25478A.
×Balyeat, Ray Milton, 25476A.
×Partyka, Leo Charles, 25479A.
×Bednarz, Wallace Walter, 25697A.
Wolter, David Frank, 26363A.
Thompson, James Mitchell, 26364A.
×Minyard, A. E., 25659A.
×Kolb, Earl John, Jr., 25480A.
×Chambers, William Norman, 24223A.
×Haynes, Herbert Curtin, 25643A.
×Jackson, Carmault Benjamin, Jr., 25660A.
×Goslin, Frederick Billings, 25661A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Weiss, Earl, 23222A.
×Hodgkins, Harold Charles, 24234A.
×Black, Wilbert Anderson, 21629A.
×Park, Arthur Walker, 23077A.

CHAPLAIN

×Bayha, Charles David, 24690A.
Shaddox, Thomas Nelson, Jr., 25632A.

Second Lieutenant to First Lieutenant

AIR FORCE

×Julian, Thomas Anthony, 23389A.
Shields, William Laurie, Jr., 23518A.
Brickel, James Russell, 23277A.
×Welsh, Leland Merritt, 23565A.
Webb, Carl Robert, 23562A.
May, David Chapin, Jr., 23442A.
×Kirk, William Leroy, 23401A.
×Streett, James Kenneth, 23539A.
×Studebaker, William Anthony, 23541A.
×Smith, Roy Benjamin, 23528A.
×McEvers, Robert Darwin, 23449A.
Gay, Robert Anson, 23341A.
×McCullough, Willard Lee, 23448A.
Todd, George William, 3d, 23550A.
Peters, Arthur Carl, Jr., 23481A.
Stafford, Thomas Patten, 23534A.
×McEwen, Thomas Carothers, Jr., 23450A.
Bryan, Charles Waters, 23282A.
×Mattox, Reginald Hardy, 23438A.
×Bridgman, Charles James, 23278A.
Winne, Clinton Harold, Jr., 23572A.
Hobbs, Thomas Herbert, 23370A.
×Sullivan, James Harold, 23542A.
×Paulk, John Irvine, 23479A.
Girard, Raymond Francis, Jr., 23345A.
×Denfield, Richard Eduard, 23315A.
×Rutte, Robert Louis, 23505A.
×Dickinson, John Charles, Jr., 23317A.
×Skantze, Lawrence Albert, 23523A.
Givens, Edward Galen, Jr., 23346A.
Olson, John Theodore, 23472A.
Dimon, George Huntington, Jr., 23318A.
×Markum, Joseph Aloysius, Jr., 23433A.
×Ivers, James Hardes, 23380A.
Mauldin, Mack, Jr., 23440A.
×Eisele, Donn Fulton, 23323A.
×Bulger, Joseph Arthur, Jr., 23283A.
×Pahre, Elmer Gordon, 23475A.
×Steele, William Oliver, 23535A.
×Johnson, Roger Wayne, 23386A.
Johnson, Lawrence Duane, 23384A.
×Thawley, Thomas Melvin, 23548A.
Smith, James Henry, 23526A.
Dana, William Harvey, 23309A.
Erdle, Philip John, 23327A.
×Kelsey, Thomas Leese, 23395A.
×Strickland, Robert Neal, 23540A.
Hester, Keete Lockett, 23365A.
Sell, John Richard, 23514A.
×Dunn, William Walton, 23321A.
Kelly, William Bernard, 23394A.
Winger, Robert Fredrick Curry, 23571A.
×Hilland, Carl Boyd, 23367A.
×Knaggs, John Christopher, 23402A.
Kelley, Robert Neill, 23393A.
×Dodson, Clinton Festus, Jr., 23319A.
×Leonard, Edward Jones, 23414A.
Brown, Bruce Kilroy, 23281A.
Schwartz, John William, 23512A.
×Mitchell, Harry Martin, 23457A.
Clark, Allen, Jr., 23296A.
×Kubal, George Jerome, 23406A.
×Ralph, John Edward, 23488A.
×Craig, Robert Jay, 23303A.
×Pidkowicz, Joseph, 23482A.
×Jensen, Donald Eugene, 23382A.
Kendall, Robert Bruce, 23396A.
McInerney, James Eugene, Jr., 23452A.
×Pimentel, Frank T., 23483A.
×Rounding, Robert Campbell, 23503A.
×Stockdale, Wendell Berg, 23537A.
×White, Edward Higgins, 2d, 23567A.
×Mulcahy, Richard Thomas, 23463A.
Simonet, Kenneth Adrian, 23521A.
×Maughan, William Patrick, 23439A.
×Washington, Robert Walter, 23561A.
×George, George Abraham, 23342A.
McLemore, John Robinson, 23454A.
×Anderson, Mason Evans, 23260A.
×Moore, Thomas Willard, Jr., 23459A.
×Portney, Joseph Nathaniel, 23484A.
×Underwood, James Edward, 23554A.
×Schifferli, Walter Frederic, Jr., 23510A.
Lyons, Richard Curtis, 23426A.
×Loeschner, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., 23421A.
Hunt, Harvison, 23377A.
Crowell, James Britton, Jr., 23307A.
×Prueher, Roi Francis, Jr., 23486A.
Naber, Gerald Junior, 23466A.
×Troutman, James Scott, 23553A.
×Masi, Joseph Louis, 23435A.
×Kronlund, Kenneth Harold, 23405A.
×Urschel, Joseph John, 23555A.
×Hall, Richard John, 23356A.
Kingsley, Glennon Mead, 2d, 23400A.
Collins, Michael, 23298A.
×Deaton, William Alexander, 23312A.
Rottler, William Drayton, 23502A.
×Austin, Joseph Clair, 23262A.
×Richter, Edward Bailey, 23496A.
×Thompson, Paul Bristol, Jr., 23549A.
Scaman, Warren Alan, 23509A.
×Isidoro, Robert Joseph, 23379A.
×Allen, John Henry, 23259A.
×Reeves, James Horace, 23490A.
×Owens, Robert Andrew, 23474A.
×Rohr, Davis Charles, 23500A.
×Walsh, Charles James, 23560A.
Hutton, John Edward, Jr., 23378A.
×Rentschler, Russel Riegel, 23492A.
×Kersteen, Richard Elmer, 23397A.
×Snodgrass, Clyde William, 23531A.
Tacke, Raymond Leroy, 23545A.
×Koestner, Raymond Fred, 23404A.
Woodward, Robert Donald, 23574A.
×Tallman, Oliver Howard, 2d, 23546A.
×Williams, Jack, Jr., 23569A.
Richardson, Donald Luther, 23493A.
Dickey, Roy Sterling, 23316A.
×Maddocks, Preston Tyson, 23430A.
Lester, George William, Jr., 23417A.
×Luther, Charles Jennings, 23425A.
×Britton, William Guy, 23279A.
Conover, John Cedric, 23299A.
×Johnson, Clarence Louis, 23383A.
×Morgan, John Ross, Jr., 23461A.
×Shelgren, Robert Nels, 23517A.
×Cook, Jack Wilbur, 23300A.
Rollston, John Paul, 23501A.
Robinson, John Francis, 23498A.
×Saxer, Richard Karl, 23507A.
Monopoli, Richard Vito, 23458A.
×Cosner, Wendell Ernest, 23302A.
×Milner, John Edward, 23456A.
Sanchez, Manuel Patricio, 23506A.
McCoy, Richard Ernest, 23447A.
×Mayer, John Henry, 23443A.
×Howell, Robert Lynn, 23374A.
Van Bergen, Richard Henry, 23556A.
×Noell, Paul Edward, 23468A.
×Baldner, John Landaker, 23265A.
×Munson, Clarence Nash, 23464A.
×Moravec, Robert, 23460A.
×Hauff, Frank William, Jr., 23361A.
×Scott, Richard Hilling, 23513A.
Delaney, William John, 23314A.
Hubeli, Robert Eugene, 23376A.
Payne, Dwight Ernest, 23480A.
Youree, Charles David, Jr., 23576A.
×Miller, Francis Harold, 23455A.
×Young, David Dale, 23575A.
×King, Edwin Harris, Jr., 23398A.
×Gorman, Robert Hinds, 23348A.
Schultz, Ernest Gordon, 23511A.
×Sjaastad, Gerald Don, 23522A.
Larimer, Walker Ames, 23411A.
×Lusby, William Arthur, Jr., 23424A.
×Lay, James Odo, 23412A.
×McClung, Thomas James, 23445A.
Hogan, James Dickerson, 23371A.
×Churchill, Louis Lawrence, 23295A.
Burch, Robert Morris, 23285A.
×Hoyt, William Brenner, 23375A.
Linkenhoger, William Lee, 23419A.
×Ortiz, Marvin, 23473A.
Niblack, Emmett Augustus, Jr., 23467A.
×Hester, Harold Hayne, 23364A.
King, Robert Bennett, 23399A.
×Houston, Jesse Barnes, Jr., 23373A.
×Gordon, William DeWitt, 23347A.
×Hazlett, Wendell Thomas, 23362A.
Craine, Robert Louis, 23304A.
Smith, William Andrew, 23529A.
×Maxson, William Burdette, 23441A.
Berry, Roy Nelson, 2d, 23273A.
Crews, James Ronald, 23306A.
Rodeen, James, 23499A.
Read, Charles Harold Wickliffe, Jr., 23489A.
×Gragg, Walter Lee, Jr., 23350A.
×Kutz, Gerald Alvin, 23407A.
Keilt, Francis Xavier, 23392A.
×Beauregard, Theodore Henry, 23270A.
×Burch, James William, 23284A.
×Quinn, James Lee, Jr., 23487A.
Landon, William Dearborn, 23409A.
West, Henry Meadows, 23566A.
×Cordes, Keith Donald, 23301A.
×Marchand, Jean Maurice, 23432A.
Carter, Henry F., 23290A.
×Rider, Graham Wharton, 23497A.
×Bingham, William Paul, 23274A.
Jenkins, Elmer Mason, 23381A.
×Webster, Arthur Lake, 2d, 23563A.
Wiggins, James Richard, 23568A.
Swatt, Stephen William, 23544A.
Macomber, Victor Kingsland, 23428A.
×Etheridge, Coy Eugene, Jr., 23330A.
×Morrin, Richard Bruce, 23462A.
×Leonard, Ralph Edmund, 23415A.
Carlone, Robert Angelo, 23289A.
Johnson, Paul Wayne, 23385A.
×Woodward, James William, Jr., 23573A.
×Hattin, Ronald Farrell, 23360A.
×Erwine, James Richard, 23328A.
×Stephens, John Peter, 23536A.
×Freeman, Robert Franklin, 23337A.
Bakke, Thomas Neil, 23264A.
Carey, Gerald John, Jr., 23288A.
×Bower, Joseph Edward, 23276A.
Spence, James Everett, Jr., 23533A.
×Campbell, William Harold, 23287A.
×Troske, Erwin Edwin, Jr., 23552A.
Beard, Bruce Raymond, 23269A.
Hamilton, Ercell Century, Jr., 23358A.
×Daniels, Edward Eugene, 23310A.
Rule, George Lloyd, Jr., 23504A.
McFeeters, James Richard, 23451A.
×Lucas, Larry Roland, 23422A.
×Clarke, Lawrence Hutchinson, Jr., 23297A.
×Gallinger, William Davis, 23340A.
×Fuelling, Paul William, Jr., 23339A.
×Aldredge, James Henry, Jr., 23258A.
Evans, William Ashby, Jr., 23331A.
×Lang, David Wall, 23410A.
×Pajares, Robert Don, 23476A.
×Fellerman, Keith David, 23333A.
×Reichmuth, Charles Ferdinand, 23491A.
×Degnan, John Samuel, 23313A.
×Friedman, Karl Morris, 23338A.
Burciaga, Juan Guerrero, 23286A.
×Mathers, Robert Gilbert, 23437A.
×Kanakanui, Richard Dwight, 23390A.
Anderson, Warren Randolph, 23261A.
×Griffing, Donald Alford, 23353A.
Barton, Donald William, 23268A.
Bartley, Robert Paul, 23267A.
Ballou, Charles Davison, 23266A.
Richardson, Robert Brooks, 23494A.
Eames, Eugene George, 23322A.
×Fischer, James Elry, 23335A.
×Swanson, Stanley Runyan, 23543A.
×Haaren, John Arthur, 23355A.
×Joyce, Robert Thomas, 23388A.
Harvey, Charles Vincent, 23359A.
×Hines, Frank Lewis, 23369A.

Severs, George Edward, 23515A.
×Liontas, Nicholas Arthur, 23420A.
×Smith, Jimmy Lee, 23527A.
Williamson, Donald Nelson, 23570A.
×LeMoal, Andrew Yves, 23413A.
×Sorrentino, Michael Louis, 23532A.
×Henderson, William Simpson, Jr., 23363A.
×Vining, Robert Winfield, 23557A.
Champlin, Calbraith Perry, Jr., 23294A.
Smyth, Robert Turner, 23530A.
×Lepthien, William Gilmore, 23416A.
Murphy, Thomas John, 23465A.
×Knapp, Walter Charles, 23403A.
×Panchisin, John Edward, 23477A.
×Bernier, Francis William, 23272A.
×Stolle, Thomas Joseph, 23538A.
Ludlam, Douglas Glen, Jr., 23423A.
Walls, Thomas Edward, 23559A.
×Shaw, Ronald Glenn, 23516A.
×Webster, Sherman Lile, 23564A.
Baker, Richard Julian, 23263A.
Honaker, Jimmie Scott, 23372A.
×Price, George Edward, Jr., 23485A.
×Bell, Robert Graham, 23271A.
×Foley, John Joseph, Jr., 23336A.
×Elrod, William Herbert, Jr., 23325A.
×McKinley, Jack Stanley, 23453A.
×Dow, Maynard Weston, 23320A.
Link, James Frederick, 23418A.
×Waldrop, William Thomas, 23558A.
Charneski, Mitchell D., 23429A.
Tanguy, Robert Bringhurst, 23547A.
×Hewitt, Lester Rolin, Jr., 23366A.
×Macik, John, 23427A.
Simon, Joseph Searle, 23520A.
×Paris, James Patrick, 23478A.
Giles, Charles Walton, 23344A.
×Guzman, Santiago, Jr., 23354A.
×Oliphant, Marcus Ray, 23471A.
×Smith, Ferris MacArthur, 23525A.
×Jordan, Roy Harding, 23387A.
×Abbott, Mark Oliver, 23257A.
×Boone, Daniel, 23275A.
Brooks, Loren Read, 23280A.
×Karbus, Joseph Eugene, 23391A.
×Smith, David Sheridan, 23524A.
Simmons, Raymond Charles, 23519A.
×McConnell, William Ellsworth, 23446A.
O'Grady, John Francis, 23470A.
×Celec, Martin Joseph, 23293A.
×Martin, Arthur Thomas, 23434A.
×Cawthon, Harry Willis, 23292A.
McClelland, William James, 23444A.
×Crehan, Alfred Emmanuel, 23305A.
×Falgoust, Jean Barry, 23332A.
×Gregg, Stanley Lee, 23352A.
×Anderson, John Hackett, 23972A.
×Davis, Walter Joseph, 23976A.
×Bannerman, James William, 23980A.
×Mitz, Eugene Raymond, 23969A.
×Bastedo, William Gardner, 23989A.
×Graham, William Ragan, 23994A.
×Fry, Clarence Berger, 23996A.
×Young, Frank Russell, 3d, 24004A.
×Conklin, James Albert, 23977A.
×Cole, Ardis Michael, 23973A.
Culpepper, Burford Wallace, 23978A.
×Thurnau, Gerald Samuel, 23986A.
×Bailey, Hugh Dowden, Jr., 23997A.
×Ripley, Robert Alan, 24000A.
Middlebrooks, Burton Stone, 24002A.
Taylor, Arthur Kibby, 23992A.
×Nichols, William Mead, 23993A.
×Holley, Edward Eugene, 23995A.
×Spencer, Edward Lee, Jr., 23998A.
×Owen, David Hugh, Jr., 23999A.
×Trauth, Ignatius Charles, Jr., 24001A.
×Griffith, Kenneth Edward, 23975A.
×Bullard, Nathaniel Grayham, 23982A.
Carlson, Eric Wilburn, 23985A.
Leming, Paul Jones, Jr., 23988A.
×Schmidt, Edwin Victor, Jr., 23966A.
Webber, Leon Bruce, 23971A.
×Jones, Charles Thomas Vaughn, 23984A.
×Dominguez, Luis Frutoso, 23990A.
×Young, Durward Dudley, Jr., 23965A.
Hatfield, William Harold, 23979A.
Cragin, John Richard, 26616A.
Smathers, Paul Eugene, 24018A.
×Hood, Edward Exum, Jr., 24028A.
×Hansrote, Lawrence Shultz, 24012A.
×Deutsch, Jeffrey Stanton, 24013A.
×Lockamy, Vance Millard, Jr., 24023A.
Farrar, Howard Ashby, 24024A.
Cheatham, Daniel Washington, Jr., 24029A.
×Covington, Richard Edward, 24020A.
×Bultmann, Edward Henry, Jr., 24007A.
×Zink, David Daniel, 2d, 24006A.
×Baxter, David Alexander, 24009A.
×Harris, Donald Joseph, 24021A.
×Horras, John Beall, 24025A.
×Green, William Thomas, 24030A.
McIntire, Scott Winston, 24005A.
×Clifford, Donald William, 24011A.
Wood, John Thurston, 24010A.
×Nelson, Charles Langford, 24016A.
×Giltner, William Clarence, 24008A.
×McLean, John Michael, 24017A.
×Panian, Richard Paul, 24027A.
Roberts, Lee Walton, 26617A.
×Putnam, James Otis, 24034A.
×Wingerson, Richard C., 24037A.
×Jamar, John Woodbridge, 24032A.
×Welch, Jasper Arthur, Jr., 24042A.
×Landis, George Richard, 24033A.
×Burkholder, William Russell, 24036A.
×Baker, Jay Frank, 24040A.
×Black, Gareth Hunt, 24031A.
Kaye, Charles Forbes, 24035A.
×Matthews, Edward Kay, 24039A.
×Porter, Edwin Henderson, Jr., 24041A.
×Beyer, John Herman, 24038A.
×Widing, Joseph William, Jr., 24053A.
×Elpi, John Daniel, 24057A.
×Morgan, Robert Walter, 24049A.
×Hastler, Russell Clifford, Jr., 24044A.
×Eckert, Don Charles, 24050A.
×Mitchell, James Kenneth, Jr., 24054A.
×Badgett, Charles Shepard, 3d, 24055A.
×Thompson, William Albert, Jr., 24058A.
×Strong, Michael Lincoln, 24063A.
×Brantley, Raymond Bryant, Jr., 24064A.
Albright, John Raymond, 24047A.
×Letourneau, Vernon Roland, 24052A.
×Hull, Rolland Grosvenor, 24056A.
×Kershaw, Junius Harold, Jr., 24043A.
×Beaudoin, David King, 24048A.
×Walter, William Chester, 24045A.
×Brenneman, James Millard, 24046A.
Douglas, Edward Peter, 24051A.
×Dean, William Evans, 24060A.
×Craven, Joseph Hyer, Jr., 24061A.
McCallister, Frank Wesley, Jr., 24059A.
Costin, Mina Patricia, 27034W.
Kitchens, Ralph Lester, 24093A.
Schrank, Wilburn Ronold, 27035A.
×Gomez, Raymond Victor, 24070A.
×Frantz, John Joseph, 24083A.
×Cobb, Earnest, 24068A.
×Anderson, Ronald Edson, 24069A.
×Miller, Ennis Fulton Prospus, 24075A.
×Jameson, William James, 24086A.
×Morrow, John David, 24087A.
×Florence, Mitchell Garth, 24092A.
×Rehbien, Richard Delvine, 23255A.
Sermon, Thomas Duane, 24073A.
×Sweet, Wayne Anthony, 24077A.
Graubard, Peter Arthur, 24080A.
Matasick, Robert Anthony, 24088A.
×Shissler, Charles Ernest, 24067A.
×Leestamper, Robert Eugene, 24076A.
×Herman, James Henry, 24081A.
×Grosse, Armin Ernest, 24082A.
×Balcer, Raymond Loon, 24085A.
×Sparr, Daniel Beattie, 24066A.
×Stephenson, Claude D., Jr., 24072A.
×Taylor, Wilford Hall, 24074A.
×Koonce, James Fitzhugh, 24084A.
Ortloff, Wayne Dale, 24089A.
×Maxson, Frederick Gordon, 24091A.
×Doty, Jack Emerson, 24875A.
×Herbener, Gerald Everett, Jr., 24876A.
×Payne, Chester James, 24877A.
Gunst, Richard Austin, 24094A.
×Larson, Richard Albert, 24095A.
×Burkardt, Edward Adolph, 24097A.
×Hilden, Jack Gilbert, 24096A.
Lawrence, Paul Clark, Sr., 25360A.
×Agre, Oscar William, Jr., 25357A.
McClintock, Herbert Howard, 25361A.
×Uhl, Charles Wellington, 25363A.
×DeSchon, Theodore James, 25358A.
×Ramsdale, Charles Frederick, 26618A.
Taylor, Harry King, 27036A.
Webb, James Cameron, 27037A.
×Dickhaus, Alfred Joseph, 24286A.
Vise, Bernard, 24277A.
Oakes, David Logan, 24275A.
Hoag, Earl Jerome, Jr., 24282A.
×Dupree, Forist Gleaton, 24274A.
Carter, Leland Wayne, 24272A.
×Swarts, James Cleon, 24290A.
Kahler, Richard Eugene, 24289A.
Hill, Robert Bradford, 24281A.
Freeman, Frederick Clifton, Jr., 24280A.
Fullerton, Jerry Edwin, 24287A.
Malone, James Joseph, 24279A.
×Lemcke, Theodore Foster, 24283A.
×Stratton, Charles Bailey, 24284A.
×Sumner, Bryan, 24285A.
Walker, Thomas Marshal, 26619A.
Smith, Fendrick Jefferson, Jr., 27039A.
Shearer, Lowell Elwin, 27038A.
Chamblee, Marion Franklin, 27040A.
Robins, Kenneth Eugene, 27041A.
Hatfield, Richard Cecil, 24099A.
Sawhill, Robert Ralston, Jr., 24101A.
Stanley, Richard Cleve, 27042A.
×Thompson, John Paul, 24102A.
Bohren, Theodore Fred, 24103A.
Cash, James Harvey, 27043A.
Mitchell, William Royster, 24879A.
York, Charles Alvin, 26620A.
×Weed, Gordon Harold, 24169A.
×Bradford, Jimmie Lee, 24172A.
×Massingill, Bobby Joe, 24170A.
×Kading, Richard Batker, Jr., 24171A.
Strom, Elmer Lawrence, 27044A.
Kraus, Douglas Arthur, 27045A.
×Troutman, Ray Kent, 24178A.
×DeLong, Richard Allen, 24176A.
×Fix, Oliver Wilbur, 24175A.
×Beveridge, George Graham, 24177A.
Chambers, Robert Jefferson, 24174A.
Holway, Warren Arthur, 24882A.
×Eaton, Elbridge Perley, Jr., 24881A.
McCarthy, James Russell, 26621A.
Geiss, Robert Charles, 27046A.
McComb, Charles Wight, 24182A.
×Poad, William James, 24183A.
×Peerson, Andrew Francis Petrovich, 24180A
Davis, Clarence Sylvester, Jr., 24181A.
Thompson, James Knox, 24298A.
×Schmidt, Clarence Bartle, 2d, 24295A.
×Robinson, Robert Wilson, 24293A.
×Boyd, William Barringer, 24291A.
Allan, Karl Christopher, 24296A.
×Cady, David Alan Edmund, 24297A.
×Grady, Walter Hazard, 24292A.
Singer, William Edmond, 24294A.
×Walker, Melvin Keith, 24299A.
Kilbride, Wade Robert, 26623A.
Thompson, James Leroy, 26624A.
Stegman, Ralph Leon, 26622A.
Anderson, Donald Terry, 27047A.
Johnson, Donald Carl, 27050A.
Chapman, Albert Edward, Jr., 27049A.
Franklin, Robert Andrew, 27048A.
×Harrington, Robert Arthur, 24184A.
Campbell, William Edward, 27051A.
Johnson, Julian Crawford, Jr., 27052A.
Harrison, James William, Jr., 27055A.
Dresser, Ralph Claude, 27054A.
Coffman, Carl Keith, 27053A.
Ohman, Kenneth Dale, 27057A.
Sullivan, Richard Lawrence, 27056A.
Obarr, Frederick Counts, 27058A.
Moore, Brian Girard, 27059A.
×Blanton, Charles Cleveland, 24300A.
×Jacobsmeyer, John Henry, Jr., 24305A.
Goldsby, Arthur Kenneth, Jr., 24303A.
Bertrand, Richard Ernest, 24304A.
×German, James Arter, 24301A.
×Davidson, John, 24302A.
×Montgomery, Warren Everett, 24306A.
×Lyons, Lewis Melick, 24884A.
Wise, Lucien David, 26625A.
Blais, David Edward, 27060A.
Conaway, Lawrence Yerges, 27061A.
Marinelli, Peter Anthony, 27063A.
Stafford, Herman Charles, Jr., 27062A.
Herzwurm, Ernest John, 27064A.
Baily, Carl Griffith, 27066A.
Burns, Curtis Marklyn, 27067A.
Greif, Arthur George, Jr., 27065A.
Dennis, Howell Anderson, 27069A.

Cantrell, Wayne Edward, 27068A.
Comeau, Paul Theodore, 27070A.
Thomas, John Paul, 26626A.
Reyes, Raymond, Victor, Jr., 27071A.
Harr, Minnis Charles, 24608A.
Probst, Gerald Grahm, 24607A.
×Latham, Edward Gillespie, Jr., 26627A.
Culp, James William, 27072A.
Brumfield, Richard Clayton, 27073A.
Gilk, Frank Edward, 27074A.
Hillebrandt, Leonard Gordon, Jr., 24888A.
Strong, Lowell Martin, 24889A.
×Berkman, William Worrall, 24887A.
Clark, Norman Johnson, 27075A.
×Callaway, Edward Pierce, 24621A.
×Cooper, John Raymond, 24622A.
March, Donald Ross, 24890A.
×Suggs, Jack Wofford, 24891A.
Gale, Mark David, 27076A.
Lambert, Joseph Karl, 27077A.
Hansen, John, 27078A.
Stahl, David Whittingham, 27079A.
Coverdale, Robert Frederick, 27081A.
DeMent, Kenneth Park, 27080A.
×Saunders, James Woodward, Jr., 25369A.
×Bubba, Lawrence Frank, 25368A.
×Killgore, James Alvan, 24623A.
×Carpenter, Robert Thomas, 24625A.
×Branson, Dean Howell, 24893A.
Schultz, Robert Augie, 25644A.
×Stehlin, Joseph Charles, Jr., 25692A.
Crosby, Mary Lavinia, 27083W.
Beverly, Chester Arthur, Jr., 27082A.
Zaworski, Donald Lewis, 24911A.
×Dodson, Jerome Roger, Jr., 24905A.
×James, James Kendall, 24899A.
×Harmer, Torr Wagner, Jr., 24906A.
×Plaster, Larry Egbert, 24896A.
×Henderson, Martin Fick, 24907A.
Allen, Nelson, 24897A.
Allison, Glen Wesley, 24894A.
×Jacobus, Frederick Billings, 24902A.
Schramm, Joseph Vincent, 24908A.
×Sweet, Cyrus Bardeen, 3d, 24910A.
×Boyden, Robert Winfield, 24903A.
×Clay, Ted Norris, 24898A.
×McClelland, James Norman, 24900A.
×McIntire, Daniel Stuart, Jr., 24895A.
Montgomery, Marshall Adam, Jr., 25370A.
×Finnegan, Francis Patrick, Jr., 24901A.
Howard, Joe Ed, 27084A.
Keebaugh, Eldon Lee, 27087A.
Slater, Robert Thomas, 27085A.
Williams, Conrad Ivan, 27086A.
Washburn, Troy Nelson, 24624A.
Mills, Billy James, 24626A.
×Aikman, James Howard, 25372A.
Sprehe, Forrest Dale, 25373A.
Schwartz, Douglas Milton, 27088A.
Barnes, Jere Leigh, 24912A.
Hartman, Sammy Lee, 24913A.
Bird, Ronald Arthur, 27089A.

NURSE

×Schooley, Mildred Francis, 24257W.
×Collavo, LaVerne Martha, 24259W.
×Momrow, Esther Mildred, 24258W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Gilbert G. Ackroyd and 748 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Gilbert G. Ackroyd, which appears on page 4897, and ending with the name of William J. Winter, Jr., which is shown on page 4900.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Malcolm H. Sawyer and 427 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 11, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Malcolm H. Sawyer, which appears on page 5191, and ending with the name of Charles O. Hopingardner, which appears on page 5193.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following groups of nominations for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, were confirmed today:

The nominations of Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., and 214 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1955, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., which appears on page 4900, and ending with the name of Willem Vanhemert, also appearing on page 4900; and

The nominations of Albert L. Abdon and 4,717 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on May 13, 1955, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Albert L. Abdon, which is shown on page 6330, and ending with the name of Adolph Ziegler, appearing on page 6340.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Carl Walter Berner, D. D., pastor of Faith Lutheran Church, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose name is holy, whose wisdom perfect, and whose love constant, we magnify and praise Thee for the multitude of Thy mercies upon our people—Thy blessings in field and factory, in homes and offices, in church and state.

Most of all do we acknowledge in humble thanksgiving the gift of Thy divine Gospel whereby our hearts and minds are filled with the peace that passeth all understanding.

Enable us in trust and confidence to walk upon that costly bridge built in the grace of our divine Saviour, who resolved the difference between Thy holiness and our unholiness.

Let Thy richest benediction rest upon this assembly and the high purpose which it serves. Endow Thy servants with wisdom, that we may do our work as a stewardship and a divine vocation, so that in all things Thy will be done and Thy work established.

These petitions we ask in the name and to the glory of our divine Saviour, Jesus Christ, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost lives and reigns, one God forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 20, 1955, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is considering the Salk vaccine problem, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EMPLOYMENT OF A RETIRED NAVAL OFFICER IN CONNECTION WITH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954 (with an

accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint Resolution 56

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes in order to provide the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project

"Whereas the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada are now constructing the St. Lawrence Seaway project, scheduled for completion in 1959, which will open the ports of the State of Wisconsin to deep-draft ocean navigation, with great benefits to Wisconsin port communities, to this State, and to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway project will bring 27-foot navigation only to Lake Erie and in order to bring the full benefits of the project to the ports of Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior, the connecting channels of the Great Lakes in the Detroit River, St. Clair River, St. Mary's River, and the Straits of Mackinac will require deepening and improvement; and

"Whereas the deepening of Great Lakes shipping channels is timely and necessary to permit full utilization of the many large freight carriers which have been placed in service on the Great Lakes in recent years, representing an investment of several hundred million dollars, and which vessels now cannot operate at full capacity due to limitations of depth in connecting channels; and

"Whereas deepening the connecting channels of the Great Lakes will add to the efficiency of lake and ocean shipping and will bring great economic benefit to the commerce of the Great Lakes, the Middle West, and of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas such improvement would be consistent with a worldwide trend toward deep-draft shipping and would be consistent with Federal projects for the deepening of seaboard harbors at many localities; and

"Whereas authorizing and appropriating legislation for this purpose should be given high priority so that the improvement of Great Lakes connecting channels may be completed to coincide with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States for the early enactment of legislation to authorize the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels and to appropriate funds for that purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin be requested to use their best efforts to secure the passage of such authorizing and appropriating legislation by the 84th Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Eisenhower; to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army; to each House of Congress; and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"W. P. KNOWLES,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"MARK CATLIN, Jr.,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 39

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands

"Whereas the 82d and 83d Congresses have enacted legislation liberalizing the restrictions on the sale of Territorial public lands for commercial uses, thus evidencing an intent to expand the commercial use of land in the Territory; and

"Whereas patents conveying certain former public lands contain restrictions limiting the use of such lands for residence and eleemosynary purposes; and

"Whereas due to changed conditions in the area surrounding such lands, restrictions in many instances prevent the lands from being developed to their highest and best use as business lots, thereby working a hardship on the owners thereof: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands, with the concurrence of the Governor, to amend such land patents by removing the conditions therein restricting the use of such lands for residence or eleemosynary purposes, so that the lands will be free of any such encumbrances: *Provided, however,* No such restriction shall be removed in patents conveying an area in excess of one-half acre: and *provided further,* That in the opinion of the Commissioner the surrounding area in which such lands are located has sufficiently changed to warrant such action.

"SEC. 2. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 17th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 43

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell residence lots without further notice or auction after 6 months after said lots were first offered for sale

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act substantially as set forth in the following form of bill:

"'A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. The portion of the first proviso of section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act which reads "That the commissioner shall, with the approval of said board, sell to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen, for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding 3 acres in area;" is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'"That the commissioner shall, with the approval of said board, sell to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding 3 acres in area; but any lot not sold after public auction, or sold and forfeited, or any lot or part thereof surrendered with the consent of the commissioner, which is authorized, may be disposed of upon application at no less than the advertised price without further public notice or auction but after a 6 months' period following the auction, only upon reappraisal and at the price of the reappraised value, if it be greater than the original price at the auction."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 45

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to waive certain restrictions with respect to exchanges of public lands for emergency relief to distressed persons in Puna, T. H.

"Whereas recent volcanic activity in the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., has desolated many acres of heretofore productive farm lands; and

"Whereas unlike other catastrophic events which befall lands and render them only temporarily unproductive, lands inundated by flowing lava are rendered totally worthless for thousands of years; and

"Whereas there is little or no privately owned land in or about the district of Puna, T. H., available for purchase by those persons whose lands have been so destroyed; and

"Whereas there are substantial acreages of public lands within and adjacent to the said district of Puna, T. H., which can be exchanged for lands destroyed by volcanic activity: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact suitable legislation to direct the land commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for lands destroyed by volcanic activity occurring during March and April 1955, such exchange to be of lands of comparable value and area immediately prior to the time of destruction, any provision in the Hawaiian Organic Act in limitation of such authority to the contrary notwithstanding.

"SEC. 2. Duly certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 20th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 41

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, to send its representative to Hawaii to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural electrification cooperative under the Rural Electrification Administration to serve areas without electricity in the county of Hawaii

"Whereas there exists in the county of Hawaii considerable areas suitable for homesites and agricultural purposes not now served by electric power lines; and

"Whereas the productive development of such homesites and agricultural lands is hampered by the nonavailability of electricity; and

"Whereas the United States Government, under the Rural Electrification Administration, has provided for the creation of rural electrification cooperatives, and appropriated loan funds to be used in supplying electricity to such areas; and

"Whereas it is felt that the county of Hawaii does qualify for the benefits administered by the Rural Electrification Administration; and

"Whereas the county of Hawaii has never previously benefited from said funds: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to send its representative to Hawaii to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural electrification cooperative under the Rural Electrification Administration to serve areas without electricity in the county of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 18th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint Resolution 42

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the proceeds of sales of real property owned by estates, trusts, and individuals where owned by said estates, trusts, or individuals for 10 consecutive years prior to said sale or sales be taxed for Federal income-tax purposes as capital gains and not as ordinary income

"Whereas large tracts of land in the Territory of Hawaii are owned by estates and trusts, and individuals who may have inherited said lands; and

"Whereas it is to the best interests of this Territory that these lands be subdivided and sold in fee simple to the purchasers thereof; and

"Whereas the owners of said lands desire to cooperate with the Government housing programs and otherwise to make available said lands to small-home owners but are prevented from so doing in the majority of instances because the owners of said lands on subdivision and sale might be taxed on the proceeds thereof for Federal income tax as ordinary income: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to amend the Internal Revenue Code, or by other appropriate legislation, to provide that where real property has been owned for a period of not less than 10 years consecutively prior to any sale thereof by any estate, trust, or individual, that on any sale of said real property, whether by subdivision or otherwise, the proceeds of said sale or sales shall be taxable for Federal income-tax purposes as a capital gain, or gains, and not as ordinary income.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

CONSTRUCTION OF GREER'S FERRY PROJECT, ARKANSAS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF ARKANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Concurrent Resolution No. 28, which was adopted by the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas earlier this year.

The resolution petitions Congress to provide funds for the planning and construction of the Greer's Ferry project on the White River in Arkansas. I know that other Members of the Arkansas delegation join me in urging that Members give favorable consideration to this project when the civil functions bill is taken up in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Whereas the flood-control program of the United States has saved much of the land in various areas for productive purposes; and

Whereas, said flood-control program has also greatly aided in the elimination of the dangers of overflow and the destruction of crops and various other properties in such areas, thereby increasing the productiveness of such areas and protecting the welfare of the United States; and

Whereas there is great need for additional electrical power in the vicinity of the Greer's Ferry and for the expansion of existing facilities for distribution of such power; and

Whereas there has been considerable progress made in the development of the White River Basin; and

Whereas additional dams are needed for the development of the White River Basin; and

Whereas the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, was modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greer's Ferry Reservoir; and

Whereas Greer's Ferry Reservoir has been approved by the Congress of the United States as recommended by the United States engineers; and

Whereas there was $30,000 included in the President's budget message for planning for the Greer's Ferry project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That we urge the Congress of the United States to give careful consideration to the importance of the Greer's Ferry project.

SEC. 2. That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby respectfully requested to provide sufficient appropriation to initiate the construction of Greer's Ferry Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 3. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded, or delivered by an official representative to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States representing the State of Arkansas.

ZANTON GORDON,
President of Senate.
CHARLES F. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.
ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

MARCH 4, 1955.

THE TREATYMAKING POWER—JOINT RESOLUTION OF UTAH LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah reaffirming its support of the Bricker amendment and again memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, as proposed by Senator BRICKER

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both houses concurring therein):

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Utah by joint resolution, passed December 14, 1953, memorialized the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to treaties and known as the Bricker amendment; and

Whereas the problems requiring such an amendment still exist: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do affirm the joint resolution of December 14, 1953, and again petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing the following amendment:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only

through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

"SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, United States Senate, House of Representatives, and each congressional delegate from the State of Utah.

ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Georgia, relating to an alternative method of amending the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of submitting for ratification an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so as to provide an alternative method of amending the Constitution of the United States

Whereas recognition of the sovereign status of the several States requires that the Constitution of the United States be made subject to amendment in a more direct manner befitting that status, that is to say, without the intervention of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Georgia respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of article V:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided,* That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States."

Resolved further, That such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States;

Resolved further, That as the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Georgia hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within the limitations and provisions so prescribed;

Resolved further, That such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

(1) That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

(2) That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to 3 delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to 1 vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate, the president of the senate pro tempore, or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate, and in States having a unicameral legislature the 2 highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which 2 delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third delegate from such State to such convention; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated.

(3) That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of such amendment to article V, the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

(4) That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

(5) That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise;

Resolved further, That this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and the manner herein provided;

Resolved further, That proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such con-

vention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications;

Resolved further, That as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, it is requested that receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress; and

Resolver further, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

Approved March 3, 1955.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 55. A bill to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 369).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 516. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; with amendments (Rept. No. 370).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 371).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4725. A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendments (Rept. No. 372).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WESTERN LAND BOUNDARY FENCE PROJECT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 76) authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 373) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the name of the Senator from Arizona will be added as additional cosponsor of the bill.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund; and

Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1957, vice Ralph H. Demmler, resigned.

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, 84th Congress, 1st session, a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954; without reservation (Exec. Rept. No. 7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2038. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2040. A bill for the relief of Shiu-Ming Fok; and

S. 2041. A bill for the relief of Elisabeta Drugoci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2042. A bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2043. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the control of certain land in Oregon to the Secretary of the Army, to provide for the relocation of certain Indians residing on lands required by the United States for the construction of the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2044. A bill to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2045. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for amendments to the Housing Act, to provide, among other things, for authorization for the construction of 135,000 units of public housing annually for the next 2 years. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, which is about to go into executive session on housing legislation, I shall move to insert the provisions I have just introduced into any housing bill which our subcommittee reports. In the face of the facts recently presented to our subcommittee, my proposal for a public housing program of 135,000 units annually is a modest one. Any authorization of less would fall far short of providing the housing that must be provided for the low-income groups in our population.

The administration's public housing program has been, and continues to be, a cruel and heartbreaking joke.

Our Housing Subcommittee, Mr. President, has just finished 2 weeks of intensive hearings on proposed housing legislation, including S. 1800, the administration's omnibus bill.

The administration bill makes some needed technical changes in our present housing legislation, but makes no striking advances in the housing field. It contains no new ideas, to speak of. It is of little help in meeting the need for middle-income housing. It is of no help as far as low-income housing is concerned.

I have listened to the witnesses, including the administration's spokesmen and experts on housing. We have had other experts too—the outstanding nongovernmental experts in the housing field. As a result of this testimony, I am introducing this bill, which is a truly modest reflection of expert opinion on the need for housing for the low-income groups of our country.

This proposed legislation would also, Mr. President, meet a few other critical needs, such as housing for elderly married couples and for single elderly persons, although separate amendments to meet such needs are already pending before our subcommittee.

I want to emphasize, however, that in my judgment, we do need a very fresh and new approach to the whole housing problem. What we have now is a series of stimulations, promotions, and thinly disguised subsidies for the construction of new housing, and the rehabilitation of old, but no overall housing plan to insure that the housing that is being built is housing that meets the national need. There is no real planning ahead in our housing program.

But the formulation of housing legislation which goes to the root of the problem, and effectively deals with it, is an undertaking which will require some prolonged study and careful thought. I hope our subcommittee can perform this function in the months ahead. I hope we can come up with a real plan and a real program. But we face a deadline now—the expiration of the public-housing authorization on June 30 of this year. So we must pass some kind of a bill within the next few weeks.

Mr. President, when the Housing Act of 1954 was approved by the Senate last year, I voted against it. My negative vote was based on the public-housing features of that bill. They were a snare and a delusion.

The number of units authorized, 35,000, was ridiculously inadequate. But even that drop in the bucket of public housing was hedged in with restrictions and limitations whose intent, I said at the time, could be none other than to kill all public housing.

The testimony before our committee this year demonstrated clearly that my fears had been fully justified. Do you know how many public-housing units were actually started under the terms of the 1954 act? Two hundred—two hundred units—less than one fair-sized apartment house—for the whole country, in an entire year.

In the course of the hearings, it was stated—authoritatively, I believe—that our current need for public housing runs between 200,000 and 500,000 units a year.

How long can we afford to neglect the urgent needs of literally millions of our people of low income—minority groups and others—who must live in miserable slums? These millions, now living in crowded, substandard, unsanitary conditions, cannot help but reflect these constantly deteriorating influences. Crime and juvenile delinquency cannot be materially reduced until the conditions which stimulate such aberrations are eradicated. Foremost among such conditions are the slums—breeding places of crime and disease.

There is no available remedy for this situation other than Federal aid for public housing. Although overall housing construction by so-called private enterprise is proceeding at an alltime high rate of about 1,300,000 units a year, none of this new housing is within the means of low-income groups.

Nor can these low-income families benefit by the trickle-down method, for our housing needs are so great that even our high building rate is not sufficient to reduce the number of families forced to live in substandard housing.

Our low-income groups, far from benefiting from the high construction rate, are actually experiencing increasing difficulty in finding adequate housing. Private builders simply cannot serve our low-income families' housing needs. Therefore the communities must organize and provide public-housing programs as they have done for years, and the Federal Government must continue to help finance and underwrite such programs.

The administration, however, in its bill (S. 1800), proposes to continue the unworkable public-housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1954, for a token program of 35,000 units a year. Even if 35,000 units had been actually started this year instead of the incredible figure of only 200 units, such a program would still be only a pale reflection of the actual need. The District of Columbia needs almost that many, right here in the shadow of the Capitol.

The proposed legislation would authorize 135,000 public-housing units a year for the next 2 years. The 135,000 units proposed is not enough, in my judgment, but I chose it in a spirit of compromise. This is the figure Congress authorized in the 1949 act which provided for 810,000 units to be built over a 6-year period. The proposed authorization of 135,000 units is less than 10 percent of our annual level of private construction. The late Senator Robert Taft strongly supported the assumption that our public-housing rate should be at least 10 percent of our private construction rate.

The proposed legislation also would eliminate the unworkable provisions of the 1954 act which have, in fact, completely killed our public-housing program. The Housing Administrator testified in our recent hearings, as did others, that the limitations of that act which required a community to have a slum-clearance program underway before it could receive public-housing aid, were a major cause of the failure of the public-housing program this year. Many communities cannot afford a slum-clearance program but desperately need public housing. In some communities public housing would meet the total slum-clearance needs. Furthermore, the need for public housing goes beyond the need to eradicate slums, and many persons require such housing even though they are not displaced by slum-clearance projects.

In many localities there will be no public housing for years if public-housing construction must await the launching of an urban redevelopment or slum-clearance program. Therefore, if we are to have a public-housing program, it must be on its own merits, not as a stepchild of urban redevelopment and slum clearance.

For these reasons, this proposal removes the provisions of the 1954 act which tie public housing to slum clearance and urban dedevelopment.

This proposed legislation would also give recognition, for the first time in our public-housing program, to the needs of elderly married couples and elderly single persons. It removes some present restrictions on housing for elderly married couples. It allows single elderly persons, heretofore excluded, to qualify for public housing. They are given a preference for admission to the public-housing units, but for no more than 10 percent of the units in any community. This limitation is necessary until we have some experience with this new addition to our public-housing program. As our experience develops, I am hopeful that the limitation may be adjusted.

I am hopeful that my proposal will receive favorable consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee, and that it will be enacted into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, along with the text of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2045) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "solely" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)", and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence a comma and the following: "and (ii) for aged single persons whose net annual income at the time of admission does not exceed five times the annual rental (including the value or cost to them of water, electricity, gas, other heating and cooking fuels, and other utilities) of the dwellings to be furnished such persons";

(2) by striking out "means families" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "means families (including aged single persons)"; and

(3) by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"(16) The term 'aged single person' means a person who is at least 60 years of age, and who has never married, or who is divorced or legally separated, or whose spouse is deceased and who has not remarried."

(b) Section 10 (g) of such act is amended by striking out "Second," and inserting in lieu thereof "Third,", and by adding immediately following the paragraph which concludes with the words "veterans and servicemen;" the following new paragraph:

"Second, to aged single persons and as among such persons first preference shall be given to disabled veterans whose disability has been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected, and second preference shall be given to widows of deceased veterans whose death has been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected, and third preference to other veterans and widows of veterans;".

(c) Section 15 (8) of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting after "families" in paragraph (a) the following: "(including aged single persons)";

(2) by inserting ", or aged single person" after "each family" and "each such family" in paragraph (b);

(3) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (i) in paragraph (b) a comma and the following: "or, in the case of an aged single person, had a net income not exceeding the maximum income limits fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for admission of aged single persons of low income in such housing";

(4) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of paragraph (b) a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Public Housing Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him, waive the requirements of clause (ii) in the case of families consisting of aged persons, or in the case of aged single persons, whenever he deems such action necessary to avoid undue hardship";

(5) by inserting after "families", wherever the term appears in paragraph (c), the following: "and aged single persons";

(6) by striking out "the families' housing needs" in paragraph (c) and inserting in lieu thereof: "the housing needs"; and

(7) by inserting after "families", wherever the term appears, in paragraph (d) the following: "or aged single persons."

(d) The Public Housing Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him, reconstruct or remodel low-rent housing (or any part thereof) assisted under section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to provide dwelling units reserved and designed specifically for occupancy by aged single persons: *Provided*, That nothing in this act or in any amendment made by

this act shall be construed to authorize the allocation to aged single persons (as defined in section 2 (16) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects, constructed pursuant to such act, in excess of 10 percent of the total number of such units in any community.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 (i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Authority may, with respect to low-rent housing initiated after March 1, 1949, enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 1, 1954, for not to exceed 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 135,000 additional dwelling units on July 1 of each of the years 1955 and 1956, and may enter into such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions with respect to such addiitonal dwelling units shall terminate 3 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into unless the governing body of the locality has, by resolution, approved such additional units."

(b) Sections 10 (j) and 10 (l) of such act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954."

SEC. 4. There are hereby repealed—

(1) the third, fifth, sixth, and seventh provisos, and so much of the eighth proviso as is contained in clause (2) thereof appearing in that part of the First Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(2) clause (2) of the third proviso, and the fourth, fifth, and sixth provisos appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration"; and

(3) the fourth proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration."

The analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1

Elderly single persons (those over 60) are made eligible for public housing and given a preference immediately after that for families displaced from present housing as a result of slum clearance programs. Elderly single persons must meet present requirements of the law regarding level of income, etc. This preference is available to single persons to a limit of 10 percent of the public housing units in any community. Special construction is authorized to meet the special housing needs of elderly persons.

In respect to elderly couples, and elderly single persons, the Administrator is given authority to waive the requirement that they come from substandard housing.

SECTIONS 2 AND 3

One hundred thirty-five thousand new public housing units are authorized beginning in July of 1955 and again in July of 1956. The unused part of the authorization for 35,000 units in the 1954 act as well as the new authorization for 135,000 units in 1955 and 1956 are to remain effective, in each case, for 3 years from the date of authorization. Thus the authorization for the 1954 units will expire in July 1957; for the 1955 units in July 1958, etc.

The provisions of present law limiting public housing in any community to units sufficent to house families displaced by governmental action (slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs) as well as provisions limiting public housing to those communities which have slum clearance or urban redevelopment projects are repealed.

SECTION 4

The self-liquidation provisions requiring continued project payments to the Government of the mortgage period runs out as well as the authority for the sale of public housing projects to private persons are repealed.

Provisions establishing a loyalty test for occupancy of public housing units are repealed. Provisions requiring discontinuance of public housing projects following adverse local referendums are also repealed.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONTRUCTION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPEAL OF SECTIONS 452 AND 462 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. GORE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF CERTAIN COASTAL AND TIDAL AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 928) to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution, the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Excerpts from an address delivered by him before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club, in the Woodward & Lothrop Auditorium, Bethesda-Chevy Chase (Md.) branch, on May 23, 1955.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Address on the control of juvenile delinquency, delivered by Senator HENNINGS at the University of Missouri, at Columbia, Mo., on April 29, 1955.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

John W. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Francis L. Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Guy K. Bard, resigned.

Herbert P. Sorg, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, for 4-year term, vice Timothy T. Cronin, term expired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Monday, May 30, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON S. 1894, RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to give notice that a public hearing will

be held on S. 1894, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation, on Monday, June 6, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m.

All persons desiring to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone NAtional 8-3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Wednesday June 1, 1955.

DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there was some discussion on the floor of the Senate last week as to why Canada has an orderly program for management of the Salk vaccine and the United States has had no such program.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an article heralding the Canadian program by Tania Long, in the New York Times of May 21, 1955, and two recent bulletins, dated May 7 and 8, from Canada's Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Honorable Paul Martin.

One particular statement by Mr. Martin seems to me unusually significant. He points out that "all vaccine being used in Canada's joint federal-provincial program is submitted to very extensive testing in two stages."

Mr. President, why was this not true of all the vaccine used in the United States? That question never has been answered satisfactorily by the national administration. It is a question being asked by parents of children from Oregon to Maine. If a nation of comparatively limited financial resources like Canada could test the vaccine in two stages, why were the same careful tests not made of the vaccine in the richest Nation on earth, the United States?

I am not suggesting that any public officials resign, because that is the President's business, and not mine. But I think the country ought to be told why American antipolio vaccine was not subject to the testing in two stages which occurred in the neighboring land to the north, Canada.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the New York Times, and the statements by the Canadian Minister of National Health and Welfare, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA IS SPARED POLIO AFTER SHOTS—FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND CHILDREN INOCULATED WITH TORONTO VACCINE—FIVE MILLION IS TARGET

(By Tania Long)

OTTAWA, May 20.—Ten percent of Canadian children have been inoculated with the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine without a single outbreak of the disease so far.

Of the 500,000 children involved, most of them between the ages of 5 and 6, about half have received the first inoculation and the rest have had their second shot. In the next 6 weeks it is hoped to inoculate 500,000 more children.

Canada at present is using only vaccine produced in the University of Toronto's Connaught Laboratories, having temporarily halted imports of commercially produced vaccine from the United States.

As soon as the present uncertainties concerning the United States vaccine are removed this country intends to resume its imports. The speed with which Canada can complete its program to inoculate its 5 million children under 16 depends largely on the imports.

Health authorities estimate that the program can be completed in less than 2 years with Canadian vaccine. If substantial supplies can be imported, however, the program can be completed that much sooner.

The vaccine used in the Canadian program is subjected to two series of rigorous tests. First, the Connaught Laboratories test their own product by injecting samples of each batch into 18 monkeys—12 directly into the brain and 6 into muscular tissue. If there is the slightest sign of reaction the vaccine batch is discarded.

Next, the Federal Laboratory of Hygiene in Ottawa repeats these tests on its own. It then double-checks the safety of the vaccine by submitting it to tests in mice, guinea pigs and rabbits.

This is to insure that no other noxious viruses are present and to gage the potency of the vaccine. Medical authorities believe the success of the Canadian program is due to the extreme care taken to test the vaccine before use.

The program in this country is controlled by the Government, with the Federal Government and the provincial governments sharing in the cost of the free distribution of vaccine.

The output of vaccine by the Connaught Laboratories in Toronto, and by the Institute of Microbiology of Montreal has been purchased under the Federal national health program. Allocations are made to the Provinces on the basis of population.

The Montreal institute is not producing yet, but is expected to be in production by the fall.

The program was worked out last fall at a meeting of the Dominion Council of Health, 6 months before the success of the Salk vaccine was announced. The council at that time decided that since there was enough evidence to indicate a successful outcome of the mass trials last year, Canada would be wise to initiate its own production of the vaccine.

The Connaught Laboratories were chosen not only because they are experienced producers of biological products but also because the work of their scientists had helped to make last year's mass trial possible.

A large portion of the virus used in the manufacture of the vaccine was produced in Toronto and shipped to the United States. In an effort to find a satisfactory method of making the vaccine in large quantities Connaught laboratory scientists discovered that Medium 199, which they had developed during cancer research, was ideal for the culture of polio virus in vast quantities.

NEUBERGER CITES CANADA

WASHINGTON, May 20.—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER told the Senate yesterday that the Eisenhower administration "could learn a lot from our neighbors in Canada" about a polio vaccine program.

The Oregon Democrat said Canada was making a strict and orderly distribution which can command the confidence of Canadian parents, and which stands in sharp contrast to chaotic confusion which has developed in the United States. He added:

"One facet of the Canadian program will be of interest to the American people. The Canadian Government obtains its supplies by purchasing the entire output of the Connaught Laboratories. The cost of enough carefully tested vaccine for three immunizing inoculations is $1.50. There is no other price for private purchasers because the Government contracted for the entire output."

STATEMENT ON SALK VACCINE BY THE HONORABLE PAUL MARTIN, MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, MAY 7, 1955

I have been in touch with my Deputy Minister, Dr. Cameron, and officers of the Department at Ottawa who, in turn, have been in close contact with health authorities in Washington and with all Provincial Deputy Ministers of Health, except Alberta, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, who have not been reached as yet.

Provincial health authorities report that approximately one-half million children have already received their inoculations with the vaccine produced at the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories. In some cases, this has included both first and second doses. I should emphasize that all vaccine used in Canada under Federal and Provincial Government auspices has been doubly checked for saftey, both at the Connaught Laboratories and in Ottawa at the Federal Laboratory of Hygiene.

There has been no evidence whatever of unfavorable reactions among the several hundred thousand Canadian children who have been inoculated.

On the basis of this extensive experience in the use of the vaccine and the safeguards provided by the safety checking, it is the unanimous feeling of the Provincial health authorities with whom we have been in touch that the vaccine is safe and no changes in the immunization program are contemplated.

We will, of course, continue to keep in close contact with authorities in Washington so that we may keep the Provincial departments of health advised of any further developments in the United States.

STATEMENT ON SALK VACCINE BY THE HONORABLE PAUL MARTIN, MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, MAY 8, 1955

We have been in touch with the United States public-health authorities who, with their usual courtesy, have been most cooperative in keeping us fully informed regarding the findings of the committee of experts on the Salk polio vaccine. I also discussed the problem late this afternoon with Dr. R. D. Defries, director of the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories, who has been in Washington to consult with officials of the Surgeon General's Office on this matter.

The decision taken by the United States authorities to reexamine the safety testing of the vaccine being used in that country has been discussed by my Deputy Minister, Dr. Cameron, by telephone with the Deputy Ministers of Health of all Provinces, except Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, who have not been reached. It is their feeling that there is no need for similar action in this country.

Because all vaccine being used in Canada's joint Federal-Provincial program is produced at Connaught Laboratories and is submitted to very extensive testing in 2 stages—first at the Connaught Laboratories and later at the Federal Laboratory of Hygiene—and because approximately 500,000 Canadian children have been inoculated without unfavorable reaction, the Provincial health authorities with whom we have been in touch are unanimously agreed that there should be no interruption in our present nationwide immunization program.

ELIMINATION OF HIPPODROME FEATURES FROM POLITICAL BROADCASTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, since I introduced a bill several weeks

ago to eliminate the hippodrome features from political broadcasts, a number of thoughtful commentators have expressed similar concern about the increasing tendency to introduce stage-acting into American politics.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a comment by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 19.

I also wish to cite a column in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22 by the radio editor of that newspaper, Lawrence Laurent, indorsing my bill to eliminate deception from political TVA broadcasts. Mr. Laurent writes that "use of prompting devices and male make-up is a form of deception."

A number of newspapers in my home State have tried to burlesque my bill for requiring honesty in TV political programs. These are frequently the newspapers which support those candidates who have introduced the most hippodrome and the most deception into their TV appearances. By contrast, many thoughtful and outstanding newspaper writers in the East have expressed alarm over the very deception and fiction which prompted my bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of Mr. Lippmann's column and Mr. Laurent's column be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 19, 1955]

TUESDAY'S SHOW

(By Walter Lippmann)

Watching the performance which was put on at the White House on Tuesday evening, it was painfully evident that television plus professional stage management is not necessarily what it professes to be—a new and better way of informing the people, of letting them see and hear directly and at first hand what their officials are really like and what their officials are really thinking. These stage-managed shows with props made out of the White House furniture, with live officials reciting or reading the script, are not a new and advanced form of journalism and true reporting. They are fiction and theater meant to give the illusion that they are true reporting.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22, 1955]

TV-RADIO CONVENTION OPENS MONDAY

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, certainly stirred up a lot of fuss with his recent suggestion. NEUBERGER, you'll recall, wants political candidates to admit to their audience that prompting devices are being used and that makeup is being worn.

NEUBERGER's proposed legislation brought an immediate answer from the teleprompter organization and from Max Factor, the makeup guy.

NEUBERGER's essential point seems to have been overlooked and the essential point has merit. A candidate for either party shouldn't deceive the voters. Use of prompting devices and male makeup is a form of deception.

The junior Senator from Oregon does not object to a speech being read by a candidate, even a ghost-written speech. He does think—and I agree—that the candidate shouldn't deceive the voters with an apparently ad lib speech which is read off a device or from cue cards. This practice is not entirely honest. It deceives the voters. It can make an empty headed dolt appear an intelligent candidate.

The voters need a chance to judge a candidate on his own merits.

As for makeup, what's wrong with admitting that one needs sun tan powder because of a pallor acquired through honest pursuit of knowledge? I think most of us pale and washed-out males would appreciate a candidate's admitting that he needed a bottled tan. This makes him one of us.

The tempest aroused by NEUBERGER has accomplished at least one purpose. It has made the public aware that even politicians need some help in talking on TV.

Kind of startling, wasn't it, to be reminded that even politicians sometimes can't talk without help?

UNITED STATES AND COMMUNIST AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, despite efforts to suppress discussion of the subject, and despite the confusion of official utterances, evidence continues to pile up that Communist airpower is moving up to us in offensive striking power, and is moving ahead of us in the fields of defensive power, production, and technology.

The warning light is on. Only the blind, or more sinister people, will deny that fact.

The question now at hand is—what to do about it?

The United States is no doubt stronger today than ever before in peacetime. But the one great question, the question this morning every American wants answered is: How does our strength compare with the strength of the Communists, those who have so often reiterated their determination to destroy us?

A great deal of time has been devoted on this floor to the importance of maintaining the friendship, respect, and confidence of our allies. But how will these our friends of the free world react if we ignore or evade this problem instead of facing it frankly?

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article written last Thursday by the highly respected military analyst of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson Baldwin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPOLITIC RELEASE—AN OPINION THAT NEWS OF RED BOMBER WAS OLD AND MOTIVATED BY PARTISAN AIM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The release of military information, particularly intelligence information about a potential enemy, for service advantage is "old hat" to Washington.

But last week the administration released some military information apparently to forestall political attacks by the loyal opposition—the Democrats.

The motivation was not as unusual in a town that is the Capital of domestic and international politics as was the method and the subject matter. The release concerned a sudden discovery by the Pentagon that the Russians had constructed, flown, and exhibited to public view a number of medium- and long-range jet bombers.

The wording of the announcement was terse to the point of obscurity and the motivation decidedly mixed. Special emphasis was attached to it when it was learned that the release had been cleared at the highest level—meaning the White House—and had been considered and possibly written by the Operations Coordination Board.

PROFESSIONAL TOUCH LACKING

The idea apparently had been born originally in the mind of a prominent civilian in the Air Force, but the wording was unmarred by the professional touch of any public information officer.

The intent, as far as could be judged from inquiries in the Pentagon, was to head off and forestall an anticipated criticism of the administration's defense program by Members of the United States Senate. Other sources added that Britain had been expected to announce the formation flights of the Russian bombers and that Washington had decided to release the information first.

If the hoped-for result was to steal the thunder of the opposition, this week's events have proven that the release as written was in vain, for Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, former Secretary of the Air Force, used last week's Pentagon release to justify his demand for a Senate inquiry into the strength of United States Armed Forces.

The new era of optimism that is dawning in Washington because of the Austrian Treaty and the Soviet gestures of sweetness and light will probably reduce the importance of Senator SYMINGTON's inquiry. Nevertheless, the administration by its strange release last week provided political fuel for the Democratic opposition instead of quenching the fire.

KNOWN FOR MANY MONTHS

This was because of the obscurity of the release, its obvious ulterior motivation, and because it failed to tell anywhere near the whole truth. The 2 Russian jet bombers mentioned in the release—the medium Type 39, and the heavy Type 37, both designed by Ilyushin—have been known to be in existence in some numbers for many months.

The first of these planes was publicly demonstrated in the May Day parade in Moscow in 1954, but no informed military or air attaché in Moscow and none of the correspondents there believed that the few bombers then shown were merely prototypes. The Russians would scarcely be foolish enough, all informed observers agreed, to display publicly merely a prototype.

Other planes of the same type probably were available, though not exhibited publicly, in May 1954, and the Russians were probably then in production with both the Type 37 and the Type 39.

In any case, the large 4-engined Type 37, supposed to be the equivalent of our Boeing B–52, had been seen in the air over Moscow and elsewhere in Russia by foreigners numerous times both before and after May Day of 1954.

Two or three of them, flying together, had been seen and reported by foreign correspondents and the air attachés of many countries as long ago as last summer and fall.

The "news" of the formation flights of heavy and medium jet bombers was, therefore, no news at all, at least in the way it was phrased.

Somewhat more interesting, though not unexpected as the release conceded, was the mention of a Russian turboprop bomber, and a new all-weather fighter. Both of these had been forecast in aviation circles and had been reported in attaché reports.

The Soviet turboprop aircraft may actually have more importance as a potential tanker for air refueling than as a bomber. Presumably it could reach higher altitudes and make greater speeds than the United States piston-engined tankers, thus greatly simplifying the difficult art of air refueling.

MOTIVES IN RELEASE SCORED

The all-weather fighter mentioned in last week's announcement is not the MIG–17, a development of the MIG–15 fitted in some models with radar, and having a day and night all-weather capability.

The new Soviet fighter is a radical delta-wing design. It is believed to be of high speed and is equipped with radar for all-weather day and night use.

All these developments are not really unexpected, for it has long been known that the Soviet Air Force was in transformation from an essentially defensive unit to one with major offensive capabilities. The Russians also are achieving air quality as well as air quantity.

All this can, and should be, told to Congress and the American peope—but not in a sudden, "crash" release issued not for information but for effect and restricted to partial truth.

Last week's release about the new Soviet planes is the best possible illustration of what is wrong with Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson's formula for the release of military news that is constructive. The word "constructive," in this instance, was translated to mean for political advantage and service effect.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should also like to have in the printed RECORD at this point an article published yesterday by Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, the equally respected military analyst of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA PASSING UNITED STATES IN DESIGN AND PRODUCTION OF WARPLANES; JOINT CHIEFS SHOWING CONCERN—REDS PRESSED 3 YEARS OF CRASH PROGRAMS WHILE ADMINISTRATION CUT BACK AMERICAN SCHEDULE—NOW FLYING IN FORMATION BOMBERS AIMED DIRECTLY AT UNITED STATES

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U. S. Army (retired))

WASHINGTON, May 21.—The significance of the recent disclosures of new Soviet aircraft is that the Russians are surpassing the United States in aircraft and aircraft engine design and are getting into production with advanced types more rapidly than we have been able to.

In the past, the United States has counted on superior quality to overcome Soviet quantity. The Russians are now overtaking us in heavy bombers and are surpassing us in fighters. Their production is much greater than ours.

None of this is fresh news.

The big Soviet bombers were first shown at the May day celebration a year ago. At that time also formations of the MIG–17, a bigger and more powerful version of the MIG–15, were shown. This indicated that the MIG–17 was not only in production, but in combat formations, while our comparable fighter, the F–100, a final version of the F–86, was still in the testing stage.

As to production, it has been known for a long time that 15,000 of the MIG–15s had been made and that at one time they were being turned out at the rate of 450 a month.

There should, therefore, be no surprise or shock at the news that the Russians in the not distant future will be leaving us behind in the air.

REASON FOR TIMING

There has been some speculation about why the information of Soviet progress in the air was released at this time.

* * * * *

Actually the timing of the release had to do with another day. At the annual military parade on May day, the Soviet Union displays its newest military equipment. This release simply followed the Russian May day exhibition.

The information belatedly released in the United States had been published in London and Paris and in most of the principal countries in the world. The new Soviet aircraft had been seen by hundreds of thousands of people in Moscow and by the military attachés of the nations with representation there. The American public was being deprived of what was public information on a worldwide scale.

If the noninformative release of the Defense Department had not been made, the news would have reached here from foreign sources and the administration would have found itself in the position of suppressing information of vital interest to the American people.

SYMINGTON'S COMMENT

Missouri's Senator STUART SYMINGTON told the Senate that "it is now clear that in quality as well as quantity of planes the Communists are at least in the process of surpassing the United States."

President Eisenhower, when questioned about this statement at his last press conference said, "To say that we have lost in a twinkling all this great technical excellence as well as the numbers in total aircraft is just not true."

It has not been lost in a twinkling.

The Soviet by crash programs over the last 3 years have caught up with us and passed us. While the present administration has been cutting back and slowing down the airpower program, the Russians have been rushing theirs.

So far, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not modified our air program. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, said yesterday that the Soviet advances must be taken into account in the continuous review of our air strength. It is known, however, that belatedly the JCS are seriously concerned with the remarkable Soviet advances in the air.

DECEPTIVE POSITION

The administration position on American airpower has been that never before has the American Air Force been as strong in peacetime as it is today. This is a perfectly true statement, but also a deceptive one. Airpower is relative to that of the potential enemy. It is also true that never before has Soviet airpower been as strong as it is today; and it is also true that Soviet airpower is now in the process of surpassing ours.

REASON FOR FURORE

What started the current furore was the release of information about Soviet aircraft obtained while they were practicing flying in formation over Moscow for the annual May Day military celebration.

During these flights formations of the heavy bomber, type 37, comparable to the American B–52, and flights of the medium bomber, type 39, comparable to our B–47, were seen on a number of occasions.

Eight and ten aircraft were observed in type 37 formations. A year ago a single type 37 was flown on several occasions. This indicates that the heavy bomber is not only in production, but also is in combat units. The Russians, therefore, have put a heavy jet bomber into operational units before the United States has been able to do so.

This bomber, as General Twining has said, is aimed directly as the United States. It is an intercontinental jet bomber with 4 huge engines and a range estimated at 5,200 miles. Production is believed to equal and perhaps to exceed that of the United States B–52.

The engines, when exhibited a year ago, were a shock to American designers. The Russians had achieved about twice as much thrust (power) as any Western-designed aircraft engine. The Russians were able to make 4 engines do the job on a huge plane about the size of our B–52, where we had to use 8. The smaller number of larger engines is more economical of fuel.

AIMED ONLY AT UNITED STATES

The type 37 bomber has no mission except to deter the United States from engaging in war or to attack us. Its range is not needed for any other Soviet target. Its great speed and high altitude performance puts a new dimension on American defense problems. In the past, we could pretty well count on besting the Soviet copy of our M–29, the TU–4, with our air defenses. The new bomber will be able to cut the percentage of kills way down.

The Soviet medium jet bomber, the type 39, was also displayed in formations prior to the present May Day, and about 40 had been seen a year earlier. The plane, comparable to the American B–47 with 6 engines, is powered with only 2 of the huge Soviet jet powerplants.

It is believed that the type 39 is being built at a rate at least equal to, and possibly in excess of, our production of the B–47. This bomber is designed for the longer bomber missions in Europe, and especially against the United States peripheral airbases.

A third large airplane exhibited was a huge turboprop aircraft. This might have been intended as a tanker, a bomber, or long-range reconnaissance aircraft. It had four turboprop engines with double counterrotating propellers.

This plane is believed to be in production. If so, the Soviets are 2 to 3 years ahead of the United States in this field. Our big turboprops are still in the testing stage and the Russians appear to have overcome bugs in these engines that we have not been able to iron out.

MANY MIG–17'S SEEN

The United States is planning to build 50-ton turboprop transports and tankers, but delivery is 2 to 3 years away. Many formations of the MIG–17, a larger and more powerful version of the MIG–15, have been seen. This fighter is roughly comparable to the American F–100. Both can fly in level flight at about the speed of sound. Both are capable of supersonic dives. Some all-weather versions of the MIG–27 have been seen.

While the United States has manufactured a few hundred of the F–100, the Soviets have manufactured 7,000 of the MIG–17. Production is believed to be about 300 a month. It is estimated that 4,000 of these high-performance aircraft are in combat formations in the Soviet Union. Some have been seen in the Far East.

Another shock was formations of a new supersonic day fighter with a 60-degree swept-back wing. This airplane is believed to be capable of speeds in level flight of more than 1,000 miles per hour. The United States has several such aircraft in the design and test stage, but none is operational. It is obvious that the Russians have them in production and that they are already going into combat units.

A new and advanced type of all-weather fighter was also displayed.

EFFECT ON SAC

The impact of the new Soviet supersonic and all-weather fighters on the Strategic Air Command will be very great. Until lately it was believed that the American B–47, due to its great speed and altitude capabilities, could get into and out of the Soviet Union without serious losses. The Russian supersonic and all-weather fighter of high performance may change this optimistic idea.

SAC will have to prepare for heavier losses on its missions; it may have to fly in large

defensive formations, and therefore a larger strategic Air Force will be needed to do the same job in the future.

This recapitulation shows that the Soviets have drawn abreast of us in the intercontinental jet bomber, are reaching for us with a high-performance medium jet bomber, are a couple of years ahead of us in production of high-performance sonic fighters and have a very substantial lead in supersonic fighters.

What every American would like to know is why the United States is losing ground.

One reason is the business approach of the present administration. In emphasizing economy, it has extended the lead time—the years between design and production of new aircraft—so that we cannot compete with the Soviets in advanced designs.

It breaks the heart of a businessman, accustomed to an economical routine, to put an airplane into production before it has been fully tested and then have to send it to a modification center to have extensive changes made in it at great cost. It is much cheaper to spend a couple of years testing and then to go into production.

That may do for automobiles, and the kind of competition there is between motor manufacturers, but in aircraft we are competing with the Soviet Union for survival.

EXAMPLE OF THE B–47

It is not a coincidence that American supremacy in the air today rests on the B–47. This plane was ordered into production without adequate testing. Modification has cost more than $300 million, but it was produced on time and for the last year and for the next two, at least, it will carry the major burden of American airpower.

The B–47 is the lone type of aircraft in which the United States has the advantage over the Soviets. The courageous decision to go ahead with production early was made by then Secretary of the Air Force and now Senator from Missouri, STUART SYMINGTON.

In quantity, the Russians have 20,000 aircraft in combat formations compared to the United States' 12,500 in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. Some 4,000 additional aircraft of our allies should be added to the West's total, but these are partly offset by planes supplied to the satellites of the Soviet Union.

The total aircraft in combat formations for the United States is deceptive because large numbers of Navy and Marine aircraft are not available for global missions. Marine aircraft operate on a narrow basis of close support of Marine ground units, while about half the naval aircraft on carriers have no other function than to protect the carriers themselves.

SOME SENATORS WORRIED

Soviet advances in aviation threaten our supremacy in bombardment, greatly increase the difficulties of the Strategic Air Command and set back our defensive capacity. There are several Senators on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate who have forseen this and have been worried.

Because of the President's great military prestige it has been difficult to make headway against a military program approved by the 5-star President.

Senator SYMINGTON's resolution (S. Res. 100) for the Senate to determine the relative strength of the Communist forces as against the forces of the Free World may be the beginning of the end of the surrender by the Congress of its functions with respect to the Armed Forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this time also I should like to present for printing in the body of the RECORD an editorial and an article published and signed by Mr. Robert Hotz, editor of the McGraw-Hill publication Aviation Week.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBLE SHOCK FOR AMERICANS

(By Robert Hotz)

Every American citizen should be doubly shocked by the recent Russian aerial display over Moscow.

They should be shocked first because the quantity and quality of new Soviet long-range jet bombers and supersonic fighters indicate that our once wide margin of superiority in the air has been whittled to a very slim advantage. The Russian rate of technical progress during the past year also indicates that even the slim margin of superiority we now hold may be erased in the near future unless we radically revise our own pace of aeronautical development and production.

They should be shocked again by what appears to be deliberate deception practiced against them by some of the highest civilian officials in their Government. These officials have concealed the unpleasant but true and complete facts of the Russian air display behind a vague and incomplete Department of Defense press release.

The Russian flying display of late April and early May over Moscow is described fully for the first time in this issue of Aviation Week beginning on page 12. It clearly demonstrated a significant acceleration of Russian progress during the past year both in the development of a round-the-clock defensive fighter system and in heavy emphasis on production of a long-range turbojet and turboprop bomber fleet that can deliver atomic and hydrogen bombs into the heart of the North American continent. As Gen. Nathan Twining, USAF Chief of Staff, noted last year after the first public appearance of the four-jet Bison (type 37): "It is aimed squarely at us."

REBUTTAL FROM RUSSIA

The oft-repeated statement of Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson that "Russia is developing a defensive air force" has been smothered by the roar of 40 18,000-pound thrust turbojets that propelled 10 Bison long-range heavy bombers over Red Square early this month. His claim that "we give the Russians credit for having aircraft that they just don't have" has been rebutted by the 50-plane formation of supersonic day fighters of a design more advanced than anything American aircraft factories are now producing; and the 30-plane formation of all-weather fighters and the several thousand supersonic MIG–17's that even Pentagon intelligence experts admit are in service with the Red air force.

The 1955 Moscow air display means that American military airpower policy must be radically revised. Even the official Defense Department statement admits: "These observations establish a new basis for our estimate of Soviet production of the heavy jet bomber (Bison) and of the medium bomber (Badger)."

But even more serious than the growing threat of Russian airpower is the deception being practiced officially by top-level civilians in Government that denies the American people the facts they must know if they are to make the intelligent judgments necessary to insure our survival as a Nation. The complete story of the Russian air display as reported in this issue of Aviation Week was known to top civilian officials in the Defense Department and presumably in the White House where the official press release was edited and cleared for publication.

FOUR QUESTIONS

Why was the whole story withheld from the American people?

Why were facts that were available to every resident of Moscow and hundreds of non-Russian observers who were in the Soviet capital between April 24 and May 7, 1955, denied to the American press and people?

Why are the pictures of these aircraft taken by foreign observers still concealed in the Pentagon under the guise of military security?

Why does not President Eisenhower use the leadership endowed by his position to tell the American people the complete story of the Moscow air show and what it means to the future of this country?

If the executive branch of the Government does not fully discharge its responsibility to tell the American people the facts on Russian airpower it is clearly the duty of the legislative branch to formally investigate and put the whole story on public record.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, perhaps the most informed man on military airpower in Congress, has already demanded a Senate investigation of this affair. He is supported by Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, another expert on military affairs and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This alarm over Russian airpower is no shallow plea for a boost in the fiscal 1956 military budget. It is no false cry of "wolf" from professional soldiers. The crisis is real. This country is facing one of its most dangerous hours. If freedom and democracy are to survive the American people must be told the whole truth.

Intelligent decisions cannot be made in a dark aura of public ignorance and official secrecy.

RUSSIAN JET AIRPOWER GAINS FAST ON UNITED STATES

(By Robert Hotz)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Russia is winning its technological race with the United States to develop superior airpower.

New and exclusive details on the size and scope of the Russian flying display over Moscow early this month have been reported to Aviation Week by on-the-spot observers.

These facts reveal that the Red Air Force has made such rapid progress in design and production of supersonic fighters and long range jet bombers that it shocked even the top level and most knowledgeable military aviation leaders in the Pentagon.

These details, reported exclusively in Aviation Week, contrast sharply with the official statement of the Department of Defense on the Russian air show.

This official statement was discussed at the highest civilian level of the Government and approved for release by the White House.

Although bad weather canceled the May Day fly-by over Red Square in Moscow, the Russians gave foreign observers ample opportunity to study the latest Red Air Force equipment scheduled for display. More than half a dozen low level sweeps were made over Moscow including several pre-May Day rehearsals and another series of flights during the week after May Day as though the Russians were trying to make certain that no detail of their new aerial equipment escaped notice by foreign observers.

This is what Moscow observers actually saw during the last week in April and the first week in May:

NEW SUPERSONIC FIGHTER

At least 50 new supersonic day fighters. This new model, never before publicly displayed, featured 60 degree swept-back wings and a low-set horizontal tail, both characteristics of extremely advanced supersonic design. Foreign observers evaluated the new Russian fighter design as more advanced than the North American F–100 Super Sabre and its performance as comparable to the 1,000-miles-per-hour plus Lockheed F–104.

ALL-WEATHER FIGHTER

Formation of 30 new all-weather fighters. This new design, a true all-weather interceptor with a solid radome nose has thin, straight wings and engine air intakes on both sides of the aircraft's fuselage.

Performance of this type is estimated to lie above that of the Lockheed F–94C Starfire but not up to the top supersonic speed performance of the Convair F–102.

TURBOPROP BOMBER

Formation of nine sweptwing turboprop bombers. These bombers were powered by four turboprop engines estimated at about 5,000 estimated horsepower, turning contrarotating propellers. They strongly resemble the flight photograph of the IL–38 published exclusively in Aviation Week more than a year ago on February 15, 1954, page 12.

This new Russian turboprop bomber appears capable also of functioning as an aerial tanker for jet bombers and a long-range strategic reconnaissance plane.

FIFTY BADGERS

Large formations of twin-jet Badger (type 39) bombers. Ground observers counted as many as 50 Badgers in a single formation during the Moscow fly-by. Last year the Russians flew a formation of nine Badgers on May Day. This bomber is roughly comparable in size to the Boeing B–47.

BISON FORMATION

First formation of 10 Bison (type 37) bombers. Last year the Russians flew a single Bison on May Day believed to have been the experimental prototype. Formations ranging from 8 to 10 aircraft were sighted at low altitude over Moscow before and after May Day this year. The Bison is roughly comparable to the Boeing B–52 in size and performance.

Not seen in the May Day flying activity was the MIG–17, a supersonic day fighter already in widespread service with the Red Air Force, and the Il–20, a jet transport reported by Radio Moscow to be in service carrying high-priority cargo on a European-Asia operation.

Foreign observers report to Aviation Week that the Russians have already produced several thousand MIG–17's and production is now running nearly 400 planes a month. Formations of MIG–17's flew in the 1954 May Day show. (Aviation Week, May 19, 1954, p. 14.)

USAF PRODUCTION

This compares with a total USAF aircraft production rate for 1954 that averaged 435 planes of all types per month and reached a maximum of 492 planes delivered last July, according to testimony by Brig. Gen. T. P. Gerrity, director of procurement and production in USAF headquarters, before House Appropriations Committee.

The MIG–17 (AW August 2, 1954, p. 12) is comparable in performance to the North American F–100 Super Sabre. While the MIG–17 was reported to be in squadron service with the Russian Far East Air Forces in Siberia as early as July 1954 by Gen. Earle E. Partridge, then top United States Air Force commander in the Orient, the first F–100 fighter group was equipped late in 1954.

Recent reports on the vital field of propulsion indicate the Russians are pushing technical progress hard in all types of modern aircraft power, covering the entire spectrum from turboprops and turbojets to the ramjet and rockets. There is no definite indication of any work on application of nuclear power to aircraft but since the Red air force has been able to blossom forth with new fighter and bomber types in squadron strength without any prior knowledge by foreign observers, it cannot be assumed they are neglecting development of a nuclear-powered aircraft.

Latest versions of the Bison and Badger turbojet powerplants are delivering from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds thrust. Turboprops of the IL–38 type bomber are in the 5,000 eshp. class. Rocket powerplants range from 8,000 to 12,000 pounds thrust for interceptor aircraft to a 250,000-pound motor for initial stage power for a multistage intercontinental ballistic missile.

PENTAGON PROBLEMS

Top-level military aviation leaders in the Pentagon are shocked by four conclusions that must inevitably be drawn from the 1954 and 1955 May Day aerial displays:

Rapid rate of progress achieved by the Russians during the past year in both technical development and productive capacity. This rapidly accelerating rate of aeronautical progress indicates that the vast effort in technical education and training the Russians have been pouring into their military aviation program since 1946 has reached the payoff stage.

Current momentum of the Soviet technological drive has virtually wiped out the once wide margin of technical superiority enjoyed by the USAF and naval airpower. This is the opinion of experts who have been following Russian developments accurately and warning for several years of the significant acceleration of the Communists' efforts in airpower.

Lack of adequate intelligence on the details of the accelerated Russian military airpower program. On May Day 1954, the Red air force displayed a complete formation of twin jet Badgers as a complete surprise to foreign intelligence experts. On May Day 1955, the formation of 50 new supersonic day fighters with design more advanced than the F–100 was again the first foreign inkling that this type existed. Virtually no intelligence exists on aircraft or missile developments that have not yet reached the hardware production stage.

Consistent misinterpretation of what intelligence has been available by the top level civilian heads of the Government who actually determine United States military policy.

Fast pace of Russian research and development in the field of supersonic areodynamics and propulsion. Appearance of such design features as 60-degree wing sweepback, low-slung horizontal tails, thin, straight wings, flush engine air inlets, and airborne radar indicate the Russians have the ability to translate basic aerodynamic research into military hardware faster than foreign observers have believed possible.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, most important in these publications is the box score of comparative military production, which I now ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRODUCTION BOX SCORE

DAY FIGHTERS

Russia

MIG–15. Transonic speed range. Fifteen thousand produced 1948–52.

MIG–17. Supersonic speed range. Seven thousand produced 1952–54. In service with Red air force combat units in Europe and Asia.

Thousand miles per hour, supersonic day fighter. Matching F–104 performance; in production 1954; at least 50 flying; probably in limited squadron service with Red air force.

USAF

F–86 Sabre series. Transonic speed range. Six thousand produced by North American Aviation and Canadair Ltd. 1948–54.

F–100 Super Sabre. Supersonic speed range. Several hundred produced by North American in California 1953–55; second source plant being tooled for production in Columbus, Ohio; first USAF combat wing equipped with F–100 late 1954.

Lockheed F–104. Supersonic 1,000 miles per hour, plus speed range. Two built; one lost in crash; production begun on order for 17 planes. Won't be in USAF squadron service until 1957 at earliest.

ALL-WEATHER INTERCEPTORS

Russia

Straight-wing transonic design. In production 1954; at least 30 flying; probably in limited squadron service.

USAF

Lockheed F–94C. 400 produced 1951–53; in squadron service with Air Defense Command.

Convair F–102. Supersonic speed range. About a dozen experimental models built; production begun San Diego plant on order of about 50 planes; not due for squadron service before 1957.

JET BOMBERS

Russia

Badger (type 39) medium bomber. In production 1953; at least 50 flying; in limited squadron service with Red air force.

Bison (type 37) heavy bomber. In production 1954; at least 10 built; probably scheduled for squadron service in mid-1955.

Il–38 turboprop sweptwing bomber, aerial tanker and strategic reconnaissance plane; in production 1953; formations of from 3 to 9 planes sighted by foreign observers in Russia for over a year; probably in limited squadron service.

USAF

Boeing B–47 medium bomber. In production since 1948; about 1,500 built by Boeing, Douglas, Lockheed; Strategic Air Command is 80 percent equipped with B–47s.

Boeing B–52 heavy bomber. In production since 1953; about 30 built; scheduled for squadron service with SAC by mid-1955.

USAF has no turboprop bomber. Total of 10 experimental transports now flying with turboprops; Lockheed C–130A for turboprop transport now in production Marietta, Ga., plant.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some might call a box score an accounting—in other words, a balance sheet.

Now that this balance sheet has been supplied by a magazine of high standing in the aviation industry, I again urge that the Administration either confirm or correct the accuracy of this published accounting.

RESULTS ACHIEVED BY MAJORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22, 1955, entitled "Matter of Fact: A Real Pro at Work in Senate." This article was written by Mr. Stewart Alsop of the New York Herald Tribune News Syndicate. I believe Mr. Alsop has done a splendid job of summing up the great work being done in the Senate by our majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I, too—even as a freshman Senator—have noticed the great service our majority leader is rendering to his Nation, his State, and to his fellow colleagues in the Senate by his dynamic leadership. I join Mr. Alsop in commending the distinguished Senator from Texas for a job well done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the very gracious and generous statement of my beloved friend from South Carolina. I think I should say, however, that such good work as has been done or will be done in the Senate is due primarily to the fine spirit of cooperation of my colleagues on the minority side and on my side of the aisle. No leader in the Senate or in any other legislative body has had more help from the Members of the body than I have received. I think, Mr. President, it is also fair to say that perhaps no leader has needed help more than I have. In any event, I am grateful to my friend from South Carolina and to the distinguished columnist, Stewart Alsop, who may have seen things through somewhat prejudiced eyes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REAL PRO AT WORK IN THE SENATE

(By Stewart Alsop)

There is always something peculiarly satisfying about watching a genuine professional at work, whether on the baseball diamond or on the floor of the United States Senate. Anyone who wants to see in action the best professional floor leader of our time need only visit the Senate gallery at a tense legislative moment and keep his eye on the tall, lanky, slow-moving form of the majority leader as he ambles about the floor below.

Like a great professional athlete, Lyndon Johnson of Texas makes no waste motion. A word here and there, a casual, political arm around a recalcitrant shoulder, a brief, companionable colloquy with his opposite number, WILLIAM KNOWLAND of California—and the chances are that the bill under consideration will slide through the Senate almost without debate.

Take a few recent examples. The reciprocal trade bill, which had generated immensely heavy pressures from back home was in very bad trouble. It was being freely predicted that it would pass, if at all, only after weeks of weary wrangling and many crippling amendments. It passed after 3 days of debate, in surprisingly unmutilated form.

Traditionally, the agriculture appropriations bill, touching as it does many sensitive farm pocketbooks, is the subject of loud, long, and angry argument. It passed, all unnoticed, after exactly an hour of debate. The Colorado basin reclamation bill involved one of the hottest political issues in the Far West. The bill has often been debated in other sessions, but never passed. It went through the Senate in this session in 3 days. The Paris accords, which could have been expected at the very least to have elicited a lot of oratory for the folks back home, slipped through in just 2 hours.

And so on. The fact is that this session of Congress has passed a good deal of important and controversial legislation. But it has been done so quietly, with such a minimum of fuss and bother, that old hands are saying that this is the least exciting session since the 1920's. At any rate, it is certainly the most efficiently run session in recent memory. It is interesting, therefore, to visit the majority leader and ask him how he does it.

Now that the White House has been ruined by the modernizers, the Capitol is the last place in Washington with a real smell of the past. JOHNSON'S little office off the gallery floor, with its handsome chandeliers sent up from the White House by Theodore Roosevelt, its turn-of-the-century furniture and its odd decorations (an old portrait of "Rebecka, daughter of the mighty Prince Powhattan, Emperor of Attaboughkomouck," for example) help to remind the visitor that the Congress of the United States, after all, is one of the world's most ancient legislative bodies.

The majority leader fits well into the atmosphere. The Senate is in his bones and in his blood. And the same thing is true of the committee's chairmen who are JOHNSON'S principal lieutenants and collaborators in the business of running the Senate.

When you ask him how he does it, JOHNSON gives most of the credit to the chairmen. He reels off their names and appends to each a short political biography, going back to the State legislatures and the county judgeships.

"Hell," he says, "every damned one of 'em's an old pro. They've been 25 years in Congress, on the average. You wouldn't expect them to get all flustered up about nothing, would you?"

Getting controversial issues thoroughly settled in committee before they ever reach the floor, and before anyone has a chance to get all flustered up about nothing, is the most important part of the Johnson recipe for running the Senate. For the rest, the recipe calls for a large, efficient, experienced staff, capable of finding out how each Senator will vote almost before he knows himself; and a thorough knowledge of the complicated rules of the Senate. "No slipperies or trickeries," says JOHNSON (who has an odd turn of phrase), "but you've got to know the rules."

Finally, the recipe calls for something intangible, a special sort of instinct. "You haven't got any business being in my profession," JOHNSON says, "if you can't smell things coming."

Those who have watched him in action agree that JOHNSON can certainly smell things coming—especially trouble. His critics say, indeed, that JOHNSON is a great deal better at making the Senate function smoothly, and without unnecessary rows, than at making issues which will help the Democrats win back the White House in 1956.

JOHNSON himself firmly believes that a well-run Congress and a united party are the best possible assets for next year's Democratic presidential candidate, whoever he may be. At any rate, JOHNSON is the kind of man the American system has always had to have—a man who makes the system work.

OWNERSHIP PROBLEMS OF SMALL BANKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, more than 2 years ago, a businessman from my State, Richard H. Barry, of Fargo, who is a director in a number of small companies and operates a financial consulting organization, saw a serious problem developing for the owners and operators of small independent banks who were growing old. The problem, in a nutshell, was who was going to buy their banks in a few more years when they were too old to run the institutions themselves.

As Mr. Barry saw the problem, unless steps were taken to help a younger generation of bankers and local businessmen buy the banks from the elderly owners, there would be a wave of mergers that would gradually wind up, not in county-wide or statewide branch banking, but in regional and nationwide branch banking. The wave of bank mergers and the growth of branch banking and subsidiary banking in the last few years certainly seems to support his forecast.

Mr. Barry, who has had wide experience in the ownership and capital problems of small business, not only made a careful study of the ownership problems of small banks, but he had the courage to come forward with a challenging idea to help solve certain of the basic problems. His ideas on this subject have been discussed at bankers' meetings and in financial publications throughout the Nation. He has many supporters for his recommendations, but, as might be expected, and as a matter of fact which he recognized in the beginning, a great deal of educational work would be necessary before the Federal bank supervisory officials would be willing to shake the shackles of some of their traditional philosophy. The fact remains he is making headway with a program that has considerable merit.

A few days ago Mr. Barry gave me a memorandum entitled "Mergers—Small Banks," which I believe comes as close to the meat of the small bank merger problem as anything that I have seen recently on the subject. I hope Mr. Barry's supporters in and out of Congress will study this memorandum carefully, as it contains some convincing thoughts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the memorandum entitled "Mergers—Small Banks."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERGERS—SMALL BANKS

Competition to larger banks and bank holding companies in the purchase or acquisition by merger of small independent banks could be improved materially if certain roadblocks in the way of individual investors were corrected.

1. One example is the capital gains tax situation. Individual investors willing to pay cash for a small bank can be at a substantial disadvantage when a larger bank, or a bank holding company, offers the device of a merger to defer for the sellers payment of capital gains taxes. In one recent transaction pertaining to a bank with a net worth of $400,000 deferment of the capital gains tax amounted to over $75,000.

2. Another type of roadblock to individual investors can be illustrated by examining the mechanics related to the financing of part of the purchase of a small bank. Outside of the field of banking there are three fairly common methods to choose from in setting up the mechanics of financing; for instance, $100,000 on the purchase of a $300,000 business. For example:

(A) The purchasers can execute as individuals a personal note for $100,000.

(B) The business in the case of a corporation can execute a $100,000 note in place of the individual investors.

(C) The business in the case of a corporation can issue $100,000 in class A common or preferred stock.

From the standpoint of the amount of earnings of the business required to pay the $100,000 plus the rental cost of the money, (A) above requires almost twice as much as (C).

(B) above is the most economical method.

A comparison of the earnings before taxes required between (A) and (C) on a 10-year amortization program would in round figures to $436,000 in the case of (A) and $230,000 in the case of (C). (Interest or dividends figured at 6 percent per annum. Corporate and personal income tax rates figured at 50 percent and 40 percent, respectively.)

At present the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of Currency as a matter of policy refuse to sanction the use of preferred stock (authorized in

the Banking Act of 1933), which for all practical purposes leaves the prospective individual buyer of a small bank limited to (A) above in the mechanics he is permitted to employ. This situation not only creates a tax inequity for the individual investor, but also amounts to a discouraging roadblock for certain potential buyers from the ranks of competent bankers, who, alone, or with the help of local businessmen might be ready to assume the transfer of ownership from an older group of individual investors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADVANCES FROM FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACT TO ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Governor of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska, or any other act of Congress, or any of the Territorial laws, to the contrary, to obtain from the Federal unemployment fund, established pursuant to the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954 (Public Law 567, 83d Cong., approved August 5, 1954), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the Territory of Alaska may qualify for and as may be necessary to obtain for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to claimants entitled thereto under the Alaska employment security law: *Provided*, That the general fund of the Territory of Alaska from which advances have been made for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits shall be reimbursed from advances made through the Governor of Alaska from the Federal unemployment fund.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the amendment made by the House of Representatives stipulates that the general fund of the Territory of Alaska, from which advances have been made for the payment of unemployment insurance compensation benefits, shall be reimbursed for advances made through the Governor of Alaska from the Federal unemployment fund.

I may say to the Senate that, through inadvertence, this proviso was omitted from the bill as it was passed by the Senate. Previously the bill was agreed to unanimously by both the Senate committee and the Senate, and likewise by the House of Representatives.

The reason for the proviso is that in March of this year, the unemployment insurance compensation fund in Alaska was exhausted. Because of a ruling by the Attorney General, the Territory of Alaska technically was not eligible to apply for benefits under the provisions of the act passed a year ago.

This bill corrects that situation, and in addition makes it possible for the Territory to be reimbursed for advances totaling $2 million which have been made since March.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make, and I ask the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

Today the Federal-aid road bill will be before the Senate. I understand that there are several amendments to be considered. I am informed that it is likely that a substitute will be offered.

It is planned to keep the Senate in session this evening as long as Senators desire to speak on amendments or engage in general discussion on the bill, perhaps until 7:30 or 8 o'clock.

As most Senators are aware, there is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the postal pay bill veto tomorrow. At the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow there will be a period of debate of 3 hours. I assume that the vote will come at some time between 3:30 and 4:15.

After that vote is concluded, the Senate will continue consideration of the road bill, and if no final action has been taken at the end of the day, it is hoped that the Senate will meet Wednesday morning at an early hour, with the expectation that consideration of the bill may be concluded on Wednesday.

It is hoped that on Thursday it will be possible to have before the Senate the State and Justice Departments appropriation bill. I shall discuss with the distinguished minority leader the possibility of also considering some of the new bills which have been placed upon the calendar.

I have agreed with the distinguished minority leader that there will be no session of the Senate on Monday, Memorial Day. If the Senate is in session on Friday, it can adjourn or recess until Tuesday. I make that announcement in order that Senators may have due notice, and may accommodate their engagements to the program outlined.

I believe that next week and during the following week the schedule of the Senate will be rather crowded. It may be necessary to hold longer sessions. It may be desirable to hold sessions on Saturday. If such sessions can be avoided, of course, they will be. However, the first of June is approaching, which will leave only 30 days of the present fiscal year. A number of appropriation bills must be considered, and there is a necessity of acting upon important legislation which will be expiring It may be necessary, during June, for Senators to be present on Saturdays, and for the Senate to sit later in the evenings.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished majority leader tell the Senate what business is likely to come before the Senate for consideration on the day following Memorial Day?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I regret very much that at this stage we have no plans for Tuesday, May 31. During the day and later in the week I shall be glad to confer with Senators, and I shall be glad to inform the Senator as soon as a definite plan is agreed upon. I have not had an opportunity to talk with the distinguished minority leader with respect to the minority attitude on certain bills which have recently been reported. In fairness, I may say that since they were reported I have not had an opportunity to discuss them with our own policy committee. However, before the Senate adjourns or takes a recess for Memorial Day, I shall try to make a somewhat detailed statement for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators. I, myself, am very eager to know what business can be scheduled by the Senate for consideration after Memorial Day.

Mr. LANGER. If Senators return to their homes on Memorial Day to deliver addresses, in some instances considerable distances are involved, and they cannot hope to return to Washington until sometime in the afternoon on Tuesday, at best.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is at all possible to arrange for the consideration on Tuesday of measures of a noncontroversial character, or proposed legislation which is not too highly important—if there is any such type of proposed legislation for the consideration of the Senate—I assure the Senator that the majority leader and the minority leader will attempt to reach an agreement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have received from Members of the Senate a number of inquiries—and perhaps the distinguished majority leader has also—as to whether or not any plans have been made for the Fourth of July period. I am not pressing the majority leader at this time for a statement but if at an early date some statement could be made to the Senate as to the plans for the Fourth of July period, I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is a very good suggestion, and I shall be glad to discuss the subject further with the distinguished minority leader and make an announcement as soon as possible. I appreciate the suggestion.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed with the minority

leader the request which I am about to make.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill now before the Senate be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the sake of the RECORD, let me say that this is the request which is usually made, in order that the bill itself may be considered as original text, so that Senators may not be foreclosed, because of the parliamentary situation, from offering certain amendments which might otherwise be held to be in the third degree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. After I had discussed the subject with the distinguished minority leader, I asked the Parliamentarian to prepare the usual request, which I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike our "$1,100,000,000" and insert "$900,000,000"; in line 8, after the numerals "30", to strike out "1956" and insert "1957"; on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "30", to strike out "1960" and insert "1961"; in line 5, after "(a)", to strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000"; in line 7, after "(b)", to strike out "$325,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000"; in line 9, after "(c)", to strike out "$275,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "of Commerce"; in line 9, after the word "surveys", to insert "contract awards"; in line 22, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Commerce"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "project", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That not more than 10 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 10 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, through the year ending June 30, 1960, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944."

On page 5, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the additional sum of $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961"; on page 6, line 1, after the word "to", to strike out "66⅔" and insert "90"; in line 3, after the word "remaining", to strike out "33⅓" and insert "10"; in line 8, after the word "area", to insert a colon and "*And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project"; in line 16, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Commerce"; in line 18, after the word "amount", to strike out "unappropriated" and insert "apportioned"; after line 22, to strike out:

"SEC. 3. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158) and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, approved May 6, 1954, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect."

On page 7, after line 6, to strike out:

"SEC. 4. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

After line 11, to insert:

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled 'Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States' and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions.

"(e) The Secretary is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-Aid Highway System and, as promptly as possible after the conclusion of such tests, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights."

On page 8, after line 18, to insert:

"SEC. 3. Not more than 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State under sections 1 and 2 may be transferred from the apportionment under either section or subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other sections or subparagraphs: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the governor of said State and the secretary as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available by transfer under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction costs thereof, including the costs of rights-of-way, except that in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of the total area: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944."

On page 9, after line 23, to insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

"(1) the Secretary has determined that such State is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

"(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands.

The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

"(b) The costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired and any sums paid to the Secretary by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-Aid Highways and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to

such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways.

"(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political sudivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside five feet may be conveyed to it.

"(d) Whenever rights-of-way on the National System of Interstate Highways are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection."

On page 12, after line 16, to insert:

"SEC. 5. The Secretary is hereby granted authority to incur obligations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, in an amount not to exceed $100 million for acquisition of rights-of-way, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated: *Provided*, That the funds expended hereunder shall be credited against sums apportioned to the State in which expended for projects programed under the provisions of section 2 of this act."

On page 13, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and/or sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950."

On page 14, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 7. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1941 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

"(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

"(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads, and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary."

On page 15, after line 8, to insert:

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads, through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961."

After line 17, to insert:

"SEC. 9. Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails; parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract for one year in advance of year for which authorized: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended 2 year after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated."

On page 16, after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 10. So much of the first section and of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorize appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, are hereby repealed."

After line 11, to insert:

"SEC. 11. (a) Subject to the conditions contained in this section, 50 percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal primary, secondary, or interstate systems in which Federal funds have participated, may be paid from Federal funds whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the term "utility" shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'cost of relocation' shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

"(d) No more than 2 percent of all sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year for expenditure on such systems may be expended under the privisions of this section.

"(e) Any utility required to relocate a facility within the terms of this section shall have a right to payment out of Federal funds as in this section provided. The Secretary is authorized to make such payments on the basis of an agreement approved by him, entered into between the State highway department and the utility, which agreement shall contain an estimate or an agreed price of the cost of relocation. In lieu of such agreement the utility may file with the State highway department a certified statement of the cost of relocation, subject to the approval of the State highway department. The State highway department shall transmit such statement to the Secretary with the final voucher for approval by the Secretary.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude reimbursement to States of the Federal share of the State's costs in connection with the relocation of utility facilities where a portion of the relocation cost is required by law or practice to be borne by the State."

On page 17, after line 22, to insert:

"SEC. 12. Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), designating a national system of interstate highways, is hereby amended by striking out 'forty thousand', and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-two thousand five hundred.'"

On page 18, after line 2, to insert:

"SEC. 13. (a) It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highways since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense.

"(b) It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this act is the prompt completion of the national system of interstate highways. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

"(c) It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations for the extension of the program.

"(d) Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or any community, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings and considered the economic effects of such a location: *Provided*, That a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification."

On page 19, after line 8, to insert:

"SEC. 14. All agreements between the Secretary and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the interstate system may contain a clause providing

that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary."

After line 15, to insert:

"SEC. 15. The Secretary is directed to study, and to encourage the various States to consider, the feasibility of providing by multiple-State compacts for the construction, operation, and maintenance of interstate toll roads, as a supplement to the Federal-aid highway system, for the purpose of providing adequate highway facilities for the interstate movement of motor vehicles, and particularly for the movement of those motor vehicles traveling all or a substantial portion of the length or breadth of the United States. The Secretary shall make a report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1956, with respect to the results of such study."

On page 20, after line 3, to insert:

"SEC. 16. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to negotiate and enter into compacts providing for the construction and operation of interstate toll roads. Such compacts shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of all of the States entering into it and approved by the Congress of the United States."

After line 10, to insert:

"SEC. 17. Any State desiring to accept the benefits of section 2 of this act shall submit, through its State agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act. Such State plan shall provide that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed on highway facilities projects in the national system of interstate highways approved under the plan, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified above, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267); section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a); section 625, Public Law 725, 79th Congress, second session; and section 205, Public Law 815, 81st Congress, second session."

On page 21, after line 9, to insert:

"SEC. 18. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, approved May 6, 1954, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect."

After line 18, to insert:

"SEC. 19. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

On page 22, line 1, to change the section number from "5" to "20"; and in line 4, to change the section number from "6" to "21"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and a like sum for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $400 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $300 million for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

(c) $200 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the National System of Interstate Highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the additional sum of $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and the additional sum of $2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: One-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled "Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States" and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provision.

(e) The Secretary is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the highway research board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway system and, as promptly as possible after the conclusion of such tests, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights.

SEC. 3. Not more than 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State under sections 1 and 2 may be transferred from the apportionment under either section or

subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other sections or subparagraphs: *Provided,* That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the governor of said State and the Secretary as being in the public interest: *Provided further,* That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available by transfer under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction costs thereof, including the costs of rights-of-way, except that in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of the total area: *Provided further,* That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 20 percent: *Provided further,* That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

(1) the Secretary has determined that such State is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands.

The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

(b) The costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired and any sums paid to the Secretary by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways.

(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivision to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

(d) Whenever rights-of-way on the National System of Interstate Highways are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control or access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is hereby granted authority to incur obligations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, in an amount not to exceed $100 million for acquisition of rights-of-way, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated: *Provided,* That the funds expended hereunder shall be credited against sums apportioned to the State in which expended for projects programed under the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum of each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $24 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided,* That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further,* That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and/or sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *Provided further,* That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 7. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $11 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges, and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided,* That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

SEC. 9. Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract for 1 year in advance of year for which authorized: *Provided,* That any amount remaining unexpended 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

SEC. 10. So much of the first section and of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorized appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. (a) Subject to the conditions contained in this section, 50 percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal primary, secondary, or interstate systems in which Federal funds have participated, may be paid from Federal funds whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility.

(b) For the purposes of this section the term "utility" shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "cost of relocation" shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

(d) No more than 2 percent of all sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year for expenditure on such systems may be expended under the provisions of this section.

(e) Any utility required to relocate a facility within the terms of this section shall have a right to payment out of Federal funds as in this section provided. The Secretary is authorized to make such payments on the basis of an agreement approved by him, entered into between the State highway department and the utility, which agreement shall contain an estimate or an agreed price of the cost of relocation. In lieu of such agreement the utility may file with the State highway department a certified statement of the cost of relocation, subject to the approval of the State highway department. The State highway department shall transmit such statement to the Secretary with the final voucher for approval by the Secretary.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude reimbursement to States of the Federal share of the State's costs in connection with the relocation of utility facilities where a portion of the relocation cost is required by law or practice to be borne by the State.

SEC. 12. Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), designating a National System of Interstate Highways, is hereby amended by striking out "40,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "42,500."

SEC. 13. (a) It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highways since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense.

(b) It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this act is the prompt completion of the National System of Interstate Highways. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations for the extension of the program.

(d) Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or any community, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings and considered the economic effects of such a location: *Provided*, That a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification.

SEC. 14. All agreements between the Secretary and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the interstate system may contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 15. The Secretary is directed to study, and to encourage the various States to consider, the feasibility of providing by multiple-State compacts for the construction, operation, and maintenance of interstate toll roads, as a supplement to the Federal-aid highway system, for the purpose of providing adequate highway facilities for the interstate movement of motor vehicles, and particularly for the movement of those motor vehicles traveling all or a substantial portion of the length or breadth of the United States. The Secretary shall make a report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1956, with respect to the results of such study.

SEC. 16. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to negotiate and enter into compacts providing for the construction and operation of interstate toll roads. Such compacts shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of all of the States entering into it and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 17. Any State desiring to accept the benefits of section 2 of this act shall submit, through its State agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act. Such State plan shall provide that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed on highway facilities projects in the National System of Interstate Highways approved under the plan, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified above, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a), section 625, Public Law 725, 79th, 2d session, and section 205, Public Law 815, 81st, 2d session.)

SEC. 18. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, approved May 6, 1954, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 19. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 20. All acts of parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 21. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the text of the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without being read, unless the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes the amendment to be read.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is not necessary to have it read. I am sure that all Senators are familiar with the text of the amendment, which is known as the administration bill. Unless some Senator desires to have the amendment read, I do not believe it is necessary to do so.

Mr. GORE. I do not believe it is necessary to have the amendment read.

Mr. President, I reserve my right to make a point of order until the Senator from Pennsylvania has concluded his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order may be made at any time. It is not necessary for the Senator to reserve a point of order.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON proposes to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the "National Interstate Highway Act."

OBJECTIVE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the development of a modern, adequate, safe, and efficient system of highways deemed essential for the expansion of the economy and the changing concepts of the military and civil defense of the United States. It is further declared to be desirable that the development of such system of highways be continued through the cooperation and joint efforts of the Federal Government, the States, and local subdivisions thereof. It is hereby found that those essential highways are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national and civil defense, and that the most important portion of such highways are, or should be, located on the National System of Interstate Highways.

Accordingly, it is the objective of this act to complete the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways within the next 10 years up to such standards as will produce safe highways adequate to handle traffic needs for at least the next 20 years. This objective will be reached only by means of a program which will presently assure the financing of the system as a whole, and provide for prompt acquisition of necessary rights-of-way. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to continue or to impose such taxes as may be necessary to meet this objective.

SEC. 3. This act is divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Federal Highway Corporation

Sec. 101. Creation of Corporation.
Sec. 102. Management of Corporation.
Sec. 103. Duty of Corporation.
Sec. 104. Corporate powers.
Sec. 105. Corporate financing.
Sec. 106. Services and facilities of other agencies.
Sec. 107. Misappropriation of funds.
Sec. 108. Report to Congress.

Title II—Concerning the Department of Commerce

Sec. 201. Cancellation of authorizations.
Sec. 202. Interstate system
Sec. 203. Standards.
Sec. 204. Expenditure authorization.
Sec. 205. Distribution by States.
Sec. 206. Scheduling of construction and participation by States.
Sec. 207. Credits for existing roads and toll roads.
Sec. 208. Right-of-way acquisition.

Title III—Miscellaneous

Sec. 301. Definitions.
Sec. 302. Without compensation employees.
Sec. 303. Amendment to Corporation Control Act.
Sec. 304. Construction of this act.
Sec. 305. Effect on present law.

TITILE I—FEDERAL HIGHWAY CORPORATION

CREATION OF CORPORATION

SEC. 101. There is hereby created, subject to the direction and supervision of the President, a body corporate to be known as the Federal Highway Corporation. As hereafter provided in section 303, the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia.

MANAGEMENT OF CORPORATION

SEC. 102. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") composed of five members. Three of these members shall be public members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, without regard to political party affiliation. The President shall designate a full-time Chairman of the Board from one of the public members. The remaining two members shall be the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter called Secretary) and the Secretary of the Treasury, or their representatives. The Board shall meet at least four times a year, or more often, at the call of the Chairman.

(b) The Chairman of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. As Chairman, he shall preside at meetings of the Board and be the Corporation's chief representative. He shall be responsible for general supervision of the activities of the staff of the Corporation. He shall also maintain liaison with the representatives of the States with respect to the policies set forth in this act. The Chairman in the conduct of his functions as chairman shall act in conformance with determinations of the Board.

(c) The public members of the Board (other than the Chairman) shall receive no compensation, but may receive a per diem of $100 in lieu of subsistence, plus transportation expenses, in accordance with the standardized Government Travel Regulations, when proceeding to and from their homes or regular places of business to the headquarters of the Corporation and when engaged on assignment by the Board or the Chairman in the business of the Corporation.

(d) In addition to managing the Corporation, the Board is authorized to resolve divergencies of views concerning the interpretation or application of the policies under this act which it considers will have significant effect upon the program, excluding (1) divergencies between two or more Federal agencies. Within this limitation, the Board shall have the right to determine the matters which it shall consider and act upon, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe.

DUTY OF CORPORATION

SEC. 103. It shall be the duty of the Corporation (a) to receive and borrow funds, (b) to provide and make available to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to permit him to make the payments or advances to the States of the Federal share of the cost of construction of projects on the interstate system, and such other costs or expenses as are permitted or required to be paid or advanced by him in connection with the interstate system under the terms of this act, and (c) to perform such other duties as may be required in the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers under this act.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 104. For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this act, the Corporation—

(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its functions may be carried out and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

(5) may make and carry out such contracts, agreements, or other transactions as it may deem necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business;

(6) may incur indebtedness as provided in section 105, and incur current obligations incidental to performing its functions, subject to provisions of law applicable to Government corporations;

(7) may appoint such officers, agents, attorneys, and employees as it deems necessary for the conduct of its affairs, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds;

(8) may utilize the available services and facilities of other agencies as provided in section 106;

(9) may use the United States mails in the same manner as its executive departments; and

(10) may take such actions and exercise such other powers as may be necessary, incidental, or appropriate to carry out the function of the Corporation, and to further the objectives of this act.

CORPORATE FINANCING

SEC. 105. (a) The Corporation is authorized to issue, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, obligations in an amount not to exceed $21 billion. Obligations issued under this subsection shall have such maturities, not to exceed 30 years, and shall bear such rate or rates of interest, as may be determined by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and they shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. The aggregate amount of obligations under this subsection outstanding at any one time shall not exceed the maximum amount of obligations, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of July 1 of each year, on which the annual principal and interest payments required over the life of the obligations can be made from prospective appropriations under subsection (b) and other revenues of the Corporation, but obligations lawfully issued hereunder will not be affected by determinations subsequent to date of issue. The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Corporation. The Corporation is authorized to purchase in the open market for retirement, at any time and at any price, any outstanding obligations issued under this subsection.

(b) There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program. The Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the Corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriation for that fiscal year, such advances to be repaid from amounts subsequently appropriated hereunder in that fiscal year. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, an amount for each fiscal year that bears the same ratio to the estimated costs of collecting taxes, refunds of taxes, and costs of making refunds of taxes under sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for that fiscal year as the appropriation hereunder bears to the estimated total revenue collected under those provisions for that fiscal year.

(c) The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its obligations in an amount not to exceed in any one year the amount necessary above all other revenues of the Corporation to provide for debt service of the Corporation during that year but not to exceed the aggregate amount of $5,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The obligations issued by the Corporation under this subsection shall have such maturities as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be redeemable at the option of the corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

(d) All obligations issued by the Corporation shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under authority and control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof.

(e) The penultimate sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by inserting after the phrase "or obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association," the phrase "or obligations of the Federal Highway Corporation,".

(f) All revenues of the Corporation, including moneys appropriated under subsection (b) of this section shall be maintained as a trust fund.

SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 106. (a) Except as specifically authorized by the President, the Corporation shall, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the services of the officers, employees, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States, except that any such agency having custody of any data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, upon the request of the Corporation, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

(b) The Corporation shall contribute to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to the Corporation's employees and their beneficiaries. The Corporation shall also contribute to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the Corporation's employees. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Corporation into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 107. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, or conversion, of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation.

(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 108. The Board shall prepare an annual report of operations under this act for transmittal by the President to the Congress.

TITLE II—PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CANCELLATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) The first sentence of section 2 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby amended by deleting the following clause: "and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957," so that said first sentence of said section 2 (a) as hereby amended reads as follows: "For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the National System of Interstate Highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $175 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956."

(b) Section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby amended by reducing the authorization for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, from "$175 million" to "$75 million."

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 202. In furtherance of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, the Secretary is authorized, within the limitation of 40,000 miles, to approve as part of the interstate system such lateral feeder and distributing routes, and circumferential routes as may be required to furnish maximum utility of the system within or adjacent to urban areas, provided that one or both ends of such routes shall lie on a route of the system. The Secretary is further authorized to approve as part of the interstate system any highway which complies with the standards of section 203 and which lies on an approved route of the interstate system irrespective as to whether or not tolls are collected for the use thereof. The Secretary is authorized in cooperation with the State highway departments to designate as promptly as reasonable possible routes to take up the mileage still undesignated so that the entire 40,000 miles of this system shall be designated. In approving any undesignated mileage the Secretary shall designate those routes which contribute most to the benefit of the system as a whole and are most important from the point of view of national defense. In case the actual construction of highways on the system increases available undesignated mileage the Secretary may redesignate this mileage in accordance with the preceding sentence.

STANDARDS

SEC. 203. (a) The standards to be used for the interstate system shall be those approved by the Secretary after consultation with the Department of Defense, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the State highway departments. The Secretary is authorized to make the final determination of the standards to be used, except as provided in section 102 (d).

(b) The geometric standards for the interstate system shall be such standards as are deemed adequate to properly accommodate the types and volume of traffic forecast for the 20 years' immediately following enactment of this act. Such standards shall provide for the development of a system as nationally uniform in characteristics as possible within a 10-year construction period.

(c) The right-of-way width on the interstate system shall be adequate to permit construction of the route to the geometric standards provided for in subparagraph (b) for a period of at least 20 years following the date of authorization of a project under this act. Such width shall not be deemed adequate if (1) it does not include provision for the addition of more traffic lanes at a future date, except that the maximum width in any case need not exceed that necessary for three moving lanes in each direction, plus service roads as necessary; and if (2) it does not contain the proper and necessary degree and type of control of access or exits from the highway which will permit maximum freedom of traffic flow and promote national safety.

(d) The standards shall be periodically reviewed by the Secretary to insure maximum utility of the completed system with due recognition to the desirability of developing a national system having the greatest uniformity of characteristics possible.

EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 204. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make payments in an amount not to exceed $25 billion or such lesser sum as estimated by the Corporation on the basis of prospective revenues to be the maximum amount to be available for the purposes of this act.

DISTRIBUTION BY STATES

SEC. 205. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement, and an estimate of the cost as of January 1, 1956, of bringing that portion of the designated interstate mileage within its boundaries up to the standards prescribed under this act. On or before April 1 of each subsequent year, each State shall submit a revised estimate of such cost as of January 1 of such year, including therein the actual or estimated cost of any construction of such mileage begun or carried on subsequent to January 1, 1956.

(b) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall establish an approved estimate of cost for construction of projects on the interstate system in each State, and the Secretary shall determine the ratio of the approved estimate of cost for each State to the total of the approved estimates of such cost for all States. After subtracting from the amount determined pursuant to section 204, the estimated total credits under section 207 and estimated total expenses for administrative purposes and research, the Secretary shall apply the ratio for each State to the remaining sum and the resulting amounts shall be the maximum Federal payments to the various States for the purposes of section 206. He shall promptly notify the States of these maximum amounts.

SCHEDULING OF CONSTRUCTION AND PARTICIPATION BY STATES

SEC. 206. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, and on or before April 1 of each year thereafter, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement and an estimate of the cost of projects it proposes to construct during each of the next 2 fiscal years. The Secretary shall examine these estimates, and before the beginning of each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year 1957, he shall establish an approved construction program, including the estimated cost thereof, for each State for such fiscal year. Except as provided in section 102 (d), the Secretary shall have the final responsibility, after consultation with the States, the Department of Defense, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration, for determining the scheduling and priority of construction of projects, taking into consideration the objective of a uniform rate of accomplishment of construction on the interstate system in all the States and the availability of funds from the Corporation.

(b) The Secretary shall make allocations to the States in the amounts of the approved estimates, and the Secretary shall promptly notify the States of the approved construction programs and of the amounts so allocated. These allocations shall be available for obligation by the States to which allocated for a period of 2 years. Any sums not under obligation at the end of any 2-year period may be reallocated, as the Secretary may determine.

(c) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Corporation a schedule indicating his best estimate of the cash requirements necessary to meet payments during the next 2 fiscal years. These estimates shall include estimates of amounts needed for payments under section 207, for research as authorized by section 10 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and for administrative purposes in an amount not exceeding one-tenth of 1 percent of the funds made available by the Corporation in any fiscal year. The Corporation shall promptly make available funds to the Secretary as required by his annual estimate.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to advance funds to each State to permit prompt payment of construction costs.

(e) Payments to the States made pursuant to this section shall be subject to the conditions (1) that construction of projects on the interstate system in each State shall be in accordance with the standards approved by the Secretary; (2) that the State participates in the costs of construction in

each fiscal year in an amount in cash or services no less than that which would have been required as its matching amount payable for construction of projects on the interstate system under the provisions of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; and (3) that the State will have the same obligations as to maintenance of the projects constructed under this act that it has under Federal-aid highway legislation.

CREDITS FOR EXISTING ROADS AND TOLL ROADS

SEC. 207. (a) If an existing free highway, which is located upon the interstate system, is believed to measure up to the standards of construction required by section 203, a State may request that it receive a credit for such highway, and the State shall be entitled to receive such a credit subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The Secretary shall first determine whether or not the highway meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary and the Corporation shall determine, in cooperation with each other and in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (e), the amount of the depreciated cost of such highway. There shall be deducted from such depreciated cost an amount equivalent to 10 percent thereof, and also the total amount of any Federal-aid funds used in the construction of such highway. The result shall be the credit to which the State is entitled.

(b) If an existing toll highway, which is located upon the interstate system, is believed to measure up to the standards of construction required by section 203, a State may request that it receive a credit for such highway, and the State shall be entitled to receive such a credit subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The Secretary shall first determine whether or not the highway meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary and the Corporation shall determine, in cooperation with each other and in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (e), the amount of the original cost of such highway, excluding therefrom the cost of the financing thereof, and of any facilities not included within the definition of the term "highway" under Federal-aid highway legislation. For toll roads completed prior to December 31, 1951, he shall allow as a credit an amount not exceeding 40 percent of such original cost, and for toll roads completed during the period between December 31, 1951, and December 31, 1955, he shall allow a credit not exceeding 70 percent of the original cost. The State shall be entitled to the credit so allowed.

(c) If a toll highway, which is located upon the interstate system, the construction of which is completed subsequent to December 31, 1955, is believed to measure up to the standards of construction required by section 203, a State may request that it receive the credit for such highway and the State shall be entitled to receive such a credit subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The Secretary shall first determine whether or not the highway meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary and the Corporation shall determine, in cooperation with each other and in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (e), the amount of the original cost of such highway, excluding therefrom the cost of the financing thereof and of any facilities not included within the definition of the term "highway" under Federal-aid highway legislation. There shall be deducted from such original cost an amount equivalent to 10 percent thereof. The result shall be the credit to which the State is entitled.

(d) Any State for which a credit has been established, whether for a toll or a free highway, shall be entitled to use the same for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary system, subject to the conditions that all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to a State under Federal-aid highway legislation have been expended within the meaning of said legislation, and all funds allocated under this act have been contracted as provided under this act. Whenever a State constructs such projects with funds received as a result of a credit under this section, all procedures and steps shall be taken in the same manner as though such funds had been apportioned under Federal-aid highway legislation. Any State for which a credit has been established on account of a toll highway shall be entitled, at its option, to use the credit for payment of any outstanding debt on the highway, which highway shall then become a free public highway.

(e) The Secretary jointly with the Corporation shall establish such reasonable rules and regulations as necessary or advisable to carry out the purposes of this section.

(f) Whenever the Secretary determines that a credit, pursuant to this section, should be made available to a State he shall notify the Corporation. The Corporation, within a reasonable time thereafter, shall make such credit available to the Secretary for use by the State.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION

SEC. 208. (a) If the Secretary shall determine that the State highway department of any State is unable to obtain possession and the right to enter upon and use the rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands, improved or unimproved, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, required for any project on the interstate system with sufficient promptness, the Secretary is authorized, upon the request of such a State, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General, and in the name of the United States, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), and to expend funds for projects thereon. The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interest in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations. The cost incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition; and shall be payable out of the funds available to the Secretary for construction of projects on the interstate system to the extent of 95 percent of the appraised value of such rights-of-way, or of the actual cost, whichever is lower. The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such rights-of-way, lands, or interest in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or to such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

(b) Whenever rights-of-way on the interstate system are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection.

(c) The Secretary may adopt such regulations as he deems advisable to protect fully the interests of the United States in the acquisition of rights-of-way. He may take such action as necessary to carry out such regulations.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. As used in this act, unless the context requires otherwise—

(a) The term "interstate system" means the National System of Interstate Highways as authorized to be designated by section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, and includes those routes heretofore designated by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads by the attestation of a diagrammatic map, copy of which is hereby made appendix A to this act, as well as routes to be hereafter designated. The mileage so designated as of June 30, 1954, is 37,600 miles. The mileage of the routes so designated is calculated by stating the mileage of the most traveled highway between control points. Such mileage so designated as of June 30, 1954, with respect to each State is contained in a schedule hereby made appendix B to this act. The mileage of the entire system is limited to 40,000 miles.

(b) The term "Corporation" means the Federal Highway Corporation created by title I of this act.

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(d) The term Federal-aid highway legislation means "the act providing that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads and for other purposes", approved June 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented.

WITHOUT COMPENSATION EMPLOYEES

SEC. 302. The Corporation and Secretary are respectively authorized, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate, in order to carry out the provisions of this act, to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability, without compensation, and are further authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of such persons from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99). Persons appointed under the authority of this subsection may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business, pursuant to such appointment.

AMENDMENT TO CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 303. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the words "Federal Highway Corporation."

CONSTRUCTION OF THIS ACT

SEC. 304. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECT ON PRESENT LAW

SEC. 305. All provisions of Federal-aid highway legislation shall remain in full force and effect, and shall apply to the required actions to be taken, and payments to be made, by the Secretary under this act in connection with the interstate system with the same force and effect that said provisions of the said legislation applied to such actions and payments in connection with the interstate system prior to the passage of this act, except that the provisions of this act shall supersede any provision of the said legisla-

tion which conflicts with a provision of this act, except that section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to the interstate system, and for the purposes of section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there can be no question as to the need for a greatly expanded highway program. The population of the United States by 1965 may well reach 185 to 190 million people. This means not only an increased number of automobiles using our highways, but the highways must be improved to take care of the greatly increased truck traffic.

The No. 1 problem, of course, is how to finance this road program and the proper distribution of the funds among the States, in order that we may have an integrated, well balanced highway system.

I ask unanimous consent to have three editorials on this important subject made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of March 21, 1955]

IMPASSE ON HIGHWAYS

The Clay Committee report upon which the Eisenhower administration is basing its 10-year, $101 billion highway proposal has hit some bumpy spots in the Congress, but none bumpier than that thrown in its path by Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

The budget-conscious Virginian may well have placed a fatal hex on the program Friday when he refused to support it, simultaneously charging the administration with going behind the barn on its economic balance promises.

Senator BYRD sees no great difference between outrightly raising the national debt limit and the issuance of billions in promissory notes to defray a speedup in highway construction. It all amounts to the same, in his book. Instead, he suggests the Federal Government might get better results by relinquishing to the States the 2 cents in gasoline taxes it is collecting. This, of course, is something the States have been angling for over a considerable period of time.

The Byrd proposal has its good points to be sure. Certainly the 48 States would welcome an opportunity to collect an additional 2 cents in gas taxes without raising the present bite on the taxpayer. But there is a major and dangerous weakness in the plan. At present the Federal-aid-to-highways program pretty well controls where and when major highway routes are constructed; States are not permitted to promiscuously locate a highway in which Federal participation is asked. Under the Byrd plan—with the States levying and collecting the taxes—what similar restrictions could be guaranteed? There seems to be no way Federal legislation could be brought to bear on that point.

In Oklahoma, particularly, there would be doubt that what is intended under the Eisenhower program could be guaranteed to happen if the State were initiating the building of routes. It is the inability of State road building setups to resist political pressure for minor and rural routes that has caused the 25-year neglect of our major highways.

The Byrd program might prove feasible if a way could be found to guarantee that State-raised and State-spent road funds be placed where the highways are vitally needed and not where the politicians want them.

Meantime, the only program halfway assuring this is that submitted in conformance with the Clay report.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of March 30, 1955]

FOR BIG HIGHWAY PLANS

Motor vehicles and motor travel are part and parcel of America in 1955. Our whole national pattern of life has grown up around the motorcar. Where the car can go readily the American people go. In millions of homes it is the family's most prized possession. It accounts for a vast, sprawling industry and business that employ far more persons than any other. The industry's trucks carry the greater part of American products and merchandise. The motor vehicle is the dominant fact of life in modern America.

Yet from this great Nation's seat of government in Washington we hear that this country can't find a way to build modern highways to permit the full use of its 58 million motor vehicles. Congress has ganged up on the President's highway plan. When you consider the overwhelming importance of motor vehicles the President's plan is modest. It simply proposes to deliver through Federal financing a completely modern trunk line system of 40,000 miles in 10 years. This is only a small fraction of the American primary road system and 10 years is a long time. Yet the estimated cost of $25 billion has flabbergasted Congress.

The outstanding Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has objected strenuously to the proposed financing method by which the Government would underwrite the bonds without adding them directly to the national debt. As an alternative BYRD proposes nothing but repeal of the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax which the States could pick up if they chose. With such a plan this Nation couldn't expect to catch up with its highway needs in a century.

Senator GORE, of Tennessee, and Senator CASE of South Dakota have proposed alternatives that would increase Federal spending but they are far short of the President's plan.

These and other alternatives assume that the great motorized Nation of the world is incapable of building for its urgent needs. The congressional leaders are paralyzed by the difficulty of financing $25 billion of construction in 10 years. Yet within the same period the American people will spend 6 or 8 times the $25 billion on new passenger cars alone.

For this motorized Nation the only course that makes sense is to build for the full need. Finance it by the best means that can be devised—but finance it.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times of April 5, 1955]

THINKING ABOUT ROADS

A tremendously improved and expanded highway system in the United States is looked upon as being right at the top of the list for the immediate future.

That is true for several reasons: The ever-increasing number of vehicles make such a program essential; it is needed as a part of our defense system; it would go a long way toward stabilizing our economy by furnishing employment.

Just as an example:

The $101 billion, 10-year highway program recently proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program if adopted by Congress will ultimately involve 1 million full-time workers in direct construction and in supplying industries, according to a joint estimate made by the United States Departments of Commerce and Labor.

The total, if achieved, would be more than double the current number of 450,000 workers that are now engaged in highway construction and in providing materials, equipment, and supplies for this work. The high point is expected to be reached in 1960, when the proposed road program would reach its peak.

Naturally, the $64 question is how to finance such a far-reaching road program.

Toll roads are being built in many sections of the country.

Under the President's Advisory Committee's plan, bonds would be issued to finance part of the undertaking.

It is being suggested in some quarters that Congress create a corporation to finance and build an integrated highway system with the burden of the cost to be borne by those who use the highways the most.

At any rate, it is very encouraging that much thought is being given to the absolute necessity of expanding and improving our national highways.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain editorials which comment on the pending road bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch of February 15, 1955]

PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO BUILD ROADS

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious opposition in Congress even before its formal submission. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy "watchdog" of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program submitted on January 11, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile National System of Interstate Highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way.

Senator BYRD charges that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

[From the Troy (Ala.) Messenger of February 2, 1955]

COMMITTEE PROPOSES HUGE SPENDINGS ON INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The Committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The Committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail.

Once again BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost the taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary secondary urban road systems, on the long-standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubrication oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the East Hartford (Conn.) Gazette February 3 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out the dangers which such a program might entail.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3 percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary secondary urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third. he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We hope Congress will give the program a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman of February 1, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PLANS

President Eisenhower has announced he will send his proposed multi-billion-dollar highway program to Congress early next week, thereby setting the stage for an all-out congressional battle.

The major contest the highway program will face is finance. The President's program would not be paid out of Federal funds but through bonded indebtedness outside the Federal money structure. This kind of arrangement has already drawn warnings from such men as Senator BYRD of Virginia. The contention is that once the Federal Government starts making obligations outside the established financial framework, there would be no end to it.

This Federal highway plan not only suggests a dangerous detour from normal Federal ways but it also has an effect on the States' highway planning and financing. This is true right here in Idaho at this time. Were the President's highway program not in the works, we doubt that Idaho motorists would be facing higher license plate fees. Instead, the extra highway funds would likely come from another half-cent gasoline tax which would raise as much money as the license plate fee schedule which has passed the House. The reason this half-cent gasoline tax presently is reserved in Idaho is to have it available in case it is needed for Idaho to participate in the President's highway program—if it is voted by the Congress.

What prompted the Federal plan for a national network of highways has not been explained. It is possible that the administration, fearing expansion of the unemployment that has developed since the close of the Korean war, saw the opportunity to couple a desirable project with the benefits of expanded construction payrolls. No one who has traveled across the Nation will admit that we are without superhighways. Fact of the matter, we already have great turnpikes and toll roads in heavily populated areas. A Nation on wheels, there is no lack of roads to travel. The President's program may find an obstacle in this fact that many of the States of the Nation already have what he offers.

Above all, the proposed Federal highway system is an interference with State rights and responsibilities. Except where the Federal Government needs to supply the cash for highways through public domain, the better method would be to return to the States part of the Federal gasoline tax and let the States built their own roads. Money is always used more intelligently on the local level.

Where the opinion exists that we are to learn, some day soon, that the Federal Government is going to built a lot of new roads in Idaho, it should be pointed out that this is a case where it would be better to wait and count the chickens after the eggs are hatched. There is much more reason to believe that Mr. Eisenhower will not get into the highway business than there is to believe that he will. His greatest handicap is that he has a Federal project but, for once, the Federal Government lacks the money. This horse of a different color is starting up a new and hilly road. It is important to the Nation, if the Federal debt is to be contained in one amount, that this journey is never completed. We are too near Federal bankruptcy without opening a new source of Federal obligation.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle of March 2, 1955]

HIGHWAY PROGRAM BUCKS A RED SIGNAL ON COSTS

President Eisenhower's program for a Federal-State-local roadbuilding program, involving the expenditure of $101 billion over the next 10 years, is meritorious on various grounds, not the least of which is necessity.

The Nation's present system of highways, amounting to some 3,365,000 miles, is obviously overtaxed by the 58 million motor vehicles that swarm over it. But, as the President notes, today's traffic jams are but faint shadows of those that would arise on such a system 10 years hence, when some 81 million vehicles will be rolling.

Considerably more than convenience is involved in an adequate highway system. Accidents, now costing motorists an estimated $4.3 billion a year, would be reduced. So would wear and tear on automobiles, with savings estimated as high as 1 cent a mile of travel. Transportation would be speeded up. And, in the event of atomic attack, target cities could be more quickly evacuated with the saving of countless lives.

To finance the Government's $31 billion share of the 10-year program, the President inclined to the view of selling special bond issues. Interest would be paid from increased Federal gasoline and diesel oil taxes and in limited instances from tolls on the roads.

Opposition to the President's financing plan came in a roar from Senator HARRY F. BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee. He attacked the bond issue as one which would create a debt not totaled under the national debt—it would, in short, bypass debt limitation. There is weight to that argument. But interparty quarreling over means of financing will contribute nothing to the solution of the highway shortage. Congress cannot prudently refuse to come to terms with the problem.

[From the Keokuk (Iowa) Gate City of March 3, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent-interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal aid program as it is today to primary secondary urban road systems, on the long-standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half-cent-per-gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

[From the New Albany (Ind.) Tribune of February 22, 1955]

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

There are many factors to be considered in the toll roads situation and in the relation of State and Federal financing of roads.

There are arguments for and against toll roads and no one except the most the most ardent and prejudiced supporters or opponents of toll roads would assert such highway building is entirely good or completely evil.

There are also persons who assert that toll roads will not reach the vicinity of New Albany for another 10 years and there are plenty of problems to worry about without getting concerned about toll roads.

These isolationists point out that the persons who use the roads will have to pay for them and since the roads won't run near New Albany the building and paying for such roads becomes a theoretical problem with little concern locally.

Yet history has shown, with few exceptions, that those who benefit from a program generally support it and at the same time try to distribute the burden of payment over as wide an area and large a population base as practical, possible and permissible.

In other words, the people of northern Indiana will benefit most from an east-west toll road and presumably will favor construction of such routes as long as conditions indicate they will benefit from such roads without an unusual financing burden.

There is not much point in trying to maintain the position that the people of northern Indiana will not have to carry the greatest portion of the burden of payment for such road for it is obvious such residents will be the greatest users of the road.

To this extent, the northern Indiana toll road is pretty much the business of residents of that part of the State. But it becomes the affair of southern Indiana residents when laws are passed which are statewide in application.

At this stage of the proceedings it becomes evident that laws are not going to be passed to apply solely to the northern toll route and another series of laws passed regarding inauguration, construction, operation and financing of other toll routes in Indiana.

The toll road question is one of importance to every Hoosier both because of the State's geographical and financial position. This State is a crossroads of commerce in the United States and is a practical toll road route both east-west and north-south. Debt freedom at the State level is a matter of Hoosier pride and must be kept free of encroachment by semi-official agencies in Indiana.

The problem, therefore, for the legislators is to provide a legislative answer to questions which may not arise for many years. Controls should be adequate for reasonable restraint yet not so restrictive as to discourage economically feasible road building.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD in a discussion of the proposed Federal highway program brought out this pertinent fact:

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion (through a Federal corporation with bonding power guaranteed by the Treasury of the United States) without regarding it as a debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact, I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction."

What Senator BYRD says about Federal road building programs applies with equal vigor to State road construction plans. While the toll State tax revenues has an obligation to the people of Indiana and the duty of providing complete and impartial reports to the people of this State.

The toll road commission is a creation of the people of Indiana and is responsible to the people for its actions. Creation of an agency with the power to perpetuate itself in office, the right to incur indebtedness or other obligation without the expressed consent of the people, or the privilege of determining its fees, rates, concessions, and other income sources without the supervision or consent of the legislature is not sound government practice.

Not all of these rights and privileges are expressed or implied in the present toll road commission operation regulations but these are factors which must be considered by the legislators in outlining operation of the commission and defining powers and privileges of the organization.

As Senator BYRD says, "You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition. The obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens will still remain."

Whether the people realize it or not, the toll roads in Indiana are the toll roads of Indiana and the best time for a person to determine if he is getting what he wants is before making a purchase.

[From the Longview (Wash.) News of February 5, 1955]

MULTIBILLION FEDERAL HIGHWAY PLAN NOT NECESSARILY BEST

The more we read about President Eisenhower's 10-year, 101-billion-dollar Federal-State roadbuilding program the more doubts we have about it.

For example, Governor Langlie estimates that if this program went through Washington would get $500 million in Federal funds to be used for construction of new highways. A recent survey by the State highway department shows that it will take $674 million to do an adequate job of highway building in this State during the next 10 years. Present revenues from gasoline taxes and other sources will bring in $331 million. That leaves $343 million more that the State could use at the very most. Thus $500 million in Federal funds is more than this State needs, and the same situation probably prevails in other States.

We are unable to see just why the President thinks the big highway building job should be handled with Federal funds rather than State funds. Traditionally States have built their own roads and highways, and it is difficult to see why they should not continue to do so.

One reason the States are hard up for highway money, just as Washington and Oregon are, is because of the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. Congressman RUSSELL MACK and others have protested repeatedly against the use of part of this money for purposes other than roadbuilding.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the traditional economic "watchdog" of Capitol Hill has an alternative plan to Eisenhower's highway program.

First of all he objects to the Federal highway bond issue plan, which is a device to enable large amounts of money to be borrowed without increasing the national debt. This would simply mean "operating the Government on two sets of books," he says.

BYRD charges that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987." He points out that the interest charges on these Federal highway bonds could run to more than $11.5 billion or 55 cents on a dollar.

BYRD's alternative plan calls for reducing the present 2 cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, thus enabling the States to impose a 1½ cent additional State gasoline tax without raising the price of gasoline. Then BYRD would have road construction made a State responsibility, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis. Thus, says BYRD, "States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Everyone seems to agree that our highway system is greatly in need of modernization and improvement to take care of the estimated 80 million vehicles that will be on the roads by 1974. But resort to the old familiar strategem—Federal aid—is not necessarily the only or the best way of doing it.

[From the Greenville (Tenn.) Sun of February 4, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The Committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The Committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3 percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal aid program as it is today to primary secondary urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are in favor of the BYRD program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of February 5, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

A proposal has been submitted to the administration by a committee appointed for the purpose of financing a multimillion-dollar national highway system. The recommended provisions have been attacked by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, as thoroughly unsound. Such criticism from a man of the stature of Senator BYRD deserves profound attention. One of the provisions of the report appearing especially obnoxious to him is that the bonds issued for the highway construction be not included in the regular Government debt figure, now approaching the new legal ceiling of $281 billion.

The purpose of this proposed exclusion appears obvious and reminds one of the more flamboyant New Deal theories such as the statement by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt decrying alarm over the skyrocketing public debt because we owe it to

ourselves. Pretending that the money is not owed by the expedient of keeping it off the official debt figures looks equally fallacious. As Senator BYRD says: "Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs. When the Government contracts bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit."

The Senator declares such action would pave the way for endless outlays for building programs in education, hospitals, and public health, and would mean keeping two sets of books. "You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain," he says.

This program of highway debt financing is scheduled to be submitted to Congress soon. It should be gone over with a fine-tooth comb, lest other undesirable provisions be contained in it.

[From the Glens Falls (N. Y.) Post-Star of February 1, 1955]

TRAFFIC JAM COMING

That $101 billion, 10-year highway construction program recommended to President Eisenhower by a commission appointed to give thought to the inadequacy of the Nation's road system is going to have considerable opposition although everyone agrees that though the United States owns the best highway system in the world, it is entirely inadequate. Frankly, we should rejoice in this opposition for it denotes that fiscally we are not so blase as we sometimes think we are.

Not unexpectedly, Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, the economy watchdog and the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is the leading objector and naturally his objections are with the method of financing the project.

As the plan was outlined, the Federal Government would continue its regular highway aid to the States for the next 10 years, at the rate of about $600 million a year, while State and local governments would spend about $70 billion on roads over the 10-year period. In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, Washington would spend an extra $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses on filling stations, motels, and similar ventures on rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal Highway Corporation. These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the Treasury but the debt they would represent would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. At the same time annual payments on the bonds would be met by congressional appropriations from revenues which the Federal Government would derive from motor-vehicle fuel and lubricating-oil taxes projected at the present rates.

Senator BYRD contends that the $20 billion plan would mean operating the Government with 2 sets of books, 1 for activities financed by borrowing outside the public debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budgetary control.

Senator BYRD maintains that the bond program would dry up gasoline revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, although those revenues would not be specifically earmarked by Congress for debt retirement. What is more, he says, the aggregate of interest charges on the bonds would be $11.5 billion or 55 cents on the dollar. His idea is to reduce the present Federal gasoline tax from 2 cents a gallon to one-half cent so that the States could impose a higher gas tax. That way, the Senator argues, given the usual Federal aid on a matching basis, the States could be responsible for road construction, the huge interest charge would be eliminated, and road revenues would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized.

There ought to be enough brains in Washington to figure out the best plan. The only fear is that it will fall foul of politics and that cannot be permitted. The estimate is that within 20 years 80 million cars will be on the highways.

[From the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun of February 1, 1955]

BILLIONS AT STAKE

Presidential advisers say the Nation must more than double spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic, but an influential critic calls the $101 billion program unsound.

A vigorous attack on the $20 billion, 30-year, 3-percent bond issue recommended by the administration, together with the proposed Federal corporation which would float the bonds, was launched January 17 by Senator BYRD. Although most pressure groups have not yet taken a position on this specific feature, several told newsmen they expect plenty of controversy over it.

Still another bone of contention is the proposed continuation of the Federal gasoline tax as one major source of Federal revenue. This is favored by such interests as the railroad industry. These groups argue that highways should be self-supporting through user charges. But repeal of the tax is being promoted by farm and truck spokesmen, who would leave collection of gas taxes to the States.

In the meantime, State lobbies and legislators are worrying about how States are going to provide their $31 billion increase under the program. Some have been building roads on a pay-as-you-go basis, since their constitutions prohibit issuing of bonds for this purpose. Others have gone into debt. This problem may stir up arguments and lobbying when Congress studies the President's program.

With controversy over details of the plan growing among State and national groups, most highway specialists feel that, although the administration program's broad objectives are widely supported, traffic jams are sure to develop before final adoption.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of January 27, 1955]

WE MUST HAVE BETTER HIGHWAYS

As Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, hinted in a speech here last month, President Eisenhower's ambitious roadbuilding program faces serious opposition in Congress.

One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy "watchdog" of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, the 10-year plan concentrates on modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways. The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

The $20 billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean operating the Government on 2 sets of books: 1 set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would dry up gasoline-tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2-cents-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility. Thus, says BYRD:

"States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Whether the Federal or State Governments are to bear the increased costs of an adequate highway system, our highways will have to carry some 80 million vehicles by 1974, according to the President's Commission.

Its chairman, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, told the national conference on highway financing of the United States Chamber of Commerce recently: "We are indeed caught in a traffic jam, nationwise."

[From the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun of January 25, 1955]

WHO SHOULD PAY?

It was bound to happen. The honeymoon was bound to end for President Eisenhower's nice-sounding $50 billion Federal shot-in-the-arm for highway construction.

Wrecker of the honeymoon was that old demon watchdog of the Federal Treasury, Senator BYRD, the Virginia Democrat. With typical Byrd bluntness, he labeled the President's idea thoroughly unsound. Not just a little bit wrong, mind you, but thoroughly unsound.

Senator BYRD's opposition is not to be dealt with idly. The great champion of a balanced Federal budget and of Uncle Sam living within his income, he has come to be respected down through the years of his Senate service by leaders of both parties. A conservative Democrat who never has been described as a political foe of Mr. Eisenhower, Senate BYRD's thoroughly unsound view will be respected by many who realize he is not speaking with any object of opposing the President personally or politically. The Senator's sharp opposition will cause everyone, even friends of the President's idea, to take another look at what is proposed.

They'll find that the Virginia Democrat is basing his opposition on the fact that a flatbroke (what has the national debt soared to at this point?) Uncle Sam is being asked to shell out $25 billion (that's billion, not million) as the Federal Government's share of a national highway improvement program. They will find that BYRD, instead, is suggesting that the several States, which are in far less debt trouble than Uncle Sam, should do their own financing. They'll find that he is taking the position that it doesn't make any sense for one heavily debt-ridden Government agency to go deeper into debt to give grants to other Government agencies which are in better debt position to borrow or otherwise get the money on their own.

Just to sharpen up this point, BYRD flatly declares the thoroughly unsound Federal highway program (a) will destroy the Federal budget and (b) will cost the taxpayers 55 cents interest on every dollar borrowed.

Meanwhile, we know our own State has had no difficulty to date in floating highway bond issues, and, thus, obtaining the money for needed road improvements. As a matter of fact, one of the legislative inquiries is likely to be a study of charges that the State actually has wasted $2 million in interest payments by rushing out to get some of this easily-obtained bond money too far ahead of the time for actual spending.

There isn't much argument about a need for a national highway improvement program. But Senator BYRD's opposition is bound to start a lot of folks wondering just what agency of Government ought to finance it.

[From the Point Pleasant, W. Va., Register, January 24, 1955]

A TIMELY WARNING

Alluring as is the prospect of all of those roads envisioned in the administration's hundred billion dollar highway program, thoughtful minds cannot dismiss lightly the objections to the financing plan raised by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

As projected by Gen. Lucius Clay, Chairman of the Commission which worked up the programs, the Government, in addition to the money regularly spent in Federal road aid to the States, would provide $25 billion for an interstate network of highways. The money for this would come from revenue bonds to be financed by the present 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, and rental fees from filling stations, motels, etc., along the new highways. The whole thing would be handled by a Federal Highway Corporation thus taking the operation outside the regular Federal budget.

BYRD's objection is based, not only on his assertion that every dollar spent in this manner would cost the taxpayers 55 cents in interest, but on the argument that to take this step would "destroy" the federal budget. As BYRD expressed it, "If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything. This corporation would not own any roads or have any assets.

As an alternative, BYRD proposes that Congress reduce the gasoline tax from two cents to one-half cent, thus giving the States an opportunity to increase their road revenues without increasing the overall load of the automobile driver. Regular Federal aid to the States he would finance with the half-cent gasoline tax and the present lubricating oil levy.

What Senator BYRD says about the evils of the revenue bond approach, and the danger inherent in the precedent of undertaking public financing outside the budget, commends itself at once to the cautious mind. It will take a lot of persuading to convince conservative minded Congressmen of the wisdom of such a course.

On the other hand, the Senator's proposal would seem to fall short of the need. This newspaper always has adhered to the doctrine that the Federal Government should keep hands off State affairs. For that reason it has opposed in principle the grants-in-aid device. To the extent, therefore, that the Byrd plan would return to the States more taxing potentiality without increasing the public burden, it is, this newspaper believes, a step in the right direction. Apparently however, he does not propose to change the existing Federal-State relationship. The Government would continue collecting and distributing among the States money for roads which have no important relationship to interstate commerce. His proposal would be sounder, we think, were it to contemplate use of all Federal money, whatever its source, for purely interstate highways.

If the Federal Government has any proper place in the road picture, it is in the interstate phase of it. Therefore, if the interstate network envisioned in the Clay program can be financed without resort to revenue bonds, it probably should be undertaken, even if that means complete abandonment of the present policy of sending Federal road money into the States to be spent on a matching basis.

[From the Utica (N. Y.) Press of January 27, 1955]

OPPOSITION TO THE ROAD PLAN

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious opposition in Congress even before its formal submission today. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy watchdog of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, submitted 2 weeks ago, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3 percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of "the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates."

The $20 billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean "operating the Government on two sets of books; one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt, and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2 cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Journal of January 26, 1955]

THE $101 BILLION ROAD PLAN

Presidential advisers say the Nation must more than double spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to maintain a minimum of safety.

The plan would boost spending $54 billion above the projected 10-year total of $47 billion. State and local agencies would chip in $70 billion, or 80 percent more than the $39 billion they would spend under existing programs. The Federal share would more than treble, rising from less than $9 billion to more than $31 billion. Uncle Sam would pay for 30 percent of the highway program, instead of 19 percent.

Most Congressmen have been awaiting the President's message tomorrow on highways before choosing sides, but Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, pounced on the advisory committee's report within days.

BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said the program would "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law."

He dismissed as legerdemain the advisers' key plan for financing the Federal share of the program. Congress would create a Federal Highway Corporation to issue more than $20 billion in 3-percent bonds. The bonds would not count as part of the Federal debt, which keeps bumping against the legal ceiling.

BYRD's plan emphasizes States' rights.

The Federal Government would cut its gasoline tax from 2 cents to a half cent a gallon, permitting the States to raise their taxes and build more highways with less control by Washington. Acceptance of the $101 billion plan, BYRD predicted, would lead to endless outlays for other programs.

The President's Advisory Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, gave top priority to the interstate highway system, which handles one-seventh of all traffic. Of the proposed $101 billion, $27 billion would be spent on these highways and urban connections, with the Federal Government paying $25 billion, the States $2 billion.

Federal aid for the rest of the highway system would cost $623 million a year, equivalent to the current rate. States match these Federal contributions. The Federal Government would continue to pay for roads on its public lands, a program that now costs $59 million a year.

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of January 22, 1955]

QUESTIONABLE FINANCING

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, who is widely respected in Congress as a watchdog of the Treasury, raises pertinent questions concerning President Eisenhower's $101 billion highway-building program that will merit thoughtful consideration.

Long a foe of Government waste, even under administrations of his own party, the powerful Virginia Democrat assails the plan of financing the big road program as a dangerous innovation in Federal spending in that it would set up a brand new Federal corporation to borrow money outside the Treasury, outside of budgetary control, and outside of the recorded national debt.

Such a procedure, says the Senator, violates financing principles, defies budgetary control in Government, and evades Federal debt law.

He reasons that if the Federal Government can borrow money for roads in that fashion "it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospital, public health, etc."

Such a scheme of financing, as he sees it, would mean operating the Government on 2 sets of books, 1 for spending activities outside the national debt, and the other for activities financed by borrowing on the record as at present.

In other words, the Senator sees the new program opening the door to a new means of deficit financing that would invite all kinds of big spending enterprises. He thinks the least the Government can do in fairness to the taxpayers is to keep books and accounts in a manner to correctly reflect the debt. Otherwise, he points out, confidence in Government credit will be destroyed.

Furthermore, the Senator has figured it out that borrowing $20 billion for interstate

superhighways under the plan would cost the taxpayers $11½ billion in interest. He believes this money well might be saved for future investment in highways by the States and the Federal Government. He favors continued Federal aid to the States for highways, but he would leave major taxing power for highways and their building to the States.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller of January 31, 1955]

HIGHWAY FINANCING DISPUTE

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, has made a career of riding herd on the Nation's finances. He has lost some of his battles over finances, and he has won some. In a recent statement he takes a fall out of the Clay Commission's highway report, got up at the request of President Eisenhower and designed to give Congress a working model of what the Federal road program should be in the next 10 years.

The Senator points out that the Clay plan calls for continuance of the Federal aid to the States for highway purposes at the rate of $623 million annually. On top of that it proposes to spend in the next 10 years an additional $25 billion for the so-called Interstate Highway System, bringing Federal spending on these two items to $31 billion for the next 10 years.

The committee estimates the $25 billion would construct $40,000 miles of road designated as interstate, but BYRD points out that this is little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. It would amount to about 800 miles per State.

But what burns BYRD down is the committee's proposal to borrow $20 billion at 3 percent and to collect $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the right of way.

He says these 30-year taxable bonds would cost taxpayers $11.5 billion.

And he's against it. "Based on all recent Federal experience," he declares, "I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period."

Obviously, the Clay plan will run into stiff opposition in the Senate, led by HARRY F. BYRD.

[From the Orlando Sentinel of January 23, 1955]

UNSOUND FINANCING

Although the Clay Commission's $101 billion road program has much to recommend it, the method of financing the Government's share of it is extremely dubious and has met with immediate opposition from Senator BYRD.

This calls for an expenditure of $25 billions on 40,000 miles of interstate highways, $20 billion of which would be borrowed through a Federal corporation created by the Government to float the bonds.

According to Senator BYRD, these bonds would bear interest at 3 percent and would extend for 30 years. The interest cost alone would amount to $11.5 billion, or about 55 cents on every dollar borrowed.

Even more objectionable is the method of financing such projects with Government guaranteed bonds outside of the regular budget and constituting an indirect obligation on the Government, but nevertheless an obligation just as binding as any other financial obligation.

"The least the Government can do in fairness to taxpayers is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs," Senator BYRD declares.

A better plan would be for the Government to reduce its 2-cent gasoline tax to one-half cent so that the individual States could raise theirs proportionately and build the roads under the present matching fund program with the individual States retaining as much of the control over their road building as they have in the past.

[From the Fullerton (Calif.) News-Tribune of February 1, 1955]

HIGHWAY FUND PLAN

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, has proposed a plan to finance the $100 billion 10-year highway program proposed by President Eisenhower.

Senator BYRD, the Democratic conservative who has gained a reputation as watchdog of Federal expenditures, suggests that the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax be repealed so that States may levy that much additional and pay for their own highway construction. Then, he says, a Federal tax on lubricating oil and a new half-cent tax on gasoline could be used to finance the present Federal-aid program for roads.

Senator BYRD estimates that his plan would save loading the cost of the program on future generations with an additional price tag of $11.5 billion for interest should the highways be financed by simply adding to the Federal debt.

In the Senator's home State, a first-class highway system has been built and maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis—which makes it cheaper in the long run and doesn't indulge in the dodge of passing on to the children our own obligations.

Senator BYRD's proposal should be given careful consideration.

[From the LaGrange (Ga.) News of January 26, 1955]

BYRD PRESENTS ANOTHER OBJECTION TO PROGRAM

Senator HARRY BYRD, from the State of Virginia, has long been regarded as one of the leading watchdogs on the spending programs of the United States.

As such, he has played an important and strategic part in any financial project undertaken by the Federal Government.

When President Eisenhower proposed his expansive highway construction program Senator BYRD immediately attacked the financing portion of the gigantic plan.

Tuesday we presented the first half of Senator BYRD's statement concerning the highway program. Because of the entire length of the statement we had divided it into two parts.

The Daily News is interested in publishing both sides of the arguments surrounding the highway building program proposed for the United States. Commendations of the Eisenhower program have already been presented. Today we offer the second half of Senator Byrd's statement as follows:

"There is another grave objection to this Federal road plan, of importance equal to those I have mentioned.

"Since 1934, Federal grants to States have enormously expanded in cost and functions. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the State. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things that they did not desire to do, because of grants made by the Federal Government.

"The growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was $126 million, for 18 grants-in-aid programs. Now the total of Federal grants is $3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost. Federal grants to States never end. They continue to expand.

"The commitee's proposal contemplates the greatest increase in Federal grants suggested. A Federal agency will determine the location of the interstate road system, will fix the number and location of access roads, which may be considerable distances apart, will fix the fees for the activities such as filling stations, motels, restaurants, etc., that are located along the rights-of-way and will control construction standards, etc.

"No one recognizes more fully than I the need of road improvement to meet the constantly increasing impact of modern-day traffic. A great deal of my public career has been devoted to the problems of road construction in Virginia. As a substiute for the committee's recommendations I propose:

"1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

"2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

"3. That the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

"4. A one-half cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

"Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past: $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

"Under the committee plan principal and interest payments on the $20 billion bond issue would dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, with the exception of about $600 million which is committed to matching funds of States for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

"In the next few days I will present on a yearly basis figures showing the plan I propose will result in more road development than can be accomplished under the committee's plan; that it will avoid increasing the public debt, and that it will serve to preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system."

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press of January 28, 1955]

BYRD AGAINST ROAD BONDS

President Eisenhower's Federal-State highway program in which he recommends a 10-year road building program for a total of $101 billion isn't going to meet with anything like unanimous support in Congress. Already opposition is showing itself, primarily opposed to the Presidential committee's recommendation that the program be financed through a bond issue.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in January, the 10-year plan concentrated on modernizing the key national system of interstate highways of some 40,000 miles. The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States at the present rate. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this

would come from licenses—filling stations and motels on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from bonds issued for 30 years at 3 percent, issued by a Federal highway corporation. These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Federal Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor fuel and lubrication-oil taxes.

Senator BYRD objects to the proposal for two sets of books on governmental obligations and the interest charge which he says would total $11.5 billion over the period of 30 years. He would have the States take on a larger part of the burden and reduce the Federal tax on gasoline.

We do not necessarily approve the Byrd recommendation to shift the burden to the States which they would finance by a higher gasoline tax. But the proposal for Federal bonds will stand careful examination.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 1, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some months ago President Eisenhower proposed a network of superhighways for the United States costing billions of dollars. The plan was quickly supported by businessmen, economists and many others who could see the necessity for such a development if the country is to keep pace with progress.

Traffic strangulation is definitely before the United States unless a broad and nationwide highway-building project is started without delay. In New England, of course, the building of major highways is well along, with all six States doing a good piece of work to provide this section with the best intercity roads. Naturally, however, there is still room for vast improvement and therefore a Federal program would be of great assistance in expanding our growing highway system.

Federal road building would be of great assistance to business; it would create thousands of jobs in all parts of the country, and it would also serve as a significant part of the general national-defense pattern. And when we consider the way in which this Government has been called upon, again and again, to send billions overseas to help put friendly nations back on their feet after being beaten down by war, then we must agree that the time has come when we should take inventory of our own national needs and proceed to spend some billions on ourselves.

Despite the generally favorable reaction which followed the President's statement on a national road-building program, Members of Congress have not been too quick to express themselves; they are waiting until it is presented to them directly and officially on Capitol Hill.

One Senator, however, has come out in violent opposition, contending that the whole thought violates financing principles, defies budgetary control and evades the Federal debt law. That is Senator BYRD, of Virginia, who will unquestionably spearhead the fight against this progressive proposal.

It is not likely that he will prevail in his arguments because too many of his colleagues in the Senate realize the importance of the project. While there may be some modifications of the President's ideas, it is probable that the program will get started very quickly and that 1955 will be the year in which the first phases will be noted in practically every State in the Union. In another 10 years, the whole of the program will probably be completed—with great benefit to all.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram of February 2, 1955]

MORE BILLIONS AT STAKE

President Eisenhower's $101 billion highway-building plan is receiving a lot of attention both for and against, in Congress. His advisors, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, have told him the Nation must more than double its highway funds in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic.

The plan would increase spending $54 billion above the present projected 10-year total of $47 billion. State and local governments would be expected to dig up $70 billion, or 80 percent more than the $39 billion they would spend under existing programs. The Federal share would more than treble, rising from less than $9 billion to more than $31 billion. Instead of 19 percent, Uncle Sam would pay for 30 percent of the highway program.

Congressional Quarterly points out that Connecticut will get $8,086,262 in Federal funds to spend on roads in fiscal 1956, and a lot more, of course, if Congress enacts the Eisenhower proposals. This share of funds already voted will come from the $875 million earmarked by Congress for highway aid. But to get this share Connecticut taxpayers will have to put it up first. The Government has no other way to get it.

Many interests favor modernization of our roads and construction of new ones from coast to coast, from auto manufacturers to the makers of road signs. Construction companies, State and local officials and safety groups favor the program. But it is opposed by farm organizations and groups which hold that it calls for the spending of altogether too much money.

The principal foe of the measure is one of the most influential men in the United States, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

He thinks the amount is too great, the proposed financing plan bad, a violation of financial principles. In fact, he called the whole business legerdemain.

The program calls for Congress to create a Federal highway corporation to issue more than $20 billion in 3-percent bonds, which would not be included in the Federal debt. They would be guaranteed by the Treasury and they would be paid off by gasoline and oil taxes, licenses of filling stations, motels, and tolls.

The Senate watchdog sees all this as camouflage. A debt is a debt, whether it is included in the Federal debt or not, and the Government is responsible for it. A sore point has arisen in the States. They are worried about raising $31 billion under the Eisenhower program. What is there left for them to tax?

Senator BYRD's opposition may not block the program but it insures the people that Congress will give the entire scheme a sharp look before going into it.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News of January 27, 1955]

BYRD'S HIGHWAY PLAN DESERVES FULL STUDY

President Eisenhower's conservatism in economic affairs involving Government can become overly liberal, in the view of Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. A case in point is the President's proposed $100 billion Federal-States road-building program.

Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and "watchdog" of the national economy, has considerable fault to find with the proposed 10-year plan. Basically it is the administration's approach to additional financing which Mr. BYRD considers highly extravagant.

The Senator's criticisms raise questions that deserve fuller exploration.

For example: Aside from regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Of this sum $5 billion would be raised by licenses on commercial enterprises along the rights-of way. But $20 billion would come from 30-year 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal Highway Authority.

Senator BYRD believes this debt would dry up the existing gasoline-tax revenue for 20 years since only the present tax sources is counted on to retire them.

More importantly, he points out that aggregate interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

That kind of interest, as any home buyer can recognize, is no bargain for the American taxpaying public. The rate isn't exorbitant, but a 30-year mortgage with neither a down payment nor visible source of added income can only extract a heavy interest penalty.

If it were the sole unavoidable solution, it might be accepted as a national necessity. But Senator BYRD offers what seems as a far more workable, economical alternative.

He would turn the job back to the States. In so doing, he suggests that the present 2-cents-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax could be reduced to a half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference.

This would turn both road-building opportunity and responsibility back to the States, where we believe it belongs.

Further, States which are contributing a disproportionate share toward the Federal gasoline and oil taxes would benefit by the Federal tax cut. As it is, States such as Michigan are paying far more than they receive in Federal grants.

The $11.5 billion interest saving would build a sizable length of highway, too.

No one disputes the pressing needs to modernize the 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways. The public is prepared to accept also the prediction that highways will have to carry 80 million vehicles by 1974, as the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program reports. But the means to that end, as Senator BYRD submits, need not be costly Federal financing and control.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald of January 24, 1955]

IT'S STILL DEBT

Senator BYRD (Democrat, Virginia) has raised some very pertinent questions about the suggested means of financing the multibillion highway-building program formally proposed to President Eisenhower.

He's particulaarly concerned about the proposal that bonding of the debt for the program not be included in the regular Government-debt figure.

As the Senator noted, "Count as you will, as we spend more than our income, we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs."

He further sees the threat that such a means of handling the situation would pave the way for "endless outlays" in the same manner for building programs for education, hospitals, and public health.

Once started in that direction there's no telling where it would stop. Already charges have been made that such an arrangement will discriminate against education unless similar help is provided for building schools.

Proponents of such a means of financing a nationwide road-building program contend that it resembles the many toll road or bridge authorities already in existence and which work out satisfactorily.

The Wall Street Journal has noted, however, that such authorities, where properly constituted, are self-contained operations having their own revenues and responsible for their own debts. The proposal for financing the roads, on the other hand, would set the debt outside the books of the United States Treasury while leaving the Treasury all the liabilities, actual and contingent.

As the Wall Street Journal put it, "If we have to go deeper into debt to finance this highway program, let us at least not kid ourselves about what we are doing. Let us keep an accounting system that reflects the true state of affairs, however harassing."

And as Senator BYRD succinctly expressed it, "You can't avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain."

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of January 31, 1955]

SOBER THOUGHT ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Nation is far from sold on the glittering proposal that Federal and State Governments embark on a 10-year road program that would cost $101 billion.

Even some who favor a briskly stepped-up highway development take a dim view of the financing recommended by the Clay committee—a group appointed by the President and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, who has a quick eye for trick financing, calls the scheme a bit of legerdemain. He has in mind the fiction that Federal obligations assumed would not be a part of the public debt. The idea is to create a Government-owned corporation and let it issue highway bonds. So the debt would be the corporation's, not the Government's.

But, as Senator BYRD and other critics point out, the United States Treasury would guarantee the corporation enough money each year to pay off the bonds. Furthermore, it could borrow from the Treasury as much as $5 billion in any year. No; that wouldn't be added to the public debt. Again, the corporation. That agency would have no assets or income, but would be authorized to borrow $20 billion by selling bonds guaranteed by the Treasury; that is to say, by the taxpayers. Congress would have to appropriate for payment of bonds and interest, if necessary.

The States would contribute to the fund, with the program being administered by Washington. There would follow an extension of the Federal Government's structure, along with the inevitable expansion of bureaucracy. And who would police the spending, to see that the billions of dollars were used properly?

The American Automobile Association warns that the program "has a pork-barrel and political potential of serious dimensions." It had in mind particularly the provision that the Government would reimburse the States for the money they spent in building toll roads that would become sections of the interstate network.

It is true that the increase of automotive traffic makes the existing roads inadequate. It is also true that throughout the Nation new highways and bridges are being built. They may always lag behind needs, for there seems to be no end to the increasing volume of automobiles, trucks, and buses. Probably $500 billion could be spent in 10 years without filling all traffic needs. Those needs, however, must be weighed with others.

It may be that the Nation should have a strategic network such as proposed by the Clay committee, but there should be no sleight-of-hand bookkeeping to disguise the fact that it would add to the public debt and mean higher taxes. We line up with Senator BYRD.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 30, 1955]

ROUGH ROAD AHEAD

President Eisenhower's proposal for $25 billion of Federal spending on highways in a 10-year period which, theoretically at least, would include total spending of around $100 billion by all levels of Government obviously is headed for some hot debate in Congress. The President is expected to place his program before the House and Senate in detail in a special message next Thursday.

Senator BYRD, who is about as informed a student of Federal spending as anyone in Washington, vigorously opposes the plan. It provides for financing of the Federal portion with about $5 billion in revenues from various forms of auto, motel, and filling station licenses as well as gasoline tax, plus $20 billion of Federal financing through a bond issue not carried as a public debt or placed in the budget, yet guaranteed by the Federal Government and its revenues resources.

Such a system, Senator BYRD says, would mean operating the Government on two sets of books, one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the public debt limit and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record, and expenditures under budget control.

Senator BYRD further points out that the aggregate interest charges on the Government bond financing in only 10 years would be 55 cents on the dollar. In other words the people would pay $1.55 for every $1 in highway construction by the Federal Government.

That, of course, is the evil of excessive highway bonds up and down the line. Louisiana, through the years starting with the Huey Long regime, has been paying around $1.50 for every $1 in highway construction and maintenance that came under bonds, even assuming that each dollar paid out on actual highway work brought a full 100 cents in such work—which has not always been the case in this State by any means. Politicians always seem anxious to put upper-bracket interest rates on highway bonds.

Senator BYRD proposes that the present 2 cents a gallon Federal tax on gasoline should be abolished so that States can reimpose it for their own highway revenue. This, he says, would make highway construction strictly a State responsibility, aside from Federal matching funds—which is where the responsibility should lie, in the opinion of the Virginia Senator. Basically he views the issue as part of the general picture of State's rights—that those who demand rights independent of Federal Government also must assume responsibilities independent of Federal Government and not run to Washington every time they want to spend money in large sums.

Senator BYRD added this:

"States then would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past and $11½ billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep the highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 23, 1955]

WHICH ROAD IS RIGHT?

President Eisenhower's new highway message to Congress has this in common with a new highway: the citizen has to proceed to the end of it to make sure of the destination.

The first section of the message deals with the need for better highways in terms of common knowledge: traffic fatalities on unsafe roads, high-cost transportation on slow roads, inadequate communications for defense. Most citizens will concur with the President that "action, comprehensive and forward-looking is needed."

Mr. Eisenhower then deals at length with the outline of a 10-year road program offered earlier by a special Commission under Gen. Lucius D. Clay. This program calls for Federal-State expenditures of $101 billion, and the core of the proposal is for the Federal Government alone to spend $25 billion on the interstate highway system.

Only in the last paragraphs of his message, however, does the President deal with the question which threw the Clay report into controversy. That is how to pay for this expanded Federal share in highway building. On this point Mr. Eisenhower is not nearly as specific as the Clay report.

General Clay's Commission suggested establishing a Federal corporation to issue 30-year special road bonds at 3 percent interest. The bond debt would not show up in the Federal budget, yet the Government would be obliged to pay off the bonds.

Now Mr. Eisenhower says that "I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues," but he does not commit himself specifically to the Clay proposal. He appears to add a suggestion which the Clay group rejected; namely, that Congress earmark revenues from gasoline and other highway taxes to pay off bonds.

Since the President and his special Commission seem to be in some disagreement as to just how to pay off a special highway bond issue, this aspect of the program is bound to cause some guesswork in Congress.

But congressional criticism of the Clay report has already shown that the main issue will not be how to finance special bonds, but whether to issue special bonds at all.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, quoted in today's Mirror of Public Opinion, objects that such special bonds would be a subterfuge. Issued outside the budget, they would evade the debt limit and make the budget appear closer to balance than it really is.

Aside from that, this type of bond financing is far more expensive than the traditional pay-as-you-go method of highway appropriations. Senator BYRD estimates that in 30 years every dollar borrowed through bonds would cost the taxpayers $1.55 because of interest payments.

One related question also has arisen to the bond proposal. Why is the administration willing to issue 20 billion for a 10-year road plan, but has proposed to underwrite no more than 900 million in school bonds, and has offered a health reinsurance plan of just 25 million? Necessary as new highways are, should they have such great precedence over school aid?

Rumblings in Congress about these questions were not quieted by the last-minute White House conference with congressional leaders. This was the first time the administration has called in Democrats on a domestic program. But Presidential assistants said no major changes would be permitted in the program, so the purpose of the meeting was not consultation but a preview.

Since Congress had nothing to do with forming the road policy, that policy is bound to face critical examination as it goes before Congress. The Nation does not have to be told that it needs new highways. It ought to be told how it can get them economically, and that at least should mean keeping Federal highway costs in the Federal budget.

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Telegraph of January 27, 1955]

THE NEW ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower is scheduled to send to Congress on Thursday, January 27, his recommendations for a 10-year, $101 billion Federal-State road-building program.

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious

opposition in Congress even before its formal submission. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy "watchdog" of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program submitted on January 11, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile system of interstate highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-ways. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates.

The $20-billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean "operating the Government on 2 sets of books; one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the public debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2-cents-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half-cent-per-gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility. Thus says BYRD:

"States would retain as much control over their roads as they have in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Whether the Federal or State Governments are to bear the increased costs of an adequate highway system, our highway will have to carry some 80 million vehicles by 1974, according to the President's Commission. Its Chairman, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, told the National Conference on Highway Financing of the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 13: "We are indeed caught in a traffic jam, nationwise."

[From the Newport News (Va.) Press of February 5, 1955]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO ROADS

Senator ROBERTSON put his finger directly on the sorest spot of all in the Clay Commission's report recommending a $101 billion road program over a period of years. This plan contemplates the extensive issue of bonds, with the Federal gasoline tax eliminated and certain other Federal revenues allotted to highway building.

The Lexington lawmaker simply pointed out that it costs vastly more to build roads on credit than it costs to build them when cash is paid for the job. One has to decide, then, whether it is the more expedient to undertake an immense emergency construction job, or to proceed as rapidly as possible with the available revenue.

Mr. ROBERTSON unbent enough from customary modesty to say that he worked closely with Senator BYRD in the old Virginia State senate days, to get Virginia's road program stated. Virginia has paid for its roads in cash—and avoided the waste of interest on bonds.

Moreover, it is not out of order to recall that a few years ago a prominent American who has traveled much was asked what States had the best roads. Virginia was one of the two States he mentioned. We still wonder whether more would not be accomplished if the States build their own roads—for cash.

[From the Bristol (Va.) Courier of January 28, 1955]

IKE'S HIGHWAY PLAN WOULD AID OUR AREA

Virginia can get $16,825,904 of Federal money to spend on roads in fiscal 1956, and probably a lot more if Congress enacts the multi-billion-dollar highway program proposed by President Eisenhower.

The major new proposal, of course, would boost spending for highway construction from $47 billion to $101 billion over a 10-year period. This would involve formation of a special road bureau empowered to issue bonds to pay the cost of giving the Nation, and the respective States, a better system of primary and secondary roads.

At the present time, the Federal Government is committed under a 1954 law to pay about 19 percent of highway costs. President Eisenhower's plan would raise the Government's share to about 30 percent.

For the moment, the future of the Eisenhower proposal is facing a major roadblock in the form of Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who has attacked the plan as a method of bypassing the Federal budget in order to increase the national debt. He has presented a substitute proposal which would give the States part of the money which the Government presently collects in gas taxes—thereby permitting local highway construction. (The President's proposal envisions using the gas tax fund in retiring the bonds which would be issued by the special road bureau.)

Actually, according to Congressional Quarterly News Features, little extra mileage would be added under the proposed $101 billion program. Most of the money would be spent on replacing and improving highways considered inadequate to carry today's traffic—and Virginia has more than its share of such roads.

Virginia had 54,240 miles of roads, including Federal-aid highways, in 1953. Of that mileage, 5,021 miles are part of the Federal-aid primary system and 16,974 miles are part of the Federal-aid secondary system, which would receive assistance at about the same rate as provided by the 1954 law.

Our section of the State would benefit tremendously from President Eisenhower's proposal inasmuch as it provides for a new, limited access highway from northeast Virginia to the Tennessee State line, near Bristol. Presumably, this would connect with another proposed superhighway from Bristol to west Tennessee.

There seems little hope of obtaining such a highway or of improving and expanding Virginia's present road system, under existing conditions involving diversions which subtract heavily, from the State's highway funds.

As we noted before, Senator BYRD's substitute proposal might have great merit if we could be assured that all the money made available for highways was used for highways and not for construction of buildings or upkeep of convict camps.

The report of the Clay committee, on which President Eisenhower's proposal is based, would perform a necessary service in a minimum amount of time. It may be that Senator BYRD is correct in arguing against further indebtedness on the national level, but there can be no argument on the highway needs of Virginia, and especially southwest Virginia.

If Senator BYRD can devise a plan by which Virginia could provide us with the necessary, safe highways, we would be the first to stand by his side. Until such time arrives, however, we can only hope that the Eisenhower proposal is adopted.

If it fails to win approval from Congress, and if the present system of road construction and maintenance in Virginia continues, we have little to look forward to, as one wag noted, but miles and miles of nothing but miles and miles.

[From the Freeport (Tex.) Facts-Review of February 7, 1955]

BILLIONS AT STAKE IN ROAD PROGRAM

Presidential advisers say the Nation must more than double spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic, but an influential critic calls the $101 billion program unsound.

The plan would boost spending $54 billion above the projected 10-year total of $47 billion. State and local agencies would chip in $70 billion, or 80 percent more than the $39 billion they would spend under existing programs. The Federal share would more than treble, rising from less than $9 billion to more than $31 billion. Uncle Sam would pay for 30 percent of the highway program, instead of 19 percent.

Most Congressmen have been awaiting the President's January 27 message on highways before choosing sides, but Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, pounced on the advisory committee's January 11 report within 4 days. BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said the program would violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

He dismissed as legerdemain the advisers' key plan for financing the Federal share of the program. Congress would create a Federal Highway Corporation to issue more than $20 billion in 3 percent bonds. The bonds would not count as part of the Federal debt, which keeps bumping against the legal ceiling.

BYRD's own plan emphasizes States rights. The Federal Government would cut its gasoline tax from 2 cents to one-half cent a gallon, permitting the States to raise their taxes and build more highways with less control by Washington. Acceptance of the FHC plan, BYRD predicted, would lead to endless outlays for other programs.

Interest costs high: The President Advisory Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, gave top priority to the interstate highway system, which handles one-seventh of all traffic. Of the $101 billion, $27 billion would be spent on these highways and urban connections, with the Federal Government paying $25 billion, the States $2 billion.

Federal aid for the rest of the highway system would cost $623 million a year, equivalent to the current rate. States match these Federal contributions. The Federal Government would continue to pay for roads on its public lands, a program that now costs $59 million a year.

Full cost of the $20 billion in bonds would reach nearly $32 billion, including interest. The Clay Committee estimated Federal gasoline and lubricating oil taxes—at current per-gallon rates—would feed nearly $566 billion into the Treasury during the 30-year

term of the bond issues. Subtracting nearly $19 billion—the cost of the continuing $623 million-a-year program—the committee found that $37 billion would remain. That would pay off the bonds and cover the $5 billion not raised through bonds.

Ordinarily, less is spent on highways than is collected from motor fuel and oil taxes. The committee's proposal would channel into highways money that normally would be spent on other Federal programs.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald of February 11, 1955]

SPIRALING DEBT, FEDERAL CONTROL, ISSUES IN NATIONAL HIGHWAY PLAN

Able and crusty Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, can always be counted upon to hoist the warning flag when dubious proposals are made to plunge the Nation further into debt and extend the iron hand of Federal bureaucracy.

Currently, the Senator is championing opposition to the $25 billion national-highway program which has been recommended to the President by an advisory committee. His points of criticism merit the notice of all taxpayers.

If—and it's a big if—the money borrowed for this program to improve the interstate highway system is paid off on schedule, the interest on it will amount to $11,500,000,000. But, as Senator BYRD points out, it is a wild assumption that the bonds will be amortized in 30 years as proposed, since, in effect, not a single dollar of Federal debt has been paid off in 25 years. The unique proposal is to finance the program through a Federal corporation which would borrow from the public, with the Treasury guaranteeing the corporation's bonds. Congress would be asked to make annual appropriations to meet principal and interest.

The plan, in effect, provides for a new method of disguising new public debt. If adopted for roads, the Virginia solon points out, it will open the way for similar legerdemain to finance endless outlays that may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, and so forth. But public debt is still a debt of the public, a burden which must sooner or later be disposed of. The Federal-highway program would, moreover, add greatly to Federal grants-in-aid programs. Since 1934 these programs have grown in amount from $126 million to $3 billion annually—a 2,300-percent increase.

Senator BYRD proposes as a substitute for the $25 billion program that the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax be repealed and reimposed by States. The needed highways then could be built under State control and on a current basis at a saving of at least $11,500,000,000 in interest. But it may be too late to stem the tide of Federal encroachment, for States are showing little progress in meeting their responsibilities. Senator BYRD's sane voice probably will be lost in the roar of millions of Americans foolishly clamoring for something for nothing.

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune of February 1, 1955]

PAYG BEATS IOU

When Virginia's Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD was 15, as the legend goes, he made a pay-as-you-go deal with the station agent who was holding the Byrd newsprint for express charges, so that the family paper, the Winchester Star, might continue publication. His subsequent rescue of the family fortunes may well explain his dedication to pay as you go.

Later, as a State senator, young Mr. BYRD was a prime mover in establishing a State highway system for Virginia, whose only paved road connected Washington and Richmond. This, too, at the insistence of Senator BYRD, and then Governor BYRD, was a pay-as-you-go operation, and still is. No bonds, no debts, and for years now a system of roads as adequate as those of any State to the needs of its citizens and visitors.

Today, Senator BYRD warns against President Eisenhower's 10-year highway program, expanded by his advisory committee in record time from 50 billion to 101 billion. Dollars, that is. Instead of loading this additional debt on unborn generations, with an additional $11 billion of interest, the Senator would repeal the Federal 2-cent gas tax, give it back to the States to do their own roadbuilding, and finance the present Federal-aid program with a new half-cent gas tax and a tax on lubricating oil.

We are told that our present State Governors, all 48, favor the Clay Committee plan—proving no doubt, that $101 billion can't be wrong. But perhaps we'd better listen to former Governor BYRD. We can't think of a better qualified witness.

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal of January 26, 1955]

ROAD PLAN FINANCING UNSOUND

Prediction by Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, that there's no doubt Congress will approve President Eisenhower's $101-billion-highway program if a satisfactory financing plan can be worked out is equivalent to the housewife planning on that new hat if housekeeping funds permit. Something suffers, the house or the frau.

Recommendation of the President's advisory committee that the $27 billion Federal share of the 10-year program be raised by issuing bonds through a Federal highway corporation leaves too much open to chance, especially when it is projected that the corporation would borrow from the Treasury if tax collections lag behind bond payments.

The Nation definitely needs such a program but, as pointed out by Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, that means of financing is unorthodox and unsound. Certainly, a lot of thought is needed if this feather is to be placed in the administration's hat.

[From the Redding (Calif.) Record-Searchlight of February 9, 1955]

WHAT OTHERS SAY: BYRD CALLS IT NONSENSE

(From the San Francisco News)

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has come out with a "preliminary" appraisal of the $101,000,000,000 highway program proposed by President Eisenhower's advisory commission.

The respected Virginian has made it clear that he is choosing his words with restraint, pending Ike's formal announcement on where he stands.

While merely warming up, so to speak, Mr. BYRD has this to say:

"Legerdemain * * * thoroughly unsound * * * a procedure that would violate financial principles, defy budgetary control, and evade the Federal debt."

That is pretty good for a starter. In full voice, Mr. BYRD may peel the paint right off the White House.

We admire both his splendid early season form and his views on this matter.

The President's commission says among other things that if a Federal "corporation" is set up, and if that corporation sells $20,000,000,000 worth of 30 year bonds, then for some reason or other we can just forget about adding the total to our national debt.

Nonsense, says Senator BYRD. The so-called corporation plans to pay 3 percent interest to the bond buyers. Over 30 years, that will mean the buyers must be paid $11,500,000,000 in interest. And who will be in hock for all those billions? The taxpayers, of course. If that is not adding to the national debt, what is?

Good luck, Senator BYRD. From any angle, the whole setup looks about as sound as a chain letter.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of February 1, 1955]

BUMPY ROAD AHEAD

The road is evidently not going to be smooth for the ambitious Federal and State highway program proposed by a presidential commission.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, doesn't like part of the proposed financial arrangement. The American Automobile Association objects to more toll roads. The National Education Association fears so much will be spent on highways there won't be enough left for schools.

Everyone seems to agree new roads are desirable, even essential. Massachusetts has put in its bid for $850 million to improve existing interstate highways, such as routes 1, 5, 9, and 20, and build new ones. Reports from Washington say the State might receive $750 million if the Federal program goes through.

This would give highway construction a tremendous boost here. But even that would not meet all our needs; the State department of public works has estimated $2.3 billion would have to be spent in the next 10 years to put all roads in the State in topnotch condition.

If it is agreed we need better highways, the only question is how we are going to pay for them. The President's Commission suggested a variety of sources. The States would supply most of the money, although the Commission didn't indicate just how this might be raised. Revenue from toll roads would help provide the Federal share. The Federal Government would continue to contribute part of the income from the gasoline tax, although on a reduced scale. In addition, it would borrow $20 billion.

This borrowing has aroused Senator BYRD's ire. It would be done by a new Federal corporation. By this device, the additional debt wouldn't show up as part of the regular Federal debt. This would be hardly more than a bookkeeping trick, for the borrowing would be repaid from Federal revenue. And if the corporation got into financial difficulties, the Government would probably bail it out.

The plan boils down to this: the Government would borrow $20 billion in the next 10 years and pay it back with gasoline and oil tax revenues of the next 30 years.

If we can meet all our highway needs for 30 years with one grand burst of road building in the coming decade, the plan is financially sound. Otherwise, it is not.

If, by 1964, huge new highway projects appear imperative—as they almost certainly will—then taxes will have to be raised sharply to meet those needs. We cannot spend beyond our means indefinitely.

That does not mean the highway program should be shelved. But if we are to undertake heavy new spending for roads without raising motor vehicle taxes proportionately, we should do it with our eyes open.

[From the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Journal of January 29, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Nobody will argue with the President when he says that the United States is caught in a traffic jam. But several objections are being fired at the details of the White House $100 billion program to get the Nation out of the jam.

Very shortly the President will send his program to Congress for action. Motorists, bus riders—just about all of us—have a stake in this Federal highway program, so let's take a short look at it and some of the objections.

The American Automobile Association objects principally to the building of any more toll roads. This is part of the President's proposal. The New York State Automobile

Association says this State should not rely on the national program. The State should go ahead and spend the proposed $750 million agreed on by both parties at Albany, says the NYSSA, making sure that any increase in motor fuel taxes is used to pay for better roads.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Virginia Democrat, who now heads the Senate Finance Committee, also has an objection. He doesn't like the idea of tieing up the revenues from Federal taxes on motor vehicle fuel to pay for highway bonds. The Senator suggests that these Federal fuel taxes be cut so that the States can raise their own taxes on gasoline and diesel oil. That way, he says, the States can build these roads and control them. His idea is undoubtedly good, so far as it goes, for the bigger, more populous States. But will the smaller States be able to pay for their share of the roads we will need to carry the 80 million vehicles that will be crowding them within 10 years?

Even Senator BYRD and the group that supports his distaste for the financing plans of the President's program do not come out flatly and say we do not need a national net of superhighways. That would be something like saying we do not need peace on earth. There seems to be recognition that we as a Nation have committed ourselves to living on wheels. The problem is bigger than the ability of the separate States to cope with it. Whatever is done in this Congress to the President's program, if the alterations result in putting off the solution, may be regretted by the whole Nation. Details may be altered but some national program should be started.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 23, 1955]

THE ROAD PLAN: YES OR NO?—THE MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION

(New York Times approves administration road program, says Nation can no longer make small plans for the automobile; Idaho newspaper says project is worthy but questions methods of bond financing outside of budget; asks if this is businesslike.)

THE NEW YORK TIMES

The massive road-building program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission on Highways under Gen. Lucius D. Clay denotes at last acceptance of the principle that the United States can no longer be satisfied with making small plans for the automobile.

The spending of $101 billion for the modernization and expansion over a 10-year period by the Federal Government, States, and other levels of jurisdiction would be sound investment in the future of America.

The program can be financed without undue hardship on the economy. It will be a productive expenditure, saving lives, opening new areas of the country to business, industrial and recreational development and stimulate the fuller enjoyment of our resources. When we consider that there is an automobile for about every third person in our population it is clear that the problem of highways cannot be adequately dealt with on anything less than a planned, long-range basis.

As to sharing the costs

The interest and responsibility of the Federal Government in this problem are, of course, apparent. Interstate commerce must flow, as our very lifeline. Topside direction must be given, so that the end result has connection and integration.

The States, within the limits of their resources, have struggled with an insuperable challenge. The cities, built for the vehicles of another generation, have fought a losing battle and one in which their plights as the focal center of traffic brought to their borders has not been fairly recognized.

We suppose that much of the debate, as this plan is threshed out in Congress and elsewhere, will turn upon the sharing of costs, and whether the Federal Government should assume more than the approximately 30 percent contemplated.

The Federal share would be underwritten, it is hoped, by the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. A special highway corporation would be set up as a device to avoid increasing the Federal debt, and bond issues would be retired through Congress setting aside funds drawn from the motor-fuel taxes.

Lesson of the turnpikes

By requiring lower levels of Government to match certain funds the Federal Government hopes to encourage a stepping up of construction on those levels to make the $101 billion goal, of which the Federal share would be $31,225,000,000. Where States and cities will find such money is one of the major questions that lie ahead.

The prospect of having, in a decade or thereabouts, the great modern highway system we actually need right now is exciting. We know already, from such pioneers as the Pennsylvania Turnpike and its successors, what the dividends are, in time saved, in lowered use of gasoline and diesel fuel, in repairs and maintenance costs saved on cars and trucks.

Every new highway exceeds the preliminary estimates of use. We have plenty of evidence that the American motorist (and who isn't one?) is more than willing to foot the bill for good highways.

While the details of the program will of course deserve careful study, we applaud and support this attempt to see the problem whole, to prepare for the future and to get prompt action.

LEWISTOWN (IDAHO) TRIBUNE

President Eisenhower's proposed national highway program seems headed for critical examination in Congress, chiefly because of the odd financing plan recommended for it.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat), Virginia, objected that the program would "violate financing principle, defy budgetary control and evade Federal debt law."

Byrd has a habit of objecting almost automatically to proposals which he thinks threaten "States rights" or a balanced budget. This time, however, he seems to have found a cause to which he can recruit objectors from outside his normal circle. BYRD said:

"The Committee's recommendations fall generally into two parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for the interstate system.

"Some 11 billions in interest

"The Committee estimates the $25 billion would construct 40,000 road miles designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. For this the Committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

"If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the Committee can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule, the interest would cost more than $11,500,000,000. At this rate, every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55."

However, BYRD contends it is most unlikely in view of the Federal debt's history, that the bonds would be paid off on schedule.

"The Committee recommended to the President," said BYRD, "that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for endless outlays.

"Unbusinesslike financing

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record."

Perhaps BYRD's condemnations of the fiscal methods suggested are unduly harsh. But it does seem odd that a "businessman's government" has proposed an apparently unbusinesslike method of financing a worthy project.

If the Federal Government cannot countenance, for example, a separate Columbia Basin account to help finance the expansion of self-liquidating Federal dam projects in the Northwest, how can it justify going outside regular budget channels to finance a national project which cannot directly repay its costs?

Surely there must be some way, considering the importance of a national highway program, to depend more upon direct taxing to finance it and less upon cost-doubling bonds, annoying tolls, and other trick methods of raising funds.

EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on May 17, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 2682, relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation. On May 19 the Senate passed an identical bill, S. 33. The Senate was not aware that the House had passed H. R. 2682.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 33) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the bill was passed is reconsidered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2682) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 2682. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2682) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, about 250 years ago a large area in what is now southern Arizona and northern Sonora, where the Papago Indians were then living and have continued to reside to the present time, was by discovery, conquest, and settlement, taken over by the Crown of Spain, and under Spanish law, all minerals were reserved to the Crown. When the present Papago Indian Reservation was created by Executive order on February 1, 1917, all the minerals were reserved to the United States for disposal to all American citizens under the mining laws. For that reason the only way the mineral rights in the Papago Reservation can be transferred to the Indian tribe is by an act of Congress.

I should like to quote for the RECORD from an opinion by Mr. Nathan R. Margold, former Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, with respect to this matter. It is dated March 7, 1934. In his opinion, after reviewing Spanish and Mexican laws and authorities, Mr. Margold said:

Since the cession to the United States the courts in this country have recognized both the ownership of mines by Spain and Mexico before the cession, and the succession of the United States to that ownership * * * The Supreme Court has stated expressly that under Spanish law minerals in Indian lands were the property of the crown * * *," and cites the case of *Chouteau d. Molony* (16 How. 203 (U. S. 1853)).

The executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government likewise have recognized the succession of Federal Government to the ownership of mines in what was formerly Spanish and Mexican territory.

In support of this statement he cites the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1849 quoting the Secretary's statement concerning laws of Spain and property title to Spanish and Mexican mines. In addition, he states that the Congress expressly excluded mineral lands from the operation of the statute creating the office of Surveyor General for New Mexico and providing machinery for the establishment and confirmation of land claims existing under the Spanish-Mexican law.

He continues as follows:

In the Court of Private Land Claims Act it is provided:

"Third. No allowance or confirmation of any claim shall confer any right or title to any gold, silver, or quicksilver mines or minerals of the same unless the grant claimed effect the donations of such mines or minerals to the grantee or unless such grantee has become otherwise entitled thereto in law or in equity; but all such mines and minerals shall remain in the property of the United States."

In conclusion, Solicitor Margold says:

In the light of the facts now at hand, it is my opinion that in 1853 the United States acquired title to the land in question subject to an Indian right of occupancy of an area not exactly determined; that whatever surface rights the Papago Indians may have enjoyed, no interest in minerals was accessory or incidental to those surface rights; that complete and unencumbered title to minerals in the land was vested formerly in the Mexican state and passed to the United States upon cession of the territory. It follows that the question of the appropriate manner of protecting the Papagos in their possession was, and still is, a matter exclusively of political cognizance. * * * The present measure of the rights of the Papagos is the Executive order of February 1, 1917, as modified by the act of February 21, 1931. The Papagos have no independent title which can make that action ineffective or embarrass any future action that to Congress may seem appropriate in the premises.

Mr. President, to show the change in public sentiment in Arizona in the past two decades, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a joint memorial adopted by the Arizona Legislature on March 6, 1933, and another legislative memorial adopted on February 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the memorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 15

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, D. C.:

Your memorialist, the 11th Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represents:

By Executive order of February 1, 1917, supplanting an Executive order of January 14, 1916, there was set aside in southern Arizona, as a reservation for the Papago Indians, a great body of land, embracing a large portion of the territory lying between the city of Tucson on the east and Ajo on the west, and Casa Grande on the north to the Mexican border. To the reservation so formed has recently been added, by act of February 21, 1931, the so-called 6-mile strip, the whole body of land thus set aside as a reservation amounting to 2,633,974 acres.

As a result of negotiations between representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Governor of Arizona, or his representatives, the Executive orders creating this reservation contained a specific provision to the effect that all mineral lands therein should continue to be subject to exploration, location, and entry. Without such an agreement Arizona would have objected strenuously to the creation of the reservation, with its immense addition to the already tremendous area of Indian reservations within her borders.

Relying upon said exception, prospectors continued to search the mineralized portions of the reservation, with the result that 122 placer mining claims of 20 acres each have been patented, while 58 others have been surveyed and approved for patents. There are also within the area several lode properties of importance.

These activities, while contributing to the prosperity of the State, have in addition afforded considerable employment to Indians residing on the reservation, and have in not the slightest degree curtailed or detracted from the use of the reservation lands by the Papagos.

Despite the fact that these lands were set aside with the understanding and agreement that the reservation rights so created should be exclusive of mineral explorations, location, and entry rights, the Secretary of the Interior, under date of October 26, 1932, approved an order withdrawing the said land from all forms of mineral entry or claim "in order that Congress may consider the claims of the Indians to the mineral rights within these lands."

The records disclose that this action was taken at the instance of "certain friends of the Papagos," notably certain attorneys of Washington, D. C., and Los Angeles, Calif., whose friendship appears to be based upon a contract under which they would receive a percentage of any revenue accruing from the establishment of such mineral rights.

The result of this violation of both the letter and the spirit of the agreement under which the said reservation was created has been to put an end to prospecting within the area affected; to deny many idle American copper miners, thrown out of employment by the depression in the copper industry, the opportunity to work the gulches in which placer gold is found, or, aided by a "grubstake," to search the hills for ore deposits; to discourage capital from giving assistance to the development of properties to which no other titles might be secured than objectionable and undependable Indian leases, and generally to stop all mining activities.

Wherefore your memorialist requests that the agreement of the Federal Government, embodied in the Executive orders creating the Papago Reservation, which was the basis of this State's withdrawal of objections to the said reservation, be carried out, and not treated as a "scrap of paper"; that the order withdrawing the lands of the reservation from mineral exploration, location, and entry, be rescinded, and that encouragement be given to efforts to discover and develop such mineral properties as may be found within the said Papago Reservation.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Passed the house, March 6, 1933.

Passed senate, March 7, 1933.

House Memorial 2

Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation withdrawing all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location, and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents the Papago Indian Reservation, created by Executive Order 2524 and extended by statute 46 St. 1202, is subject to mineral entry and location under the mining laws of the United States.

Except for the mining laws of the United States and Arizona, the said right of entry is not subject to any control by the United States or by the Papago Tribe.

Said right of location has caused hardship to numerous Papago Indians in the past by forcing them to move from their homes and fields and by depriving them of desirable lands and waterholes.

Due to the great interest of the general public in the possibility of discovering uranium ore on the reservation, there is great fear among the Papago Indians that they will be deprived of their reservation piecemeal by mining claimants.

The Papago Indian Reservation does not have adequate resources to support the population presently living there and the possibility of substantial mineral discoveries seems the only hope that the reservation can provide an adequate economic base for the Papago people.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays that the Congress of the United States withdraw all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation, except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona.

Adopted by the house February 4, 1955, by the following vote: 68 ayes, 0 nays, 12 not voting.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state; February 4, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2682) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 33 is indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 163. An act for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos);

S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry;

S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha;

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts;

S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri;

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, before I begin my speech I should like, in my present position as acting minority leader, to express my personal appreciation and that of the minority for the fine, courteous manner in which the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has acted at all times. He has been very diligent in connection with the work being done by the Senate, which, of course, is his duty. I congratulate him and thank him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am offering as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill what is known as the administration bill. I think the administration bill has been very carefully thought out. It provides a plan for constructing an interstate system of roads in the United States which was laid out in 1947, and it also provides a method of financing without requiring additional revenue.

As I stated last Friday, the chairman of the subcommittee held very exhaustive hearings. They lasted for many days. Everyone who desired to be heard was given an opportunity. I have already mentioned to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], an outline which I made for my own use. I penciled it and placed under the head of "Financing," which is the important thing in connection with anything we do in the United States, the method by which this great system of roads could be financed:

(A) From taxes on gasoline and other commodities used in the operation of motor vehicles;

(B) Tolls on the interstate system;

(C) Charge trucks, buses, and automobiles a license fee for traveling on the interstate system of roads;

(D) Bonds, as provided for in the so-called administration bill.

There must also be considered rates of speed, weights, rights-of-way, and limited access. In the pending bill the determination of questions of this kind is retained by the States. Personally, I have always felt that the matters relating to weights and speeds should be handled locally.

On the subject of construction, the question of having the facilities with which to build the roads arises. We went into that question very thoroughly. We considered whether we have an adequate number of engineers to prepare the plans; whether there is available in our country sufficient road machinery and other materials to carry out this great program; whether we have adequate contracting facilities and men possessing the know-how to build the number of roads desired.

On this matter the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee heard several witnesses, and I think we have all concluded that we do have a sufficient number of skilled engineers to lay out the roads and that we have the road machinery and the necessary facilities, or we can have them in sufficient quantity in perhaps a year.

In the case of materials the situation is a little different. It will probably take 2 years before we have an adequate supply of cement to build the number of miles of roads contemplated. Procurement of the required amount of gravel is probably the most serious thing confronting us. But we are informed, and I believe—and I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will agree with me—that we have sufficient engineers, sufficient building organizations, and sufficient machinery to enable this road program to go forward at full speed in a period of not exceeding 2 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I agree that the suppliers and contracting organizations gave the committee satisfactory information which indicated that a vigorous highway construction program could be inaugurated soon. I believe the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will recall that the president of the Highway Constructors Association testified that within a year they would have sufficient facilities to double the present rate of highway construction and reconstruction, but that it would probably be from 3 to 4 years before they could double it again. This played a part, as I believe the Senator will recall, in the decision reached by the committee to place in the bill a provision for a progressive stepping up of the program until in the fourth year a level would be reached which ordinarily might have required 10 years.

The same principle of acceleration of the program is contained in the Clay report and is inherent in the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the Senator from Pennsylvania has offered.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I agree with the distinguished Senator. I think what he has stated is correct. We had before the committee persons who had an excellent knowledge of what can be done relative to the construction of highways as from the standpoint of machinery, engineering, and materials. They were perhaps the best informed

witnesses who could be secured in the entire United States, and I think the country owes a great debt to that group of men who, at their own expense, made such an exhaustive study for the benefit of our committee.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The fourth point I have listed in my own outline as to what we should know before reporting a bill is this: Are the States in a situation to be able to match the Federal Government in the accelerated program? Probably it will be necessary to resort to considerable discussion in order to answer the last question in the affirmative. I think the States will be able to meet their requirements, but that is a matter which I shall leave for discussion a little later.

Improved roads have been built in the United States during the past 50 years. I think the first improved country road was built in my own State in about 1902. Much experimentation was necessary in order to determine the type of road that would stand up under the travel conditions to which our highways are subjected. It has been essential continually to strengthen the roads. It has been of great importance to obtain better drainage. It has been necessary to build roads having fewer curves. Those have been progressive developments.

The construction of roads to any great extent in the country areas was not begun until the early 1930's.

As I recall, the first gasoline tax was levied by Oregon in 1919. Now every State levies a gasoline tax for the purpose of building roads. Twenty-five States now have constitutional limitations requiring that all gasoline taxes be used for roadbuilding. I think such a constitutional provision is now pending in another State or two. This shows the tendency toward paying for road construction in the United States.

The hearings before the subcommittee showed, without a peradventure of doubt, that more improved roads are needed. Unless some plan such as that suggested by the Clay Committee or the administration shall be adopted, modern roads will not be constructed.

We have been working on this problem for almost a half century. It is frequently impossible to leave one State and enter another on an improved, continuous direct highway. It is true that U. S. Route 40, U. S. Route 30, and possibly U. S. Route 6 have been very well developed throughout the country; but generally speaking one is never quite certain, when he starts on a highway, what the condition of the road will be in an adjoining State.

I first became greatly interested in an improved highway system for the United States while I was engaged in transporting soldiers over the Nation. My last job of handling troops was in early 1941. At that time General Marshall asked if I would undertake the responsibility of moving 18,000 soldiers by motor vehicles some 1,600 miles from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the State of Louisiana.

I was amazed—yes; I was shocked—at the poor condition of our roads. It was necessary for me to send engineers ahead to repair bridges and to remove short curves. We were not handling any heavy material; we were attempting to carry only light material.

I have also had experience with the maneuvering of soldiers in many of the States, especially in practically all the Southern States, including Texas. I have also done similar work in Ohio and New York and throughout New England.

Mr. President, the roads of the United States need to be improved. A system is needed which will eventually connect the large centers of population. The roads to be provided under the administration bill, or the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I am now discussing, would connect 42 of the 48 State capitals. They would connect 90 percent of all municipalities having a population of 50,000 or more.

As to financing such a program, the people of the United States are becoming very much worried about taxation for roadbuilding. I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "Nobody Sells Roads," published a few days ago in the Washington (Pa.) Observer. The editorial comments that almost everyone is selling automobiles and accessories, but that it is necessary to build roads if the present large output of motor vehicles is to be continued. The editorial states that probably many persons who are now selling automobiles should be selling the plan of extending our road system. I feel the editorial is so pertinent that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOBODY SELLS ROADS

Automobiles are selling like hotcakes this year. That's an understatement. It's a lucky pancake flipper whose hotcakes are selling like automobiles.

Through April of last year, 2.1 million 1954 model cars were sold to the public. Through April this year 3.4 million 1955 models found owners. That's an increase of 62 percent in a single year.

Despite this tremendous record, there were more new cars in the hands of dealers at the end of April—679,000—than at any previous time in history. But the industry isn't worried. It has proved that it can sell, and it is finding that more and more families can be persuaded to own more than one car.

But another problem continues to grow. As people buy more and more cars, what are they going to do with them? More homes are being built with two-car garages, but nobody buys cars to keep in a garage. They aren't worth much to their proud owners unless they can be driven—and parked.

And that's where the squeeze is. City traffic is getting worse and worse everywhere. Municipal officials struggle with the problem of parking facilities. But these plans move in low gear while car salesmen swing into high and tromp on the accelerator.

Of course, a driver can leave the city behind and get out on the open road. Haw. Traffic is almost as heavy on main highways as in cities, and every car sold makes the problem more acute. Is the answer to draft some of the Nation's auto salesmen and put them to work selling highways?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press, a newspaper of very large circulation, also dealt recently with the tax situation in Pennsylvania. I call particularly to the attention of the Senate the criticism by the newspaper of the proposal to increase the gasoline tax in Pennsylvania in order to take care of the roads. The editorial states that the motorist already is paying up to 8 cents a gallon in many States, which is as much as should be expected from the traveling public. The editorial, to my mind, is so pertinent that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Leader wants to add another $99 million to the taxes on motorists. He wants another penny added to the 5 cents a gallon tax on gasoline. (With the Federal tax of 2 cents, that would make a total tax of 8 cents a gallon.) He also wants the license fee for passenger autos increased from $10 to $15 and truck license fees increased by $18 million.

Mr. Leader sprung this program in a hit-and-run manner in his budget message, with a scant reference to the need for improved highways and a promise to explain in detail later.

The taxpayers already stand to put up a total of $494 million in highway funds under existing legislation. That, however, isn't enough for Mr. Leader's program.

Pennsylvania now boasts of the world's greatest highway system, totaling 40,000 miles. We have accomplished that without the extra $99 million Mr. Leader wants. We also pioneered the spreading toll turnpike system, which takes much heavy traffic off State highways, with the user paying for the turnpikes.

Of course, the State highway system needs constant repair, maintenance and improvement. But does it need another $99 million on top of $494 million?

The auto long ago ceased to be a pleasure vehicle. It's now a tool, used by employed people to get to their jobs. Another penny added to the tax on gasoline is just another tax on employment, in the same class as an increase in trolley or bus fares.

As for the $5 increase in motor vehicle registration fees, it's simply a head tax on Pennsylvania's 3,500,000 motorists and truck and bus owners, in the same class as the per capita tax collected by many communities.

Mr. Leader should explain, and soon, why he thinks Pennsylvania motorists should pay these additional taxes, on top of the taxes they now pay. The motorists have demonstrated that they'll stand for fair taxes which give them value in return for what they pay, but they're not apt to look kindly on any attempt to add unnecessary burdens to their tax bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The question of financing the road program is so important that I feel I should say something about it at this time. The Clay committee, whose recommendations are embodied in the administration bill, suggested the issuance of bonds, to extend for not exceeding 30 years, and to be issued by a corporation to be known as the Highway Corporation.

The bonds would be supported by the gasoline tax collected by the United States in excess of $622,500,000. That amount, Mr. President, would take care of the present appropriations for secondary, primary, and urban roads in con-

nection with which the States match the funds provided by the Federal Government. This plan would not require any additional taxes. The tax now levied would take care of those bonds in 30 years. The roads would be constructed in 10 years and would be built in accordance with specifications which would insure that they would be good 20 years from now.

Mr. President, the question of interest charges has been brought up. It has been stated that under the Clay committee or administration plan the interest charge would be $11 billion. Under the pending bill, for which I am proposing the substitute, there is no way of calculating how much the interest charge would be, because there would be deficit financing from the beginning. Furthermore, if that plan were put into effect, only 30 percent of the interstate system would be completed. It encompasses only a 5-year period.

In the bill I am proposing all the interest would be taken care of, as well as all the costs of the roads, in 30 years. The other plan is entirely indefinite.

Many citizens in private life, as well as Members of the Senate, have stated that my proposal is not a good plan; that it is not legal. Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States has stated, and until he is overruled his opinion should be controlling, that this is a legal method, and that these bonds would not come within the category of bonds that have the full faith and authority of the United States. The operation would be similar to that of negotiating a loan at a bank. A man goes to his banker and says, "I want to borrow so much money, and I will pay for it in the following manner." He has certain income to take care of it, and the loan is made.

That is a sound procedure. It is one being followed hundreds and thousands of times every day in the year in various communities throughout the country. It is a sound financial plan if income is available to take care of the payments.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. In paying off the bonds, is not the money to come from Federal revenues obtained from taxes collected by the Federal Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. If we are to pay off the bonds by Federal tax receipts, would we get a lower interest rate if we borrowed through a corporation, or would we get a lower interest rate if we borrowed directly on the credit of the United States Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury thinks the bonds of the corporation would be salable at a slightly higher rate of interest than would be the case if the bonds were a direct obligation of the United States. I might say to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that throughout the Nation, in the case of bond issues by what we call general State authorities or municipal authorities the interest rate is just a little bit higher.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator see any prospect whatever that any set of circumstances could occur whereby the taxpayers of the United States or the Government of the United States could escape the liability of paying off these bonds?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is unnecessary to worry about that, because there will be revenue to take care of the bonds as they become due. I might say to the distinguished Senator that if receipts from gasoline taxes continue to increase as they have been increasing, we would be able to liquidate the bonds much before the end of the 30-year period.

In various places local authorities have issued bonds in order to construct toll turnpikes and toll bridges. I would say 90 percent of them are exceeding the engineers' estimates as to how long it would take to liquidate the bonds.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to comment that I know that in the State which I have the honor to represent, the State of Louisiana, a bridge is being built under an authority, and the State of Louisiana does not assume the liability of paying for that bridge. If the bridge proves not to be a paying proposition, it will simply be a bad break for the people who financed it. That occurred with respect to a bridge across Lake Pontchartrain. The people who financed that bridge lost a great amount of money, because the bridge did not prove to be a paying proposition. Over a certain period of time the owners could not meet the tax liability on the bridge, much less pay off the bonds. However, the State of Louisiana does have the authority to build bridges within the framework of its constitution. The State has not operated under that authority so far as the bridge at New Orleans is concerned. That is a separate authority. However, within the framework of the State constitution, the State earmarks revenues for certain purposes, and the taxes are used for that purpose.

As I understand, the Federal Government cannot earmark its funds for such a project. One Congress cannot bind a future Congress. Does the Senator feel we can earmark funds for the bonds of a corporation when the bonds do have back of them the full faith and credit of the Federal Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In reply, I may suggest to the Senator that we have provided pensions for certain types of soldiers, and then each Congress has made appropriations for the pensions. So far as I have known, no Congress has ever failed to make an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. We do not, however, create a special corporation to pay the pensions; they are a direct obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In the proposal we would use gasoline revenues above $622,500,000. I think there is no question that the Congress could refuse to make the appropriation, but it would be the first time in the history of our country such a thing had ever been done.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the Government expects to pay off the bonds, anyway, a lower interest rate could be obtained by making them a direct obligation of the United States Government. Inasmuch as no businessman would buy the bonds unless he felt sure they were going to be paid for, why should we not provide directly for a loan as is done in the case of veterans' pensions. In that case the Government pays the loan and pays the interest. We could then say, "On the full faith and credit of this Government, we will assure you that these obligations will be paid."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I may say that what we are anxious to do is to get the bonds paid off. I am afraid if we were to use the plan the Senator is urging, we would have no commitment to take care of them. As a result, the obligations might run on for 2 or 3 generations.

In 1926, I was asked to make a speech on a suggested model gasoline tax law, because then the States were rather generally beginning to collect gasoline taxes. We began with the premise that an ideal tax would be one from which the taxpayer would receive the advantage; and the consensus of opinon was that the gasoline tax was in that category if the revenue from the tax would be used for the building of roads.

There does not seem to be a great deal of opposition over the Nation—even though at this time gasoline taxes are very high—so long as the taxpayer receives the advantage in the form of better roads.

Until 1954, the Congress did not appropriate sufficient funds for roads to use all the gasoline tax. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was on the committee when we tried to have Congress appropriate approximately what the Federal Government would collect from the gasoline tax; and that arrangement has been very satisfactory generally. The State highway departments of the various States and the traveling public have been very much pleased. Personally, I have received many commendatory letters and messages, and probably the Senator from Tennessee has also, because there is general satisfaction over the use of the gasoline tax for that purpose.

All we are contemplating in this case is to use the gasoline tax in that way.

Mr. LONG. I am not opposed to dedicating the gasoline tax revenues to road purposes, and that is done in my State. So I have no objection to having it done in this case. However, it is argued that under the Constitution that is not possible and cannot be done by the Federal Government. I can imagine no more deplorable a situation than one in which our great Government, representing the richest Nation in the world, would find itself in such a circumstance that it would default on these bonds and would refuse to appropriate sufficient funds for the use of the Federal Highway Corporation to enable it to meet the payments on the bonds.

In view of the fact that we propose to see to it that the bonds are paid off anyway, and in view of the further fact that certainly the Government of the United States will have a moral obligation to see to it that the bonds are paid off, why not have the Government assume the legal obligation to pay them off, and thus be able to obtain a lower interest rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Secretary of the Treasury testified before our committee that the difference in interest rates would be very small, amounting to only a fraction. Furthermore, this plan provides for the completion of the almost 40,000 miles of road. As I stated before the Senator from Louisiana entered the Chamber, under the plan the interstate roads will connect 42 of the 48 State capitals, and will connect 90 percent of the communities of 50,000 or more persons. In addition, the plan will absolutely finance the construction.

Mr. LONG. I do not see in the bill anything which will finance the construction. The only thing which will finance it will be the anticipation that the Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to meet the payments on the bonds. That is my understanding of the proposal.

The Senator from Pennsylvania feels that the revenue from oil, gasoline, and other taxes on automobiles would be adequate, so that Congress would not need to make appropriations for this purpose. But it is not possible to earmark the money or to write into a bill language which will undertake to guarantee that Congress will appropriate sufficient funds from year to year.

Let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether I am mistaken, and whether such language appears in the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The amendment merely states that the amount of the gasoline tax above $622,500,000 a year shall be used for the purpose of paying the interest and liquidating these bonds.

Mr. LONG. Would that require an annual appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It would require an annual appropriation; and I may say it requires an annual appropriation to pay the interest on the direct obligations of the United States Government. That happens every year.

Mr. LONG. What I am trying to understand is the purpose of having a separate corporation to assume the liability. In a State such as Louisiana, if an authority is established to construct a project, such as a bridge across the Mississippi River, in the heart of New Orleans—a project presently being undertaken—that agency is set up in order that the State may escape the legal liability of paying for the bridge, in the event the bridge is not a sound project; and therefore, such an arrangement perhaps calls for a higher interest rate than the one the State itself would have to pay.

But as I understand, in this case there is no suggestion or proposal by anyone that the Federal Government would escape the legal liability of paying off the bonds. In other words, if the revenue were not adequate to pay for the highways, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania himself would be among the first to insist that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to pay off the bonds. Certainly I would take that position; and I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania, fairminded man that he is, would also insist that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to take care of the bonds, if the revenue were not adequate. Is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes; and I think Congress would make such an appropriation.

But, Mr. President, unless there is to be a complete change in transportation methods in the Nation, the bonds will be paid off in less than 30 years. As I said a moment ago, the States have been collecting the gasoline tax. Oregon began collecting a gasoline tax in 1919, and among the other States the collections from the tax have gradually increased every year.

So I see no reason why the revenue from the tax will not continue to increase for the next 30 years. Some change may occur in transportation methods; for instance, perhaps the time will come when all of us will travel by air. But that is not in the foreseeable future.

Mr. LONG. But my point is that if everyone agrees that the bonds must be paid and that the United States Government should see to it that the bonds are made good, and if there is no intention of having the Federal Government evade the responsibility of paying off the bonds, why not put the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States behind the bonds, and thereby make it possible to obtain for the taxpayers a saving of interest, by means of a lower interest rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I think that unquestionably the interest rate would then be lower. But what I am submitting is a plan which will make it possible to complete approximately 40,000 miles of road in 10 years, and at the same time will provide a method for the liquidation of the bonds. All of that is in one package, so to speak.

I have advocated extension of our roads, and so has the Senator from Louisiana; all of us have. Now we have a plan by which it will be possible to do the job. I am afraid that if we continue to proceed in a piecemeal manner, it will be many years before it will be possible to complete the job everywhere in the Nation and connect the States as they should be connected from the standpoint of industry and from the standpoint of both military defense and civil defense. We need to have the system completed; and this plan is one for doing so.

Mr. LONG. The point I had in mind is that only a very small and minor modification of the plan would be required, in order to put the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States behind the bonds and behind the funds which will be used for the building of the highways. If that were done, there would be a major saving in money.

So I am curious to know why there should be objection to modifying the plan in such a way as to result, over a period of years, in a lower interest rate and in substantial savings to the taxpayers. Would the Senator have any objection to such modification of the plan, so as to make the bonds full-faith-and-credit bonds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and my friend from Louisiana will indulge me, I should like to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, so that Senators may know approximately the time when amendments will be voted upon.

On behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That after the conclusion of routine morning business on Wednesday, May 25, 1955, further consideration of the bill S. 1048, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1955, shall be proceeded with under the following limitations:

(a) Except as to a substitute for the bill or a motion to lay on the table, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided, however*, That if the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

(b) On any substitute amendment for the bill, debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above indicated.

(c) No amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill or a substitute therefor shall be received.

(d) On the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in explanation of the proposed agreement, I may say that I have agreed with the distinguished minority leader that the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday. It is our hope that the Senate may remain in session on that day until consideration of the bill is completed. We do not expect any committees to meet during the time the bill is being considered or voted upon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think our mutual understanding is that the distinguished majority leader is prepared to hold the Senate in session today as long as there are any speeches to be made. Tomorrow afternoon, upon completion of disposition of the veto of the postal pay bill, time will be available for further discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has previously so stated.

Mr. President, may we have action on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether such a narrow interpretation would be placed upon the word "germane" in connection with the pending bill as was insisted upon during the debate on the last tax bill. I do not know whether the interpretation to be placed upon the word "germane" would preclude the junior Senator from Louisiana from offering any amendment he might contemplate offering to the pending bill. I do not have in mind offering an amendment to provide statehood for Alaska or Hawaii, or an amendment in the nature of a civil rights bill, or anything of that sort. However, I am somewhat fearful of agreeing to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement until I have had an opportunity to think through whatever amendments I may wish to offer.

I wonder if the majority leader can assure us that any amendment which has to do exclusively with constructing highways or financing highways, and which in no wise raises extraneous issues such as those involved in various controversial bills which are brought to the floor from time to time, and which provoke very bitter sectional issues, would be considered as germane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The only assurance I can give the Senator is my own assurance. As the Senator knows, the decision as to whether or not an amendment is germane rests finally with the Senate itself.

I will say to the Senator that the intent of the authors of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement was as the Senator has indicated. The intent was to preclude consideration by the Senate only of amendments on some other subject. I assume that the Parliamentarian and the Presiding Officer could indicate to the Senator from Louisiana what amendments would be in order under the germaneness provision of the proposed agreement.

I have the problem of trying to accommodate 96 Senators, on both sides of the aisle. It is certainly not our object to preclude any Senator from offering any amendment which is pertinent to the bill. On the other hand, as the Senator from Louisiana well knows, at times some of our own colleagues have been extremely insistent that every unanimous-consent agreement include the so-called germaneness provision, The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has often insisted upon it.

While I do not know, and cannot envision, what the Senator's amendment might be I believe that if it went to the merits of the bill, certainly the Senator would not be precluded from offering it and having it considered. It is not the intent of the authors of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement to preclude anything except extraneous amendments. I believe the Senator from Louisiana is skillful enough to draft an amendment which would express his views, and which would at the same time be germane.

Mr. LONG. Would any amendment which has to do with the apportionment of funds, or with the quantum of funds in which a State would be entitled to participate, or an amendment which might have to do with the qualifications of the Federal Highway Corporation, be germane?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it would be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that it would be impossible for the Chair to rule on amendments until they have been actually offered and are before the Senate for consideration.

Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, trusting our distinguished majority leader to protect my rights, and trusting the Chair not to place such a strict interpretation upon the word "germane" that a truly germane amendment could not be offered, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] a question.

If the credit of this Government is to be placed behind the proposed program, why should we not go ahead and issue full-faith-and-credit bonds, and obtain a lower interest rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The program of completing the interstate system is really the trunk of the tree. The other systems are branches. They are most important, but, as I stated a few moments ago, industrially, and from a military and civil defense standpoint, we need to complete the interstate system. If the financial arrangement referred to by the Senator could be placed in operation, I would have no particular objection. However, I am interested in getting the plan underway, so that we may know that the program will be completed. That would be fair to every State in the Union, and it would greatly strengthen our country from an industrial standpoint. It would also make us very much safer from a military and civilian defense standpoint.

Mr. LONG. If the money were to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury rather than from the general public by the Federal Highway Corporation, of course, a lower interest rate could of obtained; could it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. There can be no question about that, although in Pennsylvania the difference is very small. In Pennsylvania, we have what is called a general State authority, which constructs school buildings, hospitals, and some roads. The interest rate is very little different from the rate involved in the direct plan, in which the full faith and credit of the State is behind the operation.

Mr. LONG. But even a fraction of 1 percent interest, when applied against a $20 billion operation extended over a 30-year period, can amount to a large sum.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is a sound approach. I appreciate very much this discussion of the question. I believe that all such questions should be thoroughly discussed. Although I am fully in accord with the unanimous-consent agreement which has just been entered into, I realize that we shall have to move a little more rapidly. We must make our speeches a little more compact, in order to get our thoughts into the RECORD.

I appreciate very much what the Senator from Louisiana has said. All my life I have been an advocate of a pay-as-you-go type of government. Under the proposed arrangement we would pay as we use. The gasoline tax would be paid in, and then used by the Federal Government and by the various States to complete this highway system.

Mr. President, the administration bill will complete the interstate system, which, as was indicated in the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and myself, and as we agreed, is the trunk of the tree. The branches of the tree are the primary, secondary, and urban systems. They are all important, but I think the most important consideration is to get the plan started. In my own State of Pennsylvania we went along for many years without getting direct roads to certain places. Therefore we tried the plan of connecting up county seats. It is now 25 years since access by means of a good road has been provided to every county seat. Then lateral roads were constructed, and we now have 40,000 miles of roads, which include what we call the farm-to-market roads.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much time of the Senate. As I understand from the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, we will be able to discuss the bill today and then vote on it on Wednesday.

Mr. GORE. The plan is to finish consideration of the bill on Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In fairness to my colleagues, I feel that I should yield the floor at this time. I shall wish to speak later, but I believe the time should be distributed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield very gladly.

Mr. GORE. In colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana the Senator from Pennsylvania said that the retirement of the bonds would depend upon an annual appropriation. Will the Senator refer to page 8, section 105 (b) of the substitute? I read as follows:

> (b) There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

And so forth.

What I desire to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I am sure he wants to have the record as clear as we can possibly make it—is that the language which I have read is an appropriation not only on an annual basis but for each fiscal year for so long as the corporation may have an unmatured,

outstanding obligation. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Would not the Senator consider it an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. GORE. No; I would not so consider it. It says: "There are hereby appropriated."

It cannot be an authorization. It is an outright appropriation of an indefinite amount for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is an amount, as was brought out in my colloquy with the junior Senator from Louisiana, which is "equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes—including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes—imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program." It is any amount derived from the 2-cent tax above the $622,500,000, as I understand.

Mr. GORE. In other words, this section of the substitute would appropriate all the funds from all the revenue realized from the fuel and lubricating oil taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I believe that is correct.

Mr. GORE. All the funds in excess of $622,500,000 a year——

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As may be necessary to finance the program.

Mr. GORE. I do not find that language.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is on page 9, lines 5 and 6.

Mr. GORE. Yes. There is a little transitional language at that point.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. In other words, the Senator will agree, will he not, that not only would the retirement of the bonds depend upon appropriations made by Congress, but the substitute amendment does in effect constitute an appropriation for such time as there might be an outstanding, unmatured obligation of the corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It could be interpreted in that way. That would certainly make the bonds even more secure.

Mr. GORE. If that be true—and I think there is no question that this is an appropriation bill—a certain amount of money would be going out of the Treasury. There are outstanding and in the hands of the people all over the country United States Government bonds. Also outstanding would be the bonds of this corporation. Therefore, what the Senator from Pennsylvania says, in effect, is that we would give priority to the bonds of the corporation, and that out of the funds within the Treasury first priority would be given to the retirement of the corporation bonds. If there is not sufficient money with which to retire the United States Government bonds which matured during the same period, the outstanding bonds of the corporation would be given priority and the Government bonds would have to be extended. In other words, if there is sufficient money in the Treasury only to retire a certain amount in bonds, priority would be given to the corporation bonds, and the bonds of the United States Government, which are direct obligations, and behind which is pledged the full faith of the United States Government, as the junior Senator from Louisiana has stated would be placed in a secondary position. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. At the present time, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee knows, we are appropriating approximately all the tax money collected from gasoline taxes and lubricating oil taxes for the purpose of building roads. This proposal simply provides a definite plan for so much roadbuilding every year during 10 years until the interstate system is completed. From the way we are appropriating money now, I do not see that it makes any difference in the security of the obligations having the full credit of the United States Government, because we are already appropriating the taxes received from gasoline and lubricating oils for roadbuilding purposes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The point I am trying to make is that it is sought to do two things with these corporation bonds: First, to give them priority over United States Government bonds, and, second, to pay a higher rate of interest. I find myself in agreement with the junior Senator from Louisiana, that if the Government must borrow the money with which to build a national system of highways adequate to our national needs, then the taxpayers should have the benefit of the lowest possible rate of interest and not be burdened with an unnecessarily high rate of interest.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if the bankers go into this proposition and come to the same conclusion to which the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee comes, probably these bonds will collect a lesser rate of interest than will the bonds which have the full faith and credit of the United States. There is that possibility.

Mr. GORE. But the highest fiscal authority of the Government, namely, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, estimated that the bonds would sell at a rate of interest from, I believe he said, one-quarter to one-half a percent higher than United States Government bonds.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield further, there is one other point I have not been quite able to understand, namely, why the proponents of Senate bill 1160 feel that the revenue from the motor fuels tax will pay for the good roads which might be built under S. 1160, but would not pay for the good roads which might be built under S. 1048.

It seems to me that if we build a fine system of modern highways there will be more travel, more use of the highways, greater consumption of gasoline and oil, and more revenue coming into the Treasury. That will be true whether the roads are built under the terms of Senate bill 1048, Senate bill 1160, or some other bill. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the administration bill will complete the interstate system. It will be done in one act of Congress. We have been working on this problem for a long time. This is my ninth year as a Member of the Senate, and the Senator from Tennessee has been in the House and the Senate considerably longer than that, but we have not yet formulated a plan for completing the entire interstate system, which involves the important roads from the national standpoint. To my mind, the strong feature of the administration bill is that it provides a plan for completing the roads and for financing their construction. The roads will be completed in 10 years for a need of 20 years from now, and they will be paid for in 30 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will not the Senator agree that the rate of expenditure on Federal highways provided by these two bills within the first 5-year period is roughly comparable?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that is correct; but that is my objection to the bill which the Senator has introduced. I think the time has come when we want to proceed with a plan which will complete the entire job.

Mr. GORE. According to the terms of S. 1048 in which the legislative intent is declared, and by the terms of the report accompanying the bill, the Congress is declaring that this is a program not only to complete the interstate highway system, but also to bring to a condition of adequacy all Federal-aid highways. That is one of the principal points of difference between the two bills, the committee bill and the substitute bill. The committee bill states as its policy—and it is inherent in the terms thereof and the funds made available therein—the construction and improvement of all Federal-aid highway systems to a condition of adequacy for the national defense and the national economy. The committee bill is regarded and termed as the first installment and the committee considered the question seriously.

I apologize to the Senator for transpassing on his time. I interrupted not out of discourtesy, but with respect and in the hope that by our colloquy we may assist Members in arriving at a conclusion.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I think it is very enlightening. The only regret I have is that there are not more Senators on the floor at this time, because aside from war activities, I consider this to be the largest undertaking in which the United States has ever engaged. In my opinion, it is absolutely necessary that we start on a plan

that will complete not only the interstate system but will bring up to standard the other roads of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

I started to say that the committee considered the proposition of making S. 1048 a 10-year bill. Several Members, including the junior Senator from Tennessee, suggested that they would have no serious objection to doing so. However, the committee finally concluded that it would be the better part of wisdom to have the program operate for 5 years. That would permit Congress to make a review and to consider the second installment. The program might require modification. Of course, Congress could modify even a 10-year program. But with the expiration of both the program and the authorization of the funds after 5 years, under S. 1048, it would be necessary for Congress to review the program.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania would be better pleased to have S. 1048 extended to a 10-year program, the Senate might find that suggestion agreeable.

It is the intention of those who have reported S. 1048 to the Senate as the recommendation of the committee that not only the interstate highways but also all Federal-aid highways shall be brought to a condition of adequacy.

That brings me to the big point of difference, to which I alluded earlier, namely, that every single dollar of expenditure which is proposed under S. 1160 would go exclusively to the interstate highways, which are important, but which carry only one-seventh of the traffic.

S. 1048, on the other hand, provides for additional Federal aid not only for the interstate highways but also for the primary and urban highways and for the farm-to-market roads.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In reply to the suggestion by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the administration's plan will leave to the States considerably more money than has ever before been contemplated to enable them to do work on the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I think I am the first one in Pennsylvania who advocated what are called farm-to-market roads, which have been very helpful to the State.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I gladly yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding my position on the highway program for the Nation. I am making the statement because I served as a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works that reported S. 1048, which is the bill now before the Senate.

As is well known, Mr. President, I am only a new Member of the Senate, and I wish to comment very briefly upon my favorable reaction to the thorough and conscientious manner in which this bill was considered by all members of the committee. I was particularly impressed by the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and with the leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee considering the bill, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I do not think there was a single witness anywhere in the country who wanted to be heard who did not have an opportunity to come before the committee, and that includes witnesses from my own State.

I was likewise favorably impressed by the conscientious interest of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who has offered the substitute bill which is backed by the Eisenhower administration. I do not think I ever saw one espousing any cause who was more convinced of the righteousness of what he was doing than was the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The legislation to be enacted will affect every State in the Union. I think, however, all of us have to take a national interest in this program, as well as a regional or sectional interest. I believe I am taking a national interest when I say that the Gore bill, S. 1048, does far more justice and equity to the majority of the States of the Union than does the administration bill as advocated in the so-called Clay report.

I wish to outline some of the reasons for my conviction in this respect.

To begin with, the Clay report would concentrate so vast a proportion of additional highway revenues on the interstate system that rural and secondary road improvements would be virtually abandoned. This is especially important because the interstate system as now envisioned by engineers will have only limited access from roads which will be built across the country. In other words, if there are not available parallel roads—secondary roads, if you please—to serve the rural population, the people of rural areas are going to be unable to get their produce to market.

I received a letter from a constituent of mine in the agricultural area known as Milton-Freewater, Oreg., who asked if I could make it possible for him to purchase of surplus dirigible or helicopter by which he could get his produce to market if the plan recommended by the Clay report should be enacted. He went on to point out that the vast bulk of highway funds would be spent on the interstate highway system, and there would be no way for him to get the vegetables which he produces on his land to the nearest canning or marketing center.

Mr. President, I think the Gore bill, S. 1048, provides reasonable funds to finance the continuance of the rural road, urban road, and secondary road programs. On the other hand, under the plan proposed by the Clay report, these arteries would be largely neglected, because most of the available new revenues would go to the interstate system. The Clay report, for example, would freeze at existing levels, or less, all Federal aid to the secondary, urban and rural roads. I think such a policy would be inadvisable at this time.

Mr. President, I also am opposed to the plan embodied in the Clay report because of the great advantage which it gives to States which are able to support toll roads.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I assume the distinguished Senator from Oregon has concluded his discussion of what he regards as a vital weakness of the administration bill in its failure to provide a balanced program. I should like to inquire of him if it is not true that the substitute offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] actually provides $100 million less a year for urban highways than does the present law.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that it does not provide a single dollar for expenditure on the farm-to-market roads and on the primary Federal roads?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; it simply leaves that to a catch-as-catch-can.

Mr. GORE. Did not the statistics presented to our committee show that if that program were carried through for 10 years, in some States the secondary roads would have only 10 percent of adequacy, 10 years from now?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. Moreover, many engineers admitted that in quite a number of States the secondary roads actually need improvement even more than does the interstate system, compelling though the needs of the interstate system may be.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did not the records also show that at the end of the proposed 10-year period, some categories of Federal-aid highways—very important systems—would be even more inadequate than they are at present?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; we had testimony to that effect from many persons.

Mr. GORE. In other words, at the present level of expenditure for primary roads, urban roads, and secondary roads, we are falling behind, instead of going ahead?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Obviously; we heard that from many people.

Mr. GORE. Then, if we adopt that system, if we freeze the Federal expenditures at that level, not only for 10 years, but for 30 years, does not the distinguished Senator from Oregon think we would be doing a great injury and a grave injustice to the roads and highways on which most of the people are dependent, both as regards travel and as regards earning their living?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is quite obvious that what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee says is correct. If we followed the Clay report, I think it quite evident that most farmers may have to get their produce to market by using dog teams or rickshaws; and as the roads deteriorate, it seems to me—at least, insofar as I am able to judge, on the basis of my limited knowledge of the subject—that in many areas the rural roads will become inadequate and nearly worthless.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before asking the question, I wish to thank the able Senator from Oregon for his generous reference to the work I undertook to do on the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I never saw a committee chairman or a subcommittee chairman who was more patient and more tireless.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon very sincerely.

I wished to ask whether it is not a fact that the testimony before our subcommittee showed there was a definite limit on the amount of highway construction which could be inaugurated within the immediate future, because of the limitations on the supplies of building materials and on construction facilities?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; I think we heard that stated very definitely. We even heard statements to the effect that there is a limitation on the amount of gravel available. For example, I remember that at one of the hearings we heard it said that only a certain amount of gravel is available and only a certain amount of construction machinery is now ready, and that new materials would become available only relatively slowly.

Mr. GORE. Did not the committee recommend the maximum amounts the committee thought could be wisely and economically spent during the period covered by the bill, without inflating the cost of highway construction to the point of making it impossible for the taxpayers to receive a proper return, in terms of roads constructed, for the dollars spent?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; and I remember, as I know the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee does, that we voted to increase the amounts, particularly those for the interstate system; and we voted to do so to such an extent that we felt that they could not be increased further without doing great damage to the budget and without committing the roadbuilding industry to a goal which could not be attained. I believe we went to the very outer limits; and I think that even some of the minority members of the committee agreed we had done so. I believe they said so when we were discussing that point in the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Some point has been made of the fact that the committee bill would "require"—and I point out that in using that word, I use it with quotation marks around it—the States to raise larger matching funds than those which would be required under the provisions of Senate bill 1160.

As a matter of fact, neither bill requires any State to match any amount; is that not correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it not also true that under the committee bill, more Federal funds will be available for matching by the States, to improve the primary, urban, and farm-to-market roads?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. The States are not required to accept and match these funds, are they?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; the funds will simply be available, if the States wish to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded.

Mr. GORE. Is it not one of the basic differences between the two bills that, whereas the committee bill seeks to continue to aid the States and to continue to provide Federal aid to bring the primary, urban, and farm-to-market highways to a proper condition, the other bill does not provide for such matching?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes. As I recall—and I hope the Senator from Tennessee will correct me if I am in error—the Gore bill provides that in the case of the rural and secondary roads, the existing matching formula of 50–50 shall be continued. I think that formula goes back to approximately 1912 or 1913, does it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes; the 50–50 matching formula will be continued, as in the present law.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does not it go back to approximately 1912?

Mr. GORE. It goes back to 1916, I believe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Then I stand corrected. I knew it went back a long way.

Under that formula, every State is assured its share of the revenue. Under that formula, no State can be discriminated against, regardless of its political complexion or regardless of how small in area, in population, or in the number of electoral votes it may be. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yet—and again, Mr. President, if I am incorrect, I know the Senator from Tennessee will correct me—under the plan recommended by the Clay report there would be created a separate corporation or board. Of course we do not now know who the members of the corporation would be, but we do know that they would have vast authority in designating where the road money would be spent; and in the absence of any formula or standard for them to apply, it is quite possible that the members would be subjected to the most intense political pressure, with the result that many of the smaller States—those smaller in population, such as the State the Senator from Tennessee represents in part, and the State which I represent in part—might be discriminated against because they do not have as many electoral votes as do some of the States which have vast populations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oregon correctly states that the administration bill would abolish the apportionment formula for the interstate highways.

If the Senator from Oregon will examine the proposed substitute, he will find the following on the last page:

> Except that section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to the interstate system, and for the purposes of section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment.

In other words, by the terms of Senate bill 1160, no State is assured of any particular amount or part of the allocations for the interstate system. I do not wish to have it inferred that it would be the intention of anyone to discriminate against a particular State. But it is quite erroneous to list, as the distinguished members of the minority have done on page 47 of the report, an apportionment to the States under S. 1160. The table on page 47 is not based upon any evidence which was supplied to the committee. It cannot possibly be based upon the bill which is now offered as a substitute. I do not know upon what it is based, but under S. 1160 no State would be assured of any particular part of the funds.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Whereas, under the committee bill, the apportionment formula which has been arrived at after years of trial and error and successful experience—the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads cooperating to that end—would be continued, so that each State would know in advance the amount of funds which would be apportioned to it under the bill, should it become law.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; and the States could make ready for such apportionments through their legislatures, their budget departments, and their highway commissions, to see if they could provide the matching funds and go ahead and develop their road systems. But under S. 1160, which is now offered by the minority as a substitute for the committee bill, the States would have to go hat-in-hand to this nebulous corporation, to see how they would fare.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that the $21 billion proposed would, under the terms of the substitute bill, be turned over to the Highway Corporation and to the Secretary of Commerce, and those authorities, in Washington, would have arbitrary power to decide where the

money should be spent, when it should be spent, how it should be spent, and in what amounts?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is eminently correct. Does it not strike the distinguished Senator from Tennessee as rather curious that members of the very minority party which makes such a fetish of States rights are taking the lead in abolishing the tried and tested formula under which the right of States to obtain their fair share of highway funds have been so carefully protected? In place of this tried and tested formula, they would establish no formula at all to protect the States, but would leave discretion entirely with the Federal Government; yet this proposal is initiated, promoted, and advocated by those who say they are zealous believers in States' rights.

The distinguished President of the United States, who, I believe, through the entire campaign several years ago, stressed the importance of returning these functions to the States, established the Clay Committee, which submitted a report that would destroy the matching formula, which has protected the States, and would leave the entire determination to a Federal corporation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the same table to which I have referred, on page 47 of the report, it is indicated that the States would necessarily provide more matching funds for the primary, secondary, and urban highways. However, it is not pointed out that under the administration bill all the expenditures on such roads above the present level would be left to the States, cities, and counties. The Congress is not advised by this table that under the committee bill the Federal Government would assist the States, in connection with those roads, to a greater extent than would be the case under the administration bill. Nor is it pointed out that under the administration bill the States, cities, and counties would bear 100 percent of the increased burden connected with such roads. Unless that burden were borne, those roads would be in worse condition next year, the year after, and 10 years from now, than they are now.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is certainly correct. Is it not quite strange that the very ones who shed such crocodile tears over the fact that the States would have to put up some matching funds under S. 1048 seem happily oblivious to the fact that under S. 1160 they would have to put up all the money to expand secondary roads? They seem to think it is worse for a State to be required to put up $50 million in matching funds than to put up $100 million which is not matched at all.

Mr. GORE. I find it quite strange.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Oregon. I should like to make one brief comment, and then I shall desist from further interrogation of the Senator. He is making an able address, and I do not wish to spoil it.

During the hearings, as chairman of the subcommittee, I sought to find out what funds would be apportioned to the respective States under the terms of S. 1160. No such official estimate was made. No such figures could be officially supplied, because the bill would specifically abolish the apportionment formula.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me say that the very excellent comments by the Senator from Tennessee have in no way spoiled my address, but have added to it very beneficially.

I remember that the able Senator from Tennessee tried to elicit this information. I believe he tried to elicit it from the Secretary of Commerce himself. However, he never did get a definite answer or any specific information, because, of course, there is nothing specific or definite about Senate bill 1160. The only thing definite and specific about Senate bill 1160 is that the American people would spend about $11 billion in interest, which would not pay for 1 inch of pavement or a single metal tube to go into a culvert.

So far as Senate bill 1160 is concerned, I repeat that it means that the great advocates of States' rights would turn over to a Federal board entire discretion in connection with building our highway system. I think that point cannot be overemphasized. The entire lexicon of the present national administration has stressed words which emphasize States rights. They talk about States rights again and again and again; and yet they bring forth a highway bill which would destroy States' rights, and leave the entire authority under a Federal corporation.

It seems to me that such a situation would inevitably redound to the disadvantage of States with smaller populations, and to the advantage of States with great metropolitan populations.

I wish also to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the comments which he made with respect to rural and secondary roads. Both he and I represent agricultural States. If Senate bill 1160 is passed, we shall leave the farmers—certainly after 10 years, 20 years, or 30 years—without any satisfactory means of getting their products to market.

I desire now to refer to the toll road situation, which is dealt with in the substitute, Senate bill 1160. This bill, which embodies the recommendations of the Clay Committee report, provides for special credits with respect to toll roads. I think such credits would amount to about $2,155,000,000. These credits would accrue to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Massachusetts for roads either completed or under construction.

Parenthetically, my State of Oregon would not share in these credits, and most of the other States of the Union would not share in them. My State cannot support a toll road under existing conditions. The State of Oregon has about twice the area of the State of New York, but the State of Oregon has about the population of the Borough of the Bronx in New York City, which is approximately 1,600,000. Under such a situation it is simply impossible for the State of Oregon to support economically a toll road. It does not have the density of population which the engineers and economists have worked out as being essential to maintaining economically a toll highway.

It seems to me that the minute we interject the situation of toll roads, we eliminate the bulk of the States of the Union from inclusion in the essential terms of the highway bill.

S. 1048 provides no such reimbursement for toll or free roads. Apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds would be made to the States on the basis of formulas established by existing law. The Federal-aid highway funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems would be matched by the States 50–50, while the interstate funds would be matched on a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State. Thus all States would be treated equitably and none favored. Established procedures and precedents would be followed. Work would be carried forward on all programs on a balanced basis, and no system would be neglected.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 authorized $210 million for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for apportionment to the States for work on the Federal-aid secondary highway system. As reported out by the Senate Committee on Public Works, S. 1048 provides for an increase in the amount for the secondary system to $300 million annually for fiscal years 1957 through 1961. It would be apportioned to the States on the same basis as heretofore. S. 1048 also includes provision for interchange of 20 percent of funds between systems, thus permitting more flexibility in the programs.

The Clay Committee, in its report to the President, recommended that the authorization for the secondary system be continued at the present rate, $210 million annually.

Again I emphasize—and I am drawing on the very helpful material supplied by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—that if we do that, our secondary roads and our rural roads are bound to deteriorate.

The administration bill, S. 1160, would authorize appropriations for work on the National System of Interstate Highways only. These annual appropriations would consist of the revenues collected from motor fuel and oil taxes in excess of $622.5 million, which would be the same as amounts now spent on the regular systems, with even a reduction of $100 million in urban funds.

Enactment of S. 1160 would still necessitate enactment by the Congress of laws authorizing funds for expenditure on the secondary system, as well as for the primary and urban systems, forest highways, and other miscellaneous roads. These authorizations have been on a biennial basis in the past. Such enactment, by holding the $622.5 million Federal taxes, would tend to freeze the present regular programs at or less than their present authorizations, and would tend

to prevent future expansions of those programs.

S. 1160, the administration bill, also provides for credits to the States for free or toll roads located upon the Interstate System, provided they are believed to measure up to the interstate standards.

For the existing free and toll highways, the Secretary and the Corporation would issue rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the law. He would determine the depreciated cost of the highway, in determining the credit to which the State is entitled. From the depreciated cost of a free highway, an amount equal to 10 percent of that cost and the total amount of any Federal-aid funds used in construction of the highway would be deducted.

For a toll road, the cost of financing it and the toll facilities not considered a part of the highway are excluded from the original cost of the highway. Credit is then allowed the States on the basis of age of highways, 40 percent if constructed prior to 1951, 70 percent if constructed between 1951 and 1955, and 10 percent deducted from the original cost if constructed subsequent to December 1955.

Any State for which a credit has been established for toll or free highways would be entitled to use such credit for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary system if all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the State have been expended and all funds allocated under S. 1160 have been contracted. At its option, the State could use the credit established for toll highways for payment of any outstanding debt on such highway, which would then become a free public highway.

It would be possible under S. 1160 for a State to receive reimbursements in excess of the estimated needs for completion of the Federal-aid primary system in that State. The programs on systems in that State would then be out of balance. If the State did not exercise the option to pay off the toll-road bonds, it could use the funds received in credits for such roads on other highways in the State, and continue the tolls on the toll highway.

Many of those connected with the State highway department of my State, I believe, favor the financing methods recommended in the Clay report, and the recommendations of the Clay Committee are contained in S. 1160. For example, Mr. R. H. Baldock, the very able chief engineer of the Oregon Highway Department, testified before our committee that he favored the financing methods of the Clay report. Mr. Baldock, in my opinion, is the outstanding highway engineer in the Nation. Under his leadership, the State of Oregon has pioneered in many essential roadbuilding and highway developments. I am proud of Mr. Baldock, and many of my fellow citizens in Oregon are also proud of him.

However, I must disagree with Mr. Baldock when he endorses the financing arrangements provided in the Clay report. Under those arrangements, for each dollar spent on pavement, 55 cents would go to the banks in interest rates. In other words, this would not be a roadbuilding program; it would be a bankers' program.

The Clay report entails payment of $11,500,000,000 in interest to bankers in order to finance $20,200,000,000 worth of roads. Again I emphasize that each time we spend 1 dollar on asphalt or concrete or a bridge pier, we would spend 55 cents in interest charges to bankers.

I do not know whether Mr. Baldock realized that or not. He is an unusually well informed person, and it may well be that he fully understood the vast amount of interest which the American people would have to pay under the Clay report.

However, I wish to say this, Mr. President, that I do not blame Mr. Baldock, who is a highway engineer, and a very distinguished one, for favoring the financing method provided in the Clay report.

The Clay report would leave accelerated highway expenditures on the interstate system completely outside the Federal budget. In other words, about $31 billion would be spent on interstate highways, and this vast sum would not come within the scope of the Federal budget. I do not blame a highway official for favoring it, any more than I would blame school officials for favoring the expenditure of $31 billion on schools outside the budget.

Neither would I criticize a general of the Army for favoring $31 billion for the Department of Defense outside the budget.

However, the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives must take the national viewpoint on this subject. If we are to allow $31 billion to be spent on roads outside the Federal budget, what about other needs of the Government? Urgently needed though roads are, I would say that roads are not as important as schools or as the health of the Nation. If we are to spent $31 billion outside the budget on roads, how about a billion dollars for cancer research outside the budget? That is very important, too.

We all know, without being told, of the desperate situation regarding the construction of schools. I believe we are supposed to need approximately 370,000 new classrooms to take care of the vast number of children who are of school age or who are coming of school age. How about spending $5 billion or $10 billion for school construction outside the budget?

It seems to me that that is as much justified as spending money on roads outside the budget.

At the present time the whole Nation is concerned with the efficacy and with the orderly distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine. Why should we not appropriate a huge sum of money for that humanitarian program outside the budget?

I daresay that far greater numbers of the American people believe that that is an urgent and compelling need than believe more roads are an urgent and compelling need of the Nation.

I should like to point out that once we violate our established procedures of budgeting Federal funds for the construction of roads, Congress will be under ever increasing pressure to do the same thing for public health, for schools, for national defense, and for many other absolutely imperative functions of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the pending bill has been entered. I should like to ask the Senator what section 4 (a) on page 9 of the bill means. It reads:

SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding five hundred feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

I shall not read the remainder of the subsection.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon, in the first place, does that mean that 500 feet outside the right-of-way acquired is to be taken without compensation?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is my understanding—and I would appreciate it if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the chairman of the subcommittee, would corroborate me or correct me on this point—that the Bureau of Public Roads, when it acquires land on which the interstate system is to be built, may likewise buy the advertising rights within 500 feet of each side of the road.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Bureau of Public Roads to acquire the rights?

Mr. NEUBERGER. When requested by the States to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. The initiative is with the States?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, no authority is conferred by the terms of the bill with respect to the rights-of-way or realty rights except as the Federal Government may be requested by a particular State to act. I should like to point out to the able Senator from Georgia that there are a few States which do not have authority, constitutional or statutory, to acquire control of limited access right-of-way. The Bureau of Public Roads recommended that it was necessary, in order to get the program under way, to grant authority to the Secretary of Commerce to act, through the Bureau of Public Roads, as the agent of the State for the purpose——

Mr. GEORGE. Who will act as the agent of the State?

Mr. GORE. The Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Wait a minute. We are coming now to the very vitals of the question. The Secretary of Commerce of the United States will request the States——

Mr. GORE. It is the other way around. I may have misspoken myself.

Mr. GEORGE. Only the legislature or the governor can act for a State.

Mr. GORE. Under the terms of the bill, if a State requests the Secretary of Commerce to acquire limited access rights-of-way for highways, he is authorized to do so, but only upon the initiative and request of the State.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. But suppose that under the highway laws he can acquire a right-of-way of 100 feet or 200 feet, or whatever the State law requires. This language seems to contemplate that the Secretary can go over that right-of-way as much as 500 feet, I assume, on each side, and take jurisdiction over signs, and so forth.

Mr. GORE. That is in addition to the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I say.

Mr. GORE. If requested to do so by a State?

Mr. GEORGE. By whom in any State?

Mr. GORE. The proper State authority.

Mr. GEORGE. The legislature and the governor, I presume.

Mr. GORE. I presume so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The highway department, I should say.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I am not going to consent to, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The language is:

> To acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways.

I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I would be absolutely opposed to this whole provision under any circumstances, but, at the same time, I should like to be sure of my facts.

Are we to pay for the additional 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is asking only with reference to advertising rights on land adjacent to the right-of-way?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. Who is going to pay for that?

Mr. GORE. The Secretary of Commerce will pay for that, and will do so if he can acquire the land at a reasonable figure. The case supplied to the committee was from the State of New York. In that instance, where a new road was being constructed, the advertising rights on the lands adjacent to the right-of-way were acquired at the nominal cost of approximately $100 a mile. The committee had in mind acquiring the rights to be conveyed to the States at the time the right-of-way is conveyed to the States.

If the Senator will read a little further in the committee amendment to the bill he will find that at the time the right-of-way is conveyed to the State, whatever advertising rights the Secretary may then have acquired are likewise to be conveyed to the State.

The bill does not contain any provision for the regulation and control of advertising on a national basis. It merely provides that if the States request that the Federal Government acquire the rights-of-way, the Secretary may, in addition, acquire advertising rights on adjacent lands; but they must be conveyed to the States at the time the rights-of-way are conveyed to the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the point was made before the committee by by Mr. Du Pont, the former Commissioner of Public Roads, that the advertising rights would become subject to the laws of the individual States concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. Who offered that opinion?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. Du Pont. Am I not correct that he was a former Commissioner of Public Roads?

Mr. GEORGE. It sounds more or less like the Attorney General. On other occasions I have said he is a rather odd Attorney General. It could not have been a great lawyer who gave that opinion, I may say to the Senator, because if the Federal Government acquires the land it will have the exclusive right to 500 feet on each side. Suppose that in my State there is a law covering the condemnation of land for a right-of-way 200 feet wide. Under this provision of the bill, in addition to the 200 feet there would be 500 additional feet on one side and 500 feet on the other side, or a total of 1,200 feet, which the Federal Government would control right through the heart of the State, even for advertising purposes. Did the committee recommend that type of bill?

Mr. GORE. The bill does not contain any provision to acquire fee title to any land——

Mr. GEORGE. I am not talking about that. I am talking about what it does do.

Mr. GORE. It permits the Secretary of Commerce, in the event of a request by a State, to acquire advertising rights on the land.

Mr. GEORGE. To the extent of 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way?

Mr. GORE. To the extent of 500 feet adjacent to the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I said. If a State can acquire a 200-foot right-of-way, then it can also acquire 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way, or 1,200 feet right through the heart of the State.

Mr. GORE. I know of no reason why a State cannot do that now. Some States do, as a matter of fact.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps so. I hope mine does not. I say now to the Senator from Tennessee that much as I dislike certain provisions of the so-called administration bill, I would not vote for this provision in the committee bill. There are other provisions in the committee bill, also, which look exclusively to the enlargement of the Federal jurisdiction right at the point where the State has a most vital control and interest. I could not support the committee bill if this provision were to remain in it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the able senior Senator from Georgia that the advertising provision contained in S. 1048 is not a part of the administration bill.

Mr. GEORGE. No. I said that much as I dislike certain provisions of the administration bill, which I do not think I could support, I am pointing out now one reason why I could not support the committee bill.

Mr. GORE. I was about to draw a distinction between the advertising rights and the rights-of-way for the highways. Both bills contain similar provisions which authorize the Secretary of Commerce to acquire controlled access rights-of-way when he is requested to do so by the States. Both bills contain similar provisions to that effect. The administration bill does not contain authority to acquire advertising rights-of-way, to which the Senator has made specific reference.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to have the Senator's interpretation, because I have not had an opportunity to study the bill. I point out, however, that there are also other provisions in the bill which look very strongly toward Federal control of what I think are matters which ought to remain within the jurisdiction of the States. But this is one I could not support.

Let me illustrate. I have a house, in which I live. It is located 100 feet from a highway. The highway would probably be considered an interstate highway. Yet under the bill I could not erect a sign within 400 feet behind my house, on my own land, without the approval of the Federal Government.

The Senators from Tennessee and Oregon do not come from States which were colonies before there was a Union.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to point out to the able Senator from Georgia that most States—and I would be surprised if the Senator's State of Georgia were not one of them—undertake now to regulate highway advertising.

Mr. GEORGE. The States, yes; I grant that. But the Senator is proposing to place such jurisdiction in a Federal bureau.

Mr. GORE. Quite to the contrary.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; there is nothing to the contrary. I only wanted to ask if it was proposed even to pay for the right. It is not clear that payment is to be made; but probably, by implication, payment would be made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It was the thought of the committee, when the amendment was included, that the advertising rights would be acquired when the right-of-way was bought, but that they would be turned over to the States, and the States would then have final jurisdiction as to

whether advertising would be permitted. That was the thought of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Where is that thought expressed? I should like to have the Senator tell me where that language is.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield? I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It is on page 11, line 20, and reads as follows:

(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand the meaning of "the outside 5 feet." If it is just as obscure as the meaning of the 500 feet to which I have been referring, it could mean anything or it might mean nothing. The meaning of what the Senator has read is that when the Secretary acquires the fee to land he does not acquire the fee to the 500 feet outside the right-of-way; he acquires only an easement or a negative prohibition against what the owner of the land may do.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not have the floor. I am merely asking questions.

Mr. KERR. I assumed this was a general discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. KERR. First, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that it was not the purpose of the committee to replace State jurisdiction in any of these matters.

Mr. GEORGE. I am asking about this one.

Mr. KERR. I will address myself to the one in which the Senator is interested.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very much interested in it. I shall be against the whole bill if this provision remains in it.

Mr. KERR. I know there is no greater champion——

Mr. GEORGE. No; I shall be against it, because I could not conscientiously vote for such a bill.

Mr. KERR. I know the Senator wants to know the answer to the question he has raised.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and I think I know it.

Mr. KERR. I want to tell the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; the Senator from Oklahoma may tell me; but I think I know it already.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will read the language on page 11, he will find the following:

The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but the Secretary has no interest in the land 500 feet away from the right-of-way; he has only a negative easement in that land.

Mr. KERR. It could not affect the land without there being interest in it, I remind the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh yes, it could.

Mr. KERR. There is no interest that could be acquired which the Secretary is not directed to reconvey to the State, except the control of 5 feet of right-of-way for limitation of access.

Mr. GEORGE. I have not come to that. I do not know what that is.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is the limitation of access.

Mr. KERR. Would not the Senator from Georgia like to know?

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose it is intended to keep the owner from going onto the 500 feet.

Mr. KERR. Not the 500 feet. The only land the Federal Government is permitted to keep is 5 feet of right-of-way in order to limit access.

Mr. GEORGE. Five feet from where?

Mr. KERR. Along the edge of the right-of-way. It is no part of the 500 feet.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it the right-of-way?

Mr. KERR. It is a part of the right-of-way.

Mr. GORE. It is the outside 5 feet of the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. With whatever the Government acquires there, it has a right to do as it pleases.

Mr. KERR. The interest it acquires in the 500 feet must be turned over to the State.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no.

Mr. KERR. I beg the Senator's pardon. If he will read the language——

Mr. GEORGE. I have read the language three times. I did not have to read it more than once to know I was against it.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has a right to be against it.

Mr. GEORGE. I certainly will be against it.

Mr. KERR. I rose because I know of the great influence of the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. No; the Senator need not mention influence.

Mr. KERR. I know of the profound judgment of the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I will not approve that sort of legislation. Throughout the bill there is a decided trend toward the federalization of everything which the Government touches on roads of the States. I am pointing out only one thing, and I am simply trying to ascertain what it means.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is mistaken in his interpretation of the provision in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I am not. I will read the language; then I will discuss it further with the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator was reading from page 11, was he not?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. At what part of the page?

Mr. KERR. The part to which the Senator objected is at the bottom of page 9 and top of page 10. If the Senator will read it, he will see, in the first place, that this right is granted only where the acquisition is at the request of a State.

Mr. GEORGE. Who will request it?

Mr. KERR. The State.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; the highway department, which gets its money from a bureau in Washington.

Mr. KERR. I challenge the Senator to show me the words "highway department."

Mr. GEORGE. Well, who particularly is going to make the request?

Mr. KERR. The State.

Mr. GEORGE. Who is going to do it for the State.

Mr. KERR. Whoever the State designates. This language says the State. It does not say the highway department.

Mr. GEORGE. I differ with the Senator. This language says the State, and whoever under the law of the State could act for the State, could do it.

Mr. KERR. Would that be an infringement of the right of the State?

Mr. GEORGE. I would think so.

Mr. KERR. To permit the State to designate who could act for it?

Mr. GEORGE. To permit the acquisition of 1,200 feet running through the very heart of any State and control it.

Mr. KERR. I ask the Senator if it would not be an infringement of the right of his State if the Congress should attempt to tell his State who could act for it.

Mr. GEORGE. No, but the Congress is undertaking——

Mr. KERR. Not in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it is.

Mr. KERR. The bill says this shall not be done except at the request of the State.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator what authority is going to make the request—the State legislature or the Governor? What does the bill say?

Mr. KERR. The bill says the State.

Mr. GEORGE. What is a State, within the meaning of the bill?

Mr. KERR. For me to attempt to tell the great Senator from Georgia what a State is would certainly be presumptuous on my part.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not ask the Senator about that. I asked what is a State within the definition of this bill. The Senator has used the word "State." What is a State under the definition of this bill?

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator this bill does not attempt to define what a State is.

Mr. GEORGE. It leaves it up in the air?

Mr. KERR. No. The definition of a State has been adjudicated, as the Senator knows, from time immemorial.

Mr. GEORGE. What has been adjudicated?

Mr. KERR. The definition of what a State is.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no.

Mr. KERR. Where the bill refers to the highway department, it says so.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that, but in this instance it says State, and I ask the Senator to define "State."

Mr. KERR. I repeat that for me to attempt to define "State" to such a distinguished authority on States as the eminent Senator from Georgia would be presumptuous on my part. If I were seeking the definition of "State," the Senator from Georgia would be the first man to whom I would go.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want the Senator from Oklahoma to pay me such a high compliment; but I know the bill does not define "State," and I know that term would be held by the Department in Washington to mean the Bureau of Public Roads in Georgia or in Colorado or in Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Then I say to the Senator, first, the Department of Commerce does not buy any interest except at the request of the Senator's State——

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator——

Mr. KERR. May I finish?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Second, whatever right it does acquire, it then transfers back to the Senator's State.

Mr. GEORGE. I was coming to that. That was the second question. I say on that point the Senator is entirely wrong.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator that is the intent of the language, and if the members of the committee, who worked several months on this bill, and made a sincere effort to accomplish that purpose, were unable to do so, I know of no one better able to teach them and to show them how to accomplish their purpose than the Senator from Georgia, and I know of no one to whom they would rather listen, in devising language which would do what he speaks of, and which they thought they had done, than the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sorry the Senator continues to pay me excessive compliments when I am not asking for them. I have asked for information. I have gotten exceedingly little up to now.

I should now like to read what the bill says the Secretary in Washington is required to do to reconvey land to the State. I take it he has referred to subsection (c) on page 11.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I read from that subsection:

> The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed—

I presume that means a Federal secretary.

Mr. KERR. It means the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; the Secretary of Commerce.

> The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions—

All he is authorized to convey is lands which are acquired in fee, and the negative easement with respect to the land of the original owner conveys no interest in such land; it is simply a prohibition. But the bill limits even that right, for it provides—

> upon such terms and condition as to the lands acquired in fee.

That is all he could convey, and under this bill the Secretary could convey nothing else.

> as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet—

I am not interested in that now. All the Secretary can convey to a State or any subdivision is whatever fee there is, not an easement or a prohibition in the form of a negative. What is being proposed here today, in so many words, is simply to run a strip through any State 1,000 feet in excess of the amount which is allowed to be taken under the law of eminent domain in the State, and it is being proposed that the Federal Government alone shall decide who shall advertise on that land.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. That is all the bill proposes. It does not propose to convey that land back to the State, notwithstanding my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, who mistakenly thought the proposed law, when it referred to any interest in land, included a negative easement. Of course, that is not interest in land. An easement is not interest in land. It is a use that goes with the land, but it is not title to it. That is all the Secretary could convey.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently right in saying an easement is not title to land, but if I know anything about the law, the Senator is wrong when he says an easement is an interest in land.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not an interest in land. It is use that attaches to the land. It is not a part of the land itself at all. It is a condition imposed on the use of the land. That is not an interest in the land. But the bill uses further language. It says that the Secretary may convey——

Mr. KERR. That he must convey.

Mr. GEORGE. Let us assume it is mandatory and that he must do so—

> upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee—

Not an easement; not a negative easement.

Mr. KERR. There is no difference between the thought of the Senator from Georgia and that of the committee. As I told him, if the committee did not put the proper language in the bill, it would not be the first time that such a thing had happened in legislative history.

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose not. But I would not wish to quibble about that. I am raising a far more fundamental question, I may say to the Senator. He has simply said to me that, for purposes of illustration, we are to assume that he is living on land on the side of a road which, if and when the interstate highway is constructed, will be a part of that highway, and that his land begins perhaps 100 or 125 feet from the center of the highway. He asks us to assume that the State has a right to condemn for a distance of 200 feet on each side of the highway; and he says that distance would extend almost to the rear boundaries of his land, and thus he would have no right to say what advertising could be erected in that area. In other words, under this provision of the bill, that right would be vested in the Federal Government until such time as the bureau or agency charged with authority under the provisions of the bill—even under the Senator's construction of the bill—would convey that right back to the State.

Mr. President, I do not wish the Federal Government or any bureau or agency of the Federal Government to have that right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. Does he think it would be undesirable, as a goal, to attempt to regulate or control advertising signboards which might be erected along the interstate highway system?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Oregon mean along the Federal Government's interstate highway system? No; the Federal Government has a right to regulate that. But it has no right to go 1 foot beyond that, for if the Federal Government can go 1 foot beyond, it can go 5 miles beyond. I do not subscribe to any such doctrine.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If it were possible, under proper language, for the Federal Government to acquire advertising rights, and then to turn them over completely to each State, for the State to administer or use as it might see fit, would the Senator from Georgia have objection to such language?

Mr. GEORGE. I think I would. I do not want to have any such Federal interference in my State. If the Senator from Oregon wants to have such Federal interference in his State, all right; but I do not wish to be prosecuted if—on behalf on my neighbor who may live downtown or on behalf of my friend who may live in an adjoining county—I place a sign 500 feet from the Federal Government's right-of-way. I do not wish to be prosecuted by anyone in Washington or by anyone in the State.

However, I am not discussing that point. Instead, I am discussing what the bill provides.

I say now that this bill will not be passed if it contains this provision. Other Senators can do as they please about the bill, but I know the Senate of the United States will not pass such a bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that this provision is not a part of my original amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not say so; I simply pointed out the objection to the provision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I merely wish to explain the purpose of my original amendment. I submitted an amendment containing language different from this language. My amendment had only one purpose, namely, that in the case of the interstate system, which the American people are going to invest and are investing billions of dollars to construct, it should not be possible to plaster it with all kinds of advertising material, which would have no value whatsoever unless the American people had invested billions of dollars in the road system.

In the course of the discussion in the committee, this language was submitted to us by, I believe, some members of the staff of the Bureau of Public Roads—although I am not sure of that.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I would think that would be where it would come from.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But my point is that it seems to me that inasmuch as quite a few States already control advertising——

Mr. GEORGE. I do not object to State control.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Georgia object if these rights could be turned over fully to the States, after the Federal Government acquired the rights?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Let the States acquire the rights, if they wish to acquire them, and if they wish to pay for them under the condemnation laws of the States. But I do not wish to have the Federal Government intervene, and say what the States must do in reference to lands adjacent to the public highways running through the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Do I correctly understand that even if the Federal Government were completely to turn over to the States the advertising rights, the Senator from Georgia still would not approve of such an arrangement?

Mr. GEORGE. Why should such an arrangement be made? Why not let the States acquire the advertising rights, if they wish to acquire them and control them and use them? Why is it desired to have the Federal Government intervene, unless there is a desire to have the power of the Federal Government supersede the power of the State?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; I do not wish that to be done.

Mr. GEORGE. However, the bill contains 4 or 5 provisions which look definitely in that direction. At this time I am pointing out only one of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Georgia: In the absence of any legislative provision—either in existing legislation or as a provision of the pending bill—conferring on the Federal Government the power to regulate advertising along these highways, would not the States have that power, anyway, beyond the right-of-way which was acquired by the Federal Government?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely.

Mr. BARKLEY. So in the absence of any legislation on that subject or in the absence of any provision of that sort in the bill, would not that power or right automatically be left to the States?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, unless the Federal Government acquired the right. If the Federal Government acquired the right, the Federal Government could reconvey it under whatever conditions it might see fit to specify.

Mr. BARKLEY. But in reference to the right-of-way——

Mr. GEORGE. I am not speaking of the right-of-way. I think the Federal Government has the right to control the advertising on the right-of-way.

Mr. BARKLEY. No doubt. However, the bill contains a provision that the Federal Government may control advertising 500 feet beyond that.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the absence of such a provision, the State would control it, anyway, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely—either the State or the owner of the land.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to say that, although I did not sponsor the amendment, I heard all the discussion of it. No intent was expressed on the part of any member of the committee to invest the Federal Government with any power to acquire in this regard any right which it would not be required to convey to the State whenever the State was prepared to accept conveyance of the right-of-way.

If the words "interest in land" can be interpreted so narrowly as not to encompass direction for the conveyance of this right, then I feel confident, and am prepared to say, that the committee will readily accept amendments to bring the bill into conformity with the intent of the committee and with what seems to be the obvious wish of distinguished Members of the Senate.

However, that is separate and apart from the acquisition of the right-of-way proper.

If the able junior Senator from Oregon will yield further to me, let me say that, as I understood the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], he was not raising questions about the roadway itself, but, rather, he was raising questions about the proposal to acquire the right to advertise on adjacent land at the time when the right-of-way is acquired. If such interest in the land or if such easement—to use the expression the Senator from Georgia uses—is to be acquired, it can be acquired at a much less cost if it is purchased at the time when the right-of-way is acquired, rather than if it is acquired later.

If the committee has used a term which does not have sufficient meaning to encompass that interpretation, then we shall restudy the matter and shall bring the language into conformity with that intent.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so as to permit me to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. In order that the RECORD may be entirely clear, I should like to ask 1 or 2 questions of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KERR. First, let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his understanding that the Federal Government's Bureau of Public Roads would seek to acquire either the right-of-way or the right to advertise adjacent to the right-of-way only on the request of the State in which the interest was to be acquired?

Mr. GORE. That is correct; it is spelled out. That was the intention of the committee and that is the provision of the bill.

Mr. KERR. My second question is this: As regards the acquisition of the rights to advertise on any adjacent land, is it the understanding of the Senator from Tennessee that the Federal Government could acquire such rights only by purchasing them from the owner of the land?

Mr. GORE. With due compensation.

Mr. KERR. By paying for them?

Mr. GORE. By paying for them.

Mr. KERR. Is it the understanding of the Senator that it was the purpose of the committee, and the judgment of the committee as to the language of the bill, that in those instances in which that was done, it would be mandatory for the Federal Government to reconvey such interest to the State in which the land was located?

Mr. GORE. That was clearly the intention of the committee. No member expressed a contrary intention. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has raised questions as to the language used. There may be such questions. Undoubtedly there are if he says there are. I recognize him as one of the eminent legal authorities in this body. If there is a question in that connection, it is contrary to the intent of the committee. The committee did not wish any question to remain. It was the intent of the committee to require the conveyance of all interest in land.

Mr. KERR. All interest acquired?

Mr. GORE. All interest acquired. That is what the bill says.

If an easement is not an interest in land, then we need to make an amendment. Speaking with the background of my limited knowledge of easements, as I understand, an easement may be either affirmative or negative. It may be a right to use, as well as a right having a negative quality. But I do not wish to argue the point.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In the event there is the slightest question or doubt as to the purpose of the bill, the Senator from Tennessee, like the Senator from Oklahoma, would wish to join the Senator from Georgia in making expressly clear the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Tennessee is eager to join the senior Senator from Georgia to that end.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in

order that I may ask the Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator from Tennessee tell me what a negative easement is? If I have an easement over certain land, to use such land, that is a positive easement. What is a negative easement? Is it the right not to go over it? In law, I do not quite understand what a negative easement is.

Mr. GORE. If I may explain to the junior Senator from Kentucky, the junior Senator from Tennessee had in mind a limitation upon the use of land for specific purposes. For example, in the conveyance of a piece of land, a condition may be imposed granting the right to use the land upon certain conditions and for certain purposes, and those purposes only. It may also contain a covenant by which the conveyor conveys his own right to use the land. For example, if I may continue, the junior Senator from Tennessee might sell a strip of land to the junior Senator from Kentucky, or he might sell an interest in such land. He might also sell to the junior Senator from Kentucky such interest in the land as would prevent the junior Senator from Tennessee from constructing a building of a certain type upon it, adjacent to the property of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator conveys to me a tract of land, or if the Government acquires a tract of land from the Senator or from me, and gives me an easement over it, the right to use it, that is a positive easement. It is not a negative easement. If, in the deed of conveyance, or the contract, I were denied the right to use it for certain purposes, or if the Senator himself, as the conveyor, were to deny me the right to use it, that might be a negative restriction, but I cannot see how it would be an easement, because an easement is a right to use or to occupy a strip of land or certain other property in a positive degree. A prohibition against using it might be absolute and legal, but it would not be an easement, because I could not even use it. It would be a prevention of use.

Mr. GORE. I think it may be said that a covenant may be either positive or negative. It may be a right to use, or it may be the denial of a right to use.

Mr. BARKLEY. A denial of the right to use is certainly not an easement.

Mr. GORE. I think that is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to make plain my own position. I have no objection whatever to restrictions upon the use of the right-of-way, such right-of-way as the State acquires, or as the Secretary acquires and reconveys to the State, with respect to advertising, or any other use of it. I think that is proper. I am perfectly content with that.

But I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that there could be no such thing as the conveyance of a negative of an easement. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is correct. An easement is a use which runs with the land; and a mere negation of such use is not a use which runs with the land. No one could convey it. The Supreme Court of the United States even held that, when a deed provided that people of a certain race or color should not become the owners of a fee simple title in the District of Columbia with respect to certain property, such prohibition was utterly void under our law and under our Constitution.

In the present case there is involved, not an easement, but a negation of an easement. It is a prohibition. It does not run with the land. It cannot run with the land. Therefore it cannot be conveyed; and no court in the land would permit it to be reconveyed. So all that could be done would be to reconvey whatever fee was acquired, with such uses as run with that fee. That is all that could be done.

I have no objection whatever to the exclusion of advertisements on the right-of-way acquired by the State or by the Secretary, whether it be for 100 feet, 200 feet, or 300 feet on each side of the roadway. However, I do object to the conveyance of a so-called right which is nontransferable, which is not alienable, and cannot be conveyed. It is a purely personal right, which cannot run with the land at all, under any of the decisions of the courts of this country. The right to prohibit the use of any additional number of feet beyond that right-of-way, whether it be 500 feet, 1 mile, or 5 miles, cannot possibly be sustained as any form of easement which would run with the land itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in order that I may address a question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the able Senator from Georgia is not raising any question as to the acquisition of the right-of-way necessary for the road itself?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the Senator from Georgia is confining his objection to the acquisition by the Federal Government—whether it conveys or whether it does not convey—of advertising rights with respect to land extraneous to the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. Beyond the right-of-way. The Senator is correct. I do not believe that such so-called rights can be conveyed.

What is proposed to be done by the pending bill? I do not believe the proponents of the bill fully realize what it proposes to do. It is proposed that a mere prohibition against the use of land for a certain purpose, the title to which land has not been acquired and which it is not proposed to be paid for, can be acquired under the right of eminent domain. The doctrine of eminent domain cannot be sustained in such a case. No court would permit a State to exercise its right of eminent domain to acquire a right over adjacent land merely for the purpose of preventing such land from being devoted to certain uses.

If the Senator will examine the law on that point he will find that the doctrine of eminent domain does not apply in that kind of case.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to explain to the distinguished Senator from Georgia very briefly how this amendment became a part of the bill. Before I got myself into my present predicament, I was a journalist. I submitted to the committee, in my own language, a very brief amendment which I thought would deal with the control of sign boards on the highways. The attorneys for the Bureau of Public Roads—and also Mr. du Pont—stated, that the amendment should be stated in different language. The result is the language the Senator from Georgia has objected to on the floor of the Senate.

My purpose was agreed to by the committee. The language is not my language.

I wish to point out, in justice to Mr. du Pont, who was most helpful to the committee, that he claimed the State of New York, when it constructed its throughway, had acquired advertising rights along the throughway in New York State. I believe that is correct.

Mr. GORE. At a cost of only $100 a mile, I believe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe he said $100 or $200 a mile.

Mr. GORE. It was not the purpose of either the State of New York or of other States to prevent advertising, but, rather, to regulate it and to prevent a sign from being placed at an intersection or on a curve, where it would create a traffic hazard.

Many States, including the State of Tennessee, have laws to regulate advertising along and adjacent to highway rights-of-way. The only purpose the committee had in mind was to help the States in gaining that objective in the most economical way.

If we wait until the highways are constructed and signs are constructed, the cost of the rights will come very high. It may well be that we should not have entered this field at all.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia may be eminently correct, as he usually is, but the committee was undertaking to help the States in gaining their objective in this field, and to save the taxpayers money in the acquisition of the rights at the time they could be acquired at the most economical figure and at the time when signs could be prevented from being placed in positions which would endanger drivers.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The situation I had in mind was that the people of my State, together with the people of the rest of the country, through the matching of funds procedure have built a magnificent network of roads in Oregon, which has a population of 1,600,000 people, who are spread over nearly 100,000 square miles. As is well known, Oregon has wonderful scenery. Yet, the signboard industry has put along the roads of the State of Oregon, which have cost the people of our State and of the Nation millions of dollars, all kinds of advertising material, generally at curves, which are strategic locations, of course, because people will look at them longer when they are placed at an arc, without

regard at all to the scenery along the roadway.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Has the Senator ever seen any signs which have been beneficial or helpful to him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Signs which state that the distance to Frederick, Md., for example, is so many miles, or that the distance to Eugene, Oreg., is so many miles are beneficial. However, such signs are not put up by the signboard industry; they are put up by the State highway commissions.

Mr. THYE. I ask the Senator if he ever found signs which were helpful, not from the standpoint of telling him the distance to a city, but with respect to hotel accommodations and motels and business establishments located in the area. Were not such signs of some help to the Senator?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say that such signs are not of as much help to a driver as looking at Mount Hood. Mount Hood is a very invigorating sight, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am familiar with the Senator's State, because both my mother and father are buried in Portland, and I have visited the State many times.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am acquainted with some of the members of the Senator's fine family.

Mr. THYE. If any sign ever obstructed a view of Mount Hood for the Senator, I would say that he was very nearsighted.

However, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Oregon that I believe the States should have the right to determine what type of billboard construction shall be permitted along a highway. If we begin to write into Federal law, in connection with Federal-aid highways, that a certain type of billboard cannot be constructed along a highway, we will be writing into a Federal act much more restrictive language than we have ever written into a Federal act in the past.

I trust my good State administration and I trust the State highway commissioner, and the legislative body of my State, to determine what shall be constructed along the highways in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. There has been a certain amount of activity of late in behalf of Federal regulation of other types of advertising. I refer to television advertising. What I fear in connection with this whole subject is that a law limiting billboard advertising may well be the camel's nose under the tent flap, and may very well result in further encroachment by the Federal Government in the field of regulating advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from Michigan has the impression that Federal regulation of radio and television advertising is something new. As I understand, the Federal regulation of radio began when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Communications Act was enacted. The Senator from Michigan gives the impression that the regulation of television advertising and radio advertising is something new. The regulation of advertising on radio—and radio is the predecessor of television—was first started when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator from Oregon is aware of the fact that there is much interest among some people to further regulate radio and television advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator whether he regards it as undesirable to have some control over construction of signboards along our highways.

Mr. POTTER. In my opinion, the States are the best judges of the type of advertising that should be placed along our highways. If the State of Oregon should decide that it can eliminate highway billboards, let the State of Oregon so decide. If the State of Michigan should decide that it wants some billboards along its highway, let that be a decision of the people of the State of Michigan.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator object, may I ask, to the Federal Government setting certain specifications as to the width of the road surface, as to the maximum curvature of roads, as to bridge piers, and as to bridge structures?

Mr. POTTER. No; I am not objecting to any of those. However, the language proposed seems to be a means, in a highway bill, for the Federal Government to regulate outdoor advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I realized, when I first raised this issue, that there would be great objection. Again I wish to repeat that the exact language of the provision is not mine. The purpose to do something about signboard advertising was my original suggestion.

I wish to say, that, in general, I feel that signs have to do with road safety, just as do curves, bridges, or anything else. I am perfectly willing to defer to the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is chairman of the subcommittee and who is the principal author of the bill. If he believes the language to which the senior Senator from Georgia has objected should be eliminated from the bill, it is agreeable with me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregan yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Few bills of the magnitude of S. 1048 have ever been before the Congress. It may be that the committee has erred in including a provision which is extraneous to highway legislation. The committee was undertaking to facilitate the acquisition of lands by the States. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have conferred with members of the subcommittee, and we are unanimous in our feeling that such a small matter as this should not in any way endanger the bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon, without losing his right to the floor, may yield to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to propose an amendment which I believe will be agreed to without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, leaders on both sides have been contacted, and they are willing to agree to this amendment, and the Senator from Oregon has stated that he will not object to it.

I offer an amendment on page 10, line 3, after the word "lands", to insert a closing parenthesis.

On page 10, lines 3 to 5, inclusive, strike out "and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way."

I believe, Mr. President, that covers the main objection raised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Georgia in the position he has taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 10, line 3, after the word "lands", to insert a closing parenthesis; and on page 10, lines 3 to 5, inclusive, to strike out "and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask whether this amendment would still permit a State which desires to control advertising rights along the highway to provide for the purchase of such rights at the time of the purchase of the right-of-way?

Mr. THURMOND. It would leave to the States the control of advertising on the highway.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it permit the use of any Federal funds for that purpose?

Mr. THURMOND. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Federal Government purchase for a State the advertising rights, provided the State paid for the rights?

Mr. THURMOND. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the State would have to conduct a separate negotiation to acquire advertising rights if it wanted to keep the roadside perfectly free from advertising?

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct. It would have to conduct its own negotiations for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Why is it desired to offer this amendment? Why should there be any language at all in the bill with respect to signs?

Mr. THURMOND. The amendment would delete that language.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee amendments were agreed to this morning, with the understanding that an amendment could be offered to the clean bill. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina pro-

poses to strike from the bill the language of the committee amendment.

Mr. THYE. Then the bill will be absolutely silent as to road signs of anykind on the right-of-way?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. That is what I wanted to be certain of.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina is entirely agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, now that the amendment is disposed of, I wish to cite support of the brief remarks I made by referring to American Jurisprudence, page 934, in which a section is devoted to a discussion of easements, affirmative and negative.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, before I conclude what I had expected to be brief remarks on the bill, I should like to point out to the Senate a defect of S. 1048, which I support, and a defect of S. 1160, which I oppose. I think this particular point is undesirable in both bills. The defect to which I refer is the total exclusion of the Territory of Alaska from highway aid provided for in both S. 1048 and S. 1160. I think it is passing strange that the President of the United States pointed out in his press conference not long ago that Alaska was so important strategically, from a military standpoint, that perhaps the advisability of statehood for Alaska was dubious, and yet Alaska does not receive any Federal highway aid, even though many of the witnesses who testified in behalf of the bill and in behalf of various highway proposals, such as the Clay report, stated that these highways are vital to national defense.

It is a disappointment to find that the bill, which I believe is generally a good one, makes no recommendations with regard to Alaska's road needs. It is true that the program recommended is geared to the Federal-aid highway acts from which Alaska is excluded, but it had been my hope that recognition might have been given to the discrimination against Alaska which has too long been allowed to continue.

It is true that in recent years—but due to military necessity alone—quite large sums of money have been made available for roadbuilding in Alaska by the Alaska Road Commission, an agency of the Department of the Interior. But for many years before that, the road funds appropriated were infinitesimal compared with what Alaska would have received if the Federal-aid highway program had been extended to that great Territory. And now those appropriations are on a rapidly diminishing scale and the time has come, I believe, when serious consideration should be given to bring Alaska under the Federal-aid highway program. Both Hawaii and Puerto Rico are included, and there is no cogent reason for Alaska's continued exclusion. A formula should be worked out whereby Alaska's needs could be made part of the road program envisioned for the entire country. Alaska is an integral part of this country, and should be allowed to participate as a partner with the other States and with Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

It seems to me to be very curious that Hawaii and Puerto Rico, for example, are included in the Federal-aid highway program, but that Alaska, which at one point is only 40 or 50 miles away from the territory of the Soviet Union, is not included. I have stood on the shores of Bering Strait and, on a clear day, seen the headlands of Siberia in the distance. One could realize, in such a moment, the vast military significance of Alaska.

Yet despite all our talk about the importance of roads to the national defense, it is not proposed that Alaska be include in a road-building program which extends even to Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

This is no reason for voting against S. 1048, because, as I pointed out earlier, Alaska is omitted in both the committee bill and the administration bill, which has been offered as a substitute.

In general, it is my firm opinion that S. 1048 offers the best method for developing not only the interstate road system, but also the secondary, urban, and rural road system.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to express myself as being in strong sympathy with the objective of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, since I have taken part several times in the formulation of the Federal Aid Road Act.

However, I want the Senator to realize that the failure to include Alaska along with the States results not from any desire to exclude Alaska, but, I think, to the contrary, from the desire to treat Alaska more generously than she would have been treated had she been included simply as another State.

The Senator from Oregon will recall that approximately 97 or 98 percent of the lands of Alaska are publicly owned. If the distinguished Senator will read the provisions of the last Federal-Aid Road Act, he will find that there was only $1 million a year added to the special funds to build roads through the public-lands areas. He would find that the formula relative to mileage of roads and to population was completely inadequate to give anything like fair representation to Alaska, leaving only the authorized formula, which again, was so out of balance with the developmental actualities, as well as the needs, as to make it very hard to ascertain on what basis to include Alaska. So Alaska has had a separate public-roads program.

I wish to remind the Senator that only a few weeks ago, during the consideration of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, the Senate, upon the recommendation of the committee, raised the appropriation for public roads in Alaska from $1 million to $5 million, as I recall, for the fiscal year 1956, which begins on July 1, 1955.

Besides that, separate funds for Alaska have been added through the forest and reclamation provisions, which the Senator has already mentioned. Furthermore, in connection with the public works bill for Alaska, we have made it possible to construct, on a 50–50 basis, some very urgently needed roads in the small communities and nearby areas.

While I am happy the distinguished Senator has called attention to the plight of Alaska, I wish to say that, having sat several times on the committees which worked on those bills, I was of the conclusion, and I still am, subject always to being corrected if new facts may be discovered, that it is more to Alaska's interest to be treated in a separate classification; and that we must treat Alaska much more generously, and I am certain that she will be treated much more generously, than she would be if she were simply provided for in the bill as one of the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I am aware, and also appreciative, of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has made more ample allowances for roads in Alaska.

It was my thought in the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works that perhaps as much as one-half percent, or even one-fourth percent, of the total Federal-aid funds might be made available to Alaska. It was felt by some other members of the committee that this totally new feature should not be added to the bill at this time.

I am very glad to observe that the distinguished Senator from Florida is aware of the road needs of Alaska. I think I have traveled in Alaska as much as has any other Member of Congress, save, of course, Delegate BARTLETT, who represents Alaska.

One need only go across that vast land to become aware of the urgent necessity for more roads. There are many communities which have only 4 or 5 miles of road. For example, in southeastern Alaska there are many communities, like Ketchikan and Juneau, which could be connected by roads, but as to which the only existing means of travel is by ship or by air; and necessarily, in very bad weather in Alaska, this is frequently impossible because of fog, wind, or other storms.

If we are to take cognizance of Alaska's extreme importance militarily, it will be necessary to provide for more and better surface transportation in Alaska.

I am glad that the Senator from Florida has made this contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment,

House Joint Resolution 310, a joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 371) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed upon the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in order that I may address a question to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is this a report on the House joint resolution providing additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is. The joint resolution is reported unanimously, without amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the same amount as passed by the House?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And it is unanimously reported from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice to the Senate that the report has been made, and that, whenever it is possible for the Senate to consider the joint resolution, it will be taken up. I wish all Senators to be placed on notice.

TRANSFER OF CONTROL OVER CERTAIN LAND, AND RELOCATION OF INDIANS RESIDING THEREON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since time beyond the memory of man, Indians of Oregon and Washington have lived along the banks of the mighty Columbia. In early times, forests of incomparable beauty were generous to these Indians of the river. There, game abounded in plenty, and a bountiful earth brought forth food more than adequate for these, her children.

The river, too, was kind to the Indians. It provided the salmon so rich in nourishment for a hardy people. For centuries the salmon gathered annually in countless numbers at Celilo Falls, on the Columbia, where in obedience to the command of nature they struggled mightily to leap the falls on their last journey—their return to the tiny upriver streams of their origin. At Celilo, the Indians traditionally assembled for the salmon catch; and it was there at some remote time in the past that they took up their homes, and lived in comparable well-being.

The coming of the white man brought weighty problems of survival to the Indians of the Columbia. Their forests were thinned or stripped, the wild game sought refuge in more remote areas, and the Indians along the Columbia were compelled to rely more and more upon the river as their source of food. Celilo Falls thus became the central point of their salmon fishery.

Celilo Falls will soon disappear, a casualty of the march of progress. In months to come, the falls will be inundated by the backwaters of the Dalles Dam. The Indians of Celilo must withdraw to new places of abode; but they will carry with them the memories of past years—past centuries—when their ancestors fished at the beautiful falls on the Columbia.

The Indians of Celilo know that the Pacific Northwest is a new frontier of progress and economic achievement. They know that the dams of the Columbia are inseparable parts of that progress. With sadness, but with dignity, they have bowed to the inevitable. They know that their homes on the river banks at Celilo stand in the way of completion of the works of the Dalles Dam, and that these homes must be removed.

The American people are known the world around for their traits of fairness; they recognize moral as well as legal obligations. The problem of providing new homes for the Indians who live at Celilo calls for a demonstration by the American people of these qualities. The problem is one of urgency; it cannot await leisurely solution.

The situation confronting these Indians has been described to me by their representatives and friends and by residents of many Oregon communities. Those with whom I have conferred agree that, due to the relocation of the railroad right-of-way, during the coming summer several Indian families must move from Celilo.

Mr. President, only a few weeks ago I was at The Dalles, Oreg.; and I held a series of conferences not only with Indian groups, but also with their representatives and with their council and with representatives of community groups of The Dalles and of the surrounding area. In the area there is complete unanimity that, in being removed to new abodes, these Indians are entitled to fair treatment from the American people, and that the Government of the United States should compensate the Indians for the cost of the removal, and should also compensate them for the value of the homes they are losing, and should make available to them new homes in which to live.

Mr. President, the advancing waters of the Columbia River will compel the remaining families to withdraw by not later than the summer of 1956. But the plain fact is that they have no new village or new homesites to which to turn. They are without funds to reestablish themselves. They need the Nation's help, and they need it promptly.

There are many who share my apprehensions concerning the welfare of these Indians. A group of resolutions describes the problem in graphic detail, and suggests the type of remedial action b the Federal Government which will be of greatest help. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three resolutions: The first, adopted by the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, of Oregon; the second adopted by the Celilo Community Club; and the third, a resolution which was adopted by the 41st annual State conference of the Oregon State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 938

"Whereas the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg., will inundate the Celilo Falls Fishery and will also flood and otherwise destroy the homes of some 26 Indian families who have their permanent homes in the vicinity of Celilo, Oreg., and in the vicinity of Spearfish, Wash.; and

"Whereas according to the present schedule of the Army engineers, some 5 or 6 families will be displaced during the coming summer, probably in July or August 1955, due to the necessity of relocating the Union Pacific Railroad running through the Celilo Falls area, and the homes of the other remaining permanent Indian residents will be inundated during the fall of 1956; and

"Whereas the Army engineers have no plans for relocating the Indian families whose permanent homes will be destroyed by this project; and

"Whereas these families, in addition to losing their homes, also are losing their means of livelihood due to the inundation of their traditional fishery at Celilo Falls and vicinity; and

"Whereas the Indians of the Yakima, Warm Springs, and Umatilla Reservations, together with unenrolled Indians residing in the Celilo Falls area, in cooperation with the Indian Service and the County Court of Wasco County, Oreg., are doing everything possible to aid and assist the Indian families whose homes are to be destroyed by this project, in bringing the matter to the attention of Congress, and have aided in drafting a proposed form of legislation for introduction in Congress during the current session, whereby the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, would be authorized and directed to utilize the sum of $200,000 of funds to be made available in connection with the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1956, for the construction of the Dalles Dam, for the purpose of providing housing and for the relocation of the Indian families in question: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the tribal council of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation hereby approves the efforts being made to secure funds for relocating and providing housing for the Indian families in question, and urges the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, and the Members of the Congress to take such steps as are necessary to provide means of relocating and providing housing for these Indian families."

The undersigned, as secretary-treasurer of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, hereby certifies that the tribal council is composed of 11 members, of whom 9, constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof duly and regularly called, noticed, convened, and held this 10th day of March 1955; that the foregoing resolution was passed by the affirmative vote of 8 members, the chairman not voting; and that the said resolution has not been rescinded or amended in any way.

JAMES G. SMITH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Approved: March 10, 1955.

J. W. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas residents of Celilo Village, Celilo, Oreg., an Indian fishing village, are advised that their homes and fishing facilities, and their fishery, are to be inundated by the Dalles Dam; and

"Whereas the residents of Celilo Village are in the process of forming an organization to be known as the 'Celilo Community Club,' to be composed of all residents of the village who wish to join, the principal purpose of this organization to be to keep informed regarding matters which affect them and their interests, and to take such steps as they feel necessary to protect their interests, and the interests of the Indians residing in this vicinity; and

"Whereas the members of the Celilo Community Club are advised that the schedule for completion of the Dalles Dam calls for final closure in October, 1956, at which time, all Indian homes, fishing shacks, and other property will be inundated; and

"Whereas the Army engineers have advised that relocation of the Union Pacific Railroad will necessitate the evacuation of 5 or 6 Indian families who reside within the relocation area, some time during the coming summer, probably in August or September 1955; and

"Whereas no provision has been made by the Army engineers, or by anyone else to provide for housing or relocating these families; and

"Whereas, these families face a very serious and critical situation, being faced with the necessity of moving within the next few months, and having no housing facilities to move to, or means of providing other facilities; and

"Whereas a meeting of members of the Celilo Community Club was held at Celilo, Oreg., on March 22, 1955, at which 16 members were present; and

"Whereas, it is understood that the Indian Service and the governing bodies of the Yakima, Umatilla and Warm Springs Tribes and their attorneys, are taking steps to have introduced in the present session of the United States Congress, legislation which would authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, to expend $200,000 of funds to be appropriated for construction of the Dalles Dam for the purpose of providing housing for Indian families who will be displaced by this project; and

"Whereas it is the feeling of members of the Celilo Community Club that every possible effort should be made to provide immediate means of relocating and housing the families who will be displaced by the Union Pacific Railroad relocation, and for relocating the other families who will be displaced upon closure of the dam in the fall of 1956: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Celilo Community Club hereby endorse the form of legislation which the Indian Service and the Yakima, Umatilla, and Warm Springs Tribes are sponsoring, which, when enacted, will provide means of housing and relocating Indian families who will be displaced by the Dalles Dam, and hereby urge the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, the congressional delegation from Oregon, and the congressional delegation from the State of Washington to do everything possible to bring about the enactment of the legislation in question, or similar legislation, to relieve the Indian families whose homes and means of livelihood are to be destroyed by the Dalles Dam project."

EDWARD EDMONDS,
Chairman of Celilo Community Club.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was duly adopted at a meeting held at Celilo, Oreg., on the 22d day of March 1955, by an affirmative vote of 16; that there were 16 members present at this meeting.

SHIRLEY P. BACON,
Secretary, Celilo Community Club.

The following resolution was passed by the 41st annual State conference of the Oregon State Society of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, March 1, 1955, during their meeting in Portland, Oreg.:

"Whereas the Government of the United States, in pursuance of the program of the development of the Columbia River, is building the Dalles Dam below Celilo Falls; and

"Whereas the structure in pooling the river destroys the fishery which the Indians have reserved under treaty and have enjoyed for many generations; and

"Whereas damages have been paid to reservation Indians using the fishery; and

"Whereas the resident Indians have received no payment of damages nor has any provision been made for housing, rehabilitation, care of the aged, education of the children, or any way left open for future subsistence or livelihood except to become objects of charity: and

"Whereas the resident Indians are the descendants of Army Scouts, who served as guides and friends to the early settlers and were never moved from their long abiding places to any reservation; be it

"*Resolved*, That the Oregon State Society of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, hereby deplore this grave wrong against a helpless, loyal people, and call upon the Congress of the United States to make prompt and substantial amends for this act of rank and unjust discrimination against the Indians whose homes are in the Columbia Gorge; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be supplied the United States Senators and Representatives of Oregon and Washington and to Mr. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and a careful note be kept of their responses thereto."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my office has been in conference with representatives of the Army engineers, in Washington. I wish to take this opportunity to observe that the Engineers have cooperated to the fullest extent in working out a legislative solution to the problem of relocating the Celilo Indians. I appreciate the Army engineers' fine work on this problem, and I know that all who are interested in the welfare of these Indians share my views in this respect.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to facilitate the relocation of the Celilo Indians, and to authorize, for the purpose of the relocation, the use of funds heretofore appropriated to the Army engineers in connection with the Dalles Dam project; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2043) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the control of certain land in Oregon to the Secretary of the Army, to provide for the relocation of certain Indians residing on lands required by the United States for the construction of the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, among its other provisions, the bill contains one which would empower the Secretary of the Interior to relocate the resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled there when the project was authorized. The bill would enable the Secretary to acquire lands for the purpose of the relocation, and would authorize him to take title in trust for the individuals affected. Under the bill, the Secretary may terminate the trust when, in his judgment, the occupant is capable of managing his own affairs. The latter provision is consonant with the admirable trend toward endowing our American citizens of various Indian groups with full privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.

The bill would authorize the transfer of $210,000 from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior. This amount appears to be sufficient to meet all the expenses of the relocation.

Problems are likely to arise in connection with the administration of the program covered by the bill, but these must not be permitted to overshadow the importance of obtaining prompt passage of this proposed legislation.

One administrative problem deserves special mention at this time: A group of the elderly residents of the Celilo Falls Indian community are most anxious to establish new homes in close proximity to the village they will be leaving. One of the finest friends of the Indians, and a leading citizen of our State and a very wonderful person she is, Mr. President; I refer to Mrs. Martha Ferguson McKeown, of Odell, Oreg.—discussed this matter with me just a few weeks ago, and at the same time she provided me with a memorandum which she had prepared in regard to these elderly Indian people. I ask unanimous consent to have her memorandum printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The resident Indians at Celilo Falls, under the leadership of venerable Chief Tommy Kuni Tnompson, asked to be housed in a separate village beside the river. They ask that the longhouse, worship pole, and the chief's dryshack be moved, if necessary, for their preservation.

These old "long-hairs" want to remain beside the bones of their ancestors (their cemetery on top of the high bluff overlooking the falls). They want their worship pole restored and in its rightful place directly in front of the longhouse door. They want to live on in the old ways, "because they are best."

They ask that their own distinction between "home-folk and comers" be recognized by those in authority: "comers" come and go to homes in other places; "home-folk" have always lived within the rocky confines of the Columbia River Gorge.

The Wy-am-pums blame the "comers" for much of the dirt and discord at the falls. They were deeply disturbed when vandals destroyed the little carved bird on top of pole. Not only was that bird a symbol of chiefdomship, but it also carried their messages to the Almighty.

There is no official of the Bureau of Indian Affairs living in this area. Because they are wards of the Federal Government, these people are not given protection by our State police. They would like help in establishing and maintaining an "old-time Indian village" where they could welcome school children and courteous visitors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mrs. McKeown is one of the outstanding authors of Oregon, and she is recognized as one of the best-informed persons in the Nation on Indian folklore. She understands the Indians of the West. She has engaged in a great deal of research into the history of our Indian problems; and, in particular, she is very well informed on the problems of the Celilo Indians.

Mr. President, to the officials of the Indian Bureau who eventually will undertake the details of the relocation as provided in the bill, I suggest serious and sympathetic study of the desires of the elderly Indians. Those who know the Indians appreciate their deep reverence for the area of the falls. It is their home, and it was the home of their forefathers; the earthly remains of their ancestors lie at rest on the high bluff overlooking the falls. The Indians feel that they belong to this very special part of the great river, and they wish to stay there for their few remaining years on this earth.

I am sure that the officials of Government who are to be entrusted with the important task of placing the Celilo Indians in new homesites will not overlook the little items which have such great importance to the people most directly affected, and I am sure that the Congress will cooperate to the fullest extent in giving basic justice to the people who dwell on the banks of the Columbia, at the Falls of Celilo.

Mr. President, just the other day, when I was in The Dalles, and when we discussed the matter of relocation and possible sites where the new homes for the Indians could be built; namely, as close as possible to the falls, and as close as possible to the Indians' historic, ancient burial grounds, and as close as possible to the ceremonial sites of the tribe—and those who are familiar with Indian history know how important to Indians such sites are—I became satisfied that there are sites very close to the falls where these Indians could be relocated.

Although I shall discuss this matter further in the Senate when the bill comes before us for action, at this time I wish to say to those who are responsible for the relocation that I hope they will never overlook the importance of relocating these Indians as close as possible to their old homesites, because, Mr. President, those of us who are white cannot possibly begin to understand and appreciate the sentimental values, the emotional values, and the deep religious and spiritual values to these Indians of their past, in light of their traditions, their history, and their folklore.

So I hope the committee to which the bill is referred will take speedy action on it; and I hope it will be possible for the Senate to pass the bill very quickly, on the calendar.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that many of the Indians of whom the Senator spoke so eloquently have treaty rights with our own country which go back almost a century? As I recall, they go back to about 1855. We have a very solemn obligation, which goes back even before Abraham Lincoln's tenure in the Presidency, to take care of these people.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. He and I, in introducing this bill, are seeking to fulfill two clear obligations of the American people—first, a legal obligation, and secondly, a moral obligation. I believe that as a people we have a duty to see to it that justice is done to this small tribe of Indians, who are really being washed out so far as homesites are concerned, because of legislation which produced the great Dalles Dam. We have a duty to see to it that, as the result of the legislation, we do not do an injustice to this small Indian tribe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I know my colleague, with his vast knowledge of the history of our State, is aware of the fact that the Indian fishery above the Dalles Dam is soon to be wiped out as the waters rise behind the dam. This fishery may be the oldest industry in the Pacific Northwest. I think it is quite significant that in this year when the Senator seeks to do something helpful for these Indians, we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the arrival at Celilo Falls of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. In their famous journals they commented about the fishing activities of these Indians. Even then, salmon fishing was the only means of livelihood that tribe knew.

These Indians, whom the senior Senator from Oregon wishes to help, and will help if it is within his power to do so, were living in that area prior to the coming of the first white man to Oregon. I think we certainly would be abdicating all our moral and ethical obligations if we did not take action to see to it that these people are relocated properly and have a means of supporting themselves.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is entirely correct. I talked with Mrs. McKeown about this subject when I was at home recently. We are referring to what was certainly the first fishing industry in the State of Oregon. The salmon-fishing industry can be said really to have originated at Celilo Falls. The Celilo Indians made an important contribution to that region. I wish to stress something of which my colleague is well aware. He has referred to it in some of his brilliant magazine articles. We are dealing here with one of the richest lores of the State of Oregon. The relationship of the Celilo Indians to the salmon run in the State of Oregon is a very dramatic relationship. One has only to be at Celilo Falls at the time of the salmon run to appreciate it. It is still a very colorful event, although in decades gone by there was much more Indian ceremony connected with it than there is at the present time. The return of the Indians each year to Celilo Falls in large numbers for the salmon run, and the colorful ceremonials which formerly took place happened to be among the most rich and interesting pages of Oregon's history. The junior Senator from Oregon and I really are trying to do justice, both legally and morally, to this great tribe of Indians in our State.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that Mrs. Martha Ferguson McKeown, of Hood River County, a loyal friend of both the senior Senator from Oregon and myself, has done a great deal of most useful and humanitarian work in an effort to alert Members of Congress to the very urgent human needs of the Indians at Celilo Falls?

Mr. MORSE. Let me say in reply to my colleague that Mrs. McKeown really has been the No. 1 spokesman for the Celilo Indians in the State of Oregon, with regard to many of their problems, including this problem.

I do not know exactly what her title is, but she enjoys an honorary title within the Tribe of Celilo Indians. They have recognized her as a benefactress and as one who clearly understands the problems of the Celilo Indians. She has the confidence not only of the Indians, but of other groups in our State which are very much interested in protecting the legitimate rights of Indian tribes in our State.

EXHIBIT A

S. 2043

Bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the control of certain land in Oregon to the Secretary of the Army, to provide for the relocation of certain Indians residing on lands required by the United States for the construction of the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the control of the Secretary of the Army for use in connection with the Dalles Dam project, Oregon, an irregular-shaped parcel of land containing in the aggregate approximately 5.5 acres, located in lot 1 of section 17 and in lots 1 and 2 of section 20, township 2 north, range 15 east, Willamette Meridian, Oregon, lying northerly from and adjacent to the Columbia River Highway, being a portion of land previously transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the act approved February 9, 1929 (45 Stat. 1158).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to relocate those permanent resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled within the project area on May 17, 1950, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary therefor. Title to the lands so acquired shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian for whose benefit it is acquired. Any such trust may be terminated by the Secretary of the Interior by the conveyance of a fee simple title to the Indian or his heirs or devisees, without application therefor, when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the Indian or his heirs or devisees are capable of managing their own affairs.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, from sums appropriated for the constructed of the Dalles Dam project, not to exceed $210,000 for all expenses in carrying out the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into a contract or con-

tracts with any State or political subdivision thereof for carrying out any part of the Indian relocation authorized by this act.

NOTICE OF EARLY CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 4725, AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a brief announcement, with the understanding that he will retain the floor, and that my remarks will appear at the conclusion of his statement?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield under those conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Committee on Finance, for the purpose of announcing to the Senate that today the Senator from Virginia has filed a report from the Committee on Finance on House bill 4725, a bill to repeal sections 454 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This report was filed pursuant to the unanimous action of the Committee on Finance. It will be available to all Members of the Senate.

I expect to confer with the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] shortly, and I hope to bring this proposed legislation before the Senate some time later in the week. I wish Senators to be on notice that the report has been filed on the bill to repeal the so-called blooper, and that it is expected that the bill will be considered by the Senate later in the week.

I wonder if it will be agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance to proceed to the consideration of the bill on some day later in the week.

Mr. BYRD. It will be entirely agreeable; and the sooner the better.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two with reference to the road bill which is before the Senate.

At the outset I wish to extend my very sincere compliments and congratulations to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for what I consider to be the great job of statesmanship he has performed in connection with the road bill.

The questions which I now raise with regard to a certain section of the bill constitute but tentative opinions on my part. If I am proved to be mistaken in some of my tentative conclusions, I shall not hesitate to change them as the debate progresses, because I never have any pride of opinion in a wrong conclusion, and I am always willing to cast my final vote on any issue on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence before the Senate. I have been giving some study to the bill, and shall give more study to it before the final vote. I wish to raise a question or two about the bill.

I refer particularly to section 2 (d) of the bill, which has to do with weight and length limits. In my judgment, reasonable weight and length limits can be justified; but I wish to point out a Federal-State problem which I think would be created by the language of section 2 (d) in its present form.

This section of the bill applies only to a national system of interstate roads, a system which encompasses only 40,000 miles of our primary roads.

We have a total of 234,000 miles of primary roads. Of course, section 2 (d) does not apply to those many thousands of miles of primary roads over and above the 40,000 miles of interstate highways. The committee report, at page 14, points out that there are portions of the primary system in certain States which carry more traffic than the national interstate system of those States. I understand from road authorities in my State that that is true in the State of Oregon, and I believe it to be true in a good many other States.

I shall refer shortly to the map in the rear of the Senate Chamber to illustrate the question I am raising this afternoon.

In the State of Oregon only one national interstate highway traverses the State. All the other primary roads are noninterstate highways, although we have a good many miles of interstate highway. What I wish to point out is that on all the other highways of our State the trucker or logger may haul a certain weight under State law and comply with the law. However, if section 2 (d) should become the law, and he should drive his vehicle over a small portion of the interstate highway, he would be in violation of the law. That would very clearly create a great deal of conflict.

Let me now refer to the map in the rear of the Senate Chamber to illustrate my point.

We are dealing with the red line on the map. That is the interstate highway which runs from the Oregon-Idaho boundary across the State of Oregon. Of course it continues on down from Portland to California, as the map shows.

Let us take the example of a logger or trucker—and I care not what his transportation vehicle is—and let us assume that he starts at Ontario, Oreg., which is on the eastern boundary between Oregon and Idaho, and that he stays off the interstate highway itself but travels on primary roads all across the State of Oregon, until he finally must cross the interstate highway at Pendleton or just outside Portland. He may not travel more than 10 miles on the interstate highway, but he must travel those 10 miles on the interstate highway in order to reach his destination.

Under section 2 (d) of the bill he would not be able to haul that load of logs or merchandise on the interstate highway, because he would be in violation of the prohibitions in section 2 (d).

The truckers and loggers of my State and others interested have spoken to me about this subject. I have just returned from Oregon, where in a series of conferences with truckers and loggers I was besieged with inquiries regarding this matter. I spent Friday and Saturday in Oregon making five major speeches. In addition I held a series of conferences with a great number of groups who wanted to discuss this problem with me.

They pointed out that that section would work a great disadvantage in our State. Because of the fact that our towns are much farther apart and because of our sparser population, our State permits larger vehicles and larger loads, and we therefore build our highways to accommodate the larger loads. That would not be possible in a State like Connecticut, for example, which is in part so ably represented by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. Traffic congestion on eastern highways is quite different from what it is on the so-called open ranges of the West.

The truckers and loggers have made known to me—and that is why I am raising the point for the consideration of the Senator from Tennessee—their contention, at least, that the enactment of section 2 (d) would have the effect of putting out of business in the State of Oregon thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of equipment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. First, I wish to thank the able senior Senator from Oregon for his very generous references to me. I am grateful to him. I cannot understand by what interpretation of section 2 (d) any piece of equipment which is now legal in the State of Oregon or in any other State would become illegal. In fact, the section does not undertake to fix or affect any legal limit. It only attaches, as a condition to the 90-percent investment in interstate highways the requirement that the States maintain their present weight and dimensional limitations on vehicles, or comply with standards recommended by the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads, whichever is the greater.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to reply to the Senator on the basis of the representations made to me. I am merely transmitting to the Senator and to the Senate what the representatives of the trucking industry have said to me. They feel that if the bill should be passed with this section in it the load length in the State could not be changed even if they wanted it changed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. That was not what the Senator had just stated before I asked him to yield. He was saying that the representatives had said to him that the use of thousands of pieces of equipment would be rendered unlawful by section 2 (d). I believe that is an erroneous interpretation. I should like to say that indications have come to me that a great deal of erroneous information has been sent out by certain people with respect to this bill.

Mr. MORSE. That representation was also made to me. That is why I am raising the question on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. We must have on the record the answer to such representations. If what has been represented to me is in error, I want the record to show it.

In my discussions with the truckers and loggers it was pointed out to me that in Oregon, for example, rather than having a legal limitation upon lengths and weights, what happens is that the State highway department, particularly during the war, granted a good many permits for lengths and load weights over and above the basic or maximum weights which theretofore had been allowed. That has become the practice in Oregon, and apparently in some other Western States. It has become the practice to grant to vehicles hauling within those States permits which allow them to exceed, so it is contended, the weights and lengths which would be permissible under section 2 (d).

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The section to which the Senator refers would not alter that situation. I take it that what he refers to is done now in the State of Oregon in accordance with the law of the State of Oregon. The amendment would not in any way change that. It would not in any way undertake to persuade the State to change it. Permits are necessary in unusual cases, but the provisions of the bill would not in any way affect the present Oregon law on the subject.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have here a compilation of State laws with respect to this particular point. The State of Oregon now permits maximum loads of 76,000 pounds. That would not in any way be affected or repealed by this provision of the bill. What the provision does is simply to say, "Let us call a halt to the ever-increasing trend toward heavier loads, higher loads, and greater lengths." The taxpayers cannot keep ahead of the ability of the automotive industry to build axles that will carry heavier loads. There is some doubt whether the taxpayers can keep ahead of the ability of certain industries to persuade State legislatures to increase the load limits.

This bill, as has been said repeatedly, is the largest bill ever to be considered by the Congress, other than a war measure. We are undertaking to build a magnificent system of national highways and to place them to a condition which is adequate to meet the problems of national defense and our national economy. When we are undertaking in one bill to start a program which will ultimately cost the American people more money than have the combined wars which the United States has fought, with the exception of World War II, then it seems to me we should not only lodge in the Congress the right but also place upon it the responsibility of protecting the people's investment in this vital system of national highways.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon, if he will pardon me——

Mr. MORSE. This is very helpful to me.

Mr. GORE. I have never had any connection whatsoever with railroads. I do not now have any such connection, and never expect to have any. But I do have a very personal interest in the trucking industry. The small business of which I am a majority owner operates a fleet of trucks, some of which are a little bit heavy. We could make more money if the weight limits were increased. But I take it, Mr. President, that the long-term interest of the trucking industry, which is so vital to our national economy, rests in uniformity, for one thing—uniformity of weights and dimensions—and also, more importantly, in a fine system of national highways which will endure.

I believe the responsible elements of the trucking industry favor this amendment. I have talked to responsible representatives of the trucking industry in the State of Tennessee, who tell me they strongly favor it. Of course, there is always a fly-by-night operator who wants to make a "fast buck" by overloading. But he must be restrained, and the responsible members of the industry want to see such an illegal operator restrained.

I had not intended to ask the distinguished Senator to yield to this extent, but since the question has been raised, I wish to say emphatically that this amendment would not make illegal the operation of any particular vehicle. It does not fix Federal limits. It attaches as a condition to the 90-percent investment in interstate highways the requirement that the States either maintain their present limits, load and dimensional, or comply with the recommendations of the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads, whichever allow the greatest leeway.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I want in the RECORD, Mr. President. I want the contentions which are made, and the answers, and the Senator from Tennessee has usually been very cooperative in giving me his answers.

Another argument which has been presented to me is that, if we adopt this provision, an Oregon trucker who has a route from an Oregon town to a State of Washington town, may be stopped from traveling on the interstate highway in Washington to which Federal funds have gone, although he could travel on the same interstate highway in the State of Oregon. This would cause him to have a terminal on the border for the transfer of goods, or he would have to buy a fleet of smaller trucks, at great loss to himself, in order to continue transporting goods into the State of Washington. What has the Senator from Tennessee to say about that situation?

Mr. GORE. If that were the case, it would be the result of a law enacted by the legislature of the State of Washington.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from Oregon suggests could not occur unless that is the present situation.

Mr. GORE. It would not in any way be enforced by this provision.

Mr. KERR. If that were not already the situation the bill would not affect it, and if it were already the situation it would be by reason of the law of the State of Washington and not by reason of this bill.

Mr. GORE. I should like to go one step further and say that there is nothing in the bill which would prevent the State of Oregon from bringing its present limits up to the limits recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads. Let me remind the Senator that the Bureau of Public Roads now recommends design and construction standards to carry maximum loads at the levels recommended by the various State highway departments and concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads. If we are to start building roads costing many billions of dollars with standards and designs inadequate to carry the loads presently being carried on those roads, then they will be broken up. If we are to build them at standards adequate to carry the loads now recognized by the States, then we would be foolhardy indeed if after spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to build roads adequate to carry loads of those standards we should then sit idly by and do nothing and see the limits increased and the roads broken up again.

I repeat, that the long-term interest of the transportation industry is to have a national system of long-lasting highways. We can build them well, but we cannot build them to last under unlimited load conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have before me a summary of the principal State legal maximum limitations of motor vehicles. It is dated as far back as March 1952, and there have been some changes in some of the States; but, according to this statement, and judging from the standards set by the American Association of State Highway officials, there are 32 States—or there were at that time—including the State so ably represented by the Senator from Oregon, with a limit of 18,000 pounds on the axle; in 2 States the limit is 19,000 pounds; in 3 States the limit is 20,000 pounds; in 4 States the limit is 22,000 pounds; in 7

States the limit is 22,400 pounds, making a total of 48 States. But the majority of them at that time were complying with the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from New Mexico be willing to have that material placed in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the data to which the Senator from New Mexico has just referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of principal State legal maximum limitations of motor-vehicle sizes and weights,[1] March 1952

[Revised where later information is available]

State	Width	Height	Length, longest combination	Number of towed units	Axle load		Practical maximum gross weight	
					Single	Tandem	2-axle trucks	Combinations, maximum
	Inches	*Ft. In.*	*Feet*		*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Alabama	96	12 6	45	1 semitrailer	18,000	28,600	26,000	56,000
Arizona	96	13 6	65	1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
Arkansas	96	12 6	60	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	71,900
California	96	13 6	60	Not restricted	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,000
Colorado	96	12 6	60	1 semitrailer, 2 trailers, or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	36,000	26,000	76,000
Connecticut	102	12 6	45	1 semitrailer	22,400	36,000	30,400	60,000
Delaware	96	12 6	60	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer, or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	20,000	36,000	28,000	60,000
Florida	96	12 6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	20,000	32,000	26,000	64,650
Georgia	96	13 6	45	do	18,000	36,000	26,000	56,000
Idaho	96	14 0	65	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer, or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	79,000
Illinois	96	13 6	45	do	18,000	30,000	26,000	72,000
Indiana	96	12 6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	72,000
Iowa	96	12 6	45	1 semitrailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	60,800
Kansas	96	12 6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	63,890
Kentucky	96	12 6	45	1 semitrailer	18,000	36,000	26,000	42,000
Louisiana	96	12 6	60	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,000
Maine	96	12 6	45	do	22,000	32,000	30,000	50,000
Maryland	96	12 6	55	Not restricted	22,400	40,000	30,400	65,000
Massachusetts	96	(1)	45	1 semitrailer	22,400	36,000	30,400	50,000
Michigan	100	12 6	55	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	102,000
Minnesota	96	12 6	45	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	28,000	26,000	65,500
Mississippi	96	12 6	45	do	18,000	28,650	26,000	52,650
Missouri	96	12 6	45	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	28,600	26,000	56,000
Montana	96	13 6	60	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
Nebraska	96	12 6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	64,650
Nevada	96	(2)	(2)	Not restricted	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
New Hampshire	96	13 6	45	do	22,000	(3)	30,000	50,000
New Jersey	96	13 6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	22,400	32,000	30,000	60,000
New Mexico	96	12 6	65	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
New York	96	13 0	50	do	22,400	36,000	30,400	63,750
North Carolina	96	12 6	48	do	19,000	38,000	31,500	58,800
North Dakota	96	12 6	45	do	18,000	30,000	26,000	61,250
Ohio	96	12 6	60	1 semitrailer; others not restricted	19,000	31,500	27,000	82,000
Oklahoma	96	13 6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	98,000
Oregon	96	12 6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,000
Pennsylvania	96	12 6	50	do	20,000	36,000	28,000	62,000
Rhode Island	102	12 6	50	do	22,400	(3)	30,400	108,800
South Carolina	96	12 6	50	do	20,000	32,000	28,000	64,650
South Dakota	96	13 0	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	64,650
Tennessee	96	12 6	45	do	18,000	30,800	26,000	42,000
Texas	96	13 6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	58,420
Utah	96	14 0	60	1 semitrailer, 2 trailers or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	33,000	26,000	79,900
Vermont	96	12 6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	(2)	(2)	30,000	50,000
Virginia	96	12 6	45	do	18,000	36,000	24,000	50,000
Washington	96	12 6	60	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	72,000
West Virginia	96	12 6	45	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	60,800
Wisconsin	96	12 6	45	do	18,000	30,000	27,500	68,000
Wyoming	96	13 6	60	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	72,250
District of Columbia	96	12 6	50	do	22,000	38,000	30,000	64,650
AASHO uniform standard	96	12 6	60	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	71,900
Number of States higher	3	14	3	10	15	13	16	18
Number of States same	46	33	10	30	33	24	32	1
Number of States lower	0	0	35	5	0	9	1	30

[1] Variations from these limits for some specific items of minor significance are omitted.

[2] Not restricted.

[3] Not supplied.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Tennessee for giving the answers to the contentions I have presented, more or less by request, I may say, in that I did not have the information to supply answers to the contentions when they were raised with me.

There was one other point which the delegations raised. They said that the State highway departments were able to change the requirements by administrative order without the necessity of including this section in the bill.

Mr. GORE. The bill conveys to the Federal Government no authority whatsoever in this field. It does not vest in the Federal Bureau of Roads any power to bring about load or dimensional limitations by regulation or otherwise. It merely says to the States, "If you wish to participate in the program, by which the Federal Government is now willing to make the principal investment in the interstate highways—90 percent of that investment—then you must agree either to maintain your present weight and dimensional limitations, if they are equal to or above the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials, or not to go beyond those standards in the event your present laws are below AASHO standards."

To state it in another way, the committee did not desire to undertake to compel any State to roll back its laws, nor did it in any way want to dissuade States whose standards or limits are now below standards recommended by the AASHO, from bringing them up to that level.

I believe 14 States now have either weight or dimensional limitations above the standards for which the roads are to be designed and constructed. There was a good deal of sentiment in the committee to the effect that a condition should be attached that all States having limits above those standards should reduce their standards to the proposed level. After careful consideration, the committee decided that it would not undertake to persuade the States to roll back their laws. The committee also decided, as I have said, not to discourage States having limits below the proposed standards from raising their limits to that level.

We think this bill will help to bring about uniformity in the weight, height, length, and width of vehicles. It will allow the equipment manufacturers to

standardize their production in that respect.

If it is possible to attain this uniformity, the operator of a truck which originates in Florida and is headed for Boston or Chicago will be able to load the truck with the assurance that when it meets the standards it can transport the load in every 1 of the 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. That leads to the final point I wish to make, and which was raised with me. It deals with the reciprocity problem, which has been such a headache in the administration of the road program. It relates to trucks being stopped at State boundaries, even though they are operating on so-called Federal highways, because they are carrying cargoes in excess of the load limits or exceed the length limits allowed in a given State.

It was explained to me that some States have worked out so-called reciprocity relationships, while many other States have not agreed to such reciprocity.

Would the passage of the bill permit, for example, a truck from Portland, Oreg., which meets the length and weight limits of Oregon, to travel from State to State, to Miami, Fla., without being barred in any State because its length or weight was in excess of what the law of the State requires for its trucks?

Mr. GORE. We hope that that will eventually be the result. However, this provision does not fix any Federal limits, nor does it undertake to persuade the States either to raise or to lower their present limits. We think the provision eventually will bring about the uniformity which the Senator recognizes by his statement as being desirable.

The question of reciprocity or lack of reciprocity, and the lack of uniformity, creates many hazards. Perhaps no other State in the Union has had more problems in that respect than has the State of Florida. The trucking industry in Tennessee now has many problems growing out of the lack of uniformity and the lack of reciprocity. However, no assurance can be given that uniformity will be the result of the provision. It is hoped that it will be; and an additional section was included in the bill, directing the Secretary of Commerce to proceed with exhaustive road tests and to recommend to Congress, as expeditiously as possible, whatever standards of construction or standards of weights and dimensions he thinks are necessary; but also to recommend to Congress practical means, so far as he is able to do so, of obtaining the uniformity so necessary for the motor vehicle transportation industry, and which I think is desired by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. One of the most remarkable contentions made by one of the spokesmen was that under modern highway construction requirements, the argument that weight is a factor which should be taken into account no longer applies. It was his contention that highways now, under modern engineering construction, are such that the adding of weight to a truck does not produce any deterioration in the highway.

This is very difficult for me to believe, and somewhat challenges my credulity. Nevertheless, the argument is made that the building of highways under modern highway construction standards is such that no truck could, on that kind of highway, carry a load which really would deteriorate the highway.

Mr. GORE. In other words, it was difficult to convince the Senator that the law of gravity had been repealed.

Mr. MORSE. And also a few other laws of physics, such as the laws relating to friction.

Mr. GORE. I repeat: The standards for design and construction which are now recommended and approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials comply with the standards recommended by the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads. It is by those standards that the highways for which money is authorized in the bill are to be constructed. It would be an improvident Congress which would make a 90 percent investment in the national system of interstate highways, but would then take no move whatsoever to protect the vast investment of the people in such highways.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senators from Tennessee and New Mexico for giving me this record, which I shall use in a further conference with those who seem to think that section 2 (d) is a dangersous provision of the bill. In my opinion the Senators have made a record which the opponents must answer in order to continue to take the position that the section ought to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Oregon formerly was a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish he were still there. If he had been there at the time the bill was being considered, he would have had an opportunity to see the moving pictures which were shown to the members of the committee, indicating how heavy loads can damage a road. The actual conditions were brought before one's eyes. The tests shown in the pictures were made by the State of Maryland in the immediate vicinity of Washington. Words simply cannot describe the picture; they are not adequate to give a description of the severe damage heavy loads can do to a road.

The main thing the Senator from Tennessee was trying to emphasize was that there was no desire in the minds of the members of the Committee on Public Works to hurt the trucking industry. Uniformity in weights will help the trucking industry more than if it were allowed to raise its allowable weight by 10,000 pounds, because it will tend to insure the durability of the roads. Much money will be expended under this bill in constructing roads, and if the roads are going to be destroyed in 2 or 3 years, or in 1 year, will the trucking industry be better off? Are the American people, who, under this bill, will be paying 90 cents out of every dollar for the construction of interstate roads, to be protected, or are we to legislate in favor of someone who does not understand the damage he is doing to himself by overloading his trucks, and the damage which would be done to the American people?

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Tennessee, too, that my raising questions this afternoon does not indicate I am opposed to the bill. I am going to support the bill, but if someone can show me that the bill can be perfected in some way, then I shall offer perfecting amendments. That is why I raise these questions this afternoon.

I desire to remind the Senator from New Mexico that I served with him when he was the ranking minority representative on the Committee on Public Works, and he did a grand job in that capacity, as he had previously done as chairman of the committee, and as he has done once again as chairman of the committee. He is making a fine contribution to the work of the Senate by the bill which has been brought before the Senate under his chairmanship, and as a result of the efforts of the Senator from Tennessee, who has labored shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit me to say so, there were other features of the bill which caused the committee to decide to support S. 1048 instead of the so-called administration bill. The administration bill would have frozen the moneys for country roads, farm-to-market roads, primary and secondary roads, for a period of 30 years. We did not forget those roads in this bill. We know that they are just as necessary as are the interstate roads. We have plenty of respect for and interest in the interstate roads, but we must not forget that the farmer has to be taken out of the mud, even if he may not like that phrase.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am somewhat in the same situation as that of the Senator from Oregon, who has just yielded the floor. Complaints have reached me from my State, from persons who are genuinely concerned about various provisions of the pending measure and also of the so-called administration measure, which I understand has now been offered as a substitute.

I should like to ask the consent of the Senate to address some questions to the Senator from Tennessee, who is steering the pending bill, in an effort to bring about for the RECORD some discussion of some of the points which have already been mentioned, and also additional points which I believe have not been mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, if the Senator from Tennessee is willing, permission is granted.

Mr. HOLLAND. First with reference to the point just made by the Senator from Oregon, which arises under section 2 (d) of the bill, I have had from my State a great many inquiries and a great many complaints, and some mere expressions of anxiety, in connection with that

section. I believe the Senator from Tennessee said a few minutes ago, and with great truth he spoke, that no State had had more serious problems than had the State of Florida in this field, because we have had literally thousands and thousands of trucks moving our citrus fruits and our vegetables into other areas of the Nation to which we can move them, and those trucks have encountered differences in road structure, differences in reciprocity, differences in State law, differences in municipal laws, and differences in license requirements and in road tax requirements, which have been sufficient to turn grey the hair of any operator in the motor trucking industry whose hair was not already grey.

Several questions have arisen, some of which have been ably discussed between the Senator from Oregon and the Senators from Tennessee and New Mexico, and I should like to refer to one of them. My attention has been drawn to the fact that, while the bill would be made applicable only to interstate roads, in the first place there is in my State, and I think in nearly every other State heavy mileage on the interstate roads which have already been completed, either wholly by State or city expenditure or under the 50–50 program which has been under way for a long time. The question has arisen whether or not it is wise, or even proper, to impose a Federal regulation on a system which has by no means been constructed altogether by the 90–10 program outlined in the bill, but which in some States is much nearer completion than it is in others, and which, as I have said, has been constructed in different States by various methods of contributory financing.

How does the Senator justify the extension of Federal regulation to this field which is so unevenly occupied, nationwide, for interstate highway roads which are to be constructed on the 90–10 basis?

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator will not mind if I say that the bill does not provide for Federal regulation. It contemplates attaching a condition to the 90 percent grant to the States for the purpose of building interstate highways. As to the many hundreds of thousands of miles of highways to which the Senator has referred as having been constructed partly with Federal aid, and in some cases without Federal aid, I should like to call his attention to the fact that almost invariably those roads have been constructed and designed under standards which are below the standards under which the new interstate roads will be constructed, and below the standards under which the interstate roads have been constructed for the past several years.

The committee did not wish to attach a condition upon the grant of Federal funds for aid in the construction of farm-to-market roads because the heavy traffic does not move to any great extent on farm-to-market roads. The heavy traffic and the rapid traffic are the important factors. I point out that it is the speed of the vehicles and the rapidity of the passage of the vehicles at high speeds and under heavy loads which have a deteriorating effect, as well as the condition of the road itself, which is also an important factor. The committee saw no way to attach conditions, nor did it desire to do so, in order to aid primary, urban, and farm-to-market, or secondary, roads, because in that field we are still participating on a 50-50 basis. But it felt that Congress had the right and obligation to protect the people's investment in a project in which the Federal Government is making the principal investment, namely, 90 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. However, from the provisions of this section I note that in the beginning it would permit every State to participate; and I also note that the condition is in the nature of a condition subsequent, rather than a condition precedent, because in effect it provides that if hereafter the law is changed in such a way as to permit of the carrying of weights greater than those stated in the provision, then, from that time forth, no Federal money shall be paid on construction of the interstate system in the State which has thus changed its law. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. My interpretation concurs with that of the able Senator from Florida. After considerable discussion, the committee felt that we should erect a stop sign, and should say that somewhere, at some time, somehow, there must be a limit to the loads and the dimensions of the vehicles traveling on our highways, if we are ever to catch up, to to speak, as regards the construction and modernization of our highways, so that they will be able to handle the traffic as of a given period.

Mr. President, it may be that the committee has not done the wisest possible job in this case. I know of no Member of the Senate who has had as much experience in this field as has the able senior Senator from Florida. He has served as Governor of his State; and during his membership in the Senate of the United States he served for a number of years on the Senate Committee on Public Works, where he was very instrumental in bringing to the Senate and to the entire Congress major highway legislation. I sought his advice on several occasions, as the able Senator from Florida will recall, as we in the committee proceeded with the bill. So I wish to state that I appreciate very greatly the splendid contribution he has made.

If we have erred in some respects in this amendment, I solicit his aid in correcting it. We wish to submit to the Senate the best possible legislative proposal, and we wish to have the Senate pass the best possible legislation on this subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for the overly warm and kind things he has said about me.

I desire to call his attention to the fact that some States now have prescribed limits which in my opinion are too high for safe and secure operation of vehicles upon the highways and for the long life of the highway. Furthermore, I desire to point out that the proposed provision will not correct that situation, but, instead, will perpetuate it. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Tennessee realizes that is the case.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly concur in the statement of the able Senator from Florida that it will permit that condition to continue, and will not correct it. I do not think I could go so far as to say that the provision would perpetuate the condition. It would permit of its perpetuation.

I wish to say in all candor that in the committee there was sentiment—and I am not sure it was not majority sentiment—to have this condition attach more severely. I shall go a little further, and shall say that I believe that in the committee there may have been majority sentiment in favor of attaching to the 90 percent grants a condition that all States comply with the standards in accordance with which these roads are to be designed and constructed.

I asked the committee not to do that. Perhaps I was in error. However, I felt that this was the first time the Federal Government had undertaken to bring about some uniformity and to encourage the States to develop a pattern of uniformity and a pattern of realistic limits on loads and dimensions; and I believe that the Congress should, if possible, do so in a way which it can defend against all reasonable criticism. Perhaps we should have gone further.

At any rate, after much discussion, the committee finally decided to report to the Senate a measure which would not compel the States to roll back their laws, but would permit their existing laws to stand, and would permit the funds to continue to flow into the interstate system, and would permit other States to raise their limits up to the standards recommended by the Association of State Highway officials and the standards in accordance with which the highways are to be constructed, in terms of the loads to be carried.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that perhaps some attention should be given to the point I have just made, namely, that in the States where the limits are very high—and too high, I believe——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to concur in that statement by the able senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I was saying, Mr. President, I believe that some attention should be given to the point I have just made, namely, that in the States where the limits are very high—in fact, too high, I believe—the situation will be left as it is.

Secondly, I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to the fact that even where some relief is to be given to States whose limits are now too low, according to my judgment, not sufficient relief is provided by the standard employed. That is the 1946 standard, as suggested and recommended by the American Association of Highway Officials, and followed, likewise, by the Bureau of Public Roads, in the case of heavy-duty highway construction, but not necessarily the construction of heavy-duty highways of the type which it is proposed to build for this brandnew mileage on the interstate system of highways. So it seems

to me there is grave question as to the adequacy of the treatment now proposed.

Having in mind the grave questions I have mentioned, it seems to me that it would be wholly unwise for the Federal Government to go into this field, because I believe that would encourage and almost surely would bring on such things as the following:

First, a Federal speed law. I believe that the harm done to the roads by heavy traffic travelling at high rates of speed is greater than the harm done by great weight, in and of itself.

Second, whether hordes of Federal inspectors and policemen would not be on the roads, checking on such matters as speeding, size, weight limits, and length and width.

Third, whether the continued operation of very heavy buses, which now exist by the thousands over the Nation, would not actually be legalized in such a way as to permit the States to continue to receive aid, under this measure, for their interstate mileage. In that respect, I refer to buses of a width and height greater than those prescribed by the American Association of Highway Officials. Such buses operate on city streets which have been built heavy enough to carry them, although such streets are a part of the interstate system.

It seems to me the objectives are certainly sound. But I believe that the possible ill effects and the lack of good effects to flow from this provision are so many, and cause so much doubt as to its wisdom, that in my opinion it would be sounder for us to deal with this situation by reciting—and I believe that is done elsewhere in the bill—the concern of the Congress, and the fact that a survey is underway. Even though it may not be underway on the scale on which we believe it should be made, at least let us have the survey made. Then, in the case of highways built in major part with Federal funds, in the event the facts show that those highways are being traveled upon in such a way as to destroy them with undue rapidity, either because of the weight of the vehicles or because of the speed of the vehicles or because of the other factors which destroy highways, the Congress could call attention to the fact that remedial legislation would be enacted or at least would be possible. Then we could determine where we should go from there.

We are embarking on a very worthwhile venture, which will require a good many years. Facts will be developed in connection with it as we move along. It seems to me that for us to try to put something in a bill which is of doubtful effect, and may be hurtful instead of helpful in some areas, would be certain to cause grave questions to arise in certain localities, and would be of very doubtful wisdom.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may comment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Florida is one of the truly fine and able logicians in the Senate. I usually follow his logic step by step with admiration, and, for the most part, eventually with agreement.

I cannot exactly follow him in this instance, however, when he says, first, that the provision recommended by the committee is inadequate, and therefore we should not enter this field at all.

I concede it may be inadequate. I concede that there are States now with limitations, both as to dimensions and as to weight, which, in relation to the standards by which the roads are to be constructed, are already too high. It may be that the committee should have brought to the Senate a provision which would have required reduction of the legal limits to permit those States to qualify for this program. However, for reasons which I have already cited, we concluded not to do so, but to bring to the Senate a provision which could be defended in all respects, in the opinion of the committee, as being reasonable.

The Senator from Florida says that the standards were adopted in 1946. That is true; but the standards recommended are consonant with the engineering, design, and construction standards employed at the present time.

The Senator from Florida made one further point, and that is that we had directed the Secretary of Commerce to proceed with certain tests. We have; and we thought that was a wise step. We thought it also wise to undertake to maintain the present limits so long as they do not go beyond the standards we establish in the act, until we get a report on these studies and tests. It may well be that the Congress will then wish to adopt a different provision. It may well be that the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway officials will recommend different standards. But it would seem to be the part of wisdom—at least it so appeared to the committee—that, pending the making of such tests, which will require a period of 4 to 6 years, we should attach conditions which would preserve the people's vast investment in this national highway system.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

In closing I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator has recognized, as I was sure he would, because of his candor, that the standards prescribed by the bill are inadequate.

He has also recognized that the standards prescribed are nonuniform, in that, in every case in which the State statute permits greater weight, greater height, or greater length of vehicle than prescribed in the 1946 recommendations of the AASHO, those higher standards prevail. They are not uniform, as the distinguished Senator well knows.

So it seems to the Senator from Florida that the result of the enactment of this measure would be to prescribe a standard which is stated by the sponsors of the bill to be inadequate, which is known by all to be nonuniform, and which—and this is the main point I make—in the anxiety of many people, would simply be an opening step to federalization of the enforcement of highway travel regulations, to a degree we have not seen heretofore. I believe that most States are desirous of avoiding such a situation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee does not know how the Federal Government could quickly bring about uniformity in weight and dimensional limitations, except through enactment of a Federal statute providing such limitations as Federal law. That would place the Federal Government in the position of exercising police power upon the roads within our various States. The committee regarded this step as repugnant. We did not propose any such step.

As I have said to the Senator, I readily acknowledge that the provisions we have recommended may be inadequate in some respects, but we think it is vastly preferable to doing nothing at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator also recognize that the standard sought to be imposed is nonuniform, and would permit 1 State to secure matching funds for its interstate highway mileage on a 90–10 basis, on conditions under which another State would be refused the opportunity to accept such funds?

Mr. GORE. In the case of the 14 States with weight limitations above the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials, it would operate to permit States with limits above those of other States to obtain these funds——

Mr. HOLLAND. And would deny to the other 34 States the right to obtain the same Federal help on a 90–10 basis for the construction of their interstate mileage, if in the wisdom—or unwisdom—of their legislatures, they should raise their now existing limits to the limits of the 14 States, or any of them, which are above the standards set by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. GORE. That is true; and the committee reached that decision after due deliberation. We did not wish to bring to the Senate a repressive measure. We did not wish to bring to the Senate a provision which would require States to roll back their laws. As one member of the committee, I would hope that the States now permitting weights and dimensions above those standards would recognize that it is in the interest of the State, in the interest of the motor vehicle transportation industry, and certainly in the interest of preserving good roads, to roll back their laws to the standards. I inquire of the Senator just how he would propose that we bring about national uniformity with respect to weights and measures.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has made no recommendation along that line, except that the subject be studied, and that the States be apprised of the fact that it is being studied and that the Congress has in mind going into a field which we would very reluctantly enter. The Senator from Florida thinks that would bring more pressure to bear than would the enactment of a law which would permit 14 States to receive Federal money on terms which we now believe, from the best information we have, to be unsound terms.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senate would give very careful consideration to an amendment, offered by the Senator from Florida, which attached to the use of the funds the condition that all States comply with the standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials. I would not be in a position to vote for the amendment, but I am not sure that I would be entirely out of sympathy with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Florida would not offer such an amendment, because he does not believe the present state of the facts and the present state of the law permit the working out of anything in this field which would be fair as between the States. The Senator from Florida further believes that the admission of his friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, to the effect that the provision under discussion is inadequate and nonuniform as between States generally rather clearly proves that it cannot be fair in its present form.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Florida would change his word "admission" to "acknowledgment."

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to change the statement to read that the Senator from Tennessee acknowledges or concedes. The effect is the same. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee pursues a fine objective, and in so doing admits or concedes or acknowledges the two facts which I believe prevent the legislation from being sound; namely, that it is inadequate to do what he wants it to do and, second, that it is nonuniform as between the States, recognizing as he does, that that leaves us in the position of granting sums of money to certain States in which, under this provision in the bill, there is grave doubt whether the money would be wisely expended.

Mr. GORE. It is precisely upon that illogical premise—if I may respectfully describe it as such—that I believe my able friend perhaps trips himself in an unusual manner. He says, first, that the measure is inadequate. He criticizes the measure because it does not provide a perfect cure to all the ills. Because it does not provide a perfect cure to all the ills, he says we should not undertake to provide any cure at all, or to do anything at all, because we do not do all that is necessary to be done. I am unable to follow the Senator there.

I believe there is a very grave problem involved. I do not believe that the provision recommended by the committee is a perfect solution. However, I do not think we can ignore the problem merely because we are unable to recommend a perfect solution. Nor do I think we can abstain from attempting to do something merely on the ground that we cannot do a perfect job at the present time. It seems to me that, on the contrary, now is the time to give warning to the States. Now is the time to let them know that Congress is giving very careful consideration to this problem, and that it has directed the Secretary of Commerce to proceed with these exhaustive tests and to transmit to Congress his findings and recommendations in order that Congress may attain some uniformity and safeguard the people's investment.

Meanwhile, however, unless Congress does take some acton, the horse may be out of the barn.

Mr. HOLLAND. Meanwhile, if I understand the situation, we will be making grants to 14 States on terms which we would deny to any of the other 34 States if they tried to claim them on those terms, and on terms which they say are so high that they are fearful of the soundness of the investment being made.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Florida would yield so that I may ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee some questions, provided the Senator from Florida does not lose thereby the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. With that understanding, I am glad to yield.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator from Florida has commented on some dangers which may come about because of a lack of uniformity, and the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that a warning is being given to the various States.

I am advised it is more than a warning so far as the State of Nevada is concerned. The proposal made, if enacted, would practically put the whole trucking industry in Nevada out of business. I say that because in the State of Nevada there is no statute with respect to weights and lengths. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the State of California has a height limitation of 13 feet, 6 inches, and a length limitation of 60 feet. The recommended AASHO standard is a height of 12 feet, 6 inches, and a length of 50 feet. In Utah the height limitation is 14 feet, and the length limitation is 60 feet.

If a truck leaves Utah and enters Nevada, how does it comply with the provisions of section 2 (d)?

Mr. GORE. Section 2 (d) does not in and of itself create or provide any limits. I believe the Senator has pointed to a very real problem, to wit, where a State now does not have a limitation on height or length.

Mr. HOLLAND. And which—if I may interject—has trucks that go freely over the border eastward into Utah and westward and southward into California, and most of whose business must go in one direction or another.

Mr. BIBLE. I use the example because the State of Nevada has for many years attempted to bring itself into uniformity with western State associations, State highway engineering officials, and the American Association of State Highway Officials, but the State has not enacted legislation because of the divergence between the limitations imposed by the State of Utah and the State of California, to use two examples.

The same thing is true with respect to the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. They also have different height and length limitations.

I should like to know what would happen to Nevada's requests for interstate funds if it has no statute on that point. If it must fall back on the AASHO measurements, it cannot permit any trucks to come into Nevada from New Mexico or Oregon, for example.

Mr. GORE. It would appear to me that there is no problem at all, because so long as the State maintains its present law it can fully comply. Nevada has no law. All it needs to do is to continue in that category.

Mr. BIBLE. Is the distinguished Senator from Tennessee willing to have that fact spelled out in the law, so that there will be no question about it?

Mr. GORE. I believe it is already spelled out in the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator point to that provision?

Mr. GORE. I refer the Senator to page 7 of the bill. I read as follows:

> (d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955.

That is the answer to the Senator's question. All that Nevada need do is to keep its legislature out of session or keep it from doing anything in that regard.

Mr. BIBLE. Why not provide that in the event there is no law, alternative No. 2 does not apply? Some people in my State are fearful that alternative No. 2 would apply.

Mr. GORE. I know that some people are disturbed about it. However, in line 16 the bill reads:

> In excess of the greater of—

Alternative 1 or alternative 2. I have read alternative 1. No. 2 spells out the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. BIBLE. Nevada has no law on height. California provides a height of 13 feet 6 inches. The maximum recommended by AASHO is 12 feet 6 inches.

Mr. GORE. So long as Nevada maintains its present law, it compiles fully with this section. If the State of Nevada has no limit on height, and if it does not enact any law on that point, it complies fully with the provisions of this bill. I must concede that here again is another example of a situation in which this bill, if enacted, may not bring about uniformity. However, it certainly does not enforce uniformity, and that is what the committee refused to do. We did not want to attempt, certainly not at this stage, to enforce a national uniform code on weights and sizes of vehicles. It may become necessary to do so after the tests are completed, unless there is cooperation and compliance with the provisions of the bill. I personally hope it will not be necessary.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BIBLE. I think it partially answers it. I am not so much worried about the warning as about the legalistic facts which may be presented.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me for asking questions of the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to be abundantly assured that if the bill becomes law there will be no problem

about Nevada's failure to have a law on the question of height and length precluding her from receiving funds.

Mr. GORE. I point out that in line 19 the language reads "under laws in effect in such State." The provision is not limited to specific dimensional law; it does not specify weight law; it refers to laws in effect in such States. As I understand, a truck height corresponding to that which is legal in California is now legal in the State of Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. But there is no law on that particular subject.

Mr. GORE. I cannot see how Nevada's right would be jeopardized in the situation stated by the Senator.

Mr. BIBLE. I will say to the Senator that it would be embarrassing for me to go home and discover that funds for interstate roads are no longer available. Certainly the authority can be spelled out in this particular provision of the bill.

Mr. GORE. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator very much for his answers to my questions, and I thank the Senator from Florida for his indulgence.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to have the Senator participate in the colloquy, because I think we are all trying to bring out the rough points in the proposed legislation, of which there are manifestly many.

The next point I had marked for question I shall not go into, because I think it has been taken care of by the amendment striking out the language concerning advertising signs within 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way. Has not that been entirely eliminated from the bill?

Mr. GORE. Yes; it has been.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is another point which I should like to go into before the Senate takes a recess, and there are still others which I may want to explore in the morning.

I now refer to section 17 of the bill, page 20, concerning provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, with which, of course, the Senator is completely familiar, which would be made applicable to highway projects in the national system of interstate highways, that is, construction projects on the interstate system in every State. By way of a preface to my remarks I should like to say that while I can see how any earnest Senator would want to extend to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to those who work with their hands under public contracts; but I personally feel that we are now talking about a field of public works in which the provision is completely inapplicable as a matter of practicality, and to my way of thinking we would simply be loading down the program with an unsound and unworkable provision.

I will say to the distinguished Senator that in my 4 years as chief executive of my own State, to which the Senator has been kind enough to refer, we had to build a great many roads. It was in time of war, and we had to build a great many of them under force account because contractors could not be interested at that time.

We built nearly all the overseas highway to Key West under force account. From my observation during that experience, and in the State legislature, and since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have felt that work on road projects is peculiarly not adaptable to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires a level of pay the same as that which prevails in the same or similar industries in the neighborhood, and it also applies the weekly and hourly limitations which the pending bill would provide, and the overtime limitations.

For instance, let us assume a contractor begins rolling a section of road and it begins to rain, it rains a while and then lets up a while, then rains a while and again lets up for a while. He has his road materials hot and moving, and there is no way for him to shut off for the day. There is no employee of his who would think of wanting to quit at that time. The employees would keep right on, if necessary, until midnight or for such time as was necessary to get the job completed. When it comes to esprit de corps, few organizations which have come under my observation compare in the loyalty to employers and in the feeling of friendliness between employers and employees which exists in this particular field. Here they are, out on the road somewhere, building something that is very worthwhile from the standpoint of the development of the area. They are joint adventurers in it, and they will do their utmost to bring about the desired result.

It is not proper to put a business of that type under the hazard of having applied to it wages and hours which may obtain at some other point, in another direction. That is what would confront us, for instance, in the length of the interstate system in north Florida between Jacksonville and Pensacola, or is what would happen on the length of the highway between Jacksonville and Miami, between Miami and Orlando, or between Miami and Tampa. It is all impractical. Such provision has been omitted as a result of sound decisions made in this field by committees ever since we have had a Federal-aid road program.

So far as I am concerned, I am very strongly opposed to the continuation of this provision of the Davis-Bacon Act in the bill. I have supported the extension of such a provision as this with regard to ordinary Federal construction, such as the construction of public buildings, and I have supported a State law which is known as the "little Bacon-Davis Act," applied to certain State structures within the State of Florida. But I see so much difference between ordinary building construction and highway construction that I feel obliged to state my anxiety and concern at the inclusion of this provision, and my desire to eliminate it.

Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee would care to comment upon the provision and why it was included. I have read the report very carefully. One of the portions of the report which I thought was almost entitled to a smile was that wherein it is said that we are not going to confine the operation of the law to secondary roads because they often are away from civilization. There is no place that goes farther away from civilization than do many of the stretches of the interstate system, because they run clear across our Nation and through remote areas. So it seems to me that the justification in the report for this provision is very slight. Certainly, it is not conclusive or satisfactory from my viewpoint.

Does the Senator from Tennessee feel that this provision should remain in the bill?

Mr. GORE. First, in my opinion, the provision is not vital to a good highway bill. Regardless of whether the provision applying the Davis-Bacon procedure to the interstate highway project remains in the bill or is deleted, we will nevertheless have an excellent, vigorous highway program as a result of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one incidental question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that if applicable anywhere, this provision would be more nearly applicable to the urban system than to the interstate system?

Mr. GORE. That may well be, and I will come to that point in a moment. However, I have said that the provision is not necessary in order to have a sound highway program; and to some extent it may be regarded as extraneous to a highway program. Nevertheless, I think it is a wise and just provision.

Everything the Senator has said about the start of a project, about the rain coming, and so forth, can also be said of an airport project or of the construction of a hospital under the Hill-Burton Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act applies to both types of projects. It applies also to lease-purchase projects.

The committee first considered an amendment to apply the Davis-Bacon procedure to all projects on Federal-aid highways. I took the position, and eventually the majority of the committee also took the position, that we ought not apply the Davis-Bacon procedure to projects in which the Federal Government was making only 50 percent of the investment.

Mr. HOLLAND. What about projects like forest highways, highways in the public lands and national parks, and parkways, where the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost?

Mr. GORE. That brings us to the second standard which the committee sought to follow, namely, that those projects are almost exclusively far removed, not from civilization—I think the Senator from Florida was interpreting the report liberally when he used the word "civilization"—but far removed from industrial centers and large municipal centers, where, to a great extent, labor indigenous to the area would be used. It may already apply in those instances.

At any rate, the committee did not feel that in this act it should apply the Davis-Bacon procedure to the rural roads. Neither did it believe the Davis-Bacon procedure should be applied to projects

in which the Federal Government met only 50 percent of the cost.

However, the committee reached the conclusion, not unanimously concurred in, but agreed to by a majority, that unless the Davis-Bacon procedure could be applied to projects in which the Federal Government made 90 percent of the investment, then the Davis-Bacon Act might as well be repealed. Perhaps we were going a little far in reaching that conclusion. Perhaps I have overstated the feeling of the committee.

But we felt, first, that the Federal Government had the Davis-Bacon Act and was applying it to all purely Federal projects, unless there are exceptions which I do not now have in mind, and to many other projects in which we were making only part of the investment.

Second, we were undertaking a program of interstate highway construction in which the Federal Government would be making 90 percent of the investment.

Third, for the most part, contracts on the interstate system would be undertaken by large contractors and large contractor organizations, which perhaps would not have great difficulty in complying with this provision.

Those are the reasons, as I understand them, which actuated the committee in making this recommendation and reporting the provision to the Senate. I shall support its retention. Frankly, I would not want the provision to endanger the passage of the bill. I think the bill is more vital than the provision. I think, however, that the provision is just and wise.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to read for the RECORD that portion of the report to which I referred, because I think the wording of it is somewhat between the position first taken by the Senator from Tennessee and the position he may have taken in answer to my question.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Florida smile when he comes to the word "civilization"?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe we have that word to consider.

Here is the wording:

It is believed that the provisions should apply to projects on the Interstate System, but that some difficulty might be experienced should the provisions apply to the Federal-aid primary and secondary projects, many of which are located in rural and isolated areas.

Mr. GORE. I live in a rural, somewhat isolated area, but I have had a little contact with civilization.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee realizes, as I do, that this provision is not necessary to the enactment of an excellent bill. What I am trying to do is to get the bill in such shape that I can support it as readily as the Senator from Tennessee is now supporting it.

Secondly, the provision is highly questionable, because it goes into a new field, from which the Federal Government has heretofore steadfastly abstained from entering, even as to 100 percent paid projects, projects constructed wholly with Federal funds, either on force account or under contract. My understanding is that the Federal Government has completely abstained from entering this field for the reasons which I recited a few minutes ago, and I believe they are sound reasons, which make the highway-construction business so difficult to regiment in the way that most industrial and building businesses can be regimented.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe exactly as does the Senator from Tennessee. I want to support the provision, but I would be willing to agree to some kind of compromise. Would the Senator be satisfied if the language were to provide for the prevailing wage in the individual States through which the interstate system goes?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be better, of course, I may say to the distinguished Senator. I think when it comes to applying that kind of provision every time, and trying to regiment a business which simply cannot be regimented in the way a factory can be——

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator should not be surprised at the Government regimenting, because the Government is regimenting every day in the week.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; but we do not have to assist the Government in its effort in the way some officials of the Government extend regimentation to ever more fields.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But I believe this provision will not do anything more than to try to give to the human beings who work for contractors on Federal highways, and who are making plenty of money out of their contracts, at least a living wage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in the feeling that those who work on highway projects should earn a living wage, but my own observation is that the contractors are looking for the best men; and that a man who is lazy or noncooperative or disloyal cannot stay long with a contractor or with a State, if that State is building on force account. The highest degree of loyalty, cooperation, and satisfaction with the wage rate being paid should be required of a man who works on the building of public roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but a contractor is out to make a profit; and I am for that. He is entitled to a legitimate profit, yes; but not at the expense of human suffering. A contractor is like anyone else. If he can get a loyal, efficient man to work for 40 cents an hour instead of 80 cents an hour, he will do it.

But if the Federal Government is to pay 90 cents out of every dollar toward the construction of a highway, I cannot see any reason why Congress, in passing this bill cannot include in the bill a provision that one who labors, who toils, who will not make a profit, but who is actually going to construct the road, should receive a fair wage, and nothing more.

We love to brag—oh, how we brag—about the American standard of living. But the American standard of living is dependent upon our ability to maintain it. If a contractor pays a wage that will not permit his employees to maintain the American standard of living, how will the American standard of living be maintained?

Our only reason for including the provision was our desire to have a fair wage paid in every State; but I think an amendment can be drawn by which we can provide that the States shall fix what the minimum standard of wages shall be within their jurisdicaion. Let Florida control her minimum wages; let New Mexico control hers; let the other States control theirs—so long as we recognize the particular problem. That is what we had in mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. That kind of provision certainly would be preferable to the present provision of the bill, and I shall be glad to study any amendment which the distinguished Senator may prepare.

Mr. President, I have other questions to ask about the proposed act, but it is now 6 o'clock. I appreciate the attention of the Senators who have stayed here this overlong period this afternoon. I hope we can eliminate some three or four provisions of the bill, and then pass the bill in such form that we can get a resounding majority for it.

I may say that I am not unmindful of the fact that the administration has a bill in the Senate. I was privileged to know the contents of that bill, along with other Senators, prior to its introduction.

I think a very real service was performed in the suggestions made that the interstate system was being neglected. Senators may remember that I was the author of the first proposal in the Senate committee to put $50 million a year into this field exclusively, and we wrote it into the Senate bill, though it was reduced to $25 million in the House. I believe it was in 1950 that I proposed separate treatment of the interstate system, apart from the other three systems.

Senators will also remember that I supported ardently the effort by which we raised the amount to $175 million in the last Federal aid proposal. I was very strongly of the feeling that we should go even further.

I certainly want to have a measure I can not only vote for but feel is a culmination of an effort which I at least had some part in starting.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to point to one other step for which the Senator was largely responsible. It was last year that for the first time Congress raised the Federal share of the cost of interstate highways to 60 percent. The Senator offered that amendment in the Public Works Committee. If he will recall, I was the junior Senator on the committee at that time, and the vote was tied, and when my turn to vote was reached I voted with the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. I am glad he has reminded me of that. It was his vote, standing with my own, which had been cast earlier, and with the votes of 4 or 5 other Senators who felt as we did, that made it possible to have the 60–40 program which is now in the law. I am

proud to have been the author of that amendment.

Certainly I want this bill to come up for further consideration, on a final reading, in such shape that I can support it heartily. I favor it over the administration bill in certain respects.

I do not like at all the provisions of the administration bill relative to toll roads and relative to roads already constructed.

I am doubtful of the policy of the administration bill in connection with issuance of bonds and the creation of an Authority which would be just another Authority—with quite a bit of power, by the way—which would enter the picture. I doubt very seriously if it would be an improvement over the situation in which the Bureau of Public Roads has been the effective administrative agency insofar as the Federal Government is concerned.

I doubt the effectiveness of some other provisions in the bill. For instance, I think it is unwise for us to try to anticipate a 10-year program at one time. In the Federal-aid program we have always heretofore confined our thinking either to 2 or 3 years, but not more, with the thought that Congress should reserve authority to itself, with full power to review or extend or change any provision which it might feel should be changed, without doing violence to contractors, the State, the general public, organizations like the AAA, and so forth, all of whom have such concern in this field. I doubt the wisdom of a fixed 10-year program.

I particularly doubt the wisdom of that part of the administration bill which would encumber, by a bond issue, the proceeds, so far as they can be foreseen at this time, of all the Federal tax receipts in this field—gasoline and other taxes—without allowing any increase at all for a period of 30 years.

In other words, I see many things in the program which bears the name of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, which I prefer over the administration bill, and I have just related a few of them; but there are some stumbling blocks for me in the Senator's bill, of which I have mentioned, I think, 3 this afternoon, and 1 of which has been removed. I hope we can get the bill in such shape that we can all heartily support it, not merely Senators on this side of the aisle, but Senators on the other side of the aisle as well, realizing that we cannot, at one sitting, do a 10-year or a 30-year job, and that it is much wiser to do the job over the term of 5 years, as the Senator has suggested, so that we will have a right to review and extend it at the end of that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was absent from the Chamber at the time the Senator was discussing the objections to the bill as he saw them. I understand he disapproves of the bill as it was reported, one of the objections being to the provision which related to advertising. Will the Senator enlighten me as to the other specific objections to the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I mentioned one of them while the Senator was present on the floor, and one while the Senator was absent. One of them was the provision which is section 2 (d), for the application of standards, of a sort, though nonuniform, and not adequate to meet the problem. The second was the provision which was already been eliminated, and which I am glad is eliminated, relative to advertising within a zone of 500 feet on each side of the highway. The third I have mentioned was the inclusion of the application of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since the Senator has raised the question, I have no disposition to hold back until tomorrow morning. I shall be glad to place in the RECORD my thoughts as to the other provisions which cause me concern, so that there will be no surprise on that point at all in the morning.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I covet the support of the Senator, and I wish to call his attention to the fact that whether the Davis-Bacon provision remains in the bill or is stricken, it is a minor point in the bill, vastly inferior in importance to the vigorous highway improvement and construction program encompassed in the bill. Though we shall hope to win the Senator's consent as to all of the provisions, I am hopeful, in the event the bill does not conform exactly to his liking, that he will resolve some of his doubts on some of the minor points and give us the support which I know in his heart he really desires to give. And I wish to thank him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the warm invitation of the Senator from Tennessee—which is the way I interpret what he has said.

Let me state the other two matters I had in mind. First of all, it is proposed that the Federal Government pay up to 50 percent of the cost of relocating utility facilities. This provision would not apply to States where the State law permits that to be done. I pointed out that a great many States already have such a law; and the other States can have such a law if they desire to have it. But let me read from the bill the provision regarding the payment which would be made:

> Whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility.

In other words, regardless of whether the State law permits it, or even if the State law does not permit it generally because the right-of-way is held only by sufferance, it is held here that such payment shall be made with these funds, notwithstanding the State law and notwithstanding the preference of the State to have these funds go into the mileage of the interstate highway system rather than into the relocation of utilities in such a way as to controvert the provision of State law. I feel that such a provision is quite unwise.

In this instance, all the provisions which I regard as unwise are those which tend to perpetuate Federal control. I am very much averse to writing Federal control into the program, which has been a fine one primarily because of the independence of action which has been left to the States. The Federal Government has simply been a contributor. I know of no finer group of men in the States than the professional engineers who head the State highway departments; and I may say the same, generally speaking, of those on the policy level in the State highway departments.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the distinguished Senator from Florida give us an idea of how he believes this particular provision with respect to remuneration of utilities in case their property is taken away should read?

Mr. HOLLAND. First, let me say that if it is vested property, the courts do not permit such property to be taken without having proper reimbursement made.

The question arises chiefly where there is no sound and supportable property right, and where the utility is located on the right-of-way only by sufferance. If there is a property right and if there is interference between the public right and the property right, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, the property right may not be taken, even for public-road purposes, without due process of law and without the payment of adequate compensation.

The States know what is going on, Mr. President. The officials of the State highway departments know perfectly well what is going on. In my State they know that in California, under a different set of laws, reimbursement is being made for utility relocations, and the amounts thus paid are deductible from that State's part of the Federal-road-program funds.

So the legislature of my State, having had that matter called repeatedly to its attention, and knowing that the State needs new road mileage, has insisted that such reimbursement for utility relocation shall not be made from the Federal funds for the interstate road system. Instead, the legislature has decided that it will leave the situation in such a way that in a case in which reimbursement must be made—as it must be, if a vested property right is taken—reimbursement in full will be made by the State, rather than by using the Federal-interstate-highway-system funds, and thus diminishing the Federal Government's contribution to the interstate system.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In a case where a utility had gone to the expense of erecting poles and wires, and thus would lose all benefit of that expense if it had to erect them elsewhere, would the Senator from Florida believe the utility should be reimbursed, regardless of

whether it had been given a right-of-way?

Mr. HOLLAND. My very deep conviction on that point is that the matter should be left to the States, or to the municipalities, when such cases arise within the municipalities. If a property right exists, we know perfectly well that under both Federal law and State law, reimbursement must be made if a property right is taken. We believe it improper for the Federal Government to provide—and now I am quoting from the bill—"whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility," if there is a contrary provision of State law which states the wishes of the people of the State, according to their wisdom. In that event, the contribution of the Federal Government to the State, for the purpose of road construction, would be reduced up to 50 percent of the amount of the payment, regardless of whether a property right existed in such case, and regardless of whether the property right, if taken away, would have to be reimbursed for, under court order.

Let me say that the Senator from Missouri has brought up a case which is worthy of consideration.

In some instances poles have been located along the highway right-of-way as a matter of sufferance. In such cases the poles must be removed. I may say that the States must be very zealous to safeguard any existing property rights.

But even if no property right exists, the utility company concerned will not suffer, inasmuch as it is entitled to fix its rates on a scale which will permit it to make a profit. So far as I know—and certainly this is true in my State—the regulatory bodies recognize such a cost as a legitimate one to be figured and reflected in the appropriate rates.

Of course, consideration must be given to the fact that such rates must be borne by those who live in the area in question. They are the ones who are best served by the facilities which are installed. Regardless of whether such cases arise in Florida or in Missouri or in any other State, I wish to say that I believe greater justice would be done by having the utility customers respond by paying slightly higher rates, rather than by having the Federal Government impose increased taxes on all of us, to undo the will of the State. That is what I do not wish to have done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the opinion of the Senator from Florida, if a State decided it would not reimburse a utility for the loss of its property, could not the loss be expressed in increased utility rates, so that the loss would be borne by the consumers who would have to pay the higher rates which would be allowed for the particular electric current or other utility service provided? Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us say that if the State would not allow reimbursement, or if the State, under State law, could not allow it, that would be the case.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Furthermore, although, it may be strange to relate, it is true that several of the instances in which this matter has been called to my attention have occurred where municipal utilities were the ones affected, and where those receiving the advantage were the ones who owned the utilities and were being served by them, regardless of whether the utility concerned was an electrical system, a water system, a gas system, or some other utility system.

It seems to me that if complaint is to be made in such cases because of allegations that those who are served are required to pay rates which, in their opinion, are too high, then their remedy is, and should be, no farther away from them than their State legislature. I would not wish them to feel that they would have to appeal to the Congress of the United States, inasmuch as the various States approach this matter in so many different ways, and inasmuch as it is very difficult to reach a common denominator, whereas by local legislation, enacted by the State senators and representatives, the situation could easily be taken care of.

It seems to me it is somewhat in the nature of an imposition on good nature to expect the Members of the United States Congress—upon whose shoulders so many other burdens fall, and who have gone into this question during three sessions prior to this one, and who are attempting to strike a strong blow in support of the defense and security of the Nation, in terms of the interstate highway system—to go into this question, which can so clearly be completely taken care of back home.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fifth matter I wish to mention—and I have already discussed it with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—is the proposal, under section 12 of Senate bill 1048, to increase the mileage of the interstate system from 40,000 to 42,500.

One of the finest provisions of the legislation to give aid for the primary roads was the one requiring the setting up in each State of a system prescribing how that should be done, and then providing that until 90 percent of the mileage of the system in any particular State was constructed, there could be no additions to the system.

I will not say that that is precisely what we ought to have here, but I will say that if we begin this legislation with a force play under which we jump the mileage from 40,000, which was the figure set in 1944, when we are getting well under way, to 42,500, with full knowledge of the fact that already a group of bills are in the hopper to put new roads in this system, and with full knowledge of the fact that it is a good American custom for the chamber of commerce and everyone else to go out and fight for anything good they think any other community might have, we can expect a succession of drives for increased mileage and for increased recognition in this field.

It is my deliberate judgment that the wise course would be to leave the mileage at 40,000. There are still available some 2,400 or 2,600 miles of undesignated mileage within the 40,000 total.

We should leave the mileage at 40,000 and hedge the provision around with some protection against the drive which has only started. If Senators think this drive has force, imagine what it will be like when some of the 90–10 construction gets underway, and community A has it, and a neighboring community 30 miles away, of the same size and nature, does not have it. How anxious it will be to get into the interstate system. I can see confusion and difficulty, and all kinds of real trouble in connection with that point.

So, rather than extend the welcoming hand to increases, rather than increase the mileage from 40,000 to 42,500, without hedging it about with any restrictions whatever, my feeling is that it would be wiser to keep the mileage at 40,000 and throw certain restrictions around it.

If the committee feels that the figure should be not less than 42,500, in order that the new figure may not be interpreted as being an open invitation to communities, States, and people to ask for additional mileage in the interstate system, by all means the mileage agreed upon should be hedged around with conditions which would make it impossible for a long period of time for new mileage to be added to the system—that is, new mileage above any figure stated in the bill.

Mr. President, I have taken much more time than I had intended. I have unburdened my heart with respect to the things which were troubling me about the bill of the Senator from Tennessee. Some were of major concern, and some of not such great concern, but all of them have caused me anxiety. Each of them is reflected in my mail in one way or another—some by large amounts of mail, as in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act point, and in the case of the advertising question, which have already been handled. To a lesser degree, some other points are represented by only a few letters.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for his probing analysis of the bill on which we have worked since early in February. Undoubtedly we could not bring to the floor a bill which would be entirely satisfactory to everyone. It is certainly characteristic of the nature of the Senator from Florida to examine all proposed legislation carefully, but particularly highway legislation. I have previously stated, perhaps no Member of this body has contributed more greatly to the cause of good highways, particularly interstate highways, than has the able senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I take it from what the Senator from Florida has said that the bill does contain many strong points which appeal to him; and for that we are grateful.

I wish to comment briefly, even though the hour is late, upon the point he raises with respect to increasing the interstate mileage.

First, I remind the Senator that the country has undergone vast growth and development, and that vast shifts of population have taken place since 1944. The growth has been particularly rapid with respect to our municipal centers. There have been created new municipal centers unknown in 1944, which are now populous centers. I cite only one; namely, Oak Ridge, Tenn. A few years ago it was a wooded mountain. Today it is a rather large city; that is, large by my standards.

The Senator from Florida referred to the fact that there remain 2,400 miles of undesignated mileage. That is correct. 2,400 miles of the 40,000 limitation are undesignated. However, those 2,400 miles have been reserved for urban bypasses, circumferential routes, through routes, and interconnections.

Our municipal growth, particularly suburban development, has been so great that in the opinion of the committee those 2,400 miles are wholly inadequate to meet the demands of urban needs.

In addition, some 3 or 4 State capitals are not as yet connected by interstate highways. As the Senator knows, that was one of the stated objectives in the act which created the designation of interstate highways.

The committee was very conservative in arriving at the recommendation of 42,500. We could perhaps with equal justification have gone further—perhaps to 48,000 miles. The committee recognizes the cogency of the observation of the senior Senator from Florida. There will be increasing demand for interstate designation due to the 90–10 contribution by the Federal Government. The Congress must meet that test when it arises. That, as well as other tests, will grow, perhaps, as we proceed down through history. But the committee felt that there was justification for a reasonable increase.

We took one further step. The Senator will find from the hearings that, recognizing the danger that designations would be influenced by political pressures, the committee asked the Bureau of Public Roads to submit, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, the criteria which the Department would use in arriving at further designations of interstate highways. The committee also recognized that various bills had been introduced to have the Congress designate given highways as interstate highways. The committee thought it would be very inadvisable for the Congress to undertake to designate which of the highways should be interstate highways, and which should not be. That is a matter for decision by the engineers and the highway officials of our respective States, working in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads.

The committee may have erred in this respect. We do not claim that the 42,500 figure is sacrosanct. Perhaps it should be 42,000. Perhaps it should be 45,000. This recommendation represents the composite of our best judgment. I recognize the danger, as the Senator points out, of raising the figure at all. It may well open the floodgates. However, there has been a great deal of growth in this country since 1944, and I believe Congress will be able to resist those pressures successfully when they come.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the hour is late, but I wish to make a few comments for the RECORD on the pending legislation. I have had the pleasure of being a member of the Committee on Public Works for the past 2 years. It has been a pleasant experience for me. In participating in the drafting of highways legislation I can say that I have acted neither as a Republican nor as a Democrat, but as an American. That has been the history of the committee's actions this year and in the past 2 years which I have been a member of it. That is the way these questions ought to be decided.

I find myself in vigorous disagreement with some of the recommendations of the majority of the committee. I must add that I find myself also in some disagreement with the recommendations which the minority has made to the Senate.

In the position which I thus occupy, I give high praise to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and, indeed, to all the Senators who participated in the discussions of this subject in the committee.

Speaking for myself, I can also say that the recommendations which the Clay Committee, appointed by the President of the United States, made to Congress and the country are in the best interest of the people of the United States, as that Committee saw them, and are not geared in anyway to partisanship or to politics.

I was delighted when the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee, indicated that he held the same high opinion of the Committee headed by the distinguished American, General Clay, who appeared before our committee and urged the consideration of the recommendations of the Clay report.

I was struck with the conclusion which the Clay Committee reached with respect to the needs of the American people of an interstate highway system which would tie together the 48 States of the American Union by means of a modern and efficient network of highways, as well as the reasons which General Clay and his Committee gave concerning the urgency of such a system and the reasons which prompted him and his Committee to recommend its prompt construction.

When General Clay appeared before the committee, he said the interstate highway system in America needs to be brought to an efficient and modern standard within the next decade, first, because of the necessities of American military defense in the event—God forbid—we were to find ourselves in conflict, in war, at some time in the future. In such a situation it would certainly be to the benefit of all the people of the Nation for the Military Establishment to have available across the continent of the United States, a modern and efficient network of highways.

The chairman of the Clay Committee went on to say that the interests of civil defense would be greatly served by an accelerated program through Federal assistance to an interstate highway system.

He pointed out as reason No. 3 what certainly is obvious to Senators on both sides of the aisle and to the American people that a modern and efficient interstate highway system would greatly contribute to the economy of our people.

Then the General referred to the social aspects. He mentioned the appalling death toll from accidents which occur daily on our highways and which, it is generally conceded, are in part due to their inadequacy and inefficiency.

As I listened to the testimony, I concluded for myself that the imperative need of the interstate highway system ought to be recognized by all our people, and that any legislation passed by Congress this year should be geared to satisfy that need.

In their wisdom, the members of the committee who formed the majority—and it was a bipartisan majority—have recommended in the bill which is before the Senate a program which authorizes more money for an interstate system, but which falls far short of what a great number of distinguished Americans have urged be made available for that part of the program.

The bill, as reported by the majority members of the committee, also makes more Federal money available for allocation to the States for use on the primary, secondary, and urban systems, other than on the interstate systems.

Early in the hearings, at the request of the chairman, the Governors of the various States of the Union were contacted on the question of whether their States would be financially able to participate in the provisions of S. 1048 as introduced. Twenty-six of the Governors replied they would not be.

In all candor it must be stated that subsequent to the receipt of information from the Governors of the 48 States on that question, the bill was amended considerably. I participated in the adoption of many of those amendments. It may be that some of the 26 Governors may now look differently on the provisions of the bill. Nevertheless, I suggest that very little is going to be gained by increasing the amount of Federal assistance for the roads and highways of America other than those constituting the interstate system if the States have any apprehension about their ability to match dollar for dollar the Federal contributions. Thus I am completely convinced that the sound American position for the Congress to take in 1955 is that the interstate highway system needs rapid development with Federal assistance. That is why I accept completely the recommendations of the Clay Committee regarding the interstate highway system.

Mr. President, I think it was a week ago last Monday in the city of San Fran-

cisco that representatives of the 11 Western States met. They came from the legislative and executive branches of those States. I met with government representatives of my own State. They told me that among the States whose representatives participated in the conference only one State could live under the provisions of the bill which is now pending before the Senate. That State, Mr. President, is the State of California, from which I come. The representatives of the other States all said they could not live under it.

I have some documentation here which subsequently I shall put into the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the Senate. One of the comments made at the meeting to which general agreement was given was as follows:

The present program of Federal aid for primary, including urban, and secondary highways should be continued on the present basis with no change in allocation formulas of matching requirements at this time. This program may be regarded as one essential basis of the concept of equalization, and it is intended also to discharge certain special obligations of the National Government. Some States contribute more in taxes than they receive in aid under this program, but this is necessary and desirable in the interest of equity and of achieving coordinated basic highway development throughout the Nation. However, Congress might well provide a comprehensive review of national responsibilities for equalization and other aid to discharge special obligations.

Earlier, Mr. President, the State Legislature of California adopted a resolution in which it spelled out what it believed to be the essential nonpartisan American principles upon which you and I, Mr. President, and the other Members of Congress could draft legislation which would be acceptable.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that resolution be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 28

Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

Whereas the President of the United States has placed before Congress the matter of the improvement of the roads, streets, and highways throughout the Nation, giving special emphasis from the standpoint of national defense to the rapid completion of the interstate system of highways; and

Whereas there are now numerous bills pending before the Congress relating to the improvement of the Federal aid systems of highways; and

Whereas the interstate system is now recognized by Federal law as including 40,000 miles of highways throughout the United States but at the present time only 37,600 miles have been designated as being on said system, it being understood that that portion of said remaining 2,400 miles which will be allocated to California will comprise circumferential and other connecting routes in metropolitan areas; and

Whereas that portion of the interstate system located within California includes highways most seriously deficient from the standpoints of traffic volumes, traffic safety, and structural inadequacy; and

Whereas the completion of the interstate system from Federal funds would permit the more rapid correction of the remaining deficiencies on the public streets and highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation for the completion of the interstate system within the shortest feasible period of time, and that such legislation should recognize the following principles:

1. That the provisions for the Federal financing of the interstate system should permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

2. That the program for improving the interstate system should not interfere with the orderly allocation of funds for the other Federal aid systems of highways.

3. That the formula for the allocation of additional funds among the various States for improvement of the interstate system should be based upon the needs for improvement of that system in the various States, and that such formula should be made definite and certain, so that the various States may plan and construct said interstate system as rapidly as possible in an orderly manner.

4. That the provisions requiring States to match Federal funds for the improvement of the interstate system should not require a greater outlay by the States for such system than was required in amount to match the 1956 allocations for that system under the 1954 Federal Highway Act.

5. That the preparation of the plans and specifications of projects, their priority, and the handling of the construction work be substantially as has previously been provided under existing Federal-aid legislation.

6. That if credit is to be given to any State by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the Interstate System, the legislation be so drafted that such credits be taken into consideration in computing the allocation formula, so that no delays will result while such credits are being computed; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I point out specifically one of the bases on which the legislature believes Congress might adopt highway legislation at this time:

That the provisions for the Federal financing of the interstate system should permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

I believe in the wisdom of that recommendation. It is not too much for American engineering genius to look forward 10 years or more than 10 years and to develop appropriate plans for raising the level of safety and efficiency of the highways of our country. Take my own State, for example, Mr. President. It is 1,100 miles long. There live in it 13 million people. The interstate system in California runs north and south, and there are two avenues of ingress and egress east, one in the north from San Francisco, and the other in the south from Los Angeles. They are not in very good shape. If they were to attempt to satisfy the standards which General Clay prescribed for a modern interstate highway system they would fail and fail rather badly.

In the opinion of the Clay Committee, the interstate system in California and across the country can be brought up to an efficient level within a decade. I do not agree with those who feel that that is too long a time for engineering planning to be made ahead.

I realize that the hour is late, but I wish to make one more comment, and that is with respect to the basic question involved in this proposed legislation. I refer to money. The money problem is important. The pending bill follows the pattern of past highway legislation. It authorizes Congress to appropriate money. After the authorization has been signed into law, then Congress may appropriate up to the limits set in the authorizing act.

Mr. President, we have a debt limitation staring us in the face. I do not know what this Congress or the next Congress will do with respect to it. I very much fear—and I say this with the greatest respect for my Republican and Democratic brethren who favor this bill—that we may be authorizing Congress to appropriate moneys which we will be unable to appropriate under the debt limitation which is now in force and effect.

I feel sure that the Clay Committee had all the fiscal facts of the Government of the United States in mind when it made a recommendation that Congress create an agency empowered to sell revenue bonds, and that those bonds would be retired from gasoline revenues as they came into the Treasury. The reason why they urged revenue bonds is because they did not want to make them general obligation bonds and run head on into the debt-limitation provision. There is nothing illegal or unethical about that type of bond. The people of California have sold revenue bonds from time to time for the very reason that they did not want to collide head on with the debt limitation of the constitution of my State.

How is that method of financing justified in this instance, Mr. President? I justify it, because, very frankly, in my judgment, we face an emergency in America with respect to highways, which are needed across the land, and, therefore, on the basis of that emergency, the one avenue which is open to the Congress of the United States to make available $25 billion or more to do what it is believed should be done is that recommended by the Clay Committee that an agency be created with authority to issue special, not general, obligations, which will not require appropriations by Congress and will not have an impact on the debt limitation.

Those two points constitute the burden of the few words I had prepared to indicate my own views as a result of serving on the committee. I hope the Senate will consider both of them.

I should have said earlier that, in my judgment, if the interstate highway system recommendations of the Clay Commission were to be carried into law, every State in the Union would then have available a greater portion of its own moneys, raised under its own State tax laws, to utilize as it desired with respect to the other roads, highways, and streets within its boundaries. I think that is a point which ought to be iterated and reiterated in this debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments which were made a week ago last Monday by Mr. J. W. Vickrey, assistant State highway engineer, division of highways, department of public works, State of California, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME FACTORS RELATING TO AN ACCELERATED ROAD PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA

(By J. W. Vickrey, assistant State highway engineer, division of highways, department of public works, State of California)

Any change that Congress makes in highway policy and financing naturally affects our highway operations in California. We have attempted to analyze the possible effects of a number of the current proposals on potential rates of progress, on our potential ability to carry our share of the program, and on potential benefits that may accrue. I shall summarize a few of these factors.

ABILITY TO CARRY PROPOSED PROGRAMS

We believe that California can carry any of the accelerated programs thus far proposed in this Congress, and could provide matching funds for any of the financial proposals. However, at a recent meeting with representatives of the 11 Western States, we were informed that a number of these States would not be able to meet the matching requirements under proposals which greatly expand the entire Federal-aid program. However, all these States would be able to meet the matching requirements under a program such as that embodied in H. R. 4260.

We in California favor an interstate system program, such as that embodied in H. R. 4260, for the following reasons:

1. We need to complete our highways on the interstate system as rapidly as possible. This proposed program, of all that have been proposed, would enable the earliest completion of this vital system of highways.

2. A definite 10-year program will enable an effective, expeditious, and orderly planning and construction schedule to be carried out.

3. While we have been concentrating a very sizable proportion of our State funds on the highways in this system, it is very problematical how long we can maintain this allocation. A separately financed and accelerated interstate system program is the only way we can see that can give any reasonable assurance of meeting the traffic requirements on this system in the next decade.

4. The benefits which would be derived from an accelerated 10-year program will more than pay off the expenditures involved. In other words, it is an eminently sound financial investment.

BENEFIT STUDY

An analysis of benefits or savings which would result from an accelerated program which would complete the interstate system of highways in California in a period of 10 years was made recently by Prof. R. A. Moyer of the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering at the University of California. Because the proposed interstate system would be designed to meet the traffic demands for a period of 20 years, and partly because the effective average life of some of the elements of such a facility would be about 20 years, Moyer calculated the savings which would be made over this period, resulting from lower vehicle operating costs, time savings, and reduction in accident damage costs. He found this amazing result: that the savings on this system in 20 years totaled $3,855,413,000. This figure exceeds by a considerable margin the capital investment ($2,533,335,000) plus the total interest which would have to be paid if credit financing were used with 30-year serial bonds, the sum of interest plus principal being $3,401,083,000. A review of Professor Moyer's study demonstrated that he was very conservative in his estimates. For example, he charged off the costs of rights-of-way, which of course have a much longer economic life than 20 or 30 years. Further, his study did not purport to evaluate national defense benefits, increased property values, and other general economic enhancements.

THE POST-10-YEAR PROBLEM

We note that the question has been raised, both by your committee and also by our own people, as to what would happen if further needs developed on the interstate system and no more special funds were forthcoming for this system for 20 years after its supposed completion. Our answer is: We believe our own financing could take care of it.

One way of looking at the situation is this—our present rate of financing is roughly adjusted to our growing highway needs, but we have a big backlog of needs—a large gap must be overcome. If we can somehow fill that gap and get current, our revenue rates should keep us current.

THE LIMITED ACCESS PROBLEM

As Mr. Durkee has indicated, we have had considerable experience with the limited access feature of arterial highway construction. I offer a few examples of the benefits that may be attributed to having a highway facility that preserves investment.

Just north of Sacramento across the American River, U. S. 99E going to the north, and U. S. 40 going to the east, formerly passed through the center of the town of North Sacramento. In October 1947, a freeway bypass of North Sacramento was opened to traffic. This freeway is approximately a mile to the east of the former location of the highway. It is constructed on a full freeway basis, that is, there is no access from abutting property and all intersecting streets and roads are at separate grades. The acreage price of land along this alinement in 1947 was $600 per acre. In 1949 it was $1,100 per acre. In 1950, $7,100 per acre, and in 1951, $10,000 per acre. Industries have bought large tracts and located facilities in the area.

At the same time, we find that the established business in the town which was bypassed continuously increased at a greater rate than other businesses in the county after the opening of the freeway. One hundred and fifty-eight retail establishments were studied on the basis of their gross sales. During the 4-year period, from 2 years prior to the opening of the freeway until 2 years afterward, the business increased 48.5 percent, while the same types of businesses on a countywide basis increased their business only 27 percent. Cafes and bars increased their business 13 percent, while the county average was a minus 1½ percent. Service stations experienced an increase of over twice the average of the county.

A similar situation exists on the so-called Eastshore Freeway leading from Oakland along the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay to the south towards the city of San Jose; 3.3 miles of this freeway were opened on June 1, 1950, and an additional 4.2 miles on June 18, 1952. After the 7½-mile section was opened, the traffic count was approximately 60,000 vehicles per day. In 1947 the acreage land value in the area was found to be about $2,000, whereas in 1952, it had increased to $11,300 per acre. It was found that the entire area along both sides of the freeway was being developed not only for industry, but for residential subdivision. The number of new industries far exceeded the average of new industries in other areas.

A third example involves a 5-mile length of freeway in the Los Angeles area, running southeast from Los Angeles towards San Diego. A 5-mile section was opened on June 1, 1953. The traffic count, shortly after the freeway was opened, was approximately 77,000 vehicles per day. A study of land values from 1946 to 1954 was made. Land values along this freeway increased substantially more than in other areas where freeways were not present, in one instance the value rising approximately 605 percent between 1946 and 1954. Industrial acreage in 1954 was sold for as high as $55,000 per acre. It is interesting to note that the value of the property was not predicated upon the distance therefrom to the nearest freeway opening.

An additional important benefit, which cannot be evaluated in dollars, is that modern expressways preserve and improve the general service values and investments along other and ordinary routes because they lift from them the burden of through movements.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

I should like to conclude my remarks by offering a comment on a phase of what might be called the management problem. We note that in H. R. 4260 there is a provision for a Federal Highway Corporation with a Board of Directors, which in addition to its fiscal and management functions, would act as an appeals board concerning the application of the act. In the past, we, and we believe the other States, have experienced no difficulty in working with the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce, and have been able to resolve successfully such differences in interpretation as have arisen. We have no reason to expect that the workable joint-management relationships which have been developed cannot be continued. We fear that this kind of provision, regardless of what bill it might finally appear in, would result in delays and undue controversies.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, those are the general comments I wanted to make on this occasion. I hope we will have an opportunity to consider what I believe to be in the high public interest, namely, an accelerated Federal program for a modern, efficient interstate highway system, financed in the only fashion in which I know it can be financed under the existing fiscal situation of the Federal Government; a program recognized as an emergency, which requires emergency treatment.

These Presidential commission recommendations are in the best interests of the country. I suggest to the Senate that they be the basis of our new Federal highway laws.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. First, I thank the able junior Senator from California for his generous references to me.

Second—perhaps I should have said this first—I thank him for the splendid contribution he made and cooperative attitude he manifested throughout the long deliberations on the bill. There are many features of S. 1048 which bear his mark. Although he did not finally find himself conscientiously able to support the bill as reported by the committee, that fact did not deter him in the least from helping, with all the fine talents he has, to make the bill a better one. As it comes to the Senate, it is the product of the committee, and in significant part, the product of the able junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I sincerely thank my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee. I do not believe I ever enjoyed working under a fellow Senator more than I did working under my friend from Tennessee in the consideration of the proposed highway legislation; nor have I ever received a greater education in a given field of Federal legislation than I have received in this one.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement for the RECORD.

Tomorrow, sometime between 3:30 and 4:30 p. m., the Senate will vote on the question of the passage of the postal-pay bill over the President's veto.

Following that action, we will resume the debate on the unfinished business, which is the road bill.

Tomorrow it will be the plan of the leadership to ask that when the business of the Senate is concluded for the day, the Senate stand in recess until 9:30 on Wednesday morning. At 9:30 on Wednesday morning it is proposed to have the usual morning hour. It is contemplated that that will be finished sometime in the neighborhood of 10 o'clock.

It is then planned to consider amendments which may be offered, and then the amendments in the nature of a substitute, in the hope that before the Senate recesses on Wednesday evening, it will have completed the consideration of the highway bill.

Again, I call the attention of Senators to the fact that it is possible, either late tomorrow, after action has been concluded on the veto message, or on Thursday or Friday, the Senate will take up the so-called blooper repeal bill, reported by the Committee on Finance. I should like to have every Member of the Senate to be on notice that at some time convenient to the Senate that measure will be considered.

As I have previously announced, when the Senate has acted on the road bill and the so-called blooper repeal bill, it is planned to adjourn or recess until Tuesday of next week. It is expected that the mutual security bill will have been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations in time for consideration by the Senate on Tuesday of next week. I anticipate that it will be necessary to spend at least Tuesday and Wednesday on the consideration of that bill.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 163. An act for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos);

S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry;

S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha;

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts;

S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri; and

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators wish to address the Senate, then, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast been our help in all our yesterdays and art our strength for today and our hope for tomorrow, may we now be inspired by Thy spirit and endowed with insight to know Thy holy will and courage to obey it.

We beseech Thee to lift us out of all doubting and disbelieving tempers and moods of mind and heart lest we become too willful and rebellious to follow Thy leading and too gloomy to hope for nobler and better ways of living.

May we yield ourselves unreservedly to the guidance of Thy infallible spirit and daily come nearer to what Thou wouldst have us be and do.

Grant that humanity may be blessed with a new nativity of faith in Thee, and with a love that seeketh not its own and a hope that will become the authentic basis and sure foundation of a higher idealism and a more heroic endeavor to build a civilization in which there is peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 153. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936;

S. 1580. An act to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government;

S. 1805. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States;

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on

the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–17.

LEGISLATION TO PERMIT MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES TO DESIGNATE THE EASTERN ORTHODOX FAITH AS RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district that I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Greek blood and ancestry. Among these is A. A. Pantelis, who served in World War I and later was one of the organizers of the American Legion in Illinois. He was the first commander of Hellenic Post of the American Legion and was one of the group of the membership of that post that made Hellenic Post such a vital force in that early period of the Legion.

Mr. Pantelis is one of many who have written me concerning a measure now pending in this body to grant servicemen of the Greek Orthodox faith religious equality in the Armed Forces.

Servicemen of the Greek Orthodox faith have served this country loyally and patriotically in World War I, World War II, and in Korea.

The Greek Eastern Orthodox Church has a total of more than 250 million communicants in the world. One of the outstanding Greek Orthodox edifices in the United States is located in the Second District of Illinois. I join wholeheartedly with others of my colleagues in support of legislation to permit members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference. There must be nowhere in all our country, and least of all in the Armed Forces where all Americans serve with equal ardor and with equal patriotism, any semblance of any kind of discrimination.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and its subcommittee on flood control may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

JUDGE SAM M. CATHEY, HANDICAPPED MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, today in a ceremony conducted in the auditorium of the Labor Department, an outstanding blind American citizen was honored. The President of the United States presented to the Honorable Sam M. Cathey, Asheville, N. C., the trophy as the handicapped man of the year. I witnessed this presentation and was thrilled to see one of my boyhood friends thus honored.

Sam Cathey was not always blind. He lost his eyesight at the age of 20 in a dynamite explosion while working on a road construction job.

To many such a handicap would have resulted in an idle life, but not Sam Cathey. He forthwith attended North Carolina State School for the Blind and became efficient in the use of braille. Thereafter he studied law at the University of North Carolina and graduated from that institution with a bachelor of laws degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key. Following the completion of his college course and his admission to the bar, Sam Cathey returned to his native city and engaged in the practice of law, and this with notable success. He was elected judge of the municipal court of the city of Asheville and has held that important office continuously for 24 years. Last Monday, May 16, 1955, he was again sworn in as judge of the municipal court for another 4-year term.

Judge Cathey's service on the bench has been outstanding. He administers justice with that rare temperament necessary to instill confidence and understanding. His counsel to the erring has been of inestimable value to his home community where he enjoys the affection, respect, and confidence of all.

Judge Cathey's activities for good have not been limited to the bench. He has been active in the rehabilitation program in North Carolina for the handicapped and has sponsored legislation to that end. He is one of the founders of the State association for the blind, and presently is board chairman of the North Carolina State Commission for the Blind.

The honor bestowed today upon Judge Sam M. Cathey is well earned. He has led and is leading the way for others to follow.

The presentation today was under the auspices of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapepd. This Committee was established by Presidential directive in August 1947. It was created to enlist public interest and support in the employment of the physically handicapped. The 81st Congress and the 83d Congress recognized the importance of the work of the Committee and sustained it by appropriations.

By Presidential directive and congressional authorization, the President's Committee has a twofold objective. The first is to provide a continuing program of public information and education for the purpose of achieving equal opportunity in the employment for the physically handicapped in public agencies and private enterprises. The second is to cooperate with all groups in the interest of the employment of the handicapped, including Government agencies, public and private groups and individuals. It is not the function of the Committee to provide employment placement assistance or vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped persons. These services have been assigned by law to the United States Employment Service and affiliated State employment security agencies, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and affiliated State rehabilitation agencies, and Veterans' Administration for veterans with service incurred disabilities.

The first Chairman of the President's Committee was Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired, who resigned in 1954. Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps Reserve, retired, is its present Chairman. Mr. Earl Bunting, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, is vice chairman.

The Committee's membership embraces approximately 300 national representatives of labor, business, industry, agriculture, religious, civic, fraternal, press, radio, veterans, handicapped, and women's organizations. State and Territorial Governors' committees and local community committees carry out cooperative programs on a year-round basis to enlist citizens' interest and support of the program.

In order to recognize outstanding achievement in arousing public interest and obtaining public understanding, the President's Committee sponsors several informational projects. Among these is the selection of the "handicapped man of the year" to receive the President's trophy. This trophy has been awarded annually during the past 4 years. The recipient this year, Judge Sam M. Cathey, as those in the past, is rightfully entitled to the recognition received.

ARMED SERVICES DAY

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago this House approved a national-defense budget of $31,488,000,000. As we voted that appropriation it was very difficult for us to analyze the tremendous implications of that many dollars. But on Saturday, during Armed Services Day here in Washington and throughout America, and wherever American forces are stationed, we could see the defense budget on parade.

It is very difficult to breathe life into cold figures, but as one witnessed the parade down Constitution Avenue, re-

viewed by the Vice President, who was there representing the President, and by key leaders of our country, including Members of Congress, and then later saw the challenging exhibits and demonstrations on the ground and in the air at Bolling Field, it made me feel deeply grateful to the officers and men of our Army, Navy, Marine, Air Force, and Coast Guard.

I feel that the RECORD of today should indicate our appreciation of the services of these men who are representing us in every country of the world today.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a statement I made at a recent meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee on Migration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a statement I made at the second semiannual session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland, on April 28, 1955:

STATEMENT MADE BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, ALTERNATE DELEGATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman, it is with mixed emotions that I address this distinguished gathering this morning. I feel very sad that our distinguished leader and a dear friend of mine, the late Ambassador Hugh Gibson, is no more among those participating in these meetings. On the other hand, I am very happy because of the report that is now under discussion. I wish to congratulate this organization on the splendid progress that it has made. In that connection I should like to inform the delegates and those others interested that the deputy director, Mr. Pierre Jacobsen appeared before the congressional subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman, and made a very fine presentation of the objectives of the organization and its accomplishments. By so doing he has lightened the load on the backs of those of us who are compelled to watch over ICEM legislation in our deliberative body. I wish publicly to thank my friend Mr. Jacobsen.

This organization has demonstrated what cooperation in the field of international affairs can do. It seems to me that we have virtually accepted as our motto, the motto of an organization hurriedly put together in my country at the beginning of the last war, known as the Seabees, a Navy construction battalion recruited from among civilians. This organization had as its motto "Deeds, not words." It seems to me that the accomplishments of this committee has forced us to accept these honored words as our motto.

Those of us who were apprehensive a year ago concerning the type of people that would be moved by ICEM have found that our fears were not sound. It is indeed encouraging to all of us to see that the type of people we are assisting to migrate is the type of people who pioneered in my great Republic and made it the kind of country that it is.

We are indeed very encouraged, but may I add this note: We don't feel that the security barriers should be lowered, nor that we should be less vigilant. After all, we are all faced with the same common foe, communism.

It seems to me that it is in the best interests of all of us to continue the cautious appraisal of ICEM's program that has made it succeed without much criticism thus far. The goal for the 1955 movements, I am afraid, is tied too closely with the program under the Refugee Relief Act of the United States. When this organization was set up, may I remind you that the object was to find new areas of resettlement. I trust that there will not persist an increased reliance on the ability of the United States to absorb greater numbers of people. We have been willing, and shall continue to be willing, to do our fair share in accordance with our ability to absorb people in a community which has already been very thickly populated.

I should like, in closing, to say that I feel that in Mr. Tittmann, our new director, we have a man who will carry on to achieve the same high accomplishments as was done by the late Mr. Gibson. I congratulate you on your selection.

STEAM LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the House, I want to protest personally the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission as a propaganda agency. I have before me a release on the stationery of the Interstate Commerce Commission dated May 18 for immediate release in which it says that the ICC will receive a brass engine bell marking the passing of the steam locomotives. This is to be presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission by the diesel oil interests of the Nation. I would just like to remind my colleagues, I think they are jumping the gun. There were 16 million tons of soft coal used by the railroads of the country last year, and I do not think it is any time to kid anybody or any industry by implying that they are dead, and that the steam locomotive is passing out of existence. I want to register a protest in no uncertain language to this kind of procedure and this kind of action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission in receiving this bell from an abandoned locomotive formerly fueled by coal. I do not think it is any part of the business of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I protest their action and suggest they cancel their plans.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. GARY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 610)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed, insert "one hundred and seventy-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$282,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,870,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$661,620,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$157,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOE MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and The Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,680,000 for the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides 175 passenger motor vehicles for the Internal Revenue Service instead of 150 as proposed by the House and 200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $282,250,000 for the Internal Revenue Service instead of $278,500,000 as proposed by the House and $286,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes House language relating to Assistant Secretaries. It is the expectation of the conferees that this work be liquidated to a point where the additional position of Assistant Secretary will not be required after this fiscal year. It is hoped the Department will plan accordingly in its 1957 budget.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 5: Eliminates Senate language providing for payments for special services.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $1,870,000,000 for "Operations" instead of $1,850,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,886,363,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $661,620,500 for "Transportation" instead of $648,000,000 as proposed by the House and $675,241,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $157,400,000 for "Facilities" instead of $155,000,000 as proposed by the House and $159,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $1,170,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,035,000 as proposed by the House.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments have reached agreement. We also agreed, as a special favor, to permit the Senate to consider the report first, and, accordingly, the report appears in the RECORD of Friday, May 20.

Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the action of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments results in a bill which totals $3,322,488,500, an increase of $39,935,500 over the House version, a decrease of $36,133,500 in the bill as passed by the Senate, and a reduction of $37,896,500 in the estimates.

For the Treasury Department, the bill provides $599,598,000, an increase over the House bill of $3,780,000, a decrease of $3,750,000 in the bill as passed by the Senate, and a reduction of $4,800,000 in the estimates.

In connection with amendments Nos. 1 and 4, the action of the conferees restores the funds for the third position of Assistant Secretary. The conferees felt that, although substantial progress has been made in disposing of the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the volume, value, and intricacies of the remaining workload may require the services of someone of the caliber and stature of Assistant Secretary. However, in the statement of the managers, the Department is advised that the Congress will not look with favor on a further continuation of the position and expects that the budget for next year will be adjusted accordingly.

Amendment No. 2, as agreed to in conference, provides 175 passenger motor vehicles for the Internal Revenue Service instead of 150 provided in the House bill and 200 provided in the Senate bill. Of these vehicles, 100 are for replacement only.

Funds for the Internal Revenue Service are provided in the amount of $282,250,000. This is $3,750,000 more than the House allowance and the same amount below the Senate bill.

For the Post Office Department the bill provides $2,721,720,500, an increase of $36,020,500 over the House version, a decrease of $32,383,500 in the bill as passed by the Senate, and a reduction of $33,096,500 in the estimates.

The conferees agreed to eliminate language proposed by the Senate, amendment No. 5, which would have established legislative authority for a change in the manner of handling certain phases of the postal deficit. It was felt that the entire matter of financing these special activities of a subsidy nature should more properly be considered by the appropriate legislative committee.

The bill provides $1,870,000,000 for the "Operations" appropriation, an increase of $20 million over the amount provided by the House and a decrease in the estimate and in the bill as passed by the Senate of $16,363,000.

For "Transportation," the bill provides $661,620,500, which is $13,620,500 above the House version and the same amount below the estimates and the Senate bill.

An amount of $157,400,000 is provided for "Facilities," which is $2,400,000 below both the estimate and the Senate bill and an equal amount above the bill as passed by the House.

For the Tax Court of the United States, the bill provides $1,170,000, an increase of $135,000 over the bill as passed by the House, which was contained in Senate Document No. 26 and represents the supplemental requirements resulting from the recent increase in pay for the judiciary.

The following table summarizes the action of the conferees:

	Title I, Treasury	Title II, Post Office	Title III, Tax Court	Total
Appropriations, 1955	$589, 955, 600	$2, 754, 877, 100	$1, 000, 000	$3, 345, 832, 700
Estimates, 1956	604, 398, 000	2, 754, 817, 000	1, 170, 000	3, 360, 385, 000
House bill	595, 818, 000	2, 685, 700, 000	1, 035, 000	3, 282, 553, 000
Senate bill	603, 348, 000	2, 754, 104, 000	1, 170, 000	3, 358, 622, 000
Conference bill	599, 598, 000	2, 721, 720, 500	1, 170, 000	3, 322, 488, 500
Conference bill compared with:				
House bill	+3, 780, 000	+36, 020, 500	+135, 000	+39, 935, 500
Senate bill	−3, 750, 000	−32, 383, 500		−36, 133, 500
Estimates	−4, 800, 000	−33, 096, 500		−37, 896, 500

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much increase or decrease is this over the spending of last year for the same two Departments?

Mr. GARY. The bill is roughly $23 million less than last year.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Of course, it is understandable that there should be an increase by virtue of an increase in the volume of mail being handled by the Department; also the item of $11 million, which the House authorized for the purchase of uniforms.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. So it is perfectly understandable that in view of this increased volume of mail, and in view of that authorization, the bill would call for more. I think we cut them a little deeper than we should have. If some of you folks have difficulty getting extensions on your mail routes, do not blame the Postmaster General because we cut his budget to the limit, and he will be back for more money before next year. If you do not want him to have more, that is all right. If you have trouble getting extensions and getting proper mail service, the country is building up, the population is increasing, there are new developments, and we need expanded service, and we need new carriers, and if you folks do not get them just blame yourselves. Do not blame the Postmaster General. I think, if you do get them, he will be back here asking for more money before the fiscal year ends.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Congress voted the Postmaster General $101 million more than he could spend last year. This year we apparently voted him $52 million more than he can spend. This bill cuts his estimates only $33 million, and in view of the record for the past 2 years, we feel that he can easily stand this cut. In fact, I think the Department could stand a much larger cut; nevertheless, we have agreed on this amount with the Senate and I ask that the House approve the conference report.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. In view of the most recent statement of the gentleman from Virginia, I think we should add this comment, that the Postmaster General did not spend all the money we gave him for the sake of getting rid of it and asking for more.

We have had a policy in some departments in recent years where they rush out and spend all the money we appropriate, in fact, they have people working overtime figuring out ways and means to justify a request for larger amounts. But we have a Postmaster General who last year did not spend the money we gave him. However, due to an increase in population and due to an increase in the mails, he cannot save as much this year. I do not think we should penalize him because he turned back money. He will probably turn money back this year.

Mr. GARY. I commend the Postmaster General for not spending all the money the Congress authorized him to spend last year.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. We have a new policy in Government, you know.

Mr. GARY. At the same time I think the Congress should be careful not to put too much temptation in the way of department heads, that we should give the heads of the various departments what we think they can reasonably spend, and no more.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. For 20 years you did not have any money turned back. We are embarking on a different type of program now, and if the gentleman from Virginia will bear with the Postmaster General in trying to do a good job and save a little money he should praise him instead of penalizing him.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman insinuate that the gentleman from Virginia has not cooperated with the Post Office Department? I think the gentleman from Indiana will admit that not only the gentleman from Virginia, but also our subcommittee, has cooperated most heartily with the Post Office Department and encouraged every economy program that it has instituted; as a matter of fact, we pointed the way to most of it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Based on the new budget, I think the Postmaster General will be back for more money, and I think there will be enough people of this House screaming for better postal service to assure his getting that money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the head of the Foreign Operations Administration, Mr. Stassen, would take the same attitude that the Postmaster General takes and not spend everything that is thrown into his lap.

Mr. GARY. I think the gentleman will find that he has a very large amount of unexpended funds, too.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, last year the gentleman's committee pointed out that the head of the FOA, Mr. Stassen, was rushing out and committing hundreds of millions of dollars just before the fiscal year ended, just so he could get rid of it.

Mr. GARY. I think that is probably true, and I am not certain that it was not done by the Post Office Department this year. Anyway, they could not spend all the money we gave them, and for that reason we are now cutting down somewhat.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM FOR UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "(a)."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, and page 2, lines 1, 2, and 3, strike out "No property shall be transferred under this subsection until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State."

Page 2, after line 8, insert:

"(b) Paragraph (2) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'No property shall be transferred (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) of this subsection), until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certfiication that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State, and no property shall be transferred pursuant to this paragraph until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such agency or official has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property.' "

Page 2, line 16, after "under", insert "Paragraph (2) of."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "educational purposes or" and insert "educational."

Page 3, line 16, after "health", insert "or memorial."

Page 3, line 23, after "restriction", insert "which occurred prior to the enactment of this act."

Page 3, line 24, after "is", insert "pending at the time of, or."

Page 4, line 10, after "if", insert "(1) such violation occurred prior to the expiration of such 1-year period and (2)."

Page 4, line 11, after "is", insert "pending at the time of enactment of this act or is."

Page 4, line 11, strike out "within" and insert "not later than."

Page 4, line 22, strike out "donated" and insert "disposed of."

Page 5, line 2, after "donated", insert "or disposed of."

Page 5, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the words 'Federal Security Administrator' and 'Federal Security Agency' wherever they appear in subsection (j) or (k) of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare', and 'Department of Health, Education, and Welfare', respectively.

" (b) Section 203 of such act, as amended by this act, is further amended (1) by striking out in paragraph (1) of subsection (j) thereof the words 'the States, Territories, and possessions' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'any State', and (2) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"'(5) The term "State", as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.'

"(c) Clause (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after 'District of Columbia' a comma and the words 'the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico'."

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, I think it would be well if the gentleman would explain to the House the changes in the bill that were brought about in conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that all Members are interested in relating to the donable or personal property given to our colleges, universities, schools, and hospitals where it has been declared surplus.

The bill also meets the declaration of excess principle by the Defense Department.

Without going into detail, which is unnecessary at this point, may I say that the several amendments put on by the Senate are either clarifying amendments or amendments of a perfecting nature. The bill has been very carefully worked out. The Senate staff kept in touch with the staff of our committee in the House, particularly the special subcommittee and it in no way makes any substantial changes in the bill as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENT TO FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 248, Rept. No. 612), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be

considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6063) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sixth sentence of subsection (a) of section 8 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 40–303 (a)), is amended (1) by striking out "as administrative employees", and (2) by striking out "administrative employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners who are legal residents of the State, Territory, or possession from which said Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners have been elected or appointed;" and by inserting in lieu thereof "employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, employees of the standing, select, and joint committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and all other officers and employees in or under the Senate and the House of Representatives;": *Provided*, That such employees are legal residents of some State and entitled to register their motor vehicles in such State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to explain this bill.

The purpose of this bill (H. R. 6063) is to grant reciprocity to a few employees on Capitol Hill who are eligible to procure license tags in their home State. This bill only applies to a few people employed on Capitol Hill whose services are only required in the District of Columbia during the session of Congress.

This bill makes it especially necessary that a person be a resident of such State and eligible to purchase license tags from such State.

We found that a few employees on Capitol Hill were not included in the act, granting reciprocity to Members of Congress and their employees, which this Congress enacted last year.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection particularly to the bill except I feel that perhaps the personnel that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia wants to include in it should be spelled out, not the individuals but the officers involved. I am afraid that the language as it reads now would leave the door wide open and would extend to the administrative branch of the Government, the judicial branch, or to any other part of the Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. This bill specifically states the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. KEARNS. Could the distinguished chairman tell me whether or not he had any hearings on this legislation?

Mr. McMILLAN. We did not, because it did not affect any person but employees on Capitol Hill.

Mr. KEARNS. Well, I would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to state that we had 16 members at the meeting, and the bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEARNS:

On page 1, strike out the last 3 words of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, and 8.

On page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and the first 4 words of line 4.

Change the rest of the page to read:

"Administrative employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, designated employees of the standing, select, and joint committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That such employees are legal residents of some State and entitled to register their motor vehicle in such State."

Page 2, line 4, insert "administrative."

Page 2, line 5, insert "designated."

Page 2, line 7, strike out the last 6 words.

Page 2, line 8, strike out all of the line and on page 2, line 9, strike out the first word.

Mr. KEARNS. Really, the meat of this amendment is the word "designated," whereby the position of whomever we want to put on in this category from the House of Representatives is spelled out. If there are only 10 or 20 people involved, I have no objection to it; but I do not think we should leave the door open by saying "all employees."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Does the gentleman think his amendment spells out any more than the present language in the bill?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes. My amendment is purely safeguarding.

Mr. McMILLAN. Just what would the amendment do?

Mr. KEARNS. Well, you say you want to take care of 4 to 20 employees of the House, designated by whoever wants to do it, the Speaker or anybody else.

Mr. McMILLAN. Anybody who qualifies.

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is included in this bill.

Mr. KEARNS. No; not when you say on page 2, line 7, "and all other officers and employees."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me that both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from South Carolina and the committee are in agreement as to what is desired. It seems to me that the committee has given careful consideration to this bill, and it would appear to me that the bill reported by the committee would be the best one to support, with all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania. His amendment might produce results that we do not desire. I am not in a position of opposing the amendment, but I do think that under the circumstances it would be wise for us to follow the committee in this case and not to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because certainly the committee has given profound consideration to this matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUST SALARIES OF JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the municipal court for the District of Columbia, to create 'the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–771), is amended by striking out "$14,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000", and by striking out "$14,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,500."

SEC. 2. The fourth sentence of section 2 of such act of April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–753), is amended by striking out "$13,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,000", and by striking out "$13,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,500."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–920), is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The salary of the judge shall be $18,500 per annum."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 47–2402), is amended by striking out "$13,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,500."

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 771), is amended by striking out '$14,500' and substituting therefor '$17,500' and by striking out '$14,000' and substituting therefor '$17,000'."

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 753), is amended by striking out '$13,500' and substituting therefor '$16,500' and by striking out '$13,000' and substituting therefor '$16,000'."

"SEC. 3. Section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended by the acts of May 16, 1938, and June 10, 1952, is amended as follows: By striking out in the second paragraph thereof '$13,000' and substituting therefor '$16,000'."

"SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (11 D. C. Code, sec. 920) is amended to read as follows: 'The salary of the judge shall be $14,800 per annum'."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and the salary of the judge of the tax court for the District of Columbia and the judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia.

Under existing law the salary of the chief judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia is $14,500 and the associate judges of the same court receive $14,000. Under the proposed bill the salary of the chief judge of the municipal court of appeals would be increased to $17,500, and that of the associate judges of this court to $17,000.

The salary of the chief judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, under existing law, is $13,500 and under this proposed legislation the salary would be increased to $16,500. The salaries of the associate judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia are $13,000. Under this legislation they would be increased to $16,000.

At the present time the judge of the tax court for the District of Columbia is paid at the rate of $13,000 a year. Under the proposed bill he would receive a salary of $16,000.

The salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, under existing law, is $11,800 and under the proposed legislation would be increased to $14,800.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to know from the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee something about this bill, something about the necessity for it. Will the gentleman give us some information?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; the committee reported out a bill increasing the salaries of municipal judges in the District of Columbia by $3,000. That would make their salaries, if the bill is adopted, $17,500.

Mr. GROSS. At the present time their salaries are $14,500 and the committee is proposing to increase them to $17,500 and to $17,000; is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is right. Ever since there have been district courts here, the municipal judges have received approximately $2,000 less than Federal judges. In this case they will be receiving approximately $5,000 less than Federal judges.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that municipal court judges ought to be paid the same salaries as Federal judges?

Mr. McMILLAN. We made a survey of 5 or 6 cities of approximately the same size as the city of Washington and we found the average salary there was $17,500. We adopted the same rate of salary.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman what was the basis for this increase? Was it cost of living, or what?

Mr. McMILLAN. We felt that we might improve the quality of the judges we have here if we increased their salaries. We think we ought to have better judges in the District of Columbia. We have some good judges here, but we feel that we should increase their salaries.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us, were hearings held on this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And what were the salaries paid judges of the municipal courts in comparable cities?

Mr. McMILLAN. We took 5 cities of approximately the size of Washington and we found the average was $17,500.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman tell us what were those cities?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, New York——

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows the District of Columbia is not comparable to New York City; the gentleman understands that.

Mr. McMILLAN. They receive more money there; $19,000, I believe. But we took an average. We took cities like New York, Detroit, Minneapolis; I think there were five of them.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much municipal court judges are paid in the State of South Carolina?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir; I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows that this proposed salary is fantastic as compared with the salaries of municipal judges in the State of Iowa or in his own State of South Carolina. Will he not admit that?

Mr. McMILLAN. I believe the salaries of municipal judges in the State of South Carolina are less than proposed here.

Mr. GROSS. Still the gentleman is for this bill to increase the salaries of these judges to $17,500 a year and $17,000, when they are already $14,000 and $14,500 a year. Does the gentleman know of any dearth of candidates for appointment to the municipal bench in the District of Columbia when vacancies occur?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir; I think there are plenty of applicants.

Mr. GROSS. And they are qualified men, too, I think the gentleman would say?

Mr. McMILLAN. We hope we can get better applicants, better qualified men, if we increase the salaries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be an unreasonable increase in the pay of these municipal court judges and I am opposed to it. If the taxpayers of Iowa and the rest of the Nation were not contributing millions of dollars each year to the support of the District of Columbia, I would be constrained to let the hide go with the horns; to let the taxpayers of the District compete with New York or any other city in the payment of lush salaries. These municipal judges in the District have 10-year appointments. They expend no money in election campaigns as do all judges and justices of the supreme court in Iowa and many of the other States. Throughout the country, State and municipal taxes are being increased but I am unaware of any substantial increase in taxes in the District of Columbia to compensate for additional spending.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for whom I have great respect, I call the attention of my colleague to the fact that Congress has repeatedly fixed the policy of setting municipal court judges' salaries at just $2,000 under the Federal courts and the salaries of judges on the municipal court of appeals at $1,000 less. When the municipal court of appeals was created in 1942, the salary was fixed at $9,000. District Federal judges' salaries were then $10,000. In 1949, the municipal court judges' salaries were fixed by Congress at $13,000 and the salaries of municipal court of appeals judges at $14,000, to correspond with the new salary increases of Federal district judges to $15,000.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this municipal court is different from any other municipal court in the country. Nowhere else is there a municipal court having jurisdiction embracing offenses against the United States Government as well as the usual local jurisdiction—general civil jurisdiction, and general criminal jurisdiction to the level of felonies as well as the usual magisterial jurisdiction. For example, in no other municipal court in the country will there be found a United States attorney maintaining a permanent staff of assistants.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield in order to inquire as to the jurisdiction of the municipal court, and, of course, the gentleman was just about to discuss that aspect.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. They have general jurisdiction.

Mr. JONAS. Up to what?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Up to $3,000 in civil cases, and up to and including felonies, and they are committing magistrates on felonies.

Mr. JONAS. I take it from the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota that the jurisdiction is limited in civil cases up to $3,000 and under.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is up to the present time. May I say in that connection, there is now under consideration, as I understand it, general legislation which will increase that up to $8,000. That is a general change which is being considered all over the country at the present time. We are presently considering before the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the

District of Columbia the question of transferring all domestic-relation cases and divorce cases from the Federal district courts to the municipal court here. So that it is a court which is completely different from the municipal courts of my State and the gentleman's State as well as the State of our colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. It is not to be compared at all.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, there is not so much difference between that court and the courts in our State if the jurisdiction is limited to $3,000 in civil cases and limited in its final jurisdiction to misdemeanors.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The misdemeanors here would be Federal misdemeanors which are considerably more serious than misdemeanors in most States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. In the State of Minnesota you have either circuit court or district judges; is that not correct?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. We have district and municipal judges.

Mr. GROSS. You have district judges?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And the jurisdiction of the district court judges exceeds that probably of municipal court judges in the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say to my dear friend that they have been raising their salaries much more in the State of Minnesota than they have in salaries of the circuit court judges in the State of Iowa. The circuit court judges in the State of Iowa are badly in need of an increase.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but will the gentleman tell me what a circuit judge gets in the State of Minnesota or a district judge?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Between $13,000 and $14,000 a year, as salaries as I understand.

Mr. GROSS. And they have greater jurisdiction than the municipal court judges?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is not comparative at all. Courts vary all over the country. There are some municipal courts where the salaries of the judges go as high as $20,000 per year.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Minnesota can tell me the basis for this increase.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Because it is traditional and in keeping with the salaries of the courts. We just raised the Federal district judges salaries $7,500 per year. Now they are bringing in a raise of only $3,000 a year in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this is a case of keeping up with the Joneses.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is a question of having some comparative standard as far as the salaries are concerned. It is traditional and in keeping with the policy followed by the Government. The salaries paid to the judges should be commensurate with the duties of the court. I do not see anything wrong with it. I do not think that they should be overpaid, but neither do I feel that they should be underpaid. They should be fully compensated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 33, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—283

Abernethy	Dawson, Ill.	Jennings
Adair	Dawson, Utah	Jensen
Addonizio	Deane	Johnson, Calif.
Albert	Denton	Johnson, Wis.
Alger	Derounian	Jonas
Allen, Calif.	Devereux	Jones, Ala.
Allen, Ill.	Dixon	Jones, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Dolliver	Jones, N. C.
	Dondero	Judd
Andrews	Doyle	Karsten
Arends	Elliott	Kean
Ashmore	Ellsworth	Kearney
Aspinall	Engle	Kearns
Auchincloss	Evins	Keating
Ayres	Fascell	Kee
Bailey	Feighan	Kelley, Pa.
Baker	Fenton	Kilburn
Baldwin	Fernandez	Kilday
Barden	Fisher	Kilgore
Bates	Flood	King, Calif.
Baumhart	Flynt	King, Pa.
Beamer	Fogarty	Knox
Belcher	Forand	Laird
Bell	Ford	Landrum
Bennett, Fla.	Frazier	Lankford
Bennett, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	LeCompte
Berry	Friedel	Lesinski
Betts	Garmatz	Long
Blatnik	Gary	McCarthy
Blitch	Gathings	McCormack
Boland	Gavin	McCulloch
Bolling	Gordon	McDonough
Bonner	Grant	McDowell
Bowler	Gray	McGregor
Boyle	Gregory	McIntire
Brooks, La.	Gubser	McMillan
Brooks, Tex.	Gwinn	McVey
Brown, Ga.	Hagen	Mack, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hale	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Haley	Magnuson
Broyhill	Halleck	Mahon
Burdick	Harden	Mailliard
Burnside	Hardy	Marshall
Bush	Harris	Martin
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.	Meader
Cannon	Harvey	Merrow
Carlyle	Hayworth	Metcalf
Carnahan	Henderson	Miller, Md.
Carrigg	Herlong	Miller, Nebr.
Cederberg	Hess	Mills
Chatham	Hiestand	Minshall
Chelf	Hillings	Mollohan
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	Morrison
Christopher	Hoeven	Moss
Church	Holifield	Murray, Ill.
Clark	Holmes	Natcher
Clevenger	Holt	Nicholson
Cooley	Hope	O'Brien, Ill.
Cooper	Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cramer	Huddleston	O'Hara, Ill.
Cretella	Hull	O'Hara, Minn.
Crumpacker	Hyde	Ostertag
Cunningham	Ikard	Passman
Curtis, Mass.	Jackson	Patman
Dague	James	Patterson
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Pelly
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins	Perkins
Pfost	Rutherford	Thompson, Tex.
Phillips	Sadlak	Thomson, Wyo.
Pilcher	St. George	Thornberry
Poage	Saylor	Trimble
Poff	Schenck	Tumulty
Polk	Schwengel	Udall
Price	Scrivner	Vanik
Priest	Selden	Van Pelt
Prouty	Sheehan	Van Zandt
Quigley	Shelley	Velde
Rabaut	Sheppard	Vinson
Radwan	Sieminski	Wainwright
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Walter
Ray	Sisk	Westland
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Kans.	Whitten
Reuss	Smith, Miss.	Widnall
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Va.	Wier
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Richards	Spence	Williams, Miss.
Riehlman	Springer	Willis
Riley	Staggers	Wilson, Calif.
Roberts	Steed	Wilson, Ind.
Robsion, Ky.	Talle	Wolcott
Rodino	Teague, Calif.	Wright
Rogers, Colo.	Thomas	Yates
Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, La.	Young
Rogers, Mass.	Thompson, Mich.	Younger
Roosevelt		Zablocki

NAYS—33

Abbitt	Forrester	Rogers, Tex.
Alexander	Gentry	Shuford
Andersen, H. Carl	George	Siler
	Gross	Taber
Bow	Harrison, Va.	Tuck
Budge	Johansen	Vursell
Burleson	Krueger	Watts
Cole	Murray, Tenn.	Weaver
Coon	Norrell	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	O'Konski	Winstead
Dies	Rees, Kans.	
Dowdy	Robeson, Va.	

NOT VOTING—118

Anfuso	Durham	Matthews
Ashley	Eberharter	Miller, Calif.
Avery	Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.
Barrett	Fallon	Morano
Bass, N. H.	Fine	Morgan
Bass, Tenn.	Fino	Moulder
Becker	Fjare	Multer
Bentley	Fountain	Mumma
Boggs	Fulton	Nelson
Bolton, Frances P.	Gamble	Norblad
	Granahan	O'Neill
Bolton, Oliver P.	Green, Oreg.	Osmers
	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Bosch	Griffiths	Pillion
Boykin	Hand	Powell
Bray	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Buchanan	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Byrd	Heselton	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Hill	Rooney
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott
Chase	Holtzman	Scudder
Chenoweth	Hosmer	Seely-Brown
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Short
Colmer	Keogh	Sikes
Corbett	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Klein	Sullivan
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Taylor
Davidson	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Lane	Thompson, N. J.
Dempsey	Lanham	Tollefson
Diggs	Latham	Utt
Dingell	Lipscomb	Vorys
Dodd	Lovre	Wharton
Dollinger	McConnell	Wickersham
Donohue	Macdonald	Williams, N. J.
Donovan	Machrowicz	Withrow
Dorn, N. Y.	Madden	Wolverton
Dorn, S. C.	Mason	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Latham.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Avery.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hill.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Short.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. Williams of New Jersey with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Fjare.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Wharton.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Withrow.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. COON and Mr. REES of Kansas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2406) to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Property transferred exclusively for public or municipal purposes, to the United States or the District of Columbia, or exclusively for charitable, educational, or religious purposes, shall be exempt from any and all taxation under the provisions of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (e) of Sec. 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (47 D. C. Code, sec. 1601), is amended to read as follows."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

By way of explanation of the purpose of this bill, I would like to state that our distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has been very much interested in this legislation and has rendered great assistance to the committee in preparing—as well as a number of other Members of the House who have also written and called me in support to it.

The purpose of this legislation is to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition.

Under existing law property transferred exclusively for public or municipal purposes to the United States or the District of Columbia, exclusively for charitable, educational, or religious purposes within the District of Columbia, and property transferred to the American National Red Cross, is exempt from any and all taxation under the provisions of this section.

This legislation would remove the words "within the District of Columbia, and property transferred to the American National Red Cross," which would mean that all estate gifts, made for public or municipal purposes to the United States or the District of Columbia, or made to, exclusively, charitable, educational and religious organizations would be exempt from the estate tax.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comend to the Members and urge their favorable vote on H. R. 2406, the proposal to provide a reciprocal exemption from District of Columbia inheritance taxes for bequests made to charitable and educational institutions located in States which provide similar exemption for bequests to institutions in the District.

We in California are particularly interested in the enactment of this legislation because our State has long adhered to the policy of providing this assistance to charitable and educational institutions and we are anxious to establish a reciprocal relationship with the District so that the institutions in both areas may benefit.

It is true that the taxing agencies in both the States and the District may be deprived of some direct tax revenue under this proposal, but I believe the benefits to the people as a whole far outweigh the possible tax losses. A great share of our educational and charitable load today is borne by institutions either entirely or partially supported by donations and bequests. The taxpayers are thereby relieved of a tremendous burden. Collection of death taxes on bequests to these institutions substantially reduces the funds available for educational and charitable purposes to be carried on at private expense and thereby increases the public expense.

It appears to me that the over-all beneficial effect of this legislation will be markedly in favor of the people of the District of Columbia. This is a focus point for many of our national educational and charitable organizations. It is likely that the number and amount of bequests by persons residing outside the District to institutions in the District will be far in excess of the bequests by residents of the District to organizations in the several States.

This is our opportunity to encourage a most useful devotion of private funds to education and charity in the District of Columbia and in the several States we represent. In my opinion it is a worthy measure, immediately useful to those States which now already have reciprocal acts, and which will encourage other States to adopt similar laws, to the lasting benefit of the people of the entire country. I sincerely hope this measure will win unanimous approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATES TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That national committeemen and national committeewomen of political parties and delegates and alternates from the District of Columbia to all conventions of political parties nominating candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency of the United States shall be elected as provided in this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "qualified elector" means a citizen of the United States (A) who has been domiciled in the District continuously

since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of the next election or, if such period has not begun, is domiciled in the District and who does not claim voting residence in any State or Territory; (B) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, 21 years old; (C) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned; and (D) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) The term "Board" means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia provided for by section 3.

CREATION OF BOARD OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Board of Elections for the District of Columbia, to be composed of three members appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The first terms of offices on the Board shall expire, as designated by the Commissioners, one at the close of December 31 of each of the first 3 years which begin after the date of enactment of this act. Subsequent terms of each such office shall be 3 years beginning January 1 following the expiration of the preceding term of such office. Any person appointed to fill a vacant office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such office. Until his successor is appointed and has qualified, a member may continue to serve even though the term of the office to which he was appointed has expired.

QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall be a member of the Board unless he qualifies as an elector and resides in the District. No person may be appointed to the Board unless he has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the 3-year period ending on the day he is appointed. Members of the Board shall hold no other office or employment in the Federal or District government. Not more than two members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day while performing duties under this act. Except as provided in subsection (a) no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Board because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source. The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be of compensation as a member of the Board, abridged by the fact of his service or receipt if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall—

(1) maintain a permanent registry, keeping it accurate and current;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(4) divide the District into appropriate voting precincts, each of which shall contain at least 350 registered persons;

(5) operate polling places;

(6) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(7) perform such other duties as are imposed upon it by this act.

(b) The Board, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 7 and 8. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(c) The Board may prescribe such regulations as it considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(d) The Board may employ necessary personnel.

BOARD TO BE INDEPENDENT AGENCY

SEC. 6. (a) In the performance of its duties, the Board shall not be subject to the direction of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(b) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board, upon request of the Board, such space and facilities as are available in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable the Board properly to perform its functions.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) No person shall vote in any election in the District unless he is a qualified elector and, except as provided in subsection (e), is registered in the District.

(b) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he is a qualified elector;

(2) he has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the 9-month period ending on the day he offers to register;

(3) except as prevented by physical disability, he can read and write the English language, as shown by his ability to read and complete the affidavit prescribed by paragraph (4); and

(4) he executes a registration affidavit, completed in his own handwriting (unless prevented by physical disability) and on the form prescribed by the Board pursuant to subsection (c), showing his political affiliation, and that he meets each of the requirements specified in section 2 (2) for a qualified elector as well as the requirement of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(c) In administering the provisions of subsection (b) (4), the Board shall prepare and use a registration affidavit form in which each request for information is readily understandable and can be satisfied by a concise answer or mark. With respect to each requirement named in or imposed by such subsection, the Board may make such requests for specific information as in its judgment may be necessary or appropriate to show whether a person seeking to register meets such requirement.

(d) The registry shall be kept open except during the 60-day period ending on the first Tuesday in April of each Presidential election year, and except as provided by the Board in the case of a special election. While the registry is open, any person may apply for registration or change his registration.

(e) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board, but not later than 3 days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied, the appellant may, within 3 days after such denial, appeal to the municipal court for the District of Columbia. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged," as provided in section 9 (e).

NOMINATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Candidates participating in an election held pursuant to this act shall be the persons registered under section 7 who have been nominated by a petition—

(1) prepared and presented to the Board in accordance with rules prescribed by the Board, but not later than 60 days before the date of the election; and

(2) signed by not less than 100 voters, registered under section 7, and of the same political party as the nominee.

(b) No person shall hold the office of committeeman, committeewoman, delegate, or alternate unless he has been a bone fide domiciliary of the District of Columbia for 3 years previous to his nomination and is a voter registered under section 7.

METHOD OF VOTING

SEC. 9. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(c) There shall be no absentee voting.

(d) Each qualified candidate may have a watcher at each polling place, provided the watcher presents proper credentials signed by the candidate. No one shall interfere with the opportunity of a watcher to observe the conduct of the election at that poling place and the counting of votes. Watchers may challenge prospective voters who are believed to be unqualified to vote.

(e) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any such challenge or acting on his own initiative with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged." Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (f).

(f) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board within 3 days after election day. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(g) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one how the voter voted. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(h) No person shall vote more than once in any election nor in an election held by a political party other than that to which he has declared himself to be a member.

(i) Copies of the regulations of the Board with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

ELECTIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The election of national committeemen and national committeewomen of political parties and of delegates and alternates to national political conventions shall be held on the first Tuesday in April of each presidential election year. Any such election shall be conducted by the Board in conformity with the provisions of this act. Polls shall be open from 8 o'clock antemeridian to 8 o'clock postmeridian on election days.

(b) Candidates receiving the highest number of votes in said election shall be declared the winners.

(c) In the case of a tie, the candidates receiving the tie vote shall cast lots before the Board at 12 o'clock noon on a date to be set by the Board, but not sooner than

10 days following the primary, and the one to whom the lot shall fall shall be declared the winner. It any candidate or candidates, receiving a tie vote, fail to appear before 12 o'clock noon on said day, the Board shall cast lots for him or them. For the purpose of casting lots any candidate may appear in person, or by proxy appointed in writing.

RECOUNT AND CONTESTS

SEC. 11 (a) If, within 7 days after the board certifies the results of an election, any qualified candidate at such election petitions the board to have the votes cast at such election recounted in one or more voting precincts, the board shall order such recount. In each such case, the petitioner shall deposit a fee of $5 for each precinct petitioned to be recounted. If the cost of the recount is less than $5 per precinct, the difference shall be refunded. If the result of the election is changed as a result of the recount, the entire amount deposited by the petitioner shall be refunded. Such recounts shall be conducted in the manner prescribed by the board by regulation.

(b) After the board certifies the results of an election, any person who voted in the election may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to review such election. In response to such a petition, the court may set aside the results so certified and declare the true results of the election, or void the election. To determine the true results of an election the court may order a recount or take other appropriate action, whether or not a recount has been conducted or requested pursuant to subsection (a). The court shall void an election only for fraud, mistake, or other defect, serious enough to vitiate the election as a fair expression of the will of the registered qualified electors voting therein. If the court voids an election it may order a special election, which shall be conducted in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for regular elections), and at such time, as the board shall prescribe. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable.

INTERFERENCE WITH REGISTRATION OR VOTING

SEC. 12. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for a breach of the peace then committed or for treason or felony.

EXPENDITURES

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the funds of the District of Columbia, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Subject to the penalties provided in this act, a candidate for national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of $2,500.

(c) No independent committee or party committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $100,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than $100,000 for any campaign covered by this act.

(d) No person shall, directly or indirectly, make contribution in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 in connection with any campaign for election of any national committeeman, national committeewomen, delegate, or alternate.

(e) Every candidate and independent committee or party committee shall, within 10 days after the election, file with the Board of Elections an itemized statement, subscribed and sworn to, setting forth all moneys received and expended in connection with said election, the names of persons from whom received and to whom paid, and the purpose for which it was expended. Such statement shall set forth any unpaid debts and obligation incurred by the candidate or independent committee or party committee with regard to such election, and specify the balance, if any, of election funds remaining in his or their hands.

PENALTIES

SEC. 14. Any person who shall register, or attempt to register, under the provisions of of this act and make any false representations as to his place of residence or his voting privilege in any other part of the United States, or be guilty of bribery or intimidation of any voter at the elections herein provided for, or, being registered, shall vote or attempt to vote more than once in any election so held, or shall purloin or secrete any of the votes cast in such elections, or, if employed in the counting of votes in such elections, make a false report in regard thereto or attempt to vote in an election held by a political party other than that to which he has declared himself to be affiliated, and every candidate, person, or official of any political committee who shall make any expenditure or contribution in violation of this act, shall upon conviction, thereof be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], the author of the bill, seek recognition on the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, naturally I am for the bill. This is legislation which I will say I introduced and was passed last year by the House and by another legislative body. It was vetoed by the President. Some revisions were made and the bill was reintroduced this year with the Presidential objections removed. So far as I know, no one is against it. The Republican National Committee in Washington and the Democratic National Committee are for it. I think we ought to support and pass it now, in plenty of time for next year's national election. In addition, the legislation officially sets up election machinery sorely needed for the District of Columbia and affords qualified voters in the District an opportunity to vote.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The purpose of this bill is to regulate the election of national committeemen and committeewomen and delegates and alternates from the District of Columbia to all conventions of political parties nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

A board of elections, composed of three members appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, would maintain a permanent registry of electors, conduct the elections, certify nominees and the results of elections, and perform other functions incident to the conduct of such elections.

The bill also regulates expenditures by a candidate, committee, and individuals as follows:

(a) Candidates shall not make expenditures in excess of $2,500.

(b) No independent committee or party committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $100,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than $100,000 for any campaign.

(c) No individual shall, directly or indirectly, make contribution in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000.

At the present time elections in the District of Columbia are held under party rules, and there is no law regulating or governing such elections.

The president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia, and representatives from the following appeared in support of this measure: Democratic Central Committee, Citizens for Eisenhower, District of Columbia, District of Columbia League of Women Voters, Washington Home Rule Committee, Washington Chapter, Americans for Democratic Action, Young Democratic Club of Washington, D. C., Federation of Civic Associations, and Federation of Citizens Associations. The committee also received a communication from the Republican State Committee of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING FARES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3908) to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and the provisions of the unification agreement incorporated therein, and notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportatin of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare," approved February 25, 1931, the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia shall fix the rate of fare for transportation by street railway and bus of schoolchildren going to and from public, parochial, or like schools in the District of Columbia at not more than one-half the cash fare established from time to time by the Public Utilities Commission for regular route transportation within the District of Columbia, and shall establish rules and regulations governing the use thereof. No fares for schoolchildren shall be avaialable to persons over 18 years of age.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits the Public Utilities Commission to adjust the fares of school children in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I think the Members of the House should realize that what we do in this bill is to turn it over to the Public Utilities Commission to find out whether the fares are too low and whether they should be increased or not.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This legislation does not of itself raise or lower the fares. Is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. It does not. It turns over the fare-fixing authority to the Public Utilities Commission, where it should have been all the time.

Mr. GROSS. Obviously there will be an increase in fares if this Commission is established.

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, I have not talked to any of the members of the Commission on that subject whether they intend to increase it or not. I understand they expect to make that request.

Mr. GROSS. Does this legislation provide any means by which the Congress can scrutinize the report before it becomes effective?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, Congress can always call for a report.

Mr. GROSS. Does it provide that this Commission shall report?

Mr. McMILLAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. It does not provide that they will report back to the District Committee?

Mr. McMILLAN. No.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Are there any limits fixed in this act between which the fares may be fixed?

Mr. McMILLAN. No. The original act provides that the fares of school children shall be one-half the adult fare. The children's fare has never been raised.

Mr. ADAIR. Is that provision still in the law if this is enacted?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. It would not be more than one-half of the adult fare?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding, that it cannot be more than half the adult fare.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. That concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia for today.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO PROCESS FOOD COMMODITIES FOR DONATION

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 249, Rept. No. 613) which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM VETERANS INDICATE FEAR OF TRICKY DEALINGS OF HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission has made a lot of recommendations, which, if carried out by Executive order of the President or changes in laws by the Congress, will be shocking to the veterans of all wars of the United States and their dependents. I doubt that the veterans realize the devastating consequences of these recommendations.

Every veteran should belong to some recognized veterans' organization. Every recognized veterans' organization should keep its membership fully informed of what is going on. I do not claim that they are not doing it now. I know that they are. Particularly the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans are doing a wonderful job through their contact representatives in Washington, in the States, and their various publications in keeping the veterans advised.

POWERFUL GRASSROOTS LOBBY

The Hoover Commission is so subtle in its approach that it has been successful in the past in getting destructive things done without notice or mention in the press. If there ever was a time when the veterans of all wars and their dependents should be on the alert against the devastating consequences of proposals of the Hoover Commission against their interest, it is now. Remember this group—the Hoover Commission—is a part of one big package that also includes a powerful lobbying organization that is built up from the grassroots with unlimited amounts of money to support it. This powerful lobby group, known as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports, is advertising for contributions from corporations. It has not registered in compliance with the Lobby Registration Act. Corporations making these contributions—and they are making generous contributions judging by expenditures—are allowed to deduct their contributions from their income taxes. So, Uncle Sam is paying 52 percent of every dollar of the money paid by corporations. If an individual, who happens to be receiving a few million dollars a year from a special privilege that he enjoys under the protection of the Government and is required to pay the maximum of 91 percent on income taxes, it is obvious that the individual is out 9 cents of every dollar and Uncle Sam is out 91 cents of every dollar contributed.

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORS

In this way, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports is collecting enormous sums of money. This committee has as its active directors and members prominent persons, who are also identified with the Hoover Commission that was set up by Congress for the purpose of doing a fair and impartial job. Mr. Hoover, himself, is an active participant in the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports this lobbying group and allows his name to be carried as honorary president of the group. This group is spending and will spend a lot of money advertising. These advertisements will be read by good citizens who will be misled by them.

In addition, this Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports is hiring many prominent people over the country to assist in getting the Hoover reports put into effect, either by Executive order of the President or by Congress.

The Hoover Commission's way of pressuring through Executive order, changes, or legislation is not the American way. It is not democracy's way.

PHONY SAVINGS

Mr. Hoover's claims of savings to the taxpayers are largely phony. There is proof that cannot be disputed that a recommendation of the Hoover Commission involving the Post Office Department actually lost 10 percent, instead of a saving.

A $10 million flood-control project that would save valuable soil and preserve

needed water that has been scuttled by the Hoover Commission, is considered a saving by Mr. Hoover. I think it is a great loss instead of a saving. Our country cannot progress or expand under the Hoover philosophy. We should be looking forward to a progressive, dynamic economy. An economy that will provide for a population of 200 million, 10 years hence. The Hoover Commission route is the wrong road.

I am inserting herewith a letter from an adjutant of the American Legion Post at New Boston, Tex., Mr. William B. Coleman. It is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NEW BOSTON POST 488,
New Boston, Tex., May 18, 1955.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Members of our Legion post have information to the effect that the Hoover Commission has submitted several recommendations which seriously affect veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Three of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission that we are referring to are:

(a) That a system be established which divides career employees into three retention categories:

1. Veterans with compensable service-connected disability.

2. All other veterans and those nonveterans with 15 or more years Federal service.

3. All other career employees.

(b) That disabled veterans presently receiving 30 percent compensation or below be deleted from the roll of disabled veterans and no compensation be paid.

(c) That 15 veterans hospitals presently operating be closed.

It is the concensus of opinion that the Hoover Commission is keeping their recommendations which pertain to veteran legislation hidden or camouflaged to such an extent that veterans are not afforded an opportunity to offer objections to these recommendations through their Congressmen or Representatives. The Army Times has called to the attention of military personnel those recommendations made by the Hoover Commission which adversely affect them while the only source of information the veterans have is civilian personnel news letters from the Department of the Army, Office of Assistant Chief of Staff G1, Office of Civilian Personnel. These letters only refer to those recommendations which are applicable to Federal employees.

At the first district convention held in Jefferson, Tex., May 1, the three Hoover Commission recommendations referred to above were discussed by Department Commander E. L. (Stonewall) Jackson, also by First District Commander Don Harmon. All Legion posts in the first district agreed to contact their Congressman and representatives offering objections to these recommendations. Our post had no knowledge of these recommendations prior to this convention.

Hosiptal facilities at the present are inadequate to afford veterans proper hospitalization and medical treatment which they are justly entitled to in accordance with past legislation. Mentally ill veterans are being denied hospitalization at the present time simply because hospital facilities are not available. It is felt that many of these veterans could and would be restored to good health in a short time if they were afforded proper hospitalization and care. Many of the veterans referred to are unable to earn a decent living, therefore, they cannot afford to pay private doctors for the type of treatment required. Many of these veterans are receiving 10, 20, or 30 percent disability compensation. Is our United States in such a financial condition as to warrant stopping compensation for these veterans? If so, it seems feasible that a part of the billions of dollars we lend to foreign aid should be utilized to partially care for our disabled veterans.

With reference to the Hoover Commission's recommendation for reduction in force procedures being modified, it is apparent that a large number of disabled veterans which would, under the present procedure fall in category 1, under the Hoover Commission's recommendation automatically fall under category 2, which includes those nonveterans with 15 or more years Federal service. We are aware of the fact that the Federal service today is filled with nonveterans who have completed 15 years service. To us, it seems a bit unfair to deny these veterans compensation and at the same time place them in a category with Federal employees who have completed 15 years of Federal service.

All members of our Legion post wish to express their appreciation for services rendered by you in the past, and request that you take necessary action to oppose recommendations of the Hoover Commission referred to above and any other recommendations made by this Commission which adversely affect present legislation. If available to you, we would appreciate you furnishing our post with any legislation pertaining to veterans.

Yours sincerely,
WILLIAM B. COLEMAN,
Adjutant.

It will be noticed in this letter that the veterans realize that the Hoover recommendations are hidden and camouflaged. The veterans also recognize that they are being required to go through special interests—members of the task forces of the Hoover Commission—to get their views over to Congress. This is a disgrace. No citizen, and certainly no veteran, should be required to go through Mr. Hoover or any group set up by Mr. Hoover to get his views considered by the Congress.

It is surprising how little information is printed that is so devastating to the veterans and their dependents that is contained in the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I am not blaming anyone, because I know how difficult it would be for anyone to get the significance of all these recommendations by a casual reading. That is the reason that the members of the American Legion, who attended the First District convention held in Jefferson, May 1, had no knowledge of the recommendations of any kind prior to the convention.

I desire to congratulate the members of the New Boston Post and the alert officers of the American Legion of the First District of Texas for bringing this matter to the attention of the veterans, the people, and the Congress.

MESSAGES FROM MR. HOOVER TO CONGRESS

Congress is receiving more messages from Mr. Hoover than from President Eisenhower. Our congressional committees will soon be completely bogged down with bills to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations. Current news items indicate that Government agencies are now bogged down trying to pass on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Many people are wondering why the Congress ever gave the Hoover Commission so much power and so much money—$2,500,000—to use it. Congress is now wondering the same thing. This present Hoover Commission got through Congress on the theory that it is a continuation of the first Hoover Commission; that it is bipartisan; that it was to recommend ways to stop any waste or extravagance in government and to expose any duplication of work.

The First Hoover Commission was bipartisan and had a Republican, Mr. Hoover, as Chairman and a prominent Democrat, Mr. Dean Acheson, vice chairman. All the members of the task forces were approved by the 12-member commission composed of 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The present Hoover Commission is strictly a one man show. Mr. Hoover never caused the selection of a vice chairman as required by law. It is therefore not legally organized. It is composed of 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats. It is not bipartisan as the word "bipartisan" was stricken out of the law creating the Commission just before its passage in Congress. The members of the commission are not approved by the 12-man Commission. They were selected by Mr. Hoover and his selection was determined by him to be final. The present Hoover Commission has decided, unlike the first Commission, that it has policymaking powers. It is even preparing bills to be submitted to carry out its recommendations.

The New York Times, Sunday, May 22, 1955, under heading "Final Hoover Reports Face a Real Battle" by W. H. Lawrence, the following paragraphs appeared:

While the administration has two of its highest officials—Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General, and Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization—on the Commission, it has submitted each report from the Hoover group to the most thorough study by Government agencies affected before attempting to fix White House policy on the changes proposed.

Only in the last week has the Bureau of the Budget finished its job of compiling the agency reaction to the first reports, on personnel and paper-work problems. These are slated for Presidential consideration soon.

Still due for Budget Bureau study are reports dealing with medical services, lending agencies, transportation, legal services and procedure, surplus property, governmental food and clothing purchases and business enterprises.

One authority remarked this week that its recommendations with respect to the defense agencies would trade "combat efficiency" for "dollar efficiency."

The recommendations now before the White House deal with explosive political questions, such as curtailing the medical services and job preference rights provided by the Government for the veterans of its wars.

HAS IT DELAYED VACCINE PROGRAM?

It is possible that very important matters in the interest of the people have been held up or pushed aside because of Hoover Commission reports. It is sincerely hoped that the consideration that the departments are forced to give these reports has not caused the delay and confusion in the administration of the Salk vaccine program.

CONGRESS UNDER MISAPPREHENSION

Congress I believe voted for the establishment of the present Hoover Commission, the second, in 1953 under a misapprehension. If Congress had known what Mr. Hoover expected to do as they know now what he has done and how he has accomplished it I am sure that this present Hoover Commission would not have been created.

Members of Congress did not expect a one man commission; the abuse of power; the wrongful use of power or the usurpation and assumption of power that was never intended or anticipated by Congress.

PART OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

One of the chairmen of a Hoover Commission task force testified before a House Committee on Government Operations recently that the Attorney General of the United States, who is on the Hoover Commission, has officially ruled that the Hoover Commission is a part of the legislative branch of the Government. This was certainly not intended by Congress.

In other words when a Hoover task force conducts a hearing or investigation it acts as a congressional committee and for Congress according to the Attorney General.

DIFFERENCE IN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE AND HOOVER COMMISSION

Members of a congressional committee are elected by the people; they take an oath to faithfully perform their duties in accordance with the United States Constitution; they are paid by the Government; if they do not perform their duties properly they can be punished by the people by suffering defeat at the next election.

The members of the task forces are not elected; they did not take the oath to faithfully perform their duties; most of them were paid by their employers and not by the Government; they cannot be punished by the people if they fail to perform their duties faithfully.

Members of the Hoover task forces were allowed to serve although the interests and the employers they represented—who were paying them their salaries and expenses, were in conflict with the interest of the United States Government. The conflict of interest did not deter Mr. Hoover from selecting them on a task force where they could render the maximum service to their employers even though the service rendered by them would be against the interest of the people, the public interest, and the Government. This is not the way a democracy should work.

I am opposed to any waste or corruptions in government. So are all the Members of Congress and we vote that way.

It is unnecessary to bring into our legislative branch a group of people to supplant elected members in many of their important duties; men who have selfish axes to grind and nothing to lose if they cause wrongs and hardships to be imposed upon the people.

VETERANS WARNED

The most dangerous time for veterans is when Congress adjourns this summer and goes home until next January 3. Executive orders can be written by the Hoover group, which if issued by the President, can deprive war veterans and their dependents of valuable and substantial rights.

It is my plan to again study all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relating to veterans and their dependents and do everything within my power to stop every one that is hurtful to them. I expect to keep the veterans of the district that I have the honor to represent fully informed by sending information from time to time to every veterans' organization in the First Congressional District of Texas, and support them in their efforts to properly protect veterans' rights and benefits.

CONGRESS HAS DELEGATED POWER OVER MONETARY POLICY WHICH DETERMINES CONDITION OF OUR ECONOMY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. Allan P. Demanovich, of Seattle, Wash. Mr. Demanovich is a pharmaceutical chemist in Seattle and his letter is so full of thought-provoking questions and intelligent suggestions that it is being inserted in connection with my remarks.

The question is often asked, why should unearned interest be paid? Why should private bankers, who are not necessarily students of the science of money, be allowed the privilege by Congress of determining whether or not our country has good times or bad times? Why should the New York Federal Reserve Bank operated by 9 directors, 6 of whom are selected by the private bankers, be allowed to take our Federal Reserve notes—printed money—and trade these notes for United States Government bonds and be permitted to keep the bonds in the name of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and draw interest on them when the interest is due? Why should banks that create money by a bookkeeping transaction be allowed to purchase long-term Government direct or guaranteed bonds with such created money instead of providing for local projects through local loans? Should there be a new look at what has happened under the Federal Reserve System after 41 years of operation without any kind of an investigation of its activities? Should there be a new look at the Federal Open Market Committee, which is known to be the most powerful committee in the United States—even more powerful than Congress—over economic affairs, that is composed of 12 members, only 7 of them public members, and operated by 1 person in the New York Federal Reserve bank after 22 years of operation without any sort of investigation or study by the Congress?

The letter is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *May 18, 1955.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Your illuminating weekly letter No. 1131, April 28, 1955, on banking as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1955, states that banking should be allowed to operate with a good profit. That is entirely a reasonable statement, but how good is good in reference to banking? Does it mean profits to the extent of interest on most of the national debt?

You also state the privilege of creating money and regulating its value "has been properly farmed out to banking interests under restrictions and limitations." Does the House of Representatives have any voice in confirming the appointments of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve who direct the creating and regulating of money?

Orthodox economics teaches that a purchaser of wealth should give up something equal in value to what he receives and that interest is paid for waiting. When a banker buys a highly secured note with an interest-bearing credit loan, what does he part with and wherein does he do any waiting, since the loan is not real money and unearned? The only observable service performed is that of bookkeeping, for which he is entitled to compensation.

Wealth cannot be created out of nothing. The banking system is allowed to manufacture a money claim to wealth out of nothing. This something for nothing act is contrary to the laws of mathematics, chemistry, physics, and morality. Many believe it contrary to our Constitution. It is also contrary to the laws of agronomy, since the bankers reap where they did not sow.

Aside from the fact that he puts money into circulation interest-free, what is the difference, if any, between a manifest counterfeiter's money and the fictitious loans of the banking system? The only difference seen is that the counterfeiter cannot collapse the monetary system by withdrawing money from circulation at his pleasure and that his act is illegal. If his profits are the greater, so are his risks.

How is it mathematically possible to pay any interest to the banking system since it demands more money be withdrawn from circulation than it allows to be put into circulation, without payment of additional interest? When interest is paid by one individual to another, the title to money merely changes hands and the total amount of money in circulation remains the same, but when interest is paid to the banks, that amount of money represented by the loan and interest is withdrawn from circulation.

Since it is a mathematical impossibility to return more money than received, the interest has to be extracted from someone else and eventually someone down the line loses title to property, if not the original borrower. Behold, "the king is in his countinghouse, counting out his money." What a subterranean swindle. What a beautiful hoodwink. It is significant that the only time Christ used force was when He drove out the moneychangers.

Benjamin Franklin said we had a Republic, if we could keep it. Is our Republic to be lost due to bookkeeping entries?

"If all debts were paid we would not have any money with which to do business," you say. Therefore, interest has to be paid on the debts in order to do business. In plain words, it might be called a tribute. It might also be asked to whom and why? Is not that sufficient to condemn our money system?

A slave is defined as a person held in bondage. Is not our monetary system a form of bondage for all our citizens? Who is optimistic enough to believe that all debts will ever be paid, since their total is greater than the total wealth?

If our monetary system is the root of most of our evils, is not a great part of the work of Congress a hacking at the branches?

When will Congress replace our centralized private money with national interest-free earned money?

Why are banks allowed to advertise their large deposits when in fact the deposits are mostly debts of the people?

Why are they not called debt shops instead of banks, since they deal mostly in debts?

Is the income of the Federal Reserve banks taxed?

Why could not the Government buy, subject to an income tax, the capital and reserves of the Federal Reserve banks with its own interest-free money, exchange all Federal Reserve notes with its own money, and cancel all United States bonds in the possession of the Treasury and Federal Reserve banks?

Your concern for small business is appreciated by all who know of your years of yeoman service.

There seems to be a power in Congress that reason and eloquence cannot sway.

Yours truly,

ALLAN P. DEMANOVICH.

DEBT PAPER

Debt paper and more debt paper is the subject discussed more than any other subject in banking and financial circles. Long-term debt paper at the highest rate of interest possible is best. Furthermore, debt paper that carries the least risk—if possible guaranteed by the Federal Government—is the type that is most desired.

Every discussion of the highway program, the plan that would permit the holders of the bonds to build them, and get more in interest than the cost of the highways, is presented first for consideration.

Every discussion of school facilities brings further plans from those, who want more debt paper that provide for long-term Government bonds. The bonds and interest receive first consideration.

No effort seems to be made to pay off our national debt. There are several good reasons for this, but one in particular and that is people, who have money to invest, want this big backlog of Government bonds for investment purposes.

NO DEBT, NO MONEY

Money is based on debt under our capitalistic system. We believe it is the finest and best system. However, even the capitalistic system does not require unnecessarily high interest be paid on Government riskless securities. If all debts were paid, there would not be sufficient money to transact the business of the country.

Today, our debts are about $700 billion, including both public and private. I do not agree with Mr. Demanovich that our debts exceed the value of all wealth. It is my belief that the total wealth is far in excess of total debts. As our country expands, we cannot afford to have less than $700 billion in debts. Otherwise we will have insufficient money to do business on, since money is based on debt. Furthermore, it will be necessary to increase our debts 3 percent or 4 percent a year, in order to take care of an expanding economy, which is required to provide for increases in population. Our population is increasing tremendously—4 million last year and it is estimated by over 5 million this year. We have a real challenge. It is necessary that we use the limited land that we have—no more land will be produced, we know that—to produce the food and fiber necessary to take care of an expanding population.

PRIVATE DEBT MUST INCREASE TO REDUCE NATIONAL DEBT

If we reduce the national debt, such a move will be deflationary, unless private debts are created immediately in sufficient volume to make up in the decrease of the national debt. I believe we should have a definite policy of decreasing the national debt, in order to pay at least 2½ percent a year so that the entire debt could be liquidated in 40 years. In that way, private debts could be created each year to make up in the reduction in the public debt.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS NOT OWNED BY PRIVATE BANKS

Contrary to the beliefs of many people, the 12 Federal Reserve banks are not owned by the bankers. They are owned by the Government of the United States. The money that is issued by these 12 banks is issued upon the credit of the Nation and the stockpile of gold. All of the gold also belongs to the United States Government. The gold is useful in international transactions but serves no useful purpose in our domestic economy. The 12 Federal Reserve banks do not use anything for money except created money or manufactured money.

NOT STOCK—JUST CALLED STOCK

The small amount of so-called stock owned by the private banks in the Federal Reserve banks is not stock at all. It is a token investment upon which the banks receive 6 percent interest used only for the psychological reason of making the banks feel that they are a part of the Federal Reserve System. Insofar as ownership or part ownership is concerned, the investment is "phoney." The 12 banks do not use this little investment of the private banks in so-called stock at all. It is put to no use whatsoever. It is not needed by the 12 Federal Reserve banks. The 6 percent that is paid for its use is out-of-pocket expense, so far as the Federal Reserve banks are concerned and nothing has been received by the Federal Reserve banks in return for this payment. The banks, however, are out the use of the investment in the so-called stock and it is reasonable to pay a fair return for its use. The so-called stock cannot be voted; cannot be sold; cannot be hypothecated. It has no relationship to ownership.

FOR A LOOK AT FEDERAL OPEN-MARKET COMMITTEE

I hope the House will soon pass the resolution, which permits a Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House to take a look at the Federal Open Market Committee. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in knowing what has happened during the last 22 years by this important committee.

The New York banks are making more money dealing in Government securities than ever before in history. They seem to be able to buy Government securities when they are lowest and sell them when they are highest. The Federal Open Market Committee makes all changes which cause Government securities to go up or down.

DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the President's request for an extension of the Renegotiation Act, I raised the question of the Act's applicability to the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. The Renegotiation Act extension has passed the House and is pending in the other body.

The Atomic Energy Commission furnished a report to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in response to my request, but it did not contain the answer. I include the letter as a part of my remarks.

Thereupon, I took the matter up with the chairman of the Renegotiation Board. His response, which I am also placing in the RECORD, would indicate there is a rather strong possibility that the Dixon-Yates contract is subject to review and renegotiation. Therefore, I take this means of bringing the matter to the attention of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I urge that committee to give careful consideration to the correspondence I have received, with the view of requesting the Renegotiation Board to review the contract after the other body has acted upon the extension of the Renegotiation Authority.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1955.

DEAR MR. COOPER: At a hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee on April 25, 1955, George C. Taylor was requested to furnish a statement to the committee as to whether the contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and Mississippi Valley Generating Co. was subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, and whether there was any procedure for recovering excessive profits, if any are realized, in the construction of the generating facilities by that contractor.

The contract provides for the delivery of electric energy to the United States at rates specified in the contract. The generating facilities will be constructed by and with funds provided by the company, and will remain the property of the company. The United States does not pay directly for the construction of the generating station.

For such period as the United States purchases electricity or pays cancellation charges, it will pay a charge for power in which the cost of construction will be reflected to a limited extent. The contract provides for a base capacity charge of $9,052,050 per year, which includes interest and amortization on debt and return on equity. It further provides that this charge will be adjusted so that the effect of any increase in construction cost between the estimate of $104,115,000 and $113,865,000 and of any decrease in construction cost without limit, will be shared equally by the company and the United States. The effect of increases above $113,865,000 will be borne entirely by the company. Cost of construction is to be mutually determined in accordance with the uniform system of accounts prescribed for public utilities and licensees subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act.

In addition, provision is made for a limitation on earnings derived from the contract.

The contract provides that all revenue derived from service rendered to the United States in excess of that required to provide net income to the company at the rate of $495,000 per annum (9 percent of the equity capital of $5,500,000) will be divided equally between the parties. (The permissible earning rate under this provision is subject to adjustment so that the company's rate of return on equity capital will increase if the cost of construction is less than the estimate and decrease if the cost of construction is more than the estimate.) In addition, there is provision that in any event the amount available to the company as net income during the life of the contract derived from operations under the contract shall not exceed $600,000 per annum (approximately 11 percent on equity capital). Any amounts in excess of that figure are to be deposited in a special fund and upon completion or termination of the contract, such amounts, together with income from the investment of those amounts, will be paid to the United States.

The contract with Mississippi Valley Generating Co. is for the delivery of electric energy and as such may be exempt, under the provisions of 50 U. S. C. A., App. 1216 (a) (4), from the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended. For this reason, as in the case of the Commission's contracts with Ohio Valley Electric Co. and Electric Energy, Inc., a renegotiation clause was not included in the contract, it should be noted that the requirements of the Renegotiation Act, if applicable to the contract, would not be affected by not including such a clause, and that the Renegotiation Board is the appropriate agency to determine whether the contract is in fact so exempt.

We feel that the provisions of the contract provide adequate safeguards against excessive profits under the contract.

Sincerely yours,

K. D. NICHOLS,
General Manager.

THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1955.

Hon. FRANK M. KARSTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KARSTEN: Further reference is made to your letter of April 28, 1955, inquiring as to the status in renegotiation of the so-called Dixon-Yates contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. My conclusions are based upon the statements in your letter and that of General Nichols to Congressman COOPER dated April 27, 1955, a copy of which you enclosed.

Section 106 (a) (4) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (50 U. S. C. A. App. 1216 (a) (4)), provides an exemption of any contract or subcontract with a public utility for electric energy when made at rates not in excess of published rates or charges filed with, fixed, approved, or regulated by a State, Federal, or local regulatory body, or at rates not in excess of unregulated rates of such a public utility which are substantially as favorable to users and consumers as are regulated rates. It will thus be seen that this section, providing a mandatory exemption, is divided into two parts, the first applying to contracts and subcontracts at regulated rates and the second part to contracts and subcontracts at unregulated rates.

There is serious doubt whether the contractor, Mississippi Valley Generating Co., from the nature of its operations, is or would later be found to be, a public utility. While a public utility may be variously defined, certain general concepts appear to be essential. The term implies a public use carrying with it the duty to serve the public and to treat all persons alike without discrimination, and it precludes the idea of service which is private in nature whether for the benefit of a few or of many. The true criterion to be applied in determining the character of use of a plant alleged to be a public utility is whether or not the public may enjoy it as of right or by permission. As I understand the contract, the output of power is to be supplied to the United States to satisfy its needs. Any amount over and above that so required may be disposed of commercially. It is not known whether this surplus is to be offered to the public generally or disposed of by contract. On the assumption that the United States will take substantially all of the power, it is difficult to visualize how the public generally can share in the contractor's output. Of course, if the contractor is not a public utility, that disposes forthwith of the exemption provided by section 106 (a) (4).

Even if it is conceded, for the purpose of discussion, that the contractor is a public utility, it is clear from the letter of General Nichols that the electric energy furnished under the contract is not supplied at published rates. The contract is not subject to regulation by a Federal regulatory agency and there is no State regulatory body with authority to regulate the rates at which the Government may obtain the power. There is nothing for a regulatory body to regulate, the contractor's output being primarily for the Government. Whether there will be any surplus power is at the discretion of the Government and will depend upon the needs of the Government.

As I have heretofore pointed out, section 106 (a) (4) also exempts contracts or subcontracts with public utilities for furnishing electric energy at unregulated rates under certain conditions. RBR (Renegotiation Board Regulations) 1453.3 (e) (2), 32 CFR 1453.3 (e) (2), exempts contracts for furnishing services at unregulated rates which are not in excess of regulated rates for the same type of services. But there has been no showing that there are regulated rates for such services or that the price at which the electric energy is to be furnished under the contract would not be in excess of applicable unregulated rates, if any.

Finally, RBR 1453.3 (e) (3), 32 CFR 1453.3 (e) (3), provides an exemption in the case of a public utility furnishing services, including electric energy, to Departments and to other consumers at unregulated rates which are substantially as favorable as regulated rates for comparable services. Obviously, the contractor does not qualify under this subsection, for it is to furnish the service only to the Government and, in any event, there is no showing of regulated rates with respect to which the price to be charged under the contract is substantially as favorable.

In view of the foregoing, and in the absence of an affirmative showing by the contractor (1) that it is a public utility and (2) that the contract otherwise qualifies for exemption under section 106 (a) (4), the mandatory exemption provided in that section will not apply. The fact that the contract does not contain a clause subjecting it to renegotiation will not relieve a contract otherwise subject to the act. See section 104 of the act.

It has been suggested that the contract provides adequate safeguards against excessive profits and may be exempted on that ground. Section 106 (d) (3) of the act and RBR 1455.4 (c) authorize the Board to exempt individual contracts upon receipt of a request from the agency entering into the contract, together with information which would support a conclusion that the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits. To obtain the benefit of this permissive exemption, there must be reason so clear and compelling that the contractor can be excused even from showing what profit it has realized on the contract. No information has yet been furnished to this Board which would form an adequate reason for exemption on this ground.

You inquire also whether this Board would have jurisdiction to go into the cost of construction. I am not sure that I understand the import of your question. If you are inquiring whether the Board has jurisdiction to renegotiate the contracts and subcontracts covering the construction of the plant to be employed by Mississippi Valley Generating Co. in furnishing the electric energy under the contract with the Government, the answer is in the negative. I understand that such construction is to be financed entirely through the use of private capital. On the other hand, to the extent that the cost of construction has a bearing on a determination whether the contractor realized excessive profits for a fiscal year under the contract with the Government to furnish electric energy, the Board would have jurisdiction to inquire into the costs of such construction.

Very truly yours,

FRANK L. ROBERTS,
Chairman.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Representative from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] took a double-barreled blast at the upper Colorado River storage project. As is usual with attacks originating from that section, the blast consisted entirely of distortion and misinformation.

In the first place, it started out with the completely false assumption that if Congress authorized the ultimate billion dollar project this year, its dams and irrigation projects will be constructed and operating by next spring. This is just not so, as anyone who takes time to examine the testimony could learn. The entire project contemplates a construction schedule of more than 25 years.

Using the false assumption of a 1-year lump-sum appropriation and a 1-year construction period as a springboard, the gentleman from southern California then hurled himself to some utterly fantastic conclusions both as to the alleged subsidy to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers and as to the effect of the project on our agricultural surpluses.

I would like to deal with these two misrepresentations separately.

FAVORITE PASTIME

A favorite pastime in southern California these days is inflating the cost of the upper Colorado River storage project in terms of cost per acre of land to be benefited. The figure used last Thursday was $5,000 per acre—a figure as misleading as it is round.

I have been unable to determine exactly how this figure is arrived at. But I think it is obtained by leveling a flat 2½ percent interest charge against the total cost of the project from the moment it is authorized. This amount is then compounded over a period of 50 or 60 years—depending upon the amount of misrepresentation wanted—and the total divided by the number of acres benefiting from the project.

These southern California mathematics are selective mathematics. They

are not ever used in computing the costs of California reclamation projects. They are not even used in computing the costs of reclamation projects elsewhere, unless the projects contemplate using water that would otherwise flow into California. It does not matter whether this water belongs to southern California. Things like rights and titles and compacts mean nothing. Just let any State try to use water it owns which now flows into California and the old subsidy mathematic theory is dusted off, costs are inflated, and a nationwide, high-pressure campaign is on.

POOR PATCH FARMER

It is no coincidence that only three reclamation projects have been subjected to this type of canard. These three are the central Arizona, the upper Colorado, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects. What do they have in common? They would permit other States to use their water. It is water to which California has no right, but which—in the absence of upstream development—flows through southern California to waste in the Pacific Ocean.

But let us get back to the subsidy argument and analyze it. I can best illustrate its wrongness by applying it to an imaginary flood-control dam along the Mississippi River. This dam is built to protect a city downstream at a cost of $120 million. In addition to protecting against floods, however, the dam makes it possible for some patch farmer to irrigate 12 acres of bottomland which the dam reclaimed from swamp. What a field day for users of southern Cal math. The project cost $120 million and reclaims 12 acres. That is a cost of $10 million per acre even without figuring the compound interest. And since this is a flood-control project and there is no repayment, you can compound interest to eternity. There is no limit to the amount of subsidy the taxpayer is giving the poor patch farmer for his 12 acres.

SOUTHERN CAL MATH

Let us not limit the application of southern California math to hypothetical cases. That would not be fair. Let us apply it to real cases. Let us apply it to water resources projects constructed, authorized, or proposed for California.

Federal water resource expenditures in California

Reclamation projects constructed or authorized	$563,000,000
Proposed Trinity and San Luis projects	448,000,000
Flood-control projects (nonrepayable)	330,000,000
Total	1,341,000,000

Now, let us invoke the southern California math theory. We find the total cost is not $1.3 billion, but $4.5 billion—a subsidy of $3.2 billion for just one of the 48 States of the Union. This type of figuring is, of course, neither correct nor fair. I have every reason to believe that the costs of reclamation projects, both constructed and proposed, will be paid back to the Treasury by California water and power users. Of course, the flood-control expenditure is something else. They are outright gifts of tax money. This golden giveaway must not be questioned. Interest charges must not be computed and compounded to doomsday. The program is as sacrosanct as rivers and harbors programs are. But can you blame some of us from arid, inland States which seldom benefit, for occasionally wondering why?

NOTHING TO HIDE

Let us leave the southern California mathematical theory. It assumes a lump sum rather than continuing appropriation. It assumes that the entire sum will be interest-free. It completely ignores in computing acreage costs that there are power, municipal and industrial water features which pay interest and help pay the cost of the irrigation projects.

There is nothing to hide in the cost of the upper Colorado River storage project. Our plans are set up on the basis of having the cost of each power unit paid out with interest within 50 years from the time that unit first becomes productive. A similar provision appears in the bills.

Our plans also call for repayment of the irrigation allocations of each unit of the storage project and each participating project within 50 years of the time that unit is completed—exclusive of a development period up to 10 years, where applicable under the reclamation laws. Repayment will be accomplished by the water users paying, up to their ability to repay, for a 50-year period, with the balance paid by the application of excess power revenues from power units of the storage project during the same 50-year period, except in the case of the small Paonia and Eden participating projects, for which special legislative provision has already been made.

WHO PAYS?

The irrigated lands in this project will be subsidized, we do not deny that. They are subsidized to the extent that the money lent is interest-free. This has been part of the reclamation program—in fact it was the reason for its inception—since it was set up under President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. The irrigator is also subsidized by the purchaser of power. This power will be sold in the four upper-basin States—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Revenue over and above that required to repay power costs with interest to the Federal Treasury will be used to help pay for water. But this is not a charge against the taxpayer in Ohio, New York, or southern California. It is a subsidy paid for by power users in the States that directly benefit from the project. And there is ample expert testimony that these power users are ready, willing, and able to pay this subsidy. It is a small price, they feel, to pay for the continued development of this vast four-State area.

The amount of subsidy per acre to be paid by power users is as follows:

Twelve participating projects, State, and average costs per acre assigned for repayment from net power revenues

Central Utah, Utah	$700
Emery County, Utah	245
Florida, Colo	250
Hammond, N. Mex	535
La Barge, Wyo	150
Lyman, Wyo	205
Navaho project, Shiprock division, N. Mex.	1,590
Paonia, Colo	255
Pine River extension, Colo	195
Seedskadee, Wyo	305
Silt, Colo	310
Smith Fork, Colo	220

That is the story of the direct cost and repayment program. This is not a reclamation project that has large, hidden nonreimbursable items tucked away in it. We have not written off vast amounts as flood control or harbor improvement. In the entire $1 billion development, less than $7 million is allocated to nonreimbursable items.

This project is one of the most conservative multipurpose reclamation projects ever presented to Congress. That is one of the reasons it has the backing of President Eisenhower. Among the conservative features of the project are: First, for the first time, so far as I am aware, the interest repaid on the power investment goes into the General Treasury rather than the reclamation fund; second, the power features pay interest, not only on the capital investment but also the interest accruing during construction; and, third, the repayment period of 50 years is much less than that for many projects we have heretofore approved in Congress.

TREASURY BENEFITS

The taxpayers of all parts of the Nation also should not overlook the fact that these projects have a conservative useful life of at least 100 years. After their costs are repaid with interest, the National Treasury will be beneficiary of approximately $20 million per year in revenue.

That is a direct benefit. It pains me to realize that due to the unfair attacks on this project some of our eastern friends are forgetting the indirect benefits of the reclamation program. These are vast and they affect every State in the Union.

Each step taken in the development of the Nation's basic resources moves the economy of the Nation to a new and higher plateau. This is strikingly demonstrated in an analysis of Federal tax revenues from Federal reclamation project areas. Based on the projected results of a sample study of 15 reclamation projects, the estimated cumulative return to the Treasury from the 69 projects or divisions of projects receiving water under the Federal reclamation program in 1952 now stands at well over $2.7 billion. This is an amount greater than total reclamation expenditures for all project works either complete or incomplete since the beginning of the Federal reclamation program in 1902.

NATION BENEFITS

The benefits accruing to the Nation through reclamation development are also measured in terms of families served, crop production and value, livestock raised, and acres irrigated. They are expressed in rapidly expanding trade

and business activity, in direct repayment to the Government by the beneficiaries of reclamation in increased population on and adjacent to projects, and in a wide variety of other phenomena. These are all tangible, measurable benefits of a broad and lasting nature. They translate into expanding business activities in the project and surrounding areas. They filter to every State in the Union and every segment of society. They provide through this process additional economic stability to the Nation which is reflected in part by increased revenues to the Treasury in the faraway States and areas, as well as on the projects themselves. The estimate of Federal tax revenues from reclamation project areas is, therefore, only a partial measure of the true contribution of basic reclamation resource development to the Nation's tax structure and to the economy as a whole.

TAXES BOOSTED

In 1952 individual income taxes paid directly by irrigation farmers and by persons of the neighboring towns and villages whose business or employment was affected by the construction of 15 selected reclamation projects were estimated at $105 million. The aggregate individual income tax revenues from this sample study area since 1916 is estimated at over $700 million. In addition to individual tax revenues, an appropriate share of corporation and excise tax revenues collected in the same 15 projects areas is directly attributable to reclamation development. Estimated receipts from these sources total nearly $400 million. The combined returns from individual and corporate tax revenues accordingly are estimated at $1.1 billion. Total Federal project construction cost through June 30, 1952, for the same projects aggregated $264 million. Thus far, Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by 4½ times.

Long after project costs have been repaid by water and power users the new wealth created through Federal reclamation investment will be reflected in a continuous flow of tax revenues from the projects themselves and from the rest of the Nation as well.

FALSE ASSUMPTION

Let us examine this project in relation to our problems with agricultural surpluses. Much was made of this last Thursday by the Representative from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. Here again, he made the false assumption that should this project be authorized it would be constructed and its irrigation features would be in production by next year in competition with other acreage growing supported crops. Surely, he could not be serious.

The legislation to authorize this project contemplates an orderly development of an entire river basin over a long period of years. We in the States involved do not want nor expect Congress to appropriate $1 billion at once. Before we can use the water we are entitled to, we must store up replacement water in mainstem dams along the Colorado and its tributaries. The construction of these dams will take from 5 to 10 years. Under the present construction schedule, the first irrigation project will not reach full development until 1966. Irrigation features of the central Utah project—largest participating project in the legislation—will not be completed until 1983 if construction were to begin a year from now.

AGAINST EXPERTS

If the Representative from California feels that this Nation's surplus food problem is a lasting one, he is going against every major agricultural economist in the world.

Here is what John H. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said on that subject in a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on July 31, 1953:

> Looking ahead, say to 1960, we are likely to have a population total close to 175 million people. And if our rate of economic growth continues as it has in the past, the average person should have a level of living at least 15 percent above that of today. Such a rise in the general level of living for this higher population total would mean greatly expanded domestic markets for food and other farm products produced by our agriculture.
>
> And even if the people we will have in our country by 1960 consume food and other farm products at the same rate as in 1952, our domestic consumption of farm products would then be 9 percent higher than in 1952. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952 as well as greatly increased quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other products.
>
> I want to stress that * * * over many years there has been a very distinct trend in this country to upgrade diets. This desire to expand food consumption and improve nutrition will express itself as long as our people continue to have adequate buying power.

Mr. Davis was overconservative in his population estimate of 175 million by 1960. Latest estimates place the figure at 178. And by 1975—when most of the irrigation features of the upper Colorado River storage project will be coming into full production, this Nation will have to produce food for an estimated 207 million citizens.

TABLE FARE

The States that will directly benefit from this project are not the States that have been contributing heavily to agricultural products now in surplus. In my home State of Utah, less than 16 percent of the farm income is from supported commodities. Our valuable irrigated acreage is used to grow vegetables and fruits, perishables needed by the West's rapidly expanding population and perishables which have with rapid transportation transformed the eating habits of America.

In order that the Members might know how dependent they are on the western reclamation States for these commodities, I submit the following table:

Crop production

Year	Crop	Total for United States (million pounds)	17 Western States	
			Total (million pounds)	Percent
1954	Asparagus	307	189	62
1954	Carrots	1,550	1,108	72
1954	Celery	1,496	837	56
1954	Lettuce	2,834	2,527	89
1954	Peas	850	329	39
1952	Olives	114	114	100
1954	Tomatoes	7,390	3,766	51
1952	Apricots	354	354	100
1954	Cantaloups	1,322	1,101	83
1954	Cherries, sweet	200	170	85
1952	Grapes	6,347	6,028	95
1952	Plums	122	106	87
1954	Strawberries	427	265	62

It is not irrigating acreage in Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah some 10 to 15 years from now that threatens to add to our surplus. We need not fear that. But if southern California could steal this water, it would be added to other Colorado River water now being used to grow cotton on vast irrigated tracts of land. Here is a commodity not in short supply and one not needed to feed our expanding population.

I HAVE A LITTLE LIST

The gentleman from California closed his address Friday by submitting a list of organizations allegedly opposing this project. Examination shows that nearly all of these organizations are in southern California. They should be for it. They are the beneficiaries of cheap power generated with water that belongs to the upper Colorado River Basin States. For each I could name a matching organization favoring the project in one or all of the upper basin States, along with such national organizations as the Farmers Union, the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the local private and public utilities serving the four States.

I will not burden the Public Printer with my list, but it is available for any Member who wishes to study it.

I only hope that the membership of this House will look behind the propaganda promoted for selfish reasons by one area in order to see the merits which have won for this project the endorsement of the President and the Department of the Interior, both of this and of the Truman administration.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly do not blame the gentleman for answering or attempting to answer the talk which I made on Thursday. He is naturally interested in this matter. I have the highest personal respect for him; however, I believe that the gentleman does me wrong by putting words into my mouth and an interpretation on my language which I did not put in my remarks and which I did not intend. At no place did I seek to create the impression that this

total expenditure would be accomplished by the spring of 1956. Being from the West, and being acquainted with the time it takes to build these great projects, I realize it would take a series of years to build these dams. But I am taking the result which, if carried forward, by the legislation which has recently been passed in the other body, Senate bill 500, and I am taking the figures of the Bureau of Reclamation, both as to estimated costs and also I am taking the Bureau of Reclamation reports on conflicting crops. I have tried to the best of my ability to obtain accurate information to support my position in this matter. I note that the gentleman has not attacked the figures which I have used in my speech, but he has apparently tried to put an interpretation on it, which I honestly did not want to create, and which I do not believe I said.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I want to be entirely fair, and I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement. I have studied the figures the gentleman used in his speech. Of course, you referred to surpluses in certain fields and then go on to say they are in surplus. Take the dairy products, for instance. It is true in dairy products that there will be some dairy products raised in this project, but the big part of it is going to be crops not in surplus.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. How about the grain crops and how about the sugar beets? They are also crops in surplus.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Let me say to the gentleman that sugar beets are not in surplus in this country. We produced less than one-third of the sugar in this country which is consumed here.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I recognize that fact, but there have been acreage allotments in sugar-beet land.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. By reason of the world sugar act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. Of course, we are faced with a current condition. As to why we have these surpluses, I did not go into that, but we do have the surpluses and they have affected the acreage allotments, both up in the great Federal irrigation projects in Washington, where recent acreage allotments have been cut down, and where the farmers on that Columbia River Basin project and the cotton acreage in Arizona has been cut, and yet the Federal Government is depending upon the income from these areas in order to discharge the liability of those projects—that is, the cost of those projects.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. All of the agricultural experts estimate we are going to be in shortage by 1975. So we are looking forward.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it would not take 20 years to build the dams.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. No. Not to build the dams, but it will take 20 years before the participating projects get into operation. They are the ones that grow the crops. We need to build the dams now in order to store up the water, because it will take 20 years in some instances to store the water. In reading your speech I think you made the statement that you were not opposed to all reclamation projects.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. You picked out only two in which California was interested in the water. Will the gentleman tell me whether he is going to be against the Trinity project, a California project, which will come to this floor before the Colorado River project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows I have over the years supported reclamation projects, and I intend to in the future. The gentleman asked me a question and I will be glad to answer. The gentleman knows that these reclamation projects are planned on a well-known formula which extends much past the payment time of the so-called Hoover Dam project on the Colorado River. There is a long period of time in which the reclamation cost will not be paid off. They will not be amortized.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is talking about something entirely different. Your talk was based on agricultural surpluses. You asked why this administration was pushing reclamation projects when we already have great surpluses? That same argument applies to the Trinity project in California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. When the time comes for the Trinity project to come before this House, I will study the project and I will speak my mind on it. But the reason I am speaking my mind on this is because these projects have already passed the other body. That is, a bill authorizing them has passed the other body and I assume that shortly the same type of bill will come from the gentleman's committee. Of course, I have no way of knowing whether the bill will be the same as the one reported by the other body or not. Personally, I hope it is not. I hope it is a modest bill with the type of projects in it which I can conscientiously support. But the gentleman well knows that the people of southern California are at this time before the Supreme Court pleading for a determination of the Colorado River pact. We have invested many hundreds of millions of dollars in those projects——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was going to say that southern California people have a case before the Supreme Court seeking to determine what the Colorado compact actually means at this time. We are of the opinion that pending that determination of the rights of the river which are in dispute and which may well go against southern California, but on which we seek a Supreme Court determination, we feel that those rights should not be disturbed, pending a Supreme Court declaration on those rights.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I may say to the gentleman that we have testimony in the record from representatives from California, and from southern California, to the effect that all in dispute in the Supreme Court suit is some 2 million acre-feet of water. There is still ample water to provide for all of these participating projects. It was so admitted before our committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the gentleman from California attacks the project because it would add to crop surpluses. One of the first he places in the record as being opposed to irrigation, is the Imperial Irrigation District in California. I wonder what the Imperial Irrigation District would be if they did not have water to put on that great valley? It is a little amazing when he finally boils it down that he is opposed to two projects, namely the upper Colorado, and the Arkansas-Fryingpan. His arguments in the record are not very consistent when they are based against an irrigation project because of surpluses; as a matter of fact, the crops produced under irrigation projects do not add to the surplus. The wheat is not irrigated and the small grains; it is largely alfalfa and beets, things that are not in surplus.

On the matter of the cost of projects, I may say to my colleagues who have been complaining about reclamation costing so much, we spent about $2,800,000,000 in 50 years on reclamation projects. About $560 million of that has been paid back; eventually all will be paid back. In the State of California, the gentleman's own State, they have had $753,687,914, most of it nonreimbursable projects, flood-control projects that pay back not 1 penny. It seems rather odd that the gentleman comes in and complains about reclamation projects and flood-control projects when he has so many in his own State that pay back not one single penny.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I interrupt the gentleman to ask my distinguished chairman if he knows of any reclamation project which in the foreseeable future can result in a surplus.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is quite true.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman from Utah assure the Members of the House that no surplus producing crop will be planted on irrigated projects?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Absolutely not.

Mr. GROSS. Can he look that far into the future in a crystal ball?

Mr. DAWSON. Absolutely not; and that applies as much to the reclamation projects in California as in other places. You cannot look ahead and say there will not be some gain or that there might not be something surplus; there is no way of figuring it out, but I again call attention to the fact that the best authority we have indicates that we are

going to need much more agricultural production than we now have by the time these projects are constructed and in operation. The time is coming when we are going to want this production.

I yield again to the gentleman from Nebraska, whom I am afraid I cut off.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As to surplus, I remember back in the year 1946 in the Foreign Aid bill the gentleman now speaking sponsored an amendment requiring the retention of a backlog of 150 million bushels of wheat, yet today we have a surplus of nearly 1 billion bushels.

Another thing I wish to call attention to is the fact that we are adding about 3 million new mouths to the population every year in excess of deaths each year. The time is not far distant when we shall have a population of two hundred or more million and we are going to need all the food we can produce, not only from the projects the gentleman is speaking about but also from the Imperial Valley project.

What would California be today without water? California would be a desert, yet the gentleman from California comes here with very poor grace arguing against irrigation projects on the ground of producing surpluses. Again I say his own State would be a desert if they did not get water to put upon the soil. Bear in mind also that in California they have many flood control projects that will never pay a cent of money back to the United States Treasury.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE POSTAL PAY INCREASE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate on tomorrow will take up the matter of whether or not that body will override the President's veto of the postal pay increase bill. Frankly, I hope that the Senate will override that veto. It will, of course, take a two-thirds vote to override the veto and from what I understand there will be a close vote. However, the postal workers and all of those who have been trying to help the postal workers on both sides of this Capitol are hoping that the two-thirds vote will result when the vote on the veto of the bill comes up tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read at this time an editorial appearing in the Boston Post, a newspaper I understand supported the President in his campaign and I also understand that it supports the President now. Here is what that paper had to say in an editorial about the veto of the postal-pay increase:

POSTAL-PAY VETO

The President's veto of the 8.6 percent postal-pay bill will, we sincerely hope and trust, be overridden. The reasons given for the veto were as devious as it is possible to get without being hypocritical.

To call upon Congress to enact postal-pay legislation in the public interest which will be fair to 500,000 postal workers—a Congress which, incidentally, granted itself a 50-percent increase, is the height of absurdity.

Instead of seeking to have only a part of the postal-service staff patched and shabby it seems rather obvious that the President prefers to have them all looking like Confederate soldiers on the way home after Appomattox.

The discriminations and inequalities mentioned by the President as one of his reasons for vetoing the bill were, strangely enough, not seen by the individuals in need of a pay increase—the postal workers themselves. This veto message is a new low.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the arguments pro and con on this bill. We know that the committee spent a great deal of time in studying the measure. The full committee heard testimony in hearings that were held day after day, attended by all those interested in the bill. Especially did that committee hear testimony from the Postmaster General and all of the officials of the Post Office Department who were experts insofar as the Post Office Department was concerned.

The bill as finally sent to the President was a compromise between the House and Senate and was the best and fairest compromise that could have been worked out by both houses. The House passed one version, the Senate passed another, then the conferees of both parties met, agreed to a compromise and by overwhelming vote the recommendations of the conferees were accepted by both the House and Senate in the form of a conference report.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. It would appear now that the veto is an attempt to enforce upon the Congress the absolute limits of judgment, and outlining exactly what they shall do. It is either the will of the administration, the position of the Postmaster, or it is nothing. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the veto message?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. MOSS. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to discuss some of the points mentioned in the veto message.

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. MOSS. I am rather puzzled, frankly, to find a veto offered on such weak and, I believe quite frankly, baseless grounds. There are three of them mentioned. First, that the bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees. On the matter of discriminations and inequities, I cannot recall a single case other than the rural mail carriers, and, as the gentleman knows, he joined with me and other members of the committee in an effort to secure some action which would alleviate the unfairness for the rural carriers and give them more money. Their own association urged that the bill be enacted as reported by the committee without change, and it is difficult to aid a group who say they do not want any assistance. But, the fact that there were inequities and that they affected the rural carriers, we readily admit to, but is it not true that in the bill which was presented to the committee last year, the original Frye-Summerfield proposal, an increase was recommended for the general field service employees, but not 5 cents was recommended for the rural carriers? They were completely ignored in the original request, and had the committee acceded to the President at that point and to the Postmaster General, they would have suffered real discrimination, far more than is contained in the legislation which passed the Congress and suffered a veto. It is the only group I can find who suffered discrimination in the version approved by the two Houses of Congress which was not already presented in the version requested by the Postmaster General and by the administration.

The second cause for the veto is that the bill creates grave administrative problems such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates. That is not a good or a sound reason, because you create thousands of individual pay rates whenever you have a salary schedule and reclassification. Reclassification was demanded by the Postmaster General. Each man and each woman having different deductions for their dependents are going to have individual pay schedules, and they are going to be in the thousands, and they were increased very little by the actions of the Congress following upon the bill which secured the blessing of the administration in the first place.

The third reason is, of course, a matter of personal opinion. It was the opinion of Congress that the third reason given by the President, at least, was not convincing. It said that the bill imposes a heavier burden upon the taxpayers than is necessary to establish salary rates throughout the Department which will compare favorably with rates for similar work elsewhere in Government and in private industry. In connection with the cost of the bill and the amount which might be justified, I think it is well to point out, that consistently, the administration has chosen to base their comparisons on 1945 figures, the time of the first pay increase after World War II. In 1945 the cost of living started rising, but it had risen considerably before 1945. A more accurate comparison would be a 1939 base, and on that base every penny of raise voted by the Congress was fairly justified.

The message goes on with some rather interesting reasons, equally groundless, equally lacking in merit. I am reminded over here that the bill fails to make these criteria specific. First, it discriminates against large groups of postal employees such as rural letter carriers, and that we acknowledge. That discrimination is much less than under the administration recommendations of a year ago. It is the schedule recommended by the administration. It is discriminatory as the entire original bill was discriminatory. Then it says "Special-delivery messengers." That just is not the truth. There is no discrimination against the special-delivery messenger in the bill passed by this Congress. The special-delivery messenger was graded up with a very substantial increase and the proposal to put him on a par with the letter carrier would give him a double increase. Historically the special-delivery messenger has drawn a lesser amount. Orig-

inally he was not in the postal field service classified personnel. It has only been in recent years that he was accorded a classification standard. He does not come in with the same type of examination, it is not required to maintain the same proficiency on the distribution of mail, nor have the same overall knowledge of postal regulations that the carrier or clerk, or the postal transportation worker must maintain. Definitely there was no discrimination there. And any other treatment than that accorded the special-delivery messenger in the bill would be giving to him a far greater percentage increase than would go to the bulk of the other working men and women of the postal field service.

Then as a third group there are mentioned supervisors and postmasters. What kind of discrimination did we bring about by the amendments adopted by the Congress which was not present in the bill presented to our committee in the first place? I think it is well to examine exactly that discrimination mentioned by the President and see how well founded it is.

What did we do that affected the postmasters and the supervisory personnel? We took the unfair increases and cut them from the $440 annual maximum recommended by the Postmaster General and by the administration and brought them to a $250 maximum in order to bring about some degree of conformity between the postal field schedule and the general classified schedule.

It might be interesting to note that in grade 14 of the general schedule the step increase is $200; grade 15 it is $250, and in all of the other grades it is $200. The amendment passed by this House brought the field schedule of the Post Office Department into strict conformity to get away from the inequities existing today between the classified schedule and the postal schedule. And if it is because of that that we have been charged with discrimination, then I, for one, as the author of the amendment, want to plead guilty to that discrimination because it is not discrimination; it is simple justice, it is good business, good administrative policy. If the administration wishes to raise the step increases in the higher scheduled employees, let them be consistent and recommend to the Congress that we do the same thing for the classified employees. That has not been done. So that discrimination charge is a baseless charge.

Now we travel on. And I might point out here that all of us recall last year when a 5-percent-increase postal bill was vetoed after the Congress had gone home. One of the principal reasons given was the failure of the Congress to provide postal revenues to underwrite the cost. Strangely enough, that reason has not again been advanced. I guess someone, somewhere, someone convinced the administration that there is no proper relationship between postal rates and postal salaries, that in the role of the employer in the Post Office Department we should hire men and women and pay them decent wages, wages sufficient to attract a career-service employee.

Postal rates is not their responsibility in any way. The rates are set by the Congress, but the President again refers to them as requiring the attention of the Congress. So, I would like to divert for just a moment and point out that in every recommendation coming through our committee for an increase in postal rates, it has been proposed to take the one class of mail which pays a substantial profit to the Department, that is the first-class mail and increase it by an addition of 1 cent per letter in order to underwrite the extremely heavy deficit incurred by reason of the transportation of second- and third-class mail, mail which is subsidy mail and mail which may well be justified to be carried under a subsidy because, after all, it was the decision of the Congress to subsidize that class of mail. But, if it is to continue in a subsidy class, then I think the Congress should underwrite that cost as a public service but not, as has been proposed by the administration, to try to use that as a means to load the cost of the deficit on the back of individuals who use the first-class mail or to use it as a completely unfair and unrelated excuse for vetoing postal legislation, or as a subterfuge to veto the payment of proper salaries to postal workers. To me, this is an example of the most arbitrary use of the veto power that I have ever heard of because it can only mean that we will be threatened with a veto each time the Congress attempts to exercise independent judgment. I was amazed to read in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, May 21, an editorial called "Politics and Pay" and, I will admit now, this has entered the realm of politics and put there squarely by the veto message of the President himself and by no one else. I did everything I could, and I know the gentleman from Louisiana did, together with a number of our colleagues on the committee, to arrive at an honest compromise. We did not try to take the politically popular course of 10 percent or nothing and no reclassification. We swallowed reclassification features of which we were very wary, and which I think the entire Congress should view with considerable concern. We went below what we felt was a proper salary increase figure in a sincere effort to effect a compromise. But, we are now told that the measure of what will be approved by this administration is exactly what the Postmaster General will recommend to the President. I blame the Postmaster General a great deal for giving bad information to the President. But I must state very, very firmly that the President shares the responsibility because he appointed the Postmaster General and, if it is bad information, it is from a man of his own choice.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished colleague, and majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It is true that the President has vetoed one bill passed by a Republican Congress and another bill passed by a Democratic Congress.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. The President has set forth certain objections in his most recent veto message. Do we have any way of knowing whether we have to comply with all those conditions or whether the President will veto any bill which does not follow precisely the language recommended in the veto message?

Mr. MORRISON. That is hard to say because the President has been very inconsistent. First of all, he intimated he would not sign a bill which was over the amount recommended by the Department, which was 6.5 percent or a 5 percent increase with 1½ percent reclassification. Then the committee of the House came out with 7.6 percent, after the Senate committee came out with a 10 percent bill with no reclassification. The press came out with the idea that the President would only sign that bill and nothing more. Then when the bill was amended in the House and went to conference, it came back and was passed by the House overwhelmingly and by the Senate overwhelmingly and the President vetoed that bill which provided for an 8.8 percent pay raise for Federal employees.

Now, the press intimates that they have assurance, evidently from the White House, that the President will sign a straight 8-percent increase bill. How does the Congress know if the President is going to sign 8 percent or what he will sign? He has been quoted by the press as saying he would not sign this and not sign that. He did not sign the 5-percent bill in the preceding Congress. On the other hand, by comparison, we passed a bill that cost the Government far more in salary increases than the 8.8-percent postal bill, which was the Armed Forces bill. There was never any mention made before that bill went before the committee; there was never any mention made before that bill came before the House or the Senate about any veto by the President. He never commented at that time about vetoing that bill. He signed that bill when Congress passed it. It was a good bill and I voted for it and I'm glad the President signed it. However, it seems strange to me why the President, after the postal workers have made a legitimate case, an honest case, a fair case, that they are entitled to 10 percent, the President will not give them 8.8-percent increase, but vetoed this 8.8-percent postal bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the Congress have anything officially at all, either in the veto message or anywhere else, that the President will sign an 8-percent increase bill?

Mr. MORRISON. No; only by indirection from the press.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. We do not have anything in the veto message that tells us what he would sign. In fact, despite all assurances we received about H. R. 4644, I am intrigued with the statement of the President that subsequently, when the House Committee on Post Office and

Civil Service by a substantial bipartisan majority reported the bill H. R. 4644, which although approximately $30 million more costly than my recommendation, that it embodied the essential elements of the reclassification system. In the matter of reclassification, that bill, as reported by the committee, could have been and still can be, with certain corrections, the basis for legislation which would establish fair relationships between salaries. In other words, despite the assurance that H. R. 4644 had been placed for final passage, we are now told that if it is changed—and do you know what those changes are—it may be vetoed. It is to overcome the shortsightedness of the administration, their failure to deal fairly with rural carriers—and again it seems that they must get for their postmasters and their supervisors who have supported every effort of this Congress to grant to the Postmaster General this tremendous authority—they must get for them a percentage increase ranging up to 58 percent and more. That is the sort of equitable pay they want to give. Down at the bottom, 6.7-percent increase for 60 percent, or the majority, of all the people in the Post Office Department, and up at the top as much as 58- or 60-percent increase to the minority. It is typical of the whole administration's policy. To those who have little we give nothing. To those who have everything we give everything we possibly can.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for obtaining this time in order that we on the minority side of the Post Office Committee—that is the minority side from the standpoint of those who signed the report—might let the public know what we think about this veto message.

On April 20, when this subject was under consideration on the floor, I engaged in the debate very briefly. I made a statement on the floor, and I find I was wrong in the statement I made at that time, at least in part of it, and I want to take this opportunity to correct the statement which I made.

First I would like to read the statement which I made on April 20:

> What does the committee amendment of 7.6 percent increase mean in a week to the average employee in increased wages dollarwise? It means an increase of $5.60. What does the Moss amendment mean? It means 80 cents to $1.20 more a week. It means 16 cents to 20 cents a day more than the committee bill. We are now getting down to the point where the wife of a post-office employee goes to the grocery store to buy a quart of skimmed milk and she will get under the Moss amendment from 16 to 24 cents a day more. She can buy 1 quart of milk for her children with the increase under the Moss amendment.

I want to say I find according to the computation of the committee staff that I should have used a cost of 13 cents a day average increase between the Moss amendment and the committee bill. So I was giving the committee bill a little bit the best of it, from 16 to 24 cents. I should have said 13 cents average. That is the correction I want to make in that part of my remarks.

Then I go on to say:

> Does anyone in this House want to tell me that the President of the United States will veto this bill because the Moss amendment will give to the wife of the postal employee the opportunity to buy 1 quart of milk a day more than under the committee bill? If the President should veto this bill because of the Moss amendment I think that his veto would be known as the quart-of-milk-a-day veto. I do not think the President will veto it.

I did not think the President would veto that bill which provides under the Moss amendment an average of 13 cents a day more than the committee bill. My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] has already answered the points made by the President in his veto message to the imbalance in calculations, so now we come down to the very milk of the cocoanut, as we say, or the milk of the argument.

The Moss amendment passed this House by an overwhelming majority. It provided 13 cents a day on the average more to each postal employee in the United States, and the President vetoed it. I did not think he would use the veto on that bill on the basis of that 13 cents a day. I grant to the President the right of the veto, as the Constitution grants it to him—I do not have to grant it to him; I acknowledge that he has the right of the veto, but it seems to me that in times gone by the right of the veto has been exercised only when great principles were involved, principles which were important to the Nation, when vital principles were involved. Now we have noticed over the period of the last year and a half or 2 years that in many cases legislation has gone to the President on things in which he had expressed his viewpoint that were merely changed from his viewpoint. The Congress saw fit to change them. There was the reciprocal trade bill, its time and duration and other things that we can call to mind, yet the President signed the bills and they became law. But here on the postal-pay bill, with 13 cents a day on the average more for the postal employees, goes to the President, and the President uses the great power of the veto. That is as much as saying that a majority of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives were wrong and that a majority of the 96 Members of the other body were wrong, that the President and his advisers were right, that for 13 cents a day he vetoed this piece of legislation and keeps pay raises of something like $5 or $6.50 a week, or $1 a day over their previous wages from getting to these people who need these increases so badly.

I said I did not think the President would veto it. I have to admit that I was wrong; he did veto it. I can only say that in my humble judgment the power of the veto has been used in a case which did not call for a veto but which might have called for an expression of disagreement and at least letting the bill become law without his signature. I say I think the veto was used unwisely in this instance.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very fine remarks and the contribution he has made. I yield at this time to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the country has the unusual spectacle of a President vetoing a pay-raise bill for about 600,000 Federal postal employees where only 13 cents a day is involved. We also have the spectacle of a President twice vetoing the same bill, once last year, but for another reason. The main reason last year was that Congress did not bend to his will and provide as he and the Postmaster General wanted in the same bill for an increase in first-class mail rates from 3 cents to 4 cents. This year he vetoes it, not for that reason but because there is a difference of 13 cents a day between what he insists the Congress pass and what the Congress passed in the bill that was vetoed, applying, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] well said, to at least 60 percent of the postal employees, where they get an increase of about 6½ percent, and some in the supervisory service under the bill that was vetoed, but not for that reason, would receive as high an increase as 58 percent in salary.

We did not see the President veto the tax bill of last year. We now hear unraveled some of the legislative steals involved in that bill. The repeal of two sections has already passed this House upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, a Secretary of the Treasury under the present Republican administration. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] called attention the other day to another provision of that bill which might involve many, many hundreds of millions of dollars, if not some billions of dollars, that was never understood or contemplated. So he did not say anything about that. But when it comes to the pay-raise bill, and the only difference is 13 cents a day, the bill passed by the Congress being 13 cents a day higher for at least 60 percent of the postal employees, than the bill that the President insists upon, I think the editorial of the Boston Post was fair and mild when it said that was small.

I wonder if the President was acting as the Chief Executive of our Government, which is civilian, or whether for a moment he relaxed to the position that he occupied for so many years in the military, particularly when he was Chief of Staff of the Army? Everyone admits he had an outstanding record in the military field, but the President of the United States is the head of the civilian government and not a military government. To veto this bill simply because of a 13 cents a day difference between his views and the views of Congress seems to me putting 600,000 postal employees on trial and court-martialing them without giving ample opportunity to present their views. Much can be said on this. I do not remember when any President ever vetoed a pay-raise bill. At least, I have no recollection of it in my 27 years as a Member of this body.

It is recognized that the question of pay raises is a very difficult one and involves compromises of divergent views within the Congress as well as with the executive branch.

To veto this bill because of a difference of 13 cents a day is about as unjustifiable an act as any I have ever seen committed.

I am strong for foreign aid as being necessary for the national interest of our country. But, I wonder what the position of those Members will be, if they fail to override the veto, will be when they go before their constituents in 1956, having voted $3.5 billion for foreign aid and not voting to give 13 cents a day more to the postal employees.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent contribution.

I yield at this time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, during the proceedings leading up this veto, I had numerous occasions to speak on this bill, and I had generally been following the proposition that the President would find it in his heart to sign a bill that was .6 percent higher than the bill that his supporters indicated he would sign. I was very much disillusioned and disappointed when I read that he had vetoed this bill. I could not help but think that the veto message, which supposedly was the result of great study by the President—in fact, since the bill passed, the press daily carried stories of the great agony the President was going through; he had never studied any bill harder while he was out putting golf balls on the lawn in back of the White House—I was wondering whether he was using that excuse for putting them, the postal workers, into a sand trap. I was wondering whether this whole program was not directed by Robert Montgomery, because it was a very splendid piece of dramatic fiction. But, when the mountain labored to bring forth a mouse, I concluded that for the first time in history a Postmaster General outranked a 5-star General. It seems to me that General Summerfield should be called Mr. Winterfield, because of the coldness of his heart, is so great that he cannot listen to the pleas of the wives and children of the postal employees for a .6 percent raise while he sits in arrogant splendor directing the news agencies of the Republican Party. I wonder whether Mr. Winterfield had gone to Mr. Icy or Mr. Summerfield for this language. We were told this bill would be difficult to administer. As a matter of fact, we find many things that are difficult to administer, so that would not be any good reason. Mrs. Hobby's hobbles have been going on now for the past 7 or 8 weeks. I was wondering whether they were loosing their sails to capture the postal employees, to snare them up and carry them away. Of course, I voted originally for a 10-percent raise, and I was willing to compromise, and being a young Congressman, I was not used to the cooing persuasion and was under the impression that the great smile would not turn to a frown when it came to the women and children of postal workers involved in this matter. But, we are convinced now that there are apparently billions of dollars for dubious foreign allies but not 1 cent for a loyal American doing his daily round of duties. So we are told that the reclassification features have inequities. Well, as I said on the committee when I first saw the first bill—and I served 8 years in the New Jersey legislature as preliminary training to coming here, and I am somewhat familiar with bills—the first bill that Mr. Winterfield put in would take an Indian guide to take you through the intricacies of that bill, designed for one purpose, not classification but absolute nonclassification. It would seem that a man could start out as a janitor at 9 o'clock in the morning, one of these highly efficient gentlemen, and wind up almost being postmaster by 6 o'clock at night, and by the time he got home for dinner he would be off the payroll. So, this veto has closed the icebox door. It has slammed the door against the women and children. It has taken the baby carriage away from somebody who has saved up for it. It has taken away the pint of milk. It has taken away the pound of bologna—it is about the size of what the bologna would cost today, and when it comes to the cost of food, as you can see, I am up to the minute on that important item. So, I conclude by voicing my protest and taking off the gloves and calling it for what it is, a veto by the big brass.

Let me just give you a brief history of the legislation. This is taken from the Postal Record. It says that in 1954, before I arrived here, there was an attempt to jam the Rees 6 percent bill through, and that was defeated 228 to 175.

July 21: Discharge petition on Corbett 7 percent pay bill completed.

August 9: House passes Corbett 7 percent pay bill by a vote of 352 to 29.

August 11: Senate passes Carlson amended Corbett bill.

August 20: H. R. 7774 reconsidered in Senate; Senator KNOWLAND's attempt to attach discredited Summerfield amendments defeated 55 to 16.

August 20: H. R. 7774 approved 69 to 4.

August 23: President Eisenhower vetoes pay bill.

That was last year's veto.

Now we come to 1955. Attempt again made in House to jam through inadequate pay bill; H. R. 4644 defeated 302 votes against 120 votes for.

March 25: Senate passes 10 percent pay bill by a vote of 72 to 21.

Attempt to substitute Summerfield proposal defeated 52 to 41.

April 20: House passes Moss amendments 224 to 189; Taber motion to recommit defeated 287 to 125; S. 1 passes House 324 to 85.

May 9: Rees motion to recommit defeated 275 to 118; S. 1 conference bill passes House 328 to 66.

May 11: S. 1 passes Senate 66 to 11.

On May 19 President Eisenhower vetoes the pay bill for a second time.

His theme song, it seems to me, to the postal employees and to all employees, is "No, no, a thousand times no. No pay raise for you under any circumstances."

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and at this time I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, anyone who is sincerely interested in the wellbeing of the postal worker and his family will vote to override the veto of the postal pay raise bill.

There can be no ifs, ands, or buts about this matter. We all know the postal worker deserves a raise—in fact he deserved it a whole year ago when another Presidential veto deprived him of it.

We all know that the postal worker and his family sharply need such a raise; they are living on humiliatingly low budgets and they should not have to wait any longer for relief.

If an exhorbitant amount of money were involved in all of this quibbling about the size of the raise, it would be different. But there is not. The difference between what we in Congress want to give the one-half million postal workers and what the administration wants to give them is only about $19 million per year. This is a very small sum when stacked up against our overall Government expenditures.

For the postal carrier, the amount involved is just about enough to allow him to enjoy an extra egg, sunny side up, and one extra slice of buttered toast each morning before he starts out on his long hike to deliver the mail. Or it may be enough to put an extra meatless sandwich in the lunch box one of his children takes to school.

The postal worker has been discriminated against for too long a time now. This body should show him that he is not a second-fiddle citizen, but a fine and respected public servant who is appreciated and adequately awarded for the very essential service he performs for all of us.

The veto of the postal pay raise bill should be overridden.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentlewoman for her spendid contribution.

At this time I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] in obtaining time to bring to public attention our side of this important issue. As the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] pointed out, the Postmaster General has a most favorable press. It couldn't be better for him if he wrote all the news stories and editorials in some of the Washington papers.

Members of Congress have been charged in the Washington press with demagogery on postal pay. It seems to me that it would be very difficult to surpass the demagogery of the press on this issue. Under the pretense of being sympathetic to postal and Federal employees the Washington press has campaigned against the bill passed by the Congress and made the veto less difficult for the President to sign.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the President would, in all fairness, sign the postal pay bill. It was a compromise measure worked out by House and Senate conferees. It had been overwhelmingly adopted in both Houses as a reasonable

solution to a most complicated subject over which there has been sharp differences of opinion.

Few were completely satisfied with all of the provisions of the bill. In my opinion, a pay raise of at least 10 percent was thoroughly justified, and for the life of me I cannot see how any Member of Congress can justly oppose the modest 8.8 increase by supporting the President's veto.

I had serious doubts that the so-called reclassification provisions in the bill would benefit the great majority of the postal workers, or result in increased efficiency in the Post Office Department.

But the pay raise was long overdue so I voted for the compromise. There is a great need for additional income by postal workers. Their pay bill had been vetoed last year. The President was poorly advised then. He insisted on a postal rate increase as a condition. Now again he vetoes a postal pay bill regardless of its overwhelming support in both Houses of the Congress.

I have no doubt but that, like Members of Congress, he has been under strong pressure. But I cannot believe the President really understands the injustice his veto is to hard-working postal employees and their families. His veto statement is but a weak defense of the determined position of the Postmaster General.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have heard many stories about the pressure exerted upon Members of the Congress by the Postmaster General, and particularly upon the Republican Members. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] give us any information in that respect not only with reference to last year but this year also?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I think it was true last year as well as this year. I have received complaints from some of my Republican friends. I might say, that on the other side, are some true and sincere friends of the postal employees. They are in favor of this increase, but they are subject to very heavy pressure and threats as I understand from the information which was given to me. It seems to me the President's statement on the veto is a very weak defense for the determined position which was taken by the Postmaster General all along on this bill.

Some of the things that were happening in the postal service caused me to come to a decision on compromise with great reluctance. With the adoption of several safeguarding amendments, I finally voted for the bill which the House passed.

The President had little choice but to veto the bill. His action had been predecided by the adamant position taken by his own Postmaster General and by his Republican leaders in Congress. They had staked their arguments against the bill and even their own leadership reputations on the premise that the President would veto any postal pay legislation granting more than a 7.6 percent increase.

Had the President signed the bill after these desperate and intemperate predictions by his appointed Cabinet officer and his congressional leaders, it would be viewed as a personal rebuke to these individuals and their misguided policies. It would have made it necessary, perhaps, for the Postmaster General to submit his resignation. It also would have cast strong doubt on the further usefulness of his congressional leaders, whose predictions of a veto forced many Republicans to vote the party line on this controversial issue.

Thus, in order to save a few overzealous leaders from embarrassment, the President had little choice but to yield to their pleadings and veto the measure.

Of course, the President had to go through the motions of seriously considering the legislation. To do otherwise would be to admit that the veto message had been prepared in advance.

The emphasis of the veto message was placed on alleged inequities in the bill. This is but a convenient slogan on which to dodge the real objections to the bill and to hide the reactionary thinking and philosophy that motivates the President's advisers.

These same allegations of inequity were made during the debate on the bill in the House. They were effectively answered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], who sponsored the amendments which made the bill palatable to a majority of the House Members. The allegations were repudiated even before the bill left the House and their repetition in the veto message further proves the weakness of the administration's arguments against the bill.

The real inequity involved in this matter is the unwise decision of the President to lend his name to a veto which cannot be morally, economically, or justly defended.

I trust that the Members of both Houses will stand firm on the principle of just and equitable treatment for the postal workers of this country and overwhelmingly vote to override this arbitrary and capricious veto.

This will be a real test and true friends of the postal workers will have the opportunity to stand up and be counted.

I am confident that if we in the House are afforded this chance, the postal workers will surely get the pay raise to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the position that many of our friends on the other side of the aisle are in. Some of them sharply disagree with the Postmaster General on this veto. They resent the kind of pressure that they have been subjected to. I know that many of them would like to vote for this pay bill despite the President's veto.

They do not like to act like rubber stamps. I do not blame them. They have my sympathy. I trust Members of the Senate will ignore the pressure and continue to support the position previously taken for the bill by the overwhelming vote of 66 to 11 on the conference report. Members of the House will then have a chance to express their independence.

This is not a party issue. It is, as a matter of fact, a question that goes much deeper. It is a difference in thinking and philosophy. It is a conflict between supporters of the veto who believe in the "trickle down" theory and those who want to percolate up.

It is a conflict between those who believe that good government needs a strong civil service, Government employees with dignity and self-respect, and those who believe in the big man theory—the strong man who by unscrupulous tactics would have Federal employees crawl and conform with the thinking and philosophy of those who hold the lash.

Mr. Speaker, if right and fairness is to triumph over might and injustice, then Congress will override the President's veto of the postal salary bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of Congress would like to follow the leader of his country on matters of domestic and foreign policy. However, when he is confronted with a message of veto, such as was presented by the President of the United States on the postal pay question, it also becomes his solemn duty and obligation to take a good straight look at the message in determining whether or not he can follow the President's views.

I have taken such a look, and, for myself, I cannot follow the President on his message. I have followed this matter very closely since its inception, being a member of the committee. This Congress has put a lot of time and thought and study on the problem of postal pay, and of reclassification at the Administration's request.

I recall very, very impressively the statement of the President of the United States in this Chamber when he said:

> It is my philosophy that with respect to the human values I shall be liberal, but with respect to fiscal matters I shall be conservative.

I respectfully submit that the message sent down on the postal pay problem does not follow his own philosophy.

To point out that this matter is not purely one of emotion, that it is understood by the rank and file, I would like to read a letter which was written by a constituent to the Miami Daily News, May 18, 1955, which summarizes this whole thing:

> LETTERS FROM OUR READERS—OPPOSES VETO OF POSTAL PAY BILL
>
> To the EDITOR OF THE MIAMI DAILY NEWS:
>
> The postal employees are asking President Eisenhower to approve a bill giving them an 8.8 percent increase in wages. I would like to submit the following facts in opposition to a veto by the President.
>
> Congress is overwhelmingly on record for the postal pay bill. On April 20 the House passed the bill 324 to 85, and on May 9 the House accepted a conference agreement with the Senate 328 to 66. On March 25 the Senate approved S. 1, which at that time called for a flat 10-percent increase by a vote of 72 to 21. On May 11 the Senate accepted the conference agreement by a vote of 66 to 11.
>
> Concern over the cost of the bill, quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5860, May 5: "The cost attributable to salary increases and reclassification is $173,200,000 annually, representing 8.59 percent of the

present payroll." This cost is approximately 1 percent more than the 7.6 percent bill on which the threatened veto is predicated. Dollarwise the difference runs from $40 to $70 annually to rank and file employees, in opposing this the administration does not mention that in the original bill it proposed to give up to 58 percent increases to certain supervisory positions.

Comparison of costs between the postal bill and the military bill approved March 31, 1955: The April 2 issue of Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal reports that the military pay bill provides a 12.4 percent average increase for 1,624,638 officers and enlisted men at an annual cost of $750 million. The postal pay bill before President Eisenhower provides an 8.59 percent average increase for 500,000 employees at annual cost of $173 million.

Because of the time involved a veto should necessitate taking the bill back to both Houses. The problem of postal wage increases has been in Congress for the past 17 months. This seems like a long time to postpone something that everyone is in favor of except a small minority who wish to foist their wishes on the majority.

RICHARD E. WOLFE.

MIAMI.

That, to me, is a factual presentation of the whole problem. I do not see any unyielding emotion on the part of an employee, if this is the postal employee, and I do not know that it is. It is signed by Richard E. Wolfe, Miami, Fla. I would like to elaborate on one single point in the postal-veto message which gives me concern regarding the whole message. One of the big issues was the question of discrimination, inequities that would exist and would be made possible in the postal pay bill because of the fact that whereas the original administration bill provided for an average increase of 27 percent for all supervisory personnel—some ran up as high as 58 percent—on the theory that those charged with greater responsibility should be paid more money, but under the bill as sent to the President a flat increase was provided for all those supervisory personnel increasing percentages, and that according to the theory as we understand it, was one of the reasons why this bill was vetoed, because it would create an inequitable situation, and yet I point out that the administration bill on classified personnel contains a flat increase for all supervisory personnel corresponding.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the overriding of the veto.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent contribution. I would like to say at this time that I have been on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years. I have heard many arguments, pro and con, for pay raises for Federal employees and for postal employees, and the committee during those years reported out many pay-raise bills that were more or less of a compromise, bills that were passed by the House, went to the Senate and to the President; and the Presidents before President Eisenhower always signed and approved the various pay bills which were, in effect, compromises on the part of committees of both Houses, and were passed finally by both Houses.

This particular bill that the President has seen fit to veto, the committee gave it unusual attention, they gave it long attention and, frankly, I think the postal workers made out a reasonable and justifiable and excellent case for a 10 percent increase. I was for a 10 percent increase and felt they deserved a 10 percent increase. I argued before the committee in support of a 10 percent increase, but later yielded to the will of the majority and voted for what did come out of the committee, which was a compromise. On the floor of the House I voted for the Moss amendment. That amendment raised it and made it a little better bill. Then the bill went to conference after the House had passed one version and the Senate had passed another. I was a member of the conference committee. The Senate demanded that the amount be raised to 8.8 percent. I went along with that as I had done on other items. I thought that by giving in to this and by coming out with an 8.8 percent bill—and it was a unanimous vote on behalf of the House conferees and on behalf of the Senate conferees—I felt sure that if both the House and the Senate agreed to it that it would be signed by the President. When I saw how overwhelmingly the 8.8 percent compromise passed both the Senate and the House I thought it was reasonable to believe and hope that the President would sign the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the veto message comes up, it is on exactly the same bill that they voted for when the conference report was adopted?

Mr. MORRISON. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. How are those who voted for the conference report going to reconcile their vote on that occasion, if they vote to sustain the veto? It is on identically the same bill.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct. If the Senate votes consistently the way they voted for the same bill when they voted for the conference report which their conferees demanded and insisted upon, they will have to vote by more than a two-thirds majority which would override the President's veto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. MORRISON, he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Further, is it not true that not only is the bill identical with the issue confronting them at the time of the conference report but the circumstances would appear to be the same, because at the time of the adoption of the conference report each Member was told by the Republican leadership that you will be faced with a veto if this bill is passed? Having voted with the threat of veto hot on their backs, they are now faced with the actual veto. That would be the only changed circumstance.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct. May I add that it was a unanimous vote by the Senate conferees and a unanimous vote by the House conferees on the exact bill that came out of the conference, which is the exact bill that the President vetoed. It is the same bill that is going before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MOSS. I know that the gentleman from Louisiana will join with me and others on our committee in saying that in the event this veto is sustained we will still get out of this House, we hope, a bill that is agreeable and not one that is forced on us and enacted as a result of the blackjacking by the postmaster.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know how many more bills, if the veto is sustained tomorrow, this House is going to have to come out with. But I am not a quitter and I am sure that the larger number of Members of the committee of the House as well as the Senate are not going to quit. We are going to keep on trying until we come out with some sort of a bill that we hope the President will some day agree to. However if the Senate is consistent in their vote, as we hope they will be, that vote will result in overriding the veto tomorrow and it will give us an opportunity here in the House to vote to override the veto also. I would like to make clear, and I do not think this has been made clear, that if the Senate does not vote to override, the House, unfortunately, will not have an opportunity to vote on overriding the President's veto of this particular bill.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman is aware of the fact there has been a campaign on by a great part of the press, I know the majority of the press here in the city of Washington, to convince the employees that this fight has hurt them, but unless we had made this fight, and if we had knuckled down to the first position of the administration, the 5 percent with 1½ percent for reclassification would have been the full measure. As it is, we have had a bitter fight, but we have forced upward the amount which they indicate they will accept. I for one am going to continue to make that fight until we get to the point where we are dealing at least halfway fairly with these people.

Mr. MORRISON. Along that same line of reasoning, we made a fight for a higher bill than a 5 percent bill in the last Congress, but we were not able to get more than 5 percent. But the 5 percent bill which was not justifiable nor fair to the postal worker which passed Congress last year was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Am I correct that the cost of the Moss amendment would have been about $12 million additional? I have just been informed by the gentleman from California that it would be approximately ten to twelve million. Is the gentleman aware that there was testimony before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the U. S. S. *Press Agent*, that the President intends

to send around the world showing peaceful pursuits of atomic power, a ship that contributes nothing directly to the program of nuclear energy and is a ship that is purely a press agent's dream, would cost over $30 million to build, a thoroughly useless ship for the Zulus to look at and the Hottentots to gaze at and the headhunters to get an idea of nuclear power, and the only difference between that ship and any other ship is that it does not have a smokestack? Does the gentlemen think that if the President does away with this useless ship, the *Press Agent*, that will finance the raise, and does not the gentleman think that that will be a good idea?

Mr. MORRISON. I think that would be a splendid idea and perhaps enable us to do something else to further help the postal employees.

Mr. TUMULTY. Instead of that, he ought to call the ship the Postal Veto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also am one of the Members that did not believe the President would veto the postal pay bill. It did not seem possible that he would be so small, as the Boston Post had stated in a recent article.

Such action seems quite typical with this administration when it comes to smallness.

The tax bill passed last session primarily benefits a small few. The administration's juggling on the question of Government bonds hurt the small bank for the benefit of a small group of big bankers. The present farm program hurts the smaller farmers and aids the small minority of large land owners. I can go on—REA and TVA.

All the administration's actions are to help monopolies and large corporations. When it comes to give money to the little guy, the President vetoes it without justifiable reasons. If he had given specific recommendations that Congress could act upon, we certainly would have grounds to either accept or reject the recommendations. As it stands, we will just have to go on fighting as we have been for what we think is proper. This may seem simple, but the administration has put so many roadblocks in the way that it is just impossible to place into a bill what we honestly believe is proper.

I certainly hope the other body overrides the veto, for the bill that was presented to the President is the most equitable one that could be reported out during this session of Congress.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana and my other distinguished colleagues concerning the irresponsible use of the veto power by the President in connection with the postal pay raise bill. I was extremely sorry that the President elected to exercise his veto in this instance. This action is to be regretted primarily because it denies again an immediate pay raise to the thousands of persons to whom one has been long overdue. Secondly the veto is to be regretted because, as a reading of the veto message so clearly indicates, it was based on such shallow grounds. I am certain that the overwhelming number of Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle, are disappointed in the President's action in denying benefits so richly deserved for such obviously undeserving reasons.

A further reason for my regretting the veto is in a sense personal and unique. I regret it because it was the handiwork of one of my most distinguished constituents. A constituent who nowadays seems to be enhancing his knowledge and his reputation on how to raise prize-winning beef cattle but shows a discouraging lack of knowledge and appreciation of the problems of the people in this country whose primary concern is putting enough hamburg on the table to feed their family.

In his remarks the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, suggested that in vetoing the postal pay bill the President suffered from a reversal to his military character and had forgotten that this is not a military state but a civilian government. That may or may not be true but I would rather suggest that the President's unfortunate action in this instance illustrates the wisdom as well as the rumor in the story that was making the rounds a year or so ago. That story had to do with the reply of the gentleman to the lady who expressed deep and sincere concern over the fact that a professional military man now occupies the White House. As the story goes the gentleman's sage remark was: "Madam, having a professional military man as our President doesn't worry me nearly so much as having an amateur civilian." It is difficult to cite many instances in our history where the veto power was used for a less substantial and more picayune reason than in this instance. I seriously suggest that anyone who really understands the purpose of our Constitution in our form of government would not have abused the veto power as it was last Thursday. Further I would daresay that anyone who truly appreciates the problems of the postal employees of this Government would not have done so. In my opinion this unfortunate veto can only be explained as the action of a man who lacks the fundamental appreciation of the basic problems facing the average American citizen as well as an understanding of the functions of our American democratic government. For these reasons I sincerely hope and trust the Congress of the United States will override the President's veto of the postal pay bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes on two subjects, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express my deep appreciation to the House that our fine Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN KENNEDY, returns to Washington either today or tomorrow. We have missed him greatly. He had a very serious operation 8 months ago as the result of an injury he received during World War II when he saved the lives of a number of his crew. He was tremendously brave then when he risked his life for others. He has been tremendously patient and brave in his illness. He was getting along well when I understand he had a fall resulting from a defective crutch. But he has won out, and he is coming to Washington to resume his duties. We all admire the brilliance of his mind and his kindliness and his friendliness, and we are delighted that he is back again with us in the Congress. And I would like to pay tribute to his very beautiful and devoted wife, who was with him all during his operation and all through his convalescence in Florida.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The remarks of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts are consistent with the fine example she has always set, a member of the Republican Party, in making the expressions that she has about our distinguished Senator, JOHN KENNEDY, who is a member of the Democratic Party. It is consistent with the nobility of mind that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has always evidenced and been an example of, to others. I want to join with the gentlewoman in her remarks. I am very glad to see my good friend, JOHN KENNEDY, able to come back, and I know that the gentlewoman joins with me in my sincere hope that his condition will continue to rapidly improve and that he will quickly regain good health.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel sure that he will. I know that the gentleman, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, was a very gallant veteran of World War I and that JOHN KENNEDY was a very gallant veteran of World War II. It reminds me that we would have no freedom in this country today without veterans like my colleagues from Massachusetts, Congressman McCORMACK and Senator JOHN KENNEDY. I, too, hope that Senator KENNEDY will steadily improve, and I hope that the people will be kind in not asking too much of him on his return. He is so able; we are likely to do that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. TUMULTY), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. BONNER), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST in connection with a program for hearings on the Salk vaccine before his committee on Wednesday.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) in three instances.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. WITHROW.

Mr. COON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include an editorial.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include an article.

Mr. FORD and include remarks made by the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. RICHARDS and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JONES of Missouri and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FLOOD and include a statement, in support of House Resolution 237 introduced by him for the establishment of international trade centers in the United States.

Mr. KNOX.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. MORRISON) and to include a newspaper article.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 153. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1580. An act to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1805. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 163. An act for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos);

S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry;

S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha;

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts;

S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri; and

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

822. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

823. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

824. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and a list covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act of July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

825. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 83d Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

827. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

828. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

830. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

831. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

832. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Navy industrial fund, Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, for the period July 1, 1953, to November 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1955, the following bills were reported on May 20, 1955:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 191. A bill to

regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2406. A bill to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601, of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition; with amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3908. A bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6227. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 23, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARY: Committee of conference. H. R. 4876. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 610). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5923. A bill to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway; without amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5881, a bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 249. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2851, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 6402. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the various States with respect to civil causes of action and criminal offenses committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6403. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6404. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6405. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6406. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 6407. A bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 6408. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6409. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 6410. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6411. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 6413. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 6414. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and to provide for the insurance of loans thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6415. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6416. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6417. A bill to revise and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.," approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 6418. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 6419. A bill to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6420. A bill to provide that the town referred to as "Saffaras, Ind." be referred to in all laws, regulations, documents, and records of the United States as "Sassafras, Ind."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to erect a memorial to the memory of Albert Einstein; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 312. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution relating to sales of Commodity Credit Corporation feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Joint resolution passed by both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature which memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes in order to provide the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes in order to provide the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, to send its representative to Hawaii to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural-electrification cooperative under the Rural Electrification Administration to serve areas without electricity in the county of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to the use of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell residence lots without further notice or auction after 6 months after said lots were first offered for sale; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to waive certain restrictions with respect to exchanges of public lands for emergency relief to distressed persons in Puna, T. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

to enact legislation to provide that the proceeds of sales of real property owned by estates, trusts, and individuals where owned by said estates, trusts, or individuals for 10 consecutive years prior to said sale or sales be taxed for Federal income-tax purposes as capital gains and not as ordinary income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 6421. A bill for the relief of certain individuals whose land was flooded by action of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 6422. A bill for the relief of Clelia Cusano Puglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6423. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Sanchez-Villegas, Maria Luisa Gama de Sanchez, Juan Jose Sanchez-Gama, Oscar Fernando Sanchez-Gama, Maria Luisa Sanchez-Gama, and Ruth Sanchez-Gama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 250. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6401, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

282. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution supporting in principle the report of the Reserve program committee submitted to and approved by National Council, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, adopted at Madison, Wis., May 7, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

283. Also, resolution unanimously passed at the annual membership meeting of the Racine County Republican Party, Wisconsin, April 28, 1955, supporting and urging passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which in essence provides that no treaty, or agreement of any kind, or law, shall become superior to or supersede the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

284. By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming: Petition of Mrs. Kenneth Lynn, Newcastle, Wyo., and 27 others, to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

285. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of citizens of Herkimer, N. Y., favoring H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

286. Also, petition of citizens of Ilion, N. Y., favoring H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Control of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address concerning the control of juvenile delinquency, delivered by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], at the University of Missouri at Columbia, Mo., on April 29, 1955. In my opinion, his address was an important contribution to an understanding of this major social problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI CONFERENCE ON THE CONTROL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, COLUMBIA, MO., APRIL 29, 1955

Senator Noble, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a twofold privilege and pleasure for me to take part, with you, in this tremendously important conference on juvenile delinquency; first, because it affords me an opportunity to speak on a problem that is so close to my heart; and second, because it is a source of real gratification to have this inspiring evidence that you and the people of our own State of Missouri are not sitting back and waiting for someone else to find the answers to this difficult problem for you. You have taken the leadership; you are pointing the way; you are setting an example—an example of democracy in action—an example, I might add, of the kind of action that should be taking place in every State of the Union but that, unfortunately, is not.

All of you who have joined as individuals and as organizations in making this conference possible are performing a real and worthwhile service. You can indeed be proud of your part in this conference and I know it goes without saying that you recognize that the responsibility doesn't end here. We haven't solved the problem of juvenile delinquency because we have met here to talk about it. We have just taken the first step—an important and necessary step, to be sure—but the real job lies ahead of us.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I do not claim to be an expert in this field. I am sure that the distinguished and able speakers who have preceded me are experts in their fields and have contributed a great deal to your thinking. I also feel sure they would agree with me that just as the causes of delinquency are many and diverse, so the answers must be sought from many and diverse sources. Out of my own experience as a prosecutor and district attorney, and out of my service as a member of the Senate Committee on Federal Penitentiaries and the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have learned—just as you doubtless have learned through your own experiences—that the more we know about this problem, the more we realize that we are not going to find the answer all done up in fancy trimmings and handed to us in a nice neat package. It isn't that easy.

The hard, unpleasant truth is that we are not even holding the line against juvenile delinquency. We are losing the battle. And each day, each week, each month that we procrastinate, we are losing further battles and wasting more of our resources, not just financial resources, but human resources. After all, we are dealing with human lives, and each day more and more young people—more and more children—are coming into conflict with the law.

Our recent committee report, covering more than 16 months of intensive work in this field, minced no words in this respect. We said, bluntly: "If this Nation continues its present feeble attempts to prevent juvenile delinquency, we can be certain that the harvest we will reap in later years will be a bigger and tougher crop of juvenile delinquents and youthful and adult criminals, ultimately requiring more and more prisons." We pointed out that the stream of children through the Nation's juvenile courts grew from 300,000 in 1948 to 435,000 in 1954, and that if it continues to mount at this same rate the figures may well reach 785,000 in the next 5 years. But this is only part of the picture, because we also know that only 1 in 3 cases reported to the police ever reaches the courts. So we have the appalling figure of a million and a quarter youngsters every year coming into conflict with the law. The tragedy is that in a great majority of these situations a youngster could be saved for a happy, productive life and useful work in society.

Much of the problem exists today because of apathy—apathy of the local and Federal Government, apathy of parents, churches, schools, and all the other pillars of our society. This is a blunt statement, but I don't think you invited me here because you wanted to hear some fancy phrases about how well we're doing. This is the way I see the situation today. Now, I do not say all parents, nor all schools, nor all churches, but in every community in our country enough of them are falling down on the job to be contributing factors in this complex problem of juvenile delinquency.

In California a bewildered mother testified before our committee. She told us the tragic story of her son's addiction to narcotics, of his ventures into crime, and of his inevitable conflict with the authorities. "Why?" she asked us. "What was the reason?" We couldn't give her the answer.

Wherever we go we are approached by parents, teachers, social workers, interested citizens, and reporters, and they ask us, "Do comics cause juvenile delinquency? Does television cause juvenile delinquency? Do slums cause juvenile delinquency?" Everyone seems to be searching for a simplified, prepackaged answer, so that we can go right out and correct the situation. We can't give these people a simple answer, either, but the work of our committee is helping to find the answers. What we can do—and what we are doing—is to set the framework within which this many-faceted problem can be solved. We can recommend—and we have—corrective legislation on the part of the Federal Government. We can—and I believe we have—aroused communities to action by focusing the spotlight on those who benefit from the exploitation of youth. And we will make progress, if we are willing to devote our energies and resources to the job.

When our recent report was issued, one national news service commented: "Seldom in the memory of veteran legislators and newsmen here has Congress issued so shocking a report." I'd like to tell you some of the things the report said—and some of the things it did not say.

Last year, we went about our hearings this way: We went north to Boston, south to Miami, west to San Francisco. We studied the problem in the District of Columbia and in New York and Philadelphia, and along our southern border at El Paso, Texas, and San Diego and in many other communities.

What we tried to do was to take a representative sample of the Nation, and by the time the community hearings were completed, we had perhaps not a complete, but certainly a comprehensive picture of the national problem. In community after community, we heard testimony about local conditions that duplicated the problems we found everywhere else. The most disheartening thing, I think, was that so many of the factors contributing to juvenile delinquency could have been prevented.

One of the most distressing factors brought to light by our committee's investigation is the use of narcotics. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get any reliable statistics on the extent to which narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs are used by juveniles because the methods of reporting differ from those of other criminal activities. Most of us have been vaguely aware that there exists a narcotics problem, but seldom has this been more clearly illustrated than in our committee's hearings. The readily available evidence that an increasing number of children are becoming drug addicts was presented to us over and over again.

From the evidence presented to our committee, it would appear that this is a major problem in perhaps a dozen of our largest metropolitan areas and in cities close to the Mexican border and in port areas through which narcotics are smuggled into our country. But it is a potential danger in every other community where narcotics syndicates can gain a foothold because State or local statutes are weak or unenforced.

In testimony before our committee, a chief probation officer in California reported frankly that there was an alarming and rapid increase in the use of narcotics by teenagers. In Denver it was revealed that in one section of the population, 80 to 90 percent of the teenagers had used marihuana at least occasionally. In Iowa—yes, in our calm, peaceful midwest—the superintendent of the State training school for girls testified that 25 percent of the girls coming into her institution had used marihuana. One responsible organization estimated that 7,500 youngsters in one city alone were narcotic addicts. In our hearings we found a direct correlation between the users of narcotics and juvenile delinquency. Most of the young people arrested for narcotic offenses already had a police record. Many youngsters turned to criminal activity in order to raise the $20 or $30 a day necessary to keep them in drugs.

There was considerable evidence, too, that many youngsters take to drugs or narcotics just for the thrill of it. Once addicted, the road back is long and doubtful. Only in two cities in the entire United States, for example, are there follow-up centers for the care of cured narcotics addicts, yet some estimates of recurrence run as high as 99 percent.

What about Federal Government activity in this field? It can be summed up in three words: understaffed, overworked, and underpaid. To illustrate, in El Paso, Tex., almost 34 percent of the total narcotics arrests were youngsters under 21 years of age. Yet the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has only one man in El Paso and another in San Diego. These two men not only must police the entire Mexican border—a major entry point for narcotics—but are also responsible for policing the thousands of legitimate outlets for narcotics and drugs as well as for maintaining their own offices and doing their own clerical work. On its face, this is an impossible situation. Is it any wonder that so many youngsters in El Paso come under the influence of narcotics?

As in so many other contributing areas of juvenile delinquency, most middle income families tend to feel that drug addiction is something that can't happen to their children. But sometimes they are abruptly shaken out of their lethargy, like those parents in pleasant Oklahoma City where over 250 juvenile addicts were arrested last year in just one police roundup. All of these children were between 13 and 18; all of them were from middle and upper-middle income homes.

In this connection, our committee made three recommendations to the Congress. We recommended more narcotics agents. We recommended compulsory hospitalization of addicts. And we recommended mandatory graduated sentences without suspension or probation for convicted narcotics peddlers.

Not, perhaps, so sensational an area so far as newspaper headlines are concerned, but nevertheless an important problem in this field is the matter of runaway children. Our committee found that at least 200,000 children became runaways each year and more than half of them go from one State to another. We found tremendous variations among State and local agencies in dealing with children who run away from home. Detention facilities in most cases are grossly inadequate. We found such practices as "border patrols" or "sunset patrols" which consisted of escorting the youngster to the edge of a community or county—sometimes after a night's lodging and a meal—and admonishing him to move on or get home any way he can. We found that one of the major problems was lack of funds to pay for transportation or care for the runaway. It is perfectly understandable that most States are reluctant to spend their limited funds for out-of-State children when these funds are so badly needed for the care of their own children. The result is that thousands of youngsters annually are apprehended as destitute or delinquent and are thrown into jail where they are exposed to every kind of vice and crime until someone works out the puzzle of how to get them home.

With two of my colleagues in the Senate, I have introduced legislation aimed at correcting these situations. One of our proposals would provide Federal assistance to the States on a temporary basis and with a clause for Federal reimbursement, to assist in getting runaway children back to their own communities as quickly as possible.

Narcotics and runaway children are but two of the many contributing causes to juvenile delinquency. There are also the problems of fathers who desert their families, of the traffic in crime and horror comics, and of pornographic literature, and of crime and violence on television. Our committee made intensive investigation into these problems, but I mention these factors now only in passing because there are other matters I would like to talk about.

Now, we know that a child doesn't grow in a vacuum—that his immediate physical environment plays a major role in the development of his attitudes and actions. With this in mind, we went into studies of housing, health, and education.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to spell out to anyone here the overcrowded conditions prevailing in our classrooms. Nationwide, we need at a minimum 300,000 additional classrooms. Here in Missouri we will need close to 10,000 additional classrooms in the next 5 years. Serious as our situation is here, in some areas it is even more shocking. For example, with 200,000 children now attending school on a part-time basis because of overtaxed and overcrowded facilities, the county of Los Angeles would have to dedicate a new 1,300-pupil school every Monday morning of the year, merely to keep abreast of increased enrollments.

I would like to read you just one sentence from Nation's Business for May. Under the heading "Education: Crisis Will Continue," it stated: "Today more than 600,000 children are attending school on a half-time or part-time basis because of lack of available classrooms, and in 526 urban communities, one-third of the children were in classes of 35 or more."

What happens in these overcrowded schools? The teachers in our elementary and high schools who are in the best position to spot signs of maladjustment and emotional tension are trying desperately to handle large classes and must necessarily plan their programs to meet the needs of the normal, well-adjusted children. The child with problems—and the delinquent child, in the vast majority of cases, has been a problem child in school—is inevitably neglected because in the average school in the average American community today there is no time, there are no funds, and there are no facilities, no special classes, no remedial teachers, no skilled social worker or visiting teacher programs to help families and children with difficulties. Here, where we could identify and help a troubled child before he becomes a delinquent, we are neglecting him instead.

Local school districts simply are unable to meet this problem. If our school facilities are to be anywhere nearly adequate, the Federal Government must assist. I am glad to be a sponsor of legislation to make Federal funds available for school construction. Our schools are in the first line of our Nation's defense against delinquency, and all the arguments about economy, all the false propaganda that Federal assistance means Federal control, all the conferences to review for the 100th time the extent of the need, all the classrooms that we may, perhaps, get around to building 10 or 15 years from now, will not mean a thing to the troubled child who needs help today. Nor will they result in one penny's saving in our annual crime bill and in the funds we pay out each year for prisons. We can make a bold, realistic attack on our shameful school situation, or we can drift along and hope somehow things won't get too far out of hand. The choice is up to us.

What about housing and juvenile delinquency? We have all heard over and over again that slums breed delinquency and crime. That statement, of course, is not literally true. Some of our finest citizens were born and raised in slum areas, but those Horatio Alger stories are the exception, not the rule. The fact is that a disproportionately large number of delinquents do come from slum areas. All children—some more than others—are affected by the sights and sounds to which they are exposed every day. We know that slums have a demoralizing effect on the kind and quality of home life, and we know that they expose children daily to examples of every kind of vice and crime and to the kind of distorted values that make the neighborhood hoodlum the local hero.

We need more slum clearance and more low-cost public housing—a need that is not being met by private builders because other types of home building are more profitable. Here again, we have a choice—are we willing to vote local bond issues or spend Federal funds to wipe out squalid slums and provide better housing, or are we going to spend that money to pay the cost of adult crime and to try to punish or rehabilitate adult offenders.

Treatment services and facilities, including detention homes and after-care services, were found in our hearings to be one of the weakest links in the chain of rehabilitation for juveniles. It is incredible, but true, that so many communities still seem to expect that if they put a delinquent boy behind four walls in an institution lacking adequate facilities and staff, and that if they keep him there for a period of months, by some miracle he will be rehabilitated. Too often, exactly the opposite happens. Yet, every year, over 100,000 boys and girls are confined in ordinary jails with older and hardened criminals as their companions 24 hours a day. Other institutions for the rehabilitation of youngsters are sorely overtaxed, and nationwide there is a severe

shortage of trained personnel to care for such youngster.

Another major problem in the field of delinquency, our committee discovered, lies in the whole complex area of the authority of the juvenile courts and their relationship to probation officers and welfare agencies. I am sure that this was discussed in detail in your sessions yesterday, but I would like to add just one thought. Our committee found an impossible state of confusion in the laws relating to children and the family. For example, we asked numerous juvenile and domestic relations judges to define the legal status of a child who is committed to a training school. What rights remain to the child's parents—what are their obligations? Can a training-school superintendent decide to place a child in a foster home, or must the consent of the parents be secured? The amazing answer was received was: They just don't know; the law isn't clear. In the field of family law—a field that affects the day-to-day lives of so many people—why have we not devoted more thought to codification and restatements of the law? I think this conference could perform a tremendous service if it were to set in motion a real effort for such a codification and restatement.

Another service to youth demanding immediate attention is the area of mental health. Our committee heard considerable testimony as to the value of mental-health clinics in preventing juvenile delinquency. It is estimated that from 10 to 20 percent of the young people who will appear before the juvenile courts this year—and there will be four to five hundred thousand of them—will be in need of residential care under the supervision of a psychiatrist. The emotionally disturbed child can often be saved for a happy and productive life in society if his problems are noted early enough and treatment is promptly available. But all too often, the testimony revealed, treatment is available only after many months of waiting. This is another field in which Federal assistance is needed, and, to this end, I have joined with a number of other Senators in sponsoring legislation to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness by qualified nongovernmental groups. This study should result in a well-knit body of knowledge that will be of incalculable value to us in the study of the mental-health problem.

Another major concern to our committee is the tremendous gap that exists between the amount of money required and the amount actually available for family welfare work, for education, psychiatric treatment, parole work, court work, and recreational facilities. The problem here is so basic that we have to face up to the fact that lack of adequate funds will hamper our efforts to combat juvenile delinquency for some time to come. I have repeatedly said, and I firmly believe, that the emphasis in the delinquency fight must be placed upon local endeavor, but there are many areas—some of which I have mentioned today—where Federal participation is essential. I might say, in this connection, that not a single witness who appeared before our committee nor a single one of the thousands of people who wrote to us suggested that any of the Federal services now in effect be curtailed or discontinued. Rather, the majority expressed a desire for expanded Federal activity.

Now you may say—and I certainly concur—that most of the recommendations we have made will cost money. You can't build schools and clear slums and train personnel and provide additional services with good intentions. These things cost money—and so does crime. For the year 1954, the crime bill of our Nation was $20 billion. This is the appalling figure presented by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before Congress. This amount would buy 100 supersize aircraft carriers. It represents a cost of $495 for each family in the United States. For every dollar we spend on education, we spend $1.82 on crime. For every dollar contributed to all the churches in America, we spend $10 on crime. In fact, if we combined all the contributions of all Americans to all charities, we would find that crime costs twice that amount. How shortsighted, then, to think that a dollar lopped off our educational budget is a dollar saved.

In all of this, we must remember that delinquency is a product of our very complex society and of the conflicts and tensions that surround all of us all of the time. We must keep ever in mind that there is no one simple solution—that the answer is not to be found merely in more recreational facilities, or in better housing, or in more institutions, or, for that matter, in psychiatric care, although all of these measures are important and will help alleviate the problem. Competition between gangs reflects the sharp social and economic competition in our general culture. Gang fights between children of various ethnic groups reflects the antagonisms and prejudices of adults in a society that preaches democracy for all, but, all too often, practices discrimination against some because of their membership in racial, national, or religious groups. In the final analysis, this problem is a symptom of the weaknesses in our whole moral and social fabric. The responsibility falls upon all of us, for it is the delinquent family, the delinquent community, the delinquent society that breeds a delinquent child—children are not born delinquent.

We do know that delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect, and by this, I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation as well as physical. As parents, we must strive to maintain the kind of home life where, irrespective of economic circumstances, our children will feel the warmth of love and affection, will feel that they are an integral part of the family unit and are wanted and understood. We must look also to our churches and to our schools to help impart to our children a feeling of security, a feeling that they really belong.

What can we here in Missouri do?

One of our committee's major findings was the almost complete lack of coordination among agencies interested in the problem. In many areas we found no machinery whatsoever geared to cope with the problem of juvenile delinquency. What you are doing here, today, in this conference, represents one of the most constructive steps in fighting this problem. The coordination and cooperation represented here should be carried on, not only within the State, but by maintaining a liaison with the Senate committee and with other Federal, State, community, and national and local private agencies in the field. Out of this conference can come the leadership not only for groups throughout our State, but for other States. You can keep public attention focused on the problem. I don't suggest sensationalism. The true picture of juvenile crime is altogether too sensational. It is that bad.

Here are some other suggestions that have come out of our committee study: Each police force should have at least one man and woman, and larger cities should have a squad, specially trained in handling juveniles.

Each community should investigate its own detention facilities for young people. They should not be confined indiscriminately with adults.

Physical and psychological examinations should be given to every youngster who comes into serious trouble with the law.

All courts should have an adequate probation staff, and I want to stress here, that we should make sure the caseload does not negate any efficient operation of the system. We should also work out better systems of cooperation between the courts and the social agencies.

We should establish and adhere to fresh, modern standards for institutional care that will insure that training schools are a place for juvenile rehabilitation; not a place for training criminals.

Is the problem so broad, are the efforts and the funds required so great that the situation is hopeless? I heartily reject such a defeatist attitude. We must have the courage and the will to begin where we are, just as did the men who drained the swamps to combat malaria, long before DDT was discovered, just as did Sister Elizabeth Kenny, long before Dr. Jonas Salk found his wonderful vaccine. We can never look forward to finding a DDT or a vaccine to prevent delinquency, but we can, like those courageous citizens, begin where we are.

I realize this is no small order. But this is Missouri. And in Missouri we have the courage, and the heart, and the will to do the job.

Hon. L. Mendel Rivers Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article from the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 17 concerning the festivities at L. MENDEL RIVERS Day in Charleston on May 16.

It is good to know that the people of the First South Carolina District appreciate the outstanding service rendered his district and the Nation by our colleague, MENDEL RIVERS. It has been said that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." Rivers Day proves that that is not always the case.

The article follows:

Armed Forces Week started here yesterday with what turned out to be an L. MENDEL RIVERS Day, honoring the Charleston Congressman who is one of this Nation's greatest supporters of the military services.

The words were those of Joseph P. Riley in introducing Mr. RIVERS at a giant luncheon in the Francis Marion Hotel. Arranged by 7 service clubs of the area, it was attended by 457 persons. Included were top echelon Army, Navy, Marine and Air Corps personnel, and civic leaders in all walks of life.

Each service club had a part in the program.

Paul Quattlebaum, Jr., chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee, was master of ceremonies. The Reverend Ralph S. Meadowcroft, president of Rotary, pronounced an invocation, after the 6th Naval District Band played the national anthem.

Mr. Meadowcroft first asked 10 seconds of silent tribute to the memory of Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former president of the Citadel, who died Saturday in Washington. He then said two prayers: one for the men and women of the armed services, another for the Nation's men in authority.

The program centered entirely around Mr. RIVERS. He was introduced by Mr. Riley as president of the Lion Club and the response was by T. Frank Simmonite, president of the Charleston Exchange Club.

Harold A. Petit, president of the chamber of commerce, then read a number of tributes to Mr. RIVERS, including letters and telegrams from such persons as Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, Adms. Arthur Radford and Robert B. Carney and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. All members of the South Carolina delegation in the National House of Representatives also sent tributes to their First Congressional District colleague, and other expressions came from civic and business leaders. The entire collection, mounted in glassine pages in a heavy leather case, was presented to Mr. RIVERS.

Civilian honor guests were next introduced by Julius E. Burges, president of Kiwanis, and military guests were presented by Herbert N. Steinert, vice president of the Uptown Exchange Club. The latter represented commanding officers of all Charleston area and Lowcountry installations, including the Parris Island Marine Base.

Final tribute was presentation to Mr. RIVERS of a handsome silver tray, appropriately engraved. This was done by Richardson M. Hanckel, president of Sertoma.

In addition to expressing his thanks, Mr. RIVERS' address was a general discussion of the military services and their problems, with which he has been connected closely as a member of the Armed Service Committee of the House of Representatives.

He emphasized the great size of military expenditures—65 cents, he said, of every tax dollar—and the deadly nature of war in an atomic age.

"Our armed services have got to be smart," he said. "They play a deadly game."

In two occasions he departed from a prepared text to make side comments on items which have figured recently in the news.

Taking note of disclosure that some of the armed services are heavily overstocked on foodstuffs—including enough hamburger in the Navy, one story has said, to last some 400 years—Mr. RIVERS said the services have to be prepared for any eventuality: "I would rather they had too much than too little."

Of recent cutbacks in the Armed Forces personnel, including an attempt by President Eisenhower to stabilize manpower on a permanent basis just short of 3 million men and women Mr. RIVERS said: "If anybody knows manpower problems, Dwight D. Eisenhower is the man. If he doesn't, nobody does. There have been peaks and valleys in armed services manpower which have been unconscionably costly. If manpower can be stabilized, then we can plan intelligently."

"The world," Mr. RIVERS said, "has seen more dramatic changes in the techniques of warfare in the last 20 years than was witnessed in the 5,000 preceding years. To cope with fantastic developments, amazing discoveries, requires a new type of individual in our Armed Forces.

"Today we have electronics specialists, nuclear physicists, radar experts, sonar operators, engineers fully versed in the problems of supersonic speeds, experts in the defense against biological warfare, men trained in the highly complex field of guided missiles, submariners who are conversant with atomic power—all performing duties unheard of 20 years ago.

"So when you see a member of our Armed Forces today you are not looking at a young man who has merely acquired the simple attributes of a sailor, or a soldier, or a marine, or an airman. You are looking at an individual who must be conversant with weapons and equipment, and techniques that were unknown to mankind 25 or 30 years ago. The intellectual level of our Armed Forces has necessarily increased. We demand more and more from our young servicemen and thus they are entitled to even greater respect and admiration from every American citizen.

"They must be prepared to fight a conventional war or a nuclear war. They must be prepared to combat hydrogen bombs, atom bombs, biological warfare, and all of the newest devices that are capable of destroying. This is a double burden.

"Now we hear a great deal about waste and duplication in our Armed Forces. And we all hate waste just as we are all opposed to sin. But I would caution you against the specious remedy of consolidation, that is usually proposed in the guise of eliminating waste and duplication. There is oftentimes a fine line of distinction between duplication and competition and if we eliminate competition because it involves some bits of duplication, we may be playing with the fate of our Nation.

"We are undergoing a reduction in strength today in our Armed Forces. Next year the end-strength of the Armed Forces is estimated to be 2,859,000 men and women. On December 31, 1954, we had an armed force of 3,180,000 men and women. There, of course, is a savings in manpower and a savings in dollars. Unfortunately, there are few people in the world who are competent to estimate exactly what strength we must maintain to be sure of safety. Obviously, it is better to err on the side of too many, than it is to err on the side of too few. If those who have been trained for the greater part of their lives in the strategy of war can assure us that our commitments can be maintained and the defense of this Nation guaranteed on a force of 2,859,000 men, then it must abide by their decision. In announcing this estimated end-strength for next year, the President has also indicated that for the foreseeable future this strength will not be materially diminished. Thus for the first time in the history of the United States we are entering into a long-range military program of a predetermined size which augurs well for our own security. It means that the days of valleys and peaks are a thing of the past. It will permit orderly planning and orderly procurement."

Federal Aid To Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 25, the House Committee on Education and Labor will start hearings on several bills introduced in Congress and referred to the committee to determine what action Congress should pursue in Federal aid to libraries.

I am greatly interested in this program, as I represent a rural area consisting of 16 counties in northern Michigan.

In Michigan at present we have 835,000 persons who are without public library service. However, Michigan has not been derelict in meeting its obligation for library service. State aid to libraries was established in Michigan in 1937 and has continued with appropriations annually since that date; however, we do have this area where no library service exists. This has been brought about mainly by the rapid growth in population and the question of libraries is unsolved.

Michigan Library Service is attempting, at this time, to develop a five county regional library in Grand Traverse, Benzie, Antrim, Leelanau, and Kalkaska Counties. This new service would serve approximately 90,000 people.

I, therefore, recommend favorable consideration of legislation which would bring Federal aid to States where there are areas without public library service. My colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, Miss THOMPSON, joins me in this request.

An Un-American Labor Practice Which Should Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered this morning before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club, in which I touched on a developing situation which, in my opinion, should command the prompt attention of all liberty-loving Americans. I desire to call this to the attention of the Congress and the country through the insertion of a news release covering my address.

Federal and State laws protect stockholders of corporations from having their resources dissipated by business leaders through contributions to political campaigns in support of candidates selected by these top business officials. Unfortunately, it appears that Federal and State laws are ineffectual in providing the same protection for workers belonging to labor unions whose leaders frequently impose contributions upon union members for use in political campaigns, even though the individual worker may prefer some opposing candidate. Obviously, this is an un-American and an unjustified use of labor-union authority.

The State of Wisconsin last week approved legislation barring these practices. By State and Federal legislation the freedom of the laboring man to support only such candidates as he individually prefers should be restored.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS DELIVERED MONDAY MORNING BEFORE THE ROCK CREEK WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB IN WOODWARD & LOTHROP AUDITORIUM, BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE BRANCH

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 23.—Speaking before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club here this morning, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, urged the assembled women to "use the vantage point of your location here in our National Capital to warn American women everywhere that the great crusade they led in 1952 in electing President Eisenhower must be climaxed by even greater efforts in 1956 in

order to preserve the peace and protect the new moral tone in Government and overall prosperity which have come as dividends from the last Republican victory."

Senator MUNDT warned the women of a "growing menace to freedom" which he said, "is hidden in the increasing tendency of labor bosses in powerful unions to invoke the tyranny of taxation without representation upon their members by forcing them to make involuntary political contributions by the check-off system to campaign war chests created for the purpose of electing leftwing Democrats to office."

The South Dakota Senator continued, "With the sly approval and secret urging of certain national Democratic officials, the recent merger of the AFL and CIO labor organizations is being employed to expand the un-American practice of forcing union members to pay out portions of their hard-earned dollars for the use of big labor bosses in the selection and election of New Deal and leftwing Democrats in State and National campaigns. Like nazism and communism, this pernicious practice denies laboring people their rights of free choice. It makes them captives of the political party they are forced to support with their earnings even though by their votes they frequently prefer to vote for the very candidates their earnings are being taxed to defeat.

"This new menace to freedom has grown so great that such States as Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan and several others are already considering legislation to make compulsory contributions to political campaigns illegal and other progressive States are certain to pass legislation protecting their people against such perniciously un-American practices. Southern Democrats would do well to join Republicans and all liberty-loving Americans in supporting legislation designed to prevent a labor monopoly from employing strong-arm methods and unlimited campaign war chests to bludgeon and batter the American political climate under the control of power-hungry labor bosses.

"Even the most casual study of the financial records filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the last election gives a startling and shocking picture of the alarming degree to which labor unions have been using vast sums of money to control public elections. It is futile to discuss improvements in our campaign methods and legislation unless we take steps to keep American elections free from this unholy marriage between labor bosses in big cities and the leftwing Democratic officials who work with them to control conventions as well as primary and general elections. Freedom of the ballot must once again be made to mean freedom to decide individually which candidates and which parties, if any, a voter may desire to support with his personal funds."

International Trade Centers in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of House Resolution 237 "creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of methods of promoting the establishment and improvement of international trade centers, trade fairs and expositions in the United States" was impelled by the overwhelming response to my bill, H. R. 5301, which I have received, and the further confirmation of my convictions that the establishment of an International Trade Commission is vital to the creation of international trading posts within our country, where foreign and domestic traders can meet together.

The time element in world travel is being so reduced that it is now practical for foreign buyers to do their business in this country, as well as to see such an assortment and wide selection of American products as it would be impossible for us to send abroad.

The recent Inter-American Investment Conference in New Orleans during March of this year demonstrated that the foreigner will come to our trade centers, when there is a real reason, and where we have proper foreign trade facilities.

The letters I have received from an eminent cross section of thought in America connected with our industry, and its promotion, both at home and abroad, has borne out my judgment in presenting bill H. R. 5301. Not only have, with two exceptions, these letters been enthusiastic, but they have even waxed poetic. The expressions of opinion from abroad, both personal and in the press, have further added to my resolution of pressing the passage of my bill. Possible replies to my letters have run about 85 percent.

The reactions to my bill have been so favorable that I felt we should begin, immediately, to assemble the most experienced thought in this country, so as to lay a groundwork for the operations of a future International Trade Commission as well as to satisfy the Congress that my request for a $100 million revolving fund was within the realm of reason. I can substantiate this sum, but have certain doubts as to whether the House Appropriations Committee would accept my bare word, without broad and experienced confirmation. Hence my suggestion that we begin assembling the available facts, as soon as possible.

The investigations and studies of a select committee can be of real assistance to the President's program for Government participation in foreign international trade fairs, as well as the United States participation in the Brussels Universal and International Exposition of 1958, where the Belgian Government intends to spend some $200 million in connection with this exposition, which will only last 6 months, although Brussels will get some fine permanent buildings as a result of the exposition. Should we not advance sums, which will be repaid, toward the establishment of permanent centers and other media for the furtherance of our international trade, at home, when one of the smaller nations can spend such a sum for a temporary manifestation?

I regard our participations in foreign international trade fairs and the Brussels Exposition as feeders to the foreign trade media, which my bill, H. R. 5301, is intended to provide in the United States. They are really our salesmen abroad, for the enhancement of our dignity and prestige, and in addition to stimulating our trade throughout the world, have the important mission of bringing the foreigner to our shores, where he can see how these United States really live and function in their daily life and pursuits. Here he can do business in a real American atmosphere, the contacts with which will advance international understanding and help us forward on the rugged road to permanent peace.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Armed Forces Day Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday evening to present Gen. Lemuel G. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, to an audience of 3,000 at the Grand Rapids, Mich., Armed Forces Day Exposition. This exposition was in celebration of Armed Forces Day and of Michigan Week.

On Friday our people gave special attention to the noble heritage which has been bequeathed us, and to all that is being done to preserve and protect that heritage.

General Shepherd spoke of our military strength and its power for peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of General Shepherd and my own remarks in presenting him:

INTRODUCTION OF GEN. LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR., COMMANDANT, THE MARINE CORPS, BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, JR., ARMED FORCES DAY, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., MAY 20, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed an honor to be able to participate in this Armed Forces Day Exposition in Grand Rapids, my hometown. And, ladies and gentlemen, it is well that this event occurs during Michigan Week, and on our Michigan Heritage Day, for "I'm glad to live in Michigan." It is a State of which we all may be proud, the arsenal of democrary, the powerhouse of victory, a mighty weapon for peace.

Michigan has a long and noble heritage, and Michigan has been foremost among the States in doing what needs to be done to make our country and our heritage secure against any danger from the Godless, atheistic, Communist forces that seek to destroy us. And, my friends, standing between our heritage and every potential danger since our Nation was born, has been the United States Marines. We are highly honored this evening, on the eve of Armed Forces Day, and on Michigan's Heritage Day, to have in our midst the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., the first of the Marines.

It is now 150 years since our land, this soil of the Chippewas, the Ottawas, and the Potawatomies became the Territory of Michigan. In that century and a half, through diligent use of its natural resources, and the effective application of its human knowledge and skill, a State of 7 million people has evolved as the arsenal of democracy and as a mighty power for peace.

In our recent conflicts the bulk of Michigan's war production was accounted for by the automobile industry and its skilled and conscientious workers. Yet it was only 59 years ago on March 6, 1896 that the first successful car built in Detroit appeared on the streets of that thriving and dynamic city. Just 1 month before, on February 10, there was born at Norfolk, Va., the man who is today Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In 1917, 5 days after the declaration of war, Lemuel Shepherd was commissioned a second lieutenant. In 1917, our Camp Custer was built at Battle Creek, and Michigan's factories began to turn out the all important Liberty engines, tanks, trucks and shells.

In France, Lieutenant Shepherd was twice wounded at Belleau Wood, and in 1918, for the third time was wounded in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. Michigan-Wisconsin's 32d Division, the Red Arrow, was there too, and its officers and men won 134 Distinguished Service Crosses. Back home, our civilians in Michigan exceeded their quota in the Second Liberty Loan drive by over 140 percent.

In 1928 Captain Shepherd was on duty in China, and Michigan elected to the United States Senate for the first time, our revered and beloved fellow citizen, Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Grand Rapids. During the following year, while Captain Shepherd was a student at the Marine Corps School, the completion of Ambassador Bridge between Canada and the United States expressed two nations' lasting friendship.

Promoted to lieutenant colonel in 1936, our speaker was assigned to the Naval War College at Newport, R. I. The same year in Michigan the UAW–CIO was organized to promote the cause of workmen in the automobile and related industries.

War clouds were again hanging heavily in 1940, and the 32d Division was again mobilized. Many here this evening can well remember how GI after GI marched off to Camp Beauregard. Undoubtedly there are many in the audience tonight who marched with them in the cause of freedom. In 1942, the 32d Division landed in south Australia and New Guinea, and Colonel Shepherd assumed command of the 9th Marine Regiment. In 1943, the Red Arrow Division was back in New Guinea, and Brigadier General Shepherd was helping to dig out the enemy on Guadalcanal. The next year found the 32d Division on Leyte and Luzon, while General Shepherd was leading his brigade in the invasion and recapture of Guam.

Back in Michigan, the MacArthur locks were jammed, bow to stern, at the Soo. Eighty-five percent of the vitally essential iron ore required by American industry passed through this crucial waterway. At Willow Run, 18 powerful bombers were coming off the production line every 24 hours, and the tank arsenal at Detroit turned out General Grants, General Shermans, and General Pershings at the rate of 1,000 a month. And then victory.

In 1945, General Shepherd received the surrender of the Japanese in the area of Tsingtau, China, and Michigan's Senator Vandenberg helped frame the charter of the United Nations to preserve and protect that peace.

Five years later our honored guest was in command of the Fleet Marine Forces in the Pacific with duties which carried him with our troops to Korea during our head-on struggle against the diabolical forces of Soviet Russia and Red China. On January 1, 1952, he was appointed Commandant of the Marine Corps. We are happy, General Shepherd, to welcome you to our State, which during the past 4 years has supplied for the defense of this Nation nearly $9 billion worth of military hardware.

Michigan's arsenal, like the United States Marine Corps, and all the Armed Forces, exists only for the protection of that great heritage which, under God, is ours to have and to hold. General Shepherd, I have the distinct honor of presenting you, a great patriot, to my friends in Michigan, and at the same time introduce my fellow-Michiganders to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the first of the marines, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant.

REMARKS BY GEN. LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR., COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., ON ARMED FORCES DAY, MAY 20, 1955

I am both pleased and honored to be here to celebrate this Armed Forces Day with you.

This annual observance has developed into an event of major significance—because Armed Forces Day now symbolizes the bond which exists between the military forces of our Nation and the citizens whom we serve.

In particular, these occasions afford an opportunity for representatives of your armed services to meet directly with you—and to review the status of our national security and some of its problems.

In my own case, I am especially happy to be in Grand Rapids. From personal experience I am aware of the continuous and active attention given to national defense by the citizens of this community.

Furthermore, the strategic nature of this area, associates it closely with the basic elements of our national strength. Your great industrial capacity, coupled with excellent and varied transportation facilities, combine to make Grand Rapids of real importance to our defense.

There is also your direct and personal interest in military affairs which is manifested by the thousands from this vicinity who have and are serving in the various armed services.

You are, moreover, particularly fortunate in being represented in Washington by a man whose own distinguished record as a naval officer provides him with such insight into the complex problems of our national defense. I refer, of course, to Mr. GERALD R. FORD, JR., of the Fifth District.

We of the Marine Corps have a special interest in the Grand Rapids area since it provides some of the finest young men who enter our corps, and it is also the location of one of the elements of the Organized Marine Corps Reserve.

So you can see that my reasons for pleasure at being here are well founded. I have already been made to feel at home in your midst—and there is no need for me to request an interest, which is already so apparent on your part, in the subject of our national security.

On this sixth national Armed Forces Day, all Americans are provided a timely occasion to take a serious look at our preparation for defense. I am with you today for that purpose—not simply as Commandant of the Marine Corps, but as a representative of all the Armed Forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Force as well.

In this capacity, I would like first of all to discuss briefly some of the principal aspects of our defense program in terms of today, or the present. Following this, I wish to offer for your consideration certain basic principles which furnish guidance for future planning.

At the outset let me say that our greatest strength, our real source of security, lies—as it always has—in the intelligent and informal patriotism of the American people.

In any list of the factors of our national power, the awareness, responsibility and determination of our citizens constitute the key upon which all else depends.

I feel no need to describe for you the nature and extent of the threat that confronts us—and all free men—in the world today. Our free press, radio, television—indeed all of our news media—remind us daily of the relentless, determined and enduring efforts of international communism.

Following this knowledge, we as a Nation have been steadily advancing into a position of greater strength. There is ample evidence that in the crucible of three wars, we have at last really learned that freedom and strength are synonymous. Moreover, we have recognized that the father of this country spoke for the centuries when he said,

"If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Specifically, we have achieved the hard won realization that our national strength can no longer be sustained through intermittent effort. The individual citizen knows that the wisest course is the steady, consistent endeavor of preparedness for an indefinite period of time.

This understanding is our best hope for the future. And from it, despite some widespread gloomy forbodings, our country has in the last few years achieved defensive capabilities greater than ever before. And with each advance we have made, our aim of peace has been made more possible.

At this point I wish to say that I do not hold with those persons who believe that another catastrophic worldwide war is inevitable. Nor do I hold with those who think that such a war can be prevented simply by the renuniciation of war on the part of those who hate it.

In fact, there is little to choose from between those who would advocate preventive war and those who would put all their trust in the semantics of peace at any price or appeasement. Both groups are apostles of defeat. Historically, their divergent paths have led again and again to disaster.

Our best assurance, therefore, against losing our freedom and way of life lies in a posture of strength—always working for peace—but always being prepared for whatever sacrifices and risks that may confront us.

Working from this understanding, we have achieved a defense program that has resulted in a steady acquisition of enduring military power. Let me list for you some of our key achievements.

First, we have a strong retaliatory capability, and we are going to keep it strong. It is an instrument of infinite power and responsive to instant demand. We have a long-range Strategic Air Command without peer, and we have balanced naval task forces capable of projecting their power ashore wherever needed—unmatched by any other nation. In both of these vital elements we possess a capacity to counter large-scale aggression in a manner never before possible.

Second, we have strong land, sea, and air forces which can be used in a variety of situations and in the manner which special circumstances may require.

Most important, we are not placing undue reliance upon any one weapon or concept. We have not crippled ourselves by anticipating just one kind of war.

As a matter of fact, in recent years new definitions of warfare have evolved from the problems with which our military strategists have been confronted.

We have learned to distinguish clearly between two very different kinds of war; the all-out nuclear war, where the sky is the limit, and the so-called limited war, or cold war.

The all-out war needs no description—but the concept of limited war is something relatively new, something we have not faced before.

We have discovered—the hard way—that the cold war means not only war by proxy and by satellite, but that it includes propaganda, subversion, armed threats, political infiltration, and all the other Communist tactics with which we are familiar.

It is apparent, therefore, that we must be prepared for both kinds of warfare, if we are to avoid defeat which could come by either route. With this in mind, we are maintaining our military forces in a degree of preparedness and flexibility never before attempted as a long-range effort.

We have tactical air forces that can carry a great variety of weapons depending upon what the target requires. We have Army forces in being, equipped and ready to do their part in the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have naval forces that can be tailored into balanced units capable of roaming three-fourths of the earth's surface and able to be exactly fitted to whatever special tasks may arise. We have a Marine Corps—3 divisions and 3 air wings strong—that is kept in instant readiness to move with the fleet to any part of the world where their striking power may be needed.

In short, we have a balanced, powerful Armed Forces team. It represents the greatest defense effort that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war.

In the precarious and uncertain field of international relations, this fact enables our country to speak from strength instead of weakness.

Third in my list of achievements lies the fact that we have allies. Collectively, the free world has increased its ability to withstand Communist assault. To meet local aggression, a growing reliance can be placed on those allied forces now being strengthened in many parts of the world. At the same time, we stand ready with our forces to continue military assistance and cooperation with our friends. Thus, within admitted limits, the pattern of our own effort conforms to that of various members in several great alliances.

Fourth, we have in the United States an industry-science-military team which, in my opinion, presents an unbeatable combination.

We often hear of the disadvantage which confronts a free society in its need to match the efforts of a dictatorship which can ruthlessly regiment and exploit every resource available. I submit that the achievements of our American system have produced military strength of a kind impossible to a slave state.

To be sure, the Communists have a vast military machine. Certainly they have been able to produce atomic and hydrogen bombs. We must assume, moreover, that they are pressing with all possible speed toward the development of newer and even more effective weapons.

But here in America, a free science and a free industry are the partners, not the servants, of our military forces. Indeed, the services are themselves organized to utilize our national scientific, technological, and productive abilities. Science helps us to devise new weapons and new techniques. Industry makes them for us with speed and dispatch.

It is my firm conviction that no slave society, however ruthlessly administered, can ever in the long run match our system. Inevitably, communism must become the prisoner of its own mistakes.

So far I have been discussing some of our more important sources of military strength. These, of course, are based upon conditions that obtain today.

I would not wish you to believe that we have solved all our problems or that we have achieved absolute security and safety. Indeed, we should review our defensive power with mixed feelings.

We can derive satisfaction and assurance from the strength available to protect our way of life.

We can also be sobered by the contemplation of a modern weapons system in the hands of a callous, ruthless antagonist in the years which lie ahead. In a lawless world, we must be prepared for a fight—of varying proportions—at any time. And we must be prepared with weapons and techniques better than those which may be used against us.

This leads me to what I wish to say concerning the future.

No military man of any experience ever believes that he can see with absolute clarity into the years—or even the weeks—ahead. But there are certain basic principles which do give us some guidance.

We know by its very nature that the Communist threat must be an enduring one. No system that depends upon the acquisition of power for its continued existence, can ever voluntarily change its course or retreat from its fundamental objectives.

We also know that—in the long struggle that stretches out before us—we must press our every natural advantage if we are to survive. Constant vigilance and unremitting effort are to be a long term demand. All of our sources of strength must be utilized to the best and most efficient degree.

In this framwork is found a vital role for each of your Armed Forces.

Our Air Force, with its vast atomic capability, must continue to maintain a superiority that renders it a major deterrent to all-out war. In addition, it must defend our continental air space from aggression and it must continue to provide modern tactical air support of the Army ground forces.

The United States Army—as always—must continue to provide the major elements of those men who fight upon the ground. The men, I might point out, whose presence upon the ground of an enemy continue to represent an indispensable ingredient of military victory.

From the point of view of naval operations, the entire prospect of future strategy has been greatly altered by the realinement of the power balance between nations.

Today, the United States alone possesses adequate functional means for a comprehensive exercise of sea power. Only we have the balanced naval establishment that can fully control the oceans and the air above them—and this situation will obtain for the foreseeable future.

We are, therefore, not faced with the prospect of generating our naval power on the land—as in World War II—and applying it against the fleets of an antagonist on the high seas. Instead, defense of the free world requires that we have the capability of applying great naval power, generated from the sea, against a ponderous, landlocked antagonist—an opponent who is vulnerable the world around to attack from the ocean.

For the Marine Corps, this strategic reality has the deepest significance. It means that amphibious landing operations—our primary responsibility—must inevitably assume a greatly increased importance.

So long as we maintain our naval command of the seas—and the air above them—we are endowed with a form of power and flexibility not available to a continental enemy. It is an area of great superiority—one which if effectively exploited could be decisive.

But all these forces are not sufficient in themselves.

Military forces are at once the product and a measure of the society which they serve. In other words, the true strength of any country lies in the vigor and spirit of the citizens which compose it.

And herein, as I said before, lies the real power of our country.

Each one of us—as citizens—has an obligation and a responsibility in the organization for defense.

Every man who alines his own hopes and aspirations with those of his community—is making a fundamental contribution to the cause.

I am sure that all the citizens of Grand Rapids will agree with this.

In this world of 1955, nothing less than each individual's personal freedom and safety is at stake. And it is at stake 24 hours a day.

That freedom will never be lost, so long as we are willing to pay the price—in willingness to accept whatever sacrifices may be required—in willingness to devote any effort needed to the defense of the ideals we cherish.

That spirit, coupled with close understanding and teamwork between our Armed Forces and the American people—will generate the "Power for Freedom" we must have to defend our heritage of freedom; the heritage which remains the hope and inspiration of all mankind.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks both William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and Gen. David Sarnoff have called for the greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war. In a brilliant speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, Mr. Hearst declared that—

> Preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence * * * the Western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

Mr. Hearst went on to say that our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected. He pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries—

> Sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence. This board should develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems.

In a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, advocated the same strategy which Mr. Hearst urged earlier. He suggested the expenditure of up to $3 billion a year for the kind of political warfare which Mr. Hearst had in mind.

General Sarnoff stated in his memorandum that—

Before essaying a breakdown of cold-war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and I have introduced bills—H. R. 5724, H. R. 4893, and H. R. 5040—which would carry out some of the major proposals advanced by Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff. These bills are before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

I am happy to be able to say here that a subcommittee has just been established to consider these and the other bills before the committee calling for increased attention to our American arts and cultures and providing for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism.

The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. With the challenging proposals of Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff before us it is my hope that the hearings will be held quickly and that legislation meriting the support of my colleagues from both major parties will be reported to the floor in time for consideration by this Congress.

The administration's plan for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts was recently introduced in the Congress by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. The text of the executive communication which accompanied the administration proposal is included here. It is expected that the administration proposal will also be considered by the subcommittee.

There is also included articles from the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times on the cultural interchange program being carried on by the Department of State and the American National Theater and Academy. Title I of the bills I have mentioned, written by officials of the Department of State, is designed to make this program permanent, a program which is proving to be one of the finest and most important ambassadors our country has ever sent abroad. This program was given an appropriation of $2,500,000 by the 83d Congress at the request of the President.

It seems to me that what General Sarnoff has to say about not abandoning what is already underway, the problem, rather, being one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity, applies especially to the kind of program which the congressionally-chartered American National Theater and Academy is carrying on.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas has called for the "greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war." Senator JOHNSON spoke at a meeting called to honor General Sarnoff and urged support for the general's plan for an all-out cold war against communism.

Now Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in an historic address given at the Wayne University student forum, in Detroit, Mich., has called for all-out support of the congressional proposals for cultural interchange and the rest of the Hearst-Sarnoff program.

The communication and articles follow:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 8, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of a bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes. The proposal is designed to carry out the recommendation of the President, contained in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955. In that message he said:

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

Encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny. Throughout the great epochs of history, civilization has been importantly exemplified by masterworks of art and architecture, music and the dance, drama, and literature. Achievements in these fields represent, of course, one of the enduring criteria by which history appraises any nation.

The United States despite its relative youth is rich in artistic achievement. We have contributed new power of design in architecture, created new rhythms in music, and developed a literature which commands worldwide attention. In the theater and film, and in the ancient form of the dance we show a creative vitality. Our great museums, art galleries, and orchestras are a source of pride for our people. Yet there are many respects in which we lag behind other nations in the general position we accord to the arts in our society. For example, new ways should be sought to bring the enjoyment of and participation in the arts to more of our people. We should also find ways to develop individual talents in the arts. There are in our Nation many persons of talent and genius, whose gifts need the encouragement and recognition which persons in other comparable fields enjoy. Private organizations and individuals and public organizations, at both community and State levels, have provided strong support for the arts, and that is as it should be. On the other hand, our National Government has not lent its encouragement and prestige to the arts to the extent that is desirable.

The enclosed draft legislative proposal would provide for a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts which would undertake studies of, and make recommendations related to, appropriate methods for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies would be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the particular field of art involved. After considering reports on these studies, the Commission would make recommendations in writing to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the selection of subjects to be studied and in the formulation of recommendations the Commission would obtain the advice of interested and qualified persons and organizations.

Federal encouragement of the arts should go forward in accordance with the traditional principles which the American people believe should guide the relationship of their National Government to them. The draft legislation therefore recognizes three essential governing principles: (a) that the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative; (b) that the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, promote the general welfare and is in (the) national interest; (c) that the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government.

The proposed legislation creating the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts would not supersede the laws or orders vesting certain authority in the Commission of Fine Arts, and the draft bill has been prepared in consultation with that Commission.

We shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed bill to the proper committee for consideration.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

[From the New York Times of May 23, 1955]

SYMPHONY OF AIR ENDS JAPAN VISIT—ORCHESTRA IS HAILED FOR BUILDING GOOD OPINION OF UNITED STATES ON FAR EAST TOUR

By William J. Jorden

TOKYO, May 22.—The Symphony of the Air, formerly Arturo Toscanini's NBC Symphony, will end this week a triumphant 3-week tour of Japan.

Through a series of concerts here and in other major cities, the orchestra undoubtedly has done much to raise Japan's opinion of the United States and to create good feeling.

Performances of the orchestra have won highest critical praise in the Japanese press. There was also a surprising display of enthusiasm from intellectuals and students, the groups who were inclined to be most critical of America and its "materialistic culture."

"I do not believe there have been any musicians from abroad who ever so successfully grasped the heart strings of the Japanese people as did the Symphony of the Air," one critic wrote.

When tickets for the concerts went on sale hopeful music lovers began to line up at box offices as much as a day and a half in advance. Young students and musicians bundled themselves in quilts and slept on the ground rather than lose their chance to hear the symphony, the first to visit Japan since the end of the war.

Thousands of Japanese have been unable to attend 1 of the symphony's 16 scheduled concerts. Tickets bought by scalpers sold for as much as $50, more than most Japanese make in a month.

FREE CONCERTS GIVEN

For the benefit of many others who could not get tickets, including American servicemen at air bases such as Misawa and Tachikawa, the orchestra has given free and unscheduled concerts. Yesterday, the Symphony of the Air played in Tokyo's Hibiya Park, where thousands of young Japanese were able to hear them for only 100 yen (about 25 cents).

After its final appearance in Japan on Tuesday, the orchestra will fly to Korea for both military and civilian concerts and then to Okinawa, where it will play twice for the American Armed Forces and their families. It was announced today that the symphony's Far Eastern tour had been extended 2 weeks and that it would play in Bangkok, Singapore, Colombo, and Kuala Lumpur as well as at Manila and Hong Kong.

The Asian tour of the Symphony of the Air is sponsored by the International Exchange Program operating through the American National Theater and Academy. The Japanese newspaper Mainichi was cosponsor of the orchestra's tour in Japan.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1955]

ARTS PROVE GOOD ENVOY IN BUSY ANTA PROGRAM

(By Paul V. Beckley)

The ambassadorial work of American culture abroad will reach its greatest peak this summer when the international exchange program of ANTA alone will send or take a hand in sending 610 musicians, actors, singers, and dancers to most of the nations of the world. For the first time 3 of this country's major symphony orchestras will go abroad, 2 to Europe and 1 to the Orient.

The symphonic visit to the Orient is already a fact, because the Symphony of the Air made its Tokyo debut—the first American orchestra ever to appear there—on Tuesday night and proved a thorough success. The Tokyo enthusiasts stood in line in front of the box office for 24 hours, and 2 hours after it opened all seats had been sold for the orchestra's 3 performances.

THE MANAGER

General manager of this exchange program is a dark-haired, quick-talking expert in the theatrical business, Robert C. Schnitzer. Mr. Schnitzer stepped to one side of the "series of overlapping crises" which the program naturally entails, long enough to offer some explanations, definitions and statistics.

This summer the program is involved to some degree in the appearances overseas of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony, Philadelphia Orchestra, Ballet Theater, New York City Ballet, and the Symphony of the Air and the Sauter-Finegan Band, as well as the companies which will produce Oklahoma!, Medea, and The Skin of Our Teeth.

RUSSIANS ARE BUSY

The importance of all this cannot be overestimated in terms of good will generated in favor of this country. Mr. Schnitzer pointed out that the Soviet Union has spent $3 million in the last 2 years sending its own artists abroad "as propaganda pure and simple" and then he added, "not so pure, perhaps."

It might be noted that the Soviet effort in this field is not so "simple," either, but is actually a smart play for international prestige in the minds of people who hold such artistic efforts in high esteem. Although willing enough, perhaps, to enjoy an American soft drink or reap the advantages an American tractor may afford, they are more disposed by reason of cultural traditions to reserve their applause for a pas de deux, a Beethoven sonata or—as has been demonstrated—a Porgy and Bess.

Neither Mr. Schnitzer nor anyone else in the program looks on it as a piece of nationalistic propaganda. Although the results may serve that purpose, these displays of this country's spiritual, esthetic and emotional side is mainly intended for what it is—self-expression.

In 1950 the program handled the administration for the Ballet Theater when it became the first American company to make a European tour. But in 1951 came the first large Government allotment. The foreign ministers of America, France and Great Britain had met the previous summer and concluded it would be nice to give a festival in West Berlin when the Russians planned their youth rally in the eastern sector.

This first attempt came off very nicely. ANTA sent over Oklahoma!, Judith Anderson in Medea, the Hall Johnson Negro Choir, Juilliard String Quartet, Angna Enters, the dance mime, and Astrid Varnay (who sang with the Berlin Opera). An RCA-TV group went along, too, to show the Germans what television was doing over here, and put sets in a hundred shopwindows in the Kurfurstendam district. Also in the Potsdamer Platz, where the western sector meets the eastern, they erected a theater-size screen. When they televised Oklahoma!, there were riots in the Platz when 20,000 East Germans tried to get across the border to see it.

HOW IT WORKS

Administratively, the program begins when an American group submits a plan for a foreign tour. Mr. Schnitzer takes it up with 1 of 3 advisory panels of experts on the dance, music, and drama. Nothing further happens unless they agree the project under consideration will best represent the artistic activity of this country.

With the panel approval, Mr. Schnitzer goes to work with the manager of the group involved, setting up a tentative schedule and budget. He looks into the interest shown in the area to be visited.

LAST SAY BY COMMITTEE

The final decision is in the hands of a committee with representatives from the State Department, the United States Information Agency, Defense Department, Foreign Operations Administration, and a few others. "So far," Mr. Schnitzer said, "they've not turned us down on anything we've presented." In addition, they have not and Mr. Schnitzer said they will not force anything on ANTA that its artistic panels opposed. "Anyone saying one can't get Government subsidies without political controls has been disproved," he observed.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here a brilliant and historic speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he delivered at the Wayne University Student Forum, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955:

THE NEW CHALLENGES OF "COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE" A PROPOSED THREEFOLD UNITED STATES OFFENSIVE FOR PEACE

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, of Wisconsin), senior Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at Wayne University student forum, Detroit, Mich., Thursday, May 19, 1955)

The most important single challenge in the world today is for the free world successfully to combat the new and old strategy and tactics of the Soviet Union, aimed at world domination.

I should like to propose a threefold United States peaceful offensive, designed to fulfill this challenge, an offensive which will entail—invincible United States military preparation—an intensified United States cultural, propaganda effort—and all-out support of effective Eisenhower-Dulles diplomacy. Now, what of the Soviet counterchallenge—new and old?

THE OLD STALINIST APPROACH

The old tactic was, of course, the belligerent, tough unyielding Stalinist approach.

It included naked, direct aggression, such as the brutal invasion of the Republic of Korea. It includes formenting internal civil war, with full outside aid, such as the long and bloody civil war in Indo-China—a war which only ostensibly ended with the Geneva Peace Conference. It included unceasing, worldwide revolutionary agitation, including stirring up of the ferment of nationalism and racialism among under-developed peoples against the Western powers.

THE SOVIET'S NEW MASK

Most of these phases continue. The new tactic of international communism has changed only somewhat. There is only a partial new mask on the Kremlin. It is the mask of "peaceful coexistence," or, as it is sometimes called, competitive coexistence."

But the worldwide revolutionary agitation does continue. The night-and-day espionage, the sabotage, the sedition, the treason by Red Trojan horsemen—throughout the world persist.

What has altered, however, is the previous bluntness, directness, and crudity of Soviet external relations. Moscow and its Peking junior partner are intentionally and slyly showing a somewhat softer face to the world. Why? Principally, no doubt, because of the historic western success in ratification of the Paris Pacts.

FOUR ILLUSTRATIONS OF NEW SOVIET TACTIC

The most dramatic illustration of the new face of the Kremlin is, of course, in the form of the surprisingly concluded Austrian State Treaty.

The agreement on that treaty, ending 9 long years of negotiations, involving more than 400 talks, attests to the fact that the Soviet Union now wants to be regarded by the world as "flexible," as changing its traditional policies, as conciliatory.

A second illustration was quick Soviet acceptance of latest proposals for a meeting in mid-summer of the heads of the four major states, the so-called Meeting at the Summit, involving President Eisenhower, Premier Bulganin, Prime Minister Anthony Eden, and Prime Minister Faure.

A third illustration is the impending visit to Belgrade and to that arch-Communist heretic Marshal Tito on the part of a top-drawer delegation headed by Nikita Khrushchev and Nicolai Bulganin. This visit represents another about face from previous Moscow denunciations of "Titoist Fascist deviationism." It is supposed to further demonstrate Soviet efforts to "normalize" and make more cordial Moscow-Belgrade relations.

A fourth illustration of the new mask of the Kremlin was the conciliatory approach which has been shown at the Bandung Conference and elsewhere by Chou En-Lai and by the Peking government. It consists in part of the indications that the long-imprisoned United States airmen—outrageously imprisoned, I may add—may be "magnanimously" released.

And there are other signs of the new tactic on the part of the Kremlin, such as in the Soviets' new version of disarmament proposals.

SOVIET BEAR WANTS MORE MEAT

Now, I have used the word "mask" and I have used the word "tactic" for very exact purposes.

I say "mask," because the basic fact of the matter is that the Soviet bear may put on a sheep's head or sheeps' clothing, but it is

still obviously an aggressive, hungry beast which desires more human meat.

Already the Russian bear holds under its bloodstained paw almost a billion people on the face of this planet; 1.5 billion people still live in the non-Communist world. But the lips of the bear drool with the desire to take them over as well.

Temporarily, the Soviet bear is following a new tactic. Instead of growling and roaring and uttering defiance, it is meowing like a pussycat. It is purring as though it wants to be stroked gently and as though it is really friendly.

But the basic fact is that nothing has really changed concerning the Kremlin's long-range revolutionary strategy. The Soviet Union is still intent upon complete world domination. Marxist dogma has not changed in that respect.

I should like to point to the words of Nicolai Lenin which are still regarded as atheistic gospel:

"As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace. * * * We must say that either those who want to cause our destruction must perish * * * or the capitalists will live and in that case the [Soviet] republic will perish."

And Joseph Stalin said: "Who will conquer whom, that is the whole question."

The fact of the matter is that the millennium has not come and is nowhere near coming. The Kremlin has not altered one iota its long-time instructions to the Communist insurrectionists in Malaya, to the Communist saboteurs in southern Viet-Nam, to the Communists agitating in north Africa or in South America or in our own country. The Austrian State Treaty is signed, but no Soviet spy has voluntarily given himself up. The Reds hope to neutralize West Germany. But no Soviet saboteur in the Federal Republic has announced that he is going out of business, so to speak.

OMINOUS SOVIET ARMS BUILDUP CONTINUES

What is more, the massive Soviet military buildup continues. Most ominous in that buildup is the latest grim news of our air intelligence in Moscow. It indicates, as you know, a Soviet formation of latest-type intercontinental jet bombers—equivalent to our B-52's—has already been seen flying over Moscow. Thus, those among us who have been unfortunately smug, those of us who are overconfident have been given a rather rude shock. It has been proven once again that the United States is not nearly as far ahead in the technological race for air superiority as we mght have hoped. On the contrary, the Soviets, by going all-out in long-range air development, by going all-out in nuclear development have been exceeding the buildup schedule which some people had originally anticipated.

Thus, once more, some of us have been wrong in our military estimations of them. Once more some of us have erred, on the dangerous side of underestimating their capacity, underestimating their iron determination to catch up with us and pass us.

Meanwhile, too, far up, facing the Arctic Circle, the Soviets continue to build their series of Siberian rocket-launching sites for what they hope will be intercontinental missiles. These may be both intercontinental ballistic missiles, fired like bullets, or artillery shells, and intercontinental guided missiles controlled by Soviet electronics equipment.

These missiles—with atomic or hydrogen warheads—could, it is estimated, when they are developed (which may only be a matter of 5 or 10 years or so), conceivably reach the city of Detroit a mere 30 minutes after they might be fired. They could blast this and other centers of production and population into radio-active rubble.

So, these basic facts or prospects have not changed. The basic conspiratorial nature of the Kremlin has not changed.

Tactics may be changed, but not long-range Soviet strategy.

Now, then, what should be our answer? I believe that the answer must basically be threefold.

INVINCIBLE UNITED STATES MILITARY PREPARATION

1. In the first place, we must continue our defense preparations at the highest level of efficiency.

This does not mean mere quantity, because a quantity of planes, tanks, or ships can grow quickly obsolescent.

But it does mean quality in the most advanced weapons and training. It does mean having our defense factories tooled up to high efficiency, so that at instantaneous notice, they could go into mass production of the most advanced models of weapons and weapons systems.

We must never again fall asleep. We must never again lay ourself open to another disastrous Pearl Harbor attack. It could be the last such attack suffered in United States history, a fatal attack from which we might not be able to recover.

We must never again overcentralize our production facilities. I am pleased that Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson—an able man, but one with whom I have not agreed in this respect—has begun to decentralize defense procurement. It is long overdue. We offer at present a few key "over-ripe" bomb targets, which, if hit, could result in paralysis of America. We are far too vulnerable, far too centralized.

We must decentralize if we would survive. And we must strengthen our civil defense as well, instead of treating it as an orphan child untended and ignored.

A CIVILIAN "JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF"

2. Secondly, we must accompany our efforts for military preparation by taking the offensive in the political, cultural, social, propaganda field. Why? Because "man does not live by bread alone," and he will not survive by armaments alone.

Illustrating the type of offensive which I have in mind is the brilliant long-range program outlined by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, who has proposed, in what is truly an historic memorandum, a strategy board for political offense—a cold-war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side.

General Sarnoff's proposal rightly suggests that this operation be headed up by a leader directly under the President with Cabinet status. The able Chairman of the Board of RCA, one of our foremost leaders in American communications for more than a quarter of a century, suggests, of course, the most modern types of techniques be used, for example, "mobile big-screen television units in black and white and in color" to be used in non-Communist regions where "illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radio bars the spoken word."

He reiterates a striking proposal which he had made some years ago, for mass distribution of cheap, lightweight receivers, tuned to pick up American signals. He suggests "a simple hand-operated phonograph device, costing no more than a loaf of bread" and "records made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of beverage."

EXPLOITING WEAKNESSES INSIDE IRON CURTAIN

He emphasizes that we exploit the weak link in the Kremlin based on the hunger for facts inside the Iron Curtain and based upon the Soviets own miserable failures at home.

I point out to you, my friends, that for example, Soviet agriculture indeed is in a state of collapse, as attested by redfaced Soviet leaders, themselves. We should exploit the Red farm breakdown to the fullest, but it will take the sort of audacious, imaginative program as General Sarnoff has suggested to penetrate the Iron Curtain and accomplish our goal.

The program, which has been welcomed and commended in principle by President Eisenhower, commands the earnest consideration of the Congress and of the American people.

This in no way depreciates the steps which are now being carried on by the Operations Coordinating Board, by the United States Information Agency, and by other means, but it does signify that we all recognize that infinitely more could and should be done.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the concluding half of the great speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, delivered at the Wayne University Student Forum, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955, follows:

USIA PERSONNEL ARE FRONT LINE FIGHTERS FOR PEACE

But it certainly won't be done if the Congress slashes USIA's funds. I say that these USIA information personnel, working in 210 posts and 79 countries are frontline fighters for peace and they should have our fullest support instead of needling, peevish criticism which has too often been their lot.

In 38 languages they faithfully disseminate truth around the world. Over 29 television stations, alone, in 21 countries they are "giving light so that the people will find their own way."

The President's atoms-for-peace program is a particular highlight of USIA's message. This is by far one of the most thrilling, constructive subjects which can be conveyed to the world in our time, particularly as the prelude to the historic UN Geneva Conference, opening in August. Eighty-four nations have been invited to this precedent-breaking assembly on peaceful application of atomic energy—an assembly which may open up whole new vistas for mankind.

But why is it that we are invariably so willing to appropriate billions for aircraft carriers, destroyers, giant bombers. And yet, some people are so reluctant to appropriate far lesser sums for truth dissemination which may help completely to prevent the dark day when the military weapons have to be used at all? Isn't it most important of all to prevent war from coming in the first place, rather than concentrate our efforts almost exclusively on winning a war, if it should come (as crucial as the latter is, under that circumstance)?

I point out now that General Sarnoff's wise war-prevention proposals were paralleled in a most enlightening and significant address which had been made back on February 28 before the National Press Club by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr. He had recommended a competitive coexistence council which would match and surpass the Soviets in every field of human endeavor, whether it be in the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, Australia, or in the field of the ballet, theater, art, literature.

Since then, the Hearst newspapers have done an excellent job in amplifying the vital necessity for such a council.

Now there may be differences as to the details of this effort. There may be differences as to the actual level of appropriations for it, particularly in view of the importance of adequate aid under the mutual-security program, as such, for the next fiscal year especially for southeast Asia.

There may be differences as to how the Council is to be organized. But the basic idea, particularly that of all-out effort by private American groups, is fundamentally sound. The Soviet Union does challenge us today in everything from the Olypmics, to cultural exhibitions, trade fair pavilions, and the like.

Recently, for example, at a luncheon meeting which I arranged in the United States Capitol, an eloquent representative of the International Exchange Program, managed by the American National Theatre and Academy, a congressionally-chartered group, pointed out that within 2 years the Kremlin has sent 2,000 performing artists into France alone.

And evidences have poured in from other quarters regarding massive Soviet efforts to win the minds of the world. We cannot ignore this. We cannot sit back and let them beat us by our own smug default.

RESTORE FULBRIGHT FUNDS

Now, of course, there are ceilings to the amount of spending which we can devote to this and similar tasks. The United States Treasury hardly has unlimited resources. We are already running a serious deficit.

But I believe that within reason we could and should greatly step up our programs. I see no justification for the House of Representatives, arbitrary slash of 40 percent in the international student exchange program. To my way of thinking, that is one of the soundest programs that the United States possesses to counteract Soviet lies. It is, in my judgment, exceedingly poor economy to slash what are rightly known as the Fulbright scholarships. Instead of slashing them we should be increasing them. Only 7,000 grants could be made this year. Every single student or other leader who can, after judicious selection, come to the United States, who can gain a better, more accurate, more personal understanding of American culture, of the American home, the American community, can be a potential, vital asset to our cause.

That doesn't mean that everybody who comes here, will automatically thereafter be our friend. On the contrary, you and I know that we could do far more to improve the program so that the 35,000 foreign students who are new here—of all races and creeds—do bring back with them the best possible impression. But at least we have got to bring people over in the first place to give them a chance to see us and understand us.

ENCOURAGING THE LIVING ARTS

Now, there is one further observation which I should like to make on this matter of victory through things of the spirit.

We here in this country should look to our own cultural laurels. There has been a magnificent flowering of the arts in this free country, but we could voluntarily do more—far more—to encourage the creative arts—music, literature, poetry, ballet, the living stage. And if we do so, we will, by that much, be strengthening our foreign policy. Because we will be further demonstrating to the world that, far from being a "crass, materialist civilization," we have a deep and abiding interest in the "things of beauty which live forever."

A FINE ARTS CENTER FOR WASHINGTON, D. C.

Recently, I was delighted to see that the House of Representatives approved a bill, H. R. 1825, to create a Federal Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, a center for music, drama, the fine arts, and mass communications. Its counterpart on the Senate side is S. 1321, offered by one of my able colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee—one of the youngest men in spirit in the Senate, Senator THEODORE GREEN of Rhode Island. On the House side, a leading spokesman for this cause to bring this great asset to our Nation's Capital has been a Congressman from New Jersey—young in years and another Democrat, if you please, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey. He has also been in the forefront of the effort to set up a program of cultural interchange throughout the world. Congressman THOMPSON has offered H. R. 5040, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor for the latter purpose. It is my intention on my return to the Capital to explore the possibility of companion legislation on the Senate side.

I feel that by steps such as these we can fill in a domestic and foreign program which definitely needs filling in.

The sending of musical troupes like Porgy and Bess over seas—a stage group which met with thundering acclaim everywhere—should not have to be financed out of the President's special funds, but should be gladly authorized on a regular annual basis, as should, for example, United States participation in trade fairs.

And, here in our own country, in the Capital of our Nation, in the shrine to which young and old—in hundreds of thousands—come, I say that there should be a national civic auditorium—a great fine arts center.

I want every American to be prouder than he has ever been before of the Capital of our land. I want every American to feel that not only is the District of Columbia the political center of this great Republic, but that it is a center for the worthiest aspirations and creations of the human spirit. Let the best in the art, the music, the literature, the ballet, the stage in the 48 States—blossom in the city named for the Father of our Country. Let Americans revere the city of Washington as the Frenchman reveres Paris—for far more than governing; for the expression of the essence in national culture.

And so, I turn to the third of the three-pronged proposals for peace.

SUPPORT EISENHOWER-DULLES DIPLOMACY

Now, my third point is that we should all give our support to the wise foreign policy which is being so soundly spearheaded by the statesmanlike President of the United States and by his able Secretary of State.

It has been a troubled foreign policy—not without its difficulties, not without its crises—for that is the very nature of modern diplomacy.

But it has been a bold, forthright, creative policy, carried out in sound cooperation with our allies. And it has numerous spectacular achievements to its credit; one of the foremost of which is the long-awaited, now-fulfilled entry of West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

WE MUST BE WILLING TO NEGOTIATE FURTHER

In carrying out our overall policy further, we should, in my judgment, approach the new Soviet tactic with a sense of realism, a sense of caution, but with a willingness to go halfway.

There are some people who deplore the meeting of the Big Four and who want us completely to shut the door to further negotiations with the Soviets.

These people are falling victim to their own inflexible, unchanging judgments. Their position is not, however, completely without logic. They contend the empty Soviet word isn't worth the paper it is written upon. And it is indeed a fact that out of 52 major agreements which we have made with the Soviets in the last 22 years since we recognized Russia, they have broken 50 of the agreements. They have lived up to only two small agreements. One was for entering the fighting against Japan in World War II, and the other was to permit the Western Allies aerial corridors to Berlin. As you can see, the first of these two agreements was certainly to the U. S. S. R.'s definite advantage, because she came in for a lion's share of the spoils from defeated Japan. And the second is certainly a modest concession on her part, because she should never have been given the right to encircle Berlin by land in the first place. Her previous tactic in sealing off Berlin from direct land access and in requiring us to conduct the costly Berlin airlift was outrageous.

In view of her record of treachery, some impatient people throw up their hands in disgust and say that almost all agreements with the Soviet Union have been futile. That is largely true. But that does not mean that future ironclad commitments, backed up by action, will not work.

These people say that the Soviet Union goes into conferences usually, principally for propaganda purposes or to lull their opponents to sleep. And that is true.

These people say that no one knows whether an overturn in the shaky Soviet hierarchy tomorrow could completely reverse present Soviet tactics and reinstitute the tough Stalinist line. And that is true.

DO NOT BRAND ALL TALK AS APPEASEMENT

But my point is this: that notwithstanding these facts, the United States must very definitely not slam the door on further negotiation. On the contrary, we must prove ourself ready, willing and able to talk, to negotiate, to confer. We must not permit anyone to brand all talk as appeasement. Such criticism is utterly unjustified.

We will not appease, and we never intended to. We will not sell out an ally like Nationalist China or anyone else. And to negotiate does not mean that we are going naively to place faith in an empty Soviet pledge. It does not mean that we are expecting any miracle solutions to our problems overnight.

But it does mean that, as the wise chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WALTER GEORGE, well said, in effect: the United States is great enough, strong enough to show to the world that, so long as there is the slightest chance of success, we will never slam the door on a peaceful approach.

We have talked for 8 futile years about control of atomic weapons. But I say we should talk more. We have talked for 7 years about overall disarmament, but I say we must talk more. We have talked for 10 years about unifying Germany through free, uncontrolled elections, but we must talk more.

We must talk not for the sake of hearing ourselves talk or to hear the Reds talk, because certainly, we have had our stomach full of Red double talk.

But, rather, we must be patient. We must strive as hard—as unswervingly—for the goal of peace as we strove for the winning of the war. The lives of you young men and women and of all of us are at stake. Why should we be half-hearted or reluctant to do our all?

The world is hungry for signs of peace. The world is desperate that the United States take all possible steps to avoid a nuclear Armegeddon.

LET'S NOT GIVE FUEL TO RED PROPAGANDA

The Soviet Union would like to picture us to the world as a war-mongering, saber-rattling power. The Soviet Union asserts in its propaganda to the world that the United States is "not interested in peace; it is only interested in a so-called preventive war of aggression. It does not want to talk; it wants to bomb."

That is a vicious lie.

But if we were to put ourself in the foolish position of slamming the door on negotiations and hurling all sorts of belligerent, ill-conceived ultimatums, we would simply be providing fuel for Soviet propaganda. We would be estranging ourselves from our allies and from the neutral peoples. I say, therefore, that we must, as we will, sincerely, earnestly, devotedly continue to confer for peace—at the summit and below the summit.

I repeat, however, we must not expect miracles. We must not change our realistic conception of the Soviet bear. We must not be a pawn in Soviet propaganda tricks. But we must leave no stone unturned to try to find some firm, active basis for relieving East-West tension.

We can do so without being soft, for the Soviet Union despises softness.

We can do so without appeasement, because appeasement is utterly futile and self-defeating.

We can do so without naivete or gullibility.

We can and should do so with full confidence in our leaders. Certainly, the President of the United States deserves our confidence. Certainly, the Secretary of State of our country deserves our confidence. There is nothing in either what Dwight D. Eisenhower or John Foster Dulles has ever done which should make us feel the slightest doubt in their ability to conduct negotiations in the most forthright, most constructive manner, with firmness, yet with understanding.

We must not be afraid of conferences. We must not be afraid of ourselves. We must not underestimate our own abilities.

We must not listen to ill-tempered talk of unilateral "blockades" and ill-thought-out angry threats to Moscow and Peking. To be hard and strong is one thing; to put a chip on your shoulder and arrogantly dare someone to knock it off is another.

Avoiding extremes—avoiding half-baked cure-alls—this is essential if we would save the peace.

These, then, are my suggestions for combatting the efforts of the U. S. S. R. to control the world by peaceful or forceful means.

This Nation Under God and Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this great legislative body a resolution seeking to add amendment 23 to our present United States Constitution to the end that the basic and fundamental law of our land might recognize the Master Architect, Creator, and Builder of the Universe, the Almighty God, who hung out the stars and lit the burning taper of the sun and draped the glorious rainbow as a scarf about the shoulders of the storm; and also to the further end that there may be recognized in that same Constitution Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Universal Saviour of all mankind. Many people, I believe, think the greatest deficiency of our present Constitution lies in its failure to recognize specifically God Almighty and America's definite position as a great Christian nation. In this modern day of paganistic and mundane attitudes, when communism and all of its philosophy of atheism and statism and materialism hold full sway in many places of the earth and embrace millions of its peoples, there is surely a great need for America to assert humbly her unalterable dependence upon God and her own daily followership of Christianity as the prevailing ideology of most of her people. As most everyone knows, the Constitution is whatever the people decree it shall be, and since most of the American people are God fearing and Christ following, the Constitution itself should make manifestation accordingly.

This proposed amendment is in no way any encroachment upon the demarcation line of church-state separation that has always characterized our Government, since this amendment would neither recognize nor support with tax revenue any church organization whatsoever. While this amendment would not in anywise establish a church, yet it would in a positive way recognize the authorship and authorityship of the Supreme Being and His Son, Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Bible tells us:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

And the great Apostle Paul once wrote:

For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

I hope our great Constitution may come to recognize God as our Lord and may also come to recognize that the Nation's foundation must be laid upon Jesus Christ as the firm Rock of Ages and Saviour of the world.

Rumors About First Lady Are Dispelled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks and include a great story by a brilliant writer, Betty Beale, of the Washington Star, telling about some of the experiences—hardships and pleasures—of the First Lady, the great First Lady of the greatest land on earth—Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the wife of the President of our great Nation; a great woman who has done and is doing such an outstanding job in helping her husband, who is not only the most popular man, in my judgment, at this time, in his own country, but in the world, and who has the love and respect of so many people. So has this wonderful woman. In talking to a great and God-fearing man, Dr. Billy Graham, who is doing such a wonderful job far across the seas, he said that he thought that President Eisenhower and Mrs. Eisenhower were one of the greatest couples and were doing the finest job of any President and any First Lady that he had ever known.

She has had so much to do, but always with that pleasant smile, and she goes out of her way to be nice to the highest and the lowest of this land. She has a way about her that just commands love and respect, and I would like for all of our men and women who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only in every beat in this Nation and in every library, but in many foreign lands, to know a few things about this wonderful woman whom God gave to our great President to help him along the way.

All of us know that man cannot do much without a good wife, a good mother, a sister, or a good woman to steer him along the way; and that is what this great and wonderful woman has been doing and is continuing to do at this time—in these troublesome times; in the times when we not only need strong men, but strong women; and we have in these two great people just such a couple. We all know that they are doing their best, and their best seems to be mighty, mighty good, and we are thankful that we have such a great man and such a great woman in the White House, to lead us along the way.

It is a real pleasure to see our great leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and other Democrats cooperating and working together with our good Republican friends to put the President's program through, or at least that part of it where the Democrats and the Republicans agree.

God bless this wonderful woman, our First Lady, and this marvelous man, our President of these United States, so I say with millions of other people all over the earth, God bless our President and our First Lady and give them strength to carry on the great work they are doing that has helped to bring us peace, prosperity, and plenty.

The story follows.

RUMORS ABOUT FIRST LADY ARE HEREWITH DISPELLED

(By Betty Beale)

Always a hot caldron of rumors, this town has been boiling with them ever since Mrs. Eisenhower canceled all her engagements for this past week. Here are some of the stories that have been repeated as gospel, and after each, to the best of my knowledge, is herewith the gospel truth.

Rumor: Not 1 but 2 doctors were called in during Mrs. Eisenhower's recent stay at her Gettysburg home.

Truth: A doctor is always in attendance where a President or First Lady is concerned. Maj. Gen. Howard M. Snyder, the White House physician, was up there checking on Mamie as she attempted to recover from a virus infection, and when he left, his assistant took over.

Rumor: The DAR's were furious because Mrs. Eisenhower said last year when she didn't receive them that she would receive the larger organizations every other year. But she didn't receive them this year, after all.

Truth: The DAR's didn't ask to be received this year, says Mamie's secretary, Mary Jane McCaffree, because they may have felt it would be an imposition to do so.

Rumor: Mrs. Eisenhower is refusing to receive all kinds of organizations that used to get the A–1 treatment at the White House.

Truth: Mamie says there are literally hundreds of women's groups that have never been inside the White House or received by any First Lady, and until each has had a chance she is not going to keep on dupli-

cating. According to her staff no group is too small or insignificant to be invited to the White House, providing she can see them on the day requested. * * * She is no longer receiving 600 women daily, as her staff said she did her first year in the White House. Now she receives only on days not already filled with other functions, a state dinner, luncheon, tea, etc. She tries not to tax herself with 2 or 3 things in 1 day.

Rumor: When she gave her luncheon for Senate wives a fortnight ago, before they entertained her first (as has been the custom in years past), she probably had no intention of attending their luncheon this past Tuesday.

Truth: No such thought entered her mind, because her calendar is drawn up months ahead. She picked the earlier date simply because there was room for it on her engagement book.

Rumor: Mary Jane McCaffree is a slave driver who forces sweet, warm, agreeable Mrs. Eisenhower to accept more than she can possibly do.

Truth: This is the most absurd of all. It will even give Mamie and her secretary a good laugh. Mary Jane is a very efficient gal with a mind of her own, but Mrs. E. is one of the strongest-willed women they know, say her close friends. It's true that she's an agreeable warm person, but nobody has ever said she was easy to handle and it would never occur to one of her employees to try it.

Rumor: By withdrawing from the Senate wives' luncheon and the Congressional Club brunch, Mamie was giving another indication that her husband wouldn't run again, said some early this past week. To disappoint these groups that reach back into the grass roots of every State was pretty good proof, they said. Especially since this was the first time in the 47-year history of the club that a First Lady had missed a party in her honor.

Truth: The doctor made the decision, not Mrs. Eisenhower, and the President's appearance at the brunch in her place completely discounted such talk. Better indication that Ike won't run again is his conversation at his stag dinner of 10 days ago. Only 16 were present and Ike spent much of the time pointing out to them that no President has ever lived to be 70—not in the White House. If Ike were reelected he would see his 70th birthday in the White House, if, that is, he were the only President in history to be so lucky. Why should he tempt fate when he has been serving his country, his wife points out to friends, ever since he was 21?

Rumor: Mrs. Eisenhower wastes most of every day playing her favorite card game, Bolivia.

Truth: To say this of any official wife in Washington, least of all the top one, indicates an appalling ignorance of the demands of officialdom. Here's how Mrs. Eisenhower spends an average day:

She breakfasts around 9 o'clock and afterward, between telephone calls that never cease, she discusses the business of running the White House with at least two people—the usher and the housekeeper. Every single thing connected with the house is brought up, whether it concerns a homey thing as the breaking down of the washing machine, or a difficulty with 1 of the 45 servants, or the planning of the meals, or fresh flowers for the Red, Green, and Blue Rooms. Her secretary then sees her and she's presented with the endless requests to appear, to receive, or to patronize.

By that time, it's noon and she gets dressed to: Receive a couple of hundred women; go out to an official 3-hour luncheon; lunch with a member of her family; or lunch alone when she may start tackling her mail. She signs between 100 and 200 letters every day and she has to have some idea what she's signing. Sometimes she can't even get to the mail until late in the day.

In the afternoon, if she is not receiving groups and posing for a picture, she might have a visit from a personal friend or more likely one from her sister, Mrs. Gordon Moore, who likes to bring her little granddaughter, "Peaches," whom they both adore. When her mother is staying at the White House, she spends a part of each day with her. She's lucky if she can find time to play Bolivia one afternoon a week. In fact, and this is meant to be gospel, she hasn't played it for weeks and weeks.

Everybody in this world is subject to some false speculation and unkind comment, but I'll bet there's a new unfounded rumor born every few minutes about the President of the United States and the First Lady, whoever they may be. Apply commonsense and remember it's two decent people you're hearing about and you can automatically dispose of most such talk.

Pertinent Questions on Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the hearings which will begin on Wednesday, May 25 before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, are scheduled to deal primarily with two specific bills, namely, H. R. 6286, the administration's $28 million poliomyelitis immunization assistance bill, and H. R. 6207, a bill designed to give authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through an amendment of the biologics control law, to supervise and control, in the interest of protecting and preserving the health of the American people, the distribution and use of biological products.

I have introduced both of these bills. A companion bill to H. R. 6286, the administration's immunization assistance bill, has also been introduced by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey, ranking minority member of this committee, being H. R. 6287.

On the surface, it might seem as if the subjects covered by H. R. 6286 and H. R. 6207 are related to each other only in an incidental way. A closer study of the bills, however, will make it apparent that the relationship between the two is rather close and direct.

The purpose of this statement is to point up the way in which the subjects covered by these two bills are related to each other and generally to give a proper focus and perspective to these hearings.

The hearings on H. R. 6207 and H. R. 6286 are the first ones to be held by this committee since the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on April 12, licensed six manufacturers to produce the Salk vaccine. This action was taken by the Secretary under the biologics control law which may be found in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

The events which has occurred between April 12 and the present day are too well-known to be repeated in any detail. A summary of these events is contained in the Secretary's report to the President and that summary will probably be brought up to date by one of the witnesses speaking for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Being the first hearing on a subject on which many, and perhaps too many, statements have been made which have been interpreted by some people as having a partisan slant, I want to state categorically that this committee never has and I hope never will approach any public health problem in a partisan spirit. Rather, this committee will seek to approach the problems created by the attempt to secure rapid mass application of the new Salk vaccine in such a way that prompt action may be taken on bills dealing with some of the immediate problems. On the other hand, this committee would feel derelict in its duties if it failed to give at the same time close attention to the long-range implications of the Salk situation.

The second point I wish to make is that this committee's interest in and concern with the Salk vaccine situation is not a recent and belated one.

Several weeks before the licensing of the vaccine by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I contacted Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with respect to any plans which the Department might have to provide for allocating the scarce vaccine so that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where it would do the most good. Also, the question of making the vaccine available to all children regardless of their parents' ability to pay, was discussed. At that time, I was advised by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer that no legislative action was required.

Two days following the licensing of the vaccine, on April 14, 1955, I addressed a letter to Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which summarizes, briefly, the views expressed by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer at that time. The letter also requested the Secretary to review the situation and to advise the committee whether the Department might feel the need for additional legislation granting the Department power to allocate the vaccine.

The bill on which the administration now has requested action is designed to authorize an appropriation of $28 million to assist the States in providing, for a limited period, Salk vaccine immunizations to children of parents who may not be able to pay for the cost of the vaccine. In connection with this bill, the administration has proposed a voluntary system of allocations and priorities to assure that the Salk vaccine, during the initial scarcity period, will be distributed fairly among the several States and will go to the children in those age groups which are most susceptible to the disease. The administration has not sought any additional powers to police this system.

A great deal has been said already by spokesmen for the administration, interested groups, organizations, and Members of Congress, with regard to the adequacy of a voluntary plan. Many

bills have been introduced in Congress to give additional powers to the President for a limited period of time to deal with specific allocation and priority problems arising from the present scarcity of the Salk vaccine.

I have introduced H. R. 6207 for the purpose of raising the question whether permanent legislation is needed granting powers to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through an amendment of the biologics control law to control, through regulations, in the interest of public health, the distribution and use of biological products.

I have particularly in mind that these additional powers may be needed in all instances where as, in the case of the Salk vaccine, rapid mass applications are attempted of new biological products.

In this connection, I further desire to raise a question whether there is continued justification for differentiation in responsibilities of the Federal Government with regard to: first, new biological products; two, new drugs; and, three, insulin and certain specified antibiotics.

I want to call to the attention of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, the voluntary agencies, the pharmaceutical trade, and the medical and pharmaceutical professions, and last, but not least, the American public generally, the new problems created by the rapid mass application of new wonder drugs as exemplified by recent experiences with the Salk vaccine. Therefore, I have directed the committee staff to prepare a series of questions which will focus attention on some of the problems created by the new phenomenon of rapid mass application of new drugs.

The answers to these questions cannot and will not be forthcoming during the few days of hearings that this committee can hold on the two bills now before it. However, the answers to these questions should be found at a reasonably early date.

The best way, in my view, to secure reasonable answers, including necessary additional Federal legislation, is to conduct an intelligent discussion of these questions. In order to promote an early start of this discussion, I am making the questions public at this time in advance of the hearings in the hope that all interested groups and individuals will give their careful attention to these questions.

In closing, I want to emphasize again that in spite of the broad scope of the committee's inquiry, there will under no circumstances be any delay in taking up H. R. 6286, which contains the administration's proposed authorization of $28 million to assist the States in providing immunization against poliomyelitis for children whose parents are unable to pay the cost of vaccination.

BACKGROUND PROBLEMS RELATING TO H. R. 6207 AND H. R. 6286

A. Responsibilities of Federal Government under present law:

First. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to new drugs as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Second. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to new biological products, as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Third. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to certain new drugs, including insulin, and several specifically enumerated antibiotics, as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Fourth. What accounts for the difference in responsibilities?

Fifth. Is the difference in responsibilities justified?

B. Rapid mass application versus gradual individual application:

Sixth. Are there any public policy considerations which distinguish rapid mass application of new drugs from gradual individual application with regard to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Seventh. Do these considerations differ according to whether such drugs are primarily preventive or curative?

C. Respective responsibilities:

Eighth. What are the respective responsibilities—legal and other—in connection with rapid mass applications of new drugs—(a) preventive, or (b) curative of—

(A) Governmental agencies—Federal, State, and local;

(B) Voluntary agencies;

(C) Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and pharmacists;

(D) Medical profession—individually and collectively; and

(E) Others?

Ninth. Are these respective responsibilities the same in the case of rapid mass application and in the case of gradual individual application of new drugs?

Tenth. Are present Federal laws adequate for the discharge of Federal responsibilities in connection with rapid mass application and gradual individual application of new drugs—preventive or curative—with regard to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Alien Property Report of the American Legion 36th National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make it known to my colleagues and my many national-minded constituents the stand which the American Legion has taken in regard to the return of alien property.

From August 30 through September 2 of 1954, the American Legion met in the city of Washington, D. C., at which time the Committee on Foreign Relations of the American Legion stated as follows, and I quote:

> Believing that the American veteran has a vested interest in enemy assets seized by the United States, and that such assets should continue to be devoted to the purpose provided by the Veterans' Claims Act, the American Legion opposes any effort to return these assets to their former owners or their governments.

This resolution as aforementioned was approved with no opposing vote whatsoever by the full Legion assembled. Not only has the American Legion taken a stand in opposition to the return of alien property, but also the other numerous veterans organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth. I have noticed in the past few weeks that many of my colleagues in the House and the Senate have introduced numerous bills for the return of this vested property. I believe that we should all be cognizant of the stand that our leading veterans organizations have taken on this particular subject.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for the week of May 23, 1955, concerning a visit that a number of my colleagues and I had the pleasure of making aboard one of our aircraft carriers, the U. S. S. *Intrepid*, off the coast of Norfolk, Va., to witness some tactical operations. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The United States Navy—and God bless those who make it great—has a long and awe-inspiring tradition of fighting on against any and all odds, and of persevering no matter what. Its great names, John Paul Jones, Oliver Hazard Perry, Dewey, Halsey, Lawrence, and the others, are names of men who fought on and won, or who went down fighting to the end.

But the Navy has now demonstrated that, in addition to knowing how to fight on stubbornly, it has finally learned how to give in. Not in battle, of course—never in battle—but about this matter of Congresswomen.

In previous years, invitations to Members of Congress to board fighting ships for demonstration cruises or maneuvers were always carefully limited to Congressmen. Women Members of Congress frequently are outstanding friends of the military services, but while the Navy might have appreciated that very much in the past, it still made certain not to include us in the invitation list for congressional cruises. Our protests went unheeded, until this year.

This year things were different, and a group of Congresswomen went along with the congressional delegation which boarded the U. S. S. *Intrepid*—a 40,000-ton attack aircraft carrier with a flight deck the size of three football fields—for a weekend glimpse up front of carrier tactics in a task force which also included a battleship, four

destroyers, and two submarines. We saw, among other things, jet aircraft takeoffs and landings at sea, a night attack on a submarine, a drone shoot, gunnery practice by the battleship *New Jersey*, and an underway replenishment exercise. We saw the men of Carrier Air Group 4 fly their F9F–8 Cougar and F2H–2 Banshee jet fighters, and AD Skyraider propeller-driven attack planes in a series of exercises designed to help protect America and keep us safe. I was especially lucky to rate an overwater helicopter tour of the task force group, a real thrill.

Enjoyable as all of this was—and indeed it was—it was no junket. For it gave us a much better realization of the problems of the Navy and of Navy personnel, of the needs and requirements of the service, of the demands of modern warfare at sea. We have to provide the funds for the Navy; it is important that we know something of the way the funds are used.

Equally important, it gave us a new insight into the lives of the fine young men who risk their lives to protect the lives of all the rest of us—who proudly wear their Navy uniforms as a badge of courage and of fidelity to country.

There is no doubt about the courage of today's Navy. After all, in defying its previous superstition—for that's all we insisted it was—against Congresswomen on board, the Navy went all the way and took us aboard on Friday the 13th. Truly that ship was well named the *Intrepid*.

Veto of the Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress, while admitting that the cost of living to postal workers had risen approximately 10 percent since the last salary raise, decided finally that 8.8 would be the right thing to do. The Senate had decided that a 10-percent raise was not too much and so voted. The House, however, voted 8.2, and the conference came back with an agreement at 8.8 percent, and both Houses again passed the bill. In the debate administration leaders of the House quoted the President as saying that he would veto anything over 7.6. That was used as an argument, but the House refused to be put in a straitjacket.

The administration leaders like JOE MARTIN, CHARLES HALLECK, and ED REES were right. The President did veto the bill.

The veto will be sent first to the Senate, which was the first body to pass the bill and the question will be, "Shall the bill be passed, the President's veto notwithstanding?" This must pass by a two-thirds vote and the veto will probably be sustained. Many Republicans who were willing for a 10 percent raise, and voted for it, will reverse themselves in order to support the President. If the veto is sustained in the Senate, the matter will not come before the House at all.

This muddled situation has all been caused by the representations made by Republican leaders that the President would veto the bill if it carried more than a raise of 7.6. Having told the leaders that this is what he would do, these leaders would be out on a political limb if the President signed the bill.

The fact remains that this is a poor way to legislate, because carrying this policy to the *n*th degree, the President can tell Congress what to do and, if perchance Congress does differently, down comes the veto with a slam. Isn't this a direct interference with the legislative branch?

If the veto is sustained, the administration will then rush a bill up to a congressional vote on a bill just as the President wants it. There is only 13 cents per day difference in the bill the President vetoed and the one he wants. All this talk about the difficulty of administering the vetoed bill is bologna hatched up by Postmaster General Summerfield. He has difficulty in administering the present law.

A bill must be put through—the Republicans in the next Congress can be easily counted if no raise is passed. The Republicans will move heaven and earth to pass the President's bill. Watch the scramble and see if I am right. No matter what is done, the postal workers will remember too much about this situation to be very enthusiastic about electing Republicans. In other words, I think the veto, involving only 13 cents per day, was a blunder regardless of politics. Can any President come within 13 cents of arriving at just pay for postal workers? No, it was not the 13 cents—it was because his leadership had been challenged. The President has done so many good things that my conclusion in this case is that he was poorly advised. He ought not to have been so determined—he should have permitted Congress to work its will.

As a Republican I have always tried to bring about a friendly feeling between organized labor and the Republican Party, for the reason that I knew laborers in many sections of the country were not too well sold on the Republican Party. This veto is not going to make this feeling any better, but probably worse. The way this matter has been maneuvered around, it is doubtful now that the Republican Party will get the credit for any raise.

This issue has never been a Democrat or a Republican issue—it is an issue of justice. These workers are entitled to a raise and all sides know it. When there was such a trifle involved—13 cents per day for 500,000 workers—why was it necessary to arouse all this opposition? Congressmen, at the earliest solicitation of the President, received an increase of $20.50 per day, and here we are fighting a half-million workers who want 13 cents per day more than the President approves. That is not the way I would run the Republican Party if I had any part in directing it. And remember, this extra 13 cents does not exceed in the aggregate enough to cover the full rise in the cost of living to these workers.

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night, after 79 years of incredibly rich and productive life, Mary McLeod Bethune died at her home in Daytona Beach, Fla. Hers was, indeed, a rare spirit, marked by true greatness of soul, of wisdom, and of heart. Her death is a loss which the whole world will feel.

Life was not easy for Mrs. Bethune, although she would be the last person to say that it was cruel or unjust. She was one of 17 children whose parents had been slaves. Yet despite the seemingly overwhelming obstacles in her path, she has left behind her enduring monuments to her greatness that will forever enrich the lives of the people of her country and will stand as an inspiration to the people of the world.

There is no need here for a detailed discussion of her accomplishments. They are now a permanent part of our national treasure. Suffice it to say that we shall forever be in her debt for the college she founded and served so long and brilliantly, for the organizations which she created and served so well, and for the inestimable services she performed for her Government over a period of many years.

Mary McLeod Bethune held degrees from 14 colleges and universities. Cuba, Haiti, Liberia, and other foreign countries decorated her for her work. She was the recipient of honors and awards too numerous to mention. Certainly no one ever deserved them more.

Mary McLeod Bethune was a woman of great courage, infinite faith, profound wisdom, and boundless determination. No one understood better than she the problems of her race and the ideals of her country. Without these qualities she could never have succeeded; with them she could not fail.

The ultimate tribute that we, the living, can pay to Mary McLeod Bethune is to carry on her work and to strive to attain her ideals. That is the way she would have wanted it. We owe this much to her, and we owe it to ourselves.

Mrs. Bethune was a warm and close friend of both my father and my mother, and I am sure that her many friends in this Congress who perhaps did not read my mother's column of May 20 will appreciate seeing her tribute to Mrs. Bethune. I, therefore, append it to these remarks:

MY DAY
(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK.—I was distressed to read in the newspapers Thursday morning of the death of a really great American woman, Mary McLeod Bethune.

Dr. Bethune started life under conditions which must have made her education seem almost impossible, but both she and her parents had a great desire for her to gain knowledge and they seized on every opportunity.

And the opportunities came, as they so often do, when people are ready to use them.

The newspapers were full of stories of how she led her remarkable life. Beginning with a dollar and a half she built a Negro college in Florida. She fought for the rights of her people but never with resentment or bitterness, and she taught both her own people and her white fellow Americans many a valuable lesson.

I always liked the story of how once a patronizing pullman-car conductor, asking her for her ticket, said: "Auntie, give me your ticket." She let him repeat it twice. Then, looking up sweetly, she said: "Which of my sister's sons are you?" This was a way of turning the tables on a gentleman, which was far more effective than any amount of anger would have been.

She had a deep religious faith, and religion was not academic with her. It was both a weapon and a shield. She has told me very simply how time after time she has prayed for things, never for herself, but she always believed that if they were good things the Lord would hear her prayer. And there must have been many, many times when people were moved to answer her needs just because of this faith. She helped herself and the Lord helped her.

I knew Dr. Bethune best, of course, in the years when she worked for the National Youth Administration and she did good and courageous work for the young people of her race in a difficult period. But I have kept in touch with her all through the years and I will miss her very much, for I valued her wisdom and her goodness.

I would like to be at her funeral but I doubt if that will be possible. I have many commitments that would mean disappointment to various causes, which I think Dr. Bethune would be the first to feel should come before one's personal desires. Nevertheless, I will cherish the spirit she lived by and try to promote the causes that she believed in, in loving memory of a very wonderful life.

Commissioner Slusser Answers National Association of Real Estate Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the address of Hon. Charles E. Slusser, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, on May 17, 1955, at the annual conference in Galveston, Tex., of the southwestern regional conference of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, as follows:

Having said that I want public housing to be a local enterprise, I must tell you that there are also occasions when the Public Housing Commissioner intends to exercise his prerogative to speak for all of you without sideline coaching or prompting. When this program is unjustly attacked, I intend to take the first public opportunity to answer.

To clear up any doubts that might exist in any minds, my remarks are occasioned by an editorial put out by the Washington office of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in their May 2 publication, Headlines, and signed by their president, Henry G. Waltemade.

Less than a year ago I spoke in Philadelphia at NAHRO's annual national convention. I discussed then the almost fanatical campaign directed against public housing by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, of which I am a member. I said I would not let distortion and fraud go unchallenged. Evidently NAREB does not take me at my word, because this newest editorial shows neither regard for facts nor an intelligent understanding of the program. There are methods of supporting a cause or a system. You can lead with the truth or you can mislead with unsupportable propaganda.

Valid, constructive criticism should never be rejected. But we have not had this from NAREB. Instead, behind a thin veneer of respectability, we have had the unlikeliest set of conclusions that were ever based on not wishful, but willful thinking.

I am not unaware that these offensives begin at the time our Congress considers new housing legislation. So be it. Let us examine the previously mentioned May 2, 1955, editorial.

First, they ask, "Does public housing take care of the needy?" Their answer is "Hardly ever. In Washington, D. C., the model of Federal experimentation, a study showed that only 47 of more than 4,000 families receiving welfare aid were permitted in public housing." The propaganda went on from there, but what are the facts? They need to be brought out.

NAREB tells you that there are only 47 Washington, D. C., families receiving relief being benefited by public housing. There are 399 such families in Washington's public housing. A dime local phone call to the National Capital Housing Authority would have established the facts. NAREB's Washington office could spare it.

I give NAREB its poor choice. It has used either faked or negligent statistics. In either case, it owes an abject apology to the National Capital Housing Authority, in particular and the public housing movement in general, and I for one haven't the time to wait for it.

There are more than faked statistics in this matter. Washington, D. C.'s welfare loan wasn't picked at random as an illustrative case. It was used in this instance because it is among the lowest in the country. Washington has only eight-tenths of a person out of a thousand on relief, while the national average is six and a half persons out of a thousand. Not satisfied to use an extreme case that completely distorts the national situation, the writer of this Washington, D. C., editorial had to give false figures, exaggerated by more than eight times.

In this same editorial of May 2, 1955, NAREB charges that "the mayor of Detroit was refused information by the public housing authority in his city." I have had the honor of knowing Mayor Cobo. In addition, I know something, as Public Housing Commissioner, of the operation of public housing in that city and the State of Michigan, which requires all public housing authorities, or commissions as they are referred to there, to operate directly under the control of the city government. Given that as a fact, how could any public housing commission in Michigan refuse information to its mayor, let alone the Detroit Housing Commission, refuse Mayor Cobo?

Not content with the obvious falsity of this charge by NAREB, I have had my office contact that of Mayor Cobo, with regard to this statement. He authorized us to deny its veracity and to state that the Detroit Housing Commission has at no time denied him information, but quite the contrary, has always supplied it. On what figment of imagination NAREB has based this charge, I do not know. I do know, and Mayor Cobo knows, that it is false.

Like many national organizations, NAREB meets annually, and for the most part, much good accrues to the realtor and the real-estate industry from the interchange of ideas at these meetings. But unfortunately, through the years, public housing has become the whipping boy at these annual affairs. We run the gauntlet.

Periodically, all the old housing bogies are dragged out by NAREB for public display—the old chestnuts are refurbished.

Eight years ago NAREB was saying that public housing was a "fascistic, communistic, socialistic doctrine." Public housing, they said then, "is a danger to freedom, a danger to home ownership, and a danger to our form of government." In 1947, a NAREB spokesman told a Senate committee that public housing could destroy the country's entire private housing industry.

They have kept it up. Last year NAREB alleged from Washington, D. C., that public housing failed to house needy families; it was a special privilege and a political racket; it was a Russian custom; it herded families together into ghettos, and it is an unfair burden on homeowners.

In 1955, NAREB's tune is largely the same. The lyrics are but little different in the May 2 editorial. They said this year that public housing is a form of mental sickness. It does not eliminate crime and delinquency. It is not public. Who wants it? And has it done any good?

The passage of time has not had any visible effect on NAREB's public housing views.

Not much. NAREB asked the hackneyed question: "Does public housing take care of the needy?" Earlier in my remarks we examined their statement concerning the National Capital Housing Authority. What is the national picture?

Our records show that during the first half of 1954, the recheck of over 142,000 families living in low-rent public housing showed an average annual income of $1,852 after allowable exemptions. For families admitted during that time, the figure was $1,810. We have no data yet on rechecks for the rest of 1954, but the 30,000 families moving in during October, November, and December 1954 had average annual incomes of only $1,803 after exemptions, $7 less than those admitted in the first half of the year.

These families then were existing on an income of $150 a month. I say they needed help from public housing. Further, 30 percent of the families admitted during the last quarter of 1954 were receiving public or private relief or some form of public benefit.

What is NAREB's definition of need? What are they doing about it? Beyond pious platitudes, have they any practical solution for getting these people out of slums into decent, livable housing?

Take a long look at NAREB's oft-repeated assertion that public housing means the extinction of the private home-building industry. A look at the figures leads me to question the plaintive note in the May 2 tirade, "Public housing strikes down a large element of the construction industry, always a main source of investment and jobs."

What is the record?

The housing census of 1950 showed there were 46 million dwelling units in the United States, a net gain since 1940 of almost 9 million units. Of the total number, 39 million were classified by the census as nonfarm units, with the balance classified as rural farm dwellings.

A large part of the increase in nonfarm housing was accounted for by 5.7 million new units constructed between 1940 and 1950.

How many federally aided low-rent public housing units were started in that decade? About 150,000. Who's being shoved into oblivion?

Now, let's take a look at housing starts for the past 5 years.

Private enterprise started construction on almost 6 million dwelling units in that period.

Local housing authorities started construction on a total of 204,000 low-rent units.

Elementary arithmetic will show low-rent public housing accounted for just about 3 percent of the total nonfarm housing starts. If this 3 percent is scaring 97 percent, it is the wonder of the age. The only people we're really scaring are the slum landlords.

Obviously, public housing is neither throttling private enterprise, nor dooming the private building industry to extinction—a charge trumpeted by NAREB.

NAREB's Washington editorial also asked "Does public housing eliminate crime and delinquency?" And it answered, "All the news we get is that both are on the increase everywhere in our cities, regardless of public housing."

Public housing will not solve every problem of the current age. Just as the police departments, the fire departments, and the welfare departments of your cities do not eliminate crime, fire, and disease entirely. But without any of these municipal agencies, you can conjecture with horror the state we would be in. We have not eliminated crime and juvenile delinquency, either, but we have bettered the record that was in existence before us. Certainly, there is less crime and juvenile delinquency in our projects than there were in the slums that we replaced.

There is also another side to the problem.

As you know, the Congress has been devoting considerable attention to the problems of juvenile delinquency.

The Senate Judiciary Committee selected a subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States. Earlier this year the committee released an interim report on its findings. I believe you will find the following of interest: "Although physically deteriorated and socially disorganized neighborhoods, usually termed slum areas contributed disproportionately to the delinquency caseloads of police and juvenile courts, economically well-to-do communities also produce many juvenile delinquents. As a matter of fact, certain forms of delinquent conduct appear more prevalent in the latter type of neighborhoods." It is not just our problem.

Public housing is not the sole panacea for the Nation's social and economic needs. But as a businessman, a realtor, a former mayor of a good-sized city, I can assure you that public housing is good business, both socially and economically.

You are all too familiar with the pros and cons of federally aided low-rent public housing for me to repeat them. You live with them 7 days a week. I only wish that those who seek to discredit and destroy public housing could spend a week, or at least a day, in a slum house. Or to spare them this mild horror, let them merely tour a slum area on a hot summer day. They'll find out soon enough whether families want to escape from their slum hovels into the decent public housing that NAREB has tagged a ghetto and the cornerstone of the socialistic state.

NAREB has tried through the years to make public housing a synonym for socialism, for communism, for something un-American. Tell me, is it un-American to want to live in decent homes? Do we force families from slums into clean, bright accommodations at rents within their means? Do we hold them in public housing against their will? I know of no pressure—political or otherwise—which binds an American family to a low-rent lease.

Basically, Americans of low income are the same as you and I. We all seek constantly to improve our station in life. We can go as high as our opportunities and our abilities permit us. That's the American way. We all want a decent home for our families.

By the way, the title of NAREB's editorial was "Let's Stop It Now." I agree wholeheartedly.

Roger Lowell Putnam—Advertising Club of Springfield, Mass., Honors Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the William Pynchon medal is an award given by the Springfield Advertising Club to a Springfield citizen for distinguished service to his city. It is the most coveted of civic awards. I am happy to inform the Congress that this year's presentation went to one who is familiar to many Members of this House, Roger Lowell Putnam.

The Springfield Advertising Club is to be congratulated on its choice. There are few men who have served the city of Springfield, Mass., more conspicuously than Mr. Putnam. He has been a "good citizen" in the very best tradition of those words. Whether in peace or in war, he has answered the call of his Nation and his community. And no matter what level in which he served, he has given outstanding, noteworthy service. In a life that has been crammed with private executive functions, he has nonetheless found much time to devote to the public good. Indeed he has been and is an inspiring example not alone to his own city but to the Nation. The father of five children, a graduate magna cum laude from Harvard, studied at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, honorary degrees from Boston College and St. Anselm's College; vice president, president, and chairman of the board of Package Machinery Co.; director of Van Norman Co., American Bosch Corp., Third National Bank & Trust Co., Springfield Chamber of Commerce, New England Council; sole trustee, Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Ariz.; member of American Astronomical Association, Petersham, Mass., Memorial Library, Springfield, Mass., Library Association, Commission on Fine Arts and Music, Astronomical Society of the Pacific, Harvard Club of Boston and New York, Colony Club of Springfield, Delta Psi—all of these give testimony to his success in education and in business. Further achievements in behalf of his Nation and community are detailed in his service as an ensign and lieutenant, United States Navy in World War I; lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, 1943; research and development on staff of Admiral Kirk, Deputy Director of Office of Contract Settlement, 1944–46; Economic Stabilization Administrator, 1952; and mayor of Springfield, Mass., 1937–41—the first three-time mayor up to that time in the history of the city.

Roger Lowell Putnam received the William Pynchon Medal at the annual award dinner of the Advertising Club of Springfield on last Tuesday, May 17, 1955. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial titled "Pynchon Medal Award" that appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News on May 18, 1955.

PYNCHON MEDAL AWARD

Roger Lowell Putnam last night became the 80th person to receive the William Pynchon Medal, awarded by the Springfield Advertising Club for distinguished service to the city.

The award, named for the founder of Springfield, was given to Mr. Putnam, a former mayor and chairman of the board of the Package Machinery Co., of East Longmeadow, for "his outstanding contributions in the field of humanics which have been dedicated to the betterment of mankind, for his voluntary acceptance of duty in local, national, and international affairs, his business and personal integrity, and his devotion to responsibilities, which have been reflected in higher standards of human values in the civic, industrial, and community life of the Springfield area."

Adm. Alan G. Kirk, former Ambassador to Russia, spoke at the dinner and lauded Mr. Putnam who served on Kirk's staff during two world wars.

There are many in Springfield who can testify to Mr. Putnam's ability and intelligence, who can cite his achievements, and can do honor to his devotion to public causes. However, we are pleased when the judgment of our community is endorsed by someone from another field of service who recognized Mr. Putnam's worth.

Mr. Putnam is honored with the Pynchon Medal, and he adds honor to the award as he joins the roll of distinguished citizens who have served Springfield well.

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in offering for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, May 19, 1955, issue of the Missouri Cash-Book, of Jackson, Mo., I would call attention to the fact that it appears that the Farm Bureau, through its Farm Bureau News, appears to be following the policy set by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in his apparent efforts to widen the breech between consumer and farm groups, is deliberately, purposefully, and maliciously misquoting the record.

In this particular instance I am referring to the misquoting of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, who has been misquoted by those who would attempt to leave the impression that Representative COOLEY has said that Mr. Walter Reuther made the best speech that he had ever heard given before the House Committee on Agriculture, and the same people would, also by their misquotations attempt to leave the impression that Chairman COOLEY had said that Mr. Reuther had presented the farmers case better than it had been presented by any witness who had appeared before his committee. The Farm Bureau News, according to the reprint of its article in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, apparently has dealt in the

use of the superlative to leave the impression that Chairman COOLEY was discrediting the testimony of many outstanding farm leaders who have appeared before his committee.

In my opinion nothing could be further from the truth. I attended the hearing at which Mr. Reuther testified, and I have been present at many other hearings during the time I have been a Member of Congress and during which I have been privileged to serve on this great committee which is working so hard in the face of dogged, determined and persistent opposition of the present Secretary of Agriculture. It was my first time to ever see, meet, or hear Mr. Reuther, and I must confess that before he began I was skeptical of any contribution which might be made by the president of any group of organized labor, even if he did represent an estimated 6 million members, all of whom naturally are consumers of farm products.

Following his talk I said that I concurred with the statement of Chairman COOLEY that Mr. Reuther had made one—and I repeat, one—of the best speeches dealing with the problems of agriculture that I had heard. Likewise, Chairman COOLEY did not say that Mr. Reuther had presented the farmers' case better or more effectively than it had been presented by any farm leader. What he did say, and I quote from the hearings, which I believe were correctly reported:

> We have had many farm leaders in this committee during the 20 years that I have served here on this committee and I want to say that not one of them has surpassed you in the presentation of the farmers' cause.

To those who have been critical of our chairman for inviting representatives of consumers groups to appear before our committee to discuss the proposed changes in the farm bill to restore 90 percent of parity to support prices on basic commodities, which has now been approved in the House, I would only remind them that every person in this Nation is affected either directly or indirectly by the prosperity of agriculture and the millions of farm families who derive their livelihood from the soil. Those consumers who have been led to believe that the high prices they are having to pay for food and fiber are caused by the fixed fair support prices which have been accorded the basic commodities, need to learn the truth. One of the best ways for them to get the true picture is to attend and participate in the hearings on legislation of this type. This is the opportune time to correct the wrong impressions they may have gained from reading propaganda put out by those who contend that they represent agriculture, but who at this very hour are attempting to destroy the agricultural program which we have been attempting to build for years.

It is for this reason that I commend to my colleagues for reading the editorial below, which was written by my good friend, Mr. C. C. Oliver, a contributing editor of the Cash-Book:

MAYBE THEY REMEMBERED

In last week's issue of our Farm Bureau News, there was a reprint in its editorial column from the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram in which Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, was taken to task because he praised a talk made before his committee by Walter Reuther, head of the CIO, in behalf of farmers.

The article was headed "A Scratching of Backs?" Since our experience has been that the Farm Bureau News prints only opinions that meet with its editors' opinions, we assume that it agrees wholeheartedly with the article reproduced from the Drovers Telegram.

The D. T. says the thing that gave it a jolt (and we presume jolted the F. B. News) was Mr. COOLEY's statement that Mr. Reuther "actually made the best farm speech that I have heard in our committee room during the entire 20 years that I have served on the House Committee on Agriculture."

What is there in or about a statement like that to give the Drovers Telegram and in turn the Farm Bureau News, a jolt? Do they think Mr. COOLEY wasn't telling the truth or do they think he's just a poor judge of speeches on farming? If it's the latter view they take, we'd like to inform them that Mr. COOLEY wasn't alone in his appraisal of the speech as the best that he'd ever heard. Our Congressman from this district, PAUL C. JONES, wrote in his newsletter to the papers of this district, the first of last March, saying:

"One of the most impressive witnesses who has ever appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture which is presently considering a proposal to restore the 90 percent price-support program, was CIO President Walter Reuther, whose opening statement was that while he was not appearing as an authority on farm problems nor as an expert on farm policies, that speaking on behalf of the 6 million members of the CIO, he wanted to make it clear that 'American farmers who are making a tremendous contribution to the well-being and the economic progress of our great country ought to be given the kind of support and consideration that will enable farm families to get that measure of economic justice that parity reflects.'

"At the conclusion of Mr. Reuther's statement, made from notes and lasting about 45 minutes, I believe that without exception and regardless of politics or philosophy, the members of the committee concurred with Chairman COOLEY when he stated that in his opinion, Mr. Reuther had made one of the best speeches he had ever heard, and added, 'We have had many farm leaders in this committee during the 20 years that I have served here on this committee and I want to say that not one of them has surpassed you in the presentation of the farmer's cause'."

This appraisal and statement of Congressman JONES would seem to warrant the opinion that Chairman COOLEY expressed following Mr. Reuther's talk.

But quoting the D. T. further as reprinted in the Farm Bureau News it says: "But to say in effect that an outsider has been able to present the farmer's case more effectively than the farmer himself, obviously is to do an injustice to a great many intelligent farmers and conscientious farm leaders."

Where's the injustice? If we're trying to do a job and a fellow comes along who can do better than we can at it, we'd welcome his help instead of considering that he was doing us an injustice.

Doubtless Chairman COOLEY, Mr. JONES and other members of the committee have heard many intelligent farmers and conscientious farm leaders. But they might have been like Allen Kline, former national president of the organization, and H. E. Slusher, present president of the Missouri Farm Bureau, neither of whom in our opinion represent the rank and file of our membership. We've read some of their speeches and heard them talk and when they'd get in stride and go to talking to us about losing our freedom and security if we voted controls on our major crops and got as much as 90 percent of parity on them, it always seemed to us like they were long on verbiage and short on meat.

Maybe Mr. COOLEY, JONES, and the rest of the Committee on Agriculture recalled their kind of speeches when they were passing judgment on Mr. Reuther's talk.

Germany and the United States Are Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from my remarks at the annual Founder's Day dinner of the Steuben Society of America at the Hotel Statler, New York, Saturday night, May 21:

The problem of the status of Germany today and its relations with the United States is of the deepest concern not only to members of the Steuben Society but to all Americans.

It is now 10 years since World War II, 10 years that have been as fateful for mankind as any decade in history. Ten years ago hopes for permanent peace were high. We have seen those hopes fade as the Communists made clear their intention to dominate the world. We have seen the advent of the atomic age, with its awesome potentialities for good or evil. We have seen whole societies in flux, as colonial regimes have yielded to pressure, and new states have been launched to fend for themselves. As the conquest of time and space has assumed fantastic proportions, we know, with a sense of utter finality, that geographic isolation is impossible. Thus we have seen our own America emerge as the acknowledged leader of the free world.

During this entire period a crucial problem in American foreign policy has been the problem of Germany. I might almost say the crucial problem—for the trained manpower and the huge industrial complex of Germany represent the greatest prize in the deadly game originated by the men in the Kremlin. In short, the future of Germany and of America are inextricably linked.

Once Soviet intentions toward Germany became clear, our present German policy began to evolve. In his famous speech in Stuttgart in 1946, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes declared that America would help Germany toward economic recovery and political stability.

We merged our occupation zone with that of the British, and when the Marshall plan was inaugurated we made help available to Germany in liberal amounts. That aid sparked the remarkable economic recovery of Germany, a recovery that has aroused the admiration of the world. Under Allied auspices, a constitution for a democratic Federal Government of Germany was drawn up, and that Government was launched in 1949. A few months before, our airlift had called the Soviet bluff designed to push freedom out of West Berlin. Then came the complex negotiations for the rearmament of Germany. They were rendered more urgent by the bold Communist attempt to seize South Korea, the lesson of which for Germany was all too

clear. The current of pessimism which swept the free world at the defeat of the European Defense Community was fortunately replaced by the thrill of hope when the Western European Union became a reality. The salient fact, however, is that today, 10 years after the end of the war, Germany stands again a sovereign state, with democratic political parties, institutions, courts, and press.

This reforging of the bonds of German-American friendship is not solely a product of power politics. It did not arise simply because Russia covets Germany and we oppose Russia. Nor is it completely the result of our desire to keep German economic strength on our side, important as that factor may be. It is also a recognition of the intrinsic virtues of the German people, of their energy and their dedication. Above all, it is an appreciation of the effort by which Germany pulled itself up from the depths. Such a people obviously cannot be treated as a cipher in international politics; they cannot be a purely agricultural people; they cannot be left powerless, tempting prey to Soviet rapacity.

On the surface, then, our policy in Germany has been a success. But beneath the surface are many boiling tensions which may yet defeat the policies on which we have labored so long. Occasionally it seems that we are in danger of converting those policies into ends in themselves, and thus of losing the advantages in Germany and Europe which we now hold.

Lest this all seem cryptic, let me hasten to specify. It is no secret, for example, that not only the French but the other nations of continental Europe as well are lukewarm on German rearmament. They have accepted the idea, but only in the context of a complicated set of alliances in which we are the dominating partner. This attitude, perhaps, is only to be expected, in view of the long memories which war often breeds.

But the interesting thing is that considerable numbers of Germans and anti-Communist Germans at that, likewise oppose rearmament. Some oppose it because they fear renascent militarism. But even more widely held is the conviction that final alinement with the Western bloc through rearmament closes the door on reunification of Germany for as long as those of us alive today can reasonably foresee.

What a trump card this situation gives to Soviet diplomacy. The Soviets have always had it in their power, of course, to bring about German unification. But they have always balked at genuinely free elections. Their ill-concealed desire to communize all of Germany has caused them to forfeit this diplomatic advantage. Not only would the Western Allies not accept unification of Germany on Communist terms, but Germany would not accept it either.

Now the Soviet Union is seeking to turn to central Europe the face of sweet reasonableness. After 10 years of blocking an Austrian treaty, it has suddenly agreed to conditions on which the West had not been able to win acceptance for years. The Russians have agreed to withdraw all troops. Austria, on its part, is not to join any military alliance, or permit military bases on its territory, and is to ask a guarantee from the Big Four against any future attempt by Germany at anschluss, or union. This week the bells of St. Stephen's in Vienna pealed out the glad news of Austria's freedom.

It is apparent, however, that the real object of this not too subtle maneuver is Germany. The Russians are quite plainly saying to Germany: Withdraw from the Western alliance, do not proceed with rearmament, accept the status of neutrality, and we will see to it that you are happily reunited with your 18 million brethren in the East. In the offing are hints of increased trade with Eastern Europe. It is easy to see why this argument should make a powerful appeal to German opinion. It is equally easy to see why it should appeal to European opinion outside of Germany, which is only reluctantly reconciled to the idea of German rearmament. At one stroke the Russians have contrived to put pressure on the Western system of alliances and on the Adenauer government which supports them.

The Russian object still remains the same: to draw a "neutralized" Germany into the Communist orbit. This she intends to do by retaining her hold on Germany's enslaved neighbors in Eastern Europe, and by biding her time for the day when she can swing another Molotov-Ribbentrop pact with a remilitarized Germany.

Far be it from me to suggest that the Bonn Republic is about to leap into the arms of Moscow. The people of West Germany know that the United States is their proven friend. They do not look inward, but outward to a united Europe, and to a Western Union that spans the Atlantic. But they would be less than human if they were not sorely tempted by a Soviet offer of the character I have described.

This situation presents the United States with both a trial and an opportunity. I am afraid that if our policy becomes encased in rigid formulae, we are in for a time of trial. It is all well and good to insist that we favor German unity, as our State Department has done repeatedly; but this insistence must be coupled with a thorough examination of the means to achieve it. It is in just such an examination that our opportunity lies, for it may be possible, in cooperation with West Germany, to arrive at a solution for the problem of reunification that the Russians must either honor, or lose permanently the advantage of the diplomatic trump they now hold. What is required is some imagination, and an ability to take a long, clear look at our German policy, a look marked by detachment and devotion to the national interest, and uncluttered by political slogans. I cannot believe that our country lacks either the brains or the courage to do this.

Having said all this, it is with some trepidation that I offer a few of my own thoughts on this subject. It seems to me that perhaps one fruitful approach would be to do something like this: Let the President tell Western Europe in the clearest terms that Germany is being rearmed because Russia has left the West no alternative; that, however, if Western Europe will agree, and if Russia will withdraw to her historic borders, we would welcome a Germany that is unified in freedom, and a liberated Eastern Europe, all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the United Nations. I think that in this manner we would give a crystal-clear demonstration to those people of Western Europe who genuinely fear German rearmament that we are not ruthlessly overriding their point of view. At the same time, by dropping our insistence that Germany adhere to the Western bloc for military purposes, we might force Russia to consent to the unification of Germany under what, in the last analysis, would be Western auspices for every purpose other than military. Certainly if Russia refused her consent, on these terms, her diplomatic position in Germany would suffer a heavy blow. She could no longer pose as the champion of German unity.

But I feel this proposal can be pushed even further. It seems to me that a logical solution for Eastern Europe is at least a partial internationalization along the lines now being pursued in the western part of the Continent. Countries such as Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria might be free and independent, but linked in a Central and Eastern European community based on a respect for human rights. Who knows? Perhaps one day the Eastern European and the Western European federations could be merged in a real United Europe. And could not the vision of Charlemagne and the dream of Dante then become a reality?

Under such a proposal, the advantages that might accrue to Germany are considerable. The prospects for peace would be vastly greater. The partial internationalization of Eastern Europe offers a constructive opportunity for a just settlement, with German concurrence, of the trans-Oder-Neisse territory now administered by Poland. While no longer a member of the Western military alliance, Germany would not be required to forego membership in the European Coal and Steel Community, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, even of a transatlantic economic and political NATO, nor of the United Nations. Germany would lack arms, but she would be free to form economic, political, and social ties with whom she wished—and I think she would wish them mainly with the West. Lying in the heart of Europe, she would be the natural center of trade within the Continent. Her mighty economy would be devoted toward peace, not war. I refuse to believe that Germany can find greatness only in militarism, or that the prospect of using her economic might to benefit the Free World in peacetime trade and aid does not hold out a higher inspiration to her people.

For ourselves and our NATO allies, the advantages of such a proposal are equally obvious. The worst sources of tension in Europe would be eliminated. True, Russia herself would still be our antagonist in the cold war. But NATO could and should continue its policy of strength. Certainly the NATO position would not be worsened by relinquishing 12 hypothetical German divisions for 60-plus existing satellite divisions. And if Russia means anything by her current disarmament gestures, progressive disarmament on both sides can go hand in hand with a European settlement.

Now I know that to expect Soviet Russia to withdraw to her historic borders is expecting a great deal, and it is easily conceivable that she would turn such a proposition down flat. But that should not deter us from trying, particularly at a time when signs of Soviet stress are beginning to show. If the Soviet Union, offered a meaningful guaranty of her security in Europe, chooses to stand before the world as the force preventing German unification, as the force imprisoning the satellites, as the force blocking the formation of a European federation dedicated to peace, then let her so stand. We at least will have done our share.

Now obviously I do not have the temerity to suggest that these proposals with respect to Germany and Central Europe are the only proposals, or the best proposals, or anything of the sort. I merely offer them because I am concerned, as I believe you are concerned, with the way our policy toward Germany seems to be stuck on dead center.

I think American policy toward Germany needs to assume a more affirmative character. We must not allow ourselves to be led by events. Rather, we must advance positive, constructive suggestions looking to the solution of this problem. To remain complacent is to court disaster.

When the Four Powers meet "at the summit" this summer, it would be well if the West had something positive to talk about. For unless we do, a massive Soviet propaganda victory is in prospect.

In the 10 years since the cessation of hostilities, American policy toward Germany, and indeed Germany itself, have come full circle. At first our policy was stern, specifically designed to destroy Germany's military power. The aggressive pursuit by the Soviet Union of its goal of world communism forced a reconsideration of our aims and methods,

a reconsideration which led to their thorough overhaul.

But it was not only the activities of the Communists which forced this reconsideration. It was the growing realization, as well, that the spirit of Germany was not the spirit of Adolf Hitler, but rather the spirit of Goethe, of Schiller, of Beethoven. It was inspired by the manner in which Germany set to work to erect a new, democratic structure, on the ruins of the old.

On its part Germany, at the end of the war, was stunned and apathetic. But the will to live and grow was strong. Apathy was put aside, and by a great national effort, Germany lifted herself by her own bootstraps, restored her once flourishing economy, and earned the respect of the nations. Once again, she resumed her rightful place in world affairs.

Today Germany is our trusted friend. She looks to us to help her solve the economic and political problems with which she is still beset. We see her as our ally, working toward a peaceful world. It is to the mutual advantage of both nations that this happy relationship should continue.

In my home city of Milwaukee, a statue of Baron von Steuben stands near that of George Washington. It is fitting that these two heroes of freedom should thus be linked. Let the spirit of freedom which both men exemplify light the way for Germany and America, each united in freedom, to stand together against the despotism that threatens to engulf us.

Radioactive Fallout in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as apprehension over radioactive fallout has been running rife since the AEC authorized publication of a typical diagram and description of so-called fallout patterns, I have thought it might contribute to a completely sobering effect if an article were to be prepared, officially, which would relate the actual facts concerning quantities of radioactive fallout that had occurred in the United States since our country and the U. S. S. R. started testing atomic weapons. Now appears the article following, which was prepared for the weekly publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science entitled "Science" of May 13, 1955, by two eminent staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I presume this is official enough to qualify, although for the lay reader it is a bit technical.

First, it must be understood by us all that every minute of our lives we are receiving radiation from natural sources—from the sun, from outer space, from radioactive isotopes in the earth's crust and atmosphere, and even from the minute quantities of radium in the luminous dials of our watches. That radiation is described as "background radiation." It has existed since time began and will continue. It varies a bit from place to place, depending much on the contents of the earth's crust at the particular place, but, generally speaking, the background radiation our ancestors and we and our descendants absorb constantly is on the order of 160 milliroentgen—0.160r—per year. The total amount laid down by all the atom-bomb tests up to now in the States of the heaviest fallout is the equivalent of scarcely half of that and on the average is not even 10 percent. Compare that small amount with the lethal dosage which is estimated to be on the order of 400,000 milliroentgen and you can see that the total fallout to date would have to be multiplied several thousand times to be dangerous to human life.

To better understand table 2, a person living, for example, in Georgia, which has received approximately 58 millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile from bomb-test fallout, receives 3 times as much radiation each year from natural background-radiation sources. The total radiation from both natural and fallout sources that a person in Georgia receives in a year is scarcely as much as is received by having one chest X-ray. It does not amount to anything.

This entire subject is under constant study and close observation by AEC scientists and we can rest assured that if any danger shows up we will be warned in plenty of time. To date there appears to be none.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Science of May 13, 1955, entitled "Radioactive Fallout in the United States," by Merril Eisenbud and John H. Harley, Health and Safety Laboratory, United States Atomic Energy Commission, New York:

This report summarizes the data accumulated up to the present time by the fallout monitoring network of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.[1] Having reviewed the information obtained through early 1952 in a previous article,[2] we now add the data obtained in more recent atomic tests, including the Pacific exercises in the fall of 1952 (Operation Ivy), the Nevada tests early in 1953 (Operation Upshot-Knothole), and the Pacific tests in the spring of 1954 (Operation Castle).

The data are representative of the entire area of the United States except that within 200 miles of the Nevada test site. This region is not covered by the monitoring system described here, but the radioactive fallout within this area has been reported in the semiannual reports from the AEC to the Congress.[3 4]

Description of monitoring system: When tests are under way in Nevada, the monitoring network consists of 89 sampling stations,[5] but at other times the number is reduced to 41, a reasonable distribution of sampling sites for the more diffuse radioactive debris that may originate from detonations beyond the continental limits.

Table 1 lists the stations that are operating during the Nevada tests this spring. These stations, with the exception of Cleveland, Ohio, Cape Hatteras, N. C., and Concord, N. H., were also in operation during the 1953 spring tests in Nevada (Upshot-Knothole); those marked with an asterisk were in operation during the Pacific tests conducted in the spring of 1954 (Castle).

The 1-ft^2 gummed surface previously described[2] continues to be used to collect samples. The adhesive is supported on an acetate film mounted horizontally on a frame about 3 feet above the ground. The coating retains its adhesive properties when it is wet, and dust particles that are entrapped in raindrops are collected. The gummed films are changed each day and are mailed to the AEC Health and Safety Laboratory in New York, where their radioactivity is assayed.

The samples are prepared for analysis by ashing at 550° to 600° C. This results in the loss of some volatile isotopes, such as those of iodine and ruthenium, but these comprise less than 10 percent of the total activity. This defect in procedure is justified by the simplicity of the operation.

The small amount of residual ash is transferred to plastic planchets that are sealed between two layers of vinyl tape for automatic beta counting.[6] These counters have a background of 7 to 10 counts/min and efficiencies of the order of 10 percent. Samples are counted for 20 min, or for 640 counts if this occurs before 20 min have elapsed. Blanks and standards are sealed into every tape. The counts are extrapolated using the $t^{-1.2}$ law to express decay.

This method of monitoring fallout is exceedingly sensitive. We have observed that a general rise in the gamma background of 10^{-4} r/hr is associated with fallout of approximately 10^6 disintegrations/min ft.^{2} The counting procedures in routine use in this laboratory permit detection of a daily fallout of as little as 10 disintegrations/min ft.^{2} It is thus possible for us to detect radioactivity that produces a general elevation of background of about 10^{-9} r/hr. The normal gamma background count, which is caused by cosmic rays, radiopotassium, radium, and other natural sources of radioactivity, is quite variable in the range of 5×10^{-6} to 5×10^{-5} r/hr. This method thus makes it possible to estimate minute amounts of radioactivity that are insufficient by far to affect measurably the general gamma radiation background of an area.

It is clear that no one sampling procedure provides the ideal method for estimating the deposition of radioactive dust under all conditions. The deposit on any given area will depend somewhat on the character of the surface presented. For example, when there is no rainfall, dry fallout may drift somewhat with other windblown dusts. In this situation the gummed filter technique may yield a high estimate of the average fallout, because it will tend to collect dust that is being redistributed laterally.

We have compared the collection characteristics of the gummed film (G) and a high-walled pot (P). During a 49-week period we found that the regression of P on G was 1.17 ± 0.19. That is a highly significant relationship that does not differ significantly from 1.

Methods of collection utilizing pots or pans for collection of total rainfall are disadvantageous in practice because of the need to transfer and handle the wet samples preparatory to shipping to a central radiochemical facility. The gummed-film method is uniquely simple—at the end of the sam-

[1] The work summarized in this report was performed by many individuals on the staffs of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission and the U. S. Weather Bureau. We are particularly indebted to J. S. Alercio, A. E. Brandt, J. C. Bugher, N. Halden, H. D. LeVine, D. E. Lynch, and L. Machta.

[2] M. Eisenbud and J. H. Harley, Science 117, 141 (1953).

[3] U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Thirteenth Semiannual Report (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., January 1953).

[4] U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Fourteenth Semiannual Report (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., July 1953).

[5] Together with the stations operated within a distance of 200 miles from the test site, the total number of monitoring locations in the United States is more than 100.

[6] Radiation Safety for A-Weapons Test, Nucleonics 10, No. 5, 10 (1952).

pling period the film is folded and placed with a data card in an envelope for mailing to the Health and Safety Laboratory, where it is processed in the manner described.

The routine operation of this network has been greatly facilitated by the cooperation of the United States Weather Bureau, at the stations of which our collectors are placed. Duplicate samples at all stations provide insurance against loss of samples and also give the advantage of replication.

We have discontinued the routine monitoring of air-borne (suspended) dust at all locations. We have previously reported [2] that the highest daily mean air-borne dust concentration recorded during the Nevada tests in the spring of 1952 was 23×10^{-3} $\mu\mu c/cm^3$ (equivalent to 53,000 disintegrations/min m^3) at Elko, Nev., on June 1. The estimated cumulative dose to the lungs of persons who breathed this concentration is 20 millirads,[7] somewhat less than the dose from a chest X-ray. We now have the experience gained during a more recent Nevada series of tests, those conducted in the spring of 1953. We collected samples of air extensively during that series, but none was as high as this previously recorded maximum level.

Accumulation of radioactive fallout: Table 2 gives our estimates in millicuries per square mile of the total fission products deposited throughout the country since early 1951. These estimates are based on approximately 250,000 samples collected since 1951. The accumulation varies from 21 mc/mi^2 in Arizona to 120 in New Mexico. The mean of the reported value is 61 mc/mi^2. The spread is rather narrow in view of the many factors that affect the amount of fallout in any given place. Nevada is not included because gradations in the fallout patterns make it impractical to assign a single value for the State.

The manner in which each of the test series has contributed to the total fallout now estimated to be present in the Northeastern United States is illustrated in Figure 2 [not shown], which continues the type of graphical presentation first used in our earlier report. In order to facilitate the presentation of these data, we have made the simplifying assumption that the debris from each of the detonations of a series of tests originated from a single burst occurring at the midpoint of the series. The total artificial radioactivity continues to be of a low order when it is compared with the radioactivity normally present in the earth's crust. The naturally occurring isotope Ra^{226} is present in amounts that vary between 100 and 1,000 mc/mi^2, considering only the upper few inches of the earth's crust.

Of the various long-lived constituents present in this radiactive debris, Sr^{90} is of most interest. This is because of its relatively long half-life (25 years) and the fact that its chemical similarity to calcium makes it possible that strontium can enter into biological systems along with calcium and ultimately be deposited in human bone. As is well known, this is also true of radium.

The estimated accumulation of strontium in the soil in northeastern United States is also shown in figure 2. The contribution from Sr^{89} is not shown because of its relatively short half-life (55 days). The ratio of Sr^{89} to Sr^{90} in the accumulated debris from all detonations is estimated to have been about 1.0 on January 1, 1955.

By September 1, 1954, the estimate of accumulated Sr^{90} was 1 mc/mi^2 This estimate is based on the assumption that Sr^{90} is present in the debris in an amount that can be predicted from the data of Hunter and Ballou.[8] The proportion of Sr^{90} of the debris may vary somewhat from theory, and more or less Sr^{90} may be present. This is consistent with the manner in which Sr^{90} is formed and the general dynamics of the fireball as we presently understand it. The Sr^{90} is derived from a radioactive parent Kr^{90}, which is an inert gas having a half-life of 25 sec. Thus, much of the Sr^{90} that is ultimately present in the debris is formed when the fireball is relatively old and has cooled considerably. This can result in the presence of a disproportionate fraction of Sr^{90} in a given particle of debris. A tentative assumption, supported by incomplete studies, is that the debris which falls out in the immediate vicinity of a detonation is depleted in Sr^{90}. Conversely, the debris that falls out at great distances is likely to be enriched in this nuclide. Recent unpublished analyses from our laboratory suggest that the use of the Hunter and Ballou curves to estimate the radiostrontium content of our samples may yield values that are about 30 percent of the true value. The same reasoning applies to Sr^{89}, which is also derived from a krypton isotope.

However, an upward adjustment, by a factor of 3, of our estimates of the Sr^{90} contribution to the earth's crust does not alter the conclusion that the fallout of long-lived radioactive constituents of the debris has been minute compared with the radioactivity that is normally present in the earth's crust. Bugher [9] recently estimated that the amount of strontium present would have to be increased by the order of 1 million times before the biological effects from this cause could be recognized.

In a few places relatively heavy fallout caused by a combination of meteorological coincidences resulted in elevations of the radiation background that were readily detectable with conventional radiation detection equipment. In each case the fallout was associated with precipitation coinciding with the transport of radioactive dust into the rain-forming levels of the atmosphere. The bulk of this radioactivity is eliminated by decay in a matter of hours or a few days after the fallout. At no place except in the immediate vicinity of the test site in Nevada is there a sustained elevation of the background sufficient to be demonstrable by direct measurement of the gamma background in the area. For example, the deposition of mixed fission products in New Mexico is estimated to have been approximately 120 mc/mi^2 on January 1, 1955. The gamma radiation from this deposition is of the order of 0.0010 mr/hr; the normal background of the United States varies from 0.005 to 0.05 mr/hr and in any one place may vary by as much as a factor of 5, primarily because of meteorological situations that inhibit the dispersion of the radioactive gas radon and its daughter products. It would be difficult, although possible, to measure the increase in dose rate caused by 100 mc/mi^2.

An example of relatively heavy fallout was the radioactive rain in Troy, N. Y., of April 1953. This instance was particularly well documented by Clark.[10] Although Troy is located at a great distance from the Nevada test site, the fallout on that city is to our knowledge the highest that has occurred except, as reported elsewhere,[4] for some of the communities located within 200 miles of the Nevada test site. Clark reported that the cumulative dose from Troy fallout was about 100 mr. It is apparent from this and previous descriptions of methods by which we document radioactive fallout at distances from the site of a detonation that the widespread dispersion of radioactive debris is readily demonstrable by rather simple techniques.

It is not surprising that at times anomalously high fallout at great distances from a detonation has been readily observed by conventional radiosensitive laboratory equipment. It will be recalled that fallout from the first atomic detonation in July 1945 was observed as a result of contamination of photographic packaging material.[11] A number of scientists have recently recorded their observations in systematic fashion and a number of excellent scientific publications have resulted. Unfortunately, the calm presentation of the facts, usually many months after the incident, does not erase from people's minds the more sensational statements that have appeared in the press as a result of either pure speculation or superficial and incomplete information.

TABLE 1. *Network of collection stations, February 1955*

(The stations in operation during Operation Castle, the Pacific tests conducted in the spring of 1954, are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mobile, Ala.	Helena, Mont.
Montgomery, Ala.	Kalispell, Mont.
Flagstaff, Ariz.	*Scottsbluff, Nebr.
Phoenix, Ariz.	Elko, Nev.
*Tucson, Ariz.	Ely, Nev.
Yuma, Ariz.	*Las Vegas, Nev.
Fort Smith, Ark.	Reno, Nev.
Eureka, Calif.	Winnimucca, Nev.
Fresno, Calif.	*Concord, N. H.
*Los Angeles, Calif.	*Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Sacramento, Calif.	Roswell, N. Mex.
San Diego, Calif.	Albany, N. Y.
*San Francisco, Calif.	*Binghamton, N. Y.
Colorado Springs, Colo.	*Buffalo, N. Y.
Denver, Colo.	*New York, N. Y. (LaGuardia)
*Grand Junction, Colo.	*Rochester, N. Y.
Pueblo, Colo.	Syracuse, N. Y.
*New Haven, Conn.	*Cape Hatteras, N. C.
*Washington, D. C. (Silver Hill, Md.)	Fargo, N. Dak.
*Jacksonville, Fla.	Williston, N. Dak.
*Miami, Fla.	*Cleveland, Ohio
*Atlanta, Ga.	*Medford, Oreg.
*Boise, Idaho	Portland, Oreg.
Pocatello, Idaho	*Philadelphia, Pa.
*Chicago, Ill.	*Pittsburgh, Pa.
*Des Moines, Iowa	Providence, R. I.
Concordia, Kans.	Charleston, S. C.
Goodland, Kans.	Huron, S. Dak.
*Louisville, Ky.	*Rapid City, S. Dak.
*Wichita, Kans.	*Knoxville, Tenn.
*Louisville, Ky.	Memphis, Tenn.
*New Orleans, La.	Abilene, Tex.
Caribou, Maine	Amarillo, Tex.
Baltimore, Md.	*Corpus Christi, Tex.
*Boston, Mass.	*Dallas, Tex.
Alpena, Mich.	Del Rio, Tex.
*Detroit, Mich.	Port Arthur, Tex.
Marquette, Mich.	Milford, Utah
Grand Rapids, Mich.	*Salt Lake City, Utah
*Minneapolis, Minn.	Lynchburg, Va.
Jackson, Miss.	*Seattle, Wash.
*Kansas City, Mo.	Spokane, Wash.
*St. Louis, Mo.	Green Bay, Wis.
*Billings, Mont.	Milwaukee, Wis.
	Casper, Wyo.
	Cheyenne, Wyo.

TABLE 2.—*Cumulative radioactive fallout in the United States, by States, from the spring of 1951 to Jan. 1, 1955, in millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile (mc/mi^2)*

Alabama	72
Arizona	21
Arkansas	86
California	29
Colorado	54
Connecticut	33
Delaware	37
Florida	75
Georgia	58
Idaho	90
Illinois	57
Indiana	55
Iowa	84
Kansas	85

[7] The rad is a unit of dose equivalent to an energy absorption of 100 ergs/g.

[8] H. F. Hunter and N. E. Ballou, Nucleonics 9, C–2 (1951).

[9] J. C. Bugher, Medical Effects of Atomic Blasts, paper presented at the Seventh Annual Industrial Health Conference, Houston, Tex., Sept. 23, 1954.

[10] H. M. Clark, Science 119, 619 (1954).

[11] J. H. Webb, Physics Revised 76, 375 (1949).

TABLE 2.—*Cumulative radioactive fallout in the United States, by States, from the spring of 1951 to Jan. 1, 1955, in millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile (mc/mi²)*—Continued

Kentucky	53
Louisiana	96
Maine	33
Maryland	40
Massachusetts	33
Michigan	46
Minnesota	59
Mississippi	76
Missouri	84
Montana	35
Nebraska	94
New Hampshire	33
New Jersey	30
New Mexico	120
New York	41
North Carolina	69
North Dakota	56
Ohio	56
Oklahoma	89
Oregon	36
Pennsylvania	35
Rhode Island	33
South Carolina	51
South Dakota	58
Tennessee	72
Texas	110
Utah	96
Vermont	33
Virginia	39
Washington	55
West Virginia	41
Wisconsin	63
Wyoming	49

Awards of William and Noma Copley Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the announcement of the awards of the William and Noma Copley Foundation. This foundation is little more than a year old, having been incorporated in the State of Illinois on May 3, 1954, as a nonprofit organization for the encouragement of the creative arts.

Its laudable purpose is giving aid to creative individuals of outstanding talent or unusual promise to the end that they may communicate more effectively through their chosen media. It will from time to time select individuals who, in its judgment, are deserving of assistance and will make funds available after a careful study of and commensurate with their specific needs.

Such assistance may include outright grants for living expenses during periods of work or study at home or abroad or outright assistance in arranging performances, exhibitions, recordings, publications, or publicity. The foundation will protect the rights of the artist it is assisting and will not require for itself any copyrights or material gains.

FOUNDATION CAPABLY MANAGED

William N. Copley is a painter and journalist. He is a director of the Copley Press, Inc., which owns a chain of great and influential newspapers in Illinois and California, including the Illinois State Journal and Register of Springfield. The editor of this great newspaper in Springfield is V. Y. Dallman, long and brilliantly active in both the journalist and public life of Illinois.

It will interest my colleagues to be reminded that this is the chain of newspapers developed by the Honorable Ira Clifton Copley, who served with great distinction in this body in the 62d and the 5 succeeding Congresses. Colonel Copley, who died in 1947, was one of the newspaper giants of the period when American journalism was building to the stature of the present day. He was a great American. On his passing the control of the powerful newspaper dynasty that he had built passed to the competent hands of William N. Copley and James S. Copley.

Mrs. William N. Copley, who shares with Mr. Copley the administration of the foundation, has long been interested in the field of music and has worked in the motion picture industry and in publications.

Mr. and Mrs. Copley are assisted in the administration of the fund by the Honorable Barnet Hodes, Chicago attorney and art collector. Mr. Hodes, who served longer as corporation counsel of the city of Chicago than anyone in the city's history, has a distinguished record of cooperation with worthy foundations and is presently serving as chairman of the board of the American Heritage Council. While corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, Mr. Hodes established a pattern for a public law office that has been nationally adopted. He is a member of the Chicago law firm of Arvey, Hodes & Montynband.

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Also serving on the executive board of the William and Noma Copley Foundation are the composers Darius Milhaud, of the Paris Conservatory of Music and Mills College, and the artist, Marcel Duchamp.

Advisers to the foundation in the field of music are Winthrop Sargeant, Carleton Sprague Smith; Richard Jones, of Capitol Records, Inc.; the composer, Samuel Barber; Conductor Walter Hendl; and Concert Singer Jenny Tourel. Advisers in the field of plastic arts are Alfred Barr, Jr., of the Museum of Modern Art; Sidney Janis; Sir Herbert Read; Roland Penrose, of the Institute of Contemporary Art, London; Pierre Roche and Alfred Vallotton, of Paris; and painters Max Ernst and Matta Echaurren.

AWARDS FOR 1954 ANNOUNCED

In keeping with its aims to promote and encourage the creation and development of art and music, the William and Noma Copley Foundation takes great pleasure in announcing awards of $1,000 each for the year 1954 to the following artists in recognition of their achievements in their respective fields: Joseph Cornell, constructionist, for his work in the media of film art; Atillio Salemme, artist; Harris Danziger, conductor; Benjamin Lees, composer.

Also the foundation has awarded three scholarship awards of $100 each to the following students of the Paris Conservatory of Music: Jacques Bondon, Manfred Kelkel, Jean Doue.

The William and Noma Copley Foundation plans to sponsor an exhibition of paintings in Paris for which it will invite resident artists of all nationalities to participate. Mr. Alfred Vallotton of that city has generously offered the use of his gallery for this purpose.

Biographical sketches of the recipients of the above awards follow:

JOSEPH CORNELL

Joseph Cornell is one of the most unique artists in America and it is probably for this reason that his work is neither sufficiently understood nor appreciated. Some 20 years ago he began working in a college media, without benefit of artistic training, unconscious of the fact that his work was destined to fit into the historic showing at the Julien Levy Gallery which launched Surrealism in America. It was at this exhibition that his first two constructions appeared. Since then they have been exhibited widely. The Museum of Modern Art in New York has a Cornell construction in its permanent collection as does the Art Institute of Chicago. Mr. Cornell has always been interested in ballet as subject matter for his constructions and has done several covers for the magazine Dance Index.

He has also worked extensively in the motion picture media and has built up a collection of rare stills of use to film historians, as well as a collection of equally rare early French primitive films. He has several avant guarde films in various stages of completion.

ATTILLIO SALEMME

Attillio Salemme was born in Boston on October 18, 1911 and has been living in New York since 1929. Although he has had no formal art education, he received encouragement and valuable advice from his brother Antonio, a sculptor and painter. He has devoted all of his time to painting since 1940. In 1947, Mr. Salemme received the Flora Mayer Witkowsky prize at the 58th Annual American Exhibition of Abstract and Surrealist Art, and in the same year won the purchase prize at the First National Print Exhibition. He has received commissions to do paintings for the Manhattan House and Moore McCormick Line for the steamer S. S. *Argentina*. Pictures of his art are in the permanent collections of the Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum and the Whitney Museum. He has had seven 1-man shows since 1945 and his paintings have been bought by many outstanding collectors. He is married and has two children, both boys. His wife Lucia is also a painter.

HARRIS DANZIGER

Harris Danziger is an American conductor with extensive experience in both symphonic and operatic fields. For the past several years he has been conducting the orchestra of the Manhattan School of Music and in this capacity has been responsible for introducing to New York audiences a number of significant modern works. In recognition of these

concerts he was engaged by the Alice M. Disson Fund and New Music, Inc., to conduct a concert of important American chamber-symphonic works at Columbia University. In 1952 Mr. Danziger was awarded the first Ford Foundation fellowship in music ever granted which enabled him to spend a year in Europe studying and conducting such orchestras as the Vienna Symphony and the Paris National Radio Symphony. As a conductor Mr. Danziger has worked in Broadway operatic productions, was musical director of the Eastern Maine Musical Festival, the Lemonade Opera Co., and the Negro Opera Co. He has been program consultant for the New Friends of Music in New York. He has also been a member of the world famous Manhattan string quartet.

Mr. Danziger has studied under Pablo Cassals, Pierre Monteux, Eduard Van Beinum, conductor of the Concertgebouw, and Karl Bohm of the Vienna Staatsoper.

BENJAMIN LEES

Prize pupil of George Antheil, Benjamin Lees, at the age of 30, is one of America's most promising composers. He received his early musical education at the University of South Carolina. His first string quartet, composed in 1952, has been played by the Israeli quartet at the McMillan Theater of Columbia University, and later again on the American Music Festival program in Town Hall, New York, and broadcast over station WNYC. Recently it was played by the Budapest string quartet. He has also written a first symphony, which is soon to be performed. A profile for orchestra was played by the NBC Symphony last winter. Mr. Lees, who now lives with his wife in New York, has received the Fromm and Guggenheim Foundation awards and will soon be leaving for Europe, where he plans to continue his composition in Florence.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes for May 26, 1955, concerning the President's statement before the convention of the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters to the effect that the broadcasters may have an influence even greater than the press.

The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Hon. ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

Yes and no.

Personally, I think it is more no than yes—referring, that is, to the remark by President Eisenhower the other morning in attempting to measure the relative effectiveness of radio and television on the one hand, and the press of the Nation on the other, in influencing public understanding and in disseminating information.

Speaking to 3,000 delegates at the convention in Washington of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the President said he thought the broadcasters may have an influence "even greater than the press."

The black-on-white print of a newspaper report is "essentially cold," he said, whereas television and radio "put an appealing voice and an engaging personality into homes."

Yes and no. The voice and personality of radio and TV may be warm and appealing; the newsprint cold. We could say yes to that. But as to the relative effectiveness of their informational work—in not just entertaining but in informing the public—well, on that score I'd have to say no to the President's theory.

How many times have you half heard a radio bulletin, glanced at but not really seen a TV news film clip, and because you hadn't paid sufficient attention to get the facts wished you could hear it or see it again—or read it?

It's not the fault of the voice of the broadcaster—the appealing voice the President referred to. The fault lies in our own senses—or in the impossibility of paying attention to the sounds and sights and calls and demands upon us which seem to fill each moment.

But then the newspaper arrives and we can read the news and think upon it. We can disbelieve it, too, but in reading it we feel more certain we have the facts of the story only because we are less inclined to mistrust our eyes than our ears—because we can read and re-read a news report to doublecheck those same eyes.

This is certainly not meant to disparage radio or TV. There are things the broadcasters can do—and do perform day after day—that make the publishers and editors green with envy. But as one broadcaster who is also an outstanding editor-publisher, Mr. Mark Ethridge, of Louisville, Ky., told the same convention, radio and TV are putting greater emphasis on entertainment and less and less upon the primary things for which readers buy newspapers.

Happily—and for all of us it is, indeed, a happy thing—both media have not just a role in American communications but vitally essential roles, which complement each while competing with each other.

The last thing I'd want as a citizen or as a Congresswoman would be to have to choose between the newspaper, on the one hand, or radio-TV, on the other—to be forced to give up one or the other.

It's just that I can't sit quietly by and let the President go unchallenged when he puts the appealing voice of radio-TV a notch above the cold but solid, re-readable type of a newspaper in conveying information the public.

Now, if you'll excuse me, it's time for the news broadcast and I want to switch on the set.

The John Day Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of an editorial from the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of May 21 and also a copy of a letter which Senator NEUBERGER wrote to the editor of the Gazette-Times. The letter is in criticism of an editorial explaining the John Day bill, H. R. 5789, and the instant editorial is in answer to that letter.

This letter and answering editorial bring out so many of the unfounded questions which the opposition to this legislation ask and answers them so clearly that I would like for them to become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I ask for their insertion:

THE NEUBERGER LETTER

We did not contend the Northwest has been getting too much of the Federal public-works budget, but that we have been most fortunate in the past to have received as much money as we did. While this may not have been out of proportion to our needs, it was certainly out of proportion to our population and taxes paid. You know this and so do Congressmen from other sections of the country.

Like you, we would like to see the Northwest get 100 percent of the budget and realize this wouldn't be enough to do the complete job. Everyone, also including you, know that former Senator Cordon and our Republican House delegation did a wonderful thing in getting one-third of this budget for us.

It will be most interesting to see if you, as Senator Cordon's replacement, can equal this record. Since the Republican delegation talked the money out of a Congress dominated for the most part by Democrats, it should be easy for you as a Democrat not only to exceed this record but to improve upon it.

We don't go along with the entire Colorado River program any more than you do. You voted properly, but how could MORSE vote for it? At least the McKay position is consistent—he is willing to spend Federal money where private money cannot or will not do the job.

We don't know how accurate your power sale figures are and will be interested in knowing the answer to your accusation and will write to Mr. COON to see what he says. However, we do know the bill authorizes sale of the power on a prepaid basis to all power outlets—public and private—so it is not just the reactionary political forces who are concerned.

Speaking of the preference clause and your charging yourself with protecting the public interest, will you please explain to a dumb editor just how this preference clause works to the best interests of all of the said public?

The preference clause, as we understand it, governs the sale of Government-produced electric power. Now suppose the Government builds a flood-control dam and has as a by-product a large amount of power to sell. Is it not logical that the Government, after establishing a price for the power, would sell it without discrimination to any distributor who wanted it—whether municipalities, REA co-ops, or the publicly regulated private utilities? But, again as we understand it, the preference clause won't permit that * * * it makes it obligatory that his power must go first to customers of certain public bodies.

We interpret this to mean that "preference" makes sure that certain consumers (distinguished largely by the fact that they do not get power from electric companies—are allowed to buy electricity which all the taxpayers pay for; while other citizen taxpayers who do buy their electricity from electric companies (about 80 percent of all the consumers) may have only what's left over—if any.

Now this 80 percent of the people pay a lot of their taxes through the power companies (20 percent of all private-power utilities income is paid back out in taxes) but

these same taxes are not paid proportionately by users through the REA power companies. So it would seem that the preference clause subsidizes the users of public power and these people pay less in taxes through their power supplier to create the dams which provide the power on which they have a preference.

If the above interpretation is correct, how is it that you, who have charged yourself with looking out for the interests of the people, are only concerned with protecting the unfair advantage of the 20-percent minority?

Perhaps you will straighten us out in our fallacious reasoning on this preference matter because we know you want to represent all of the people as well as the squirrels.

NEUBERGER ON JOHN DAY

To the EDITOR:

I have read your editorial of May 11 criticizing my opposition to the Coon partnership bill for John Day Dam. I believe your readers may be interested in some facts which the editorial did not disclose.

You infer that—because the Northwest gets one-third of the Nation's Federal funds for multipurpose river projects—this is too much. I contend that—because of the power potential and the need in the Northwest—this is too little. We have 42 percent of the Nation's waterpower potential, and the volume of water carried by the Columbia poses one of the worst flood-control problems in the Nation. Would you propose that the money be spent where there is no power potential and no flood-control problem, merely to equalize geographically the distribution of funds

You said there are no funds for John Day as a Federal project. The total cost of John Day as an authorized Federal project would be about $310 million. Yet you do not explain why Secretary McKay is urging Congress to authorize $1,815,000,000 worth of Federal projects on the upper Colorado River.

Evidently, according to McKay and COON, there is not $310 million in the United States Treasury for John Day Dam, but there is 6 times this much for projects on the upper Colorado.

Of course, the real reason for this contrast is easy to see. John Day is a marvelous power site coveted by the private utilities. The sites on the upper Colorado are marginal and of poor quality. McKay is quite willing to have these developed as Federal projects.

The Cordon-Coon John Day bill of 1954 provided that power companies would put up $164 million to get the power facilities for 50 years. The bill was defeated when Senator MORSE and others opposed it. Now, the Coon John Day bill of 1955 provides that the companies put up $273 million. Isn't this a bald confession that the 1954 version tried to deprive the public of $109 million? How much will the 1956 bill offer?

According to the Army Engineers, the power facilities of John Day are worth $25,538,000 annually. Over 50 years this would amount to a total of $1,276,900,000 worth of electricity at wholesale, for the utilities to sell at a profit. No wonder the reactionary political forces in our State are trying so hard to put across the Coon bill for the private power companies. What a bargain they would get.

Partnership power would be high-cost power. Private utilities pay more interest for their money than does the Federal Government. In addition, partnership power would not be pooled as to costs with the extremely cheap energy now obtained from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Furthermore, piecemeal use of the river reduces administrative efficiency, increases conflicts over use of this great national asset.

Your editorial did not mention the outstanding farmers' rural electric cooperatives, like the Benton-Lincoln Cooperative, which are dependent on the Columbia River Federal dams for their energy. Yet, under the Coon bill for John Day, the preference clause protecting these co-ops will die. The kilowatts will be monopolized by private companies. Where will the co-ops turn for power? They have no generating sources of their own.

As a United States Senator, I regard myself as charged with protecting the public interest. That is why I oppose the Coon bill to surrender the John Day power facilities to private utility companies for half a century.

I appreciate the fine willingness of the editor of Gazette-Times to open his letter columns to discussion of this crucial issue to our State.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for this hallowed moment at the day's beginning we would step aside from the crowded highway, with its clamant voices, to seek the garden of the soul; that we may become conscious of Thee, claiming the assurance that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee. As we pause now in reverent silence may this high place of governance, so great a factor in tomorrow's pattern for all men, become the audience chamber of Thy presence. Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the hearts of men, where are the issues of life, we pray for ourselves: Cleanse Thou our hearts by Thy grace; feed our minds with Thy truth; guide our feet in Thy paths; teach us that there is no peace save in Thy will. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

John F. Kennedy, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 23, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 6, 1955:

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

On May 7, 1955:

S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

On May 11, 1955:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent.

On May 23, 1955:

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2406. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6063. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2406. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 6063. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations may be permitted to hold hearings at any time during this week while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Hess, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committee, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT ON NAVY INDUSTRIAL FUND, NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD, BUREAU OF SHIPS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Navy Industrial Fund, Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, for the period July 1, 1953, to November 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN PORTIONS OF CAPITOL GROUNDS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to transfer to the District of Columbia jurisdiction over certain portions of the United States Capitol Grounds and other grounds belonging to the United States for use in connection with the widening of Independence and Constitution Avenues and the rechannelization of Union Station Plaza (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Legislative Resolution 32

"Resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation for the improvement of wheat

"Whereas the United States wheat producers have lost much of their foreign markets for wheat; and

"Whereas Nebraska is one of the major quality wheat-producing States; and

"Whereas much of this market is lost because of the poor quality of wheat offered for sale in foreign countries; and

"Whereas present grain standards have not been revised to reflect technological improvements in the handling and processing of wheat: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 67th session assembled:

"1. That the Members of Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture be urged to provide the necessary legislation and regulations to achieve an improvement in the quality of product offered for sale in foreign markets by raising the standards, and lowering the tolerances for foreign material, damaged grain and mixed varieties, and to tighten inspection procedures in the case of export shipments to insure that wheat moved on a grade basis actually meets the official requirements for the grade assigned to it.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

"C. J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

A resolution adopted by the Northern California Culinary Arts Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 4944, to recognize as professionals the National Academy of Chefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of joint resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations; and, under the rule, the joint resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 7

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Columbia River is the main navigation artery for Astoria, Portland, and other great Oregon ports; and

Whereas a bar-depth of 48 feet is essential to safety and continued commerce on the Columbia River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to deepen the bar at the mouth of the Columbia River to the necessary depth of 48 feet; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by house April 22, 1955.
Adopted by senate April 28, 1955.

EDITH BYNON LOW,
Chief Clerk.
E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.
CLINE E. SMUTS,
President of Senate.

House Joint Memorial 9

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, acting upon the advice of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, had the vision and foresight to authorize in 1937 a deep-draft ship channel in the Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg., for the purpose of creating an extension of the sea lanes of the world to encourage navigation and commerce; and

Whereas completion of this ship channel, originally scheduled for 1942, was deferred because of the military requirements of World War II and subsequently of the Korean conflict; and

Whereas the most recent estimate of the Corps of Engineers is that the sum of $2,764,000 is required for prompt completion of the authorized channel from the lower entrance to the Bonneville Dam locks to The Dalles, with a comparatively small additional maintenance fund appropriation necessary for maintenance work in the completed channel between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville Dam; and

Whereas immediate completion of the authorized project is crucial to the continued progress of development of the Columbia Basin and vital to the economic welfare of the State of Oregon and the entire Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Senate of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to assure completion of the authorized Columbia River ship channel from below Bonneville Dam locks to The Dalles, Oreg., without further delay and to permit the Corps of Engineers to maintain the channel below Bonneville Dam at its authorized depth and width, that the Pacific Northwest may continue to grow and fulfill its destiny as a vital component of the economy of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house April 21, 1955.

Adopted by senate April 28, 1955.

EDITH BYNON LAW,
Chief Clerk.

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

ELMO C. SMITH,
President of Senate.

House Joint Memorial 13

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas a substantial majority of the residents of Curry County and Southwest Oregon desires, approves and indorses a construction program for the development of the Chetco River in Curry County in order that there be constructed at the mouth of the river a small craft harbor designed for the use of the public for recreational enjoyment, sport fishing and as a haven for commercial fishing boats, sport fishing boats and other small craft; and

Whereas heretofore the proper designated Federal governmental agencies have investigated the project, and approval of the project has been submitted by the agencies to the Congress of the United States of America, but that further progress of the project has been necessarily deferred because of the emergencies of the World War II and the Korean conflict; and

Whereas the prompt completion of the project is crucial to the continued progress and development of Southern Oregon and Curry County and of the entire Pacific Northwest and is now expedient; and

Whereas the governmental agencies previously approving the matter have estimated that the cost of completion would be less than the sum of $200,000; and

Whereas the construction program for the development of Gold Beach Harbor at the mouth of the Rogue River in Curry County has the wholehearted support of the people of Curry County and the entire Southwest Oregon area together with the lumber and fishing industries of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the United States Army engineers have found a high ratio of benefit to expenditure in connection with the Gold Beach Harbor project; and

Whereas the Gold Beach Harbor project has been authorized by Congress and now needs only the appropriation of funds before construction can begin on the project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds necessary to complete the Chetco River harbor development and construction and that provisions be made forthwith by Congress for the construction of the development in accordance with the plan heretofore submitted to Congress and suspended because of national and international emergencies; and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds necessary to carry out the Gold Beach Harbor project already authorized by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house April 22, 1955.

Adopted by senate April 28, 1955.

EDITH BYNON LAW,
Chief Clerk,

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

ELMO C. SMITH,
President of Senate.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; with amendments (Rept. No. 374).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 34. A bill providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona for certain purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 375).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 2046. A bill to further encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic lead and zinc; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2047. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2048. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 2049. A bill to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, the first national monument established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2050. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2051. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras; and

S. 2053. A bill for the relief of Ivan Gerasko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2054. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2055. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by the McGuire Act, so as to declare it to be an unfair method of competition for manufacturers or distributors of commodities subject to resale-price-maintenance contracts to willfully and knowingly sell or deliver such commodities (A) to persons selling same at less than prices prescribed in such contracts or (B) to persons selling same to others who so sell, and to provide for injunctive relief and damages to those injured thereby; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2056. A bill for the relief of Oscar O. Wolfe, Jr., et al.; and

S. 2057. A bill for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2058. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder, and to provide full annuities at age 60 for men who have completed 30 years of service and at age 55 for women who have completed 25 years of service; and

S. 2059. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2060. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 2061. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2062. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2063. A bill for the relief of Ljuba Kevdzija; and

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Spiros Ferentinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to correct basic deficiences in that act which were repeatedly called to the attention of the Banking and Currency Committee during its recent hearings upon the stock market.

Today an investor in a company which has its stock listed and registered for trading on an exchange gets the following protections:

First. Current information about the financial condition of the company.

Second. Information necessary to enable him to vote intelligently upon matters which are mentioned in proxy solicitations.

Third. Information about trading by officers, directors, and large stockholders in the equity securities of the company. If these persons seek to take advantage of inside information by engaging in short-term trading, their profit may be recovered by the corporation.

Investors in securities not listed on an exchange do not, save for a few minor exceptions, get these protections. No matter how large the corporation, how widely its stock is distributed, or how great the public interest in it, the disclosures I have mentioned need not be made unless the corporation has stock listed on a securities exchange.

The bill I am introducing is designed to end this double standard, which has neither logical foundation nor reasonable basis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2054) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

USE OF WORKING CAPITAL FUND BY NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2060) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION OF SPAIN TO MEMBERSHIP IN NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

The concurrent resolution is bipartisan in authorship. It calls for the admission of Spain to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO presently consists of 15 member nations. They are the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

The concurrent resolution would put Congress on record as favoring the admission of Spain to NATO. It would specifically require the Department of State to take all necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO is a tangible recognition of the fact that the free nations of the Western world have a common objective in the struggle against communism.

Spain is of increasingly strategic importance as a valuable ally in the fight to maintain freedom, whether it be cold war or hot war, and it is entirely proper that she should assume full partnership in this effort.

It should be remembered that the United States has made a tremendous investment in Spain, both in the construction of military bases for our possible use and in direct economic aid. In my judgment, the admission of Spain to the community of free nations of which NATO is composed would not only serve to protect that investment but would strengthen our western lifeline of defense as well.

I believe the concurrent resolution is worthy of favorable consideration by the appropriate committee of the Senate, which I assume will be the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope that committee will give the concurrent resolution its prompt attention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators in sponsoring the concurrent resolution directing the Department of State to take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Several weeks ago the final documents were deposited with the Federal Republic of Germany in Bonn, completing years of hard work and negotiation. West Germany has now regained its sovereignty; it has become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and it is now a full partner in the community of free nations in Western Europe.

West Germany has formed an important link in the chain of free nations organized within NATO along the northern perimeter of the Atlantic Ocean and more recently in the Mediterranean. NATO forms a united front beginning in the Western Hemisphere with the United States, north to Canada and Iceland; then across to Norway, down to Denmark, West Germany, the Benelux, the United Kingdom, France, Portugal; then east to Italy, Greece, and Turkey along the Mediterranean. It is rare indeed in the history of mankind that such a large number of nations should be so united. After studying a map of the North Atlantic and Western Europe and taking note of the arrangement of these NATO countries, I fully realize that there is a glaring omission from this roster of free nations. I refer to Spain.

Spain is of great strategic importance. She controls the western entrance to the Mediterranean and could thereby have considerable effect on traffic to the Near East. Spain is strategic from many points of view. She controls the southwest approach to Europe. Portugal, a member of NATO, is isolated from its allies on the Iberian Peninsula. As things now exist, Portugal protrudes like a sore thumb, unprotected. Spain is the only major missing link in this chain of nations.

In recent years normal relations have flourished among the NATO countries and their Spanish neighbor. The Spanish people are contributing and cooperating in the channels of world trade. I can see no sound reason why Spain should not be allowed to contribute to the defense of Western Europe through NATO if she so desires.

The United States has a great deal at stake, economically and militarily, in

Spain. The American Government has invested heavily in the form of grants and loans for economic development and technical assistance. The United States is building four large airbases on the Spanish mainland, in addition to other military installations. If an emergency came up tomorrow or next week through Communist aggression in Europe, American planes could use these bases, which, under the Spanish-American agreements of September 26, 1953, are being enlarged, improved, provided with living quarters for aircrews, with underground fuel tanks and pipelines to the north.

Spain today is one of our strongest partners in the mounting effort of the free world to create a less precarious peace. Spain's position in history and influence on international relations and trade are important to the free world.

It is not important to labor on its importance as a European defense outpost. What is important is that Spain should be a part of NATO. The resolution submitted today would pave the way for an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and United Kingdom are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the primary objective of the treaty is to contribute to the maintenance of peace by making clear the determination of the parties collectively to resist armed attack upon any of them; and

Whereas the parties have joined, pursuant to the treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a collective defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area established within the framework of the United Nations Charter and based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the charter; and

Whereas the membership of Spain would strengthen the strategic position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Department of State should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

INCREASED EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 103), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $100,000 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it prior to July 1, 1956, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF CERTAIN COASTAL AND TIDAL AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any Senators who wish to join in the sponsorship of the bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, be granted permission to do so if they notify the clerk today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, under authority of the order of the Senate entered earlier today, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] have requested that their names be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 414.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 24, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator ELLENDER before the 20th annual meeting of the Delta Council at Cleveland, Miss., on May 12, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement entitled "Poland's Constitution of 1791," prepared by him.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Address delivered by him at the Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., on March 28, 1955, on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	George	McNamara
Bender	Goldwater	Monroney
Butler	Gore	Morse
Carlson	Hayden	Pastore
Chavez	Hill	Robertson
Clements	Holland	Saltonstall
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lehman	Thurmond
Ellender	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	
Flanders	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the United States has always taken justifiable pride in its merchant marine. It has been a potent factor in the development and progress of our country.

Lately, as on some occasions in the past, it has fallen upon poor times. In an effort to save this precious shipping, legislation has been enacted over the past several decades to guarantee to our American ships, whenever possible, a modest percentage of cargoes exported or imported. This 50–50 legislation, as it is known, applying exclusively to Government-financed cargoes, has helped somewhat. But it is pertinent to note that our United States-flag ships are not carrying one-half of cargoes leaving or coming to this country. Latest avail-

able cargo records show that our ships are transporting little more than 25 percent of all cargoes.

What other maritime nation would permit such a situation without initiating drastic steps to correct it? Yet the United Kingdom and some other nations which have received the beneficence of our Nation's generosity are continually attacking this 50–50 bill, which seeks only a reasonable percentage of Government-financed cargoes, with respect to which a requirement of 100 percent for American vessels would be entirely in order.

The Journal of Commerce, in its issue of last Friday, May 20, has editorially answered the latest bleat from Britain's highest shipping official, Sir Colin Anderson, who levels a charge of discrimination against this country. I ask unanimous consent that this masterful answer to a baseless charge be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks. It probably will not stop our British friends from misrepresenting the situation, but it will set the record straight for our own people who may have been misled by the ceaseless and unfounded clamor about 50–50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING OUTLOOK: THE 50–50 LAW

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Discrimination is a dangerous word to bandy about at any time unless you happen to be talking about the finer things in life, like art or music, when it assumes a certain majesty.

We find it necessary, however, to discuss discrimination today—flag discrimination particularly—and how it is being applied specifically to the United States ever since the Butler-Tollefson so-called 50–50 law was enacted last year.

The criticism that has been leveled against this measure abroad during recent months has mounted steadily. It reached a new peak this week when Sir Colin Anderson, president of the International Chamber of Shipping, told delegates from 35 nations representing some 17 million tons of shipping, who attended the Baltic and International Maritime Conference at Copenhagen, that "one of our biggest problems today is United States flag discrimination."

Since this use of the word in a depreciatory sense before such an important group can only result in a false and misleading statement coming to be accepted as genuine by many, unless challenged, it is time to state a few facts.

First. This law does not provide that American-flag ships are to get 50 percent of certain types of cargo to which it applies. The American-flag ship "must be available" and at "reasonable rates." Otherwise, the shipment can move on a foreign ship, as many of them have been handled. Last year, for example, 82 percent of this country's tramp-borne commerce moved in foreign ships, because the 50 tramps still under the United States flag were not able to handle the allowed percentage.

Second. The law applies only to overseas cargo paid for or guaranteed as to payment by the United States Government, including American surplus commodities that are sold for local currency and hence must be covered by dollar appropriations out of the United States Treasury. This local currency is either spent by the United States in that foreign country or allowed to stay there as a grant or long-term loan. Regardless of the final disposition, it is a tab that the American taxpayer must meet.

Third. Cargo preference of the type just mentioned has been applicable in one form or another over several years, or ever since this country engaged on its policy of helping friendly nations at the end of the war. American ships had a priority up to 50 percent of all aid cargo. We do not recall any great furor being raised abroad during this period though the surrounding circumstances, basically, were little different than they are today.

Yet, despite this effort to assist United States shipping, the percentage of our dry cargo trade handled by American bottoms has steadily dropped. In 1946, for example, American ships handled 60.9 percent of our exports and 56.3 percent of our imports. The figures for November 1954, the latest available, show American ships handling 24.4 percent of dry cargo exports and 29.1 percent of imports.

This is rather ironic in view of another observation by Sir Colin at the Copenhagen conference that world trade is 20 percent greater than in 1950 and 50 percent greater than prewar.

United States-flag shipping certainly hasn't been doing too well in this expanding market.

So we have a situation in this 50–50 law where United States flag shipping is not guaranteed any percentage of cargo but must meet certain conditions: Where the cargo involved is directly tied to the taxpayer's dollar; where the so-called preference has been in effect for years; and where, despite this misnamed discrimination, the fleets of every leading maritime nation have expanded while that of this country has declined.

Surely this has not resulted in any restraint of trade. Competitive forces have been freely at work around the world outside this country as the statistics covering the handling of our waterborne commerce indicate.

Overlooked in all this hullabaloo is the fact that whatever flag a vessel flies, it is placed at no disadvantage with American ships in normal trading with this country. We do not have any special port dues, consular fees, berthing preferences and other dodges to aid our shipping.

This is discrimination in the proper meaning of the word as we see it, for these gimmicks are aimed to divert all cargo to a particular nation's shipping, not 50 percent of taxpayers' financed cargo which, in turn, is a small percentage of all cargo moving in and out of our ports.

Our friends abroad have every right, of course, to criticize this statute, but we believe that in labeling it flag discrimination they are putting on a handle that does not fit. In so doing they are letting loose impressions that are not warranted by the simple truth.

FOUR-POWER MEETING OF "SUMMIT" LEADERS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the last few days we have been treated with a blast in Pravda against the United States and its role in preparing for a four-power meeting of the "summit" leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

In the report of the Secretary of State to the President and the Nation over television last week, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it was made abundantly clear that the top-level four-power meeting would be brief and simply identify the areas of friction which might lead to international trouble but would definitely not make any decisions. The matter of procedures and decisions, if any, would be left to be negotiated by the Foreign Ministers of the respective countries.

It is vitally important that this limitation be publicized to the American people because of the fears in many quarters of this top-level conference. In the Herald Tribune of Tuesday, May 23, there appears an editorial entitled "Pravda on a Four-Power Meeting." This editorial brings out clearly the issue as to the scope of the four-power meeting and the proper limitation as set forth by Secretary Dulles and as approved by the President.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be included in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAVDA ON A FOUR-POWER MEETING

Pravda's weekend blast against the United States and its role in preparing for a four-power meeting will hardly be taken as a withdrawal. But it will properly be understood as an advance warning (if warning were needed) that the Soviets will use the conference for their own propaganda purposes.

The note of the Western Powers inviting Russia to attend a top-level meeting set forth th enature of the talks: general conversations, limited to a few days' duration, with the actual work of attaining agreements left to other groups. Now Pravda cries out against the absurd proposals and the unreasonable suggestions of the United States. In particular, it indicates that the heads of States must themselves negotiate substantive solutions, and not confine themselves to preparing the ground for the negotiations of others.

One of the hopeful aspects of the proposed conference was that lengthy arguments over procedure and agenda were to be eliminated. It will be regrettable now if such arguments are revived—and carried on by public charge and countercharge. The Russians may hope to stir dissension within the Western alliance by their attacks on the United States. In that they can hardly have much success. But they do certainly have it in their power to make any conference fruitless.

If that is their plan, they must realize that they will stand under the judgment of the great masses of the world's population who long for peace and look for good faith in the world's leaders.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON ATOMIC DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to proceed briefly under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. President, on February 23, 1955, I introduced in the Senate S. 1200, a bill calling for the establishment of a Commission on Atomic Defense. This would be an 18-member Commission comprised of Members of Congress, the executive department and private industry, charged with the task of making a thorough but rapid study of the problems of industrial dispersal and civil defense. Under the bill, the Commission would report its recommendations to Congress by January 31, 1956.

Earlier in the year the Committee on Armed Services heard the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization urge such a study. The dramatic developments in the field of thermonuclear

warfare make such a study imperative. Only when a body commanding nationwide prestige and respect recommends a practical yet effective program can the people feel assured that what is being done is wise, and, more importantly, that all that can be done is being done.

Since the introduction of my bill, the Secretary of the Air Force on several occasions has called for the movement inland of future airplane and guided missile factories, pointing up the dangers of the geographical concentration of that industry. Now, over the weekend, the chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, Mr. Donald Hughes, has urged "a thorough and realistic study by a special commission" whose job it would be "to recommend how much dispersal we need and how it can be obtained." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Hughes' letter to the President be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1955.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last February, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, proposed to Congress that a special commission be appointed to study the problem of industrial and population dispersal. This proposal has not yet been acted upon, and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Senate committee which would make recommendations on such a commission, has informed us that there are no current plans to consider it.

We, the Federation of American Scientists, heartily endorse Dr. Flemming's proposal, and we commend your administration for its awareness of the need for the study of dispersal. We urge you to use your good offices to encourage prompt and effective action by the Federal Government to secure an increased discussion and comprehensive study of population and industrial dispersal as an aid to the defense of the United States.

Dispersal is a means of saving lives and protecting our capacity for defense if war should come. It also makes enemy attack less effective and therefore less likely, giving us time to work out peaceful solutions to our international problems. Economic forces in the United States are already causing some dispersal, but not enough in proportion to the need. The longer we delay in launching an adequate program, the more drastic it would have to be to meet the danger of intercontinental missiles.

Dispersal is a defense that new methods of attack are unlikely to make obsolete, whereas conventional military arms become out-of-date in a short time and must be replaced by new ones at great expense. We are now spending many billions of dollars each year just to maintain our weapons in a state of readiness, while hardly a cent is being applied to the one measure that has a reasonable prospect of lasting effectiveness.

We believe that the following measures should be adopted by the Federal Government:

1. A thorough, realistic study by a special commission to recommend how much dispersal we need and how it can best be obtained. This commission should be composed of recognized experts on military, economic, industrial, and governmental affairs. As specific examples of the areas of policy that should be considered, we would like to suggest the following: (a) Effective dispersal of the Federal Government, (b) Federal aid and initiative in construction of highways and other transportation and communication facilities out of and around target areas, (c) more substantial tax differentials to encourage industrial building in nontarget areas, and (d) Federal aid for hardship cases resulting from the dispersal program.

2. A clear, frank statement to the people by the highest governmental authority with respect to our vulnerability and the measures, such as dispersal, that must be carried out to reduce this vulnerability to a lower level.

It has been almost 10 years since the first atomic bomb explosion made doubtful the survival of large concentrations of population and industry in the case of a major war. The need for all measures to reduce the probability of attack is apparent; the security of the United States is too vitally involved to permit further delay.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD J. HUGHES,
Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to whom my bill was referred, has requested reports from the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Defense Administration.

I believe congressional action establishing this Commission during the current session would be most prudent. There are many collateral programs through which the Government can encourage industrial dispersal, such as the expansion of our highway system, which the Senate is now considering. The sooner Congress can determine the type of program we need to protect our Nation in the event of atomic attack the sooner we shall be able to pass implementing legislation. I believe, Mr. President, in the event of thermonuclear war that the Nation with the greatest and most rapid powers of recovery after the initial holocaust is the nation which will determine the outcome of such a war. I am therefore urging Congress not to act impulsively on this measure, but at least to authorize its study and thus prepare ourselves to legislate wisely in this field.

PULITZER AWARD TO WILLIAM S. WHITE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago I was greatly gratified to learn that the Pulitzer award had been granted to Mr. William S. White, of the Washington bureau of the New York Times. Mr. White has long been one of the most distinguished and respected members of the Senate press. I believe every Member of the Senate will agree that his reporting has been invariably fair, objective, and accurate.

The award was given to Mr. White for his leadership in letters, specifically in biography, for his book, the Taft Story, published by Harper's. The citation reads:

For your distinguished American biography teaching patriotic and unselfish service to the people, illustrated by an eminent example.

Mr. White's many friends will rejoice in the signal honor which has come to him and wish to join me in congratulating him heartily on this further recognition of his talent as a writer and biographer.

LOOPHOLES IN THE TAX LAW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, later in the week the Senate will consider the recommendation of the Committee on Finance that certain provisions of the tax law which are responsible for two big loopholes be repealed. These loopholes were discovered by Representative MILLS and Representative ZELENKO, and they deserve a great deal of credit for it. Reluctantly, the Treasury Department finally admitted its error of last year.

Now Representative MILLS has discovered another possible windfall. I ask that a statement which he made, which is quoted in an article published in the Evening Star of May 20, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE TAX LOOPHOLE COSTING BILLIONS SEEN

Representative MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, said today he has found a new and highly dangerous loophole in last year's tax revision act.

Mr. MILLS said it would cost the Government more than a billion dollars a year in revenue in the future and would give corporations many billions of dollars of tax-free profits from speculating in their own stocks.

Mr. MILLS said Treasury Secretary Humphrey only recently reviewed and approved this revision, and he added in an interview:

"The only conclusion I can reach is that this section was deliberately proposed to provide a windfall for corporations. In all probability, the bigger the corporations are, the more they will make."

There was no immediate comment from the Treasury.

WAS FOE OF ACT

Mr. MILLS was a leading foe of the 1954 act rewriting almost all tax laws, proposed by the Eisenhower administration and backed by most Republicans in Congress. He is a veteran member of the Ways and Means Committee.

The section to which he referred provides that for income tax purposes "no gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the receipt of money or other property in exchange for stock (including treasury stock) of such corporation."

The term "treasury stock" means the corporation's own stock, held in its treasury.

Mr. MILLS said it is a common practice among the Nation's 450,000 corporations to buy some of their own stock on the open market and retain it for a time in the company's treasury.

WIDE OPEN INVITATION

The new law, he said, is a "wide open invitation for corporations to speculate and invest in their own stock."

Corporation officials knowing of their firm's plans, he contended, could well buy their own stock at low prices, before taking some action that would tend to increase stock prices, and then sell it for tremendous profits.

Under the old law, Mr. MILLS said, the Government usually tried to collect taxes on all profits from a corporation's dealings in its own stocks. Sometimes courts declined to uphold the tax where the stock transaction was considered a regular part of the business

operation. But the courts always have held that such profits are taxable, he said, if the main purpose of the stock transaction was to make a profit.

He said there is "no limit" on the amount of tax-free profits under the section and "the language is so emphatic, so broad and so definite there is no possibility of recovering the revenue by any Treasury regulation."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Journal of Commerce of May 19, 1954, in its News Letter column stated:

Here's a hot tax tip for profit-minded corporation treasurers and comptrollers, one that appears to have been entirely overlooked by students of the new tax code.

Collect treasury stock—

I interpolate to say it apparently means stock of one's own company—

buy it low, watch it rise, perhaps split it now and then, sell it.

You cannot be taxed on your profits.

That is the hot tip of the Journal of Commerce. Representative MILLS has brought this matter to the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Journal of Commerce be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX REPORT: HOW FIRMS CAN EARN TAX-FREE INCOME IS EXPLAINED

WASHINGTON.—Here's a hot tax tip for profit-minded corporation treasurers and comptrollers, one that appears to have been entirely overlooked by students of the new tax code:

Collect treasury stock, buy it low, watch it rise, perhaps split it now and then; sell it.

You cannot be taxed on your profits.

Unlike the old law, which said nothing, the new code contains statutory provisions on the subject.

BASIS OF LITIGATION

Under the old law, regulations dating back to 1934 held that "whether the acquisition or disposition by a corporation of shares of its own capital stock gives rise to taxable gain or deductible loss depends upon the real nature of the transaction, which is to be ascertained from all its facts and circumstances."

Then follows the language that has given rise to two decades of litigation: "But if a corporation deals in its own shares as it might in the shares of another corporation, the resulting gain or loss is to be computed in the same manner as though the corporation were dealing in the shares of another."

As may be recalled, this space last week considered the problem the courts have had in interpreting that somewhat cloudy language. The various circuits of the United States Court of Appeals have been unanimous in holding that profits on the resale of treasury stock (when the transaction does not affect the corporation's capital structure) are, indeed, taxable.

The tax court, after long holding the contrary view, also came around to this position, and the Court of Claims' contrary holding is to be tested in the Supreme Court this fall in the Anderson, Clayton & Co. case.

TREND REVERSED

But the new law sharply reverses the trend court-made law has been taking in the absence of statutory provisions in the old code. The new law has a section 1032, a short section, which states in its entirety:

"No gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the receipt of money or other property in exchange for stock (including treasury stock) of such corporation."

In other words, a company holding a block of treasury stock that has appreciated in value and that has perhaps also multiplied through stock splits may now realize statutorily guaranteed untaxable profit in its resale—where prior to 1954 most courts, if not all, would have taxed those profits.

When the new code was being written, the administration calculated no revenue loss attributable to this section.

POSSIBLE LOOPHOLE

The Treasury position was that since it was legally possible for a corporation to cancel its cheaply reacquired treasury stock and float a new issue at the new, higher market value—both capital structure transactions and hence untaxable—the same effect could be achieved by this more round-about route, and that therefore all section 1032 did—so the Treasury assumed, rightly or wrongly—was to remove a technicality become meaningless.

Whether this is in fact true, or whether the new section will spur a movement to deal in treasury stocks, is one of those imponderables that makes miserable the life of a Treasury revenue-effect estimator. No one even knows or can reckon how much treasury stock is being held by the country's 425,000 corporations.

But some of the Government people charged with gathering the revenue privately express fear that section 1032 may turn out to be a revenue loser dwarfing the more highly touted loophole in section 462.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, true to form, the Treasury now denies that there will be any appreciable loss from this windfall, although some have stated it might run as high as another billion dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that the reply of the Treasury Department published in the Wall Street Journal of May 23, 1955, under the heading "Lawmaker, Treasury Dispute Size of Loss From New Tax Loophole" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWMAKER, TREASURY DISPUTE SIZE OF LOSS FROM NEW TAX LOOPHOLE

WASHINGTON.—Treasury and congressional tax experts are at odds over the seriousness of a new tax loophole uncovered by Representative MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS, a key member of the House Ways and Means Committee, says the situation, which exempts from tax any profit a corporation makes reselling its own stock, is very serious. He declares the provision probably will cost the Treasury far more than the expense reserve fund provision, which Congress now is in the process of repealing at the Treasury's request.

Treasury officials admit they are taking another look at the provision, but say they doubt it involves any great revenue loss. "We're not very excited about it," says one informed Treasury man.

At issue is a provision in last year's tax revision law declaring that "no gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the receipt of money or other property in exchange for the stock (including treasury stock) of such corporation." In other words, the law says that when a corporation has bought back some of its stock and then resells that stock, profit on the resale will be free from tax and any loss on resale will not be tax deductible.

The provision reverses a long series of decisions by Federal circuit courts declaring that profit on the sale of treasury stock is taxable unless there is a legitimate business purpose to the transaction and unless the company actually cancels or retires the stock it buys back and then issues and sells new stock in its place.

The United States Tax Court early last year brought its rulings into conformity with this long-standing view of the various circuit courts. The Court of Claims, however, has taken the stand that any profit is tax free so long as there is a legitimate business purpose to the transaction. It said the company did not have to retire or cancel the reacquired stock and issue new stock instead, in order to have tax-free profit. This case, involving Anderson, Clayton & Co., has been appealed by the Government to the Supreme Court, which already has agreed to hear and decide the appeal.

All these court rulings, however, are now almost academic. They apply only to transactions made before January 1, 1954. For later transactions, the new law applies, with its provision that all profits made by a corporation reselling its own stock will be tax-free.

REPEAL URGED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. MILLS believes that this provision should be repealed retroactively at once. In a letter to Treasury Secretary Humphrey, urging the Treasury to look into the matter immediately, Mr. MILLS said, "a situation may arise under this language that will result in losses to the Treasury in the future in excess of any contemplated by anyone" under the prepaid income and expense reserve fund provision now being repealed by Congress.

Mr. MILLS sent a copy of this letter to House Ways and Means Committee Chairman COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and Senate Finance Committee Chairman BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia. He said he would ask Mr. COOPER for early committee consideration of the matter.

He pointed out that the loss to the Treasury under the reserve fund and prepaid income provisions would be a "one-shot" loss, taking place only in one year and then would be ended. The possible loss under the treasury stock provision, Mr. MILLS said, would be a recurrent loss. "It could cost the United States Treasury in each of several years as much as the reserve fund provision will cost in one year," he asserted. The cost of the reserve fund loophole has been estimated from $500 million up.

Not only will the treasury stock provision cost the Federal Government great loss of revenue, Mr. MILLS said, but it is also "highly conducive to speculation by a corporation in its own stock." He said it would be a tempting source of profit for corporations whose officers know in advance of some corporate situation that will send up the price of its stock.

Arguing that the doctrine laid down by the circuit courts and the Tax Court should be the law of the land, Mr. MILLS said that the provision in last year's law "is clearly a loophole that has to be plugged, and the sooner the better."

TREASURY MEN DOUBT GREAT LOSS

Treasury officials were inclined to doubt any great loss to the Government from the provision cited by Mr. MILLS. "There might be some small change in revenues," said one, "but whether it will be plus or minus we don't know."

They admitted that under the old law profits on the resale of treasury stock were taxable in many cases but pointed out that corporations could avoid taxable gains by canceling the stock and issuing new stock. What's more, they noted, under the old law losses on such sales were tax deductible. They said many corporations were able to arrange sales to create losses to hold down a corporation's tax liability, and thus the

United States Treasury lost considerable amount of revenue under the old system.

Now, the Treasury officials said, losses on the sale of such stock will not be deductible and the Treasury may pick up enough revenue from this fact to offset any loss arising from the fact that the profits on such stock sales are no longer taxable.

The new law treats company dealings in its own stock the way they were before the law was changed in 1934, Treasury men said. The Securities and Exchange Commission has taken this viewpoint "many times," they added.

Mr. MILLS, however, replied that this was "just talk." He declared that under the old law a corporation, in order to claim a tax deductible loss, had to prove a legitimate business purpose in reselling its own stock at a loss, and that this was extremely difficult to do.

"If the Treasury doesn't think it will lose a lot of money from this provision, taking into account all the corporations that already have treasury stock, it will shortly have reason to think otherwise, after it has studied the matter further," Mr. MILLS said. "After all, the Treasury's first opinion on the reserve-fund provision was also that it would not cost the Government much revenue loss."

THE 34TH CONGRESS OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a message I am sending to the 34th Congress of the Slovak League of America.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO THE 34TH CONGRESS OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

It gives me great pleasure to send a message of greeting to the Slovak League of America. And, I am particularly delighted to learn that the 34th congress of the league is convening here in our Nation's Capital.

America and the Free World needs organizations which energetically, enthusiastically, and tirelessly fight communism. Democracies are devoted to peace, as indeed they must and should be. But although devoted to peace, democracies must be alert and constantly ready to repel any treacherous advances by those who would destroy their liberty. The record of the Communists as enemies of freedom and as destroyers of the independence of nations is an appalling one. Millions of people have fallen victim to their treacherous tactics of subversion and aggression. Unfortunately among them have been some of the Slovaks whose cause you represent today.

No man is an island, a great writer once said, and no man can be truly free as long as any of his fellowmen are in the chains of servitude. This is the reason why the democratic peoples must do everything they practicably can to bring hope and eventual freedom to those now enslaved by communism. It gives me considerable assurance to know that there are such groups as the Slovak League standing vigilantly on guard, combating tyranny and giving warning that the enemy of our day, world communism, is an uncompromising force of destruction. May the deliberations of the delegates of the Slovak League meeting in their 34th congress bear wholesome and satisfactory results; may there be harmony in Central and Eastern Europe when the Communist forces are rolled back and may nationalistic hostilities abate. And to all of you thus assembled I send my heartiest congratulations and warmest best wishes.

NEWS REPORT OF SENATOR DOUGLAS' ILLNESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for a moment. I know that I bespeak the feelings of all of his colleagues in the Senate in observing this morning that newspaper reports, as so frequently is the case, are again mistaken as to a question of fact. We are delighted to see the Senator appear on the Senate floor in such vigor and health. We are aware of the fact that he, like the rest of us, from time to time, must take special care of himself when a virus bug attacks. However, he has no idea, I am sure, of the consternation that went through this body when the first rumors were circulated that the Senator was seriously ill. We are delighted to see him here today in his usual fighting form, serving the people of Illinois as always in such a statesmanlike manner. We trust that his minor illness will leave him quickly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks.

MEDICAL SOCIAL WORK A UNIQUE PROFESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of my constituents in Portland, Miss Mildred Iverson, has written me:

The pioneer tradition of readiness to help neighbors or strangers who are sick or injured is still very much alive with us, although it has taken new forms.

But, she goes on to say:

The hard facts of personnel shortages are handicapping Oregon's health and medical care authorities in their efforts to improve and expand our health services and medical care programs in order to serve our citizens as they should be served.

In Oregon, it matters a great deal to us that our young people prepare themselves—in new ways—to keep alive the pioneer tradition of helping neighbors or strangers in trouble. Doctors and nurses are, we all know, absolutely essential. I have been interested to learn recently that out of every 100 workers in our civilian health services, only 11 are physicians but that all of the 89 others are considered "essential links in the circle of health protection."

Mr. Ray D. Murphy, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, has called attention to the real threat to all of us unless many more of our undergraduates begin now to prepare themselves for useful and interesting careers in the health field. Mr. Murphy warns:

The tremendous advances which medical and related sciences have made in recent years may not benefit us as quickly as they should if there is a continuing shortage of trained people in the health field. This would be intolerable—and it need not be. * * * The truth is that the health field is short of people. The jobs are there, the need is there.

Mr. Murphy is a practical man who persuaded his board of directors to contribute $1 million, as a public service, to help the National Health Council launch a nationwide campaign of information about health careers, known as Health Career Horizons.

I am very glad, therefore, to have received a letter from Miss Mildred Iverson of the Community Council in Portland, Oreg., calling attention to the opportunities in her own profession of medical social work, one of the many "essential links in the circle of health protection."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the communication which I have received from Miss Iverson.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Portland, Oreg., May 19, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As Oregon's population and industry continue to grow, many persons in this great State are doing their utmost to improve and expand our health services and medical-care programs in order to serve our citizens as they should be served. The pioneer tradition of readiness to help neighbors or strangers who are sick or injured is still very much alive with us although it has taken new forms. We find ourselves handicapped, however, by the hard facts of personnel shortages.

Within the next 2 to 5 years, we must add to our ranks more young men and women who possess the high professional qualifications we demand of those who man our health and medical-care programs. I am writing to ask your help in making known to Oregon college students, their parents and counselors, the career opportunities open to professionally qualified persons in this field in our State.

In my own profession of medical social work we have at least three times as many jobs available as there are qualified applicants. This is true in Oregon and true in the whole country.

Not enough young men and women know that modern medicine's emphasis on the patient as a person gives the medical social worker an increasingly important place on the medical team—a team which includes the doctor, nurse, therapists, and allied professionals. Medical social work is a unique profession, combining as it does knowledge of medical care for the sick and disabled with the skills of social work.

Any young person who likes the medical atmosphere, who wants to help sick people and their families, who likes to work on a team, and who wants to grow with an expanding profession will be proud to wear the white coat of a medical social worker. I have never regretted my choice of this profession nor have any of my colleagues.

Physicians and health authorities in Oregon want and need more medical social workers to help them work with patients and their families when social, psychological, or economic upsets related to illness interfere with recovery and return to normal life. They want people with special professional training to work with crippled children and their parents, with men and women needing vocational rehabilitation, with sick and disabled veterans, with others who have tuberculosis, polio, or the illnesses of old age, to mention but a few examples. Our State and county health departments, as well as private hospitals, also want the services of medical social workers. But they want only persons who meet the educational requirements of a demanding profession.

Medical social work salaries are neither high nor low. A trained but inexperienced beginner in Oregon will probably receive about $3,500 the first year. Experienced

medical social workers with administrative responsibilities will receive about $6,000. Many of the positions are under civil-service systems.

Like all professions, the educational requirements for medical social work are high: a Bachelor's degree from an accredited 4-year college followed by 2 years of postgraduate study at one of the 26 schools of social work offering the medical social work curriculum. This postgraduate study leads to the Master's degree and includes classroom and supervised field work in hospital, clinic, or health agency. Undergraduate preparation should emphasize the social sciences or the biological sciences.

We have at least 16 colleges in Oregon which offer the kind of sound liberal arts undergraduate background future needed by medical social workers before entering a school of social work to prepare themselves for practice as medical social workers. These colleges and universities are Cascade, Eastern Oregon, George Fox, Lewis and Clark, Linfield, Marylhurst, Mount Angel, Northwest Christian, Oregon College of Education, Oregon State, Pacific, Reed, Southern Oregon, University of Oregon, Portland, and Willamette.

Undergraduates in our Oregon colleges and universities, especially those majoring in the social or biological sciences, would do well to investigate the career opportunities of medical social work. Until recent years, Oregon hospitals and health services have had to depend on persons from other States to fill medical social work positions. Now, more medical social workers employed in Oregon are native Oregonians who received their professional education outside the State, but have returned to Oregon to live and work.

Medical social workers in Oregon will be glad to interview any interested students if it is at all possible. Some of us travel within the State on business and might be able to arrange our time to meet with campus groups to answer questions about medical social work and scholarship opportunities. In any event, students, counselors, and parents may secure printed information about professional requirements and schools of social work by writing to the American Association of Medical Social Workers, 1700 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Yours very truly,

MILDRED C. IVERSON,
Secretary, Health Division.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], because I now wish to offer an amendment to the road bill. The amendment is along the lines of the colloquy in which the Senator from Tennessee and I engaged on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon. I want him to understand the purpose of the offering of the amendment and of the explanatory remarks I now wish to make concerning it.

Last night, following my colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee, I had another conference with the persons who, as I said yesterday afternoon, had been conferring with me about section 2 (d) of the bill. They seemed to be still somewhat dissatisfied, although they felt that the legislative record which was made yesterday was very helpful.

It is quite possible that with the offering of the amendment as a part of the legislative record, and further discussion of the matter during the course of the debate later today and again tomorrow, the entire matter may be clarified, and the amendment can be withdrawn. Or it may be that further debate will show that the amendment, in some form, at least, ought to be taken to conference.

Be that as it may, with the permission of the Senator, I should like to place my explanation of the amendment in the RECORD. I think I can do this in 2 or 3 minutes. If I should run beyond the 2-minute mark, I assure the Senate that I have only three and one-half pages of manuscript. I wish to have the explanation in the RECORD, where it will be available for the consideration of the Senator from Tennessee and other members of the Committee on Public Works.

At the close of the brief explanation of the amendment, I shall offer it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may make this brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, section 2 (d) of the bill would work grave injustices to the trucking industry and to all operators of large trucks and combinations in several States of the Union, including Nevada, Oregon, Vermont, and New Mexico. I am offering an amendment which would clarify the present section 2 (d) of the bill and make it possible for the laws and practices now in force in the various States to be continued, as the chairman of the subcommittee told the Senate in the debate yesterday it was the intention of his committee so to do.

In the case of the State of Nevada, there are no dimension regulations written into the law, with the result that under section 2 (d) the AASHO—American Association of State Highway Officials—code of 50 feet would automatically impose length dimensions in that State. At the present time tractor-trailer combinations operated from California to the East and from Oregon, Washington and Idaho to the South are 54–55 feet in overall length to conform with size and weights standards in the States I have just mentioned. As a result, if section 2 (d) were enacted, this equipment, of which there are several thousand pieces, would become obsolete overnight—a penalty which the over-the-road trucking industry cannot stand.

Also in the case of Nevada, there is no height limit and automobile transporters are now permitted to travel across that State and other Western States carrying cars the height of which overall is 13 feet 6 inches. In view of the fact that Nevada has no height limitation, the AASHO limit of 12 feet 6 inches would apply, thus obsoleting all automobile transporter equipment operating through that State from California and making it impossible to transport automobiles in the fashion in which they are now transported.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to complete the statement. Then later in the day, when the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement, has concluded action on the postal pay bill, we can discuss the amendment I propose to offer. But I thought it would be better to place the statement in the RECORD now.

In the State of Oregon, the legal limit for tractor-trailer combinations is 50 feet by law, but the State Highway Commission is authorized to designate specific highways which, in their opinion, are capable of handling longer vehicles and they have so designated several interstate routes which would be on the interstate system, permitting 60 feet instead of 50 feet. Section 2 (d) of the bill specifically refers to laws of the State and there is grave question as to whether regulations issued by an administrative body can be classified as laws and have the effect of law. If they are not, Oregon would find itself with a 50-foot overall limitation for tractor-trailer combinations, thus making obsolete much of the equipment which is in use in that State and which operates through it from California to Washington.

In the State of Vermont, there is no limitation on axle weights, but the weight is computed by the size of the tires. If section 2 (d) becomes effective, the AASHO code of 18,000 pounds per axle would go into effect for Vermont, thus drastically reducing the permissive axle weights now in effect in that State.

The State of New Mexico has already enacted legislation which has been signed by the Governor, considerably increasing gross weights for combinations of vehicles. If section 2 (d) as now written, with the cutoff date of May 1, becomes effective, the legislation passed by the Legislature of New Mexico will be invalidated. Similar legislation has already been enacted by the State of Idaho, and legislation is pending in the State of Pennsylvania to increase both the axle weights and the weights permitted on tractor-trailer combinations.

It should be pointed out that the so-called scientific data on which the AASHO Code is based derives almost entirely from the so-called Bates road test which was conducted in Illinois around 1922. The Maryland test, which has been referred to on the floor, and which was conducted several years ago, showed conclusively that, in the case of rigid pavements, axle weights above 18,000 pounds did not cause any appreciable damage when the pavement rested on a good granular soil, which permitted rain water and drainage water to run off freely. The western State highway officials have recently conducted, in cooperation with the automobile, oil, and trailer industries, a road test of flexible pavement, on which the report has not

yet been published. However, indications are that roads can be built economically which will carry axle loads up to 22,400 pounds under continuous use by heavy trucks. Another comprehensive road test is now about to get underway in Illinois, in cooperation with the automobile industry and the Bureau of Public Roads and the 48 States, to determine the effects of much higher loads than those now in use in the United States on various types of flexible and rigid pavement. It is expected that these tests will show that axle loads considerably higher than 18,000 pounds can be carried on roads built with the proper subbase.

In light of these facts, I believe it would be only fair for the Senate to adopt my amendment which will simply clarify the unclear language in section 2 (d) and carry out exactly what the chairman has said his committee intended, namely, to make it lawful for all vehicles to operate in all States the same as they are now operating. I have set up the cutoff date to July 1, 1956, which is the date on which the funds, as authorized by the bill, would become effective.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee and also to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that all I have sought to do is to tell them very frankly the source of the information. This was all presented to me again in a briefing last night. My mind is perfectly open on the question. I think, however, that so long as there is great concern in the trucking industry over section 2 (d) we have a duty to make perfectly clear just what the effect of section 2 (d) will be.

The representatives of the trucking industry seemed to think that the amendment I have offered—and they wrote it; I did not write it—will, in their judgment, make the clarification which they feel is needed because there is no doubt about their sincerity and very great concern that section 2 (d) in its present form will result in making obsolete tens of thousands of dollars' worth of equipment, so they have said to me.

I have presented the amendment, as I always do, with all my cards on top of the table, and I ask the committtee, during the debate, to consider the contention of the trucking industry, in the hope that if there is merit in their contention my amendment either can be adopted or a modification of it, at least, can go to conference for further clarification; or, on the other hand, we can write into the record of the debate a legislative intent which will define section 2 (d) beyond question of doubt.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will understand my motivation in presenting this material.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The presentation of the amendment by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon is welcome. It will be printed and all of us will have an opportunity to read and study it. So far as I am concerned—and I think, also, I can speak for the committee—the amendment will be given careful consideration. We wish, without question, to implement the policy which was stated in the debate yesterday. If the amendment is needed, we will be prepared to consider and accept it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the 19th instant, the Chair lays before the Senate S. 1, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, returned by the President of the United States to the Senate without his approval.

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is: Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the agreement, there is a limitation of debate of 3 hours, to be controlled by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

Under section 7 of article I of the Constitution, a yea-and-nay vote is required to be taken on the question now before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, out of the time I control, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall not require 5 minutes.

I voted in favor of the postal pay raise bill when it was first passed by the Senate, and I voted for the postal pay raise conference report. I also voted for the postal pay raise bill of last year. I so voted because I believe that those in the postal service sorely need and richly deserve an increase in pay.

This year I voted for this legislation in the hope that the President could be persuaded to approve it. I did so realizing that many in the postal service were opposed to the bill in its final form. I have felt that, most of all, they are in great need of higher pay.

The President has now acted. For the reasons he has stated in his veto message, he has declined to approve the bill. I cannot argue against some of the reasons he has stated for vetoing it.

At the same time, he has expressed a strong desire to approve a bill within the specifications he named. More than this, he has indicated a desire to compromise if those sponsoring the legislation are willing to do so.

There still remains ample time in this session of the Congress for drafting and passing a bill upon which there can be common agreement. The only obstacle to such action may be partisan politics.

If the Democratic leadership, now in control of the Congress, so decrees, postal pay increase legislation can be enacted in the present session. Moreover, the effective date of the increase itself can be made retroactive.

For these reasons I am voting to sustain this veto by the President. I urge that, if the veto is sustained, the Congress proceed at once to pass a postal-pay-raise bill which the President will approve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is at another crossroad. We must decide whether we are going to travel the road which leads to complete domination by the executive branch, or whether we are going to stand up and fight for our rights.

I propose to follow the latter course. Furthermore, I extend an invitation to each and every one of my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to join me in this fight to preserve the prerogatives of Congress. We can win the fight by voting today to sustain the twice-expressed will of Congress on the postal pay bill.

Immediately following delivery of the President's veto message to the Senate, last Thursday, I referred to it as "shameful."

Mr. President, since making that statement, I have had a week to consider the position taken by the President. After studying the veto message I am convinced that the President did not give full and proper study to the compromise agreement. For that reason, the facts set forth in that statement should be discussed in some detail, so there can be no possible misunderstanding of the situation. I propose to direct a few remarks to a review of the history of the pay issue, then to the action taken by the President, and, finally, to the problem which confronts us.

The following is the history of the postal pay raise issue: The last adjustment in the pay of postal employees took place on July 1, 1951. However, the increase granted at that time did not completely close the gap between the cost-of-living and the rate of pay of the

postal employees. Since the cost-of-living has continued to go up, the gap has grown wider and wider with each passing month. This plain fact has never been recognized by the present administration.

The President and his administration have made no sincere effort to give postal employees a pay raise. The record is completely clear in that respect.

Last year the administration wanted two things with respect to the postal service: First, it wanted an increase in the price of the 3-cent stamp—just another form of taxation—which would have cost the American public millions of dollars a year; and, second, it wanted unbridled authority to operate the postal service, with no advice or direction from Congress. The administration boldly offered to purchase these two items for a price. The price was a postage-tax increase and dictatorial powers to Czar Summerfield. It offered to buy both for an increase of less than 5 percent in the pay of postal workers. Just think of it, Mr. President: Bartering a pay raise for additional taxes and dictatorial authority, and doing so in the same cold and callous manner that shares of stock in General Motors have been bought and sold for years by the present Postmaster General.

Congress had a somewhat opposite opinion of the matter. It neither wanted an additional postage tax imposed on the American public, nor did it wish to turn over to the Postmaster General the unbridled authority he so badly wanted. However, Congress did favor a pay raise for the postal employees.

Acting without support of any kind from the administration—or, to state the matter more accurately, in spite of all-out opposition of the administration, Congress enacted a straight pay increase bill in the closing moments of the last session.

The bill enacted by Congress was modest. It was justified. It should have become law. However, it died on the desk of the President, after Congress had adjourned and gone home.

Why did this happen? It happened because the administration was not at all interested in a pay raise. That was only the price it would pay for additional revenue and authority. When these were not forthcoming, the pay increase enacted by Congress was not approved by the President. Let there be no misunderstanding about it, Mr. President; the administration was willing to go along with a modest pay increase only if by that process it could obtain additional revenue and power. When that effort failed, the well-justified increase to our postal employees and other Federal workers was doomed.

That brings us to the present session of Congress. On the Senate side, Senate bill 1 was introduced on the opening day of the session by 21 Members of the Senate. That bill provided for a 10 percent or $400 minimum increase to every postal employee. On January 11, the President sent to the Congress a proposal for a 5 percent increase in basic salaries, with the stipulation that it be coupled with the position classification plan purchased for $50,000 by the Postmaster General from an outside management consulting firm.

Following extensive hearings and weeks of deliberation, Senate bill 1, with minor amendments, was passed by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, and was sent to the House, for its consideration. The House, just as had been done by the Senate, held extensive hearings and devoted weeks of study to the problem, and then by an overwhelming vote passed the bill with amendments calling for a 6-percent increase in the basic salaries and the administration's classification plan, with only minor changes and certain technical corrections.

Accordingly, the Senate and the House conferees had, on the one hand, the Senate version of the bill, providing a 10-percent increase without position classification: and, on the other hand, the House version of the bill, providing a 6-percent increase and the position classification plan of the administration, with minor modifications.

In spite of our skepticism, notwithstanding our doubts, and casting aside our reservations, we finally agreed to accept the position classification features of the House version of the bill. In the true spirit of honest compromise and in the sincere hope and belief that our action would result in an immediate pay increase, we accepted the position classification features of the House version. In return, we were able to obtain an additional increase of 1 percent in the amount of immediate raises. It is this compromise—which then was approved by a vote of 328 to 66 in the House, and by a vote of 66 to 11 in the Senate—that the President returned without his approval. There we have the ugly history.

Mr. President, I turn now to the message from the President of the United States returning without approval the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

The first paragraph of the President's message sets forth three reasons for his not approving the bill. The first reason is that—

> The bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees—

Coupled with this is his statement in paragraph 6 of his message that H. R. 4644, as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—

> could have been, and still can be, with certain corrections, the basis for legislation which would establish fair relationships between the salaries of various positions in the postal service.

Let us begin our probe and bring out for all to see the exact difference between H. R. 4644, as reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—hereinafter referred to as the administration's bill because of its acceptability to the President—and S. 1, as sent to the President and hereinafter referred to as the compromise bill, because it was not acceptable to the President.

First, the administration's bill provided an immediate increase of 6 percent, as against 7 percent provided in the compromise bill. I do not believe any reasonable person would argue long that a difference of only 1 percent is sufficient to make one bill completely good and the other bill completely bad.

Secondly, both the administration's bill and the compromise bill contain a salary schedule made up of 21 different pay levels. These 21 levels represent and recognize the different degrees of job responsibility in the postal service. They establish the basis for giving equal pay for equal work. There are no differences between the administration's bill and the compromise bill in regard to the 21 levels or the jobs that fit into each such level. For example, under both bills, all janitorial jobs are in level 1; all mail handler jobs are in level 3; all special-delivery messengers are in level 4; all letter-carrier jobs are in level 5; and so on up the ladder to level 21 where we find the job of regional director, the top position in the postal field service. Therefore, the position classification features of both bills are the same.

Both the administration's bill and the compromise bill establish an entrance salary rate in each of the 21 levels. Both proposals provide, in addition to the entrance salary rate, 6 annual increases within each of the 21 levels. Therefore, there are no differences in the salary structure of the administration's proposal and the compromise agreement.

What are the differences that make one bill good and make the other bill bad? The differences are few indeed. Senators will be amazed at how small they are and what little it takes to bring the wrath of the administration down upon the Congress.

First. Level 1 under H. R. 4644 has an entrance salary of $2,870 and six annual increases of $100 each. Level 1 under the conference agreement has an entrance salary of $2,890 and six annual increases of $100 each. Thus, there is a difference of $20 a year.

Second. The entrance salary in level 2 is $3,080 under both bills. However, under H. R. 4644, there are six annual increases of $105 each, whereas under the vetoed proposal, the annual increases are $110 each. Think of it—an increase of $5 a year more under S. 1 than under H. R. 4644. And this additional $5 a year increase is not effective now, but occurs only after a full year has elapsed. It is only a potential increase.

Third. Level 5 under the administration's bill has an entrance salary of $3,640 and six annual increases of $120 each. Level 5 under the compromise has an entrance salary of $40 a year more and the six annual increases are $5 a year larger. The $40 a year more for the employees in level 5 amounts to 76 cents a week before tax and retirement deductions. It amounts to less than the price of a loaf of bread a day.

Mr. President, unbelievable as it may seem, these are the only increases made by the conference agreement over what the President now says he will accept.

In summary, the conference agreement raised the amount of immediate increases above the administration's proposal from 6 to 7 percent; added $20 a year to all pay steps in level 1; raised the annual increments in level 2 by $5; and, raised the entrance salary in level 5 by $40 and the annual increments by $5 a year.

Having established that the increases contained in S. 1 are modest in the extreme—so modest that they are hardly worthy of discussion—one must look elsewhere in an effort to justify the President's second veto action. There is only one other difference between H. R. 4644, the administration's bill, and S. 1, the conference agreement, and that occurs in 6 of the top 7 grades of the pay schedule. In these six grades the administration's bill provides annual increases of up to $400 to top officials in the postal service, whereas the conference bill limits the annual increases to these top officials to $250.

One must assume that under the "trickle down" theory of the Eisenhower administration this is the feature of S. 1 that makes it unacceptable to the President.

Mr. President, the President's second reason for not signing the bill is that "the bill creates grave administrative problems, such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates."

The person who misinformed the President on this point should be discharged either for complete incompetency or deliberate misrepresentation. The plain facts are that under our Federal payroll system each employee has an individual pay rate. This is occasioned by the fact that, irrespective of the base rate of pay for any given group of employees after deductions are made for taxes, retirement, and bonds, they have an individual rate of net take-home pay. The charge that grave administrative problems would be created should be dismissed as completely unjustified.

The President's third reason for not signing the bill relates to its cost. The President says he will accept a bill that costs $160 million a year. The actual cost of the pay increase under the compromise agreement is $13 million higher.

The President might, if he wished, reduce his pending request for additional billions for foreign aid by more than enough to cover the cost of the bill he vetoed, and the bill he is quoted as saying he would approve. In fact, this Congress has already reduced a number of the President's requests for money by more than enough to cover the full cost of the bill he has rejected.

Now that we have probed the President's three reasons for not approving the conference agreement and found them wanting, let us give some thought to the problem that confronts us today.

At the request of the President, the present Congress increased its own pay by 50 percent. Democrats and Republicans alike voted for the increase.

The newspapers carried a picture of the President signing the bill. He had a broad smile on his face and was quoted as saying that he did not believe the increase was enough.

At the request of the President, the present Congress increased the pay of our military personnel by 11½ percent on the average. Here again, the President signed the bill into law and was quoted in the press as stating that the increase was long over-due.

Our 800,000 blue-collar workers whose pay is based on local prevailing rates have had upward adjustments in keeping with the increased cost of living.

The present Congress has also increased the pay of the judiciary and that of the district attorneys, and others in the Department of Justice.

How can we—in the face of these facts—vote to longer deny postal employees the raise to which they are entitled?

How can we return home and face our friendly mailman—as he makes his daily call to our doorsteps—if we turn him down here today?

Mr. President, the issue is very clear. In spite of the efforts of the press to becloud the picture and charge the Congress with playing politics with this proposal the President of the United States must assume the responsibility for denying a pay increase to Federal employees. He has, by his lone action, delayed and delayed this deserved increase.

He has placed himself in the ridiculous position of vetoing a 5-percent proposal in August and proposing a 5-percent increase in January, and by vetoing an 8.5-percent proposal while advocating a 7.6-percent bill. I would not be at all surprised to see some stalwart supporter of the President now offer an 8-percent bill and say the administration will accept it.

Yet, even with such flagrant abuse of the basic principles of American Government the Republican-controlled press would have the American people believe the present Congress is interested only in the political aspects of this problem and not in gaining a much needed and deserved increase in pay for the Nation's public servants.

Why do we not place the blame where the blame belongs—squarely on the shoulders of that poor, misguided, and confused man in the White House?

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate should understand that their vote to sustain the President's regrettable action is a vote for the arrogant pride of the present Postmaster General. A vote to override the President's veto is a vote on the side of justice, fair play, and in keeping with the promise that the Nation's postal workers would gain an equitable adjustment in salary without delay.

Let us make no mistake. This vote will show who is in favor of the man who labors hard for his bread.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram, an editorial, and some letters dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the telegram, editorial, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *May 22, 1955.*

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The more than 100 special-delivery messengers in the Detroit post office unanimously endorse S. 1 and urge you to override the veto. We have faith that Congress will correct any inequities in future legislation.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of May 21, 1955]

POSTAL PAY VETO

As had been predicted President Eisenhower has vetoed the pay increase for postal employees. It is reported the President said he would not approve an increase of more than 7.6 percent, whereas the new bill providing for a pay increase of 7 percent and reclassification of jobs and so on would actually amount to a raise of 8.8 percent.

The President may be justified in this alleged attitude, but in view of the colossal expenditures he has approved for giveaway programs, this seems a bit like quibbling. It appears to us from information presented over the last several years that the postal workers have made a clear case to prove that they have been overlooked.

As in other matters it appears that the President's staff of advisers cannot be compared to his staff officers who served under him as a military commander. Possibly he would have done well to bring them along with him.

Anyway, we think the Congress would be justified in overriding the veto.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *May 21, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: Enclosed you will find a newspaper article. This article and a number of other things has changed my political views. As a Government employee, I am not allowed to expressed my political views, but in this case I will take my chances.

I am a post office employee and feel a great injustice has been done us in the recent veto of the Postal Pay bill. Many others undoubtedly feel the same.

I know that you and your colleagues (Democratic) are on our side. If your opposition thinks a man with two children can live on $3,270 a year, they should try it.

I hope the Senate and House override the veto.

You may quote me as saying, President Eisenhower did something that Harry Truman could not do—that is, he made a Democrat out of me and my family.

By the enclosed article, it seems that Mr. Summerfield and his assistants are the policy-makers in Washington.

I now have proof that I was mistaken about the Democratic Party. It is the workingman's party. All Democrats have my loyal and devoted support.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *May 19, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: As you know, I was one of the very few employees of the Columbia Post Office who was a Democrat in 1952. However, since the veto of the pay bill today by Eisenhower, I believe that our boys have returned to the fold. I have almost "popped at the seams" laughing at the change in most of the employees from Republican back to Democrat since their pocketbook was touched. Many who were for Eisenhower have told me today I could place my foot in that part of their anatomy

which is close to the "sacroiliac." I just laughed and didn't "kick."

Good luck.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senate is confronted with the necessity this afternoon of determining the action it will take on Senate bill 1, which the President has returned without his approval. We will be given an opportunity to vote and to decide whether we shall override or sustain the President's veto.

Time is running out in this session of Congress for securing pay increases for Federal employees, both postal and classified.

We have marched up the hill, and we have marched down the hill. If the President's veto is sustained, I urge that we take immediate action on a postal pay measure and also on a classified pay measure which can and will be enacted into law. Let us stop shadow boxing and, as Members of the Senate, consider proposed legislation on this subject which can be enacted into law and to which the employees are justly entitled.

For the record it would be well to devote some time to the history of this proposed legislation.

On January 11, 1955, the President recommended to the Congress an adjustment of the salaries of postal employees by 5 percent, along with a salary plan to eliminate inequities which would cost an additional 1½ of payroll, or a total of $129 million a year for both the increase and adjustment of inequities. These recommendations were designed to place the salaries of postal employees in proper relationship to each other and to the salaries paid for similar work in nearly all of the thousands of communities where postal workers are employed.

After extended hearings, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a bipartisan majority of 17 to 6 reported H. R. 4644, which reclassified Postal Field Service salaries and corrected most of the inequities, but at the same time created a special salary level for clerks and letter carriers substantially higher than was recommended. This action and other amendments to the original bill by the committee increased the cost to approximately $160 million a year. As finally reported to the House, H. R. 4644 incorporated some 20 substantial changes in the bill originally proposed by the administration, but with certain exceptions would have accomplished the objective of establishing proper relationships between the salaries for various positions in the postal service based on the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and higher pay for more difficult and responsible work.

However, further amendments to this bill on the House floor destroyed the carefully worked out salary relationships between positions by making 60 changes in the rates provided in the salary schedule, thus creating new inequities.

These changes had the effect of decreasing the salaries proposed for many thousands of employees and increasing the pay proposed for thousands of others, placing the salaries of these employees at a substantially higher level than is paid for similar work in their individual cities and communities. The net further increase in the total cost of the bill resulting from these amendments was $10,700,000 annually.

In attempting to reconcile the difference between the bills passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate, the conference committee, restricted by applicable parliamentary rules, was not able to correct the extreme salary schedule distortions and administrative problems inherent in the bills, but did make changes adding further to the total cost. Thus, the bill now includes inequitable salary schedules and creates monstrous and expensive administrative problems as well as adding $180 million a year to the cost of operating the postal establishment.

The President has stated that in the consideration of such legislation as this there can be reasonable differences of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. However, in any final decision reached, consideration must be given to the Nation's taxpayers who will pay the cost, and the increases must be distributed on a basis that is fair for all employees in relation to the average salaries paid for similar work throughout the Nation.

Among the specific distortions, inequities, and administrative problems which make this proposed legislation unacceptable and unworkable are:

First. More than 20,000 of the 32,546 rural letter carriers now employed would receive pay in excess of the salary schedule in the bill. This absurdity would occur because of the combined effect of the 7 percent general increase and the savings clause, and would have the effect of creating more than 20,000 individual protected salary rates with consequent enormous administrative problems. Remaining rural carriers and all new rural carriers could progress in salary only to the limits provided in the schedule. Thus, employees with idenical routes would have different maximum salary rates.

Second. The bill destroys the historical and correct relationship between salaries of rural and city carriers by providing substantially greater increases and a relatively higher salary schedule for the city carriers. The schedule provides a maximum salary of $4,280 for a rural carrier on a 42-mile route, working 6 days a week, as compared to $4,430 for a city carrier working 5 days a week.

Third. The bill provides two separate salary levels, Nos. 4 and 5, for work of essentially the same level of duties and responsibilities. This provision would make it impossible administratively for the Postmaster General to carry out on a fair basis other sections of the bill which require him to determine which of the two levels should be used for remaining employees whose positions are not assigned specifically to either level.

Fourth. Up to salary level 13 the bill provides step rate pay raises, within a salary range, which increase as the salary levels increase. Above that level the step rates are reduced and made uniform, which has the effect of substantially decreasing the pay raise proposed for positions at these levels, thereby discriminating against key management and supervisory personnel. In fact, new postmasters assigned to these positions would be required to serve for years before receiving even the inadequate salaries provided by the present law enacted in 1951.

Fifth. The salaries provided for the senior clerks and letter carriers, $4,430 to $4,730 per annum, or $2.13 to $2.27 an hour, are substantially higher than the salaries paid by private employers for work of a similar level in most communities of the Nation. Acceptance of these rates would be unfair to the taxpayers who must foot the bill for an unconscionable postal deficit.

Sixth. This bill provides that the further changes in salaries provided by reclassification shall become effective on enactment, though it is agreed that 180 days will be required for the Post Office Department to complete the allocation of all positions to the proper levels. Thus, it would require the reconstruction of a work and placement situation in effect on date of enactment in a department where thousands of assignment changes occur each month. The administrative problem created would appear impossible of a just solution for all employees.

Seventh. The bill directs the Postmaster General to preserve the anniversary dates of employees who were in the automatic grades prior to reclassification, provided that in no case shall a junior employee be advanced ahead of a senior employee in any individual post office or organization unit. Retention of anniversary dates for junior employees would then depend entirely on the circumstances of placement on the separate rosters which would have to be compiled in each post office station or organization unit, rather than the individual's own record of service. Thus, treatment of employees in identical positions with the same service record would vary greatly from office to office throughout the postal establishment, and dates of salary increases would be controlled by administrative accident or a caprice of fate.

For 2 years with the aid of the Congress, the President has been making a sincere and determined effort to improve the personnel system of the Federal service. The Congress has approved much progressive personnel legislation for the benefit of the Government and its employees. Especially notable were the authorization of group life insurance, unemployment compensation, incentive awards, uniform allowances, and removal of restrictive controls on appointments to the career service. During this period, the President consistently urged the enactment of salary legislation for postal employees providing for salary increases to place salaries for the various positions in proper relationship to one another and to the salaries paid by private employers for work of the same level so that the principle of equal pay for equal work

and more pay for more difficult and responsible work would be followed, inequities eliminated, and incentives offered for advancement to positions of greater responsibility.

As was explained in the President's message to the Congress last January 11, a flat percentage increase would not eliminate the serious inequities which presently exist, nor would it correct the antiquated and unfair practice of paying most employees on the basis of job title alone without regard to duties, others on the basis of the number of cubic feet supervised, or solely in relation to number of employees directed.

Mr. President, for nearly 2 years it has been the desire of the great majority of the Members of the Senate to give postal employees a deserved and reasonable salary increase. In order to place money in the pockets of the postal employees, it is essential that Congress enact a salary increase measure which will correct inequities in the present salary structure as well as give all employees an increase which is within the limits the President has indicated he will approve.

Some of us have expressed the belief that the increase should be somewhat larger than it now appears possible to enact into law. But we have delayed long enough, and certainly an increase that can actually becomes a reality is far preferable to postal employees than continued discussion of a larger increase. It is time to quit talking and to act.

Therefore, if today the President's veto is sustained, I propose to introduce a bill, which is virtually identical in offering the same protection to employees with respect to reclassification as the bill which has been rejected by the President but which is less costly in that it restores the salary schedule contained in S. 1489, which I have previously offered as a substitute for S. 1. Further improvements have been made for the benefit and protection of employees and to eliminate certain major inequities and serious administrative problems which the President found objectionable. These changes may be summarized as follows:

First. The effective date of the minimum 6 percent increase which all postal employees will receive under this bill has been made retroactive to March 1, 1955, and the further salary increases resulting from reclassification adjustments will become effective 180 days after enactment.

I do not believe postal employees should be penalized for the delay in the enactment of this legislation, and it is only fair to make the general increase effective March 1. In order that due care may be used in the reclassification and also to permit an opportunity for senior employees to be transferred into the more responsible positions which will result in higher pay, it is essential that the Post Office Department be given a reasonable time to accomplish reclassification.

Second. S. 1 left only special delivery messengers in salary level 4. These employees take exactly the same civil-service examination as city carriers and it has been agreed by the employee organizations as well as the Department that they should be at the same salary level as city carriers. Therefore, this bill, in effect, eliminates salary level 4 by raising the special delivery messengers to the same salary level as city carriers.

Third. The provision agreed upon by the Senate and House conferees to require the Postmaster General to transmit to the Congress a comprehensive report as to the actions taken under the reclassification section of the bill has been included. This provision will enable the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to evaluate the reclassification actions and to take any necessary steps to correct inequities if they appear.

Fourth. Provision is made to retain existing anniversary dates for increases in the automatic grades except in cases where a junior employee would receive so large an increase, in addition to the 6 percent provided, on adjustment to the new schedule that he would pass a senior employee.

The only other changes are technical corrections designed to make clear the intent of the proposed legislation. I am sure that this bill meets the objections which were raised to S. 1. I particularly invite attention to the fact that the salary schedule for rural carriers is such that the proper and traditional relationship is maintained between the pay of these employees and that of the city carriers. This corrects one of the major defects in S. 1 which would have resulted in a serious injustice to the 33,000 rural letter carriers.

As was explained in the President's message to the Congress last January 11, a flat percentage increase would not be acceptable because it would not eliminate the serious inequities which presently exist; nor would it correct the present unfair practice of paying most employees on the basis of job title alone without regard to duties, of paying others on the basis of the number of cubic feet supervised, and paying still others in relation to the number of employees they direct.

In correcting these inequities, every possible protection for employees has been incorporated and each employee is guaranteed that his salary plus the 6-percent increase provided is properly protected.

During the debate on the conference report on S. 1, it was stated that the salary raises provided for clerks and letter carriers in S. 1 amounted to only 90 cents a week per employee more than the increases in the administration bill. Surely, we should not allow such a small amount of difference to stand in the way of immediate enactment of this bill which includes correction of the inequities as recommended by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short analysis of the bill I propose to introduce may follow my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The analysis is as follows:

This bill would—

1. Give all postal employees an increase of 6 percent retroactive to March 1, 1955.

2. Provide the reclassification recommended by the President, which brings total cost to 8 percent of payroll, and guarantee that no employee's pay will be less than his present salary plus 6 percent. Increases for city carriers would total over $41 millions or 8.2 percent of the present payroll for these employees.

3. Correct the injustice to 40,000 rural letter carriers and special delivery carriers by giving them a salary schedule comparable to that of city carriers.

4. Protect anniversary dates for automatic increases based on length of service, except in cases of junior employees who would get additional salary adjustments equivalent to their automatic increases.

5. Correct administrative problems by eliminating individual rates through a proper salary schedule for rural carriers.

6. Restore proper increases for key supervisors, assistant postmasters, and postmasters.

7. Require the Postmaster General to make a complete report to Congress on any classification actions taken in any cases where the specific salary for the job is not stipulated by title and description in the bill.

8. Restore the original larger increases proposed for lower paid clerks and letter carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is very good and most cheering to learn that the United States Senate, particularly the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], has been in touch with those of such great influence in high posts in the Post Office Department, and that the Senate will soon be let in on the kind of pay bill we may pass.

I think it is very peculiar that at this time the great United States Senate and House of Representatives are being made the captives of an arrogant Postmaster General, who has said, in effect, "If the bill does not follow, to the very last page, chapter, and verse, the form that I demand, then there will be no pay increase for the 500,000 loyal, patriotic Federal workers in the postal service."

The Senate this afternoon has a chance to determine whether it will still legislate the pay increases for Federal employees or whether we will surrender our prerogative to the heads of Government bureaus.

The issue, it seems to me, is far more important than the principal monetary difference in the bill—the famous 76 cents a week difference between the Postmaster General's bill and the bill so overwhelmingly passed by both Houses of Congress.

The bill vetoed by the President, at the insistence of the Postmaster General, squarely poses this question. If the Senate supinely abdicates its right to pass upon Federal employment matters, when the difference between two bills is so slight, then we may as well disband the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

We are asked to sustain not a broad principle of government in this veto, but a question of weekly compensation of 62 percent of the 500,000 postal employees—the great body of postal employees—amounting to only 76 cents a

week. We are, in fact, asked to vote to sustain the vanity of Postmaster General Summerfield.

If this were the first veto along these lines, it might not be so surprising. But this is the second of a 1-2 punch at the morale of the large body of postal workers. But Postmaster General Summerfield, the man who guided the Eisenhower crusade, must have his way, no matter what happens to the morale or efficiency of the Government service.

Admittedly the Government workers are entitled to a pay raise. Even the administration admits that. The Government employees have not had a pay increase in 4 years. Yet because of Postmaster General Summerfield and his will to dictate to Congress and to all Government employees, they have waited some 18 months for their Government to do them justice on the increase all parties admit they are entitled to have.

At the outset of the session last year, Congress took up the pay bills. Both Houses worked on the bills, and just before adjournment passed the 5 percent pay increase bill for Government employees. But because Congress failed—or, may I dare to say, refused—to rubberstamp Mr. Summerfield's demands, that pay bill was vetoed. Congress could not override it because of adjournment.

The first bill on which Mr. Summerfield won his veto did not affect merely the 500,000 postal workers under his jurisdiction. It was an omnibus bill affecting the salaries of more than a million other Federal workers with whom Mr. Summerfield is supposed to have no connection. It also carried increases for our congressional employees. But the bill did not suit Mr. Summerfield, so all Government employees—his own, and those in other Government departments, as well—had another year's delay added to their waiting time for an admittedly deserved pay increase.

The reasons then—as now—were strained to the limit. The bill, we were told then, was vetoed because the Congress did not increase the letter mail rate from 3 cents to 4 cents and make other revenue adjustments upward in mail rates. Although the administration had forced through a tax cut, largely for big corporations, it did not seem inconsistent to them to lodge a veto simply because the letter mail rate was not increased to take care of postal salaries. If the same logic is to be followed, a tax bill should accompany every pay increase ever made.

The other reason given for vetoing not only the postal increases, but the pay increases of all other classified workers, as well, was that the bill did not include the reclassification which the Postmaster General had insisted upon.

In some way or other, as we near the election, the Postmaster General and the administration seem to have forgotten or have allowed to become obscure their demand for the 4-cent letter rate. But the demand for Mr. Summerfield's own personal private reclassification ideas is still important enough to win a veto from the President.

So, 18 months after the hearings started, some two million Federal employees have their pay problem tied up with Mr. Summerfield's insistence on dictating in its entirety the act that Congress writes. We were told in the beginning on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that if we did not pass a bill substantially as submitted that a veto was likely.

In the second veto, it is stated by the President that the bill would create new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees.

Let us look at that one. The "bad bill," which the Senate passed on the conference report—66 to 11—and the House passed 328 to 66—stands on all fours with the Postmaster General's "good bill" excepting in very few particulars. The administration bill provides a 6-percent immediate pay increase for all. The congressional bill provides an immediate 7-percent increase for all. Congress, after hearings, consideration of the matter, and knowledge of the inflationary impact, voted to give an increase of 1 percent above the amount dictated by Mr. Summerfield.

Generally the difference is that a slight amount of added pay increases will go to the 62 percent of the postal workers who are the backbone and the legs of the postal service—the post-office clerks and the letter carriers. They will get, as I have said, the sum of 76 cents a week more under reclassification than the Postmaster General wants them to have. Others, such as janitors, the lowest paid in the postal service, will get $1.92 a week more. All others in the great body of the postal working service will get virtually the same under the "bad bill" which was vetoed, or under the "good bill" which Mr. Summerfield insists on pushing through. All of these computations are based upon the starting salaries under the new reclassification schedule.

The higher paid brackets of the postal service, including supervisors, postmasters, and others in positions of an executive or managerial nature, will get the same new higher reclassification pay as recommended by the Postmaster General. Their increases will be of a nature ranging from $500 to $1,400 per year. None of the pay brackets above, at the starting rates, were changed a thin dime in the conference report. Yet because Congress, in its wisdom and determination, saw fit to add 76 cents a week to the pay of 62 percent of all the postal workers, including the clerks and letter carriers, we now find a veto lodged against the bill.

Congress dared to change the annual step increases in the Postmaster General's bill. Perhaps that is one reason why the Postmaster General is so anxious to see the veto sustained. Since such generous increases had been made to compensate for responsibility of the higher posts, the annual step increases were trimmed down. While the Postmaster General had urged step increases for the better paying jobs, amounting to from $260 to $400 a year, Congress had the timerity to reduce this to a standard step increase every year, to $250.

This served two purposes. It saved some money on the total cost of the bill. Another reason was to keep the postal workers in comparable brackets in line with those occupying similar posts in the overall classified civil-service system. The classified service employee receives an increase of $200 after each 18 months of service. This "bad bill" reduces the postal steps in the higher brackets from $260 to $400 ranges to a flat $250 every 12 months for 7 step-ups in pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask to have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have tried to detail the points of difference between the administration bill and a bill the President said was so bad it had to be vetoed to prevent new discriminations or inequities.

If the postal service is to function properly, morale of the principal groups who handle and deliver the mail must be considered, as well as the morale of those in higher paying positions.

Morale, after long, long delay, is at a new low throughout the postal service. It is impossible to estimate the lasting damage this one-two punch given by the Postmaster General has created. Testimony for page after page in the Senate hearings details how thousands of wives and children of our main body of postal employees have to have outside work in order to hold their homes together.

If there is any department in Government that needs high morale and devotion to duty, it is the Department which must preserve the sanctity and integrity of our mail deliveries. Throughout our long history, the postal service has turned in the finest example of true character in devotion to honor and duty.

No employee, however, can continually see his family faced with hardships, his debts ever increasing, and his wife or children finding outside jobs, and be the kind of an employee we must have in Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask to have 1 additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, because of the addition of a mere 76 cents a week, a vindictive Postmaster General insists on his own way, and his alone, in forcing through 2 vetoes to enforce his will on the employees and on the Congress.

Could it be that Mr. Summerfield wants to show he is boss, not only of the postal service, but of the Congress, and the White House as well?

Could it be that the purpose of these 2 vetoes is to drive fear into the hearts of postal employees, and show them that

unless they become Summerfield sycophants their wage proposals will be continually vetoed? Could it be that the Postmaster General is adopting an old and discredited technique of breaking up employees' organizations?

Bear in mind that the Government employees cannot strike. They cannot employ the accepted techniques of wage negotiations which the Congress has provided for all other employees. They rest their case for justice in wage matters with the Congress, where, under the Constitution, it rightfully belongs.

If we abdicate this right to the whims of the Postmaster General—even though the congressional bill parallels that of the Administration in most particulars—we are depriving their loyal workers of their proper day in court.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have long urged, supported, and endeavored to bring about a salary increase for the postal employees. On this my record is very clear.

I urged, more than a year ago, that a postal employees' salary increase bill be acted on.

It is imperative that any Federal job pay should be commensurate with that of private employment.

When Federal wages, retirements, and other related compensation, such as group insurance, lag behind those of private employment, the Federal service is endangered because it does not attract the best of the younger applicants.

If there is a failure to attract the best of our young people, the situation becomes more grave and serious with each passing year, for the reason that the Federal service then does not have the most apt young people qualifying themselves for positions as foremen, supervisors, superintendents, inspectors, and numerous other positions of responsibility.

This I have always recognized, and it was this question, and also the justice of a proper wage for Federal employees, that compelled me to insist to our leadership a year ago that a salary increase bill be approved.

The question now before the Senate is: Shall the veto of S. 1 by President Eisenhower be sustained?

I believe that the President acted in the best interest of all the Federal employees and the service of the postal department when he vetoed S. 1.

S. 1 contained several inequities. If permitted to become law, these would discriminate against large groups of postal employees, such as the rural carriers and special delivery messengers, and would destroy the incentive for men to qualify themselves and strive to obtain promotions to certain supervisory positions.

If there is no incentive to improve one's services, there results a stifling of a great heritage which it should be the privilege of every American citizen to claim—the encouragement of individual initiative and the will to go forward, or to progress.

I have named a few of the shortcomings of S. 1. There are many specific questions that could be amplified and discussed further; however, most of my colleagues are familiar with the various inequities other than those mentioned.

This is only the date of May 24, in this legislative session. We have ample time to approve a salary bill which will be just and fair to all, proper in all of its provisions, and make the pay increase retroactive to March 1 of this calendar year. I shall endeavor to have such a bill enacted at an early date.

The Republican leadership will strive to accomplish such a legislative enactment.

If the Democratic leadership will cooperate with us, we can enact such legislation within the next few weeks, assuring every postal employee of the opportunity of receiving a salary increase, leaving none to lament, "Why did the Congress discriminate against me?"

Therefore, Mr. President, I find these many compelling reasons why S. 1 should not be enacted into law, and I, therefore, support the President and shall vote to sustain his veto.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the veto by the President of Senate bill 1, and I urge all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to take similar action.

I believe the President sent to us a very honest and forthright message which makes clear his reasons for the veto. It fairly outlines the type of legislation which is needed for the Post Office Department, and which will result in a wage increase.

All of us recall the President's special message of January 11, 1955, in which he recommended a general increase in postal salaries and a reclassification of postal jobs which would put that great organization on a businesslike basis. That recommendation, by the President, would, if followed by the Congress, have given a 6½ percent total pay increase, at an aggregate annual cost of $129 million.

The President now advises us that the bill which finally reached his desk was discriminatory, excessive in cost, and filled with inequities.

In these days of streamlined business management and modern, efficient operation, it seems illogical that administrative modernization cannot be accomplished in the Post Office Department.

For years, I have been deeply concerned with our postal service and its fine employees. I firmly believe they are entitled to all the benefits modern management can give them.

I am convinced the President has given dedicated study to this subject. He deserves our wholehearted support, for the benefit of the postal employees, their management, and the customers of the postal service—the taxpayers.

Every Member of the Senate knows it is our firm desire to give the postal employees a real and proper salary increase. Each of us likewise realizes that in order to put additional money in the pockets of postal workers, we must enact a salary-increase measure which will correct the inequities in the present salary structure, and will be within the limits the President can and will approve. Such legislation can and should be considered and enacted during this session.

If we sustain the action of the President in vetoing Senate bill 1, which we should do, I am informed that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], will introduce a bill which will meet all of the several objections to Senate bill 1 and will give all postal employees an increase of 6 percent, retroactive to March 1, 1955.

I, for one, believe it is the responsibility of the President to see to it that the Post Office Department is operated properly and economically and that he should be held accountable for proper stewardship in the executive branch of the Government.

The President has made it abundantly clear that he, too, favors a real and proper salary increase for postal employees, but without discrimination in favor of one group and against another. Assuredly, both the President and Congress wish to be fair to all the half million employees of the postal service.

If we are going to provide adequate pay increases—and I think we should—there should be no discrimination whatsoever.

I believe the lower paid clerks are entitled to equal consideration with the better paid clerks; and that the supervisory personnel, which have had an average increase of only 15 percent since 1939, are also entitled to equitable consideration.

I urge the Senate promptly to sustain the action of the President, and with equal promptness consider and pass the bill which I understand will be introduced by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas. His bill is intended to give the postal workers the desired pay increase and to correct injustices and inequities now existing.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote to uphold the hand of the President and to sustain his veto; and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in my strong desire for the enactment of legislation granting an increase in compensation to postal employees, I have, during this year alone, on three occasions voted for such an increase. On one occasion, I voted for a 10 percent raise. The last time proposed legislation for this purpose was before us, I voted for an increase of approximately 8.8 percent. However, when those bills were passed by the Senate, I doubted that they would become law; and in all my correspondence on this subject with my constituents, I cautioned against overoptimism. The President had made it clear he would not approve a bill providing for an increase in excess of 7.6 percent, or one which did not provide for reclassification of postal positions, so as to bring about

proper wage relationships and to eliminate inequities.

Interested as I am in a raise for the postal employees, I have great confidence in the President, and I shall vote to sustain his position. I know his veto is no whim or caprice on his part. He has made his position clear throughout, and I am convinced that the position he has taken is based on a very careful and thorough study. I, for one, am willing to accept his judgment regarding the technicalities of the measure we pass, for I know that both of us are striving for the same objective, namely, a pay increase for the postal employees. The President's veto message makes it clear that it is his hope and it is his recommendation that the Congress will act quickly on a postal pay bill which will be in the public interest and will be fair to all employees of the postal service.

I share that hope. So, Mr. President, with all respect I urge the members of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee to make this problem the first order of business, and to report a bill which will be in line with the President's recommendations, so there will be no further delay in enacting such legislation and in getting an increase into the workers' paychecks. My own investigations and conferences with the workers convince me that this money is badly needed by them, in order to enable them to pay their grocery bills, their doctors' bills, their rent—in short, to enable these workers to pay for all the necessities of life, not the luxuries.

This is a question which should have been settled long ago. When the congressional pay raise bill was before us, I strongly objected to consideration of that bill until we had settled the question of pay raises for both the postal employees and the classified employees. In my opinion, our own pay raise was inappropriate and untimely, and I voted against it.

We shall be remiss in the performance of our duty if we do not act quickly on a bill which will meet the President's recommendations. I urge that such a bill contain a retroactive provision as of March 1, 1955, so the postal workers will not, in the long run, be the losers because of the delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe that the veto message of the President is contradictory in itself, and in my opinion his reasoning is completely fallacious. He points out in his veto message certain alleged defects in the bill which is now before us, on reconsideration, and which was passed by the Senate 2 months ago.

That bill provides for a gross increase in salaries of 8.6 percent. While the President points out certain alleged defects in some of the provisions of the bill, he has said that he is willing to sign a bill providing a pay increase of 7.6 percent. I was interested to hear my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] emphasize the fact that a bill would be introduced which would be substantially identical, in many of its provisions, with the one which was vetoed.

In my opinion it is impossible to correct defects in a bill merely by lowering by 1 percent the increase in the compensation paid to workers, or, as pointed out by the Senator from Oklahoma, by 76 cents a week.

The second fallacy in the President's veto message, it seems to me, is the fact that the President seeks to tie an increase in the salaries of the postal workers to an increase in postal rates.

That, in my opinion, is not only a fallacious point of view, but it is also a dangerous point of view. I do not recall many if any agencies of government except the Post Office Department in which the salaries of the workers are dependent upon the income of the department or agency, and dependent upon whether the department involved sustains a loss or makes a profit. We do not demand that of the armed services. We do not demand it of the public road agency. We do not demand it of the Internal Revenue Service. We do not demand it of Congress itself. We do not demand it in the conduct and operation of our courts.

I repeat, so far as I know—there is no other agency of government of which it is demanded that its income shall balance its outlays.

Mr. President, I voted for the postal pay bill when it was passed by the Senate 2 months ago. I shall vote to override the President's veto. I believe the postal workers are fully entitled to the pay raise provided in the bill which the President has vetoed. In its present form the bill is eminently fair, and the increase in pay for postal workers is long overdue. I very much hope that the veto will be overridden and that there will be no further delay in raising the salaries of the postal workers, who for a long time have been grossly underpaid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am going to vote to override the veto of S. 1 because I believe a 10-percent pay increase for our postal employees is fully justified.

In 1951 classified and postal workers received their last basic pay increase. In the interval, the general cost of living has gone up 3 or 4 percent; this means these Government employees have suffered the equivalent of a 3 or 4 percent cut in wages.

While the pay of postal workers has been remaining stationary since 1951, the weekly pay of office clerical workers in six large representative key cities of the United States rose during the same period by 13 percent. The weekly pay of factory workers went up by approximately 15 percent.

Can anyone claim that justice and equity has been done our postal workers when their pay stayed the same during a time when the wages of men and women in comparable income brackets rose by 13 percent or 15 percent?

Alvin Shuster wrote in the New York Times for Sunday, May 22, 1955, that "in the low as well as the high grades of Federal employment, salary increases in recent years have lagged behind pay increases in private industry."

Furthermore, Mr. President, I dispute the thesis of this administration that postal employees should not receive higher wages until there have been increases in postage rates to pay for these wage boosts.

If a pay increase is proposed for employees of the State Department, does someone advocate raising the fees for passports and visas?

If a pay increase is advocated for employees of the National Park Service, does someone propose a boost in the entrance fees to Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks?

If a pay increase is proposed for employees of the Bonneville Power Administration, does someone propose an increase in Columbia River hydroelectric-power rates?

Only in the Post Office does it seem necessary to balance expenditures with new income before we can properly safeguard the living standards of the employees of that Department.

A Government agency exists for service, not for profit. If it can return a profit to the Treasury, fine and good. But service must come first. Why must the Post Office pay for itself when no such measurement is applied to the Public Health Service, to the Fish and Wildlife Service, to the FBI?

For example, the Hoover Commission would boost parcel-post rates sky high to make that agency profitable. Think what this would do to the thousands of rural people in America, whose only delivery service is parcel post. And this parcel-post increase would surely be followed by huge increases in postal rates for first-class mail, airmail, special delivery, newspapers, books and magazines.

I admit that the Hoover thesis of "those who receive governmental services should pay for them" is persuasive and convincing—that is, until the thesis is closely examined.

What if this theory were put into effect? Would it not mean that only the people with children would pay school taxes—the more children, the more taxes?

Would it not mean that a man whose house burned down would receive a bill from the city for turning out the hook-and-ladder truck? Would it not mean that a family needing police assistance would be billed for the patrolman's time and wages?

I renounce this tooth-and-fang theory. I believe we are indeed our brother's keeper.

I am voting to override the veto of S. 1, of which I am a cosponsor, because I believe the facts justify a 10-percent pay increase for postal employees on the merits.

Even with a 10-percent increase, postal workers still will lag behind the pay increases won since 1951 by office help and factory employees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of the disparity in compensation between city carriers and rural carriers. What would actually happen if Senate bill 1 should be passed over the President's veto would be that each long-service clerk and carrier in level 5 would receive an increase in his base salary amounting to 8.8 percent, whereas a long-service rural carrier, traditionally receiving a comparable salary, would receive only a 5-percent increase under the bill before us.

There are presently 32,546 rural carriers. They serve more than 9 million families, embracing 33 million or more individuals throughout the country. They, too, are concerned in this matter.

Each Member of the Senate has received a copy of a telegram sent by Mr. Warren B. Bledsoe, president of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association. It is dated May 24—today—and is very important.

I read the telegram, as follows:

This is to clarify and reaffirm the position of this Association on Postal Pay Legislation. We supported a 10-percent salary increase both in the House and Senate hearings. It soon became apparent, however, that this goal had to be compromised if postal employees were to receive a needed pay raise. Thus, on April 4, we directed a letter to all Members of the House supporting a compromise agreement within the framework of S. 1489 and H. R. 4644, which would have provided an average increase approximating 8 percent. It has been stated that representatives of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association informed Members of the House that they were entirely satisfied with H. R. 4644 as reported. This is in error. We were not satisfied with the inequitable salary treatment in H. R. 4644 and strongly supported the salary schedule of S. 1489 which would have corrected the inequity. The amendments adopted by the House and conference committee further distorted the inequitable relationship already existing in the bill between the rural schedule and the clerk-carrier schedules.

We have not in the past nor will we in the future support legislation which accords rural carriers inequitable salary treatment when compared with the treatment accorded other postal employees with whom we have historically and with full justification received comparable salaries. We will continue to support legislation which accords fair and honorable salary treatment to rural carriers and all postal employees. In view of the unjustified and unwarranted salary discriminations in the pending legislation and in consideration of the practically unworkable hodgepodge of salary levels it would automatically create for almost 20,000 rural carriers by pushing them through the salary schedule set forth in S. 1, the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association cannot support its enactment into law.

WARREN B. BLEDSOE.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the very bill that House Members were told the President would approve contained the provisions which the Senator from Kansas now criticizes?

Mr. CARLSON. I am not familiar with that situation. However, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that, as no doubt he will remember, in conference we would have corrected certain inequities had the language of the House and Senate versions of the bill been sufficiently diverse as to permit correction. There was no question between us in conference as to the desirability of such correction, but, because of the circumstances, the conferees could not make it.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator feel that the President should have vetoed the bill merely because of an inequity which could have been corrected by a subsequent bill?

Mr. CARLSON. The President had no other bill before him, and he had to base his judgment on the bill which had been passed and sent to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The inequities which have been mentioned were in the bill when we voted on it 2 or 3 weeks ago. The president of the Rural Carriers' Association must have known about it. Why did he wait to express his views until today, when we are about to vote on a veto?

Mr. CARLSON. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I was advised personally that they were not satisfied with the bill. I do not know whether the Senator from Kentucky was so advised.

Mr. BARKLEY. Personal advice to the Senator from Kansas is not official advice to the Senate, which comes to us today.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state very emphatically that my bill—Senate bill 1489—did correct the inequities, and I so stated to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks editorials regarding postal pay legislation, and some information regarding the operations of the Rural Carriers' Association.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 21, 1955]

A POSTAL PAY COMPROMISE

President Eisenhower has rightly based his veto of the S. 1 postal pay bill primarily on the deep disturbance it would cause in the complicated relationships between salaries and job requirements.

It would, he said, create new discriminations or inequities, which would affect many thousands of postal employees. It would add administrative difficulties beyond measure. This would be particularly obnoxious in view of the Department's thoroughgoing proposed reclassification of positions and salaries, designed to do away with present inequities, which was embodied in the original administration bill. S. 1 would throw that whole structure, as well as the present one, badly out of line.

The President has wisely suggested a compromise measure which would do no such violence to sound administration and yet would give postal employees a larger increase than the original bill allowed. This is H. R. 4644, which combines the essential elements of the proposed reclassification with a 7.6 percent average increase. For example, it would raise the basic salary of clerks and city letter carriers to a range of $3,590 to $4,280 a year—a 104- to 100-percent increase over 1939, compared with an 88-percent increase in the cost of living.

The Senate should promptly sustain the President's veto and both Houses should then pass the compromise measure which the President has in effect pledged himself to sign. That the House committee has already approved H. R. 4644 by a substantial bipartisan majority is evidence that its provisions can command influential support on both sides of the aisle.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1955]

A COURAGEOUS VETO

President Eisenhower is right in vetoing the postal pay raise bill. As might be expected, he has aroused a lot of furious protest from civil-service groups, organized labor, and anti-Eisenhower Democrats. But the President refused to sign the same type of bill last year, and he still disapproves for exactly the same reasons. The legislation is unfair and overly expensive.

Since the Senate Democrats, or at least some of them, are going to try next week to override the veto, Mr. Eisenhower has painstakingly explained his grounds for opposition. He is all in favor of a general pay increase, but not one that discriminates against large groups of postal employees (from rural letter carriers to supervisors and postmasters) and fails to heed the necessity for a reclassification system.

The President admits that there can be honest differences of opinion as to what constitutes a suitable raise in pay. He himself proposed 5 percent last January. Together with reclassification to assure equal pay for equal work and extra compensation for the upper rungs, the total increase came to 6½ percent. But, as the veto message emphasizes, "any pay legislation must be fair to all to whom it applies," and it must be administratively sound, and, of course, not an affront to the taxpayer.

The bill which the President vetoed is none of these things. It is inequitable, unworkable from the point of job-classification reform, and horribly costly. Instead of the Eisenhower 6½ percent, Congress voted 8.8-percent increases that contained blessed little to make any management expert happy. This was more than Mr. Eisenhower could endure.

The Presidential veto was an act of courage. There are close to 500,000 postal workers, and they and their kinfolk can exert plenty of pressure. But President Eisenhower, as the delegate of 165,000,000 Americans, saw his duty and did it. The Senate should sustain the veto.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1955]

FOR A POSTAL PAY RAISE

President Eisenhower's reluctant veto of the postal pay bill throws back on Congress the responsibility for writing a bill he can conscientiously approve. His arguments against the bill are unassailable—yet the fact remains that the postal employees ought to have a raise and have it soon. The administration rightly wants to couple the raise with an increase in the postal rates. But the President, knowing that a postal-rate increase this year is unlikely, would not insist on the rate feature if Congress would pass a pay bill without the discriminatory provisions of the vetoed measure.

Congress is overwhelmingly in sympathy with the request of postal employees for a pay raise. But it allowed partisanship to get the upper hand in the measure it recently approved. As the President said, the measure would create new discriminations and inequities, create grave administrative problems, and impose a heavier burden than necessary on the taxpayer. The vetoed bill would have provided an 8.8-percent overall increase while the administration recommended a somewhat smaller amount. But the size of the increase was not the critical factor in the President's decision. It ought not to be in the next measure, either, for the administration proposal of a 6½-percent raise may not be adequate.

Surely Congress ought to be able to write a bill without the objectionable features. It should begin work on this at once in the interest (to borrow the President's words) of a more speedy, certain, economical, and efficient handling of the mail. This purpose can be achieved only with dedicated and satisfied employees.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 20, 1955]

IKE'S COURAGEOUS VETO

The President has shown political courage in vetoing the bill to raise the pay of postal workers. Nobody, least of all the President, denies that a raise is needed. But this bill was certainly not the answer.

Perhaps its worst feature was that it retained and in fact widened the inequities in pay for different kinds of postal work. Clerks made out much better, relatively, than supervisors and technical people. City letter carriers got more of a raise than rural ones. In all, it went against what the President has described as "the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work."

The bill would have raised pay an average of 8.8 percent. The President—who has to keep in mind that what postal workers get other Government workers will want—has said he will go for a raise of up to 7.6 percent.

Congress ought now to write a bill that will both match the President's figure and give the kind of job incentive that is basic to running any business, and especially the big business that is the Postal Department.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 20, 1955]

EQUAL PAY, EQUAL WORK

Hardly anyone would deny that our postal employees deserve a pay raise. The squabble is over two points: How much the raise should be, and whether postal job classifications should be changed at the same time in order to distribute pay boosts fairly.

President Eisenhower has vetoed the postal pay bill. Within the next few days the Senate, and perhaps the House as well, will vote on whether to override.

The President had no choice but to say "No," in our opinion, and has clearly explained why.

He recommended a postal pay raise months ago. He still stands willing to O. K. a reasonable one which does not discriminate against certain categories of postal workers.

As he said when he vetoed it, "equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work."

That policy is common in private enterprise. It should be common in Government, too. It is ridiculous to expect men of administrative ability to carry supervisory responsibility—or even to seek it—if boss pay is little more than that of the men supervised.

Yet that narrow differential seems to be the goal of the postal employee unions which represent the rank and file and seem to have influence on Capitol Hill far out of proportion to their numbers.

Their attitude is understandable, for union leaders hold power only by "taking care" of their members.

But the Post Office Department belongs to all the people, who pay for it, directly by postage and indirectly by taxes.

Congress should cooperate with the President by passing the kind of pay and reclassification bill he has requested.

And it should also raise postage rates to pay for it.

[From the Evening Star of May 21, 1955]

POLITICS AND PAY

The sooner Congress stops playing politics with postal pay legislation, the sooner postal and other Federal employees will get the salary increases they should have had long ago. Similar political shenanigans last session killed the pay raise. Then, as now, warnings of a presidential veto were ignored. There was no time to try overriding a veto last year. An effort to override the latest veto will be made, of course, but indications point to failure. In the end, Congress undoubtedly will have to pass pay legislation that will be acceptable to the administration.

Chairman JOHNSTON, of the Senate Civil Service Committee, in a statement accusing the President of shameful treatment of postal workers, has attempted to lay the blame for denial of a postal pay raise on the President. But President Eisenhower has not denied postal workers a fair and equitable raise. Senator JOHNSTON himself said that the individual increase voted by Congress would amount only to the cost of "a bottle of milk or so" above the sum approved by the administration. The real hardship comes from the long denial, because of politicking, of any pay increase. And those who have been trying to make political capital out of the pay-raise issue are the ones who should be blamed for doing a disservice to postal and classified employees.

THE RURAL FREE DELIVERY

There are 32,546 rural letter carriers who serve 9,372,621 families (as of June 30, 1953 (latest data available)) and 33,878,226 individuals (as of June 30, 1953).

The average daily time required to serve routes is 37 hours, 48 minutes per week, or almost 38 hours per week.

They work a 6-day week.

Principal base pay for a rural carrier is based on fixed compensation plus an annual rate per mile for each mile up to 30. Thus, a 30-mile route carrier in top pay grade earns an annual salary as follows: Fixed compensation, $1,610; 30 times rate per mile up to 30 of $74 in top pay grade, $2,220; or total annual salary of $3,830.

For each mile over 30 rural carriers are paid an additional $20 per mile per annum. (This pay of $20 per annum for miles over 30 has been standard for many years.)

Analysis of what this means in time required to render service is computed as follows: For that $20 per year for each mile of rural route over 30, the rural carrier travels an aggregate of roughly 280 miles per year (making deductions for Sundays, holidays, and annual leave). This means that for $20 compensation the carrier drives at least 280 miles. Official standards substantiate the fact that it requires approximately 1 hour to drive each 25 miles of rural route. This average time takes into consideration road and weather conditions. Thus, if you break the $20 per mile per annum rate down into hours, you find that for providing service on this mile, the carrier is being compensated at approximately $1.85 to $1.90 per hour. This would be the approximate hourly rate merely for the travel involved and does not take into consideration the factors of providing the service of a complete postal facility to whatever number of patrons reside or conduct business along that mile.

The rural carrier is a post office on wheels—delivers mail, sells stamps and money orders, accepts registered and c. o. d. mail—and, in fact, performs almost every service to the rural patron which can be secured at any post office.

All of this service, the responsibilities involved, the tremendous problems with roads and weather, plus his 6-day workweek, certainly highlights that he is not being overpaid and rightly deserves equitable salary treatment for work performed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Kansas signed the conference report, knowing about the inequities; did he not?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. I did sign the conference report. I did not know how else we could complete legislative action, although I knew the inequities were in the bill, and I so stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it is perfectly clear that when the Senate voted upon the conference report on S. 1, it is presumed that every Member of the body knew what he was doing. I respectfully suggest that it would be well if the Members of the Senate would try to adhere to that presumption. Having known what we were doing, having had all the facts before us, after a careful consideration of the bill in committee, on the floor of the Senate, then in the conference committee, and, finally in connection with the final vote, it is difficult to understand why any Senator should now admit that they were unaware of any so-called difficulties or limitations in the legislative proposal upon which the Senate acted.

I voted upon the conference report in good faith. I voted on S. 1, as it passed the Senate, in good faith. I think the point has been well made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that

the House bill which the Post Office Department was willing to accept, and which, apparently the President of the United States was willing to sign, included all the so-called difficult administrative problems which now seem to be so bad and so obvious in the President's veto message. The difference between the House bill, in the main, and the conference report which was adopted and which the President has vetoed is a difference of 13 cents for each postal worker, if I am not mistaken. A difference of one pint of milk a day for a member of a postal worker's family.

I must say, Mr. President, that this administration is literally stretching a point and making a mountain out of a molehill when it says that on the basis of administrative principle it must veto this very important and long-overdue measure.

I am somewhat impressed by the President's message. I wish he had spent as much time on the tax bill, which he signed, as he did on the postal pay bill. He has found grave administrative difficulties in this measure, but he did not find a billion-dollar loophole in the tax bill when he signed it. He could not get the pen out fast enough to sign that special interest tax bill, but we now find the Secretary of the Treasury coming to the Congress and admitting that his Department could not see a billion-dollar loophole in the tax bill. Oh, my. But the administration can see a $179 million pay bill. Apparently they have gotten new glasses and a new insight into fiscal responsibility. Practically every competent tax attorney and accountant in America pointed out that the tax bill would offer grave administrative problems to the Treasury, but that did not impede the President in signing the tax bill. Oh, no. He signed a bill which provided millions of dollars of relief for those who needed it the least.

Not long ago the Democrats were accused of being financially irresponsible because they wanted to offer a modicum of tax relief to the average citizen. Because we wanted to help balance the budget we were accused of being financially irresponsible, but when the administration wanted stock dividend credits for a handful of people, that, in Republican parlance, was economic responsibility.

Let us see how much irresponsibility is in the President's veto message.

First, the postal workers have waited 4 long years for an increase in pay.

Second, we passed a bill half a year ago providing for a 5-percent pay increase, and the President vetoed it.

How does it happen that the President could veto a 5-percent bill in the summer of 1954, and now indicate that he is willing to sign a 7.6-percent pay bill in the summer of 1955? I am not impressed by this phony argument of principle and administrative responsibility.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Does not the Senator realize that we are nearer the time when Mr. Eisenhower is going to run to succeed himself than we were when he vetoed the 5-percent pay increase?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do realize that; and I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that his political insight is exceeded only by the logic of his argument.

I watched the administration play percentage points in connection with commodity prices. From a figure of 75 percent they finally got around to 82½ percent.

If the Members of Congress really believe the postal workers are entitled to an increase of pay, let them stand up like men and give it to them.

Where was the protest coming from, for example, in connection with the extra interest rates on the 30-year bond issue which went to large-scale investors? Let the President of the United States explain that situation, when he wants fiscal responsibility and when he says the burden upon the taxpayer is too heavy.

The great President of the United States, through his Secretary of the Treasury, authorized 1-year certificates the interest on which cost the Treasury of the United States an additional $42 million.

On another issue of short-term certificates the additional interest amounted to $30 million. On short-term 10-month certificates, the additional interest amounted to $1,250,000.

This grand, humanitarian, dynamic, progressive administration increased the interest rate on GI loans by 13 percent, costing veterans $269,939.

On commodity-credit price-support loans, there is an annual increase of interest amounting to $14 million which the farmers, who are already hard pressed, must pay.

How about farm disaster loans? Talk about fiscal responsibility and concern for the taxpayers. On emergency disaster loans, the administration tried to sneak through—and I repeat the words "sneak through"—an increase in interest rates from 3 to 5 percent, which would cost the farmers of the United States $1,440,000.

I would be more impressed by the argument about the burden upon the people, Mr. President, if this administration were really concerned about the burden upon the people. Where was their concern for the people when the Dixon-Yates contract was negotiated?

Of all the colossal, massive giveaways of public funds and public interest, the Dixon-Yates contract was the greatest.

Mr. President, I will tell you what is wrong with the bill. What is wrong with the bill is that it was sponsored by and was reported from a committee which was under the general management and chairmanship of a distinguished Member of the Senate who for many years has served the interests of the civil service and postal workers.

The administration is going to have its own bill, not as a matter of principle, because it is going to cut the rates just a little bit. It has a bargain-counter sale coming on for the postal workers. It is going to cut the amount of the increase from 8.8 percent to 7.6 percent. This is not a matter of principle; it is simply a matter of cutting a little closer to the bone, a little deeper; that is all. I wish the administration were half as much concerned about other aspects of the Treasury as it seems to be about this bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator from Minnesota mind a slight correction? It is not a reduction from 8.8 percent to 7.6 percent; it is a reduction from 8.8 percent to 8 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the modification. I have difficulty in keeping up with the administration's manipulations of percentage points.

I suggest that the administration take one good look at the measure and see what is so wrong with it, except for the fact that the administration does not want to pay people on the job what they are worth. I read in the press and I heard in messages that money was worth its hire. That is why interest rates went up, I may say to my distinguished colleagues.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the President's chief official, the pride and joy of the administration—not HUBERT HUMPHREY, but George Humphrey, "Trickle-Down" Humphrey, the pride and joy of the administration—said that money was worth its hire. I agree. So are the postal workers.

It is about time we set a good standard in the Senate for all good men to rally around. There is not one thing wrong with the bill that could not have been corrected long ago. We do not need to get the "death bed" political religion which some people are now getting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have said enough, Mr. President. I am certain that what I have said will at least vindicate the record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

THE POSTAL WORKERS PAY A MEASURING STICK FOR MONEY—BILLIONS FOR FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, my remarks which appear on page 3657 of the RECORD of March 24, 1955, and also an excerpt from the Union Postal Clerk magazine, appearing on page 29 of the May 1955 issue.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1955]

POSTAL PAY RAISE LONG OVERDUE—EQUAL INFLATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed pay raise for the carriers, clerks, postal transport, and motor vehicle employees is long overdue. The ultimate effect of the deliberate inflation over two decades has finally caught up with the Congress. The chickens have come home to roost, as a result of unbalanced budgets and cheapening money.

TWO WAYS TO REDUCE WAGES

There are two ways to reduce wages. One long recognized way was simply to reduce the pay. The more subtle method, which

has become customary over two decades, is to cheapen the value of money, resulting in higher prices.

The subtle method of inflation has cast less immediate blame on Congress and has always put the postal workers behind, and they never catch up. The increase proposed by the pending legislation is long overdue.

ANALYSIS OF HOUSE BILL 4644

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing an analysis of House bill 4644.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Analysis of H. R. 4644

Classification	Proposed level	Number of employees	Present salary	Proposed salary	Ultimate dollar increase	Ultimate percentage increase	Immediate dollar increase	Immediate percentage increase	Years to reach top grade	Amount of yearly step increases
1. Janitor	1	3,202	$2,870- $3,270	$2,870- $3,470	$200	6.1	$200	6.1		
2. Elevator operator	2	1,166	2,970- 3,370	3,080- 3,710	340	10.0	235	6.9	1	$105
3. Order filler	2	212	2,950- 3,430	3,080- 3,710	280	8.1	280	8.1		
4. Clerks, 3d-class post office	2	19,651	2,770- 3,070	3,080- 3,710	640	20.8	220	6.4	4	105
5. Guard	3	650	3,170- 3,570	3,330- 3,990	420	11.7	310	8.6	1	110
6. File clerk	3	1,250	3,270- 4,070	3,330- 3,990	−80	−10.9				
7. Typist	3	125	3,270- 4,070	3,330- 3,990	−80	−10.9				
8. Mail handler	3	25,712	3,170- 3,470	3,330- 3,990	520	15.0	300	8.6	2	110
9. Garageman	3	624	3,170- 3,470	3,330- 3,990	520	15.0	300	8.6	2	110
10. Special-delivery messengers	4	4,533	3,170- 3,770	3,590- 4,280	510	13.5	280	7.3	2	115
11. Motor-vehicle operator	5	4,160	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
12. City carriers	5	121,731	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
13. Distribution clerk	5	113,890	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
14. Window clerks	5	64,750	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
15. Automotive mechanics	6	1,192	3,270- 4,070	3,880- 4,630	560	13.7	310	7.8	2	125
16. Transfer clerk	6	1,459	3,470- 4,270	3,880- 4,630	360	8.4	360	8.4		
17. Distribution clerk, railway post office	6	17,107	3,470- 4,270	3,880- 4,630	360	8.4	360	8.4		
18. Claims clerk, post office	6	54	3,270- 4,070	3,880- 4,630	560	13.7	260	6.3	5	125
19. Postmaster, small 3d-class office	6	162	2,883- 3,645	3,880- 4,630	985	27.7	235	6.3	6	125
20. Claims clerk	7	105	3,470- 4,070	4,190- 5,030	960	23.5	260	6.3	5	140
21. Postmaster, 3d-class post office	7	8,005	2,883- 4,298	4,190- 5,030	732	16.9	452	10.5	2	140
22. Foreman, mails	8	564	4,787- 4,896	4,530- 5,460	564	11.5	409	8.3	1	155
23. Postmaster, 3d-class post office	8	1,162	3,781- 4,298	4,530- 5,460	1,162	27.0	387	9.0	5	155
24. General foreman, railway post office	9	640	5,114- 5,270	4,890- 5,910	640	12.1	470	8.9	1	170
25. Assistant postmaster, 1st class	9	940	4,896- 4,970	4,890- 5,910	940	18.1	430	8.4	3	170
26. Postmaster, 2d-class post office	9	840	4,770- 5,070	4,890- 5,910	840	16.5	330	6.5	3	170
27. General foreman, mails	10	1,020	5,005- 5,370	5,280- 6,390	1,020	18.9	465	8.6	3	185
28. Postmaster, small 1st-class post office	10	2,639	5,370- 5,570	5,280- 6,390	820	14.7	450	8.0	2	185
29. Building superintendent	11	7	5,970- 6,270	5,800- 7,000	730	11.6	530	8.4	1	200
30. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	11	1,663	5,670- 6,170	5,800- 7,000	830	13.4	430	6.9	2	200
31. Tour superintendent	12	175	5,270- 5,670	6,380- 7,700	2,030	35.8	710	12.5	6	220
32. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	12	865	6,370- 7,070	6,380- 7,700	630	8.9	630	8.9		
33. Postal inspector	13	385	5,970- 6,770	7,020- 8,460	1,690	24.9	490	7.2	6	240
34. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	13	122	6,570- 7,370	7,020- 8,460	1,090	14.7	610	8.2	2	240
35. Station superintendent	14	15	6,470	7,730- 9,290	2,820	43.5	1,260	19.4	6	260
36. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	14	54	6,070	7,730- 9,290	3,220	53.0	1,660	27.3	6	260
37. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	14	120	7,370- 7,770	7,730- 9,290	1,520	19.5	480	6.18	4	260
38. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	15	44	6,270- 6,870	8,500- 10,180	3,310	48.1	1,630	26.0	6	280
39. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	15	54	7,770- 8,770	8,500- 10,180	1,410	16.0	570	6.5	3	280
40. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	16	15	7,070	9,350- 11,150	4,080	57.7	2,280	32.2	6	300
41. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	16	34	8,770- 9,770	9,350- 11,150	1,380	14.1	780	7.9	2	300
42. General superintendent, PTS Division	17	9	8,470	10,300- 12,220	3,750	44.3	1,830	21.6	6	320
43. Assistant postmaster	17	10	7,970- 8,470	10,300- 12,220	3,750	44.3	1,830	21.6	6	320
44. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	17	10	10,770	10,300- 12,220	1,450	13.5	810	7.5	2	320
45. General superintendent, PTS Division	18	3	8,470	11,400- 13,440	4,970	58.7	2,930	34.6	6	340
46. Assistant postmaster, largest 1st-class post office	18	2	8,470	11,400- 13,440	4,970	58.7	2,930	34.6	6	340
47. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	18	15	11,770	11,400- 13,440	1,670	14.2	990	8.5	2	340
48. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	19	10	12,770- 13,770	12,500- 14,660	890	6.5	890	6.03		
49. Postmaster, largest 1st-class post office	20	2	13,770	13,600- 14,800	1,030	7.5	1,030	7.5		
50. Regional director	21	15	12,000- 12,800	14,800	2,000	15.6	2,000	15.6		

BREAKDOWN ON POSTAL PAY

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table which breaks down the 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and the motor vehicle employees.

Of 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and motor vehicle employees in level 5, 213,121 would receive increases of less than $300 under House bill 4644; 180,086 employees would receive increases of less than 7 percent.

The table shows the number of employees in each of the present pay grades in the classifications enumerated in this paragraph, the actual dollar amount they would receive, and the percentage pay increase they would receive under House bill 4644.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Present grade	Number of employees	Dollar increase	Percent increase
1	1,492	$370	11.3
2	2,684	270	8.0
3	12,683	290	8.3
4	7,121	310	8.68
5	12,828	330	8.9
6	23,906	230	6.1
7	20,583	250	6.4
8	13,715	270	6.8
9	17,668	290	7.1
9A	39,517	290	6.9
9B	30,723	290	6.7
9C	51,642	290	6.6

RAISE OVERDUE AND SHOULD PASS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed 10 percent increase for postal workers at this time is little enough. The bill should pass.

[From the Postal Union Clerk for May 1955]

TEN PERCENT LITTLE ENOUGH, SAYS SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE, OF NEVADA

Vigorous support of the bills increasing pay of postal and Federal employees by 10 percent was given by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE prior to the Senate's passage of both bills on March 25.

The pay increase, Senator MALONE said, is long overdue. For two decades, he declared, wages of the employees have been reduced due to inflation, which has resulted in higher prices, and they have never been able to catch up.

In a statement on the Senate floor on Thursday, March 24, after the postal pay measure was called up by the majority leader, Senator MALONE vigorously endorsed the bill S. 1 and said:

"Mr. President, the proposed pay raise for the carriers, clerks, postal transport, and motor vehicle employees is long overdue. The ultimate effect of the deliberate inflation over two decades has finally caught up with the Congress. The chickens have come home to roost, as a result of unbalanced budgets and cheapening money."

TWO WAYS TO REDUCE WAGES

"There are two ways to reduce wages. One long recognized way was simply to reduce the pay. The more subtle method, which has become customary over two decades, is to cheapen the value of money resulting in higher prices.

"The subtle method of inflation has cast less immediate blame on Congress and has always put the postal workers behind, and they never catch up. The increase proposed by the pending legislation is long overdue."

BREAKDOWN ON POSTAL PAY

"Of 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and motor vehicle employees in level 5, 213,121 would receive increases of less than $300 under House bill 4644; 180,086 employees would receive increases of less than 7 percent."

RAISE OVERDUE AND SHOULD PASS

"Mr. President, the proposed 10 percent increase for postal workers at this time is little enough. The bill should pass."

In a further statement to the legislative director of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks after the bill passed the Senate, Senator MALONE amplified his views by calling attention to the fact that even the increase provided in the bill S. 1 would not restore the 1939 purchasing power of postal wages. He again placed the blame for present conditions on the cheapening of the American dollar due to inflation, and said that without such inflation postal employees would neither need nor seek an increase.

WILL VOTE TO OVERRIDE VETO

Senator MALONE further stated that he was prepared to vote to override a veto and had already given notice of that intention.

CONGRESS LOWERED WAGES FOR 22 YEARS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for 22 years Congress has deliberately lowered wages through inflation, on the theory, I suppose that the money supply can be doubled without affecting its purchasing power.

The real purchasing power of the dollar, on the 1934 basis, is about one-third. Reducing the purchasing power of the dollar after the wages are fixed is dishonest. How long would a merchant last with his shelves loaded with goods paid for on a basis of 3 feet to the yard if Congress passed a bill providing that he must sell the goods on the basis of 4 feet to the yard. It is time that Congress woke up and reestablished as a measuring stick for money the gold standard.

BILLIONS TO FOREIGN NATIONS

It is time we stopped distributing billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money throughout the world without a quid pro quo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to announce that the time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for another 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

PROTECT WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. It is time that we protected the higher living standard of our workingmen and investors in accordance with article I, second 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

COMMON HORSESENSE

We need to use some of the common horsesense we used to be taught in grade school. But ordinary common horsesense is probably the scarcest commodity in the Capital City of the Nation today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] if he is ready to proceed at this time?

Mr. NEELY. I shall speak a little later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, when the conference report on Senate bill 1 was before the Senate, I ventured to say that I thought it was the kind of bill which the President of the United States could approve. I said that as sincerely and as honestly as I could have made any statement.

As I look back today and read again all the utterances which were made by representatives of the administration in the Senate and the House of Representatives, and also in the administrative departments of the Government, I am not at all surprised by the veto of the bill. More than anything else, in connection with the bill and the veto, we have become involved in false pride. Too many prophesied that the bill would be vetoed by the President. The minority leader on the floor of the House, the minority leader on the floor of the Senate—and I say this with all due deference to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—and the Postmaster General of the United States—all of them—said that the President would not sign the bill; that he would veto it.

It has been said that the President gave a thorough study to S. 1. I do not wish to say anything unkind about the President of the United States; I have too much respect for the dignity and the prestige of his high office. But I doubt that any serious study, consideration, and attention were given to the bill at the White House, because if it had so happened, I am afraid that the President would not have used the reasons which he assigned in his veto message in justifying his action.

The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]—and I wish to say that there is no finer or fairer Member of the Senate than the distinguished Senator from Kansas—has made quite a distinction with reference to the question of rural letter carriers.

Let us consider exactly what has happened. What had been proposed in the administration bill, so far as rural letter carriers were concerned, was that in the first step the increase would be $281. Under S. 1, the first step, the increase is $281.

In the second step the difference would be nothing, for the reason that the increase under the administration bill was $297, and the increase under S. 1 is $297.

We come to the third step. The increase under the administration bill was $313. The increase under S. 1 is $313.

In steps 4, 5, 6, and 7 under Senate bill 1 the rural carriers would receive $100 a year more than they would under the administration bill.

But the important point is that the provisions contained in S. 1 pertaining to rural letter carriers are precisely the same provisions which were in the bill the President had said he could approve.

We come next to the special delivery messengers. We did not touch them at all in conference. As a matter of fact, with respect to special delivery messengers we adopted the very conditions which were contained in the administration bill. That is the second big point made in the veto message.

The administration talks about the burden upon the taxpayers. With complete deference, I may say that I would not be surprised if we witnessed today the biggest flipflop of this session. There is no question at all in my mind that the veto will be sustained because we have already heard from 2 or 3 Members on the other side of the aisle who voted not only for S. 1, which was passed by a vote of 72 to 21 in the Senate, but also voted for the adoption of the conference report which was agreed to by a vote of 66 to 11, but who today have said in the Senate, "I am compelled to vote to sustain the veto because there are inequities in the bill."

If they should be asked what the inequities were, they would politely say that they were speaking on limited time and could not answer the question.

I know we are not going to change the mind of any Senator at this late hour. We will not save any souls on the floor of the Senate. But this is really significant: We are told today that the President will approve a bill which will amount to an 8 percent increase. This is how picayune we are getting: The difference between the bill which he would sign and the bill which he has vetoed amounts to approximately $8 million.

I will admit that the President did not let BILL KNOWLAND down; he did not let JOE MARTIN down; he did not let Mr. Summerfield down. He made their prophecies stand good. They said on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that the President would never sign the bill, and he did not let them down. They took note of the fact that what they said was true, and they carried out their charge. There was no question about that. But who was let down, Mr. President? The 500,000 small postal workers of the United States of America. And who are they? Are they traveling around in Cadillacs? Do they have unlimited money to spend and funds to send their children to the best colleges? Oh, no.

What is the difference we are talking about? Only 76 cents a week. When one considers that this is the biggest giveaway administration in the history of the United States, how careful we are becoming in the month of May.

It will make no difference how long I talk on this question, Mr. President. I think the result is already pretty well foregone. It might well be, and the chances are, that representatives of the administration wanted a Republican bill. I do not say that is the fact; I do not know; but for the life of me I cannot understand what justification there was for the vetoing of a bill which provided for an 8.6-percent increase and, at the same time, saying, "If you send me a bill that will provide for only an 8-percent increase, I will approve it." How ridiculous can we get?

Mr. President, I do not know the real background of everything that led up to the veto, but the bill which came from the administration provided for a flat 5-percent increase, plus 1.5 by reason of its position classification features, and it would have cost $129 million.

The House passed a bill providing for a 6-percent increase, plus classification amounting to another 2.2 percent which would have cost $164 million.

No conferees from the Senate could ever be fairer and more understanding than were the conferees who were appointed to carry out the mandate of the Senate on S. 1.

We went as far as we could go and still protect and defend the prestige of this august body. We came from the conference committee with a bill which would have cost the people of the United States $173 million. The difference between the cost of a bill which the President said he would accept and the one which the Congress passed is so small that it shocks me to think that it could have been vetoed.

Mr. President, perhaps Congress will pass another postal pay bill. Maybe it will be a bill which the President of the United States will approve. The picture now is so confused that I really do not know what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. We still have to take the

administration's word for it. But, come what may, one thing I do know, Mr. President, is that while the statements and the utterances and the admonitions of many persons representing the administration may be upheld we did let down the 500,000 postal workers.

I hope that, regardless of what happens, the Senate will finally pass a bill which will give some relief to these faithful workers of the United States of America.

I know the Senate will not override the veto today, Mr. President. I say that as sincerely and as honestly as I can, but honestly and sincerely as I say that I also say I do not think any man can rise and in good conscience gloat over that fact.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not so egotistical as to think that anything I may say will change or will affect a single vote. Nevertheless, I wish to submit my views on the pending questions; and I hope my presentation will be quite brief.

Mr. President, the bill does not now contain a single sentence or a single paragraph which was not in it when the Senate passed it before. The bill does not now contain a single defect or a single inequity which was not in it when it was passed. The bill was first passed by the Senate by a vote of 72 in favor of its passage to a very small number of votes in opposition. On the second occasion, when the question was on agreeing to the conference report, the vote in the Senate was 66 to 11 in favor of agreeing to the report. Every shortcoming now in the bill was in it on both those occasions, and we are bound to assume that Senators knew they were in it when they voted for it. Otherwise, that would be a serious reflection on the intelligence of the Senators who voted for the bill. I am not willing to make such a reflection on the intellectual capacity of Senators of the United States.

I am told that the difference between the overall cost of this bill and one the President would sign is approximately $8 million a year, and that in some individual cases it amounts to 90 cents a week. Yet the President has vetoed the bill because of inequities which we knew were in it—if any were in it, which I deny—and any Senator who voted for the bill in the first instance, and who later voted in favor of agreeing to the conference report, when it was before this body, and who now will vote to sustain the President's veto, was either wrong then or he will be wrong now; he cannot be right both times.

So, Mr. President, approximately $8 million is involved, as I understand, as the difference between the bill we have passed and a bill which we are told the President would approve. I ask the chairman of the committee whether my understanding of that matter is correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President; that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this situation reminds me of an occasion when I was in the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee reported a bill appropriating $14,927,868.92. One Member of the House rose and said, "Mr. Speaker, I can understand the big figures, but I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain the 92 cents in the bill." [Laughter.] It took an hour to explain the reason for the inclusion of the 92 cents.

I am also reminded very much of an old saying which I once heard from an orator who was a great expert in playing on words. In order to reduce something from the sublime to the ridiculous, he said, "The lightnings flashed, the thunders roared—and killed a chigger." [Laughter.] Mr. President, that seems to be what has happened here.

A few weeks ago we voted overwhelmingly to increase our own salaries, not by 8.8 percent, but by 50 percent. The President recommended that that be done, and he signed the bill. I realize that the overall amount of the increase involved in that bill was not so great as the overall amount of the increase involved in this one. In that case, only 96 Senators and 435 Members of the House of Representatives were involved, whereas the bill before us involves 535,000 postal employees. However, individually, as Members of the Senate or Members of the House of Representatives, the Members of Congress have no more claim to a 50-percent increase in pay than the postal employees have to an 8.8-percent pay increase.

At about the same time we voted for a 10-percent increase in the pay of all other Government employees, including our own office staffs. The House of Representatives has not yet acted on that bill, and I do not know what the House will do regarding it. But there has been no great protest against the bill, either on the part of the President or on the part of anyone else in the administration.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me especially peculiar that so great an assault is made against a bill providing so modest a pay increase for the postal employees of the Nation, who on the darkest nights and in the roughest weather must go forth and deliver to us the mail—the messages which come to us, either for business or for pleasure, from our friends and our kinfolk. These are the employees whose proposed pay increase is now inveighed against.

Mr. President, I shall vote that the bill be passed, notwithstanding the President's veto of it. I am sorry that it seems that the Senate will not be able to pass the bill over the veto. But if we cannot, we cannot.

However, Mr. President, those of us who voted for the bill in the beginning because we thought we were right then, stand by our guns now, because we still think we were right then; and we can only do our duty, no matter what it is.

Mr. President, I shall take great pleasure in voting to override the President's veto, because I think it is unjust, unfair, and based on petty considerations which should not enter into the consideration of a great bill of this sort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains to this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 22 minutes remaining under his control, and the other side has 49 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me an additional one-half minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, merely to emphasize what I said a moment ago about the pay increases which have been provided for other groups, I now wish to call attention to the fact that Congress has voted to increase by 12½ percent the pay of the military, and the President has signed that measure. It seems that only the postal employees are the forgotten men and women of this Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the minority leader will be able to yield some time at this point. Only 22 minutes remain to this side.

While I am waiting for the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that I may now suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of course there is no question about the fact that

under Article I, section 7, of the Constitution, the President of the United States has the constitutional power and right to veto the pending piece of legislation. Yet I respectfully suggest today that what we ought to do is to review the constitutional origin of Article I, section 7, of the Constitution. If we do, we shall find that it was not the intention of the constitutional fathers that the President of the United States should set himself up as a superlegislature. The veto check was placed in the Constitution in order to provide an executive check in protecting the interests of the American people against violations of our constitutional system by the legislative branch of the Government. It was not intended that the President's legislative will should be imposed upon the legislative branch of the Government except when a clear violation of our constitutional system was involved or a clear infringement of sound public policy was involved.

Although throughout the history of our country Presidents have expressed their subjective legislative views by throwing vetoes at the Congress, nevertheless, I respectfully submit today that the primary purpose of the veto check in the Constitution of the United States is to see to it, through the executive, that we, as legislators, do not do violence to our representative system of government.

What have we in this case? We certainly do not have a bill which does violence to our representative system or to sound legislative policy. On the contrary, we have a bill which was worked out very carefully by committees in both Houses of the legislative branch, a bill which represents reasonable compromises in the legislative processes to the end that we brought forth in the House and in the Senate a bill which could be properly described as a nonpartisan piece of legislation.

To prove that statement we have only to look at the votes by which the bill passed in both Houses of Congress. Republicans and Democrats alike, by a large majority, voted for the bill. It is a fair bill. It is an equitable bill. In my judgment it is a good bill. But let us be frank. Republicans and Democrats alike thought it was a fair and good bill. It was passed by a vote which, if Members held to the same opinion still, would clearly make it possible for us to override the veto by a substantial margin.

But the Republican partisan whip has been cracked on the Republicans. A subject which should be nonpartisan has now become highly partisan in the thinking of many Members of Congress. I think that is to be regretted.

Who suffers? In this instance a group of postal workers. But let me say to Government workers in general, "You may be next. It is the postal workers this time, but you may be next."

In my judgment we should not sit idly by in the Congress of the United States and allow the President to function as a super legislature. In this instance the Congress has not infringed or impinged in the slightest degree whatsoever upon our system of representative government. We have passed a good bill.

What has happened is that the President has been sold a bill of goods by Summerfield; and it is a rotten bill of goods. It is a bill of goods which does not augur well for the future of Government employees. We ought to stand firm here today, as Republicans and Democrats alike, in support of the legislative judgment we rendered not so long ago, when, by substantial majorities in both Houses of Congress, we placed our stamp of legislative approval on this bill.

In closing I invite attention to what I think, even from the standpoint of the exercise of legislative judgment by the President of the United States, is excedingly poor judgment.

The President speaks of the financial aspects of the bill. I say to him, "Mr. President, why did you not talk that way when you were trying to obtain support for such a huge increase in salary for the lawmakers and judges of the country?" In my judgment, those salary increases were all out of proportion to good, sound public policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President we have before us a bill which calls for a small increase in salary, an increase, on the average of 8.6 percent, for some of the most public spirited public servants we have, the postal workers of the country.

We have a President who vetoes the bill in terms of economy with regard to that increase, and who talks also in terms of classification and the relationship of postal pay to postal rates. We ought to separate the classification issue and the postal rate issue from the question of how much money the postal workers deserve in order to have a fair and decent wage from the taxpayers of the country.

I close by saying that a reading of the bill shows that it is a fair and equitable bill. The Congress of the United States should give its answer to the President today for what I consider, in the light of the history of the veto power under the Constitution of the United States, to be an abuse of such power. The President should be overruled in the Senate by a substantial vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, so long as I remain a Member of the Senate I do not propose to be a stooge for any member of the Cabinet. When I was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 80th Congress, not once did the Postmaster General come before our committee and tell us what to do. If he had tried to do so, we would have thrown him out of the committee.

However, when S. 1 came before the committee, we had the spectacle of Mr. Summerfield coming before the committee and telling us that unless we did so and so the President would veto the bill.

I should like to know how any Member of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle would feel, if he were chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and a member of the Cabinet walked into his committee and told him that unless his committee did so and so the President would veto the bill being considered by the committee.

That is the spectacle we had in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As every member of the committee knows, so far as I am concerned, I will not let any member of the Cabinet do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I have only 3 minutes, but I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When the Langer-Chavez bill passed, increasing benefits to the Federal employees, did we have one word from any Government department or agency?

Mr. LANGER. Indeed, we did not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not one word. We carried on the work, and we did pretty well, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. The action of Mr. Summerfield is probably due to the fact that he was formerly chairman of the National Republican Party. In the last election he could not even reelect his own Representative, and he lost even his own Senator from Michigan. Maybe it is due to the fact that he is always sticking his nose into someone else's business.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the veto, and I shall vote the way the people of the United States expect us to vote under the Constitution, as Senators of the United States, not by dictation from any member of the Cabinet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I was a little amazed by the remark of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon wherein he purported to question the presidential veto. I do not know whether he was questioning the constitutionality of the veto, or its propriety. Certainly, under the Constitution, the President was exercising his constitutional responsibility. He is charged with that responsibility under the Constitution.

The President gave consideration to the pending legislation. He is a man of sincere convictions. He is interested in having fairly and equitably paid postal employees, as well as fairly and equitably paid employees of the other departments of Government. I do not believe he lightly undertook to veto the bill. In accordance with his views on the subject, his veto is entitled to respectful attention on the part of the Senate.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have a table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Average base salaries of postal employees	Percentage increase of salaries over 1945	Average monthly consumers' price index (1947–49 as base)	Percentage increase in consumers' price index over 1945
1945	$1,769		76.9	
1946	2,390	35.1	83.4	8.5
1947	2,649	49.7	95.5	24.2
1948	2,666	50.7	102.8	33.7
1949	3,106	75.6	101.8	32.4
1950	3,273	85.0	102.8	33.7
1951	3,344	89.0	111.0	44.3
1952	3,828	116.4	113.5	47.6
1953	3,817	115.8	114.4	48.8
1954	3,855	117.9	114.8	49.3
April 1955			114.3	48.6

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President it will be observed that the base salaries of postal employees have increased from $1,769 in 1945, to $2,390 in 1946, to $2,649 in 1947, to $2,666 in 1948, to $3,106 in 1949, to $3,273 in 1950 to $3,344 in 1951, to $3,828 in 1952, to $3,817 in 1953, to $3,855 in 1954.

The percentage increase in the average base salary of postal employees is 117.9 percent.

During the period 1945 to 1955 the percentage increase in the consumers' price index was 48.6 percent.

The President of the United States desires an equitable increase in postal salaries. It is my belief that the postal service is one of the finest services in the Federal Government. I believe that with some statesmanship on the part of some of their leaders, the postal workers could have benefited from the passage of a bill which would have given them an increase in salary, not, to be sure, to the full extent they might have desired, but an increase which would have been in keeping with the increased cost of living, and perhaps considerably above that.

Congress has been fair and equitable in its treatment of the postal workers. I believe it will continue to be so over the years.

For the reasons stated in the President's veto message, the veto should be sustained. After it is sustained I hope a bill, which has been discussed by the able Senator from Kansas, will be promptly introduced and passed by Congress.

It is certainly well within reason and equity that the classification recommended by the Postmaster General should reflect compensation for comparable work in the business world. There has been some criticism of the Postmaster General. I believe the Postmaster General would have been derelict in his duty if he had not come before the proper committees of Congress to give his judgment concerning classification features, particularly with respect to what is necessary to be done in order to keep in proper balance the responsibilities of the supervisory employees and the responsibilities and duties of the other postal employees.

The Post Office Department is a very important branch of the Federal Government, and it is essential that it be properly administered. I believe the Postmaster General has been trying to install in the Post Office Department modern methods of administration. In that effort he has had the support of the rank and file of the postal workers. They recognize that it is important to them that the postal service operate efficiently. In discussing the subject with postal workers in my own State and in other States, I have found that they are the first to make suggestions for the betterment of the service.

The Postmaster General should not be criticized or made the whipping boy in this matter. I do not believe he was trying to pre-empt the responsibilities of the Senate or of Congress as a whole.

We made our decision. In the regular constitutional way, the bill went to the President. He, for valid reasons, vetoed the bill. I hope the veto will be sustained.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are about to determine by a yea-and-nay vote whether we shall sustain or override the President's veto of S. 1, dealing with pay for the postal workers of this Nation.

When I offered S. 1489 as a substitute for S. 1, I stated on the floor of the Senate that I was fearful we would pass a postal-pay increase bill which would not meet with the approval of the President. I wish to say that with other Members of the Senate, I have been consistently trying in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and on the floor of the Senate, to secure the enactment of postal-pay increase legislation.

In the event the President's veto is sustained, I am hopeful that the bill I shall introduce immediately thereafter will receive immediate consideration. It is a bill on which we have already heard testimony in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Some modifications have been made in it, of course. For instance, the date has been made retroactive to March 1. That was not a provision in S. 1489.

We have corrected the inequities between rural carriers and city carriers. We have taken care of the special messengers. We have clarified the anniversary date. It is a good piece of proposed legislation. It increases fairly and equitably the pay of the various postal employees.

More than that, it is a bill about which there would be no question of Executive approval.

I certainly hope that if the President's veto is sustained we will take early action on that bill, which applies to the postal workers, but also on a bill for the classified workers. At the present time we should not act for the benefit of one group of Government employees without also acting in behalf of the other group. I shall do everything in my power to see to it that such proposed legislation is presented to the Senate for decision at an early date.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know of no man who is fairer to the Government worker than is the Senator from Kansas. But for quite a few days I have been mulling over this matter and considering the position I should take not only as to the pending bill but as to future legislative proposals. This is what confuses me: How can I, under my oath, vote to sustain the veto, and then justify myself in approving an appropriation of two or three billion dollars as a giveaway to countries in Asia?

Mr. CARLSON. I would say to the Senator that I am unable to help him with that problem. It is a personal one which he will have to work out for himself. But the President of the United States has returned to the Senate, Senate bill 1 without his signature. The President had very good reasons, in my opinion, for vetoing the bill. But that does not mean that we are not obligated to do everything in our power to correct the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, with the fervor with which I would feed a starving Lazarus who had been denied the crumbs from a rich man's table, I shall vote to override the President's indefensible and intolerable veto of the bill to provide a long overdue increase in the compensation of postal employees.

My text consists of the following 9th and 10th verses of the 7th chapter of Matthew:

> What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?
> Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?

For nineteen hundred years these questions remained unanswered. But now every postal employee in the United States can instantly identify the man. He is the confused, and floundering mythical one who momentarily occupies the Presidential chair. Last year the postal workers asked for bread. The Senate and the House voted to give it to them. But the President, with his veto, gave them a stone. This year the postal workers asked for a fish. Again the Congress favorably responded. But the President, with his veto, gave them a serpent.

According to Ripley, the well-known author of Believe It or Not, Turkey in the year 503 froze the wages of laboring men and women in Constantinople at 2 cents a day, and the freeze continued for 1,400 years. If General Eisenhower had been in authority in Turkey at the proper time, he doubtless would have vetoed the repeal of this tyrannical Turkish law. Certainly he would not have approved it if any considerable number of the Turks had been letter carriers or postal clerks.

In my opinion, there are two grounds for hope that the Eisenhower veto will not be sustained. The first of these is sufficiently indicated by the following quotation from a speech which the wishful candidate Eisenhower in 1952 made to the letter carriers and postal clerks:

> Every man who has ever carried me a letter is a friend of mine. I was in the Army too long not to place mail call above every other call that the bugles could blow. * * * Your

compensation, retirement, and so on have been close to the hearts of the Republican leaders for a long time. They will continue to be close.

Mr. President Eisenhower, if you were sincere when you made that statement, please tell us why you and your fellow Republican leaders now pour out all your vials of disservice and wrath upon the postal workers' defenseless heads.

The second ground is a little more complicated than the first but it should be much more impressive to 17 Republican Senators who will be running for reelection next year. If they ignore the warning implicit in this second ground, as they go about campaigning in 1956, their constituents will ask them the searching question: "Did you in 1955, at the expense of the taxpayers, vote to increase your salary 50 percent or $7,500 a year?" And the distinguished Senators, whom I will soon name, will be compelled to answer that question in the affirmative.

The next question will be: "Did you vote to sustain the Eisenhower veto, and thereby help to deprive every postal worker in the land of sufficient increase in his daily compensation to buy a pint of milk or a loaf of bread?"

If, as a result of your action today, you are obliged to answer that question in the affirmative, the voters whom you are electioneering will say to you, in scriptural language, subject to slight modification,

Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.

And thereafter all you will hear as you wearily "tramp, tramp, tramp" over your State seeking votes will be the melancholy refrain:

Hark, from the tomb a doleful sound.
Mine ears attend the cry.
Ye sinful men, come view the ground
Where ye shall shortly lie.

And now for the exposition of ground No. 2, on which we base our hope for overriding the President's veto. The following are the names of the Republican Members who recently and successfully voted to increase their official salary 50 percent, or from $15,000 to $22,500 a year: Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BENDER, BENNETT, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUTLER, CASE of New Jersey, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DUFF, FLANDERS, GOLDWATER, IVES, JENNER, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, MALONE, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, MCCARTHY, MILLIKIN, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE, and WATKINS.

Let us now call the roll of the Republican Senators who recently praiseworthily voted for the inadequate but substantial increase of compensation for postal workers as set forth in the bill before us: Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BENDER, BENNETT, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DUFF, FLANDERS, GOLDWATER, HICKENLOOPER, IVES, JENNER, KUCHEL, MALONE, MARTIN of Iowa, MCCARTHY, MILLIKIN, MUNDT, PAYNE, PURTELL, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE, WATKINS, WELKER, WILEY, and YOUNG.

Many of the Senators named, before they began to enliven this body with their wit, enlighten it with their wisdom and enchant it with their eloquence, had obtained the priceless benefit of highly qualifying experience as civilian officeholders. For example, the Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], had been a member of the Phoenix City Council before he became a Senator; the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] served for many years as a member of the New York Legislature and as Speaker of the Assembly of the State of New York before he became a Senator; the distinguished Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CASE] long served as Members of the House of Representatives before they became Senators. A number of the others named had been governors of States.

It is boldly asserted that it would be impossible to find in all the land a similar group of men more thoroughly qualified by experience for the proper performance of duty in the greatest legislative body in the world than are those Senators whom we have named.

But, according to current rumor, practically all these Senators purpose to vote to sustain the veto of the postal pay increase bill in response to the demand of the man at the other end of the avenue, who never held a civilian office or had a moment's civilian official experience in his life until he had been inaugurated President of the United States.

It is my hope that these honorable Republican Senators will not throw their practical experience to the wind, blind their eyes, deafen their ears, surrender their judgment, and at the former general's imperious command vote to sustain the veto of a bill for which they enthusiastically voted a few days ago.

Senators, if, in existing circumstances, you obey this Presidential command, you will not only repent in sackcloth and ashes on the "Ides" of November 1956 but you will also inflict upon yourselves a greater injury than was suffered by the base Indian who—

Threw a pearl away
Richer than all his tribe.

Let us trust that we are not unduly optimistic in believing that the factual matters now before us are sufficient justification for hope that the veto will not be sustained.

Supplementary to the foregoing is an economic and humanitarian factor which we should consider in determining how we shall vote on the approaching roll call, which will be of unlimited importance to a half a million postal workers and their families. Let us remember that the salary of the President, whose veto message is before us, is a hundred thousand dollars a year. He has a yearly travel allowance of $40,000 and an expense allowance of $50,000, making the President's total official compensation $190,000 a year. The salary of a letter carrier or postal clerk is $3,270 a year. The President's monthly official income is $8,333.33. A postal clerk's monthly salary is $272.50. The President's official income is $2,083.33 a week. The salary of letter carriers and postal clerks is $68.12 for the same length of time. The President's compensation is $297.61 a day. The compensation of letter carriers and clerks is $9.73 a day. The President's salary—whether sleeping or waking, or golfing or fishing—is $12.40 an hour, or 20⅔ cents a minute. Yet he heartlessly vetoes a bill largely because, in his opinion, it extravagantly grants an underpaid postal worker a little less than enough increase in his daily compensation to buy a loaf of bread or a bottle of milk for his hungry children.

Mr. President of the United States, let me entreat you to try the noble experiment of refraining for a period of 7 days from using any part of your weekly salary of $2,083.33, and endeavor to support yourself and your family—whether in your home in Gettysburg or in the White House where you will have no rent to pay—on the letter carrier or postal clerk's weekly salary of $68.12. If you will do this, it is my confident prediction that at the end of your trial period, you will not only regret your veto, but if you are as good a man as I hope you are, you will bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and thereafter help the Congress in a spirit of generosity and Christian charity to do unto the Nation's toiling men and women as you and we of the Congress would have them do unto us.

Mr. President of the United States, let us abandon all phony crusades and embark upon a real one to promote the welfare of the poor and the needy as faithfully and vigorously as we promote that of the wealthy and the well-to-do. Officially, let us henceforth be as just and as generous to the man with one talent as we are to the man with a million or more, and thus speed the day when—

All crime shall cease
And ancient fraud shall fail,
Descending justice lift aloft her scale,
Peace o'er the world her olive wand extend,
And white-robed Innocence from heaven descend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. NEELY. My dear Republican friends, please cast your vote on the Eisenhower veto in the spirit of Whittier's memorable lines:

While there's a grief to need redress,
A balance to adjust;
Where weighs our living manhood less
Than Mammon's vilest dust,
While there's a right to need my vote,
A wrong to sweep away.
Up! clouted knee and ragged coat,
A man's a man today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It will be a sad day for the Republic, in my judgment, if threats of political annihilation made on the floor of the Senate prevent any body of men and women from voting their convictions on proposed legislation. Many times men and women are called upon to vote their convictions, not on the popularity of a measure, but on whether they believe it to be in the best interest of the country and the entire 165 million Americans.

There are always special groups, but—and I say this with no disparagement of

the group of postal workers, who, of course, have a point of view—we sit in the Senate representing not only 500,000 postal employees, representing not only 1 million or 2 million, or more, Federal workers, representing not only a single segment of the national life; but representing 165 million Americans.

Sitting in that capacity, Senators certainly should vote their convictions, even if it meant the defeat of all 96 Members of the Senate. They should be willing to vote their convictions, even though they know that to do so would put them out of office in the following November.

If the time ever comes when Members of the legislative body, acting under threats of duress of any type or character, are constrained not to vote their convictions, it will be a sad day in the history of the Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield when I have finished.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] that I have differed on occasions with the President of the United States; but I know him to be a man of deep, sincere convictions. I know he has a vital interest in all Federal employees, including those in the postal service.

The President and the Postmaster General have indicated that they want equitable legislation. They want those who have given years of service and have advanced to supervisory positions also to be treated fairly in any legislation which may be enacted. It is my judgment that if Congress will cooperate in enacting that type of equitable legislation, it will be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California does not take the position, does he, that when 72 Members of the Senate voted a few days ago for this very bill, they did not vote their convictions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but I say to the Senator——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On that basis, would they be voting their convictions today if they voted to sustain the veto?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Senators may vote on the assumption that additional facts have not been presented. But facts have been presented. I believe the President's veto message and the additional information furnished by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] justify support of the veto and the passage of other legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know of no fact which has been presented, either in the message or in the discussion on the floor, of which every Senator was not aware, including the fact that the President would veto the bill, because, as I recall, the able minority leader assured the Members of the Senate that the President would veto the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The minority leader also suggested that we should be interested in passing a bill which would put a pay increase in the hands of postal carriers, and not merely the passage of a bill which would be an empty gesture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is correct. Will the Senator answer this question? After the Senator from California had given the assurance that the President would veto the bill, and thereafter 72 Members had voted their convictions, does the Senator think that having gone up the hill last week, we should come down the hill this week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I say to the Senator the only way this matter could be brought to a head—and I believe this was the judgment of a number of Senators—was to send the bill to conference, then to the White House, and then, when action was taken by the President, be prepared to enact legislation which would put an increase in the hands of the Federal employees.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As one of the 72 Senators referred to by the Senator from Texas, I want to say that voting to send the bill to the White House was the only way we had of indicating we approved of a substantial and reasonable increase for the postal workers. It did not mean that we approved word for word or amount for amount what was included in the bill, but it did mean we were in favor of a substantial pay increase.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from California referred to the great man in the White House. In view of what is before the Senate, namely—the President's action in vetoing the bill, let me remind the Senator that the Apostle James said: "Faith without works is dead." That is applicable today. What counts is not what the President has said about a pay increase, but what he has done about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a short while ago I was a little confused as to what my vote should be, but I have overcome that confusion, and I am going to vote to override the veto without any confusion whatsoever.

When the Senate acted in passing Senate bill 1, it acted on conviction. It acted after being advised that a veto would be forthcoming. I voted for the proposed legislation at the time, in spite of the threat of a veto.

It is true that the President has the responsibility for that veto. That is his business. But that has nothing to do with a Senator's performing his duty and meeting the obligation, which he assumed when he took his oath of office, to vote his conscience on the merits of proposed legislation.

I agree entirely with my good friend from West Virginia. Do we have to enact legislation which is in the interest only of the wealthy, the great industrialists, and completely ignore the postal workers who, in the service of the Government, toil for the American people?

Oh, the Treasury Department and the other departments might think they are close to the American people, but the ones who are actually close to the American people are the postal workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if the Senator from California will yield me further time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who is it that the housewife meets daily to receive a note of sadness or a note of gladness? Who is it that brings a message to her from a son who may never come back from a foreign battlefield? It is the postal worker.

Mr. President, I have been chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have seen the anguished faces of wives of postal workers—the sidewalk pounders. I have heard such a wife tell what she and her family had to eat. In a city like Washington, unless one has the cash, he cannot buy a loaf of bread or a quart of milk for his family. Some of them have used a soupbone for 4 days before payday, keeping it in water for 3 or 4 days. Butter? Some postal employees were lucky if they could have a quarter pound of butter for Christmas.

Mr. President, let us be human. Let us have a conscience. Let us override the veto.

SENATOR KENNEDY'S RETURN TO THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

(At this point the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] entered the Chamber, Senators rising and applauding.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I know I speak for every Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, and I think for every Member on the other side, when I welcome back to this Chamber one of our most beloved colleagues.

It is a great pleasure to all of us to see JACK KENNEDY return to the Senate. During the months of his indisposition, he had our sympathy. We are delighted he is back with us again. We welcome him here today. Although he tells me he spent several months in sunny Florida as a next-door neighbor of the Republican State chairman, I know that fact has not changed his views.

We are glad to see you, Jack.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose

of joining with the majority leader in extending a very warm and cordial greeting, on his return to the Senate floor, to our good friend JACK KENNEDY. He has not been a Member of the Senate as long as have some of us, but those of us who have gotten to know him have for him a very warm and high place in our affections. I assure him that the feeling of admiration and regard is no less on this side of the aisle than it is on the side on which he sits.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader is ready to yield back the time remaining to him——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall be ready to do so when I fulfill my commitments to the Members of the party on the other side of the aisle.

I yield a minute and a half to the senior Senator from South Carolina, who I understand desires to have certain documents printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram which was sent to me, and I think to all other Members of the Senate. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Representing more than 60 percent of all employees in the postal field service, we urge you to vote to override the veto of S. 1, Tuesday.

The criticisms made against the bill possess little validity. Many of the supervisors who are alleged to be discriminated against will receive an ultimate increase of $4,310 or 49 percent. We believe that the bill has been disapproved chiefly because employees in levels 1 and 5, who were discriminated against in the original departmental proposal were granted additional increases by Congress. Seventy percent of all field employees are in these two levels.

Do not be misled by the statement that the Carlson substitute will take care of the postal pay problems. It will not. Further the Carlson proposal stands little chance of favorable approval by Congress. Bills similar to the Carlson proposal have been rejected by substantial votes in both Houses. The Carlson bill proposes to reinstate many provisions vigorously opposed by postal employees and corrected by the House, Senate or conferees.

During the past 2 years there have been 15 separate votes on postal pay legislation in both Houses—despite that fact there still is no pay bill.

A vote to override the veto will give postal employees a long overdue raise without further prolonged debate and without further cruel delay. Failure to override will have an extremely bad effect on morale already at a low ebb.

The decision is yours to make. S. 1 is a fair compromise worked out by both Houses of Congress. The Senate approved it by a vote of 66 to 11, the House by a vote of 328 to 66.

On behalf of the thousands of employees that we represent, we urge you to cast your vote in favor of overriding the veto of S. 1.

ROSS MESSER,
Legislative Representative, National Association of Post Office and General Service Maintenance Employees.
SAMUEL KLEIN,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.
WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.
WILLIAM THOMAS,
President, National Postal Transport Association.
PAUL CASTIGLIONI,
Legislative Representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees.
HAROLD MCAVOY,
President, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service, Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation on increased incomes from 1935 to 1955, showing that the national income has increased 500 percent, and the income of the postal workers about 95 percent.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increase incomes, 1935–55

	Percent
National income	500
Personal incomes	475
Incomes of postal workers	95

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing the productivity of the postal worker as it has increased from 1946 to 1953.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Productivity of postal workers increased 37.2 percent from 1946 to 1953

	Percent
Total pieces handled:	
1946	−100
1947	101
1948	109
1949	118
1950	123
1951	128
1952	135
1953	144
Total revenues:	
1946	100
1947	106
1948	116
1949	+128
1950	137
1951	145
1952	159
1953	163
Total employees, Postal Field Service:	
1946	+100
1947	−100
1948	103
1949	106
1950	103
1951	102
1952	107
1953	104

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control if the other side will do likewise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to express my personal gratitude for the generosity the distinguished minority leader has demonstrated not only to me but also to the other Senators on this side of the aisle.

In accordance with the customary practice of the distinguished Senator from California, he has been very considerate of all of us, and has yielded to us from the time under his control in order to make it possible for Senators on this side of the aisle to submit their arguments. I certainly appreciate very much the courtesy and consideration of the senior Senator from California.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Clements	Kennedy	Smathers
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the vote which is about to be taken, a vote "nay" will be in favor of sustaining the President's veto, and a vote "yea" will be in favor of overriding the veto of the President; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Article 1, section 5, of the Constitution requires a yea-and-nay vote on the pending quesion, which is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]

is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that if the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I annuonce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—54

Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barkley	Hill	McNamara
Bible	Holland	Monroney
Capehart	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Jackson	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pastore
Duff	Kennedy	Russell
Eastland	Kerr	Scott
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Ervin	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Frear	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
George	Long	Symington
Gore	Magnuson	Thurmond
Green	Malone	Welker
Hayden	Mansfield	Young

NAYS—39

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Cotton	Millikin
Barrett	Curtis	Mundt
Beall	Dirksen	Payne
Bender	Dworshak	Potter
Bennett	Flanders	Purtell
Bricker	Goldwater	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Martin, Iowa	Williams

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy	Murray	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, on reconsideration the bill fails of passage.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Federal employees of America cannot fail to know now which political party is the party of the workingman.

In the vote just taken, 46 Democrats have voted to override the regrettable action taken by the President while only 2 Democrats saw fit to approve that action.

Thirty-five Republicans have just voted to sustain the action taken by the President and to deny to the Nation's postal workers once again the pay increase they so justly have deserved for so long.

I know not how the members of the opposite party justify their action. I rather suspect that it is their terrible fear that if they did not vote to sustain the veto, the confused man in the White House would not agree to be their standard bearer in 1956.

However, be that as it may, the issue is clear and will be settled in 1956.

In order to gain for the postal workers of America their much sought and deserved pay increase, I now send to the desk another Democratic compromise plan. While this is more of a compromise than I am in favor of, I, along with the other Democratic Members of the Senate, desire to exert even the very last effort to gain this increase, and I propose to call the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee into executive session tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to consider this new proposal.

I shall make every effort to report this bill to the Senate tomorrow afternoon, with the earnest hope that it will be immediately considered and favorably approved by this body, by the House of Representatives, and by the President of the United States.

I introduce the bill on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senatore from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2061) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, during the debate on the veto message, I said I would introduce a bill dealing with postal pay increases. I was pleased to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service say that he is calling a meeting of the committee tomorrow morning to consider proposed pay increase legislation. Personally I am pleased that he plans to do so, and I expect fully to cooperate with him. I am introducing a bill which I know could be approved and become law within a matter of days.

I sincerely hope the committee will have an opportunity to consider my bill. Although I am not familier with the terms of the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the committee, I sincerely and earnestly assure him that I will cooperate with him in the consideration of his bill so long as it meets requirements which I believe are necessary to be met in the enactment of such legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not know what is contained in the bill being introduced by the Senator from Kansas. I assure him also that I shall be very glad to cooperate in the consideration of any pay-raise measure which comes before the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. I feel certain there will be no serious difference between us, and that we will be able to work out acceptable legislation. I hope for early action by the committee.

Mr. President, I now introduce the bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2062) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and the employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. BENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, it has always been my view that public employees should be well paid, and that adequate provision for their retirement should be made by progressive legislation.

The postal service is a most important part of our governmental machinery. The postal employees have been good workers. There is universal agreement that they merit a pay increase.

I voted in favor of the postal-pay-raise bill which President Eisenhower has vetoed. However, after the President vetoed the bill, I voted to sustain his veto. I maintain that there is nothing inconsistent between my vote on the question of passing the bill over the President's veto and my political philosophy and my point of view regarding the entire question of the payment of public employees and the treatment of pubilc employees. I am not alibing. I have no explanation to make. I am merely stating what my record has been during 25 years of public life as an elected legislator, and during my many other years of public service.

I have always believed in removing the excess baggage from public payrolls. I have always maintained that there are too many public employees, not only in the Federal Government, but also in the State and municipal governments. But I believe that for service rendered, a public employee should be paid well.

So, Mr. President, during my political life I have consistently taken the position that the best investment the taxpayers can make is in paying well the public employees.

Back in 1927, in the State of Ohio, we had a fee system, similar to that now in existence in the State of Virginia. That system was for the purpose of providing fees for certain public officials, so as to make public service attractive to them. In Ohio we abolished that system; and I led the fight to abolish it, in the case of State highway officials, and certain courts, including justice-of-the-peace courts with countywide jurisdiction.

My record has been consistent with my present stand with regard to public employees and the manner in which they should be treated.

President Eisenhower has vetoed this bill. However, he has said he is in favor of a bill which will provide adequately for the postal workers and the other civil-service employees.

After he made that statement at his press conference, I found on the front page of one of the Washington newspapers an article which is comparable with other articles which appeared in all the other Washington newspapers.

I shall now read from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, May 18. The headline reads as follows: "Dem Leaders

Warn: If 8.8 Is Vetoed and Sustained, No Pay Hike At All."

Mr. President, after all the huffing and puffing and blowing the house down, it is interesting to observe that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the committee, could scarcely wait to get on his feet and say that he was introducing another bill. So obviously that newspaper statement is wrong, and obviously the Democratic leaders will vote for a bill to increase the pay of Federal employees, including the civil-service employees, which the President will support.

I read now from the article:

The Government employee pay-raise fight appeared veering today toward a possible impasse which could kill both postal and classified (white collar) raises at this session of Congress.

President Eisenhower told his press conference today that he's still studying the 8.8 percent postal pay bill and still hasn't decided whether to sign or veto.

The threat of no pay raises all this session came from another source.

If there's a veto, the News learned, Democratic leaders are prepared to tell the Senate that, should the veto be sustained, there will be no further action on raises at this session of Congress.

Obviously the Democratic leaders did not consult with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], because he is calling a meeting of his committee at 10 o'clock in the morning. After the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] announced that he would introduce another bill, the Democratic leaders say they would call a meeting of the committee in the morning for the purpose of discussing this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know upon whose authority the Senator from Ohio speaks for the Democratic leaders, but I can personally assure him that, so far as the present majority leader is concerned, he concurred wholeheartedly in the action taken by the chairman of the committee, and has never taken any other position.

Mr. BENDER. I accept the statement of the distinguished majority leader. I have known him for many years.

However, I am reading from an article which was published in a Washington newspaper, and which was brought to my office by a postal worker. The article states, in effect, "If you do not do this, there will be no pay raise."

I appreciate the statement of the majority leader in sustaining the action of the chairman of the committee, who announced that he was calling his committee together for the purpose of considering another postal pay bill. I am satisfied, if that bill comes before us, that as the President has indicated, those of us who are interested in pay raises and in living conditions can be sure that the bill will pass the Senate, as a cat would pass through a dog show. I am sure that not only Republican Senators, but Democratic Senators, as a whole, will vote for a bill providing for an increase in pay, and providing for good working conditions for our postal and classified civil service employees.

Reading further from the article by Mr. John Cramer, who is a very responsible reporter for the Scripps-Howard Washington News, he says:

The leaders will take the position that the issue is much larger than the size of pay raises—or whether the 8.8 percent bill's postal job reclassification plan should be the one sought by the administration or the modified one approved by Congress.

They will argue, it's reported, that the prestige and prerogatives of Congress are at stake, that the administration has attempted to dictate to Congress, and that Congress must resist this dictation as a matter of principle.

Democratic Senators are described as eager for an all-out showdown.

Obviously, from the expressions made by the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the committee which has this legislation before it, there is no such purpose in their minds. Obviously we have been misinformed, to the effect that the Democratic leadership in both Houses proposes to call a halt so far as postal and civil service legislation is concerned. We are to have a bill. We are to have a good bill. We are to have a bill which the President will support. I am satisfied that the President will act in as good conscience as he has acted with respect to every other measure which has come before him for consideration.

I happen to be occupying the seat in the Senate as a Senator from the State of Ohio which was filled for many years by the late great Senator Robert A. Taft. I am proud to say that I was one of the first sponsors of Senator Taft when he ran for the Ohio Senate, when most of the Republican machines in Ohio were against him. I supported him in Cleveland, and in my own county, Cuyahoga County, because I believed in him. I served with him in the Ohio State senate.

I know that Bob Taft never did anything merely because he thought it would gain votes for him. Bob Taft acted upon orders which he received from within, and not from without. Bob Taft did the things which he believed to be right. So I admire Bob Taft very much.

After we fought to defeat General Eisenhower at the 1952 convention, after we had done everything in our power to make Robert A. Taft the nominee, Bob Taft was the best possible soldier following his defeat, because he was a good sport. He did not sulk. He did not make wise cracks about the then candidate, General Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower. Bob Taft became President Eisenhower's No. 1 man. Senators who served with him will recall that, during Bob Taft's lifetime, he was the outspoken champion of President Eisenhower on the floor of the Senate on every occasion.

I can understand why Senator Bob Taft supported President Eisenhower. Frankly, I have considered myself a liberal Republican or a progressive Republican. I am not a standpatter. I have never been for sale. Republicans in Ohio, as well as all the other people of my State, know that. I had less money with which to work in my campaign for the senatorship than did any other candidate for Senator in the history of Ohio, in either party.

I supported President Eisenhower from the very beginning in the other body, and have supported him in the Senate 100 percent. Why? Because I believe in him. I believe in President Eisenhower and in his philosophy. I believed in his philosophy long before I knew the name of Eisenhower and long before I knew there was such an individual as Eisenhower. I supported the things he stood for. He has said that his philosophy is to be a liberal in the matter of human rights and a conservative in the matter of our economy. I believe in that philosophy. I believe President Eisenhower, in the short space of 2 years, has done more for civil rights than had previously been accomplished in the history of our country. Certainly he has done more in 2 years than the previous administrations had done in 20 years. The previous administrations gave us conversation; President Eisenhower has given us action.

I know the hour is late. I have always been consistent in my feelings for public employees, and I certainly do not want to keep any of them here overtime by making a long speech.

But I feel this is an occasion on which I should say what I have in my heart regarding the action the Senate took today.

No one has been closer to the postal workers in my home State than I have. I have testified to that fact not only in voting for bills but in my whole interest in the postal workers of the State.

When they assembled in my office I told them very frankly that my batting average so far as President Eisenhower is concerned was 100 percent. I have not voted against him once, not because I am a rubber stamp, but because I believe wholeheartedly in what the President is doing.

As I say, I was for him long before I knew him. I supported his philosophy and his point of view long before I knew him. He is good for the Republican Party. He is good for America. He is good for the world.

I do not know of anyone who has done a better job and a more honest job than our great President.

When he sent his veto message to the Senate, I did not like it. I had hoped that he would sign the bill. But I read his veto message and, under the circumstances, I felt the urge to support him because he said the administration would sponsor another bill immediately. Obviously he is acting in good faith, because the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has presented an administration bill, subject to amendments that are in keeping with what the administration believes it is desirable to do.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for his zeal to get the floor immediately after the vote on the veto message and to denounce what the Democratic politicians not only in Washington but elsewhere have been saying, namely,

that the Republicans want to deny the common, ordinary worker a fair chance.

As a matter of fact, the dollar is worth more today without a war than it has been at any time in recent years. The dollar is worth more in every way. Conditions are better. We have peace on earth and more good will toward men because of the leadership provided by our great President. Under the circumstances, the new bill will receive immediate consideration not only by the committee but by Congress, and the President will sign a bill providing for approximately an 8 percent raise in pay, which will be suitable and desirable not only so far as the postal employees are concerned but also so far as the other employees of the Government are concerned.

I believe with all my heart in our President. I believe in him thoroughly. I have supported him with all the vigor I have at my command; but I have done so quietly. I have not made many speeches on this floor. Even though I was a Member of the House for 14 years, this is only the second or third time I have spoken on the floor since I became a Member of the Senate. Nevertheless, sometimes I feel the urge, even as a new Member of the Senate, to say the things I feel deeply. I say to my colleagues and I say to the postal workers and I say to other Government employees that the President has not been hounding the employees.

As a matter of fact, Republicans are complaining about too many hold-overs in Government employment. The President has not been trying to take advantage of any situation. He has the power to clean house altogether. He has not done anything that people can criticize as a purge. The President has been very considerate. Sometimes I think he has been more considerate than people have a right to expect him to be, particularly those who have entrenched themselves in the other political party and who in many cases are doing everything in their power to promote discord and disunity inside the administration.

Mr. President, I wish to close by saying that I am not at all apologetic about having supported the veto message. As a friend of the postal workers, as a friend of Federal employees, I believe in the bill which is to be reported, they will have a better bill, with more justice and more consideration. I further believe the new bill will come before the Senate with the unanimous vote, not only of the Republican members of the committee, but of the Democratic members as well.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 771), is amended by striking out "$14,500" and substituting therefor "$17,500" and by striking out "$14,000" and substituting therefor "$17,000."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 753), is amended by striking out "$13,500" and substituting therefor "$16,500" and by striking out "$13,000" and substituting therefor "$16,000."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended by the acts of May 16, 1938, and June 10, 1952, is amended as follows: By striking out in the second paragraph thereof "$13,000" and substituting therefor "$16,000."

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (11 D. C. Code, sec. 920) is amended to read as follows: "The salary of the judge shall be $14,800 per annum."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses theron, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

DRAWING THE LINE ON COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader, one of the leading daily newspapers in New England and the Northeast, recently contacted a number of our top military figures who commanded large forces and were otherwise identified with our tremendous successes during World War II. They were all asked the same question: Do you consider Quemoy and Matsu vital to the defense of Formosa, the key to the free world's Pacific defense? The answers were virtually unanimous that the abandonment of these two small but strategically located outposts would ultimately result in the loss of the Nationalist Chinese stronghold.

I think that their opinions are very significant for two reasons. In the first place these men, among them General Chennault, Admiral Sherman, and General Stratemeyer—to mention just a few—have come face to face with the Communist menace during their many years of military service. They played a large part in leading our country to victory in World War II, and we have only respect for their sound judgment and mature understanding of the need for containing and stemming the advances of Red China in southeastern Asia. Secondly, these men are no longer on active military duty. They are under no compulsion to restrain in any way their personal feelings. They are in a position to speak out strongly and effectively on a problem of vast significance to our country today—the need for a strong security chain in the Far Pacific.

I am impressed by their urgings that Quemoy and Matsu be defended to the utmost. I am firmly of the opinion that their counsel on a matter of this importance should command the attention of all thinking Americans. It is a course of action that I have felt imperative for some time. I think theirs is a contribution that this country and the other free nations of the world can ill afford to overlook. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD DRAW LINE NOW ON COMMUNIST GRABS—FREE YANKS IN PRISON

In response to queries from the Manchester Union Leader, 10 of America's top military figures yesterday made their views positively clear that the United States should not abandon the islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

The military leaders asserted that the United States should draw the line on Communist aggression. Some favored active military action now to release Americans held prisoner by Red China.

The Union Leader's question was: "Do you think giving up of the liberty of Quemoy and Matsu would produce peace?"

TOO FAR ALREADY

All 10 were unanimous in their opinion that the free world has allowed the Communists to go too far already and that on the question of Quemoy and Matsu, the United States must defend the islands or surrender to even more Communist grabs.

One other military leader was less positive in his approach to the problem, and another advocated surrender of the islands.

The list of those replying to the Union Leader queries included Gen. Claire Chennault, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, Rear Adm. Robert E. Theobald, Adm. William H. Standley, Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer; Adm. Frederick C. Sherman, Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, Col. L. E. Bunker, former staff officer of General MacArthur; Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, Frank L. Howley, and Adm. H. E. Yarnell.

Gen. Claire Chennault, former commander of the Flying Tigers in China and adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, believes the United States must draw the line beyond which communism may not pass by force. He wired this message:

"We should make it unmistakably clear that we will resist with adequate force, any Communist attempt to occupy territory now inhabited by free people, whether Quemoy, Matsu, or elsewhere. The line beyond which communism may not pass by force must be drawn sometime.

"We have shamefully permitted our own people to live in Communist prisons too long. We should issue an ultimatum with a definite time limit demanding their release and be prepared to use force if ignored. Communists will never respect us unless we demand it."

WOULD USE ATOM WEAPONS

Gen. James A. Van Fleet, United States Army (retired), referred this newspaper to an article by him in Life magazine for April 18. He wrote:

"It seems clear to me that as long as the Nationalists can hold Quemoy and the Matsus, the Communists have little chance, if any, of successfully invading Formosa. Red

China can almost gage American intentions from comment heard in the capitals of the world. If the reaction is weak, more pressure is applied. Should firmness be encountered, the Reds withdraw."

The former Eighth Army commander, who fought the Reds to a standstill in Korea, wrote further: "Suppose the Communists do launch a sizable invasion to capture any of the islands in the Matsus or Quemoy groups? It would present the United States with good reason to shoot back with atomic weapons and annihilate the Red effort.

"The use of such force would stop Communist military aggression here and elsewhere in the world. Such an act of warning would preserve the peace for years to come. This may be a God-given opportunity to avoid a general war."

APPEASEMENT NOT PEACE

Rear Adm. Robert E. Theobald, former northern Pacific fleet commander, put this message on the wire at his Marblehead, Mass., home:

"Appeasement and retreat before an aggressive dictatorship is never the road to peace. Red China should be told we will defend Quemoy and Matsu.

"The Nation must protect nationals abroad from persecution. We should take drastic action, to and including a Pacific blockade, to secure the release of servicemen and civilians illegally held by Red Chinese."

NEED DEFINITE STAND

Adm. William H. Standley, United States Navy (retired), former Chief of Naval Operations, wired from his Coronado, Calif., home that: "The surest way to avoid war is to take a definite and vigorous stand now.

"Our present policy in re Quemoy and Matsu is a continuation of the appeasement policy inaugurated with the withdrawal of our Army to enable the Russian Army to enter Berlin ahead of the American Army," he said, adding that it was similar to American policy in the shooting down of unarmed planes, of our pusillanimous Korean police action, our failure to meet aggressive action in Indochina, our policy in repeated violations in the Korean armistice agreement, and our failure to obtain the release of American prisoners from Red China.

COULD BE DISASTER

It is the opinion of Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, USAF, retired, former commander of the Air Forces in China, that "the old 'Spirit of '76' has nearly disappeared from our leaders and many of our people." He says: "I do not understand the strange times we are encountering. If the United States forces the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese Communists, it will be a great disaster for our country. Remember, the Red Chinese have no effective north-south communications except shipping. Nationalist guns on Matsu and Quemoy force this shipping far out to sea where Chiang Kai-shek's naval vessels destroy or intercept it. With Matsu and Quemoy abandoned to the Red murderers, their shipping can hug the coast and the Communist domination of southeast Asia and the Communist seizure of supplies we propose to send to Indochina can be made certain.

"This abandonment of Quemoy and Matsu would surely immobilize Chiang permanently on Formosa and in a few years, as his army grows old, the Communists would take without opposition that great strategic island so essential to the security of the United States of America. That island is the key to the free world's Pacific defense."

ISLANDS IMPORTANT

From a background as combat commander of the famed aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Lexington*, retired Adm. Frederick C. Sherman wired: "I believe that Quemoy and Matsu are important to the military defense of Formosa and should be defended. As a military ally of Nationalist China, I think the United States should assist in their defense and announce this decision to the world."

This veteran of the battles of Bougainville, Salamau, and the Coral Sea added: "We cannot defeat communism at home and abroad by continually withdrawing and giving up additional territory."

MUST USE FORCE

Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, USAF, retired, believes this Nation should establish a military backfire on the Quemoy-Matsu firing line.

He wired: "It is my opinion, our national interest demands immediate revival and future preservation of the basic principles of international law and associated laws of war, as understood and practiced by the United States in the days when protection of American lives and property at home and abroad were of paramount interest. Such barbaric practices will never be checked except through the use of armed military force."

General Foulois concluded: "As we are directly and primarily concerned with the present diplomatic-political brushfire now burning around Quemoy and Matsu, it is my opinion that from a military point of view we should establish our military backfire on the Quemoy-Matsu firing line."

MAC ARTHUR AIDE COMMENTS

Although special attempts were made to reach Gen. Douglas MacArthur for comment, the message apparently failed to get to him, as his aide de camp, Col. S. L. Huff, reported him away from his office. However, Col. L. E. Bunker, of Wellesley, Mass., former MacArthur staff officer, wired:

"It is my personal feeling we should announce a firm intention to defend these islands and prevent the destruction of the morale of the Chinese Republican Army.

"If they disintegrate, who defends Formosa—officially declared an essential part of America's defense perimeter?"

FEAR IS LIVING DEATH

Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle wrote from his home in Elkridge, Md., commander of the 1st Marine Division in Okinawa's capture, that: "We should take a firm and uncompromising stand, either liberate the Americans held prisoner by Red China, or we shall back Chiang in an attack on the mainland and Rhee in an attack on North Korea."

He wrote: "To continue to live and act in fear is a living death. Americans would rather die fighting than live this kind of a life."

The morale, not only of the Armed Forces, but of the entire Nation would be bolstered immediately by such action (the backing of Chiang and Rhee attacks). The people today are confused and unable to understand why this great and powerful country has to keep appeasing the Reds when even the earliest shadow of firmness would be infinitely more effective as a peacemaker than the shameful surrenders we have made at each and every conference with the murderers of our sons."

SHOULD TRY TO FREE PRISONERS

A former chief of naval operations, Adm. Louis E. Denfield, United States Navy (retired) believes President Eisenhower—whom he calls "one of the greatest military leaders of our time"—and his staff will "take appropriate steps to defend Formosa as well as Quemoy and Matsu if conditions require it."

The former superior of the present Chief of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, said: "No military man discloses his intentions in advance, and I am sure that is the reason that no statement has been given out on the defense of Quemoy and Matsu."

He added: "With regard to our servicemen and civilians held prisoners by the Chinese, I think every possible step should be taken to obtain their release."

PRESTIGE IN ORIENT LOW

"Quemoy and Matsu are of tremendous importance," writes Frank L. Howley, retired Army officer, nationally known business leader, and now vice chancellor of New York University. In Berlin as United States commandant on Allied Kommandatura, he spent thousands of hours of negotiation with the Soviets and has since kept track of their activities in Guatemala, North Africa, and Germany. Only recently he visited Hong Kong and other spots of the Far East, including Formosa.

After declaring Quemoy and Matsu to be of great importance, General Howley asserts:

"We must regrettably admit that our prestige in the Orient is at a low point as a result of past activities. It is useless to go back and debate whether or not we should have made commitments or should have become involved with the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. We have to start where we are today and these two islands are part of the territory still held by the legitimate government of China, which we recognize. To the people of Asia we are allied, militarily as well as politically, with the Nationalist government of China. Therefore, if these islands are captured by the Communists it would be a most serious blow to us. It might, in fact, be the final act necessary to discourage our allies and encourage our enemies."

WOULD SURRENDER ISLANDS

Adm. H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy (retired), former commander of the United States Asiatic Fleet, a veteran of Spanish-American and First World War, was the only voice urging the islands of Quemoy and Matsu be turned over to the Communists.

"To paraphrase Bismarck," he wrote, "these islands are not worth the bones of a single American."

He continued: "Use the surrender of the islands to secure the release of the servicemen and civilians illegally held prisoners by the Chinese Communists."

Only two of those replying refused to take a stand on the issue. They were Adm. William F. "Bull" Halsey, and Gen. Mark W. Clark.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I expect to take only a few minutes of the Senate's time this afternoon to discuss a matter that is of vital importance to the American people.

The record of debate thus far indicates that there is overwhelming sentiment in the Senate that an accelerated highway construction program is essential for an expanding economy and for the national defense. The question for determination is the selection of the method of approach which will provide the roads we need and at the same time preserve sound principles of representative Government.

Mr. President, I wish to pay high tribute to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the tremendous amount of study and consideration he has given to the entire road program. Whenever he undertakes any assignment

he does it thoroughly and always keeps always in mind what is best for the welfare of the Nation. His committee held extensive hearings. Their point of view has been presented, and the conclusion which he and his committee have reached is well backed by sound principles of Government. I think the junior Senator from Tennessee is entitled to the thanks of the Senate and to the backing of the American people who are interested in good roads and a road program which is in keeping with our constitutional method of doing business.

We are faced with a most fundamental issue. The drafters of the Constitution were dedicated to the concept of representative Government. In other words, they were determined that the people should control the Government, rather than vice versa. So our Constitution contains a careful delineation of responsibility and authority as between the respective branches of Government.

The powers of the Congress are specified in article I. Section 8 of article I provides that, "The Congress shall have the power," among other things, "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," and "to borrow money on the credit of the United States."

Mr. President, I do not know how the proponents of the so-called administration bill got the idea that it would be in keeping with constitutional government and would save money if the Congress delegated its responsibility for many, many years to come to a corporation, over which it would have little control, and granted to it the authority to borrow money with which to finance the highway program.

Certainly, no power of the Congress has been guarded more zealously than its control over the pursestrings.

It seems to me that we should think seriously about our responsibilities along this line in reaching our individual decisions on the question before us.

In the substitute which has been offered we are asked to support a proposal whereby Congress would delegate its responsibilities relative to the expenditure of funds and the creation of debt to a Federal Highway Corporation, which would operate entirely under the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government. We are asked to grant to this Corporation the authority to issue $21 billion in bonds, with the proceeds to be distributed among the various States as the Corporation may see fit. We are asked to make an indefinite appropriation of vast sums of money to be used by this Corporation to service its bonds over a period without limitation of time, but which would certainly extend beyond 30 years.

If the substitute is adopted, Mr. President, Congress will have lost control of our road-building program and the expenditure of the taxpayers' funds. If these bonds are issued, Congress will have no control whatsoever over the manner in which the proceeds are spent.

In my opinion, the dangerous procedures embodied in the substitute proposal are aptly summarized in a section of the committee report, which I should like to read to the Senate. I quote from page 8 of the report:

> The committee concluded that the special corporate system of financing as proposed by S. 1160 is not conducive to sound fiscal management. The creation of governmental obligations and the expenditure of the proceeds thereof outside the budget by a corporation, without apportionment to States, would be basically unsound. The dedication of general revenues as proposed by S. 1160 and the indefinite appropriation thereof to the corporation to service its bonds would place the Congress in a fiscal straitjacket, and, in practical effect, prohibit the Congress from exercising its constitutional responsibilities with respect to creation of debt and expenditure of funds.

I believe the committee was wise, Mr. President, in rejecting this highly unorthodox approach.

It is my further opinion that S. 1048, in its present form, embodies a sound program for highway construction. It builds upon a program which has been developed over the years and which has worked well. It insures an equitable distribution of Federal funds among the several States. It provides sufficient flexibility to permit a program to meet the varying needs of the individual States. It preserves the principle of cooperative partnership between the Federal and State governments in the field of highway construction and, most important of all, Mr. President, it preserves to the people through their representatives control over the expenditure of our funds.

Mr. President, I was, however, disappointed that the committee did not accept the amendment which was offered to the committee by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and me. The presentation to the committee was in connection with a special item for highways for civil defense. The statement by the Senator from Massachusetts appears on page 580 of the hearings, and my statement to the subcommittee begins on page 574. The statements were the result, not of our individual opinions, but of weeks and weeks of hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which had studied the problem of civil defense. The statements did not represent any formal action of the committee; but I am certain that every member of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense feels that some action should be taken in this field.

The statements are the result of opinions expressed by leaders in Government, including the governors of some of the States, mayors of cities, and civil defense officials, as to what would be required in order to save a maximum number of lives and the greatest possible amount of property in the event of an atomic or a hydrogen bomb attack upon our Nation.

If war, unfortunately, ever should come, the civilian population in our cities would be as much a part of the battleline as would be the men in the frontlines. If war should come, I think we must anticipate that the attacks would be made upon our cities, and, as matters now stand, our home front would have difficulty in surviving.

In spite of the valiant efforts on the part of the Federal Civil Defense Administrator; in spite of the activities of the Federal agencies, such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in carrying out the delegations of authority made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator; in spite of the remarkable interest and activity on the part of many of the cities and States, the sad fact is that the United States is woefully unprepared to protect the people and the industries of the Nation in the event of a thermonuclear attack.

Sufficient attention simply has not been given to the matter at any level of the Government. In the executive departments, civil defense has been considered as a stepchild. In Congress, appropriations for civil defense have been almost nil, considering the work that must be done. There have been too many areas of indecision.

Everyone agrees that the only protection which can be afforded people living in the target areas is by the evacuation of our cities. In the beginning of the civil-defense program there was a concept of building shelters inside buildings. But we know, as a result of the explosion of hydrogen bombs and of the information which has been given about them, that even bombs of the size used in tests would craterize the ground and destroy buildings for a substantial distance.

The figures which have been given indicate that in a city having a population of 1 million if nothing were done in the way of civil defense, it could be anticipated that probably 900,000 persons would lose their lives.

It is known that the explosions in the Pacific a little more than a year ago left a crater large enough to place 14 Pentagon buildings inside, and much additional space. So no protection of a substantial nature can be secured by constructing bomb shelters inside a target area. Therefore, the only alternative is to evacuate the cities.

The first requirement for evacuation is adequate highways, streets, and roads to enable the movement of people out of the cities. After they have been moved away from the cities, the question arises as to what will be done with them and how to shelter, feed, and clothe them. In those phases of the civil-defense program, policy decisions have not been made as to whether the Federal Government or the State governments will assume responsibility.

The Civil Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, consisting of five Senators, last week issued a unanimous report dealing with this problem, and I now call it to the attention of Members of the Senate.

Unless sufficient highways and ingress and egress roads can be built to and from the cities, then what will happen to the people outside the cities becomes an academic question. Without adequate highways the people would never be able to leave the cities.

All the civil-defense tests which have been held, including the one in Milwaukee, which was the most complete, and in Philadelphia and other cities, showed

the great need of additional highways in order to move people away from the target areas. Such highways and roads would also be a valuable addition to the national highway system.

If the people are to have any protection at all, they simply must have more highways and roads leading out of the target areas. So I have prepared an amendment which makes a very modest start on the problem. It is amendment designated "5–23–55–c," which I expect to offer some time tomorrow.

My amendment would provide for $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Of that sum, $20 million would be available to be spent immediately. Already plans and programs have been submitted by the States and cities in critical target areas, calling for an expenditure of a much larger amount than I have proposed. The $20 million would be spent for highways and roads in the target areas, both in the cities and the counties, for evacuation purposes. The Federal Civil Defense Administrator would designate the target areas.

The program would be worked out between the Secretary of Commerce and the States in which the target areas are located. The apportionment of the payment for the special evacuation highways would be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State. That is a larger Federal amount than is provided in other sections of the bill. But, after all, this is a part of the cost of defense. It is as important for the defense of our country to have a civil-defense program as it is that we have a military-defense program.

So I think we are met with the plain fact that the Federal Government will have to bear a larger proportion of the cost of building special roads and of enlarging and widening streets for evacuation purposes. This, in my opinion, is largely a Federal responsibility.

I hope Senators will consider well this proposal, and will agree to the amendment when it is offered later.

Another part of the amendment, which pertains to the 2,700 miles which will be left over in the interstate highway system, provides as follows:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall, by not later than February 1, 1956, make a report to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives containing his recommendations as to the manner in which the undesignated mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways can best be utilized for the purpose of eliminating bottlenecks in the evacuation routes leading from target areas as designated by the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

We all talk much about civil defense. Everyone bemoans the fact that civil defense is not being given more attention. Here is a way—the most important way—in which Congress can make a small start toward taking some action to protect the people of the Nation in the event of an all-out attack.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for a number of years the highways of our Nation have been fast deteriorating and becoming obsolete. Highway construction has not been keeping pace with traffic demands, and the gap between highway usage and improvement needs has widened.

The time has come when positive steps are needed to correct our highway deficiencies in order to assure the continued growth of our economy. In meeting these needs, it should be noted that our civilian needs also coincide with our military needs.

The most serious highway deficiencies are in and around our cities and metropolitan areas. These areas have become extremely congested from the traffic overload, and now constitute bottlenecks on through highways, with consequent delays to through traffic. These sections also involve the most expensive construction of any of the highway systems.

Highways around municipalities involve higher standards of construction, and wider traffic lanes and more lanes are required. Access control is needed. Thus, service roads, grade separations, and cloverleafs must be provided. Rights-of-way through the urban areas are very expensive.

The problem of financing street and highway construction in cities is acute. Most cities now have extensive obligations for schools and other community facilities. Many of the municipalities are bonded heavily to meet their obligations. The greater part of the State road taxes collected in cities goes back to the counties. The cities have to rely largely on real-estate taxes for their financing.

S. 1048 is a realistic approach to our highway problem. This is particularly true as it affects the situation in urban areas.

The bill recognizes the importance of the national system of interstate highways, and places emphasis on its expeditious completion. At the same time, it does not neglect the other important highway systems—primary, secondary, and urban.

The interstate system connects the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers of the country. Four thousand three hundred and forty-six miles of the designated 37,600 miles are located in urban areas. Early planning routed most of these highways through the centers of the cities. The same is true of the primary system, of which 14,466 miles of the total 196,807 miles are in urban areas.

The committee bill authorizes an appropriation of $400 million annually for 5 years for projects on the Federal-aid primary system, and $200 million for projects on the primary system in urban areas. It averages $1,550 million a year for 5 years for projects on the interstate system to be matched on a 90–10 basis.

The study of the highway needs of the Nation, conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads, indicates that the total estimated cost of improving the interstate system is $23,253 million, of which $10,717 million is in urban areas. To render the interstate system fully effective will require provision for additional feeder and distribution routes in urban areas, and bypasses around metropolitan centers, the most heavily congested areas at the present time.

There remain undesignated about 2,400 miles of the authorized 40,000 miles on the interstate system, which are available for feeder routes and bypasses. The committee has recommended in the bill that the mileage limitation for the interstate system be raised to 42,500 to provide for additional route designation on that system.

While considering improvement of highways at the present time, the civil defense aspects must not be overlooked. In the event of an atomic attack, large-scale evacuation of the cities would be necessary. Completion of the Interstate System and the urban connections would be of value as a civil-defense measure, and additional improvement of the primary, secondary, and urban routes, for dispersal of the population over many routes out into the countryside, would be essential.

The committee has also provided in the bill for transfer between the various systems of not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to a State. This provision will permit a large degree of flexibility to the States in keeping their programs in balance, and using funds of the various systems where urgently needed.

The bill would also permit early acquisition of highway rights-of-way by the Secretary of Commerce, when requested by a State to do so, or where the State cannot acquire control of access. This provision, to be applicable for fiscal year 1956, will prevent the program from being slowed down in certain States.

Mr. President, I think S. 1048 is a good bill. It is a necessary bill. There are no questions about the need for a more adequate and safe highway system. The only questions appear to be as to the method of providing that system, the speed with which to accomplish the goal, and the way the program should be financed. The committee considered that a well-balanced program, carried forward within the framework of the existing law, and financed as other Federal authorizations are, would accomplish the desired results, and modernize the highway system of the Nation.

Approaching the whole problem from its economic importance to the people of the United States, I think it almost impossible to overstress the program's value. In 1940 there were 34 million vehicles operating on the Nation's roads. This year there are 58 million. It is estimated that by 1965 the total will be 81 million. What this can mean in terms of low-cost haulage, of added recreational facilities, of convenience of transport between homes and places of employment, cannot be computed in dollars and cents. But it will result in vast good, and it will redound to the benefit of the Nation, if the roads to carry the traffic are built.

Coming as I do from Wayne County, Mich., where the first mile of concrete highway in the world was laid—and this was within my adult years—and where the automotive industry of the Nation is centered, I have always had a keen sense of the importance of good roads to all the people of the United States.

I have not forgotten that history tells us that the might of the Roman Empire, which endured for centuries against the assaults of barbarians, was built upon

strategic roads of the highest quality. In that simple, but at that time new, approach, the Romans solved the problems of trade, of military effectiveness, and of communications, by a road program.

The importance of good roads is far greater today than it was then. Roads are expensive, but there is no substitute for them in these days of mass mobility of the population in automobiles.

I believe there will be further important dividends from the passage of the committee bill. Many of our cities are suffering from rot at the center for lack of adequate means of reaching the downtown areas from the suburban districts. Immense taxing powers are gradually being lost to the cities by this insidious dry rot. The committee bill will make it possible for the cities to meet the problem, and I hope solve it. These are days which call for grand strategy in building the America of the future. The committee's road program, which I support, is of key importance in that grand strategy.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a fellow-member of the subcommittee on roads, which considered both Senate bill 1048 and the Clay report, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan for his very effective contribution to the discussion of this vital issue.

Mr. President, speaking further as a member of the subcommittee, I wish to point out that no Member made a greater contribution to the consideration of this issue than did the Senator from Michigan, not only because he represents the State where the vast preponderance of our motor vehicles are manufactured, but also because of his personal knowledge of the construction business and his long association with the men who will be called upon to build the great interstate road system, as well as the subsidiary roads.

I desire to take this opportunity to express to the Senator from Michigan my own personal appreciation of the work he contributed to the subcommittee. I am particularly grateful because my State is primarily rural, rather than manufacturing, except for the lumber business; and I felt that the Senator from Michigan, who brought to us much knowledge of the problems of a great metropolitan area and its transportation difficulties, and particularly of the metropolitan area where most of our automobiles are manufactured, was especially helpful to me, in connection with my work on the subcommittee. I know I speak for the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the other members when I thank the Senator from Michigan for his splendid contributions to our work.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very flattering remarks. I assure him that it was a pleasure to serve with him on the subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to concur fully and wholeheartedly in the statements the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has just made.

Let me say that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] brought to the subcommittee not only the determination to render public service—a determination which has activated the excellent work he has done in the State of Michigan—but the ability to separate the wheat from the chaff, and also a personality so likable that his efforts were made very successful, very useful, and very helpful. I have appreciated his constant attendance at the subcommittee meetings, and his fine contribution to the work which has been done on this legislative proposal; and I have listened with pride to the fine address he has delivered today to the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I thank him very much for his most flattering remarks. I assure him that it was a pleasure for me to serve with him on the subcommittee, and I shall be very glad to work with him again at any time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be modified.

Before submitting the modification, I wish to say that I have checked it with the ranking minority member of the committee, and the majority leader has checked it with the minority leader.

I now ask unanimous consent that on page 7, in line 20, the word "May" be changed to the word "July."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward several amendments which I request to have printed and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table and be made the pending question for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 11, it is proposed to strike out all of section 17, through page 21, line 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the request of the Senator from New Mexico that his amendment be made the pending question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it was my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] yesterday offered an amendment which is the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a perfecting amendment has precedence over an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from South Dakota is too good a parliamentarian to contend that no other amendment can be offered because an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been offered and is pending.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota would not contend that such an amendment could not be offered. In fact, it is my understanding that if this is a perfecting amendment, it or other perfecting amendments may be considered before the consideration of a complete substitute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that is what the amendment is, I have no objection to making it the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. Lest any Senator be disturbed, there is no intention to have any vote or action on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico today.

The Senator from New Mexico merely wished to offer the amendment and have it printed, in order that it might be available to Senators. It is a perfecting amendment. Other amendments were submitted earlier in the day, and yesterday, notwithstanding the fact that the substitute of the Senator from Pennsylvania was pending. I am sure other such amendments will be submitted tomorrow.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota has not been in the Chamber during the entire afternoon, and was not advised as to what the situation was with respect to other amendments which might have been offered, and did not know whether or not there was something else which might be the pending question. However, he was aware that the Senator from Pennsylvania had offered his substitute.

In order that we may be clear as to the parliamentary situation, has any other amendment been offered with respect to which a request was made that it be made the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, with the exception of the substitute amendment, nothing of that nature has been offered prior to this moment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The request of the Senator from New Mexico was that the amendment offered by him be made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has offered it, and it is now the pending question.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 9:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that it is the plan of the leadership that the Senate convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning so that all Senators may have sufficient opportunity, if they so desire, to participate in the transaction of morning business.

Following the close of the morning hour, there will be a quorum call. Perhaps the debate on the pending bill will not be resumed until 10 o'clock. If all time for debate is consumed on the pending amendment, there will probably not be a vote on it until 12 o'clock.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, because of the circumstances under which we are meeting tomorrow, I wish to state for the RECORD it is my understanding that a statement was made by the distinguished majority leader yesterday—and the statement appears in the RECORD—that it would be his plan to have the Senate meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning. Therefore, Members of the Senate have had notice of that fact in advance of the order that has now been entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that all statements I make on the floor appear in the RECORD. I made such a statement on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota could have read it in the RECORD, but he wanted the RECORD to show that fact at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know that I called the matter to the attention of the minority leader and that we were in agreement on it. I want the RECORD again to show that we will have a morning hour tomorrow morning from 9:30 to 10 o'clock. Any Senator who wishes to introduce bills or submit memorials or petitions, or make statements at that time, may do so, without the time being taken out of the time allotted for debate on any amendment, substitute, or motion. It may be that not all the Senators will be in the Chamber at 9:30, but the majority leader will be here, and I am sure the distinguished Senator from South Dakota will also be here. Any Senator who desires to make a statement will be given that opportunity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The hour is late; it is after 5:30. Normally it would be a little unusual at this time of day to permit an order to be entered that the Senate meet at 9:30 the following morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be very glad, if the Senator should desire it, to move that the Senate meet at 9:30 tomorrow and to have a quorum call.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, the junior Senator from South Dakota merely wishes to make it perfectly clear for the RECORD that there was an earlier understanding reached on this matter and that we are not establishing the precedent of entering an order at 5:30 in the evening providing that the Senate meet at 9:30 the following morning without having more than 4 or 5 Senators on the floor to act on the request for such an order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas never functions in that fashion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know that the Senator from Texas does not do so. That is why I call attention to the fact that when the Senator from Texas made his statement yesterday there were other Senators on the floor, including the minority leader.

UNION PARTICIPATION IN POLITICS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, much has been said in the press in the past few weeks regarding union participation in politics. It will be recalled that the Wisconsin Legislature recently passed an act limiting union participation in politics, and I understand that the august legislative body of the State of the present Presiding Officer is presently considering proposed legislation along the same line.

Mr. President, because of this, and because of the interest of all the people of the country, both members of unions and nonmembers, and politicians, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks an interesting proposal in the form of a letter from the California Industrial Union Council, which is an affiliate of the CIO. I ask that the entire article, including the return card, be printed.

There being no objection, the article and return card were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, CIO,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: We are inviting you, as a member of the articulate liberal community in your area, to take advantage of our Legislative Secretarial Service. Over 800 citizens holding pro-liberal-labor views in California have already signed up, and we are sure that other citizens like yourself will be similarly interested.

This is how it works:

You fill out the enclosed authorization card and drop it in the mail. From time to time, during legislative sessions, you will receive from our office an individually typed letter to your Congressman, Senators (United States or State), or assemblyman. Your return address will be on the letter; all you need to do is sign it and place it in the envelope which will be enclosed with it. The envelope will be already stamped and addressed, ready for you to mail. You will also receive a carbon copy of the letter to keep.

The letters will be concerned with issues which are important, timely, and controversial. The point of view expressed will be based on liberal-labor attitudes which most liberals generally hold. We are sure that you are in full agreement with liberal-labor policy on issues such as minimum-wage laws, unemployment insurance, housing, child-care centers, and the like.

This secretarial service will mean more letters on important issues to your legislators. It helps you to keep in touch with your legislators at the time the legislative fight is on in Congress or Sacramento. It can be your way of letting your legislator know that you, as an individual, are keeping abreast of the most important issues arising in Congress and in Sacramento. It also helps your legislator keep in touch with you, because he will answer your personal letter, letting you know his position.

Remember that the final action—the signing and mailing of the letter is taken by you. You approve, sign, and mail every letter which bears your signature. The authorization card which we have enclosed with this letter is merely to let us know that you want us to provide you with this service. There is no charge.

The only way your legislator can know how you, the voter, feel about a proposed law is through your telling him. We will be happy to help you tell him if you will sign and mail the enclosed card.

Legislatively yours,

JOHN A. DESPOL,
Legislative Representative.

P. S.—This proposal can be summed up as follows: We will provide you with what amounts to a private secretary who will do research, write and type your letters for your signature. Professional lobbyists have this kind of service. So do many business executives. We just thought it would be a good idea to provide the same kind of service to those of you who would like to be amateur lobbyists more often.

I hereby authorize the CIO State council to act as my legislative secretary on any State and National legislation endorsed or opposed by CIO. I understand I will receive an original and carbon copy of any correspondence typed for me by the council. I will mail my original copy to my legislator.

_____
Name

_____
Address

_____ _____
Phone number Local union

Congressional district_____

Assembly district_____

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to be recognized, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate now stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1955, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Hess, O12599, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and sections 513 and 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for remainder of term expiring June 5, 1957.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this moment of prayer we are coming unto Thee with glad and grateful hearts, for Thou art mindful of all our needs.

We rejoice that Thou hast given unto our generation the wisdom to discover the wonders and mysteries of Thy handiwork.

Grant that men and nations may never use its power for cruel and unworthy purposes but only for Thy glory and the good of all mankind.

Show us how we may strengthen the ties of brotherhood, bringing the members of the human family into a cooperative and invincible fellowship.

Inspire men everywhere to live together in peace and good will, united in their aspirations and endeavors to build a world which has in it a love that is as inclusive as the love of God.

In Christ's name we offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 244, Rept. No. 614), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission established by Public Law 37, 77th Congress, with a view to ascertaining when it may be expected that the bridge and approaches thereto operated by such Commission near New Harmony, Ind., will become free of tolls, and what money has been received, and what expenditures have been made, by such Commission since its establishment in 1941.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], be excused from meetings of the House today, tomorrow, and Thursday, because of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION IN ARMED FORCES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, within the last several days, despite my protests, the House passed the cuts in the Armed Forces appropriation bill. I was advised by this House that I had nothing to worry about because you were going to pass a Reserve bill. Now you have cut the armed services, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines. We have failed to pass a Reserve bill.

France is moving one division from NATO to North Africa. You have lost that one from NATO. You are now going to beef up a Marine division and take it from Japan and send it to Okinawa, though you have cut the Marines 20,000. You are considering another division for Korea, although you will not have the men. We have cut the Army nearly 80,000.

I just bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, out of an abundance of caution. Do not say I did not tell you.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LET'S HOLD COFFEE PRICES IN CHECK

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the price of coffee has come down some more and that is good news to the American housewife. I am asking the membership of the House to join me later this afternoon in a step to hold coffee prices in check. I would like to announce now that I plan to offer an amendment this afternoon to the Commerce Department appropriations bill as soon as it is opened for amendment to add $25,000 to the funds of the Census Bureau for a continuing, monthly survey and report of coffee stocks on hand in this country. If we had had such information in 1953 and 1954, through the period of the fake coffee shortage, our housewives would have saved hundreds of millions of dollars. My amendment will come right at the start of the reading of the bill at page 2, line 12. The Commerce Department appropriation bill appropriates $1,121,000,000 and I ask that a mere $25,000 be put in the bill to protect the American housewife against the kind of fake shortage that we recently experienced in coffee.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, according to the Evening Star of yesterday, Harold E. Stassen, President Eisenhower's new "Secretary of Peace," is restlessly awaiting his cue to move onto the international stage and fill his "peace" role.

The cue, according to the report, will be a decision by the President that the country is ready to take definite steps toward bringing about world disarmament. We are told further that Mr. Stassen seems to think his cue is coming sooner than many people believe.

Recently the President was quoted as saying that we cannot have peace without disarmament or disarmament without peace. He did not indicate which came first or whether there was a cause-and-effect relationship. Actually, the President was half right. One cannot safely have disarmament without peace. But one may have what passes for peace without disarmament. In my opinion, the administration should be careful to restrict Mr. Stassen to his office of Special Assistant to the President on Disarmament, as the President himself should take prime responsibility for peace and realize that, as a matter of fact, all governmental activities in the

domestic field should be directed toward justice and international relations sustained by domestic policy—directed toward securing peace among nations. This is a responsibility not to be delegated.

While getting his teeth into the peace job—this is rather a strange figure of speech to use in this application; I do not know whether it is Mr. Stassen's contribution or that of the Star reporter—Mr. Stassen is serving out his time as head of the Foreign Operations Administration, which is being dissolved. We are told that peace and disarmament now get just half of Mr. Stassen's time. In this half-time work he has been doing a lot of things, we are told, which he cannot talk about. He has received and has been studying approximately 1,000 suggestions which have been sent to him in response to a plea for suggestions made on television and he is waiting for responses to a more recent plea beamed out by the Voice of America.

In the first place—

Says Mr. Stassen—

you never know where a sound idea is going to come from.

How true. In addition, a hastily recruited staff has been studying, we are told, all disarmament efforts since the dawn of history. It will be interesting to see this digest of the history of mankind soon, I assume, to be completed.

Meanwhile, while Mr. Stassen has been waiting for his cue and beaming out pleas for sound ideas, the Russians are conducting a peace campaign with specific proposals which threatens to sweep much of Europe into neutrality.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

THE LATE MRS. MARY BETHUNE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, few people have so dramatically lived their belief in the divinity of the individual as did that woman who said, "I believe in God and so I believe in Mary Bethune." Few women have contributed more to raise the standard of living of other women and so of a whole group than has Mary Bethune. I question if any man or woman has overcome greater difficulties with as great serenity or with as constant faith as Mary Bethune. When she opened the Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, she did so with $1.50 and a prayer. On the day of the opening she read the 23d Psalm, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want"; and she believed every word of that beautiful song of praise, and lived every word of it through many, many long years. When she finished reading the psalm she sang with a very full heart and an unshakable faith the song that the students of her college sang at her burial service, Leaning on the Everlasting Arms.

That was Mary Bethune, a woman of great courage, a woman of great faith, a woman of absolutely indomitable will, and of a strength that overcame mountains.

I am happy to pay my respects to this woman who has done so much for all of us who are women and all of us who are Americans—Mary Bethune.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

IDENTIFICATION TAGS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are many persons throughout the United States who are interested in several bills that have been introduced in both branches of the Congress to have designated on identification tags of those in the armed services the fact that they are communicants or members of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The Department of the Army in a report to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has reported against it on the ground that they have 4 or 5 classifications now. One, "C" for the Roman Catholic; two, "J" for Jewry; three, "P" for Protestant, and one for any other group that would not be included by those three, "Y," a preference which the individual had indicated but does not necessarily follow.

They also provide administratively that a particular religion may, if desired, give some identification to a member of the Armed Forces if they are a member of that particular religious group, such as Protestant, and so forth.

I have in my hand an identification tag given me by a young man of Greek origin who served during World War II. He told me last night that this identification tag was received from the Army as his Army identification tag, and it clearly shows on the tag the letters "G. O.," showing that he was a communicant or member of the Greek Orthodox Church.

I call attention to this fact to show that during World War II the Army did issue such tags. This might be of interest to the Members who are receiving a number of letters from well-meaning people who would like to see such legislation put through, and it might also be of interest to the members of the Armed Services Committee.

Apparently what they are seeking now was already being used in World War II.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not know that the gentleman has introduced a bill which would follow out the wishes of the Greek Orthodox Church, but I have introduced one today for that purpose. I am delighted that the gentleman brought up the matter. I am receiving hundreds of letters. It seems only a just thing to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are several bills introduced. I am glad to note that the gentlewoman has introduced one; but I wanted to call attention to the fact that apparently the Army followed this procedure in World War II which these good people seek to have them do again. As this identification tag indicates, they did issue such tags bearing the designation of the Greek Orthodox Church through the letters "G. O." during World War II.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not see any reason why they should change now. I sometimes feel that the armed services' right hand does not know what its left hand does.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I introduced a bill to accomplish this. I wish to congratulate the majority leader for his fine contribution.

HURRICANE WARNINGS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of general debate on the Commerce Department appropriation bill and when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, it is my intention to offer an amendment for an increase of funds for salaries and expenses of the Weather Bureau in order that we may be able to have faster advance warnings of hurricanes and tornadoes, such as those that caused so much damage in the last few years. Because it affects not only aviation and agriculture, but also all the citizens of the country, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6367, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee handling the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriations brings the bill for fiscal year 1956 to the floor today for your consideration. As chairman of the subcommittee, I want to thank the other Members who have worked with me so hard during the past 6 weeks to bring out a bill which adequately provides for the various programs provided for therein and at the same time effects every possible economy.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has been of immeasurable help during the hearings and markup of this bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has had an active hand in the handling of this appropriation bill for many years, has been of valuable assistance. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] have also been very helpful and cooperative.

The four Members on the minority side have also been very diligent in their work on this bill and have been 100 percent cooperative. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] had the major responsibility for most of the appropriations contained in this bill during the 83d Congress. His intimate knowledge of these appropriations has been of great assistance to the subcommittee this year. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] also have done everything possible to help me bring you a satisfactory bill today.

The bill before you appropriates a total of $1,121,435,000 for the coming fiscal year for the Department of Commerce, the Canal Zone, the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and the Tariff Commission. While funds for the Small Business Administration also come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, no budget estimates have been submitted as yet in connection with its operations for the 1956 fiscal year.

The amount provided in the accompanying bill is a decrease of $26,077,746 below the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1955. Also it represents a reduction of $244,958,000—nearly $245 million—in the 1956 budget estimates. This is a reduction of 18 percent below the budget, a rather substantial decrease. In complete frankness, however, it should be pointed out that the major portion of these reductions are in items which may require supplemental funds at a later date, depending on obligations incurred under basic legislation for subsidies to air carriers and ship operators, and depending on payments of contracts on Federal highways and forest highways. While the decreases in these items do not necessarily represent savings to the taxpayers in the final analysis, and they are not claimed as such by the subcommittee, it is believed that tight control over these items by the Congress is necessary. The appropriation of a little less than needed, rather than a little more, should encourage the Department of Commerce to effect every possible economy and make every possible saving.

In order that the Members of the House may have a complete picture of the action on every major program included in the bill, I will comment briefly on each appropriation, following the table commencing on page 14 of the committee report.

TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The amount provided here will permit the Secretary's office, and the top administrative staff of the Department, to continue its operations in 1956 at the 1955 level. The increase of $122,000 over 1955 covers the transfer of the Defense Air Transport Administration from the Business and Defense Services Administration to the Secretary's office.

CENSUS BUREAU

The amount recommended for salaries and expenses will permit the Bureau to continue its program in 1956 on the same basis as was authorized for 1955. The committee did not feel that the additional statistics to be gathered with the increase of $1,200,000 proposed in the budget were of sufficient importance at this time to warrant the appropriation of the additional funds requested. Some of the additional information proposed to be gathered appeared to be a duplication of information in other bureaus of the Department. Furthermore, all of the additional surveys proposed were merely extensions of existing programs already in existence. The funds requested to complete the Census of Agriculture and the Censuses of Business, Manufacturers, and Mineral Industries are recommended in substantially the amounts proposed by the budget estimates. The funds proposed for next year will permit the completion of these censuses, which were initiated a year ago.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The amount approved provides for the operation and regulation activities of the administration at about the same level as was provided for the fiscal year 1955. It is believed that additional economies and increased efficiency in operation can be effected to permit the commissioning of additional airways facilities to be added next year from establishment funds authorized for this year.

A rather sizable increase is provided for the establishment of air navigation facilities. The committee believes that the additional $13,500,000 over 1955 is necessary to permit the continued improvement of our air navigation facilities throughout the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Pacific. The growing needs of the rapidly expanding aviation industry of this country must be recognized and adequately financed from year to year. This is important to assure adequate safety in flight, which is important to every citizen of the country, whether or not he uses air transportation. It is also important that we have an adequate airways system in the interest of protection in the event of a national military emergency. Therefore, the committee is recommending to you today a rather sizable appropriation for this purpose.

With respect to the airport program, the committee is recommending an appropriation of $20 million for next year, an increase of $9 million over the budget. This amount will permit the continuation of this program at approximately the same level as was provided for the fiscal year 1955. The committee was impressed with the testimony indicating the expanding need for larger and better airports throughout the country. It is also convinced that direct Federal participation is essential to assure a well-planned and closely integrated national network of airports of proper design and adequate capacity to be useful for military as well as civilian purposes. In the interest of economy in construction as well as cooperation with local communities, the committee feels that the appropriation recommended is the proper amount to be authorized for the coming fiscal year.

The amounts proposed for 1956 for the operation of the Washington National Airport and the airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, are the same as were provided for the fiscal year 1955. It is expected that improved efficiency will enable these airports to continue to operate at present levels and to absorb additional costs authorized last year under the so-called fringe benefits bill.

The committee has also provided an additional $525,000 for the improvements at the Washington National Airport. This amount includes funds for installation of additional safety devices such as additional gasoline storage facilities, additional apron paving, standardization and replacement of field markings and lights, installation of an emergency electrical generator, and improvement of fire protection facilities. In addition, this appropriation will provide $70,000 for the construction of additional baggage facilities essential to meet the constantly increasing traffic at the airport.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

An additional $123,000 has been provided for the operation of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the coming fiscal year. This amount is recommended in order that the Board may increase its field audit staff sufficiently to assure adequate audit and verification of air carrier subsidy claims in advance of payment. The committee is not at all satisfied with the present audit procedures of the Board. It is convinced that more thorough field audit will make it possible to reduce the subsidy payments to air carriers in the future.

The committee has reduced the funds in the bill for payments to air carriers from the budget estimate of $63 million to $40 million. While it may be necessary to provide some additional funds for this purpose at a later date, the committee recommendation is adequate for the Board to commence operations during the next fiscal year. The committee feels that this approach to the problem of financing air carrier subsidies is desirable, in that it encourages the Board to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the taxpayers in the handling of these claims.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The amount authorized for the salaries and expenses of this organization for 1956 will permit the continuation of its operations at exactly the same level as was provided for the fiscal year 1955.

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The appropriation of $6,198,000 recommended for 1956 will permit continuation of the operations of this agency at the 1955 level. The reduction of $122,000 below 1955, as reflected in the table, is the result of the transfer of the Defense Air Transport Administration from this organization to the Office of the Secretary.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Rather sizable reductions have been made in the appropriations for the coming year for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. This results from the reduction of some 45 percent during the past year in the number of items on the positive list used in the export-control program of the agency.

OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

The $75,000 increase over 1955 recommended in the bill for this Bureau is to be used to make a special study of unemployment problems throughout the country. In view of the serious nature of this problem in some areas, the committee feels that more complete and accurate information is essential to guide both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government in developing future policies.

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

A rather large appropriation is recommended for the coming year for ship construction. The bill includes a total of $64,700,000 for 5 major construction programs of the Maritime Administration, as follows: Title V, construction, $44,750,000; tanker trade-in-and-build program, $11,500,000; acquisition of cargo ships, $4,200,000; research and development program, $2,500,000; and administrative and warehouse expenses, $1,750,000. The amount approved for title V construction include $14 million for 2 combination cargo-passenger ships for the American President Lines, $19,250,000 to replace 5 cargo ships, $11,300,000 to convert 2 mariners for the Oceanic Steamship Co., and $200,000 for reconditioning 2 vessels for the American President Lines. The amount recommended for the tanker trade-in-and-build program will permit the trade-in of 10 used tankers and the construction of 5 new ships. In addition, the sum of $4,200,000 has been included in the bill to acquire the 5 cargo ships to be replaced under the title V program. The $23,500,000 requested for the construction of 3 proto-type vessels for the Maritime Administration is not recommended by the subcommittee at this time. In view of the advent of atomic-powered vessels, the committee does not feel justified in recommending the expenditure of large amounts for construction of conventional type proto-type vessels.

The amount recommended for operating-differential subsidies, $90 million, is somewhat less than the amount requested and the funds available for the current fiscal year. Here again, it is difficult to predict accurately the funds required here. However, it is believed wiser to approach this matter on a conservative basis and to encourage efficient and careful handling of these subsidy claims through tight congressional control over appropriations.

The amount provided for salaries and expenses, which appropriation finances the operations of the Maritime Administration, covers approximately the same operating level as authorized for 1955. The additional $100,000 is to be used for reserve fleet expenditures.

The committee has also provided the budget estimate of $2,085,000 for the operation of the Kings Point (N. Y.) Maritime Academy. While this amount is slightly below that appropriated for 1955, it actually provides some additional funds for maintenance, in view of nonrecurring items and estimated savings made during the current fiscal year.

The committee has restored the full amount for the State maritime schools for the coming year. After full and complete hearings on this matter, in which many Members of the Congress presented testimony, the subcommittee believes that the future of the maritime industry and the national defense of the country warranted the restoration of the same amount as was appropriated for 1955, $660,000.

PATENT OFFICE

The committee is recommending $14 million for 1956, an increase of $2 million over the budget estimates and an increase of $2,500,000 over the amount appropriated for 1955. The committee took considerable testimony on this subject from Members of Congress and outside witnesses. It was apparent that a fairly well-organized effort to impress the committee with the need for additional funds was underway, spearheaded primarily by the patent lawyers of the country. While requests totaling $15 million and more were presented to the committee, the final figure recommended in this bill was based on testimony presented by the head of the Patent Office, Mr. Robert C. Watson, to the effect that he would not be able to employ experienced and qualified examiners at a rate which would require more than $14 million during the coming fiscal year. Subsequent informal discussions with several other top officials of the Department further supports this position.

The committee is in full sympathy with efforts to increase the staff of the Patent Office in order to reduce the existing 4-year backlog. It believes that the Secretary of Commerce was in error in submitting a budget of only $12 million. At the same time it does not feel that funds should be provided in an amount greater than can be used effectively. On the basis of the testimony from responsibile officials, it is believed that $14 million is the maximum which can be justified for 1956.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

The bill includes $600 million for Federal-aid highways for the coming fiscal year, a reduction of $80 million in the budget estimate. This amount will liquidate all authorizations through the middle of the fiscal year 1955. Since actual payment usually follows 15 to 18 months after contracts are approved, it is believed that the amount recommended will be sufficient to carry this program during the next fiscal year. If additional funds are required in 1956, supplemental appropriations will be necessary. It should be pointed out that the committee has little or no control over these funds, since the authority for the Bureau to enter into contracts and thereby commit the Government is contained in basic legislation. Therefore, the principal function of the Appropriations Committee with respect to this program is to provide adequate funds to make payments under contracts previously entered into on the basis of the authorizations contained in the basic legislation.

The same situation exists with respect to forest highways. For this purpose, the committee is providing $18,500,000 for 1956, the same amount as was appropriated for 1955. This amount will permit the payment of authorizations through the fiscal year 1955. This should be adequate, considering the normal time lag between commitment and final payment.

The original budget estimate submitted for the Inter-American Highway in January included $5,750,000 and was based on completion in about 6 years. This estimate was increased by House Document No. 126, dated April 13, 1955, to a total of $74,980,000. The revised estimate is based on a recent proposal of the administration to complete the highway within a 3-year period. In view of the lack of basic legislative authority for the revised estimate, and in view of the additional cost which will result from speeding up this program, the committee is recommending only $8 million for the coming fiscal year—on the basis of completion in 6 years. Officials of the

Bureau of Public Roads stated that a speeded-up program on a 3-year basis would cost the taxpayers of the country an additional $12 million, due to the necessity of bringing in larger amounts of heavy equipment to complete the job on a "crash basis," and in view of the need to bring in more outside labor at much higher labor costs. While the committee agrees that this project should be completed within a reasonable time, probably the 6 years originally planned, it does not feel that the additional cost of 20 percent should be approved in order to complete this program in 3 years.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The committee is recommending $7 million for the operations of the Bureau of Standards for the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of approximately $1 million over funds available for 1955. The increase is recommended in order to permit the Bureau to make adjustments required by the Comptroller General in the handling of overhead charges against projects undertaken for other agencies. The additional funds provided in the bill will make it possible for the Bureau to establish a proper charge for overhead against its own programs and thereby reduce the disproportionately high rate being charged to programs supported by transferred funds. In addition, the increase provided for 1956 will enable the Bureau to expand its regular research and testing, and radio propagation and standards work. The increased demand for improvement of the Bureau's work on such projects as temperature measurements, transistors, and engineering standards and techniques, is closely related to new developments in the fields of atomic energy, particularly with respect to military operations.

The committee also has included $995,000 for improvement of the plant and equipment of the Bureau and for the construction of an addition to the radio laboratory at Boulder, Colo., to conduct research for our armed services on electronic equipment calibration. This appropriation covers the cost of constructing the necessary buildings, whereas the cost of equipping and operating the facility will be borne by the military services.

WEATHER BUREAU

For the regular operations of the Weather Bureau the Committee recommends $27,650,000 for next year, an increase of $2,710,000 above funds available for 1955. This rather large increase will permit the Weather Bureau to take over certain basic meteorological activities now being supported by the Department of Defense, including 25 upper-air basic network stations, the central analysis work in Washington, the preparation and publication of special weather maps for the armed services, and the handling of weather services in Trust Territory Islands of the Pacific. Since these facilities have been operated by the Weather Bureau for some years now by a transfer of funds from the Defense Department, it appears advisable to provide the funds directly to the Weather Bureau. The Committee has been assured that a comparable reduction has been made in military funds to compensate for this portion of the increase. The balance of the increase will cover the full year cost of certain facilities operated during the fiscal year 1955 on a part-year basis. It will also cover the additional fringe benefit costs authorized by the last Congress.

The committee is also recommending the sum of $5 million for next year for the establishment of new meteorological facilities. Most of this increase is to provide additional hurricane and tornado-warning equipment, which is so urgently needed to help reduce the devastation caused each year by the severe storms such as those experienced along the east coast last year. A small portion of this fund will also be used to improve weather facilities needed to facilitate the landing of aircraft under adverse-weather conditions, to replace wornout and obsolete equipment of the Bureau, and to provide necessary engineering and technical support for installation of all equipment included in the $5 million recommended under this appropriation.

TITLE II, PANAMA CANAL—CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The committee has approved $14,500,000 for the operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government for 1956. This is an increase of $482,000 over funds available for 1955. The increase is provided to cover employee benefits authorized under the Fringe Benefits Act adopted last year and to meet increased needs for maintenance, education, and hospital services in the Canal Zone.

The sum of $1,800,000 is recommended for the capital program of the Canal Zone Government for the next fiscal year. With the exception of a major program for the construction of a sewage-disposal facility on the Pacific side, the fund provided covers the normal annual requirement for capital improvements in the area.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The committee has recommended $3,589,000 for administrative expenses of the Company during 1956, the same amount as was authorized for 1955. The committee is also recommending that the recent decision of the Directors of the Panama Canal Company to abandon the railroad in the Canal Zone be deferred until the matter has been given further consideration by the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives.

TITLE III, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

An increase of $55,000 is recommended for this agency for 1956, which provides a total of $175,000. The additional funds cover full-year salaries for certain persons employed for only 6 months in 1955. In addition, a small increase in various experimental projects is provided for.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $280,000 for administrative expenses of this organization for 1956. This amount provides an increase of $30,000 over 1955 for the employment of 3 additional engineers required as the major construction program gets underway.

TARIFF COMMISSION

The full budget estimate of $1,400,000 has been included in the bill for next year. The increase of $73,000 will enable the Commission to more adequately meet increasing demands for its services. In addition, it will cover the new duties required by the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that I believe this to be a very fair and adequate bill. I am sure it does not provide all the money which some people think should be appropriated. On the whole, however, it is a well-balanced bill which provides the maximum amount which can reasonably be expected in view of the present condition of the Treasury. It represents the combined opinion of the subcommittee based on thorough and exhaustive hearings and careful deliberations on each item in the bill. I strongly recommend it to every Member of the House for adoption.

Mr. Chairman, there are several items in this bill that need some discussion. The first item I would like to discuss is the request for the Inter-American Highway. The committee received a supplemental request for $74,950,000 to complete the Inter-American Highway on a crash basis rather than on the 6-year basis contained in the regular budget. It was brought to our attention by the Bureau of Public Roads that this would require a penalty or a premium of $12 million in order to build it on a 3-year basis rather than a 6-year basis. The committee decided that it could not afford to spend $12 million in order to accomplish the job in 3 years rather than 6.

One reason assigned for the additional $12 million, among other things, was the necessity of moving a large amount of heavy equipment into the area and also sending additional people. So it was decided in the committee that we would complete the job on a 6-year basis, at a saving of $12 million, rather than on a 3-year basis.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I wonder if the gentleman gave any consideration that the completion of the road might be helpful in promoting our good will with South America and if that would not be far more important than the saving of $12 million, which will eventually be expended.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I can only speak for myself. I would not undertake to speak for the remainder of the subcommittee. But it was my personal judgment that it would be more beneficial to the countries involved to have this money spread out over a 6-year period, that is, as to the economic effect, rather than on a 3-year basis, because in 3 years the economic effect would have been dispensed with, been over with, and if you save the $12 million and have it spread out over 6 years, it was my judgment it would be more beneficial to the countries involved.

Mr. MARTIN. In the meantime, you would be promoting travel between the

several countries, and that would be helpful in good will and trade. South America is where America has unlimited possibilities.

Mr. PRESTON. That is true, and that is one of the prevailing arguments and one of the convincing arguments that the committee considered in even approving the item at all.

Now, there is another item in the bill: Federal aid to airports. The request that we received from the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Department of Commerce, was in the amount of $11 million. The committee increased that to the sum of $20 million, and when you take into account the fact that $2 million are administrative expenses under another category, the present level of the program will be continued during the coming fiscal year as it was during this fiscal year.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to press an inquiry at this point concerning the smaller airports in this country. I have an airport in my district that has not been able to share in the Federal funds because it fails to meet unwise regulations. One company has a franchise to operate in the city of Fall River, but it is not using the permit. Another company would like to have the airport as a stop and they are not able to get that privilege. This makes it impossible for the airport to comply with the demands. Does the gentleman believe that that situation should be allowed to continue?

Mr. PRESTON. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that that has been a matter of concern to me, also. There is language in the report which recommends that the formula be changed. The present formula is 3,000 enplaned passengers during 1 year with 30 civil based aircraft, and under the language in the report I think I can assure the distinguished minority leader that smaller airports will be included in this program in the future rather than metropolitan airports.

Mr. MARTIN. I hope this is true. It is the smaller airports we are appropriating money to help.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] the language on page 4 of the committee report in regard to this feature of the bill:

> While the committee is in full agreement with this program and is endeavoring to support it with adequate funds—

And, of course, the amount was raised by the committee from $11 million to $20 million—

> it believes that every effort must be made to make certain that they are used wisely and effectively. It is felt that the present formula prevents development of smaller airports and operates to the advantage of airports in larger metropolitan areas.
>
> It is believed that the formula should be revised and consideration should be given in justifiable cases to smaller airports and in certain cases where operating facilities are involved.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. It is a step in the right direction and I will be pleased to see if the smaller airports get the aid Congress wants them to have.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FORD. I notice in the report that the committee has recommended $8 million for the Inter-American Highway, which is, by $2½ million, more than was available during the current fiscal year, I believe, but substantially less than the budget recommendation for this program.

I have read the committee's recommendations on page 8; I would like to ask this, however. Is my understanding correct that the Bureau of Public Roads of our Government decides how the $8 million or whatever the final figure is, is allocated for construction during the fiscal year 1956, or does some other party or agency make that decision?

Mr. PRESTON. No, the Bureau of Public Roads makes that decision.

Mr. FORD. They have the final authority as to where on the overall Inter-American Highway this sum, or whatever the final figure may be, shall be spent during the fiscal year 1956?

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORD. They could, if they wished, put it all on one segment of the road within one country, or they could spread it out over the full length of the highway and in a number of countries?

Mr. PRESTON. That is true; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. With reference to the item of grants-in-aid for airports, and the item of $20 million, to which the gentleman has just referred, I should like to ask the gentleman how the $20 million, plus the other $2 million referred to, will be used; for what purposes will that money be used?

Mr. PRESTON. There is a formula that is employed in allocating the funds. It is much too lengthy to have put it in the report or even in the hearings. It is available in the committee, and I am sure the committee would be delighted to show it to the gentleman from Georgia at any time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that point. The point that I was interested in principally was this. The Municipal Airport for Atlanta, Ga., is in the district which I represent. Atlanta issued bonds some years ago for improvement of the airport there. There has been no matching money to take care of that construction. I was wondering what the possibility was that some substantial matching funds would be available for that purpose from this appropriation.

Mr. PRESTON. Under the $20 million level or the $22 million level, there would be approximately $450,000 allocated to the State of Georgia.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I think it might be well to point out that the distinguished mayor of Atlanta, Ga., testified before the subcommittee and gave us the benefit of his advice with regard to the airport situation generally over the United States.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I appreciate very much the contribution of the gentleman from New York. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] for the information.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There is a considerable amount recommended to be appropriated for maintenance and operation, and so forth, including construction, at the Washington National Airport. In the past, I am told, there has been some difficulty concerning concessions at the Washington National Airport and the revenues derived therefrom.

Has that matter been entirely cleared up—the revenue from concessions?

Mr. PRESTON. The committee went into that only briefly. They did not make a full-scale investigation of it, but the Washington National Airport is self-sustaining. The revenues are sufficient to defray all expenses.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the chairman of the subcommittee, has pointed out the fact that Washington National Airport is practically self-sustaining, insofar as present income and revenue are concerned. There has never been any real difficulty with regard to these concessions mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa. Over the years and from time to time, the Committee on Appropriations has expressed the thought that they were not charging enough for certain concessions and fees. That situation has always been promptly rectified. I think this is one of the operations of the Federal Government of which we might well be proud.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I merely inquired for information and I appreciate the answer given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that we are getting revenues from the concessions that the Committee on Appropriations thinks we ought to have.

May I address one other question to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield further.

Mr. GROSS. On page 9 of the bill, under the item "Bureau of Foreign Commerce," there is this language, "including awards of compensation to informers."

What is meant by that language? Does that mean what it says?

Mr. PRESTON. I do not have a copy of the bill before me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. That is the usual legislative language in connection with operations of the customs service and export control. When an informant gives our Government information with regard to smuggling, he may be entitled to a reward.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for answering the question.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Georgia could tell me offhand how much of the $20 million was allocated for use in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. PRESTON. My recollection is, and I could be slightly in error on this, that it is in the neighborhood of $450,000, just as it is in Georgia.

Mr. JONAS. About the same as it is in Georgia?

Mr. PRESTON. It is about the same as it is in Georgia.

Mr. JONAS. I have a case in my district similar to the one referred to by the gentleman representing Atlanta. I am interested to the same extent he is in that appropriation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. There is a prevailing opinion, pretty widespread, I fear, that in the matter of Patent Office appropriations we have over the years been penny wise and pound foolish. Would the gentleman like to explain why this increase is adequate to do the job?

Mr. PRESTON. I will be glad to. The committee gave a great deal of consideration to this request and we heard a large number of patent lawyers and people from business. We must have heard maybe 15 people in 1 day. The committee was of the opinion that if we would ever overcome this huge backlog of applications, which is more than 200,000, we would certainly have to give them additional funds. However, in looking into it we learned that $2 million above the budget request would be sufficient. The budget request was $12 million and we approved an item in the amount of $14 million. The committee concluded that that was as fast as they could employ new examiners to deal with the backlog, and that after they had employed additional people maybe next year the amount should be increased to $15 million. We think we have adequately handled the problem.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it not also the fact that the committee considered the evidence before it on mechanization of the Patent Office and the study that is being made may improve the Patent Office by use of business machines and things of that type?

Mr. PRESTON. That is true. We hope we can develop some type of electronic machine that will assist in the examination of the applications.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I represent the city of Columbus, which has an airport where the city has raised funds and issued bonds, but these amounts have not yet been matched by the Federal Government. I was wondering about the table on page 286 of the hearings which shows the Federal-aid airport program distribution of $11 million, the budget figure. I was wondering whether the increase of $9 million would be proportionate or not. For instance, Ohio is down for only $268,221 in this table.

Mr. PRESTON. It would be proportionate, because there are no administrative funds in the $20 million. They are contained in another category under the title of "Operations and Regulations."

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman have at hand the amount that would go to Ohio under section 6 of the Federal-aid program as applied to the $20 million proposed by the committee? I understand it would be about $500,000.

Mr. PRESTON. I think the staff would be glad to provide it to the gentleman from Ohio if he would step over to the table.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] and all my fellow members of the subcommittee for reinserting in this Department of Commerce 1956 appropriation bill the amount of $660,000 for the 4 State marine schools in Maine, New York, Massachusetts, and California. The Eisenhower administration saw fit to deny these funds, or attempted to deny them, and the committee is now furnishing these funds to the Department of Commerce and the President with an instruction that they be used and that Federal aid to these academies be continued in the coming fiscal year. I commend the gentleman from Georgia for the action of his committee.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. The committee felt it was a perfectly justifiable thing to do to restore the funds and that they served a very important service in connection with the overall potential of our Nation.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I join in expressing the appreciation of the committee for the restoration of these funds. As the gentleman knows, I come from the district in which the California State Maritime Academy is located. It has received these funds under the basic law of 1874 ever since it was created and has considered them as a part of its budget operations. Without these funds it would be in very difficult straits. I do want to express the appreciation of the Academy for your generous effort in restoring the funds.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the total of the appropriations carried in this bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies is $1,121,435,000. This is a reduction of $244,958,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. It should be pointed out that of this reduction, $23,225,000 is in the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board, $63,540,000 in the Maritime Administration's budget request, and $153,480,000 in the budget estimate of the Bureau of Roads.

For the Office of Secretary the committee has allowed $2,172,000 which is the same as for the current fiscal year when transfers are taken into consideration.

The Bureau of the Census has been granted $6,200,000 for "Salaries and expenses," the same amount as for the current fiscal year. The sum of $5,500,000 has been recommended to complete the census of agriculture and $4 million to complete the censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries.

A total of $159,525,000 is included in the bill for the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The committee has recommended $20 million for grants-in-aid for airports which is an increase of $9 million over the budget estimate for this item. This increase should not be construed as a signal or an invitation to build or add unnecessary airports throughout the country. I, personally, am much more interested in seeing that the proper and necessary safety facilities are provided rather than the fancy chrome-stripped dining rooms in terminal buildings.

The committee has allowed $3,900,000 for "Salaries and expenses" for the Civil Aeronautics Board. This is an increase of $123,000 over the current fiscal year and is for strengthening the field audit program. The sum of $40 million is included for "Payments to air carriers."

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has been allowed $10,200,000, the same amount as provided for the current fiscal year.

For the Business and Defense Services Administration, there is provided in the bill $6,198,000, which is the same as for the current fiscal year when transfers are taken into consideration.

The committee has allowed $1,800,000 for "Salaries and expenses" and $2,500,000 for "Export control" for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. The Office of Business Economics has been allowed $975,000, an increase of $75,000 over the current fiscal year.

A total of $177,445,000 is included in the bill for the Maritime Administration. Of this amount $64,700,000 is for "Ship construction"; $90 million is for "Operating differential subsidies"; $14 million is for "Salaries and expenses"; $6 million for "Repair of reserve fleet vessels"; $2,085,000, the budget estimate for "Maritime training" and $660,000 for "State marine schools."

The committee has recommended $14 million for "Salaries and expenses" of the Patent Office. This is $2 million above the budget estimate and is $2,500,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. This action is recommended in an effort to get this

office on a more current basis. The committee was advised that the backlog of pending cases was 216,266 as of the end of March. An applicant for a patent should not have to wait as long as he must now do. In fairness I should point out that this backlog is not something new or something which has sprung up overnight. A check of the records will show that back in 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 there was a backlog of over 200,000 cases in each of those years.

An examination of the record will also reveal that this situation is not the fault of the Congress. This agency has been granted substantially what they have requested of the Congress in their budget estimates each year. Last year they received $500,000 more than the budget estimate. The amount recommended for this coming year is 228 percent of what it was for 1946. Additional funds alone will not solve the problem. The necessary additional competent personnel must be recruited. Modern methods and techniques must be applied in order to give the public the service to which they are entitled.

The bill includes $600 million for Federal-aid highways. In the event that the roadbuilding program proceeds at a faster pace than anticipated by the committee's action, additional funds will have to be provided. These funds are to pay for previously authorized road construction.

The sum of $18,500,000 is recommended for forest highways, which is the same amount as for the present fiscal year.

For the Inter-American Highway the committee has recommended $8 million, a decrease of $66,980,000 in the budget estimate.

A total of $7,995,000 is recommended for the National Bureau of Standards, of which $7 million is for expenses and $995,000 is for plant and equipment.

The committee recommends the sum of $32,650,000 for the Weather Bureau, an increase of $7,710,000 over the current fiscal year. Of this sum, $5 million is for establishment of meteorological facilities, of which the largest part is for additional upper-air hurricane and tornado warning equipment.

The committee has recommended $14,500,000 for operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government and $1,800,000 for capital outlay. A limitation of $3,589,000 for administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company has also been recommended.

The committee has recommended $1,400,000 for the Tariff Commission, an increase of $73,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

While I do not agree completely with every figure in the bill, it represents the combined judgment of the committee and in most respects I am in accord with the recommendations made.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I first extend my appreciation to the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to say a few words in reference to a matter which is of grave importance to us in New England. You heard earlier in the day that my colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] intends to offer an amendment to this bill later in the afternoon for which he asks the united support of the delegation from New England. The Fogarty amendment seeks to increase the appropriations for the Weather Bureau to the extent of $3,850,000 in order to increase the existing station facilities which have been substantially reduced over the past few years and which seeks also to restore some of those abandoned or eliminated weather stations, and which would permit employees to be placed on a 24-hour basis rather than on a partial or temporary work program.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the 1954 hurricanes that swept through New England were the most destructive in our Nation's history.

Three savage blows killed hundreds of persons and injured additional thousands. The first hurricane, called Carol, caused more than $500 million in property damage alone.

Insurance rates have gone up.

Felled trees in the forests have since dried out and constitute a continuing fire hazard.

While States and communities, industry, agriculture, and transportation keep their fingers crossed, hoping for the best.

As weather experts tell us that New England will be squarely in the path of future hurricanes.

We are not considering a danger that may hurt us, as in the case of a possible radioactive fallout, but of damaging storms that have hit us and will continue to do so.

In the face of these facts, there is no excuse for the Federal Government to operate the vital Weather Bureau with a skeleton staff and with facilities inadequate to provide us with an early alert.

We could prevent more than 25 percent of the property damage, and save more than 90 percent of the lives that are lost, with advanced, accurate, and widely disseminated warnings that a hurricane may have its eye on us.

Although New England is now a principal target area, every Atlantic and Gulf State, from past experience, and projections for the future, must be prepared for the worst. Individual States are in no position to pick up and trace a hurricane that begins to mobilize for the attack far down in the West Indies. This is the responsibility of the United States Government.

The Department of Defense, due to the special weather forecasts it must have to safely guide the movements of planes and ships, and because of the ample funds at its command, has become very efficient in the field of meteorology.

The military services recognize that this should be the function of the United States Weather Bureau, providing that the civil agency is given sufficient funds, personnel, and facilities to maintain a national weather facsimile network.

They concur in the belief that certain basic meteorological activities, including upper air observations at 25 locations, should be transferred from the Department of Defense to the Weather Bureau.

Wind, and rain, and pressure, and all other weather phenomena, do not operate for a few months, and then take a vacation for the remainder of the year.

It is difficult to understand why the Weather Bureau was only given enough funds to maintain facilities on a part-time basis in 1954.

Part time?

Even the increasing number of business organizations which must have special information regarding weather conditions in order to carry on their operations, failed to insist upon adequate staffing, equipment, and coverage.

This neglect resulted in heavy losses to human beings and economic enterprises last year.

All for want of a few million dollars' worth of foreknowledge. The need for advance warnings on hurricanes is a subject that cannot be disregarded.

We invite disaster when we economize at the expense of public safety.

The New England delegation in Congress, together with the Representatives from many other States, favor the additional appropriations for staff and equipment to maintain an efficient hurricane-warning service.

And to enable our Weather Bureau to become up to date.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to ask a question about the amendment proposing an increase for the Weather Bureau. In my mind there is a question as to its sufficiency, because only a short time ago I introduced a bill which was written on the advice of the best meteorologists in the country. They said they could not get by for less than $5 million, but that would also include a warning system for tornadoes and other severe storms. How does the gentleman reconcile the amount of $3,850,000 as against the $5 million the experts recommend?

Mr. LANE. I assume that the author of the amendment has conferred with the Weather Bureau division of our Government and has been informed that perhaps with that amount of money they could adequately take care of the situation. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman has been very vitally interested in this subject matter and has worked zealously here in the Congress for it. May I say to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] that I have read his bill, I have read his statement made to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I agree with him most heartily, but I was hopeful, since the matter has been brought to the attention of the committee, that since the gentleman's bill called for that sum of money, $5 million, and that with the paring down of this sum by the Fogarty amendment, that the amount would obtain the approval of the Congress by way of a compromise amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. May I say to the gentleman that the insurance companies of the country and the meteorologists of the country have agreed that my bill is the one that should be accepted.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee in charge of this bill has reduced the overall requests of the Department of Commerce by about $245 million, or, roughly, 19 percent.

Included in that reduction is a substantial slash in the funds requested by the President for the maritime ship construction program.

The request was for $102.8 million. The committee has allowed $64.7 million. The result is that the amount approved is $38.1 million or 37 percent below the request of the President. It is also $17.9 million or 21 percent below the amount allowed for the current fiscal year.

The reduction eliminates 3 prototype vessels desired for mobilization purposes, 1 high-speed tanker very much desired by the Navy and 2 cargo ships. It also eliminates 5 tankers from an extended trade-in-and-build program, a program which has been strongly endorsed by the National Security Council.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this reduction.

I am opposed to it because of the vital importance of a proper maritime-construction program to our national defense.

A proper maritime-construction program is vital from the standpoint of merchant marine vessels essential in time of an emergency.

For years we have been told by the Department of Defense of a deficiency in essential merchant ships. Two years ago the deficiency was officially estimated at 214 ships—no real progress has been made since then.

Time and time again we have been told by the Department of Defense of the need for new tankers; that those on hand are obsolete or too slow; that there are practically no tankers at all in the reserve fleet; that there are not enough tankers on hand to meet the initial mobilization impact.

It was only a year or so ago on March 27, 1954, that Admiral Leggett, then Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Navy Department advised us and I quote:

> The current and prospective scarcity of commercial ship construction constitutes a serious threat to our national security.

A proper maritime-construction program is also vital from the standpoint of the preservation of facilities and know-how which are essential in time of emergency.

Our shipbuilding industry has been in distress. It still is in distress. Employment on merchant ship construction has been declining ever since the first quarter of 1953. It is still declining. As of March 1, 1955, the total construction personnel on oceangoing ships was less than 7,000. This figure compares with that of 36,000, officially estimated a year or so ago, as the minimum required for an adequate mobilization potential in terms of our national security.

Living near the seaboard, as I do, I come face to face with ship construction problems. It is tragic to see skilled workers who have given from 20 to 25 years of their lives to ship construction, who have made a great contribution to the Nation in the past, who would be in great demand tomorrow in the event of an emergency, who are now forced to be idle or to look for work in other fields where their skills will be lost to national defense.

The construction yard in my own congressional district, which has made magnificent contributions to the Nation, both in time of war and time of peace; which employed some 30,000 construction workers during World War II; which requires probably 6,000 workers from the standpoint of an essential mobilization facility; has today only 2,000 people on its payroll.

Speaking a year ago on April 28, 1954, before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Admiral Leggett also had this to say:

> The situation today in our private shipyards is so critical that I have grave concern whether the industry can meet mobilization production schedules.
>
> It is apparent that the industry is not prepared today to meet initial wartime requirements. Our private yards now have less than one-third of the total employees in December 1941, and a further drastic reduction is expected later on this year as the privately owned and mariner construction now on the ways is completed.

I repeat—

He said—

> the Navy is gravely concerned with the plight of the shipbuilding industry which promises to become the most vulnerable area in our entire preparedness program.

I do not say, Mr. Chairman, that all shipyards are essential. I do say that it is vital to keep in being those yards which are essential in time of need, and those staffs of skilled workers which are essential in time of need. A proper maritime ship-construction program is essential to these ends.

To fail in either respect is to limit our military power and to go contrary to the fundamentals of our whole national defense policy.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the reduction made in the funds requested by the President for maritime construction.

I have canvassed many Members of the House and Senate who are deeply interested, as I am, in the restoration of these funds.

I believe that additional funds can and will be added at the other end of the Capitol and that this action will greatly strengthen our hands later in opposition to the position taken by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. The figures contained in the bill now being considered by the House were arrived at as the result of compromise.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman from New York. The matter must, of course, be reviewed at the other end of the Capitol. Neither he nor I would wish to jeopardize that review.

I am assured that the matter will be thoroughly and carefully reviewed. I am confident that funds will be restored in the course of that review, in the light of further evidence that will be available at the time.

Funds eliminated by the committee should be restored before the bill is enacted into law. I shall do my utmost to that end.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts on his very fine statement. We in Maryland, too, are very much concerned about this reduction. Our hope, which is the same as that of the gentleman from Massachusetts, is that the money will be restored in the other body.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the very able gentleman from Maryland for his contribution. He always has the best interests of the merchant marine and the shipworkers at heart.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested in reading the report of this subcommittee and reading the hearings conducted by the subcommittee, with particular attention to that section of the hearings and the report dealing with the American merchant marine. I want to congratulate the committee on the language in the report, and I want to let the committee know and the chairman of the committee know that this language has been of great interest to the legislative committee dealing with the American merchant marine. I read:

> It is believed that close scrutiny should be given to employment practices and similar cost factors of subsidized lines in order that future payments may be reduced to a minimum.

Yes, the American merchant marine is essential to the national defense of this country and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] I would say that we must have more ships afloat if we have any idea of maintaining the proper number of employees in the shipyards ashore. Some way must be found by all segments of industry to increase the number of American-flag vessels on the high seas.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today a bill which contains funds for maritime activities for the coming fiscal year. Among other items there will be appropriated the sum of $90 million for the payment of operating differential subsidies. This is $25 million less than the amount requested by the administration and it is altogether possible that unless the full amount is restored, either here or in the Senate, we will be called upon to make a supplemental appropriation for this purpose later on.

This is an obligation we owe. This is not some forecast; this is not just by perchance. These figures are obligated at the present time, the full amount that was requested. To have a merchant marine we must pay the subsidy. There is no other way we can have it.

But in any event, Mr. Chairman, this is a large sum of money and the fact that this item has increased year after

year has been of great concern to many of us.

I want to assure my colleagues in this body that the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I have the honor to be chairman, not only are concerned but are determined to ascertain whether the taxpayers of this country are getting their money's worth in the payment of these bills. I think it is appropriate at this time that I review the activities of my committee since the beginning of the current session of Congress.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was designed to develop and maintain an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine. It provided subsidies to aid in the construction of safe, modern ships, as well as subsidies to enable those ships to compete on a parity basis with the fleets of other nations. Today foreign competition is at an alltime high. Nations which have never before embarked on maritime careers are entering the field—even landlocked Switzerland has a merchant fleet. Our coastal and intercoastal fleets have all but disappeared. This was brought to pass when the Congress placed our coastal tariffs under the Interstate Commerce Commission. That obliterated the coastal operation of merchant fleets. There never was a chance for an operation to exist after that date.

During the past year we have fallen from 7th to 12th place among the nations of the world in ship construction. Is it any wonder that I say we are dealing with a sick industry?

We began our program this year by holding a series of orientation hearings. Primarily for the benefit of the new members of the committee. These were very instructive and have served to enable the membership better to understand the problems with which we are now struggling.

We took a look into the administration of the Tanker Trade-In Act, enacted by the 83d Congress. This act is designed to encourage the building of new tankers of a high speed and improved design. The basic necessity for the legislation was described as twofold. First, to stimulate our shipbuilding industry; and, second, to enhance the strength of our reserve tanker fleet. We find that progress under this law has been slow but steady. Generally speaking, its purpose is being accomplished. However, it was found that although the legislation contemplated the construction of tankers with a speed of not less than 18 knots, several contracts were negotiated, or in the process of negotiation, calling for the construction of tankers of less than 18-knot speed. I am pleased to report that by timely action on the part of your committee, this deviation from the program as outlined to the Congress has been checked.

Soon after the first of the year charges were made that the Cargo Preference Act, commonly referred to as the 50–50 law, was constituting a bottleneck in the administration of our foreign-aid programs. You will recall that under this law the privately owned American flag vessels are entitled to carry at least 50 percent of all cargoes given away or sold for foreign currency by the United States Government. The committee took cognizance of these charges and promptly called before it all those charged with the administration of the law.

Let me pause to say at this point that I am amazed at the efforts being made, both here and abroad, to sabotage this statute. I have every reason to believe that these efforts began to generate even before the ink was dry on the President's signature. I am fortified in this belief by the fact that we found no real basis for the charges that the law was delaying foreign-aid shipments.

There were to be sure some temporary impediments which, to some, seem more apparent than real, but which the committee immediately took steps to eliminate. Measures also were recommended to prevent overlapping in efficiency and future maladministration of this most important legislation to the American merchant marine. We have just concluded a series of hearings on the problems facing the American merchant marine in connection with the replacement of the existing fleet. Between 1956 and 1966, practically the entire fleet which was built during the war period will become obsolete. Obviously, it would not be sound policy to wait until 1966 to begin the construction of new replacement vessels. This would serve only to add to the feast or famine characteristic of the shipbuilding industry. Consequently, it is in order for the Government to try to secure an orderly replacement of the existing fleet at the least possible expense to the American taxpayers. A report containing the committee's findings and recommendations for dealing with this problem will be issued in the near future. Beginning next week, the committee will begin the most important phase of this program for this session of the Congress. We are going to call up before us in closed, off-the-record meetings the top leaders in labor and management in the maritime industry. We intend to engage in frank discussions with these leaders of the basic problems and difficulties confronting the American merchant marine. We shall ask them for recommendations and solutions for improving these conditions. I do not want to leave the impression that the present Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is a pioneer in the field of attempting to find the causes and prescribe the remedy for the ills of the industry. Many studies have been made and it is not our intention to retrace the steps of other groups. We do intend, however, to take full advantage of their work and to insist by legislation or otherwise on the adoption of some of the remedies that other groups have already recognized as essential to any improvement in the situation.

Members of our staff have been sent to practically every major port in the country to study this problem and to help find the answer to it. We have received reports from these field studies, and these reports have increased our concern. I am very much afraid there has been a lack of responsibility on the part of the leaders of the maritime industry, both labor and management. And, if the Government is subsidizing irresponsibility, we shall lay the facts before the Congress and the American people. If operating costs have increased to unreasonable levels, we shall do all in our power to see that that is cut out. Labor and management must be made to realize that beyond the obligations they owe to their rank and file or to their boards of directors, they owe a great fidelity to the Government of the United States in the position they hold in the American merchant marine. Perhaps there is no more vital link in our defense setup, which we have designed to let remain under civil control. We want to keep it that way, but irresponsibility cannot be countenanced.

Mr. Chairman, I quote the Secretary of the Navy in his Maritime Day address, at the Shoreham Hotel last Thursday evening, when he said:

> Only did we begin to win World War I and World War II when the production of merchant vessels became greater than the losses we were sustaining at sea.

That one statement alone shows definitely, and is convincing, that the American merchant marine is vital and necessary to the defense of this Nation, just as great as the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in a measure of this sort which involves $1.1 billion distributed among varied agencies including the entire Department of Commerce, it is only natural that there would be differences of opinion among the 10 members of the subcommittee; but I think it is proper to report to this Committee of the Whole that as far as I could observe our subcommittee was in remarkable accord in the overall picture.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], was most considerate. The views of all members were fully considered. While I would not want to tell this body that there is a single member of this committee who is entirely satisfied with every item, I think we have today a bill that has been brought out with as much unanimity of feeling, and with as little partisanship or sectional bias as it is possible to have in such a complex piece of legislation.

Personally, I am grateful to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee on both sides for the courtesies shown me.

As has been pointed out, there are some places where perhaps some of us would have appropriated a little more money. Mention has already been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and others, of a matter which is very close to the hearts of many members of this subcommittee, and that is the welfare of our great merchant marine. I think we are all very conscious of the need of an outstanding merchant marine.

I might call attention to the fact that as far as the maritime training schools in the 4 States are concerned, this committee provided funds even though they were not requested in the budget. However, I think we should bear in mind the fact that money alone does not answer all the ills of the day. We cannot always accomplish the desired results by appropriating more and more money. It is most important in the shipbuilding program and in the entire merchant marine program to move with reasonable economy, but at the same time with dispatch. I hope it will be possible to wisely spend more money in some of that field than is provided for in this measure, but until it is definitely shown that it can be economically and wisely spent during this year, the committee, perhaps, would be in error in providing more money just because the committee would like to see progress in that field.

The same thing applies with great force to the Patent Office.

As was mentioned earlier in the debate, we are concerned with the long delay in clearing the backlog of applications in the Patent Office, but money alone will not solve the problem. The committee feels that the sum that has been allowed is all they can spend wisely, because it is not wise to hire people to fill those places without providing proper training for them, and the people who are now overworked, overburdened, are the very ones who not only would have to carry along the regular work but also train the new people. It would therefore seem unwise to appropriate more money than can be effectively used even though there is great need for improvement.

Another matter that has already been mentioned deals with the Weather Bureau. I guess there are few people more cognizant of the ills that befall the countryside from a hurricane than myself, because I was in the heart of Hurricane Hazel, that lady who did almost as much damage as Carol, and certainly made a very lasting impression on this area here in Washington as well as in my country on the Chesapeake Bay, in Maryland. We have allowed an increase in the funds for the Weather Bureau. I think an increase of some $7,700,000 over the year before; in fact, I think the committee recommended only $200,000 less than the full budget estimate on an item that runs somewhere around $32 million. Certainly, if the spending of $200,000 or $2 million would alleviate hurricane damage, there is no one on this committee, I think, who will oppose it. But truth of the matter is that, important though the subject is, the money provided may well be all that can be wisely spent under the circumstances and the situation that has been placed before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we are going to be confronted here with an amendment to increase the appropriation for the purpose of expanding the hurricane warning system, does the gentleman not agree that we should also expand the facilities for tornado warnings in other parts of the country?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think the facilities in both fields should be expanded as rapidly as they can be efficiently; but I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the initial stages the mere appropriation of money does not get results.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. We want to appropriate money which will give results but only where the funds can be wisely spent.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, but I also think if any increase is provided we should couple with it increased tornado warning facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. They are equally important. Anything that causes such damage to property and loss of life is of top priority.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is not a question of repairing hurricane damage; what we want in essence is ample warning to batten down the hatches and do the things that will save our property and our lives. In the case of the last hurricane we did not know anything about it, we had no warning of it until the thing was practically over. There must be some way by which the Weather Bureau could have informed the New England coast, Connecticut, and Rhode Island of what was coming.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I am not sufficiently informed to assess properly the capabilities of this great scientific organization and how adequately it operates. I can only say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that in this bill we have given all but $200,000 of the amount asked of us to operate the Weather Bureau. We feel that they can do without that $200,000 by making reasonable economies without interfering with their service.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to call attention to page 9 of the report where we allowed $2,700,000 additional for hurricane and tornado work and warning.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. And on the showing made to the committee that that was the amount the Department felt it could use properly and to the benefit of all concerned. Is that not so?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then no request has been made for extra money by the Weather Bureau? Is that true?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. As I recollect it we cut $200,000 below the budget request on an item that ran over $32 million. It is there in the report. It was merely tightening up a little bit without cutting out any of the functions. We felt they could economize to that extent.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not quite understand this because I have been in communication with people in the Weather Bureau and they inform me that they need around $5 million to carry out this program of warning people in New England, in fact, along the entire coastline, including Texas, when a storm is brewing. Now, there is something wrong some place if they tell you one thing and tell us another.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I would like to refer the gentleman from Connecticut to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia. I do not want to misrepresent anything. My understanding is that we have given them within $200,000 of what they asked.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman will see from the report of the committee, page 19, that there has been an increase this year over the appropriation for last year of $7,710,000 and that we come this year to within $200,000 of the total budget request.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is what I stated.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The gentleman from Connecticut has said he was told by someone in the Weather Bureau that they needed $5 million that we have not given them. That is what I was asking the gentleman from Georgia to verify, because I had not heard of it.

Mr. BOW. We gave them the budget request. What they might have asked the Bureau of the Budget is something else, but that is what we have given.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is all we know about.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. My understanding is that the Weather Bureau asked the Department of Commerce for $49 million and the Secretary of Commerce cut that by $11 million. When the Secretary of Commerce came to justify his request for the Weather Bureau, they cut it $5 million more. The gentleman from Ohio talks about a $7 million increase in the budget. Five million dollars of that increase goes for meteorological facilities which everyone realizes they need and that $5 million is $5 million less than what they put to use. The other two or three million dollars increase concerns itself with a transfer of operations from the Department of Defense to the Weather Bureau, so, actually, the Government does not lose any money there. There is not an additional $3 million outlay by the Government because you are saving the money by not having the Department of Defense do the work. I think it has been the history of the Weather Bureau that it has been very reluctant, and very hesitant, to ask the Congress for specific appropriations to take care of the warnings that are necessary to take care of lives and property in the New England area.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. If a reasonable increase in this appropriation can be of help in this important matter or even can be held to have a fair

chance of being useful in saving life, I will support such an amendment.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, there are three items in this bill that I would like to address myself to. The first one is the Inter-American Highway. Now, it was my pleasure to represent the Subcommittee on Commerce Appropriations at the dedication of a link in that highway some 2 weeks ago. I think it is a good highway. I think it is a very valuable contribution to inter-American affairs. When you realize that up until the time in 1934 when we began construction of a highway from Laredo, Tex., headed in the direction of the Isthmus of Panama, the only access to the outside world that 8 million people living in Central America had was by means of banana boats, it is quite obvious to anyone who travels in Central America that this highway is helping to bring into being a substantial middle-class. It is easy to appreciate the value of that highway. We have already invested some $46 million in that highway. It is not a bad road. There are about 130 some odd miles that today are still impassable between San Jose, Costa Rica, and the Isthmus of Panama. The President has requested the Congress to provide funds to complete that highway in 3 years. Our subcommittee did not allow these funds because the basic authorization had not yet passed the Congress, but I understand it now is out of the Committee on Public Works and that a rule is being sought, and the authorization will allow for the speedy completion of the Inter-American Highway.

The second item I want to report on is a trip that I took with other members of the subcommittee last Friday who went out to the National Airport and made an afternoon flight up to Atlantic City to a naval air base there to try to clear up some of the confusion that exists today between two systems of aviation safety facilities, namely, VOR-DME versus a new system which is called TACAN. The conclusion of all those that I have talked to who made that trip is that we had better go slow with TACAN and that it will be further investigated, preferably by the CAA.

The third matter I want to bring to the attention of the Committee is the new system of accounting down in the National Bureau of Standards where so much of their funds previously have been accounted for through transfers. They now have sort of a revolving fund working down there. That will help us greatly in appropriating wisely for the National Bureau of Standards.

When we go back into the House, I expect to ask unanimous consent to place that report in the RECORD at this point.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS.

THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND OF THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

INTRODUCTION

As a technique for effective fiscal management and cost ascertainment the National Bureau of Standards uses a working capital fund. This fund permits the NBS to utilize methods of fiscal management and cost control that are common to nongovernmental organizations. The concept of this fund is similar to revolving funds, and industrial funds which are used increasingly in the management of operations of an intragovernmental-service nature.

The NBS system was one of the early applications of the working capital fund technique. It is unique in certain respects, and, occasionally, its use has been confusing to persons responsible for reviewing the programs of the Bureau. The reasons for its use, and the major features of its operation are described here to clarify this aspect of the Bureau's management for those who need to understand, or are interested in how the fiscal affairs of the Bureau are managed.

BUREAU ACTIVITIES

The National Bureau of Standards serves as a national laboratory for problems relating to the fundamental standards of measurement in the physical sciences. Within the fields of physics, mathematics, chemistry, and various branches of engineering, the Bureau engages in fundamental and applied research, development, calibration, and testing and provides a variety of technical and advisory services to science, industry, and Government. The programs of the Bureau are supported both by appropriations to the Bureau and by funds supplied by other agencies. During the past 6 years, appropriations to NBS for its own basic operations have ranged between $6 million and $8 million each year. The Bureau appropriations support between two and three hundred distinct projects in 15 technical divisions. During that same period, funds supplied by other agencies have ranged from $10 million to $45 million each year to finance several hundred projects throughout the Bureau.

PROBLEMS OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT

The type of work performed at NBS, and the large volume of work for other agencies creates many problems in accounting, budgeting, and other aspects of fiscal management. The following is a partial list of factors affecting these problems:

1. The transfers from other appropriations result in several hundred separate working fund acounts for which NBS is responsible.

2. Many projects receive support from more than one source.

3. Most of the employees in the technical divisions work on several projects during a year, and many of them work on more than one project during a pay period.

4. Indirect costs—supervisory, administrative, and maintenance costs—must be supported by the various appropriations and working funds.

5. Much of the equipment needed for the technical programs is used on more than one project.

6. For effective work, a large storeroom of various supplies and materials must be maintained and accounted for.

Prior to July 1, 1950, the Bureau had a regular appropriation-accounting system. The factors mentioned above created many problems which could be dealt with only in a makeshift manner. For example, a portion of each advance of funds from other agencies was deducted for overhead expense when the advance was received, and therefore without regard to when, or whether, the portion of the fund for technical work was ultimately completely expended. The processing of payrolls was very cumbersome because the charges had to be related to the several hundred fund accounts in order to make the necessary disbursements. Thus, payments and management reports were both delayed by the processing of costs through the numerous funds, and techniques for splitting charges to two or more funds on shared services or items was very difficult.

DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVED METHODS

During fiscal year 1950, the Bureau decided that fiscal control of the Bureau's program, at the scientific level and at management levels, would be improved by developing new methods of fiscal management, cost ascertainment, and reporting for each of the projects undertaken by the Bureau. Action on this problem was stimulated by complaints of the House Appropriations Subcommittee based on a report by their staff. Emphasis on solving this problem was also prompted by a General Accounting Office survey.

The problem was studied, and solutions proposed by a group of experts from the GAO, the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, and officials of the Bureau. This group concluded that the use of a revolving fund would aid in the solution of some of the Bureau's fiscal problems. Costs could be initially allocated to projects in a revolving fund which could be reimbursed by the supporting funds after payments were made to vendors and reports were prepared for management use.

In the course of establishing the revolving fund, attempts were made to deal with such problems as charging for equipment, charging for indirect costs, and allocating salary costs of personnel on leave. As a result, the revolving fund took on some of the aspects of a capital fund of a corporate organization. In the accounting system that was developed, provision was made for including accrued leave and depreciation of equipment as elements of cost, for recording charges for supplies and materials as cost only when the supplies were delivered to the point of use, and for distributing administrative and maintenance expense as indirect—or overhead—cost to all programs.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER USES OF REVOLVING FUNDS

It should be noted that revolving funds, stock funds, and similar financing techniques had been used previously in the Government, e. g., the Bureau of Engraving and Printing had recently been put on a working capital fund. However, so far as is known, practically all of these financing devices were applied to programs which were wholly of a service nature, and did not mix in one organization, or financing system, the availability of appropriated funds and the utilization of a revolving, or capital, fund. The authority for industrial funds in the Department of Defense was new at this time, and generally speaking, was being used only in the financing of supply depots, manufacturing, or other operations which were wholly charged to customer units. At NBS the use of a working capital fund introduced a unique concept: The NBS as an agency which has its own program appropriations would be contracting with itself (the fund). This concept can be stated in reverse: The WCF embraces all of NBS operations which are services provided for many customers, and one of these customers is the NBS program appropriations.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE MAIN FEATURE

The working capital fund was established July 1, 1950, by the appropriation of $3 million of working capital. (Due to an increase in the volume of work performed by the Bureau, the Congress subsequently appropriated $2 million of additional working capital.) The fund finances the initial cost of all work performed by the Bureau and is reimbursed periodically by the applicable appropriations and working funds. As of June 30, 1954, the principal of the fund consisted of $5 million in appropriations and net donated assets such as buildings and grounds of over $26 million.

For purposes of accumulating costs and for program management, the programs of the National Bureau of Standards are classified in a series of projects. Each distinct

job undertaken by the Bureau, either for other agencies or as a part of the basic Bureau program, is identified as a project. Each project is assigned to an organization unit, for example, section or division, and is in one of four activity categories established for program budgeting: Research; development; testing, calibration, and specifications; and general technical services.

All obligations and costs incurred in the performance of a project are recorded for that project in the working capital fund. Direct costs include salaries, travel, materials, contractual services, and special equipment. In addition, indirect costs, or overhead, which include costs of supervision and administration of the technical divisions, depreciation of equipment, administration of the Bureau, and maintenance of Bureau facilities, are charged on a pro rata basis to all projects.

The charges to projects for salaries of personnel include, in addition to the hourly rate for productive time worked on the project, a charge for the amount of leave earned by employees while working on the project. The amount charged to projects for accrued leave is accumulated in a leave reserve account from which salary payments are made when the employees are on leave. Since an employee engaged in the technical programs of the Bureau will often work on more than one project during a given time period, some means is necessary to determine which project shall bear the costs of his salary when he is on leave. The method of charging for leave on an accrual basis provides a ready solution to that problem.

The Bureau maintains a large storeroom for frequently used supplies and materials. These supplies are purchased by the working-capital fund and carried as an asset of that fund until such time as they are requisitioned for use. At that time the cost of the supplies is charged to the requisitioning project.

The accounting system for the working-capital fund distinguishes between capital outlay and expenses. Equipment is purchased by the working-capital fund and carried as a fixed asset. The costs of equipment are recovered by charging the using projects for depreciation of the equipment. For equipment which is of general use in a technical division, the charge for depreciation is based on estimated life and is included as an indirect cost which is prorated to all projects in the division. For other equipment which is of special use only to certain projects, or for which use beyond the immediate fiscal year is uncertain, the entire cost of the equipment is directly charged to the using project; that is, the equipment is fully depreciated at the time purchased.

THE METHOD OF APPLYING OVERHEAD, INCLUDING THE BILLING DIFFERENTIAL

The major element of indirect cost to a project is for administration of the Bureau and maintenance of Bureau facilities. Administration includes the costs of executive direction and of central service activities such as personnel and accounts. Since the Bureau is responsible for maintenance of its buildings and grounds, the costs of this activity are also included in Bureau overhead for proration to all projects.

The distribution of indirect costs to technical projects is based on salary costs in those projects. Each project is charged a percentage of its salary costs, the percentage being calculated to recover a total equal to the costs of the administrative and maintenance activities. For example, the administrative and maintenance programs of the Bureau were budgeted at about $3.4 million for fiscal year 1955. Since salary costs in all technical projects were estimated to total $11,040,000, an overhead rate of 31 percent of salary costs was derived.

The so-called billing differential arises from the fact that the Bureau does not charge all projects at a 31 percent overhead rate. Projects supported by Bureau appropriations are charged less than 31 percent and projects sponsored by other agencies are charged more than 31 percent. The difference between the amount charged to each group of projects and the amount which would be charged using the true or average rate has been termed the billing differential.

The rise of two overhead rates has its origin in the structure and size of the appropriations made to the Bureau for its own programs. For example, the Bureau received 3 appropriations in 1955: Research and testing, $3,150,000 (for technical work only); radio propagation and standards, $2,100,000 (for technical work only); and operation and administration, $990,000 ($740,000 for overhead; $250,000 for other purposes).

It is estimated that, of the $5,250,000 in the Bureau's 2 technical appropriations for 1955, approximately $4,180,900 will be expended for salary costs. At a true overhead rate of 31 percent, the Bureau's appropriations should pay $1,296,000 for overhead costs. However, the Bureau has available only $740,000, equivalent to a rate of approximately 18 percent. The difference of $556,000 is an increase in the amount charged to projects sponsored by other agencies and results in an overhead rate of about 40 percent.

The Comptroller General has criticized the billing differential practice and has stated that it is illegal and must be corrected. The elimination of the practice would simplify the administration of Bureau programs, permitting a uniform system of control and management for all projects. Also, elimination of the practice becomes more important as the Bureau approaches achievement of the program goals outlined in its budget request. A major goal is to achieve a better balance between work financed by its own appropriations and work financed by other agencies. As the ratio of NBS work to other-agency work increases, the billing differential and problems associated with it are magnified.

In its budget for 1956, the Bureau has requested funds be appropriated sufficient to permit the same rate on all projects, and that these operating moneys for the Bureau, technical and overhead, be in the same appropriation.

THE RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM

The operation of a project cost accounting system in the working capital fund has provided the solution to some of the accounting problems of the Bureau, and has enabled management control of Bureau programs at the project level. The cost accounting system lends itself readily to mechanized accounting operations, which in turn provides prompt and accurate accounting reports at several levels of detail. Summary statements of project costs are provided monthly for the use of project managers as well as central Bureau administration. More frequent interim reports on the status of the costs of a project are also available for project managers. Program costs are provided in readily usable form for presentation of the Bureau's budget requests and for reports to sponsoring agencies. The total operations of the working capital fund are summarized in business-type statements monthly to reflect the changes in assets, liabilities, and categories of income and expense.

SOME REMAINING PROBLEMS

The operation of the working capital fund and the project cost accounting system has a significant effect on the manner in which the Bureau's budget requests are presented. In terms of program budgeting, the accounting system provides a wealth of detail concerning program costs. It also provides ready summaries of costs by objects of expenditure. However, such summaries can be provided only for direct costs in particular programs and indirect costs in total, regardless of the program which ultimately bears a share of those costs. That is, the costs of the various object classes of expenditures for the administrative program can be determined for that program in total, but not for the portion of that program which is borne by Bureau appropriations, since that portion represents merely a pro rata distribution of the total. Similarly, it is possible to provide summaries of personnel costs and man-years of effort directly devoted to specific programs, but personnel costs and man-years of effort in the administrative program are not directly relatable to specific technical programs.

A similar problem occurs with regard to analysis of filled positions or Bureau employment as of a given date. It is possible to present information concerning all positions or all persons on the rolls but it is not possible to present information of the number of positions for a particular appropriation or program. Since employees work on more than one project, the single position which an employee fills cannot be related to any one appropriation or program. Relating individual positions to specific programs would either distort the costs of the programs or be incompatible with the true costs as they are now recorded.

These are problems mainly in the use of fiscal and budget data by reviewing levels who are more accustomed to the normal governmental financial techniques. They are not problems in the day-to-day management of the Bureau.

EXAMPLES OF REPORTS

As has been indicated, the accounting system uses electric accounting machines, which permit a wide variety of reports at many levels between detail and summarization. The three most significant reporting documents are the individual project cost-summary statement, the budget report, and the business-type statements. Samples of each of these are attached.

The project cost summary is prepared monthly for each project. This report shows the accrued cost by object class for the current month, and the year to date, with the total obligations compared to the authorized budget for the project.

The budget report compares obligations with budget plans. Its comparisons distinguish between programs supported by bureau appropriations and work for other agencies. The levels of summarization are section, division, and Bureau totals.

The business-type statements are a series of reports which reflect the status of the working-capital fund as a commercial entity. Some of the most significant statements cover income and expense, balance sheet, stores inventory activity, profit and loss, and the sources and application of funds using commercial categories or nomenclature.

The first two reports are of primary significance in managing the programs of the Bureau. The business-type statements are used mainly in managing the special features of the WC fund, such as inventories, equipment, leave payments, and controlling factors such as accounts payable and receivable, and profits and losses on fixed-fee work.

Examples of other reports prepared as a part of the working-capital fund accounting system and used in managing the Bureau's fiscal affairs can be supplied.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, appropriations bills, of course, can sometimes be quite dull. Money figures are not always most interesting. But, it seems to me that it should properly be observed

at this time that with all this talk of the so-called Hoover Commission saving money for the taxpayers and helping to balance the budget, according to an article in today's Washington Daily News by Mr. Albert M. Colegroce, the Hoover suggestions made headlines but no results. Not one recommendation has been carried out. Now, you have spent substantial sums of the taxpayers' moneys for this Commission and its huge staff, but whatever recommendations they have made have not been accepted in the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me that the philosophy today of the Eisenhower administration is to spend, and spend, and spend. A perusal of the printed hearings of this subcommittee on the budget requests for the Department of Commerce will show some interesting items.

The following questions were asked and the following answers given by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Moore with regard to appropriations for the office of Secretary of Commerce:

Mr. ROONEY. Is it correct that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, fixed the sum of $2.3 million for running the Office of the Secretary?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Is this the highest amount in the history of the United States of America for the running of that office?

Mr. MOORE. I have not gone back to check. We can get that for you.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, is it?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

It developed that when there was appropriated the amount $1,300,000 in fiscal year 1950 for the running of the office of the Secretary of Commerce he administered over 42,000 or 43,000 employees, which appears at page 61 of the printed committee hearings, whereas with $2.3 million now requested by Secretary of Commerce Weeks, he would administer but 36,000 employees.

The Eisenhower administration's philosophy with regard to trying to balance the budget might further be indicated in the following colloquy:

Secretary WEEKS. I have no comment particularly on the Bureau of Public Roads. That is self-explanatory. We have an amendment to the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. ROONEY. You want to add $69,230,000 to the Inter-American Highway request?

Secretary WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. That would be something like $75 million?

Secretary WEEKS. Yes. That has been discussed thoroughly in the administration.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you think that is a step toward balancing the budget, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. PRESTON. Let the record show general amusement on the part of the Secretary.

As we go further on we find that Mr. Williams, the Under Secretary of Commerce, at page 64 of the hearings, although everyone in the country knows that President Eisenhower in the campaign of 1952 promised to balance the budget and everybody thought that he was immediately going to proceed to balance the budget—we find the Under Secretary, Mr. Williams, saying:

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the budget will be balanced.

Mr. ROONEY. When?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that was the point that I was leading up to. I think that at no time did Mr. Eisenhower, either in his campaign or afterward——

Mr. ROONEY. When was the last time the budget was balanced?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Set a time when the budget would be balanced; we are working toward that end.

Mr. ROONEY. Excuse me, Mr. Williams. When was the last time the budget was balanced, Mr. Nielson?

Mr. NIELSON. I do not have the exact date here; I will see if we can supply it.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish you would and would you please insert who was head of the executive department when the budget was balanced?

All right, Mr. Williams, I do not want to take too much time.

(The information requested follows:)

"The Federal budget submitted in January 1948 for fiscal year 1949 reflected estimated budget receipts of $44,477 million and estimated expenditures of $39,669 million. The Chief of the executive branch at this time was Harry S. Truman."

Then, the committee found in the proposed budget a request by Secretary Weeks for $10,000 for entertainment expenses. I am glad that the committee unanimously agreed to turn down this request in toto because, although this country has profited and has succeeded in growing larger and becoming more healthy since the year 1933 under the Democratic administrations, we never had to spend $10,000 for the Office of the Secretary, 1 of the millionaire Cabinet members, to entertain his friends and visitors. Let me call your attention to the following colloquy:

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by an item at page 170 of the proposed committee print. It would seem that while the Department of Commerce has been trying to take over the Department of State for some little while, as I see it from where I sit, they are now going into the business of entertainment. Here is an item "$10,000 of such transfers shall be available for entertainment." What is that for?

Secretary WEEKS. Who can answer that? I cannot.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Secretary. this is your budget.

Secretary WEEKS. Quite right, sir, but I cannot answer every item off the cuff.

Mr. NIELSON. Mr. ROONEY, there is an item of $10,000 in here covering entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. This is something new, is it not, Mr. Nielson? There were some few dollars in Maritime budget, as I understand it, a few years back, about $1,025?

Mr. NIELSON. About $1,125.

Mr. ROONEY. Now we are in the $10,000 entertainment field.

Mr. NIELSON. This would provide, Mr. ROONEY, for allowing entertainment of top officials, international officials, who come to this country and have to meet with top officials of the Department. The funds for this could not be provided through the State Department allowances which are provided through your committee for the Department of State.

There are also some instances in which businessmen come to the Department and it is necessary to have luncheons or other types of entertainment. That is the basic reason why this request is contained in the 1956 budget.

Secretary WEEKS. I can assure you——

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary WEEKS. I can assure you there is not much entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. $10,000 worth, if we give you your request.

Secretary WEEKS. If a businessman comes to me to talk strictly commerce business and we have lunch, I would pay that out of my expense. We are not wasting money on entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. Would it be too much for us to expect what has been done over the years, that the person who comes to you would pay for your lunch rather than the other way around? I was under the impression we were trying to balance the Eisenhower budget, but when we see a huge budget such as the instant one before us and we find an item such as this included, we wonder whether or not there is a real intention to balance the budget as the American public were promised. Is that a fair question?

Secretary WEEKS. It is certainly a fair question. My answer is that there is every intention to balance the budget.

Mr. ROONEY. As of what date? You know you are not going to balance the budget if every department of the Government comes in with an increased budget such as the Department of Commerce.

Secretary WEEKS. I only know about this budget.

Mr. FLOOD. I have not heard an answer. Did you get an answer?

Mr. ROONEY. What would you use this money for, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. ROTHCHILD. May I give an example?

Mr. ROONEY. What do you use this money for?

Mr. ROTHCHILD. Perhaps this might clear it up a bit. I went abroad for the Department of State about a year and a half ago, and was told that if any entertainment was done for us on an official basis, we should return that entertainment for our hosts before we returned to the States. We were entertained by the British and did entertain them in turn. I had 23 people for lunch and gave the luncheon at the least expensive place, which was the officers' club, and I was allowed $40 for the complete luncheon, which in Europe includes beverages.

Mr. ROONEY. Are beverages included in this $10,000? You are talking about $2 lunches.

Mr. ROTHCHILD. I am afraid it was more a $10 lunch.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a pretty fair lunch in London; is it not?

Mr. ROTHCHILD. That is a pretty fair lunch anywhere.

Secretary WEEKS. Suppose we provide you with a statement on that.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall get to this later on when we get to the reading of the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as was said by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER]—and I serve with the gentleman from Maryland on the Armed Services Subcommittee as well—this bill came out with desirable though surprising unanimity.

I have only one or two observations to make, and the first one is not very important but it is one of those irritating little things you encounter in Washington that get under your skin.

In the years I have served on this subcommittee I have made a motion to eliminate this item every year and I have been getting more and more votes every year. This year I lost by only one vote. I even had the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the full committee, vote with me this year. One more year and I think I will have it.

I do not like the idea of going to the National Airport, the only airport in the country run by the Federal Government, and standing around there waiting for a plane and seeing a lot of kids and a lot

of taxpayers with their noses up against that big window looking out at the aircraft. There is a beautiful big balcony out there. It has been there ever since we have built the place. But these kids and these taxpayers, who are running that airport, the only one they are running, have to pay 10 cents into some kind of a slot machine, whatever it is they have there, before they can walk out on that balcony, their own balcony, to watch the aircraft just come in and go out. I think that is an outrage. If I sit on this committee long enough, someday I am going to get it knocked out of there, so that you can go over to that airport with those kids and they can walk through the door and see all they want to for nothing.

Another problem I want to bring to your attention is in connection with the Panama Canal, the operation of the zone and the corporation. Down there you have 3,700 American citizens; and actually they are. But we have a tendency up here most of the time to treat them like second-class citizens or colonials down there. We give them a 25-percent differential, but that is not the point. You try to live down there and raise your children as those people do. They come from your hometown as they come from mine. They have no objection to bearing their tax burden like other American citizens, but if the Congress of the United States sees fit to raise tolls or to raise any other operating expenses of the canal, that is all right with them, but they do not believe and I agree with them that if the Congress does raise the operating cost the American citizens who work for the Canal Zone should be forced to bear a higher proportionate share of those costs than any other citizens. All they want to do is bear their own equal share as American taxpayers. What in the world is the matter with that?

Second, I direct your attention to the testimony on this bill, the hearings, where for some length of time I examined the Governor of the Canal Zone and the Chairman of the Canal Company, who is the same fellow. He wears two hats in connection with this whole operation. Those who are interested can see it there. I will not take the time of the Committee to detail that. But I want to mention in passing that this Congress spent dozens of thousands of dollars to renovate the three little ships run by this Canal Company to the zone from New York. For no reason at all that I can find in this record the board of the Canal Company made one of those ships, the *Panama*, a freighter. Two weeks later, for no reason, again, they changed their minds and made her a passenger ship.

There is a classic example of how this kind of thing should not be done—clearly the problem was not thought out or it would never have happened. There is much I could say about this whole thing but I will let it pass for the time being. These matters are of importance to you as well as to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, we have no requests at this time.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; and for general administration, including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; $6,200,000.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill now before us eliminates from the Commerce Department appropriation all of the increases for economic statistics which the budget requested. It happens, Mr. Chairman, that I am a member and the chairman of the subcommittee on economic statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. This subcommittee was first established during the 83d Congress. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] presently a member of the committee, was at that time chairman. During its hearings on the President's economic report this year, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which as all Members know, is composed of Members of both parties from both the House of Representatives and the other body, had a special panel discussion on the problem of statistics, and in its report recommended that the provisions of the budget be adopted by the Congress so far as they affect economic statistics. The reason for this unanimous approach to this particular problem is very simple. The decisions which are made on a daily basis by business large and small, by all elements of our economy, by farmers, labor organizations, by government at all levels, including the Federal level, and by the legislatures of the several States as well as the Federal Government, are to a large degree in the economic field based on the factual knowledge which is at hand, most often in the form of statistics. There is absolutely no disagreement on the part of any special interest group in the country with regard to the need for improved statistics in a great many different fields. This program of improving our statistical information has the support of business, labor, and of organized farm groups. I think it is something that Congress over the years has tended to slight and tended to treat as an expendable item. I recognize the mood of the House and I am aware of the respect which all Members of the House hold for this subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations, a respect which I share; but I am hopeful that this year the other body will include at least some of the funds which are needed to move forward with a program which has been recommended by this administration and which is supported unanimously by a committee comprised of Members of both the House and the other body, by both Republicans and Democrats. Permit me to give you an illustration. There was requested in the budget money to improve statistics on construction. Today, one of the reasons that we are having a boom in many parts of the country is that there is an unusually high level of construction going on. It happens, however, that the statistics for the field of construction are among the least adequate, the least accurate. They prove out less often, in the light of actual factual knowledge, than do many other statistical efforts. If we had full knowledge of what is actually going on in the construction field today, we might be able to make wiser decisions with regard to the future plans of the economy. When I say that I mean not only those of us in Government but people in private enterprise who are making almost daily economic decisions of very great importance.

This is a subject which may seem dull to some, but a subject to which I think the Congress individually and collectively should give more attention than it has been willing to do in the past.

Mr. Chairman, the unanimous report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1955 Economic Report of the President included the following statement under "Findings and recommendations"—Senate Report No. 60, page 4:

> We strongly urge that the Government improve its economic statistical programs. Important steps forward have been made and recommended in the President's budget. Witnesses at our recent hearings were unanimous in urging congressional action. We trust the Appropriations Committees will give these requests sympathetic consideration and approval.

This conclusion was reached after careful investigation, extending back over the past year, of whether the Government's present economic statistics are adequate for the uses to which they are now put—particularly for purposes of economic analysis. Hearings were held last July by the joint committee's newly established Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, at which outstanding and representative economists and statisticians were asked to testify concerning the kind of statistics and other economic information specifically needed for analysis of the economic plans and expectations of consumers, Government, and business.

As a result of these hearings and its study of the problems raised, the committee issued a progress report—House Report No. 2628—presenting a number of preliminary findings and recommendations. Important among these findings were that, first, private economic interests and Government policymakers require an increasing quantity and improved quality of economic statistics; and, second, the principal stumbling block to providing an adequate economic statistical program is the lack of financial support.

The President's budget estimate for 1956 contained a number of increases for statistical programs, designed to meet the needs and correct the shortcomings which were stressed in the committee hearings last summer. The specific programs included in the agency appropriation requests for 1956 were again reviewed by the joint committee, when it held a hearing on economic statistics as part of its series of hearings on the 1955 Economic Report. Representatives of

business, labor, and research organizations testified in the session on economic statistics, and without exception endorsed the proposed increases as necessary to correct major deficiencies in our statistical information.

This was the background against which the joint committee reached its unanimous recommendation urging support and improvement of economic statistical programs.

A number of these programs were included in the appropriation requests for various units within the Department of Commerce—specifically, the Bureau of the Census, the Business and Defense Services Administration, and the Office of Business Economics. None of these increases was allowed by the House Committee on Appropriations in its report on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1956—Report No. 603.

Following are the specific increases in the Department of Commerce which the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has unanimously endorsed:

In the Bureau of the Census, under "Salaries and expenses":

Annual sample survey of retail trade	$99,207
Annual sample survey of manufactures	257,900
Improvement of labor force and unemployment statistics	563,115
Improvement of data on State and local government finances	95,000
Administrative and miscellaneous	184,778
Total increase	1,200,000

Also in the Bureau of the Census, $500,000 was requested for an Intercensal Housing Survey to obtain information on the number and characteristics of the Nation's housing units. The need for this survey was emphasized at the Joint Committee's recent hearings on economic statistics.

In its report, the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount requested for completion of the census of agriculture by $500,000, and the amount for completion of the censuses of business, manufactures and mineral industries by $655,000. Reductions in the final requests for these censuses mean a decrease in the tabulation, analysis, and publication of data already collected at great expense.

The budget estimate for the Business and Defense Services Administration included an increase of $800,000 for the construction statistics program. This increase was designed to correct deficiencies in the present statistics on new construction activity and to allow for compilation of data on expenditures for alterations and repairs, materials requirements, and residential vacancies.

In the Office of Business Economics an increase of $100,000 was included in the budget estimate, and endorsed by the joint committee, to allow for improvements in the national income and gross national product accounts. The report of the House Committee on Appropriations recommends an increase of $75,000 for the Office of Business Economics, but for a totally different purpose—"to finance a special study of unemployment throughout the country."

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I urge that these increases, which are requested to meet the needs of both the legislative and executive branches of the Government for more accurate information on our economy, be included in the 1956 appropriation for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to underwrite the comments made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] and emphasize the great need for improving economic statistics.

The Employment Act of 1946 provided for the establishment of what is called the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, comprising 7 Members of the House and 7 Members of the Senate. This joint committee last year appointed a Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. The membership of that subcommittee was the gentleman from Kansas, Senator FRANK CARLSON; the gentleman from Missouri, Representative RICHARD BOLLING; and myself, as chairman.

This subcommittee went about its business earnestly and held significant hearings on July 12 and 13, 1954. Cooperating in these hearings were Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, both of whom testified the first day. On the second day panel discussions were held and participating in those discussions were representatives of eight departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government, 12 expert witnesses thoroughly schooled in economic statistics and representing industry and business broadly defined. This group of witnesses cooperated earnestly and enthusiastically with the subcommittee, and for the first time it was possible to have an exchange of views and suggestions among persons representing Government administration, business administration, and lawmaking.

Briefly stated, the conclusion of this group was that there is great need for more, better, and prompter economic statistics.

Recognizing the validity of this conclusion, the subcommittee recommended to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that the President be informed of this need.

In his budget message last January, the President acted on this recommendation and called attention to the need emphatically by including in his message what is called a special analysis and a request for a $4.8 million increase in appropriation for improved work in economic statistics. This part of the budget message was unique.

I express the hope that the cut in appropriation made by the House Committee on Appropriations may be restored before final enactment of the bill now under consideration, so that this need which has been scrutinized and demonstrated with the greatest of care, and which is in line with the President's recommendations, may be met. There is no substitute for accurate information on which to base decisions. Accurate and up-to-date economic statistics are invaluable to Government and to private business alike.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 2, line 12, strike out "$6,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$6,225,000, of which $25,000 shall be for the purpose of gathering and publishing monthly reports of coffee stocks on hand in the United States."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it places additional responsibilities upon the Secretary to publish monthly reports. I find no basic legislation which would authorize this sort of a survey to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Missouri care to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Under Public Law 671 of the 80th Congress, it has been authorized that these reports and statistics be made. I had a letter from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, stating that they are authorized to make this study, but they do not have sufficient funds. I looked this matter up last year when the same thing was before the House.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved and the gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

PROTECTING OURSELVES AGAINST ANOTHER FAKE COFFEE SHORTAGE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to close a serious gap in our statistical information involving America's biggest import item—coffee. Everyone knows how we were victimized from late 1953 to mid-1954 and thereafter by a fake shortage of coffee. Hoarding and speculation ran rampant, and the consumer was held up and robbed. Hundreds of millions of dollars were taken out of the pockets of American consumers in tribute to a shortage which never existed.

It has recently been revealed that the former Brazilian Government administration was even participating directly in gambling on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange in an attempt to keep coffee prices unnecessarily high. That is how far reaching this price-raising drive actually was. Our coffee roasters overbought at excessive prices in fear of a shortage; the consumer paid exorbitant and unconscionable prices; yet all this time there was no shortage. But we did not know that for sure, for the statistics once kept by the Census Bureau on coffee stocks on hand had been discontinued. A year ago, I was successful in having the House agree to renew those studies. But the amendment was killed in the Senate, either under a misapprehension or deliberately, but the impression was given that the studies would be made in any event.

The studies were not and are not being made. The State Department believes we should have this information; so does the Federal Trade Commission. The

Census Bureau says it can provide it for only $25,000 a year. Think of that—only $25,000 a year to protect us against a swindle of hundreds of millions of dollars.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] took this matter up at my request in the subcommittee hearings but, unfortunately, the Bureau's answer was off the record. I inquired about that, and discovered that it was based on fear that if we had up-to-date information on coffee supplies on hand, it was possible the roasters might at some time in the future, if supplies were clearly shown to be short, be held up for a higher price.

On the other hand, just imagine what happened to all of us last year because we did not have such information. We were taken in by a hoax—by a mythical shortage. And so, I may say, were the roasters.

We would all be much, much better off to have the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote one paragraph from a letter written to me by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Thruston B. Morton, on April 27, 1955, in which he says:

In the opinion of this Department it would be very useful to have information on inventories of coffee held in the United States collected on a quarterly basis if possible. The prospective supply position cannot be evaluated properly without such information. Although stocks normally constitute a relatively minor part of the total supply they can be of great importance in a situation such as that which arose last year, when frost damage to the Brazilian crop threatened to reduce supplies below current requirements.

I wish also, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD at this point a short excerpt from the hearings, pages 683 and 684, dealing with the matter of census of coffee inventories.

(The matter referred to follows:)

The next item has to do with coffee inventories. The Congresswoman from Missouri, Mrs. SULLIVAN, has been trying to have coffee inventories made in this country, and funds were contained in the House bill last year for that purpose, but were knocked out in conference since the Senate did not approve that item. Mrs. SULLIVAN has received a letter from the Department of State which I will insert in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, indicating it would be a very desirable and helpful thing to have such a census made since coffee ranks first in value among United States imports at this time.

Under the studies that you now make of wholesale inventories, could this study be included without specifically earmarking funds?

Mr. GRIEVES. We did conduct a survey of coffee stocks as of the end of 1954, the results of which have been published.

Mr. PRESTON. Will that be a continuing study?

Mr. GRIEVES. There is no specific appropriation for it. It is not a very expensive project. We could do it at a reasonable frequency, but not every month.

Mr. PRESTON. You could do it quarterly and have a fairly accurate idea of the coffee inventory, could you not?

Mr. GRIEVES. If I may make a statement off the record.

Mr. PRESTON. All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. PRESTON. Back on the record. I am glad to hear you state that you can continue this program, because it no doubt would have some value to the consuming public.

(The complete letter from the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 27, 1955.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I refer to your telephone request to Mr. Cale for the Department's views regarding the desirability of obtaining periodically, through the Census Bureau, information on coffee inventories in the hands of United States importers and roasters. Such information was compiled during the period of the Second World War, as you know, and was very useful to the Government in appraising the supply position on coffee. It is my understanding that the service was discontinued after the war as an economy measure, and that only 2 spot studies have been made in recent years, 1 in 1951 and another at the end of 1954.

In the opinion of this Department it would be very useful to have information on inventories of coffee held in the United States collected on a quarterly basis if possible. The prospective supply position cannot be evaluated properly without such information. Although stocks normally constitute a relatively minor part of the total supply they can be of great importance in a situation such as that which arose last year, when frost damage to the Brazilian crop threatened to reduce supplies below current requirements.

Coffee ranks first in value among United States imports at the present time. The outlook for coffee supplies and coffee prices is a matter of very real concern to United States consumers, and to the producing countries as well. Yet statistical information on this commodity is notably poor, as the Federal Trade Commission pointed out in its Economic Report on Coffee, published last year. I believe you are aware that the United States agreed, at the recent economic conference in Brazil, to participate with representatives of the producing countries in a study of the long-run outlook for coffee. It is already apparent that the working group will be hampered in its efforts by the inadequacy of the statistical data available. Any action which the United States is able to take to fill the gaps in our information on the coffee situation would be most helpful to study groups such as this one. It might also serve, by example, to encourage other countries with an interest in coffee to improve their own statistical services. The work involved in compiling this information would be done in the Department of Commerce and the State Department is, of course, not in a position to judge whether it could be carried out under the existing appropriations of that Department.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Also in this connection I wish to include as part of my remarks a letter addressed by me, under date of May 20, to Mr. Burgess, the Director of the Bureau of the Census, and his reply to me of the same date, also a release from the Department of Commerce under date of March 4, 1955, dealing with green coffee inventories and roastings of 1954.

The matter referred to follows:

MAY 20, 1955.

Hon. ROBERT W. BURGESS,
Director, Bureau of the Census,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: Will you please prepare for me and have in my office by noon Monday, if possible, a statement on just what the Bureau of Census can, or cannot do, in regard to collecting statistics on coffee supplies on hand in the United States under:

1. The appropriate budget item (and please indicate which one it is);

2. The bill as reported from the House Appropriations Committee;

3. Also, will you please give me a definite figure on how much it would cost to provide monthly statistics on the amount of coffee on hand in the United States, including supplies in the hands of the importers and roasters?

In connection with the hearings by the Appropriations Subcommittee, Congressman PRESTON attempted to find out for me just what your plans were in this respect. Page 684 of the printed hearings reveals that when he asked Mr. Grieves how you could handle this problem of collecting coffee statistics, the answer was off the record.

I should like to have, on the record—unless national security is involved—the true facts on this situation. I feel that I have been given a deliberate run-around on this whole matter. I feel the Census Bureau has been partly responsible for our failure to have adequate statistics last year on the stocks of coffee on hand, and thus partly responsible for the unnecessary continuation of excessive coffee prices down to the time of the Federal Trade Commission Report. Last year, as you know, I succeeded in having an amendment accepted by the House to earmark $10,000 for this work of collecting and publishing monthly statistics on coffee supplies.

The testimony by the Census officials before the Senate Appropriations Committee last year apparently gave the Senators the impression these reports would be made without specific earmarking of funds as provided in my amendment. I know what you intended to inform them—that is, if you received the full budget request, you could make these studies and would prefer not to have the amount earmarked specifically. But that is not the impression they got, and the result was that you did not make the monthly reports.

Therefore, I would like to have, by noon Monday, a statement on what you can, or cannot do, under the bill as reported to provide these monthly statistics, and how much it would require for you to provide them.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1955.

Hon. Congresswoman LEONORE SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your letter concerning the Census Bureau and coffee statistics dictated over the phone to my secretary today.

You ask what the Census Bureau can or will do in regard to collecting statistics on coffee supplies in the United States. The answer in general is that the Census Bureau has the legal authority but lacks the appropriation to conduct a monthly survey on coffee stocks in the hands of importers and roasters. Under the law if the data are gathered more often than once a year the filing of a return is wholly voluntary.

The cost of compiling a monthly report on coffee stocks in the hands of importers and roasters would be approximately $25,000 to $30,000 per annum. The exact figure would depend largely on the amount of effort which would have to be expended in obtaining returns and in keeping the mailing list up-to-date. Incidentally, a quarterly survey would cost approximately $10,000 per annum.

The only appropriation made to the Census Bureau which could be legally employed

to finance a coffee survey would be the item "salaries and expenses." There is currently no provision in this item for a coffee survey.

You call attention to the fact that Mr. Grieves made a statement off the record in connection with the Appropriations Committee discussion of coffee statistics. For your information, Mr. Grieves briefly reviewed one of the rather delicate aspects of a voluntary reporting system which arises when the interest of the reporting companies may be adversely affected by publication of the results. There is a feeling in the trade that publication of the stock figures on occasion places the American purchasers of coffe at a disadvantage in dealing with tightly controlled foreign sources of supply. Therefore, as a practical matter, this is not alone a question of funds but also of the ability of the Census Bureau to collect sufficient returns to provide reliable est'mates.

I can assure you, Mrs. SULLIVAN, that the Census Bureau has no motive other than that of providing the most useful public service with the limited funds at its disposal. We cannot begin to undertake all of the surveys which are urged upon us, nor could we for long operate if appropriations were not provided to carry out additional surveys.

The Bureau will be glad to consider conducting a quarterly coffee stock reporting program in the coming fiscal year provided there is general concurrence amongst the interested agencies of the Government that this is a desirable project in relation to other projects as yet unfinanced, and as indicated above, provided that the continued cooperation of holders of the coffee stocks can be obtained.

In closing, may I remind you that the Census Bureau did conduct a year-end coffee survey showing the change in the stock position during the year 1954, largely because of your interest in the subject and without the assistance of any appropriation. The Census Bureau is always anxious to meet important needs and I only wish it were possible for me to assure you that circumstances permitted the monthly operation of this project in which you are so sincerely interested.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. BURGESS,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1955.

GREEN COFFEE INVENTORIES AND ROASTINGS: 1954

Inventories of green coffee held by roasters, importers, and dealers in the United States totaled 2,144,000 bags on December 31, 1954, a decrease of 35 percent from the 3,315,000 bags held on December 31, 1953, according to an announcement made today by Robert W. Burgess, Director, Bureau of the Census. Coffee roasting during 1954 totaled 17,601,000 bags, a decrease from amounts roasted during 1951 (19,051,000 bags) and 1950 (18,416,000), the 2 most recent years for which roastings were measured by the Bureau of the Census. The low level of coffee roasting was also reflected by imports of green coffee, which were at their lowest level since 1943. Imports amounted to 17,072,000 bags during 1954, a decrease of 19 percent from 1953 imports of 21,017,000 bags.

Green coffee inventories reported for the year-end 1954 were at the lowest level for any year-end period measured in surveys conducted by the Bureau since 1948 (Census data for 1952 are not available). Roastings during the first quarter 1954 were at a comparatively high level compared with those for 1949 through 1951, but for the other three quarters of 1954 were generally lower than for those years.

Of the total amount roasted during 1954, 2,052,000 bags—or 12 percent of total roastings—were used for soluble coffee. However, this amount was 32 percent of the total roastings of those firms which reported roastings for soluble coffee during 1954.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY

Estimates of green coffee inventories and roastings shown in this release represent industry totals based on reports received from virtually all known roasters, importers, and dealers of green coffee.

Inventories of green coffee were held by approximately 850 firms at the end of 1954, of which 730 did roasting. Included are firms which do contract roasting for the trade and those who own green coffee but have it roasted for them under contract. Not included are wholesalers who purchase and sell roasted coffee but do no roasting and own no green coffee. Data on green coffee inventories in this report are limited to stocks which have cleared customs and are in the United States. Stocks in foreign trade zones or those held for, or roasted by, the military services are not included.

Data on imports shown in this release were compiled by the Bureau of the Census as a part of its foreign trade statistics program.

TABLE 1.—*Total inventories of green coffee held by roasters, importers, and dealers: Year-end 1948–51, 1953, and 1954*

[Standard bags of 132.276 pounds each]

Date:	*Inventories*
Dec. 31, 1954	2,144,000
Dec. 31, 1953	3,315,000
Dec. 31, 1952	(1)
Dec. 31, 1951	2,759,000
Dec. 31, 1950	2,936,000
Dec. 31, 1949	3,355,000
Dec. 31, 1948	3,083,000

[1] Census data not available.

TABLE 2.—*Total coffee roasted (excluding roasting by military service)*

[Standard bags of 132.276 pounds each]

Period [1]	Amount roasted			
	1954	1951	1950	1949
Annual total	[2] 17,601,000	19,051,000	18,416,000	[3]
1st quarter	5,629,000	5,216,000	4,369,000	5,238,000
2d quarter	3,873,000	4,397,000	4,313,000	[3]
3d quarter	3,367,000	4,287,000	5,178,000	4,993,000
4th quarter	4,732,000	5,151,000	4,556,000	5,925,000

[1] Roasting not available for years 1952 and 1953.
[2] Of this amount, 2,052,000 bags of green coffee were used for soluble coffee.
[3] Not available.

TABLE 3.—*United States imports for consumption of raw or green coffee*

[Standard bags of 132.276 pounds each]

Period	*Imports*
1954	17,072,000
1953	21,017,000
1952	20,266,000
1951	20,301,000
1950	18,424,000
1949	22,060,000
1948	20,947,000

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman from Missouri has offered an excellent amendment. I would point out to her that this speculation really started back in 1949 and 1950 when the ECA, the Economic Cooperation Administration, bought 61 million pounds of coffee and shipped it over to foreigners. That was the lever that was used to pry the lid off coffee prices, and the gouging of housewives followed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Does not the gentleman agree, though, that this study and these statistics would be of great value?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly think so. I support the gentlewoman's amendment. I only wish that statistics regarding the importation of canned Polish hams and bacon could be included.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman, and I urge, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment be adopted. If it is, who knows—we may again have a 5-cent cup of coffee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized.

The gentlewoman from Missouri supports her contention by citing Public Law 671 of the 80th Congress. The Chair has had opportunity to refer to this public law. It states that the Director of the Bureau of the Census is authorized to "compile and publish censuses of manufacturers, mineral industries, and other businesses." The Chair is of opinion that the language of this section is sufficiently broad to cover the proposed amendment, and that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri is in order.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 683 of the hearings wherein the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], chairman of the subcommittee, brought to the attention of the Bureau of the Census and Mr. Grieves commented on the situation. I read from the hearings as follows:

The next item has to do with coffee inventories. The Congresswoman from Missouri, Mrs. SULLIVAN, has been trying to have coffee inventories made in this country, and funds were contained in the House bill last year for that purpose, but were knocked out in conference since the Senate did not approve that item. Mrs. SULLIVAN has received a letter from the Department of State which I will insert in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, indicating it would be a very desirable and helpful thing to have such a census made since coffee ranks first in value among United States imports at this time.

Under the studies that you now make of wholesale inventories, could this study be included without specifically earmarking funds?

Mr. GRIEVES. We did conduct a survey of coffee stocks as of the end of 1954, the results of which have been published.

Mr. PRESTON. Will that be a continuing study?

Mr. GRIEVES. There is no specific appropriation for it. It is not a very expensive project. We could do it at a reasonable frequency, but not every month.

Mr. PRESTON. You could do it quarterly and have a fairly accurate idea of the coffee inventory; could you not?

Mr. GRIEVES. If I may make a statement off the record.

Mr. PRESTON. All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. PRESTON. Back on the record. I am glad to hear you state that you can continue this program, because it no doubt would have some value to the consuming public.

From that you will see that the chairman of the committee said it would be well if these censuses could be had quarterly and the representative from the Census Bureau said that under existing provisions they could be made quarterly.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the inventory has been made and they can now make these inventories quarterly without any additional amount. Coffee prices are going down and cost of statistics are going up. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have a letter from the Bureau of the Census in which they state that they do not have the funds, that if they made this quarterly it would require $10,000 a year. That is what we asked for last year. If they made it monthly it would take between $25,000 and $30,000 a year. I have submitted a letter to be put in the RECORD that states both of those figures.

Mr. BOW. I submit to the gentlewoman that before the committee they did testify as I have read. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], who conducted the hearings, will bear me out that they did say they made a census in 1954 and they could make it quarterly on the present budget. I am depending on their testimony.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I called to find out what off-the-record statement was made. I asked them if they could give me the information that would not divulge anything that might hinder the security of our country. They told me that is what they had said, that because of the fact there was a delicate situation existing between countries they did not want to have any open hearings, but that they did not have the funds to make this study. They did make it once last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the statement that they have the funds to make a survey was made off the record?

Mr. BOW. It is now in the record, that they could continue to make it quarterly for the same amount.

Mr. GROSS. Where in the record?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] said he was glad to hear that; so they could continue on the same basis; the quarterly basis.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from Ohio has correctly stated the facts. I specifically inquired about it and did my very best to take care of the charming gentlewoman from Missouri in conducting these hearings and I thought we had done pretty well.

Mr. GROSS. What I am reading is:

Mr. PRESTON.. Back on the record. I am glad to hear you state you can continue this program.

It does not say anything about on a quarterly or monthly or annual basis.

Mr. BOW. In the testimony ahead there the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] asked whether it could be done on a quarterly basis.

Mr. GROSS. That is off the record.

Mr. BOW. That is on the record. Then he came back on the record and said he was glad to hear it can be continued on that basis.

Mr. GROSS. We would be clearer as to what the Appropriations Committee does if it would stay on the record more often than it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRESTON) there were—ayes 35, noes 51.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. PRESTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 54, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities (liquidation of contract authorization): For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts, $7 million.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss briefly one of the controversies raging in the field of aviation today, relating to the question of the superiority of one type of air navigation facility over another. For some time the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been developing an air navigational system known as VOR–DME. The VOR part of the system refers to directions; DME is a distance-measuring device. With both, the position of an aircraft in terms of direction and distance from a particular object can be determined.

During the last few years the military has been developing an air navigational equipment which it has called TACAN, which it claims is superior to VOR–DME. I don't know whether it is. As a matter of fact, I don't know whether anybody knows whether it is superior, even the socalled experts in the field. I think for our purposes, however, it is unimportant because even in the event it is found to be superior equipment to DME, it will not be available for a minimum of 5 years and, therefore, cannot take care of present flying. needs. DME is usable at the present time and DME will make flying safer.

For the last few years we have been appropriating money for the installation of DME ground facilities and there is an appropriation in this bill for that purpose. Unfortunately, however, there seems to be no disposition on the part of the airlines to install the corresponding DME equipment into their planes so that the DME ground installations are of no value whatsoever. Of all the thousands of aircraft in our country, only about 250 have installed DME instruments. It makes no sense to me that we should appropriate funds to put the finest air navigation equipment on our airports in order to make aviation safer when the airlines refuse to purchase the instruments needed to take advantage of the ground installations. Some say it is because of the pending issue which would require the airlines to pay a user fee for facilities installed by the Federal Government. Others say it is because of the cost of installation of DME aircraft equipment, which I am told is about $6,000 per instrument at the present time. Others say it is because TACAN is a better system than the VOR–DME system. It seems to me that none of these reasons is valid when the question of air safety is involved.

Experts to whom I have spoken, however, assured me that DME will promote safety. With DME the pilot will know his exact position at all times instead of occasionally, as is now the case. Collisions with mountain tops which still occur due to unknown positions will be a thing of the past. DME will increase efficiency in air navigation, as better navigational control of aircraft is the natural result of continuous position and speed information.

Those of us who come from metropolitan areas know that the air space over our airports is shrinking quickly as more and more flights are added to regular schedules. I am told that Midway Airport in the city of Chicago dispatches a plane or lands one every 40 seconds. Present equipment requires that there be a distance of 30 miles clearance on every level for each plane flying. With DME equipment this distance could be shortened to about 5 or 6 miles so that instead of being spaced every 30 miles, planes could be spaced in shorter clearance distances. More aircraft could be utilized under these operating conditions.

I do not know how the airline companies can be compelled to install DME equipment. I would have liked to be able to offer an amendment to this appropriation bill which would have required them to install DME equipment in their planes, because I consider it so necessary for more efficient and safer operation. This is an appropriation bill, however, and such legislation would be out of order.

The military believes that TACAN is better. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is of the opinion that DME is better. TACAN will not be available for 4 or 5 years. DME is available now. I

think some way has to be found now to require the airline carriers to install DME equipment, and I would urge the CAA to do so as quickly as possible.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I would call attention to page 314 of the hearings, where Colonel Taylor was discussing these two Rho-Theta systems of distances and positions. He said that by the first of next year they should have dependable findings on TACAN, and that by that time we will know exactly where we are. We should know by that time what they will require by way of safety legislation. That would be an authorization, however, from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] that the colonel's information differs from that which was furnished to me by the various officials of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. They have told me that TACAN will not be operational for another 3 or 4 years and cannot be placed in production for another 3 or 4 years. We do have DME at the present time, and DME will make flying safer. We need it now.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. His testimony, however, was that they may find that TACAN is completely unusable. His statement was:

> We may run into something that will preclude its adoption.

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. He meant thereby that TACAN may be completely out if their findings so indicate.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

It seems to me that some way has to be found to require the carriers to install DME to make flying safer at the present time. It does not make sense to me that we should appropriate money for DME ground equipment without having the carriers purchase the equipment for their aircraft which will permit it to be used.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, the President's veto of the postal pay-raise bill is most regrettable and unwise. But the matter goes deeper than that. The issue is no longer the postal pay bill. The more important issue now, as I see it, is whether or not Congress is going to abdicate its right to legislate.

It took several months of patient, hard work by congressional committees and by both Chambers of Congress to agree and approve the measure which was forwarded to the White House. The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, S. 1, as the measure is known, was passed in the Senate on March 25 by a vote of 72 to 21. On April 20 it was passed by this House by a vote of 324 to 85, with some amendments. Both Houses met in conference and agreed on a compromise bill, which was subsequently approved by this House on May 9 by a vote of 328 to 66, and in the Senate on May 11 by a vote of 66 to 11. Thus was manifested the will of Congress and the people whom we represent here.

Now comes the President and with one stroke of his pen undoes the work of Congress throughout all these months. Furthermore, this is not the first time he has set Congress back on this issue. He did the same thing last August when he vetoed a 5-percent pay raise, and as a result of that veto postal workers and Federal employees are still without a raise. It may well be that the President's action has again killed their chances for a raise for another year.

If we, as Members of Congress, are willing to abdicate to this kind of "cooperation" from the executive branch, which evidently has a callous disregard for the welfare of the postal workers, then we must be prepared to surrender our right and duty to legislate. Under these circumstances, we can no longer act as free men and free women in this august body. We will be reduced to a status of being mere puppets of the White House. This is not a democratic process. This is not the way of a democracy; it is the way of a dictatorship, where those sitting in Parliament are told how and what to legislate.

I, for one, am not prepared to surrender my right to legislate. That was not the purpose for which I was elected by the people of my district; hence, I will not be dictated to. I voted for the compromise pay raise bill in all good conscience, and I am sticking by that vote. I ask all of you legislators, who voted for the compromise bill, to follow the dictates of your own conscience and to do likewise.

If we have faith in ourselves and respect for our own judgment, then we cannot and must not fall back now. Otherwise, how can we face the people next election day? We must keep up the fight to preserve our right to legislate, even if we lose the battle today. Should we fail to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote to override the President's veto, then we should go back and pass the same compromise measure—or change it, if we will. The point I am trying to make is that Congress must vote out its own bill, over and over again if necessary, until the will of the majority is recognized by the President. The will of the people is much more important than the desires of a single individual, even if he is the Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the difference in the bill recommended by the President for a 7.6-percent increase and the 8.6-percent increase in the measure approved by both Houses of Congress is said to be "an amount equal to the cost of a bottle of milk" per week for each postal worker. The total amount for all 500,000 employees in the postal service for the entire year is approximately $13 million, and yet the President in his veto message claims that "the enactment of such legislation will substantially increase the postal deficit."

By way of comparison, let me point out the following very interesting facts: If a 7.6-percent pay increase had been offered and adopted last year, when the 5-percent bill was vetoed, each postal employee would be about $300 richer today. Thus, figuring on the basis of the bill now favored by the administration, each postal worker has already sustained a loss of $300. If you multiply this sum by the number of postal workers, that is, 500,000, it comes to a total of $150 million. This total is $137 million more than the difference between the 7.6 and 8.6 bill approved by Congress. So, actually, the President's claim that the bill will substantially increase the postal deficit or that it is excessive, is not borne out by the facts.

I say to you in all earnestness that we have a moral obligation to the 500,000 hard-working, loyal, and devoted Americans who serve us 24 hours a day in all kinds of weather, under all sorts of difficulties and circumstances.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that not only is there a danger that we might surrender our right to legislate, but the situation appears to be even worse. Should the Senate sustain the President's veto, then we in the House will not even have the chance to vote on the President's unjustifiable action. We, as the representatives of the people, will not have had the opportunity to express the will of the people or to voice our opinion. This is a most humiliating situation in which the President has placed Congress.

I plead with Members on both sides of the aisle to stick by your convictions. If you do, this would be one battle that General Eisenhower or General Summerfield could not win. This is a battle the Congress must win if it is to preserve its constitutional right to legislate.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise under some sense of obligation to the Committee of the Whole on this question of VOR/DME and TACAN. It is a highly technical and complicated subject. The reason I rise is that insofar as I can tell, looking over the Chamber, I am the only member present of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which held very lengthy hearings on that subject. Our committee went to Atlantic City and visited the naval air station there and inspected the facilities. We also listened to testimony of experts, both civilian and military, for several days here in Washington. The statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] are in substance accurate with the qualification that the testimony, as I recall it, is that it will be at least 2 years before TACAN could be ready. There are possible bugs in it, to use a colloquial expression, but

it is a very promising system. Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has issued a factual report and made specific recommendations. If I had realized that this was coming up in debate at this time I would have armed myself with the committee recommendations and read them to the Members. The committee's factual report is a very good job done by the committee's professional staff. Substituting TACAN for the VOR–DME or visual omnirange system could not be done at the present time. I think that is about the gist of the situation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. It does pose a very difficult question so far as the changeover is concerned. We find TACAN better than VOR–DME, but then we will have a big job of changing over because they will not both work in the same air channel.

Mr. HALE. May I say to the gentleman it is a terribly difficult question, but everybody agrees there should be a common system and a common system means common to civilian and military flying and civilian flying includes not merely the commercial airlines but the private and corporate flights. As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that the TACAN system is more accurate, is more promising, and its military uses are more advantageous. It is more readily sited. You can put it on a carrier. That is about all I want to say on the subject, but I should like to refer the Members to the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which goes into the whole matter very thoroughly, and to the committee's recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a–883i), including purchase of not to exceed 3 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114); lease of sites and the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation, maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation at not to exceed $15 per month to each member of the crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instrument observer, and at not to exceed $1 per day for each station to employees of other Federal agencies while making oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; pay, allowances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and household effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as authorized by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned officers on the active list; payments under the Uniform Services Contingency Option Act of 1953; and pay of commissioned officers retired in accordance with law; $10,200,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year this appropriation shall be reimbursed for press costs and costs of paper for charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and furnished for the official use of the military departments of the Department of Defense.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask a question or two of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Did the subcommittee make any inquiries of the CAA of any intention to sell the communication centers that exist, that are owned by the Government and under the jurisdiction of that agency, located at the various airports, and which are there for the purpose of safety and efficiency and other important reasons, located at the various airports and other places?

Mr. PRESTON. We made no inquiry about it and there was no evidence of any such plan on foot. I understand there was some appearance in the press indicating that such a plan was on foot, but that was after the hearings.

Mr. McCORMACK. And then, after they were sold, buy back the services. The gentleman has heard about that.

Mr. PRESTON. I have heard about that, but I am sure the gentleman can rely on our committee not approving of any such action as that.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman that he have some of his staff look into this matter, because I think you will find there is something to it.

Mr. PRESTON. We will be happy to do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization): For the payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the "Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954," $6,000,000: *Provided*, That advances may be made from this appropriation to "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities," for administrative expenses (not to exceed $150,000), and for reserve fleet expenses (in such amounts as may be required), and such advances shall be in addition to amounts otherwise made available for such expenses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My purpose is to compliment the subcommittee on putting back into the bill $660,000, which will enable the four State maritime schools to continue in existence during the next fiscal year.

We in Congress are well acquainted with the valuable contributions made by those schools to our merchant marine and also to our national defense.

I particularly compliment the subcommittee because that estimate was eliminated from the budget, and the subcommittee put the sum of $660,000 back into the bill. I was very much concerned when I read the hearings to note that Secretary Weeks, who comes from Massachusetts, in reply to a question asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], supported the budget recommendation of eliminating the appropriation, as a result of which these four State academies would have to be discontinued and not be able to render the excellent services they have been rendering for so many years.

Secretary Weeks, who comes from Massachusetts, testified that one or two of them were not very good:

Massachusetts, where I come from, is not one of the best. The Massachusetts school does not come up to the best.

The views of Secretary Weeks do not, in my opinion, reflect the sentiments of any person in Massachusetts; certainly they do not reflect the view of the subcommittee, because the subcommittee did not think much of his testimony in this respect; they put the $660,000 back into the bill.

I like Secretary Weeks, personally, but as Secretary of Commerce he probably is not familiar with the Massachusetts school, and he probably does not even know where it is located. In any event, the Secretary by his testimony has made himself the laughingstock of Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inter-American highway: For necessary expenses of continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), $8 million, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the committee for information.

Some years ago the United States undertook the building of the Central American Highway. The United States was to pay two-thirds of the cost and the countries through which it passed one-third the cost.

We have expended $50 million on the Central American Highway to date. It is now proposed that we spend an additional $75 million to complete that highway within a period of 3 years. We have never heretofore spent more than $6 million in any one year on the Inter-American highway. It is now proposed that we step up spending on this highway during the next 3 years to $25 million a year.

We were informed in the Public Works Committee when we were asked to authorize $75 million of spending on this road during the next 3 years that this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was desirous of having the Public Works Committee authorize a $75 million expenditure to be made on this road in the next 3 years instead of $15 million or $20 million. I want to find out if the subcommittee or the full Appropriations Committee wished this authorization to be made and asked it be made?

Mr. PRESTON. It was the position of the subcommittee that we prefer the 6-year program and we turned down the request for $75 million.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In other words, the committee prefers that this road program be carried out over a 6-year period rather than in a 3-year period?

Mr. PRESTON. That is the position of the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Is it the opinion of the committee that we could not expand this program from $6 million a year to $25 million a year and do the job efficiently and effectively?

Mr. PRESTON. The testimony presented by the Bureau of Public Roads was to the effect that to do it on a 3-year basis, a crash program, would entail a premium of $12 million on the basis of

$25 million a year, that it would cost about $4 million more for each year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say to the gentleman as a member of the committee that the reason we did not appropriate the full amount, as far as I am concerned, was because there was no authorization for making an appropriation of that size.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does the gentleman from Ohio believe it would be more efficient and effective to do this work in 3 years rather than 6?

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman that I believe the construction of the Inter-American Highway is a very worthwhile project and should be completed at the earliest possible date. But the thing that disturbs me in the suggestion of the $75 million appropriation is that we understand it will cost about $11 million more to complete it in 3 years than it would to take the whole 6 years. Whether or not an investment of the additional $11 million would pay off in goodwill on the completion of the road I do not know and I am not ready to state at this time, but we were faced with that situation. Even though we had an authorization, the testimony before our committee was that it would cost us about $11 million more to do a crash job to complete it than if we took the full 6 years.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is my understanding at the present time that under existing law our Government may spend one-third of the money entirely and completely without any contribution by the six Central American Republics. On the other two-thirds of the cost they put up one-third and we two-thirds of the cost.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say that the subcommittee is not against the completion of this highway. The discussion resolves itself around the length of time for its completion. We were confronted with the fact that there was no basic authorization to speed up and accelerate the program.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am in favor of completing this road. I wonder, however, if it is wise to crash this job through in 3 years. I voted against the authorization for the $75 million for a 3 year job. I was the only member of the committee to so vote.

Mr. HORAN. The Committee on Appropriations is still looking into the matter and trying to make up its own mind as to which is the wisest course to pursue.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The House will have to decide within a few days whether or not it is going to favor a bill creating a $75 million authorization for the 3-year period, since such a bill has been favorably reported out of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to assure the gentleman from Washington that insofar as I am concerned, just because of the fact that somebody goes traveling outside the confines of the United States and makes certain promises with great attendant publicity, I am not going to fulfill such not fully considered promises at a premium and unnecessary added cost of 11 or 12 million dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. This highway so-called has been a long cherished ambition of the United States ever since the days of Blaine. There are many people who believe that right now it would result in a tremendous improvement in good feeling between the 2 continents if this highway were completed as expeditiously as possible. I think the committee should give full consideration to that because it might well be money well spent.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentlemen for their information.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the gentleman from New York, who has made some reference to people traveling around through Central America and making promises for the completion of the inter-American highway, that the gentleman from New York has for some years been voting for the completion of a road in Central America that somebody did not even go down there to look at, but wrote a letter. Somebody promised in that letter to build a road. In this case at least we have someone who went out to look and see and to observe the advantages of the highway. In the other case the gentleman has been voting for, it was simply on a letter written to the head of a State saying, "We will build a road for you."

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman referring to the road which was the brain child of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and for which the gentleman from Ohio voted to appropriate funds along about the 14th of April just past?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Known as the Rama Road?

Mr. BOW. That is correct. I voted for it because I believe in it as I do the Inter-American Highway. I believe that the spending of money in this hemisphere will do us much more good than many of the millions and billions of dollars that we have spent around the world and in other places. If we were met with the situation of a shooting war and we became involved in a submarine war on both coasts of Central America, the completion of that highway might well be worth $11 million or $11 billion to the defense of the hemisphere. I believe, too, in the development of friends to the south, that that is a necessary thing, and that it should be done as promptly as possible.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to observe that it is amazing how viewpoints can change. I have sat on this Appropriations Committee all these years and have advocated the building of and appropriations for the Inter-American Highway when most of those on the other side of the aisle refused to appropriate a dollar for it. They were always the great objectors to it. I remember the distinguished Member of the other body, a gentleman from the State of Michigan, who sat in our conference each year, the conference on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill. It really is amazing how liberal you can now get with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, how it is that the gentleman has now changed his viewpoint? Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I most certainly have not changed my viewpoint. He evidently does not get the point I am making.

Mr. MARTIN. Then we are in agreement on this project.

Mr. ROONEY. I want it finished as fast as possible when it is properly authorized by the legislative committee but not at a premium to the taxpayers of $12 million out of $75 million requested to be appropriated. I think we know as much about this as our celebrated traveler.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and not to exceed $10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington, as authorized by law; $27,650,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the maximum amount authorized under section 3 (a) of the act of June 2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327), for extra compensation to employees of other Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall be $5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized under section 3 (b) of said act, for employees conducting meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be $6,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such employees at any one time may receive a base rate of $8,500 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 22, line 11, strike out "$27,650,000" and insert "$29,900,000."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I am instructed by the subcommittee to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to propose an amendment to this bill which would increase the funds allotted to the Weather Bureau by $3,850,000. However, after full consultation with the committee, and with that body's agreement to unanimously accept a revised figure, I am submitting an amendment which will add $2,250,000 to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am introducing will increase by $2,250,000 the total appropriations allotted to the Weather Bureau. This critically needed sum would be especially earmarked for the immediate establishment of an improved emergency hurricane and severe storm warning system within the Weather Bureau.

Many of you may be surprised to learn that the eight hurricanes of 1954 together caused about $1 billion of property damage—yes, $1,000 million of property damage—and in addition, the loss of about 850 lives.

In fact, a single storm, hurricane Carol, on August 31, 1954, caused property damage amounting to about $500 million. With each hurricane my own State of Rhode Island suffers new and staggering losses which affect the lives of thousands of its citizens and the entire economy of the State. The same is true of the entire New England region. The New England and New York Interagency Committee has estimated total damage in the seven State region as running into the hundreds of millions of dollars for the three major 1954 storms. The damage in Rhode Island alone has been estimated at close to $200 million. As an indication of the very severe property damage experienced, I would like to point out that hurricane losses in 1954 for just the State of Rhode Island amounted to 7.4 percent of the State's total personal income. In addition to property damage, consideration must also be given to the hundreds of fatalities from the storm in 1938 as well as the loss of 19 lives in the 1954 hurricane. It was only for the fact that the storm last year happened to hit at midday that even more casualties did not result.

We in Rhode Island and New England now know—beyond the shadow of a doubt—that we are in the hurricane zone. The pattern over the past few years has definitely established that fact. We also know that we must have earlier danger warnings in order to reduce the horrible loss of life and property in future hurricanes. The Rhode Island Development Council in October of 1954, published an interim report of its hurricane rehabilitation study in which it said:

> The time of day a hurricane strikes is unpredictable, but the amount of warning Rhode Islanders get of a hurricane's approach is something which can be controlled.

I should like to add emphasis to that statement by having it read: "Warning of a hurricane's approach is something which should be controlled."

Today, after more than 70 years of systematic weather observations, the general effects of hurricanes on wind velocity and tide are known. Hurricanes can be traced from their point of origin and warnings given to those endangered. But to do this the Weather Bureau must have sufficient manpower and suitable facilities.

The Weather Bureau now definitely does not have the staff or facilities to provide modern or reasonably adequate hurricane warning service along the entire coastline from Maine to Texas—not to mention the sparse facilities now available to warn the public promptly about other severe storms like blizzards, cold waves, and tornadoes.

The committee bill as presented is fine as far as it goes—but it hardly begins to meet the problem. For example, the bill does not provide for even a single additional storm forecaster, nor for even a single additional research meteorologist, nor for even a single additional weather chartman or weather communicator. Besides there is not one new station to be established along the coast in this bill. Finally, there is not a single part-time station that will be made into a full-time station under the present allotment.

Additional observational equipment to replace obsolete types of existing equipment over the United States obviously is long overdue. What the people who have suffered from hurricanes want most of all, however, is the additional protection that comes from improved forecasts and quicker warnings. All weathermen agree that these requested improvements in 1955 and 1956 can come only if staff and facilities are provided to deal with the many deficiencies which are known to exist.

I believe you will all agree that these improved night and day warning services cannot be realized without increase in their present professional staff. During the past 8 years, the Weather Bureau has had to operate with a smaller number of employees each succeeding year until they now have about 1,000 fewer weathermen than they had in 1949. Nevertheless, aviation and general weather services requirements have increased to the highest levels ever recorded. My amendment will provide for the addition of about 300 more professional meteorologists.

As pointed out in the New York Times editorial of May 9, 1955:

> The public has a right to expect an immediate and substantial increase in the Weather Bureau's facilities and personnel.

There are millions of people along the coast who also would agree with the New York Times editorial that it is "shocking and nothing of the sort is included in the estimate for the next fiscal year." Accordingly I urge all to support my amendment which would call for an increase of $3,850,000 in the Weather Bureau's appropriations for the coming fiscal year. This, it seems to me, is a small price—in fact, less than 1 percent of the total property damage that occurs every year from storms in the United States—and I think it is a small insurance price, indeed, for the added protection to property, not only along the coast of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico but, in fact, for the entire United States.

The following is an analysis of the increased activity which passage of the amendment which I originally intended to introduce would have permitted the Weather Bureau. I am advised that the reduced figure which I have submitted will be sufficient for the Bureau to provide for most of these improvements to be put into effect. I am convinced that passage of this amendment will result in a much improved hurricane warning system and better storm forecasting throughout the country.

First. To provide staff sufficient to keep Weather Bureau offices open 24 hours a day in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where existing Weather Bureau offices are now open only part time, and at other points in the United States. Stations involved follow: Apalachicola, Fla.; Athens, Ga.; Avoca, Pa.; Bishop, Calif.; Block Island, R. I.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Bristol, Tenn.; Columbus, Ga.; Concord, N. H.; Del Rio, Tex.; Dubuque, Iowa; Eugene, Oreg.; Flagstaff, Ariz.; Florence, S. C.; Grand Island, Nebr.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Green Bay, Wis.; Havre, Mont.; Key West, Fla.; La Crosse, Wis.; Lewiston, Idaho; Lynchburg, Va.; Marquette, Mich.; Meridian, Miss.; Milford, Mass.; Muskegon, Mich.; New Haven, Conn.; Norfolk, Va.; Peoria, Ill.; Prescott, Ariz.; Roseburg, Oreg.; Roswell, N. Mex.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Sheridan, Wyo.; Spartanburg, S. C.; Texarkana, Ark.; Valentine, Nebr.; Victoria, Tex.; Williamsport, Pa.; and Williston, N. Dak.

Second. To provide technically trained staff sufficient to reopen Weather Bureau offices in 5 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where formerly existing Weather Bureau offices have been closed, and at additional points in the United States. Stations to be reopened are: Albany, Ga.; Butte, Mont.; Eastport, Maine; Ellensburg, Wash.; Elkins, W. Va.; Erie, Pa.; Melbourne, Fla.; Raton, N. Mex.; Rock Springs, Wyo.; Santa Catalina, Calif.; Terre Haute, Ind.; and Valdosta, Ga.

In addition to the stations to be reopened, new Weather Bureau offices are required at the following strategic locations: Alexandria, La.; Donner Summit, Calif.; Flint, Mich.; Johnstown, Pa.; Lancaster, Pa.; New Bedford, Mass.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Ocean City, Md.; Rockford, Ill.; Saginaw, Mich.; Waterloo, Iowa; Wheeling, W. Va.; and Worcester, Mass.

Third. To operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

Fourth. To provide staff and observing equipment to obtain additional rawinsonde observations at 6-hourly intervals instead of 12-hourly intervals during periods of hurricane or other severe storm threat.

Fifth. To provide additional weather observations during storm periods from merchant ships traversing the western Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico.

Sixth. To provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Seventh. To establish an improved high water warning service in order to inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves, and other coastal inundations from abnoral water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

Eighth. To provide meteorological staff and facilities for emergency hurricane warning centers and for mobile storm warning squads to supplement the local Weather Bureau staffs during the intense activity accompanying the approach and passage of hurricanes and major storms; and afterwards to survey and review (a) the quantity and quality of hurricane reports, alerts, and forecasts, (b) the times, places, and amounts of hurricane information distributed by all news media, (c) the protective action taken by all concerned, (d) and the types and amounts of hurricane damage incurred.

Ninth. To obtain weather reports of upper-air conditions in the path of approaching hurricanes similar to the information obtained at the ocean vessel ship station formerly located half way between New York and Bermuda. This will be accomplished as a result of a cooperative project with the Coast Guard and will be more economical than a fixed station.

Tenth. To carry out a cooperative private and governmental public information program involving important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, the changing characteristics of moving hurricanes, and the precautions that should be taken by citizens in the forecast path of future hurricanes to save lives and property.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to include in my remarks a press release of a speech delivered by the senior Senator from my State of Rhode Island, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN; two news stories from the New York Times for September 27, 28, and 29, 1954, dealing with the Weather Bureau; a release from the Weather Bureau entitled "Statement of Future Requirements of the Weather Bureau"; a paper written by Norman R. Hagen, of the United States Weather Bureau, regarding losses from the 1954 hurricanes; an editorial from the New York Times for May 9, 1955, on hurricane warning; and an analysis of the appropriations history of the Weather Bureau from 1951 to 1956:

A LEGISLATOR VIEWS THE STORM TIDE PROBLEM

(Address of United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN on the occasion of the symposium on meteorologically induced changes in water level. Thirty-sixth annual meeting of the American Geophysical Union, in Washington, D. C., on May 4, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to address this illustrious group of scientists and to present my views as a legislator as to the storm-tide problem. This is particularly so since it concerns the citizens of my home State of Rhode Island who have been visited by four disastrous hurricanes in the past few years.

After the 1938 hurricane which caused many deaths and millions of dollars of damage, not only in Rhode Island, but along the entire Atlantic coast, I received many letters about it from my constituents and others. Practically all of these were adversely critical of the Weather Bureau's activities during that emergency. Some of these communications were from persons deeply concerned over what they believed was the inactivity of the Weather Bureau in giving sufficient warning of the approaching storm. So, acting in their behalf I had considerable correspondence with that agency and became deeply interested in the administration of that Bureau, and have watched carefully the appropriations of funds for its operation.

In August and September of 1954 the hurricanes Carol and Edna visited us with even more disastrous results, and a little later a visit from Hazel also was expected. At these times I again received a flood of similar critical letters and the press of my State published critical editorials regarding the Weather Bureau. As a matter of fact news stories in papers in some of the larger cities of other States were also critical of it. As a Member of the United States Senate I recognized the significance of these letters from constituents and the editorial opinions of the press. As a resident of Rhode Island and one who on personal inspection tours viewed the damage done by the hurricanes in practically every city and town in my State, I concluded that some explanations were in order from the Federal agencies involved.

Therefore, I communicated with officials of the Weather Bureau and obtained reports on these matters, some of which were satisfactory, and others of which were disappointing. I also obtained reports from other Government agencies, such as the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Navy and the Coast Guard. As a result I became firmly convinced that there was no proper coordination of the various agencies involved in weather reporting activities.

However, I learned that the Navy, contemplating the visit of Hurricane Carol, took appropriate steps at the great naval establishments in my State to protect lives and Government property. Further than that, when the hurricane struck the naval establishments there, the officers and men did an excellent job not only during but also after the storm. The Navy, especially the Seabees stationed at Davisville, provided essential assistance to civilians in neighboring towns by lending heavy equipment, such as generators, to those who were left without electrical power. In fact, the Navy worked closely with the State civil defense administration during the whole disaster period, and as a result of this cooperation, many cities and towns recovered more quickly from this disaster. We are thankful that the loss of life suffered was not so great as that which occurred in the 1938 hurricane.

As a result of my correspondence with the Weather Bureau, I learned that the average citizen does not understand the Weather Bureau advisories and bulletins in the sense the Bureau intends they should be understood. To add to this handicap, during the hours just prior to the visit of Hurricane Carol, most of the advisories and bulletins were issued from the Weather Bureau at Boston and not from the station in Rhode Island. I am convinced that there were not sufficient employees manning the Rhode Island station during that emergency. This conviction is borne out by the fact that during the visit of the next hurricane, Edna, a full staff of employees was on duty at the Rhode Island Weather Station and a continual stream of advisories and bulletins came over every radio station in the State. This was in definite contrast to the meager information given out during the visit of Hurricane Carol. It seems to me that during emergencies of this kind, some authority should be given to the person in charge of a weather station, such as that in Rhode Island, to allow additional personnel to be called to duty, and additional personnel to be hired for the duration of the emergency. This would insure adequate reporting to the press, radio, civil defense, and other State agencies which are deeply concerned and spread the news to the public.

I believe the public should be constantly advised when a storm of this kind is forecast but realize that even if all the people were well aware of the advent of such a storm, there would be some criticism, especially if the storm veered off in a different direction and did not strike as forecast. However, in the long run it would prove best for all concerned, for if, on the other hand, the storm did strike as predicted, the preparations made and precautions taken to decrease damage would be well worthwhile.

I hesitate to be critical of the Weather Bureau because there are excellent men working with that agency—some of the best in the country. However, they cannot work without adequate funds and proper tools and I believe they should have increased appropriations so that they can maintain the best in equipment. It is also important that the best men possible be procured and assigned to extensive research of violent storms.

Beyond that, I believe that adequate warning systems and advisories, expressed in plain language which the average citizen can understand, should be developed by the Weather Bureau. An understandable warning system would allay the fears of many persons who at the present time are very weather conscious. For example, since the visits of Carol and Edna to New England, and in particular Rhode Island, the weather in all its aspects has become front-page news—especially so to those who lost their homes and all their belongings as the result of the disastrous storms. Recently the Providence Journal, which has been at the forefront in the reporting of weather news since the visit of Carol, conducted a "Forecasting Sweepstakes." The results were based on a rating system established by the Providence Journal to compare the forecastings of the United States Weather Bureau and those of the Northeastern Weather Service, a privately owned operation. Daily reports and 5-day outlooks from the United States Weather Bureau and the Northeastern Weather Service were printed on the front page of the Journal, starting March 20 and ending April 24, practically in a tie. The "Sweepstakes" was unique and was followed with interest by the citizens of my State.

Many estimates have been made of the amount of damage in dollars and cents caused by these 1954 hurricanes. I do not have any exact figures but I do know that it amounted to many millions of dollars. According to the press over $276 million in claims have been paid by insurance companies as a result of the visits of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel in 1954. Of course, there have been additional millions expended by individuals who lost their property but were not insured. Of course, there will always be extensive damage done by storms such as these, regardless of how accurate the forecasting may be. However, I also recognize the fact that an improved warning system and proper coordination of Federal, State, and local agencies during such a period, would greatly decrease property damage and loss of life.

I know that meteorologists and forecasters of the Weather Bureau cannot materially improve their forecasts and give sufficient warning of the approach of hurricanes, unless and until they improve their knowledge of storm structure and movement. To improve this knowledge it will be necessary to institute a comprehensive research program

which will cover not only hurricanes, but all sorts of storms such as tornadoes, hailstorms, and the like.

It is my understanding that the Weather Bureau has recently been able to improve its hurricane warning system and to arrange for better collection and distribution of information. I understand that the Bureau is proceeding with the installation of radar at certain points—that aerial reconnaissance for locating hurricanes has been worked out with the armed services—that a special telephone service has been arranged with certain priorities being given to the Weather Bureau during such emergencies—and that better press relations have been established so that the press will be kept informed of approaching storms, with a view to passing understandable information along to the public. All these steps which have recently been taken by the Bureau are in the right direction. However, I am firmly convinced that the Weather Bureau does not have sufficient funds to improve its research and to maintain the service which is expected of it. I am one of those in the Congress who believes that the Weather Bureau is one of the few Government agencies which does not waste any of the taxpayers' money and that appropriations are used with discretion.

As a legislator I have reviewed the requirements for hurricane research as recommended by the Interagency Hurricane Research Conference which was held last December here in Washington. The report of this conference is, in my opinion, far-reaching and practical, and funds to put the recommendations into operation should be appropriated immediately. I concur with the recommendations of the conference, particularly with regard to the establishment of a Federal advisory committee on hurricane research. A group such as this would be comprised of representatives of all Government agencies interested in weather reporting activities. It would be of inestimable value by providing for an expanded research program and better coordination of all agencies concerned with weather forecasting.

Therefore, as a Member of the Senate and one who is deeply interested in the activities of the Weather Bureau, I intend to do my best to have Congress appropriate adequate funds for that agency's research program. I know that there are some legislators and Government officials who are economy-minded and hesitate to increase any appropriation. In this case I call it false economy and shortsightedness. The total funds allotted to the Bureau are very small in comparison with the funds appropriated for some of the other agencies and I fully intend to solicit the support of the members of the New England United States Senators Conference relative to working as a unit for increased appropriations for the Weather Bureau.

The country needs men such as the members of your organization, with your training and scientific knowledge of the elements, to guide the Congress and to advise the public in matters of this kind. I know that Congress appreciates highly the cooperation and assistance of your organization and your continued interest in all Federal legislation affecting the agencies interested in weather forecasting and reporting. I trust that it will take advantage of your helpful advices.

[From the New York Times of September 27, 1954]

Failings of Weather Bureau Laid to Parsimony

(By Robert Alden)

The United States Weather Bureau, charged with a grave responsibility in terms of life, property and commercial interest, is severely handicapped by a lack of funds to carry out a complex operation. As a case in point, meteorologists say that if the trend toward eliminating weather observation stations continues there is a very real danger that the Bureau's forecasts will become less accurate.

In 1947 there were 443 such weather stations. Next year there will be 321. In 1949 the Weather Bureau had 4,517 full-time employees. Next year there will be 3,728.

The plight of the Weather Bureau was brought into focus by Hurricane Carol, which roared into an unprepared New England at the end of August, killing 60 persons and causing damage estimated at $500 million.

As a result of that storm this newspaper interviewed about 40 persons in the field of weather study and prediction, most of them privately employed and thus holding no special brief for the Weather Bureau.

To a man they agreed that the Bureau had been treated penuriously by Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget, and that, consequently, its product was not up to what it could be.

One description characterized the Weather Bureau as a neglected "horse-and-buggy outfit struggling to get along on just a pittance—a fraction of the money it should have."

The more generously inclined commented that in spite of severe budgetary handicaps the Weather Bureau through constant struggle was "almost" managing to keep abreast of the times in a branch of science that was said to be much more complex than such a notably difficult field as the development of the hydrogen bomb.

All of those surveyed agreed that the Weather Bureau, with only a token amount available for research, was not able to take the lead in attempting to solve the knotty problems in weather prediction.

Such an accelerated research program does not necessarily hold out the key that will enable the Weather Bureau by next year or the year after that to warn us with certainty that a hurricane like Carol will strike a specific area at a specific time with a specific force.

It does mean, however, that unless such research is done now, in 10 and 20 years from now other Carols will still be roaring in from the sea, violently and unexpectedly. And again there will be the consequent tragedy of lives snuffed out, homes and life-long possessions destroyed and business establishments, built up through a lifetime, wrecked without hope of repair.

Government bureaus have seldom been notable for economy of operation. Apparently the Weather Bureau is exceptional in this respect.

A committee of private citizens, expert in the field, was appointed last year by the Secretary of Commerce to study the Weather Bureau and its functions: That committee's report said:

"A review of the history of the Weather Bureau's budget has impressed the committee with the frugality of this Bureau's operation and its management is to be commended for the manner which they have administered public funds. We know of no other governmental agency that has been so economical in the expenditure of its funds."

Comparatively low expenditure

The committee went on to point out that while countries such as Iceland spent $1 per capita a year for a weather service, while the Soviet Union spent 47 cents (last available figure 10 years ago) and England spent 20 cents, the United States, with a gross income far higher than any of these countries, was allotting each year only 18 cents per capita for its Weather Bureau.

Yet, quite literally, billions of dollars are at stake in the United States as a result of the foibles of the weather. It is not only a question of whether a lawn party can be held or a ball game will be played—the sort of thing that many associate with the weatherman.

A merchant fleet unwarned of the approach of a storm can be wiped out overnight. A crop of oranges can be destroyed by a cold snap. Hundreds of persons can be killed in a tornado when a scant 10-minute warning might save them all.

It was for this reason that the Secretary of Commerce's committee, headed by Brig. Gen. Joseph J. George, superintendent of meteorology at Eastern Air Lines, recommended "that the Weather Bureau receive the strongest possible support in budgetary matters at the department level for the next few years when adequate funds will be absolutely essential."

In spite of the fact that this recommendation was made last December, Congress appropriated only $24,750,000 for the Weather Bureau this year, a figure well under the $27,250,000 allotted for the Bureau's high year, fiscal 1953.

But these bare figures do not tell the story. As a science, meteorology has exacting demands. Talented and trained personnel are required to tackle the tough job of weather analysis and prediction. Such personnel are not being attracted by the meager salaries that the Bureau is forced to pay. Similarly, research, the life-blood of science, is getting scant support from the Bureau.

Another result of the continual cutting of the Bureau's budget is that the amount of data upon which the forecaster must depend to make his predictions is becoming less each year as additional weather stations are closed.

That trend, of course, is very dangerous.

The Bureau's equipment is also becoming antiquated and newly developed equipment that should be in the weather stations is not being acquired. A good case in point is the matter of radar sets.

A new radar set is prohibitively priced (as far as the Weather Bureau is concerned) at something over $200,000. Fortunately, the Navy gave the Weather Bureau a hundred old radar sets. But even the money to convert this equipment—about $10,000 a set—was not available.

With some financial sacrifice, four of the sets were installed along the Atlantic seaboard to watch hurricanes and other severe storms. (It is generally agreed that about 14 are needed to track storms adequately along the east coast.)

The other sets were offered to communities willing to pay the price of converting the equipment. Several cities in Texas, plagued by tornadoes, assumed the financial responsibility and a few of the sets were installed there.

However, there are many other cities and weather stations that could profitably use the equipment, which now lies gathering dust in a warehouse.

Another solution to the problem of adequate employment of radar in weather detection lies in the Air Defense Command. This command has an excellent radar net and it is perfectly willing to cooperate in every way with the Weather Bureau.

But reading radar in connection with the weather is difficult. For example, rain squall lines appear on the scope in such a way that they seem to indicate the presence of the eye of a hurricane. Such a false reading can be misleading to a disastrous degree.

To do this difficult job accurately, the Weather Bureau should post a man either at the Air Defense Command's radar machines or at least at the radar report filter center.

But, lacking this personnel, these centers remain uncovered by the Weather Bureau and the radar reports that finally get to the Weather Bureau from the Air Defense Command's radar net are late, incomplete, and possibly misleading.

Left in the lap of Congress

As a result of all these factors, the weather experts in the field agree, the country is not getting the kind and quality of service that should be available to it. Consequently lives may be lost unnecessarily and millions of dollars of preventable damage may be done.

This year, as in the years before, the Department of Commerce will urge on the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress an increased appropriation for the Weather Bureau. Until now the pleas met with no success. The Bureau, it seems, always loses "the Battle on the Hill."

If the weather experts could go to Congress and say: "Give us more money and we guarantee that next year there will be no more Carols striking the coast without warning," the Bureau would undoubtedly get an adequate appropriation.

But in the difficult science of meteorology no such guarantee can be made. Progress comes only slowly and the results cannot be assured in advance.

It is certain, however, the meteorologists agree, that unless an attempt is made to improve the situation, everything will remain as it is at present. The weatherman will continue to be the butt of jokes and the Nation will be a heavy loser as a result of the unexpected quirks in the weather.

[From the New York Times of September 28, 1954]

CAPRICES OF CAROL DEFIED FORECASTS—HURRICANE STILL IN DISPUTE—EXPERTS DISAGREE ON ROLE OF WEATHER BUREAU ECONOMIES

(By Robert Alden)

The capricious and destructive Hurricane Carol, which tore into New England without adequate warning on the morning of August 31, still remains a lady of mystery.

No one, for example, can say with any certainty whether an additional dollar investment in the Weather Bureau through the years would have enabled the bureau to forecast the course of the storm any sooner than it did.

At least two responsible meteorologists (outside the Weather Bureau) argue that if a weather ship, formerly stationed about half way between New York and Bermuda, had been at its post, the New England coast could have been alerted to the storm 12 hours sooner than it was.

Other equally responsible meteorologists think that the presence of the weather ship, removed last year for reasons of economy, would have made no difference at all. They maintain that it would not have been in the right position to give the data pertinent to the course of the storm.

The fairest appraisal of this situation was given by a high official in the Weather Bureau. He said:

"I don't think the ship would have done any good. But, after all, the ship wasn't out there. We don't know whether the data she might have picked up would have helped because there just weren't any data. It's one of those things you can't possibly figure out."

VALUE OF RESEARCH WEIGHED

Similarly there is the matter of research. The meandering course of a hurricane seems to be governed in large measue by upper air currents. Some meteorologists maintain that if a comprehensive research study of those currents and other factors influencing hurricanes had been instituted years ago, Carol's mad middle-of-the-night dash toward the New England coast could have been plotted in advance an a substantial advance warning given to the area.

TOUCHES OFF POLITICAL DISPUTE

Carol is destined, it seems, to have a political career. Already there has been a sharp exchange on the subject in Washington.

Senator THEODORE GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, has charged that false economy was one reason that no adequate warning was sounded.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks replied that there had been no false economies in the Weather Bureau that would weaken the agency's hurricane-warning system.

Meteorologists are inclined to straddle the fence on the issue. Hurricanes are strange and difficult-to-predict meterological phenomena. The general feeling among the scientists is that while one cannot buy the answer to the hurricane problem in a year or 2, perhaps in 10 or 20 years such a purchase can be made.

They feel that with 1 hurricane like Carol costing 60 lives and $50 million in property damage, even 20 years of payment might prove a good bargain.

Other weather experts say it is speculative to predict what might have been uncovered by research.

All agree, however, that the institution of a large-scale research program years ago certainly would have done no harm. If no solution to the hurricane problem had been found by now, at least meteorologists would be that much closer to finding a solution.

At the same time persons critical of the Weather Bureau point out that even without benefit of the additional research or the weather ship, at least one private forecaster advised his client in Providence, in advance of the Weather Bureau, that a hurricane was about to strike that city.

To understand that situation it is necessary to trace the history of the storm.

Carol, like most hurricanes, was peculiar. For several days it idled off the Carolina capes, not doing anything in particular. At times it would stand still. Then it would move northward or northeastward at 3 to 4 miles an hour. Sometimes the winds at its center would increase in intensity. Then they would diminish.

During the day of August 30 Carol began to move north northeastward, first at 5 miles an hour, then toward evening at something more than 10 miles an hour. Highest winds at the center were measured at 100 miles an hour.

Without warning, at about midnight, the hurricane started a wild dash toward the New England coast. Soon the winds at its center were boiling up the sea at 100 miles an hour while the hurricane herself was skimming across the Atlantic at a speed of over 50 miles an hour.

SAFETY CUSHION SUDDENLY LOST

All through the night Carol raced onward.

While a few hours earlier it had seemed that those 500 miles of water that lay between the Carolina capes and New England would provide an ample safety cushion for sounding a warning, it was now apparent that the storm if it hit land at all would strike the New England coast by morning.

But New England was still sleeping. And it is impossible for the weather bureau to pour a warning into a sleeping ear.

There were other complicating factors. The Weather Bureau was not receiving very much data about the storm in the middle of that critical night. Frequently information from the sea areas is scant.

From the material it did receive, it appeared at one point as if Carol were veering out to sea and might miss the coastline completely.

By 5 a. m., however, the Weather Bureau in Washington, utilizing radar information it had received from Norfolk, Va., issued a bulletin that all precautions should be taken for high tides and "on-shore gales" from central Long Island to Nantucket. Gales are a notch below hurricanes in intensity.

In view of the complexity of the situation that night, most meteorologists agree that this 5 a. m. advisory was a "pretty fair" prediction.

The private forecaster who warned his client in Providence telephoned that client at 6:49 a. m. that a hurricane would strike the area at about noon.

In explaining this divergence of opinion meteorologists will say that plotting the course of a hurricane is much like handicapping an immensely complicated horse race. One studies all the available data and then comes up with his choice. Sometimes he is right and sometimes he is wrong.

BUREAU BACKED WRONG HORSE

In the case of Carol, when the Weather Bureau's forecaster had picked the word "gale" he had backed the wrong horse, although he had done a good job, in the opinion of meteorologists, in handicapping the race.

As for the private forecaster, working from data supplied by the Weather Bureau, he had picked a better horse and had come in first. At the same time it is apparent that any other private forecaster who hadn't picked a better horse would not be advertising the fact.

On another occasion it will be the Weather Bureau's choice that will nose out that of the private forecaster's. Horse races and hurricanes are like that.

The Navy, in New England, was also able to batten down its hatches and make ready for the storm in plenty of time to avoid serious damage. People have wondered publicly why the Navy was forewarned while civilians weren't.

Here, an entirely different factor is involved. It is best illustrated in the words of a Navy weather forecaster in a discussion of a hurricane other than Carol.

"As a meteorologist," he said, "I was fairly certain that that storm wasn't going to strike our docks or our air bases.

"As a Navy officer, however, I recommended that all hurricane precautions be taken in the harbors and that all flyable aircraft be evacuated. We just can't take a calculated risk on a thing of that kind. It just isn't worth it to us."

On the other hand, if the Weather Bureau were to alert the public too often to storms that didn't strike, it would be severely criticized, particularly because of the big commercial loss that might be involved.

After a time, as in the case of the fable about the boy who cried "wolf!" no one would pay much attention to the Weather Bureau.

[From the New York Times of September 29, 1954]

PUBLIC AID URGED BY WEATHERMEN—PALLED BY STALE JOKES, THEY ASK BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR COMPLEX WORK

(By Robert Alden)

The weatherman is tired of being the butt of a parade of stale jokes.

He wishes the public had a better understanding of his job and the economic problems connected with it.

He would especially like the public to know that meteorology has turned out to be one of the most complex sciences man has undertaken to explore.

It involves the study of a layer of gases cloaking the earth to a height of several hundred miles and weighing something in the neighborhood of 4 million billion tons.

These gases are in a constant state of flux—boiling upward, spinning, turning, and then plunging down again. In this devildance of the earth's atmosphere, the weather is created.

It is something of an exaggeration to say that if a man sneezes in China a hot day in Texas may result. But it is true that any action in the atmosphere in any part of the world may have an effect on the weather anywhere else in the world.

"Man doesn't know the complete answer to problems involved in such things as economic cycles, polio, or cancer," the meteorologist will say in his own defense. "Why should people expect us to be able to tell them everything about the weather?"

The weatherman's job begins with the gathering of data from weather stations all

over the world. At those stations things such as temperature, wind velocity, humidity, and atmospheric pressure are measured.

UPPER AIR DATA NOW TAKEN

Formerly these measurements were made only at ground level. Now some of the weather stations also take soundings in the upper air. These new measurements have proved extremely valuable.

The data from all these stations are transmitted to the forecasting centers where they provide the raw material with which the forecaster works.

The limited budget provided for the Weather Bureau coupled with the inflationary trends of the times has made it necessary for the Bureau to effect economies. Consequently there has been a steady whittling away of weather observation stations.

The committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce to study the Weather Bureau said in its report that it viewed "with considerable concern" the elimination of those stations and advised that the matter be carefully considered before further reductions were made.

If the trend were to continue important gaps would appear in the weather map and the forecaster would be hobbled almost to a crippling degree in trying to do his job.

In general the meteorologists queried for this survey felt that the present land net of observation stations in the United States was adequate for forecasting. Several, however, complained about the closing down of particular stations.

Most felt that more frequent soundings of the upper air (it is now done twice a day) would be helpful for those involved in weather research.

MORE SEA INFORMATION NEEDED

Many of the meteorologists also felt that not enough upper air data were available from sea areas. There is a gap in the Pacific Ocean, for example, that is as big as the United States itself. And much of this country's weather is born in the Pacific.

As a result of this situation instead of solid data with which to work the forecaster must, substitute an educated guess. Such a procedure is hardly satisfactory from his point of view.

At this point the cruel matter of economics again interjects itself. The operating cost of a land weather observation station is about $25,000 a year. A year's upkeep of a weather ship at sea, providing the same kind of information costs $1 million.

At some point along the line it must, therefore, be decided if the data obtained from the ship are worth $1 million a year. In the case of Weather Ship "H," which was stationed in the Atlantic about halfway between New York and Bermuda, it was decided to discontinue its services. Meteorologists are still arguing about that decision.

Once the data are obtained, the next step is to disseminate it to forecasters and private users throughout the country. Here again the Bureau is encountering trouble because of budgetary difficulties.

Officials of the Weather Bureau say that their communication network just isn't adequate; that a lot of the data picked up at the observation stations cannot be transmitted because of a bottleneck in the wires.

NEW DEVICES REQUIRED

Were the Bureau able to purchase a new type of teletype equipment, which can handle 600 words a minute instead of the 60 that the present equipment can transmit, that bottleneck would be eliminated.

When the data does arrive at the forecasting center, it is then worked on by the meteorologist in the Bureau. A weather map is prepared from the data, and then the forecaster must pit what he knows about the science against what shows on the map.

His answer comes out in the form of a prediction. How good that prediction is depends on the ability of the forecaster—how well he is able to estimate the product of the many, many forces that are at play in the atmosphere.

And again monetary factors are interposed. One of the crying needs of the Weather Bureau is good personnel. Not many young men are entering the field of meteorology. To get the good men in the field it is necessary to pay them an adequate salary. The salaries paid by the Weather Bureau are not high.

Many of the employees of the Weather Bureau leave to work elsewhere for economic reasons. And young men just entering the field are attracted by the salaries offered by private industry.

RESEARCH PROGRAM PINCHED

For years now the Weather Bureau, for reasons of economy, has been spending just token sums on research. So badly has their research program been pinched, that the Air Force and the Navy have been forced to undertake research functions, which are not properly within their realm.

Everyone concerned with the problem is anxious to see the Weather Bureau undertake the basic research in the weather field. But this cannot be done until the Bureau receives a larger budgetary allotment.

It is axiomatic that the fewer employees there are in a weather station, the less direct service can be given to the public.

Beyond a straight forecast there is controversy as to exactly how much information the Weather Bureau should give to the public. Most meteorologists feel that the Weather Bureau should not take upon itself the burden of supplying a special service to a special business.

That kind of service falls within the province of private meteorology, a profession which those connected with weather study and prediction feel has great potentialities.

While the Weather Bureau will be issuing general forecasts, the private meteorologist will be thinking in terms of the particular conditions that will affect a company's operation.

Occasionally, however, the Bureau does step across the line and give special advice—perhaps to a utility company, perhaps to a candy company, which doesn't want to make shipments when it is very hot.

In another instance, some of the large airlines depend entirely on the Weather Bureau to provide their pilots with the detailed and specialized information they require.

Many persons in the field feel that these special services of the Weather Bureau should be discontinued. They feel it is a disservice to the public to take the time of the Bureau's limited personnel to perform such special jobs.

Others disagree, maintaining that these services are a proper function of the Weather Bureau.

[Press release of U. S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau]

STATEMENT OF FUTURE REQUIREMENTS OF THE WEATHER BUREAU

The Weather Bureau is responsible for forecasting severe storms, floods, and general weather conditions and making such forecasts available to the public promptly for the protection of life and property and for the economic benefit of the Nation. In summarizing what is required for an optimum weather service for the modern needs of the Nation, it should be kept in mind that weather is a highly variable phenomena which affects the daily activities of almost every citizen and the entire national economy. Furthermore, the weather forecast problem is one of the most difficult in the physical sciences and requires a large network of weather reporting stations equipped with modern instruments for accurately measuring weather elements from the earth's surface to high levels in the atmosphere (80,000 feet or more) at frequent intervals. There are certain serious limitations in the Weather Bureau facilities for preparing accurate forecasts and warnings and for disseminating such information promptly to the public.

I. IMPROVEMENTS PLANNED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1956

The Weather Bureau's plans for fiscal year 1956 include provision for improving its forecasts and advices by installing improved equipment for measuring high altitude wind and weather conditions at all upper-air observing stations, radar for detecting and tracking severe storms will be installed at 12 stations, equipment for measuring the height of cloud bases and visibility near the end of the instrument landing runways will be provided at 45 airports, and other improvements will be made in facilities for reporting surface weather conditions.

II. IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS

A. Observational requirements

1. Land reports: Additional radar facilities should be provided for detecting and tracking severe storms so that radar weather coverage can be maintained along the Pacific coast and over the entire area from the Great Plains eastward to the Atlantic and gulf coasts. The completed network will require about 70 additional sets of high-powered radar equipment. End-of-runway observational equipment should be provided for approximately 120 additional airports for protection of life and property during marginal weather conditions. Airway observations for airline operations are required at a number of airports used by scheduled carriers where there is no Weather Bureau or other Government weather reporting facility. Weather stations at these airports are needed. The frequency of observations taken at all upper-air sounding stations should be increased from 2 to 4 times daily and a few additional upper-air stations should be established. These improvements will complete the observational facilities currently needed over the continental area.

2. Marine reports: Approximately 75 additional marine reports of surface conditions by merchant vessels are needed daily from the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific areas. The need for additional nighttime reports from ships in the Gulf and Atlantic areas during the hurricane season is especially urgent.

3. Instrumental development: Intensified work needs to be done on the development of improved instruments for weather observational purposes. Most urgent are the needs for (1) development of improved and cheaper methods of obtaining upper-air observations, particularly over the ocean areas; and (2) development of automatic equipment and remote reading instruments for observing and reporting weather conditions, so that the large amount of labor required for weather observational purposes may be reduced and reports may be obtained from isolated locations which are difficult and costly to staff.

B. Forecasts and severe weather warning requirements

1. Staffing: Additional staffing for preparation of forecasts should be provided at most of the forecast centers, particularly for the preparation of agricultural weather forecasts. Modern river forecast centers now provide forecast service for approximately half the streams of the country. Eight additional river forecast centers with supporting facilities should be established in order to provide full coverage.

2. Communications: Facsimile receivers for the reception of charts and maps from the Central Analysis Unit should be provided for about 200 offices in order to improve the

preparation of forecasts and severe weather warnings. The installation of additional teletypewriter facilities in the tornado and hurricane areas also is needed for the transmission of data required for the forecasting of severe storms.

C. Facilities needed for dissemination of forecasts, warnings, and related weather information

1. Staffing and stations: Approximately 125 counties in the United States having a population of 75,000 or more are outside the areas served by a local Weather Bureau office. Stations should be established in each of these locations and in several less populous areas where severe weather seriously affects the public interest. Service to agriculture would be given high priority in the programs of most of these offices. Additional staffing also is needed at practically all stations in large metropolitan areas in order to facilitate the dissemination of forecasts and warnings to the general public.

2. Communications: Automatic equipment for disseminating aviation and general weather information by radio and telephone has been developed and is in use at a few locations. Equipment of this type should be provided at about 90 locations in the Nation, so that routine information can be disseminated rapidly without need for a large staff.

D. Climatology

Additional professional climatologists are needed in each State to develop, in cooperation with the land-grand colleges, better utilization of climatology by agriculture and other interests. The climatological archives contain a vast amount of data which is potentially highly valuable to business, industry, commerce, and agriculture but the limited facilities of the Weather Bureau have prevented adequate use of this material. A comprehensive climatic atlas of the United States should be developed to meet the great variety of climatic problems confronting agriculture, commerce, industry, public works, and transportation. More intensive studies of drought, of long-term climatic changes, and of the influence of climate on agriculture should be conducted.

E. Research

For a number of years expenditures for research have amounted to only about 2 percent of the Weather Bureau's budget. The complex nature of meteorological processes and the urgent need for improved forecasts justify a substantial increase in funds for research purposes. The following items should receive high priority during the next few years.

1. Severe storms: An intensive research program on the various aspects of the hurricane forecast problem is very urgently needed. Research on other types of severe storms, such as tornadoes, also should be intensified. Improvement in the forecasting of severe storms and other weather occurrences is dependent to a large extent upon a better understanding of their structure and nature.

2. Numerical weather prediction: Trials now being made in the application of high speed electronic computers to weather forecasting offer great promise that the accuracy and quality of weather forecasts may be substantially improved. However, the preparation of weather forecasts with electronic computers is a highly complex procedure and needs intensified study.

3. Long-range forecasts: Within recent years moderate success has been achieved in preparing monthly outlooks or forecasts. The technique employed is dependent upon analysis of the large scale atmospheric circulation over the entire northern hemisphere. The improved high altitude wind observations which will be available in the next few years will provide valuable basic data with which to improve this technique. Studies in this field should be increased because even limited improvements in the accuracy of long-range forecasts would be of great benefit to the Nation.

4. Additional research also is needed concerning the physical processes involved in the formation of precipitation and on the possibilities of artificially modifying weather conditions. The manner in which water vapor in the free atmosphere is transformed into precipitation or cloud masses is imperfectly understood and constitutes one of the major basic problems in meteorology.

The foregoing improvements will provide a highly effective national weather service but will require about 6 years to accomplish in a sound and efficient manner, because of the time requirement for recruiting and training technical staff and the procurement and development of supporting facilities. Funds in the President's Budget for 1956, therefore, represent an important step in this long-range improvement plan for the Weather Bureau's observing, forecasting and distribution system.

Notes on the Record Losses From 1954 Hurricanes

(A paper presented at the joint spring meeting of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society at Washington, D. C., May 2–6, 1955, by Norman R. Hagen, meteorologist, U. S. Weather Bureau)

(Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel not only broke many meteorological records, but together far surpassed previous annual records for damages by all types of North American severe storms. Hurricane Carol on August 31, 1954, alone caused damage amounting to nearly $500 million. Comparisons with previous losses, some storm highlights, and damage assessment problems are discussed briefly.)

The 1954 hurricane season at many localities broke a variety of meteorological records, such as highest wind speeds, lowest pressures, greatest rainfall amounts, and deepest salt water inundations.

The purpose of these notes is not to enumerate all such observation data, but rather to highlight facts showing that hurricane damages in 1954 far surpassed previous annual damage records by all classes of North American storms. These recently collected figures on the size of the 1954 losses, however gruesome, may be of more than passing interest to coastal business interests and to meteorologists already concerned about preparations for the 1955 hurricane season.

Annual storm damage, to some extent, is a measure of the worth of warning services that could be provided by a forecast organization. There would be less public demand for storm protection services if there were no severe storms, or if our severest weather occurrences were of no economic significance. Conversely, there would be more public demand for better forecast services if the total number of severe storms were large. Moreover, if total annual property damages were tremendous, and total loss of life exceptionally high, there would be reduced strain on scientists in justifying adequate warning program budgets before fiscal-minded officials.

It seems useful, accordingly, to review the estimates of damage that occurred as a result of the 1954 hurricanes.

First of all it must be realized that only general estimates of property damage are possible. A complete catalog would be needed to total all the areas affected by hurricanes, and all the various types of losses which occurred. Such assembled statistics, however, still would be subject to criticism as to the damage criteria and the census techniques used.

Figures on fatalities also may be misleading, since some of the deaths are only indirectly attributable to hurricanes. Nevertheless, the actual figures for 1954 are very large indeed.

In one 1954 hurricane a quarter-million telephones suddenly went out of order, and millions of feet of wire were blown down. In another 1954 hurricane, hundreds of thousands of homes and business establishments were deprived of electric power, and the business economy of many communities quickly came to a full stop.

In many States repair crews worked night and day for a month untangling the devastation. In a single city thousands of employees were thrown out of work for weeks because of salt water damage to vital production machinery and stock material.

Along some beaches dozens of houses disappeared without trace. In other communities hundreds of buildings were completely demolished. Food spoilage was immense. Crops covering entire counties were ruined. Thousands of small craft were sunk or damaged. The real cost and social loss of millions of downed trees perhaps never can be measured satisfactorily.

From the data readily available I have abstracted the following brief statements on general damage from the 1954 hurricanes in North America (it should be remembered that figures on property damage, and on the loss of life from hurricanes are prepared by several different procedures, and are not always comparable in different States or countries):

1. Hurricane damage in 1954 was the largest in history. The total loss in North America, by conservative estimate, was nearly $1 billion.

2. In North America 750 lives were lost because of hurricanes in 1954.

3. Hurricane Carol on August 31, 1954, caused more property damage than any single storm in North American history. Estimates of the damage caused by this New England storm now total about $500 million.

4. About 600 people lost their lives throughout the long twisting passage of Hurricane Hazel over Haiti, the Bahamas, the United States, and Canada.

5. Mexico also suffered large damage from 1954 hurricanes. Hurricane Alice caused 38 deaths in that country, and 5 more Mexicans died because of Hurricane Florence.

6. The tropical disturbance Gilda caused very heavy rainfall in British Honduras, and resulting floods brought death to about 30 people, and left thousands homeless in Central America.

7. In the United States alone the 1954 hurricanes caused about 200 deaths, and caused property damage of about $800 million.

8. It is sometimes mentioned that the number of claims made to insurance companies is a rough indication of total storm damage. If so, Hurricane Carol was the worst catastrophe in history, since more damage claims were made as a result of Hurricane Carol than any other storm or natural disaster in American records up until September 1954. Insurance men say that about 300,000 damage claims were made following the onslaught of Hurricane Carol across New England. Yet, in the National Underwriter magazine of last month, it is stated that Hurricane Hazel resulted in more damage claims than Hurricane Carol and Edna combined.

9. Approximately $150 million were paid out by insurance companies to the property owners in New England who claimed damage as a result of Hurricanes Carol and Edna. The total damage in New England, both insured and uninsured, apparently was about 4 times the $150 million actually paid out to insured property owners.

10. One insurance official stated that 840 insurance adjusters worked around the clock for 5 months settling claims resulting from Hurricanes Carol and Edna, and that this small army of adjusters paid out an average of $350,000 a day for this entire period.

11. A report in December 1954 by the National Board of Underwriters estimated that total insurance property damage caused in the United States this year by all 3 major hurricanes, Carol, Edna, and Hazel, exceeded $276 million.

12. The losses of many insurance companies in 1954 were staggering. For example, in Massachusetts one large group of insurance companies received $8 million of premiums in 1954, and paid out losses of $54 million. That is about a 7 to 1 loss. Many individual companies reported a 10 to 1 loss. Naturally, insurance rates for the coming years have already gone up, in some cases several hundred percent.

It is not known to meteorologists what part of total property damage, on the average, is covered by insurance. Much damage obviously is not covered, since certain types of damage usually are not included in standard insurance policies. Moreover, there are many policies which contain special deductible and exemption clauses.

Many complaints, and many new protection coverage problems, have arisen. For example, the problem of wave-wash damage recently has caused much discussion between policyholders and adjustment agents. The extent of television antenna damage also raises new problems.

All the damage figures have not yet been collected, and all the damage claims have not yet been paid. For those interested in taking action for future protection it might also be said that all the solutions proposed for better warning services have not yet been collected nor publicly discussed.

The record property damage and loss of life figures listed above suggest that the 1954 hurricane season not only warrants a second look by meteorologists, but also calls for a thorough study by those directly interested in added protection of life and property in our coastal areas.

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1955]

HURRICANE WARNING

Last summer's hurricanes killed 200 people and caused about $800 million damage to property as they tore into the coasts and back country of our Northeastern States. They also confirmed the grim presumption that this part of the country is now definitely in the hurricane zone. Disaster experts, however, estimate that 90 percent of the loss of lives and possibly as much as 25 percent of the property damage from hurricanes could be prevented if the Weather Bureau were able to give more precise and timely warnings broadcast over all our communications media and based on much more knowledge than it has about the air currents far aloft and out to sea.

In view of all this, the public has a right to expect an immediate and substantial increase in the Bureau's facilities and personnel. Shocking as it will be to those unfamiliar with the Federal budget now before Congress, nothing of the sort is in sight for the next fiscal year (July 1, 1955–June 30, 1956). In a letter published on this page a well-known meteorologist raises a timely alert as to this dangerous situation. His letter, however, suffers from understatement.

If the appropriations called for in the budget are not increased, the Weather Bureau will not, in practical effect, get a cent more for research and its general weather reporting services next year than this. The Bureau itself states in its budget justification that "research in 1956 is planned at about the same level as for 1955," and there will actually be one less staff member assigned to this work.

The overall budget for next year, it is true, is $3 million more than last ($27,850,000), plus a special $5 million extra for equipment to be spent over the next 4 years. But the $3 million is to cover the expenses of taking over observation activities which the Air Force previously carried on, and the $5 million—except for new radar installations—is largely to replace old equipment. No more stations are provided for and no strengthening of the present inadequate and underpaid but expert staff. (The Bureau has lost 1,000 employees since 1949, and the average annual pay for those who remain is $4,864.)

The very least that should be done by Congress is to pass the Patterson bill, H. R. 5260, which provides an additional $5 million above the budget allowances for the Weather Bureau—to be used exclusively "in the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system." But Congress might well look into the adequacy of the Weather Bureau's budget all along the line. As far as hurricanes are concerned, additional expenditures now may well be covered, and many times over, by savings to the public in the long run.

WEATHER RESEARCH ASKED—NEED SEEN FOR FULL-SCALE PROGRAM TO IMPROVE WARNINGS SYSTEM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Last fall your paper carried an interesting series of articles by Robert Alden on the hurricane prediction problem. This was followed, as I recall, by an editorial in which you pointed out the need for more research in the general field of weather prediction.

I would like to take the liberty of referring your readers to that series of articles and to your editorial at this time, because there are now before Congress several bills aimed at providing funds for research on the hurricane problem and for development work on a system of improved hurricane warnings (e. g., H. R. 5260, introduced by Congressman PATTERSON). It is to be hoped that the interest and enthusiasm which was enkindled last fall by your discussion can now be brought to bear on the important matter of making funds available for such work.

In the matter of weather prediction in general, and in the case of hurricanes and tornadoes in particular, we are confronted with one of the most difficult scientific problems of our times. However, we have seen time and again during the past weeks, months, and years that scientific problems of great difficulty have succumbed to a sustained and intensive research effort. As a professional meteorologist, I feel that the weather problem in time will also be brought into hand.

In order to do this, however, we must be prepared to support the full-scale program of research and study which will be required. The measures now before Congress asking for this kind of work are rather modest relative to the magnitude of the problem, but unless they are supported we are only going to defer positive action on a weather problem which has in the past, and may in the future, take a frightening toll of life and property.

THOMAS F. MALONE,
Director, the Travelers Weather Research Center, the Travelers Weather Service.
HARTFORD, CONN., *April 26, 1955.*

U. S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau, appropriation history 1951–56

Year	Requested of Department	Requested of Budget Bureau	Requested of Congress	Amount appropriated
1951	$35,578,242	$28,817,000	$26,100,000	$24,897,000
1952	41,850,967	32,173,000	28,565,000	26,970,000
1953	42,305,000	30,315,000	28,000,000	27,244,775
1954	42,434,600	30,456,400	26,700,000	27,000,000
1955	28,022,200	26,810,500	25,135,000	24,940,000
1956:				
Salaries and expenses	33,956,744	27,950,000	27,850,000	----------
Establishment	15,284,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	----------

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment on the basis of assurance given by the sponsor, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that the increased appropriation will be used to expand Weather Bureau facilities in the middlewest as well as improve the hurricane warning system along the east coast.

In his statement setting forth the need for an increased appropriation, the gentleman from Rhode Island includes Waterloo, Iowa, as one of the strategic locations for a new Weather Bureau station.

I am pleased to note that the gentleman specifically singles out Waterloo, Iowa, as a strategic and necessary location in the chain of stations gathering and disseminating weather information and it is to be expected that the Weather Bureau in Washington will take full cognizance of this recommendation in the opening of new stations.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, offered by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, to increase the proposed appropriation for Weather Bureau activities, in order to provide more extensive hurricane warning service and more efficient storm forecasting throughout the country.

This comparatively small amount of money is designed primarily to permit Weather Bureau offices in 15 coastal cities from Maine to Texas to maintain warning operations throughout 24 hours and allow the opening of new offices in several geographically strategic locations from California to Massachusetts, including forecasting facilities at New Bedford and Worcester, Mass.

Anyone familiar with the recent history of terrible destruction of life and property following in the wake of sudden and violent weather changes realizes they have cost the Nation thousands of lives and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage and disintegration of physical properties.

In my own home city of Worcester, and the surrounding area, we experienced the actuality of such terrifying weather phenomenon in the nature of a vicious tornado which struck unexpectedly without warning on June 9, 1953, leaving 98 deaths and 1,000 injured, 12,000 homeless and 25,000 demolished homes. Conceivably, many of these lives might have been saved and a substantial part of the physical damage prevented if full and adequate warning and directing facilities were available.

In these days of very heavy Federal spending, none of us are inclined to increase appropriations without serious

justification but under conditions and circumstances where a relatively small sum could well preserve the lives of American citizens and prevent millions of dollars of damage to their homes, with accompanying tragedies, this action certainly cannot be termed an extravagance but is more truly described as a service and precaution we can ill afford to be without.

God forbid that the time should ever arrive when we succumb to the temptation of trying to save a comparatively few dollars instead of many American lives.

I urge you, therefore, to unanimously approve this amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. Chairman, weather is the Nation's business. The Weather Bureau is a service function of our Government. This was so recognized by the Congress in 1870 when it established the Signal Service of the Army. The service this agency of the Army performed spilled over into civilian life and it soon became evident that a civilian bureau was necessary to collect and disseminate weather information. The organic act establishing the Weather Bureau under the Department of Agriculture came in 1890. The rapid strides in aviation placed greater emphasis on weather information and, in 1940, the Weather Bureau was transferred to the Department of Commerce.

The service the Weather Bureau has rendered to the Nation is incalculable. Every segment of the Nation's economy benefits from its functions, for every segment of the Nation's economy feels the impact of the elements, whether fair or foul.

One of the functions of the National Weather Service is to issue severe storm warnings, cold wave warnings, and flood warnings to the general public where extensive danger to life or property is involved. And this is the particular area in which the Weather Bureau activities have been most criticized by the press, the public, and, strangely enough, by the Congress itself.

I think it elementary that the Weather Bureau is prohibited from exercising its maximum efficiency in this field unless, first, it is adequately staffed with competent personnel; second, it maintains sufficient observation stations; and, third, it is equipped with the most modern and up-to-date equipment. Without these three basic requirements, it is not possible for the Weather Bureau to adequately perform the tremendously important task of detecting severe and unusual weather, and issuing timely warnings to the public to save lives and protect property.

The record will show that the Weather Bureau has never received adequate funds. Its budget requests have been consistently cut by the Department of Commerce, again by the Bureau of the Budget and many times by the Congress. In the face of these dollar slashings, how can anyone expect the Weather Bureau to give adequate service, particularly with reference to severe and unusual weather—hurricanes and tornadoes?

It has been well said that the Weather Bureau has been for many years a stepchild. This attitude has resulted in a hesitancy on the part of the service to push more vehemently for adequate funds to perform its functions.

Mr. Chairman, I direct the attention of this House to a very significant report published on December 1, 1953, by the Department of Commerce Advisory Committee on Weather Services. In its findings the committee deplores the moneywise meagerness paid the Bureau. Let me quote from that report:

> We have been aware of the need for effecting budget savings when compatible with acceptable efficiency. This has been difficult because, as will be seen, this is one Government organization which has been frugal to the point of diminishing returns.

And again:

> Throughout the activities of this committee budget difficulties of the Weather Bureau have been encountered at every turn. It is only fair to state that part of the recommendations contained in this report cover deficiencies recognized by Bureau officials and could have been remedied if sufficient appropriations had been available.

Mr. Chairman, the Advisory Committee on Weather Services has reviewed budget estimates and fiscal matters of the United States Weather Bureau dating back to 1938 to obtain background information on the development of the Weather Service. It came to the conclusion that—

> A review of the history of the Weather Bureau budget has impressed the committee with the frugality of this Bureau's operations and its management is to be commended in the manner which they administered public funds. We know of no other governmental agency that has been so economical in the expenditure of its funds.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Appropriations, and specifically the members of this subcommittee, for granting some increases—particularly with reference to the item dealing with the establishment of meteorological facilities. The acquisition of modern equipment has at long last been recognized as a must.

But, Mr. Chairman, as pointed out by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], it has not gone far enough. There is an urgent need now for increased personnel; the reopening of old and the establishment of new observation stations; the setting up of a better warning system. The amendment under discussion provides these deficiencies. The Weather Bureau recognizes their need; the Advisory Committee on Weather Services recommended the addition of trained and adequate number of forecasters.

This is one way in which we can meet our responsibility to the public. To provide sufficient funds to warn the public of possible impending disasters to life and property is the duty of this body. No, Mr. Chairman, we cannot, at least now, stop the severity of the hurricane, the tornado, the tidal wave. But we can and we must lighten their impact on the public. This amendment does just that. It ought to be overwhelmingly adopted by this committee.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in support of his amendment. The Weather Bureau budget originally called for $49,731,000; the Secretary of Commerce reduced the amount to $38,441,000; the Bureau of the Budget cut out another $5 million; the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount still further. The United States Weather Bureau is expected to service airlines, farmers, travelers—in fact all our citizens for this pauce amount.

But above all, we who live on the Atlantic coast need first class storm warning. Last year, for example, there was inadequate warning before Hurricane Carol struck. Had we been given even 12 hours' notice, lives would have been saved and property protected. The first action I took after this great hurricane was to call the Acting Chief of the Weather Bureau, Mr. Little.

After a long and detailed conference on this subject with Mr. Little, I became convinced that the Weather Bureau had been given insufficient funds. This year they have also been given insufficient funds. The fault, for once, does not seem to lie wholly with Congress. The Commerce Department and the Bureau of the Budget have mauled the Weather Bureau requests. By our action in supporting Mr. FOGARTY's amendment, we have restored $2,250,000.

This money will be used to provide a sufficient staff to keep the weather stations open 24 hours a day at such important locations to those of us who live on Long Island as New Haven, Conn.; Block Island, R. I.; Bridgeport, Conn.; and New Bedford, Mass.

Specifically, these funds will be used to operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

It will also provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Of great importance to Long Island and to our fishermen will be the improved high water warning service which will inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves and other coastal inundations from abnormal water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

I have been told the funds will also be used for the establishment of emergency hurricane warning centers. I suggested the establishment of such centers in my

conversation last year with Mr. Little. We will also be able to obtain reports of upper-air conditions in the path of approaching hurricanes similar to the information obtained from the ocean vessel ship station formerly established as a weather station halfway between New York and Bermuda.

Finally, I would like to pay a tribute to the men of the Weather Bureau Service for the grand work they do under extremely difficult conditions. They are always to blame if in the smallest degree wrong—and they never receive any credit when right. Maybe these funds will give them a better break.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chaiman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusets?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this amendment to increase the funds for the Weather Bureau and heartily congratulate the very able gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for persistency, zeal, and great ability which have led in such large measure to favorable action.

Those of us who reside in areas that have been stricken by the ravages of Mother Nature's great and unexpected catastrophes particularly appreciate the urgent need for adequate hurricane warning and accurate storm forecasting.

Some of these great storms strike with startling suddenness and with little or no warning. Such a storm was the Worcester, Mass., tornado of about 2 years ago which inflicted heavy loss of life and property damage. It tore a path through parts of the district I have the honor to represent and through the district represented by my able and good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], and in the short space of minutes left a trail and wake of death and devastation never before known in New England and with few equals, indeed, throughout the Nation.

Hurricanes of great severity and fury have repeatedly taken a toll of lives and property in New England. Last year we were visited by three very destructive storms.

It is believed by expert meteorologists and climatologists that much of the loss of life and property damage could have been avoided or minimized if proper warnings had been sounded in advance of the storm and failure to give such warnings was due in large measure to the fact that the Weather Bureau was not sufficiently financed and organized in the area.

Thanks to this amendment, these added most valuable services will now be provided. Established offices of the Weather Bureau will be improved and new offices will be opened, including one at Worcester, Mass., and New Bedford, Mass. I think that this is a very helpful and constructive amendment and I am glad, indeed, to support it. Our great friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has rendered another distinct public service in securing agreement on this amendment.

In brief, this amendment, as a matter of actual benefit, makes possible the following extensions of Weather Bureau service:

First. It will provide staffs to keep Weather Bureau offices additionally open in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas.

Second. It will reopen certain key observatory offices across the country.

Third. It will permit installations and utilization of special technological equipment for proper relay of weather information.

Fourth. It will improve and extend all facilities for weather forecasting, "emergency hurricane warning centers," and other modern methods of weather broadcasting, and on the whole it will have a most salutary effect on the agency. It will provide a stimulus and encouragement to personnel. It will improve the administrative tone. It will bring many good results.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation of the recognition given today to the objectives of my bill, H. R. 5260. Today's amendment to H. R. 6367 by the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee provides $2,250,000 of additional funds to the Weather Bureau for the immediate establishment of an emergency warning system for hurricanes and severe storms.

Today's action will mean a small amount of increased protection during the hurricane seasons of 1955 and 1956, but I feel our citizens should be guaranteed a much greater reduction in unnecessary loss of life and property damage from storms along the eastern and southern seaboards of our country than can be procured through such a meaningless amount as adopted today.

This increase of $2,250,000 will carry out only a small part of the complete warning program which was planned under my bill, H. R. 5260. But I admit it is at least a timely step in the right direction. In my opinion a $5 million increase to the original 1956 fiscal year estimates of the Department of Commerce would be needed to establish the minimum facilities and staff required for a modern hurricane warning system. This opinion is backed up 100 percent by meteorologists all over the country, and by insurance companies and businessmen who know the problem firsthand.

Passage of the $2,250,000 Appropriations Committee amendment means that only a few additional stations can now be reopened in hurricane-swept areas, and only a few additional stations can now be kept open 24 hours a day. Passage of this amendment also means that only some minor improvements can be made in hurricane warning communications systems, and means that some key warning centers can not be provided the increased staff actually needed to do the job forecasters want to do.

I know that many citizens along the coast will not be satisfied with these modest improvements in hurricane protection services. But since I well know that business firms and trade associations are vitally interested in better and more timely warnings, and without further delay, I have not objected further to this small increase in funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

I have assembled below several excerpts of the hundreds of letters I have received from citizens located in all States along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts who have commented on the objectives of the bill I introduced on March 28, 1955, H. R. 5260.

A similar bill, it is of interest to note, was introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, of Connecticut, on May 11, 1955, S. 1932. I feel certain Senator PURTELL will receive numerous letters supporting our stand that $5 million is the minimum amount needed for a modernized hurricane warning system that will give the type of complete protection against storms demanded by millions of our citizens.

I commend Connecticut's Senator for his foresight and consideration of the lives, welfare and prosperity of the people of our great State, and for the protection Mr. PURTELL offers through his legislation for the people of the east coast and the tornado-torn areas of the Southwest and Middle West. I feel certain the other body of this Congress will see the great need for the requests in his legislation.

From the Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New Bedford division, New Bedford, Mass.:

I think the bill is an excellent one.

In a survey of the damage sustained it was noted that the direct cost of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel amounted to over $9 million. This did not include the loss of jobs, profits, and other tangible and intangible costs. In the instance of our own company, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., we sustained a loss of $1,455,000.

If we had had early warning on hurricane Carol it is estimated that our loss would have been reduced by $300,000 to $500,000. I venture to say that the same is true of our waterfront firms in this area.

Including the industrial loss, New Bedford suffered a total loss of over $50 million in the series of hurricanes last year, a considerable amount of which could have been saved had the area had sufficient warning.

As you pointed out, along with the early warning we could expect a reduction in "unnecessary fear and apprehension in the areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes." This is a very important item with industrial plants, and it is best exemplified in this area by the fact that over $350,000 was expended by our 35 industrial firms in getting ready for hurricanes Edna and Hazel, which did not cause any serious damage.

To sum it up, we are wholly in accord with your bill H. R. 5260.

From the chamber of commerce, Greenwich, Conn.:

The board of directors agree with the proposal outlined in H. R. 5260. We believe your proposal has real merit.

From the Acushnet Process Co., New Bedford, Mass.:

The city of New Bedford, Mass., was very badly hit in 1938, in 1944, and by Carol in 1954. In 1938 we had 230 deaths in the Greater New Bedford area, and in 1954 we had more than $50 million damage. There were 35 industries in New Bedford which were badly affected by flood and salt water and extremely high winds. Damage to these industries alone amounted to more than $10 million.

Surveys which we have run among the 35 industries indicate that probably one-half of the $10 million damage could have been spared if the plants had ample warning to move material and equipment to higher ground and bulwark their plants against the surge of the salt-water flood.

We recognize that in the long run it may be possible to get physical protection, but we also realize we may be able to get relief from future hurricanes if we are able to get accurate forecasting as to the probable path of the hurricane and as to the time of arrival.

The New Bedford committee on hurricane damage and each of the industries it represents is wholeheartedly in favor of your program, and would like to do anything we can to get speedy passage and prompt action.

From the Union Reinsurance Co., of Zurich, Switzerland, the United States branch office:

Anything that will be done to reduce, as far as possible, the loss of our life and property has our wholehearted approval and support.

From Mr. Thomas F. Malone, director Travelers weather research center, Travelers Weather Service, Hartford, Conn.:

Your active interest in a matter of deep concern to New England is much appreciated, and, as a meteorologist, I am happy to endorse your proposed bill.

The loss of life and property from hurricanes has been so great that a concerted program of research on this problem seems obviously justified.

From the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I think there is no question but that the east coast is entitled to the additional protection that a better hurricane warning system might provide.

I think in these days of needed reduction in budget, one should hesitate to ask for even a modest increase in appropriations, but this is a case where I have no hesitancy in recommending an enlargement of Government facilities.

From the president of the Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am glad to tell you that I join with Dr. Malone, director of the Travelers weather research center, in endorsing your proposed bill.

From the president of the Bankers Fire Insurance Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

I think this bill is a splendid and very worthwhile work, and that it certainly should be approved.

From the vice president of the Northeastern Insurance Company of Hartford, Hartford, Conn.:

Your proposal, H. R. 5260, is to protect the lives and property of 2 million American citizens living in the immediate vicinity of newly menaced coastal zones, and we all here at this company readily concur in your proposal. We wish you complete success in this undertaking.

From the president of the Phoenix Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am in favor with the purposes of this bill and believe that if passed it will perform a very useful service to many millions of citizens and property owners in the Atlantic coastal area from Maine to Texas.

The payout on claims by property insurance companies, such as ours, for the storms in 1954 was a rather devastating experience and naturally resulted in a substantial underwriting loss to our company. Anything that can help people to protect their property by being alerted in advance would be advantageous and interesting to our industry.

The advantages in being alerted to storms can accrue to insurance companies through loss prevention by protecting property when advices of an approaching storm are available. Closing shutters, securing doors, and moving contents, particularly from exposed property on the waterfront, can go a long way in keeping the ravages of wind from doing unnecessary damage.

From the Committee of American Steamship Lines:

Improved hurricane detection is desirable and your efforts to assure adequate provision for this purpose are very much in the public interest.

From the American Boat Builders & Repairers Association, Inc., 2382 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.:

We know that such a bill will be greatly appreciated by our members, and we are accordingly advising them of it and requesting that they support it.

From the New England Council, Statler Building, Boston, Mass.:

In a recent survey of New Englanders' opinions of issues before Congress there semed to be substantial support for the services proposed in your bill.

Unlike many of the other issues on which opinion was solicited where there was a fairly equal division of opinion, the vote was more than 3 to 1 in favor of increasing the appropriation to the United States Weather Bureau for more intensive study and reporting on hurricanes.

Congratulations on your preparation and submission of this bill. The New England Council intends to support it and we wish you the best of luck in gaining its passage in the House.

From the New Orleans Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.:

We are in favor of your proposal that an emergency hurricane warning system be improved to provide better protection.

From the Dixon Sintaloy Co., Inc., Stamford, Conn.:

I am in complete agreement with the need for a satisfactory appropriation for hurricane warning service to the eastern seaboard.

Your bill, H. R. 5260, certainly should serve to provide the means for saving many times over the amount of the appropriation required.

From the PM Industries, Stamford, Conn.:

We support enthusiastically the legislation which you propose and hope that the necessary action will be taken to enact it.

The appropriation under consideration to enable the United States Weather Bureau to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system would be of benefit to the manufacturers in our area.

From the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.:

There is no question but what these hurricanes have done a terrific job in Connecticut. No one was prepared for hurricanes which we had not had in quite a number of years, but it is quite evident that we can look for many more of them, and we should be better prepared than we are.

From the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., Administration Building, Fish Pier, Boston, Mass.:

What happened in New England during the hurricane which visited us last fall indicated a willful lack of an adequate warning system.

The matter of preserving life and property as much as can be humanly expected should be of immediate concern to our Federal authorities.

The commercial fishing industry of New England is a hazardous occupation at best, and a timely and adequate Federal weather forecasting system would aid immeasurably in reducing the perils of fishing during the season in which we are subject to sudden changes in the weather.

From the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Members of this National Association of the Barge and Towing Vessel Industry, who operate on all of the inland waters of the Nation, suffered severe losses during hurricanes last year and thus, I am sure, will actively support the above-mentioned bill in the hope that much of these losses can be eliminated in the future.

From the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council, 308 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.:

The matter of appropriating $5 million, in order that the United States Weather Bureau may be enabled to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system, was discussed with a number of manufacturers who are members of the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council. This matter was also brought up at our executive committee meeting, and I was authorized to write to you in support of this bill.

I do not need to advise you on the extent of damage done by wind and high water in this area.

Certainly the appropriation you ask, which would serve the entire eastern seaboard, is well justified. We believe that effective and reliable warning service, provided by the United States Weather Bureau, is imperative.

From the president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.:

I should like to assure you of my personal support for your measure, which would seem to me to be of great advantage to the American merchant marine, as well as to others affected by weather and hurricane conditions,

From the executive director, Rhode Island Development Council, Providence, R. I.:

I believe that all New England Congressmen and Senators should use every effort to see that this type of legislation becomes a reality.

From the head of the department of meteorology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.:

Since our department is in the forefront of research on the problem of hurricanes, we are keenly aware of the need for action on the part of the Congress.

We are urging our friends to support your bill, or a similar proposal to achieve the same end, as well as any well-conceived proposal which will meet the urgent requirement for a hurricane research and development program.

Your active interest in the hurricane problem is a source of gratification to professional meteorologists, and a great service not only to your constituents but to all the millions of Americans who live along the Atlantic Seaboard and the gulf coast.

From a professor of meteorology at the Blue Hill Observatory of Harvard University of Milton, Mass.:

I was much pleased to see a news dispatch that you had filed a $5 million independent appropriation bill to provide greatly expanded forecast facilities up and down the east coast.

A forecast's accuracy depends mostly on the adequacy of the information available. In my opinion, the greatest inadequacy affecting forecasting for New England is the lack of a complete and dependable surface and upper air station in the Atlantic Ocean a few hundred miles offshore.

I think your proposal is definitely worthwhile.

From the chairman of the department of meteorology and oceanography, College of Engineering, New York University, University Heights, New York 53, N. Y.:

My colleagues and I in this department are well aware of the importance of this bill for the welfare of the population in the affected area.

You have in preparing this bill, of course, been in touch with our weather bureau, and know the excellent work which they are doing with inadequate financial means. Your bill will go far toward remedying this situation. It is very gratifying to know of this support for meteorology in Congress, and to find a realization of the contribution which meteorology can make to the welfare of the Nation.

The effects of this bill will be of great benefit to the people in the regions visited by hurricanes, including the people of New York State.

Your bill will go far toward alleviating the financial difficulties impeding the development of a really adequate warning service.

If ship station Hotel had been available in the fall of 1954, much property damage and many casualties could have been avoided.

From the president, American Meteorological Society, 3 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.:

It is most encouraging to learn that some of our Representatives in Congress realize that the weather service in this country deserves more, not less, support. In the long run such support will, I feel sure, result in a net savings to the taxpayers through a more efficient weather service.

I believe the records will show that for last season, involving only hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, insurance companies paid some $276 million in claims (New York Times of December 26, 1954).

I know there must have been many additional millions of dollars spent by individuals which do not appear on the record since several members of my own family in Rhode Island suffered uninsured damage as a result of last season's storms.

Thus, it seems to me that the expenditure of $5 million to improve the storm warning service for the protection of our citizens is a very modest outlay to accomplish the desired objectives.

We in the American Meteorological Society have for some time been concerned about the problem of severe storms of all types. The council of the American Meteorological Society recently voted that the council recognize deficiencies in the state of our knowledge of severe storms, particularly tornadoes and hurricanes. We strongly endorse an increased research effort in this area.

In view of the great losses of life and property suffered by our citizens from the destructive action of tornadoes and hurricanes, the American Meteorological Society recommends that special funds be appropriated to enable the United States Weather Bureau, in cooperation with other public and private agencies, to conduct research projects on tornadoes and on hurricanes.

From the head of the meteorology department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge 39, Mass.:

I was very pleased to learn of your interest in this important matter which affects the life and property of so many persons on the eastern and gulf coasts of this country.

You are to be commended for your active interest in these problems and for your realization that the Weather Bureau must have additional funds if real progress is to be achieved.

From the editor of Motor Boating magazine, 572 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.:

We are much interested in your bill, which we hope will receive favorable action by Congress.

From the executive vice president of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

It is known that the various hurricanes which have visited the northeast section of our country have done a great deal of damage to property insured by our members. Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, last fall, were particularly devastating.

The advance warning of approaching storms should give more opportunity for protection of property, and for possibilities of moving such property to safer locations. Accordingly, the marine insurance underwriters are definitely interested in any provisions and actions leading to adequate and timely warnings of hurricanes and severe windstorms.

We wish to express our appreciation of your foresight in presenting this legislation.

From the general manager of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

Surely, the Weather Bureau services are invaluable to the people of this country. If additional funds are needed in order to make the Bureau more useful, such funds should be made available within proper limits.

We appreciate fully the great damage which many of us suffered at the hands of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel.

From the executive vice president of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn.:

May I commend your alertness in watching out for the interest of southern New England in this peculiar climatic change which we are undergoing.

From the general manager of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex.:

We have on many occasions suffered losses from hurricanes and we would like very much to have the Gulf of Mexico coast included in H. R. 5260.

In addition to the above letters, I have received dozens of letters from Representatives, Senators, and governors of States along the east coast and bordering the Gulf of Mexico who have warmly endorsed my bill, H. R. 5260. They have not only written to me expressing their vital interest in the passage of this bill, but have frequently telephoned with offers of their support.

I also have received numerous letters from private citizens who are not connected with any particular company or organization, but who have wished me well in my efforts to secure congressional support for increased protection against the loss of life and property from hurricanes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on that bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to address the House 1 hour on Friday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

INQUIRIES RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 203, Rept. No. 621), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including, but not limited to, (1) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, and the role of Government-assisted mortgage programs with respect thereto, (2) the rate of default and foreclosures of Government-insured mortgages, and the disposition of such properties, (3) the refinancing and extension of Government-insured project mortgages, (4) the status and adequacy of the several Government mortgage insurance funds, (5) the disposition of Government-owned war and related housing, (6) operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (7) the operation and activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

INQUIRIES RELATING TO FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 210, Rept. No. 622), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters concerning (1) the composition, operation, and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee, (2) the fluctuation in rates of interest and prices of securities issued by the United States and the effect of such fluctuations on the public debt, general price level, employment, the cost of State and municipal financing, and other segments of the national economy, (3) the various types of Government securities, manner of issue, method of payment, maturities, character of investors, and amount and degree of speculation therein, and (4) the various proposals for Federal assistance (other than grants) in the financing of State, county, and municipal (or instrumentalities thereof) highway and school programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under active investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "and."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "directed."

Page 2, beginning on line 2, change the comma to a period, and strike out the following language ending on line 5: "and (4) the various proposals for Federal assistance (other than grants) in the financing of State, county and municipal (or instrumentalities thereof) highway and school programs."

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 251, Rept. No. 623), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HURRICANE WARNINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] about his bill with regard to warnings of hurricanes, tornadoes, and other unusual acts of nature.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentlewoman will yield, I do not see the gentleman from Connecticut here at the moment, but I understand that the need to which his bill refers was taken care of by the Fogarty amendment to the appropriations bill that was just passed a few moments ago.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but that did not appropriate nearly as much money as the gentleman from Connecticut asked for. I have seen editorial after editorial all over the New England States and elsewhere endorsing his bill. I have read hundreds of letters and telegrams about it. An editorial in the Lowell Sun, Lowell, Mass., of May 12, 1955, reads as follows:

HURRICANE ALERTS

Since there is reason to believe that New England may now be directly in the course of some hurricanes that churn up the coastline from the Caribbean, it would be stupid to wait for the howling winds before doing something about it.

The question was scouted thoroughly this week at a meeting of the New England Region, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Boston. It was practically a unanimous opinion that steps must be taken to protect this area against new storms—which may or may not arrive in the latter part of the coming summer.

The general opinion expressed at this Boston meeting is one that will be promptly applauded by the people of New England. It was proposed the Army engineers should make an immediate survey "for the most effective protection against damage from tidal flooding in New England." Moreover, it was proposed that the Federal Government should exert itself in more ways than one to launch a campaign that would give extraordinary protection against the fury of hurricanes.

The conference apparently forgot (at least, it was not reported), that the Federal Government and all military bases in this area should step up their meteorological efficiency so that all the people of New England would have a fair idea of what might be in store for them when one of those turbulent twisters is spotted off Florida, moving north.

New England suffered two major hurricanes late last summer—and it was threatened with a third. The first and worst big blow struck and caught the whole section by surprise, simply because satisfactory and sufficient warnings were missing.

We hope the Government will see to it that all stations responsible for alerting the people to approaching danger are functioning around the clock at all times and will be in position to send out the alarm to New England well before a hurricane strikes.

In the second hurricane we had in New England, Hurricane Hazel, I bailed water from an upstairs room in my house from 12 o'clock noon until 7 o'clock at night. I would not have been at my house to bail out the water if I had not received the warning that the hurricane was coming.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I commend the charming and distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts on her remarks. I was on a railroad train during Hurricane Hazel, and I fully appreciate what the gentlewoman is talking about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. May I say also that at least part of the house I was in would probably have been destroyed if the hurricane had lasted any longer. I know my sufferings were absolutely nothing compared to what happened to other people, but the damage to property was great. I think every one of us in all of the hurricane areas would like to have something done about this matter. I believe the Department of Commerce recommended $5 million for the Weather Bureau for reports. After the tornado at Worcester I asked for various surveys and investigations but they did not take place.

These hurricanes are horrible things. There was much loss of life in Rhode Island during these hurricanes in New England, and a great deal of loss of life in Worcester, Mass., after the tornado there. I visited Worcester and saw the damage. I think there was a wonderful spirit in these communities that were damaged. They certainly ought to be helped in every way. The military was very helpful in Massachusetts in sending troops to remove trees that had live wires in them.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. May I compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts on her interest in this subject matter. I know she has been one of the prime movers since last fall when we were visited by those hurricanes in New England. The bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] requested an appropriation of $5 million to help do something in the way of these weather stations, but in the appropriations bill for the Department of Commerce as it was passed today at least the committee compromised that request by adding the sum of $2,250,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is not nearly enough.

I know all of the New England Members and other Members of the New York delegation have fought very hard for this. I think the other body may put it in, and I will do everything I can to help. I know you and I talked about the damage of the hurricanes. It is appalling to my mind that we do not take care of the civilians and the military, too, because some of them were injured in the hurricanes. It is little enough to do for the people in our country. We try to save them from war and certainly we ought to protect them from so-called acts of God.

THE LATE HONORABLE PETE JARMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that some of our colleagues, especially our Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and our former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], could pay tribute to our wonderful friend, Pete Jarman.

I yield at this time to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend, FRANK BOYKIN, and the Alabama delegation, in paying tribute to Pete Jarman, soldier, legislator, and diplomat. He served his country with distinction and great ability.

Following a fine military career he served 12 years as a Member of Congress. He was faithful to the best interests of his district and at the same time zealously fought for the welfare of the country. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he was conscious of the need of world cooperation. It was from this service he was aroused to our relationship with other countries. This caused him to accept an appointment as Ambassador to Australia, where he served most creditably.

Pete Jarman was a friendly, likeable man, and his death is the cause of much sorrow. Alabama and the country have suffered a great loss in the passing of this fine American statesman.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you, Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I attended the funeral services for our late friend, and also spoke on the floor of the House later. Pete Jarman was one of the most lovable characters I have ever served with, and one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives. I join with my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in expressing our keen regret at his recent passing. It was shortly after that I spoke at greater length, more fully expressing my feelings on the passing of our late friend.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in paying tribute to the fine record of our late friend and colleague, Pete Jarman. It was my privilege to know Pete quite well during his years of service in the Congress. He was possessed of a keen sense of humor and he also took his job most seriously. In saying that, I mean he tried in every way to live up to the high ideals that representation in the Congress of the United States carries not only for the people he represented, but for the position itself. It was my observation that nobody did a better job of work for his constituents and for the country at all times trying to carry on the splendid traditions of the people from whom he came. I have truly missed Pete Jarman in the years since he left the Congress, but during that time we followed his work and came to appreciate and look forward to his visits with us. Now I know that America is poorer because of the passing of this fine American and this splendid Congressman.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I knew Pete Jarman for a quarter of a century. I do not think I ever knew a finer American or a greater Christian gentleman than Pete. When I was first elected to the Congress, I was serving in the Navy at Pearl Harbor.

The first letter that I received after having been nominated in Alabama to represent the Third District was from my friend Pete Jarman, offering to help me in any way he could.

On coming to Washington I found that Pete was sincere, and he was a great help to me as a young Member. Pete served his State and his Nation well. I think the first office that he held was that of public examiner for the State of Alabama. As examiner of public accounts, he traveled all over the State of Alabama and made friends. To know Pete Jarman was to love him. Later he was elected State Commander of the American Legion. And then he was elected overwhelmingly to the office of secretary of state in Alabama. Following a distinguished service in that office, he was elected to Congress from the Sixth District.

Pete Jarman was sincere and able, and over the period of 10 years that I knew him in Congress, he was an outstanding Member. He was an expert in his chosen field of foreign affairs. He had a keen sense of humor, and it was a genuine pleasure at all times for me to be with him.

Pete Jarman possessed what I think are three necessary characteristics for a good public official to have. First and foremost he was an honest man. He was a man of integrity. Second, he was an able man. Third, he was a courageous man. Many times I have seen him vote against the majority of the Members of his own delegation on certain matters because he had the courage of his convictions.

I have missed Pete and always will miss him. I think one of the finest things that could be said about Pete was his unfailing devotion to his lovely wife, Beryl. At the time I knew him in Congress Beryl served very efficiently in his office. I have never seen a more beautiful relationship between husband and wife than that which existed between him and Beryl. I knew that her loss was great. I hope that she finds some comfort in the knowliedge that those of us who knew Pete Jarman, who knew and worked with him, and who loved him, feel some of the loss that must be hers.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise that in the rush of our everyday life we pause to pay a well-earned tribute to a former Member of this body. Of course I speak of our late beloved departed friend, a former Member of this

body, Pete Jarman, who represented so ably the Sixth District of Alabama for many years.

Prior to my coming to Congress, I had known Pete for many years. I had served with him when he was State department commander of the American Legion, and also when he was examiner of public accounts. Later he was elected as secretary of state of Alabama, and served in that office with credit and distinction to himself and to his friends, until some years later when he was elected to Congress.

It seems that I can see Pete's smiling bright face now coming down this aisle. I do not think Pete hated anybody; he loved his fellow man. He not only loved America, but Pete loved the world and I think he as much as any man worked as hard as a person could work on the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and when we had Pan-American Day here he always took the leadership in celebrating that great day.

Our colleague from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] has referred to Pete's helpmate, Beryl Jarman, who, I think, had much to do with Pete's success in life. She also served as his secretary.

After Pete left Congress he was appointed by President Truman as Ambassador to Australia. He served there with honor and distinction. And, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I know that in his immortal soul, Pete Jarman now sleeping over the banks of the Potomac in Arlington secretly watches our every move here and he watches our movements as representatives of one of greatest bodies in the world.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] and now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. HAYS]. I would like him to say a few words about our departed friend.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the generosity of my friend from Alabama in according me the opportunity to join my friends from Alabama in paying tribute to this great American.

It was my privilege during the thirties when I was employed by the Department of Agriculture, to go into the State of Alabama and into the district served by our late respected colleague. I had an opportunity to learn something of the great affection which the people of Alabama had for him.

I later had an opportunity as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to appraise his work as a student of foreign-policy problems, and I want to join in tribute to him as a leader in that field. I know that he made great contribution to the cooperation between the Latin-American republics and our own Nation, and I know that he had great influence in this field.

I also wish to join, Mr. Speaker, in the tributes to his wife. I was deeply impressed by the beautiful companionship which they enjoyed, and I am sure the Members have an appreciation of her contribution to his service here.

He was ideally fitted for the post of Ambassador to Australia. I have heard from many quarters of the globe statements of appreciation of his work as the representative of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in appreciation of Pete Jarman's outstanding career.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is rendering a distinct service to his State and to the Congress in giving those of us from other States the opportunity to express our deep appreciation of our late friend, Pete Jarman.

I would not say that I speak for North Carolina, but I am sure that every member of the North Carolina delegation joins with the gentleman now giving us the opportunity to express our high appreciation of this late friend, their deep appreciation of Pete Jarman.

I simply say that I join with his colleagues from Alabama in expressing our great admiration and that I would express to his relatives that I join with them in the great loss they feel.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the death of Pete Jarman brought to an end the career of one of Alabama's most outstanding and distinguished sons. His record of public service and his many accomplishment are a source of pride to the people of his State and especially of the Sixth District which he served so long and so well.

It was my privilege to know Pete Jarman well and to admire and respect his sincerity of purpose and the greatness of his character. Pete was already an experienced legislator when I came to Congress, and I shall ever be grateful for his kindness to me and the help and guidance he so willingly and generously offered.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Pete Jarman played a leading role in formulating legislation necessary to carry out the foreign policies of our Nation. He was diligent in his committee work and no man gave more time, thought and study to committee legislation than Pete. He was respected for his thorough and complete knowledge of committee affairs.

This outstanding record of achievement and devotion to duty won for Pete the important appointment as Ambassador to Australia. This post he filled admirably. In fact, it has been said by those who visited in Australia during his tenure that no Ambassador has ever been so well liked or so respected as Pete Jarman. He won scores of friends for our country, and he enjoyed a popularity that was unequaled in diplomatic circles.

True to his State and to the best traditions of our Republic, Pete Jarman met every test as a public servant. Alabama will long honor the distinguished service her loyal and faithful son gave. I salute his memory and shall ever cherish his friendship.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS.]

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to join in this tribute to the late Pete Jarman. I was not privileged to serve in Congress with Pete Jarman, but I did know him intimately. I believe the first time I ever saw Pete was when he was making his race for the office of secretary of state. He won approval at the hands of the voters of Alabama and served honorably and well in that capacity. Prior to that time he had served as commander of the American Legion of the Department of Alabama. He was always interested and battled for the servicemen of this country and made a great contribution in that field.

As has been said here, he served a long term in this body, a body that he loved and was devoted to.

Pete Jarman was the first Ambassador produced by the State of Alabama. Prior to that time we had produced a Minister to Spain, Dr. J. L. M. Curry, but Pete Jarman had the distinction of being the first with the rank of Ambassador who came from and was a native of the State of Alabama. He made many friends for us in Australia because he had been well trained in the principles of diplomacy at high levels and made a great contribution in that field.

He came back to this country I believe in 1952 and frequently visited the Members on the floor here. He had many friends not only in the Alabama delegation but in the delegations of other States as well.

I think Pete's life epitomized the wisdom of what Henry Van Dyke said about the way a man should live. He said that "four things a man must do if he would make his record true. To think without confusion clearly, to act from honest motives purely, to love his fellow man sincerely, to trust in God and Heaven securely."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in this tribute, and my heartfelt and deepest sympathies go to his wife and to the members of his family.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jarman and his lovely wife were great friends of mine. I had a very deep affection for him and his wife. I always think of them as one, because they worked as one. Everybody who has spoken has mentioned the fact that they were a wonderful couple. I certainly never knew a couple that was more lovable or did more kind things. I served with him on several committees. The most recent one was the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was extremely able while he was there and extremely gracious. I would like to speak of one incident that, I think, typifies the man's courtesy and helpfulness. He and I were on a national radio broadcast hook-up. It was a very controversial subject, and I remember his extreme courtesy at that time. But, he made his point very effectively and very courteously. I think

perhaps I was a little too vigorous. After that the people in Massachusetts and elsewhere wrote me what a wonderful, fine, and able gentleman Congressman Jarman was. They spoke of his great courtesy at that time. I know what an extremely able Ambassador he was, and I know of the constant letters he wrote to me and other Members of the Congress asking us to visit Australia and wishing us well and asking how he could help. The Nation can ill spare such a man. I mourn with his wife especially and with all of you very fine gentlemen from Alabama. There is no finer delegation in the Congress than you are, and I mourn with you in his passing. You may well be proud of him, and I know his memory will not be forgotten.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to read a letter from the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House. He is unavoidably detained, so he wrote me this letter:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1955.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I have your letter of April 21, 1955, regarding Pete Jarman, and I want to make the following statement, which I would like to have put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"I am deeply grieved to hear of the death of my old friend, the Honorable Pete Jarman. It was my pleasure and privilege to serve in Congress with him for many years, in which position I found him faithful, patriotic, and able. After he left Congress, he did a great service as our Ambassador to Australia. In every position in which Pete Jarman was put, he did a good, honest, capable job. With his loved ones, I shall miss him very much. To his wife, who was his loyal helpmate, I tender my deepest sympathy."

With every good wish to you and thanking you for the opportunity of joining in tribute to Pete Jarman, I am

Sincerely yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

I think that is wonderful, and I appreciate the statement made by Speaker RAYBURN. Here are two of the greatest men in the land paying tribute to our departed colleague, former Speaker MARTIN and the present Speaker of the House. Those two men would have been President of the United States had anything happened to the Vice President during the last few years. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was Speaker for two full terms, and I served under him. The present Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], has been Speaker longer than any man who ever served in the Congress of the United States, even longer than Henry Clay. It is wonderful to have my two beloved friends talk about this great man, Pete Jarman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the remarks of Hon. James G. Fulton on the late Pete Jarman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

REMARKS BY HON. JAMES G. FULTON

Mr. Speaker, we on the House Foreign Affairs Committee have served on the committee with Pete Jarman during his service in Congress, and it was a real pleasure to have Pete as a personal friend. Friendly, and with a quick smile, Pete Jarman was always loyal to his friends and to his congressional responsibilities.

We friends on the committee were especially pleased when Pete Jarman was appointed as United States Ambassador to Australia, for the recognition given by the President to the committee, and as a special tribute and honor to Pete Jarman as a former Member. During Pete's service as Ambassador, he took the time to keep up his correspondence and contacts with many of us, so we know directly with what care he handled his duties, and how closely he followed events in our friendly ally, the Great Dominion of Australia, during his period of service there.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield to the gentleman who now represents the district once represented by Pete Jarman. He comes from one of the greatest districts in the Nation. We have had some of the greatest men on earth come from that district. I want to mention just one of them. He was Richmond Pearson Hobson who sank the *Merrimac* and won the war against Spain. At that time we first came to the world's attention as a great and powerful Nation. Hobson served in the Congress of the United States from this same great district. I yield at this time to Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama's Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep respect and great admiration for the late Pete Jarman.

His career in the government of his State and Nation has placed him high on the list of outstanding Alabamians.

After serving a term as Alabama's secretary of state, Pete Jarman was elected in 1936 to represent the Sixth District of Alabama in the United States House of Representatives. He served with distinction in this great body for six consecutive terms.

In 1949 Pete Jarman was appointed Ambassador to Australia. Although there have been a number of men from Alabama who have served in high diplomatic posts, Mr. Jarman was the only Alabamian who ever actually held the rank of Ambassador. After 4 years of outstanding service in Australia, Ambassador Jarman returned to Washington during the summer of 1953. He was living here in Washington at the time of his sudden death last February.

Although I did not serve with Pete Jarman as did others who speak here today, I knew him as a friend for many years. Our friendship became even closer after I was elected to Congress and he returned from Australia. During the year preceding his death, he visited my office on numerous occasions and we had many pleasant conversations. Our talks often reminded us that we were both born in Greensboro, Ala., received degrees from the University of Alabama, and were members of Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity. The district that he so faithfully served for 12 years I now have the privilege to represent. One of the last communications I received from Pete Jarman was a card expressing pleasure that I had been assigned to the Foreign Affairs Committee. He had been a diligent and able member of that committee until his retirement from Congress.

Pete Jarman was a man whose gentle manner and gracious personality won friends wherever he went.

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music to the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

Pete Jarman's passing is an irreplaceable loss to his gracious and lovely widow, Beryl Bricken Jarman, who stood so faithfully at his side throughout their married life. It is a great loss to those of us who knew him as a friend. It is an even greater loss to Alabama and the Nation.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read a statement from the senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL:

REMARKS OF LISTER HILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ALABAMA, ON THE LATE PETE JARMAN

It was with sad hearts that we laid Pete Jarman to rest in historic Arlington Cemetery. It is fitting that he should sleep there, where rest so many of the Nation's heroes who served our country so nobly and so well.

Pete Jarman spent his life in the service of his people, his State, and his country. He made his way up in public service to become secretary of state of Alabama, Member of Congress for 12 years, and United States Ambassador to Australia. In every position he demonstrated his exceptional ability, his high character, his steadfast faith, and his unswerving devotion to his country and its ideals of freedom, justice, and democracy.

As a soldier in the American Army in France in World War I, he saw at first hand the destruction and horrors of war. He sought membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, that he might give his best to the building of peace for ourselves and for all nations. As a member of the committee, he traveled to many countries seeking the answers to the problems of peace. He was dedicated to the great cause.

Pete Jarman and I were schoolmates at the University of Alabama, comrades in the American Legion, colleagues, neighbors, and friends. I know how fine he was and how today he would wish me to add my tribute to her who was his kindest critic, his wisest counselor, his best friend, his devoted wife, Beryl Bricken Jarman. Alabama is proud to have given to the Nation the stalwart patriot, the distinguished statesman, the devoted public servant, and the fine American, Pete Jarman.

At this time I should like to read the remarks of the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina. We call him "Dick," as you know:

REMARKS BY HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words of tribute to the life and works of a distinguished public servant.

Pete Jarman's life was a full and unselfish one, dedicated to the service of his fellowman and of his country. I came to know him well during his service in this House from the 75th through the 80th Congress.

He served as chairman of the House Committee on Printing from the 76th through the 79th Congress. During his first term, he served as chairman of the Committee on Memorials, and also on the Committees on Irrigation and Reclamation, and World War Veterans' Legislation. From the 76th through the 80th Congress we served together on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His diligence, energy, courage, and keen mind quickly won for him a position of great respect on the Foreign Affairs Committee, which was his primary committee interest. Later on, he served as United States Ambassador to Australia from June 9, 1949, until his resignation on September 17, 1953. During this period, he rendered distinguished service, and his ability and great understanding won for the United States many Australian friends and brought about an increased understanding of our mutual problems.

Pete Jarman's kindness, friendliness, energy, and unselfish dedication to duty will long stand as a monument to a colleague and friend who knew so well the meaning of life and its significant opportunity for devotion and service.

Truly, our friend's life has enriched and ennobled the lives of all who were fortunate to have known him. May he rest in the heavenly peace he so richly deserves. May a kind providence dry away the tears of the fine and faithful wife who survives him.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked you for 1 hour for our friends and colleagues to pay tribute to a great man, a great soldier, a great statesman, and one of the most wonderful friends a man ever had on this earth, the Honorable Pete Jarman, of Alabama.

Pete Jarman had a full life. He worked—he worked for his district, he worked for his State, he worked for his beloved Southland, he worked for his Nation, and he worked for the entire world. Pete Jarman had a brilliant Army career; then he served in the Congress of the United States 12 long years—6 terms—representing the Sixth District of Alabama. Then he was appointed as Ambassador of the United States to one of the greatest countries in the world—Australia. Australia is as large, or larger than our great country, the United States, and this soldier, this statesman was selected by the State Department and the President of the United States, and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, to serve there as our great Ambassador; and what a wonderful job that he and his precious wife, Mrs. Beryl Bricken Jarman, did there in representing this Nation. I have had letters from Australia and from many places all over the world about the wonderful way they handled this, one of the highest positions in the land. They served well; they served with dignity; they served with loyalty; and they did a lot of good. They will always be remembered—both of them—not only Pete Jarman, but Lady Jarman, as we always called her.

This great man was in my office for 2 hours just 4 days before he went to his reward. He looked so well; he had just been down in Florida, playing on the beaches and getting ready to do more deeds of good—the same as he had been doing all of his life. He was stricken early one morning, and when his wife telephoned our good friend, Congressman GEORGE GRANT, who in turn telephoned ARMISTEAD SELDEN and me, we at once went out to the hospital. He died very quietly and went away to his reward. You cannot do anything for loved ones after they have gone, but you can do this—you can help do something, if the opportunity arises, for the loved ones they leave behind, and he left a wonderful person—one of the most marvelous women I have ever known. My wife and I, my office force, and my entire family love her very, very dearly. Everybody seems to love and respect this great woman, and I will just have to say a word about something that happened in Pete's passing that impressed me very much. There is another great and outstanding and successful woman that is really a very unusual woman in so many ways. She has raised a fine family and has been very successful in that, and she is one of the partners in one of the great businesses of our beloved Southland. I am speaking of Mrs. Mildred Warner.

When the Alabama delegation, headed by Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, went out to the beautiful old Lee estate; that is, the Arlington Cemetery, there Mrs. Warner stood, to be with her beloved friend, Beryl Jarman, to help and comfort her—she and many others flew many, many miles—over a thousand miles—to be here with this wonderful woman. I thought that was one of the finest things I have ever heard of anyone doing. Of course, many people do this, but in these busy times it does not happen as often as it used to. I just wanted to mention this as I go along.

There is one thing that I want to say. I believe every man and every woman here in the Congress of the United States loved and respected not only Pete Jarman, but also Mrs. Pete Jarman.

Pete Jarman was one of the best loved men in the Congress of the United States, and we have here 435 Representatives from every district in this entire Nation and representing every human being in the United States. I know that our great Alabama delegation will tell you there never has been, and in my judgment, there never will be another man that did better work and was more loved and respected than our own wonderful, good and beloved Pete Jarman.

At this time I wish to include a statement by our junior Senator, Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, another great man, whom our Democratic Party chose as our candidate for Vice President of the United States in our last election. He, like our senior Senator, has made a great record.

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN

Pete Jarman was a great Alabamian, a patriotic American, and my friend.

It was my pleasure to know him well and to work with him in the House of Representatives for many years. In fact, Pete and I came to Congress together. He had the rare distinction of being designated chairman of the Standing Committee on Memorials during his first term in Congress.

He always placed duty above selfish gains and the welfare of his country above personal motives.

Pete met you with a smile and a friendly word of greeting. Never have I known a more sincere and conscientious man—nor one more devoted to public service. Your problem was Pete's problem—he stood ready always to lend a hand to a friend. Pete had the personal touch.

After serving in Congress, he was Ambassador to Australia. He was respected and loved by the people of Australia as he was by his fellow countrymen. In my opinion, Australia came to think even more highly of our country because of the fine job performed by Ambassador Jarman.

Pete Jarman had many friends all over Alabama. Prior to his election to Congress he was active in State government and in this capacity traveled widely over the State making friends wherever he went. He served as secretary of state and as a member of the State Democratic executive committee.

Pete Jarman was a soldier. He was active throughout his life in military affairs and attained the rank of colonel. In World War I he was wounded in battle.

The veterans of this country have lost a real friend. I personally know of many veterans he helped. In addition, he was active in veterans organizations, at one time serving as commander of the Alabama department of the American Legion. He also was active in the work of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was a statesman and a diplomat.

Pete was truly a Christian gentleman and active in the Methodist Church.

Alabamians and others who knew Pete Jarman mourn in his passing. We grieve with his dear wife, Beryl, and we know that her loss is easier to bear because of the generosity, the loyalty, and the acts of kindness displayed by her husband and my friend, Pete Jarman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Pete Jarman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this privilege of joining with my colleagues to pay honor to the outstanding public service of Pete Jarman, our departed friend.

Pete Jarman was active in the political life of Alabama, and of the Nation, for a period of 30 years.

In the Congress of the United States, he carved out a great career for himself, and a great record for Alabama.

His understanding of the Nation's problems in the field of our foreign affairs was deep. His contributions to the solution to those problems stand today in silhouette against the times in which we live. They speak for themselves.

As a climax to his career, he served as our Ambassador to Australia.

Pete Jarman was a man of high ideals. He was a man of great principle. He was a hard worker. He was faithful to the trusts reposed in him.

Pete Jarman is survived by his lovely wife, Beryl, who in life shared his joys and his heartaches. I leave with her this thought:

Death is only a quiet door
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond the light lies still;
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart
Nothing to hurt at all
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old garden wall.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] who was previously granted permission to include in her remarks on the Commerce appropriation bill certain letters and a press release that the matter indicated on the second page of the press release in tabular form may be printed in tabular form in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have permission until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 3822.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, is there any opposition to that bill that will require a minority report?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I regret that I cannot inform the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman include in his request that the minority may have the same privilege?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. I will be glad to include that in my request, that the minority be granted permission to file a minority report if so desired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be inserted following the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] regarding the Weather Bureau, during the debate on the appropriations bill this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ (at the request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today on Commerce Department appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an address.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter which will exceed the amount allowed and is estimated to cost $640.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for several days, on account of death in family.

Mr. ALLEN of California, for the period from May 25 to June 2, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

833. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

834. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board and the Atomic Energy Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

835. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the liquidation of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, pursuant to Public Law 276, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

836. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

837. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 244. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4802. A bill to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5597. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national-park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6410. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all

other work incidental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; with amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 232. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the Government of Venezuela; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to housing; with amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee, and other matters; with amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 251. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3990, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6382. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3822. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; with amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 6424. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6425. A bill to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the trade-in of old vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 6426. A bill to protect the public health by providing for grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 6427. A bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 6428. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that awards of pensions made under part III shall not be discontinued solely by reason of an increase in the annual income of any beneficiary of such pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6429. A bill to amend paragraph I of Veterans Regulation No. 3 (a), as amended, to provide that in the application of any schedule for rating disabilities no differentiation shall be made between disabilities which are organic in nature and those which are functional in nature; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6430. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that no deduction on account of outside earnings shall be made from the benefits of certain widows having dependent children in their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6431. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer for himself and his spouse, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6432. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 6433. A bill to provide for the national defense by encouraging the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6434. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to assist in planning and financing the construction of county agricultural buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 6435. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Fire Research Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6436. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 6437. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 6439. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the various States with respect to civil causes of action and criminal offenses committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6440. A bill to appropriate $40,000 for the restoration of a navigable channel 10 feet deep in Bayou Bonfouca, La.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 6441. A bill to provide that a levee shall be constructed and maintained by the United States along the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 6442. A bill to exempt from duty under paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 certain crawler-type diesel tractors imported into Puerto Rico for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6443. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt transportation by air taxi from the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6445. A bill to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6446. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics", to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 6447. A bill to provide that where a veteran has been totally disabled or permanently and totally disabled for 20 or more years, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not thereafter reduce the veteran's rating of total disability or permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6448. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6449. A bill to erect in Bossier City, La., a Federal and post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 6450. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in 1955 in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects

of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the necessary legislation and regulations to achieve an improvement in the quality of product offered for sale in foreign markets by raising the standards, and lowering the tolerances for foreign material, damaged grain and mixed varieties, and to tighten inspection procedures in the case of export shipments to insure that wheat moved on a grade basis actually meets the official requirements for the grade assigned to it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Behar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 6452. A bill for the relief of William H. Foley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ines Meneghetti Tatko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

287. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Donald S. McCall, Jr., and others, Henderson State College, Arkadelphia, Ark., urging approval of Senate bill 533, which would increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

288. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Margaret Burnop, president, Ladies Auxiliary, No. 45, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, Naugatuck, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the minimum wage be increased to $1.25 per hour, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address Delivered by Hon. Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, Before the 20th Annual Meeting of the Delta Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address delivered by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] before the 20th annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., on May 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE 20TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE DELTA COUNCIL, CLEVELAND, MISS., MAY 12, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, I was highly pleased and greatly flattered when I received an invitation to address your annual meeting. It is always good for those of us who believe in farming as both a way of life and as the touchstone of our Nation's economy to meet, to exchange ideas, and to compare our experiences. I do not propose to exhaust your patience with a long speech today. I realize that most of you probably know more about the practical side of farming than I, for it has been much too long since I followed behind a plow and watched the shining steel cut into the rich soil of my own State.

I will attempt to review briefly with you today some of the factors which have made the great Mississippi Delta the thriving agricultural area which we know today. I would also like to share my thoughts with you as to what our agriculture must do in order to continue to flourish—in order to remain strong to meet future demands.

My philosophy, both as a farmer and as a United States Senator, is a simple philosophy. I like to treat it and regard it as basic. It is this: "A sound agriculture is the greatest single bulwark our Nation has against the tide of 'isms' which are lapping at our shores."

It has therefore given me considerable pain to note that selfish interests and unscrupulous politicians have sought to pin the red tag of socialism on our agriculture, on our price support program, and even on our individual farmers. Unfortunately, their efforts, aided and abetted by the trumpeting of nationwide propaganda devices, have gone far towards blackening the good name of American agriculture.

It is high time that these people, as well as the millions of men and women who are supported by the products of our soil, realized that the tar brush they have wielded is blackening our greatest single hope for the future.

By 1975, our Nation shall number its inhabitants not in the one-hundred-and odd millions, but in the two-hundred-and-odd millions. We shall have more mouths to feed, more bodies to clothe, than we ever dreamed of having only a decade ago. At the same time, we are going to have to produce the extra food and fiber required to meet these demands on even fewer acres of land than we now have. We will be compelled to use every form of American ingenuity in coaxing from our dwindling stock of precious soil the cotton, the corn, the wheat, the vegetables and the hundreds of other commodities our population will need in order to eat as well in 1975 as we did in 1950 or even now.

To meet this task, our agriculture must remain strong. It must prosper. It must be made attractive.

As I stand before you today, I cannot honestly report that we are building the strength that we shall so urgently require in the years to come. On the contrary, American agriculture is bleeding to death. Farm income is falling. The waters of the great river which flow past our doorstep continue to carry down to the gulf 2 million tons of precious, irreplaceable topsoil every day. That is 730 million tons of soil a year; put another way, enough topsoil to cover a 40-acre farm to the depth of 6 inches is dumped into the Gulf of Mexico every 3 minutes.

And besides the Mississippi River, other great rivers—the Colorado and the Columbia—are doing their share in washing away the very source of agricultural abundance for generations as yet unborn.

Make note of this waste, ladies and gentlemen, for it is problem No. 1 on our agricultural agenda.

Problem No. 2 is somewhat less tangible—but of infinitely great importance. That problem is the economic health of our American agriculture—of the men and women who till our soil.

Just a month ago, the Department of Agriculture reported that farm income has fallen 10 percent below last year. This downward spiral has not stopped, contrary to what the bright-eyed economists who sit behind the mahogany desks in Washington may

say. Every day, more and more of our American small farmers take a look at their dwindling income and decide to abandon farming and seek employment in the city. Only 30 years ago, 1 out of every 8 Americans lived on a farm; today, 1 American out of every 19 lives on a farm.

This mass exodus from the farm has been caused primarily by declining prices and spiraling operating costs. In 1949, nearly 43 percent of our total gross farm income was retained in the form of profits; in 1954, only 37 percent of our farm income went into the farmer's pockets. In 1951, the average net income of our farm family workers was $2,120; in 1954 this had dropped to only a little more than $1,900. President Eisenhower reported to the Congress only a month ago that over a million and a half American farmers have cash incomes of under $1,000. During this same period, corporate profits increased. The wages and salaries paid to nonfarm workers skyrocketed from a total of $195 billion in 1952 to $207 billion in 1954. At the same time, farm income fell from $14 billion to $12 billion.

In the face of this disastrous trend, the Congress last year was presented with a most unattractive farm program—the so-called sliding scale, or flexible price support program. The objective of that program, as announced by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson, was to achieve for our farmers "full parity in the market place." That laudable goal would be attained by discouraging production to the point where supply and demand would come into balance. Coupled with this laudable objective, however, came the most abusive description of the American farmer I have ever witnessed. The Secretary of Agriculture left no stone unturned in blackening our farmers and our farm program. The Senate Agriculture Committee, the Congress, the Nation as a whole was deluged with totally misleading estimates of what our farm price support program cost our Government. Our farmers were pictured as regimented robots, feeding at the Government trough and looking for their sustenance in the pockets of the American taxpayer. Never before had there been such a concentrated effort by so few to hurt so many, so much.

The Secretary of Agriculture himself told the Senate Agriculture Committee that our farm program had cost the American people since 1932 a grand total of $16 billion. Since the occasion of the Secretary's appearance before the committee was to present testimony on the price support program, the impression was left that price supports alone had cost our Government $16 billion. Many newspapers carried stories to that effect.

Secretary Benson could have determined the true facts; he could have stated specifically what the price support program had actually cost instead of presenting a "loaded" table to the committee. The Commodity Credit Corporation records plainly showed that the total cost of the price support program was not $16 billion, but only a little more than $1 billion over a 20-year-period—and that $1 billion covered losses on all commodities, including losses on milk, honey, and—last but not least—the potato program which accounted for almost 50 percent of the total loss. As for the basics, well, the total cost of price support operations for the basics had been only $21 million—or something more than $1 million a year. Under these circumstances, I was led to only one conclusion—that the Secretary of Agriculture was "out to get" our price support program.

But agriculture should not have to stand alone, and it does not stand alone, in receiving benefits from our Government. American business gets its share. According to figures in my files, our American businessmen have received nearly $26 billion in rapid tax amortization benefits since 1951. Yet, there has been no great hue and cry arising about this program. Only the farmers have been treated with scorn. Labor has its minimum wage, a floor placed on wages and, indirectly, a floor beneath prices charged for manufactured goods. There has been no cry for repeal of the minimum wage; to the contrary, the President has only recently recommended that the minimum wage be increased to 90 cents an hour. No one will argue that should wages be increased, the farmers income will not be affected. Only the farmer has his "minimum wage" program whittled away.

Ladies and gentlemen, we shall never build a sound agriculture, an agriculture able to meet the food and fiber demands tomorrow will bring, by laying the economic foundations of this great industry on the shifting sands of insidious propaganda and flexible price supports.

In the South, our agriculture is comprised of many small farmers. We shall not attain assurance of agricultural abundance by concentrating our lifeblood—food and fiber—in the hands of too few farmers. The gamble is too great.

This, then, is problem No. 2. We need a sound, forward-looking farm program upon which to build our agriculture for tomorrow, one that will make it attractive for more and more farmers to remain on the farm and encourage others who have left to come back to the farm.

But we need something more—we need more adequate agricultural research. It is time for us to give our scientists the tools they require in order to develop higher-yielding varieties, better farming equipment, improved methods of soil conservation.

As you have been told, I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; I am also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I am chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which recommends funds for all flood control and navigation projects in our country.

Only a few months ago, we received a budget request from President Eisenhower to appropriate some $551 million for all flood control and navigation projects in the United States. This represents less than 1 percent of our total budget for the next fiscal year. We were also asked to appropriate $55 million for our soil conservation program, plus $250 million for the agricultural conservation program. Between all these programs, we have budgeted slightly over 1 percent of our total Federal budget for conserving our precious topsoil and for expanding our network of Federal waterways.

This, to my way of thinking, is folly. It is shortsightedness. We have seen, during the last 15 years, once-great nations submit to the yoke of world communism because their people were hungry and their agricultures weak. We face a similar danger in this country. Today, we curse surpluses and search for ways to dispose of them. We do not stop and consider that tomorrow these surpluses will dwindle. By 1975, they will be gone entirely and our scientists tell us that our farmers are going to be hard-pressed to produce enough food and fiber to feed the 220 million mouths for which we shall then have to provide.

We are committing one fatal mistake; we are failing to keep our agriculture strong and prosperous. We are leaving the gate wide open to the entrance of the companion evils of dissatisfaction and ultimate destruction of our way of life. Let me tell you now that a lack of food and fiber breeds isms and the Red plague of communism is anxiously waiting at our doorstep for the day when hunger shall stalk this land.

We have found billions to spend in foreign lands, but we pinch our pennies here at home. Such a course must be halted and more attention given to our domestic requirements. American generosity to those nations less fortunate than our own has been hailed far and wide, but I wonder how many of our allies realize how niggardly we have been with our own people. I am certain that few, if any, of our friends across the seas know that our generous contribution to them has been borrowed money—every cent of it.

The time has come for us to look around at our own backyard. There are multitudes of things which we have too long neglected here at home. Our agriculture is one of them, and the most vital, if we are to survive as a free nation.

Before I am charged with preaching gloom and doom, let me tell you that I am proud of our farmers for the things they have already done, despite the odds against which they must toil. Here, in this rich delta, we have seen a transformation. Twenty-five years ago, one traveling by train from New Orleans to Memphis, could, for mile after mile, see the effects of poverty, of depression, of eroded lands along many stretches of the way, and human spirits swept by despair. Only 2 weeks ago I made the trip from Memphis to New Orleans and I witnessed signs of much progress. We have made tremendous headway, and we shall continue to go forward. Because our southern farmers have the "git up and go" to get things done, southern agriculture shall not stagnate. Cotton is still king here, but we have a few crown princes to help him. We have licked the cattle tick, and our beef and dairy herds are second to none. We have planted alfalfa, clover, soybeans, and kudzu among other crops and restored the fertility to thousands of worn acres.

You delta folks have linked arms with your county agents and gone out to attack the evils of the one-crop system. Working with your State legislatures, you have attracted industries from other parts of our country. No more must southern cotton be shipped to New England for spinning; the textile mills are locating next door to the cotton fields—where they should have been in the first place.

Just the other day, one of my colleagues referred to the "new South." This is not the new South; this is the same old South, with new ideas and without discriminatory freight rates.

It is a South that is beginning to flex its long-dormant economic muscles, to roll up its sleeves, and to gird itself for tomorrow's battles.

Winston Churchill told the world a decade ago that he had not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. You and I know that the South has not become our Nation's most rapidly expanding region in order to witness the dissolution of the American way of life.

We are not going to be crushed—we are going to triumph. Folly and false economy, propaganda and twisted outlooks are not going to strip our Nation of its great agricultural heart land. But it is time for us to get to the task.

We need a sound price program, one which will keep our families on their farms, one which will fill our agricultural arsenals with the weapons of scientific research. We need an enlightened program of soil and water conservation, one which will halt the dissipation of our soil and restore the fertility of the lands we have.

I frankly do not feel that the enactment of rigid price supports this year would do our farmers any good, for the simple reason that because of the set-aside provisions in the present law, all basics except wheat are to be supported in 1955 at 90 percent of parity. But I am equally sure that adherence to the flexible price-support program—a program which lends itself to the concentration of our agriculture in the hands of the few—will lead us to ruin. It is my hope that in the early part of next year the Senate Agriculture Committee will have be-

fore it for presentation to the Senate a price-support program which is geared to tomorrow's needs. I wish to add that I am still a strong advocate of rigid price supports for our basics, and I shall continue to champion them until a better and more suitable program can be devised. I have named subcommittees to hold hearings on the proposed two-price plan for rice. I intend to work closely with our other southern Senators and Congressmen, and with all other members of all congressional delegations who have an interest in American agriculture, to the end that a program designed to prevent disastrous price fluctuations is achieved. I am convinced we can do this without so far depressing farm prices that only the wealthy can afford to stay in the farming business.

Your representatives in Congress are going to continue to wage an unrelenting fight to obtain enough soil and water conservation funds to halt the shameful waste of the very source of agricultural abundance—our precious topsoil.

We are going to do everything in our power to see that agricultural research is expanded; that new and more efficient farming methods are devised, that higher-yielding, disease-resistant crop varieties are developed and made available, and that expanded uses for our agricultural products are discovered and utilized. Last, but not least, a realistic approach in expanding our foreign markets is urgently required. We must devise ways and means of competing in world markets. American exporters of farm commodities must not continue to be placed in the position of having to consult and obtain permission from the State Department before they are able to sell our farm products abroad. Experience has shown us that our diplomats sometimes seem to have more concern for foreign farmers than for our own.

This effort will require the all-out assistance of every farmer and every farm organization in our country. It will require a tell-your-neighbor campaign in order to dispel the attitude of distrust which too many of our people display toward our American farmers. We must make sure that we give the lie to the theory that a reasonable farm price-support program carries with it high consumer prices. We must let the folks who live in the cities know that a shirt which costs $4 has in it but 1 pound of cotton worth whatever the current market price for cotton happens to be. They must understand that out of every dollar spent in the grocery store, slightly over 40 cents goes to the farmer. We must tell them that a loaf of bread has in it only 3 cents worth of wheat—even though the grocer must charge 17 cents for it in order to make a profit.

This is a time for counterattack, and I know that the leaders of our southern agriculture will be in the vanguard.

Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, and the other agricultural States have embarked upon a farsighted program of balancing their agriculture with industry. We must also embark upon a program of combining realism with commonsense; we must be realistic about the future and utilize sound, commonsense methods of strengthening our agricultural industry.

One of the best ways we can achieve this end is by increasing our markets as I have just stated, and thus reduce the burdensome surpluses which have forced our farmers to accept drastic acreage reductions in order to remain eligible for price protection. We must expand markets, however, without destroying the abundance we need to supply those markets, both domestic and foreign. We have heard much about price, and I am in agreement that if we are to compete with synthetics here at home and foreign cotton abroad, we must price our cotton so that it will sell. But we must also price our cotton so that the farmer can make a decent living. As the Senate Agriculture Committee studies possible price programs, these two objectives will be first and foremost in our minds.

This year, our farmers' production belts are drawn tight. The result is hardship; of that I am well aware. But let us remember to take the good with the bad. As much as these acreage reductions hurt right now, they are not without their compensating factors. Our farmers, you folks who produce cotton in particular, have learned to make each acre of land yield its utmost. You are using new varieties, harvesting them with new means, and generally making each acre of land do what it required 2 acres to do only a decade ago. This increased efficiency is going to be our salvation 20 years hence. The things you have learned in producing more cotton per acre of land are going to spell the difference in 1975 when 220 million Americans instead of 164 million are going to depend upon the fertile soil of the Mississippi Delta and other agricultural areas for their very livelihood—food and fiber. This year of tight acreage controls is a cloud on our national agricultural picture, but it is not without its silver lining.

In the dark days of this Republic's infancy, Thomas Jefferson wrote that the man who tilled the soil had a duty to his fellowmen to till it well. There is a corollary to that basic philosophy. It is this: Those of our people who wear the mantle of national leadership have a duty to safeguard the future interests, as well as the present interests, of all inhabitants of this land. I feel sure that the time will come, and come quickly, when the smokescreen of misrepresentation surrounding our industry will be blown away. It must be, for the future welfare of 220 million Americans hangs in the balance.

As farmers, as Americans vitally interested in a vigorous agriculture, you folks in the delta have been true to the trust imposed upon you. Those of us who have been chosen by you as your agents in the Congress will not let you stand alone. Working together, we can bring a sound program from out of the confusion into which our agriculture has been plunged.

And working together, we will.

Poland's Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in our continuing struggle against the forces of world communism, we must never forget those historical landmarks which show the development, over a period of several hundred years, of man's struggle for liberty and independence. The Polish Constitution of 1791 is such a milestone. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that free people everywhere, pause to commemorate the anniversary of this great document. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me, pertaining to Poland's Constitution of 1791.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF 1791

The year 1791 was a critical one in Europe's turbulent and revolutionary history. The political principles of the French Revolution were beginning to spread, and the sparks of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" were being scattered in all directions. Those peoples suffering under foreign or unrestrained and despotic monarchs of their own, were becoming restive, and nearly all of them were striving feverishly under enlightened and farsighted group leadership to free themselves from foreign oppression or from despotic tyranny at home. And, at the same time, they were working toward remodeling and revitalizing their governmental institutions with a definite view of widening the area of freedom within their own countries or of strengthening themselves against actual or potential foreign aggressions.

In 1791, Poland seemed to be at an ideological crossroads. She had already undergone a partition at the hands of her three powerful and greedy neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. In order to forestall any such steps in the future, certain liberal leaders of Poland, imbued with genuine democratic ideas, had been working on a new constitution. It is that document adopted in May of 1791 that we are commemorating.

This historic document seemed at the time a true bill of rights for the Polish nation. By that constitution, a government of limited monarchy was established with definite ministerial responsibility. The electorate of the Parliament was considerably enlarged, and numerous privileges formerly enjoyed by the small upper classes alone were, by this constitution, made available to other classes. Certain rights of the peasantry were restored and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. And, above all, freedom of conscience was guaranteed and absolute religious toleration was established.

Today, so many years after that epochal event and after so many advances in all forms of democracy, this document may seem somewhat outdated, but nevertheless, it is regarded as a forerunner of later liberal constitutions, particularly in central and eastern Europe. In many respects it was a pioneering document and therein may be found its real significance.

Unfortunately, there was little chance to put its provisions into operation. Soon Poland was again partitioned by her three more powerful neighbors and was removed from the map of Europe as an independent country. Even so, all Poles regard this document as a landmark in their history, and I am glad to join them in the 164th anniversary of that memorable constitution. Let me express my wish that the principles of the 1791 constitution will give hope and boldness to the people of present-day Poland in their struggle against their Communist tyrants.

Statement in Support of a Proposal To Raise Personal Income Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is one act of simple justice that the 1st session of the 84th Congress should not leave undone before it adjourns for 1955. Earlier this year, those of us who believe that our income tax unfairly burdens the recipient of low income, suffered a defeat in the rejection of the $20 tax refund. This was most discouraging, but I am sure that we can turn this defeat into victory. We can do this if all supporters of higher personal income tax exemptions will rally around a bill that offers much delayed justice.

I have introduced a bill which I feel provides a very minimum of relief. It is my thought that the present $600 exemption is hopelessly inadequate for a single person, and $1,200 is just as hopelessly inadequate for a married couple. Certainly no one is prepared to argue that $600 will support a single person in accordance with any real concept of a true minimum standard of living. And how many married couples are there today who can live decently and healthfully in proper surroundings on $1,200 a year, or $23 a week? All studies show that it simply cannot be done. If the income tax is a tax based on ability to pay, it must be recognized that persons with incomes below a reasonable level have no tax-paying ability. If a tax is nevertheless exacted, then our tax law becomes an instrument of degradation. That is why I propose to raise the exemption for single persons to $1,000, and for married couples to $2,000.

It is also my thought that the added exemption of $600 allowed to the blind should be raised to $1,000, while the exemption for each dependent should be raised a minimum of $200 above the present $600 level.

Sound though my bill is on equitable grounds, it is just as sound economically and administratively.

It is sound economically because the little tax saving accruing to each of many millions of taxpayers will run into billions of dollars of increased consumer purchasing power. Every mother and father in this country fears the day when the wheels of industry are shut down and the family pay envelope ceases to exist. The wheels of industry will never be silent so long as there are consumers with dollars to spend on the necessities of life. That is why I feel it so important that we should take every opportunity to leave the low-income groups with a few extra dollars, because they will spend them. When they do spend them, that makes jobs for retailers and wholesalers and keeps men employed in the factories.

Finally, great administrative costs will be saved by the Internal Revenue Service because millions of recipients of low income will be dropped off the tax rolls. No longer will the Service be swamped with returns that yield only a few dollars in tax but which nevertheless must be received, recorded, and checked and filed. Not only will administrative expense be saved for the Government—which could, by the way, then apply itself to a more careful scrutiny of the larger returns where the real money is—but also the burden of computing and filing a return will no longer be the periodic headache it is for many with low incomes. And industry, too, will benefit in saving tax compliance costs. Industry has long been an unwilling tax collector for Uncle Sam, and my proposal will reduce some of its burden, too.

Just one last thought. In 1954 Congress provided tremendous tax savings for corporations and the well-to-do in the higher income brackets. Congress now should do something for those of small income. My bill shows the way.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, on the Subject of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by me at the Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., on March 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the text of the address was ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE LOOKS AT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(Address by Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., at Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., March 28, 1955)

Mayor Tucker, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real privilege as well as a personal pleasure for me to participate in this Southwest Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America. The history of the league is a distinguished one, and I think it is no exaggeration to say that it is, in considerable measure, through your leadership that we have made such great progress as a Nation in improving services for children. From the early days of your organization in 1920 and under the leadership of Mr. C. C. Carstens, you have consistently focused national attention on the dangers and problems confronting our young citizens. You have been flexible in a field where flexibility is tremendously important, and your program has changed to meet the problems brought about by changes in the social, economic, and cultural conditions in the world.

That you have made a place on your program tonight for the subject of juvenile delinquency is continuing proof of your alertness to the problems of children and youth, and I must say I am honored that you should feel I can make a contribution to your distinguished group of professional men and women.

First of all, I want to make it clear that I do not proclaim myself an expert in the field of juvenile delinquency. I cannot help being suspicious of self-proclaimed experts in this field, as we are of self-proclaimed experts in other realms of knowledge. There is no need for me to tell you, who deal in the whole field of human relationships, that the causes of maladjustments—and delinquency is, in a broad sense, a maladjustment—are many and diverse, and that some partial answers to the problem must be found in many places. Out of my experience as a prosecutor and district attorney, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Federal Penitentiaries and the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have learned—as you have learned through your experiences in working with children and families—that the more we know about this problem, the more we realize that there are no easy answers to it and that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done—unspectacular, ofttimes, but none the less rewarding and productive.

Now, I don't need to tell you that when we deal with the science of human behavior, we are likely to be either misunderstood, abused, or ignored. Since we do not speak in the authoritative terms of the exact sciences, we are likely to be derided by our friends in those fields for our lack of precision, and because we do not accept many of the unqualified broad assumptions about social behavior, we are just as likely to be misunderstood by the general public. I might say that the professions of social work and politics share this problem in common. The profession of social work needs no defense before this audience, but I do want to say that you have reason to be proud of your goals, your methods, and of the fine dedicated men and women, like yourselves, who are giving of their lives for progress. Fortunately, the public is coming to a better understanding of your field, and you have the satisfaction of knowing that you are serving your fellow man in a manner that helps him to preserve his self respect and to fulfill his best opportunity for usefulness as a citizen.

Now, we think we know something about human behavior, but we have had considerable difficulty in translating what we know into terms of constructive programs. We know that every child needs certain physical conditions—he needs nourishing food, warm clothing, and shelter. Since these needs are universally understood and accepted, it has not been difficult to secure support and funds for institutions to care for dependent children. The equally pressing needs of the same child for individual attention, for love and understanding, and for a sense of worth and achievement are less apparent—less easily recognized. For this reason, adequate funds for the support of necessary case work services, for foster-home care for dependent children, and for training personnel in juvenile court and institutional work are much harder to come by.

Yet, it is true that many of the behavioral problems of young people stem directly from the failure to meet these emotional needs. And it is also true that an adult who may be, for example, attacked and robbed by a juvenile, is not likely to react sympathetically or to understand that this violence is probably the result of early and perhaps prolonged parental neglect or other contributing factors beyond the control of the particular individual.

In the work of our Committee on Juvenile Delinquency over the past 2 years, I have been impressed over and over again by the appalling gap between what we know about delinquency and what we do about it. Our committee has had the opportunity to discuss this problem with police officers, psychiatrists, social workers, parents, teachers, representatives of Federal agencies, and juvenile offenders throughout the country. We have held extensive hearings in the District of Columbia, in New York and Philadelphia, in Chicago, El Paso, Denver, San Diego, Los Angeles, Bismarck, N. Dak., and other places. We have heard and questioned hundreds of witnesses. And we have received thousands of letters from judges, educators, recreational workers, and citizens in every walk of life from communities of every size. I shall not attempt to review the testimony here this evening. It is voluminous and I am sure that most of the details form a pattern all too well known to you.

I would like to say a word, however, about the size of the problem. Because of varying definitions and different methods of reporting from city to city and State to State, it is impossible to get absolutely accurate statistics. But taking into account all the figures that are available through local, State, and national agencies, it appears that at least a million and a quarter youngsters each year are getting into trouble with the police or law-enforcement agencies. While this represents only about 5 percent of all American boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 17, it is nonetheless an alarming figure, and it indicates that we have a tremendous problem, not only to rehabilitate boys and girls after they get into trouble, but to pre-

vent their getting into trouble in the first place. From the mass of data compiled by our committee, I would like to make a few observations about the course of action which, in my opinion at least, will be required if we are to meet realistically the problem of young people in trouble—as I prefer to call it—and deal with it effectively.

We know that the seriously delinquent boy or girl is not what we are pleased to call a normal individual. We know that his delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect—and by this I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation, as well as physical. I am not talking just about broken homes, nor about children of working mothers, although we know that in many instances these conditions have had damaging effects on children. I am talking about the homes where, irrespective of economic circumstances, the child does not feel the warmth of love and affection, does not feel that he is an integral part of the family unit and is wanted and understood. I am talking about the homes where the child is overindulged, which, of course, may be just a form of compensation for the parent who, consciously or unconsciously, rejects the child. I am talking about the homes—and there are many of them in this generation—where parents have swung to the school of thought that teaches that children should not be disciplined nor should they be made to assume responsibility. I think our recent experience is demonstrating that lack of discipline makes the child feel insecure and that lack of responsibility makes him feel that he really doesn't belong.

All of these are forms of neglect, and the child's reaction, is probably well known to the neighbors, perhaps to the police officer on the beat or to community agencies. Certainly it is known to his teachers, because it has undoubtedly found expression during his early school years in one or more symptoms, such as withdrawal, day-dreaming, lying or cheating, fighting, learning difficulties, or truancy. In other words, both the child's early family situation and his outward behavior in school and elsewhere provide clear and unmistakable evidence that here is a child who needs special help if future trouble is to be averted.

Yet, in the face of such an apparent and obvious need on the part of many children, what does our society provide in the way of help? The crucial role in child preservation is one that can be filled by skillful protective services geared to detecting and reaching neglected children and to working with parents while the family situation may yet be repaired and before a child is too severely damaged. Yet, on the basis of our committee's study, it is apparent that in the average American community today there is no service specially equipped to perform this crucial child-saving function—no service capable of detecting and giving special help to the child suffering from some form of neglect in his daily family life, his school or his community.

May I quote very briefly from our recent report on this aspect of the problem?

"The subcommittee is forced to conclude that such essential defenses against delinquency are today weak, inadequate to the task, poorly manned, and, in some measure, even totally lacking in every community in the Nation. This is not to say that the quality of homelife for the average American child is grossly inferior, nor that the average American community is lacking in decency, nor that educational standards in our schools are universally poor. It does mean, however, that services designed to support these institutions and to catch children falling through their chinks are not only weak but literally gaping with holes.

"A family deprived of its breadwinner may be broken up for lack of financial aid; mental health services are so scanty that a family member with a serious emotional problem may disrupt the whole fabric of family life for want of specialized treatment; schools spilling over with youngsters are undermanned by underpaid teachers; utterly no services exist in the average community which are designed to identify and provide early remedial treatment for the child exhibiting unusual problems at home, in the school, or elsewhere in the community."

The school is the one agency in the community which is in contact with virtually every child. The testimony before our committee amply supports the conclusion that the delinquent child, in the vast majority of cases, has been a problem child in school. In a few metropolitan areas, special programs have been inaugurated, but in the average school in the average American community, there are no special classes for children with specific learning disabilities; there are no specially trained remedial teachers; and there are no skilled social or welfare services working with the schools by means of which they may reach out and help families and children experiencing difficulties.

From the standpoint of prevention, we are particularly concerned about the plight of what we call the predelinquent youngster. Through his early experiences of neglect in the home, this child has come to believe that the world is a hostile environment peopled with aggressive fellow human beings, and so he deliberately isolates and insulates himself from the representatives of larger society. It is obvious that no playground or recreational center which shapes its program around boys and girls who conform to the rules, and that no ordinary youth service or school program designed to meet the needs of the cooperative, well-adjusted child, will successfully catch the disturbed child and help him to reshape his own feelings and reactions to the world about him. And I am sure you recognize as well as I do that the child will not be helped by a social agency which, for a variety of reasons, budgetary and otherwise, waits for him to knock at their door and request service.

Now, in making these statements, I am being rather critical, not only of social agencies, but of parents, teachers, law enforcement agencies, and offices of Federal, State, and local governments. I feel that I can speak frankly to you. You wouldn't need to have this conference if everything were rosy in the child welfare field, and you would not have asked me to talk about juvenile delinquency if all I could do would be to toss a few bouquets in your direction and say we're all doing a fine job. A conference such as this gives us an opportunity to share our information and our experience—it is truly democracy in action.

In the fields of social work, education, recreation, youth services and mental health, I think we are doing only part of the job—an important part, to be sure, but nonetheless one that leaves a large area of necessary service unfilled. Mainly, I think, we have failed in finding effective means of reaching out to the boy and girl who most needs our help. By this I do not mean that we should abandon all of the present methods or basic concepts underlying social welfare services. Rather, what I am suggesting is that we need to find and add new techniques, and it is largely up to you who are professionals in this field to find the ways of augmenting the tools of your trade and thereby enlarging the end results of your work.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have been particularly interested in some of these reaching-out techniques now being tested in various communities. Several cities, notably Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, are successfully carrying on what is known as the detached-worker program. This program seems to me to afford an excellent example of how group work can reach out to boys and girls who fail to find their way into settlement houses and recreation centers, but instead, become part of a gang that expresses and supports their rebellion against society. In an effort to reach these youngsters, these cities have developed a program where the worker makes contact with and, in a sense, identifies himself with a gang. Though he may be regarded with suspicion and rejected at first, the quality of his personal relationship with the gang members has often been such that he has been able to influence gang behavior, direct the activities into more constructive channels, and help the individual members to secure jobs or vocational guidance or other services. The so-called aggressive casework program—which in some ways might better be called persistent than aggressive—is being tried out in New York and offers considerable promise as a means of carrying casework directly into the home of the child who needs help. The school social service and visiting teachers programs are being used in a few of our larger cities, but they need to be adopted much more widely and certainly with more and better trained personnel.

It is the responsibility of social work and social workers, in my opinion, to give enlarged leadership in the field of social engineering. We have made great strides in preventive medicine—but that, again, is dealing with a more exact science. We have not gone nearly so far in preventing social disorders. I maintain that rehabilitation is not the answer. It is necessary, of course, to repair the damage resulting from the rocks and reefs in family and community life, but how much better it would be to remove the obstructions, or to guide a safe course around them before the damage is done.

We know, of course, that not all delinquent youth are emotionally disturbed youngsters. And even the emotionally crippled child may manage to function within the law in a favorable community environment, while unwholesome factors in the community can seriously affect the normal child. Out of my work with the Senate committee, I have become convinced that many of us, including social workers, attach too little importance to demoralizing community influences.

During our hearings in a seemingly average American community, which I shall refer to as Community X, our committee was inquiring into the possible effects upon the children of that community of another community a short distance away—let's call it Community Y—which was a center of every form of vice. The evidence before our committee showed that many youngsters regularly went over to Community Y for their recreation and fun. We questioned the director of a social agency, a well-trained individual, about the possible damaging effects of this situation, and learned that he was not concerned about their proximity. The aim in his community, he told us, is to develop the kind of stable boys and girls who can go to Community Y, and come back unscathed. I, for one, cannot go along with such a thesis. Of course, I don't believe that boys and girls should be insulated completely against the realities of life, but I think we take a foolish and needless risk by exposing them, in their most impressionable years, to vice and crime, in the hope that they will be strong enough to resist it. Sound parent and child relationships, in my opinion, are scarcely enhanced by this kind of unnecessary strain, particularly when the bad community conditions could be controlled. I am not suggesting that crusade for decency is the panacea for juvenile delinquency, but I do believe that its dividends would be great and its cost little.

We expect children to develop a concept of morality and to learn to distinguish between right and wrong, but this is not a concept that comes easily because they are continually surrounded by confusing examples. What is the difference, they may wonder, in terms of moral standards, between the traffic policeman who accepts a $5 bribe, and robbery at the point of a gun? What is the difference between his mother's "white lie" when she invents some nonexistent excuse to avoid an engagement or responsibility and a child's own falsehood when confronted by his parents with some misdemeanor? What possible conclusion can a child draw when we are continually saying to him, in effect, public and private dishonesty is all right in some cases, all wrong in others?

And speaking of examples of crime, vice, and dishonesty, I would like to mention my concern about some of the materials and programs produced today by the so-called mass media of communications. Our committee made an extensive investigation into the subject matter, production, and distribution of the crime and horror comic books. Some of you may be familiar with these publications. Their title is certainly a misnomer, since they are not the simple crime stories or "whodunits" and they are far from comic. Rather, for the price of a thin dime, they offer children vividly illustrated lessons in almost every form of vice and degeneracy in the annals. Following our hearings, publishers of comic books established the Comics Magazine Association of America, adopted a code designed to eliminate objectionable material, and named former New York City Magistrate Charles F. Murphy as administrator. It is too early to determine whether the publishers' efforts to clean their own house will be effective, but it is at least a hopeful sign that 24 of the 27 publishers of comic books belong to the association.

Although distinctly superior to the crime comic, I am also concerned about the volume and frequently the kind of crime and violence shows presented on television. In terms of content, these programs do not begin to compare with the horror comic books. I do not believe that an essentially normal child will be transformed into a delinquent by these materials, but even the specialists tell us that they cannot, with confidence, estimate the effect upon either a normal or an emotionally disturbed child of witnessing several murders each evening in his own living room. To illustrate how little agreement there is on this particular point, I might mention that when I was in Europe last summer inspecting a number of penal institutions, I talked with an inspector at Scotland Yard who told me that, in his judgment, television was responsible for a sharp decrease in delinquency because it keeps young people off the street. The nature of the material presented by the BBC, of course, might have something to do with this. However, while I do not believe television as such produces delinquents, neither can I subscribe to the theory that these programs are harmless, provided that law and order prevails in the end. We recognize how difficult it is to make any precise measurement of cause and effect in this area. Yet, the testimony of psychiatrists and other experts in this field makes it clear that sensational presentations of materials, programs that invest crime and depravity with glamour, may well stimulate the gang or the individually hostile child to the point where his potential delinquency is "triggered" as a result.

Recently I had a most interesting letter from a man who was greatly concerned with the content of some television programs. He wrote: "It happens that I drive a school bus and I am constantly amazed at the conversations of some of the 10 and 12 year olds. Every morning they rehearse the programs of the previous night, complete with all the details of crime, vice, immorality and brutality." I think it is clear, therefore, that particularly where these programs are directed toward audiences of children and young people, we are taking, at minimum, a calculated risk that we can ill afford where human welfare is at stake.

There are other well-known delinquency-breeding conditions in our communities which are subject to control, providing we have both the wisdom and the determination to dedicate enough of ourselves and our resources to the task.

We have available to us, for example, studies of slum areas going back for more than half a century that reveal a consistently disproportionate rate of delinquency and crime on the part of slum inhabitants. This is not to say that delinquency is the result only of poor housing or lack of sanitation or outdoor plumbing, or that outstanding citizens cannot emerge from these conditions. Slums do, however, have a two-fold effect: on the one hand, they have a demoralizing effect on the quality and character of home life; on the other hand, they systematically expose young people from earliest childhood to every form of vice and crime. Indeed, in many slum areas, the neighborhood hoodlum or racketeer represents to the children the only known example of a local boy who made good.

I have referred to the major role which could be played by our schools in the fight against juvenile delinquency. I firmly believe that in this day and age, with our way of life seriously challenged in many parts of the world, we cannot afford, from any point of view, the overcrowded and understaffed schools that are the rule today in almost every American community, and which must inevitably shunt the problem child into a back seat in the classroom because there are no facilities for helping him. I am glad to be a sponsor of legislation—which I hope will be passed by this session of Congress—making Federal funds available to assist State and local communities to build additional school facilities. I am sure you know as well as I do that there has been no little opposition to the school construction bill. One of the loudest and most persistent arguments is that Federal funds inevitably mean Federal control. This, my friends, is nonsense. We have long made Federal funds available for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, and the Federal Government does not control the hospitals. We have made Federal funds available to school districts in federally impacted areas, and it has not meant Federal control. This is just a strawman, set up with the aid and encouragement of Secretary Hobby, to avoid doing anything about the problem, in the interest—at least so it is claimed—of economy. The fact remains that the child who has problems now will not be helped by additional school facilities or teachers or services that will not become available for another 10 or 15 years—if then.

Now you may say—and rightly so—all of these things will cost money. You can't build schools and clear slums and train personnel just with good intentions. And my answer is, of course, they cost money—so does crime. The crime bill of our Nation is staggering. For the year 1954, my friends, it was no less than $20 billion. This was the appalling figure presented by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before Congress on the Department of Justice budget. Just think how many schools we could build for $20 billion, how many families we could move out of deplorable slum areas into decent homes, how many people we could train and employ in preventive services. Of course, these things cost money, but that $20 billion will soon grow to 25, 30, and even more—all annually recurring expenses of adult crime—unless we strike at the roots of the problem and strike now.

With two of my colleagues on our committee, Senators KEFAUVER and LANGER, I have introduced legislation aimed at achieving just this end. Our bill, known as S. 728, or the Delinquent Children's Act of 1955, and presently pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would, for a temporary period, make Federal funds available to the States for three purposes. First, it would make funds available for the organization of a representative body within each State to assess the needs of that State and assign priorities in developing a program of action to meet those needs. Second, funds would be available to enable agencies involved in the fight against juvenile delinquency to undertake new and extended services on a project basis—the projects to be approved by a coordinating body. And third, it would make funds available both to States and universities for the development of a real program for training personnel in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. We certainly do not feel that this proposed measure represents a total answer to the increasing problem of youthful crime, but we do believe that it is an indispensable step in the right direction.

The problem, of course, demands the coordinated effort of national, public and private organizations. A few months ago, at the request of our committee, representatives of 18 of the leading organizations in the field—of which the Child Welfare League was one—gathered to give the committee the benefit of their advice and counsel. Incredible as it may seem, this was the first time that all these organizations had met together. It is hard to understand why no such meeting had ever been held before, because the opportunity for the interchange of ideas and information is invaluable. The question now is, will such meetings continue as a basis for sharing ideas and for joint planning.

As representatives of a profession, and of agencies dedicated to the advancement of human welfare, I know that you most emphatically believe that it is both your duty and your privilege to provide leadership in the fight to conserve the greatest of our human resources, our youth. It is part of your job to needle the public conscience—and to keep on and on, without concern sometimes, for the easily ruffled feelings of the smug and complacent—and to keep the country's view fixed upon the whole of the problem, rather than upon small fragments of it.

Some years ago, a distinguished pioneer in the field of child welfare, Emma Lundberg, wrote a book entitled "To the Least of These." The least of these are, of course, those children in our midst who, for one reason or another, are deprived of the kind and quality of family and community life which they so urgently need if they are to have a fair chance in life. In the last analysis, the real test of our humility and humanity—even of our civilization itself—is not how we treat, nor the honors we extend to our well-known and distinguished citizens. Quite to the contrary. The real test is how, and how well, we meet the needs of the least of these.

Labor, Politics, and the Gompers Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I submit the address delivered on May 9, 1955, by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable

DON HAYWORTH, the Representative from the Sixth District of Michigan, at a State convention of the Michigan Federation of Labor, held in Detroit, Mich.

Because of the able way in which he has dealt with the problem of the place of labor in the formation of the policies of our Government, I believe that his remarks are of general interest and are well worthy of consideration.

The address follows:

In this group I feel I'm a member of the family, not merely because I'm a brother member of the teachers' local at Michigan State University, but because I've been working hand in hand with many right in this room—both in campaigns and in legislation. The postal pay increase, for example, an extremely delicate series of negotiations, was piloted through the Senate, the House, and the conference committee with little, I think, to regret. The postal workers are to be complimented on having in Washington a level-headed, hard-working group of legislative representatives.

I'd like to tell you something connected so closely with the organization which brings us together today, that I think it's highly appropriate.

I was raised a farm boy out in Iowa, and two things were almost as rare in Mahaska County as Eskimos on the Sahara. One was a labor leader and the other a Democrat. If either one of those rare specimens had been found in my township we'd have locked him up and charged people to see him.

Well, I grew up, went to college, and became a teacher of public speaking. It happened that certain ambitious teachers in this field were working together on the biographies of outstanding American speakers. Their idea was to go into every field, like preaching, business, and law, and pick out the most outstanding speakers, whom they would then write up in this biographical series. In looking over their list of speakers I thought they'd overlooked a number of fields. I suspected, for example, that undoubtedly some effective speaking had been done in building the labor movement. Even in the twenties the labor movement was something to be respected. This led me to study the life of Samuel Gompers. I read not only his two-volume autobiography, but everything else about him I could lay my hands on. So I wrote an article about Gompers' speaking ability which apparently caused his biography to be included in the series.

I mention this experience because it was my first contact with the labor movement. It was a good first contact. I caught the idealism, the selflessness of America's first great labor leader—architect of the organization that brought us here today.

Another thing I learned from my study of Gompers was the fallacy of the idea that the American Federation of Labor has never been and should not be interested in politics. All though the administration of Samuel Gompers from 1886 to 1924, the A. F. of L. lived and breathed politics. From headline and housetop they shouted, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," and that applied to parties as well as individuals. In 1908, Samuel Gompers presented both great political parties with the kind of labor plank the Federation thought was right. The Republicans turned them down, but at the Democratic convention, according to Gompers' own words, "we were received and the plank was placed in the Democratic platform." At that time, in 1908, 47 years ago, Gompers went on to say, "The Democratic Party showed us that it was our friend, and that is why we are in this campaign working for the success of the Democratic ticket."

The A. F. of L, officially endorsed William Jennings Bryan and right down the line through Woodrow Wilson in both 1912 and 1916, James Cox in 1920, and then, which wasn't a bad idea, supported LaFollette in 1924.

The Federation wasn't active in politics for a number of years, but George Meany said recently, "It took the harsh lessons of the 80th Congress elected in 1946 to shock the A. F. of L. convention into forming Labor's League for Political Education. We now have returned to the policy of Gompers."

And don't think for a moment this was against the wishes of William Green. In William Green's last years I heard him give a ringing denunciation of those enemies of labor who framed Taft-Hartley. He called for labor again to get into politics and meet reaction head on. He stated in no uncertain terms that a new situation had developed and that the only way of preserving the life of organized labor was through the ballot. Those of us who heard that speech felt we had witnessed one of the landmarks of labor history—perhaps of national history.

Here we may well say something that needs to be said about the leadership we have in the labor movement. In the last 30 years we've seen some divisive influences in labor. We've seen brother fight against brother. And when you get that sort of thing started it's always easier to keep on fighting than to sit down together in generous and broad-minded cooperation. But in the last year the wholesome and unusual thing has happened. The A. F. of L. and the CIO did get together toward making the workingmen of America full brothers instead of half brothers. That would never have happened unless the leadership of both organizations had been broadminded men—willing to submerge personal ambition to common good. I've never had the privilege of meeting George Meany. But I've seen him on television, read his speeches, and watched his action over the years on the national and world stage. And he serves well the fine tradition laid down by Gompers.

On the other side of the picture it happens that I have many times been close to the Reuther brothers—have talked with one or more of them personally and at length. All labor can be proud of them. They have the devotion to the cause that Gompers had. They have the intelligence to meet on equal terms the best that management or government can put down at the table across from them. They have a willingness to set aside personal interest for the common welfare. If they did not have that breadth of vision, we would not have seen at this time a united labor movement. In the midst of the primary campaign for United States Senator from Michigan we saw both great labor groups of Michigan swing into action together. Only because they did this was it possible for this State to give the Nation a great, liberal, dedicated public servant, the Honorable PATRICK V. MCNAMARA.

If we're going to have a strong America we need both forward-looking industrial leadership in management, and also forward-looking leaders in labor. Strong men don't always have to struggle against each other. They can team up and work together for great purposes.

In America today, both labor and management have two great purposes. In the first place, much needs to be done to give our people a better life. We're proud of America, but, oh, how we fall short of what could be done. How many millions are afflicted needlessly from disease; how cruelly other millions suffer for the simple reason they aren't getting enough income to buy decent food, clothing and shelter. Responsible men of labor and responsible men of management should work together to give us and our children a life of abundance—a life of economic and social justice.

But, for the immediate present, something even more important demands that labor and management get together. We need to make America strong—strong enough to meet the greatest menace this civilization has ever faced. Across the ocean we have a powerful enemy—an enemy, incidentally, that doesn't have free, democratic labor unions. If we waste our strength, if we get careless, we could lose this battle with communism so fast we wouldn't know what had happened to us.

Some people are afraid labor will be too powerful in one big, national movement. But those people don't really know how labor feels. I, myself, never cease to be surprised at the broadmindedness of organized labor. Take this matter of minimum wage. Now, actually, there's no immediate reason why the carpenters or the plumbers or any other members of the A. F. of L. should concern themselves with a minimum wage. No minimum wage will raise their pay checks. But labor leaders have enough industrial statesmanship to see that we can't have a strong Nation unless there's widespread and universal well-being. They realize that if carpenters are to be busy the masses should be building houses. One thing's sure, nobody's going to build a house on the present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. Too many industrial leaders shortsightedly believe that if they can saw lumber, and make nails and turn out roofing with low-priced labor then they'll be able to sell at a big profit and make a lot of money. They forget somebody has to buy that lumber, nails and roofing. Big sales are only achieved as a result of high purchasing power.

One fundamental fact the Democrats revealed way back in the thirties, but which the Republican Party has never quite understood, is that when the common people have purchasing power they use it. Of course, I like to look at a higher minimum wage as giving boys and girls better food, providing them with better shelter, guarding their health. But, even those not interested in the human side, should realize that a minimum wage is one of the obvious ways of stimulating our national economy.

This brings me to one of my favorite complaints. That's the tremendous effort, made by all the apologists for things-as-they-are, to convince the Nation everything's all right with the economy. They don't compare economic activity of today with that of 1953. We're down today on almost all counts. They take great pains to show we're doing better than we did in the slump year of 1954. But still we're losing ground. We have five million more people than we had in 1953, but we're not producing or consuming as much as we did then. The productivity of the American worker is going up nearly 2½ percent a year. On that basis alone we should be producing 20 billions more than we did in 1953. But we actually are producing several billions less.

Here we are, face to face with an appalling Communist menace, and yet our defeatist industrial and political leadership is trying to make the country satisfied when it's falling billions upon billions of dollars short of what we could and should be producing. When organized labor is big enough to see, that for the good of all, unorganized labor needs a higher minimum wage they demonstrate that they have in mind the welfare of all the Nation—not merely of their own wage contracts.

The labor movement of this country has a magnificent heritage in such men as Gompers. You can be proud of leaders like George Meany and Walter Reuther. And I know, because I have mingled with them, that over this country from local to local are devoted men and women who measure up toward the national leadership.

But let's face the fact that, although many have tried, and much has been done, still labor hasn't done the political job it should. Throughout Michigan I know all labor hasn't been as close to liberal candidates as it should have been. And the precinct work generally over the State has been lamentable. In at least three-fourths of the

precincts and townships of my district are many members of the A. F. of L. As members of this, the greatest labor organization in the world, they will serve well their common cause if they work steadily through the year, and especially during a campaign, to see that voters understand the issues involved. This ought not to be done merely for the issues involved in congressional legislation, but for local and State issues.

This picture I spread before you in outline form can't be painted in with depth of color and true perspective by a few resolutions in this convention. Although it's important to formulate your organization's policies and program, by resolutions, here in convention, you must carry out their meaning and intent by hard work. If you start the job right now and work at it every day until the opening of the campaign next year, and even if you have consecrated efforts in all your locals, still you won't achieve the goals that could be reached. We need to do more than whip or shame people into going to the polls. The soundest method of political effort is first to build good citizenship.

Those of us assembled here today couldn't have the glory of pioneering the American Federation of Labor. But the idealism of those early days is something we ought never forget. When the office of president of the federation was created, it was decided to allow the president a fulltime salary of a thousand dollars a year. Samuel Gompers didn't want it. He disliked taking money for a job that he considered a sacred responsibility. They offered it to another who didn't think a thousand dollars was enough. Then they came back to Gompers and he took it. In going from one city to another organizing unions he stayed in the cheapest hotels and traveled in cabooses with friendly conductors. No one expects that kind of self-denial today. But every member of every local and every city federation has a right to expect you to put your soul into your job. Your responsibility goes far beyond the bargaining table. The A. F. of L. membership should be proud of their craftmanship and should continue to develop their skills, thereby deserving the high wages you help them to get. You need to see that they and their unions take responsible places in the community. You need to deal wisely and honorably with other labor groups so that we have real team work. And, being in Government, I think especially of your obligation to help develop a more responsible citizenship.

Some time in the near future the two great labor organizations will be joined from top to bottom. My closing suggestion is that for the purposes of political activity in 1956 you join hands right now. It takes time and experience to deal effectively in politics. You can hear an occasional local group and some individuals here and there talk loudly about their achievements. But, if you look into the facts you'll find all this activity has been lamentably spotty and ineffective. There've been a dozen misses for every bull's-eye.

Unfortunately there hasn't been any moving force in the political field to bring all labor together in a well-knit, cooperative, fighting force. They have had some meeting of the leadership. But it never got to the place where any group sat down and said, "Now here's the second ward, precinct K. What can we do about it?" Nobody went that far, nobody tried to locate a person in every block—someone who commanded respect in the neighborhood, who could win over the wavering, and on election day get out to the polls those who knew the story.

I'm not dealing in generalities. I'm laying before you a program of specific action. It's a program I know you believe in. The problem is to take the first step. Only by organized political action at the precinct level, we can carry to success those great ambitions that Gompers had, not only for the bargaining table, but also for the ballot box.

Social Security's Retirement Test Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been protesting against that section of our Social Security Act which penalizes people for working. I refer, of course, to the so-called "retirement test" which cancels benefits when outside earnings exceed a given amount. All of us know of the effect on our senior citizens of the substantial increase in the cost of living of the past decade. We know, as well, that millions of these people are struggling along on a meager income. The average old-age benefit under social security is only $59 per month. But if they manage to find a job—and this is no easy matter if they are over 65 years of age—and then if they can manage to earn enough to bring that $59 monthly payment up to enough to provide a decent living, they lose the right to the social-security benefit.

I am aware of the fact that changes were made in this retirement test in connection with the 1954 amendments of the Social Security Act. These changes raised the amount of earnings allowed and removed the requirement entirely for people aged 72 and over. But this liberalization of the retirement test has, in many respects, only further complicated the situation, as far as I can see. For the new annual earnings test is exceedingly involved. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued an entire leaflet on this one subject alone, explaining all of its ramifications.

First, it seems, you let the Department know each year whether you expect to earn more than $1,200 in the coming year. If you start working during the year there is another blank to fill out. If you stop work there is another. At the end of the year, if your earnings have been more than $1,200 you fill out another blank—which also shows the months in which you earned $80 or more. All this information goes into the bill and then sometime during the following year—when you may be needing that benefit very desperately because you are not working then—the benefits are canceled in proportion to the amount of earnings in excess of $1,200 which you had in the previous year.

There is another gross inequity in this new retirement test. Until this year it applied only to earnings in covered employment. Now it applies to earnings from any source. Formerly, for example, it was possible to keep on getting your benefit if you had a job which was not covered by social security. Now, no matter where you are working, you lose your benefit. Moreover the law continues the gross inequity which cancels benefits only for earnings, but makes no cancellation whatever if the additional income is from unearned sources such as dividends, interest, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely unable to understand why we continue this reprehensible practice of penalizing people for working. It is a principle which cannot be improved because it is wrong in the first place. The only right and equitable solution is to remove the retirement test entirely.

To accomplish this purpose I am today introducing a bill which would amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder. I believe this is a matter which calls for our immediate action. I urge the support of every Member of this Congress in making this important improvement in our social security system.

Remarks of Hon. Philip J. Philbin at DAV Installation of Officers, Southbridge, Mass., April 17, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address I delivered on April 17, 1955, at the annual installation of officers of chapter 101, Disabled American Veterans, and its Auxiliary, in Southbridge, Mass.

The material follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator Benoit, Representative Cournoyer, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a great privilege for me as well as a great pleasure to join you here this afternoon because I always enjoy coming to this beautiful town of Southbridge whose faithful people have been so cooperative, helpful, and loyal, and, as you know, I have unbounded admiration for all the members of this great American organization.

There has never been any question concerning the type of Americanism and the type of patriotism which the members of this organization have stood for throughout the years. Not only in war but in peace you have demonstrated in ways very definite, very explicit, and very clear to all your loyalty to the principles of this country and your willingness to serve it faithfully and zealously, however great the sacrifices involved.

I am proud and happy, therefore, on this occasion once again to offer you, your auxiliary and all your members my congratulations and expressions of warm gratitude and appreciation for the magnificent contributions which you have made in behalf of the Nation and in the interest of that exalted kind of citizenship based on unquestioned loyalty and devotion to the country which is so urgently needed in the crisis of the affairs of free men which confronts us today.

We all recognize, I am sure. that we are living in a world that is rapidly changing and that is rapidly taking on new shape and form. In the past decade since the end of World War II our own social and economic institutions have developed at an unprecedented rate. The productivity of our great economy has mounted and mounted until we are in the main and on the whole so

far as the Nation is concerned, not only producing more than ever before of food and fiber, commodities and articles necessary to sustain life in this advanced age, but we have also achieved a standard of living for the rank and file of our people which would have been scarcely imaginable not to many years ago.

Of course, there are gaps, very unhappy gaps, in this fabric of prosperity and well-being that is spread over the country. There are certain areas including some right here in our own district, with which we are so intimately and so deeply concerned, where many of our fellow citizens are not able to obtain full-time employment, or indeed, are unable to find any employment at all. This is a very serious problem which must be attacked at every level and in every way possible, because neither a great democracy nor a great free private-enterprise system like our own can ever tolerate to have people unemployed and unable to find work properly to sustain themselves and their families. It is one of the great social challenges confronting us today speedily to correct these conditions so that the prosperity which the Nation is enjoying as a whole, can be spread into every section and part of the country and to every segment of the American people.

Notwithstanding these dislocations which beset us so grievously in some places, we nevertheless have reason to feel proud of the generally good health and marked strength of our great powerful economic system which has been built up on the basis of freedom as distinguished from the coercion and dictatorship and suppression which exist in other nations of the world.

It must be our purpose always not only to build and expand this great system of free activity to produce still higher standards of living, but it must be our unswerving purpose always and in every circumstance to protect that system and the free institutions that have made it possible from the attacks of those godless, conscienceless forces of communism and radical social reform which are working so tirelessly for the destruction of the values of free enterprise and freedom and the priceless institutions which have made possible the unequaled liberties and the unprecedented prosperity which this country and the American people enjoy in a measure greater than any nation or people in history.

The members of this organization know better perhaps than any other group the bloody sacrifices, the stern discipline, and the unselfish devotion that were required to defend our Nation in past wars, because you have never faltered, you have never hesitated, you have never been found wanting in the defense of freedom. On the other hand, you have realized the urgency of protecting this country against brutal dictatorships and against the vicious enemies of democracy which made unprovoked and unconscionable attacks upon this Nation. And you were willing to serve this great cause with your lives and your blood.

It is said that history repeats itself and this is an all too pitiful fact as we survey the situation that obtains in the world today. Instead of the peace which you and your comrades fought for, which the entire American people unselfishly worked for and sacrificed for, in spite of the bloodshed and suffering, despite all the glorious proclamations and promises and international charters, the world seems to be right back where it was prior to the last great war and is faced once again with a gigantic, widespread powerful conspiracy directed against democracy and freedom and aiming to destroy the free institutions which have been built up throughout the centuries at such great cost in treasure and in blood.

This situation would be extremely difficult and fraught with great danger at any time. But in this atomic and hydrogen age when modern science combining with military skill has produced weapons of such incredible power and destructiveness, it is all the more disturbing to the loyal citizens of America, as it is and must be to human beings everywhere.

But we have not flinched in the past in time of danger and we are not prepared to flinch now. World communism may rant and rave and hurl its invectives against our religious faith, against our democracy, and against our great Government. It may conduct insidious conspiracy throughout the world calculated to weaken and destroy free governments, it may use every means at its disposal, as it is doing, to obstruct and prevent a true world peace. But the people of this Nation will never be discouraged, will never be terrorized, will never cease to defend their freedoms. To the contrary, we will resolve with increasing fervor and determination, come what may, to build up the kind of strength, military, economic, and spiritual, which is needed to preserve the national security and to deter wilful aggressors from carrying out their designs of infiltration, conquest ,and enslavement of the free world. This is no time for useless fears or for appeasement.

We have tremendous resources on our side in the form of the greatest productive system ever wrought by the hand of man, in the form of a most powerful striking military force equipped with all the latest weapons, including atomic and hydrogen substances in much greater quantities and of greater power than any other nation. These are important and necessary to be sure, and they may well give us a sense of security and a sense of confidence that any aggressor or combination of aggressors will be restrained from launching an attack upon this country, or provoking war against the free nations.

But we have other weapons, more powerful weapons, that are not available to the totalitarian dictators. We have the weapons of faith, of understanding, of tolerance, of justice, of unity among all our loyal people regardless of race, class, or creed, and the confidence and determination to sustain the integrity and the principles of this great Nation in any and every contingency that may arise. These are weapons that are not available to the potential enemy because they are based not on material strength alone but on the spiritual values of freedom and they cannot be matched by any Godless Communist state or any ruthless totalitarian dictatorship.

Just as we are pledged to the cause of our magnificent veterans, their dependents, and their families, just as we are devoted to the building of a greater and better Nation, just as we are dedicated to the principles of free enterprise and freedom, we must ever be resolved to defend, preserve, and protect the mighty and noble heritage of political, economic, and spiritual strength which has been the basis for all the things we are and which must be the enduring basis of our liberties in time to come.

Hurricane Warning Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my bill, H. R. 5260, has been effective to the point where the Department of Commerce, and in particular the Weather Bureau, has received additional funds for the operation of a hurricane warning system for the protection of our coastal residents, although the sum adopted by amendment today is an increase, it still is not sufficient, in my estimation. However, I am pleased that my bill and work was not in vain.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments:

From the Chamber of Commerce, Greenwich, Conn.:

The board of directors agree with the proposal outlined in H. R. 5260.

We believe your proposal has real merit.

From the Union Reinsurance Co. of Zurich, Switzerland, the United States branch office:

Anything that will be done to reduce, as far as possible, the loss of our life and property has our wholehearted approval and support.

From the Acushnet Process Co., New Bedford, Mass.:

The city of New Bedford, Mass. was very badly hit in 1938, 1944, and by "Carol" in 1954. In 1938 we had 230 deaths in the greater New Bedford area, and in 1954 we had more than $50 million damage. There were 35 industries in New Bedford which were badly affected by flood and salt water and extremely high winds. Damage to these industries alone amounted to more than $10 million.

Surveys which we have run among the 35 industries indicate that probably one-half of the $10 million damage could have been spared if the plants had ample warning to move material and equipment to higher ground and bulwark their plants against the surge of the salt water flood. We recognize that in the long run it may be possible to get physical protection but we also realize we may be able to get relief from future hurricanes if we are able to get accurate forecasting as to the probable path of the hurricane and as to the time of arrival.

The New Bedford committee on hurricane damage and each of the industries it represents is wholeheartedly in favor of your program and would like to do anything we can to get speedy passage and prompt action.

From the Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New Bedford Division, New Bedford, Mass.:

I think the bill is an excellent one. In a survey of the damage sustained it was noted that the direct cost of Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel amounted to over $9 million. This did not include the loss of jobs, profits, and other tangible and intangible costs. In the instance of our own company, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., we sustained a loss of $1,455,000. If we had had early warning on Hurricane Carol it is estimated that our loss would have been reduced by $300,000 to $500,000. I venture to say that the same is true of our waterfront firms in this area.

Including the industrial loss, New Bedford suffered a total loss of over $50 million in the series of hurricanes last year, a considerable amount of which could have been saved had the area had sufficient warning.

As you pointed out, along with the early warning we could expect a reduction in unnecessary fear and apprehension in the areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes. This is a very important item with industrial plants, and it is best exemplified in this area by the fact that over $350,000 was expended by our 35 industrial firms in getting ready for Hurricanes Edna and Hazel, which did not cause any serious damage.

To sum it up, we are wholly in accord with your bill, H. R. 5260.

From the president of the Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am glad to tell you that I join with Dr. Malone, director of the Travelers Research Center, in endorsing your proposed bill.

From Mr. Thomas F. Malone, director, Travelers Weather Research Center, Travelers Weather Service, Hartford, Conn.:

Your active interest in a matter of deep concern to New England is much appreciated, and, as a meteorologist, I am happy to endorse your proposed bill.

The loss of life and property from hurricanes has been so great that a concerted program of research on this problem seems obviously justified.

From the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I think there is no question but that the east coast is entitled to the additional protection that a better hurricane warning system might provide. I think in these days of needed reduction in budget, one should hesitate to ask for even a modest increase in appropriations, but this is a case where I have no hesitancy in recommending an enlargement of Government facilities.

From the president of the Bankers Fire Insurance Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

I think this bill is splendid and very worthwhile work and that it certainly should be approved.

From the vice president of the Northeastern Insurance Company of Hartford, Hardford, Conn.:

Your proposal, H. R. 5260, is to protect the lives and property of 2 million American citizens living in the immediate vicinity of newly menaced coastal zones, and we all here at this company readily concur in your proposal. We wish you complete success in this undertaking.

From the president of the Phoenix Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am in favor with the purposes of this bill and believe that, if passed, it will perform a very useful service to many millions of citizens and property owners in the Atlantic coastal area from Maine to Texas. The payout on claims by property insurance companies such as ours for the storms in 1954 was a rather devastating experience and naturally resulted in a substantial underwriting loss to our company. Anything that can help people to protect their property by being alerted in advance would be advantageous and interesting to our industry.

The advantages in being alerted to storms can accrue to insurance companies through loss prevention by protecting property when advices of an approaching storm are available. Closing shutters, securing doors, and moving contents, particularly from exposed property on the waterfront, can go a long way in keeping the ravages of wind from doing unnecessary damage.

Rest assured we are in favor of your bill.

From the Committee on American Steamship Lines:

Improved hurricane detection is desirable and your efforts to assure adequate provision for this purpose are very much in the public interest.

From the American Boat Builders & Repairers Association, Inc., 2382 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.:

We know that such a bill will be greatly appreciated by our members and we are accordingly advising them of it and requesting that they support it.

From the New England Council, Statler Building, Boston, Mass.:

In a recent survey of New Englanders' opinions of issues before Congress there seemed to be substantial support for the services proposed in your bill. Unlike many of the other issues on which opinion was solicited where there was a fairly equal division of opinion, the vote was more than 3 to 1 in favor of increasing the appropriation to the United States Weather Bureau for more intensive study and reporting on hurricanes.

Congratulations on your preparation and submission of this bill. The New England Council intends to support it and we wish you the best of luck in gaining its passage in the House.

From the New Orleans Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.:

We are in favor of your proposal that an emergency hurricane warning system be improved to provide better protection.

From the Dixon Sintaloy Inc., Stamford, Conn.:

I am in complete agreement with the need for a satisfactory appropriation for hurricane warning service to the eastern seaboard.

Your bill, H. R. 5260, certainly should serve to provide the means for saving many times over the amount of the appropriation required.

From the PM Industries, Stamford, Conn.:

We support enthusiastically the legislation which you propose and hope that the necessary action will be taken to enact it.

The appropriation under consideration to enable the United States Weather Bureau to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system would be of benefit to the manufacturers in our area, and our company in particular.

From the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.:

We shall be very happy to go along with you on anything that we can possibly do.

There is no question but what these hurricanes have done a terrific job in Connecticut. No one was prepared for hurricanes which we had not had in quite a number of years, but it is quite evident that we can look for many more of them and we should be better prepared than what we are.

From the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., Administration Building, Fish Pier, Boston, Mass.:

What happened in New England during the hurricane which visited us last fall indicated a willful lack of an adequate warning system.

The matter of preserving life and property as much as can be humanly expected should be of immediate concern to our Federal authorities.

The commercial fishing industry of New England is a hazardous occupation at best and a timely and adequate Federal weather forecasting system would aid immeasurably in reducing the perils of fishing during the season in which we are subject to sudden changes in the weather.

From the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Members of this National Association of the Barge and Towing Vessel Industry, who operate on all of the inland waters of the Nation, suffered severe losses during hurricanes last year and thus, I am sure, will actively support the above-mentioned bill in the hope that much of these losses can be eliminated in the future.

From the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers Council, 308 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.:

The matter of appropriating $5 million, in order that the United States Weather Bureau may be enabled to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system, was discussed with a number of manufacturers who are members of the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council. This matter was also brought up at our executive committee meeting, and I was authorized to write to you in support of this bill.

I do not need to advise you on the extent of damage done by wind and high water in this area.

Certainly the appropriation you ask, which would serve the entire eastern seaboard, is well justified. We believe that effective and reliable warning service, provided by the United States Weather Bureau, is imperative.

From the president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

I should like to assure you of my personal support for your measure, which would seem to me to be of great advantage to the American merchant marine, as well as to others affected by weather and hurricane conditions.

From the Executive Director, Rhode Island Development Council, Providence, R. I.:

I believe that all New England Congressmen and Senators should use every effort to see that this type of legislation becomes a reality.

From universities.

From the head of the department of meteorology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.:

Since our department is in the forefront of research on the problem of hurricanes, we are keenly aware of the need for action on the part of the Congress.

We are urging our friends to support your bill or a similar proposal to achieve the same end, as well as any well-conceived proposal which will meet the urgent requirement for a hurricane research and development program.

Your active interest in the hurricane problem is a source of gratification to professional meteorologists and a great service not only to your constituents but to all the millions of Americans who live along the Atlantic seaboard and the gulf coast.

From a professor of meteorology at Blue Hill Observatory of Harvard University of Milton, Mass.:

I was much pleased to see a news dispatch that you had filed a $5 million independent appropriation bill to provide greatly expanded forecast facilities up and down the east coast.

A forecast's accuracy depends mostly on the adequacy of the information available. In my opinion, the greatest inadequacy affecting forecasting for New England is the lack of a complete and dependable surface and upper air station in the Atlantic Ocean a few hundred miles offshore.

I think your proposal is definitely worthwhile.

From the chairman of the department of meteorology and oceanography, College of Engineering, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.:

My colleagues and I in this department are well aware of the importance of this bill

for the welfare of the population in the affected area.

You have in preparing this bill, of course, been in touch with our Weather Bureau and know the excellent work which they are doing with inadequate financial means. Your bill will go far toward remedying this situation. It is very gratifying to know of this support for meteorology in Congress, and to find a realization of the contribution which meteorology can make to the welfare of the Nation.

The effects of this bill will be of great benefit to the people in the regions visited by hurricanes, including the people of New York State.

Your bill will go far toward alleviating the financial difficulties impeding the development of a really adequate warning service.

If ship station Hotel had been available in the fall of 1954 much property damage and many casualties could have been avoided.

From the president, American Meteorological Society, 3 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.:

It is most encouraging to learn that some of our representatives in Congress realize that the weather service in this country deserves more, not less, support. In the long run such support will, I feel sure, result in a net savings to the taxpayers through a more efficient weather service.

I believe the records will show that for last season, involving only Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, insurance companies paid some $276 million in claims (New York Times of December 26, 1954). I know there must have been many additional millions of dollars spent by individuals which do not appear on the record since several members of my own family in Rhode Island suffered uninsured damage as a result of last season's storms. Thus it seems to me that the expenditure of $5 million to improve the storm warning service for the protection of our citizens is a very modest outlay to accomplish the desired objectives.

We in the American Meteorological Society have for some time been concerned about the problem of severe storms of all types. The Council of the American Meteorological Society recently voted that the Council recognize deficiencies in the State of our knowledge of severe storms, particularly tornadoes and hurricanes, and strongly endorse an increased research effort in this area.

That in view of the great losses of life and property suffered by our citizens from the destructive action of tornadoes and hurricanes, the American Meteorological Society recommends that special funds be appropriated to enable the United States Weather Bureau, in cooperation with other public and private agencies, to conduct research projects on tornadoes and on hurricanes, along the lines of the successful thunderstorm project of several years ago.

From the head of the meteorology department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.:

I was very pleased to learn of your interest in this important matter which affects the life and property of so many persons on the eastern and gulf coasts of this country.

You are to be commended for your active interest in these problems and for your realization that the Weather Bureau must have additional funds if real progress is to be achieved.

From the editor of Motor Boating magazine, 572 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.:

We are much interested in your bill which we hope will receive favorable action by Congress.

In addition to the above letters, I have received dozens of letters from Representatives, Senators, and governors of the Eastern States and the States in the Gulf of Mexico area, warmly endorsing my bill, H. R. 5260. They have not only written to me expressing their vital interest in the passage of this bill, but have frequently called me and have offered their support. In addition, I have received letters from private citizens who are not connected with any particular company or organization who have wished me well in my efforts to secure congressional support for increased protection against the loss of life and property from hurricanes.

Some more excerpts from letters received:

From the executive vice president of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

It is known that the various hurricanes which have visited the Northeast section of our country have done a great deal of damage to property insured by our members. Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, last fall, were particularly devastating.

The advance warning of approaching storms should give more opportunity for protection of property and possibilities for moving such property to safer locations. Accordingly, the marine insurance underwriters are definitely interested in any provisions and actions leading to adequate and timely warnings of hurricanes and severe windstorms.

We wish to express our appreciation of your foresight in presenting this legislation.

From the general manager of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

Surely, the Weather Bureau services are invaluable to the people of this country. If additional funds are needed in order to make the Bureau more useful, such funds should be made available within proper limits.

We appreciate fully the great damage which many of us suffered at the hands of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel.

From the executive vice president of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn.:

May I commend your alertness in watching out for the interest of southern New England in this peculiar climatic change which we are undergoing.

General manager of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex.:

We have on many occasions suffered losses from hurricanes and we would like very much to have the Gulf of Mexico coast included in H. R. 5260.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following:

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED SPECIAL AND IMMEDIATE HURRICANE-WARNING PROGRAM

1. To reduce unnecessary loss of life and property in all coastal States from future hurricanes.

2. To reduce unnecessary interruptions, costly protective action, and time-consuming precautionary measures of thousands of business firms and millions of citizens in fringe areas of expected hurricane paths.

3. To reduce unnecessary fear and apprehension in areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes.

4. To increase the value of hurricane forecasts to the people of 19 coastal States who need better and more precise information as to expected wind speeds, water levels and times of hurricane occurrences.

5. To enable the Weather Bureau:

(a) to provide an improved hurricane-warning service immediately.

(b) to give locations, speeds, directions, and intensities of future hurricanes with more accuracy than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(c) to describe present and expected weather conditions in and surrounding future hurricanes more accurately than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(d) to provide alerts and warnings of future hurricanes 6 to 12 hours farther in advance than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(e) to distribute essential hurricanes reports and warnings with greater speed, efficiency, and certainty than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(f) to give complete and accurate forecasts of high-water levels for all occupied coastal areas subject to inundation.

HOW THE ABOVE OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED

(a) Secure appropriations to carry out a special and immediate hurricane-warning program of the United States Weather Bureau starting June 1, 1955 and as long thereafter as may be necessary to avoid unnecessary loss of life and property from hurricanes.

(b) Secure the above appropriations in addition to the funds contained in the budget estimates for the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau submitted to Congress in January 1955 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

(c) Secure appropriations for both of the above programs, and also for a hurricane research and development program for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

WAYS IN WHICH REQUESTED FUNDS ARE TO BE EXPENDED BY THE WEATHER BUREAU

1. To provide staff sufficient to keep Weather Bureau offices open 24 hours a day in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where existing Weather Bureau offices are now open only part time.

2. To provide technically trained staff sufficient to reopen Weather Bureau offices in 5 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where formerly existing Weather Bureau offices have been closed.

3. To operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

4. To provide staff and observing equipment to operate 12 additional rawinsonde stations in the United States east of the 100th Meridian and in other selected land areas adjoining the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea and western Atlantic Ocean; and to provide staff and supplies at existing rawinsonde stations to take required upper air observations at 6-hourly intervals instead of at 12-hourly intervals during the hurricane season.

5. To provide additional weather observations during storm periods from merchant ships traversing the western Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico.

6. To provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

7. To establish an improved high water warning service to inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves, and other coastal inundations from abnormal water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

8. To provide meteorological staff and facilities for emergency hurricane warning

centers and for mobile storm-warning squads to supplement the local Weather Bureau staffs during the intense activity accompanying the approach and passage of hurricanes and major storms; and afterward to survey and review (a) the quantity and quality of hurricane reports, alerts, and forecasts, (b) the times, places, and amounts of hurricane information distributed by all news media, (c) the protective action taken by all concerned, (d) and the types and amounts of hurricane damage incurred.

9. To reestablish the ocean weather ship station formerly located halfway between New York and Bermuda and maintained there by the United States Coast Guard for 12 years prior to its removal in June 1954.

10. To carry out a cooperative private and governmental Public Information Program involving important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, the changing characteristics of moving hurricanes, and the precautions that should be taken by citizens in the forecast path of future hurricanes to save lives and property.

Shall We Continue To Penalize Widowed Mothers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest American traditions is the concern which we have always shown for widows and children in the community. Yet our social-security law, through its principle of canceling benefits for outside earnings above a given amount, continues to work a terrific hardship on many of the widowed working mothers in our land. I, therefore, am today introducing a bill which would remove this penalty clause with regard to the benefits received by widows having dependent children in their care. I am convinced that this so-called retirement test is a gross inequity as it applies to any social-security benefit, and I have introduced a bill to remove it entirely. But it seems to me to be an especially grievous penalty as it applies to working mothers who have been widowed.

We know that the working mother incurs additional expense because she must make some provision for the care of the children during her working hours. Yet if she earns more than a given amount existing law will deduct the benefit awarded to her, thus further reducing her income. The average mother's benefit today is only $38 a month. Surely, in this great and productive country of ours it is not necessary to pinch pennies in this respect. Surely it is not wise public policy to exact a penalty which is concerned with a widow's mite.

The costs to the social security system of making this change would be relatively minor. Currently the number of widowed mothers receiving social security benefits is around 270,000. As I have said, the average benefit they receive is only $38 per month. Can we, in good conscience, believe that we cannot make the change in our social-security system because of the amount of money which is involved? The answer is obvious.

But to the 270,000 mothers involved the regular monthly benefit is a very important item, even though its amount is so small. None of us need be told of what an additional $38 per month can mean in meeting the needs of a growing family. This amount may represent the difference between good medical care and inadequate care in some families. In others it could represent the difference between good nourishing food and just enough food.

Early this year, hundreds of mothers working for the Federal Government learned how important these benefits were to the family budget. For beginning January 1, 1955, the effect of the retirement test was extended to cover all earnings from any source. Previously mothers working in the Federal Government had received full benefits without penalty because they were not working in employment covered by social security. They are still not covered by social security, but they have lost the right to the "mother's benefit." My bill would restore to them the benefit which they formerly received, and extend the same privilege to other widowed mothers in similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must consider the circumstances of these working mothers. At the death of their husbands too many of them are practically forced to go to work to provide adequately for their children. The very act of getting a job adds to their expense, for adequate care for the children must be provided, and this costs money. On their shoulders rests the full family responsibility for providing for the children's future. Is this the kind of situation in which we should be exacting penalties?

I believe that it is not. The Congress has recognized the particular problem of widowed working mothers, by providing tax relief for them because of their added expenses for child care. I believe this Congress should act, on the same grounds, to remove the existing penalty against these same mothers as it applies to social-security benefits.

I urge your support for my bill, which would amend the Social Security Act to provide that no deduction on account of outside earnings shall be made in the case of widows having dependent children in their care.

Civilian or Military Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, May 21, 1955:

So many military men are being sent on special diplomatic missions and are serving in other civil positions in Government that we begin to wonder if they are not gaining too much influence in the determination of our foreign policy, and in their impact on American life.

If this trend continues, we could find ourselves living in a garrison state, even though we are not engaged in actual war.

This raises the question as to whether in checking the spread of communism we are relying too heavily upon military and economic factors.

Of course we need armed strength, because that alone prevents the Communists from conquering the world by force.

But it does not prevent Communist infiltration, and it does not win the allegiance of wavering nations who look for more positive and constructive signs of leadership.

Make no mistake about it, we have very competent military leaders who are unsurpassed in their field. God knows we need them. If we did not have a strong Military Establishment, led by skilled and experienced professionals for whom the Communists have a realistic respect, our situation would be desperate.

It is not my purpose to suggest that our military leaders are seeking supremacy over the civilian authorities. I simply raise the question: "Are we not taking the lazy and dangerous way of expecting too much from them? Are we not inviting military control and direction by failing to think out and decide upon other factors in the shaping of our foreign policy?"

Up until 1917 we had little to do with the rest of the world, busy as we were with the development of our own country. Yet even under these circumstances, and from the time the first settlers stepped ashore in the New World, we were determined that civilians should guide the destiny of the American people.

This principle assumes greater importance, now that we have become the champion of freedom versus communism. The tired nations of Europe that have been weakened by wars, and the young nations of Asia that still remember and resent the white man's domination of them, backed by military force, will not cooperate with us if we insist on material power to conquer all problems.

Our own Declaration of Independence, in registering its protests against the tyrannous acts of George III, pointed out that, and I quote: "He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislature. He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power." The Bill of Rights incorporated in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 echoed the now familiar refrain that "as, in time of peace, armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without the consent of the legislature; and the military power shall always be held in an exact subordination to the civil authority and be governed by it."

As a result of the victories in the Revolution and in succeeding wars, in nearly all of which militiamen and volunteers bore the brunt of the initial fighting, the conviction of the American people that a formidable Regular Army was not a necessity became progressively stronger. It has only been in recent years as our responsibilities became worldwide that our traditional military policy has undergone public reexamination.

On the other hand, a gross slighting of defense forces can prove a tragically expensive luxury. Gen. Emory Upton, in his famed analysis of America's military policy from the Revolution through the first 2 years of the Civil War, observed that, and I quote: "Twenty thousand regular troops at Bull Run would have routed the insurgents, settled the question of military resistance and relieved us of the pain and expense of 4 years of war."

It is here that we must separate militarism, which dominated Germany under the Kaisers, which overthrows governments in South America today, and reaches for supreme power in Red Russia and Red China, from the military way with which democracies must defend themselves from actual or would-be aggressors.

Every war is fought and every army is maintained in a military way and in a militaristic way. The distinction is fundamental and fateful, according to Alfred Vagts. The military way is marked by a primary concentration of men and materials on winning specific objectives of power with the utmost efficiency, that is, with the least expenditure of blood and treasure. It is limited in scope, confined to one function, and scientific in its essential qualities. Militarism, on the other hand, presents a vast array of customs, interests, prestige, actions, and thought associated with armies and wars and yet transcending true military purposes. Indeed, militarism is so constituted that it may hamper and defeat the purposes of the military way. Its influence is unlimited in scope. It may permeate all society and become dominant over all industry and arts. Rejecting the scientific character of the military way, militarism displays the qualities of caste and cult, authority and belief.

Elihu Root, onetime Secretary of War, statesman and sage, in a testimonial to his country's men at arms, delivered in 1899, declared that:

"No one ever knew of the American Army seeking to make itself a political agent. No one ever knew of the American Army seeking to make itself a Pretorian guard to set up a president or an emperor. Whenever the enlarged Army of the United States finds the duty of the hour accomplished it melts back into the mass of the people unnoticed. When the Civil War was over, the million men under Grant's command took their way to their homes. The greatest military power which to that day had ever existed, never dreamed for a moment of threatening the institutions of our free Government."

After World War II, I might add, we also demobilized suddenly, this time with unfortunate consequences, leaving a vacuum into which communism moved.

Since the start of World War II the armed services have not only pervaded the public consciousness as never before but have also exercised an unprecedented influence on educational, economic, and political affairs.

Fully cognizant of their newly won power and prestige, military leaders have not hesitated to venture into other fields beyond their accustomed purview.

The censorship imposed in recent years by the services has been almost limitless. A great deal of information which probably should have become public property has been labeled "secret" and buried from civilian view. It is not the democratic way to misuse security requirements for the purpose of concealing blunders, waste, or political maneuvers.

The prominence in world affairs, political as well as military, attained by America's top military figures since the advent of World War II, and the high incidence of succession by our generals and admirals to major civil responsibility, have constituted one of the most important public developments of the postwar period. It would appear to Arthur Krock, keen editorial writer of the New York Times, that "If the world remains an armed camp, possibly aspirants to public life should investigate the curricula of (American) service academies."

Or as Quincy Wright observed as a result of the second global war that enlisted the active services of more Americans than ever before:

"It has left the American people with a greater disposition than at any previous time to trust professional military opinion and to employ the military method in foreign policy. It is clear that if armies increase in size, and if military experience extends to a larger and larger proportion of the population, the military mind is more likely to become characteristic of the national mind."

Objections to the use of the military in civil positions are impressive. The career soldier may be dictatorial and uncompromising, a natural result of lifelong discipline. He tends to ignore public opinion and, sometimes, even to slight civilian rights, and military methods of organization have been known to make for inefficiency when applied to civilian projects.

It has been urged in some quarters that soldiers be barred from doubling as diplomats, if only because the use of the military in key civil posts, especially in the Foreign Service, has led friendly observers abroad to wonder whether the United States has become imperialist-minded.

Most of us are certain that this is not so, but we cannot ignore this reaction among other people.

I am not going to mention the long list of professional officers who have served and are serving in sensitive civilian posts and as officials of our Government both here and abroad.

I refrain from doing this out of grateful respect for their military services.

However, in view of our Nation's traditional belief in the civil supremacy over the military, and in view of the disturbing trend toward the employment of military personnel in civilian posts, I believe that the American people should think hard about this contradiction and of the effects it may have upon American life and upon foreign policy if this emphasis gains strength.

I reiterate that under present world conditions we must have a modern and competent Military Establishment.

But the extension of that power and influence throughout the whole fabric and functioning of American life poses the serious question of the protector gradually assuming the role of master.

Unintentionally, perhaps, but pervasive.

The pressures of the cold war may test us for many years to come.

This is no excuse, however, for subordinating other strengths and value to a dependence upon economic and military factors.

The concentration on things military, and the selection of military men for civil positions in Government is a disturbing development.

Many Americans are dismayed by the successive retreats in our foreign policy regarding Asia. The "keep 'em guessing" strategy of the administration seems to be working on its authors. There is no other way to excuse the day-to-day confusion resulting from bold pronouncements, followed by ill-concealed diplomatic appeasements. Somewhere the rudder has been lost.

While this indicates lack of intellectual courage and moral stamina on the part of some civilian leaders, it is no reason why we should delegate all responsibility to the military mind.

From the great resources of the American people, their faith in God, their sense of justice, and their passion for freedom, we should draw the balanced strength to do what is right.

In the long run, that is our surest guide.

Statesmen and generals must never forget that they are servants of the American people and are duty bound to represent the best in our traditions.

Neither arrogant militarism nor cowardly compromises will see us through.

Instead of a manic-depressive foreign policy, we should build one that includes all the constructive values that are summed up in the basic integrity of a well-informed, generous, and courageous public opinion.

It is we the people who must lead.

The National Townsend Convention, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of Americans who, in my estimation, could properly be classed as the veterans of a half-century of productive output in America which is almost beyond belief. On May 2 of this year, representatives of this "veteran's" group met in St. Petersburg, Fla., where they had the opportunity of honoring their great patriarch, Dr. Francis Townsend. Since that day in September 1933, when this retired country doctor sat down and wrote a letter to a Long Beach newspaper, he has been carrying forward his great fight for security in declining years.

In the depths of a deep depression, Dr. Townsend dared to say two very important things. He demonstrated his faith in the American people by declaring that the way out of want and despair in years of retirement lay in increasing our productive power as a nation. Secondly, he dared to say that the aged members of our national community are entitled to a decent retirement income which will assure them of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness rather than a mere pittance which barely keeps them alive.

The passing years have demonstrated that his faith in our country and its productive power was justified. His concept that assured retirement income, with no questions asked, is the right of American workers, was incorporated into the Social Security Act of 1935. In the years which followed the Townsend organization has been in the forefront of every movement for the improvement and extension of the social security system. They have continued to perform the function—so vital in a democracy—of keeping us all informed as to the weaknesses and inequities in the structure of our economy, which form the dangerous hazards on the road of our continuing quest for a better life for all Americans.

On the occasion of the recent Townsend Convention, I forwarded the following message to St. Petersburg:

On the occasion of the 15th national convention of your fine organization, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for your outstanding progress in the past and, I'm sure, for the tenacious and optimistic program which you have planned for the future. Since my first day in office as Representative of Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District, I have been a stanch advocate of your commendable plan, one which most certainly should receive further consideration from the Congress of the United States. Your organization very definitely can count on me to assist you in your future endeavor to alleviate the chronic problems of old age. Again, permit me to extend my congraulations to you at this time and I trust that your program is a successful one. I will have the occasion of your national convention duly noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From all over the land Americans assembled to mark the gains which the organization has made so far and to stake out goals for the future. The nature of these goals speak of the spirit of the Townsend movement. For today Townsendites are engaged in communities throughout the land in a crusade against the lien laws, which require recipients of old-age assistance in many States to sign over their homes before they can receive a penny of relief. They are campaigning against the shame lists which make the names of old-age assistance recipients in many States a matter of public record subject to inspection. They are appropriately concerned with the residence requirements which deny any relief at all to too many of our senior citizens.

The Townsend movement is broad in its scope and great in its goals. Its program is built upon a concept of the rights of Americans—the right to freedom from want; the right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources; the right to decent housing; the right to the respect of the community based on service to the community; and the right to live with dignity as a free human being. I salute the spirit and purpose of the members of this great organization for the breadth of their vision and the courage and humanity in their hearts.

Merry-Go-Round on the Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Buffalo Evening News carries the headline "MILLER Calls Democratic Bills on Falls Power Socialistic," and the article which follows goes on to explain how my colleague, Congressman MILLER, of Lockport, feels that two Democratic-sponsored measures for development of power at Niagara Falls by the New York State Power Authority are "varying degrees of socialism." On the very next page of the same issue appears another interesting headline on the same subject "Private Power Couldn't Profit in St. Lawrence," Moses says, and below that in subheadline type, "That's Why Five Concerns Gave Up on That Project and Now Seek Falls Development. He Charges." In the article which follows, Chairman Robert Moses, of State power authority, fires a return salvo at the sponsors of private-power development. But examining still another and earlier issue of the News, we see that even the "two Democratic-sponsored measures are not in agreement," as we read the headline "LEHMAN Denounces Niagara Power Bill—Will Submit His Own." In other words, the Senator from New York State is displeased, to say the least, with the bill sponsored by the New York State Power Authority.

We see three different viewpoints, each one sincere, each one has its points, and all are in complete disagreement. But there is one thing they all say together, as one man, even though you have to read between the lines to see it. They say, "Here is concrete evidence that the stalemate on Niagara power which has now continued for 5 long years, at a cost of $300 million in lost power, will continue for some time yet." They reflect the fact that with a Republican administration in Washington and a Democratic Congress, and a Republican New York State Legislature, and a Democratic Governor, it would be little short of a miracle if the controversy which has raged over the Niagara for 5 long years were settled overnight.

All of this controversy points up more eloquently than anything I could say, the need for immediate passage of H. R. 5377 which I introduced last March 30. It simply calls for immediate construction of power development works on the Niagara by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical construction agency, so that construction can proceed while these divergent interests are settling their differences. In that way, the project will be finished and not just beginning when those differences are settled, as they some day must be.

A recent editorial in the Buffalo Evening News accurately captures the spirit in which I introduced this bill. It recognizes the disastrous stalemate which has imposed a stranglehold on this essential project for 5 years, and which threatens to continue indefintely into the future. It realistically appraises the chances of complete settlement of the whole Niagara problem at this session of Congress, and it finds them not very good. It observes the nonpartisan character of my bill for immediate construction, and the fact that it is not inconsistent with any final solution which is ultimately adopted, whether now, or 4 or 5 years from now, because construction started today, will not be completed for that length of time. It notes that Canada, which can use our share of the power until we are in position to use it, has now completed its project, not 1 year ahead of us, as originally feared, but 5 years ahead of us if we started today. It recognizes that passage of the Radwan bill would itself act as a spur to the setlement of the differences which plague the Niagara, and that other pending bills are natural extensions of my bill for immediate, nonpartisan construction, and not inconsistent with it. It repeats the sober statistics that the value of the American share of this power, which has flowed over the falls since the 1950 treaty authorized us to develop it, is $300 million; that if we started today, $300 million worth would run over the falls before we finished.

Almost $10 million worth of power has run over the falls since I introduced my bill, and while it has languished in committee. Meanwhile, Buffalo and the Niagara frontier are denied power which they need for their industries, and to attract new industries; and the State and the Nation are denied their full power potential at a time when we need all we can get to meet the growing power behind the Iron Curtain. A recent editorial in the Washington Evening Star points out that the need for more electrical power in this country is doubled every 10 years.

As I stated to the chairman of the Public Works Committee in a recent letter urging him to report out this bill, I have no pride of authorship in it. If anyone has any ideas which will improve it and speed its passage, I will be pleased to consider its amendment, so long as I can preserve its basic intent. But who can, in good conscience, oppose its basic intent? This is one situation where we can only lose, not gain, by the passage of time.

Rock Island Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the defense appropriation bill for 1956 was recently presented it contained a provision that—

> No part of the funds appropriated in the act could be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

The object of the provision was to protect the work performed by civilian personnel in the Defense Department from being given to private contractors unless such disposal or transfer could be justified before the appropriate committees of Congress. In other words, it was designed to protect the continuation of work done in our arsenals, navy yards, and so forth.

An attempt was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to strike this provision out of the bill.

I have consistently supported various proposals to get the Government out of business as I felt the Government should not compete with private business when the work can be done just as economically outside. I believe the Government should not take over functions which can properly be justified by private industry; and if it has done so, I believe it should withdraw and not be a competitor of free enterprise.

On the other hand, proper functions of the Government should be retained by the Government. I believe the work at our arsenals is such a proper function and should not be turned over to private industry. The arsenal at Rock Island is such an example. Besides repair work on arms and other ammunition of war as laid out by Congress in 1862, it carries on research development for the Ordnance Corps, manufactures and assembles material as required for the effective accomplishment of assigned missions, and performs functions of maintenance and supply.

There are hundreds of skilled workers who have been especially trained for these jobs. Some families have devoted themselves to these skills for generations. The arsenal at Rock Island has as fine or finer machine tools than any private manufacturing plant I know of. To turn this work over to private industry is not in the best interest of economy.

I voted against the Vinson amendment because I did not want to take any chances of eliminating the work at the Rock Island Arsenal by having it assigned to private industry in other parts of the country. Not only have I tried in this instance to protect the fine work being done at this arsenal but I have made every attempt to get additional work allocated there in an effort to increase the workload and avoid unemployment.

The American Exporter and the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at the 56th annual meeting of the Rice Millers Association held in Washington on May 12 and 13, my colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana, delivered a significant address which is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

He and I have much in common besides the fact that we both bear the same name. We represent districts which are tremendous producers of rice. We also have deep-sea ports with their attendant problems of ocean shipping. Mr. THOMPSON is on the Merchant Marine Committee, where I served with a great deal of satisfaction for a number of years. I still retain my deep interest in our American Merchant Marine—a vital component of our national defense, and a mighty force in maintaining peaceful commerce in the world of civilized nations.

I commend to each Member of Congress the address of Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana, which I insert in the RECORD herewith.

THE AMERICAN EXPORTER AND THE MERCHANT MARINE

(Address of Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, 56th annual meeting, the Rice Millers' Association, May 13, 1955)

Mr. Reid, members of the Rice Millers' Association, and distinguished guests, when your president, Mr. William M. Reid, asked me to address this group today, he requested that I talk on a topic that would be related to my committee work in Congress as well as to the interests of the rice marketing trade. He suggested that perhaps my work with the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee might provide a great deal of information of interest to rice millers and other segments of the rice industry, all of whom engage in or are affected by export business.

There are times when it takes a tremendous stretch of the imagination for a congressional speaker to relate his committee work to the particular interests of the group which he is called upon to address. That is certainly not so with me here today, and I am very happy to have this opportunity to talk with you briefly about two subjects which mean a great deal to me: the American merchant marine and the rice industry, both of which are of prime importance to the economy of my home State, Louisiana.

Prior to going into a discussion of current day rice problems and the merchant marine consideration in connection therewith, I would like to express at this time my sincere appreciation to the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, chairman of the Rice Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, the members of the subcommittee, and all of my colleagues in the rice-growing areas for their extremely generous and active help in matters so important to us in Louisiana. If the remarks I have prepared for this meeting are repetitious in any manner, I only hope that they are not too far different from those stated by my cousin from Texas, as I feel sure that any statement made by him can be considered as authoritative.

I am sure the major problem confronting this convention is that of high rice production in the United States which, based on a report of the Department of Agriculture in December 1954, was expected to reach a total for 1954–55 of 50,106,000 hundredweight (rough basis). Of this amount, plus a 7.6 million hundredweight carryover from the 1953–54 crop, about 27 million hundredweight, it was estimated, would be domestic consumption and 26 million hundredweight exported, leaving a carryover of about 14 million hundredweight. However, because of political policies followed by the administration (unless the State Department changes its policy of interferring), our exports this year will amount to only about 20 million hundredweight, which will leave us with a carryover probably in excess of 20 million hundredweight. According to the Department of Agriculture, this carryover is an all-time record as compared with the 1948–52 average of 2.8 million hundredweight. We, therefore, find ourselves in a very unusual position when it is borne in mind that prior to World War II average rice exports were about 2¼ million hundredweight (milled) as against the average for the past 3 years of 16½ million hundredweight (milled rice). Thus, where export production prior to World War II was only 17.6 percent of the rice milled in the United States, now well over one-half of our production, or 55.7 percent, is dependent upon export markets.

Most of this increase has come about through the loss of production in the Asiatic countries in the chaotic period following the war, with a special upsurge of demand during and following hostilities in Korea. Today, however, there is beginning to be a return to high production in the Far East, with a consequent downward trend in the price of rice from the record levels of 1952–53. From recent reports which I have had an opportunity to examine, the subject is a very complicated one with many ramified economic aspects. Various proposals have been made, such as a two-price marketing plan, to enable the American industry to retain its present high level of production and efficiency, and yet compete in the world market, maintain or increase domestic consumption, and avoid the building up of wasteful surpluses.

In this connection several years ago representatives of the fishing industry of northeastern United States appeared before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to tell of their problems with regard to world competition. One witness, complaining of competition in the domestic market from foreign imports, indicated that the industry would be in sound condition if domestic consumption of New England fish could be increased. The suggestion was made by a committee member that perhaps this problem could be met if Lent could only be made a little longer. To date that suggestion has not been successfully put into effect. Similarly, talking off the top of my head, I might try to help by suggesting that increase in domestic rice consumption could be brought about by governmental action designed to encourage a greater number of marriages each year as a stimulus to the sale of rice supplies.

However, I believe I realize my limitations well enough to leave that problem to your domestic marketing experts who make a full time job of selling rice to the American consumer. I will confine my remarks to a matter I have given a great deal of thought during the past few years.

I think it is safe to say that during this past Congress the most important legislation considered by the Merchant Marine Committee was the proposal which, when enacted into law, became the Cargo Preference Act. This act, Public Law 664, provides, among other things, that at least 50 percent of all cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States flag vessels, to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for United States flag commercial vessels. The Cargo Preference Act enacted into general law the principle which has been spelled out in every individual foreign-aid program since the war. It conforms with the spirit and intent of our national maritime policy which recognizes the need for an American merchant marine sufficient to transport a substantial portion of our waterborne commerce and to serve as military or naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. We hoped, with the enactment of this legislation, that Congress would not be confronted with irrelevant speechmaking in opposition to the 50–50 principle, diverting attention from the main issue every time proposals are brought up for consideration involving the disposal of surplus commodities to our friends and allies elsewhere in the free world. We thought, and I am convinced, that the provisions of this act are eminently fair and reasonable and, in fact, necessary in the national interest so long as vast Government-aid programs substitute for a large portion of our normal foreign trade. So did a majority of both Houses and the President, as attested by the approval of the Cargo Preference Act on August 26, 1954.

Notwithstanding the action of the Congress and the President on this legislation, the enemies of an American merchant marine and those of our own citizens who believed that the simple and obvious answer to the most economical transportation of our foreign trade is to withdraw all Government support and turn the business over to the merchant marines of other nations are still at work trying to undermine the Cargo Preference Act. No sooner had the 84th Congress convened than stories began appearing in the American press that the administration's program for sale of farm surpluses overseas is "running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in Public Law 664." These stories would have had you believe that the law makes it mandatory that 50 percent of agricultural products must be shipped in American vessels, irrespective of the availability of tonnage or the reasonableness of rates. They would have had you believe that greedy American shipowners were using the law to gouge the American farmer and the American Government. The stories made no reference to the fact that under this law if American-flag vessels are not available at reasonable rates, then foreign-flag vessels may be freely used.

Our committee, which has made a close study of this problem in relation to the needs of the American merchant marine for

a number of years, was very much disturbed at the untrue and unfair charges leveled at the Cargo Preference Act. It was even more disturbing and very significant to find that coincident with the publicity in the American press similar attacks were being made in the shipping journals of Europe.

In the course of hearings held on the administration of the Cargo Preference Act in February 1955, it seemed clear that much of the opposition to the act came from the efforts, direct or indirect, of foreign nationals to undermine the legislation. No matter how the opposition would state it, it is obvious that their goal is to compel the reduction of the American merchant marine so they may increase transportation for their own shipping at the same time they are saying it is discriminatory and wrong for us to want only 50 percent of the business which we are giving away.

To the best of my recollection, I have received no complaints from members of the rice industry in my area about the operations of our 50–50 policy in foreign-aid programs or any charges that the American merchant marine is an unnecessary burden on the taxpayer. Nevertheless, I feel that it is timely to raise the subject before you, because it has been the agricultural interests of the Nation which have been the misguided opponents to this important bulwark of our national transportation policy.

Perhaps I know why I have had no complaints from my gulf coast friends and constituents. They have seen and enjoyed the prosperity which has come to the gulf coincident with—and I believe attributable to—the upbuilding of modern American-flag ocean shipping services sailing from our ports. The American gulf coast now lined by flourishing port cities served by several leading American-flag cargo lines, with service to all parts of the world, was once wholly dependent for its export-import trade upon foreign-flag carriers which furnished a sporadic service or withdrew altogether except during the seasonal peak cargo movements of cotton, rice, and other products.

The danger of placing reliance upon imprudent or shortsighted policies of dependence on foreign-flag shipping was graphically emphasized by Mr. Solon B. Turman, president of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., when, in an appearance before the southeastern area transportation conference of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in New Orleans on February 3, he discussed the predicament in which the American shipping industry found itself only 40 years ago. Mr. Turman said:

"This Nation had so neglected its merchant marine just before World War I that our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export-import trade. When war broke in Europe we were still a neutral Nation and found ourselves without ships even for our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed. Goods and materials piled up on the docks. As an example, in August 1913, we exported 257,000 bales of cotton. In August 1914, only a year later, this dropped to 21,000 bales. And because we did not have the ships to make deliveries, the price of cotton dropped from $62.50 a bale in July 1914, to $36.25 in December of the same year."

During that period much of the foreign-flag shipping, upon which we had been relying, was withdrawn because of the European hostilities. Thus, even before the heavy movement of munitions and due to the absence of sufficient American ships, ocean shipping rates went up 700 percent. When the war got going full blast, these rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent. Contrast this with our experience in World War II, when we had providentially developed at least the beginning of a modern American flag merchant marine. Despite the vastly greater demands upon shipping, at no time during that period did American shipping rates rise higher than 70 percent. Therefore, I must agree with Mr. Turman when he said, "It seems incredible that the need for an American flag merchant marine can still remain a subject for debate." Yet there are, even today, many Americans, including some in high quarters, who have yet to learn that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than our first line of defense. It is our advance line of action. It is our protection against the enemy on the economic front long before our first line of military defense is called into action.

Our experience in World War I should provide example enough to all Americans that our domestic economy cannot depend on foreign flag merchant marines to carry our export and import trade. But, lest anyone feel that things have changed in the past 35 or 40 years, let me refer to a clipping from a recent issue of the Financial Post, published at Toronto, Canada, which provides a current dramatic example of the effect of too few national flag merchant ships on a nation's economy. Within the past few years our good neighbor, Canada, decided it could not support an adequate merchant marine, with the result that most of its merchant fleet left the Canadian flag. Let me read briefly from this story:

"Swiftly climbing ship charter rates are causing a serious vessel shortage at both Canadian coasts, which is interfering with export orders.

"Because of a worldwide lack of available bottoms, shippers are having to pay almost 100 percent more for cargo space in Vancouver and about 60 percent more in Halifax than last summer. * * *

"With the high world demand for merchant ships, foreign-flag vessels have been diverted from servicing Canadian ports to the more profitable trans-Pacific and Mediterranean runs.

" 'This,' W. J. Fisher, general manager of the Canadian Shipowners Association, told the Post 'is one of the disadvantages of not having an adequate Canadian flag merchant fleet. Canadian ships must come home, because they have Canadian crews. A Canadian flag fleet would go a long way in eliminating the current shipping shortage.' "

Let me cite just one more example of our need for an American merchant marine supported by our Government and supported by our exporters and importers. I do not believe it is generally realized that better than 80 percent of all ocean transportation to Korea during the recent war was supplied by American ships. So, let's look at rice export statistics. For the period 1950–51, 271,000 bags of American rice were shipped to Korea; in 1951–52 shipments totaled 2,821,000 bags; and, in 1952–53 American rice exports to Korea consisted of 4,631,000 bags. I think it is fair to consider that wartime devastation and postwar rehabilitation were largely responsible for such heavy imports by a rice-producing nation. But, my point is that during their period of great need the American rice industry was able to supply the demand with almost full dependence upon American-flag shipping.

Naturally we cannot depend, nor do we have any desire to depend upon the misery and domestic dislocations of our friends abroad for the creation of our export markets. But, we can depend upon a strong American flag merchant marine to create new international trade through the operations of their trade development and promotion departments. Our home-based shipping industry is eager to assist American businessmen to develop new sales markets abroad.

American steamship companies have trade development offices located in every State in the Union, manned with trained specialists to work with industrialists, businessmen and financial people in developing new markets or locating new sources of supply. As a result of these combined trade development activities of American flag lines, over 2,000 domestic and foreign firms are personally contacted every working day of the year and offered the assistance of this vast international network of trade promotional facilities. Fifteen subsidized American steamship lines operate 113 domestic promotion offices, 143 foreign offices, and employ 900 foreign and domestic freight agencies. Through their membership in shipping conferences it costs no more to ship via an American cargo liner than aboard a foreign liner.

Let me mention 2 leading American shipping companies with their home port in New Orleans, and with operations of frequent, regular and dependable service all over the world. I refer to Mississippi Shipping Co. (Delta Line), and Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. The strength of the economy of the Gulf States means more to them than anything else in the world. They are dedicated to giving the gulf area rice exporters unfailing service. They are dedicated to giving that service to all American exporters and importers and to do everything within their power to increase the flow of trade through the gulf area. Their services will be available when foreign flag shipping disappears for whatever reason. The same, of course, is true of all of the companies in our American merchant marine but I could not resist an opportunity to put in a plug for these 2 great companies from home.

With the vastly higher standards of living in the United States as compared with those of competitive maritime nations, our merchant marine is naturally at a disadvantage because of the big spread between United States and foreign costs of ship construction and operation. The wage differential alone demonstrates the problem of operating American ships in competition with our foreign friends. The average monthly wage cost of operating an American-flag cargo vessel in 1952 was $24,500, as against $4,100 under Japanese registry, $5,100 under German registry, and $6,500 under British registry. Therefore, we must offset that differential in some way if we are to maintain the merchant marine which our commerce and security require. Our Government meets this problem by the granting of subsidies only sufficient to place the American-ship operator on a cost parity with his foreign competitor. In return, the operator agrees to have available at all times the equipment and the know-how to provide frequent, regular, and dependable service to the American businessmen and the vital logistic support required in times of war and national emergency.

The opportunity which has come to me during my 2½ years of service in the Congress and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has given me the unshakable conviction that support of a strong American merchant marine is one of the cheapest forms of insurance which this Nation can have, and provides the greatest assurance that our foreign trade will develop and prosper. Your voluntary patronage of the American merchant marine will go a long way toward increasing your selling power in the markets of the world.

Who Should Blush Over Echo Park?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a recent incident emphasizes how deeply felt is the Echo Park issue involved in the up-

per Colorado River storage project. So intense is the feeling, so deeply has the issue of invading the National Park System touched the conscience of the American people, that a great newspaper has gone out of its way to attack an innocent action of conservationists who are defending Echo Park against spoliation.

So touchy has this Echo Park subject become that an innocent letter of invitation to membership in the Wilderness Society, in which no mention is made of Echo Park, has been interpreted by the Denver Post, in an editorial entitled "They Should Blush," as a sinister attack on the upper Colorado River storage project.

Psychologists tell us that when we are insecure about our beliefs, we do irrational things. Can it be that the Denver Post, for which I have the utmost respect, is not very secure in its position that Echo Park Dam should be built and thus forever ruin the Dinosaur National Monument and pave the way also to other invasions of our National Park System?

Can it be that the Denver Post's tortured misreading of the conservationists' simple little letter or invitation to membership is an indication that those who are pressing for the proposed Echo Park Dam need the solace of believing that those who are opposing it are dishonest and sinister and that therefore the proponents' position—however uneasy—is justified?

It requires a very touchy conscience indeed to read into the straightforward general invitation to membership sent out by the Wilderness Society, a highly respected conservation organization, the kind of meaning which led the Denver Post to say editorially that conservationists "should blush" to send out such material.

It needs a very touchy conscience indeed to say of the photograph printed with this membership invitation that "it looks suspiciously like Mount Rainier in Washington." As a matter of fact, the photograph is of Mount Adams in the Mount Adams wild area, in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in Washington, chosen for no other reason than that it is an unusually fine picture of a wilderness area, illustrating all in one photograph: water, forests, and mountains.

Why should the Denver Post think the mere publication of a photograph—whether of Mount Rainier or of Mount Adams—is "suspicious"? I can think of only one reason: The Denver Post was implying that the Wilderness Society was trying to mislead people into thinking the photograph represented the Dinosaur National Monument.

If so, how foolish can people get? Only an uneasy conscience would suggest that an organization which knows the parks, monuments, and wilderness areas in the way that the Wilderness Society does, would be witless enough to try to pass off a photograph of Mount Adams—or Mount Rainier—for a photograph of Dinosaur or its Echo Park—areas so unlike each other that any novice can recognize the difference.

The Wilderness Society has answered the Denver Post's attack and has pointed out that the conservationists' opposition to Echo Park Dam is on the record in statements fully explaining their position and made in the deepest sincerity.

Says the society's executive secretary, Mr. Howard Zahniser, addressing the Denver Post:

> However you or others may differ from us as to conclusions, it seems to us that a full understanding of our position and our statements must lead to a respect for our sincerity and for our competence. We have based our recommendations on first-hand observations in the area involved, and on a searching examination of the principles with which we are concerned and the policies involved, and we feel that we have arrived at conclusions that are in the public interest from a national point of view and that also are considerate of the interest of our fellow citizens in the region most immediately concerned with the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

Far from blushing over their stanch and earnest insistence that the Echo Park Dam is unnecessary to the upper Colorado River storage project and over their presentation of evidence that such a dam would not only ruin the Dinosaur National Monument but would be also the entering wedge for the invasion of other national parks and monuments, the conservation organizations should, in my opinion, be proud.

They deserve the plaudits of the American people for their efforts to prevent the exploitation of our parks and monuments for the purposes contrary to those for which they were established.

With facts and figures, carefully worked out and presented to congressional committees, the conservation organizations have shown that the water needed by the upper Colorado States can be supplied without destroying the Dinosaur National Monument.

The conservation organizations have stood four-square—and continue to stand—as the bulwark against the invasion of our national parks and monuments. They represent the public conscience on conservation questions. They grind no personal axes.

Attacks on their integrity are without foundation in truth and will not turn them from their honorable purpose of protecting the public interest.

The editorial entitled "They Should Blush" from the Denver Post for May 2, 1955, is as follows:

> We have discovered recently, with more sorrow than anger, that some of our best people are not above using trickery and exaggeration in their campaign to stop the Echo Park project.
>
> We refer to the members of various organizations devoted to protecting nature from nasty human beings who are constantly in search of more water to drink and more water to put on crops.
>
> We knew these people would not approve of Echo Park Dam which would drown out a couple of canyons in a semiarid region which may look prettier to them than to the rest of us, but we expected them to keep their opposition within the realm of the factual. We were fooled.
>
> Suddenly more nature-protecting societies than we ever heard of have sprung into the battle with reckless propaganda which would make an old-time circus press agent blush.
>
> There is, for example, the recent pamphlet put out by the Wilderness Society. Its front cover is a picture of a mountain lake, a dense forest and a snow-covered peak in the background. (It looks suspiciously like Mount Rainier in Washington.)
>
> Opening the pamphlet the words that first strike your eye at the top of page 3 say, "Here they propose a dam which would substitute a 'millpond' for the waters which now plunge between walls of glorious canyons. There they would substitute stumps for our already pitifully small remnant of virgin forest."
>
> Of course, there is no direct statement that the scene on the cover is the one that would be despoiled by Echo Park Dam. But we believe any reader not acquainted with the site of the proposed dam would get the impression that calamity was about to befall an area comparable to Mount Rainier.
>
> Then there is another pamphlet just received from the Emergency Conservation Committee. This pamphlet has an actual Colorado River scene on its cover. But it outdoes the California opponents of Echo Park in its scare technique.
>
> Californians are shouting the upper basin storage project, of which Echo Park is a key part, would cost $4 billion. The Emergency Conservation Committee has raised the cost to $15 billion. We won't be surprised if the next pamphlet to come in will say $50 billion.
>
> According to the emergency committee, "Not one teacupful of water from the dam at Echo Park would reach the water-impoverished people." That argument, of course, is pure chicanery and we are sorry to see our best people using it. Such tactics can do a lot of harm to the cause of legitimate nature protection in the long run.

The pamphlet referred to is a "Dear Friend" letter from the Wildernes Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C., signed by its president, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, as follows:

> DEAR FRIEND: If you are like most Americans, you have imagined—or even experienced—the wilderness; lofty mountains, vast carpets of forest which cover their slopes and valleys between them, white water of rushing streams and waterfalls, placid lakes, and ponds—all of these untouched, unmolested by man.
>
> Some people are fortunate enough to experience it, to walk its rough trails, climb its mountains, and paddle its lakes; to feel its noonday heat, hear the night breeze sighing in the treetops overhead, and absorb the peace and serenity of the stars.
>
> Some of us have just to imagine it, or relive past experiences in it, or hope that one day we shall have such opportunities, or that our children will have them.
>
> But all of us can take satisfaction in knowing that some wilderness is still to be found in America, even after three and a half centuries of exploitation. And we hope that we shall continue to have some of it—some samples of our original America, where forests remain uncut, streams undammed and unpolluted, the earth free of the pockmarks of mining, the mountain meadows ungrazed except by wild animals native to them.
>
> We hope, but we are not too sure.
>
> Shortsighted, practical men are threatening the diminishing areas of our original heritage, even those which have been set aside for preservation.
>
> Here they propose a dam which would substitute a millpond for the waters which now plunge between walls of glorious canyons. There they would substitute stumps for our already pitifully small remnant of virgin forest, the growth of centuries, which other, more farsighted, men have struggled to hold inviolate.
>
> Nowhere, unless we can defend it sturdily and persistently, can we be sure of handing on to our children, and to their children, any part of the wilderness. It needs a spokesman.

The Wilderness Society exists so that all of us may work together, effectively, to protect these wild lands. The society is a defender of the national parks and the wilderness areas of the national forests and of all lands dedicated to the preservation of wilderness and the natural scene.

Will you not play a part in this effort by joining the Wilderness Society? Your membership will contribute to the welfare of future generations; it will be an investment from which, we are sure, you will profit in profound and lasting satisfaction.

Incidentally, your membership will entitle you to receive the society's beautiful quarterly magazine, The Living Wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

OLAUS J. MURIE,
President.

Mr. Speaker, is there trickery in this letter, or exaggeration? After all, I wonder just who should be blushing over this Echo Park incident?

Government Pursuant to the Constitution or Government by Treaty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in the question of law by treaty, a statement by the Honorable George A. Finch, a member of the bar of the District of Columbia and vice chairman of the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association. Mr. Finch presented this statement to the Senate subcommittee which is considering Senate Joint Resolution 1, called the Bricker amendment.

In this statement, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Finch answers many objections that the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have raised. The statement follows:

GOVERNMENT PURSUANT TO THE CONSTITUTION OR GOVERNMENT BY TREATY?

(Statement by George A. Finch, member of the bar of the District of Columbia; vice chairman of the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association, May 11, 1955)

The title I have given to this statement poses the question that this committee and the Senate of the United States are called upon to decide in considering Senate Joint Resolution 1. I am appearing in support of the resolution. I reject the argument that government by treaty is government pursuant to the Constitution. According to the Supreme Court, the Constitution does not require that treaties be made pursuant thereto. (*Missouri* v. *Holland*, 1920 (252 U. S. 416).)

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TREATIES

Everybody admits that no treaty has ever been declared unconstitutional. In my opinion no treaty will ever be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of its repeated holdings that the conduct of foreign relations is committed to the political departments of the Government "and the propriety of what may be done in the exercise of this political power is not subject to judicial inquiry or decision." (*Oetjen* v. *Central Leather Co.* (1918 (246 U. S. 297), and the earlier cases cited in Senate Report No. 412 made by the Senate Judiciary Committee on S. J. Res. 1 during the last session of Congress.) Accordingly, all statements by the Supreme Court that it is now the law that treaties may not violate the Constitution or do what it forbids have only the value of dicta. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will require the Supreme Court in future cases to give judicial sanction to what it has said on this point in the past.

In 1928, the then Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Harlan F. Stone, warned the American Bar Association of the striking extension of Federal police power during the last 30 years through the exercise of the treatymaking power. (Address of Chief Justice Stone, report of the American Bar Association, 1928, vol. 53, p. 259.) This process had received great impetus from the decision of the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland, supra.*

In the following year, former Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, and a future Chief Justice of the United States, speaking before the American Society of International Law as its president, referred to the "new line of activity" which "may in the future give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treatymaking power." (Proceedings of the American Society of International Law, 1929, pp. 194–196.)

APPROPRIATE SUBJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

There seems to be general acceptance of the view that treaties should only deal "with an appropriate subject of international agreement" (Report of the committee on amendments to the Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association, signed by the late lamented Hon. John W. Davis, former Solicitor General of the United States, and the Honorable William D. Mitchell, former Attorney General of the United States), and to subjects "which pertain to our external relations" (Mr. Hughes cited supra.)

The report of the New York State Bar Association conceded that if a treaty dealt with a subject not "appropriate for international agreement" then "the rule announced in *Missouri* v. *Holland* would operate to give the Congress power to implement the treaty by legislation which it could not enact in the absence of treaty and thus enter a field heretofore reserved to the States." Mr. Davis, before his death, opposed Senate Joint Resolution 1. The only suggestion his committee made to limit government by treaty and restore government pursuant to the Constitution was that "Treaties outside the normal field of international agreements and which can be used as a device to enlarge the powers of the Federal Government and diminish those of the States should be opposed as not within the treaty power." This is the position taken by Secretary of State Dulles on May 2 during the present hearings. That is to say, every time a President of the United States decides that treaties of the character deplored by Mr. Davis' committee and Secretary Dulles should be a part of our foreign policy, you Senators will be required to choose between the Constitution and the administration for the time being in power. Senate Joint Resolution 1 is designed and intended to safeguard the fate of the Constitution from the vicissitudes of partisan politics.

Mr. Hughes did not live to take part in the present debate; but he left the following indication of his views:

"If we attempted to use the treaty-making power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdictions of the States * * * there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treatymaking power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treatymaking power." (Cited supra.)

At the same time Mr. Hughes pointed out that the power to make treaties "is a power that has no express limitations attached to it," and he refused to "voice any opinion as to an implied limitation." He added: "The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such." Senate Joint Resolution 1 would resolve that doubt.

TREATIES AND DOMESTIC MATTERS

It is apparent from the foregoing that the crux of the problem involved in the present proposal for a constitutional amendment is the delimitation of a recognizable and acceptable line in treatymaking between subjects that are properly within the exercise of that power and subjects that are not. In the language of international and constitutional law the problem is expressed by the difference between matters regarded as "domestic" or "foreign," "internal" or "external," "interior" or "exterior." The difference is indicated in other countries by the official designations of their government departments charged with the conduct of international relations. There are departments of foreign affairs, departments of external affairs, and departments of exterior affairs. In the United States the ambiguous term Department of State is used.

The committee of the American Bar Association of which I am a member approached the drafting of a constitutional amendment by seeking a phraseology that would delimit the respective areas of domestic and foreign affairs in terms of the subject matter of treaties. That task is difficult because according to international law a domestic matter becomes foreign whenever a treaty is concluded on any subject. (Opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague in the Tunis-Morocco Nationality Question, 1923, Hudson, World Court Reports, vol. 1, p. 143.) That was the position taken by the Department of State during the last administration in justification of its participation in a series of treaties which would bypass the reservation embodied in the Charter of the United Nations that "Nothing contained in it shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state" (art. 2, par. 7). Our committee concluded that it would be futile to continue to seek distinction between domestic and foreign affairs in the subject matter of treaties, especially when we were confronted with an official publication of the Department of State, with a foreword by President Truman, which opened with the assertion "There is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs." (State Department Publication 3972, released September 1950.)

DOMESTIC MATTERS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Our committee then sought a delimitation, not in international law, but in the constitutional law of the United States. In our research we found that abuse of the treaty-making power, to which Mr. John Foster Dulles so forcefully called our attention in his address before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association at Louisville, Ky., on April 12, 1952 (see his speech quoted in S. Rept. No. 412, supra, p. 5), was among the sources of objections to the ratification of the Constitution of 1787. "To allay fears that the new National Government might seek to exercise powers not granted, and that the States might not be able to exercise freely their reserved powers," the tenth amendment was adopted. (*United States* v. *Darby*, 1941 (312 U. S. 100)). Thomas Jefferson,

leading advocate of the Bill of Rights, held the view that if the treatymaking power were unlimited "then we have no Constitution." After the Constitution was ratified and the Bill of Rights adopted he wrote as follows in his Manual of Parliamentary Practice:

"By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaty, and cannot be otherwise regulated. It must have meant to except out all those rights reserved to the States; for surely the President and Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way."

This interpretation of Jefferson, shared by two former Chief Justices of the Supreme Court in the present century, was adopted by the Committee on Peace and Law of the American Bar Association as containing an appropriate line of demarcation between domestic and foreign matters for the purposes of the exercise of the treatymaking power under the Constitution of the United States. That view prevailed during the infant years of the Nation and for many years into more modern times. In 1836 the Supreme Court held that "Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the Federal jurisdiction nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power." (*New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Peters 662, 736).) This holding was reversed by the Supreme Court in 1920 in the decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*. Senate Joint Resolution 1 seeks to restore the treatymaking power to its rightful place in our Federal system.

In his decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, Mr. Justice Holmes stated that "The case before us must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago." As a supporter of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I would bring Mr. Justice Holmes up to date and counter with the suggestion that the merits of that resolution should not be considered in the light of what Mr. Justice Holmes said 35 years ago.

RESERVATION OF DOMESTIC MATTERS BY THE SENATE

The interpretation of the Constiution by Jefferson has been confirmed by a long series of reservations appended to many treaties by the Senate before their approval by that body. For example, when the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the Charter of the Organization of American States on August 28, 1950, it did so subject to the reservation that "none of its provision shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States." (S. Doc. No. 87, 83d Con., 2d sess., p. 177.)

U. N. CHARTER AND DOMESTIC QUESTIONS

No reservation was attached to the Charter of the United Nations because it had embodied in it the reservation of domestic matters I have already quoted. Without that integral reservation it is doubtful that the charter would have received the advice and consent of the Senate by the requisite two-thirds vote; but, as I have indicated, the two preceding Executives sought to bypass the reservation in the manner described. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will restore the true meaning and effect of article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter in the sense that its original sponsors intended.

A comparable provision in the League of Nations Covenant was a limitation only on the powers of the League Council, but at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco the sponsoring governments transferred the paragraph in revised form to its present position in the charter as "a governing principle for the whole organization and its members." The official explanation of this change was given to the Conference by Mr. John Foster Dulles, of the United States delegation, who said that it was required by the broadening of the scope of the organization's functions, particularly in respect to economic, social, and cultural matters. It was intended, in partciular, he said, to require the organization in carrying out its economic and social objectives to deal with governments, instead of allowing the organization to "penetrate directly into the domestic life and social economy of the member states." (U. N. Conference on International Organization, Documents, vol. VI, pp. 507–508.)

Friendly commentators on the charter of the United Nations have this to say on the meaning of paragraph 7 of article 2:

"There can be little question of the importance of the paragraph. It establishes the principle that certain matters are to be excluded from the competence of the United Nations to act, in much the same way that the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States together with the other provisions of the Constitution limit the sphere of action of the Federal Government." (Charter of the United Nations, by Prof. Leland M. Goodrich, of Brown University, then director of the World Peace Foundation, and Edvard Hambro, then registrar of the International Court of Justice of The Hague.)

Those authors proceeded in their interpretation as follows:

"The practice of the United Nations makes it clear, as indeed does the phraseology of article 2 (7), that the word 'intervention' as used in the paragraph is not to be given a narrow technical interpretation. While discussion does not amount to intervention, the creation of a commission of inquiry, the making of a recommendation of a procedural or substantive nature, or the taking of a binding decision constitutes intervention under the terms of this paragraph." (Ibid., p. 120.)

BYPASSING ARTICLE 2, PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE U. N. CHARTER

Compare this analysis of the true intent and meaning of this reservation of domestic affairs from the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with the actual program of the Economic and Social Council as described by the Director of the United Nations Division of Human Rights:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of States. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supranational supervision in this relationship between the state and its citizens." (Mr. John P. Humphrey, in Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1948.)

The reason for a large segment of opposition to the proposed amendment was stated by the New York Times in an editorial of April 8, 1953, as follows:

"The resolution is dangerous because it forbids any treaty that would allow any foreign power or any international organization (meaning the U. N. or one of its agencies) to control the constitutional rights of American citizens within the United States 'or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States'."

At this point it will be enlightening to insert the opinion of another leading opponent of Senate Joint Resolution 1 on the constitutional position of the United States in the United Nations. I refer to Dr. Edward S. Corwin who maintains that—

"The question whether the United States should enter an international organization for the promotion of peace and of what pledges it should give with respect to the use of its constitutional powers to the same end, is one which the appropriate agencies of the National Government are free to decide on grounds of national interest, substantially unfettered by Constitutional Limitations of any kind." (The Constitution and World Organization, 1944, p. 30.)

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE TREATYMAKING POWER

When it was first proposed to substitute a treaty for constitutional amendment to enlarge the power of Congress for the protection of migratory birds, voices were raised in Congress against the future risks involved to our Constitution. On February 7, 1913, the Honorable Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, in opposing the first Federal Migratory Bird Act, said in the House of Representatives:

"Mr. Chairman, we live in the midst of revolution—revolution proposed and revolution threatened. It is true there are few open avowals of revolutionary intent; no armed forces hostile to our form of Government and to our institutions thunder at our gates or threaten our liberties. On the contrary, the forces of revolution, though they have among their leaders many supremely selfish and inordinately ambitious and some thoroughly irresponsible and consciousless men, are in the main composed of entirely well-meaning people, who, carried away by their enthusiasm or by the claims and sophistries of others, fail utterly to realize that they are the advocates and supporters of a revolutionary cause.

"This is a Government we are sworn to uphold. The portion of the sovereignty of the people which they have surrendered, or, rather, agreed to exercise jointly under a National Government, is set out in the Constitution in language reasonably clear and explicit; and that is the instrument we are sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, which includes well-meaning enemies as well as willfully wicked ones." (Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 11, 1954, p. 1578.)

Today, with Western civilization in a struggle for survival with atheistic communism, the risks predicted by Mr. Mondell exist to a greater degree and extent than when he spoke some 30 years ago.

Prior to the establishment of the United Nations, treaty stipulations with respect to individuals were limited in scope to the rights of aliens, in consideration of mutual concessions of similar treatment of citizens residing or doing business abroad. After the United States became a member of that organization representatives appointed by the President actively participated in United Nations programs to expand the area of international negotiation beyond the rights of aliens so as to include as matters of international concern the rights of citizens vis-a-vis their own governments and within their own countries. (See, for example, the Genocide Convention signed and sent to the Senate for approval, and the Covenants on Human Rights awaiting final action.)

That program, so candidly described as revolutionary by the United Nations Director of Human Rights (Mr. Humphrey, previously quoted), was lauded by President Truman and his State Department as "one of the great revolutionary enterprises." (State Department Publication 3972, previously cited.)

We do not dissent from the official admissions of the revolutionary character of those United Nations activities. The extraordinary parallelism between the United Nations Covenants on Human Rights and the Soviet Constitution has been shown in some detail by Dr. Felix Morley, who asserts: "Actually, a large part of the Soviet Constitution was almost textually embodied in these U. N. Covenants." (Treaty Law and the Constitution, New York, pp. 36–37.)

Senate Joint Resolution 1 has been drafted and is being supported by those who are

opposed to that kind of a revolution. We do not agree with Mr. Dulles that the raising and discussion of the question has reversed the dangerous trend in our ideological thinking and that no action need now be taken. We urge that this Trojan horse in our constitutional bulwarks be now removed against the time when the revolutionists will return to power and be in positions of authority to continue where they left off. The President and Secretary of State are not permanent officials of the Government. A constitutional amendment has been adopted to limit the President's tenure of office.

ATTEMPTED SEIZURE OF THE STEEL MILLS

An example of what Mr. Dulles meant when he said at Louisville that treaties might take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President was President Truman's attempt to seize the steel mills. His Executive order of April 8, 1952, was issued 4 days before Mr. Dulles made that statement. The President directed the seizure of that private property without due process of law, among other reasons "to fulfill our responsibilities in the efforts being made throughout the United Nations and otherwise to bring about a lasting peace," and because "American fighting men and fighting men of other nations of the United Nations are now engaged in deadly combat with the forces of aggression in Korea, and forces of the United States are stationed elsewhere overseas for the purpose of participating in the defense of the Atlantic community against aggression" (16 Federal Register, p. 3503). In other words, President Truman claimed and exercised this implied Executive power as flowing from the United Nations Charter, the NATO Treaty, and the war power, the last-mentioned being vested solely in Congress by the Constitution. The Supreme Court in a divided opinion on June 2, 1952, held 6 to 3, that the seizure was unconstitutional and without authority of law. (*Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. et al* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579).) A change of 2 votes in favor of the President's action would have reversed the Court's decision and made that Truman doctrine the law of the land.

Apologists for the minority opinion in the Steel Mills case deny that the case involved the treaties referred to. If that denial be true, why did the late Mr. Justice Jackson in his majority concurring opinion find it necessary to answer the President's foreign policy justification of his act, as follows:

"I cannot foresee all that might entail if the Court should endorse this argument. Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress. Of course a state of war may in fact exist without a formal declaration. But no doctrine that the Court could promulgate could seem to be more sinister and alarming than that a President whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely uncontrolled, and often even unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the Nation's Armed Forces to some foreign venture" (343 U. S., p. 642).

It is the purpose of the constitutional amendment now pending to remove the danger that a future Supreme Court will uphold a President's unconstitutional views of Executive power under treaties.

IN PURSUANCE OF THE CONSTITUTION—MISSOURI *v.* HOLLAND

The facts of this notorious case are so well known as not to require repetition. Mr. Justice Holmes' decision was doubtless in the mind of Mr. Dulles when he warned the American Bar Association at Louisville 4 years ago that treaties were liable to override the Constitution. Compare his statement with what Mr. Justice Holmes said: "No doubt the great body of private relations fall within the control of the State, but a treaty can override its power."

It was in *Missouri* v. *Holland* that Mr. Justice Holmes also relied upon the phraseology of the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution to distinguish between acts of Congress which "are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States." This subcommittee is in possession of a letter, which I hope will be printed in full in the record of these hearings, containing the explanation of this variance in those descriptive words in article VI. The letter, dated April 27, 1955, is from Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, of Evanston, Ill., who, I believe, was formerly a Member of Congress.

Mr. Pettengill calls attention to a rare law book entitled "A View of the Constitution of the United States," written by Mr. William Rawle, a distinguished lawyer of Philadelphia, and published in that city in 1829. Mr. Rawle explains that at the time of adopting the Constitution certain treaties existed which had been made by Congress under the Confederacy, and that the words "under the authority of the United States" were considered as extending equally to those previously made and to those which should subsequently be effected. But, Mr. Rawle continued, although the former could not be considered as made pursuant to a Constitution which was not then in existence, the latter would not be "under the authority of the United States," unless they are conformable to its Constitution. In short, since the ratification of the Constitution, the words "under the authority" and "in pursuance" mean the same things so far as treaties are concerned. As Mr. Pettengill says in his letter, "This point seems to have been completely overlooked by Justice Holmes when he wrote his opinion in the migratory bird case." Senate Joint Resolution 1 will remedy the learned Justice's oversight.

As stated by the Attorney General before this subcommittee on May 5, the "in pursuance" language was introduced into Senate Joint Resolution 1 in an amendment proposed by former Senator Homer Ferguson in the 83d Congress. When he introduced the present revised version of the resolution, Senator BRICKER stated that he desired to retain Senator Ferguson's language. In debate Senator Ferguson denied that the "in pursuance" clause was intended as a substitute for the so-called which clause. Since I agree with Senator Ferguson on that point, I am supporting the retention of the "which" clause as contained in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, now under consideration, but with an amendment I shall shortly suggest.

DEFINITION OF "TREATY"

Opponents have raised the question of the meaning of "internal law" as used in section 2. In his statement of May 2 before this subcommittee, Secretary Dulles said: "It might be construed to mean affecting the determination of issues in judicial or administrative proceedings." I shall be glad to answer that argument, but, first, I think it is more important to define the meaning of the word "treaty" as used in the Constitution, as well as in section 2.

In international usage, the word "treaty" is generically applied to a formal agreement between sovereign states. Other words are often used synonymously, as "convention," "agreement," "pact," "covenant," "protocol," "charter," and even "statute." The use of the word "treaty" is not confined exclusively to public-law transactions. In private law "treaty" signifies the discussion of terms which immediately precedes the conclusion of a contract or other transaction (Black's Law Dictionary).

No doubt exists as to the meaning of the word "treaty" as used by the framers of the Constitution. In defending the treaty-making power against objections to the ratification of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist (No. 75) that treaties "are contracts with foreign nations" and "agreements between sovereign and sovereign." He stated explicitly that "the power of making treaties relates neither to the execution of subsisting laws nor to the enaction of new ones." The legal force of treaties, he added, is derived "from the obligations of good faith; they are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject."

Hamilton's explanation removes what would otherwise be a conflict between two provisions of the Constitution relating to the exercise of the legislative power. Article I, section 1, provides that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." No residuum of legislative power accordingly remains to be exercised by the President and Senate under their treatymaking power. The provision of article VI that treaties shall be the supreme law of the land must mean that treaties in their contractual sense are binding upon the States and enforceable in their courts.

In his testimony before this committee on May 2, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles repeated certain statements he made 2 years ago which are so strikingly similar to Hamilton's concept that I beg leave to quote him again in juxtaposition with Hamilton's statement in the Federalist. Mr. Dulles said:

"This administration is committed to the exercise of the treatymaking power only within traditional limits. By 'traditional' I do not mean to imply that the boundary between domestic and international concerns is rigid and fixed for all time. I do mean that treaties are contracts with foreign governments designed to promote the interests of our Nation by securing action by others in a way deemed advantageous to us. I do not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

Mr. Dulles confirmed and reenforced his previous statement by adding:

"I believe that it reflects a pattern which will be followed by the executive branch of Government and enforced, if need be, by judicial determination that, under our system, treaties are contracts between nations in their corporate capacity, and not means for writing domestic law."

The Constitution denies to the States the power to enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign power without the consent of Congress (art. I, last paragraph). The power to make treaties, under the authority of the United States, in the nature of contracts as explained by Hamilton, and now accepted by Secretary Dulles, is an essential counterpart of the denial of that power to the States. As stated by Mr. Rawle, the treaty clause was never intended to validate treaties or agreements not made in pursuance of the Constitution. The President and Senate when making treaties, or the President alone when making other international agreements, are acting as the agents of the people and Government of the United States. Their powers as agents are stated in the Constitution. They have no more authority to exceed or violate those powers than has an agent to disregard the powers conferred upon him by his principal in the making of a private contract.

THE MEANING OF "INTERNAL LAW"

The expression "internal law" is used in contradistinction to "international law." The two terms denote the distribution of the supreme power, called sovereignty, by which a state is governed, and which may be exercised either internally or externally. According to Henry Wheaton:

"Internal sovereignty is that which is inherent in the people of any State, or vested

in its ruler, by its municipal constitution or fundamental laws. This is the object of what has been called internal public law, droit public interne, but which may more properly be termed constitutional law." (Elements of International Law, 1836, Dana's ed. 1866, sec. 20.)

To complete the comparison with international law, I also quote Wheaton's explanation of the meaning of that term:

"External sovereignty consists in the independence of one political society, in respect to all other political societies. It is by the exercise of this branch of sovereignty that the international relations of one political society are maintained, in peace and in war, with all other political societies. The law by which it is regulated has, therefore, been called external public law, droit public externe, but may more properly be termed international law."

Henry Wheaton's Elements of International Law was the first complete treatise on international law written by an American. He was an eminent authority on that subject because of his ripe experience with the law of nations and in diplomacy. He was also well versed in our constitutional law, as for many years (1816–27) he was reporter of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. His Elements went through many English and American editions. It was translated and published in a number of foreign languages, including French, Italian, and Chinese.

MISSOURI *v.* HOLLAND RECONSIDERED

The Supreme Court in the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, 1890 (133 U. S. 258), declared "that the treaty power in the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiations between our Government and the governments of other nations." No one supporting Senate Joint Resolution 1 denies the validity of that basic principle of both constitutional and international law.

Reviewing the migratory bird case in the light of what has been said regarding the meaning of the terms "in pursuance of," "under the authority of the United States," "treaty," and "internal law," and of the extent of the treaty power to include all proper subjects of negotiation with foreign governments, subject to the limitations indicated by Messrs. Hamilton and Dulles, I submit that the same decision in that case might have been reached without striking down the 10th amendment and thus opening a Pandora's box of abuses nowhere better described than by Mr. Dulles at Louisville.[1]

In the Migratory Bird Case, Mr. Justice Holmes found that "here a national interest of very nearly the first magnitude is involved. It can be protected only by national action in concert with another power." That finding was adequate to bring the subject-matter within the first requirement of treaty making. Had he then forgotten his obsession as to the difference in meaning of the qualifying phrases "in pursuance of the Constitution," and "under the authority of the United States," and applied the correct concept of the meaning of the word "treaty" in the Constitution as in the nature of contract and not of legislation, the migratory birds would still be migrating and propagating without let or hindrance from the American Bar Association, Senator BRICKER, or any other supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Since the determination of issues in judicial or administrative proceedings does not fall within the category of legislative law, Mr. Dulles fears as to the effect of section 2 on such determinations are unfounded. The same assurance can be made concerning the fears expressed by opponents that section 2 would interfere with the daily conduct of the Government's minutiae of administration which do not rise to the dignity or importance of legislation under the Constitution. The validity of such transactions should be tested by the applicable laws of Congress enacted for that purpose.

The retention of section 2 of the resolution is now necessary if the Constitution is to be safeguarded in the future against the destructiveness of the Holmes principles foisted into that document by his decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*.

OBJECTIONS TO SECTION 2 OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1—48 STATES' APPROVAL

Opponents have persistently circulated the propaganda that this section, if adopted, would require that all treaties be approved by the legislatures of all 48 States of the Union and thus return the Nation to its status under the Articles of Confederation. This propaganda is wholly untrue. The section would not require the approval of the legislature of any State of the Union to any treaty before it becomes effective. To put an end to this unjustified criticism, I now suggest that the text be amended by inserting the words "by Congress" between the words "legislation" and "valid" in line 6 of page 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1. These words were in the text approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on February 26, 1952. (See report of the committee on peace and law through United Nations, Feb. 1, 1952, p. 3.)

THE WHICH CLAUSE

The insertion of the suggested amendment would make it imperative that the final clause of section 2, "valid in the absence of international agreement," be retained. Otherwise the amendment would confirm the worst feature of the Holmes principle in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, that is, that by a treaty the Government of the United States can confer upon itself legislative power which it does not have otherwise under the Constitution. If we substitute the word "contract" for the word "treaty" in the Holmes decision its real significance as a legal paradox becomes obvious.

The which clause has met with the most violent opposition on the ground that its adoption would cripple the President's powers in international negotiations and require the approval of all 48 States of the Union to future treaties. If opponents argument is sound, then we must conclude that the framers of our Constitution left this Nation in the position where it is dependent upon a foreign nation or nations by treaty to confer power upon Congress to legislate upon matters of vital concern to our citizens and Government. That is an utterly absurd dogma in either constitutional or international law. That ridiculous position of opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 was demolished years ago by the Supreme Court when it upheld the power of Congress to abrogate a treaty by law. The power of abrogation by Congress could not be derived from the power to make treaties vested in the President and Senate. Would opponents contend that Congress does not have the power to abrogate treaties since it is not among the expressly delegated powers? Here is the answer to that question given by the Supreme Court itself:

"The National Government is vested with power over the foreign relations of the country, war, peace, and negotiations and intercourse with foreign nations, all of which are forbidden to the State governments. It has jurisdiction of all those general subjects of legislation and sovereignty which affect the interests of the whole people, equally and alike, and which require uniformity of regulation and laws." (*Chinese Exclusion* case 1889, 130 U. S. 581.)

Opponents of the which clause who contend that its adoption would return our international negotiations and treatymaking to the days of the Articles of Confederation completely ignore the powers of the National Government in external affairs in the absence of treaty; although they contend that the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution are inadequate without the additional powers they claim may be conferred upon Congress by treaties, they seldom mention the text of the Constitution delegating legislative powers to Congress. I therefore ask that the complete text of Article I, section 8, be inserted as a part of my argument.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

To establish post offices and post roads;

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations;

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in

[1] The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional bill of rights. (Address at Louisville, Ky., Apr. 12, 1952, before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association.)

which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings;—and

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES

To those who contend that the adoption of the which clause would make it impossible for the Government to conclude commercial treaties without the approval of all 48 States of the Union, I answer that all the powers of the Continental Congress over commerce with foreign nations were transferred to the Congress of the United States by the power granted in section 8 of the Constitution "To regulate commerce with foreign nations." Treaties approved by the Continental Congress included the grant of reciprocal rights to aliens to inherit real property, to carry on business, to appoint consuls, and to do many other things,[2] all of which opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 contend that the United States Congress would be powerless to do in the absence of treaty. We deny that the treaty is a source of power—it is but a contract stipulating for reciprocal concessions. The question involved is one of power, not the means for exercising the power.

At the conclusion of his testimony here on May 2, Secretary of State Dulles laid before the subcommittee a list of hundreds of commercial treaties which he said would be impossible under the which clause, because they would not be valid in the absence of treaty. In my testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 1 last year I called attention to the series of revised treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation which the President had submitted to the Senate for approval. At the same time I quoted a statement by a representative of the State Department to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in which he said: "Where the subject matter covers fields in which the States have a paramount interest, such as the formation and regulation of corporations and the ownership of property, the treaty provisions have been worked out with the same careful regard for the States' prerogatives and policies that has traditionally characterized agreements of this type." (Department of State Bulletin, vol. XXVI, No. 675, June 2, 1952, pp. 881–883; hearings on S. J. Res. 1, 1953, p. 1125.)

Which of these two conflicting statements of the policy of the State Department are we to rely upon? The policy declared in the statement of 1952 is exemplified in a number of treaties which make the reciprocal concessions to aliens on the part of the United States conformable to State laws, such as the Consular Convention with France of 1853, the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with China of 1946, the similar treaty with Italy of 1948, and 5 of the commercial treaties approved by the Senate in 1953, with Denmark, Ethiopia, Greece, Israel, and Japan. Types of such treaty provisions were inserted in my testimony in 1953 (hearings, pp. 1124–1125). Conflicts between treaties and State laws would never arise if such a policy were consistently followed, and all the untenable propaganda on this score against the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would vanish in thin air.

[2] (See the Treaty of Amity and Commerce with France, Feb. 6, 1778; and Consular Convention with France Nov. 14, 1788; Commercial Treaty with the Netherlands, Oct. 8, 1782, and Treaty of Amity and Commerce with Sweden, Apr. 3, 1783. The texts of these treaties are published in Malloy, Treaties, etc., vol. 1, pp. 479, 490, 1233, and 1725.)

The argument that the adoption of the "which" clause might cause foreign nations to refuse to make commercial treaties with us is too absurd to merit serious consideration. The fact that many nations have already made with us treaties conformable to the "which" clause refutes the argument. Opponents have failed to meet the challenge to show that any of practically all the other nations of the world whose constitutional systems embody the principles of the "which" clause have any difficulty in concluding treaties for that reason; and, finally, the argument was brushed aside nearly a century ago by the Supreme Court when it stated "If the people of the United States were to repeal so much of their Constitution as makes treaties their municipal law, no foreign government with whom a treaty exists could justly complain, for it is not a matter with which he has any concern." The court did not deny the fundamental principle of international law that treaties are made to be observed—pacta sunt servanda, for it continued:

"The foreign sovereign between whom and the United States a treaty has been made has a right to expect and require its stipulations to be kept with scrupulous good faith; but through what internal arrangements this shall be done is exclusively for the consideration of the United States. Whether the treaty shall itself be the rule of action of the people as well as the government, whether the power to enforce and apply it shall reside in one department or another, neither the treaty itself nor any implication drawn from it gives him any right to inquire." (*Taylor* v. *Morton*, 1858 (2 Curtis 454, affirmed by the Supreme Court, 2 Black 481).)

EXTRADITION TREATIES

Time will permit only a brief refutation of some of the many other specious arguments that have been advanced against the adoption of this clause.

In my testimony in 1953 I gave a summary history of the practice of international extradition by the United States. (See S. Rept. 412, 83d Cong., 1st sess., reporting favorably on S. J. Res. 1 of that year.) The essence of my testimony is that extradition in this country is regulated either by treaty or congressional legislation. I cited the leading authority on the subject, John Bassett Moore, and several Supreme Court decisions, all of which have been distorted or ignored by opponents of the amendment.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The minority views on Senate Joint Resolution 1 of 1953 stated that "the proposed amendment would block our own Baruch plan for controlling atomic energy" (S. Doc. No. 412, p. 46). As I have pointed out previously, the Congress of the United States has already legislated on this subject without benefit of any treaty to vest it with additional power. That part of the Baruch plan that depended upon the exclusive ownership by an international authority of source materials, control of facilities for development, monopoly of the know-how, etc., has been abandoned in favor of the nationally safer plans of President Eisenhower. Should any attempt be made to revive those features of the Baruch plan dangerous to our security, they would run afoul of the Constitution in the absence of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The power of the Federal Government to enter into any agreement on this subject is derived from the power of Congress to provide for the common defense. That power in turn is controlled by the provision of section 8 of the Constitution vesting in Congress the exercise of exclusive legislation and authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. If that provision can now be violated by some "invisible radiation," to use Mr. Justice Holmes' words regarding the 10th amendment, from the President's power under treaties or other international agreements, then Senate Joint Resolution 1 with the "which" clause is needed to maintain the Constitution as it was written.

DISARMAMENT

It seems incredible that any high official of the Government should argue that the Congress of the United States lacks the power, in the absence of treaty, to provide for the limitation of armaments or to participate in a world arrangement on that subject. Is not that power included within the power to provide for the common defense, or to raise and support armies, or to provide and maintain a navy or to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces? Without any treaty obligation to do so, Congress passed a joint resolution which the President approved on August 31, 1935, establishing a permanent National Munitions Control Board to regulate, by a licensing system the import and export of arms and munitions of war in the interest of the peace and security of the United States. How can the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 take away a power of Congress it has already exercised in the absence of treaty?

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

It is suggested that Senate Joint Resolution 1 might interfere with the President's powers under NATO. That could happen only if the President claimed the power to make war in defense of foreign countries without authorization by the Congress. The same observation applies to all other mutual defense treaties cited by opponents as potential victims of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The inclusion in such treaties of the common phrase that they shall be ratified and their provisions carried out by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes" (NATO, art. 11)[3] should not be open to the interpretation that the treaties have taken the war power away from Congress and given it to the President or to some international body, as Mr. Dulles said at Louisville treaties might do. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will make certain that such abuse of the treatymaking power will not occur in the future.

In the statement read to this subcommittee on May 5, the Attorney General enumerated certain multilateral treaties dealing with the respective rights and duties of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which treaties, the statement alleges it would have been impossible to conclude if Senate Joint Resolution 1 had been in effect, becauses they involve subjects on which Congress lacks the power of legislation in the absence of treaty. On the status of forces agreement I testified in 1953 in re-

[3] During the course of the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty in the Senate on Feb. 7, 1952, Senator GEORGE said: "When we were writing the North Atlantic Treaty, it was upon my insistence as a member of the committee, that article 11 was inserted.

"The Secretary of State who was the spokesman for the administration interpreted the words 'constitutional processes' to mean congressional approval insofar as the declaration of war or employment of our troops in any foreign country was concerned, and that language was designedly inserted in the treaty. The only difficulty has arisen because of the failure of the Executive to follow a straightforward course and to act in accordance with the power delegated to him by the Congress or, in this case, by the Senate."

(See the colloquy between Senator WATKINS and Secretary Dulles in the 1953 hearings, pp. 875–881.)

ply to canards circulated then and repeated this year by representatives of the bar of the association of the city of New York. Their testimony was to the effect that foreign forces in this country upon invitation would, under Senate Joint Resolution 1, be hampered in their operations by local, State, and Federal ordinances and laws, and that for the same reason Gen. George Washington would have been unable to make agreements with our French allies at Yorktown during the War of the Revolution. I pointed out that such fantastic results would be impossible under the rules of international law expounded by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Exchange* v. *McFaddon* (1812, 7 Cranch 116) which grants immunity to foreign troops in such cases from all territorial law, local, State, and Federal. I refer to my testimony in 1953 (hearings, pp. 1144–1145) in response to the revival of that criticism of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Nations may, by treaty or other international agreement, in their national interest attach conditions to their permission for the entry of foreign troops and thus consent to the modification of their rights under international law. In the United States, to Congress is delegated the power "To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." The power extends to those forces wherever they may be located. Should it be necessary for the defense of the United States to station foreign troops in this country, Congress undoubtedly has the power to legislate on this phase under its power to provide for the common defense. If the Status of Forces Treaty conflicts with existing congressional legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would require additional implementation by Congress, not in conflict with any other provisions of the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights. The argument that the resolution would have made impossible the conclusion of the treaty because Congress would have lacked the power to legislate on the subject is untenable.

The statement read by the Attorney General on May 5 lists the Agreement Relating to the Status of NATO, signed September 20, 1951, and the Protocol on the Status of International Military Headquarters of NATO, signed August 28, 1952. In reply to this criticism, attention is respectfully invited to the statute extending privileges, exemptions and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, enacted by Congress and approved by the President on December 29, 1945 (Public Law 291, 79th Cong.). That statute legislates on substantially all matters dealt with in the two treaties referred to. The act applies by its terms to any "public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided." Two important international organizations in which the United States now participates under authority of an act of Congress are the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization. According to the Attorney General's reasoning on the NATO treaties, our participation in the ILO and WHO in the absence of treaty is unconstitutional, or did he overlook the statute of Congress of December 29, 1945, when he made his argument that Senate Joint Resolution 1 would have made impossible the conclusion of the NATO treaties?

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS

The argument is repeated this year that the which clause would make it impossible to conclude treaties for narcotic control because Congress is said to lack power to pass legislation for the domestic control of the production and distribution of narcotic drugs in the absence of treaty. As I stated in my testimony in 1953, an act was passed by Congress in 1942 to discharge not only the international obligations of the Nation, but to "promote the public health and general welfare, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in opium poppies, and to safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of opium and opium products" (56 Stat. 1045). By the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the act of 1941 (52 Stat. 31), Congress had previously exercised authority to control the domestic production and distribution of wheat, and that act was held constitutional notwithstanding it regulates production even when not intended for commerce but wholly for consumption on the producer's farm. (*Wickard* v. *Filburn* (1942, 317 U. S. 111).) This legislation, upheld by the courts, effectively negates opponent's objection to the which clause on the ground that it would make it impossible to participate in the international control of narcotics due to lack of congressional power in internal law.

COLLECTION OF DEBTS

The objection that the which clause would prevent the United States from collecting foreign debts was also disposed of by citing the previous laws passed by Congress to collect such debts without resort to treaties (hearings, 1953, p. 1142).

The argument is now advanced that the which clause would make it impossible to carry out in the United States the provisions of the agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the validation of German dollar bonds signed at Bonn on April 1, 1953. That agreement provides that the two governments establish jointly in New York City a Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States. The United States Government "consents to the said Board's conducting its operations within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States." From an explanatory discussion of the arrangements worked out by the two governments the reason for the agreement seems to have been the disappearance of uncancelled German bearer bonds from Berlin after that city was captured by the Soviet forces. This situation impeded "the free and open trading in the United States of all German dollar bonds," and the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, to prevent the Soviet Government from introducing unlawfully held bonds into our security markets, requested the securities exchanges in this country to suspend dealings in listed securities of German origin.

The Government of the United States recognizes in the agreement that the policy of Germany embodied in its validation law is in conformity with the policy of the United States, and that the procedure of validation prescribed in the German law is in the interest of an orderly and appropriate determination of the validity of claims of the United States and its nationals against German debtors.

The agreement provides that the holders of German dollar bonds that have not been duly validated cannot resort to courts in the United States for the purpose of enforcing their rights under such bonds. No reason has been advanced as to how Senate Joint Resolution 1 would interfere with the carrying out of the agreement in this country. If the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission had power to take action to prevent trading in the bonds, which it is assumed it had, the subject obviously falls within Federal and not State jurisdiction. It is, therefore, not clear how any court would hold the agreement unconstitutional under Senate Joint Resolution 1 due to lack of power in Congress to implement, if necessary, the policy of the Government expressed in regulations of the Commission as well as in the treaty. The necessary and proper clause of section 8 of the Constitution applies to all delegated powers of Congress as well as to the treatymaking power.

THE SENATE AND TREATYMAKING

It is urged that Senate Joint Resolution 1 is unnecessary because of the constitutional requirement that treaties be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that Senators should be relied upon to refuse their approval of treaties that violate the Constitution. It is said that Senators when acting upon treaties are the representatives of their States and are thus in position to safeguard any State's rights that may be imperiled by the approval of treaties.

I yield to no one in my admiration of the abilities, industry, and patriotism of the Members of the United States Senate; but I would not place upon them responsibilities they are not in a position to fulfill. Most modern treaties are long, complicated documents. No Senator should be expected to read through one of them and then and there determine whether or not any of its provisions are in conflict with his State's constitution or laws. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations does not refer treaties to the constitutional authorities of the States for information of this kind. The Association of Attorneys General of the States has approved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as have many State legislatures.

Many treaties become the object of intense propaganda by groups throughout the Nation with special interests such as the organized propaganda to force the Genocide Convention through the Senate before there was time to have it examined and analyzed by competent legal critics. Only the intervention of the American Bar Association acting through the committee of which I am a member, gained the time necessary for the proper consideration of that convention, resulting in its nonapproval up to the present time. The treaty has not, however, been withdrawn from the Senate, and it may be approved whenever its advocates gain sufficient control of the Senate.

PRESIDENT WILSON AND THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

Senate Joint Resolution 1 is directed not only to treaties submitted to the Senate, but to forbid the bypassing of the Senate whenever the President doubts his ability to command the necessary votes in that body. Such an attempt was made by President Wilson at Paris in 1919. Here is that story as told in the diary of one of the President's principal legal advisers on the American Commission to Negotiate Peace:

"We [Dr. James Brown Scott and Mr. David Hunter Miller] went in to see Mr. Lansing and he said that the President had advanced the idea that afternoon (March 17, 1919) that the preliminary peace treaty need not be ratified by the Senate, and that he, Mr. Lansing, had been shocked at the idea and told him that it was impossible, and that the President had said to consult the legal advisers.

"Mr. Lansing asked me my opinion, and I said that I did not think that it was debatable; that the status of war could not be changed into the status of peace, as far as the United States was concerned, except by a treaty ratified by the Senate. Dr. Scott was entirely of the same opinion and cited several cases to that effect, including one in the war between Great Britain and us in 1813, one after the Mexican War, and one after the Spanish War.

"Mr. Lansing was in accord with these views and instructed Dr. Scott and myself to prepare a short opinion on the matter, which, after we went out, I asked Dr. Scott

to write." (Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, vol. 1, p. 73.)

I was one of the assistant legal advisers of the American Commission at Paris and was assigned to assist Dr. Scott. After the interview with Mr. Lansing by Messrs. Miller and Scott, as related in the former's diary, Dr. Scott called me into his office and told the incident to me. He added some details not given by Mr. Miller, namely, that President Wilson had first suggested his idea at the meeting of the Council of Four representing the Big Powers at the conference; that the President thought he could arrange terms of peace in accordance with his ideas without consulting the Senate, have the peace established according to those terms, and at some future date when the heat of political discussion had cooled off, have the status quo established by the preliminary peace treaty formally confirmed by a treaty quietly put through the Senate. Dr. Scott told me that the President's position was challenged by Mr. Lloyd-George, the British Premier, and it was he who had suggested to President Wilson that he consult his legal advisers. Since the opinion rendered by the legal advisers under those circumstances may have some bearing upon the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am attaching a copy of it to this statement.

The original draft of the opinion was prepared by me at Dr. Scott's request. It pointed out that as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States the President had the authority to conclude an armistice and incorporate therein such terms of a military nature as the exigencies of the situation may seem to him to require, but that the President had no power to terminate the war by treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate. Following this opinion, President Wilson abandoned his plan and submitted the Treaty of Versailles to the Senate, with the results that are now well known in history.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND THE YALTA AGREEMENT

President Roosevelt was more successful at Yalta in avoiding the Senate's prerogatives of advising and consenting to treaties. I have stated elsewhere that the Yalta agreement is the blackest page in American diplomatic history. The reasons why I think so are given in an article entitled "How a President Made Law" published in the February 1955 issue of the National Republic, pages 5–6. I have produced this article for inclusion in the appendix of these hearings.

Secretary of State Dulles testified before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1953 (hearings, pp. 873–874) that the President could not properly make the agreements at Yalta which had any long-range permanent effect unless and until they had been ratified by the Senate as treaties. His statement is in accordance with the rule of international law incorporated as part of our constitutional law by Chief Justice John Marshall speaking for the Supreme Court in 1828:

"The usage of the world is, if a nation is not entirely subdued, to consider the holding of conquered territory as a mere military occupation until its fate shall be determined at the treaty of peace. If it be ceded by the treaty, the acquisition is confirmed and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed, either on the terms stipulated in the treaty of cession or on such as its new master shall impose." (*American Insurance Co.* v. *Canter* (1 Peters, 611).)

The text of the Yalta agreement makes no mention of the necessity of ratification, but President Roosevelt stated that he intended to submit it to the Senate in the prepared text of his report to the joint session of Congress after his return from the Yalta Conference on March 1, 1945. (Department of State Bulletin, vol. 12, No. 297, p. 324.) For some unexplained reason, that sentence was omitted from the President's report as delivered. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 2, p. 1620.) The complete text of the secret Yalta agreement was not made public until nearly a year later, after President Roosevelt's death. When releasing the text on January 26, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes stated that President Roosevelt always held the view that as to the cessions of territory at Yalta "it was a matter that had to be settled in the peace treaty." (Department of State Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1946, pp. 189–190.)

I do not maintain that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 will make it possible for a private citizen or even a Government official to go into court to compel a future President to submit his agreements to the Senate. The courts would probably decline to entertain such an action for various good and sufficient reasons. Senate Joint Resolution 1 would, however, make plain what is now lacking in the Constitution, namely, that the President does not have the power in his discretion to make executive agreements in lieu of treaties; and that an international agreement made without the advice and consent of the Senate does not have equal supremacy with treaties "from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the National Government." (Mr. Justice Douglas in the Pink case.)

THE PINK CASE

The facts and legal arguments which show that this decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property (Dr. Jessup in the American Journal of International Law, vol. 36, 1942, p. 282) have been set forth many times by proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1. We shall confine our statement now to pointing out some confusions in the minds of those who disagree with our conclusions.

It is contended that because the claims of no American citizens were involved in the fund held by the State of New York and seized by the Government of the United States in reliance upon the Litvinoff assignment, the fifth amendment did not apply. This argument ignores a previous holding of the Supreme Court in another Russian case, speaking through Chief Justice Hughes, that "the petitioner was an alien friend, and as such was entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment of the Federal Constitution" (*Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States*, 1931 (282 U. S. 481), and numerous cases there cited). In his opinion in the Pink case, Mr. Justice Douglas dismissed this aspect of the constitutional law question by stating "There is no constitutional reason why this Government need act as the collection agent for nationals of other countries when it takes steps to protect itself or its nationals on external debts." To which a commentator in the American Journal of International Law replied. "Whatever the United States constitutional question, most countries, contrary to the United States policy, allowed foreign creditors to have their share in the local Russian assets, and our creditors had the benefit of others acting as collecting agents for all creditors—incidentally the policy to which we adhere in bankruptcy" (Kurt H. Nadelmann, vol. 46, 1952, pp. 530–531, and authorities there cited).

To our charge that the Pink case is authority for the principle that the President may make law in the United States without reference to the prerogatives of the Senate in treatymaking or to the exclusive legislative powers of Congress, it is asserted that the joint resolution adopted August 4, 1939, authorizing the President to appoint a Commissioner to adjudicate the claims of American nationals against the U. S. S. R. (53 Stat. 1119), constituted a congressional ratification of his executive agreement known as the Litvinoff Assignment. A reading of the joint resolution fails to establish such a purpose. In law, there is no warrant for imputing such intention to Congress. "Acts of Congress are to be construed and applied in harmony with and not to thwart the purpose of the Constitution." (*Phelps* v. *United States* (274 U. S. 341), cited in *Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *U. S., supra.*) Whether the aliens whose property was taken without due process of law and just compensation were personally present in New York, I do not know; but it appears from the decision that they had invoked the protection of the courts of New York by attachment proceedings, and thus were in this country at least by attorney.

It should be remembered that in the Pink case the Supreme Court was not dealing with enemy private property—we were not at war with Russia—but with the property of friends who had fled their country to avoid the confiscation of their property by their Communist masters. The effect of this aspect of the decision was illustrated shortly after it was rendered, as follows, by Dr. Jessup:

"The effect of the decision may be illustrated by imagining—a most improbable case—that in the settlement of the present war after the defeat of the Axis, the United States by executive agreement might take an assignment from the German Government of that Government's claim to the confiscated properties of their Jewish citizens and of the citizens of the occupied countries, including all choses in action in the United States and fines imposed upon persons physically present in this country. The purpose of the United States, let us assume, would be to provide a fund for pensions of disabled soldiers and sailors or merely to avoid the international disruption likely to follow the imposition of huge 'reparations' payments. Under the rationale of the Pink decision, the United States could, under such an assignment, take to itself all such private properties and no American court could protect the owners." (Ibid.)

RETROACTIVE EFFECT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

In the course of these debates it has been argued that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as part of the Constitution might have such retroactive effect as to disturb the stability of law settled since the beginning of our national existence. The sponsors of the resolution certainly have no such intention and would not oppose an amendment of the resolution that would make that clear. To meet that objection I would suggest that a new section be added reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The provisions of section 1 and section 2 hereof shall apply only to treaties and other international agreements made after the approval of the charter of the United Nations by the Senate on July 28, 1945."

The amendment would thus restore to the charter the understanding of its provisions which was inherent in the Senate's approval of it. It would revive and maintain in full force and effect the reservation of domestic affairs from the operations of the United Nations embodied in article 2, paragraph 7. It would nullify any further efforts to declare judicially that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing and the supreme law of the land without legislative action, and make it impossible to contend that these articles have transferred power to the Federal Congress to legislate on all the subjects enumerated in them. The unlimited extent to which such Federal legislation might be enacted to regulate substantially every aspect of our daily lives has been explained in these hearings by

Mr. Carl B. Rix, a former president of the American Bar Association and a former member of this committee of the association.

TREATIES FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF WAR AND THE PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

In reply to the specious allegations of opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 that its approval would prevent the United States Government from concluding treaties of this character, I repeat the answer I gave when these same objections were previously made. (Hearings, 1953, p. 174.)

Beginning with the Jay Treaty of 1794, the United States has occupied a position of leadership in promoting the substitution of law for force in the conduct of international relations. Of the many Congressional declarations of policy to that end, I shall mention only the Concurrent Resolution of 1890 which requested the President "to invite negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peacefully adjusted by such means." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 51st Cong., 1st sess., vol. 21, pt. 3, p. 2986.)

Secretary of State John Hay proposed a plan for a permanent international tribunal to the First Peace Conference at The Hague in 1899. In his instructions to the American Delegation he used the following inspiring language:

"Nothing can secure for human government and for the authority of law which it represents so deep a respect and so firm a loyalty as the spectacle of sovereign and independent States, whose duty it is to prescribe the rules of justice and impose penalties upon the lawless, bowing with reverence before the august supremacy of those principles of right which give to law its eternal foundation."

I regard the continuance of that policy by our Government as vital to the maintenance of our civilization. I would like to see the present International Court of Justice at The Hague, established as one of the principal organs of the United Nations, given a place of increasing importance in the settlement of international disputes.

There is nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 1 that can have any effect upon the negotiation and ratification by the United States of treaties for the establishment of mixed claims commission, arbitral tribunals, conciliation commissions, boundary commissions, or international courts for the adjudication of disputes with foreign nations. Such international questions are not within the domestic jursdiction and cannot be regulated by internal law. The Supreme Court in denying any power in the States to deal with foreign nations over matters in dispute, expressly pointed to such power in the National Government:

"The National Government, by virtue of its control of our foreign relations, is entitled to employ the resources of diplomatic negotiations and to effect such an international settlement as may be found to be appropriate, through treaty, agreement, or arbitration, or otherwise." (Chief Justice Hughes in *Monaco* v. *Mississippi*, 1934 (292 U. S. 313).)

The power and duty of the Federal Government to enter into treaties for the submission of international controversies of all kinds to peaceful solution in lieu of resort to armed force should not be confused with the conclusion of treaties and agreements which would impose criminal and civil liability upon persons within the United States, or that would be destructive of the existing division of authority between the States and the Federal Government.

Witnesses have testified against Senate Joint Resolution 1 on the ground that it is being put forward as part of a campaign against the United Nations and to deter the United States from participation in all forms of international cooperation. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is to restore the charter of the United Nations to its original meaning, and thus enable all our citizens to unite in confidence with whole-hearted support. I believe that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is more vital to the continuance of American support of the United Nations than anything that might be accomplished in the proposed revision or review conference on the charter.

CONCLUSION

1. Following years of intensive study, examination of different texts, and critical analyses of the highest order in the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and in debates in the Senate, the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association has recommended a constitutional amendment which will safeguard the Constitution from the liability to the abuses of the treaty-making power of which the present Secretary of State gave us warning 4 years ago.

2. Although the Constitution does not require that the amendment meet with the approval of the President, we have gone as far as we should, without sacrificing fundamental principles, to meet his objections and those of his principal legal advisers, that the amendment might interfere with his Executive powers and impair his power to conduct the foreign relations of the Government.

3. The amendment obviates any sensible reason for the repetition of the untenable criticism that its adoption would require the approval of treaties by all the 48 States of the Union.

4. The amendment meets the criticism that its adoption might play havoc with the settled constitutional law of treaties.

5. The amendment would be a stop sign to any future overambitious President who might attempt, by avoiding constitutional processes, to take us down the road that leads to one-man government.

6. The amendment would strengthen our participation in the work for peace of the United Nations by assuring us that the charter means what its framers intended it to mean, and cannot be used as a Trojan horse by those who would continue the social and economic revolution in this country through extraconstitutional means.

7. The amendment would assure us that the United Nations will not be used as a stepping-stone toward any form of world government, as was suggested in the pamphlet published by the State Department, with the endorsement of President Truman, in September 1950. The purpose of that pamphlet was stated in it to be to explain to the American people that, although they began life with "a Declaration of Independence * * * today the foreign policy of the United States is a declaration of interdependence of men and nations" (p. 99). The pamphlet continued: "Where the experiment" of an international community which is "in fact, the substance of our foreign policy" will lead "nobody can predict. * * * It may lead eventually to a form of world government" (pp. 17–18).

Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 use the same arguments that Alexander Hamilton used to prevent the adoption of the Bill of Rights, namely, that it is unnecessary and dangerous. The amendment is in the nature of a new bill of rights against the liability to abuse of the treatymaking power. To those who question its need and urge us to have confidence that future administrations will not abuse the power, we reply in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

DOCUMENT No. 526

(David Hunter Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, vol. VI)

OPINION RE SENATE AND PRELIMINARY PEACE TREATIES

From David Hunter Miller and Maj. James Brown Scott.

To The Commissioners Plenipotentiary.

The question submitted to the technical advisers for their opinion is whether a preliminary treaty of peace negotiated by the President would bind the Government of the United States from the date of its signature or whether it would require the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, and only bind the Government upon and from the latter date.

In providing that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties" (art. 2, sec. 2), the Constitution makes no distinction between classes of treaties which are subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, and in determining whether an instrument is or is not a treaty within the constitutional provision the name given to it is not essential; it must be construed according to its purposes and objects.

As Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, the President has the authority to conclude an armistice and incorporate therein such terms of a military nature as the exigencies of the situation may seem to him to require. Of such a nature was the "Protocol of agreement embodying the terms of a basis for the establishment of peace" between the United States and Spain signed on August 12, 1898, which was not submitted to the advice and consent of the Senate. This protocol suspended hostilities upon its signature, embodied a promise on the part of Spain to relinquish her sovereignty over Cuba and to cede Puerto Rico and certain other islands to the United States, and made provision for their evacuation by the Spanish troops. It provided for the occupation of Manila by American forces "pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace," and for the appointment of "commissioners to treat of peace."

In the case of a preliminary treaty of peace between France and Germany signed at Versailles on February 26, 1871, ratification by both parties, namely, the Emperor of Germany and the French National Assembly, was expressly stipulated (art. X). The same is true of a number of other important preliminary peace treaties. (See Phillipson, Termination of War and Treaties of Peace, p. 99.)

The declaration of war by the United States Congress on April 6, 1917, created a status of war which may only be terminated by a treaty of peace equally as valid as the law of the land with the declaration of April 6, 1917, and "as in the case of other treaties, a treaty of peace is not definitely binding until the exchange of ratifications; and a state of war in the technical sense continues until the date of the exchange." (Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, p. 352, citing several decisions of the Supreme Court.)

The legal effect of the protocol between the United States and Spain of August 12, 1898, was judicially passed upon in the case of Hijo *v.* United States, in which the United States district court held that "the protocol and proclamation did not end the war. The protocol worked a mere truce. The President has not the power to terminate the war by treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States." In confirming this decision, Mr. Justice Har-

lan, speaking for the Supreme Court, declared that "a state of war did not in law cease until the ratification in April 1899, of the treaty of peace." (194 U. S., pp. 317, 323.)

It is therefore submitted that a preliminary agreement signed by the President, but not ratified by the Senate, can have no legal effect, so far as ending the war is concerned, and can operate only as a truce; and that if it is desired in the preliminary agreement, by whatever name it may be called, to effectuate the transition from the state of war to a state of peace, this may only be accomplished by submitting it to the Senate for its advice and consent according to the constitutional provision.

JAMES BROWN SCOTT,
DAVID HUNTER MILLER,
Technical Advisers,
American Commission To Negotiate Peace.
MARCH 18, 1919.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who hath made and preserved us a nation, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. In Thee we trust. Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice and free from all the ugly sins of disposition that do so easily beset us. Lift us, we pray Thee, above the mud and scum of mere things into the holiness of Thy beauty, so that even the common task and the trivial round may be edged with crimson and gold. Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life, so that the multiplying years shall not find us bankrupt in the things that matter the most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. In these desperate and dangerous days, when the precious things we hold nearest to our hearts are threatened by sinister forces without pity and without conscience, help us to give the best that is in us against the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance, and to the future in the distance, and the good that we may do.

We ask it in the name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 24, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Morton S. Howell, to be postmaster at Broadway, N. J., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER, FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES, OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT, RELATING TO LOANS TO LOW-INCOME AND PART-TIME FARMERS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide more adequate credit for low-income farmers, including part-time farmers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 83, 83D CONGRESS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF PUERTO RICO RECONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the liquidation of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REASONABLE NOTICE OF APPLICATION TO COURTS OF APPEAL IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Atomic Energy Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ABBREVIATION OF RECORD ON REVIEW OR ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES BY COURTS OF APPEAL

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of E. Vlasoff, and sundry other citizens of the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for admission into the United States of escapees from communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Holy Name Society, Church of St. Christopher, Baldwin, and the Holy Name Society, Saint Mary, Mother of Jesus Church, Brooklyn, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, from Matthew A. Liotta M. D., New York, N. Y., relating to the Rating Board's activities in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2065. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey at Sachem's Head, Conn., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 2066. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in respect to distributions in kind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2067. A bill to provide for the location of claims and the mining of source material found in lands that also contain deposits of lignite; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2068. A bill to amend the joint resolution of August 30, 1954; relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2069. A bill for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2070. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash.; and

S. 2072. A bill for the relief of Miyeko Murase (nee Ohno); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2073. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain temporary housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2074. A bill to extend for an additional 5 years the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950, to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2075. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain bank mergers, to provide for prior notification of certain mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2076. A bill to amend chapters 4, 5, 6, and 8 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2077. A bill for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 2078. A bill to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2079. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERMISSION FOR A RETIRED NAVAL OFFICER TO BE EMPLOYED IN A COMMAND STATUS IN CONNECTION WITH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions. This bill is requested by the Department of the Navy and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD, immediately following the listing of bills introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter accompanying the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2078) to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation "To permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions."

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposal is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to employ Capt. George John Dufek, United States Navy, in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions after he has been placed on the retired list with the rank of rear admiral. Captain Dufek will be placed on the retired list on June 30, 1955, his retirement on that date being mandatory. Under the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89) a retired officer of the Navy is not eligible for command at sea except during time of war and then only when detailed to command a squadron or single ship by the President with Senate confirmation.

The Department of the Navy is the executive agent charged with the conduct of one or more Antarctic expeditions, the first of which is expected to leave the United States in November 1955. These expeditions constitute a part of the participation by the United States in the international geophysical year. Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy, retired, has been designated by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations as their personal representative in this enterprise and as the officer in charge of the venture. It is the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, in which the Chief of Naval Operations and Rear Admiral Byrd concur, that Captain Dufek is the officer best qualified and available to serve as the task force commander of the unit which will proceed to sea in connection with this expedition. Captain Dufek is currently serving in command of the task force which is now being organized. On June 30, 1955, however, when he will be placed on the retired list he will be ineligible to continue in command unless legislation of the type proposed is enacted.

In view of Captain Dufek's experience and special qualifications for this assignment, it is desired that an exception be made in his case and accordingly it is requested that the Secretary of the Navy be given statutory authority to employ Captain Dufek after his retirement in a command status. The authority sought would be limited to the Antarctic expeditions.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would result in an additional cost to the Government equal to the difference between the retired pay of Captain Dufek based upon a captain's pay and the active duty pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half, but only during the period he might be actively employed. This additional cost equals $529.80 per month.

The Department of the Navy has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN THE SO-CALLED SCHOOL INTEGRATION CASES

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 104), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision on May 17, 1954, in the case of *Brown et al.* v. *Board of Education of Topeka et al.*, and four related cases, which admittedly departed from the established law and precedents in declaring the "separate but equal" doctrine of separation of the white and black races was unconstitutional insofar as it applied to public school facilities; and

Whereas this decision was based solely and alone on psychological, sociological, and anthropological considerations in that the Court stated: "Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority"; and

Whereas the footnote to the opinion lists six allegedly modern authorities and concludes with the sentence: "And see generally Mydral, An American Dilemma (1944)"; and

Whereas a provisional investigation of the authorities upon which the Supreme Court relied reveals to a shocking degree their connection with and participation in the worldwide Communist conspiracy in that Brameld, and Frazier, listed in the group of 6 authorities, have no less than 28 citations in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives revealing membership in, or participation with, Communist or Communist-front organizations and activities; and

Whereas the book An American Dilemma was prepared by a Swedish Socialist, who declared in the book that the United States Constitution was "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people"; and

Whereas this book was the result of collaboration between Myrdal and certain alleged "scholars and experts" assigned him by the Carnegie Corp., of Alger Hiss fame; and

Whereas 16 of these so-called scholars and experts, who contributed to no less than 272

different articles and portions of the book, have been cited numerous times as members of Communist and subversive organizations; and

Whereas the citation of these authorities clearly indicates a dangerous influence and control exerted on the Court by Communist-front pressure groups and other enemies of the American Republic and individual members thereof that is inimical to the general welfare and best interest of the Republic; and

Whereas this Senate, the 16 sovereign States whose constitutions were nullified by the illegal decision of the Supreme Court, and all of the people of the United States are now entitled to know beyond doubt and peradventure the complete extent and degree of Communist and Communist-front activity and influence in the preparation of the psuedo "modern scientific authority" which was the sole and only basis for the decision of the Supreme Court: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary should proceed under its presently constituted powers to investigate the extent and degree of participation by individuals and groups identified with the Communist conspiracy, Communist-front organizations, and alien ideologies, in the formation of the "modern scientific authority" upon which the Supreme Court relied in the school integration cases.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today a list of 80 persons for appointments and promotions as Foreign Service officers of various classes. The list is printed elsewhere in the proceedings of today. Notice is hereby given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days.

The Chair also desires to say that the Senate received today the nomination of John B. Hollister, of Ohio, to be a Director of the International Cooperation Administration. Notice is hereby given that this nomination will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all too often there is a tendency to overdramatize juvenile delinquency, to the detriment of the youthful offenders and of society itself. I think we must try to understand the soil in which such delinquency has its roots. Then, perhaps, in treating this malady we will drain the swamp rather than merely swatting flies.

I have received a most compassionate and thoughtful letter along this line from a distinguished school principal in my State, Mr. L. E. Rinearson of the Markham School of Portland.

In addition, Mr. Rinearson has called my attention to a careful analysis of the personal problems and difficulties of one typical juvenile offender. This analysis was written by a competent reporter, Art Chenoweth of the Oregon Daily Journal. Mr. Chenoweth's article should serve to show that many youngsters who break the law have come from shattered homes or family backgrounds where the youngster never really had a bona fide chance for real personality development.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter by Principal Rinearson and the article by Mr. Chenoweth may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Portland, Oreg., May 18, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing this letter to you in regard to that group of great Americans whom we label as teenagers. This group has been maligned long and extensively by ignorant adults and irresponsible scandalmongers who seem to think they have an ear for news. The practice of broadcasting indiscriminantly to the world the weaknesses of our youth exclusive of their strength will destroy this Nation. I cannot stand by and let this insidious practice continue without at least expressing myself to responsible men high in Government office.

In my 25 years as principal in the Portland public schools I know from experience how young people develop high character and also how they fall into disrepute. It naturally takes many factors to produce desirable or undesirable behavior in children but one absolutely necessary factor for success involves first of all faith. One must develop faith in many directions such as faith in God, in family, in church, in school, in community, in country, and probably most important, faith in one's self.

What chance has a child to develop this necessary faith if he comes from an ignorant background where fear is the guiding influence and where in his whole country the crime and weakness of youth is emphasized?

The bomb threats in Portland will serve as an example of lack of responsibility in reporting news. The world has been told in every conceivable means of communication that the brazen teenagers of Portland, Oreg., are threatening to bomb the schools. (Enclosure No. 1 should be read at this point.)

This enclosure gives you a partial background of a 12-year-old boy who called my school and warned that a bomb would go off at 9:02 a. m. I do not object to this particular news report. In fact I consider it probably worthwhile. It did not appear on the front page and it was not glamorous, but on the contrary, the writer made an attempt to get behind the scenes and pointed out the hardships the child has faced in his short 12 years of life. I am sorry that the writer in his story left the reasons for the telephone threat locked in the head of the boy. The reasons were obvious but the writer must keep his job; so he could not pass judgment nor divulge the combination of circumstances which prompted the boy to make the call that made him a statistic, juvenile delinquent No. 3565281.

Do I need to point out that the home situation fanned by the sensational publicity for several weeks are the major reasons for this call?

I wish you could see this boy whose act has had international publicity.

At heart this boy is not a delinquent but in the eyes of his family and community he is. It would be difficult for any one to understand that I, his principal, declare that this boy is good enough for any sensible father to call him son, and be proud to do so. Because of his training in school, he was not afraid to tell the truth. He will soon be back in school where he will be welcomed not as a hero but a boy who told the truth under very trying circumstances. He will be made to understand that he has many more problems to solve including responsibility.

In contrast to this story three of our outstanding students received the publicity in clipping No. 2 for making excellent speeches at the Southwest Portland Lions Club where I heard and met you personally. The speeches were good enough, in my opinion, for a national television program but the publicity they received could only be found in the city briefs.

I hope the examples I have given will help you realize the need for far greater responsibility in news reporting and that you will be fired with a desire to do something about it on a national level. I feel that the greatest cause of the increase in the juvenile delinquency rate is the widespread publicity of the negative aspects of youth.

I further feel that a correction of this problem means the difference between a better nation or one that declines from lack of social responsibility on the part of its leaders.

Respectfully,

L. E. RINEARSON,
Principal, Chairman, Boys and Girls Committee, Southwest Portland Lions Club.

CLIPPING No. 1

[From the Oregon Journal of May 13, 1955]

WHY DOES A 12-YEAR-OLD TELEPHONE A BOMB THREAT TO HIS SCHOOL?

(By Art Chenoweth)

What pressures, what impulses, would lead a sixth-grade student, a 12-year-old, to call his school on the telephone and threaten to blow the place up with a bomb?

Was it a funny prank? Was he another one of those kids with a nasty disposition? Was it teen-age hooliganism?

Somehow none of those labels seemed to fit the thin, angular-faced boy who shifted his body back and forth on the chair in the office of David Ashmore, counselor at the county juvenile home. Constantly he rubbed his blue-jeaned legs together, twisted his billed cap in his hands, sometimes set the cap on one knee to twist the joints of his fingers almost to the breaking point.

Fear had drained every iota of color from his face. Fear had left his lips an ashen blue. He answered Ashmore's sympathetic questioning willingly. But so paralyzed was he by fear that his answers were only fragmentary gulps of sound.

From them, however, one could piece together, gradually, part of the story of his life, as it used to be and as it is now. And here is that piece of a story, about a piece of a life.

His natural father is not in Portland. He was "run out of this country by the cops." The boy's mother and stepfather, a mechanic who hasn't worked too regularly lately, married about 6 years ago.

The real father was a heavy drinker. He once brought liquor home and tried to get the children to drink it.

"One night he brought home a big sack and there wasn't anything in it but apples and oranges. He said he bought it for us to eat. He worked at the shipyards and he made plenty of money.

"We found out there was a fruit car broken into and he took the bag of fruit from the car. After he went to bed my mother used to go out and buy us something to eat, some macaroni or something."

This father beat one of the boy's sisters when she was a baby. Now she's in a mental institution. The "cops ran him out of the

country" because the father is years behind in child support payments.

This sixth grade boy has 6 sisters, in all—3 younger, 3 older. His parents give him no money. One of his sisters who works gives him 75 cents a week allowance if he does his house chores properly. If he doesn't, and she is the only one who decides, he may get less than 75 cents, maybe as little as 10 cents a week.

His stepfather and mother don't agree on discipline. The stepfather believes in strictness; the mother is more lenient. The boy and his stepfather do some things together. They've been trout fishing lately "and we got quite a few." The stepfather also cuts trees on the home property which the boy bucks up into firewood about three times a day for cooking and heating.

How does this boy like Edwin Markham school, the school he threatened to bomb?

"It's all right. It's a lot better than the other schools I went to. It's a better neighborhood and the kids and teachers are better." He said he's no standout in school "but I think I'm getting by."

What would he like to be when he grows up—a mechanic like his stepfather?

"No," he almost shouted. "I want to be an artist. An architect, maybe. Or maybe draw comic strips."

He had a chance for an art scholarship, he said, but his mother didn't want him to take it because it meant he would have to live away from home. Did he resent that? He merely shrugged his shoulders, his face expressionless.

If there's a reason why he phoned the bomb threat from a filling station pay booth, it's locked inside his skull. He doesn't know, he said.

Outside Ashmore's office Albert Green, director of the home, said. "He's pretty badly scared. The deputies just brought him over a few minutes ago. This is the 14th youngster we've had on these bomb things.

"Some of them, a few of them, we've had to send to training school, most of them we get going back to school again before long."

CLIPPING No. 2

Students on program: Students from Edwin Markham school will present the program for the Southwest Portland Lions club at 7 p. m. Wednesday at Bruer's Tower restaurant. Judy Kinney will speak on Atoms, Gary Tjernell on Crime Comics and Kay Ross on Muscular Dystrophy. Leonard Rinearson, school principal, will be chairman for the day.

WELCOME TO SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to join briefly in welcoming back to the floor of the Senate, after his long absence, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. That he is with his colleagues again is an indication that many fervent prayers, on both sides of the aisle, have been answered.

I am particularly glad to express my gratitude that he is here once more because of his notes of encouragement to me during the campaign of 1954. Recently I had the privilege of addressing a traditional and famous forum in the home city of the junior Senator from Massachusetts—the Ford Hall Forum.

When I referred favorably to the junior Senator from Massachusetts upon that occasion, the enthusiastic and spontaneous reaction of that large audience left no doubt as to the warm place which Senator KENNEDY occupies in the hearts of his constituents. I feel sure that their prayers and hopes and good wishes have been with him during his illness, and that this support from so many devoted people undoubtedly helped to hearten and encourage him.

I think it fitting, Mr. President, that some of the items in the press which have heralded the safe return of the junior Senator from Massachusetts should be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done. They pay tribute to a man who has written a book about the United States Senate while confined to a sick bed, and I am certain that we all wait with high anticipation Senator KENNEDY's forthcoming literary and historic contribution to the published material on this body.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald]

TANNED KENNEDY RETURNS TO SENATE—WARNS OF PERIL FOR UNITED STATES IN ASIA

(By Edward Michaelson)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Smiling and heavily tanned, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY returned to Capitol Hill today to an affectionate, bipartisan reception 7 months and 3 days after undergoing major spinal surgery.

NIXON WELCOME

He appeared in good shape, as he described his condition. The crutches he had needed to get about in the closing weeks of the 1954 session were missing.

"I threw them away a couple of days ago," he told a jam-packed press conference in his office late today. Atop his desk, as he spoke, was en enormous basket of fruit bearing the tag, "Welcome Home, Dick Nixon."

A call from KENNEDY's senior colleague, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, brought another hearty "Welcome home, glad you're back."

KENNEDY's good-natured attitude and alertness as he answered questions ranging in subjects from his operation and a book he is writing to the significance of the Kremlin's wooing of Yugoslav dictator Tito, dispelled some of the gloomy rumors about his physical well-being that have circulated for years.

He indicated, however, that he was taking good care of himself as he assumes his duties on the Labor Committee and as chairman of a subcommittee on Government reorganization plans.

GETS NEW OFFICE

An office off the Senate Chamber which is assigned to Senator BYRD has been made available to KENNEDY by the veteran Virginia Democrat. There, the Massachusetts Senator, who will be 38 years old Sunday, can spend much of his time between votes. Otherwise, he would have to shuttle between the Capitol and his Senate Office Building quarters.

The first vote comes tomorrow, when he will join in the attempt to override the Presidential veto of the postal pay raise bill. Later in the week there may be voting on the Federal highways program proposals.

KENNEDY has a crowded schedule of appearances in Massachusetts next month. The first, June 3, will be at Assumption College in Worcester. On June 9, he is introducing Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler at the $100 a plate Jackson-Jefferson day dinner in Boston.

He also, is dedicating a new home for the aged in east Boston, and introducing the Italian ambassador to Washington at a dinner in the latter's honor in Boston.

WILL ATTEND REUNION

In addition, he will attend the 15th reunion of his Harvard class. Some of his classmates were on hand at National Airport today when the Senator, his wife and his sister, Jean, arrived from Palm Beach. They were greeted by Mrs. Kennedy's mother, Mrs. Hugh Auchincloss of Newport, R. I., and nearby McLean, Va., and Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, the Senator's sister-in-law.

From the airport, the Senator and Mrs. Kennedy and two aides, Administrative Assistant T. J. Reardon, Jr., and Legislative Secretary Theodore Sorensen, drove to the Congressional Hotel, where the Senator and his wife will stay for the next several days.

When the Senator later posed for newsreel and TV cameramen on the Capitol steps, he was welcomed by numerous tourists and former associates in the House of Representatives. Also very much in evidence was a longtime friend, Capitol Policeman John O'Leary of Somerville, Mass.

The Senator elicted laughs at the press conference when asked about President Eisenhower's prestige today as compared with a year ago.

"His popularity seems to be standing up in Palm Beach pretty well," he observed.

NEED POSITIVE PLAN

He said he thought the Democrats would have to present an effective, positive program next year to wage a successful presidential campaign, rather than go after Mr. Eisenhower hammer and tongs as former President Truman recently advised.

This was his answer to a question as to whether the Democrats should pinpoint responsibility directly on President Eisenhower for any mistakes made by his administration.

Kennedy observed that the Democratic Party was in good shape, judging from gains in recent local elections around the country. He emphasized, however, that nationally, the big issue is foreign policy, specifically in the Far East.

"I don't think the domestic issues are comparable," he said.

He said the administration, while responsible for foreign policy decisions, was influenced by Congress, particularly the Senate, and that the administration had erred in its estimates of Red military might by "guessing short" on Soviet air and army strength.

SAYS CUTS WRONG

He made clear that even though Mr. Eisenhower was an able soldier and successful commander that the decisions to "cut the Army and Air Force were both wrong.

"I don't think there is any doubt events will prove those of us who opposed such cuts were right," he said.

He also said he considered the Indochina situation a lot more important than what happens to the offshore Nationalist Chinese outposts of Quemoy and the Matsus. While the Communists in Europe are not likely to provoke war, the situation in Indochina is perilous, in his view.

"In the Far East you don't have a frozen line—a sharp, divided line as you do in Europe," he said.

He said the forthcoming Viet-Nam elections placed the United States at a psychological disadvantage and the division among Asians as to the merits of our position made the Indochinese situation extremely critical, particularly in the absence of a specific line as prevails in Europe between communism and the West.

[From the Boston Post]

SENATOR KENNEDY BACK IN EXCELLENT HEALTH

(By John Kelso)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Flashing a broad smile, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, returned today to Capitol Hill after an absence of several months caused by surgery to correct a World War II back injury.

The youthful Democrat—he will be 38 a week from today—limped noticeably, however, as he ascended the Capitol steps for the benefit of a large contingent of photographers.

But he turned down a ride in his convertible from the Capitol to his office, a distance of about 300 feet, to walk through the park with his pretty wife, Jacqueline. As they strolled along together, the Senator appeared to be favoring his left leg.

Police Officer John O'Leary, of Somerville, Mass., was prepared to drive the Senator and his wife to his office where he was to hold a press conference that turned out to be heavily attended.

DOESN'T USE CRUTCHES

On the drive in from the airport this noon, after his arrival from West Palm Beach, Fla., where he had been convalescing at the home of his parents, Theodore J. Reardon, Jr., his administrative assistant, was at the wheel.

At no time during the afternoon did the Senator use crutches, although both crutches and a wheelchair were in readiness at the airport.

Senator KENNEDY's features were tanned a golden brown and his hair was bleached out a little by days spent in the healing Florida sunshine.

He told newsmen that he will be on the floor of the Senate tomorrow when a vote is taken on a pay raise for postal workers.

The Senator, who obviously has kept well posted on national and international affairs during his prolonged absence, said he will vote to override the Presidential veto of the proposed 8.6 percent raise.

For the next few weeks, at least, he said, he will use the office in the Capitol itself of Senator HARRY S. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia. This office is only a few yards removed from the Senate Chamber.

FRUIT BASKET FROM NIXON

The Senator said that he and his wife will also live at the Congressional Hotel, located on Capitol Hill across the street from the Old House Office Building.

Aside from experiencing some difficulty in walking—and it did not appear to be serious—the Senator looked to be in excellent shape. His face was fuller than it was last summer when he was in almost constant pain from his back.

As KENNEDY posed for pictures on the Capitol steps, a crowd of textile workers from the South appeared and greeted him enthusiastically.

When he entered his office, the secretaries there arose and applauded him warmly. Reaching his desk, he found a big basket of fruit from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, the Republican President of the Senate.

A few feet from the basket on the desk, and unnoticed by the swarm of newsmen, was a tropical shell on which KENNEDY, as a naval officer, had carved the position of his men and himself after their small craft had been overrun by a Japanese destroyer. This shell, which he had cast upon the Pacific waters, was mute testimony to the pain he has undergone for nearly a year.

ANSWERS QUERIES WITH CANDOR

No sooner was he seated at his desk, than newsmen began shooting a series of questions at him which dealt with the national and international scenes. He answered all of them with candor and ease.

He explained that he will resume work immediately on the committees of which he is a member. One of them, dealing with the reorganization of the Government, is under his chairmanship. The other committees are now concerned with minimum wage and education bills.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, telephoned KENNEDY during the afternoon. "Welcome back," SALTONSTALL said. "I'm glad to be back, KENNEDY replied. "I'll see you on the floor."

KENNEDY told reporters he will be in Massachusetts for a period of several days the first of next month. His schedule calls for him to speak at the Assumption College, in Worcester, on June 3. His Massachusetts visit will conclude with his attendance at the 15th reunion of his class at Harvard on June 16.

[From the New York Times]

SENATOR KENNEDY RECOVERS AND RETURNS TO THE JOB

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, returned to duty today from a 7-month absence made necessary by major operations. The surgery was required by wounds he suffered during World War II as commanding officer of a motor torpedo boat. At a press conference, Senator KENNEDY, who looked brown and strong, remarked that he had thrown away his crutches only a few days ago and found walking still a bit tiring. He said he had tried to keep his hand in during his convalescence at Palm Beach, Fla., by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day. "An inspiring experience," he quipped. Asked about the political situation and specifically whether President Eisenhower's popularity remained high, Mr. KENNEDY smiled and said: "It seems to be holding up pretty well—in Palm Beach, anyhow."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, after line 10, it is proposed to strike out the following:

SEC. 17. Any State desiring to accept the benefits of section 2 of this act shall submit, through its State agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act. Such State plan shall provide that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed on highway facilities projects in the National System of Interstate Highways approved under the plan, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified above, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a), section 625, Public Law 725, 79th, second session, and section 205, Public Law 815, 81st, second session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the unanimous consent agreement, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has offered the amendment, will control 1 hour, or one-half the time, on the amendment; and the distinguished minority leader, unless he favors the amendment, will control the remainder of the time. In view of the fact that I favor the amendment, is my understanding correct that the distinguished minority leader will control the time in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time in opposition to the amendment will, under the circumstances, be controlled by the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Public Works, after long consideration, inserted in the bill, beginning on page 20, line 11, and extending through line 9 on page 21, what is known as section 17. That section would have included in the bill the so-called Davis-Bacon Act provisions, which are now applicable in the construction of hospitals and airports.

A few years ago the so-called Davis-Bacon provisions were made applicable to a large amount of governmental construction. I still favor those provisions, and I think the committee took the right stand when it included them in the bill. They would be applicable only to the interstate system. But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that I think the Davis-Bacon Act provisions are fair and are in keeping with the protection of the rights of those who toil, I am not fooling myself. I know that, in many instances, legislation is a matter of compromise. At this very moment the American people are road conscious. They want to have roads constructed. We must have a road bill. So in order to satisfy some of the opposition to section 17, I offered the amendment which I am now discussing. It was not a question of my feeling that section 17 was not good; it was a question of trying to get together with other Members of the Senate in order to pass a road bill for the American people.

Yesterday the Senate kicked American labor, or at least the postal workers, on their proverbial trousers. It was not done with my vote; but the Senate took

that action. I feel that it was unfair. In my opinion, the provisions of section 17 are good.

My good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], has submitted an amendment which would substitute the purported administration bill for the committee bill. I know the provisions of the administration bill contain much gain for those in the road construction industry. Section 17 would protect labor and all who toil, but I know there is plenty of gain in the proposed administration bill for those who would invest in the program as it is outlined in that bill, to such an extent that the investors would make $11 billion out of a $21 billion investment. I hope that the investors will be as tolerant of the rights of labor as they are——

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico will yield on the time of the opposition.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. How much will the investor get by reason of deficit financing, as is provided in the committee bill, which is also known as the Gore bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not give the Senator from Pennsylvania exact figures, but I know a profit of $11 billion on a $21 billion investment certainly is not in keeping with the conscience of the American people. Deep in my heart I feel that way because I have seen statements published in investment journals to the effect that the so-called administration bill would be good for the investors. What is sought to be done by the committee bill is to build roads, and not make road building an investment proposition.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield again, under the same conditions?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is there any provision in the Gore bill to terminate the deficit financing? For example, there will be deficit financing of this program to the extent of $7 billion. There will be interest on that amount. Is there any plan to liquidate that deficit?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall let the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who has handled the bill on the floor, answer the Senator's question.

Mr. GORE. There are some similarities in the two bills before the Senate, as well as differences. One similarity is that neither bill provides any source of revenue. Another is that neither bill contains any element of self-liquidation. There is more deficit financing in the administration bill than there is in the committee bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, under the same conditions?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In the administration bill, provision is made for revenue——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that according to the unanimous-consent agreement, under which the Senate is now proceeding, the time would have to be charged to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. What I asked, Mr. President, was that the time for my remarks be charged to our side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from California has control of the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Pennsylvania wish to catechize me on this point?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Possibly it would expedite the debate on the amendment if this question were discussed later on the time of the opposition. I am very sorry more Senators are not on the floor now. This is one of the most important matters which has confronted the United States for many years. Two plans are before the Senate. I should like the people of America, and especially the Members of the Senate, to understand them. But I do not believe it will avail us anything to discuss the question now, because so few Senators are present. Later in the day more Members may be in the Chamber.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if it is not a fact that under the provisions of the so-called administration bill the bulk of the money will go to the interstate system. Is not that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The same amount of money as the 1954 act provides would be used for the primary, secondary, and urban systems. Then the money above that amount, which is about $622,500,000, would be applied to the interstate system. The substitute would not raise taxes; it would simply allocate the taxes for the purpose of liquidating the bonds, as provided in the administration bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator from Pennsylvania has not answered the question, or at least I did not understand that he answered it. The question is, Is it not true that under the so-called administration bill the bulk of the money provided for would go to the interstate system?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me ask the Senator another question. Is it not also true that so far as primary, secondary, and farm-to-market roads are concerned, the substitute would freeze the present funds for 30 years?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who has given so much thought and attention to roads and other public works projects, I may say that the money the States now use on the interstate system would be released, and they could then apply it to the primary, secondary, and urban systems of the various States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but so far as the Federal Government is concerned, so far as the bill which the Senator wants substituted for the Gore bill is concerned, are not the present amounts frozen for a period of 30 years?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. But, Mr. President, a sufficient amount of money would be available to the States, I think as much as the great majority of the States would be able to match. The fact of the matter is that in Pennsylvania, as is the case in certain other States, we have a remarkably good road system. There is now before the Pennsylvania State Legislature a bill to increase the gasoline tax 1 cent, in order that the State may match the funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will go the Senator one better. The State of New Mexico has authorized the issuance of bonds in order to meet the requirements, so long as provisions are made by the Federal Government to do its share in constructing farm-to-market roads.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. BUSH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I do not have the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will someone yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I shall make my question brief. Is there anything at all in the Martin substitute which would prevent any future Congress from making any appropriation it may see fit to make for primary, secondary, and farm-to-market roads?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I hope in a succeeding Congress, in line with orderly legislative procedure, the House Ways and Means Committee will recommend and the House will pass a bill providing by way of taxes, so that we may even accelerate the road program we are now contemplating. For example, provision might be made for tolls on bridges and tunnels in the interstate system. Probably a tax could be imposed on rubber. Perhaps a license fee should be imposed on trucks and buses which may use the interstate system.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no reason why receipts from any particular source should be earmarked, is there?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Any amount of money which may be desired may be taken out of the general fund, if the Congress so votes and the President approves.

Mr. AIKEN. If I know the disposition of the Congress, it will respond to whatever the public demands in that respect prove to be, and it will provide such funds as can properly be used for the primary, secondary, urban, and rural highways. By adding the President's interstate system, which will be of tremendous value to all the States of the Union, we would not in any way be undertaking to decrease the construction of better primary, secondary, urban, and rural roads.

Mr. BUSH. And there would be no limit.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to refer to section 105 which deals with this very question.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, to which bill is the Senator referring?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am referring to the administration bill, on page 8, line 19, section 105. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania is requested.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am a soldier, and I am used to being subjected to discipline. When the leaders come to talk to me, I feel that I owe a courtesy to them to attend to what they are saying, because our two leaders have done such a magnificent job during this Congress, and I want to help in any way I can. I apologize to the Senator from New Mexico and to my colleagues for engaging in conversation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is nothing to apologize for. I appreciate the fine work of the majority leader and also of the minority leader. There is nothing to apologize for.

On page 8, in subsection (b), appears the language about which I was interrogating the Senator. I read, beginning on line 19:

> There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year.

That is the language, along with the rest of the section, which would freeze the $622,500,000 for 30 years. Am I not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there will be provided the amount required, but, as I stated in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that does not prevent the Congress from providing for additional revenues by way of taxation, or even taking revenues out of the general fund.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. But I have seen legislation enacted over and over again, and I know what happens once the nose gets under the tent, notwithstanding the right of future Congresses to appropriate otherwise.

Mr. President, we got off the subject matter. I again wish to emphasize that I think section 17 belongs in the bill. I think section 17 is fair. I think it is in keeping with the American tradition. But I know that in many instances legislation is a matter of compromise, and I wish to have a road bill passed at this section. In the interest of harmony, in the interest of supplying plenty of work for American labor as a result of the construction of roads which would be constructed if Senate 1048 should be passed, I have decided to offer the amendment. I have done so in the interest of the harmony which is so much required, and in the interest of comradeship and compromise on a matter as to which Members of the Senate may disagree.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the amendment. I hope the Senate will take favorable action on it promptly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield one minute to me, so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]? I was called out of the Chamber. I wish to address a question to the Senator from New Mexico, for I desire to be a sponsor of the amendment he has submitted, if the amendment is what I think it is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I yield an additional minute for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

Let me ask the Senator from New Mexico whether I correctly understand that the amendment he has just submitted would strike out entirely from the bill the section which he and I have discussed, namely, the section which would impose the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act and would provide for control by the Secretary of Labor, in the case of wages, standards of work, and so forth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. However, I say that in offering the amendment, I do so contrary to my conscience.

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendment the Senator from New Mexico has submitted would strike out entirely that provision of the bill, would it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I know the amendment is agreeable to the Senator from Florida. I hope the remarks I made regarding the reason for submitting the amendment will also meet with the approval of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me ask the consent of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to be a joint sponsor of the amendment, along with him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to have that done, provided the Senator from Florida agrees that American labor should be protected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will not accept any conditions. I did not have an opportunity to hear what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico said. I am strongly of the opinion that the control should be left in the hands of the States, as it has been heretofore.

Therefore, Mr. President, I withdraw my request; and I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, today we are considering a multi-billion-dollar road bill. There has been some discussion with regard to labor and as to whether the bill is fair to labor. As I understand, the common construction of the term "labor," as generally used in parliamentary bodies, is organized labor.

Mr. President, organized labor does not need to have the Bacon-Davis Act written into this road bill. Some 30 years ago the construction industry established rather generally the 8-hour day in that industry. So this particular provision means nothing to organized labor, as such, for the 8-hour day is well established.

Therefore, Mr. President, who will be affected by the amendment? Let me say at the outset that in the modern construction of roads, comparatively small amounts of labor are used. There has been technological development in the construction industry, particularly in the construction of roads, just as has occurred in all other American industries.

So the proponents of the amendment are saying that the 8-hour day shall not apply, even though a comparatively small amount of labor is involved in this tremendous, multi-billion-dollar road program. Mr. President, I say that is most unfair. For a Senator to state in this Chamber that he is entirely in favor of having the bill include a provision that the Bacon-Davis Act shall apply, and then for such a Senator to submit an amendment to make the application void, is a kind of double talk that I do not understand.

Mr. President, the workers in the urban areas are not the ones who will need the protection of the Bacon-Davis Act. The ones who will need the protection of that act are the workers in the rural areas, namely, those who will be employed as truck drivers or who will be employed to work in gravel pits—in short, workers who will be employed by subcontractors throughout the Nation. They are the ones who will be taken advantage of unfairly if Congress eliminates the provision for the 8-hour day.

I wonder how many Senators have ever worked handling cement or sand or gravel for an 8-hour stretch. Eight hours a day is enough for one who is engaged in such laborious, back-breaking work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that I have mixed concrete by hand—not for 8 hours a day, but for 12 hours a day. I know what that means.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I do not know how that is pertinent to the question. I doubt that many Senators have worked for 8 hours a day handling cement, sand, or gravel. I would not brag about it if I had to work 12 hours a day, in the hot sun of summer or in the cold of winter, to make a living on a road job. Mr. President, 8 hours a day is enough for any man to put in.

The pending amendment is a backward step, Mr. President. To fail to rec-

ognize the 8-hour day in perhaps the largest construction job upon which our country has ever entered would be a backward step; it would make us go back at least 30 years. I am definitely opposed to the amendment.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. At the proper time I shall take whatever steps I can to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I desire to thank the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the minority leader, for yielding to me sufficient time in which to make these few remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, but without charging the time required therefor to the time available to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Oregon is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] on the Davis-Bacon provision of the bill.

In the Subcommittee on Roads, I was the sponsor of the proposal to include in the bill the provision incorporating in it the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act. It was upon my original suggestion that a majority of the subcommittee and, later, a majority of the full committee voted to include in the bill this humanitarian provision.

I regret that the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have great respect and admiration, has seen fit to submit an amendment which would strike out of the bill the Bacon-Davis Act provision—a provision which has been included to protect the working standards and working conditions of the men who will build our interstate highway system.

Mr. President, I realize that practical politics dictates that this provision of the bill be removed from it. It has been said here on the floor that this particular highway bill cannot be passed by Congress if there is retained in the bill the provision which now applies to the construction of airports with Federal aid, the construction of hospitals with Federal aid, and the construction of schools with Federal aid, namely, the provision which protects the working standards of the men who build them.

Mr. President, I am not a practical politician. If I were, I doubt that I would be a Democrat in a State which only once before in its history has popularly elected, at the polls, a Democrat to the Senate of the United States. I am the first Democrat to be elected to the United States Senate from the State of Oregon in 40 years, and only the second Democrat to be elected at the polls in Oregon. So if I were a practical politician, I probably would not be a Democrat in a State with that political history.

But, Mr. President, I believe that the American people are idealistic in their approach to the problems of government. I believe that if the Democratic Party has anything to offer the American people, it is an idealistic approach. I believe that when the Democratic Party says to its members that we must strike from this vast highway bill a provision put in to protect the workers who will build the interstate highway system, the Democratic Party is not being true to the traditions on which it was founded, and the program on which it has won the allegiance of the majority of the American people through most of the elections which have occurred in the past quarter century.

This provision is not a revolutionary thing. This is nothing unique. The Davis-Bacon Act has applied to much Federal construction. It was written into the law many years ago—I believe under the administration of President Hoover. The Davis-Bacon Act merely says that where Federal aid is provided in the form of funds there must be obedience to a certain standard to protect the working conditions of the men who are paid with Federal funds. I believe that is the sort of issue which the American people identify with the vast majority of the Democratic Party.

I repeat that I do not believe the Democratic Party is being true to its traditions, to its programs, and to its promises when it deliberately removes this humanitarian section from the bill in order to pass the bill through the Senate, in the name of practical politics. That is why I agree with what was said in defense of this provision by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

SCOPE OF THE EFFECT OF S. 1048 ON EMPLOYMENT IN ROAD CONSTRUCTION

S. 1048 would pour $7,750,000,000 in Federal funds into the interstate system over the 5 years 1957–1961, on a 90–10 percent Federal-State basis. This is in addition to an expanded program for the other subsidiary highway systems, totaling $4,500,000,000, to which the Davis-Bacon provisions are not to be extended. This great Federal program will give an immense impetus to road construction all over the Nation.

In 1954, about $3½ billion was spent on all roads in the United States, and, according to the Department of Labor, average monthly employment on all road work, Federal, State and local, was 231,600 men.

By the time the proposed highway construction program goes into full swing, 1958, it may be estimated that about $6 billion will be spent on road construction, with average employment rising to about 400,000 men. On this basis, it may be estimated that from 100,000 to 150,000 men will be employed on the interstate highways, to which section 17 is applicable.

A REAL NEED FOR REQUIRING PREVAILING LABOR STANDARDS

Some highway construction contractors operate under union contracts and maintain fair standards of wage scales for the various skills needed in construction, as well as of overtime for work beyond 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, and on weekends. In addition, their union contracts may cover employer contributions towards certain fringe benefits.

Other contractors often do not maintain such high labor standards.

In the absence of any laws setting fair labor standards for public construction work, contractors with the lowest labor standards could necessarily underbid high labor standard contractors for construction contracts.

In other words, federally financed projects would be forced to discriminate against contractors who, under labor agreements or otherwise, maintain high labor standards, and to give contracts instead to the contractor who can recruit the cheapest labor—perhaps from distant areas—to underbid the high-standard humanitarian contractor.

MINIMUM WAGE STANDARD NO PROTECTION OF VALUE

A proposed alternative administered by the Secretary of Commerce, under which State highway departments predetermine minimum wages for construction contracts, offers no protection to the contractor paying prevailing wages and overtime. Obviously minimum wages are the lowest for which labor may be had, without regard to standards which may have been established as prevailing by legitimate local contractors.

While the minimum rates predetermined by the highway departments only set minimums for three categories—skilled, intermediate, and unskilled labor—"prevailing rate of wages" means the rate paid to the majority of those employed in the corresponding classes of laborers or mechanics on projects that are similar to the contract work.

These regulations break down the crafts much more specifically than merely skilled, intermediate, and unskilled. They stem from the Davis-Bacon Act.

Obviously, neither workers on construction projects nor high-standard contractors bidding on such projects can expect any real protection from highway departments' predetermination of minimum rates.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS RECOGNIZED PRINCIPLE OF REQUIRING PREVAILING WAGES FOR 24 YEARS

The Davis-Bacon Act to require payment of prevailing wages on direct, 100 percent Federal contracts was enacted in 1931, under President Hoover. It was amended in 1935 to provide for predetermination by the Secretary of Labor, who thus has had that responsibility for 20 years.

The appropriateness of such requirements of fair-labor standards on federally financed construction has since been so widely recognized that Congress has included them in a number of grant-in-aid and even loan programs. All of these involve far smaller percentages of Federal funds than the 90 percent Federal share in the interstate highways.

Such examples include:

The Federal Airport Act: The normal Federal contribution is 50 percent, with up to 62½ percent in the western public land States. This act provides for predetermination of prevailing wages by the Secretary of Labor.

The Hospital and Construction Act requires compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act. Federal share runs between one-third and two-thirds, usually near one-third.

The School Survey and Construction Act also requires compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The Federal contribution here differs greatly from case to case, with the degree to which the school district is federally affected, but, of course, it usually runs far below 90 percent.

Other examples of similar provisions are housing legislation, including the slum clearance and urban renewal program of the Housing Act of 1954 and the FHA rental housing program, and the Lease-Purchase Act of 1954.

PROVISION CAN BE PROPERLY ADMINISTERED WITH FAIRNESS

The minority dissent from the report S. 1048 recognizes that "the Davis-Bacon Act is now applicable to highway work performed under direct Federal contract" on 100 percent federally paid projects, but it opposes the same principle on the 90 percent federally paid interstate highways. Yet if the public interest requires that highway construction personnel be paid the prevailing wage when the Federal Government pays 100 percent of construction costs, why not when it pays 90 percent? Why should that 10 percent make such a crucial difference? Why resort to a quibble?

Some of the objections to inclusion of the labor-standards provisions in S. 1048 are directed against possible maladministration by the Secretary of Labor. For example, opponents claim to fear that the Secretary may apply the high skill standards of the building industry in setting prevailing rates for highway construction. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] made much of the idea that highway construction is peculiarly unsuitable for fair-labor standards. Yet, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] cogently pointed out, highways are not so different from airports. And, according to the Clay report itself, about one-third of the money spent on the interstate system is needed for structures such as tunnels, bridges, and viaducts, other than surfacing, structures which require the same kind and degree of skills as other vertical construction.

Another objection by the minority is that inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provisions would require "checking of upwards of 10 million payroll items for compliance with labor standards provisions."

I have been told that contractors must now send in their payrolls to show compliance with antikickback laws. The Davis-Bacon provisions would not in fact be enforced by the Secretary of Labor checking the payrolls for compliance. Violations would normally be reported and investigated on the complaints of workers, unions, or competing contractors.

The best answer to arguments based on possible maladministration of the law is, of course, that this is possible with any law, and that it is a matter to be taken up with the national administration. It does not contradict the principle of including fair labor standards provisions in the Highway Act, unless the opponents wish to repeal such provisions in the other laws set out above, and the Davis-Bacon Act itself.

REPUBLICANS RECOGNIZE OVERTIME PRINCIPLE ON FEDERAL-AID CONSTRUCTION

The provision of section 17 which requires time-and-a-half for work beyond 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week is just as important as the provision for prevailing wage determination under the Davis-Bacon Act. Overtime is an important item in labor agreements, so that unionized contractors will still be at a considerable disadvantage if competitors can work their employees overtime without extra pay.

The fairness of applying the 8-hour and 40-hour standard to federally paid construction has been recognized in S. 1204, sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], ranking Republican on the Labor Committee, and four other Republicans, namely, Senators IVES, PURTELL, and BENDER, all on the Labor Committee, and Senator CASE of New Jersey. This bill is intended to carry out a recommendation in the President's state of the Union message by recodifying the 8-hour laws to make overtime rates mandatory on all contracts "financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from" or insured by the Federal Government. S. 1204 may in some particulars be inadequate, but the principle of fair labor standards on all Federal-aid projects is broader than the modest objective sought in section 17 of S. 1048, which reaches only the Interstate highways to be built with 90-percent Federal funds. As the sponsor of section 17, it is reasonable for me to ask if the advocates of S. 1204 will be consistent and support my fair labor standards proposal.

In my opinion, this bill will not be the bill it ought to be unless it contains this provision to protect the working standards of the men who construct our interstate highway system.

I have been informed of two recent examples of out-of-State contractors underbidding local construction companies on the basis of substandard wages.

On a job in Beaver County, Pa., near Pittsburgh, last December, a contractor allegedly brought in an entire crew from North Carolina to take over a highway job, paying them 60 or 70 cents below the prevailing wage. He was picketed by local highway construction workers, and an injunction suit against the latter is now in court.

In another instance in recent months, a North Carolina contractor allegedly brought 500 men into New Hampshire, where they lived in tents along the highway on which they were working. Protests were finally successful in having these underpaid workers withdrawn from the job.

Contractors who are themselves committed to maintaining fair-labor standards, including fair wages and overtime pay, are as interested as the labor unions of the Nation in the protection of section 17. I ask unanimous consent to include telegrams received from contractors and representatives of the construction industry in support of section 17.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building:

The National Electrical Contractors Association strongly endorses section 17 of S. 1048 (Gore highway bill) which would extend Davis-Bacon Act provisions to construction work subject to the bill. Enactment of this section would tend to equalize competition on this work and prevent uneconomic practices.

PAUL M. GEARY,
Executive Vice President,
National Electrical Contractors Association.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *May 24, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Constructors Labor Council of West Virginia representing large segment of highway and heavy contractors in West Virginia approves application of prevailing wage rates for Federal-aid road projects.

NATHAN S. POFFENBARGER,
Attorney for Constructors Labor Council.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 24, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Allied Contractors Association of Cleveland, Ohio, urge passage of support and embrace of the Gore highway construction bill. Therefore we urge you to do everything within your power to see that this bill is passed.

RAY SCHLOSS,
President,
The Allied Contractors Association.

ARCADIA, CALIF., *May 23, 1955.*

Senator NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference S. 1048 urge you support inclusion of section 17, which I understand would

require application of Davis-Bacon Act to all contracts under this bill.

THOMAS H. PAUL,
PETER KIEWIT SONS CO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 24, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the General Sewer and Water Contractors Association of Cleveland, Ohio, urge passage of support and embrace Senate bill 1048. Therefore we urge you to do everything within your power to see that this bill becomes the law of the land.

STEPHEN PARKER,
Executive Secretary, General Sewer and Water Contractors Association.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, before I conclude I should like to read a telegram I have received from the commissioner of labor of the State represented in part by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is chairman of the subcommittee which considered the pending bill. The telegram reads as follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *May 24, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The general assembly of the State of Tennessee in 1953 enacted a law whereby the State department of labor would establish prevailing wage rates on all building and construction projects wherein any State funds were expended. This department has from experience found this act to be in the public's interest and we sincerely hope that Senate bill 1048 as amended to include the Davis-Bacon provisions is enacted into law.

W. H. PARHAM,
Commissioner of Labor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. First, I wish to express my genuine appreciation for the fine cooperation and great contribution of the junior Senator from Oregon to the pending legislation. He was punctual and regular in his attendance. His intellect and energies were freely devoted to the deliberations of the subcommittee, and the entire committee benefited therefrom.

Moreover, it is very pleasant to work with the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. I find him not only able, but affable, and, in addition, courageous.

Next, I wish to thank him for reading the telegram from the commissioner of labor of my State of Tennessee. Commissioner Parham is a very fine man, and a close friend. It was my privilege and honor at one time to occupy the position which he now fills.

I agree with the sentiment expressed in the telegram which the able Senator has just read. I expressed such sentiments on the floor of the Senate day before yesterday. I also expressed the sentiment at that time, however, that I thought the most important question before the Senate was the passage of a vigorous highway-improvement program. That is the question now before the Senate, together with the consideration of the pending amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able Senator from Tennessee for his observations. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that it has been a pleasure to work under his leadership, and that my admiration for the Senator from Tennessee long preceded my coming to this body.

Before I conclude, I wish to make several observations. In opposition to the Davis-Bacon provisions, a great deal was said on the floor of the Senate the other day about States' rights. I, too, favor States' rights. I served in the legislature of my State for a period of 7 or 8 years, and I appreciate the importance of State governments and of State sovereignty.

However, under the terms of the pending bill, the States will not pay for the interstate roads. Ninety percent of the funds will come from the Federal Government. If those who are so concerned about States' rights were to suggest that the States pay 90 percent of the money, or even 50, 60, or 70 percent of the money, I could well understand their abhorrence of any provision in the Federal law which would prescribe certain fair labor standards for the men who will build the highways. However, under the terms of the bill we are considering, 90 percent of the money to build the interstate highway system will come from the Federal Treasury. The Davis-Bacon provision merely provides for the protection of labor standards with respect to the men who build the interstate roads.

It seems to me the amendment is fair when we consider that similar provisions apply to Federal construction on which the contribution of the United States Treasury is only one-third or perhaps one-half of the total amount.

Something has been said about the American people being road conscious. They are road conscious. The American people are also conscious of the need to maintain decent wages and equitable hours and fair conditions under which men work.

It has also been said that the Davis-Bacon fair labor provisions could not apply to highways because highways are in rural areas. I do not believe that makes very good sense. Airports are in rural areas. Some of the hospitals built with Federal aid are in extremely small towns and in relatively remote areas. There has been no difficulty in applying fair labor provisions to airports, hospitals, and schools. Schools are also in rural areas.

I believe the Senate should retain the Davis-Bacon fair labor standards provisions in the highway bill. I believe it will not be nearly so good a bill or nearly so fair a bill or nearly so advantageous a bill to the Nation if it is enacted without provisions to protect the hours and pay and working conditions of the men who in all kinds of weather will construct the interstate highway system.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding this time to me.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, S. 1048, the Federal Highway Act of 1955, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 375, House Joint Resolution 310.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], is on the floor; the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, is aware of this request, and has approved it; and the minority leader also has approved it. There is no opposition to the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in brief explanation of the joint resolution, I should like to say that, as passed by the House and approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution provides $263,475 to carry on the work of the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization until June 30, and then for 90 days thereafter until its final liquidation.

The appropriation of $25 million for the Veterans' Administration, which is a reduction of $3 million under the budget estimate, is necessary because of the increased number of claims which have been presented. The committee decided not to restore the budget estimate, but to conform to the action taken by the House. The total amount available to the Veterans' Administration is $600 million. Because the amount provided in the joint resolution is such a small percentage of the total sum, we felt the Veterans' Administration could get along with $25 million.

I offer an amendment on page 2, line 7, after the word "Law", to insert "41", so as to make line 7 read: "by Public Law 41, 84th Congress,".

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as

amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the remarks which have been made on the floor of the Senate this morning with reference to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to strike out of the bill the provisions relating to the application of the Davis-Bacon law might indicate, or cause readers of the RECORD and those who follow the debate to get the impression, that a deep and far-reaching and important principle is involved which has significance in the matter of labor relations.

In order that the record may be kept straight, I wish to take this brief time to call to the attention of the Senate certain facts which were discussed quite fully in the Committee on Public Works when the bill was being considered by that committee.

In the first place, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is a necessary amendment, not merely to propitiate someone, not merely to still some opposition to the bill which might otherwise prevent its being passed—although I appreciate the fact that it might have that effect—but because it clears away the underbrush and is necessary for practical reasons.

If in passing a Federal highway bill designed to build highways throughout the land, with emphasis on the interstate system, we inject into the measure the Davis-Bacon amendment, under which the Secretary of Labor in Washington will be called upon to establish certain standards of wages to be paid, we will create so much book work and so much confusion and so much red tape in the administration of the act that we will either increase the cost of the highways or reduce the miles which can be built, without conferring any real benefit on American labor.

I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the minority views on the bill:

> It has been estimated that some 4,000 contracts would be involved annually under section 17. This would require the checking of upwards of 10 million payroll items for compliance with labor standards provisions. In addition, there would be involved investigations and hearings on wages or other labor disputes growing out of the performance of the contract, and surveys of wage levels.

It should be borne in mind that the proponents of this part of the bill, the Davis-Bacon provision, themselves in committee voluntarily restricted its application to the interstate system and provided that it should not affect or extend to the primary, secondary, urban, and rural highways. That fact in itself is significant.

To establish a standard for all the highways throughout the country, including country roads, farm-to-market roads, roads being built by States and by counties and by townships and by municipalities, and dirt roads, certainly would complicate the situation. As a matter of fact, the Davis-Bacon law was enacted some time in the early 1930's. At that time many States of the Union had not enacted suitable minimum-wage standards. Today most of the States are operating under such laws.

The Federal minimum-wage law is under scrutiny at the present time with a view to revising and correcting it. Every factor is being considered very carefully.

Therefore, when, without mature and lengthy deliberation, we inject into a sweeping highway bill, which reaches out into every State and into every town and into every county, a provision which places in the hands of the Secretary of Labor in Washington the power to determine local wages—and he apparently has indicated that he could rule that the whole United States is a locality—we are thoughtlessly and needlessly placing in the hands of one official in the Federal Government the power to complicate the whole system.

It has been suggested that the Davis-Bacon law applies to the building of hospitals, airports, and certain other projects. I submit, Mr. President, that that is a far different matter than its application, indiscriminately, to road construction because it would inevitably seep down from the interstate roads to the secondary, rural, and urban projects, and apply universally to projects all over the country—in metropolitan areas, in country areas, and in small communities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that in the light of the interpretation made by the office of the Secretary of Labor with reference to the Davis-Bacon Act, if there is only one city in the Senator's State which has a recognized standard of labor, the Secretary of Labor could apply that standard to every rural community in the State?

Mr. COTTON. That is exactly correct; and I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I shall gladly yield if I may have a little more time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield a little more time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the able Senator from New Hampshire is bringing out some matters which may well be considered. We have been building roads for a great many years, but we have not yet had this proposition presented in any specific proposal. Since its appearance in the bill I have been receiving various communications on the subject. Some of the communications have brought out the point that where there is no predetermination of what the prevailing wage is, the contractor is placed in the position of having to play safe and make his bid on a basis which takes into consideration the possibility of the highest rate paid in the State in which the project is to be constructed, or in what might be determined as a locality. In that case the bid would be unnecessarily high, with a resultant increase in cost to both the State government and the Federal Government.

I have thought that if the bill were to contain a provision of this sort, it should be accompanied by a clear requirement that a predetermined wage rate should be included in the advertised specifications, so that the contractor would know on what he was bidding. I thought the questions involved in a provision of this sort probably should be determined by an appropriate State agency rather than by a bureau in Washington. But, in any event, I think the subject is one which clearly should be thoroughly explored before it is tied into our permanent highway legislation. Therefore, in general, I am in accord with the ideas expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. He emphasizes the main point I wish to stress. I am sure every Senator desires to do everything that is possible in guaranteeing that the use of Federal funds shall be made with fairness to labor; but the rather haphazard inclusion of a provision of this kind in a great Federal highway bill can also create confusion, have very meager results, and have very little impact on the wages to be paid. It would delay the work. Undoubtedly, in its administration, before the contract was even entered into the wage scale of the contractor would have to be submitted to Washington, and it would have to be checked, presumably by the Bureau of Public Roads, or possibly, by the Labor Department. It would cause untold delay in letting contracts, in acting on bids, in starting highway projects, and it might well increase the cost of highways. There have been estimates of increases in cost of from 10 to 20 or 30 percent.

Mr. President, this is not a labor bill; it is a highway bill. In due time we shall be carefully considering the question of increasing minimum wages throughout the country. I think almost all the States in the Union have been giving increasing attention to their minimum wage and fair labor standards laws. Therefore, the matter which I wish to have clearly appear in the RECORD is that when we vote on the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico we shall not be casting a vote for or against labor. We shall be merely passing on the practicality of having in this complicated and complex measure a provision which can result in a tremendous amount of bookkeeping, a great deal of confusion, and cause incalculable added expense to a highway project. It is not likely to have much impact on the problem of wages to be paid.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. President.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I was asked to yield several minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He is not in the

Chamber at this time, so I should like to yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am one of those who sincerely believe in the recommendations of the Commission created by President Eisenhower and headed by General Clay which asked the Congress to recognize the urgent need of immediate and accelerated Federal assistance to the 40,000-mile interstate road system of America. By way of recommendations for the supply of the necessary funds to accomplish that purpose, the Commission recommends that a Federal agency be created and that it be empowered to issue revenue bonds by which the moneys will be made available at once for the rapid construction by the Federal Government of a 40,000-mile interstate road system across the Nation. That is an American program for the American people and I support it enthusiastically.

I hope I may be given an opportunity later on to discuss that subject in more detail.

We have before us, Mr. President, a motion to delete the following section from the pending bill:

SEC. 17. Any State desiring to accept the benefits of section 2 of this act—

I observe, parenthetically, that that pertains to the interstate system in the pending legislation—

shall submit, through its State agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act. Such State plan shall provide that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed on highway facilities projects in the National System of Interstate Highways approved under the plan shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

And so forth. I oppose the amendment to delete these provisions from the committee bill.

It has been suggested on the floor that the Democratic Party speaks for the working men and women of America, and that the Republican Party does not. I deny that. The pending motion has been made by Democrats in the Senate. If section 17 is deleted from the bill, it will be deleted because of votes in favor of the amendment on both the Democratic and the Republican sides of the aisle. If section 17 remains in the bill, it will be because some of us on the Republican side will be joined by some on the Democratic side to constitute a majority against a motion sponsored by Democrats.

The question whether the Davis-Bacon Act shall apply to the interstate highway system, which I might add will be paid for almost entirely by Federal funds, has nothing to do with partisan politics; it has solely to do with whether the Senate desires to indicate, in the proposed highway legislation now before it, that the prevailing wages on similar construction in the particular locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall apply to those Americans who may earn their livelihood from a multi-billion-dollar Federal road-building undertaking which, to my mind, constitutes an urgent need for all the people of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KUCHEL. I therefore suggest to my friends on both sides of the aisle that they now indicate to the American people that the prevailing wages in the appropriate locality will be the basis on which working people will be paid under this measure. That is the way it is in California; that is the way it ought to be throughout the country.

I voted for this provision in committee; I shall vote on the floor to retain it in the bill. I shall do so in no partisan sense, but as a United States Senator, answerable to my own conscience and to the people of California as to what I ought to vote for and what I ought to vote against. I find no sound argument against making the Davis-Bacon Act, which has been in existence for many years, apply to the proposed Federal highway legislation which is now being considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to delete section 17 of the bill, beginning on line 11, page 20, and extending through line 9, on page 21.

This section refers to the application of the so-called Davis-Bacon Act to the construction of roads in the interstate system. Up to this date, the Davis-Bacon Act has never applied to the construction of any roads, except those in the national forests; in fact, I think it has applied only to the construction of hospitals and airports on Federal-aided projects.

Under the Davis-Bacon Act the prevailing wage rate is fixed by the Secretary of Labor for an arbitrarily determined geographical area. The prevailing rate is almost invariably the highest rate in the geographical area.

An instance of this was called to my attention when a hospital in the city of Winchester, Va., obtained a grant of funds. The Secretary of Labor fixed the wage rate for Winchester as that of the District of Columbia, which is 72 miles away. The labor conditions are entirely different. The result was that while the hospital obtained a grant of $500,000 for its construction, much of that grant was wiped out—because all the construction work was required to be done under the prevailing wage rate of the District of Columbia—by reason of compelling the payment of wages much higher than the prevailing rates of the locality.

That is what will happen if section 17 is permitted to remain in the Gore bill, because highway construction, as we all know, will be in operation all over the United States. While the provision technically applies only to contracts for the interstate system, it would be foolish to assume that the application of the prevailing wage rate as determined by the Secretary of Labor would not spread to virtually every highway program in the country—primary, secondary, urban, State, and county.

Roadbuilders who contract for construction on the interstate system also contract for the construction of roads on other systems. It would be impossible for such contractors to pay one scale of wages on the interstate system and other scales of wages on the other roads.

Under the Davis-Bacon Act, the Federal Secretary of Labor arbitrarily defines geographical areas for prevailing wage rate purposes. The Boston wage rate may be prescribed for road construction in New Hampshire, just as the District of Columbia rate was applied to construction work on a hospital in Winchester, Va., 72 miles from Washington. In all probability, if section 17 were retained in the bill, and the bill were passed, it would cause endless confusion and would increase the cost of highway construction conceivably to a point where Federal appropriations practically twice their current size would build no more highways than are being built today.

I have been told that if this provision were applied to the building of roads, it would increase construction costs approximately 20 percent.

As I understand, the cost estimates in the Clay Committee report were not calculated on Davis-Bacon rates.

Therefore, I hope the provision will be deleted from the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Davis-Bacon law has been in effect for a long time. I do not recall when it was enacted, but it has been in force for a good many years. The Senator from Virginia does not advocate, does he, that construction labor on the highways shall be paid less than the prevailing wages in the locality where the labor is employed?

Mr. BYRD. Not in the locality where the labor is employed; but that is not the way the Davis-Bacon Act is administered. I just cited an instance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator has cited probably an extreme instance, because Virginia is close to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. Winchester is 72 miles from the District of Columbia. It is not influenced by business conditions in the District.

Mr. BARKLEY. The great State of Virginia, which is so ably represented, in part, by my friend who now has the floor, has many advantages by reason of its proximity to Washington which might

offset the disadvantages to which the Senator has referred.

I do not know how far, by mileage, the Secretary of Labor would regard the area of a locality to be. It might depend on the circumstances. It might be more in one case than in another. But it seems to me, superficially thinking of the matter, that it would be rather odd for the Senate to vote, in effect, that those who work on the highways shall receive less than the prevailing wage in the locality where they are employed.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection to paying the prevailing wage for that locality.

Mr. BARKLEY. What practical objection or disadvantage, then, would come from applying the provisions of the Davis-Bacon law?

Mr. BYRD. It would come from the interpretation of the law by the Secretary of Labor and of the prevailing wage for the locality involved. He could interpret it any way he pleased.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would depend on the definition of "locality." How large a locality?

Mr. BYRD. That question would be determined by the Secretary of Labor. He would have arbitrary power to decide.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one could determine the question except the Secretary of Labor. It could not be left to each separate State to determine what the prevailing wage would be, because it would be different in each State.

Mr. BYRD. The Davis-Bacon Act applies only to airports and hospitals which are constructed with Federal money. There are many other Federal activities, involving aid, affecting projects all over the country to which the Davis-Bacon Act does not apply.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize the act does not apply universally to all projects in which the Federal Government has invested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the argument which has been made today against including the Davis-Bacon provisions in the Highway Act could have been made almost equally well against its long-standing inclusion in the acts providing for Federal aid for hospitals, schools, and airports. I have tried to find if there has been any general movement anywhere in the United States to repeal the fair-labor standard provisions as they apply to hospitals, schools, and airports, and I have found none. If it is so unsound to provide for the payment of the prevailing wage for labor employed in the construction of highways, why has there not been any agitation to rescind such provision as it applies to airports, schools, and hospitals?

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made the point that the inclusion of the provision might increase the cost of building the roads. I say that has not been proved. Conversely, I say that if we made it possible for a worker to be paid $1 or $2 a day, we would cut down the cost of roads, or anything else, for that matter, in the construction of which the Federal Government is involved, whether it be the building of aircraft carriers or schools. But is that what we want?

It seems to me that the argument about roads being in rural areas, and therefore being different from any other type of construction, is not valid. To begin with, what is wrong with paying a decent wage in rural areas? The people in those areas have to eat. They have to educate their children and pay medical costs. They are human beings. They are no different from people in the cities.

Furthermore, I say there are hospitals, schools, and airports in rural areas. I dare say that Oregon has as lonely and vast and rural an area as has any State represented by any Senator who has spoken against this amendment, and in Oregon there are airports, schools, and hospitals in some of the loneliest, most remote areas of the United States of America.

I know of no agitation to rescind the fair-labor provisions as they apply to the laws providing for Federal aid for the construction of schools, hospitals, and airports. Therefore, I think there is every good reason why the fair-labor standard provision, which gives assurance that the men who build the interstate roads shall be paid the prevailing wages, should remain in the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a telegram from Joseph V. Moreschi, international president of the A. F. of L. Hod Carriers and Building and Common Laborers Union of America, which I have just received on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1955.*

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the approximately 500,000 members of this union who are employed primarily in the construction industry, I wish to extend their sincere thanks and appreciation for your support in having the Federal-aid highway bill S. 1048, as reported out, include the prevailing wage and hours provision. Your interest on their behalf has been transmitted by letter to the entire membership of our union in your State. Your continued support for these vital, human, decent provisions is earnestly solicited on behalf of the fair contractors, our membership, and their dependents in your State. The attempt to have the bill amended on the floor to let the State engineer determine a minimum wage would if passed create chaos in this national industry. This is exactly what our membership opposes, because experience has shown that it proves worthless.

We request simply in accordance with time-tested principles where Federal money is involved that the Federal Government itself determine the prevailing local rate. There is no better avenue for determining prevailing wages than the Department of Labor where the machinery is already available.

Sincerely yours,
JOS. V. MORESCHI,
General President, International Hod Carriers and Building and Common Laborers Union of America (AFL).

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bridges	Hruska	Potter
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Young
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	
Frear	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I wish to say in opposition to the amendment is that I believe the Davis-Bacon Act as it has applied to other Federal projects has been what we call a leader in setting fair wage rates in this country. The Davis-Bacon Act has been a great stimulus to industry generally. It has served as a bellwether. It has been ef-

fective in assuring more decent standards of living to American workers in leading American industries.

The workers who benefit under the Davis-Bacon Act set a standard for workers generally.

I believe it would be an unfortunate step of retrogression to adopt the amendment. I believe it would be a great injustice to the construction workers of the United States. In State after State the principle of the Davis-Bacon Act has been applied to Federal projects generally. Here we expect the Federal Government to appropriate 90 percent of the cost of a project in respect to Federal participation. I cannot imagine the Senate moving back 20 years in labor progress. That is what we would do if we adopted the amendment. It would endanger for some time the Federal roadbuilding program, because there would be lost the support of the workers of the country for an act which, if adopted with the Davis-Bacon provision included in it, would mark a long step forward in providing a sound highway program.

I know pretty well how deeply concerned American labor is over this very important amendment. I do not believe we should slap labor in the face by the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does either side yield some time to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McNAMARA. I merely wish to ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is controlled, and the Senator's suggestion of the absence of a quorum is out of order, unless time is yielded to him for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays, and I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed by the vote be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's withdrawal comes too late. The question is, Shall the judgment of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the motion now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is the motion of the Senator from Illinois appealing from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what is now the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time, if the Senator——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I be yielded one-half minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield half a minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Senate. I wish to be associated with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have a few minutes to discuss the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield the Senator from Florida 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I wish to say, first, that I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for permitting my name to be added to his amendment as a cosponsor of it, without any condition. Senators who were on the floor some time ago will recall that in colloquy it appeared that conditions were being imposed to which I could not agree.

I am strongly in favor of the amendment, but not necessarily for the same reasons which have been advanced by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I had prepared and there is printed and lying on the table an amendment similar to that offered by the Senator from New Mexico. In my opinion it is a good, sound policy and one that ought to be continued, to leave the matter of control of employment in road construction in the hands of the States and not to have federalized power reaching down from Washington to determine what shall be the rate of pay or what shall be the hours of labor, particularly in an industry of this kind, which is not susceptible to regimentation like many other industries from the standpoint of fixing wages and hours of labor.

Every Senator knows that to be the case. I have not had from anyone in labor who works on road construction even the first request to vote for this proposal of the Gore bill. I have had some such requests from representatives of labor in other organizations. However, I think they should not be allowed to say to those who loyally work in this roadbuilding industry what shall be prescribed for them by Federal law.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. If so, we will kill another of the several bad provisions in the bill which would federalize the construction of Federal-aid highway projects, instead of leaving these matters in the hands of the States, as they have been uniformly left heretofore, and as I hope they will be left hereafter.

I again thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield half a minute to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior and junior Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER] and with those of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I believe if we delete the Davis-Bacon provision from the bill we will take a serious step backward and that we will repudiate a policy which has been successful in advancing the standard of living of a very large segment of our population. We should strengthen and wholly safeguard the Davis-Bacon provision, not disregard and destroy it.

I hope we will have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment so that I may be recorded against it. I want the RECORD to show that I am strongly opposed to the amendment which I hope will be defeated.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, during the course of the next hour I shall place on every Senator's desk an analysis showing how the funds would be distributed under S. 1048.

We have been criticized for calling this a blunderbuss bill. After he has read the analysis of the distribution of the fund, I will leave it to every Senator to say whether he does not agree that that is a good term to apply to the proposed legislation.

The fact is that 30 States are given less than they say they need to complete the interstate system, and 18 States are given far more than they need and far more than they can use.

Therefore, I say that S. 1048 simply scatters dollars and does not build the roads where the roads are needed. I shall have more to say later. In the meantime, I hope Senators will look closely at the analysis when it is placed on their desks, and will note how it affects their States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I request a division on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Illinois is in order.

On a division, the amendment of Mr. CHAVEZ was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois, and Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, after line 5, it is proposed to add a new title as follows:

TITLE II.—INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PERMITS

SEC. 201. No motor vehicle shall be operated on or after April 1, 1956, on any highway in the national system of interstate highways unless there has been issued for, and is displayed in a conspicuous place on, such vehicle in accordance with the provisions of this title, a current permit license in the form of an interstate highway stamp to be issued through the facilities of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 202.—(a) Interstate highway stamps required under the provisions of this title shall be issued, upon application therefor, through the facilities of the Post Office Department. The Secretary shall furnish to the Postmaster General without prepayment a suitable quantity of interstate highway stamps to be distributed to and kept on sale by postmasters in the United States. The Postmaster General may require each such postmaster to give additional or increased bond as postmaster for the value of such stamps furnished to him, and each such postmaster shall deposit the receipts from their sale to the credit of and render accounts to the Postmaster General at such times and in such form as the Postmaster General may by regulations prescribe. The Postmaster General shall at least once monthly transfer all collections from the sale of such stamps to the Treasury. The Postmaster General is authorized to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the Secretary in the sale of such interstate highway stamps.

(b) Each interstate highway stamp as a permit license required under the provisions of this title shall cover the period beginning on April 1 of a calendar year and running through March 31 of the succeeding calendar year. In the case of any application during any such period for a permit stamp for the remainder of such period the charge for such license as established under section 203 shall be prorated for the number of quarters in such period during which such permit license shall be in effect.

SEC. 203.—Each permit license in the form of an interstate highway stamp shall be issued in return for the payment of a fee in accordance with the following table:

For each motor vehicle with a gross weight of—	*Fee per year*
Less than 4,000 pounds	$4
4,000 to 10,000 pounds	8
10,000 to 20,000 pounds	10
20,000 to 30,000 pounds	20
30,000 to 40,000 pounds	40
40,000 to 50,000 pounds	60
50,000 to 60,000 pounds	80
60,000 to 70,000 pounds	120
70,000 pounds or more	200

SEC. 204. Effective date: Except as to section 5 of title I relating to contract authority for acquisition of rights-of-way, the authorizations for funds created by this act shall not take effect until the first fiscal year beginning July 1, next, after a certification by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of Commerce that the prospective total revenue to the Treasury from taxes on motor fuels, motor vehicles, motor vehicle accessories or the sale of interstate highway stamps in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, or a subsequent fiscal year will exceed by $700 million the revenues received from those sources in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, had it not been for my great interest in the subject of roads and highways I might never have been a candidate for Congress or have been a Member of the House and, subsequently, entered the Senate of the United States.

In 1928, because of some of my experiences when I was the editor of a small newspaper in Hot Springs, S. Dak., and from personal knowledge which I acquired of roads and highways, I entered the congressional primary. I did not "make it," but the principal issue on which I based my campaign was that when highway funds were allocated by the United States to the State of South Dakota the State law was such that the funds went to the counties on the basis of the highest assessed valuation, even though the apportionment of the funds to the State was the result of a formula established by Congress apportioning funds on a three-way basis, area, population, and road mileage.

There are in my State a number of Indian counties where the assessed value is low because the land is truck land. But the Indian counties needed roads. They had the necessary population, they had the area, and they had the mileage; but they did not get the roads because the State law took most of the money and distributed it on the basis of the assessed valuation of land.

Growing out of that situation there came a time when I was a candidate for Congress. I was not elected. I was not even nominated at that time. I did not run again until 1934, when I did win the nomination, but was not elected. But I was elected in 1936. During my campaign the question of roads and the question of water conservation were basic issues.

I merely cite that, Mr. President, because my interest in roads has a grassroots foundation.

Since I have been a Member of the Congress, 14 years in the House of Representatives, and in the fourth year of a term in the Senate, I have been consistently interested in the subject of roads and highways.

The amendment which I have offered proposes two rather simple things: First, that in connection with the use of the interstate highway system, the users contribute a little bit to defray the very high cost of construction.

Second, that the effective dates of the authorizations in the pending bill be postponed until the Secretary of the Treasury can certify to the Secretary of Commerce that the prospective revenues in the ensuing fiscal year will be in the neighborhood of $700 million in excess of what they were for the fiscal year which closes June 30, 1955.

Revenues from taxes from motor fuels, motor vehicles, and accessories of motor vehicles, and returns from the collection of the use fee will come to the Treasury.

To illustrate, I might say that today if we wish to use our communication system which has been provided by the United States Government, we go to a post office and buy a stamp, which carries our letter to any part of the United States. I have suggested a stamp in this instance which would be prominently displayed on a car, presumably on some small corner of the windshield, or a window, as the regulations might prescribe. According to the estimates I have been able to make, this would produce approximately $500 million a year. The normal increase in our receipts from taxes on motor fuels, motor vehicles, and motor accessories will provide in the neighborhood of from $200 million to $300 million a year for the improvement of the highway system.

So, Mr. President, I estimate that without any other new revenue feature or new financing feature it would be possible even before fiscal 1957, when S. 1048 would take effect, for the Secretary of the Treasury to make the required certification to the Secretary of Commerce. That would in effect go a long way toward putting the committee bill upon a pay-as-you-go basis.

I shall return to the financing feature and the need for it, in my judgment, after I have made a brief review of my interest and part in highway legislation. I trust that Senators who are somewhat familiar with my custom or habit in the Senate will indulge me if I talk longer than I ordinarily do when I speak on the floor of the Senate. Ordinarily I do not speak for a very long period; but I shall use, I think, possibly a half hour of the time which is allotted to an amendment because I wish to review the highway picture and some of my principal reactions to it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from South Dakota has a precedent for his amendment, because during World War II there was a $5 stamp tax.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. That $5 stamp tax certainly was very inequitable as compared with the fee proposed in the Senator's amendment. During World War II, the stamp tax was universally $5, whether the cargo was 15 pounds or 15,000 pounds. I am delighted to note that in the Senator's amendment the amount is graduated according to the weight of the vehicle.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from North Dakota has made a very discerning observation. As he has noted, for a vehicle weighing less than 4,000 pounds, which would include the great majority of passenger automobiles in the United States, the cost of the stamp would be $4. But the cost provided in the schedule increases progressively and is related to the weight of the vehicle.

During the hearings on the highway bill, the committee had before it a representative of one of the motor carrier associations. We asked him if there was any quick way to determine the tonnage a truck, for instance, might carry during a year in relation to its mileage. Many States have a ton-mile tax of one sort or another; but it is always difficult to enforce such a measure. So I asked the witness if there was any quick method of determining the total tonnage carried in relation to mileage.

The witness said a quick rule of thumb is that the annual ton mileage of a truck is roughly equivalent to the gross weight of the truck itself—that the number of ton-miles is roughly equivalent to the gross weight of the truck. So I followed that idea somewhat in suggesting a schedule, and have provided in the amendment that any motor vehicle traveling on the national system of interstate highways shall be required to display a stamp as evidence that the operator has bought a communication right on the interstate highway system.

I appreciate the discerning observation made by the senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a short question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Before the Senator begins to speak on the general terms of the bill—and I am very anxious to hear him speak on it—I wish to ask him one question about the proposed stamp tax.

If a person fails to put a stamp on a letter which he mails, unless he happens to be a Member of Congress, or anyone else having the franking privilege, the letter will not be delivered. But in the case of the Senator's amendment, which I personally consider favorably, how would the stamp requirement be enforced? Suppose a person failed to buy a stamp and put it on his windshield. Who would enforce the law or keep the vehicle from operating on the interstate highways?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is a very good question, and I will answer it in this way: It would be impossible, I think, and impracticable, to police every port of entry on the interstate system to see whether every car had a stamp. But the fee would be so small for the use of the highway that every owner of a vehicle, so to speak, who proposed to travel any distance at all, would deem it prudent to acquire a stamp, for the same reason that he acquires a permit to drive his automobile, wherever a permit is required.

If the operator of a vehicle becomes involved in an accident, the first thing the policeman asks to see is the driver's license or permit. The officer does not know whether the driver of every car he sees going down the road has a permit; but if the driver becomes involved in an accident, or if any question arises, he had better have his license or permit with him.

So as to the need for a stamp, I suggest, that if a driver were stopped by any policeman on a highway of the interstate system, and he did not have a stamp attached to the windshield of his vehicle, it would be prima facie evidence that he had not complied with the regulation.

Furthermore, it would be possible to make spot checks occasionally, in the same way that trucks are spot-checked are sometimes made to determine whether they are violating the load limit regulations within the States. As we travel along the highways, we see truck-weighing stations. Today such a station may be practically idle, but tomorrow it may have more spot checkers on duty, asking truckers to drive onto the scales, to determine whether the trucks are being operated in violation of the load limits.

So it would be possible periodically, at irregular intervals, to make spot checks of vehicles. Drivers could be stopped as they went by a certain point, to determine whether the stamp requirement was being observed. I think that for the same reason every prudent driver carries a permit, he would also acquire an interstate highway stamp.

The stamp proposed by my amendment would be very similar to the duck-hunting stamp which is required by the Federal Government. If one is at all prudent, he will buy a duck-hunting license at the post office and attach it to his hunting license. Not much redtape is involved. The purchase of such a stamp is a simple procedure, and it provides revenue.

In struggling in the committee with the serious problem of revenue, I was trying to find some way whereby the Committee on Public Works, a legislative committee, could propose something which would answer the question of financing without invading the prerogatives of the House of Representatives in initiating revenue legislation, or of the House Committee on Ways and Means in initiating taxes, which are primarily levied irrespective of whether the person who pays them is a user of the facilities or not.

The distinguishing feature between the proposed interstate-highway stamp and a tax is that the highway stamp is in the nature of a use fee; it is not a tax. If one does not travel on the interstate system, he does not need to pay the fee. If he does not wish to use the turnpike, he can take a back road or a parallel road. He would not need the interstate-highway stamp at all unless he intended to travel on the turnpikes. But if he intended to travel on the national system of interstate highways, boulevards, or turnpikes, he would be expected to have the stamp.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have just read the Senator's amendment. The idea appeals to me very much. But how does the Senator propose to enforce the proposal? Suppose a highway had no toll gates, such as we have on the New Jersey Turnpike. Would there be any way to check on whether a driver had such a stamp, unless he were arrested for speeding?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator has partly answered his question. In fact, I answered a good part of it when a similar question was asked by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I know the Senator from New Jersey has just come into the Chamber.

Let me elaborate. A tollgate would not be required, but it would be possible to spot-check vehicles, the same as trucks are now spot checked to determine whether they are violating the truck-weight limits. I suppose such checks would be the best way to enforce the provision.

But if a driver were involved in an accident, then, in addition to noting whether he had a driver's permit, the officer who checked on the accident would also note whether the accident had occurred on an interstate highway and whether the car had a current stamp as required by law.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is any penalty proposed if a vehicle does not have a stamp?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No penalty is provided in the amendment I have submitted. If the amendment were adopted, I think probably a penalty provision could be added. I had included a penalty provision in the form of the bill which I introduced, S. 1573, which would have made one guilty of a violation subject to a small fine, sufficiently large so that it would have been worthwhile for the driver to have bought the stamp.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to return to the general subject of highway legislation. I do so because I want to support the general proposition that increased emphasis needs to be placed upon the interstate highway system, but that it is impractical to devote all our efforts to completing one segment of the highway system of the country. When the Clay Committee submitted its report, it suggested a program for completing all systems of highways—$101 billion worth of highways, which would have embraced the primary, secondary, and urban systems as well as the interstate system.

In the bill which was introduced to implement the recommendations of the Clay Committee, there was no provision whatsoever for doing anything for the primary system, the secondary system, or the urban system, except to continue the primary system and the secondary system allotments on the basis of the 1954 act, with a reduction of the amount provided for the urban system from the current $175 million level to $75 million, on the assumption that the enlarged funds provided for in the interstate system would be applied in large part to the urban road connections.

Mr. President, it is inevitable that one thinks of roads or highways according to his individual experience. Had I lived only in a large city like Washington, D. C., had I traveled only upon highways connecting cities of a population of 50,000 or more, as one does in traveling across the country, probably my concern would be for the completion of the interstate system. Although living at present in the city of Washington and traveling across the country between Washington and South Dakota 2 and 3 and sometimes 4 times a year my early road experience was on back country roads. I am not driving between my home State and this city now as often as formerly; sometimes I come by plane, but heretofore I have driven from South Dakota to Washington as often as four times a year.

My experience on roads included that of being plagued either by a cloud of dust, or by some sticky gumbo which fastened itself to the tires and piled up over the tires underneath the fenders until the car had to be stopped because the rotation of the wheels was impeded by the mud.

My driving experience included travel on roads where gas stations were anywhere from 20 to 80 miles apart.

My personal experience in traveling on roads included occasions when sometimes I had to stop in the mud and spend all night there.

My personal experience in traveling on roads included traveling on trails with high centers; and yet they were the best roads available even to county seats.

My personal experience in traveling on roads included traveling in counties which are larger than many Eastern States, in a Congressional district where the distance between the county seat and the second largest city in the county is 120 miles—in that one county.

So, the background of interest which leads me to the convictions which I have with respect to roads embraces a concept of doing something not only for the interstate system, which is the system involving the greatent costs, but also for the farm-to-market roads, the back country roads, and the primary roads which serve most of the towns and cities in States such as the one which I have the honor in part to represent.

My legislative interest in and experience with roads relates back to my membership on a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee dealing with the Independent Offices appropriation bill, at a time when the Bureau of Public Roads was an independent agency, and funds were appropriated specifically for the Bureau of Public Roads.

At this time I should like to pay a tribute to the personnel of the Bureau of Public Roads. I recall that in very early years I dealt with Thomas H. McDonald, a career official of the Bureau of Public Roads, a commissioner of the Bureau through Republican and Democratic administrations, who served Members of Congress, irrespective of their political affiliations, with a devoted interest that could not be surpassed by anyone in any branch of government.

I remember the Solicitor for the Department at that time, Mr. Boykin, who was very helpful in assisting me to establish an interpretation of an early highway act, which made it possible for roads on Indian reservations to be built on a 100 percent Federal basis, without requiring matching by the States. Later, because of that, in the House of Representatives, I proposed an amendment to a bill which had come from the appropriate committee, of which Representative Whittington, of Mississippi, was chairman. The amendment extended that principle to roads built on other Federal lands into the national parks, so that roads in national parks could be built on a 100-percent Federal participation basis.

The Bureau of Public Roads has a tradition being manned by fine nonpartisan officials. That tradition was continued in the appointment of Mr. F. V. du Pont, who served for something over a year, and recently resigned to become special assistant on highways to the Secretary of Commerce.

That tradition has been continued in the appointment of Mr. C. D. Curtiss, who is a career man and has been with the Bureau for probably more years than I have been a Member of the Congress.

That tradition has also been continued in the person of the present solicitor of the Bureau, Mr. H. J. Kaltenbach, who also serves Members of Congress, irrespective of their political affiliations, on a basis of service.

When I came to the Senate of the United States the one committee on which I served initially, which pleased me beyond measure, was my assignment to the Committee on Public Works, because there I felt I would be dealing directly with legislative matters having to do with highways.

I participated in the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, and the legislation which is now under consideration in the Senate.

Without intending in any way to take undue credit, I desire to mention some of the features of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952, the act of 1954, and of the pending bill, which were of special interest to me.

In the 83d Congress we were assigned the responsibility of dealing with highway legislation for the biennial act of 1954. It was my great privilege to serve as the chairman of the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, which conducted hearings and reported the bill which became the Federal Air Highway Act of 1954.

Before we started those hearings I introduced S. 2859 in February 1954, in which I proposed for the first time that the Federal Government make allocations for Federal aid in the construction of highways which would be substantially equivalent to the amount of funds which the Treasury receives from the taxes on motor fuels.

A few days after that, other bills were introduced which proposed a lesser amount. They were labeled at that time as administration bills.

Mr. President, I mention that fact because I wish to draw an illustration from it. The bill I had introduced in the 83d Congress, in February 1954, called for more funds for highway aid generally than were provided for in the so-called administration bills subsequently introduced in that Congress; but the hearings demonstrated such a need for a stepped-up program of highway aid that when the Senate Committee on Public Works reported the bill, it reported one which provided for funds very close to the amounts which I had proposed for Federal aid for primary, secondary, and urban roads. The bill which came from the conference with the House of Representatives was substantially the one providing the amounts I had proposed in the bill first introduced.

For some time I had been studying the needs in connection with Federal highway financing and construction. In fact, on March 20, 1953, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, which proposed the making by representatives of the House committee and representatives of the Senate committee of a joint study on highway financing. The House was conducting a separate study, so it did not indicate that it wished to participate in a joint study.

Consequently, in Senate bill 2859 and, subsequently, in Senate bill 1384, which became the Federal Highway Act of 1954, I proposed a section—which became section 13 of the Federal Highway Act of 1954—calling for the making by the Secretary of Commerce of a study on highway financing, including a study of toll highways. That study formed the basis for the information subsequently supplied to the so-called Clay committee or the President's advisory committee.

During the hearings on the pending measure, the representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads and those who testified in connection with the Clay report testified—as does the Clay report itself—that the study made by the Department of Commerce, in response to the provisions of section 13 of the Highway Act of 1954, provided the statistics and figures which led to the recommendations for improved highway programs.

Mr. President, in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 there were also incorporated some other features which had been proposed in Senate bill 2859, of the 83d Congress. One of them was a provision for increasing the ratio of Federal matching for interstate highway construction or apportionment. In the bill I introduced, I proposed a 75–25 ratio for matching in the case of interstate highways. The committee did not accept that proposal; but it did increase the ratio from the ordinary 50–50 one to one of 60–40.

I may say I was interested in the action of the committee this year. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] proposed, in the bill he originally introduced, a change from the 60–40 ratio to a ratio of 66⅔–33⅓.

In the bill I introduced at this session, namely, Senate bill 1573, I proposed that the ratio for matching be 90 percent by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the States, in connection with the interstate system; and when we came to work out the provisions of Senate bill 1048, the committee adopted the amendment I proposed in the committee, so as to make the ratio 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State.

So, Mr. President, without complimenting my own idea too much, but merely to illustrate that the idea is one which grew out of the study of the needs in connection with meeting the costs of the interstate highway system, I point out that the provision which was proposed in the measure I introduced in the 83d Congress, and again in this Congress, in respect to changing the ratio of matching, is incorporated in the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, while the 90 percent basis of matching has much appeal, a point which concerns some of us is the fear that the States will not spend the money economically if they themselves do not provide a sufficiently large amount, so as more or less to compel themselves to see to it that they get their money's worth for every dollar available.

I wonder what the thoughts of the Senator from South Dakota are in regards to that subject.

For instance, a person might have property located alongside an interstate highway, and he might contend that to widen the highway to 4 lanes might entail, so far as he was concerned, an expense of $100,000. But the highway commission might think it really should not cost more than $15,000. If a fight were made on that disagreement, and if the landowner insisted on going to court, and so forth, and if he had some political influence in the community, it seems to me that under such circumstances the highway commission might feel that it would be better to let that person have his way, rather than to have a long fight in the courts, if in connection with the program the State was providing only a very small amount of the money. But I think the commission would take an entirely different view if the State were providing 50 percent of the money or even as much as 25 or 30 percent.

Has the Senator from South Dakota carefully considered that point?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the validity of the point the Senator from Louisiana is making, for he has a profound knowledge of the way human nature works in matters involving the apportionment of money. It is precisely because of the point the Senator from Louisiana has made that I proposed that the ratio be 90–10, rather than 95–5, as proposed in the report of the Clay Committee. I believe that local participation in the payment of the costs of any Federal project is highly important if the money is not to be wasted. It was because of that fundamental conviction, which was strengthened by having seen WPA money spent when local contributions were not required, that when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, we proposed to require matching or counterpart funds in the case of the foreign-aid program, so as to require the payment of as much as 20 percent by the foreign countries that would receive aid from the United States. In that way it was believed that the foreign countries would have a stake in the work being done, and would not be careless in spending the money which we proposed to give them.

Applying that point to the highway problem, let me say that the Clay Committee report recommended 100 percent Federal construction, and 95 percent Federal spending for rights-of-way, with the States providing 5 percent. It seems to me that would not be adequate. I recognize that when we are to build a superhighway, with controlled access, cloverleaf intersections, and four lanes here or there, as may be necessary, the cost rises rapidly; and the States may hesitate to build highways on a 50–50 matching basis, if they are asked to share in the great cost of a highway which is built in accordance with the standards required by interstate traffic. In short, the States simply may not be willing to participate on such a basis.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must provide some inducement for the States to contribute some funds to the program. How much should they provide? Under the report of the Clay Committee, the States would provide what would amount to approximately 6 percent, as I understand, when the relative costs of construction and of rights-of-way, are evaluated under the arrangement calling for 100 percent Federal construction and a 95-to-5 ratio with respect to the rights-of-way. So I believe the State participation should be 10 percent in both cases.

In the bill reported by the committee, it is specifically provided that the 10 percent applies to the rights-of-way, as well as to the other expenditures. So, if the Federal Government proceeds to buy rights-of-way at the request of a State, the State must agree to provide 10 percent of the cost. In the committee we felt that would be a restraining influence against wanton purchase of rights-of-way by a State or wanton jury awards in case of condemnation cases in court.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that 5 percent is really too low, and that the matching ratio should be at least 90 percent to 10 percent.

But I wondered whether even 10 percent would require a sufficiently large or substantial contribution by a State, so as to assure us of fiscal responsibility when the State is handling the funds. I wonder whether the State should provide as much as 20 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will go into the matter further, and will consider the relative costs of the higher standards required for highways in the interstate system, as compared with the lower costs under the lower standards required for the secondary or primary system roads, he will realize that in the case of the interstate system the cost is so greatly increased by the higher standards, that close to 90 percent is justifiable as the Federal contribution.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I speak only from memory; but the cost of clover-leaf intersections, controlled access, and related structures is so high, in the case of the interstate system standards, that I think the cost ratio is rather fairly distributed under the 90-percent 10-percent formula.

Proceeding with the features which were incorporated in the 1954 act, and which would be continued by S. 1048, for a number of years it had come to my attention that the Federal Government was not treating itself as well as it was treating States and private individuals in the matter of highway allocations. We were not putting as much money into roads on Federal lands, roads on national park lands, national forest lands, and on lands in Indian reservations, as was necessary to keep them in step with the improvement of highways on other lands.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I certainly agree with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I should like to inquire from him why it is that the committee saw fit to increase the funds available for the primary system, for the secondary system, and for urban roads, but determined that the amounts available for the national forest highway system and for the national parks system should be left at the same identical figure as that in last year's bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that neither bill, as introduced—neither S. 1048, the bill now reported, nor S. 1160, which will be offered as a substitute for the pending bill—made any provision for extending the authorization with respect to forest highways, park highways, or Indian roads, except that S. 1160 would have continued the forest highways alone on the level of the 1954 act. However, as to forest roads and trails, nothing was provided for forest roads and trails in the $622,500,000 figure reserved for continuing the 1954 act. Forest roads and trails had received $24 million under the 1954 act.

There was nothing in S. 1160 for national park highways, parkways, or Indian roads. So the junior Senator from South Dakota introduced a bill, Senate bill 1573, which proposed a modest increase over the 1954 act in the level of all those categories of Federal land roads. I was unable to persuade the committee to step up the levels, but the committee did incorporate in Senate bill 1048, as reported by the committee, the level of the 1954 act, plus a new feature which we put into the 1954 act, that of establishing contract authority.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator indulge me for a moment?

It had been my observation, through a period of years, that though we had an authorization for forest highways or for forest roads and trails, national park highways, and Indian roads, the appropriations were never coming up to the level of the authorizations.

When I conducted hearings before the Roads Subcommittee in the 83d Congress, there was developed specific testimony from the Park Service, from the Forest Service, and from the Indian Service with respect to the lag between appropriations and the authorizations for those several services. For example, we developed, from the Park Service, that the National Park Service was receiving $3½ million a year in appropriations, although it was authorized in the Highway Act to receive about $10 million. So the junior Senator from South Dakota proposed to the committee—and such a provision was incorporated in the bill which was reported and which became the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954—that the national park highways, parkways, Indian roads, and forest roads and trails, should have contract authority up to the amount of the authorization, so that Federal land roads could be treated as well as State roads would be. Under Federal highway legislation for years, when apportionments have been made to a State, the State knew that they represented commitments. It could propose road contracts, and once it made a contract, that contract represented a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to put up matching funds on the basis of the contract price for the approved project.

So the apportionments to States became commitments, and the States could count on matching that much money, according to the authorization in the Biennial Authorization Act. But the Federal bureaus could not do so. They were at the mercy of some subsequent appropriation.

The junior Senator from South Dakota, as chairman of the Roads Subcommittee in the 83d Congress, developed that testimony at some length. It will be found in the hearings at that time. I proposed a contract authority provision. We also stepped up funds for forest roads and trails to the level of the 1954 act, which was the highest it had ever been.

I have consulted with the roads division chiefs in the Forest Service, in the Parks Service, and in the Indian Service. They say to me, "If we can continue at that level, and continue to have contract authority for 10 years, 5 years, or whatever period is proposed for others, we can have a long-range building program, and we shall not be doing mere patchwork."

We found that on one of the parkways south of Washington the Parks Service was spending more than $2,000 a mile each year in maintenance, whereas on a comparable road built to a modern standard, the maintenance was less than $300.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I appeared before the Senator's subcommittee during the previous session of Congress, in behalf of the contract obligation provision for the forest and park road funds. I commend the Senator for the fine work he did at that time.

I wish to take issue somewhat with the statement that the funds provided for under that act, as carried forward in the bill before the Senate at this time, are adequate to do the job, particularly in view of the fact that the funds made available for the primary system and the secondary system have been materially increased, whereas the funds for forest highways and for national parks are left practically as they were previously. I think the result will be a very bad situation, because in the Senator's State, in my State, and in many other Western States, the roads in the forests are connecting links, in some cases with the interstate system, and in other cases with the primary system.

The result will be a situation in which we shall have a well-improved Federal system connecting with a forest system which will be lagging behind by a great many years.

So it seems to me that, in view of the fact that our highways in the parks and our highways in the national forests are considerably behind the primary system, funds ought to be made available on a contract basis, to the extent of double the figures provided by the 1954 act. I hope the committee will look into that situation and see what can be done to increase those funds so that the proper kind of transportation can be provided for the people who visit our national parks, and also for the people who are obliged to travel through our forests on trips, using the national Federal-aid system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will permit me to comment at that point, Senate bill 1573, which I introduced at this session, would have increased the amount for forest highways to $24 million. However, the committee did not wish to increase those amounts.

I point out to the Senator that previous to the 1954 act there was a lag of about $48 million, over a 5-year period, between prior authorizations and actual appropriations. We have not yet operated under the new level of appropriations established by the 1954 act. Those will be effective for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true that while the money was authorized, appropriations were not made available?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true.

Mr. BARRETT. It was not because there was no authorization?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We have made the money available. In fact, we made the contract authority applicable not only to the 2 years 1956 and 1957, but also to 1955, so that last year the three services—parks, forests, and Indian—were able to establish a 3-year program and to know what they could do. Instead of patching, they could start new construction.

Mr. BARRETT. The point I am trying to make is that if we are now to accelerate the primary system and the secondary system under any of the bills we are presently considering, by the same token, we ought to step up the work in the national forests and in the national parks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no disagreement between the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Dakota on that point. I should like to step it up more. It will be stepped up more, because actually those in charge of the roads in this category will be able to get the money, whereas as formerly it was merely held up to them as a dream.

Mr. BARRETT. In the bill the Senator introduced, S. 1573, I notice section 303 sets out some different figures for the permit licenses. It starts with $300 for the first category.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. S. 1573 has not been presented. Those fees are not proposed in the amendment which I offered. Those fees were limited to trucks. We sought to set fees which would be comparable to what trucks now pay on such roads as the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

Mr. BARRETT. Does the Senator have some figures with reference to the revenue that would be realized as the result of section 303 of S. 1573, so that I would know approximately the amount which would be made available under the amendment the Senator is now offering?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; the estimates we were able to make indicate that under the truck schedule of S. 1573, the revenues would be about $410 million. However, I believe as much or even more would be raised under the amendment. Let me give the Senator a quick figure. There are approximately 60 million automobiles in the country. If each paid a $5 fee, there would be a revenue of $300 million. Of course, most of those are automobiles which would come under either the $4 or $8 fee, rather than the $5 fee. Most of them would come under the $4 figure. However, with the larger amounts coming from trucks it is my very rough estimate—and I do not know that anyone can give an accurate figure—that probably half a billion dollars would be realized in fees under the proposed amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Proceeding with the development of some of the features of the committee bill—and I use the term committee bill without any disparagement at all for the very excellent and outstanding leadership given by the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator permit me to proceed for 1 or 2 minutes more? I should like to talk about the Senator from Tennessee. I have just stated that the Senator from Tennessee provided excellent leadership in conducting the hearings and in working on the bill. I am sure he will not misunderstand me when I speak of the bill as the committee bill. I believe the bill is the product of the extensive hearings and the work of many Members of the Senate, and I believe he will not object if I point out that the bill received many amendments, some of which were proposed by the Senator from Tennessee as a result of the hearings on the bill. The most notable one, I believe, is of his own suggestion. It changes the amount of money proposed to be made available for the interstate system. As the Senator from Tennessee had introduced his bill, it provided $500 million for the interstate system. However, the Senator from Tennessee stated very frankly to the committee that as a result of the hearings he believed the interstate system should receive greater emphasis. It was his own amendment, which the committee agreed to, that raised the figure for the interstate system from $500 million in the first fiscal year of the 5-year period to $1 billion for the first year, a billion and a quarter for the second year, a billion and a half for the third year, and $2 billion for each of the fourth and fifth years of the 5-year period which the bill encompasses.

The Senator from Tennessee also led in amending the bill with respect to truck weights and other features of the bill. Many features of the bill grew out of his leadership. Having said that, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his generosity and kindness. I am deeply grateful to him.

Second, I wish to express my profound appreciation for the devotion to duty and the keen insight and effectiveness of the Senator from South Dakota. Not only does he work hard, but he has as keen and quick an intellect as it has ever been my privilege to work with. This is not the first time it has been my privilege to work with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. He and I served together in the House of Representatives and on the same committee. The affection and esteem in which I hold him is limited only by human bounds.

Third, I wish not only to acknowledge that what he says with respect to the bill is correct, but also to call his attention to the fact that in my opening address in the debate I acknowledged gladly all that he has said.

I repeatedly referred to the bill as the committee bill. I even went a step further than the junior Senator from South Dakota has gone. I said I thought I was on the losing end of more votes on amendments than perhaps any other member of the committee. However, the basic structure of the bill has remained. It is a committee bill. It is a composite of the best our group could produce. It is the product of group action. No man on the committee has his mark more indelibly placed on the bill, if as much so, than has the distinguished and able junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I deeply appreciate the very kind and generous remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. I think it is a committee bill. I would go further than that and say that I think the bill, whatever name it may bear, will carry the impact of the recommendation of the President of the United States for speeding up the highway program, particularly the interstate system.

Actually, had it not been for the President of the United States, who sent a special message to Congress making a recommendation for a stepped-up highway program, it is doubtful that we would be considering highway legislation at this session of Congress. Normally, the biennial Federal-Aid Highway Act is considered in the second session of a Congress. That has been true for a number of years. We passed such a bill in 1954, and we would not normally consider another such bill in 1955 were it not for the push given highway programing by the President in his message to Congress and by his message to the governors last year after he had signed the 1954 act.

With respect to the value of the other amendments and features of the bill which support the idea that it is a committee bill, among the other amendments which I regard as of considerable importance is the one to which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has alluded. It is the stepped-up program for the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Mr. President, the figures in the committee bill are not haphazard figures. I have before me a rather graphic presentation of the case for better highways which has been compiled to illustrate a 10-year construction program and the construction needs on a 10-year basis, which is the period which was considered by the Clay Committee. I have a chart which I think Senators may find to be of interest, which sets forth the funds which are currently available under the Act of 1952. It should be remembered that the Act of 1952 covered the fiscal years 1955 and 1956, and the year which ends June 30, 1955, is the one in which we are at this time.

In the first column are shown figures for the several categories of Federal aid in the year in which we are now operating. The Federal primary road aid amounts to $247,500,000; secondary road aid, $165 million; urban road aid, $137,500,000, making a total of approximately $550 million.

In the current year, note the figures. For the interstate highway system, there is $25 million only, making a total of $575 million for those principal categories of Federal aid in the year in which we are now operating, fiscal 1955, under the act of 1952.

In the second column there are figures for the fiscal year beginning July 1, for fiscal 1956 and 1957, as established by the act of 1954, and which are operative for fiscal 1956 under the provision of either S. 148, as amended, or under the substitute proposed, and for 1957 if we adopt no new legislation.

First of all we establish a higher level. The total for the three categories of Federal aid were raised to $700 million for the new fiscal year, distributed in this way: $315 million for the primary system, as against $247,500,000 before; $210 million for the secondary system, as opposed to $265 million before; $175 million for the urban system, as opposed to $137,500,000.

These proportions follow the historical distribution of 45 percent to the primaries, 30 percent to the secondaries, and 25 percent to the urbans. These percentages were in the 1952 and 1954 acts.

Last year we stepped up the interstate system sixfold, $25 million in the current year, under the 1952 act, and $175 million under the act of 1954, making a grant total of $875 million for these forms of Federal aid. That does not include the Federal roads for parks, forests, and so forth.

It is proposed to continue the level of primary and secondary systems as it was in the 1954 act, and to decrease the amount for urban roads from $175 million to $75 million, on the theory that the interstate system would itself take care of a large part of the urban needs. There is a total of $600 million for those categories, whereas the present law carries a total of $700 million.

The committee bill proposes $400 million for primary roads and $200 million for urban roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee give me 20 additional minutes?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes additional time to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator very much.

The figures $400 million for primary roads, $300 million for secondary roads, and $200 million for urban roads bear a direct relationship to the estimated cost of building the systems as established by the studies of the Clay Committee and the Bureau of Public Roads.

In the bill which was introduced originally, the total would have been $1,100,000,000. In the bill which I introduced, it would have been $810 million, plus an additional amount for urban roads, which would have brought it very close to the $900 million figure. That figure was not brought out of thin air. It bears a direct relationship to the estimated completion costs for those three categories. In the Clay Committee report and in the study by the Bureau of Public Roads, the estimated cost for completing the primary system in the rural sections of the country was $19,887,000,000, or, in round figures, $20 billion.

For completing the secondary system, the figure came to $14,876,000,000, or approximately $15 billion, and for the urban roads the figure was $10 billion. When it is borne in mind that those figures are matched 50–50, of course, the amounts double.

But Senators will note that the ratio or relationship is exactly the same—40, 30, and 20 percent. It is exactly the same as the ratio of 20, 15, and 10. In other words, the figures in the committee bill represent the proposed program for completing the primary, secondary, and urban systems on a 5-year basis when matching is considered.

When we consider the figures of the Clay Committee, Senators will note that it will take 25 years to complete those systems, but the distribution is such that there will be a balanced completion at the end of a 25-year period, and that the system will be complete on the basis of a 10-year need as estimated by the studies which I have mentioned.

In relation to the interstate system——

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I notice that under S. 1048 and the substitute the contribution on the basis of 45, 30, and 25 is not carried out as it was in last year's bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The differences between S. 1160 and the current act come wholly in the urban system. The reason for that is that under the recommendations of the Clay Committee many of the urban connections will be taken over on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. BARRETT. From the interstate system?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. Under the Clay report the estimate for completing the interstate system, nonurban, was $23 million. The uban connections were estimated to cost $4 billion, half of which would be Federal and half of which would be local. So it is believed that to a great extent the urban connections will be picked up by the interstate system.

The historical percentage basis goes away back to our early highway legislation. It must be remembered that we have taken 40,000 miles of the 240,000 miles of the primary system and set them apart as categories of the interstate system.

The interstate system actually is only a part of the primary system. The total primary system of the country is estimated at 240,000 miles. The interstate system is comprised of 40,000 selected miles out of the 240,000. The distortion has occurred because of picking up the interstate system and giving it a tremendous boost, which distorted the historical 45–30–25 ratio.

This is the first time I know of that we have what might be called a scientific and logical distribution between primary, secondary, and urban roads, with expenditures of $400 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system, $300 million for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system, and $200 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary-highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas, reflecting exactly the ratio of cost of building those systems when the interstate system is taken out.

Mr. BARRETT. What disturbs me somewhat with reference to the committee bill, S. 1048, is that the amount available for the urban roads is $200 million. Under that bill, the amount available for interstate system has been stepped up tremendously, as the chart indicates. Consequently, it seems to me that the funds available for the primary and secondary systems should be higher than they are in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very glad the Senator has pointed that out. I hand him a chart, which shows the estimated completion costs. The urban roads have been separated into two categories—interstate urban and primary urban. It will be noted that the figure given reflects the cost of building the primary urban roads, and leaves in the interstate category the interstate urban roads.

There is another feature which meets the question which the Senator from Wyoming has suggested, and I think it is very proper that he has raised it. He has been the Governor of his State, and understands the problem of the apportionment of funds at the State level.

In the bill which I introduced in the 83d Congress, which became the act of 1954, it was proposed for the first time to permit transferability among the different categories of funds when they were once allotted to the States. For a number of years the American Association of State Highway Officials had been recommending, and the Bureau of Public Roads had been concurring in the recommendation, that the States be permitted to transfer funds among their systems, in order that they could tailor their highway funds to the particular needs of the States.

It is impossible for the Federal Government to know exactly, in distributing highway funds, the needs within a State. So in the act of 1954 a program of transferability was begun. We authorized 10 percent transferability as among the different funds, so that if a State found that for its particular system or its particular needs it wanted to place greater emphasis upon primary, secondary, or urban roads, it could participate up to a 10-percent apportionment for the State, provided, however, that it could not increase any particular apportionment by more than a total of 10 percent.

In S. 1048, which is now before the Senate, we have gone a step further, in an amendment which I proposed, because it was consistent with a proposal I had made in the bill I had introduced. I refer to the proposal to increase the transferability to 20 percent, so that it becomes possible, under S. 1048, as amended, for a State to take its allocation for interstate highways, and to transfer not to exceed 10 percent of its allocation to one of the other categories, provided, however, that it goes to the matching basis that would be applicable to that particular fund.

So if the State of Wyoming wants to put more money into its secondary system, its urban system, or its primary system, than into the interstate system, it can transfer from the interstate fund to the other funds, provided it does so on a 50–50 basis.

Conversely, if a State wanted to take its secondary-road money and apply it to the interstate system, it could do so, or it could transfer it between the primary and secondary or urban systems.

Mr. BARRETT. I think that is a very wise provision, but the difficulty Wyoming would encounter, under the committee bill or the proposed substitute, would be that in which most of the States in the West would find themselves with reference to the matching of funds. I realize that the Senate is restricted in its authority to provide funds to finance the road program; but does the Senator agree with me that the States should be given the first opportunity to increase the gasoline tax? Perhaps the Federal Government should leave that field largely to the States, so that the States could, if necessary, increase the gasoline tax and thus provide the funds necessary to match the increased amounts to be available for the primary, urban, secondary, and also the interstate systems.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Wyoming is, as usual, alert to the implication of the problem confronting the States. I point out that as S. 1048 is amended, instead of becoming effective in fiscal 1956, it will become effective in fiscal 1957. That means that the legislatures of the States will meet within 6 months after S. 1048 has become effective.

The standard highway legislation for a number of years has proposed that funds shall be available for expenditure for 2 years following the time they are apportioned in the States. Consequently, the State legislatures which have already met have taken cognizance of the situation for fiscal 1956. They are already prepared to meet that situation. That will take care of the period from July 1, 1955, through June 30, 1956.

The new authorizations or apportionments would be effective, under S. 1048, for the year beginning July 1, 1956. The State legislatures will be meeting in January 1957, only 6 months afterward. The higher apportionments will be available for 18 months after the legislatures have met. The provision already made for carrying on under the 1954 level certainly will take care of the first 6 months, because the stepup is not so much beyond that time.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct when he says that the States will be able to take care of the first 6 months. But, from a practical standpoint, if, perchance, the House should provide, let us say, an additional Federal gasoline tax of 2 cents a gallon, then the Federal Government would have preempted the field, from a practical standpoint, and the States would not have an opportunity to provide additional funds by themselves imposing a higher gasoline tax.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the question of distribution of revenue, and whether the State or Federal Government shall go further into the gasoline tax field or adopt other sources of revenue, is a part of the total problem. I do not know that that can be settled in a legislative committee.

But I think this is a practical situation. For the legislatures which will meet within 6 months after the new authorization becomes effective, funds will be available for 2 years, thus enabling the legislatures to take care of the situation.

I felt that the original provision in the Gore bill, namely, for $1,100 million, instead of $900 million, was too high. It was too big a jump from $700 million. Therefore, I offered the amendment which made the figures what they now are.

There is one other committee amendment in the bill which I wish to speak to, and that is the one authorizing 42,500 miles of interstate system. The interstate system had a 40,000 mile limitation, which was approved in 1947. It was approved at a time when the States and the Nation as a whole were still under the impact and influence of World War II. But there have been tremendous shifts in population since 1947, as there were in the years before that, when the States suggested what they would like to have in the interstate system. Therefore, some readjustment is inevitable if we are to meet the needs of changing population patterns since World War II. The committee thought there should be authorization for additional mileage, and I am happy that the committee adopted the amendment which I proposed in that respect, to increase the authorization to 42,500.

I feel that the main weakness of the committee bill is the financing provision; and I have offered an amendment, which is pending, providing for a stamp use permit fee. Since I discussed my amendment at the outset of my remarks, I do not wish to repeat them now.

I intend at an appropriate time to say something about the financial features of the substitute bill, because I believe they do grave violence to traditional and sound principles of Government financing, Government budgeting, and congressional review of Federal expenditures, but I shall reserve my remarks on that phase of the question for a later time, when we consider the amendments directly relating to them.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to all of my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Public Works. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], as a former governor of his State, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works during the 83d Congress, and as a student of public affairs and public needs, through a long career of public service, repeatedly rendered invaluable counsel to the committee throughout the consideration of the bill.

The ranking Democratic member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], rendered invaluable service to the committee, growing out of his service as governor of his State, and out of his prior membership on the committee, when it considered other highway legislation. It was he who offered several of the amendments which were adopted by the committee. It was he who saw instantly the value of many of the amendments which were proposed, because of his prior experience in working with the problem.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], all made important contributions. The Senators from New Hampshire and Nebraska served on the great Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives and had an acute knowledge of fiscal aspects in Government financing.

I mention those Senators as my colleagues on the minority side of the committee, because I know that every one of them attended hearings faithfully, and that every one of them made his contribution to the consideration of the bill.

I also mention the other members of the Committee on Public Works on the majority side. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has a great career of public service behind him, and he was extremely valuable because of his understanding of the financial problems involved in the bill before the committee.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], both because of his experience in State highway construction, and because of his deep study of the fiscal problems of Government, was invaluable in his comments and suggestions to the committee.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] were alert to preserve the human elements in our consideration of highway needs.

I feel that in presenting this bill to the Senate we are offering what is truly a committee bill. Its adoption by the Senate should not be considered in any sense a defeat for any pet ideas of anyone, but, rather, as a victory for everyone who wants a highway program which wil meet the needs of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendment of the junior Senator from South Dakota is provocative. It shows that he has given to the subject now under consideration a great deal of thought. More importantly, it demonstrates courage on his part, which all of us may not have, when he suggests a tax, though the junior Senator from South Dakota does not call it a tax.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And does not admit that it is a tax.

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator to excuse me for calling it a tax. I did so inadvertently. The Senator from South Dakota has the courage to suggest the imposition of a fee for all vehicles using the interstate system. Not only does he have the courage to do so, but he has the patriotism to undertake to have revenue raised to help in financing this enormous program upon which we are, I believe, about to embark.

The Senator from South Dakota had this provision, in essence if not in identical terms, in the bill which he introduced and which was considered by the committee. It was the only bill considered by the committee, Mr. President, which did not contain a provision which would bring additional revenue into the Treasury. Senate bill 1160 did not provide for bringing any additional revenue into the Treasury, nor does Senate bill 1048. It is inherent in both bills, and it would be inherent in any bill under the terms of which public highways would be built in the country, that additional revenue would come into the Treasury.

Regardless of the terms of the legislation under which a better system of highways is built, there is going to be a greater use of the highways; more gasoline and more lubricating oil are going to be used, and as a result there will be more revenues going into the Treasury of the United States during the life of those roads. That accretion in revenue may approach the cost of the roads. That would be true under either the committee bill or the administration bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I shall yield if I may go one sentence further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Tennessee 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. The bill of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] went one step further. It did include the amendment now before the Senate to levy upon each and every user a fee to be evidenced by a stamp. While the Senator from South Dakota says it is not a tax, I believe it is fair to say that a majority of the committee considered it was in the nature of a revenue measure, and a majority took the position that we were without jurisdiction to consider a revenue measure. Therefore, the committee declined to approve the amendment, and I must respectfully decline to do so now, but with sincere praise for the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the question I was about to ask does not particularly relate to the tax question which the Senator has mentioned, but I should like to have the Senator refer to a chart which has been placed upon the desks of Senators. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] earlier in the session referred to the chart when he said it would be placed on our desks.

As I look at the chart I find, for instance, that the bill, while providing for all the States, provides for some States sums which are greater than those States could possibly use. There would not be the means in those States for matching the Federal funds.

Then, when I refer to my own State of Minnesota, I find that the need in our State would be in the amount of $229 million, whereas the Federal funds provided for the interstate system——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THYE. The Federal funds provided for in the interstate system by Senate bill 1048 for the highway program would provide Minnesota with only $176 million. That is a question which has somewhat disturbed me, because if it be true, as this chart indicates, and as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has stated——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have only 1 minute.

Mr. THYE. I am almost through, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. THYE. I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee comment on the figures referred to, as they appear on the chart.

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to comment briefly on the chart. When the substitute amendment is called up I am sure it will be discussed more fully.

The chart is not based upon the bill. The Senator from Minnesota cannot find in Senate bill 1160 any provision which assures his State of $1, let alone of the larger amount set forth on the chart. That is a basic difference between the two bills. Senate bill 1048 has a formula by which the Senator's State and every other State will be apportioned funds. Senate bill 1160 abolishes the apportionment formula.

I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Minesota that distribution of Federal funds by means of some formula is better than not to have any formula at all. The figures on the chart are not based on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota. I may say it is somewhat unusual to yield to the author of an amendment time in opposition to the amendment. But the Senator from South Dakota is an unusual legislator, and all of us can profit by what he says. So I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind words. I appreciate them, although he is almost overwhelming with his kindness.

I am afraid that the kind words of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], in his comments on the amendment, are designed more to kill the amendment with kindness than to do anything else.

Be that as it may, I wish to state for the record that, of course, I realize that neither the Senate of the United States nor any other legislative body will adopt an amendment such as the one I have proposed without giving it more deliberate consideration than can be given to my amendment at this time. So I do not expect the amendment to be adopted. But it should be made available, so all Senators will will be able to study it further, for sooner or later something of this sort must be done and will be done. If we are to build roads, we shall have to pay for them. Regardless of whether we pay for them by means of use fees or by means of taxes, somewhere the money must be found.

Let me say a word regarding whether what my amendment proposes would be a tax or a fee. I believe the amendment is within the capability of the Senate to consider under both the legislative precedents and the rules of the Senate and the Constitution. The amendment does not propose a tax. If the amendment were adopted, no one would have levied on him a tax by the sovereign power of the Government; no one would have to pay for one of the stamps unless he used the facility which would be provided. No one regards a postage stamp as a tax. No one has to buy a postage stamp unless he wishes to use it.

This amendment is proposed as one to be applied only to those who wish to use the interstate system of highways. Under the amendment, one who wishes to use the interstate system of highways would have to have on his car a stamp showing that he had purchased the right to use those highways. So the amendment does not propose a tax. Instead, it proposes only a toll or a use fee, depending upon whether people use or do not use these highways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend, the former chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have already spoken several times in commendation of use fees or of paying for roads as they are used. I think the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has rendered a very fine service in bringing the amendment before the Senate; but I very much fear that what the amendment calls for is a tax.

On the other hand, I think it excellent that the amendment has been considered by us today. It will be necessary to obtain other revenue in order to complete our road system and bring it up to the standards required in the United States.

I appreciate very much the nice things the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said about me. He is a fine legislator.

I wish to say, further, Mr. President, that I do not believe I have ever served on a Senate committee which has more conscientiously and diligently performed its duties than has the committee which has considered this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control, so that a vote may be taken on the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me? I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well; I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this is my question: When we impose a use tax or stamp, will it permit the operator of any vehicle, as listed on the chart—whether a vehicle of 60,000 gross pounds or one of 70,000 gross pounds—to have a permit to drive the vehicle either 100 miles or an indefinite distance on the national system of highways?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am glad the question has been asked. The arrangement would be exactly the same as that which applies

when we buy a postage stamp. A postage stamp will carry a letter either from Minneapolis to Mankato or from Minneapolis to New York City; the distance allowed is indefinite.

Mr. THYE. Would there be any justice in charging the same fee or toll, regardless of the distance traveled and regardless of the weight of the vehicle?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota whether there would be any justice in charging the same use fee, regardless of whether the vehicle in question traveled only from Philadelphia to Harrisburg, or whether it traveled from Philadelphia to Los Angeles, Calif.? Would there be any justice in charging the same use fee for the operation on the national system of highways of a heavy truck which pounded the paving all the way from Philadelphia, Pa., to Los Angeles, Calif., and for the operation of another truck which traveled on the highway system only from Philadelphia to Harrisburg, Pa.?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the answer is twofold. First, in each instance the truck operator would have paid a larger ton-mile tax, or license fee, or whatever it may be called. But according to the chart, the gradation in the case of a 70,000-pound vehicle is much heavier than in the case of a lighter vehicle. Thus, the ton-miles carried by such trucks roughly corresponds to the gross weight of the vehicles. That is the reason for the gradation in this case.

Mr. THYE. I have referred only as an example to a truck of 60,000 gross pounds and a truck of 70,000 gross pounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I may have one more minute, I shall take my seat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we wish to try to have this bill passed. The administration has recommended it. I do not wish to have the bill talked to death.

On the other hand, I still cannot resist the pleas of my Republican friends. So I yield an additional minute to the Senior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished majority leader, Mr. President. The majority leader is always very gracious, and that is what makes all of us try to cooperate with him.

I point out that this is only the third minute I have requested; and I do not believe that in requesting 3 minutes I am trespassing on the good nature of either the majority leader or of my friends on this side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire me to yield him another minute? [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. No, Mr. President, I do not.

This is the question I should like to have answered: Is there not great injustice in the proposed use stamp or use fee, inasmuch as the same charge would be made, regardless of the weight of the vehicle and regardless of the distance the vehicle traveled? In other words, under the amendment, the operator of a heavy truck which traveled all the way from Philadelphia to Los Angeles, Calif., would pay the same use fee which would be paid by the operator of a lighter truck which traveled on the highway system only from Philadelphia to Harrisburg, Pa. If a toll is to be charged, it should be charged on the basis of the use made of the highway system and the amount of wear and tear applied to it, and not on the basis of a use stamp which will cost all users the same, regardless of the distance traveled.

Furthermore, let me point out that in the case of the postal system the charges for the handling of parcel-post packages are based on a zone system, plus the weight.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the alternative is to charge nothing unless the system proposed by my amendment is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is identified as "5–24–55–G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 2 (d) of the bill as reported and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum permissible corresponding dimensions or maximum permissible corresponding gross and/or axle weights applicable on July 1, 1956, to vehicles lawfully using any of the public highways of such State, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled "Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States" and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be operated lawfully within such State on July 1, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 60 minutes. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. MORSE. To begin with, I yield myself not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I wish to make a series of perfecting modifications to the amendment which I have just offered, as follows:

On page 1, line 8, change "1956" to "1955"; on page 2, line 16, after the words "allowing the" insert "lawful"; in the same line, after the word "operation" insert "over the public highways"; in line 18, before the word "within" insert "over the public highways"; and in the same line, strike out "1956" and insert "1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modified amendment to the desk?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, Mr. President.

We made great progress on this amendment as a result of the colloquy yesterday afternoon, because the RECORD will show that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and his subcommittee reached a conclusion as to the change of the date from July 1, 1956, to July 1, 1955.

The proviso clause of my amendment really goes to the heart of the problem. I feel that that subject was pretty thoroughly discussed yesterday in my colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee, who has been very gracious in his endeavor to ascertain the basis for the request of those who have asked me to sponsor the amendment.

What we really seek to do is to cover the type of situation which exists in the State of Nevada, so ably represented in this body, in part, by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, in his State there is no law governing dimensions and height of trucks. Of course, the Senator from Nevada can speak for himself, but he has authorized me to say in the course of my remarks that he supports me in this amendment.

In view of the fact that the proviso clause goes to the heart of the problem, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will discuss the proviso clause with me, and the chairman of the committee will discuss the proviso clause with me. It is quite possible that in the colloquy we can reach an agreement to accept the amendment, at least so far as the proviso clause is concerned.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I heard the amendment stated, and the modifications made therein, it would seem to state with some clarity what I believe the present bill

contains. If I correctly understand the amendment as serving to clarify the purpose and intent of the committee, I see no objection to it. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to have the clerk read the amendment as it has been modified, in order that we may have a basis of understanding.

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to have that done.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have the amendment, as modified, stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment, as modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Tennessee wishes to have read is the proviso clause, with the modifications I have made. I think he would have me strike out all of the amendment except the proviso clause.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the proviso clause on page 2, beginning with the middle of line 14, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proviso clause, as modified, will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided, however, That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the lawful operation over the public highways within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be operated lawfully over the public highways within such State on July 1, 1955.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that amendment conforms with what I believe the bill, as amended, means. Yesterday, by amendment, we changed the date from May 1 to July 1. Therefore, I am willing to accept the proviso if the Senator will strike from his amendment everything preceding the proviso.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under that condition, I will strike from my amendment everything preceding the proviso clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, in view of the fact that I was not present when the amendment was agreed to yesterday, what was the reason for changing the date from May 1 to July 1? There is no provision as yet with respect to weights.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the legislatures of the States of Montana and North Dakota had enacted laws affecting weights and dimensions of vehicles, such laws to become effective on July 1. We felt that if we left the date of May 1 in the bill, we would either force those States to amend their statutes——

Mr. CHAVEZ. To roll back their statutes?

Mr. GORE. To roll back their statutes to that date, or be denied matching funds. In this case the chairman of the subcommittee is endeavoring to avoid doing an injustice to Nevada and Oregon. We do not want this to be an oppressive policy. Yesterday we agreed to an amendment changing the date, and I am prepared to accept the modified amendment now offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with the permission of the senior Senator from Oregon, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] a question.

Is legislation with reference to this subject now pending in the legislatures of other States?

Mr. MORSE. Pennsylvania is another such State.

Mr. GORE. I know of only one other State. There may be others, but there are not many. The State of Pennsylvania has pending legislation. There may be other States, but I am not aware of any other.

Mr. MORSE. In my statement yesterday I mentioned the fact that Pennsylvania was another such State.

Mr. GORE. That is the only one I know of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Illinois is another such State.

Mr. GORE. I am informed that the State of Illinois also has such legislation pending.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there any time limit covered by the proviso which is sought to be added by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, or would that amendment apply throughout the time of operation of the act, or until it is amended or repealed by the Congress?

Mr. MORSE. It would apply until the act was amended or repealed.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the effect and purpose of the proposed amendment is to freeze at their present legally authorized figures the lawful weights and dimensions of each kind of motor vehicle which is now permitted to operate lawfully over the highways of each of the 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; and it is in the interest of the principle of uniformity about which the Senator from Tennessee spoke in his previous discussion of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is not the effect of the operation of such an amendment to bring about a very great lack of uniformity in that the present standards on weight and dimensions as found in the various States under the laws of those States differ so greatly at this time and may differ even more greatly by July 1, 1955?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself another 10 minutes.

I will say to the Senator from Florida I do not believe there is any danger of the situation becoming worse. The best we seem to be able to do is to work toward freezing the status quo. We have already listed the States which have legislation that will become effective on July 1, or have legislation pending. What the amendment would do, as the Senator from Tennessee pointed out the other day, would be to prevent our creating a situation in the next year or in the year thereafter whereby the weights and measures would become so great that damage would be done to the highways.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the feeling of the Senator from Oregon that the present weight limits in many of the States do not exceed the figure at which they are held to be harmless in those States?

Mr. MORSE. I believe the committee found the situation was not so very serious that any great damage would be done if we protected the rights of the States under present laws. I am sure the Senator from Florida will be a little surprised to hear me make such a strong argument in favor of States' rights. I am making the argument only in connection with this bill to protect the States' rights as presently established. I believe we should not proceed to try to impose a restrictive feature on them. It boils down to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that I am delighted to find the distinguished Senator from Oregon taking a position which he deems to be in protection of States' rights.

Mr. MORSE. I always do when it is within the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. However, it occurs to the Senator from Florida that the real result of the amendment would be to freeze the present situation of very great nonuniformity in the several States and to allow certain of the States with very high weight limitations to be financed by the Federal Government on a 90–10 basis in the construction of their interstate highways on a continuing basis which is completely out of line with what prevails in other States, and to deprive those other States of the opportunity to come to that same position if in the exercise of their own discretion they saw fit to do so. Would not that be the result of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MORSE. No; I believe the result would be to put a stop to excesses. What we are trying to do is to stop a bad trend from continuing. We can do it legitimately in this way. As the Senator has heard me say before, I discussed the matter with the truckers. It is their amendment. I believe I made that very clear when I offered the amendment. They believe it would be a fair solution of the problem. At least their representatives who have spoken to me have said it would be a satisfactory and equitable solution of the problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the pending amendment is adopted, would the amendment of the Senator from Florida, which is lying on the desk, be in order? The purpose of my proposed amendment is to strike entirely from the bill subsection (d), which is the subject matter of

a partial amendment by the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could offer an amendment to strike out that sentence.

Mr. HOLLAND. Such an amendment would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 5–23–55–C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 10. (a) For the purpose of improving evacuation of localized and existing highway routes leading out of urban civil-defense target areas there is hereby authorized the sum of $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 1956, subject to the following general standards:

(b) Of the sum herein authorized $20 million shall be immediately available for contract and shall be apportioned among the several critical target areas as designated by the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and in a manner to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce upon application of the States in which the target areas involved are located: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce shall also find that any project approved under this section will serve to increase the localized capacity of existing routes in such areas and that such improvements constitute a part of preliminary evacuation routes.

(c) The remaining sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended and shall be apportioned to the States in which (1) the critical target areas, or (2) the target areas are located in a manner as determined by the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration for the purpose of improving evacuation capabilities to reception zones for such areas: *Provided, however,* That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be 90 percent of the total cost thereof: *And further provided,* That the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Secretary of Commerce shall approve the plan of evacuation routes prior to the apportionment of any funds to a critical target area or a target area.

On page 19, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 14. The Secretary of Commerce shall, by not later than February 1, 1956, make a report to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives containing his recommendations as to the manner in which the undesignated mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways can be be utilized for the purpose of eliminating bottlenecks in the evacuation routes leading from target areas as designated by the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 60 minutes. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Yesterday, when I presented the amendment I made a short statement in connection with it, which I do not wish to repeat in detail at this time. The situation is that in the event of an enemy attack upon our target areas, we are almost utterly unprepared to save the civilian population of our cities in those target areas. In a thermonuclear attack, shelters inside the target area will be of practically no use. Everyone agrees that the only protection for the civilian population is to evacuate our cities. The present highways and roads leading from target areas are not sufficient for that purpose. Milwaukee, Philadelphia, and many other cities in which practice evacuations have been held, have found that the spending of a little money for the widening of certain streets and improving evacuation routes would enable them to evacuate the cities much more rapidly, and that in the event of an attack millions of lives would be saved.

It is high time we were doing more and thinking more about civil defense. We have the problem of what to do with the people after they are evacuated, how they are going to be sheltered, clothed, and protected from radioactive fallout. But those considerations are academic unless we can first make arrangements to get the people out of the target areas.

What my amendment does is to authorize $40 million so that a start can be made on the program. That is the total amount. Of this sum, $20 million would be immediately available for contracts to be apportioned among the target areas as designated by the administrator of Civil Defense. The other amount is authorized to be apportioned among the States in which the critical target areas are located.

The other part of my amendment is with reference to the Secretary of Commerce making a report containing his recommendations as to the manner in which the undesignated mileage in the national system of interstate highways can best be utilized for the purpose of eliminating bottlenecks from evacuation routes as designated by the Administrator of Civil Defense Administration. This is at least a small start to give the cities and States which are working so hard on civil defense some little additional Federal help in our civil defense program.

I know the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee are interested in this matter. I hope something can be agreed upon regarding it in connection with the pending highway bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The efforts of my distinguished colleague are certainly appreciated. In all candor, I must say that his testimony before the committee was more constructive regarding the problems of civil defense than was any other testimony presented before the committee.

In connection with the amendment he now offers, I wish to invite his attention to the fact that the Administrator of Civil Defense came before the committee, and it was revealed that he had no plan. Indeed, $12 million has recently been made available to Mr. Peterson and his agency to develop plans. It would seem to me to be unwise to authorize $20 million when there is no plan to use $20 million.

I think there is a great deal of merit to section 14 of the Senator's amendment. It would appear to offer a constructive suggestion directing the Secretary of Commerce, operating, of course, through the Bureau of Public Roads and otherwise, to proceed in cooperation with the Civil Defense Agency to develop plans. I would be prepared to accept and take to conference section 14 of the Senator's amendment, but, without the concurrence of the members of the Public Works Committee, I would not be in position to accept additional monetary authorization in the bill to be used by an agency which has no plan to use such funds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations of my colleague. I admit that the Civil Defense Administration has been very slow in working out plans for highway needs in connection with the evacuation of people from our cities. It is only within the past 2 months that designation has been given to the Department of Commerce in respect to planning needs for civil defense in connection with highways. Some work has been done by the Bureau of Public Roads, but during the time the Armed Services Committee held its hearings, upon the suggestion of the committee telegrams were sent to the mayors or civil defense administrators of the principal target areas asking if surveys had been made and what the status was and what the cost of roads would be. Almost all those cities responded. A great many of them already have plans as to how streets are to be widened and what should be done to iron out bottlenecks and make evacuation possible. Most of the plans are already in existence. Others would be consummated. I am sure the money would not be used unless and until well-worked-out plans were provided.

I appreciate the willingness of the Senator to accept the second part of my amendment. I have a suggested alternative, in line with conversations with the Senator, which I should like to suggest as a possible substitute for the first part of my amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before we reach that point, is it not a fact that in the pending bill there is sufficient authorization for urban road money which could be used for this purpose?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate that suggestion. It is along the same lines of the suggestion made by my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I have an alternative amendment in this language:

On page 4, line 2, after the word "project," add a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce, out of the amount authorized in subsection (c) hereof, is authorized to use the sum of

$10 million for improving evacuation routes leading out of urban civil defense areas. Of the sum thus set aside for highway civil defense needs, the Secretary shall apportion some to the States in which target areas are located as determined by the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration for the purpose of improving evacuation capacities to reception zones for such areas."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In a moment.

Does the Senator from New Mexico think that if the need were great, we could take $10 million of the funds for urban roads, in order to widen certain bottlenecks and make evacuation possible?

Mr. CHAVEZ. So long as the Secretary had the authority to do it, he could use $10 million or $15 million, or whatever amount was needed, out of the total available to him for urban road expenditures.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the Senator, but I thought the committee would want a limit, because some of the money might not go to a particular State for the reason that it might not contain a target area.

Mr. President, I yield myself an adtional 5 minutes, and I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It probably has not been brought to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee that under the $23 billion figure for interstate road construction which is recommended by the Clay Committee, $10 billion is for urban road development. The figures which I have in the chart show the interstate highways broken as between interstate and urban, including arterial routes, with which the Senator is rightly concerned. But the breakdown between the two shows $10,862,000,000 for the urban portions of the interstate system and $13,052,000,000 for the rural portions of the interstate system. In other words, the urban connections and arterial routes, with which the Senator from Tennessee is rightly concerned, will be cared for out of the total amount of money for the interstate system.

I am appreciative of the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee in bringing this matter before the Senate, because in the act of 1952 or 1954, I have forgotten which it was, a clause was included, which I proposed, to provide authority for placing arterial routes and circumferential routes in the general category of access roads.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am familiar with that provision, and also with the provision that some consideration should be given to civil defense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the 10–20–30 apportionment, so to speak, of money for interstate highways, it is indicated that for urban connections ample funds will be provided.

The suggestion of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], which is contained in the amendment offered by him, is very good, in that it will be possible to know exactly what is necessary to focus attention on the evacuation route needs, but funds will be provided in the total application for the interstate system.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My amendment was addressed to the amount provided for urban roads, referred to on page 2 of the Gore bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that is what is proposed, then money would be taken away from the urban roads, or there would be a changed proportion.

If the Senator followed the explanation I made a while ago, the funds now proposed in the bill for the primary, urban, and secondary roads are exactly in proportion to the cost of building those systems; and the earmarking of an additional $42 million would distort the formula considerably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The substitute I have prepared would simply authorize the Secretary of Commerce to set aside not to exceed $10 million from the urban authorization and $200 million for special use on certain roads in the target areas, the funds to be apportioned among the States for the target areas.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who serves on the Committee on Armed Services, knows that in certain places, merely by spending small sums of money, bottleneck conditions can be remedied. That is something which ought to be done. I think it is time the Federal Government, in this very modest way, showed a litle more concern about the problem of evacuating congested areas in the event of an attack. The amount which is provided is not sufficient to do very much, but if properly used it could help tremendously.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the colloquy between my senior colleague and the junior Senator from South Dakota. It would appear that the modified amendment which my colleague has suggested would involve the apportionment formula.

Secondly, I concur in the sentiment expressed by the Senator from South Dakota that funds are available for urban extensions of not only the primary highways, but also of the interstate and secondary highways. There is no reason, as I see it, why the Senator should not submit his proposed section 14, making a declaration of policy, under which the Secretary of Commerce, the various State highway departments, and the municipal authorities could use and apportion in even greater amount than the Senator has suggested, the urban funds, of which $200 million are provided in the bill.

I believe the Senator would accomplish his purpose by having section 14 of his original amendment adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. Then, so that we may have the legislative intent expressed, is it the intent of the sponsor of the bill——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Is it the intent of my colleague from Tennessee, who is the sponsor of the bill, that of the amount provided for urban roads—$200 million annually—the Secretary of Commerce shall have a right to apportion or use some part of that sum for the purpose of special civil defense needs, including the removal of bottlenecks on the urban highway system?

Mr. GORE. Let me put it this way: The $200 million available for urban roads, as provided in the bill, is for the extension of secondary and primary roads within urban areas. I know of no reason why, with the declaration of policy contained in section 14 of the Senator's amendment, the Secretary of Commerce could not make available portions of the urban highway funds for the development of urban extensions of primary, secondary, and interstate roads. That would not only serve the purpose, it seems to me, which the Senator has in mind, but it would also facilitate the further development of urban extensions of the existing system of highways.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the clear statement of intent as made by my colleague from Tennessee, who is the author and the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. President, on that basis, I ask unanimous consent that the first part of my amendment, down to and including line 23, on page 2, be stricken; and that the amendment be considered only beginning with the part setting forth the policy matter to which we have referred, which is section 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the senior Senator from Tennessee will be so modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment about the Senator's amendment. Would that be in order now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for such time as he may require.

Mr. BUSH. I shall need only 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I thought the senior Senator from Tennessee spoke rather disparagingly of the Administrator of Civil Defense respecting this matter. He said the Administrator had no plan at all in connection with the proposition.

I think the testimony of the Administrator before the committee indicated that he had given the matter very careful consideration. He highly endorsed the Clay report and the administration bill in connection with the National System of Interstate Highways. I refer Senators to page 592 of the hearings, where the Honorable Val Peterson, Administrator of Civil Defense, said, in part:

A highway program that will provide for the improvement of highways critically need-

ed for peacetime use will furnish an important service in the event of a civil-defense emergency. The administration's highway program proposes that $25 billion be made available to finance improvements on the National System of Interstate Highways.

The rural portion of this system, particularly in the more densely populated areas, and virtually all of the urban portions of such system, will constitute the backbone of the highway system required for civil-defense purposes.

I refer also to page 5 of the message of the President, in which reference is made to the civil-defense aspects of the entire highway program. The paragraph is entitled "Civil-Defense Aspects."

Another paragraph refers to the traffic jams, and so forth, and the very urgent need for an interstate highway system to deal with the whole situation as it affects the national defense.

Mr. President, I submit, as I have before, that while I have no objection to this amendment, the bill to which it is offered does not come to grips directly, thoroughly, or satisfactorily with the problem of civilian defense.

I shall not oppose the amendment, but I did want to make that observation about the bill to which the amendment is offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill, to strike out subsection (f), on page 17, beginning on line 18 and ending on line 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out subsection (f) on page 17, as follows:

(f) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude reimbursement to States of the Federal share of the State's costs in connection with the relocation of utility facilities where a portion of the relocation cost is required by law or practice to be borne by the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in this connection I wish to say that, in my judgment, the provision I am asking to have deleted does not add to the effectiveness of section 11, but it has been interpreted by some persons as placing a limitation upon subparagraph (d) of section 11. In view of the fact that it was not the intention of the committee to do so, and in order to preserve the benefits of section 11 without impairment, the amendment was discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee, with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and with other members of the committee, and it was felt that elimination of the subsection would add value to the bill, and not detract in any way from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it seems that it is agreed all around that subsection (f) can be deleted without doing violence to the purposes of those who advocated the provision, and I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] desired to speak. Does the Senator have an amendment to offer?

Mr. COTTON. No. I shall withhold my request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wished the Senator from New Hampshire to be recognized, but he has to have time allotted to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. COTTON. Three minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire, to be taken from time allotted on the bill itself.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I merely desired to call to the attention of the Senate at some point during the consideration of the important subject now being discussed the fact that the current issue of Life magazine, which is dated May 30, 1955, and presumably is hardly yet on sale on the news stands, carries a very remarkable article entitled, "Dead End for the United States Highway." The article reviews in a rather able way the highway problem. It calls attention to the fact that the Memorial Day weekend just ahead of us will launch what will be a record motoring season, in which more cars will take to the roads than in any other year in the history of the Nation. The article states that more than 50 million cars will be on the highways on the Memorial Day weekend, and approximately 360 persons will lose their lives.

Among the striking points brought out in the article is its conclusion, after reviewing the Clay report, that regardless of whether the Congress adopts the Clay plan, regardless of whether the Nation spends in excess of $101 billion on the highway program, the United States will spend that much in the next decade on its roads, anyway. I read further from the article:

Even at the present slim rate of expenditure, it will spend $47 billion in the next decade. But it will spend far more than what it normally spends on road maintenance for automobile insurance to safeguard itself on its insecure roads. And it will spend, unknowingly, $5.5 billion this year on extra gas, oil, tires, etc., expense caused by unnecessary stops and starts and long waits. That figure will rise to $8 billion a year by 1965.

The article then comments on a statement by a former United States roads commissioner, who remarked that a Nation pays for good roads, regardless of whether it has them; and it pays more for bad roads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, so that all Senators may have an opportunity to read it. The article is entitled "Dead End for the United States Highway," and was written by Herbert Brean.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAD END FOR THE UNITED STATES HIGHWAY

(By Herbert Brean)

Among other things, the United States consists of 165 million people, 59 million automobiles and 3.4 million miles of road and highway. The people are reasonably intelligent. The automobiles are big, fast and comfortable. The highways are awful, although how awful not even the reasonably intelligent people appreciate. This may be because few Americans ever see as much as one-half of 1 percent of their Nation's roads and consequently they tend to think of the narrow, congested, archaic and hazardous one-half percent that they themselves customarily use as worse than the rest.

This is in error. It is practically all worse.

Another reason may be that Americans identify their highway troubles with traffic rather than with the highway itself. Delayed, frustrated or bumped from behind, the American motorist instantly blames the other guy. This is like blaming the fish in the sea for a contrary tide or a shallow channel, but the motorist does it because the highway and its defects have been so familiar to him for so many years that he simply no longer sees it as it is.

This Memorial Day weekend launches what is going to be a record motoring season, during which more cars will take to the road than in any year in United States history. Over the weekend there will be 50 million automobiles on the highways and probably 360 people will die. Everyone will see the traffic but few will really study the highways. But those who do can reduce their own danger of injury or death, and those who examine the highway long enough might even be moved to do something constructive about it and thus save themselves enormous sums.

If this weekend's average motorist could somehow be given an aerial glimpse in one look of the entire United States road system, crawling with molasses traffic, he would come to a fast boil of indignation. If he looked at it through the eyes of a highway engineer he would go jumping, screaming mad. For he would discover that while the highway network of the world's richest, most mobile Nation consists of 3.4 million miles of roads, only a little over 400,000 miles has what engineers call high-type pavement—solid concrete or asphalt.

1955 CARS, 1935 ROADS

He would notice that the country has thousands of miles of back roads which average less than one vehicle per day and that the great bulk of national travel is concentrated on the primary-road system. (Seven States have half of all United States cars.) He would observe that more than half the primary-road system still bears the design of 20 years ago, and that a third of it was built before 1930, when rural traffic averaged 26 miles per hour (it now averages 47 miles per hour).

He would look again at the heart of the United States highway network, the Interstate System, which is less than 40,000 miles long and yet links almost all cities over 50,000 population, serves more than half the United States population, and carries one-seventh of all the Nation's traffic. Eighty-five percent of the Interstate System is already inadequate—narrow, acutely curved, dangerously graded, frequently intersected, narrowly shouldered or shoulderless—or is in the process of becoming so in the light of the next decade's predictable traffic burden.

If our average motorist had an experienced highway engineer at his elbow as he looked down on the holiday chaos he might learn that whatever each motorist paid for this inefficient highway system in the form of physical damage to life and limb, or psychic damage to his nervous system, he was also paying an extra—and unnecessary—cent to 2 cents a mile for the exasperating privilege of driving on it. This is without reference to tolls (there are less than 1,500 miles of toll road in the United States and only 2,700 miles of parkway or throughway). It is the cost of the extra gasoline, oil, tire expense and lost time caused solely by bad highways, as worked out by Lawrence Lawton, a New York city traffic engineer.

Lawton's study, which was made in 1950 and figured the cost of gasoline at 23 cents a gallon—it now costs around 29 cents—indicated that it costs 5.6 cents per mile to drive an average passenger car on a congested business street, 4.5 cents on a through city street, 3.3 cents on an expressway. A similar study made in 1953 of Los Angeles area freeways indicated that savings, including allowance for drivers' time, averaged 2 cents a mile for a freeway compared to an ordinary highway. The total saving for all drivers using the freeway would completely pay off its cost in less than 10 years.

Our motorist-observer might also be told by an engineer that a 4-year study of Connecticut highway accidents shows that his chance of having an accident is almost doubled by driving on an inadequate, which means any old-fashioned, highway, no matter how cautiously he drives.

Finally, if he knew what the future holds for him, this weekend motorist would take a last look from on high at the highway network below, then tear up his driver's license and sell his car. In recent years United States auto production has averaged about 6 million new vehicles per year while the Nation has been scrapping around 4 million a year. The result: 15 years ago this country had 32 million motor vehicles, today it has almost 60 million. More than 3 million new cars were produced in the first 5 months of this year alone. By 1965, only 10 years from now, there will be an estimated 81 million cars, buses and trucks on the highway.

But what kind of highway?

This year the Nation will spend at least $10 billion for new cars. It is spending only $6 billion both for highway construction and for repairs. We are actually building cars faster than we are pouring the concrete on which to park them, let alone drive them. Barring a world war or a 5-year strike in the auto business, the United States in the next decade faces highway congestion and general traffic paralysis that will be simply incredible.

What has gone wrong? The answer can be found in the history of one stretch of a typically busy highway, U. S. No. 1 from Baltimore to Washington. For 200 years No. 1 has traversed almost 30 miles of rolling, sunwarmed, wooded hills in Maryland's countryside.

A road was first scratched through wood and field from Elkridge, just south of Baltimore to College Park, north of Washington, in 1749. This was little more than a scarified streak in the earth, in some places studded with tree stumps, for no one much cared what happened to travelers. One of them in the years that followed was George Washington, whose wagon once sank up to its boxes in the road's rain-churned ooze near the Patuxent River and had to be extricated with additional horses and ropes. Another time, when Washington had stopped at Spurrier's Tavern at Waterloo for dinner, his horse fell dead, exhausted by the highway's summer heat.

The 19th century was a stagnant time for this road, as it was for almost all United States roads. Although a Washington and Baltimore turnpike road company was organized in 1812 and obtained a 60-foot right-of-way to build a turnpike over the old road, it never kept the pike in repair. Few such companies ever fulfilled their obligations; this was a time of burgeoning rail and canal travel.

In 1844 wires were strung on poles along the road. On May 24 Samuel F. Morse transmitted his famous message, "What hath God wrought" from the Capital to Baltimore on his new telegraph instrument. That invention helped reduce the need for travel.

After the Civil War, which affected the road relatively little since most of the fighting took place to the west, the turnpike company's charter was revoked. Ownership of the raw streak through the hills reverted to the three counties it traversed. When the 20th century dawned, it was a 15-foot path of blowing dust in dry weather and an axle-snapping morass in wet, with grades as steep as 9 percent and treacherous curves coiled haphazardly through the hills. That is how things were 150 years after the birth of the road, when the Nation stood on the brink of the most stupendous transportation revolution in history, and that is how things were with almost all United States roads.

By 1906 there were more than 100,000 passenger cars registered in the United States. That year Maryland's General Assembly appropriated $30,000 for each of the next 3 years to be spent on rehabilitating the road, henceforth known as State road No. 1. That expenditure, handsome for the times, was the beginning of a long, losing battle.

State road No. 1 was gradually paved with 14 feet of macadam, concrete, and occasional gravel, although by 1910 the assembly had to appropriate another $100,000 for it. When it was completed in 1915, comprising 29.95 miles from the Baltimore city limit to the District of Columbia limit, it had cost more than $600,000 and portions of its thin, 6-inch roadbed already had had to be resurfaced because of the intensity of the traffic.

The steady pounding of the solid rubber tires on World War I's military trucks ground the road's tender pavement to rubble and shale, and the record cold of the 1917–18 winter damaged it further. So 3-foot concrete shoulders were added to each side, increasing the width to 20 feet, and the center was repaved. In 1919 the State roads commission proudly announced it was whitewashing all bridge headwalls, poles and other objects near the road edge for safer night driving. Motorists applauded. White middle lines were added on the hills in 1920–23.

A KILLER'S MOUNTING TOLL

The road had begun killing people—2 or 3 a year—long before. Now, with traffic mounting and commerce booming along its narrow length, more and more died in ghastlier accidents. Pop stands, a few discreet speakeasies, filling stations and real-estate shacks grew up along the road. In the dark of night bootleggers in souped-up cars ran their loads of liquor along it.

The nicknames the road collected describe its character: Billboard Boulevard, Death Highway, Hot Dog Highway. Of course it had a dead man's curve—a seemingly endless "S" south of Elkridge which has killed and maimed dozens, and was twice relocated and rebuilt. In 1925 the road became a part of United States Highway No. 1, the main street of the east coast running the length of the eastern seaboard from Fort Kent, Maine, to Key West, Fla. Commerce along it blossomed anew. By 1929–30 traffic was so heavy that the third complete rebuilding of the road had to be undertaken. The original 20-foot width was doubled, making four 10-foot lanes. But now it cost $1,760,000.

For the road's pattern and essential character, like that of a human, had been formed in the early years of its life and was confirmed by the army of unregulated motels, pizza palaces, used-car or trailer lots, occasional private homes and beer joints that moved greedily to its very edge, cutting into it with abrupt, accident-causing driveways and lining it with eye distracters. Furthermore, the State learned that while it held title to a 60-foot right-of-way wherever the road followed the ancient turnpike, it could not afford more than a 40-foot width wherever the road had been or was to be relocated because that would have meant condemning now-costly business property.

Thus, even a quarter century ago, the road had become a hardened artery impossible to enlarge, a taut, nervous, peril-filled channel through which traffic poured and trucks roared in constantly increasing streams. The road averaged 6,000 vehicles a day then, but this often reached 18,000 or 20,000 on holiday weekends. Then there were horrendous traffic jams that reduced motorists, cops, and Monday morning editorial writers to sputtering, apoplectic exasperation. But no one could do anything about it.

OXCART ROUTE FOR GIANT TRUCKS

In the years that followed, Maryland's road commission did all that could be done with that wreck of a highway: it eased some curves, eliminated grade crossings, widened bridges, installed traffic signals and spent millions of dollars in all on the 30 miles. Yet, as the century's second half began, it was still a road that had once been laid out for horse-drawn stages and oxcarts, it was carrying 25,000 to 30,000 fast-moving vehicles a day (40,000 at some points near the Washington end), killing 30 and 40 people a year and injuring 15 times that number.

You did not have to know this to feel uneasy on the road. Each of its 4 unseparated lanes was only 10 feet wide. (Modern cars are between 6 and 7 feet wide.) When 2 pairs of cars rushed side by side at each other on an 8° curve like the one at Beltsville there was little room to swerve or sway without chancing a side-swipe or head-on collision. Passing or being passed by one of the towering 20-ton trucks that thronged the road night and day was a jittery experience. Always you knew there was the chance that someone would pull out from 1 of the approximately 1,000 driveways that cut into the highway or that the car in front of you would suddenly slow down to turn off. You drove with a constant, though only half-recognized, feeling of irritation and anxiety that sometimes led you to drive faster than the 50-mile speed limit in order to get this unpleasant stretch over with.

Perhaps that is how some of the more shocking accidents happened. The couple, for example, who drove too fast one night, sideswiped another car and orphaned their seven children. Or the five young soldiers starting home on leave who crashed into a taxi near the Howard County line and were all killed, as was the cab driver. So savage was that head-on collision that State troopers who answered the call had to walk through a blood pool that seeped over the thick soles of their police boots. Then there was the 8 a. m., broad-daylight crash on New Year's Day, 1951, when a Washington-bound car crossed the double center line on the road near Route 32 and smashed head-on into a northbound one containing some Pennsylvania educators. The two cars contained seven people; all of them died. One body was hurled 75 feet into a field.

There were hundreds of lesser accidents, sometimes 1,400 a year, for left turns were permitted almost everywhere, resulting in many, often multiple, rear-end collisions. U. S. 1 echoed regularly to the clunk and crash and shriek of outraged steel.

Sadly enough, much of this bruising mess was avoidable. For instance, one of the greatest single causes of traffic fatalities, the head-on collision, can be virtually eliminated by an adequate middle strip separating the opposing lanes of traffic. While this narrow road had no room for the 15-foot strip regarded as necessary, some sort of narrow but high curb would have helped. But local merchants, dependent on the road's traffic for their trade, protested loudly that such a barrier would cut their business in half. For the same reason they protested bans on left turns which would have eliminated many of the characteristic rear-end collisions.

Had the State been able to restrict the number of private driveways leading into the road, or to get enough additional land along it to create shoulders wide enough for pedestrians to walk on safely, the road's entire capacity and safety record would have been different. Even banning poles, signs, and other impedimenta from the pavement's edge would have tended to widen it in effect for, as traffic studies show, any obstacle erected at the edge of a 10-foot lane causes drivers to travel 2⅔ feet farther in from the pavement's edge than normal, whereas objects 4 feet or more from the edge have only minor effect. But the people of Maryland, and indeed the people of the entire United States who also help to support this road, had lost control of its borders even though borders can be as important as the central roadway itself.

Maryland finally came to the conclusion that patching old No. 1 would never be enough. It inaugurated programs costing hundreds of millions of dollars to bring its roads up to modern standards, and one of the first targets was the Baltimore-Washington stretch. A few miles to the east of No. 1 the State and the District of Columbia jointly built an entirely new expressway consisting of 2 sets of widely divided, 12-foot lanes with gentle grades and long easy curves, through a pretty countryside devoid of billboards, honky-tonk stands, or grade crossings of any sort. The speed limit is 55 miles per hour and motorists now get from Baltimore to Washington without a single stop, in a half hour or a trifle more. They get there comfortably and safely too, for it appears the mortality rate on this expressway will at least be as low as on similar expressways—one-third to one-fourth of the death rate on parallel, comparable old-style roads. Furthermore, although the entire length of 29.29 miles was not opened until last October, a part of it was in use earlier and diverted so much traffic from the old road that only 15 died on "death highway" last year.

Examined in the perspective of 200 years, the history of the now bypassed No. 1 is a discouraging tale of degradation and defeat. And that is the history of most United States highways. Once the highway was indeed a way—"that along which one passes or progresses to reach some place," in the words of Webster. But the rapid development of auto transportation, coupled with laggard upkeep of roads, failure to modernize, and the unrestricted encroachment of roadside business, have turned much of the national highway into a choked, slow-moving business avenue. The basic highroad principle has been forgotten.

This year the Federal Government moved to do something about the degraded United States highway. At the request of President Eisenhower, a committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay studied the national highway situation and then made a series of recommendations, predicated on the expenditure during the next decade of $101 billion. This is $54 billion more than would be spent in that time at present rates, and the Clay Committee proposed that the difference be financed in part by creation of a Federal corporation that would issue bonds redeemable by gasoline and oil taxes. This drew heavy criticism from Congress as a dodge to escape increasing the Federal debt, and consequently national attention was focused on the plan's financial framework instead of on its farsighted solutions to the Nation's highway imbroglio.

That was very unfortunate. The Clay program is noteworthy for two major reasons. First, it took into account, possibly for the first time in our history, the fact that all estimates of future highway needs have heretofore fallen grieviously short of actual needs. An example is New Jersey's "new" (1951) quarter-billion-dollar turnpike, which was to have paid off its cost in 35 years; instead it will pay it off in 22, because its toll receipts are so unexpectedly large. (The turnpike itself is already being widened in places.) Clay and his associates recommended enlargement of the interstate highway system by 1965 to accommodate the traffic volume expected by 1975, when the United States will have upward of 100 million vehicles. If the Clay proposals were put into effect, the United States might find itself in 1965 a little ahead of its highway problem, for the first time in history.

MAKING WAY FOR A CUSTARD

The second salient feature of the Clay recommendations was the emphasis on the principle of limited access. With the exception of the present total of 4,164 miles of throughway, the United States highway system has always operated on the principles of unlimited access, i. e., anyone owning property along a highway has the right to cut as many entrances into it as he wishes, anywhere on his land. When the highway was an empty road traversing wilderness this did not matter. Today, as the example of U. S. 1 shows and every motorist knows, a busy highway that is unprotected from every entrepreneur able to obtain a license to sell frozen custard or foot-long hotdogs quickly ceases to be a traffic carrier. This means that the public which may have spent $1 million per mile to get the highway service it needs is quickly deprived of that service by merchants who settle along its edge, lure traffic to the curb, and fight every effort to keep cars moving steadily and swiftly. There is a neat illustration of the futility of this at Lafayette, Ind., where a bypass was built to carry east-west traffic around the town's congested business section. However, access to the new highway was not controlled, with the result that it was quickly lined with roadside business and its original purpose defeated. A chagrined State highway department is now considering the possibility of building a bypass around the congested bypass.

To restore the United States highway's character, Clay and company boldly proposed that the entire interstate network be either converted to limited access through relocation or land acquisition or protected against future encroachment by legislative act. This means that 180- to 250-foot rights-of-way would be obtained or set aside for future widening, and service roads would be built to accommodate nearby business. This would eliminate most crossroads and permit 60-mile speeds in safety.

Other Clay recommendations would increase the number of lanes in the interstate highway system by about 50 percent. The system would then consist of 2,300 miles of 6-lane or wider highways, more than 28,000 miles of 4-lane highways, and about 7,000 miles of 2-lane highways. All but the 2-lane highways would be divided expressways, with lane 12 feet wide and 10-foot shoulders for buses and disabled cars to stop on. (One car stopped on the pavement can reduce the traffic capacity of a road by 60 percent, and today car disablements occur once every 20,000 vehicle miles.)

Congress will almost certainly pass some kind of highway legislation this session, though not the legislation proposed by the Clay report. A bill introduced by Democratic Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, calls for a Federal-State expenditure of about $18 billion over a 5-year period ($8.6 billion for the interstate system, $9 billion for primary, secondary, and urban highways, and $330 million for park, forest, and other miscellaneous roads). The Gore bill's modest provisions, which would be conventionally financed by Government appropriation, have been attacked by a number of State governors, as well as by New York's famed highway and park expert, Robert Moses, who has pointed out that the Gore bill does not provide for proper land acquisition and that its pay-as-you-go feature is shortsighted, since future drivers who will use the new roads will not have to help pay for them.

Still, the Gore bill has survived Senate committee hearings. The House, on the other hand, is known to show somewhat more favor for the Clay plan. Since Treasury Secretary Humphrey has suggested that the Federal debt limit be increased to include the bond-financing feature, it seems possible that some of its provisions may be adopted.

Whether or not Congress adopts the Clay $101 billion program, the United States will spend that much in the next decade on its roads anyhow. Even at the present slim rate of expenditure, it will spend $47 billion in the next decade. But it will spend far more than what it normally spends on road maintenance for automobile insurance to safeguard itself on its insecure roads, and it will spend, unknowingly, about $5.5 billion this year on extra gas, oil, tires, etc.—expense caused by unnecessary stops and starts and long waits. That figure will rise to $8 billion a year by 1965.

As a former United States Roads Commissioner has remarked, a nation pays for good roads whether it has them or not—and it pays more for bad roads. That being the case, it would seem that the cheaper price tag on the Gore bill is more apparent than real. The objections to the original financing methods of the Clay program were sound, but nothing less than the broad planning and new construction embodied in that program will save the country from eventual strangulation. The obvious problem before Congress, therefore, is to find a sound financial base for a program with the breadth of the Clay proposals.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Iowa has an amendment at the desk. I now yield to him such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 1048, offered by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON, it is proposed, on page 20, beginning with line 18, to strike out all down to and including line 6, on page 22.

In line 8, on page 22, it is proposed to strike out the words "a toll or."

On page 22, it is proposed to strike out the language in line 19 through line 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Iowa allot to himself?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Sufficient time, but I believe I shall take only about 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I have had the amendment checked by the experts on the bill, so as to be sure that the amendment will accomplish what I wish to have accomplished.

All this amendment to the substitute would do would be to strike from the substitute the provision conferring authority on the corporation to indemnify, under a certain formula, States which have existing toll roads. Under the amendment, they would be paid under that formula for their toll roads, and then the States would be permitted or given an opportunity to use that money on other roads; but under the substitute they would be permitted to continue to collect tolls on the toll roads.

Mr. President, such a situation is one which I do not believe I could tolerate. I believe it is bad legislation, under all the circumstances, in connection with this program.

Therefore, I have submitted the amendment which will eliminate that particular provision from the substitute. My amendment will leave in the substitute, provision to enable the corporation to acquire free roads under a formula of acquisition and payment based upon the amortized value, but will eliminate the provision of the substitute which would permit the toll roads to continue to be operated as toll roads after the States had received compensation for their construction.

Mr. President, that is all there is to my amendment to the substitute. I do not care to take any more of the time of the Senate to discuss the amendment, unless there are some questions to be asked about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to the fact that I control the time in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa to the substitute. I do not know what position the Senator from Tennessee will take on this question, but I yield to him whatever time he may desire to use.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I believe I shall use 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, during the consideration of the bill, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, no group of men could have been finer in their attitude than have been the minority Senators. Despite the fact that they were not conscientiously in support of the bill as reported by the committee, they cooperated and helped make the bill as good as possible.

Now the time comes for consideration of the measure offered as a substitute for the bill reported by a majority of the committee.

The question now before the Senate is on perfecting the proposed substitute. So far as I am concerned, I desire to have the minority members of the Public Works Committee perfect their substitute in whatever way they wish to have it perfected, so that when the vote finally comes on the question of agreeing to the substitute, the minority will have before the Senate an amendment with which they will be satisfied.

So far as I am concerned, I expect to follow the views of the ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], in respect to amendments to the substitute.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the matter of toll roads has been discussed considerably since the bill was before the committee. It seems to me it is most unfair to penalize the States which have been sufficiently forward-looking to build toll roads. My own State of Pennsylvania, built the first modern toll-road in the Nation. That road has been a marvelous financial success, and it has also been a great success from the standpoint of transporting materials by truck, transporting people by bus, and transporting individuals in their private automobiles. People from all over the Nation have been traveling on that road.

So this proposal seems to me to be eminently unfair because under it we would receive only the depreciated value, and it would be necessary to pay off the bonds before we would have a free road.

I believe it would be most unfair to penalize the States which have been sufficiently forward-looking to inaugurate a toll-road plan.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have no thought or desire of penalizing the States which have been forward-looking as regards toll roads. I desire to call attention to the fact that there still would remain in the substitute the provision that if the corporation takes over the toll roads and pays off the investment in them, those roads then would become free roads. That provision will still remain in the bill, if my amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have consistently supported the provision in the Martin substitute which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] wishes to strike out, namely, the credit for existing toll roads. I think, in equity, it is a perfectly proper provision. The governors who testified before the committee very strongly supported that provision. I think it is fair to say that on close examination it will be found that the question is rather academic. The quality and construction of existing toll roads simply do not measure up to the standards of the interstate highway system as of today. I have assurance from the Bureau of Public Roads that today there are no toll roads in the country which would meet those standards and be accepted into the interestate system under the provision which the Senator from Iowa now wishes to strike out. So while I shall vote against his amendment, I think it is fair to say that under present conditions the question is academic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], as amended.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield 1 hour of my time on the substitute to the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in my study of the Nation's vital need for an accelerated highway-development program I have become convinced beyond all question that the plan proposed by the President of the United States on the recommendation of the Clay Committee and the conference of governors is sound financially, sound legally, and sound morally.

I think my position with regard to Government finance is well known to my colleagues. For many years I have taken a firm stand with those who believe that one of our primary objectives should be a balanced budget.

On numerous occasions, on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, I have warned against the dangers of continued deficit financing.

I have argued that excessive taxation and an ever-increasing burden of debt can prove disastrous to our economic stability and the national security.

I have always favored the pay-as-you-go principle at all levels of government because it means greater economy and provides the most effective method by which taxes can be kept at the lowest possible level.

If it were possible to do so, I would prefer to have the highway-expansion program carried out on the pay-as-you-go basis. But we have been told by qualified experts that we have reached an emergency situation as far as our highways are concerned.

We have been told that even with a substantial increase in taxes it would require 30 years to do the job that is needed right now and can be completed in 10 years under the plan proposed by the President and the Clay Committee.

There has been placed before us ample testimony that we are paying a high cost in lives and dollars because we have allowed our highways to lag far behind the traffic needs of today.

We are therefore forced to the conclusion that some form of credit financing is justified if we are to have a system of highways adequate to meet the demands of today and the increasing needs of the years ahead.

In my opinion the financing plan set forth in S. 1160 should be supported because—

First. It provides a method by which the necessary funds can be made available without increased taxation.

Second. It provides for the repayment of the debt on a self-liquidating basis with the costs paid primarily by those who benefit from an improved highway system.

Third. It assures the completion of the interstate system without hampering the orderly development of the other highway systems.

Fourth. It permits the apportionment of funds to the various States on the basis of actual needs.

I wish to emphasize that point. The amendment is based on needs.

Fifth. It applies the same principle that has been used for many years in this country of amortizing capital investments over a part of the life of a project. This principle has been successful whether used by private enterprise or by State and local subdivisions of government. The building of highways through the issuance of bonds is a common practice in many of the States.

The interstate system, under the plan proposed in S. 1160 will be a productive capital asset that will pay for itself many times over by generating new revenues and by advancing the economic welfare of the whole Nation.

Much of the criticism of S. 1160 has centered about the interest charges on the proposed highway bonds. Figures have been presented to show that the interest would reach a total in excess of $11 billion during the 30-year life of the bonds.

If we could pay cash, of course there would be no interest to pay. Under any plan that would meet the present urgent highway needs credit financing and the payment of interest cannot be avoided. It is important to remember, however, that under S. 1160 we have a planned method for paying off the principal of the bonds and paying the interest in a definite term of years. On the other hand, S. 1048 makes no provision either for the liquidation of the debt incurred or for the payment of the interest. It places no limitation on the number of years during which interest payments would continue. It could go on for generations.

I do not think anyone can estimate with any degree of accuracy the total amount of interest that would be paid under S. 1048. In my opinion it would be far greater than the interest payments required by S. 1160, unless additional Federal taxes were levied.

Everyone recognizes the urgent need to bring the interstate highway system up to adequate standards. It is the trunk of the highway tree. Despite its vital importance to commerce, travel, and defense, it has lagged far behind the present needs. It is estimated that in the next 10 years the number of automobiles in the United States will increase from present levels of approximately 58 million to 81 million.

It is absolutely essential, therefore, that we adopt a program at this time which will make this system of interstate roads adequate as promptly as possible. I believe that the essential parts of such a program are the following:

First. The interstate system cannot be completed on a piecemeal basis. In order that it may be brought to adequate standards within a period of 10 years, it must be planned and designed as a single nationwide project. Only in this manner will we obtain uniform standards in the matter of rights-of-way acquisition, limited access and other important features of design and engineering. Only by this means are we able to determine the amount which is needed to bring the interstate system up to adequate standards and to assure the completion of the system with a known amount of expenditure.

Second. We must provide a definite plan for liquidating and paying off the expenditures for such a large program. It is quite apparent that, if we desire this interstate system to be completed within a reasonable period of years, starting at once, there must be some borrowing. It is very important that Congress make provision for the liquidation of this borrowing and have a definite plan for paying it off, rather than simply adding it to the general deficit.

S. 1048, the Gore bill, does not comply with either of these basic essentials. In my opinion, it represents an unrealistic approach to the problem of prompt completion of the interstate system. All reliable estimates indicate that the total cost of an adequate interstate system will approximate $27 billion. The authorization of S. 1048 is $7,750,000,000 less than 30 percent of the estimated cost of the system. This amount will not build the roads, and being inadequate to do the whole job, it will result in greatly increased cost.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield, if I have the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to ask only one question. The Senator recognizes the fact, of course, that S. 1048 as presently before the Senate is a 5-year authorization. The amendment is a 10-year authorization. If the pending bill were a 10-year authorization it would provide more money for the program. It is a question of whether we should do everything now or review the program after 5 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has given so much attention to the study of the highways of our country. However, I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can the fact that we must have a plan. It must be a complete plan. Regardless of the way it is financed, it must be a complete plan. I think the first consideration is a complete plan of the interstate highway system in the United States.

The economical way to build the entire system is to plan it and construct it as an entire project, rather than to sprinkle an inadequate amount over the whole system in a partial and patchwork program.

The plain fact about S. 1048 is that it will not build the interstate system within 10 years or in any other given period.

On the other major aspect of this program, S. 1048 is equally unsound. It offers no plan to finance construction of the interstate system except through higher taxes and increased general debt.

It completely ignores the responsibility of the Congress to provide a definite

plan for the financing of the construction of the system, but, instead, would merely add to the public debt, which has already mounted to staggering proportions.

In addition to these basic objections, S. 1048 has many other serious deficiencies, in my opinion. In the first place, it increases the Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban roads nearly 50 percent above 1954 levels, which were the highest in history, and thereby authorizes the expenditure of Federal dollars that a number of the States cannot match.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it the position of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that his substitute would provide the funds with which to build the interstate system without adding to the public debt? In other words, is it his position that the obligations issued under the authority of his bill would not be obligations of the Federal Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States—and until the Attorney General of the United States is overruled by a court, it is the law—that these revenue bonds would not be a direct obligation of the United States. Personally, Mr. President, I would rather have the full faith and credit of the United States behind them, but there is a provision in the bill for the liquidation of these bonds within 30 years. To my mind, that is sound financing. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma knows much more about financing than I do, but in my small way, when I go to the bank to request a loan I am asked how I am going to repay it, and if I can show that I have definite income over a certain period which will liquidate the debt, the loan is granted. I believe the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has had many experiences of that kind.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator, but I still do not know whether his position is that the plan he proposes would cause the issuance of obligations which would or would not be direct obligations of the Federal Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, according to the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, as I stated a moment ago—which is the law, until it is overruled by a court—these bonds would not be a direct obligation backed by the full faith and credit of the United States. Personally, I would prefer that they would be; but we have a plan for repaying the bonds which, to my mind, is sound financing.

In contrast to S. 1048, S. 1160 will accomplish these basic objectives. Under this plan the interstate system can and would be completed within a period of 10 years, to standards adequate to handle the estimated traffic for a period of 20 years. This is essential if we intend to reduce the mounting toll in automobile deaths and injuries, promote commerce between the States and strengthen our military and civil defense.

S. 1160 makes no fresh invasion of the province of the States, and, at the same time, properly emphasizes the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to the national interstate system.

I call attention to the fact that the assumption by the Federal Government of paramount responsibility for the completion of the interstate system on an emergency basis, relieves the States from the usual 50–50 matching with respect to our most expensive roads.

This will enable the States to build more miles of road with other Federal-aid funds and their own matching funds on the less expensive primary and secondary road system. In short, it will result in more primary and secondary roads, without directly increasing the Federal aid to these roads. In contrast, S. 1048 will vastly increase the direct Federal aid to primary and secondary roads beyond the present capacity of the States to match those funds in many cases.

Much has been said and written with regard to the provisions of S. 1160, which would create a Federal corporation to implement this financing. The purpose of the Federal corporation is to provide a proper and convenient vehicle, to which can be channeled and dedicated the portion of the Federal gasoline tax needed to pay for the interstate construction program.

The distinction between S. 1160 and S. 1048 is simply the distinction between a program which provides a plan for liquidation of a debt, and one which does not.

The important thing is to have a definite and workable plan for completing the program and liquidating the cost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address which I delivered in St. Louis, Mo., on November 11, 1926, when I was requested to speak on a model gasoline-tax law.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MODEL GASOLINE-TAX LAW

A model law directing any governmental activity is most difficult to frame. The boundaries of our Nation are so extended, our industries so diversified, and our constitutional limitations so varied that a uniform law applying to all of the States is almost impossible.

Before discussing the immediate subject assigned let us for a moment consider taxation generally. In a representative form of government tax measures are usually a compromise. Nearly every kind of industry observes, through organized effort, all tax legislation affecting it. The desire is to pass the burden to some other class. Efforts along these lines have increased as taxes become higher. Preceding the World War few business concerns, in the formation of their budgets, dignified taxes under a separate head. All tax payments were placed under miscellaneous. Now taxation is one of the heaviest burdens met by businessmen. In fact, it is a fortunate corporation which is able to pay out in dividends to its shareholders an amount equal to the sum assessed in various forms of taxes.

The basic theory upon which any tax is levied or assessed against certain property is that the holder thereof receives certain benefits therefrom. There is more dissatisfaction over the methods used in raising funds to carry on the various functions of government than from any other cause. The expenditure of the money received from taxes is not as important as a just and equitable plan of levying the same. Improper expenditure may be corrected, but an unsound tax policy may bankrupt commercial enterprises before a slowly acting legislative body may be able to pass remedial measures. The competition in different lines of business is so keen that favorable taxation frequently means the success of the proposition. The expenditure of public money is quite safely guarded by the various checks provided by law, and the general criticism against taxes as a rule is not so much how they are expended but how they are assessed and collected. The proper raising of revenue of a nation or subdivision thereof determines, to a great extent, the prosperity of its people and the political success of the party or individuals concerned. The importance of a tax measure is thus apparent.

If a system of taxation could be devised by which all the revenue derived from the same would go to the benefit of the individuals making the payment, the plan would be ideal. This, of course, is practically impossible. We have, therefore, raised much revenue by the indirect method. A taxing system whereby the burden is equally distributed is also ideal and means the economic happiness of a State or locality.

During the last 25 years governmental activities, local, State, and Federal, have greatly increased. There is now a strong tendency to form bureaus, commissions, etc., to regulate individual activity. This all requires much money.

The three greatest avenues of expenditures at present are for roads, education, and public welfare. The State governments have assumed much of the increased expenditures along these lines. It has required many new tax measures to meet these additional expenditures. More money has been expended for roads than for any other branch of public improvement during the last decade. The money for these improvements comes from the automobile, sale of bonds, and general funds. The automobile, and the accessories connected therewith, largely take care of the construction of new roads and the maintenance of the same.

We have in America over 500,000 miles of improved hard-surfaced roads. We are spending for this purpose more than $100 million annually. We have in the United States 18 million automobiles, 2.5 million trucks, and 60,000 motor buses. The automobile industry constitutes at the present time America's greatest export business, exceeding fuel, cotton, and steel.

We have been collecting tax on gasoline or liquid fuel since 1919. The first law was by Oregon in that year. Since that time other States have entered the fold, namely, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Illinois. There is now over $80 million annually collected from this source. It is a generally accepted view that a gasoline tax is a logical and fair addition to the license fee of an automobile. The additional burden is distributed in proportion to the amount we use our cars. In addition, it exacts a just share from the numerous visiting motorists, who otherwise would not contribute anything for the expensive facilities which they enjoy. The field seems to be permanent and the form of the law to be used is deserving of the best study of our tax experts.

In this paper we will not attempt to give any model law, but call to your attention the certain important things for consideration in the preparation of a statute for any State.

In a general way, three principles should be followed in forming any tax measures.

First, the money derived should go as far as possible to the benefit of the taxpayer. This makes it as popular as it is possible to make any tax measures. Second, it should be difficult to evade the tax. Public opinion helps along this line more than any other single thing. If the public knows it is for a use in which it is greatly interested, it will demand that each individual or corporation pay his or its proper share. Third, it should be economical to collect. There is much opposition to many tax measures at the present time because the cost to collect the tax is too high. It has been found that gasoline or liquid fuels tax goes for roadbuilding and it is an economical tax to administer. It should be collected for less than 1 percent.

OBJECT OF THE LAW

In the framing of the law the objects to be obtained should be as follows:

1. The collection of the largest amount of tax.
2. The closest collection of the tax.
3. The most economical collection of the tax.

BASIS OF THE LAW

In the framing of the law the following are the important things to consider:

1. The thing taxable. In other words, a clear definition of the article to be taxed. It must be broad enough to meet the requirement of the State.
2. The definition of the dealer or other agency through whom the tax is collected.
3. The tax rate.
4. The distribution of the tax. The use of the tax depends upon State requirements.

In keeping with these suggestions and the objects to be accomplished, it would seem that the following definition of liquid fuels would be broad enough to assess all liquids used or usable for internal combustion engines, irrespective of their actual use and we suggest it for your consideration:

"The term 'liquid fuels' shall mean all liquids produced, prepared, or compounded for use in or usable in internal combustion engines for the generation of power, and shall include all distillates of, and condensates from petroleum, natural gas, coal, coal tar, and vegetable ferments—said distillates and condensates being ordinarily designated as gasoline, naphtha, benzol, benzene, and alcohols so usable, but not restricted to such designations."

The next question to consider is how the States shall collect the taxes. There are two distinct methods of collecting the same at the present time. One is through the wholesaler, which includes the manufacturer, importer, or producer. The other is the retailer who makes the final sale to the consumer. Out of the States now collecting gasoline tax all but five collect by the first method. Our own State, Pennsylvania, has used the latter plan, and while it has cost us less than three-fourths of 1 percent to collect, we are of the opinion the best interest of the State can be served by collecting taxes through the wholesaler, who can be defined as a "dealer" in the following language:

"The term 'dealer' shall include any person, firm, copartnership, association, or corporation who produces, refines, manufactures, or compounds such liquid fuels in the State for use, distribution, sale, or delivery therein."

The word "distributor" could be used instead of "dealer." The definition of the term "liquid fuels" may also be limited to suit the requirements of the State.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW

Now let us consider some of the things necessary in the administration of the law.

1. Collection of the tax: Inasmuch as it is a State tax, it seems more appropriate that the tax should be collected directly by a fiscal officer of the State rather than through some local officer of a county or city, or other local subdivision.

2. License: All dealers should be licensed and said license to be issued by the fiscal officer of the State through whom the tax is collected.

3. Reports: Periodical reports should be required to be submitted by all dealers to the proper fiscal officer of the State, together with the return of all taxes due on the report submitted.

4. Penalty: A penalty provided for imposition upon those dealers who fail to comply with the law in the matter of taking out a license or who fail to report and remit when due.

5. Revoking licenses: Power in the proper fiscal officer to revoke the license of any dealer who fails to comply with requirements.

6. Tax lien: Priority of tax liability in case of judicial sales, receiverships, dissolutions, or transfers.

7. Notice of change of ownership or management: Provisions requiring notice to State fiscal officers of changes in a partnership or the officers of a corporation, which is acting as a dealer.

8. License not transferable: The license to apply to the direct location for which issued and be nontransferable, either to other dealers or to a different location.

9. Notice in case of sale: Provision making any transfer of a dealer's business unlawful, unless and until the tax due from the seller is first paid to the State and then only upon 10 days' prior notice of such proposed sale to the proper State fiscal officer, by purchaser, otherwise the purchaser assumes such liability.

10. Power to audit: Power of the fiscal officers to audit the tax accounts and records of dealers to determine the correctness of any reports or returns.

RATE OF TAX

The rate depends on the amount of revenue required. The rate now runs from 1 cent to 5 cents per gallon. The average is now 0.02139 cent per gallon. It would probably make the law more popular if there could be a uniform rate, but whatever the rate is it should be sufficient with motor-license fees to maintain the highways. An investigation shows that there seems to be no complaint in States where 4 and 5 cents per gallon is charged.

DISTRIBUTION

An examination of the various gasoline and liquid-fuels tax acts of the several States discloses that about two-thirds of the taxes collected are appropriated, either directly or indirectly, to the building and improvement of highways. This is proper. There are a few States which only spend a portion of these taxes on the improvement of the highways and distribute the other portions to various functions of the State government. This violates one principle of tax-law making, but this is a question which each State should meet. We believe, however, that all the tax should be used for roadbuilding purposes.

LIMITATION OF TAX OR REFUND

Some States only tax gasoline or liquid fuels used for operating or propelling motor vehicles on the public roads, and this creates the necessity of making refunds for the return of the tax collected on that portion of the gasoline or liquid fuels not used in such motor vehicles.

Other States tax all liquid fuels sold for any purpose whatsoever and this has simplified the administration of the law, as it avoids the necessity of any refunds. We should have as few exceptions as possible in the law. Every exception makes it more difficult to operate and more open to criticism.

I regret exceedingly that I have consumed so much of your valuable time in giving a large number of figures, but these have been given in order to show the plan upon which this tax is imposed. No tax in recent years has been levied where so large an amount of it has gone to the benefit of those paying the same. Good roads have almost revolutionized our plan of living. Millions of our people are visiting various parts of our country in a most inexpensive and pleasant manner. This acquaints them with trials and difficulties of the different sections of the country. Usually each locality considers that it is imposed upon from a tax standpoint and has the greatest difficulties to encounter as far as government matters are concerned. Traveling disabuses this to a great extent. Therefore, gasoline or motor fuels taxes used for the improvement of our highways will, to a great extent, obliterate sectional feeling, one of the more serious problems confronting the men of America in the founding of our Nation and the gradual expanse of the same.

In considering all these matters it must be remembered that America moves rapidly. That it demands improvements, but that it is our duty as the representatives of the people to survey these questions carefully and to place before the taxpayers the exact situation. In transportation the stage coach, conestoga wagon, canal and horse-car have given way to the trolley and the steam road, and these probably in turn will give way to the motor car, truck and bus, but it will cost us much money, and the users should know what they must finally pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to say to my colleagues that I have been giving close attention to the matter of constructing roads and the method of financing them since the time I made that address.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the pending substitute embodies the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, known as the Clay Committee.

It provides for the establishment of a Corporation known as the Federal Highway Corporation. The management of the Corporation would be vested in a Board of Directors composed of five members. Three of these would be public members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate without regard to party affiliation. The remaining two members would be the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury, or their representatives.

This Corporation would be authorized to issue, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, obligations in an amount not to exceed $21 billion. The bonds so issued are payable over a term of 30 years.

The interest, estimated by the Clay Committee at 3 percent would be $11.5 billion. In other words interest would cost an amount equal to 55 percent of the bond issue.

The $21 billion borrowed would be paid directly into the fund of the Federal Highway Corporation. It would not go through the budget, nor would it go into the Federal Treasury. It would not be included as a public debt. It would not be subject to the debt limitation established by Congress.

None of this fund would be under the control of Congress and it would not be subject to appropriation control. It is predicated upon the collection and dedication of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax over a 32-year period.

All of the funds would be expended in the first 10 years, and in the next 22 years no funds would be available from the Federal gasoline tax. All the receipts from this tax for that 22-year period would be required for repayment of bonds with interest. In other words, the gasoline tax would be dried up for 22 years—from 1966 to 1987 inclusive.

It is obvious, of course, that the need for road construction and improvement will be just as essential during that 22-year period as it is now. In our future growth the need for road improvement can never be regarded as stationary.

In fact, no Congress can obligate a subsequent Congress to a dedication of taxes. Here is the legal opinion of the head of the Senate Legislative Counsel:

It seems elementary that one Congress, or one law enacted by a Congress, cannot completely foreclose action by a subsequent Congress, or by a subsequent law of the same Congress. To so hold would be to say that once a policy had been enunciated by the Congress it is not susceptible to change.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the remainder of the statement of the Senate Legislative Counsel.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That is not to say, however, that a subsequent Congress is always left with an unlimited realm of action. Rights may have accrued under a law which cannot be validly divested. But the power of each Congress to enact legislation for future application cannot be eliminated by action of a prior Congress. A change of policy by a Congress, effected by amending or repealing previously enacted laws, may give rise to causes of action by persons whose vested rights are thereby adversely affected, but unless the policy change is invalid in all aspects the power of the Congress to make the change is not destroyed by previous enactments. For example, the next Congress could reduce the amount of indebtedness which the Corporation is authorized to incur, or could provide a different method of financing with respect to obligations subsequently issued by the Corporation.

It should be noted that the bill does not appropriate the moneys in excess of $662,500,000 collected under section 4081 and 4041 of the 1954 code, but an amount equal to the moneys collected in excess of such amount. While the obvious purpose is to earmark these revenue collections, the bill does not attempt to prescribe the tax rates under these sections of the 1954 code nor to foreclose a change in the rates.

The statement in section 2 of the bill can be taken as no more than a statement of policy by the present Congress; in fact, only of the present Congress at the time this bill is enacted. Each Congress has power to make changes in the tax laws which it deems desirable. Likewise, each Congress has power to appropriate such moneys as it deems desirable to provide for the operation of the Government and to satisfy the debts of the United States.

The answers to these two questions are in the affirmative. Each Congress has power to repeal or reduce, at any time, the taxes imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code and to reduce or repeal, at any time, the permanent appropriation made by section 105 (b) of the bill. For the same reasons, the Congress could not be compelled to increase the amount of the permanent appropriation should it prove insufficient to meet the debt-service requirements of the Corporation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no legal way by which we can obligate gasoline taxes to pay the interest and principal on these particular bonds.

I have searched the records and never before has such a proposal as this been seriously considered by Congress. In order to confirm this, I made inquiry of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, and, on February 17, 1955, he replied as follows:

Insofar as we are aware, such a financing arrangement for a Federal expenditure program of the scale and magnitude contemplated for the proposed Federal Highway Corporation has never been used by the Federal Government.

The substitute bill would create a dummy corporation without income and without assets, and this corporation would be authorized to borrow $21 billion. It specifically provides that this would not be a debt of the United States Government.

It was testified by leading Federal officials before committees of Congress that it would not be a debt, but that it would be an obligation, and an honest obligation. Those who testified did not explain the difference between a debt and an honest obligation. But they contended that it would not be a debt.

Nothing has been proposed during my 22 years in the United States Senate that would do more to wreck our fiscal budget system than the adoption of the measures embodied in this substitute. If it is possible to issue bonds on so-called capitalization of a tax not to be collected in full for 30 years, with a declaration that the bonds will not be a legal debt of the United States Government, then it would be possible to earmark in similar fashion other taxes, such as the tobacco tax, for some specific purpose and borrow money on it outside of the budget and the debt limitation. I could name hundreds of other taxes that could be treated in this manner. The result would be the end of honest bookkeeping and confusion as to the liabilities of our Government, making it impossible to ascertain what our bona fide indebtedness is.

Every sensible person knows that a Government corporation without assets or income cannot sell $21 billion of bonds unless actually it is Federal debt.

This is what the Comptroller General of the United States had to say. I am quoting the Comptroller General because he is the independent representative of Congress. He was appointed for the purpose of making certain that the expenditures of Congress were all made in a proper, legal manner.

In response to my inquiry of February 17, 1955, the Comptroller General said:

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: * * * You inquired as to whether or not the Government has ever used a financing arrangement such as is proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in its report of January. That proposal called for the creation of a new Government corporation to be known as the Federal Highway Corporation and an authorization for it to issue bonds in an amount sufficient to cover the Federal share of the cost of constructing the proposed Interstate System of roads over a construction period of 10 years.

While the terms and conditions of the Corporation's bonds would be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the plan calls for their repayment from funds provided by the Treasury as authorized by the Congress annually (presumably by appropriation action), the plan does not specifically provide that such bonds be guaranteed by the Secretary of the Treasury. However, all related factors plus the fact that they are to be issued by a Federal corporation would have the same effect. The total amount of such borrowing from the public would amount to $25 billion. The Corporation's activities would not be self-liquidating, it would have no important revenues, and funds for paying off the bonds would have to come from the general funds of the Treasury.

Sincerely yours.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

As we spend and spend and borrow and borrow, the least we can do for future generations—our children and grandchildren, on whom we would place astronomical burdens—is to keep an honest set of books so they will know what debts we of this generation have incurred for them to pay.

Here is the language of the substitute bill in section 105 (A):

The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Corporation.

Yet, section 105 (C) provides that—

The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its obligations in an amount not to exceed in any one year the amount necessary above all other revenues of the Corporation to provide for debt service of the Corporation during that year but not to exceed the aggregate amount of $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Furthermore, section 105 (D) provides:

All obligations issued by the Corporation shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under authority and control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof.

This would indicate the intention that the various Federal trust funds for which the Government is trustee, such as the social-security fund, the unemployment insurance fund, and so forth, should purchase the bonds of this no-asset, no-income corporation.

I submit it is a remarkable procedure to assert in one section of the substitute amendment that the Highway Corporation bonds are not a debt of the Federal Government and declare in another section that they are eligible for Government trust-fund investment.

The Government, in fact, owns not a dollar of these trust funds. It is acting as trustee with the sacred obligations that rest upon any trusteeship to preserve the solvency of the funds entrusted to its care.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have followed the leadership of the Senator from Virginia during the past 2 years in connection with the legislation on the debt ceiling. Does the Senator share my fear that the financing procedure provided in the administration bill would actually have the effect of getting around the debt ceiling, in that the bonds would not be carried on the Federal books actually as a debt, when in fact they would be?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is absolutely correct. As the substitute amendment is now written, the bonds would not be carried on the books as a Federal debt. In fact, they are declared not to be a Federal debt. But there is one provision, to which I have just referred, which permits the trust funds which are held by the United States, such as the social-security fund and similar ones, to invest in the bonds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask two more questions?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Virginia share my fear that the effect of the financing plan in the administration's road bill will not only serve to increase interest rates in respect to financing the roads, but also will be bound to have an effect upon interest rates in the economy as a whole?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. The very fact that the bonds were disowned, so to speak, as an obligation of the Federal Government will compel the payment of higher interest rates. I do not think there can be any doubt about that.

The fact remains, and we must understand it fully, that the bonds are not to be included in the public debt. Expenditure of the proceeds would be outside of budgetary procedure. Once the money has gone into the corporation, it will be completely removed from the control of Congress thereafter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding of the philosophy of the Senator from Virginia in regard to the fiscal policies of the Government that when a governmental function is charged with the national interest or national policy, then the cost of that function should be paid for out of the Federal Treasury, from revenue derived by the operation of the tax system.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If that is not done, and if—and I say this most respectfully—a series of fiscal gimmicks is adopted to get around the debt ceiling, to get around the low interest rates which the Federal Government has to pay when it does the borrowing, then we are likely really to undermine the sound fiscal system of the United States. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say—and I am not trying to engage in flattery—that while the Senator from Virginia and I do not always agree on some things, nevertheless, during my term of service of 8 years on the Committee on Armed Services, whenever there was a question relating to fiscal matters, the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Oregon never disagreed.

I congratulate the Senator from Virginia upon what I think is a great act of statesmanship on the floor of the Senate today, in warning the American people, before it is too late, what must be done in order to protect the sound fiscal policy of the Government. We must not permit the enactment of a road program having in it the financial gimmick which the administration bill has, to serve as a sort of bellwether, which will lead the country into great trouble in respect to Government finance.

Again, I congratulate the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, it is by the devious methods I have mentioned that this debt would be created, and its advocates claim it would not be a Federal debt. We must remember that we cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, nor can we evade debt by definition.

If, by some hollow words in a bill passed by Congress, we could declare public debt not to be the Government's solemn promise to repay what it has borrowed, we could by the same process wipe out the $280 billion of Federal obligations we owe to citizens, trust funds, banks, insurance companies, and so forth.

If we should adopt the policy of directing the Secretary of the Treasury simply to pay out money whenever an agency needed some, there would be no further need for the appropriations procedure check in the legislative branch of the Government. But that would be the result of the adoption of the amendment. In addition to the borrowing, this proposal would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make available to the roads corporation $5 billion outstanding at any one time, without further action by Congress.

As an advocate of more and better roads, I am opposed to spending 55 percent of the cost for interest which will never build a foot of road—good or bad.

The substitute would abolish the State-matching formula which has existed since 1916. It would turn over to the Federal Government absolute control over 40,000 miles of our most important roads heretofore under the control of the 48 States. This plan would be the greatest single step yet taken toward Federal paternalism.

It is based upon the erroneous conclusion that the interstate system it proposes will meet the road needs of our Nation for a period of 32 years.

As I have said, it would dry up the gasoline tax for road improvement on this system from 1966 to 1987, in order to pay the bonds and the interest thereon. It apparently assumes that no new road improvement on the interstate system will be necessary in this 22-year period.

It provides for payment of principal and interest on these bonds with permanent, indefinite appropriations, which removes the corporation completely from annual appropriation control by Congress.

To qualify for roads in the interstate system, States would have to abdicate their authority over the roads within their borders and maintain them under standards and specifications fixed in Washington.

A superficial glance at the map of this interstate system as now proposed makes it absurd to think that 40,000 miles will be the iron bound limit for the interstate system of roads over a period of 32 years. I suspect the present mileage will be greatly increased when it is found that the system as now established bypasses the capitals of six States and omits many heavily traveled roads in every State.

In a growing country such as ours, a so-called interstate road today may be a secondary road tomorrow, and, because of population shifts, a secondary road may shortly become an interstate road.

Governors and Senators who have been governors know the year-to-year demands for constant changes and increases in primary system roads in their respective States. The Federal interstate system may be compared with the primary system roads in the States.

This proposed legislation specifically provides that in cases of dispute between the State and Federal authorities, the Corporation would decide, in the nature of a supreme court. Absolute Federal authority over the vital roads in all the States is a serious matter.

In testimony before congressional committees, it was clearly pointed out that on hardly any road does the so-called interstate traffic predominate over the so-called local traffic. No road system can be predicated solely upon the thought that such a road will serve interstate traffic only. Every road must serve the local traffic as well as the through traffic.

While it is not clearly defined, it is apparently provided that all concessionaires, such as restaurants, filling stations, motels, and so on, may be licensed, and it is indicated in the report that license fees would be charged. But, I emphasize, whatever may be said as to the powers of the Highway Corporation, such powers would be virtually unlimited. It could move the roadbed. It could establish a license system for all concessions, charge fees, or do anything else it might choose to do within the right-of-way limits.

To those who deny this, I should like to ask: Where are the safeguards in this legislation to prevent the Federal Government from exercising this conclusive and dictatorial control if it chooses to do it?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. KERR. As the Senator has examined the substitute bill, has he found anywhere that anyone, with the sole exception of the Secretary of Commerce, would have any authority to spend a single dollar of this money?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct; the Secretary and the Corporation.

Mr. KERR. But the direction of where the money is to be spent is to be by one man, without any safeguard or protection given to any State in the Union that it shall receive any fixed portion or definite part thereof. Is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is true. The bill provides no distribution, to the States, on any basis on which they could rely.

Mr. KERR. The bill not only vests in the Secretary of Commerce the power to which the Senator from Virginia has referred, with reference to limiting actions and issuing licenses and imposing upon the States the Federal will, with reference to specifications and locations of roads, but also denies to any State in the Union any fixed or visible interest in any particular percentage of the roadbuilding money. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that under the substitute amendment the different States of the Union are, first, to make an estimate of their needs to the Secretary? The plan is to complete the entire interstate system, but the first step is that each State shall make an estimate of its needs. Is not that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct; but my understanding of the substitute is that it provides no assurance whatever that any specific allocation will be made to the States over any particular period of time. As the Senator knows, the customary way of distributing road funds is on a certain base which applies to every State. There is nothing in the substitute bill, so far as I know, which would give assurance to any State that it would get any funds for road improvement over any particular period.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the first step is that the State would make an estimate of its requirements, and the plan is to complete all of the approximately 37,600 miles of so-called interstate roads up to a standard that may be prescribed by the Secretary.

Mr. BYRD. That is true, but there is no basis of distribution. Let us take as an example the State of West Virginia. That State has nearly as much surface area as has the State of Virginia. Tables in the Clay report suggest that the State of West Virginia would have 250 miles of interstate highways, the State of Virginia would have 900 miles, and the State of Delaware would have 24 miles. But the bill contains no formula. There is no assurance as to when those particular miles of roads will be improved. It may take 10 years. There is a 10-year period provided for in the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. If the Senator will yield for another question, I should like to ask him if it is not true, as provided in the substitute bill, that within 10 years the roads would be completed.

Mr. BYRD. That is the ultimate purpose, but the point I wish to make clear is that there is no assurance to any State that there will be a certain specific allotment to it within any particular time.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It will be done within 10 years.

Mr. BYRD. That is true, but it is of no comfort to a State to know that it may not get an allotment for 8 or 10 years. There is no basis provided in the bill on which a State could depend for annual construction programs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Under the substitute bill now being discussed, we who live in Minnesota would have no assurance that our State would get one dollar in 1956 or 1957 or the calendar year 1958. But at some time in the course of 5 or 10 years, some funds might be allocated to us. I say "might"; it would not be mandatory that, from the funds made available through the sale of the bonds, any dollars would specifically be allocated to our State or our area. Is not that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. There is no specific formula in the substitute bill for the distribution of funds.

Mr. THYE. I am very much interested in this point, because Minnesota is one of the States which issued bonds for the construction of its highways; and our State has probably one of the best highway systems in the land. Our system has been based specifically on using the revenue to retire the bonds.

So if, under this program, we do not have a formula which will tell us the amount of money we shall receive yearly, I am very much concerned as to what will happen to the highway system in our region.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota understands that under the substitute all the funds will be used entirely for the interstate system.

Mr. THYE. I fully realize that.

U. S. Route 16 and U. S. Route 14 cross Minnesota. U. S. Route 2 also crosses Minnesota, passing through Crookston and Grand Forks.

Of course, we have received Federal assistance in the development of our roads. However, under the plan here proposed, we could not be certain that we would receive any funds or any assistance in 1957 or 1958. That matter would be left entirely to the discretion of the administrator—whoever he might be—in the Department of Commerce. He would be able to use his own discretion in determining whether possibly our State would be allocated some funds.

I wish to have that point made entirely clear, because it is a key point in determining whether to support or to oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Let me say I think the point which has just been made is well covered in the proposed substitute; and I now read from page 16, section 205, which is entitled "Distribution by States":

DISTRIBUTION BY STATES

SEC. 205. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement, and an estimate of the cost as of January 1, 1956, of bringing that portion of the designated interstate mileage within its boundaries up to the standards prescribed under this act. On or before April 1 of each subsequent year, each State shall submit a revised estimate of such cost as of January 1 of such year, including therein the actual or estimated cost of any construction of such mileage begun or carried on subsequent to January 1, 1956.

In subsection (b) the rest is spelled out. Since the question has been raised, I believe it important to read the remainder of the section; and I hope the Senator from Minnesota will note it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I hope it will be possible for our side to yield some time at this point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield time, Mr. President.

Mr. BUSH. I think our side should yield the Senator from Virginia an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, Mr. President; if those on the other side of the aisle desire to have extended discussion, they should yield us some of their time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have yielded 10 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from New Jersey; and I continue to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I now read subsection (b):

(b) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall establish an approved estimate of cost for construction of projects on the interstate system in each State, and the Secretary shall determine the ratio of the approved estimate of cost for each

State to the total of the approved estimates of such cost for all States. After subtracting from the amount determined pursuant to section 204, the estimated total credits under section 207 and estimated total expenses for administrative purposes and research, the Secretary shall apply the ratio for each State to the remaining sum and the resulting amounts shall be the maximum Federal payments to the various States for the purposes of section 206. He shall promptly notify the States of these maximum amounts.

Mr. President, I simply submit that under all the circumstances, that is a definite commitment to the States.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Connecticut is speaking of allocations, is he not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes; I am speaking of the distribution of the funds.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut turn to page 28.

Mr. BUSH. I will.

Mr. BYRD. I ask the Senator from Connecticut to read the last two lines, as follows:

The allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment.

It is true they are allocated, but they are not allocated for any particular time for expenditure. They may be spent 7, 8, or even 10 years after the date of the allocation.

Mr. BUSH. But this goes back to the fundamental difference between the concept of the substitute bill and the concept of the Gore bill. The substitute is based on actual needs for the interstate highway system. The Gore bill is not.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut knows—and I am not arguing about the Gore bill especially—that the Gore bill makes a specific apportionment to every State for every year.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator from Virginia point to something in the bill which would guarantee to the State of Virginia a specific apportionment for any one year? I cannot do so, because no such apportionment is to be found in the bill.

Mr. BYRD. In the substitute bill there is no guaranty whatever; there is no formula of distribution.

Mr. BUSH. It would be impossible to allocate the funds on the basis of need unless the matter were handled in the way it is handled in the substitute bill. It must be handled in this way.

Mr. BYRD. What is the interpretation of the Senator from Connecticut of the last two lines on page 28, which I read just a moment ago?

Mr. BUSH. But the Gore bill is a measure to distribute dollars. We are proposing to distribute dollars on the basis of the needs of the States for completion of the interstate highway system.

Mr. BYRD. If the roads are to be built, dollars must be distributed.

Mr. BUSH. But the Gore bill will distribute dollars all over the place, even though the money could not be spent for roads.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator from Connecticut to state his interpretation of the last two lines on page 28, which I read a moment ago. I read them again:

The allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment.

In other words, they are not an apportionment, but are set down on a piece of paper, so that 5 or 10 years from now the money may be spent. But there is no guaranty when it will be spent or that it will be spent.

Mr. BUSH. The apportionments have to be made from time to time, as the work progresses.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask my question again. For instance, in this connection let us consider the State of Connecticut. If the Senator from Connecticut wishes to be able to tell his constituents about the effect of the substitute measure, how much money will he be able to say Connecticut will receive next year? Where in the substitute is there a guaranty that Connecticut will get even $1?

Mr. BUSH. I will say that under the proposed substitute bill Connecticut will get approximately $540 million over a period of 10 years.

Mr. BYRD. That may be correct. But there is no apportionment or formula for it.

Mr. BUSH. It may be that more miles of road will be built in one year than in another, and the payment made may depend on the nature of the land on which construction occurs. For instance, some land will require a much greater cost per mile than will other land. So the amendment cannot be pinned down to a particular amount in a particular year. There has to be a program, and it must be worked out—just as in the case of a business program.

Mr. BYRD. But is it not proper to say that under the substitute the matter is left entirely to the Secretary, who will determine when the money will be allotted, and how much will be allotted?

Mr. BUSH. I would not say so, because the States will——

Mr. BYRD. Every State in the Union will try to get all of its share the first year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, each State must match the Federal funds.

Mr. BYRD. Not in this case. In this case there will be no matching at all; not a dollar will be provided by the States. This money will be provided solely and completely by the United States Government. That means that the United States Government will completely subsidize the interstate system; and under the substitute bill the Federal Government will be under no obligation to give to a particular State any particular amount on any particular date, or to give any amount at all.

Mr. THYE. Let me say that three national highways cross Minnesota. As I understand, those who will administer this program for the Federal Government might say that they would see fit to improve the southern roads, and they might wish to postpone construction on the northern routes. In that case, Minnesota would simply sit by, whistling, and hoping to attract the attention of the Federal officials, so as to get them to examine our routes at some time or other. Is that the case?

Mr. BYRD. The State would have to do a good deal of whistling, I presume. It is a considerable distance from Washington.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I do not agree with that statement at all. I think there is no reason to suppose that the Federal Government would try to trick the States out of any money to which they are entitled. The system of apportioning the money is made clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to announce that the time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes more to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I have never said that I thought there would be any trickery. I have said that there is no formula for distribution to the States on an annual basis. I still say that is correct. If I am incorrect, I ask the Senator to point out the part of the substitute which so provides.

Mr. BUSH. I do not say whether the Senator is correct or incorrect on that point. I do not think it makes any difference whether he is correct or incorrect, because I am satisfied that under the language of the Martin bill a fair apportionment of the funds would be made in accordance with the need. That is the fundamental concept of the Clay Committee proposal all the way through. It is on the basis of need.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that this issue is one of the outstanding issues involved in the bill. I am glad he is bringing it out. The language which gives sound ground for the fear which the Senator from Virginia has expressed is found on page 18, lines 6 and following, reading as follows:

Except as provided in section 102 (d), the Secretary shall have the final responsibility, after consultation with the States, the Department of Defense, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration, for determining the scheduling and priority of construction of projects, taking into consideration the objective of a uniform rate of accomplishment of construction on the interstate system in all the States and the availability of funds from the Corporation.

In other words, the Secretary shall have the final responsibility for determining the scheduling and the priority of construction of projects. That will give to the Secretary, and whoever speaks for him, complete control over the timing as to when money is released. I have seen that done too many times in the old WPA days, when the scheduling of

the priority of construction of projects was put on a political basis, ever to want to write it into a law.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator. That is the point I was trying to make. I do not charge that anyone would use trickery. All I say is that there is no formula in the substitute bill for distribution. Since 1916, when the first Federal-aid for roads law was enacted, we have had a formula whereby every State received a given amount every year. I wish to make it clear that the proposed legislation would be permanent. Under this proposal, there would be no recovery of the power over these roads and activities along them which we would give away. It would be permanent.

Following through with the detailed statements of Comptroller General Campbell, I should like to read to the Senate some observations which he made. The Comptroller General is the officer of the Government who represents the Congress. It is his duty to advise us about bills when he is asked to do so, and it is his duty to see that the funds which we appropriate are spent legally and properly. This is what he said when he testified before the Public Works Subcommittee on March 28, 1955:

We feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable because the result would be that the borrowings would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States.

While the issuance of the Corporation's bonds would be with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the obligations would be repaid from the permanent appropriation established by section 105 (c), the obligations would specifically state that they are not obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has just referred to appropriations. Will the Senator turn to page 8 of Senate bill 1160? I read, beginning with line 16:

There are hereby appropriated—

Would not the Senator call that an appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; and the appropriation would be permanent.

Mr. GORE. It would be not only an appropriation bill for 1 year.

There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation—

So not only are we asked to appropriate an indefinite amount, but we are asked to appropriate an indefinite amount for an indefinite time.

Mr. BYRD. It would be a permanent appropriation during the period covered by the bill.

Comptroller General Campbell said further:

The fact that the bill provides for a permanent appropriation measured by gasoline taxes does not, in our opinion, establish revenues for the Corporation in any normal use of the term.

The gasoline taxes are revenues of the Treasury and go into the general fund of the Treasury. The appropriation provided would come out of the general fund of the Treasury exactly as most of the appropriations made by Congress.

Here is an appropriation which has not been considered by the Appropriations Committee of either branch of Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not only is this an appropriation bill which has not been considered by the Appropriations Committee of either branch of Congress, but it would take out of the hands of the Appropriations Committees certain revenues for a period of 30 years.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the complete statement of the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable because the result would be that the borrowings would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States.

While the issuance of the Corporation's bonds would be with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the obligations would be repaid from the permanent appropriation established by section 105 (c), the obligations would specifically state that they are not obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

However, the legislation provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the Corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriation for that year and, in addition, the Corporation would be authorized to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Both of these provisions coupled with the permanent appropriation would apparently be to assure the investors of ability to meet obligations, and tend to have the effect of a Government guaranty of the highway obligations, at least in the minds of the investing public.

As a practical matter, the obligations would be moral and equitable obligations of the United States, since they would be issued by a Corporation entirely owned by the Government.

While the obligations would specifically provide that they are not guaranteed by the Government, it is highly improbable that the Congress could allow such obligations to go in default when one considers that credit standing of the Federal Government would be involved.

In addition, the Corporation's activities would not be self-sustaining. It would have no substantial revenues, and funds for paying off the obligations would come from the general fund of the Treasury. The funds available would be measured by future anticipated increases in collections of taxes on gasoline and special fuels.

The fact that the bill provides for a permanent appropriation measured by gasoline taxes does not, in our opinion, establish revenues for the Corporation in any normal use of the term.

The gasoline taxes are revenues of the Treasury and go into the general fund of the Treasury. The appropriation provided would come out of the general fund of the Treasury exactly as most of the appropriations made by Congress.

The total amount of borrowings by the Corporation would amount to the very substantial sum of $21 billion and, in our opinion, would be borrowings of the United States Government, irrespective of the terminology applied. It seems only right that such obligations should be considered, classified, and disclosed as a part of the total borrowings of the Government; that is the public debt.

It is our opinion that the Government should not enter into financing arrangements which might have the effect of obscuring the financial facts of the Government's debt position. We believe that the highway program—since it, in reality, is nonrevenue producing—should be financed by appropriations made by the Congress.

If, to provide these funds, it is necessary to borrow from the general public, we believe that the borrowings should be handled under the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

This is a normal function of the Treasury Department, and in carrying out his assigned fiscal and debt management responsibilities, we do not feel that the effectiveness of the Secretary of the Treasury should be weakened by authorizing other Government agencies to borrow directly from the investing public.

Also, under the procedure we recommend, any borrowings necessary to fund the appropriations approved by the Congress would automatically be treated and disclosed as a part of the public debt of the Federal Government. In making this recommendation, we recognize that a borrowing operation of this magnitude may require changes in the existing statutory public debt ceiling.

Also if the direct appropriation method is used to finance the highway construction, the Congress would be in a position to make an annual review of the progress and changing needs of the road program because money to carry it out would have to be specifically appropriated by the Congress each year.

In addition to reviewing the actual needs of the program, the Congress could also consider whether, from an overall picture of revenues and expenditures of the Government, the full amount authorized for highway construction should be spent in a particular year.

In the event a Federal Highway Corporation is created, the Congress would, to some degree, lose its control over the program. The Corporation would submit annual budgets to Congress under the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, but only funds for administrative and operating expenses would be approved by the Congress. The program funds would continue to be available unless the Congress took affirmative action to limit the program expenditures.

I think most of you are aware of the position of the General Accounting Office with respect to Government corporations. We are opposed to the creation of new Government corporations, unless for the most compelling reasons or overriding public necessity.

The corporate form of Government activity is objectionable because, for the most part, it is free from the normal safeguards set up by the Congress to maintain adequate control over the conduct of public business and the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. BYRD. In addition to the foregoing statements made by the Comptroller General, he went to the trouble of making specific, definite recommendations to the committee for safeguarding the situation.

On March 28, when he testified, he further said:

In the event the subcommittee is to favorably act on S. 1160, we recommend that several provisions of the bill be considered for amendment:

1. Consideration should be given as to whether the powers of the Corporation are too broad. We would recommend that the legislation be more restrictive as to the functions and duties the Corporation is to perform. Also, consideration should be given to limiting the life of the Corporation to a definite date.

2. Section 105 (d) is contrary to many of the existing statutory restrictions on the investment of trust funds. For example, the unemployment trust fund can only be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

If the purpose of section 105 (d) is to permit investment of these and other trust moneys in bonds of the Federal Highway Corporation, existing statutory restrictions on the investment of trust funds should be declared inapplicable to avoid any possible conflict.

3. Section 203 dealing with right-of-way acquisitions should be clarified as to the source of funds for payment of the property acquired. The section provides that the Federal Government will pay 95 percent of the appraised value or the actual cost, whichever is lower, but the section is silent as to who pays the additional 5 percent.

It is assumed that the 5 percent will be paid by the State. We think the section should so provide and also make it clear as to whether the State advances the 5 percent to the Federal Government prior to the payment for the property, or whether the Federal Government may pay 100 percent and then be reimbursed by the State for 5 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Who is this speaking? Is it the Comptroller General of the United States?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. He says that this proposal would change the law regarding the investment of the unemployment trust fund, for which the United States Government acts as guardian. The substitute amendment would change the law so as to make the fund available for purchase of highway corporation bonds, which the bill says are not an obligation or debt of the United States Government.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask the Senator if his views on that question would change, or if his attitude toward the Martin bill would be modified, if it were amended so that the language respecting the guaranty by the Federal Government, or the lack of it, were changed to read as follows:

The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are guaranteed by the United States Government.

Mr. BYRD. If the fund did not go through the budget, would it be regarded as a deficit or not?

Mr. BUSH. It would not.

Mr. BYRD. All the Senator is seeking to do is trying, by putting words in the bill, to say that it is a debt when it does not go through the budget, and is not included in the deficit.

Mr. BUSH. The only purpose of keeping it out of the budget is to keep the fund on a self-liquidating basis, and to provide a sinking fund for the retirement of the debt.

Mr. BYRD. Those who advocated the proposal in the original instance did not want the amount to be regarded as a deficit or as being paid out of the Treasury. They wanted to have the money come to the corporation, and not go through the regular books of the Treasury or the budget.

With all due respect to the distinguished Senator, his suggested amendment—I will not use the word "substitute," because it is not quite that—would create a debt without creating a deficit.

Mr. BUSH. Let me say to the Senator that the whole purpose of the corporation device, in my judgment, and the only real excuse for it, is to take the revenue which comes from the increased use of highways and segregate it into a sinking fund with which to retire the debt. That is the only purpose.

Therefore I think the Senator is correct about the full faith and credit of the United States. I am disposed to agree with him, which I had not done at first. I think the United States should guarantee these bonds, and remove all doubt, if there is any doubt, as to whether they are actual obligations and a debt of the United States, but I believe the corporate device should be kept so as to liquidate the debt.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield in order that I may ask a question at this point?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not true that if a purchaser is to be induced to buy the bond, unless it is guaranteed by the Government, the interest rate on the bond would have to be made so attractive that the investor would be induced to buy the bond. In other words, unless the bond was guaranteed by the Government, the interest rate would have to be attractive enough to induce a purchaser to buy the bond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Chair regretfully states that the time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. THYE. I should like to have a reply to my question.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to give my reply to the Senator's question.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Connecticut may give his reply first; and then I will give my reply.

Mr. BUSH. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that when the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the committee he testified that the corporation bonds, as provided for originally in the substitute bill, and, as it now reads, would carry an interest rate one-eighth to one-half percent over and above the interest rate on similar long-term Treasury bonds fully guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, if he were a banker and was making an investment for his bank, whether he would buy bonds on which the interest rate was a quarter or an eighth of 1 percent higher than on bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government? Would he advise his board and his investment agent in the bank to buy that kind of security if it did not carry a Federal guarantee?

Mr. BUSH. I will say to my friend from Minnesota that that is an academic question, because I would not advise a bank to buy any long-term bonds anyway. I intend in due course to offer an amendment which will make these bond obligations guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, it has nothing to do with expenditure of the funds. In other words, they would not be subject to budgetary or appropriation procedure, and would not be regarded as deficit financing. Why should they not be considered like any other funds?

Mr. THYE. Am I correct in saying that no investor would buy the bond unless it carried a Government guarantee, or unless the interest rate was so attractive that a purchaser would buy it on that basis? Therefore I see the danger of an excessive interest rate being imposed upon what we might term the average user of the highway in order to retire the bonds.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has ably stated the situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If we should adopt the amendment which the Senator from Connecticut says he will offer later, under which the bonds would be guaranteed by the United States, how could they be excluded from inclusion in the national debt? Would they not then be part of the national debt?

Mr. BYRD. The debt limit is fixed by statute which excludes certain obligations. I should hesitate to pass hasty judgment on the question as to whether the suggested amendment would subject these bonds to the limitation.

Mr. BUSH. In other words, the Senator means——

Mr. BYRD. I am not certain that guaranteeing these bonds would automatically subject this debt to the statutory limit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They would not under the language of the substitute bill, but if we were to modify the bill to that extent, they would, as I understand.

Mr. BUSH. My feeling is that bonds fully guaranteed by the United States, which my amendment would make them, would become a part of the Federal debt and be subject to the debt limitation provisions.

Mr. BYRD. If they should be subject to the ceiling it would be necessary to

amend the Liberty Loan Act and to raise the Federal debt limit so as to provide for this program.

Mr. BUSH. It is a moot question whether it would be necessary to raise the debt limit. That would depend on a great many other factors.

Mr. BYRD. We will discuss the debt limit a little later.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. There is no question that the $7½ billion deficit under the Gore bill would be added to the public debt, is there?

Mr. BYRD. That is another question, which is not concerned with the pending amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me to be very odd, at least, to say that the bonds shall be guaranteed by the United States but shall not be included in the national debt.

Mr. BUSH. They would be included in the debt.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Why should they not be subject to the debt limit?

Mr. BUSH. I said they should be.

Mr. BYRD. If they are, we had better appropriate the funds and let the Treasury borrow the money for less interest, call it deficit spending and keep the Government's records straight. Is the Senator from Connecticut willing to put this program on a deficit and debt basis?

Mr. BUSH. It is not a question of whether I am willing to have it done.

Mr. BYRD. Does the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Connecticut make the bonds of this corporation a Federal debt under the statutory limit?

Mr. BUSH. I do not believe they should be, but I am perfectly willing that they be. I do not believe it is necessary.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe we should have 5 minutes yielded to us by the other side.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Connecticut is offering an amendment which apparently indicates that he needs to strengthen his position. The substitute measure has been before Congress for 3 or 4 months, and up to this time the bonds for which it provides have not been regarded as being a debt or coming under the debt limit, but all of a sudden we have a change made in that regard.

Mr. BUSH. Several amendments were offered to the Gore bill today, too.

Mr. BYRD. But nothing so fundamental as this amendment.

Mr. BUSH. It is a matter of opinion as to what is fundamental and what is not fundamental.

Mr. BYRD. I still say when bonds go through the books of the Treasury and when we spend $2½ billion a year of receipts, the bonds should be regarded as a deficit. That is the only honest procedure.

Mr. BUSH. I am perfectly willing to have them regarded as a deficit, if the Government requires it to be done that way.

Mr. BYRD. We would have to abolish the corporation if we did that.

Mr. BUSH. If a corporation is created and the money is segregated and goes into a sinking fund, a question is raised whether that money goes into the income account of the Government. I do not think it does.

Mr. BYRD. The substitute would have to be amended in a dozen particulars. All through it provision is made for the money to go to the Corporation.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. It stays there. Congress loses all control over it.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The corporation could do with that money what it pleased.

Mr. BUSH. The borrowed money would be used to build the roads, and the income would be used to pay off the debt. That is right.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Is not the substitute bill predicated upon the theory of a double budget system?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Under which an item appears as a liability but does not go through the Treasury's books and does not enter the conduct of its fiscal affairs. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I have always mistrusted such a system. I compliment the Senator from Virginia on his very clear exposition of the situation. When we embark on a double budget system we take a step along a road that does not ever return to fiscal or financial responsibility on the part of the Government.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has admirably stated the situation.

In order to conclude without further delay, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of Mr. BYRD's remarks are as follows:

None of these recommendations has been incorporated in the substitute now before the Senate.

The Comptroller General had good reason to bring up the question of rights-of-way. No one will seriously deny that the Federal Government through this synthetic corporation could exercise virtually supreme power over the construction, operation, and other activities connected with, and related to, the 40,000 miles of interstate roads.

I have spent a large part of my life working for sound expansion of highways. I fully recognize the need for highway improvement to meet the impact of the new traffic. In opposing the substitute bill (S. 1160) I am still engaged in that objective.

During 10 years in the Virginia State Senate, I became chairman of the roads committee. I was a patron of the legislation establishing Virginia's first State highway system and I introduced in 1923 the bill for a 3-cent gasoline tax—at that time the highest imposed by any State—to build and pay for good roads. That was 40 years ago.

As Governor, my administration was dedicated to improvement of our road system. Virginia is 1 of 4 States in the Union which constructs and maintains a statewide highway system with no expense to the localities. According to Federal records, the State highway system of Virginia embraces 54,240 miles of State roads, more than 95 percent of them surfaced.

For these roads we have paid as we progressed. There hasn't been a State highway bond issue in Virginia since 1835. Our State gas tax is 6 cents and our license tax is $10 a year. I shall always support sound pay-as-you-go road improvement plans.

Governors of the States frequently have requested, if not demanded, repeal of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. This would be one way greatly to promote the road program. Should it be repealed, and should we continue the 1955 Federal highway authorization of $575 million a year for the period of this proposed program, far more money would be available for road improvement than this bill would produce.

I doubt if there is a State in the Union which does not stand ready to reimpose the 2-cent tax if it should be repealed by the Federal Government.

Personally, I suggest road improvement through the combination of the following three methods:

1. Repeal of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax so it may be reimposed by the States.

On an average of $1.6 billion a year, this would yield $52 billion for expenditure by the States in the 32-year period ending in 1987. States and localities, for all road purposes, currently are spending approximately $6.5 billion a year out of their own revenue exclusive of Federal aid. Assuming continuation of this annual rate, in the next 32 years they would spend $208 billion for roads, exclusive of expenditures from the reimposed 2-cent gas tax, and this does not take into account the normal increase in traffic. If the $52 billion of additional revenue from the reimposed Federal tax were added, minimum State and local expenditures for roads in the next 32 years would total $260 billion.

2. Continuation of present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, currently at the rate of $575 million a year authorization. This Federal aid, for many years, has been integrated with State programs on these systems. Over the 32-year period this would total $18.4 billion. This, added to the $208 billion of State and local funds and the $52 billion from the reimposed Federal gas taxes, would total $278.4 billion.

3. Judicious employment of toll roads, financed from toll revenue, in congested areas on a scale equal to if not greater than at present. This would provide for the more costly sections of our highway system, and it could be done under State authority.

Under such a plan States could retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. BUSH. First, I should like to send to the desk an amendment which I shall call up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. BUSH. In view of the remarks of the eminent Senator from Virginia, I should like to read the amendment, as follows:

On page 8 of the amendment, line 10, beginning with the word "The", strike out all down to and including the period in line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Corporation shall insert appropriate

language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are guaranteed by the United States."

If the Senate were to adopt the amendment I believe we would remove all question and controversy respecting the validity of the bonds, and whether they were an obligation or a debt of the United States. I have felt right along that that was an academic question, because this is a Federal project. It is a United States corporation that is proposed to be created—a Federal highway corporation. It makes no difference whether the bonds are guaranteed, or how much it is said they are not guaranteed. My own deliberations lead me to believe that the United States could not afford to let these bonds go into default. It would be a reflection on the credit of the United States to such an extent that there can be no real argument about it.

I submit that there is no intent in the pending amendment to deceive anyone. There is no deception involved in it. The Senator from Georgia, whom I regard very highly, as I do the distinguished Senator from Virginia, has spoken of a double budget. I find it very difficult to take issue with my friend from Virginia on this matter. But there is some unhappy connotations about the words "double budget."

There is no use denying the fact that the amendment establishes a corporation, a separate organization, to accomplish a purpose. It is to create an interstate highway system based on the needs of the Nation, based on the needs of civil defense, for which a very strong case was made before the committee, based on the needs of interstate commerce, in view of the very large increase in the number of automobiles and trucks throughout the country, and based on safety. We need high-speed, controlled access roads to connect the capitals of our States and the principal centers of population in the great industrial areas, and we need them very rapidly. That has been testified to by practically all witnesses.

The Senator from Virginia says that this device has never before been used, and he raises the question with which Secretary Humphrey dealt, as to the bonds being a debt, but not an obligation of the United States.

Mr. President, I think my amendment, if adopted, would remove any objection in that particular area. This is not a new device. Other Federal corporations have been established. The Federal Government does guarantee their obligations to the extent of almost $150 billion. There is nothing brand-new about that. The thing which is new about it and the thing which is good about it is that it does provide for a debt which is going to be self-liquidating, and it provides for an asset which is going to produce revenues to liquidate the debt. If that is not sound business, I do not know what is sound business. Any enterprise with an opportunity to borrow money under such circumstances would pay off. That is the way the copper companies in the West have developed, and the way many other companies have developed.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the great railroad systems which have connected the East with the Far West were largely built from money they borrowed, but they had the revenues with which to retire the bonds?

Mr. BUSH. There is no question about that. It also applies to other great industrial borrowers. There is nothing new in the principle of pledging revenues. It may be that it is new for the United States Government, but various States, including the State of Virginia, my State, and other States, have pledged revenues for the purpose of securing bonds. It is a very sound method of financing, particularly in connection with roads.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at that point?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. We have no right or power in the State of Virginia, under our constitution, to do that. The roads are operated on the toll revenues. There is no guaranty whatever on the part of the State.

Mr. BUSH. I think it is a very sound procedure to borrow money and secure it with revenues.

Mr. BYRD. It is done by a turnpike authority, without any guaranty by the State.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think that changes my point, so far as the principle is concerned.

Mr. BYRD. The principle is that the investor is likely to call for payment of the bonds. The bonds are issued based on the receipts.

Mr. BUSH. That may be because the State has no constitutional authority in regard to it, but other States which do have constitutional authority have done the same thing under their State highway authorities. It has worked out very well indeed. We borrow money to construct a producing asset. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is familiar with that procedure, I am sure.

Mr. BYRD. The Government corporation proposed in the substitute amendment does not have a dollar of revenue or of assets.

Mr. BUSH. It does not have anything now, but when the bill is signed by the President it will have two very important assets. One will be a call upon the Treasury, and it will also have what is set aside for it from the gasoline tax. That is a very important asset; in fact, so good that it should retire the entire bond issue over a period of 30 years.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. If I have sufficient time I shall be glad to yield later.

There is nothing new in this proposition except insofar as the Federal Government is concerned. It has been tested on the State level, and, therefore, it is perfectly proper for the Federal Government——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it has never been tested on the State level. No corporation of this kind has ever been formed by any State in the Union. Other corporations have income from toll revenues. If these bonds were based upon toll revenues there would not be any serious objection to the Federal Government guaranteeing them.

Mr. BUSH. I would say that I think the Senator's point represents a distinction without a basic difference. I think income from tax revenue is just as good income, just as measurable, as is income from prospective toll revenues. One is taken at the gate and the other is taken from the gasoline tax. There is no particular difference in principle. There is in fact, but not in principle.

Mr. BYRD. The money goes to the Federal Government. It is general revenue. In the case of toll revenue it goes directly to the company. The Senator is speaking of taking general revenue taxes which have been coming into the Treasury for many years and dedicating them to a specific purpose. We cannot obligate future Congresses in a matter of that kind.

Mr. BUSH. The revenue which comes from taxes in excess of $622 million goes into the corporation.

Mr. BYRD. All of the Federal gasoline tax goes into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States and is spent pursuant to regular appropriations.

Mr. BUSH. In this instance it would be used in part for the benefit of the corporation.

Mr. BYRD. We cannot compare that with toll charges the revenue from which goes to the toll authorities.

Mr. BUSH. I say, again, it is comparable in principle. We have here a distinction without a fundamental difference.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Am I correct in assuming that the State of Minnesota would not receive 1 cent of Federal assistance in connection with its road construction in the future; that the only way it could have any assistance would be if and when the Secretary of Commerce or his agent should say, "Now we are ready to expend some Federal funds in the State of Minnesota?"

Mr. BUSH. I think that would be a very dangerous assumption. Subparagraph (b) of section 206, on page 18, line 14, reads, in part, as follows:

> The Secretary shall make allocations to the States in the amounts of the approved estimates, and the Secretary shall promptly notify the States of the approved construction programs and of the amounts so allocated.

Mr. THYE. However, that would be entirely at the discretion of whoever the agent of the Commerce Department was. There is nothing mandatory that Minnesota should receive $1 million, $10 million, or $30 million in the next 5 years. There in so allocation or earmarking of funds. Minnesota would have to come, with tin cup in hand, and ask, "Won't you please recognize us?"

Mr. BUSH. On that I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. THYE. I cannot see anything in the substitute which would indicate anything else.

Mr. BUSH. I have just read to the Senator the language of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. It is left to the discretion of one person as to when and how he will allocate funds, to Minnesota for example.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator must keep in mind the basic difference between the Martin bill and the highway bills we have dealt with heretofore. The funds in the substitute bill now before the Senate are to be allocated on the basis of needs, and the States will have to agree with the Federal Government as to what the needs are to build an interstate highway system. What we are proposing to allocate for is an interstate highway system, nothing else. I do not think those who will represent Minnesota in these matters will be unable to work effectively in these matters, as they have in similar instances in the past. The Bureau of Public Roads has always been a good bureau.

Mr. THYE. The Bureau of Public Roads, however, is not the agent which will have, as it now has, the authority to allocate to the States on a matching basis. In this particular instance, a corporation would be established in and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, and it would have the authority to say where, in its judgment, a so-called national highway should be constructed.

Mr. BUSH. No; there would have to be an agreement with the States, based on the needs of the interstate system. It would be by agreement.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota is in the northern tier of States, and we are a little afraid——

Mr. BUSH. I do not think the Senator's State has anything to be afraid of.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Connecticut is correct in his belief that a State can receive funds when they are allocated, will he tell me the meaning of the language in the amendment in the nature of a substitute which provides that allocations made under it shall not be deemed to be an apportionment? Why was that put in the substitute bill if, as the Senator has indicated, the funds would be deemed to be an apportionment?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is speaking about apportionment as it is customarily used in highway bills, when 45 percent, 35 percent, or 25 percent is the apportionment. That is the way funds have been apportioned in the past.

But that is not the way the money for the interstate system will be spent. It will be apportioned on the basis of need, regardless of what the cost is. This is not a bill to divide dollars; it is a bill to construct a highway system.

Mr. KERR. That has to be done with dollars.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. The Senator knows that there must be an apportionment before the funds can be allocated to a State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I call the Senator's attention to the difference between the amendment in the nature of a substitute and the so-called Gore bill. Every Member has on his desk the estimated distribution of funds under the Gore bill. By looking at the apportionments, it can be seen that the Federal share for a 5-year period is one-half of the interstate system needs for 10 years.

Take, for example, the State of Oklahoma. Under the Gore bill, the Senator's State would receive $178 million. Actually, the need for the interstate system is $140 million, so Oklahoma would get more than it needed.

There are 18 States which would get more than they needed.

Under the Gore bill, there would be many millions of dollars unspent, and unable to be spent, because of the system of apportionment about which the Senator is speaking.

I submit that under the administration bill the funds will be spent on the basis of need: How much of the interstate system does a State have? How much will it cost to build? On that basis, the State will receive what it needs.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. KERR. First, I wish to thank the Senator for making this so-called blunderbuss a part of the RECORD.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his appreciation.

Mr. KERR. I find here a column headed "Estimated 5-Year Needs." I ask the Senator to indicate to the Members of the Senate a single provision in the substitute bill which would give their respective States the amounts designated in the column, or any amount, during any given year.

Mr. BUSH. I may simply say to the Senator that I read that once for the RECORD. I read it from the amendment. Does the Senator want me to take time to read it again?

Mr. KERR. I would urgently request——

Mr. BUSH. To simplify the matter, I will call the Senator's attention to page 16 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, sections 204 and 205. I think the Senator will find his answer in that language.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Connecticut show me the language which would give Oklahoma any amount of dollars in a given year, or any other State a single dollar in a given year?

Mr. BUSH. Neither the great State of Oklahoma nor any other State is specifically mentioned in the bill.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma thinks that Oklahoma ought to be in the bill, because he is against any plan which does not include Oklahoma.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Oklahoma says he does not believe in the theory of the interstate system.

Mr. KERR. Quite to the contrary. The Senator from Oklahoma believes in the theory of the interstate system. He believes there should be a program under which each State will be in the interstate system beginning in the first year of its operation and continuing throughout its existence.

If the Senator from Connecticut can assure me or any other Senator that our States will be "in on the money" for the interstate system during any specific year, I will be grateful for the assurance.

Mr. BUSH. I think that under the language of the amendment the State of Oklahoma certainly will be taken care of to the extent of its needs, which over a period of 10 years would approximate $360 million for the interstate highway system.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Connecticut thinks that, but he cannot show any language in the bill that would guarantee it, can he?

Mr. BUSH. I think the language is sufficient to assure that result.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I cannot, for the life of me, understand how any Senator or any Member of the House can quarrel with the recommendations of the Clay Committee, which provide a means by which, in the next decade, the interstate highway system throughout the United States will be made modern and efficient.

I listened to General Clay before the Senate Committee on Public Works, when he demonstrated conclusively that a modern, efficient, 40,000-mile system of highways throughout the 48 States would serve the needs of military defense, civil defense, and the economy of American society; and, beyond that, would go a long way toward eliminating the frightful and appalling toll of casualties which almost daily occurs along the highways of America.

If we grant, as I believe the American people do, that these constitute valid reasons for adopting the recommendations made by a Presidential commission, then there is only one manner whereby the funds may be immediately raised and allocated to the several States in order to do the job. In my judgment, an emergency situation confronts the Government and the people with respect to this problem. It can be solved only by the means suggested in the Clay report. It can be solved only by Congress creating an agency and permitting it to issue revenue bonds, which would be paid from the excise taxes on gasoline and oil over the next 30 years.

Twenty-six States originally informed the Subcommittee on Public Roads that they would be unable to meet the larger requirements of the committee bill. A

week ago last Monday, in San Francisco, representatives of 11 Western States said that they could not meet the requirements of the committee bill, as it is before the Senate today.

The single State which said it could was California, but California joined with the other 10 in urging Congress to adopt the recommendations of the Clay report, as they are generally enunciated in the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Connecticut.

There have been some recommendations by the minority membership of the committee with which I find myself in disagreement, but it seems to me that no one can quarrel with the desire of immediately accepting the need of a 40,000-mile system of modern and efficient highways across the Nation, and, on the basis of an emergency, adopt the recommendations which provide the one, single method by which the moneys may now be raised and expended to the beneficial use of the people of the United States.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall support the substitute proposal, and I seriously urge my brethren on both sides of the aisle to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a freshman Member of the Senate, I have been intrigued during the current deliberation by some of the statements which have been made about the administration's highway plan. At times it seemed that some of our Democratic colleagues had switched places with us. Vivid in my mind are the charges, from our recent political campaign, of Republican indifference to change and our unreasonable insistence on States rights in a modern world. Thus it is with a degree of wonder that I now hear that it is the Republicans who are being called visionary, unconcerned about the public debt, overzealous in our desire for massive public works to meet the public needs, and indifferent to the rights of the States. In short, Mr. President, the administration plan goes too far for some of our friends across the aisle.

There are compelling reasons why I intend to vote for the Martin substitute as a preferred alternate to the Gore bill. Although my discussion will center largely about my own State's role in the highway program, this is only because this RECORD already carries expert testimony as to why the national interest, including the interest of our national defense, calls for enactment of the Martin substitute. These arguments have been tellingly made by the Senators from Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and New Hampshire, among others.

Mr. President, New Jersey has estimated interstate highway system needs among the largest in the Nation, exceeded only by those of California and Ohio. Yet, under the provisions of the Gore bill New Jersey would receive, in relation to these needs, the smallest percentage of apportionment in the Nation. For New Jersey the Gore bill would provide in 5 years only 12 percent of the funds needed to provide an adequate interstate system.

New Jersey needs an interstate system estimated at $1,357 million in a 10-year period. This is 6 percent of the national total. The Gore bill would give New Jersey only one-eighth of the amount needed to meet these needs. Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, has recognized the merits of an expanded interstate program which can finish the job. Due credit goes to the Governor, who has recommended enactment of the Clay Committee proposal. He sees it the administration's way on this occasion.

At last report, Governor Meyner was still very much a Democrat. Mr. Dwight Palmer, his highway commissioner, is also a Democrat, sufficiently so that he consented to be Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee when Mr. Truman occupied the White House. Both Mr. Meyner and Mr. Palmer have adopted a wholly creditable nonpolitical stand. I say this, Mr. President, only to point out that New Jersey is united on this issue.

While New Jersey and 30 other of the States, including the District of Columbia, would receive less funds than required under the Gore bill to meet their interstate system needs, 18 others would be receiving more than required to meet their needs. In several of these States the amount of this excess apportionment over needs is sufficiently large that even should the maximum of transfer to other systems be effected as permitted under the bill, some funds would still be left over which could in no possible way be used by any State, and these funds would thus be lost to the highway program anywhere. The effect of transferring these excess interstate system funds available in some States to other systems—say to the secondary system—would mean that interstate system needs in New Jersey would be unsatisfied at the expense of constructing more than the average need for secondary roads in some other States. Actually then, the Gore bill provides an "unbalanced" program instead of a "balanced" one as claimed by its sponsors.

Computing the apportionment under the Gore bill another way, New Jersey would not be able to complete her portion of the interstate system before the year 1998, even assuming that apportionments would be maintained after the 5-year life of the bill at the maximum rate authorized in the bill. While New Jersey's needs would go unsatisfied during this period, other States would have received apportionments sufficient to complete the interstate system within their borders ahead of all other States in the Nation, estimated, for example, within the next 4 to 5 years.

This is obviously a faulty distribution formula, which permits completion of some of the lightest traveled sections of the interstate system in 5 years, while the heaviest traveled sections on which the largest gasoline tax payments are made by users remain incomplete for more than 40 years.

In contrast, the distribution formula proposed in the amendment to the bill, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], would provide a distribution of available funds in exact relation to needs in all the States, so that there would be no "dead money," no use of vital interstate system funds to build secondary roads through transfers in some States at the expense of other States, and no unreasonably slow improvement in one State while improvements are made much earlier in another. The whole system would go ahead on a uniform basis, with assurance that it would all be completed within 10 years, rather than 40 years or more. The Martin amendment contains a formula based on needs in each State in relation to the total national needs. Such a formula comes as close to providing perfect distribution of available funds as the accuracy of the estimates will permit, and results in the most efficient use of available funds State by State.

Because New Jersey is a corridor State, with virtually all traffic up and down the middle Atlantic seaboard area of several States passing through New Jersey on the interstate system, the needs of New Jersey arise largely from through or interstate traffic rather than from travel of New Jerseyans alone. The problem, therefore, is one of national rather than purely local concern. We cannot build a national interstate system by dividing that system into 48 individual packages bounded by State lines, as would be the result under the Gore formula. It does this, unfortunately, while using the national gasoline taxes without regard to their application to national interests.

New Jersey is not the only State adversely affected by the operation of this formula. In fact, 31 of the 48 States and the District of Columbia are so affected. The others are Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia.

Under the Gore bill, New Jersey would receive in 5 years $249.5 million of Federal funds, provided it matched this sum with $99.1 million of State funds. This would apply to all systems, interstate and otherwise. Under S. 1160, or the Martin substitute, New Jersey would receive $709.5 million of Federal funds in 5 years, with only $56 million of State funds required as matching amounts. All this applies to the interstate system only.

An important weakness of the Gore bill insofar as New Jersey is concerned, is the fact that there is no provision for insuring that the interstate system will be completed even if it is now begun under this legislation, since it provides or only 5-year programing of the job to be done. The States therefore cannot properly plan their development of the interstate system, because they do not know whether or when any further funds will be made available. Obviously they would use such funds to do the most urgently needed spot-type work rather

than developing an entire route, with the result that there would be created, not a smooth flowing system, but instead a patchwork of improved projects alternating with substandard sections in between, with a sort of "crawl-and-go" traffic service. The Martin substitute, however, remedies this defect by providing a 10-year program, during which time the entire needs of the interstate system in each State would be coordinated under a uniform standard throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I am supporting the Martin substitute, for the reasons which I have stated, as well as the reasons which have been mentioned by other Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is time out of the reserved time of the Senator from California, by previous arrangement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania is yielding to me the remainder of his time.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator will be agreeable to my first yielding 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, how much time did the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from California permit me to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota before the Senator from Michigan speaks?

Mr. POTTER. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is not necessary to argue that a national system of highways across the United States is needed—such a national system of highways as is described on the map on the far side of the Chamber. There is no question about that. My only quarrel with the substitute measure before the Senate is that I do not think the financing arrangement has been clearly thought out. That is the disturbing fact with which I have been confronted this afternoon.

I have endeavored to learn as much as I possibly could about what is provided by the bill which has been reported by the committee, and generally referred to as the Gore bill. As I have examined S. 1048, I am not at all satisfied that the plan offers everything which should be contained in a Federal highway system bill. I believe funds would be allocated to States which would not have available to them money with which to match the Federal amounts. Therefore, there would be considerable sums allocated to States which could not make use of them. The moneys would simply be resting in the fund year after year, just as has happened with respect to funds earmarked for the REA.

Therefore, I object to certain features of both bills before the Senate. I believe the Senate has the opportunity to perfect both measures, or to extract the best features from both and incorporate them into a bill which would assure some of the fringe States that they would have funds which would be allocated to them year by year, rather than have them wait to utilize those funds, perhaps 5, 8, or 10 years from now.

For that reason, Mr. President, I find it necessary to object to both bills, and I hope they may be sent back to the committee, so that a better bill may be worked out and the Senate may have a good bill before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for yielding me time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Chair understands the Senator from California yielded 15 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I shall not use all the time allotted to me, but I wish to take this opportunity to state my position concerning the bill which is now before the Senate.

The bill, Mr. President, was supposed to provide for an adequate interstate highway system. The bill as reported by the committee does not take care of our needs for an overall interstate highway system. Michigan's need in this respect is $627 million for the next 5 years. The Gore bill would give Michigan only $278 million—less than half the amount which is required.

The substitute bill offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would give us an interstate highway system which is considered adequate.

I believe there is no disagreement among the supporters of the Gore bill and the Martin bill as to the need for an interstate system. First, such a system is needed for national defense. We know that today our military forces are mobilized as never before, and despite all the advances made in the movement of military forces by air, in case of a national emergency the basic needs of transportation for military forces would still be met by motor vehicle. Therefore, when we consider the vast amounts of money this country spends for national defense—and rightly so—we would be derelict in the consideration of our national-defense needs unless we removed the bottleneck which now exists and brought our national interstate highways up to date.

Mr. President, we also must consider the need for improving our interstate highway system for civilian defense. Many of us who have witnessed the movement of refugees during an emergency, such as during the last war, know how the refugees clogged the highways. Today, with the existence of hydrogen and other atomic weapons, if this country were to experience a military attack in which such weapons were utilized, since we know that fall-out areas would embrace many miles, there would be great need for the best type of highway system to enable the authorities to move people out of congested areas. Therefore, for civilian defense, which subject has received much attention, we must improve our interstate highway system.

Mr. President, I am old fashioned enough to believe that we need also to improve our interstate highway system for domestic commerce. Our traffic problem is an expanding problem. The increase in the registration of motor vehicles and trucks today results in placing a great burden on our highways, and we know that burden is increasing with every month that passes.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to the so-called Clay report. This is what the Clay report states in regard to the traffic problem:

THE TRAFFIC JAM

Reduced to its simplest terms, the highway problem is this: Traffic has expanded sharply, without a corresponding expansion in capacity of roads and streets. As a result, a major portion of our facilities are seriously overcrowded. Moreover, this movement is faster and heavier than in previous years, and continues to increase.

Simple arithmetic illustrates the dimensions of the task. We now have more than 58 million motor vehicles registered; 1 for every 700 feet of every lane in both directions on all streets and highways in the Nation. This gigantic fleet traveled an estimated 557 billion vehicles-miles in 1954, much of it concentrated on main arteries in urban areas which have become the expensive, hazardous bottlenecks referred to by the President.

The existing traffic jam is bad enough, but prospects for the future are even worse. Vehicle registrations are expected to continue their upward surge, reaching 81 million by 1965, an increase of 40 percent. Total highway travel of these 81 million vehicles will likewise continue to increase as we attempt to meet the transportation requirements of an expanding economy, probably to reach an estimated 814 billion vehicle-miles in 1965.

This committee believes that these forecasts, carefully projected on the basis of all available data, are soundly conservative and represent the foundation upon which the Nation's highway-improvement programs should be planned. Our population is expected to exceed 180 million by 1965. Our gross national product, which was about $357 billion in 1954, is estimated to reach $535 billion by 1965, an increase of almost 50 percent in the next decade, as recently reported by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. President, I cite this excerpt from the so-called Clay report, in order to emphasize that today we are attempting to legislate to meet a need which is not only a serious one at present, but is constantly growing by great leaps and bounds. So it will take forthright action by the Congress to meet this problem. This is no time for us to dot every "i" and cross every "t"; this is no time for us to look behind words. This is the time for the Congress of the United States to meet with dynamic action this national problem.

I realize that when we are discussing a proposal which calls for the expenditure of great sums of money, there is need for a great deal of concern. But if we are to build highways, we must do so by one of three means: We must in-

crease the taxes sufficiently to be able to make it possible to build the highways on a so-called pay-as-you-go basis; we must build the highways in the way proposed in the so-called Gore bill, namely, by deficit financing; or else we shall have to sell revenue-producing bonds, and earmark the funds now secured from various gasoline and motor-oil taxes, for the retirement of the bonds.

I grant that none of the three methods is an easy one, but there is no easy way to build highways without spending some money. So it will cost money, regardless of whether it is financed by direct taxation, on a pay-as-you-go basis, or whether it is financed on the basis of deficit financing; or whether it is financed by the sale of bonds, to be retired by the use of earmarked funds.

I would prefer if we could shut our eyes to the financing of the highway program, but we cannot do so. We know that Congress will never raise taxes sufficiently to make it possible to build the highways on a pay-as-you-go basis, and to have a highway program sufficient to take care of the needs of the expanding traffic problem. We know that will not happen. We also know that by means of the Gore bill, Congress will never make it possible for $7 billion plus to be handled by deficit financing at the end of 5 years.

So we come to the method of issuing revenue bonds. I do not intend to argue technical points on finances with so distinguished a Senator as the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. But while I am always greatly influenced by the arguments he makes, I am also impressed by the fact that some other leading men of great stature, who are considered financial experts in their own right, claim that it can be done. The Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, maintains that we can finance our highway program by means of the issuance of such revenue-producing bonds.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to call the attention of the members of the committee and the other Members of the Senate to the testimony of a very distinguished person from my State, the Mayor of Detroit, the Honorable Albert E. Cobo. Mayor Cobo appeared before the committee, and I should like to read into the RECORD a portion of his statement. Mayor Cobo has made a remarkable reputation in the State of Michigan because of the progress he has made possible in the development of our so-called freeways within the city of Detroit. I read now a portion of the statement Mayor Cobo made before our roads subcommittee:

The question of pay-as-you-go or borrowing came up in Detroit 5 years ago.

We came to the conclusion that on a pay-as-you-go basis our people would be paying for highways but they would not be riding very far on them for some years to come.

The job was just too big for that type of financing.

Why?

Because you can't acquire property for right-of-way or let contracts for overpasses or construct concrete pavement without having funds in advance.

In other words, the work must be carried on on a piecemeal pay-as-you-go financing basis.

This type of program leaves the property owner in the position of uncertainty unless his property can be purchased far enough in advance so that he can make plans for the future.

We found that, as soon as we had adequate funds and could acquire the property a reasonable time after the highway is located, much of the dissatisfaction of the property owners disappeared.

I quote further from the statement Mayor Cobo made before the committee:

We agreed that the modern highways would last 25 to 50 years, and it seemed perfectly logical that the people using these highways during the next 25 years ought to help pay for them.

By building the highways now and paying for them over 25 years—and that is what our bonds are, and I am speaking from a practical standpoint, of the things we have actually done—we are using the same principle that has been used for so many years in this country of amortizing capital investments over a part of the life of the project.

Mr. President, I should like to read further from Mayor Cobo's statement, but in order to save the time of the Senate I ask unanimous consent that his entire statement before the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, BY ALBERT E. COBO, MAYOR, CITY OF DETROIT, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

Mayor West, Mayor Kemp, and Mayor Morrison, in behalf of the American Municipal Association, have testified as to the urgent need for accelerating our highway and street program. Speaking for the American Municipal Association, I would like to devote a major part of my time to the question of financing, which is a subject I am most familiar with.

The importance of highways to our local and national economy is well-recognized. The value of modern highways in case of war has been clearly shown. There is no disagreement as to the urgency of accelerating highway construction, particularly the interstate highway system.

The big obstacle in the way of building adequate highways has always been financing. There still seems to be some difference of opinion as to how the program should be financed and over what period of years we should do the job.

In 1950, we appeared before congressional committees and suggested that the highway program lent itself to long-term financing as well or better than other types of public works.

We recommended that the Highway Act be amended to allow Federal aid funds to be used to help retire bonds on Federal Aid highway projects approved by the Bureau of Public Roads. The amendment was adopted at that session of Congress. It was the result of thorough consideration of the seriousness of the highway problem and excellent cooperation by the Members of Congress.

Detroit was particularly interested in this amendment, as we had already a plan in mind, with a new State law authorizing the sale of revenue bonds to accelerate our expressway program. We did sell the bonds. As a result, our program was accelerated more than 300 percent.

The question of pay as you go or borrowing came up in Detroit 5 years ago. We came to the conclusion that on a pay-as-you-go basis our people would be paying for highways but they would not be riding very far on them for some years. The job was just too big for that type of financing. Why? Because you can't acquire property for rights-of-way or let contracts for overpasses or construct concrete pavement without having funds in advance. In other words, the work must be carried on on a piecemeal basis. This type of program leaves the property owner in the position of uncertainty unless his property can be purchased far enough in advance so that he can make plans for the future. We found that, as soon as we had adequate funds and could acquire the property a reasonable time after the highway is located, much of the dissatisfaction of the property owners disappeared.

We agreed that modern highways would last 25 to 50 years, and it seemed perfectly logical that the people using these highways during the next 25 years ought to help pay for them. By building the highways now and paying for them over 25 years, we are using the same principle that has been used so many years in this country of amortizing capital investments over a part of the life of the project.

The following exhibits will show how our expressway program was previously being financed on a pay-as-you-go basis, and how it is being financed now by the use of our revenue-bond plan.

This program has proven so successful in Detroit, Grand Rapids, and other parts of Michigan that we feel it is applicable for use in the Federal program.

State legislation permits the State highway commission to join with cities and counties under the Limited Access Highway Act in the joint financing of these highways. It authorizes the highway commission to pledge a portion of the highway revenues in cooperation with cities and counties for the retirement of bond issues. Under this plan we are capitalizing a portion of our revenues and in this way obtaining long-term financing, making possible the greatly accelerated program. This legislation is now being used by the highway commissioner in several parts of the State and it is proposed to use this particular legislation, slightly amended, to finance a large part of the State's share of the State primary highway system.

The bills which you are considering today recognize the highway need. Because bond financing has been successful in Michigan, and has been so enthusiastically endorsed by our citizens, we feel that the legislation agreed upon by your committee should include this type of financing.

On a pay-as-you-go basis even with a considerable increase in appropriations as allocated in bill S. 1048, it is evident that the present interstate highway system need could not be met in less than 30 years. I feel sure tht the people do not want to wait 30 years and are willing to pay the extra interest costs so that they may have the use of these highways in the immediate future.

I am convinced that the savings to the highway users during this period would save the interest cost many times over. If these highways are not worth the added interest cost for early completion, the principal expenditure could not be justified.

We have previously pointed out that the Federal Government has recognized the urgency of the highway need by permitting the use of Federal funds to retire highway bonds. Under this plan, however, the States have to provide all of the financing, and Federal funds can only be used for the retirement of the Federal Government's portion of the cost, excluding interest. This is also dependent on a continued yearly appropriation by Congress.

The bond plan recommended in bill S. 1160 is a more direct and time-saving approach to the financing problem. If each State were required to amend their laws to allow local revenue bonds to be sold, there may probably be considerable delay in carrying out the interstate-highway program.

For this reason, although we have successfully used the revenue-bond-financing plan in Michigan, we feel that the recommendation of this bill would result in a more immediate acceleration of the national interstate-highway system.

In conclusion, we offer the following suggestions:

1. That Congress recognize the national importance of the interstate-highway system and agree to finance a substantial share of its cost.

2. That financing be made available to build this interstate-highway system over a period of 10 years to standards that will adequately handle the traffic for at least 20 years.

3. That the primary, secondary, and urban program be continued on approximately the same basis as it is now being carried out.

4. That important feeder roads to the interstate-highway system be included as part of the Federal-aid system particularly in congested areas.

5. Bill S. 1160 provides the corporation with enough authority to program work on the interstate system as rapidly as any State is ready to proceed. The distribution of the money to be made on a prorated basis of needs as submitted by the State highway commissioner. We think this is a particularly good feature of the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR EXPRESSWAY CONSTRUCTION IN MICHIGAN

By terms of contract entered into in 1944 between the Michigan State Highway Department, Wayne County Road Commission, and city of Detroit:

	Annually
State highway department to furnish up to	$3,000,000
Wayne County road commission to furnish up to [1]	1,500,000
City of Detroit to furnish up to [1]	$1,500,000
Available Federal-aid funds estimated at	4,000,000
Total	10,000,000

[1] By State law, cities of over 50,000 population share the cost of State trunkline construction on a 50–50 basis with State highway department. Also, by State law, counties may assume all or any part of a city's obligation. Wayne County elected to assume 50 percent of Detroit's obligation in our 1944 expressway contract. These provisions for sharing the costs of trunkline construction apply on a decreasing schedule to all cities down to 20,000 population.

Michigan motor vehicle revenues, which include gasoline and license taxes, under present law, are distributed to the public agencies thus:

	Percent
State highway department	44
All counties [1]	37
All cities [2]	19

[1] County funds are distributed to individual counties on their respective proportion of motor vehicle registrations, road mileages, and rural population.

[2] City funds are distributed to individual cities and villages on their respective proportions of urban population, urban trunkline mileages, and street mileages. (See exhibit 5 for Act 51, Public Acts 1951, which provides for distribution of motor vehicle revenues.)

EXHIBIT 2

The following figures indicate how highway construction can be accelerated by bond financing:

EXPRESSWAY EXPENDITURES—JOHN C. LODGE EXPRESSWAY AND EDSEL FORD EXPRESSWAY

(From the inception of the agreement of September 1944)

Pay-as-you-go plan: First payment called for January 15, 1946, $1 million.

Total payments to tri-party expressway fund as of June 30, 1951, by State, county, and city	$32,000,000
Other funds:	
From Federal-aid funds	12,845,473
From State planning commission	295,000
	13,140,473
Total expenditures in 5-year period to June 30, 1951	45,140,473

Expenditures after establishing Michigan Revenue Bond Financing Plan:

Total expenditures in 3-year period from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1954 [1]	$75,070,760
Balance to be expended	74,788,767

Completion date: December 1956.

[1] Expenditures in the first year did not accelerate to their maximum limit possible under bond financing due to lack of engineering plans and other construction difficulties.

First 5-year period, pay-as-you-go plan, expenditures $45 million.

Second 5-year period, bond plan, expenditures $150 million.

EXHIBIT 3

PRESENT PLAN FOR RETIRING $80 MILLION BOND ISSUE ON JOHN LODGE AND EDSEL FORD EXPRESSWAYS

JOHN C. LODGE AND EDSEL FORD EXPRESSWAYS—INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Twenty-three miles, partly financed by an $80 million bond issue under Federal Aid Highway Act providing 50 percent Federal funds and 50 percent local funds.

State bond obligation, $80 million.

Agreement for State and local financing, $80 million:

State share (50 percent)	$40,000,000
County share (25 percent)	20,000,000
City share (25 percent)	20,000,000

Bond financing, Michigan revenue bond plan (dedicated tax).

Twenty-five-year highway revenue bonds: 2.125-percent interest (present issue).

Principal payments deferred for first 3 years.

Principal and interest paid in succeeding 22 years.

Total principal payments	$80,000,000
Total interest payments	26,389,150
Total cost	106,389,150

Average yearly funds pledged to retire, including interest, $5 million.

By agreement, State and local annual financing is as follows:

State (50 percent)	$2,500,000
County (25 percent)	1,250,000
City (25 percent)	1,250,000
Total	5,000,000

The State highway department is limited to total issues of $300 million of revenue bonds; $80 million is part of $300 million authorization.

The State highway department is limited to $7½ million first lien per annum of its income from license and gasoline-tax revenues.

The $2½ million is a part of the $7½ million limit.

Five million dollars being required yearly, the balance is made up of one and one-fourth million dollars each from city and county by contract with the State.

EXHIBIT 4

PROPOSED METHOD FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RELIEVING THE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT, FROM CARRYING THE FEDERAL SHARE, IN THEIR BOND AND LIEN LIMITS

PROPOSED HASTINGS-OAKLAND EXPRESSWAY—TOTAL COST $80 MILLION

Proposed Hastings-Oakland Expressway, Interstate Highway System: 8 miles, financed under provisions of 1954 Federal Aid Highway Act providing 60 percent Federal funds and 40 percent local funds. Total cost $80 million.

Total bond obligation, $80 million.

Federal Government obligation, $48 million.

Agreement for State and local financing, $32 million:

State share (50 percent)	$16,000,000
County share (25 percent)	8,000,000
City share (25 percent)	8,000,000

Bond financing, Michigan revenue bond plan (dedicated tax).

Twenty-five-year highway revenue bonds: 2.125 percent interest.

Principal payments deferred for first 3 years.

Principal and interest paid in succeeding 22 years.

Total principal payments	$32,000,000
Total interest payments	10,435,380
Total cost	42,435,380

Average yearly funds needed to retire, including interest, $1,697,415.

By agreement, State and local annual financing can be arranged thus:

State (50 percent)	$848,707
County (25 percent)	424,354
City (25 percent)	424,354
Total	1,697,415

State credit covers $32 million of $300 million limit.

First lien on State license and gasoline tax, yearly $848,707 of $7½ million lien.

Balance made up of $424,354 each from city and county by contract with the State.

EXHIBIT 5

Bond table, amount of financing that may be bought with $1,000,000. Annual payment for interest and principal

Interest rate (percent)	Length of issue			
	22 years	25 years; 3 years deferred; 22 years maturity	25 years	30 years
2	$17,658,000		$19,523,000	$22,396,000
2⅛	17,427,000	$18,852,196	19,238,000	22,016,000
2½	16,765,000		18,424,000	20,930,000
3	15,936,000		17,413,000	19,600,000
3½	15,167,000		16,481,000	18,392,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, may I have 2 minutes longer?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for extending me the courtesy of 2 additional minutes.

Who will benefit from this highway program? I have cited the need for the program, for national and civilian defense purposes, and domestic commerce, which is a Federal responsibility.

Who will benefit from the program? Take the question of jobs. For example, last year 240,000 workers were employed full time at roadbuilding. By 1957, if the so-called substitute should be enacted, the President's program would require another 130,000, and by 1960, still another 160,000 workers, as well as more than 50,000 off-site workers in mines, forests, factories, and so forth, the products of which are needed to supply the roadbuilders with materials.

Secondly, highways now consume about 50 million barrels of cement a year. This would rise to 162 million barrels in the fourth year of the program. Some 357 million tons of stone, sand, gravel, and slag now go into the building of roads each year. This would rise to a peak of about 535 million tons. Highway building currently uses about one-third of the country's annual production of 18 million tons of such materials as asphalt, tar, and so forth. Another 7 million tons yearly would be needed.

By the fourth year, roadbuilders will need some 2.2 million tons of steel, compared with current consumption of 656,000 tons a year.

So, Mr. President, despite the fact that this is a great national problem which needs solving, many fringe benefits will accrue from the highway-building program.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will have the wisdom to approve the Martin substitute for the Gore bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to incorporate in my remarks at this point a letter from the National Grange, in which they very strongly endorse the 40,000-mile interstate highway system, and recommend that the allocation be made on the basis of need, together with a table showing the estimated needs of the States for the interstate system and the apportionments under S. 1048.

There being no objection, the letter and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1955.

The Honorable PRESCOTT S. BUSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Grange believes that the Federal Government should assume the entire cost of rebuilding the 40,000 miles of interstate system, because of its importance in national defense, interstate commerce, and general welfare. We further believe this objective should be achieved as a capital investment rather than entirely out of current revenue and that it should be accomplished in about 10 years.

There is, however, a provision of S. 1048 amended, which may serve to some extent to nullify the intent of the bill. We refer to the provision (commencing on line 16, p. 5) which allocates funds for the interstate system as follows: One-half on the basis of population and one-half on the basis of the 1944 Federal highways-aid formula; i. e., one-third each according to area, population, and mileage of roads.

Under this provision, some States will receive for the interstate system more money than they need to complete their portion in less than 10 years. Many other States will be unable to complete their portions in a time period much longer than 10 years. Further, while normally an excess of Federal funds might be regarded as a welcome windfall, as a practical matter it would not benefit these States as they would not be permitted to spend any substantial portion on other roads.

It is not necessary to list the States that will be so affected. The fact that, all other considerations aside, this provision would prevent completion of the interstate system highways in all States at the same time is sufficient, in our view, to make it anathema to sound legislation.

This defect can be remedied easily by making the allocation in this instance in accordance with need only and, as you know, these needs in terms of money have already been established. Nor is it necessary to consider changing the 1944 formula for other Federal-aid roads. But it is vital that allocations be made according to need if we are to get the interstate system built in this time schedule.

We look upon this interstate system as a profitable investment, and believe, therefore, that financing it by a bond issue is justified. But whatever way it is financed, whatever provisions the Senate may desire to write into S. 1048 amended, we are firmly convinced that the money should be allocated for these particular 40,000 miles solely on the basis of need. We do not see what useful purpose can be served by giving some States more than their own estimates of requirements and some States less than they patently need.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM,
Master.

Blunderbuss

[Millions of dollars]

State	½ of 10-year interstate system needs—Federal share	Federal funds provided for interstate system by S. 1048 amended, 5-year program	Excess of col. 3 over col. 2	Transferable to other Federal-aid programs				Excess apportionment which cannot be utilized (col. 4 minus col. 5)
				Total	Primary	Secondary	Urban	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama	171	159						
Arizona	102	89						
Arkansas	93	113	20	14	6.8	6.1	1.1	6
California	1,136	440						
Colorado	72	104	32	14	7.0	5.3	1.7	18
Connecticut	272	74						
Delaware	29	49	20	4	2.1	1.5	.4	16
Florida	238	132						
Georgia	336	182						
Idaho	50	78	28	9	4.8	3.8	.4	19
Illinois	505	365						
Indiana	420	190						
Iowa	126	160	34	20	9.7	7.9	2.4	14
Kansas	93	143	50	20	10.1	8.0	1.9	30
Kentucky	235	145						
Louisiana	237	127						
Maine	69	63						
Maryland	210	92						
Massachusetts	407	164						
Michigan	627	278						
Minnesota	229	176						
Mississippi	114	124	10	10	4.8	4.5	.7	
Missouri	284	212						
Montana	70	109	39	15	8.2	6.3	.5	24
Nebraska	45	110	65	15	7.7	6.1	1.2	50
Nevada	35	81	46	9	5.0	3.8	.2	37
New Hampshire	30	49	19	4	1.9	1.5	.6	15
New Jersey	666	169						
New Mexico	113	94						
New York	627	548						
North Carolina	109	198	89	22	9.9	9.5	2.6	67
North Dakota	47	87	40	11	5.9	4.8	.3	29
Ohio	656	332						
Oklahoma	178	140						
Oregon	155	105						
Pennsylvania	350	412	62	42	16.1	10.7	15.2	20
Rhode Island	58	49						
South Carolina	84	105	21	5	2.1	1.5	1.4	16
South Dakota	42	91	49	12	6.5	5.1	.4	37
Tennessee	178	166						
Texas	403	446	43	43	20.4	15.3	7.3	
Utah	117	75						
Vermont	85	49						
Virginia	273	156						
Washington	226	124						
West Virginia	123	92						
Wisconsin	148	177	29	21	9.5	7.6	3.9	8
Wyoming	144	78						
Hawaii								
District of Columbia	72	49						
Puerto Rico								
Total	11,089	7,750	696	290	138.5	109.3	42.2	406

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not relish the position in which I find myself with respect to the pending amendment. I am compelled to oppose it, however, because of objections which I have consistently raised against certain features of the bill as it was introduced, first as Senate bill 1160, and now as the substitute which is before us.

First of all, let me say that I think the substitute bill would be bad legislation, because it would violate the legislative integrity of the Senate and the House in their relations heretofore.

Basically, the bill is an appropriation bill and a revenue bill. There is no question that the language, if it were presented in a House bill, would be subject to a point of order on the ground that it could not be reported from the legislative committee.

On page 8, the substitute says:

> There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year—

And so forth. It is clearly an appropriation bill under the concepts of appropriations in the House of Representatives, where, under the Constitution, revenue measures must originate.

In the Senate we may waive the point of order, or we may not have a rule which exactly covers the situation, but it clearly is an appropriation bill and an invasion of the responsibilities of the appropriations and revenue financing committees.

I am opposed to the substitute, further, because I think there are, from the standpoint of good legislation, fatal defects in the provision for the proposed Corporation.

When I first came to the Congress the Government was spending about $1 billion a year for WPA and PWA projects. If a Member of Congress wished to stand well at home he learned to carry a tin cup and go downtown and talk with Harry Hopkins or one of his underlings. Harry Hopkins never dreamed of having $21 billion. Dallas Dort never dreamed of having $21 billion. David Niles never dreamed of having $21 billion. They never dreamed of being the directors of a corporation which could go to the Secretary of the Treasury and say, "Give us $5 billion out of the credits of the United States Treasury."

In the days when the New Deal was applying the lash not merely to Republican States, but to some of the conservatives in certain Southern States, those boys never had the power to say, "Here are $21 billion of highways that we propose to parcel out. We will determine the priority and the scheduling of the projects."

Nevertheless, the Martin bill proposes the creation of a corporation without any limitation on the life of the corporation, without any specified periods for the directors to serve. It is proposed to name three men, in addition to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, to guide the destinies of a corporation pledged to get $21 billion out of the Treasury of the United States by appropriations carried in the bill, with authority for the Secretary to expend $25 billion if he so desires, and with the power to call on the Treasury at any time it is desired, to the extent of a maximum of $5 billion.

Suppose we had a board with men like Harry Hopkins, David Niles, and Dallas Dort—3 members who could outvote the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, 3 men who would handle these vast sums and be the judges of what they could do, with authority to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the functions of the board might be performed and its powers exercised.

In past days my Republican colleagues have talked about the powers given to the TVA. But, Mr. President, the TVA never was given the power proposed to be given the corporation provided for in the pending amendment. The TVA never had access to such vast funds as these. The TVA, if it wanted construction funds, had to come to the Congress and ask for construction money.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is well informed on these matters. Has any such proposal as this ever been made to Congress prior to this time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not that I know of.

Mr. BYRD. At any rate, no such proposal has ever been enacted into law by Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not that I know of, although there have been times when we have created Government corporations which had assets and direct earning power.

We now come to a point which I think has been responsible for a great deal of confusion. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] speaks of the gasoline tax as a revenue earned by the corporation.

The gasoline tax is not a revenue earned by the corporation. As the Comptroller General correctly said in his statement before the committee, the gasoline tax is a revenue of the Treasury. It is not something earned by the corporation. I quote the Comptroller General's exact words:

> The gasoline taxes are revenues of the Treasury, and go into the general fund of the Treasury.

If I lived in the State of Connecticut, and less than 1 percent of the gasoline were used for other than highway purposes, I might think that the gasoline tax was a revenue earned by the highways. However, I come from a State where 30 percent of the gasoline used in the State is used in the operation of tractors on the farm. It never gets on the highway at all.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very glad to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to hear the statement of the Senator. I served with him on the Public Works Committee previous to this year. The gasoline tax is collected over every highway and byway in the entire area of the Nation, and paid into the Treasury, not for any particular system of highways, but as general revenue.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is general revenue of the Treasury. The Federal gasoline tax is paid by users of tractors, yachts, airplanes, and by others. Under the amendment the revenues from this source would be paid to a corporation which is not responsible to Congress. They would be expended under a priority schedule established by the Secretary. The language making that provision is found at page 18. That is an unsound approach, I submit, because it violates the principles Congress sought to establish in the Budget and Accounting Act. In the Budget and Accounting Act, passed in 1921, Congress sought to bring expenditures of the Government under review by Congress. Under the proposed amendment they would not come under review by Congress.

The Comptroller General, whose office was established by that act, came before our committee and exercised what I thought was the independence it was intended he should have when the act was passed. He advised against the legislation. He thought it was bad fiscal policy.

There is another provision in the amendment which has not received very much attention, but which also is undesirable.

The Constitution provides:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

The substitute bill provides:

> The Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriations for that fiscal year, such advances to be repaid from amounts subsequently appropriated hereunder in that fiscal year.

In other words, the Secretary of the Treasury, on his own determination, may make a personal loan, of funds of the Treasury, and turn the money over to the corporation without its being in consequence of an appropriation made by law.

I believe that part of the amendment is definitely unconstitutional. In other words, under the amendment the Secretary of the Treasury can make an estimate of what he believes will be realized from the tax, and he can give the estimated amount of money to the corporation. It would be a corporation consisting of three members, who would be selected without regard to political affiliation. That provision could work either way. The members of the board could

all be members of one party, or they could be members of a splinter of one party. The board could use the money advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury under whatever priority of scheduling they wished to establish.

The present distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], may remember that a few years ago the President of the United States undertook to freeze some flood control money which was involved in a project for the city of Louisville, Ky. However, just before the election, it was determined that the priority schedule of that flood control project called for the release of that money. That was of interest to the city of Louisville.

What I fear is that the money in the road fund may be released according to the board's interpretation of the emergencies of some particular situation.

I believe that is bad legislation. I am sorry that we have gotten ourselves into this kind of proposal to implement what I regard as a truly inspiring program for the building of the interstate system.

Let us not think that the President is interested in making the bondholders of a special class of bonds preferred bondholders, or wants to dedicate a portion of the Treasury's revenue to that purpose. He is interested in building roads.

Let us keep it a road-building bill and not a bond-selling bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] upon his splendid presentation in opposition to the substitute and in support of S. 1048. I have worked with him and the other members of the committee on the pending bill, and I never saw more devoted or more able or more effective service given in the writing of a bill.

The Senate has had presented to it what purports to be a statement of allocation of funds under the substitute bill. It was called to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. The copy I hold in my hand has at the top of it the word "Blunderbuss."

I do not know what that means in respect to this particular document; but, if Senators will examine it, they will find that the interpretation is whatever they wish to give to the word.

The Senator from Connecticut has told the Senate that under the substitute States could have some assurance of getting money. I wish to say to Senators from every State in the Union that under the substitute no State has any assurance of getting any amount in the years immediately ahead, or in the near future.

He stated that the allocation set forth on the sheet is based on needs. I remind Senators that if a bill were passed which allocated Federal money on the basis of alleged needs, supported by the allegations of the States seeking the money, it would be the first time in history that Congress ever passed such a piece of legislation.

To show how ridiculous the basis is, I call attention first to the language contained in the report of the Clay Committee as submitted to Congress by President Eisenhower.

On page 11 of the message of the President of the United States it is stated:

> The estimates of the several States may vary, some tending to be lower in relation to actual needs, while others may be higher. The total estimates for the country as a whole, however, are the best available, and are accepted by the committee as a measure of requirements.

Mr. BUSH. At what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. KERR. At page 11.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator reading from the Clay report?

Mr. KERR. Yes; as submitted to Congress by the President.

Mr. GORE. It describes the figures which our distinguished colleague from Connecticut has used in the preparation of his table. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct. I read further:

> The total estimates for the country as a whole, however, are the best available, and are accepted by the committee as a measure of requirements. They establish the target for nationwide estimates of planning and financing; the actual expenditures for construction, of course, will be subject to the detailed specifications and other controls normally used.

Is that not a definite measure of allocation of money? I wish to show how that would work out.

If we look at the sheet which the Senator from Connecticut has passed around, we find that the State of New Jersey would be allocated $666 million in the first 5 years. The State of New Jersey has 204 miles of interstate highways. The estimate of needs submitted by the State of New Jersey indicated that it needs $1,357,000,000 for 204 miles of roads.

It would cost an average of $11,117,000 a mile for other urban roads——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is there any estimate as to what kind of material would be used which would cost $11,117,000 a mile?

Mr. KERR. It is not stated. I do not know whether it would be gold, platinum, uranium, or nylon. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Is this some new-found formula for apportionment?

Mr. KERR. This is the fiction which has been offered, and, if it were to succeed, it would be perpetrated upon the people of the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator think it is going to cost any less to build an interstate road system under the Clay report than under the other bill? If they are going to use nylon, they will use it.

Mr. KERR. Under the Gore bill, the money would be allocated following its appropriation of the money, and it would be used in all the States under a definite formula passed by the Congress, and not on the basis of a guessing contest, under which some States would be denied participation for the reason that they were honest or had less imagination in describing how much they might want.

Mr. BUSH. The allocation is made on the basis of the needs of the different States.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator that his statement is inaccurate in two regards. In the first place, there is no apportionment under his substitute and the language of the amendment specifically says that even after the money is allocated there will not be an apportionment.

Mr. BUSH. I do not know what particular value the Senator finds in the word "apportionment." The amendment provides for the allocation of funds.

Mr. KERR. I was referring to the Senator's language, not to mine.

Mr. BUSH. The word "apportionment" is in both bills, but in the administration bill the words are "allocation of funds." I read it to the Senator a while ago.

Mr. KERR. The Senator did, and he did so as if it would mean something even if the money were allocated. But in order to save the power of the Secretary of Commerce, and in order to cut the ground out from under any State, the Senator went to the extent of saying that even after the funds were allocated they would not assume the dignity of apportionment. If the Senator is aware of the meaning of definite language, he knows the substitute means that the States could not expect to get the money except at the sole discretion of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BUSH. The question about the allocation of funds never came up before the Committee. Why was it not raised in the hearings? The Governors of States and the mayors of larger cities endorsed the language. I cannot understand this sudden fear about the basis of allocation.

Mr. KERR. It happened that those who endorsed it were in the same status as is my good friend from Connecticut. They did not know what was in the administration bill.

Mr. BUSH. I would have to take exception to that statement.

Mr. KERR. The only position which my friend could get into that is worse than being convicted of not knowing what was in the bill is to continue to defend it after he has found out what is in it. If the Senator had known what was not in the bill, he would not have

waited until today to offer his amendment to make the bonds obligations of the Federal Government. Why else would he come here at the last minute and say, "If you are accurate in your analysis and appraisal, I would amend the substitute by making the bonds obligations of the National Government."

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has a good point there. I am perfectly willing to confess that it has taken me several weeks to study the situation and come to this conclusion. I came to it only yesterday. I am not ashamed of that.

Mr. KERR. I am happy the Senator has made what is referred to in Oklahoma as a deathbed repentance. But the Senator has not yet offered to amend the administration bill so that the great State of Connecticut could get a dollar under it.

Mr. BUSH. I am perfectly satisfied with the chances.

Mr. KERR. They are very slim and remote to satisfy a man who is so cautious and careful as is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said the question of apportionment had not arisen before today. He will find it discussed in the majority report and in the speech which the junior Senator from Tennessee delivered last Friday. It is one of the basic differences between the bills, and has been so recognized since the beginning.

The Senator from Oklahoma has said the word "apportionment" appears in both bills, and that is correct. It appears once in S. 1160, on the last page of the bill. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. KERR. I shall be delighted to read it to make it certain that even when allocated, "the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the Senator that he has taken that language out of context.

Mr. KERR. Where else would I get it?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator will find, if he reads back a little further, that it applies to two specific situations, namely, one to section 13 of the Federal Highway Act of 1950, and the other to section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act.

Mr. KERR. Those are the provisions of existing law under which money is apportioned to the several States.

Mr. BUSH. I thought section 13 had to do with the bypass section, and section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act had to do with diversion. The wording the Senator has quoted modifies those two sections. If the Senator will read the sections, I think he will agree with me.

Mr. KERR. I have read the bill over and over again.

Mr. BUSH. Does not the Senator agree with me that this language modifies just those two sections?

Mr. KERR. No. I cannot find in the bill a single line that says Oklahoma or Colorado or Georgia or South Dakota shall receive a single dollar.

Mr. BUSH. That was not my question. The question was whether the Senator does not agree with me——

Mr. KERR. I do not.

Mr. BUSH. It is perfectly clear, and I notice the Senator reads English very well.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Connecticut very much. I read language which says that the Secretary of Commerce shall have sole responsibility for the allocation of the money, on a sort of grab-bag basis.

I wish to invite attention now to another inaccuracy in the tabulation presented by the Senator from Connecicut. I shall not say it is spurious, but I say it is inaccurate.

In the first column it is indicated that there would be a total of $11,089,000,000 allocated in 5 years under the substitute bill. I wish to remind Senators, first, that the total of the substitute bill is $25 billion; that under the plan, $3 billion would be immediately diverted to the finishing of urban projects.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think the first column is headed "One-half of 10-year interstate system needs—Federal share."

That means an estimate of the needs. It does not necessarily mean they are going to get all of that money.

Mr. KERR. That is what I have been trying to tell Senators for an hour, that the document gives no indication of what the States are to get.

Mr. BUSH. It is a good indication, but it is not a positive figure.

Mr. KERR. That is the whole point of the argument.

Mr. BUSH. Then there is no disagreement between us.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Connecticut has been telling the Senate that Senators could look at that column and tell what their States would get.

Mr. BUSH. That is approximately correct.

Mr. KERR. Now he says it is no indication of what they would get.

Mr. BUSH. All I say is that it is not an official figure; it is an estimate, and I think it is reliable.

Mr. KERR. Based on that statement, I intend to show that it is not reliable. Will the Senator admit that under the Clay plan, $3 billion of the $25 billion is set aside to build urban projects? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. BUSH. What is the Senator's question, again?

Mr. KERR. I asked if the Senator from Connecticut was aware of the fact that under the Clay proposal, which he has attempted to implement by an amendment in the nature of a substitute, $3 billion of the $25 billion is set aside for the completion of access roads into and out of cities of more than 50,000 population.

Mr. BUSH. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. That would leave $22 billion. Now I call attention to the provision of the substitute bill which allocates money for reimbursement for the construction of toll roads. I believe that is on page 20.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that that provision was removed from the substitute bill this afternoon?

Mr. KERR. No; I am not. Has the substitute bill been amended again?

Mr. BUSH. A vote was taken on the amendment to eliminate the section dealing with toll-road credits.

Mr. GORE. The question now arises, Was this table prepared before or after the amendment was adopted?

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to suggest to the Senator that it has no relationship to the toll-road matter.

Mr. KERR. Was not the estimate based on what would be available under the bill?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator say that the elimination of the reimbursement feature for toll roads and primary systems would have any effect on the estimate?

Mr. BUSH. The table is based on the estimated needs of the States.

Mr. KERR. I thought it was presented, and I thought the Senator reaffirmed that position a while ago, as an indication that Senators could look to that and have some assurance that that is what their States would get in 1956.

Mr. BUSH. Yes. I reaffirm that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Would the estimate be the same if reimbursement were made for toll roads as if it were not?

Mr. BUSH. The estimates on the sheet to which the Senator refers apply to the estimates of the 5-year needs under the Gore bill.

Mr. KERR. I remind the Senator from Connecticut that he has told the Senate that the first column represents an estimate of the needs of the States and is an indication of what they would receive under the substitute bill.

Mr. BUSH. The table is an estimate of what the States need and what they would get under the Gore bill.

Mr. KERR. In the first column?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. KERR. I say to my good friend from Connecticut that he is completely confused.

Mr. BUSH. I am reading from the heading.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator must know that the first column was intended to indicate what the States would get under his bill.

Mr. BUSH. It is perfectly clear what the first column represents, if the Sena-

tor will read it. It is one-half of the estimated needs.

Mr. KERR. Has not the Senator reaffirmed three times, that it is also an indication of what the States would get under his bill?

Mr. BUSH. Yes; but only for a 5-year period.

Mr. KERR. Only for a 5-year period. Then it is not an indication of what the States would get under the Gore bill, is it?

Mr. BUSH. That is correct insofar as the first column is concerned.

Mr. KERR. Let us leave it on that basis, because a lot of time will be taken if the Senator shifts his ground again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator from Oklahoma, for my benefit at least, state how much Massachusetts, for instance, would receive under the administration bill, either on a total basis or on a percentage basis?

Mr. KERR. I may say to the distinguished Senator that, according to what my friend from Connecticut has said, namely, that this is an indication of what the States would get under the substitute bill, Massachusetts would receive $407 million in 5 years, for 347 miles.

Montana would get $70 million for 1,237 miles under the substitute bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator mean the administration bill or the Gore bill?

Mr. KERR. The administration bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would be the situation in those two States under the Gore bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma did not mean to suggest to the Senator from Montana, did he, that under the administration bill Montana or Massachusetts would receive any specific amount?

Mr. KERR. No. I said that the estimates submitted by the Senator from Connecticut, on the basis of his statement, indicate that that is what those States would get.

No, the Senator from Oklahoma has made it clear that in the administration bill there is no definite commitment to give any State anything, at any time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have certainly enjoyed the colloquy between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Oklahoma; but I have been wondering what the word "blunderbuss" at the top of the table means.

Mr. KERR. I have asked that question three times.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who put it there? It is written in ink.

Mr. KERR. I finally suggested that it was placed there as a basis for any Senator to use for his own imagination as to what the table meant.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In good humor, I suggest that it is an appropriate title for the table.

Mr. KERR. I think the Senator probably is correct. I am certain that he could arrive at that conclusion on an entirely different basis from the one which the Senator from Oklahoma has used in arriving at the same conclusion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator know who was responsible for placing this set of figures on our desks?

Mr. KERR. I think it was some prankster; but I understand there is a rule of the Senate which prohibits a Senator from being specific as to that.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to answer the Senator. I will take the blame for it.

Mr. KERR. Then, that settles all questions, but it does not solve any mystery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, under both the administration bill and the Gore bill, there is no definite method of setting aside the funds, either on a total basis or a percentage basis; but that under the administration bill, if it were to be passed, and the phony corporaton were set up, the President would have the exclusive right to dispose of the funds, where, when, and how he wanted to do so.

Mr. KERR. It would be the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But whom would he be acting for?

Mr. KERR. I must say to my good friend that it might be that the Secretary would be restrained or influenced by the President; but there is not even any guaranty of that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Secretary of Commerce would be the administrator of billions of dollars which would be collected through the issuance of bonds by a dummy or a phony corporation; and the moneys collected in that way would not become a part of the national debt.

Mr. KERR. Under an amendment offered by the sponsors of the administration bill, it has been decided to make those obligations direct obligations of the Federal Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, then they will be facing up to the problem, instead of trying to dodge it.

Mr. KERR. That is correct; but I say they have only increased their problem; they have not solved it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. While it is true that the bonds might be a debt of the United States, the funds would not function through the Treasury and would not be regarded as constituting a deficit.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. BYRD. That is the most remarkable system of bookkeeping I have ever heard of.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to tell the Senator that the substitute bill discriminates against 83 percent of the road users and 92 percent of Federal-aid roads. It would be carrying 40,000 miles of highways from the status of rags to riches; it would be sentencing 677,000 miles of Federal-aid roads from riches to rags.

It would provide, as has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Texas, bonds for boulevards, and bondage for all other roads and all other road users.

It would freeze at present levels of development more than 90 percent of the highways of the country, when they are already inadequate and getting worse, by reason of the fact that they are neither being maintained nor constructed in a manner to keep up with increasing traffic. As traffic continues to increase and the load increases, the roads which would be provided for 92 percent of the system would get in poorer and poorer condition.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Why does the Senator speak of a freeze with respect to the administration bill?

Mr. KERR. Because the Senator has, in the first place, provided in his bill only $622 million a year for all other roads than those in the interstate system. That is the present amount of allocation. And he has siphoned off all of the road users' money above that amount for an indefinite period, but for a minimum period of 30 years.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me for saying so, I think he has made a very sweeping assertion which I do not think is necessarily a correct conclusion at all. There is nothing to prevent the Federal Government and the Congress from voting for road bills every 2 years, just as we have done every 2 years since the Senator has been a Member, and just as we did last year with regard to the 1954 act. There is no reason, if that should become the policy of the Congress and the States can do the matching, why the allocations for primary, secondary, and urban roads could not be increased. There is no reason why the $622 million could not be increased if there seemed to be a need for it, and if such amounts could be financed by the States. It is true that the excess above $622 million from the gas tax is used as a measure of the revenues from which the bonds would be retired, but that does not necessarily freeze the whole road bill.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my good friend that the whole basis of his remarks and that of the sponsors of the amendment is that the interstate system must be built, and that the financing is sound because the sponsors have set aside for the next 30 years all of the road users' money over and above the amount now being allocated to pay for the program the sponsors are seeking to have enacted into legislation.

Mr. BUSH. I cannot agree with that statement, because there is no reason why we could not increase the tax on tires. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that a $5 tax increase on passenger car tires and a $25 tax increase on truck tires would result in increased revenues of $700 million. Is he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, nothing is more enjoyable than a continuation of my colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut, but I feel that nothing would be more productive of less beneficial results than a continuation of it.

Mr. President, the substitute which has been offered does not embody sound financing. It has been labeled a boon for investment bankers. It was conceived by investment bankers. Now that the proponents of the amendment have come into the open and said that the bonds should be a direct obligation of the Federal Government, why adhere to the fallacy of a special corporate setup, with power to issue bonds and fix the interest rates? If the sponsors had desired to have bonds issued at as low a rate as those at which regular Government bonds are issued, why would they have bypassed the Treasury of the United States in the issuance of the bonds? There can be but one reason, and that is that those who would handle the bonds would have an advantage which they would not have had if bonds were to be issued regularly by the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The answer to the Senator's question may be found in a reason suggested by a former distinguished Member of the Senate, the late Robert A. Taft. In a speech delivered by him before the Institute of Public Affairs of the University of Virginia on July 14, 1939, the late Robert Taft, in speaking about spending, lending, deficits, and so forth, said:

> Unable to reconcile its followers or its conscience to still larger direct deficits, a Government lending program, financed through the sale of bonds of various agencies, guaranteed by the Government, is being rapidly expanded. There are already some 43 Government lending agencies, with loans and investments in excess of $8 billion.

Mr. Taft discussed a pending bill, and then went on to say:

> It would be much franker if the Government borrowed the money itself, and added the money to be loaned to its expenditures. But this, of course, would increase the apparent deficit, which already alarms the people of the United States.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for reading those remarks from a speech of the late distinguished Senator Taft, in which speech, as I understand, he referred to 43 lending agencies which had made total loans of $8 billion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Eight billion dollars, and that was alarming the American people.

Mr. KERR. If he could look down from Valhalla, where I know his soul is in eternal security, upon the scene where his colleagues were endeavoring to create a corporation which alone could issue $25 billion of bonds guaranteed by the Government, at a rate of interest which had no relationship to that of regular Government bonds, I wonder what his reaction to such a proposal would be. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for that reference.

I say to Senators, if they want a road bill in which their States would have their equal portion of the pie guaranteed, on the basis of any sizable program, they will not get it from the substitute measure which has been sponsored by the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania and Connecticut, high as they stand in the regard of Members of this body.

We recognize the need for an interstate system, but we also recognize the need for farm-to-market roads, secondary roads, and primary roads, and we have brought before the Senate a measure calculated to build the entire system of roads—not merely 8 percent which will be used by one-seventh of the road users of the country, but the entire system, 717,000 miles, in all, Mr. President, of highways now receiving Federal aid.

We bring before the Senate a measure which certainly recognizes the need for a national system; yes, but one which will not ignore or impoverish the program with reference to the secondary system and the primary system, which constitute more than 90 percent of the total road mileage of the United States, and which provide the roads and means of transportation for six-sevenths of the American people.

I know the Senate will refuse to accept the substitute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senate prepared to vote?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say I have had no further requests for time. I am prepared to yield back my remaining time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the time remaining to me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to offer my amendment before the Senate votes on the Martin substitute. I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In Mr. MARTIN'S amendment in the nature of a substitute, on page 8, in line 10, beginning with "The", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period in line 16, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

> The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I do not propose to take much time on my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do not think this is a matter on which we need to have a great deal of debate. My amendment to the amendment speaks for itself.

I should like to state, briefly, that inasmuch as any realistic appraisal of the bonds of the Corporation would suggest that the Federal Government would have to make good on them, under almost any conditions one could conceive, we might just as well face that fact and provide that the bonds shall be guaranteed by the Federal Government, so that when the bonds are sold, the terms obtained, including the interest rates, will be as good as those which can be obtained in connection with obligations of the Federal Government.

I do not think my amendment to the amendment changes anything else in the bill; but it would eliminate the argument that there is an interest differential between the Corporation's bonds and Treasury obligations of similar maturity.

So I hope the Senate will adopt my amendment to the amendment, regardless of whether the Senate favors the Martin substitute.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say on this question; and I am prepared to have the vote on the amendment to the amendment taken, if other Senators are willing to have that done now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it proposed to strike out the language on page 8, which specifically and clearly states that the obligations issued under this section, "together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Corporation."

Mr. BUSH. That is correct; and my proposal is to substitute the language:

> The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection, clearly indicating that these obligations, together with the interest thereon, are guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will they be guaranteed, and will they be obligations of the United States?

Mr. BUSH. They will be if the law says they must be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the question here is one of policy. If the bonds are issued under the language the Senator from Connecticut has contrived, every one of the bonds will have to show on its face that it is an obligation of the United States Government. We went through that agony before, in connection with the Joint Stock Land Bank; and millions of dollars of obligations were purchased in the utmost of good faith by various per-

sons who did not examine the language set forth in the bonds. They simply saw the title of the bonds, and said, "These are obligations of the United States Government." But they were not anything of the kind. Instead, they were obligations of the Joint Stock Land Bank; and when its bonds were liquidated, both institutional investors and individual investors lost their money.

Mr. BUSH. But does not the Senator from Illinois understand that these bonds and the interest on them are guaranteed by the United States, not by the Corporation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. How did the language stating that they are not obligations of the United States Government get into the bill?

Mr. BUSH. I cannot answer that question; I did not participate in the preparation of that disavowal. But after studying this matter for several months, it seems to me there is no advantage in disavowing it, and that there is some advantage in not disavowing it. Therefore, will not some advantage be gained by guaranteeing the bonds? Does not the Senator from Illinois agree as to that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I do not. I do not know how other Senators may feel about the matter, but the language the Senator from Connecticut proposes to have included would give me no end of concern.

Mr. BUSH. Why is the Senator from Illinois bothered about it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because these are obligations of the Corporation, not obligations of the United States. But under the language the Senator from Connecticut proposes to have inserted, there would have to be a recital on the face of the bonds that they are Government obligations.

At this stage of the debate I would not feel free to do a complete about face, and, instead of specifically reciting that they are not obligations of the United States Government, now make them such obligations. I believe it would be far better for us to study the matter, and to adjust the difficulty and modify the arrangement in conference, if that were necessary.

But too much is involved in the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut. I say in all humility that I wish to go along with the substitute, but he now makes it difficult for me to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator from Illinois agree with me that if the Corporation is established and if it issues the bonds, the Federal Government will have to stand behind them, as to both principal and interest, willy-nilly? Would the Senator from Illinois think the United States Government would let the bonds go by default?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the moment, I do not pass on that question. At this time I pass on only the one point which disturbs me, namely, a bond issued by a corporation chartered under the authority of the United States is one thing; but a bond issued by the Government of the United States, with all the solemn obligation which goes with it, is another thing. At this late hour I would prefer not to get into that difficulty.

The Senator from Connecticut may be correct; but I am sure that on such short notice I cannot spell out the implications of his amendment. I am frank to state that I am not an expert in this field. I never have pretended to be a financier. But I went through this agony and fought out this battle in connection with the Joint Stock Land Bank, in the House of Representatives, a great many years ago.

Now some persons are asserting that these bonds are to be obligations of the United States, when, in fact, they are not to be obligations of the United States. So what is the purpose of the amendment the Senator from Connecticut has submitted?

Mr. BUSH. The purpose is to remove any doubt as to the responsibility of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then let me ask my friend, the Senator from Connecticut—and I ask this question once more: How did the original language reciting specifically that the bonds are not to be obligations of the United States, get into the substitute bill? Who was responsible for that language?

Mr. BUSH. I do not know. I am offering my amendment to the amendment because I have concluded that it does no good to include a protest or disavowal of responsibility. I believe that such a disavowal is no good because the United States Government would have to make good on the bonds in any event.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment considered in the committee?

Mr. BUSH. No; it was not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then that adds to my difficulty.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment will be withdrawn. Then, if the substitute prevails, the matter can be handled either in the House of Representatives or in conference.

I am frank to say that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut gives me some consternation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, at this time I will withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to obtain some time at this point. Let me inquire what Senator is now in control of the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the situation which has arisen illustrates the difficulty of dealing with this matter.

The opinion of the Comptroller General, as expressed to the committee, was that—

> The feature of the bill S. 1160 which may raise questions of legality is the financing method proposed.
>
> Article 1, section 8, clause 1, of the Constitution gives Congress power to lay and collect excise taxes provided they are uniform throughout the United States. The Federal gasoline tax meets this requirement. There is, however, a constitutional limitation on the taxing power of the Congress.
>
> That power may be exercised only "to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

In this measure it is proposed that we provide that—

> (b) There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program.

So here we have a situation in which, if we comply with the Constitution and if we also comply with the opinion of the Comptroller General, we shall be recognizing the debt as a debt of the United States.

If it is not a debt of the United States, we have no business, under the Constitution, to appropriate the revenue from a tax to pay it. But it is because it was supposed to be a debt of the United States, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, that it would be considered legal to appropriate this money if we wished to do it, even though it were considered bad policy. But if we are to appropriate a tax to pay a debt, it must be a debt of the United States. That is why the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut proposed to offer would have been much sounder from a constitutional and fiscal standpoint.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment in the nature of a substitute it is proposed to add the following new section:

INCREASING AUTHORIZED MILEAGE OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

SEC. 306. Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat., 838), designated a national system of interstate highways, is hereby amended by striking out "forty thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "forty-two thousand five hundred."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes. I do not expect to use more than 2 or 3.

The Highway Act of 1944 established an interstate highway system of 40,000 miles. After 10 years of phenomenal

growth there has been no increase in that system. Section 17 of Senate bill 1048, for which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has suggested a substitute, would increase that mileage by 2,500 miles.

There are still remaining unallocated under the law of 1944 approximately 2,400 miles, but the Secretary of Commerce has made it plain that all this mileage will be required for allocation to urban areas. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce in his testimony indicated that the 2,400 miles may not be quite enough to take care of the problem of urban areas. That leaves no margin at all for the areas out in the country.

The purpose of my amendment is to increase the available margin by the amount of the existing reserve, as though that amount were not reserved for urban areas.

Mr. President, I think that is a sufficient explanation, and since this language is in the other form of the bill, the committee bill, I hope Members of the Senate will agree that, if the substitute were to be adopted, this same increase in mileage should be permitted.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am speaking now as an individual member of the committee. We have gone into this question pretty thoroughly, and it seems to me that, in order to make a completed interstate system, there should be added some additional mileage. In the committee it was voted to add 2,500 miles to the figure in the original Gore bill. It should probably be explained to the Senate that some changes have been made. Certain roads have been made more direct, resulting in a saving of mileage in the interstate system of 40,000 miles. However, there will probably be some places where additions should be made to the interstate system, which was laid out in 1946, and more mileage will be required in the interurban system.

I feel that this amendment should be approved.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand the distinguished Senator, he proposes an increase in the interstate mileage. He is not undertaking to earmark this increase for particular urban or rural use, but rather is leaving it to the engineers and highway officials to designate the roads which are to be interstate.

Mr. BENNETT. The purpose of the amendment is simply to add a gross increase of 2,500 miles to the interstate system.

Mr. GORE. Which is commensurate with the addition in the committee bill.

Mr. BENNETT. That is my understanding.

Mr. GORE. I support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] for himself and other Senators to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, it is proposed to add the following new section:

DESIGNATING HIGHWAY AS PART OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

SEC. 306. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to designate as a part of the National System of Interstate Highways established under section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), a highway extending by a direct route from United States Highway No. 85–87 in Colorado westward across the Continental Divide and connecting with United States Highway No. 91 in Utah. The route to be followed by such highway shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of the States through which it runs after giving due consideration to any recommendations of the Secretary of Defense. The mileage of the highway designated under this section shall be counted for the purpose of the mileage limitation on the National System of Interstate Highways.

(b) The highway designated under the provisions of this section may be constructed, reconstructed, or improved by the use of Federal-aid road funds in the same manner as, and subject to the same provisions of law as may be applicable to, other highways constituting the National System of Interstate Highways.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on April 13, our former colleague, now the Governor of the State of Colorado, Ed Johnson, appeared before the committee to point out that, while it was the purpose of the interstate highway system to connect all State capitals, there is no road which directly connects the capitals of the States of Colorado and Utah. A bill for that purpose was introduced at that time, with the sponsorship of those who are sponsoring this amendment and some other Senators. I have offered that proposal as an amendment to this bill. It would have the effect of requiring the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads to put into the interstate highway system a road which it is left for them finally to locate, to connect United States Highways Nos. 85 and 87 in Colorado with United States Highway No. 91 in Utah. In effect, it would connect, by a direct route, the city of Denver with the city of Salt Lake.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado such time as he may require.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to. The State of Colorado, through its State legislature, has authorized a tunnel through the Continental Divide, so as to make it possible to connect Denver, Colo., with the capital of Utah. I think the road program would be badly mutilated if such a provision were not in it. It is not in it at this time. I think the amendment would accomplish the necessary purpose, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], for himself and other Senators, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], as amended.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. It is with reluctance that I express the opinion I am about to express. Earlier in the day I took the position that, since Members of the minority have been so cooperative, both in the committee and on the floor, in considering amendments to the committee bill strictly on the basis of merit, those of us in the majority should assist the leadership of the minority to perfect the minority bill in the form in which they wish to have it.

I do not wish to modify that statement, but I do desire to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah to the fact that this is a step which the committee cautiously resisted after careful consideration. I respectfully suggest that it would appear quite unwise for the Congress to get into the business of designating which roads should be interstate roads and which should not.

I believe I am qualified to make the statement that the testimony of the distinguished Governor of Colorado was one of the persuasive influences which caused the committee to increase the interstate mileage in its bill. The Senate has just adopted an amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the so-called Martin amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, which amendment corresponds to the action taken by the committee in connection with the bill reported from the committee. I feel that if this bill should become law, the Senator would have an excellent chance to obtain designation of this road as an interstate highway. But if the Senate is to undertake to say which roads should be interstate and which should not, I have a pocketful of amendments, and so have other Senators. I beg the Senator to consider seriously the proposed step, before members of the minority place such a provision in their substitute amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, apparently no other Senators desire time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I do not have much objection to Utah getting additional mileage for its interstate system. If it does, I hope the Senate will be equally kind to Louisiana, because we also have a

highway which we would like to put into the interstate system.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask whether, under the prior amendment adopted by the Senate with respect to the 2,400 additional miles, which were not specifically designated, if, in the judgment of competent authorities, this stretch of road should be included, the road could be included under the prior amendment without specific designation? There may be some merit to the contention of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that when we once open the door by designating a specific road we might be in difficulty; whereas, under the broader language, any section of a road, with respect to which a case could be made as being equitable and meritorious, could be included. What does the Senator from Tennessee think about that?

Mr. GORE. I respectfully confirm the opinion of the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the excellent work done by the Senator from Utah, perhaps the Senator from Utah will not feel it necessary to press the amendment, because it might open the door to other proposals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope that the Senator from Utah will comply with the request of the distinguished minority leader. I supported the prior amendment of the Senator from Utah, and I was very happy to go along with it, and I still am prepared to do so along the line expressed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], but I hope the Senator from Utah will withdraw this amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he was impressed with the argument of the Governor of Colorado that there should be a direct road from Colorado to Utah.

Mr. GORE. I was not only very much impressed by the argument and persuasion of the distinguished Governor, but also by the distinguished Senators from Utah and the distinguished Senators from Colorado.

I wish to go so far as to say that in the discussion in the committee the need for this particular highway was discussed. I do not wish to indicate that there is any legislative intent that this road should have priority consideration, but the committee was impressed, to answer directly the Senator's question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The impression upon the committee was such that it felt impelled because of the need for the Colorado-Utah road, perhaps, among other reasons, to add additional mileage to the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That, along with the demands for increasing the mileage in other areas, both rural and urban.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But this particular section of road was a potent influence in the decision.

Mr. GORE. It was.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to ask the Senator from Tennessee the same questions the Senator from Colorado has propounded. I believe he obtained the answers I sought, if I heard them correctly. Do I understand that the plea made by the representatives of the States before the committee was one of the influences that helped to bring about the adoption of the amendment by the committee?

Mr. GORE. It was one of the principal influences.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has taken place, I should like to continue briefly. I had intended to offer another amendment, which is a companion amendment to the one I have offered, and it is equally important to the State of Utah.

I should like to discuss it for a minute or two. It is my amendment No. 3. United States Route No. 30 is the only East-West road that comes into my State. It touches highway No. 91 at Salt Lake City. In doing so, it passes a junction at which, if it continued on the other leg at the junction for 42 miles, it would touch highway No. 91 at the nerve center of one of our most important military installations, at Ogden, Utah.

Therefore, I hope that this discussion will make some impression on the Bureau of Public Roads and encourage them also to consider what I would have offered as my third amendment, which would have added to the interstate system 42 miles from the junction point into the military center of Ogden.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of both amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments of Mr. BENNETT which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

Amendment No. 2: At the end of the Martin substitute amendment add the following new section:

"DESIGNATING HIGHWAY AS PART OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

"SEC. 306. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to designate as a part of the national system of interstate highways established under section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838) a highway extending by a direct route from United States Highway No. 85–87 in Colorado westward across the Continental Divide and connecting with United States Highway No. 91 in Utah. The route to be followed by such highway shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of the States through which it runs after giving due consideration to any recommendations of the Secretary of Defense. The mileage of the highway designated under this section shall be counted for the purpose of the mileage limitation on the national system of interstate highways.

"(b) The highway designated under the provisions of this section may be constructed, reconstructed, or improved by the use of Federal-aid road funds in the same manner as, and subject to the same provisions of law as may be applicable to, other highways constituting the national system of interstate highways."

Amendment No. 3: At the end of the Martin substitute amendment add the following new section:

"DESIGNATING HIGHWAY AS PART OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

"SEC. 306. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to designate as a part of the national system of interstate highways established under section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838) a highway extending by a direct route from Echo Junction, Utah, to Ogden, Utah. The route to be followed by such highway shall be selected by the highway department of the State of Utah after giving due consideration to any recommendations of the Secretary of Defense. The mileage of the highway designated under this section shall be counted for the purpose of the mileage limitation on the national system of interstate highways.

"(b) The highway designated under the provisions of this section may be constructed, reconstructed, or improved by the use of Federal-aid road funds in the same manner as, and subject to the same provisions of law as may be applicable to, other highways constituting the national system of interstate highways."

Mr. BENNETT. I withdraw my amendment No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. The two Senators from Utah and the two Senators from Colorado made a very profound impression upon the committee when they presented their proposal for an interstate road from Salt Lake City to Denver. Personally, 3 or 4 years ago, when I was making a road survey, I was surprised that that road was not on the interstate system. Our former colleague, the present Governor of Colorado, Edwin Johnson, made the statement that the Legislature of Colorado is now passing a law which will make possible the boring of a tunnel through the divide. When I was making my survey of roads I found that the reason why the road was not put on the interstate system in the beginning was the great expense involved in crossing the divide.

I believe that the work of the four Senators and the Governor of Colorado made a very great impression on the Public Works Committee, and had a great deal to do with adding the 2,500 miles to the Gore bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the minority leader and the majority leader yield back the remaining time on the substitute there be a quorum

call and that then the Senate may proceed to vote on the substitute.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, does the majority leader plan to finish the bill tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader does not know the answer at this time. If we could have the unanimous consent agreement entered, the Senate could vote on the substitute. Then, if Senators would indicate whether they plan to call up their amendments, I would be in a better position to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment I have in mind would require only 5 minutes of my time to present to the Senate. The amendment in essence provides that, notwithstanding the authorization in the bill, there shall not actually be expended in any one fiscal year more than the receipts from the gasoline tax.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As soon as the Senate votes on the substitute, the Senator from Virginia may speak as long as he wishes. First, we would like to get a vote on the substitute.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia would rather address Senators than speak to empty benches.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Virginia probably will have more Senators to speak to after we vote on the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is agreeable to my delightful friend from California, I shall yield back the remainder of my time, if he is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Having no additional requests for time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into the Senate will proceed to have a quorum call and then will proceed immediately to vote on the substitute. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished occupant of the chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Duff
Allott	Byrd	Dworshak
Anderson	Capehart	Eastland
Barkley	Case, N. J.	Ellender
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Ervin
Beall	Chavez	Flanders
Bender	Clements	Frear
Bennett	Cotton	Fulbright
Bible	Curtis	George
Bricker	Daniel	Goldwater
Bridges	Dirksen	Gore
Bush	Douglas	Green
Hayden	Long	Robertson
Hennings	Magnuson	Russell
Hickenlooper	Malone	Saltonstall
Hill	Mansfield	Schoeppel
Holland	Martin, Iowa	Scott
Hruska	Martin, Pa.	Smathers
Humphrey	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Jackson	McNamara	Smith, N. J.
Jenner	Millikin	Sparkman
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Stennis
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Symington
Kefauver	Mundt	Thurmond
Kennedy	Neely	Thye
Kerr	Neuberger	Watkins
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Welker
Knowland	Pastore	Williams
Kuchel	Payne	Young
Langer	Potter	
Lehman	Purtell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate is about to vote on the substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for himself and other Senators, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A vote "yea" is a vote for the substitute, and a vote "nay" is against it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the pending amendment I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania for himself and other Senators. The yeas-and-nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "Nay" and the Senator from New York would vote "Yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Beall	Bricker
Allott	Bender	Bridges
Barrett	Bennett	Bush
Capehart	Kennedy	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Goldwater	Millikin	
Hickenlooper	Potter	

NAYS—60

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hill	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Hruska	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jackson	Pastore
Clements	Jenner	Payne
Curtis	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kerr	Scott
Eastland	Kilgore	Smathers
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
Ervin	Lehman	Stennis
Frear	Long	Symington
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thurmond
George	Mansfield	Welker
Gore	McClellan	Williams
Green	McNamara	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Carlson	McCarthy	Wiley
Ives	Murray	

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MARTIN for himself and other Senators was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be stated. Since so many of my colleagues are present, I hope they will remain and hear the amendment as it is read, because I am certain it will be of interest to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "one year" and insert in lieu thereof "six months."

On page 16, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. (a) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, if for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957—

(1) the total of (A) the sums authorized to be appropriated by sections 1 and 2 of this act for such fiscal year and (B) the sums authorized to be appropriated by sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 for such fiscal year exceeds

(2) the total of the revenues collected during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 3412 (a) and 2450 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels,

then each such sum authorized by section 1 or section 2 of this act to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to such sum as the amount of the excess bears to the total of the sums authorized by sections 1 and 2 of this act to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, if for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, or any succeeding fiscal year—

(1) the total of the sums authorized by this act to be appropriated for any such fiscal year exceeds

(2) the total of the revenues collected during the second preceding fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels,

then each sum authorized by this act to be appropriated for such fiscal year shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to such sum as the amount of the excess bears to the total of the sums authorized by this act to be appropriated for such fiscal year.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, as soon as practicable after the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years (but not later than October 1 following each such fiscal year) certify to the Secretary of Commerce the total of the revenues collected during each such fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 3412 (a) and 2450 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. If for the second fiscal year following any fiscal year for which certification is made the sums authorized to be appropriated by this act are reduced under subsection (a) or (b), the Secretary of Commerce shall, not later that October 15 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which the sums authorized to be appropriated are reduced, compute and publish in the Federal Register the sums authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year, as reduced by subsection (a) or (b).

Renumber succeeding sections.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the language of the amendment which was just read sounds very formal, but all it means is this: Let us not spend more than we have. Everybody knows we face a deficit in this fiscal year. In all probability we shall have a deficit in the next fiscal year. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I know we have no loose money lying around which can be gathered into a new road program.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide that for each fiscal year of the 5-year program we shall be limited in our spending to revenues produced by taxes on gasoline, fuel oil, and several other taxes of that kind, which money we really call the road fund, although it is not so earmarked.

The committee recognizes that it is somewhat embarrassing to come before the Senate with a bill which proposes to spend over $7 billion more than is in sight, and so the committee says to the Senate:

> We have our individual views with respect to the levying of additional taxes and also with respect to provisions of existing tax laws, but we recognize that revenue matters are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works. It is hoped—

And I underscore the word "hoped"—

> that the appropriate congressional committees will give this matter early consideration.

I say to my colleagues that we should give consideration to that question now. Now is the time to do it, or the Senate will throw on to the Committee on Appropriations and the Secretary of the Treasury the problem of appropriating and obtaining money which we do not have.

What are the facts? The bill authorizes for the regular system $4,500,000,000; for the interstate system, $7,750,000,000; for the forest, park, Indian reservation, and public-land roads, $332 million, a total of $12,582,000,000.

Estimated receipts from the 2-cent gasoline and diesel-fuel taxes over the 5-year period are $5,475,000,000.

Spending not provided for amounts to $7,107,000,000.

In the pending budget, there is a cash item of Federal aid for roads of $680 million, although there is an authorization for an obligation of $876 million.

However, it is anticipated that the States supplying their own matching funds will not actually spend and call on Federal funds in excess of $860 million.

The average receipts from the gasoline tax, as I have indicated, will exceed $1 billion annually.

Under my amendment, if it is adopted, the road aid program can be stepped up by over $400 million a year, and still be within the receipts which will be obtained from a tax which was imposed primarily for the construction and maintenance of roads, but which has not been used for that purpose.

We in Virginia have what we call a pay-as-you-go plan, which was sponsored by my distinguished colleague [Mr. BYRD], and supported by me in the State senate. Since that time our gasoline tax in Virginia is absolutely dedicated to road construction and maintenance. We think it is a fair tax.

The Federal tax also is fair, except that we have been collecting more revenues from the tax than have been devoted to road construction and maintenance.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that the sole purpose of the amendment is to say that, as far as the Senate is concerned, we want this to be a pay-as-you-go program rather than a deficit-financed program?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. Our system in Virginia is a pay-as-you-go system. We should follow the same system so far as the Federal road program is concerned.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, the effect of the adoption of the amendment would be to say that the program must be financed from the specified present and future tax collections instead of adding to the national debt?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely correct.

There is another factor involved. Some Senators are interested in other matters besides the construction of roads. Some Senators think perhaps a little Federal aid for school construction might be a good thing. Some Senators think we might spend more for programs involving research in such diseases as cancer, heart disease, and other diseases. If a Senator sitting on the Committee on Appropriations were to listen to all the pleas for financial aid, he would know that if we had $1 billion to grant for laudable purposes, we would not have enough money.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Looking at the matter from a logical point of view, could not the Senator just as well say expenditures should not exceed revenues received from excise taxes on automobiles?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not at all.

Mr. LONG. Why limit the argument to gasoline taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The original purpose of the gasoline tax was to finance road construction, and the tax was imposed for that purpose. I am proposing that, while the money is not to be ear-marked, the money will be used; but the bill would propose to tie up $7 billion more than we have. Pressure will be exerted on the Appropriations Committee by people from all over the Nation, who will say, "You promised us sugar plums, and we expect you to give them to us."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the Senator, and I support the program, and I also appreciate the comment he has made about the fact that the State of Virginia has a pay-as-you-go program. I agree. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are not ashamed of our roads in Virginia.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have an engagement to keep. I suppose other Senators also have. I merely

wish to ask them not to listen to the language of my amendment; just listen to what I tell them it means.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In most States revenues obtained from payments for license plates are applied to highways. Perhaps the same thing is done in Virginia. I know it is done in Louisiana. I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that revenue which is obtained from direct taxes on automobiles should be applied to construction and maintenance of highways. When a person buys an automobile, he would like to be sure that there will be highways on which to drive his automobile.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When I first served on the Committee on Appropriations, and we were in the great depression, we were looking for new sources of revenue. The Federal Government was putting taxes on nearly everything, and we imposed taxes on automobiles with the idea that we would let the rich help pull us out of the hole. That did not mean that all automobiles were considered to be luxuries But that is the way that tax began; it was not for the purpose of building roads.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree that it is much easier to follow the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Virginia than it was to follow the reading of the amendment.

But as I understand the amendment, the purpose is to avoid deficit financing in connection with the construction of the roads authorized by the pending bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. RUSSELL. If an additional gasoline tax were imposed at a later date, would the funds thus raised be available to carry out the program? Or, contrariwise, would it be necessary to curtail the program if subsequently the Congress failed to levy additional taxes for it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would be the simplest thing in the world. The House could say, "We will impose the tax." The Senate could not initiate the tax, of course. If the House of Representatives voted to increase the tax by 1 cent, $500 million more would be available. If the House voted to increase the tax by 2 cents, $1 billion more would be available. Then we would not incur a great deficit during the 5-year period.

I am simply asking how many Senators are willing to say, "Yes, we want to build the roads; and, yes, we know we need the roads; and, yes, we are willing to finance them."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I commend the purpose of the Senator's amendment. I think perhaps the amendment might stand a little clarification and simplification.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the best experts in the Legislative Drafting Service prepared the amendment. But the distinguished parliamentarian said he could not understand its language so well. Then we had a 30 minute debate with him, and finally we satisfied him.

I did not propose to read the amendment because I had a little difficulty explaining it myself; but I knew what it meant. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Virginia does, because I am sure that he and the man who drafted the amendment are the only ones who do. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Johnny Simms and his assistant drafted the amendment. Then I went over it; and I said to them, "It looks powerfully complicated." But he replied, "But this is a complicated bill." [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the majority leader asked me to yield the floor. So I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I knew the Senator from Tennessee would oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee such time as he may desire.

Mr. GORE. I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have made two trips to the desk, in an attempt to understand this amendment. As best I can tell, the amendment applies to the 1954 act, as well as to the pending bill. Mr. President, the 1954 act was enacted with the support of this body. The apportionments under that act are already made, and are effective as of July 1, 1955. Even though the able junior Senator from Virginia wishes to apply the amendment to this bill, I seriously doubt that he would wish to apply it to the 1954 act.

The Senator from South Dakota read the amendment at the same time that I did. Does he concur in my interpretation of it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment is very formidable and very complicated. I hesitate to express a firm opinion as to what it will do. But as nearly as I can interpret what the amendment will do, it provides that if there is not sufficient money to take care of the combination of the authorizations in the 1954 act, plus the authorizations for 1957, plus the authorization for the interstate system under the pending bill, then both of them would suffer the cut. That would have a very disastrous effect, because the authorization for the fiscal year 1957 for the Federal primary, secondary, and urban roads would come to $700 million. If we add to that amount the authorization for the interstate system, under this bill, namely, $1 billion, we arrive at a total of $1,700,000,000. If we apply the deficit pro rata to them, the funds under the 1957 authorization for the primary, secondary, and urban roads would be cut, not only below the present authorization, but below the authorization under the 1952 act.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has misinterpreted the language of the amendment. Under the amendment there is bound to be an increase in the funds for highway construction; there will be an increase of $400 million or $500 million, at a minimun; and any amount above that will depend entirely on how much more we increase the gasoline tax. The amount we increase that tax will determine how close we come to reaching the full authorization of the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it may well be that both the Senator from South Dakota and I have misinterpreted the language of the amendment. The junior Senator from Virginia does not claim to have properly interpreted the amendment himself.

I hope the Senate will not take such a leap in the dark.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The situation is that we already have a rabbit in the 1957 act authorization for primary, secondary, and urban roads; and now it is proposed that we add a horse in the form of the billion-dollar authorization for the interstate road system, under the provisions of this bill. Then we are told that if we do not have feed enough for both of them, we shall cut down on the feed of each one in the same proportion. The result may be to starve to death the rabbit.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Tennessee understand that by voting for this authorization, the Members of the Senate will obligate themselves to vote for the appropriations, when they come before us, regardless of whether increased taxes to pay for this program have been levied?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Virginia said one Congress cannot bind another.

Mr. DANIEL. I was merely asking the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee before I cast my vote. I should like to vote for the authority; but I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I will not do so if, by so doing, I shall be obligating myself to vote for the necessary appropriations if taxes have not been raised sufficiently to pay for the program.

Mr. GORE. I would not be able to advise the able Senator from Texas on the proper discharge of his duties. He is an abler Member of the Senate than I am.

I would expect that when the bill becomes law, if it does, it would inaugurate a program which would have the support

of the people and of this Congress. And I would expect that, as was inherent in the administration bill, the more good roads we build, the more automobiles, trucks, and buses will travel on them, and the more income to the Treasury there will be.

I believe that over the period of years during the life of these highways, the program will not have to be financed on a deficit basis.

Mr. DANIEL. I was hoping the Senator from Tennessee had some anticipation that additional revenues would be raised so that this program will not be financed on a deficit basis.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has used as many words as Mr. Simms did in drafting my amendment. The Senator from Tennessee has used all those words to put us on notice that if my amendment goes into effect, he will expect that the money will be forthcoming, regardless of whether taxes are raised.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield to me long enough to enable me to request the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to his amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I doubt very much that I shall be able to explain what I am thinking. [Laughter.]

I merely wish to say that tonight I have a kind of empty feeling; I feel a little as I used to when I was a youngster, and when my father gave me a quarter to spend at the ice cream social, and when I spent all of it on pop before I got around to the ice cream. [Laughter.]

Tonight, we are debating as to whether we have sufficient funds with which to build some roads, and whether we should pay as we go or whether we should increase the debt.

Mr. President, we certainly need roads very, very badly. So I am wondering what we have been doing with the billions and billions and billions of dollars which have been expended during the past 20 years. We ran up a debt of $280 billion buying things that we did not have. Otherwise we would not have a debt of $280 billion. I do not know how many billions of dollars of debt the American people have, represented by the purchase of automobiles, houses, and so forth. If we need these roads so badly, I am wondering whether perhaps we could get some kind of aid from foreign countries to which we have been giving many billions of dollars over the years. Which country do Senators suppose would come to our rescue here tonight?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might suggest England. England has been able to reduce her taxes because of our generosity.

Mr. CAPEHART. Which country will come to our aid? We have been helping other countries for years. I am not criticizing that program. I am not standing here for that purpose. But I feel a sort of emptiness. We need roads very badly, and we have a $280 billion debt. In addition, the American people are in debt to the tune of many billions of dollars. What are we going to do?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah would like to suggest Finland, which seems to be a country which can fulfill its obligations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps we had better adjourn and get in touch with Finland, and see if she will come to our rescue.

What are we going to do? We need these roads, and we need them badly. This great Nation of ours has been built on the basis of what I call installment buying, going into debt. That is what we do in business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may I have another 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. We go in debt. We sell a bond issue if we wish to expand our factories, or we borrow money. We need roads badly. Are we going to go in debt for them? Are we going to build the roads and pay for them over the years, as we buy automobiles and pay for them over the months? Are we going to pay for them as we buy other things and pay for them over the months, or are we going to say, "We will not have any new roads until we get the money in the bank"?

If that is our philosophy, if that is what we believe in for the American people, let us apply the same philosophy to foreign aid, and everything else for which we appropriate money, except for national defense, meaning the defense of continental United States.

That is the problem which is facing us tonight. The whole problem leaves me feeling a little empty. What is it all about? Either we need roads or we do not need them. I think we need them; and we shall need them to a greater extent 6 months or a year from now than we do now.

I rather like the administration bill, the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], for the simple reason that it is a program based upon selling bonds, going in debt for the program, and paying it off out of taxes or out of earnings. That is what we have been doing for years. That is what a businessman does. That is what an individual does. What is wrong with it? Let us get on with the business of building roads.

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana, and then the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have been listening to what the Senator has said. Did not his State bond itself to build roads? Did it wait until it had the cash in the treasury? Did not almost every State in the Union, with the one possible exception, bond itself to build roads?

Mr. CAPEHART. I must be factual. The constitution of the State of Indiana prohibits the State from going into debt. We pay as we go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes? Perhaps it will require longer than I thought to say what I wanted to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much additional time does the Senator wish?

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps 5 minutes, if I am not asked too many questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. We recently put out a bond issue of $260 million for toll roads.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If we are to put everything on a pay-as-you-go basis, why not start with first things first? From my point of view, I should like to start on a pay-as-you-go basis with foreign aid. The first time we have a surplus, we can give it away in foreign aid. But if we are to operate upon a pay-as-you-go basis, let us get first the things we need most. Let us put the things we need the least upon a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. CAPEHART. Which do we need first, and which do we need second?

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that we need highways.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is my opinion. That is why this whole business leaves me a little empty. Are we coming to the time when some of the other countries must start an aid program for us?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I was very much interested in what the distinguished Senator had to say about installment buying. My suggestion is that there are many things which we do not need. I think we ought to start with the Capehart music boxes. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, no Member of the United States Senate is quite so unpredictable as the able Senator from North Dakota. [Laughter.]

I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. What would be the matter with transferring to the road fund the $9 billion which is now available to send to foreign nations of the world?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know. All I know is that I feel a little empty here tonight.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, if we continue to support all the other nations of the world, we shall indeed be empty.

In the Senate Finance Committee we are continually being importuned to raise the debt limit in order to enable us to give more money to foreign nations. Why would it not be possible to amend this bill so as to take the $3½ or $4 billion proposed for Asia and build a few roads for our folks at home to use?

Mr. CAPEHART. It certainly would be in line with my philosophy over the past 10 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the Senate in its wisdom should wish to tie highway improvement to road user taxes, then surely this amendment would not accomplish it. It does not include a tax on automobile tires, on automobiles, or buses, or on trucks or parts. So far as I know, it does not include lubricating oil.

If the Senate really wishes to tie highway improvement to highway user taxes, then surely it would wish to go further than this amendment goes. We began this work in February. We have now reached the point where we are considering an amendment which even the author says he does not understand. Is the United States Senate to act on that basis?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not the author of the amendment. The able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is the author of the amendment.

To repeat, I feel a little like the boy who spent his quarter for soda pop and did not have any money left with which to buy ice cream.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am prompted to say a word in comment on the inquiry made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as to whether they or other Senators would be morally or otherwise obligated to vote for appropriations hereafter merely because we might authorize them in this bill.

From time immemorial Congress has authorized the appropriation of money for specific purposes, which was never appropriated. It always depends upon the conditions which exist when the appropriation measure itself is brought before the Senate or the House. In my judgment, based upon our experience and customs, there is no moral or legislative obligation on the part of any Senator who votes for an authorization to vote for the full appropriation, or any part of it, when the appropriation measure later comes before the Committee on Appropriations or the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his statement. As I understand him, if the junior Senator from Texas votes for this authorization, and then a sufficient tax is not hereafter levied to provide the additional amount of money, there will be no obligation to vote for the future appropriations when they come before us.

Mr. BARKLEY. For that reason or for any other reason that appealed to the junior Senator from Texas, he would not be obligated to vote for the appropriation.

I have a few additional words to say on this subject. So far as I am personally concerned, I have been interested in highways all my life. I had the honor of helping to pass the original Highway Act in 1916, as a Member of the House of Representatives. Never during the entire period of nearly 40 years have we provided in any road bill that the money appropriated for the building of the highways, in full cooperation with the States, would have to be in the Treasury before the roads could be built.

If we do that with respect to highways now, we will be confronted with the same situation a little later. Soon we will have a housing bill before the Senate for consideration. It will be before us in a few days. If we follow the suggested course in connection with the highway bill, we may be justified in doing the same thing in the housing bill. We will have other appropriation bills to consider very shortly. In my judgment, if we set the precedent now of requiring that before these roads can be built the money must be in the Treasury from the sources from which it is to be raised before the money can be spent for the building of the roads, we will find ourselves woefully embarrassed in the years to come in our efforts to improve this country.

So far as I am concerned, I would vote today for a tax sufficient to build the roads. However, the Senate cannot originate revenue laws. It cannot originate tax laws. I do not know what the House will do. In this bill or in any other bill it could add a tax of some kind for the purpose of raising the money with which to build the highways. Whether the House will do that or not, I do not know. Obviously and certainly the Senate cannot do it. I would be willing to vote for such a tax, even though we are not able to do it now. I would be willing to vote for a tax of that kind. I do not know yet how much the tax should be, because it has not been worked out even in my own mind. However, I would be willing to vote for a tax which would pay for the roads to the extent of the 90 percent the Federal Government would contribute toward their construction.

I assume—and I believe we have the right to assume—that Congress will be wise enough and provident enough to provide the revenue for the construction of these highways if and when Congress has authorized their construction under the pending bill, or under any other bill Congress may enact. I believe Congress will be provident in that regard, although we are helpless to do anything about it now. I hope we can do it, and that we will do it. If in this highway-construction bill, for the first time in nearly 40 years of Government cooperation in the building of roads, we adopt the pending amendment, we will be embarrassed hereafter in every appropriation we may make for any good cause, whether it be cancer, polio, or any other desirable purpose, when such a proposal is offered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that we have a general law on the books which authorizes the Government to make allocations to the States and authorizes road construction money a year before the appropriation is made; and is it not a fact that the States enter into contracts and then come before the Appropriations Committee and say "You cannot deny us these funds because they have already been allocated"?

Mr. BARKLEY. They may come before the committee and say that, but the Senator knows that we can deny it if we want to deny it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have never been able to do so in the past, because the money is allocated a year in advance.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Committee on Appropriations has the right to deny an appropriation if it sees fit to do so.

It has not adopted the policy of complying with the requests for allocations every year they have been made.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say. I think it would be unwise to adopt the amendment, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it in order for me to take the chart I have with me to the front of the Chamber, or to the well, so to speak, and to use it to illustrate what I have to say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may place the chart anywhere in the Chamber he wishes to place it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the attention of the Members of the Senate as I use this chart in the front of the Chamber. I have read the amendment very carefully and I have consulted Mr. Simms, of the Legislative Counsel's office, and he agrees with my interpretation of the amendment. If I am not correct about it, I wish to be corrected. The chart shows the funds under the various acts and bills.

The chart is as follows:

Comparison of road funds

[In millions of dollars]

System	Fiscal 1954–55 (act of 1952)	Fiscal 1956–57 (act of 1954)	S. 1048 (as amended)	S. 1160
Primary	$247.5	$315	$400	$315
Secondary	165.0	210	300	210
Urban	137.5	175	200	75
Subtotal	550.0	700	900	600
Interstate	25.0	175	1,000 1,250 1,500 2,000 2,000	2,500
Total	575.0	875	2,500	3,100
Interstate matching	50–50	60–40	90–10	95–5

The first column shows the apportionment for primary, secondary, and urban roads under existing law, which will expire on the 30th of June. The second column shows apportionment under the law which goes into effect in the next fiscal year. The next column shows the apportionment under S. 1048, the bill we are considering. That bill proposes a total of $900 million for the normal category of roads—primary, secondary, and urban—plus $1 billion for the first year for the interstate system, or a total of $1,900,000,000. What the amendment means is that if not enough money is realized from the taxes to equal $1,900,000,000, a pro-rata cut would be made not merely in the $1 billion for the interstate system, but the cut would be prorated also on the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Actually, the gasoline or motor fuel tax produces between $900 million and $1 billion.

Under the Gore bill providing $1 billion for interstate roads, plus $900 million for the other categories, the total would be $1,900,000,000. Half of that would be $950 million. If we should reduce that on a pro-rata basis, we would cut the money for the primary, secondary, and urban system exactly in half.

Therefore, we would have less for the primary, secondary, and urban systems than we had under the 1952 act, because the amount for the primary system would go down to $200 million, whereas last year it received $240,700,000. The amount for the secondary system would be cut to $150 million, which is less than the $165 million of last year.

The amount for urban roads would go down to $100 million, which is less than the $137 million under last year's act.

In the meantime, the State legislatures have gone ahead on the basis of the 1954 act. They are planning on the basis of the 1954 act. They have made arrangements to match $315 million for the primary system. If we cut the $400 million in half, we would have only $200 million for the primary system, whereas the legislatures are proceeding on the basis of $315 million.

We would cut the secondary road plan to $150 million, whereas the States are already prepared to match on the basis of $210 million.

The reason is that we are introducing a new factor which boosts the amount for the interstate from $175 million to $1 billion, and we let the interstate take half of all the proceeds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. My State is in the process of authorizing a $20-million bond issue on the basis of the figure the Senator from South Dakota has used in the second column, namely, $210 million. I am very much interested in the explanation, because it makes sense to me. It would be possible to throw the money into the interstate system and wreck the whole primary system and the secondary system and urban system. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the tax revenues amount to only 50 percent of the authorization and the taxes are not changed, 50 percent of the revenue would be thrown into the interstate system, boosting it to $500 million, whereas it is $175 million under existing law. The farm-to-market road amount would be cut in two. Therefore, the proposal would add less than is provided under present law.

If we want an adverse reaction in the farming communities we should adopt the amendment.

I am in favor of the pay-as-you-go principle. I offered an amendment earlier today along that line. I wish some of the Members who are in the Chamber now had been present when I offered the amendment. I proposed to apply a stamp use fee on the interstate system, which would have produced $700 million additional and would have authorized a larger program. I postponed the effective date of the authorization, but limited it to the authorization created by this act. I did not disturb the program which was already authorized and on the basis of which the State legislatures have been taking their action.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I correctly understand that Mr. Simms, who put this amendment in technical form, has informed the Senator that it would cut the regular highway program below what it would otherwise have been?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. Mr. Simms is on the floor. I was talking with him a few minutes ago. I asked him if it would cut them all pro rata, and that was the impression he gave me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this amendment was hurriedly prepared this afternoon when I was worried about the possibility that we might go $7 billion in the red.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chart which I used for illustrating my remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the point where I referred to it, so that my references by columns will be intelligible in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I did not intend this amendment to mean what it is now said to mean. Certainly, I do not want to hurt the regular program. So, in the light of the explanation which has been given of what this amendment would really do, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to observe that this is an admission in open court that Congress had no way in the world of raising the funds, and the program would be paid for by deficit financing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is withdrawn.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I move that the pending measure be recommitted for further study by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut that the bill be recommitted for further study by the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—39

Allott	Dirksen	Millikin
Barrett	Duff	Mundt
Beall	Dworshak	Payne
Bender	Flanders	Potter
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bush	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kuchel	Thye
Case, N. J.	Malone	Watkins
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Williams

NAYS—50

Aiken	Green	McNamara
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Daniel	Kennedy	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Scott
Eastland	Kilgore	Smathers
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
Ervin	Lehman	Stennis
Frear	Long	Symington
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thurmond
George	Mansfield	Young
Gore	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—7

Carlson	Kefauver	Wiley
Hill	McCarthy	
Ives	Murray	

So the motion of Mr. BUSH to recommit the bill for further study was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5–24–55e." I modify the amendment in line 4 by striking out "thirty-six" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 2, immediately after the period it is proposed to insert the following:

> The amendment made by the first sentence of this section shall not become effective until the President proclaims that at least thirty thousand miles of the National System of Interstate Highways have been constructed, reconstructed, or improved in accordance with standards which in his opinion are adequate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the provision of the bill toward which this amendment is directed is the one which would raise the mileage of the interstate system from 40,000, as was designated in 1944, to 42,500. Already several bills have been offered for the designation of new sections of mileage on the interstate system, so we have that warning.

It should be realized that with the 90-percent–10-percent program which has been offered every ambitious area in the Nation which is not near or on the interstate system will ask to be placed on it.

We have had some good experience in this matter in that when the primary aid system was set up a similar provision was enacted after the system had been in effect only a few years. That enactment was in the year 1932 and is now found in section 304 of the code. It provides that until the primary aid system as set up in any State has been constructed, or 90 percent of it has been either completed or its construction completely arranged for, no further mileage can be added.

From some personal experience in how eager can be the efforts of communities to get onto the primary road system, even though it is only a 50–50 system, I think I know how the pressure could be exerted upon Congress to add new mileage to the interstate system when the arrangement is on a 90-percent Federal and a 10-percent State matching basis.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator from Florida realize that West Virginia is the gateway to the Southeast? All the heavy truck traffic from the Great Lakes area travels over the roads of West Virginia. It has almost made a wreck of the West Virginia Roads Commission, which has been trying to keep the highways of the State in repair, simply to accommodate that truck traffic, none of which pays a gasoline tax of a single cent in West Virginia. I wonder if the Senator realized that.

I know the Senator comes from a State which used to control—I do not know whether it does now—heavy truck traffic in Florida. I wonder if the Senator from Florida realizes how West Virginia, with its tremendous, expensive road network, suffers from the heavy truck traffic which moves through the State from as far west as Chicago, from the Great Lakes region, and from as far east as Buffalo to the Southeast. It affects the tire industry, the cotton industry, and all related industries.

Would the Senator from Florida be willing to comment on that?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I know about that situation. I sympathize with those who are affected by it, and hope that the bill, if passed in reasonable form, will very quickly bring relief.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment as originally drawn was to place the interstate system under the 90-percent completion requirement which has operated so effectively during so many years for the primary road system.

I think every Senator who has served as a governor, and every Senator who has been a Member of the Senate for any period of time, knows perfectly well of the tremendous ambition on the part of many cities to become connected with the interstate road system.

It has been a perfect, complete, and fair answer at all times to say that until the originally designated system was 90-percent complete under the law, we were not in a position to add mileage.

There was opposition to the proposed amendment because 2 or 3 State capitals are not now traversed by a segment of the interstate system.

So on submitting the matter to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], with whom I conferred on the question, as I did also with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I received a counter suggestion that, instead of requiring 90-percent completion as a condition to the adding of mileage, only 75-percent completion or arrangement for completion be insisted upon as a reasonable condition. I have consequently amended or modified the original amendment to accomplish that result.

We know perfectly well the kinds of pressures to which we shall be subjected. We know that already there is unallocated about 2,500 miles of the 40,000 miles, which I think is much more than ample to meet the needs of State capitals which are not yet touched by the interstate system.

I hope the Senate will think that it is appropriate to take a stitch in time now, to prevent the driving force of many communities—and I have already been subjected to it from my State—to have new mileage placed on the interstate system.

If Senators will look at the map, they will observe that in Florida there is no connection to the interstate system between Orlando and Miami or between Tampa and Miami. I think almost all Senators understand something about the size, ambition, aggressiveness, and progressiveness of those cities. I wish they could have immediately extensions to the interstate system; but I know perfectly well that if some sort of controls of this kind are not imposed, the entire system under which we are committing ourselves so tremendously to provide so much money will grow out of reason, and will be subject to collapse before it really gets well started.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Would not the Senator's amendment prevent the placing on the interstate system of the cities of Salt Lake and Denver?

Mr. HOLLAND. It would not. There are 2,400 miles of unallocated highway in the authorization of 40,000 miles. There would be no reason at all why a portion of the 2,400 miles could not be so used.

Mr. WATKINS. There is nothing in the law to indicate that all State capitals must be connected before other cities are placed in the system, is there?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to answer that question, but I remember that one of the objectives recited in the original law in 1944 is to connect State capi-

tals. Perhaps that statement is in the report. I do not recall.

It would be my thought that the 2,400 miles which are now available would fully meet the undoubted need which exists in the cases which the Senator from Utah has mentioned, and one other case of the same kind which urgently needs attention.

I call attention to the fact that there is no connection between the capital of the great State of Georgia, the State just immediately north of Florida, and our capital, Tallahassee. At the same time there is an interstate system road going through each of those two good cities. I certainly want to have the type of change made to which the Senator from Utah has referred.

Mr. President, that can be done easily by use of the unallocated mileage, 2,400, which is left. Two thousand five hundred miles are proposed to be added. I am reluctant to see any mileage added by the bill, because that will mean that before we really get started on the program 2,500 miles of highly expensive road will be added to a program set up 11 years ago, and on which we have hardly started.

I think that addition would be an open invitation to pressure and serious trouble if we did not enact some such protection as I have proposed. If there is a better proposal, I shall gladly yield to a better suggestion; but it seems to me if we proceed along the line in which we have been very successful in providing for primary roads, although here we would be providing 75 percent instead of 90 percent, we would be putting safeguards around the program which would be worth while.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator believe it would be very difficult to get the capitals of Georgia and Florida and the capitals of Colorado and Utah connected if all the pressure to which the Senator has referred exists with respect to the highway system?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no pressure existing on the question of connecting the capitals of Georgia and Florida, because they are traversed by one of the highways. We recognize that is not the fact in some other States, and I think they should come first. But this will be a Pandora's box of very grave consequences unless we provide some sort of safeguard which will protect not only the program and its integrity, but Representatives and Senators, from pressure of a type to which we have never been subjected before, because we have never had constructed any 90–10 percent Federal roads. Senators have not heard of any pressure in the past which will be comparable to what they will be confronted with in the future if safeguards are not put into the program.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator agree there ought to be something in his amendment which would require that the State capitals should be connected, before the provision he suggests would go into effect?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The Senator from Florida does not feel he should try to say where this mileage should be put. He has said for the record, and he says now to his friend from Utah, he thinks the Senator from Utah has made a legitimate case in requesting, or insisting, that the authorities use some of 2,400 miles of unallocated roads to meet the situation which exists in his State.

Mr. WATKINS. What chance would the State have to get a share against pressure from all over the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the very fact that State capitals in the Senator's area are unconnected and without proper roads puts them in a class by themselves. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has said he thinks the Senator from Utah does have a case which is entitled to be heard, and which he hopes will be heard, but he does not think we ought to put ourselves into the business of stating where roads are going to be constructed. If we did that we would have no end of troubles, because communities would be asking Senators to submit amendments. I do not propose to submit such amendments, because I think we have got to make a start on the program and make real progress.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the bill set up certain standards which are just as specific as the suggestion just made by the Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. The proposed law had as one of its inducements—whether it is contained in the report I cannot recall; perhaps the Senator from Tennessee can remind the Senator of that—a statement that one of the purposes of the bill was to enable highway connection to be made between capitals of various States.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is nodding his head. Perhaps he may remember where the provision is to be found. I do not remember.

Mr. President, I yield, without losing my right to the floor, to enable the Senator from Tennessee to inform the Senate on that point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I cannot give the specific citation of where that statement of purpose is to be found. It may be in the committee report rather than in the bill itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is in either the report or the bill itself; is it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida why, in order to have an adequate system of interstate highways, it is necessary to prescribe that State capitals shall be interconnected. The locations of many State capitals, as a result of historical accident, are removed from the main centers of population. They are not in direct line between important cities. In many cases this requirement or recommendation would simply mean that there would be constructed many hundreds of miles of additional roads for very little practical purpose. It would seem to me that the suggestion which the Senator from Florida has made is an impractical one. If it is desired that State capitals be connected by an interstate system of highways, let that be done on a 50–50 basis, the States bearing half the cost. But why the Federal Government should bear 90 percent of the cost to interconnect State capitals is personally beyond my comprehension.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida will simply answer by stating it to be his definite understanding that such a purpose was stated as a matter of inducement either in the original legislation in 1944 or in the committee report. I think the Senator from Tennessee is probably completely correct in his statement that he thinks it is in the report. But that was one of the purposes for setting up the interstate system.

There had been a strategic military network set up during World War II, and the mileage contemplated in it was a great deal larger than the mileage of 40,000. The President created a commission to study the matter. State highway officials studied the matter. There was a long study made by congressional committees. As a result, and in an effort to have a highly improved and very fine system of interstate highways, a measure was passed in, I think, 1944—it may have been as late as 1946—which contained—it was either in the act itself or in the report—the statement that one of the purposes of the law was to provide highway connection to each State capital in the Nation. At any rate, that is so nearly accomplished that I understand the construction of two more roads, not particularly long ones, is all that is necessary. There is adequate mileage in the 40,000-mile system to accomplish the purpose.

My amendment is designed to prevent the allocation of the added 2,500 miles unless there is some reasonable standard of completion in the program.

Unless we propose to have some such safeguard, we will be opening a grab bag the like of which I think will not be offered to lively, ambitious communities in the United States for a long, long time to come.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have heard the amendment read, and I have gone to the desk and read it again. I do not see how the amendment would keep down the pressures which the Senator has mentioned. We are all subject to pressures, and would be subject to pressures under a provision for 30,000 miles as well as we would be under a provision for 42,500 miles. Wherein does the amendment relieve us of such pressures?

Mr. HOLLAND. The original bill provides for 40,000 miles. All of it but approximately 2,400 or 2,500 miles has been allocated, and that will be available for use in accomplishing the original purpose, as announced at the time of the original act. In fact, it will go further; it will accomplish some circumferential construction around some of the large cities, which is contemplated as one of the things to be done under the interstate system.

But the adding of 2,500 miles and the introduction now of several bills requesting the designation of certain highways from point A to point B as part of

the interstate system give us ample notice of what we may expect.

The purpose of the amendment is to protect us, in the case of the 2,500 miles, against any demands for its allocation until there has been reasonable completion of the original program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the point the Senator from Florida makes; but one of the penalties we suffer in serving in the Senate is that we must become the victims of pressure. I think most of us know how to handle such pressure. We do it by advising the people at home of the facts in the cases or problems which confront us.

Of course, Senators are supposed to have influence with the executive departments, but we do not have as much influence with them as some persons think we have. I have had that experience over the years.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. He was a Member of the Senate at the time when the Senate adopted the very wise system that provision must be made for the construction of 90 percent of the primary system in each State, before any additional mileage can be added in the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. At that time I was supposed to be mature, but now I am a very junior Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Kentucky, but I think he is as able now to resist strong pressure as he was then. And I believe that he will see that, after all, we shall be confronted with enormous pressure; and we shall save ourselves a great deal of time and we shall be able to avoid a great deal of pressure and shall avoid disappointing a great many ambitious communities all over the Nation, if we resist the pressure now, before we are asked to provide for additional or new mileage.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I desire to call attention to the 1944 act, which provides in part as follows:

> There shall be designated within the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent, so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

I point out that, notwithstanding that provision, the State capital of Utah and the State capital of Colorado, although both are located in strategic areas, with heavy defense installations in both of them, are not connected by highway. Even though that act had been in effect, those capitals have never been connected, and although it makes provision for the 40,000 miles, the Senator from Florida now wishes to reduce the total to 30,000 miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, Mr. President; I do not wish to have that done. I know the 40,000 miles are already provided for, and I know that 2,400 or 2,500 miles of it are still unallocated. I also know that by means of the pending bill it is proposed to add 2,500 miles more. I insist that the allocations needed in order to complete the original program be made from the 2,500 miles; and I insist, further, that we make no effort to parcel out the additional 2,500 miles until we get the program at least 75 percent complete.

Mr. WATKINS. Is not the amendment of the Senator from Florida intended to defeat the committee amendment which includes the 2,500 miles?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is not; my amendment would leave in the bill the provision for the 2,500 miles.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the practical effect of the amendment of the Senator from Florida will be as I have stated, and that it will have that result.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; it will not. My amendment was submitted to the committee, which was agreeable to having this change made; and the committee felt that there is need for protection against the tremendous demands for the designation as parts of the interstate system of new highways in various parts of the Nation.

The amendment will give us a little time in which to see where such extensions are needed; but in the meantime the amendment will give the Senator from Utah full opportunity to have the allocation he desires, in the case of the original 40,000 miles, made out of the unallocated 2,400 or 2,500 miles.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would seem to be a rather miraculous thing if the wise men could have sat around a table in 1944 and could have arrived at a road system and program which would be impeccable even to this day, as well as for all time to come.

I think the committee has been very wise in allowing a reserve fund, we might say, in order to accommodate the changes which will be required by the passage of time. Colorado and Utah, as the Senator from Utah has said, have become great strategic areas since that time; and today the road problem is not at all the same as it was in 1944.

In taking a fresh look at the problem, as of today, it would seem inconceivable that we would do anything to prevent the construction of a national road across the mountains from Salt Lake City to Denver. The Colorado Legislature is so much of that mind that it has appropriated money, at the expense of the State of Colorado, for the building of a road there.

I believe it would be a serious mistake to provide now that we must abide by the wisdom of those who served in the Congress in 1944, and that at this time we must strike out the allowance which has been provided by the wise members of the present committee to take care of this situation.

I state frankly that I do not doubt there will be some pressure.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry the Senator from Colorado did not hear the earlier discussion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I tried to hear it.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no intention to strike out provision for the 2,500 additional miles. On the contrary, such provision will be left in the bill. There is no intention to prevent the assignment to the State of Colorado and to the State of Utah of sufficient mileage from the unallocated 2,400 miles to enable their very justifiable demand to be met.

In my opinion, they have a very justifiable demand, which should be met, and can be met, from the 2,400 miles which are unallocated.

The amendment simply seeks to prevent any scramble for the allocation of the added 2,500 miles, which will be in addition to the 40,000 miles, until some progress has been made toward completion of this program.

In regard to the amendment, I say again to my friend the Senator from Colorado that I am simply drawing on the experience of the Congress, which has had such fine results from the provisions of the original law. My recollection is that it was passed at the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and Mr. Cartwright.

At any rate, it provides that until the primary road system in any State is 90 percent completed or until its financing and construction are completely provided for, no new mileage may be added. That arrangement has given great satisfaction and has allowed for the regular and reasonable development of the primary road aid structure in each of the States, and that is the kind of development which will be made in this case.

If no mileage remaining from the 40,000 had been available for distribution, I would not have submitted my amendment, because I knew of the ambition—and it is a legitimate one, I believe—of the Senator from Colorado and his colleague and of the Senator from Utah and his colleague, in regard to the matter they have just been discussing. But from the original 40,000 miles there remains ample mileage to take care of their situation.

I say to the Senator from Colorado that the interstate system, as it now exists, was not passed upon or drawn up by the committee in 1944. It was turned over to the experts and the representatives of the Defense Establishlishment and the Bureau of Public Roads and the State commissioners, for all of them to get together and outline it; and from time to time it has been added to, until today the total is up to approximately 37,600 miles. Ample leeway is left in order to completely take care of the program the Senator from Colorado has in mind.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me that the fact that the committee in its wisdom

has voted to add the extra mileage indicates that the opinion of the committee is that there is not enough leeway under the present mileage. It seems to me that is the best evidence we can have of that. I believe it would be tragic to eliminate that provision, because the committee had before it some picture, at least, of the various demands which will be made, and the committee has deliberately voted to add this mileage, in order to accommodate for them.

I take the liberty of saying to the senior Senator from Florida that I do not think we here can ever become so wise that, in passing upon matters which vitally affect our great country, whose importance is being magnified every day, we can draw a line on a map, and can say, "This is it. It shall never be deviated from; there shall be no change. This will be the permanent structure to which we shall build." As the Senator from Utah has pointed out, we have developed many war plants. We have developed strategic materials in that area of the country. I am speaking particularly of Utah and Colorado, and similarly situated States. Ten years ago no one could possibly have foreseen such development. Ten years ago there was a different conception about going through the Continental Divide. Today we have no fear of the Continental Divide. If we cannot go over it we will go through it. We are moving water through the Continental Divide. We are moving railroads through the Continental Divide. We go through the Continental Divide whenever it serves our economy to do so.

I hope the Senator from Florida will not persist in his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators may vote against the amendment if they so desire. The Senator from Florida feels very strongly that it would be a mistake not to have any safeguard in this great program, a program that is far more expensive than any the Nation has ever undertaken, a program involving far greater participation by the Federal Government, in that it pays up to 90 percent of the cost. We would be most unwise if we did not place some safeguard around the adoption of grab-bag methods in parceling out the additional 2,500 miles.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I am sorry that I did not hear the earlier part of the Senator's remarks. Has the Senator consulted with the Bureau of Public Roads on his amendment, and does the Bureau of Public Roads support it?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not consulted them. I have patterned the amendment after the law passed in 1932, which has been continuously in force since that time, relative to the primary aid system in every State. It has worked marvelously. It has worked to safeguard and protect the designation of the original primary aid section in each State, in that no additions could be made until after 90-percent completion was attained in each State. That has been a safeguard and a balance wheel in connection with the entire primary aid system.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of Public Roads has already allocated—not publicly, but actually, in the minds of its officials—this 2,400 miles for the use of circumferential highways around large cities, and for highways for defense evacuation?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has allocated a part of it, but I believe there is ample left to take care of the need which the Senator from Utah has in mind. Circumferential highways come second in the original report, after the program of connection of capitals.

If Senators do not wish to adopt my amendment, that is completely within their purview.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to make the point that the 2,400 miles which the Senator says is still available, particularly to the States of Colorado and Utah, is actually not available, because the Bureau of Public Roads has already allocated that mileage for other uses. I know that actually it has not been publicly allocated, but in the minds of the officials of the Bureau of Public Roads it already has been allocated for the uses to which I have referred. I think the Senator will agree that that is true.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know that that is true. I have heard that they have had plans to allocate a part of it for circumferential roads. I would not have dreamed that 2,400 miles would be needed for circumferential roads.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Florida can rightfully be called the father of the interstate system of highways. I know that his amendment is entitled to careful consideration. Since the distinguished Senator left the Public Works Committee certain things have been transpiring before our committee with which he has not had an opportunity to become intimately acquainted.

The committee has been informed that the remainder of the undesignated interstate mileage has been reserved for urban development—not only circumferential roads, but interconnections and bypasses.

I am fully sympathetic with the objective the distinguished Senator from Florida has in mind. We had discussions in the committee, both in the hearings and in executive sessions, as to the effect of stepping up of the Federal contribution to 90 percent. It was felt that there would be terrific pressure to have this road, that road, or the other road designated. As one means of combating such pressure, I asked the Bureau of Public Roads, with the approval of the committee, to submit to the committee, with the specific approval of the Secretary of Commerce, the indexes, or criteria, which the Bureau of Public Roads would use in further designations. Those are to be found in the hearings.

We were also told that the 2,400 miles would not be sufficient to meet the needs for urban interconnections, bypasses, circumferential roads, or whatever they may be called. We were told that additional mileage would be necesary to meet the demands in that connection.

The committee could very well have increased the mileage to 48,000, with ample justification, but we tried to be conservative.

Again let me say that I am sympathetic with the desire of the Senator to throw around this program every safeguard. But I fear that he goes too far, because if all the 2,400 miles were allocated, and an additional 5 miles or 50 miles were needed for an interconnection around Richmond, Va., or St. Louis, Mo., or New York City, it could not be used, even though it had been authorized, until 30,000 miles had been brought to a complete state of adequacy.

I believe the Senator, as interested as he is in interstate highways, would not want to bring about such a result. As chairman of the subcommittee, let me say that I will work with the Senator when the bill goes to conference, and if we can throw any additional safeguards around the program without putting it into a straitjacket, I shall be very happy to cooperate with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I am ready for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wish to call attention to the fact, in addition to what has been said about the proposed connecting road between Denver and Salt Lake City, that if this amendment should prevail it would possibly postpone work on a highway of that kind, between Denver and Salt Lake City, even though it might finally be added to the interstate road system. In the event of war that would bring about a very serious situation. In those 2 communities, which are in a highly strategic location, there are ordnance depots, naval stores, Army stores, defense plants, and other activities. I think there are enough Government establishments in Denver so that it might truthfully be called the second capital of the United States.

If this amendment should be approved, requiring 30,000 miles actually to be constructed, it might postpone the projected road for 10 years. In that event, we could get it only if there were some money left from other programs.

I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 3, it is proposed to strike out subsection (d) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) No more than 2 percent of any sum apportioned to any State for any fiscal year may be expended under the provisions of this section, and expenditures under this section from any such sum shall be made only with respect to utility relocations in connection with projects prosecuted by the use of such sum.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The amendment throws additional safeguards around the provision for reimbursement for relocation of utilities. It has been discussed with the minority and the majority. It is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I submit the amendment on that statement.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I intended to make some remarks on the pending bill, S. 1048. However, because of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

This public highway bill, S. 1048, is an excellent example of how significant legislation can be developed in our legislative system.

The bill itself is the result of combined efforts to lay before the Senate a sound piece of legislation. Every member of the subcommittee contributed to its improvement. Each was weighed carefully. Many were adopted. All of this took place after many facts and opinions, from expert sources, had been heard and studied.

Now that a good product is before the Senate, other features of our legislative process are being brought to play. The record of the past several days attests to the vigor of these features.

Seldom have the members of the Senate been in such accord as to the soundness of purpose of a bill embracing the features of S. 1048.

No one questions that more and improved highways are needed—and this bill will provide such highways.

Our expanding economy, with its increased travel and trade, calls for a better highway system.

Our defense has never before been so dependent upon mobility. For this reason alone, we must improve on all modern forms of transportation, including highways.

The devastating character of modern weapons makes speedy evacuation of our urban centers a must. Failure to provide adequate highways for this purpose is tantamount to the abandonment of essential civil defense requirements.

It is only fair to say that alternative proposals such as the administration's bill, likewise recognize these needs, although in my opinion they do not meet them as adequately.

There are certain basic features of S. 1048 which make it superior to other proposals:

It provides for a balanced development of our entire highway system. The interstate part of our system of highways is emphasized—provision is likewise made for balanced development of our primary highways, our farm-to-market highways, and our civil-defense highways.

As I understand it, the administration's bill limits its attention to expansion of the interstate highways.

S. 1048 provides a flexibility factor by permitting the transfer of a portion of the funds as between major segments of the system. This allows for adjustment to varying needed factors, as seen by respective State areas.

S. 1048 provides the apportionment formula under which funds are allocated to the States, a formula which has been developed and used successfully over a period of years.

The purpose of this formula is an equitable division of needed funds to the respective States.

This objective and time-tested formula is to be contrasted with the executive decisions proposed by the administration's bill.

Neither S. 1048 nor the administration's bill proposes any new source of revenue from which this expanding highway program is to be financed. In the Public Works Committee, however, there was confidence that an expanding economy would produce an increased flow of tax revenues.

In this area of financing, the program is the major contrast between S. 1048 and the administration's bill.

At the risk of emphasizing points better said earlier in this debate, I mention briefly some of the aspects of this financial issue which impress me.

Somewhat different results develop from expenditure of about the same number of dollars.

As example, $2 billion spent under the administration's bill in a given period of time would provide X miles of highway. The same $2 billion spent under S. 1048 in a like period of time would provide X+Y miles of highway.

Put another way, under the administration's bill, $2 billion would necessarily give less miles of highway than under S. 1048.

The explanation is simple. Both programs obtain their money from the general revenues of the United States Treasury, but under the administration's bill, more of that money would go to pay interest. Under S. 1048 more would go into concrete, steel, roadbeds, etc. To the extent that borrowing is resorted to, the bonds must be paid off from revenue.

It is no easier to pay off bonds issued by a special Government corporation than to pay off those issued by the United States Treasury directly.

No one can believe that this highway program, under S. 1048 or the administration's bill, is self-liquidating in the financial sense. Undoubtedly, the roads will pay for themselves through their contributions to the economy and to our defense, but regardless of what device is used for borrowing the money, the taxpayer will pay for the roads in the same sense that he pays for other public improvements.

There are two basic differences between the method of financing anticipated under S. 1048 and the method anticipated under the administration's bill.

These are:

S. 1048 does not resort to any means of trying to avoid an increase in the advertised public debt. On the other hand, the interest cost in the administration's bill is more of a burden to the taxpayer.

My purpose in these few remarks is to emphasize reasons for recommending S. 1048 as a sound way of meeting the steadily increasing problem of transportation in this country.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 16, line 17, to delete the two words "or practice."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the words "or practice."

Mr. GORE. The committee accepts the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated. It is my amendment marked 5/24/55–B. It is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 12, it is proposed to strike out all over to and including line 7 on page 8.

On page 8, line 8, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to strike out subsection (d) of section 2 of the bill, which has already been amended by the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I believe that amendment did not materially change the meaning of the subsection. If anything, it made it clearer than heretofore that any weight of load and any length of body and any height of body and any weight of body that is now legal on the highways of any State of the Nation would continue to be legal throughout the program until the act was repealed or amended so as to provide otherwise.

The purpose of my amendment is to strike that subsection. I believe it is a completely inadequate section, and it has been admitted on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], in two statements he made yesterday, that it is completely inadequate to deal with the situation it is designed to deal with. It has also been acknowledged by the Senator from Tennessee to be completely nonuniform in its operation, in that it freezes at their present levels—some of them very excessive as to load limits, and some of them very

long as to length, or very great as to height or weight—the legal provisions now applicable in the various States of the Union.

It is admitted by the sponsors of the bill that there are now applicable in some of the States limits which are much too liberal. What is proposed by the bill is to freeze those limits in those States and permit them to get their 90–10 percent road construction funds, despite very heavy weights, and at the same time permit other States of the Union, which have more reasonable limits of weight and more reasonable requirements as to dimensions, to get their contributions from the Federal Government only under the more reasonable provisions which are already contained in their laws, or under provisions which are contained in a report made by the Association of State Highway Officials.

Of course, it is unusual, to say the least, to have a law recite and rely upon an unofficial document, which is not even a legal document, but only a recommendation, which is referred to only by name and date, as the standard in the law.

On the face of it, that kind of draftsmanship does not commend itself to anyone as advising the reader of the bill what is referred to, or to advise the reader of the code, after it is placed in the code, as to what the standard is. I believe such kind of draftsmanship, to say the least, is objectionable and should not be included in a measure of such widespread application as this measure is.

I do not rest my case upon that allegation or upon that fact—and there is no doubt that it is a fact—but also upon the fact that many States have such high limits that they could never be reached by other States. That would mean that the standard of roads constructed under the 90–10-percent financing in the States that have the high limits, would necessarily be higher, and they would get greater contributions from the Federal Government, and there would never be any uniformity possible under the bill as it is now drawn as between the several States of the Union.

There is no doubt about that. I have before me a copy of a table printed at page 6797 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 23. The table shows what the facts are in the various States of the Union. It appears, for instance, that the uniform standards set by the order of AASHO, which is not set forth in the bill except by reference, are 18,000 pounds for a single axle load, 32,000 pounds for a tandem load, 26,000 for 2-axle trucks, and practical combinations of a maximum of 71,900.

By the way, those limits happen to be almost identical with the provisions in my own State, and, in fact, with the provisions of several other States. There are, nevertheless, States in which such limits as these are found not to apply. In the good State of Michigan, so ably represented by my friend the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and his colleague, the load limit is 102,000 pounds, or substantially half again as large as the load limit which is allowed in many States of the Nation, on the basis of which the standard of roads to be constructed would be designed. In the State of Rhode Island, for instance—and I am glad to see the distinguished Senators of that State on the floor—the limit is 108,800, as contrasted with the 71,900 pounds which would be permitted in the case of any State whose present limit is well below that. There are a great many States whose limit is below the standard set up by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

It is admitted—and there is no doubt about it, because the record, as submitted by the sponsors of the bill, so shows—that this provision is inadequate to serve the purpose it seeks to accomplish; that it is unfair and nonuniform, and that it applies different standards in different States. Therefore, it leaves some States, which are supposed to be cooperating with the Federal Government in spending Federal money on substantial terms of equality, on a basis far from uniform and far from constituting equality before the law.

Instead of having a provision which looks to some time in the future when standards will be prescribed, this provision has now been amended so as to apply permanently until repealed or amended by the Congress.

If there is any uniformity or fairness in that kind of an approach, I do not know what it can be.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the provision in the bill went into the bill by unanimous rollcall vote in the Public Works Committee. After careful consideration, after looking at the moving picture of the Maryland road tests, and after careful examination, the committee concluded that a mild encouragement to the States to maintain reasonable limitations on weights and sizes of vehicles was necessary to protect the taxpayers' investment in this magnificent system of national highways which this program will inaugurate and, we hope, complete. It is true, as the able senior Senator from Florida says, that this amendment would not force back regulations of those States which have limits above the standards recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads. We considered that, and finally concluded that we did not want to report to the Senate a repressive measure. Neither did we want to throw any impediment against any State raising its limitations up to the standards recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads and State highway officials. But, Mr. President, unless there is a stopping place somewhere, sometime, somehow, in the weight, the width, and the length of vehicles on our highways, the taxpayers can never catch up. They cannot provide sufficient funds to keep ahead of the ability of our engineers to build axles to carry heavier loads.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. In one moment.

The committee feels that it has recommended a very mild and very reasonable provision. Lest someone think this is a provision dealing antagonistically with the motor vehicle transportation industry, let me say that I am involved in that industry in a small way. The real long-term interest of trucking, of bus operation, and of motor vehicle transportation is first in a system of good, durable highways, and second, in some uniformity in weight, so that one can travel with his load from one State to another.

The committee thinks this provision will encourage such uniformity.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Does not the Senator trust the States of this Union to have any judgment or any commonsense whatsoever?

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator would not, upon second thought, make that inquiry of me. Of course, I trust them to have not only some commonsense, but I trust them completely.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield further, I am quite certain——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THYE. I am certain the Senator will agree with me that the commissioners of highways in the respective States know the soil conditions, the frost conditions, and all the hazards to which a highway is subjected in the thawing and freezing season of the year, and that it may very well be found that it will be wise not to prescribe a certain standard which would not be applicable in dry, sandy subsoil conditions which may be found in many areas in the extreme Southwest. I recognize that this is one of the fundamental principles of the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and that is one of the reasons why I thought the bill should be recommitted in order that we might take the good out of the Senator's bill and the good out of the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania and put them together.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator's statement with the exception of the very last part. We are undertaking to follow the recommendations of the highway commissioners, not to go contrary to them. We do not force any State to accept these funds. The amendment merely provides that in order to safeguard the people's investment we attach this condition to the 90-percent principal investment bonds, if the States maintain either their present limits or the limits recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials, whichever is the greater. The committee voted for it

unanimously, and I ask the Senator to support it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the Senator from Tennessee 1 minute.

Mr. KERR. Do I correctly understand that the amendment of the language as it is now contained in the bill is to validate the weights and other specifications in the laws of the various States if those laws have been passed by the legislatures prior to July 1, 1955?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. The committee adopted an amendment last evening on account of the action of the Legislatures of North Dakota and Montana.

Mr. KERR. I think Indiana is in the same position.

Mr. GORE. If any State has a particular situation, the committee will undertake in conference to adjust it equitably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired. The Chair would suggest that the opponents of the amendment speak on their own time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what I have to say I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point in the form of a written statement. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON SECTION 2 (D) OF HIGHWAY BILL, S. 1048—WEIGHTS AND DIMENSIONS OF TRUCKS, TRAILERS, AND BUSES

I am very much concerned over the implications of section 2 (d) of this bill (S. 1048). As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, I am deeply interested in the development of a transcontinental and regional system of transportation in all of the States, that will do the best possible job for the American people. Any restrictive provision of any legislation, which tends to mitigate against achievement of this objective, I feel I would necessarily have to oppose.

As written, I think section 2 (d) comes in that category. Section 2 (d) sets forth criteria on the weights and dimensions of vehicles using the interstate highway system.

Section 2 (e), on the other hand, directs the Secretary of Commerce to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests—now being conducted by the Highway Research Board and the Bureau of Public Roads—for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal system and to make recommendations to Congress.

So we have one provision freezing the weights and size and another provision directing that they be tested and determined. I am particularly concerned with the effect of this section upon the West. It is well known that the 11 Western States do not operate upon the standard provisions of the American Association of State Highway Officials, but operate upon a different and more liberal version thereof, subscribed by the Western Association of State Officials. Vehicles in the West are generally longer and allow greater permissible weight, but have lower axle loads.

Among the questions unanswered by this provision will be: "What about the provision of law which authorized administrators in the West to deviate from certain standards with relation to certain highways and with relation to certain products—mining, agriculture, logging, etc.?"

For example, in my own State logging operators on highways designated by the highway department are allowed a 10-percent tolerance. Would section 2 (d) prevent my State from receiving matching funds, or would it force the highway department to eliminate tolerance authorized by law but administratively determined?

This single example illustrates the complexity of this problem and the maze we are getting into when we attempt to settle this question now—before the study called for in section 2 (e) has been completed.

It is possible that the Congress may wish at some future date to adopt standards on weights and dimensions. That, however, should be done only after every facet of the problem has been considered. In the meantime, I think we should leave the problem where it has always been—namely, with the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the fine work he has done on this bill. I agree with everything in the bill except the particular section to which reference has been made. I object to it because I do not believe that we should look into almanacs and similar publications to find out what is the law of the land. This particular section does not specify the maximum weights in the second subsection, but it leaves it to an almanac or a pamphlet or some such thing published by a voluntary association known as the American Association of State Highway Officials. I think the law of the land should be published in law books, not in pamphlets issued by a voluntary association.

If the bill should pass in its present form containing this subsection, no one could look in the United States Code and find out what the law is on this subsection. He would have to look into a pamphlet published by some voluntary association.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Florida. I think the laws of the land should be published in law books, and not in almanacs and pamphlets.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The committee considered that point. The question was raised as to whether the reference to this document published by the State officials, and in which the Bureau of Public Roads participated, was sufficiently and legally identified.

We referred the question overnight to Mr. Simms, the legislative counsel to the Senate. He advised us that this was sufficient identity. I have again discussed the question with Mr. Simms, and he has advised, upon further consideration, that this is sufficient legal identity.

Mr. ERVIN. I do not have any doubt about that. I think Congress can pass an act and can say that the law will be found in the second paragraph on page 16 of Blum's Almanac, and that would be sufficient reference. But I think it would be a very poor way to legislate to say that the law of the land cannot be found in the lawbooks.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I think the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida is sound and should be adopted. If it is not adopted, we shall be acting upon a bill which contains a provision which is not only dangerous, but absolutely destroys the rights of State to jurisdiction over the type of axle, weight, and length of vehicles which will be permitted on the highways that are located within the States. For that reason, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee for clarification. In the section now being discussed under the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, do item 1, line 16, and item 2, line 20, provide that both those conditions must be met, or is it intended that if a State does not have standards up to those of the American Association of State Highway Officials it would not be excluded from the funds under item 1?

Mr. GORE. The two operate together; and only the greater of the two would apply.

So, to answer the Senator's question categorically, any State which has limitations below the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Bureau of Public Roads—by which standards, incidentally, the highways are to be constructed—can raise its limits to those standards.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Even after May 1, 1955?

Mr. GORE. Even after July 1, 1955. That date has been changed. Does the Senator mean whether it can be raised at any time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the interpretation and the exact meaning of this provision is that in a State where the standards are not up to those of the American Association of State Highway Officials, according to the document referred to, the legislature may change those standards up to that point within 2 years.

Mr. GORE. Or 5 years from now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in the meantime it would not be restricted by the terms of the bill?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason why I asked the question was that at the last session of the Minnesota Legislature a bill was introduced providing standards which would have met those of the American Association of State Highway Officials, but the bill was defeated in the State senate by two votes. It passed the State house of representatives.

If a bill were introduced at the next session of the Minnesota Legislature, which provided dimensions and weights according to the standards approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials, then the provisions in section (d) would not in any way limit the funds coming to the State. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. They would not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield a minute to me in order that I may ask a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there anything in the section which is now sought to be amended which hereafter would prevent a State legislature from raising or lowering the standards, if it saw fit to do so?

Mr. GORE. So long as it did not raise them above either of the two criteria, whichever is greater: First, that limit prescribed by the present State law, if such limit is above the standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials or, second, up to those standards, in the event the State's limitations are below those standards.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, a State can raise its standards up to the level of those approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials; and if the State's standards are higher, the State can lower them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

On the question just asked by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky, I should like to advise him that the table placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Tennessee shows that the present weight limit in Kentucky is 42,000 pounds. It shows the standards approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials as 71,900 pounds.

The table also shows that 18 States have standards above 71,900 pounds, some of them going as high as 102,000 and 108,800 pounds.

Under the proposed legislation, Kentucky would be free at a subsequent time to raise its weight limit to 71,900 pounds, but it could not raise the limit to any higher figure, or between that figure and the maximum figure of 108,800 which is already the legal weight in one of the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. If up to now Kentucky has not raised its weight limit above 41,000 pounds, it is not likely that it will want to raise it above 71,000 pounds in the immediate future.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has a good point. The only point I am making is that an opportunity which is allowed to 18 States to have limits well above that figure—and some of them are very high above that figure—is denied to all the States whose weight limits are below that figure. If that be uniformity, I do not know the meaning of the word.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida refer to the table and tell me what the weight limit is in Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. In Minnesota, the present weight limit, according to the table, is 65,500 pounds, which is below the weight limit approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials, which is 71,000 pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the table show the trailer length for Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, all the lengths are shown.

In Minnesota, the width is 96 inches. That is the same width as recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials. The height is also the same—12 feet 6 inches.

The length limit in Minnesota is shorter, namely, 55 feet; whereas the length approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials is 60 feet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Florida that Minnesota subsequently could revise those dimensions to be in accordance with the standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct, up to the 60-foot length, which is the only item of measurement as to which there is any difference in the dimensions; and up to the load weight of 71,900 pounds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment I offered this morning was to protect the equipment of the trucking industry from becoming obsolete. The amendment will do that.

The movement in the States is toward restriction by their own legislation, in keeping with the formula which has been worked out by State road commissioners and Federal road officials.

We are really protecting the rights of the States in this matter, in that we are giving them an opportunity and the time in which to pass such legislation.

Lastly, if the Senate does away with my amendment, which was agreed to this morning—and that is what the Senate will do if it agrees to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida—the sky will be the limit. We will be playing right into the hands of the trucking forces that do not want a limit.

The Senator from Tennessee, himself a trucker, owning, as he pointed out yesterday, an interest in a trucking company, and other very responsible truckers have told me that the amendment I offered this morning—in fact, they prepared it for me—will do them justice, in that it will protect them from the danger of obsolescence of their equipment. They believe the amendment will be satisfactory.

Other trucking interests would like to make the sky the limit, if they could get by with it.

I believe the whole situation has been clarified along the lines which the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out. I think we ought to let well enough alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I observe that the Senate is ready to vote on the amendment. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair) subsequently said:

The Chair would like to return to an earlier precedent, which has not been followed in recent years, and announce that on the division requested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], there were 24 yeas and 28 nays.

The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which I should like to have read. I do not care to have it voted on. I should like to have it appear in the RECORD, and then I shall yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do want the Senate to know what the amendment proposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 5, line 14, to strike out the period and the remainder of lines 14 and 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "; and for each of the succeeding 5 fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the sum of $2,000,000,000. The sum herein authorized for each of the first 3 fiscal years shall be apportioned"; and in line 23, after the colon, to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and the 6 succeeding fiscal years the sum herein authorized shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the ratio which the cost of completing the uncompleted portion of the national system of interstate highways in such States bears to the cost of completing the uncompleted portion of the entire national system of interstate highways."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the adoption of such an amendment would establish a 10-year authorization for interstate highways, with the last 6 years at the $2 billion level.

The second part of the amendment would provide, after the third year, that the apportionment among the States

should reflect the cost of incompleted portions in exact ratio for every State. So that the adoption of the amendment would provide a completed 10-year program.

I realize that under prevailing conditions the amendment would not be adopted. I therefore withdraw my amendment, so that it will not be necessary to have a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Who yields time to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it may take me a little longer than that.

Section 2 (d) of the bill reads:

(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955.

The State of Indiana enacted some laws during the last session of the legislature, which adjourned about March 1, but, under Indiana law, the laws will not become effective until they are published, which will be, I think, about the 1st of July or the 1st of August. My question is, Does the date of May 1, 1955, apply to when a legislature enacted a law or when the law becomes effective?

Mr. GORE. The May 1 date has already been changed by amendment to July 1. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that in the event the law of his State does not become effective until July 15 or August 1 or some such date, the committee in conference will be very considerate in trying to meet that condition.

Mr. CAPEHART. And will change the date which was May 1, and is now July 1, 1955, to, say, August 1, 1955, if the law which the Indiana Legislature enacted does not become effective until then?

Mr. GORE. We shall endeavor to deal equitably with Indiana's situation and endeavor to give due consideration to its problems.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared which contains the language of an amendment I had intended to propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

The Senate Committee on Public Works on May 13, 1955, reported out S. 1048, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. The bill provides, among other matters, that Federal funds be withheld from States that increase size and weight limits beyond those in effect May 1, 1955. Specifically, section 2 (d) of the bill reads as follows:

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled "Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States,' and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions."

The quoted section poses serious questions.

Among the principal ones are those relating to the establishment of the May 1, 1955, deadline. Are the States the legislatures of which before the deadline date enacted laws providing increased size and weight limits which, however, do not become effective until after the deadline date to be deprived of Federal funds? Must the legislatures of these States repeal the laws for the States to qualify for the grant of Federal funds?

Are the States the legislatures of which are presently in session and considering such legislation to be deprived of the opportunity to revise their size and weight limits lest they be deprived of Federal funds?

Other questions arise from the ambiguity of section 2 (d). Are States that have had no laws limiting the size and weight of motor vehicles required to impose the AASHO limits to assure their receiving Federal funds, although they have permitted the operation over their roads of vehicles exceeding the AASHO limits?

Are States that have based their weight limits on axle loads alone required to impose the AASHO limits on gross weight to assure their receiving Federal funds, although they have permitted the operation over their roads of vehicles exceeding the AASHO gross-weight limits?

Are States that have provided length limits on trucks and combinations alone required to impose the AASHO length limit for truck-tractors and semitrailers to assure their receiving Federal funds, although they have permitted the operation over their roads of truck-tractors and semitrailers of length prescribed as the maximum for combinations?

Are the States having laws permitting the designation of highways on which the maximum weight limits shall be greater than those applicable on the remaining roads to limit vehicle weights to those generally applicable to assure their receiving Federal funds? Would the situation vary, depending on whether highways providing for greater weight limits actually have been designated?

Are the size and weight limits to be followed by the States seeking to comply with the law to be computed with or without the tolerances that have been permitted by the States? Would the situation vary depending on whether the tolerances were authorized by legislation, regulation, or administrative discretion?

Are the size and weight limits to be followed by the States seeking to comply with the law to take into consideration permits authorizing departures from established allowances? Would the situation vary depending on whether the permits were authorized by legislation, regulation, or administrative discretions?

Are States that heretofore have allowed only single- or double-unit combinations limited thereto to assure their receiving Federal funds since the AASHO Code makes no provision for three-unit combinations?

These are serious questions and the proposal needs to be amended as shown below to carry out the intent of the proposal, i. e., to assure the States that they would be permitted without penalty to continue allowing combinations, dimensions, and weights which they were allowing as of the effective date, and to assure the States of the right to proceed with changes already made or in the process of being made during the 1955 sessions of the State legislatures.

Amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, viz: Strike section 2 (d) of the bill as reported and substitute in lieu thereof as follows:

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the national system of interstate highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum permissible corresponding dimensions or maximum permissible corresponding gross and/or axle weights applicable on July 1, 1956, to vehicles lawfully using any of the public highways of such State, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled 'Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States,' and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be operated lawfully within such State on July 1, 1956."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The question has been asked if the provision was not such that it would invalidate a law when passed prior to July 1, 1955.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Indiana was not present on the floor at that time, I believe.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show my opposition to Senate bill 1048. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

S. 1048 proposes to spend a total of $12¼ billion over a period of about 7 years in which revenue from gasoline taxes will total approximately $8.4 billion.

The highway program contemplated by Senate bill 1048 contemplates deficit spending of at least $4½ billion over a 7-year period, or an average of approximately $640 million a year.

In the latter years of the program, beginning with 1960, the annual deficits will exceed a billion dollars a year in terms of Federal gasoline tax collections.

I cannot support the highway program built on such a wide divergence between cost and user taxes.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 1048), as amended, was passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTIONS 452 AND 462 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is planned to move to proceed to the consideration of a bill which has been reported from the Committee on Finance, repealing sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the so-called "blooper" bill, Calendar No. 376, H. R. 4725. After the morning hour tomorrow, the Senate will discuss it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4725.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say that the bill was reported from the committee unanimously. For the information of the Senate, I do not anticipate, although I cannot give any assurance, that there will be any yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW AND REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a further announcement. There has also been reported from the Finance Committee another bill, the number of which I do not have available, which may be called up for consideration.

I wish to call attention to the possibility of having the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following bills:

Calendar No. 365, S. 1775, reported by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

Calendar No. 366, H. R. 103, to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies.

Calendar No. 367, S. 180, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma.

Calendar No. 368, S. 1464, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber-access roads.

Calendar No. 369, S. 1747, to increase the public benefits from the National park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 370, S. 1138, to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority.

Calendar No. 371, H. R. 3885, to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts.

Calendar No. 372, S. 1718, to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954.

Calendar No. 373, S. 55, to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Cocconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 374, S. 516, to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters;

Calendar No. 376, H. R. 4725, to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which is the unfinished business;

Calendar No. 377, S. 76, a bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 378, Senate Joint Resolution 6, to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area;

And Calendar No. 379, S. 34, providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona for certain purposes.

I should say, for the information of the Senate, that, so far as I know, there is no controversy involved in any of those bills. The minority leader has cleared each of them, and the majority policy staff has reviewed them. I wish to be in a position to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of those measures on either Thursday or Friday.

There will be a session on Friday, although I do not anticipate any yea-and-nay votes. I shall do all I can to discourage them, and hope there will not be any, but I cannot guarantee that a Senator will not exercise his right.

When the Senate recesses on Friday, it is planned to recess until Tuesday. It is possible that on Friday the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill for the State Department, if that is agreeable. It may be we shall take it up on Tuesday. It is possible that we shall take up the mutual-security bill on either Tuesday or Wednesday, depending on arrangements yet to be worked out with the Armed Services Committee.

I do not expect there will be any controversial measures before the Senate on either Thursday, Friday, or Tuesday—that is to say, I do not expect that there will be yea-and-nay votes or heated fights, or what might be called partisan controversies.

I desired to have all Senators in possession of this information, so they could make their plans accordingly.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Members of the Senate who desire to address the Senate at this time, then, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

John B. Hollister, of Ohio, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Francis A. Flood, of California.
Franklin C. Gowen, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.
Joseph B. Costanzo, of New York.
Theodore J. Hadraba, of Nebraska.
Eric Kocher, of California.
David M. Maynard, of California.
John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia.
Sheldon Thomas, of New York.
Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.
William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as Foreign Service officer of class 1, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.
Orville C. Anderson, of California, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 3 to class 2.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia.
Robert J. Ryan, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Webster E. Ballance, of Illinois.
Emerson I. Brown, of Ohio.
Peter H. Delaney, of New York.
David M. French, of Maryland.
Richard Funkhouser, of California.
Raymond L. Harrell, of Connecticut.
L. Wendell Hayes, of Iowa.
Ralph H. Hunt, of Massachusetts.
M. Hollis Kannenberg, of Minnesota.
Miss Carol C. Laise, of West Virginia.
Abram E. Manell, of California.
Mervyn V. Pallister, of Michigan.
Alex T. Prengel, of Wisconsin.
Loch Shumaker, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James W. Boyd, of North Carolina.
Paul R. S. Brumby, of Missouri.
Douglas W. Coster, of Virginia.
Edward J. Dembski, of Colorado.
George H. Haselton, of the District of Columbia.
Arnlioth G. Heltberg, of California.
Thomas G. Karis, of Virginia.
Verne L. Larson, of North Dakota.
Mason A. La Selle, of Colorado.
Harry M. Lofton, of South Carolina.
Miss Juliet M. Lohr, of the District of Columbia.
James P. Parker, of Connecticut.
Albert L. Seligmann, of Virginia.
Robert W. Wagner, of Michigan.
Thurston Francis Waterman, of the District of Columbia.
David B. Wharton, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Ernest B. Gutierrez, of New Mexico.
Karl E. Sommerlatte, of Florida.
Gerald Goldstein, of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert A. Bishton, of Maryland.
Robert V. Carey, of Colorado.
Miss Ann Child, of California.
Mrs. Anne P. Comanduras, of Virginia.
Miss Marian C. Conroy, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur R. Dornheim, of Maryland.
Richard E. Dove, of Maryland.
Theodore R. Frye, of Ohio.
James A. Howell, of Texas.
Miss Virginia L. King, of Nebraska.
C. Thomas Mayfield, of Wisconsin.
Marshall Hays Noble, of New York.
Aloysius J. Warnecki, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joel W. Biller, of Wisconsin.
A. Dane Bowen, Jr., of Texas.
Byron E. Byron, of California.
Harry W. Cladouhos, of Montana.
C. Edward Dillery, of Washington.
Herbert Engelhardt, of New Jersey.
William P. Horan, Jr., of Minnesota.
Roger Kirk, of the District of Columbia.
Grover W. Penberthy, of Oregon.
Samuel G. Wise, Jr., of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Philbert Deyman, of Minnesota.
William M. Hart, of North Carolina.
Herbert N. Higgins, of Texas.
Herman Lindstrom, of California.
Herbert T. Schuelke, of Colorado.
Paul C. Sherbert, of California.
Samuel H. Young, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Lawrence G. Leisersohn, of the District of Columbia.
Francis J. McArdle, of New York.
Arthur Z. Gardiner, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Rear Adm. Arleigh Albert Burke, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 2 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry J. Cook, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, for the term of 4 years, vice Edwin R. Denney, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining, 10A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for reappointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general, for a period of 2 years ending June 30, 1957, under the provisions of section 202 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951.

IN THE NAVY

Stephen W. Reszetar, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

H. Lee Boatwright III
Trentwell M. White, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Courtland D. Ball III
Ivey B. Holt, Jr.
Ralph E. Platt
Rolland K. Shea
Harry A. Wilson

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard J. Kester
Billy P. Sammons

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Virgil L. Galey
Leon G. Saylor, Jr.

Richard F. Wicker, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Morton S. Howell to the be postmaster at Broadway, in the State of New Jersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, grant that now, through the way of prayer, our souls may ascend the mountain peak of a larger outlook and enter the zone of lofty vision and understanding.

We humbly acknowledge that humanity, with its bruised and broken heart, its gropings and confused searchings, its weakness and weariness, its fears and failures, has no one to go to except unto Thee.

Inspire us to stand in the noble tradition of those who never lost heart or hope when twilight and darkness descended upon them but held on to the promises and prophecies of a new and better day with unwearied patience and increasing tenacity.

Help us to face life with gladness and good cheer, saying to ourselves, "I am

not afraid of tomorrow for I have seen yesterday and I love today."

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A mesage from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," returned by the President of the United States to the Senate, in which it originated, with his objections, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 727) entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJUSTING SALARIES OF THE JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, with House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, HARRIS, ABERNETHY, SIMPSON of Illinois, and O'HARA of Minnesota.

NATIONAL SANITATION WEEK

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Sanitarians has suggested that Congress set aside 1 week each year to be called National Sanitation Week. This week is to be used to express appreciation of the work of our sanitary experts and to emphasize the importance of the program for our benefit which they promote. Floyd M. Miller, a resident of Shreveport, La., is doing a splendid job at the helm of this nationwide organization in calling attention to the work of the sanitarians.

During and since World War II, many of our young people have had occasion to travel to distant parts of the world. The one thing which impresses all of them as much as anything else is the superior method of sanitation in America. Whether we dwell in the great cities, towns, or small villages, we find that we have a land which is clean and wholesome. Epidemics and catastrophes such as the great plagues in Europe in the Middle Ages are matters of history because of our present, modern methods of sanitation.

These people who do such a great work, sometimes entirely unnoticed and unacclaimed, should properly be the object of our appreciation 1 week each year. I endorse the idea of a National Sanitation Week, and I commend it to the consideration of the Congress.

LET US ACKNOWLEDGE GOD IN OUR CONSTITUTION

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, about 1 year ago both Houses of Congress voted unanimously to place "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. Shortly before that we voted unanimously to have a Prayer Room in our National Capitol, and that room is now complete. Plans are under way to have stamped on our currency "In God We Trust." Many of our postage stamps are now having "In God We Trust' imprinted on them. But there is no acknowledgement of the Supreme Being in our Constitution.

Our Nation needs an anchor. "We the people" cannot lift ourselves by our own bootstraps, yet "We the people" are are highest authority acknowledged in our Federal Constitution. There is an answer for communism and all our other moral and spiritual problems, and that answer is God. Our forefathers also believed that God was the answer.

For example, the Mayflower Compact contained the following:

In the name of God, Amen. We, . . . having undertaken for the glory of God, and the advancement of the Christian faith . . . do by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic. . . .

Then, in 1643, the Articles of Confederation said in part:

Whereas we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end and aim, namely, to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to enjoy the liberties of the gospel in purity and in peace.

Not only did the early settlers of America put God first and foremost, but the Supreme Court of the United States as late as 1892 recognized our faith in God. In the case of *The Church of the Holy Trinity* v. *The United States* (143 U. S. 457, 471), the Court said:

These and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances to show that this is a Christian nation.

Since it is God who has made and preserved us as a nation can we do less than acknowledge our Maker in the Constitution of our land. "Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord"—Psalms 33: 12.

Today, I have introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to give due recognition to Almighty God.

The resolution follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgement of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

AMERICAN MILITARY PERSONNEL HELD BY CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Nation's citizens will pause, and properly so, to do honor and homage to those who fought and died that this Republic might live.

But what of the living dead—those Americans who offered their lives in the service of their country and who, in

flagrant violation of the Korean armistice terms and common decency, are held as prisoners of war by the Chinese Communists?

For these Americans, long and weary months are slowly turning into years of hopelessness.

It is said that certain officials of the United Nations will report late this week on results of the mission that was carried out 5 months ago to obtain release of these Americans.

Let there be no weaseling in this report. Let it be stated in clear language that the United Nations can enforce the terms of its armistice, or that it cannot restore hope to these, the living dead.

Any other report will be a travesty in conjunction with observance of this Memorial Day.

RETIREMENT OF GENERAL CHIDLAW

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Post of this morning there is a statement on the retirement of a great distinguished American general, General Chidlaw, of the Continental Defense Command. What I say has no reflection upon General Chidlaw. I admire him a great deal, but I notice the retirement of these Regular Army officers, generals, and admirals, in their early fifties. Now, if I told most of you Members out there that you should retire at the age of 52, I would get myself a good punch in the nose. I would like the Committee on Armed Services to examine again this business of the permissive retirement of these great and trained and skilled generals and flag officers at the age of 52 and 53 years. Certainly, when a Congressman can retire for a pension at 60 after 10 years, there should be a very important reexamination of this voluntary retirement or permissive retirement of distinguished and able leaders, with the consequent loss of the great service they can perform in important areas to the armed services at such an age. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, a great leader on the Committee on Armed Services, that we should reexamine, and very soon, this very, very important problem.

WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 244 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission established by Public Law 37, 77th Congress, with a view to ascertaining when it may be expected that the bridge and approaches thereto operated by such commission near New Harmony, Ind., will become free of tolls, and what money has been received, and what expenditures have been made, by such commission since its establishment in 1941.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Allen, Calif.	Flynt	Mumma
Arends	Garmatz	Nelson
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gray	Phillips
	Green, Pa.	Pillion
Bonner	Gwinn	Powell
Byrd	Halleck	Preston
Byrnes, Wis	Herlong	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Rhodes, Pa.
Colmer	Hope	Rivers
Curtis, Mo	James	Robsion, Ky.
Derounian	Jenkins	Short
Dingell	Jones, Mo.	Shuford
Dodd	Kearney	Smith, Va.
Dolliver, Iowa	Lanham	Taylor
Dorn, S. C.	McDowell	Teague, Tex.
Eberharter	Mason	Tollefson
Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Fjare	Moulder	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-eight Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 310, making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Public Law —" and insert "Public Law 41."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, there is nothing to this amendment except to insert the number of the public law.

Mr. CANNON. It is the correction of a mere typographical nature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. METCALF) was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements made by Members of Congress since April 12 on the subject of the Salk vaccine. This is certainly understandable, for the well-being of our children is at stake, and we have nothing more precious than that. The statements have been varied, from the most laudatory praise for Dr. Salk, to extreme criticism of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There

has been, too, a reflection of the confusion surrounding the vaccine's distribution and manufacture for the past 6 weeks.

No matter what the alibis and explanations that have been given, this confusion is an inescapable fact, and, in my opinion, could have been largely avoided if the Department and the administration had shown the proper leadership and taken the necessary steps to form a plan before the release of the vaccine, which had been expected for some time.

Evidently, according to Secretary Hobby, plans were commenced, for the most part, after April 12, and the problems of manufacture and distribution were met as they arose. This was gross neglect of responsibility by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For example, on April 12, 9 days after the announcement of the vaccine's effectiveness by Dr. Francis at Ann Arbor, the Secretary, for the first time, met with the manufacturers to discuss the amount they expected to produce. This should certainly have been done before April 12.

By April 21, although the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis had contracted for all of the first supplies of the vaccine to carry out its planned innoculations of all 1st- and 2d-grade pupils, about 650,000 cubic centimeters of the valuable serum had been released to commercial channels. According to reports, some of this serum even found its way into the arms of adults.

Because of the failure of the administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to meet the situation, many Members of the House have felt it necessary to introduce bills providing for Federal regulation of the manufacture and distribution of the vaccine. These have been referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am privileged to be a member.

The administration and Mrs. Hobby have backed voluntary programs. Dr. Francis and Dr. Salk, however, have stated that they feel some control is necessary. They point out the difficulties a doctor would have in refusing to give the serum to a patient who was susceptible to polio but not in the highest priority age bracket, unless a firm Government policy were in effect.

I, personally, feel that we must provide a means of control that will assure the most equitable distribution of the vaccine while it is still in short supply. As my colleagues have pointed out before, this vaccine is rightfully a possession of the people of the United States because of their contributions to the March of Dimes over the years. While I have the greatest confidence that the majority of our citizens, doctors and laymen alike, will follow the system of priorities that has at last been presented by Mrs. Hobby, I do feel that we must not fail to provide for a method of controlling any abuses that might develop.

However, I am primarily concerned, not with the emergency legislation, as important as it may be, but with the future protection of our Nation's health. At the present time our medical knowledge is expanding at an ever-increasing pace. Fifty percent of the drugs now in use were not heard of 15 years ago. Undoubtedly, 15 years from now, we will have available cures and preventative methods that might now seem fantastic. We must see to it that these modern miracles are aided in every possible way, and that the newly discovered products reach the public in the safest, yet speediest, manner.

The present administration has not concentrated enough of its efforts in the field of health. The President's budget for 1956 falls short of what the Nation's health demands. He asks, this year, for an increase of less than 10 percent over last year's appropriation for the work of the National Institutes of Health. The Food and Drug Administration, which has the final authority to see that our drugs and vaccines, such as the Salk vaccine, are potent yet safe, has been receiving steadily less money.

Last fall, on Meet the Press, Mrs. Hobby was asked how the budget figures were determined for the various fields of the Public Health Service. She stated that she took the advice of the advisory councils of each of the Institutes. This was not previously true. Since then the councils have prepared budget figures which are being brought to the current Senate hearings on the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These have coincided with the citizens' budget figures which have been presented and in all cases have been substantially higher than the Bureau of the Budget's figures.

The President's health message of last year called for a strengthening of the National Institutes of Health in the Public Health Service which are concerned with the very real menaces of heart disease and cancer. These were not even mentioned in this year's message, although the National Advisory Heart Council has supported the increase asked for in the citizens' budget of $4,350,000 over the Department's budget request. The situation in the Cancer Institute is the same, with a request for $4,245,000. The Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases has requested $4,060,000 over and above the President's budget request.

We have on our books the necessary legislation to control the safety and potency of our drugs. The Pure Food and Drug Act vests in the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the power to check on the manufacture of everything that is intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease. The biologic control provisions of the Public Health Service Act, as the Secretary pointed out in her report to the President, May 16, further provides for Federal control to insure the safety, purity, and potency of biologics, such as the Salk vaccine.

It would be very interesting to know to what extent, if any, the Public Health Service was unable to thoroughly check on the Salk vaccine manufactured before it was released. There is now a costly and time-consuming recheck of the vaccine in process for which Mrs. Hobby has requested $1,200,000 in emergency funds. If not granted, important research into other communicable diseases may be temporarily halted, or checks by the Food and Drug Administration of other potentially dangerous products may be made impossible. But, too often, emergency legislation is like shutting the barn door after the horse has fled.

We have a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan ahead, and to prevent, as far as is humanly possible, the need for emergency action. We have the necessary legislation to deal with the problems which arise in the fields of health; what we need is more thorough implementation of the laws we now have.

Further proof that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been remiss in its duty lies in the handling, or mishandling, of the question of how best to insure that all of our children, regardless of their ability to pay, received the Salk vaccine. On May 17, the administration did submit a bill asking for $28 million to be distributed to the States on the basis of the per capita income of the States and the number of children in the State. This would give the poorer States more money with which to innoculate those unable to pay.

But what was the position of the Department only a short time ago? On April 27, at a meeting of 50 national organizations interested in the most equitable distribution of the Salk vaccine, Dr. Otis Anderson, an officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, claimed that no additional funds would be needed to assist local public health services in making sure that the vaccine reached all children, because the States would provide for this. But on April 29, 2 days later, Dr. Scheele named only 12 States that had made funds available for free innoculations.

If the quality controls for the vaccine had not broken down, by this time we supposedly would have had vaccine for several million children outside the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis program of free innoculation for all first and second graders. Was the administration, with its advocacy of free enterprise, planning to see those innoculated first who could pay, or those who were in the most susceptible age groups?

There is, then, a lesson we can learn from all the chaos that has surrounded the introduction of the Salk vaccine. We must have adequate financial support to implement the laws, now on our books, which protect the public health. In the future, we must not forget this lesson. We must vote the necessary funds for medical research and for the inspection of the manufacture of our medicines and drugs, in spite of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if necessary.

I should like to make one last suggestion for your consideration. The Hoover Commission has suggested a separate Department of Health. Certainly, we all agree that medical knowledge is not easily come by. One does not pick it up

in a short time, no matter how dedicated the effort to do so. Medicine is highly technical and becoming more so. Mrs. Hobby is distracted by the need to study education and welfare, also. These are certainly not minor fields in themselves. Perhaps we should give some thought to whether the United States should not create a separate department concerned only with health. In that way, perhaps, we might make possible a more vigorous leadership in the field of our Nation's health.

WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution is a rather unusual one reported by the Rules Committee. Since I have been a Member of Congress, I do not recall any similar type of resolution that called for this sort of an investigation.

About 15 years ago the Congress authorized legislation to create a commission to erect a bridge between Indiana and Illinois to be known as the White County Bridge Commission and gave that commission authority to buy and to operate a toll bridge and ferry over the Wabash River between New Harmony, Ind., and White County, Ill., and that the same be purchased and financed by bonds.

Here a most remarkable thing about the bridge commission that was created by Congress in 1941 was that it overlooked to provide any regulations as to public governmental auditing or checking the toll intake and the financing of this bridge. During the past 14 years almost $3 million have been taken in tolls from this bridge. The bridge itself cost a little over $500,000. As I say, during all of this interim the people of southern Indiana and the people of southern Illinois have not been able to ascertain what the financial situation of this bridge commission really is. The public only received audits from a private accountant.

There seems to be a group operating this bridge commission that desires to keep everyone in the dark. Nobody has ever been able to determine, as far as I know, a neutral accounting on the finances of this bridge.

There was over $945,000 issued in bonds and, as I say, the bridge only cost a little over $500,000. There has been over $3 million taken in in tolls in the last 14 years. The reason for this resolution is that the people of southern Indiana and the people of southern Illinois have been demanding some kind of an audit and some kind of an investigation as to what has happened to the money that has been taken in by the manager and his assistants in connection with this bridge over the Wabash River.

The complexity of the whole financial operation of the conduct of this bridge operation seems to lie in the fact that when sufficient money was in the Treasury to pay off the bonds and to make it a free bridge back over the years, they always had some kind of a project to develop on the river. The river development is solely the duty of the Army engineers, as I understand it, instead of using the money from this toll bridge. These unnecessary expenditures merely postpone the day when this bridge will become a free bridge.

Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable thing that immediately after our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] filed a resolution to investigate the finances of this bridge, all of a sudden, the management declared in a month or two it is going to be a free bridge. They do not want any investigation.

I think it is the duty of the Congress to investigate where all this money has been going. I do not think that our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] or anybody else is accusing anybody of not handling the bridge financing honestly, but I think the people of Indiana and Illinois are entitled to know where every dollar of this money has gone in the last 15 years. Although we now find that we are going to get a free bridge out there, we do want to know what has happened to these millions of dollars that have been taken in at the rate of about $20,000 a month in tolls.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is important opposition to this resolution, because I do not know of anybody in southern Indiana and Illinois who has gone over this bridge for the last 15 years, paying these tolls, who does not want to know what has happened to this money.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman pardon me? He will have time later on. Please allow me to complete my remarks. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] does not give the gentleman any time, I will. If he wishes to ask a question, I will be glad to answer it, if I can.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows whether or not the people who appeared before the Committee on Rules ever went to the White County Bridge Commission and asked to see any records. They have the records there, and they are open to the public, under the law, every month and every year.

Mr. MADDEN. My colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] made an investigation of this situation at the demand of most of the people in southern Indiana, and a great many people in southern Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of this investigation is but nominal. As I understand, the gentleman from Indiana has consulted the accounting department, and the General Accounting Department will make a free audit of the finances that have been taken in by this bridge operation for the last 15 years. I think the only cost of this special committee will be maybe $2,000 or $3,000. I hope this resolution passes by a large majority.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

I yield 30 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, with some hesitation I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of May 23, at page 6856, which fairly well, I hope, explains the subject of radioactive fallout in the United States; and to which there is appended a table which gives the cumulative radioactive fallout by States from the spring of 1951 to January 1, 1955, in terms of millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile.

I think the Members will find it of interest and that it will be of material use to them in their own States in discussing this very important problem.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, here are some facts that I believe will convince the Members of Congress that the White County Bridge Commission has done a splendid job, and are following business policies that prove that no investigation of this organization is necessary, or justified.

The White County Bridge Commission was created by Public Law 37, 77th Congress, chapter 71, 1st session, approved April 12, 1941.

The three-man commission provided for in the bill is made up of the following: Mr. Jennings F. Marlin, president, First National Bank, of Carmi, Ill.; Mr. J. Madison Pomeroy, former president, White County Bank, Carmi, Ill., now retired; and Hon. Julius C. Kern, Carmi, who has retired after 24 years of service as circuit judge. These men are outstanding citizens and of unimpeachable character.

Mr. Roy Clippinger, manager for the bridge commission, is a former Member of the 79th and 80th Congresses, publisher of six newspapers and president of the WROY radio station.

The American National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago is the trustee of this bridge commission.

Hardesty & Hanover, of New York, are the engineers who must and do authorize the budget and all expenditures. No money can be spent by this commission unless approved and certified to the commission.

Considerable river and bridge work has had to be done, all of which had to be approved by the United States Army Corps of Engineers at Louisville, Ky.

An annual audit has been made each year by Gray, Hunter, Stenn & Co., certified public accountants, Chicago, and a copy of this audit each year has been filed with the engineering firm in New York, the trustee bank in Chicago, and

the highway department of the State of Illinois.

Each of the members of this commission has been bonded from the beginning and the bonds originally were filed with the Federal Highway Department in Washington, D. C. The amount of the bonds was fixed by Thomas H. McDonald, then Federal Roads Commissioner. The bonds were filed in his office in Washington and later he suggested that they no longer file the bonds with him but make them a matter of record on the commission's books rather than his department with further annual filing of same. This, the commission's records show, has been carried out each year.

In addition a monthly report of the business of the White County Bridge Commission is mailed to the engineering firm in New York and to the trustee bank in Chicago.

Charges have been made that the White County Bridge Commission has collected in tolls about $3 million. That is true. In fact the book shows it was exactly $3,196,021.90. But those who make such charges could have found where every dollar of the $3 million has been accounted for if they had taken the time to look at the books of the White County Bridge Commission.

Briefly breaking down the matter the bridge cost about $1 million. Under the certification and direction of engineers, due to the great floods and the pressure of the volume of water which constantly tries to change the course of the Wabash River, there has been about $1 million spent by the White County Bridge Commission to protect the bridge and keep the water in its channel under the bridge rather than washing it out.

Few people realize the great expense in insurance, taxes, upkeep and salaries for the superintendent and local engineer and 15 other employees during the 15 long years. These salaries and other incidental expenses take up the other $1 million, making a total of about $3 million.

Every expense is recorded in the records of the commission and comes under the scrutiny of the eyes of the auditors and the engineering firm in charge of this commission.

Since the purpose of the resolution is to determine why the New Harmony Bridge has not paid off, and become a toll-free bridge, I would like to point out the following important facts:

First. The White County Bridge Commission, when set up as I have above described, floated a bond issue for $945,000 to pay for the bridge and a ferry service outfit. The bonds in the beginning carried 4 percent interest, however, under able management, the commissioners, about 3 years later, refinanced, bringing about a reduction of interest on the bonds at 2½ percent. This reduction of bonded interest certainly commends the management.

Second. Congress provided that the commission should have 25 years in which to retire the bonds.

The commission issued 20-year bonds. Now, the commission has so successfully operated this bridge that all bonds will be paid off by July 15, 1955, which is only 15 years and which is 10 years ahead of schedule.

The commission is now in the process of turning over the bridge under the law and contract to the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana. The minutes of their meeting in November 1954 show that the commission set the goal of July 15, 1955, to wind up its business and turn the bridge over to the two States.

The commission is now ready to pay the last $175,000 retiring the last of the bonds. Furthermore, the members of the commission some 2 weeks ago, held a conference with the engineers and officials of the highway department in Springfield, Ill., informing them they were ready to turn over the bridge on July 15, 1955, to the State of Illinois.

The members of the White County Bridge Commission now have an appointment with the highway officials and officers of the State of Indiana for Thursday, May 26, to meet them in Indianapolis to tender to the State of Indiana their part of the New Harmony Bridge.

Since this resolution has as its main complaint that they feel there has been too long a delay in the New Harmony Bridge becoming free of tolls, and since for several months the White County Bridge Commission has been working toward the goal of turning it over to the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana on July 15, 1955, 10 years ahead of schedule, and since the books of this commission which I have closely examined will prove to anyone that all of the expense incurred had to be incurred on a certificate from the engineering firm, and since each year an outstanding auditing firm of Chicago has audited and approved their accounts which reports have been filed with the engineering firm of New York and with the trustee bank in Chicago, there can be no valid reason for the passage of this resolution.

The proposed investigation can serve no purpose except to waste the time of the Members of Congress, and incur expense to the Government to finance this proposed investigation, of the White County Bridge Commission.

There is only one purpose that it could serve and that would be to raise the question of the integrity and possibly cast aspersions on the integrity of a fine group of businessmen who, in the interest of the city of Carmi, and other towns in Illinois, and Indiana, had the vision and the courage to build this bridge and operate it which has made possible the greatest contribution to the economic welfare of southern Illinois and southern Indiana that has come to that entire area.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this body will vote down the resolution, because if it passed the money spent in investigating will be wasted. I say this because I feel certain that they will find nothing wrong with the accounts of the bridge commission and that its members have lived up to every requirement of the contract under the law bringing it into being.

This resolution has no facts to support it. It is the product of street talk, politics, jealousy, suspicion, and rumor. There have been no facts to justify its consideration or enactment. This Congress ought not to become a party to such a sham—such a miscarriage of justice.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get at the facts on this and just see how far afield we have gone.

As my colleague from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] told you, this is a resolution to investigate the White County Bridge Commission. This commission was established by act of Congress in 1941. It was authorized to issue $945,000 worth of bonds, and with the proceeds they were to buy a bridge and ferry across the Wabash River at New Harmony, Ind. They were to keep the bridge up, collect tolls, and pay interest, and then pay the principal on the bonds. When the bonds were retired, then the bridge went to the State of Indiana and the State of Illinois, provided they would accept the bridge. If they did not, the tolls would be lowered and the tolls would be collected just for the purpose of maintaining the bridge.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out, the amount of those bonds was $945,000. Almost $3,200,000 has been collected in tolls since that bridge was first transferred to the commission.

This was a rather unusual piece of legislation. I looked at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when this legislation was passed, and it was explained in the other body as legislation which would enable a county in Illinois to buy a bridge across the Wabash River. But it did set forth the names of the members of the commission. They were to hold office for life, and if there was any vacancy it was to be filled by the Federal Works Administration. There is no such official at the present time.

Then there was an unusual thing about this act. It did not provide for its books of account being examined by any Government agency, such as the General Accounting Office. I would just say this: I do not care who the public official is, if I were a public official and I was handling other people's money, I would certainly want to have some agency like the General Accounting Office examine my books and records. Oh, they have been examined by bookkeepers and auditors that they have appointed themselves, but that is not like having a public official examine them.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], pointed out, we have heard a great deal of talk in the southern part of Indiana and Illinois as to why this bridge was not free. Some other bridges were built at the same time, and they have been free for over 10 years. They struck oil in that part of Indiana and Illinois, and I think there is as much traffic on that bridge as there is on most main streets. So I undertook to see if I could get a Government agency that could go out and see what was going on in connection with this bridge. I talked to the General Accounting Office. They came to

the conclusion that they had no right to go over the records of this commission. They suggested that I refer it to the Attorney General. I did, but they were not interested. That officer suggested that I take it up with the Indiana State Board of Accounting which is just the same kind of agency as the General Accounting Office, but they were not interested because it was a State agency.

In 1952 a man named Borah brought a suit in the Federal Court for the Eastern District of Illinois. The Federal Court for the Eastern District of Illinois meets in the southern part of Illinois. He brought suit for declaratory judgment permitting him to see the records of this bridge. He brought the suit as a taxpayer and one who used the bridge. The bridge commission resisted the action and the court held that the mere fact that the man was a taxpayer and used the bridge did not give him any right to maintain this action to inspect those records.

I have taken this matter up in all the ways I know and this seems to be the only way to get at it. Certainly the people are entitled to have these records checked by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for information?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Has the gentleman not introduced a bill for another committee?

Mr. DENTON. Yes. And after talking with the General Accounting Office they thought this was the better way to handle it.

Mr. VURSELL. Why does the gentleman introduce this bill?

Mr. DENTON. Because I sought the advice of the General Accounting Office and they said this would be the more expeditious way to handle it. I acted on their advice after checking with them.

Mr. VURSELL. In the court case did the court not hold there was so little equity in the case brought in the district that it was summarily thrown out?

Mr. DENTON. I have read that opinion several times. If the gentleman wants to read it, it is to be found in volume 199, Federal Reporter, second series, page 213. I have read it many times. Just let us get that straight about the lack of equity. It was this: The court held that the fact that this man was a taxpayer and used this bridge did not give him sufficient interest to bring that suit. But let me say further that I have asked the General Accounting Office how to get at this and the Comptroller General told me this was the quickest way to get at it.

There is some talk about this bridge being free. This resolution was reported out by the Rules Committee on Thursday, and most remarkably, on Friday the White County Bridge Commission announced that the bridge would be free. But they say that this resolution had absolutely nothing to do with it and that the Rules Committee action had nothing to do with it. That, however, is very unusual, because this Mr. Clippinger, the manager of this bridge, was down here in Washington about a month or so ago with a resolution which would have amended the White County Bridge Act and permit the White County Bridge Commission to buy another bridge and issue bonds on that new bridge and this bridge, and tolls would be charged on both bridges until the bonds were paid out. I am sure my friend knows of this resolution.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. My understanding has been—I was not going to refer to the other bridge, but since the Illinois Toll Road Commission is preparing to build a bridge that will cost about $500,000 or more, they got in contact with this Mr. Clippinger, who managed this bridge so successfully and asked him to cooperate with them.

Mr. DENTON. The gentleman and I both heard Mr. Clippinger say that, but that is not the way the chairman of the Indiana Toll Bridge Commission explained it to me. As I understand it, Mr. Clippinger first approached the Indiana Toll Bridge Commission requesting them to sell this other bridge to his commission. Now, let me get something of the financing of this commission into the RECORD. On the first of this year there were $175,000 of bonds outstanding. They had cash on hand of $170,000. They had assets consisting of four automobiles and they owned something connected with that ferry. They had other property that certainly was worth up to $5,000. That bridge was not free at that time. They also had $109,000, almost $110,000, which was set up for river maintenance. I understand they were going to use that money on the river but they have decided not to do that now. I also understand they have spent a large sum of money riprapping the banks of the river. I have looked through that act from beginning to end and I cannot find anywhere where this bridge commission has the right to spend money on navigation, flood control, and so forth of the Wabash River.

Let me say one thing more. There is an authorization for the Government to do this work and $100,000 has been spent by the Government for this purpose. I cannot see any reason or justification why the people who have to use that bridge should have to pay for navigation, channel control, flood control, and so forth of that river.

Mr. Speaker, the tolls from traffic on that bridge produces about $23,000 a month. The expenses, it seems to me, are unduly high. They amount to about $8,700 a month. The manager of bridges they refer to indicates that he and his help get $18,700 a year. That is in the budget. Then there is a superintendent of the bridge who gets $6,200 a year. I cannot see any reason in the world for having a superintendent and a manager, too.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is very largely a local matter, but the Congress saw fit to set up this local commission to deal with this bridge across the Wabash River and the only place we can go for relief is to come to the Congress. I talked to Mr. Campbell, the Comptroller General, and I am advised that the General Accounting Office will furnish an auditor to make the audit. He suggested that the only expenses involved would be traveling expenses and he suggested that we ask for $5,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, he stated that if we asked for that amount we would have sufficient money and also stated if anything came up that would present a more serious question we could take it up with the House Administration Committee. I think we can depend on the General Accounting Office.

Mr. Speaker, if this bridge is going to be free we certainly want to have an audit made because we will have to pass legislation to close out the commission. It has assets because it is shown in their statement that they have over $50,000 in some kind of a fund for tickets that have been sold for going over the bridge but which have not been used. There are many assets of that commission that have to be liquidated. If we have an audit it should be an audit by a Government agency. If the State of Indiana and the State of Illinois should not take the bridge, it may have to continue as a toll bridge. And again we should have an audit. By all means this matter should be investigated because any public official who is handling other people's money should want to have his records examined. I think some amendments will have to be made to the act creating this commission.

The manager of the bridge said he had no objection to this audit being made by a Government agency. I would think that those people would want to have an audit made by a Government agency. This is no reflection on them. This is just good sound business practice. Any man who spends somebody else's money should insist on having a competent auditor examine his books. He should want it. He should be proud of it, he should be glad to have it and the ground is almost that much stronger when you deal with a Government agency.

I should think these public officials should not object, but they would come in here and ask and join in a request for this audit. I hope there is nothing wrong. But if there is nothing wrong, everything will be in the clear. Remember this, and you know it as well as I do. We live in a territory where if this audit is not made these men are going to regret it all of their lives. I have letters here, I have a big group of them addressed to you [Mr. VURSELL] and some to me, in which they say if they turn the bridge loose let us have this audit.

Mr. Speaker, all I am asking for in this case is simple, common honesty, good government, so that we can have these facts and so that the Government, having set up this bridge commission,

will do what any Government agency should do.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DENTON. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Does the gentleman recall that in 1 month, when they started out, they took in $38 instead of $20,000?

Mr. DENTON. Yes; I remember that. There is no question about that.

Mr. VURSELL. Has the gentleman read this act recently? I have the act here, and it provides fully for the termination of this commission. Let me ask the gentleman, if you lived in a town of 7,000, where there never had been a substantial complaint rendered and where you knew that the books proved that there was nothing wrong, would you like to have your two bankers and your finest citizens be investigated by a committee of Congress that ought to be doing something else instead of starting this silly situation?

Mr. DENTON. If I were in that situation, I would swim the Wabash River to get somebody like the General Accounting Office to investigate the matter. I hope this does not become a partisan issue.

Mr. MADDEN. Could the gentleman give us an idea of the cost of this investigation?

Mr. DENTON. The General Accounting Office said they would do the work free, but they suggested I should ask for about $5,000 so that they would be able to pay traveling expenses, looking at the books, and for the appearance of witnesses.

I certainly hope this does not become a partisan issue. The members of your political party or you on the other side of the aisle in my district are just as anxious to have this investigation made as are members of my party, and I have letters from them in the files. I sat in a meeting not long ago where people of your party were present where they asked to have this carried out. And I certainly hope it does not become a partisan issue. All I am asking is that you practice good government and have an audit made of this commission, the books of which have not been audited by any Government agency.

Mr. VURSELL. May I ask another question? And this is an easy one. Did you ever know of a town of 10,000 people where a mayor was elected and did a magnificent job for the town but what the grumblers and the bellyachers and those who do not want progress defeated him when he ran again? It is the same thing with this bridge situation.

Mr. DENTON. There is no reflection on anyone. All we are asking for is good business. I am surprised that these men are not joining with me in asking for this audit so that it can be done.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, when my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] offered the resolution today, he said that this was a most unusual proposition and that this action by the Committee on Rules was most unusual. To that I fully subscribe. Here we are today attempting to investigate one of the many hundreds of toll bridges throughout the United States. In other words, we are saying that we, the Congress, will not let Illinois and Indiana take care of their own business; that we are going to take care of it for them. I presume that after we start building toll roads—and we are going to have hundreds of toll roads built throughout the United States—there will be a like squabble about them.

By the way, I have the Evansville Courier before me, of last Saturday. I think it is the May 21 issue. It does not say anything about all the people being up in arms about the toll bridge. They do not say anything about excessive costs of operation. I believe that paper is published in the home town of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

I do not see anything in that paper that would indicate any big upheaval. But if I understand it, they are anxious to get this commission to turn it over to the State of Illinois and to the State of Indiana. That can be done within a few months. Those people want to have a free bridge. They do not care about investigations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does this not seem to be more or less a tempest in a teapot; that is, for the House to decide, by the adoption of this resolution, to investigate this matter, which really comes under the control and within the purview of the States of Illinois and Indiana? There is not a thing in the world the House could do about it. We could not enforce our findings or our decision or our ruling in this case, could we? The matter belongs entirely to the States of Illinois and Indiana if they want to straighten it out.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman. I fully subscribe to what the gentleman has said.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is a commission which was created by an act of Congress. The other bridges to which the gentleman may have referred are State bridges. We are not asking to investigate all those State bridges here. There is provision in this resolution for an accounting which we should have from any Government agency or any agency set up by the Government. That is the reason we had to come to Congress in this case for relief.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] would go further into the situation, he would find that while Congress originally created this commission, the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States did instruct this commission to submit their plans and reports to their State rather than the Federal Government. In recent years the State of Illinois especially and also of Indiana have had complete control and jurisdiction over this entire matter and reports have been filed with them. It seems to me, may I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] that he and I and the other Members of the House of Representatives of the United States have a great many more important tasks to take care of than to investigate a matter that falls under the jurisdiction of two of the States at this time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not predicting anything like this, but there could be some political thought injected into this matter. So I hope, when this resolution comes to a vote, that the Members on the right side of the aisle do not go right down the line, because they have the majority of the membership.

I should like to say this further. The books of the commission are open. They have had auditors there. They could submit a report to Congress showing where every nickel of this money was spent.

Mr. VURSELL. That report is ready now.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The report is ready now. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] says that where public money is involved we should have an investigation. I do not see how it would be possible for Congress every time someone spends some public money, to have an investigation of them. As a matter of fact, we have a Committee on Government Operations, a regularly constituted committee of the House, that has the power to do that.

So I hope my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will not, on a small proposition like this, take a position that could be applied to all toll bridges.

The three men who make up the commission are Mr. Jennings F. Marlin, president of the First National Bank of Carmi, Ill.; Mr. J. Madison Pomeroy, former president of the White County Bank of Carmi, Ill., now retired; and Hon. Julius C. Kern, of Carmi, who retired voluntarily after 24 years as circuit judge right in his own community. They are all outstanding men.

If we put this kind of thing through, with this as a precedent, somebody who has an idea that he paid a little too long, maybe, on a toll bridge or toll road somewhere, will bring that matter in, and we will be spending about four-fifths of our time here in Congress trying to investigate someone.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. I have been much interested in the very fine statement the gentleman from Illinois is making. We are somewhat disturbed about some elements, however, in connection with expenditures. It has been stated that the authorized expenditure for the bridge is $945,000. I believe that amount of bonds was sold. The bridge cost $500,000. Can the gentleman tell us what became of the rest of the money?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes. It went to improve the bridge. It is my understanding that about $1 million of the toll from this bridge over the 15-year period was used in connection with the overflowing of the Wabash River. It is my understanding that another million dollars was spent over that period of 15 years on maintenance. You have your taxes, you have your insurance, you have employees working over that period of time.

Mr. McVEY. Was the original bond money used for repairs and maintenance on the bridge?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not exactly have those figures, only in totals. One million dollars was used over 15 years. What would that amount to a year for employees? Seventy-five thousand dollars. So $75,000 a year would be $1 million for the employees.

Mr. McVEY. I think a full explanation of how that was used would be helpful.

Mr. DENTON. If the gentleman will yield, I have those figures. What the gentleman wants to know is the difference between the $580,000 and the $945,000? I have the figures here if the gentleman wants more information about that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In brief recapitulation I would say this: I hope my good friends on this side of the aisle are not bringing up this matter just to investigate someone. I can see from the gentleman's hometown newspaper, the town where he lives, that they do not come out in favor of an investigation. They tell all about it, but they do not say anything to the effect that anyone is objecting to it there. The people of his own hometown seem very well satisfied to have the commission turn this over to the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana, equally, in order that the people of those States can have this bridge free of tolls as soon as possible. I have read this newspaper carefully, and there is no reference whatsoever demanding Members of Congress to come out into that district and investigate reputable people who have had the great respect of all in the area where they reside. It is a bad precedent to start investigating every toll bridge because somebody back home feels abused. That is a bad precedent. The Congress just has too much to do to go into such matters.

I say in conclusion that I think probably we had better just let this be decided by the people back home. This commission is willing and anxious to file a report, and all concede where the money went. So I hope the House will vote down this resolution.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana that if I were a member of this commission I would be glad to have my books audited, but would it not accomplish the purpose the gentleman seeks by this resolution, if the House passed a simple resolution authorizing and directing the General Accounting Office to make an audit of the books and report to the Congress, or, as an alternative, should not this matter be handled by the House Committee on Government Operations instead of creating a new select committee to go out to Indiana to conduct hearings?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think that is a good suggestion. I will even go further. Instead of holding a club over the heads of some reputable people, the Congress could pass a general bill providing that every toll bridge would file a report.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. As I said before, we are not asking to investigate every toll bridge. This is the only bridge that I know of that was created by the Federal Government. I handled this bill because it was suggested to me to do it in this way. It has been almost impossible to find where to go on this matter. When I first tried to find out about this thing it was in the Federal Works Agency. Next, it was under the General Services Administration. Now it is under the Bureau of Roads. Nobody seems to know where it is. This will get at it in the quickest and easiest way. That is all we want to do.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I reiterate that I should like it if the gentleman would perhaps withdraw this, and then introduce, perhaps, a general bill requiring all bridges to file their audited reports with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, nothing crooked will be disclosed, I am sure, nor will any motives be impugned, or characters destroyed by passage of this resolution.

While it is estimated that the cost of the examination to the Government will not exceed $5,000, it should at best blow away any benevolent indifference to the affairs of the motorist in interstate travel that might exist or threatens to exist in the country, especially as we venture on a pioneer road-building program that will sooner or later affect every motorized citizen in the United States.

I think we should pass this resolution without impugning the honesty or motives of any gentleman, be he from Indiana, Illinois, or any other State.

We are now motorized, a Nation on wheels with 1, 2, and possibly 3 cars to the family, but a Nation whose motorists have no access to a redress of grievances on tolls or ratemaking on the Federal level, as do railroads, steamships, and aircraft with ratemaking and other matters before the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Debate in opposition to this resolution contends that its passage will be the forerunner of many similar requests to investigate all manner of complaints on every toll bridge, tunnel, or road in the land, that such complaints will saddle the docket of Congress with time-consuming details. That need not be so.

Passage of H. R. 1611, not now before the House, when it is reported for floor action by the Interstate Commerce Committee, would bypass congressional review on such complaints and place them, when merited, before the Interstate Commerce Commission. H. R. 1611 appears to be a sure way of blowing away or allowing any benevolent indifference to the affairs of the motorist to build up in interstate travel.

Passage of the resolution now before the House, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], would be the first step on the road to putting the growing toll problem in the United States under satisfactory Federal surveillance. The Interstate Commerce Commission, as stated above, is the agency to monitor the situation.

It is not merely a question of the local complaints of the good people of Indiana and Illinois. The examination Congress is asked to make to determine what happened to the $3 million collected in tolls on an Indiana-Illinois bridge that initially cost but some $900,000 to build, is also a question of the inherent right of people of New Jersey and America who have traveled both States and have paid some share of the Indiana-Illinois $3 million in tolls to know the facts in dispute.

It is an inherent right that we have as car owners, as well as citizens, to know where our money on such situations goes and whether it is spent as we are led to believe it will be spent—to pay for and to upkeep a facility initially approved. It matters not that two State legislatures vote to float additional bonds to improve capital investments on facilities or to extend facilities not related to motorized accommodations but levied against citizens engaged in interstate motorized travel or commerce.

By what Federal right did the New York Port Authority recently obtain some $30 million as a loan from investment bankers—the State legislatures of New York and New Jersey who approved it, notwithstanding? By what right was this done, especially when motorists from the other 46 States in the union and our territories will be levied by tolls to cross the George Washington bridge, the Holland and Lincoln tunnels to help pay on that $30 million loan? Since when has the Constitution of the United States, or the Supreme Court allowed ratemaking involving interstate commerce to be established on so local a level?

In all earnestness, I hope you will support my bill, H. R. 1611. It gives the American car owner his day in court, before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The people of the United States are going to see this toll question grow like a cancer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I do not need the 2 minutes, but I shall simply

say you are not going to hurt any bankers in Indiana or Illinois.

It is a question of the citizens of the United States who are now on wheels and who deserve to have their day before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I assume the gentleman then would support a resolution for an investigation of the New Jersey Turnpike?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I would support anything that seems to fly in the face of the motorists on the highways of America today. Let the Congress concern itself with all authorities created with the consent of the Congress. It is our duty to do so. We have been issuing blank checks to these authorities for much too long a time.

Mr. GROSS. I have often wondered why motorists pay gasoline taxes on toll roads. Perhaps Congress ought to look into the operation of the New Jersey Turnpike.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. We should look into anything questionable, including the turnpike authority. Passage of my bill, now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will permit the car owners of America to seek redress for unreasonable motor levies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] for the statement he made in regard to the toll-road problem throughout the United States. This situation between Indiana and Illinois is nothing more than a preliminary to necessary legislation to keep the traveling public of America, as they travel over the country, from wearing out their pockets paying tolls, in a great number of cases far in excess of what they should pay. It is a remarkable situation in this particular case that nothing ever started from the standpoint of financial supervision and terminating toll charges until the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] filed his resolution. Now we have a start, and for a few thousand dollars that it will cost to inspect and audit the bridge commission's books, it will have a great effect on the operation of interstate toll bridges and toll roads throughout the length and breadth of this land.

I hope this resolution is passed by a large majority.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 84, noes 73.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The rollcall is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 166, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—205

Abbitt	Fisher	Multer
Abernethy	Flood	Murray, Ill.
Adair	Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.
Addonizio	Forand	Natcher
Albert	Fountain	Norrell
Alexander	Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Friedel	O'Hara, Ill.
Anfuso	Gary	O'Neill
Ashley	Gathings	Passman
Ashmore	Gordon	Patman
Aspinall	Granahan	Perkins
Bailey	Grant	Pfost
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Philbin
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Pilcher
Beamer	Griffiths	Poage
Bell	Hagen	Poff
Bennett, Fla.	Haley	Polk
Blatnik	Harden	Price
Blitch	Hardy	Priest
Boggs	Harris	Quigley
Boland	Harrison, Va.	Rabaut
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Rains
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Reuss
Boyle	Hayworth	Richards
Bray	Hébert	Riley
Brooks, La.	Holifield	Roberts
Brooks, Tex.	Huddleston	Rodino
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Buchanan	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Buckley	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Jennings	Rooney
Burnside	Johnson, Wis.	Roosevelt
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Cannon	Jones, N. C.	Selden
Carlyle	Karsten	Shelley
Carnahan	Kee	Sheppard
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Sikes
Christopher	Keogh	Siler
Chudoff	Kilday	Sisk
Clark	Kilgore	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	King, Calif.	Spence
Cooper	Kirwan	Staggers
Crumpacker	Klein	Steed
Davidson	Kluczynski	Sullivan
Davis, Ga.	Knutson	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Thompson, N. J.
Dawson, Utah	Lankford	Thompson, Tex.
Deane	Lesinski	Thornberry
Delaney	Long	Trimble
Dempsey	McCarthy	Tuck
Denton	McCormack	Tumulty
Dies	McDowell	Udall
Diggs	McMillan	Vanik
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Vinson
Donovan	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Dorn, S. C.	Madden	Watts
Dowdy	Magnuson	Whitten
Doyle	Mahon	Wickersham
Durham	Marshall	Wier
Elliott	Matthews	Williams, Miss.
Engle	Metcalf	Williams, N. J.
Evins	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Fallon	Mills	Wright
Fascell	Mollohan	Yates
Feighan	Morgan	Zablocki
Fernandez	Morrison	
Fine	Moss	

NAYS—166

Alger	Brown, Ohio	Dague
Allen, Ill.	Brownson	Davis, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Broyhill	Devereux
	Budge	Dixon
Andresen, August H.	Burdick	Dondero
	Bush	Dorn, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth
Ayres	Carrigg	Fenton
Baker	Cederberg	Fino
Baldwin	Chase	Ford
Bass, N. H.	Chenoweth	Forrester
Bates	Chiperfield	Frelinghuysen
Baumhart	Church	Fulton
Becker	Clevenger	Gamble
Bennett, Mich.	Cole	Gavin
Bentley	Coon	Gentry
Berry	Corbett	George
Betts	Coudert	Gray
Bolton, Frances, P.	Cramer	Gross
	Cretella	Gubser
Bosch	Cunningham	Hale
Bow	Curtis, Mass.	Hand
Harvey	McGregor	Scrivner
Henderson	McIntire	Scudder
Hess	McVey	Seely-Brown
Hiestand	Mack, Wash.	Sheehan
Hill	Mailliard	Simpson, Ill.
Hillings	Martin	Simpson, Pa.
Hinshaw	Meader	Smith, Kans.
Hoeven	Merrow	Smith, Wis.
Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Md.	Springer
Holmes	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Holt	Minshall	Talle
Horan	Morano	Thompson, Mich.
Hosmer	Nicholson	
Hyde	Norblad	Thomson, Wyo.
Jackson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Utt
Jensen	O'Konski	Van Pelt
Johansen	Ostertag	Van Zandt
Johnson, Calif.	Pelly	Velde
Jonas	Phillips	Vorys
Judd	Prouty	Vursell
Kean	Radwan	Wainwright
Kearns	Ray	Weaver
Keating	Reed, Ill.	Westland
Kilburn	Rees, Kans.	Wharton
King, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Widnall
Knox	Riehlman	Wigglesworth
Krueger	Robeson, Va.	Williams, N. Y.
Laird	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Calif.
Latham	Sadlak	Wilson, Ind.
LeCompte	St. George	Withrow
Lipscomb	Saylor	Wolcott
Lovre	Schenck	Wolverton
McConnell	Scherer	Young
McCulloch	Schwengel	Younger
McDonough	Scott	

NOT VOTING—63

Allen, Calif.	Flynt	O'Hara, Minn.
Arends	Garmatz	Osmers
Avery	Green, Pa.	Patterson
Barden	Gwinn	Pillion
Belcher	Halleck	Powell
Bolton, Oliver, P.	Harrison, Nebr.	Preston
	Herlong	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Bowler	Hoffman, Mich.	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrd	Holtzman	Rivers
Canfield	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Chatham	James	Short
Colmer	Jenkins	Shuford
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Derounian	Kearney	Taylor
Dingell	Lanham	Teague, Calif.
Dodd	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Dolliver	Mason	Tollefson
Donohue	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Eberharter	Moulder	Zelenko
Edmondson	Mumma	
Fjare	Nelson	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Lanham for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. Heselton against.

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Fjare against.

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Avery against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Teague of California against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Pillion against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Hope.

Mr. WOLVERTON and Mr. JOHNSON of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow and next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we complete the two bills that are on the program today, then, if my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts has no objection, we can adjourn over until Friday and then from Friday to Tuesday, Monday being Memorial Day. The program for next week is a follows——

Mr. MARTIN. Before the gentleman tells us the program for next week, there will be nothing on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Nothing legislatively. As a matter of fact, one of the chairmen of a committee spoke to me about some privileged resolutions and I asked him to try to get them in today, if he could, because I want to announce to the Members that there will be nothing legislatively on Friday, and while there might be nothing objectionable from his committee, nevertheless some Members might feel disturbed if anything did come up of a legislative nature. Therefore, I want to announce that there will be nothing legislatively on Friday, and on Friday we will adjourn over until Tuesday. There may be some special orders that I know of and such things as that. The program for next week is as follows:

On Tuesday, the House will consider the general Government appropriation bill for 1956. If there should be a rollcall on that bill, which I doubt, it has been agreed by the leadership that the rollcall will go over until Wednesday.

For Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, we have scheduled House Resolution 203 from the Committee on Banking and Currency providing for an investigation of housing. There is the bill, H. R. 5715, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to extend the loan authority for veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. There is the bill, H. R. 3990, a bill relating to the water resources of Alaska.

Any conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later. The probability is that there will be no material change from the program which I have just announced so far as next week is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any chance of the so-called Reserve training bill coming up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us whether any life is going to be breathed into that corpse?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that, but it will not come up next week.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts inform us when the conference report on the bill H. R. 1 is likely to be called up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state when it will come up. I can state in reply to the inquiry, for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts and our colleagues, that it will not come up next week. Even if the conferees come to an agreement, it will not come up. There is no reason, except that I do not expect the agreement to be reached; but if it should be, it would not come up next week.

Mr. MARTIN. It will be put on the legislative program early, I hope?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there is no further meeting of the conference committee until the middle of next week, anyway; but if they do agree, the chances are it will be so late that it could not come up, anyway. I am simply stating there is no reason at all except that it will be so late in the week that we can wait until the early part of the following week, if they do agree. Therefore, I can definitely advise the Members of the House insofar as it is possible for me to do so in order that they may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Thursday to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 249) providing for the consideration of H. R. 2851, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

At this point I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 249) makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 2851 from the Committee on Agriculture.

Briefly stated, the substance of the bill to be made in order by the adoption of this resolution amends present law with reference to relief programs. Under the present law, when the President of the United States designates certain areas as disaster areas by reason of drought or unusual unemployment, certain commodities, particularly those of a perishable nature, are set aside for the respective States, to be used by them through the Department of Agriculture for the people in the distressed areas. This bill amends the present law to this effect:

Under the present law the Department of Agriculture can reprocess products but it cannot process products. This bill amends the present law to the effect that the Department of Agriculture may now process, and that has particular reference to grains, storable products, which may be in surplus throughout the country. That is, they can make wheat into flour; corn into meal.

Then the other amendment is that it transfers a part of this program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in that it gives them certain authority in those designated areas. In other words, it empowers the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make agreements with the departments in the respective States as to the amount needed, and the method of distribution.

As far as I have been able to learn, there is no opposition to this bill. There was some division of sentiment, as I understand it, in the committee where it was discussed, but those divisions have been resolved by amendments in this bill, and I hope the resolution is approved and that the bill made possible by this resolution is agreed to.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

LOWER SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like so many others, I have been increasingly

concerned about, and disturbed over the growing plight of our public and private school systems, and particularly, the costs of the construction of schools. Confining my remarks mainly to the public school system, what I say shall also apply to the private school system.

The figures released by the United States Department of Education in February of this year concerned with the inadequate accommodations for pupils entering the public school system are amazing in their adverse effect on our institutions of Government. Included in these figures was a table showing that there were more than 2,600,000 pupils in the public school system alone in excess of the normal capacity of the accessible public owned school plants in use. This is only a slight indication of what is facing our public school system in overcrowding, split shifts, and the use of substandard, makeshift quarters; and with our growing population, this will increase. I might also say that the cost of school construction is vitally important.

The 81st Congress passed Public Law 815 and title I of the act provided that the United States Department of Education should supervise a nationwide survey of the public elementary and secondary school plant facilities. The findings of this survey disclosed the extent of this crisis in the school construction field. Typical was the revelation that almost one-half of the school buildings of our great Nation are more than 30 years old, and about one-fourth are over 50 years old—and many of these older buildings lacked adequate lighting, plumbing, heating, and ventilating facilities. It is hard to realize that in the 43 States covered by the survey, 54.99 percent of all elementary school buildings of those States still use outdoor privies. According to accepted educational standards, more than 56 percent of the classrooms of our country are already overcrowded, with the peak of increased enrollment still some 5 years ahead.

The lag in schoolhouse construction understandingly resulted from the depression and the war period of material and manpower shortages. It has been increased by the very high postwar birthrate which has placed our nationwide school plant into a position where it needs today at least 312,000 additional instruction rooms to accommodate almost 9 million pupils, which will cost at current prices about $10.6 billion. The financial problem in countless communities has also played a significant part. To house the pupils who are expected to be added to the school population by 1965, there will be required an additional 420,000 classrooms costing an additional $14.3 billion. And to replace the classrooms in the present nationwide school plant which are inadequate, obsolete, worn out, and unsafe will require an additional 220,000 rooms by 1965 costing an additional $7.5 billion.

Historically the construction of public school buildings in the United States has been a function of the local communities or school districts. They have very successfully financed this public service by issuing general obligation bonds or other evidences of indebtedness supported by the full faith and credit of the local taxing district. Most of these groups have operated under debt limitation provisions imposed by legislative act or constitutional provisions. It has been reliably estimated that the total legal borrowing capacity of all of the cities, towns, and school districts of our Nation is about $35 billion. Of this amount more than $31 billion have previously been encumbered by borrowings for schools and other eligible public improvements. It is obvious that the school construction needs greatly exceed the available funds which may legally be raised.

I think you will agree with me that there is perhaps no greater responsibility on we Americans than that of insuring the availability of education in school buildings conveniently located, safely constructed, and presenting an environment of welcome, warmth, and friendliness that will stimulate the learning process and make schoolwork a pleasurable experience to be treasured for life.

During the 83d Congress some 31 bills and joint resolutions were introduced proposing some form of Federal assistance to schoolhouse construction and education. Each of these bills recognized the importance of education and the plight of the public school system, and each contained some element or plan to alleviate some of this distress. The current Congress has before it many similar proposals, including a plan urgently recommended by the President, who from time to time has stated unequivocally that our school system demands some prompt and effective help if we are to provide adequate education.

Over the years this question of Federal aid to school construction has arisen before this Congress and in public discussion. The arguments presented both pro and con have had wide ramifications. The supporters of each side have been able, well fortified, and vocal, and the debates have been sound and heated but also interminable. While this endless debate has been following its leisure course, the inexorable maturity of the children has brought them to the doors of substandard school buildings—to the doors of overcrowded buildings—and to the doors of nonexistent school buildings both public and private. These more than 2,600,000 pupils that I previously mentioned are being deprived in part of the complete education which is their American privilege and heritage.

The need for new and adequate schoolhousing in our States is critical, and during this trying period of current turbulence, nothing is as important to a free society as the preservation of our public institutions—of our school systems—since nothing has a deeper or more far-reaching effect upon the conduct of man as a citizen than adequate educational opportunity.

It is with great pleasure that I advise you and those throughout the country who are interested in a discovery which I recently came across, a discovery which indicates the availability of a simple, straightforward, and practical solution to some of the schoolhouse construction problems over which we have labored so long, and belabored so effectively. We, in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, are facing a schoolhouse shortage problem analogous to that of our sister States, though we have been fortunate in having available a greater degree of financial ability to meet these needs than some of our less fortunate companions. In spite, however, of our tremendous resources it was apparent to many of our citizens that to continue a school-building program at a rate of expenditure per pupil which was characteristic of the early 1950's, we would soon exhaust our resources short of having constructed sufficient classrooms for our rapidly growing child population. This is particularly so, having in mind the other duties and responsibilities of government.

A group of trained and qualified citizens of Massachusetts, realizing the implications of our school needs and the urgency for the construction of an adequate number of classrooms at a cost we could afford, undertook an exhaustive study of the problem locally and nationally. They also undertook the responsibility of developing a program that would permit communities and school districts of our Nation, and this would also cover private schools, to obtain needed school buildings quickly at reasonable costs with or without State or Federal aid, and in a manner not restricted by archaic and unrealistic statutory and constitutional debt limits.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this group proposes and offers to build and equip healthful, attractive, safe, fire-resistive, flexible, low-cost school buildings of modular components which will permit expansion or contraction of the structures as the need may require. One of the real contributions of this program comes from the fact that this group, where and when desired, is willing to finance the construction of these badly needed buildings with private capital in a manner which will not adversely affect the legal borrowing capacity of the community or school district, and at annual costs which may run as much as 50 percent less than the average current costs of conventional school-building projects. Arrangements can also be made with those responsible for the construction of a private school or schools. In order to do this with private funds, of course, these buildings provide a life expectancy and freedom from maintenance greatly in excess of the average buildings being constructed today.

The Anderson-Nichols Co., architectural engineers of Boston, one of New England's largest and most competent architectural engineering firms, in conjunction with educators, public officers, and finance specialists, have undertaken a 4-year research program which has culminated in the development of a schoolhouse plan which permits construction from readily available, modular components with a maximum degree of flexibility of design to meet the requirements of available sites and the individual desires and needs of local school authorities.

From this research group has evolved an organization known as Structo Schools Corp., located in Boston, Mass. This group offers to design, build, and equip school buildings for communities or school districts, whether distressed or not, utilizing the modular plan developed by the Anderson-Nichols Co. The group offers to finance these buildings with private capital in such a way as to relieve any encumbrance upon the debt or borrowing limits of the community. It is expected that the annual costs of a project under this program will be approximately 50 percent less than the average annual costs of the current conventional school building projects. The source of private funds for this purpose seems virtually unlimited.

The communities or school districts will only be required to appropriate an annual amount as a rental fee, and this amount is expected to produce a substantially lower impact on local tax rates than the present plans.

The program has received the approval and wholehearted support of many national organizations in the fields of education, finance, manufacturing, and construction, as a worthwhile cooperative effort to meet the challenge of schoolhouse shortages. The very startling aspect of this program has been the success of Structo Schools Corp. to raise large segments of private capital to permit school buildings to be built and rented to local school authorities, or, in the case of private schools to the proper authority, at annual rental rates substantially below the average normal average costs of debt service required when general obligation bonds are issued.

It is most pleasing to me to learn that the ingenuity and the interest of private citizens can be stimulated toward the development of a solution to a problem which has long plagued the Congress and other public officers, as well as others, and to learn that they have successfully developed a plan which may work quickly and surely, and whose objective is a contribution to the preservation of one of our most essential, democratic ideals. This group of public spirited citizens are to be complimented for their willingness to face the challenge, and their ingenuity in finding a solution of this critical national problem.

As the leadership and efforts of Mr. Anderson of the firm of Anderson-Nichols Co., after several years of study, evaluation, and of making designs, has resulted in a manner that school building costs can be sharply reduced, a number of such schools have been constructed, I am pleased, as a public duty, to make known as widely as possible this program to those interested; and particularly those who are responsible for the construction and maintenance of schools. The cost of constructing schools, either public or private, is a matter of major concern. If the cost can be sharply reduced, I know it will be a matter of major interest.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has explained the rule and the main provisions of the bill. I know of no one who is opposed to the rule, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

H. R. 5881 as reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would permit States and local public agencies to take a more active part in developing land and water resources for irrigation and incidental purposes through Federal loans and grants, and would encourage the development of small projects. The provisions of the bill would apply to the 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Under the bill, the States and local public agencies would plan, construct, and operate small projects primarily for irrigation and they would receive practically the same benefits which would be theirs if the projects were being constructed as Federal reclamation projects.

The bill would permit the Secretary of the Interior to make loans covering that portion of the cost of the project which would be reimbursable if they were being constructed as Federal projects and the Secretary would make grants covering that portion of the cost of the project which would be nonreimbursable if the project were being constructed under Federal auspices.

Federal financial participation in any project in the form of a loan, a grant, or a combination of both could not exceed $5 million.

A bill that resembled H. R. 5881 passed the House during the 83d Congress but failed to pass the Senate. The President in his budget message for 1956 advocated a program of this type and during the hearings on this bill, according to the committee report, it was disclosed that there were a number of small projects that were in the planning stage now, but could and would be completed if there is a program such as is proposed in this bill. The committee felt that $5 million was an appropriate maximum cost for a project if it was to fall within the category of a small one. However, under the provisions of H. R. 5881, as reported, a project costing between 5 and 10 million dollars could apply for the benefits applicable under the legislation but the Federal participation in the financing of the project could not be increased due to the higher cost of the project.

Any organization desiring to take advantage of the benefits provided under H. R. 5881 would submit its proposal to the Secretary of the Interior with all the plans and estimates that would be included in preauthorization reports required for a Federal reclamation project.

The bill would specifically provide that the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the State in which the project is proposed would be the approving authorities for the project.

The bill would also require that the Secretary of the Interior submit to both the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs the project proposals at least 60 days before the contracts are executed covering these projects. However, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized in this bill to proceed with negotiations for loans and/or grants without further congressional action after he and the Governor of the State involved, have placed their stamp of approval upon the individual projects.

The organization applying for the benefits offered under the provisions of this bill would have to show in its proposal that it already holds or can acquire the lands and the rights to the use of water necessary for construction and operation of the project, and the organization must finance the cost of these lands and water rights by other methods than by loans and grants from the Government.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, would authorize the appropriation of $100 million to undertake this program. It is my understanding that an amendment to the bill will be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], which will have the effect of giving the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over the implementation of the provisions of this bill in the areas where the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior is

not set up to function. It is my impression that this amendment will not be objected to by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will, of course, discuss the details of the bill more thoroughly, but I feel that the bill is worthy of the consideration of the House and that the rule, since it is an open one which would allow amendments to be offered from the floor, should be adopted by the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask for the immediate consideration of a privileged resolution (H. Res. 226).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby ordered to be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the Second Progress Report of the Department of Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, entitled "Study of Newsprint Expansion: Part II, Newsprint Production from Hardwoods," made to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, during the 83d Congress, 2d session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 155) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1955, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 154 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$125,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUE OF EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission of Louisiana is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the resolution it says "temporarily." Is that the custom?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. The gentleman from Louisiana, who is the author of the resolution, might better explain the proposition.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the resolution is to use the facilities of the rotunda for the day of the unveiling of the statue, but the statue is not to be placed in the rotunda. That is why we say "temporary" use of the rotunda for that day.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, by the act of August 15, 1876, as amended on March 3, 1921, the Congress provided for a National Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States and the President was authorized to invite all States of the Union to furnish statues, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who were citizens thereof and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military service, such as each State may deem to be worthy of this national commemoration.

Act 455 of the Legislature of Louisiana of 1952 designated the late Chief Justice White as the second illustrious son of Louisiana to be thus honored, the first having been the late Senator Huey P. Long, whose statue has stood in the Statuary Hall of our Capitol for many years.

The Louisiana Legislature also created the Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission, which is charged with the duty of having erected and installed the statue of the noted jurist. Judge Sam A. LeBlanc, of Napoleonville, a retired member of the Louisiana State Supreme Court, is chairman of the commission; and those serving with him are State Senator Clyde C. Caillouet, of Thibodeaux; G. F. Cunningham, of Shreveport; George W. Hardy, Jr., of Shreveport; and Ben N. Tucker, of Hammond, La.

Active since its organization, the commission decided upon a bronze statue, and after careful consideration of many applicants selected Arthur C. Morgan, of Shreveport, as sculptor. The program for the occasion, together with the date and hour, will be ready for announcement within a short time.

The unveiling ceremonies will soon take place in the rotunda of the Capitol, and it was a great privilege and high honor for me to sponsor legislation granting congressional authority for the exercises, similar legislation having been offered in the other body by Senators ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG. I am grateful to the House for the passage of this legislation today.

Chief Justice White was born November 3, 1845, in Lafourche Parish, La., the son of Edward Douglass White and Catherine S. Ringgold, and died in 1921. For almost a half century this great American served his State and Nation ably and devotedly. Beginning his public life as State Senator, his long career included service as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, United States Senator, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States for 16 years, and as Chief Justice, presiding over the highest court in the land during the remaining 11 years of his life.

Following his early education at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., the Jesuit College in New Orleans and Georgetown College in the District of Columbia, young White left school to enlist as a private in the Confederate Army, at the age of 16. After the war he pursued the study of law and was admitted to the Louisiana bar in 1868. Almost immediately he entered politics, was elected to the State senate and later appointed to the State supreme court. His judicial career in Louisiana was cut short, however, owing to the fact that under a new constitution the court was reconstituted, and his term ended.

Following his service on the highest court of his native State, Edward Douglass White was elected to the Senate of the United States. He made his influence felt in that body and evidently was highly esteemed by his colleagues as is evident by the events in his life which took place at that time. A vacancy had occurred on the Supreme Court of the United States, and by virtue of the circumstances which existed it was generally assumed that it would be filled by the appointment of someone from the State of New York. As was expected, President Grover Cleveland did send the name of a prominent New York attorney to the Senate for confirmation, but one of the Senators from that State blocked the nomination on the basis and under the rules of senatorial courtesy. The same thing having happened with respect to the nomination of another New Yorker, it is said that President Cleveland then stated that he would this time

send the name of a man whom the Senators would not dare to reject. He sent to the Senate the name of Edward Douglass White of Louisiana, and the nomination was unanimously confirmed.

Thus began an illustrious judicial career which was to run for a period of 27 years. In 1910 came White's greatest honor when President William Howard Taft appointed his friend to the highest judicial office in the land, Chief Justice of the United States. In so doing President Taft ignored a political pattern and tradition. Taft broke away from tradition by selecting a serving Associate Justice instead of designating an outsider, and the Republican President shattered the political pattern by appointing a Democratic Chief Justice. This was the second instance of a Southern Democratic Catholic being appointed to preside over the highest court of the land, Roger B. Taney having been Chief Justice from 1836 to 1864.

During his service on the bench, Justice White wrote opinions in more than 700 cases. He was an untiring worker, gracious, modest, genial, full of both dignity and humility, and particularly kind and helpful to young members of the bar who appeared before his court. He had a remarkable memory and apparently knew his opinions by heart, including volume and page citations, and seldom referred to the printed page. His skill and energy as a presiding officer expedited the work of the court, and his personality and engaging manner contributed much to resolving of differences of opinion among his colleagues.

Justice White was married in 1894 to Leita Montgomery Kent.

The building in which the late Chief Justice was born, on Bayou Lafourche, between Thibodaux and Napoleonville, has been preserved and on January 23, 1955, with surrounding grounds, was transferred to the State Park Recreation Commission for the establishment and development of a public park and memorial.

We of Louisiana are, indeed, proud and honored that a most distinguished son of our State, by the passage of this bill, is being paid one of the Nation's highest honors.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (S. J. Res. 18) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Cambridge, Mass., on April 7, 1955, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAGES FROM THE DOORKEEPER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 252) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $16,093 toward paying the salaries of pages from the Doorkeeper's Department, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1955.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2851, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration, H. R. 2851, was introduced on January 24 by Congressman JENNINGS, of Virginia. Congressman JENNINGS is a new Member of Congress, and during his very first term in Congress he was elected to membership on the House Committee on Agriculture. During the time he has served on our committee, he has been intensely interested in all matters pertaining to agriculture and has supported all legislation reported by our committee. During the very first month of his service in Congress he introduced the bill now before the House. Action on the bill has been delayed, not because of any lack of interest on the part of its author, but for various reasons. First, because the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates in the Department of Agriculture were not in favor of the bill, and, second, because of the great burden of work which has been assigned to the House Committee on Agriculture during the current session.

Congressman JENNINGS has been constantly interested in this measure. He is a devoted public servant and has regularly attended the sessions of the committee, and on numerous occasions has expressed to me his great interest in this particular bill. Congressman JENNINGS has served with great competency and is a very valuable member of our great committee.

Along with Mr. JENNINGS, 14 or 15 other Members of Congress have introduced bills dealing with this same subject. The names of the authors of the several bills appear in the report. I am certain that all the Members of this House are fully aware of the great activity and interest of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE], and others who have sponsored legislation dealing with this same subject, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

All of these Members of the House have been actively interested in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, since so many Members of the House are so intensely interested in the bill now before us, and are anxious to express their views concerning its provisions, I shall not attempt to explain the measure, nor to emphasize its importance, but rather, I prefer to yield time to others who will in the course of the debate explain the measure, discuss its purposes and emphasize its importance. I am, however, heartily in favor of the bill, and hope that it will pass without opposition.

My recollection is that the bill was reported by our committee by unanimous vote. I do not know of any opposition to the bill from any source except from officials in the Department of Agriculture. Actually, the Secretary of Agriculture now has the authority to make wheat and corn available for the purposes designated in this bill, but the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials in the executive branch of the Government, after having considered the matter carefully, decided that it was not a good policy to make wheat and corn available to hungry and needy Americans. There is not any doubt about the fact that Congress intended that wheat and corn and all other surplus commodities should be made available to needy and hungry Americans, but it appears absolutely necessary for us to pass this bill to clarify the situation and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates to carry out the clear intent and meaning of the law. This act might well be regarded in the nature of a mandamus.

I hope the bill will pass and that wheat and corn, which we now have in great abundance, will be made available to Americans who are in need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, my distinguished friend, Congressman JENNINGS.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering a bill which will mean much to my constituents in 6 coal-producing counties of the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia. It will mean that many of the almost 67,000 persons now living on surplus food commodities can have bread in their daily diet.

The purpose of H. R. 2851 is to allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to process a portion of our surplus grain, which is presently being stored at a cost of a million dollars per day, into flour and meal for distribution to needy persons in not only my State but to others where depressed economic conditions have caused hunger.

As present, in the coal producing counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Wise, Lee, Russell, and Tazewell in my district, unemployment has created a real need for some form of relief program. Bread winners have been out of work for several months, their unemployment insurance has been exhausted, and there are no funds for food. Surplus food commodities have been distributed during the past year to these needy people who through no fault of their own have been unable to find jobs. These food commodities have included butter, cheese, shortening, dried beans, dried milk, milled rice, and at one time, canned beef and gravy. However, these people have not been able to have bread to add to their meals which consist of the above mentioned items 3 times each day.

This bill, H. R. 2851, which I urge be passed unanimously by the House, will make it possible for flour and meal to be added to the list of commodities now being distributed. These deserving people, good Americans who have encountered hunger in this land of plenty, can then make bread.

The House Agriculture Committee has given unanimous approval to this bill which I introduced in the House and which has been amended to reflect the views of the entire committee. I believe it now accomplishes the intended purpose of my original bill, and those introduced by my colleagues who have similar economic situations in their districts, and also strengthens the assistance program for needy persons and the agricultural program.

This legislation, which I am confident will be approved here today, calls for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assume the responsibility of distribution of surplus agriculture commodities for relief purposes in two specific types of distress areas. Commodities which are available for donation under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 will be made available to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare without charge. Other commodities, which are not perishable and thus not available generally, will be made available also but the Commodity Credit Corporation will be reimbursed for these commodities and for any extra processing or handling required to make them available for distribution.

The bill under consideration will be limited in its operations to two types of areas—those designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial labor surplus and those designated by the President as warranting assistance by the Federal Government because of a major disaster. The first type operation will include those areas suffering acute economic distress such as results from the closing down of coal-mining facilities. The second type operation includes agricultural areas suffering disaster from drought and similar natural causes.

I wish to emphasize to the Members that there are safeguards written into this legislation to make certain that only needy persons receive any products made available to the States. The Governor of a State desiring this aid must certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that there is acute distress prevailing in the areas because of prevailing conditions, and that arrangements have been made for a properly designated State agency to distribute the food.

In Virginia, we have a commodity distribution section located in the department of agriculture and a supervisor of distribution. This supervisor orders commodities in quantities needed and they are then distributed to the local welfare departments in carload quantities and are made available to families who are investigated and certified as being in need. The quantity of commodities distributed through welfare channels since July 1, 1954, in the six counties mentioned above have been worth about $3 million. These people are grateful for this aid which has meant the difference in going hungry and in receiving food while seeking employment.

I wish to state that the quantities of surplus food commodities which can be requisitioned by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are limited to those quantities which can be effectively distributed and utilized by families and persons determined to be in need in the areas approved for inclusion in the program.

The Agriculture Department has opposed this bill because its officials feel distribution of flour and meal may interfere with normal channels of trade. I do not believe that this is a valid reason for such opposition. The people who will receive these grain products have exhausted their sources of income and do not have funds to purchase flour and meal. In other words, we have a breadline in sections of our Nation but there is no bread.

I feel that the Federal Government must recognize that we have these depressed economic areas and take steps to aid the residents in such areas. I realize that this is a temporary relief measure but it is a necessary one. We have made grain and grain products available to hungry people in other nations; let us put our own people, who helped through their taxes to finance these foreign relief operations, on the same basis as those needy people overseas. We have the grain; it is time to make use of it in a worthwhile program.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to take this occasion to congratulate the gentleman on his very able presentation of this matter. It is a worthwhile cause and should be supported by everyone.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have tried to make some investigation of this matter since the gentleman brought the matter up with the committee. I must frankly state I have not been able to locate any breadlines in any part of Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. No; we do not have the bread available. These people like the bread but it is not available.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not being facetious about this matter because I think it is a serious thing. Is it not true that in the coal areas represented by the gentleman there is a great deal of unemployment?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what causes the need for relief. But I still say that I have not found any place in Virginia, even in the gentleman's area, where these people are not able to get bread from some source. I do not question the gentleman's motives on this legislation, and I am in sympathy with what he seeks to accomplish, but where are these breadlines to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. JENNINGS. They are in the six coal-producing counties which I just referred to. For lack of a better name to call this program I called it a breadline without bread.

The supervisor of commodity distribution in Virginia told me that as he stood by a little store building in the mountains of Russell County, Va., a proud little old lady with tears rolling down her cheeks came up to him and said, "I never dreamed when we owned this little building and operated a little grocery store that the time would ever come when we would have to ask for Government food. The reason we lost our little store was that we just could not refuse to credit these poor people for flour, meal, and beans, even when we knew that they could not pay us for a long time, if ever. Then we could not pay our own bills and they closed us up. We are not bitter, though, even if we cannot understand so many things that are going on in this big country of ours. Surely our own Government will not fail us at a time when they are doing so much for so many people everywhere."

That points out that they are not getting the flour and meal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is a fine, pointed statement the gentleman has made. Is it the purpose of the gentleman's bill that these people shall be given flour and cornmeal, and if they are given such flour and cornmeal, do they have facilities so that they can bake

it, or must they have a baker bake it for them?

Mr. JENNINGS. These mountain people are very resourceful, and I am sure they will be able to bake it as they have in the past when the commodities and ingredients have been made available to them.

Let me add that we are only adding flour and meal to the commodities they are presently receiving, cheese, dried milk, beans, rice, and shortening.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And butter.

Mr. JENNINGS. And butter, yes. Of course, the gentleman from Minnesota would think of butter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And they must have bread on which to spread the butter.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my subcommittee chairman.

Mr. GRANT. I want to compliment the gentleman from Virginia on this bill. I know he has spent a good deal of time and effort in working on it, and he has been aided by others, by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and our friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mention was made a moment ago about there being no need for this. Is it not a fact that the need will have to be shown, so the flour and meal will not be wasted?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes, it certainly will. This will be available under only two conditions. One is that there is a surplus of labor which is certified by the Secretary of Labor to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and then certified by the Governor of the State, and the other is that the President shall declare it a distress area. So the need must be shown, and it must be supervised beyond any reasonable doubt so there will be no waste.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING], a member of the committee.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is not a very important bill. It will not accomplish much and it will not do much harm. It is supported, of course, by those who have an honest concern for those who really need free food. It is an extension of a system which we already have for the distribution of free food. And coming from Pennsylvania, I should consider this quite important because I understand Pennsylvania is now getting more of this free surplus food than all the other States of the Union combined. This bill is also being supported by the high-price supporters who are worried about getting rid of the surpluses that are being accumulated by the ridiculous farm program we have before us. But even in that respect, it will not accomplish much. It should be realized that the Department of Agriculture is opposed to this bill purely on the grounds that it will not accomplish anything in the movement of the Government surplus, and it certainly will not accomplish much in putting bread into the mouths that are not getting bread. It does, of course, extend the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation and puts the Commodity Credit Corporation into the processing business where it has not previously been. So it is enlarging an operation which is already a great burden to our country. This scheme, as I say, of merely adding the flour and cornmeal to the list of commodities that can be given away free, really costs the taxpayers more than giving them the cash with which to buy the bread and the meal that is already in their territory, because if the Government is going to supervise it, it will have to let the contracts for special milling lots and then they have to set up a separate distributing system for getting it to the location of the people who need it. It is certainly not going to be any cheaper for the taxpayers to do it this way, and it is going to be more cumbersome for the Department of Agriculture with the Commodity Credit Corporation handling it. But, of course, you should remember that those who are interested in this farm program and in getting rid of this surplus do not want to see anything like this charged to the farm program, so they have made sure in this bill that the cost is going to be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That, of course, is a very important point, and it was important in the discussions before our committee to see who is going to pay the bill. I am not strenuously opposed to this bill, but I say it is not very important, and it will not accomplish much. Any of the wheat that is distributed through this process will have to be picked up again, just as in the case of the dairy products. The justification for all this food distribution is need—not that it is going to relieve the Government of surpluses, because any distribution of these surpluses domestically simply means that that much demand is taken out of the free market and the Government has to pick it up again. It is a nice scheme for rotating the supply, but it is not relieving the Government any.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Would this bill have any significance in establishing a precedent?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Simply that it extends the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, in this matter I disagree with my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING] because I think the distribution of surplus food has been a good program, worked out under current laws with the cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture, the States, and the local authorities.

As you know, I represent the city of Pittsburgh, and Clairton, including the southern part of Allegheny County in Pennsylvania. We have had distress there caused by unemployment, and this program has helped conditions considerably. Our volunteer food distribution boards in the various communities of our area have done an outstanding job.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to yield to my good friend.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I did not mean to criticize the program of distributing food, except to point out that it was not accomplishing the disposal of surpluses in any way. I agree with the general justification for giving food to people who need it.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to report here on the program that has been set up in Allegheny County, because I had been asked by the Central Labor Union of Pittsburgh to help set up the program in Pennsylvania, under the previous Republican administration. Joined with me in setting up that program in Allegheny County were Congressman CORBETT, Congressman EBERHARTER, and Congresswoman BUCHANAN. We were able, in working with the Secretary, and the officials of the United States Department of Agriculture, to set up the free food distribution program providing originally for 7,500 unemployed persons in our county, to alleviate distress that could not reasonably be taken care of by our voluntary agencies.

In the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County that program has now grown until there are in excess of 160,000 unemployed persons on an average receiving free food under this program. I am proud to have been part of this fine program, in which so many good citizens are volunteering their time and services.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How far does the gentleman think we should go in the distribution of these surplus foods? Should it include people who are in need because they are out of work on strike?

Mr. FULTON. I do not believe we can ask the person in need of food and hungry why and for what reason he and his family are hungry. The children of a man on strike or unemployed are entitled in my view to adequate food just as the children of those who work or who do not need to work. We had a department-store strike in Pittsburgh. There was some criticism of the fact that food was brought in to take care of the families and children of these people—5,000 of whom were on strike at the time—which, unfortunately, continued for many months before settlement. My position was then, and it is now, that not in labor relations in Pittsburgh nor in the United States should we use starvation as an economic weapon in a strike dispute, no matter which side is in the right. Actually, the need for the free food-distribution program is at the family level, where children are not getting proper supplies for growth and development. We people who are mature

should not settle our industrial disputes at the expense of children; nor should the Government take steps to exclude children from social welfare or free food programs because a relative or family member might be on strike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I feel that this Federal free food distribution has been a well-run program and should be expanded by this current legislation. I am glad to see that it is being expanded and that the Federal Government will take the responsibility of moving the food products into centralized agencies in the State, and will bear the cost of processing the foods for this program. This program does two things: In this case it helps the cities because these receiving people are unemployed, have no purchasing power, and must eat; likewise, it helps the country and farm areas because we are helping to dispose of surpluses that are now costing such high amounts in just keeping commodities in storage, and there is danger of much of it spoiling.

This is not a relief program because these same recipient people have themselves paid high price supports to keep up the prices of such food, so they could buy less and save less when they were employed and had money. In addition, they have paid Federal taxes that have been used to do the purchasing of these very surplus commodities. Therefore, I feel that whether it is on an individual basis or a group basis, these needy United States families are entitled to this kind of a Federal free surplus food-distribution program and so it should be set up and be broadened by the bill under consideration. I urge both my Republican and Democratic colleagues to vote for this program under this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield for a question of an explanatory nature?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. POFF. As I understand, only those grains which are in CCC warehouses will be used for processing. Is that it?

Mr. BAILEY. I assume that is correct; I do not know.

Mr. JENNINGS. No, only those grains which are in CCC warehouses or which will be procured under the price-support program; any grain now in possession or that may come into the possession of CCC.

Mr. POFF. I understand, but what does this statement at the bottom of page 5 of the committee report mean where it states:

> The language of the bill is broad enough to permit purchase by CCC of equivalent quantities of processed products rather than go through the possibly more expensive procedure of arranging for the processing and packaging of the grain?

Mr. BAILEY. That would mean that they could purchase already processed flour in lieu of arranging to have somebody grind the wheat into flour.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. Chairman, before going into the merits of the legislation contained in House Resolution 2851—the Jennings bill—may I extend my sincere thanks to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and to the members of his committee for the action taken in reporting this legislation unanimously.

I want also to express my appreciation to the members of the Rules Committee for the prompt action in granting a rule and, most of all, my thanks to our distinguished majority floor leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, in promptly scheduling this legislation for House action.

I am sure my colleagues will better understand the need for this legislation and the urgency for its immediate passage if I take the time to give them some necessary background.

Due to the fact that 17 percent plus of West Virginia's labor force is presently unemployed, it is one of the soft spots in our national economy. Unemployment is largely in the coal-mining industry, where more than 61,000 miners have lost their jobs since 1951. This is due in a large measure to the uncontrolled imports of cheap foreign oil that has displaced our soft-coal markets.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that most of these miners have long since drawn all of their unemployment compensation, and they and their families are objects of charity. A total of 253,000 men, women, and children, representing 1 out of every 8 persons in the State, are exising today on surplus food allotments, consisting mostly of butter, cheese, dried beans, dry milk, and a limited amount of cooking fluids.

Scores of communities that were once flourishing mining centers of from one to two thousand population are today ghost towns. The mine has been abandoned; the company store closed, and there are no other sources of employment available within the State. These people have no purchasing power, and the distribution of flour and cornmeal, added to the present surplus foods, would in no way interfere with normal markets. There just is not any market.

THE CRITICAL AREAS—STATE ORGANIZATION

I am certain my colleagues are aware of my continued interest in lightening the burden of these unfortunate people. You will recall in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, in 1953, the Congress authorized a grant of 37 million bushels of surplus wheat to Pakistan. A part of this grant was to be distributed to the starving population of this country. We not only gave them the wheat, but paid $21 million in freight charges.

You will recall that I attempted to amend the Pakistan wheat proposal to provide for distribution of wheat or flour to the needy people in areas of our own country where the President had declared a critical situation existed due to unemployment. I lost my amendment by a margin of only 11 votes.

In the 2d session of the 83d Congress, when the present surplus food-disposal legislation came before the House, I succeeded in amending legislation to provide for the transfer of wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture for distribution to the needy people in this country. Months after the passage of this legislation I was advised by the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation that they would not make this wheat available for distribution because it would interfere with normal marketing.

Today, not a single needy individual in the State of West Virginia has received a single sack of flour or package of ground meal out of the bountiful supply of surplus in the commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The sole purpose of the legislation before you is to provide that these people in the several States in areas that are critical, due to unemployment, are immediately permitted to share the same gratuity that we are handing out to people abroad under the provisions of the existing Surplus Food Disposal Act.

This act provides that the President may distribute to needy people abroad for the purpose of buying their good will an amount not to exceed $300 million of surplus food by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

A recent check on expenditures under this provision of the act discloses that a major part of the appropriation has already been used by Mr. Stassen's group in the packaging and transportation of surplus foods to a large number of foreign nations.

Why, I ask you in all sincerity, cannot the hungry and needy people within our own border be accorded an equal opportunity to share in this distribution? Time will not permit me to give you the details of a tragic situation in my State which today has the greatest percentage of unemployment in any of the 48 States. You, my colleagues, know full well that the major part of my activities as a Member of this body has been directed toward correcting a situation for which the people of West Virginia are in no way responsible.

My plea to you today is that you give speedy approval to this temporary arrangement that will permit these people to eke out a living until such time as the Congress may elect to change our basic laws in order to permit the economy of my State to return to normalcy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that a moment ago I mentioned the names of the authors of these many bills. I left out the name of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], who was the author of one of these bills.

I failed to mention the activities of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and his great interest in behalf of this legislation. I think all Members of the House and all members of the Committee on Agriculture appreciate the diligence with which he has pressed this matter to the final point we reach today.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for those kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee of the Whole to adopt this bill. The principal industry in my congressional district is the mining of coal, and as the Members of Congress know it is a sick industry. As a result, many miners who have worked 30 or 40 years, and in some instances longer, now find themselves unemployed through no fault of their own. Their unemployment compensation is exhausted—their savings have been spent—and they are now living on relief.

They appreciate the fact that when they were working they paid their taxes and were a large segment of the buying market in those areas. Today, they have purchasing power.

They are grateful that a part of their taxes were used in the price-support program and that they have received from that program dried milk, butter, cheese, beans, and canned meats when available.

What this bill will do will add the staff of life—flour and meal—to those commodities they are now receiving.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has asked whether or not there were any breadlines. I can tell him very frankly that if he, or anyone else who is interested, will come to my district they will not find breadlines as such, but they will find long lines of unemployed people receiving the certificates which will enable them to obtain from the food depots this surplus food. This is not an uncommon occurrence, but rather a common occurrence in every town in the three county area of Pennsylvania which I represent.

The recipients of this food are American citizens who do not desire to receive public charity. What they desire is a job—whether in the coal mines or any other industry—so that they can earn their living, pay their taxes and continue to contribute to the growth of this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry to hear that condition exists in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. It is an unfortunate situation and I do not like to have to say that it exists, but because of the fact that a flood of oil is coming into this country, placing our miners out of work, the situation does exist and if this House would go along with some of the Representatives from the coal areas and see to it that this flood of residual oil is stopped, I can say to you that we would not be here asking for this because our men would be working.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting H. R. 2851, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts.

In plain words, the purpose of the bill as introduced was to authorize the Department of Agriculture to process wheat and corn into flour and cornmeal for distribution to needy persons in the United States.

In addition to H. R. 2851 the committee amendment has my approval since it will transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the responsibility of the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities for relief purposes in two specific types of distressed areas, namely those designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of "substantial labor surplus" and those designated by the President as warranting assistance because of a major disaster.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2851 is similar in some respects to my three bills, H. R. 863, introduced early in January and H. R. 3144 and 3145, all of which deal with the distribution of surplus commodities to needy persons in the United States.

My interest in the distribution of surplus commodities began several years ago as unemployment mounted in my congressional district while Government warehouses were bulging at the seams with surplus commodities valued at billions of dollars.

Back in 1949 the United States Department of Labor because of the unemployment in my congressional district classified it as a critical area, and today with better than 18 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed, my district is classified in group IV–B as an area having a very substantial labor surplus.

Therefore, if H. R. 2851, as amended, becomes law the unemployment in my district will qualify under its provisions to receive surplus commodities in a form suitable for home use.

In other words, the unemployed will receive flour and cornmeal in addition to surplus commodities now available under the existing program.

Mr. Chairman, as I have mentioned previously, over 18 percent of the civilian labor force in my congressional district is unemployed and is principally composed of coal miners and railroaders who have exhausted their unemployment-insurance benefits, liquidated their savings accounts, borrowed on or have taken the cash value of their insurance policies, and today are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

To give you some idea of the overall picture of unemployment in my congressional district, let me call your attention to the following chart that describes the number of families and persons receiving surplus commodities:

Surplus commodities

County	Number of families	Percentage of all families	Total number of persons	Percentage of county population
Blair	10,801	26.8	32,561	23.3
Centre	2,939	15.9	9,362	14.2
Clearfield	9,988	42.2	37,179	43.3
Total	23,728	28.8	79,402	27.1
Entire State of Pennsylvania			1,020,963	[1] 9.7

As you know, Mr. Chairman, before you receive coupons for surplus commodities you have to be certified as eligible by a local welfare agency.

Therefore these figures are official and have been verified not only by the State of Pennsylvania but also by the county commissioners in each of the three counties in my congressional district.

Surplus commodities by carload lots to Mar. 1, 1955

County	Beans	Beef	Butter	Cheese	Dried milk	Rice	Shortening
Blair	2	16	21	19	18	1	16
Centre	½	4	3	5	5	½	4
Clearfield	4	5	16	14	16	1	13
Total number of carloads	6½	25	40	38	39	2½	33
Grand total	184						

Mr. Chairman, there is no denial of the fact that these figures are startling and are an answer to those who smugly insist that there is no acute unemployment problem in the labor-surplus areas of the Nation.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, according to the Pennsylvania Department of Property and Supplies, in the great industrial State of Pennsylvania, out of its 10⅓ million residents, nearly 10 percent, or 1,020,963, are living on surplus commodities.

In this congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, out of a population of 292,000, nearly 28 percent or 79,402 persons are receiving surplus commodities.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are startling for they truly portray the extent of unemployment in my congressional district as well as in the entire State of Pennsylvania.

As I said in the beginning of this statement, the processing of wheat into flour and corn into meal will enable the families of the unemployed to use these surplus commodities to good advantage since many housewives still bake their own bread and muffins and can put the flour and meal to good use in arranging the family diet.

Mr. Chairman, this idea of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal as provided for in H. R. 2851 will not establish a precedent in the handling and distribution of surplus commodities, because over a period of years the United States Department of Agriculture has

been distributing canned beef and gravy in processed form.

According to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, during the period from March to December of 1953, they purchased nearly 172 million pounds of canned beef and gravy for distribution here in the United States, while nearly 12 million more pounds of canned beef and gravy were purchased for export, mainly to Greece and Germany.

The cost of these purchases was in excess of $72 million.

Mr. Chairman, if it has been possible to put beef and gravy in a tin container for distribution, I can see no reason why wheat and corn should not be processed into flour and meal for the unemployed of the Nation.

Therefore, I hope that H. R. 2851 will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I thought I would take this time to clear up what may be a misunderstanding as far as the distribution of wheat flour and cornmeal is concerned. I have talked with the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and also with the proper officials in the Commodity Credit Corporation, and they advise me that they do not find any authority under existing law to permit them to pay the cost of processing wheat into flour or corn into cornmeal.

They do not object to this bill, but they do not feel that they can go ahead unless there is authority granted to them to carry out the purpose and intent of the members of our Committee on Agriculture as expressed in this bill.

We had a hearing on this bill. Unfortunately, the hearings are not available here today. But I have examined them and I find nothing in those hearings to indicate that there is any material opposition to the purpose of the proposed legislation. The main opposition has come on the question of distribution and the question of who is to pay the cost of processing.

It is a simple matter to make an exchange of wheat with flour mills so that the Commodity Credit Corporation could turn over a certain amount of wheat to the flour mills and take in exchange therefor flour that has been actually milled for distribution. The same could be done with corn. So it would be less expensive and less difficult to make that exchange of wheat and corn for flour and meal.

Mr. BAILEY. That is what the bill provides.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am saying that this bill is intended to give authority to the Commodity Credit Corporation to do the very thing which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] and others have proposed here today. I am not opposed to this bill. I am just amazed to hear that in certain areas of the country there are now breadlines because of the inability of the local people or of some agency, either of the State or Federal Government, to take care of the situation. Certainly the people should have bread. They are being given butter and cheese and a good many other things from surplus food. Bread is the cheapest thing. We have an abundance of wheat in this country. Certainly we should see to it that needy people or those who are on relief and who are deserving get it.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think that they should have some bread on which to spread that fine Wisconsin butter?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know so much about the Wisconsin butter, but I would like to see them spread some Minnesota butter on it. They are getting Minnesota butter, and I am glad of it, because I feel that it is our first duty to take care of people in need in this country. Charity begins at home. We should let it begin at home instead of having it begin in some other country in the world.

The gentleman from West Virginia indicated he wanted me to yield to him, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The gentleman has largely covered the question I had in mind of exchanging flour for milled wheat. The same thing could be done with corn, the only question being the matter of the cost of processing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There should be no material objection to this bill. We are here dealing with American citizens, with people who are allegedly on relief. I do not find that situation out in my area. The relief agencies there are taking care of those who are in need. I feel they should probably do the same thing in the States of Virginia or West Virginia or in the other States, because bread is the cheapest commodity in the United States. As long as they are not getting bread, I am willing that the needy be given flour for bread. I am willing to take the word of the Governor of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, I am referring to Governor Stanley, who is one of the finest men I have ever met. He verifies the fact that there are some 12,400 people unemployed and that the number on the relief rolls down there is approximately 66,770.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know that the gentleman is aware of the fact that the State of West Virginia has set up a distributing center and has purchased and is operating 8 trucks full time, 24 hours a day, in the distribution of surplus commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear they have been willing to purchase the trucks to distribute the surplus commodities which the Government gives them.

Mr. BAILEY. And they pay the salaries of the people who are making the distribution.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad they have done that. Out in our State we have the welfare organization and we have our Community Chest that tries to take care of the people that are in need. If they are in need of surplus food, we certainly want them to get it, just as well as the people of Virginia and other States of the country.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman, and appreciate what he has to say.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, no one has mentioned the fact that on page 78 of the hearings Mr. Earl Hughes, Administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation, said this:

> We have no objection to making these products available if some other agency wants to reimburse the Commodity Credit for them.

All this argument we are having at this moment amounts to about this, and as far as the bill itself is concerned, all we are trying to do in this matter, after the manner in which it was rewritten in our committee, is to arrange the legislation so that the Department of Agriculture, handling the surpluses, can turn over to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department the surplus products, and they assume the expense of delivering these packaged or processed products to the local communities. Then the communities, we are assuming, take charge of the products from there on out to the families and to the communities that need them. I am sure I am right in that. That is all we are trying to do.

There is no nation in the world that has been, shall I say, as goodhearted—that is an old western word—to all the world as we have been. We have answered the call of hungry people in every spot on the face of this earth. Is there any reason in the world why, if we have a surplus product in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we should not make it just as easy as possible to get it into any area that needs that type and kind of food? That was the reasoning behind this bill and that was the feeling that our committee had. We were not considering going into detail as to what brought all this unemployment about or what caused these particular places to be short of food supplies. All we were trying to do was to take care of the surpluses we had on hand and do it in the most equitable and the most efficient manner possible.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation to the House Committee on Agriculture, and to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], for bringing to the floor for debate this afternoon, the bill H. R. 2851 to authorize the United States Department of Agriculture to process surplus wheat and corn into flour and cornmeal for distribution to needy persons in the United States.

The members of this committee and of the United States House of Representatives know of my interest in this matter over the recent years. I had the privilege of appearing before the Committee on Agriculture last year and urging a greatly expanded program for the distribution of surplus commodities to

people in need throughout the United States. It was generally thought at that time that the law was sufficiently broad to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, to go ahead and process surplus stocks of wheat and corn into flour and cornmeal and distribute them along with other agricultural commodities. While home last fall I looked around and found that the Secretary of Agriculture was not distributing flour and cornmeal, so on December 6, 1954, I wrote Secretary Benson urging that he immediately make flour available to the unemployed people of this country. Secretary Benson took the position that he did not have the legal authority to distribute flour and cornmeal, so it behooves us to pass the bill before us and give him the specific authority to do so.

For several years now we have furnished food and other assistance to our allies and friends around the world. Certainly we can do no less than to help our own people in this program. Charity begins at home.

Mr. Chairman, some Members have expressed the doubt that breadlines exist in this country. Much has been said about our high plane of prosperity in this country. It is true that some 62 million people are employed in America. It is true that the stock market is higher perhaps than it has ever been. Installment credit is easier to come by than ever before. But, Mr. Chairman, underneath it all are the 3 million unemployed people in this country. They can be found in many areas of the country. They are the people who are leaving the farm because they do not have the money to mechanize their farms and finance themselves for a few years. They are the people who have seen the diesel engine steal their coal markets. They are the people who have seen the coal mines close that gave them sustenance over the years. They are the people who have seen altogether too low unemployment compensation used up, and who face the despair of the future without the hope and feeling of well-being that regular employment gives.

Unemployment is an economic curse. It is an economic disease as deadly as cancer. There is no place for widespread unemployment in the United States. Members of this House know that for several years now I have been urging our Government to set up a special program for these areas of high unemployment.

My home county, Walker County, Ala., is an area of high unemployment. The failure of its coal industry threw thousands of people out of employment. The drought of the last 4 years in other counties of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama left want, hunger, and suffering in its wake. Walker was the first county in Alabama to qualify for surplus agricultural commodities. Other counties of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama qualified later. Millions of dollars' worth of food has been distributed through this program in our congressional district. It is being distributed today. But, Mr. Chairman, as necessary as this program has been, what the thousands of needy people of the congressional district I represent want and need is jobs.

Our Federal Government has not given sufficient attention to their needs. There are many things that our Government could do for the areas of high unemployment. It could build needed public projects in those areas. It could improve and develop the rivers in the areas of the unemployed. It could engage in a program of the construction of public buildings, schools, roads, and others.

The point I am making is that our Government has not adopted a program to eradicate unemployment. We have done some things such as this program for the distribution of surplus foods, but that is not enough. We should have a broad national policy, and program against depressions. Widespread unemployment is out of place in the age in which we live. Our Government should not tolerate it. At least it should make a much greater effort than has been made to eradicate it. The prevailing philosophy in the Government appears to be that of the ostrich that hides his head in the sand. Some even argue that regardless of what is done you will always have a considerable amount of unemployment. I have even heard it argued that it is economically healthy for us to have about 3 million people unemployed. These are defeatist arguments. They are defeatist ideas. I do not subscribe to them. They are based on a false philosophy. When unemployment rears its ugly head Government should do what can reasonably be done to stamp it out. This Government has not done what can be reasonably done. It has not given sufficient attention to the problems of the unemployed. Those problems cry for a solution.

As I have already stated this bill before us to add flour and cornmeal to the list of surplus commodities for distribution to unemployed and needy people is a good bill as far as it goes. It should be passed. I am confident it will be passed. I trust this Government of ours will also immediately give serious consideration to the larger problem of finding jobs for our unemployed. The people want jobs. Their Government should provide much more leadership than it has shown to date to find the answer to the problem of unemployment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the immediate enactment of H. R. 2851. This legislation is of tremendous importance to thousands of coal miners and other workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own in the district which I represent in Congress. These coal miners have long since exhausted all benefits under unemployment compensation laws. Last year I introduced a bill, H. R. 8585, which would have granted 50 percent additional unemployment benefits to coal miners and others in industries who are unemployed due to the foreign trade policies of the United States such as importation of residual fuel oil. Hearings were conducted before the Ways and Means Committee but I was unable to obtain favorable action. The bill would also have applied to lead and zinc workers. I have also introduced a bill, H. R. 5956, to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for distribution to needy unemployed persons identical with the bill we are considering. No finer use could be found for the surplus wheat and corn which the United States Department of Agriculture has accumulated under its price-support program than to process this wheat and corn into flour and meal and distribute it to our own unemployed workers who are out of work through no fault of their own due to the closing down of coal mines and plants and disasters from droughts and similar causes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think one point has been overlooked and that is that the food which is presently being distributed does not provide for a balanced diet.

This bill will provide a balanced diet which is so essential to the physical well-being of people. This is particularly true of children. Growing children need a balanced diet in order to build up their physical strength and to grow to be normal adults.

In addition, this measure will provide additional food for people who are in distress in many areas of the United States and particularly in my State of Pennsylvania. Two-thirds of the surplus food distributed in the United States goes to Pennsylvania. That is how serious the problem of poverty and undernourishment is in this great State.

I am hopeful that the bill will pass. It looks as if there were not very much opposition to it, which of course there should not be. Passage of this bill would no doubt add a great deal to the comfort and well-being of the recipients of this food.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill will greatly strengthen and increase the assistance we are presently giving through distribution of surplus foods to those in distress from unemployment and other causes beyond their control. This distress is a very grave matter in Pennsylvania as shown by the fact that two-thirds of all the surplus food distributed in the United States is distributed in that State.

The Pittsburgh area has been classified by the Secretary of Labor as an area of "substantial labor surplus" and therefore is one of the distress areas included in the bill.

Relief experts tell us of the relatively high consumption of cereal products by needy persons and families. And I know from experience how necessary wheat flour and cornmeal is in feeding a family of growing children.

It was back in January 1954, Mr. Chairman, that I went down to Secretary Benson's office along with Congressmen EBERHARTER, CORBETT, and FULTON

in response to a request from the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union for the distribution of surplus food to the increasing number of unemployed workers in the Pittsburgh area. At that time there were about 28,000 persons out of work in the Pittsburgh area and as a result of our visit surplus foods were made available to those in need in Allegheny County.

I have only recently received letters indicating that this food distribution program is still a most essential one and I am very happy to see that there is so little opposition to the pending bill which would broaden the program and add additional food items to the list.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

ALL NEEDY AMERICANS SHOULD BE ENABLED TO OBTAIN SURPLUS FOOD—WE NEED A NATIONAL FOOD STAMP PLAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H. R. 2851 and will vote for it, but I want to say at this time it does not go far enough—it does not begin to go far enough—in meeting the needs of our very-low-income groups throughout the country.

It is tragic to have all of this surplus food piling up in storage, to such an extent that we are desperately trying to get rid of it all over the world, and yet have hungry people in the United States. And we do have families not getting sufficient quantities of nourishing food.

This bill now before us was intended to broaden the existing program of surplus food disposal in the United States, but the existing program is an inadequate program. Many of our States are not participating in it. They are unable to. This bill started out as an attempt to get to the people now receiving this surplus food, quantities of flour and cereals processed from surplus grains.

What we really need—and not just for people in the so-called distress areas or disaster areas, as this bill provides, but throughout the country wherever we have needy people and particularly families on relief or various forms of public assistance—is a food stamp plan such as provided in my bill, H. R. 5105.

I submit at this point in the RECORD a copy of a statement describing my bill:

[For release Sunday a. m., March 20, 1955, from the office of Representative LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, Third District, Missouri]

MRS. SULLIVAN READIES NEW FOOD STAMP BILL FOR INTRODUCTION IN CONGRESS

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, announced last night she is planning to reintroduce this week a revised version of her much-discussed bill of last year to distribute a billion dollars worth of surplus food a year to needy Americans through a food stamp plan.

The original Sullivan bill was the first measure introduced in the House in the 83d Congress calling for a nationwide food stamp system of distribution of surplus foods to persons on relief and to other needy families. Since then there have been numerous similar measures introduced in both the House and Senate, some of them identical with Mrs. SULLIVAN's bill of last year.

Mrs. SULLIVAN said her new bill requires consultation by the Secretary of Agriculture with both the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor in establishing standards for the distribution of the surplus foods.

"This provision arises primarily out of a suggestion which was made to me by Missouri Welfare Director Proctor N. Carter," Mrs. SULLIVAN said, "who pointed out that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare maintains direct relations with the State and local welfare agencies which would play such a large part in a successful food stamp distribution program."

She said that she added the provision giving the Secretary of Labor a voice in the distribution of the surplus foods because of the responsibilities of his Department in the field of unemployment.

"The continuing high level of unemployment in the country, even though production has been increasing over the levels of last year, makes it important that we devise an effective program for getting some of our vast stores of surplus food to needy families," Mrs. SULLIVAN declared.

"The present system of distribution of the surpluses has been, I am sorry to say, very much of a hit-and-miss proposition, with some States participating and some not, with some areas operating their own food stamp plan and others giving out the food to anybody who wants to come and register for it. So far as I can determine there are no uniform standards and no means of assuring that the people who really need this help are actually getting it. The Department of Agriculture seems to be concerned more with getting rid of a storage headache than in helping to solve a serious human problem.

"Furthermore, there has been a good deal of criticism of the program in some areas of the country for permitting or encouraging so-called chiselers to get this food, while elsewhere people who are really hungry can get none. I do not know that the chiseling is actually occurring, but the whole surplus food distribution system has been chaotic, and that encourages all kinds of abuses and criticisms."

Under Mrs. SULLIVAN's measure the Secretary of Agriculture would be given broad discretion in setting up the actual mechanics of the distribution system—that is, in determining whether or not the food should be distributed through regular grocery stores or at special outlets set up in each participating community. The bill would require, however, that the food be packaged in convenient form for distribution at the local level, with the food stamps themselves to be issued by the welfare department or equivalent agency of the individual State or political subdivision participating in the program.

Stamps would be issued for each type of surplus food to be distributed.

A major principle of the Sullivan bill is that any surplus food distributed under the act be in addition to, and not in place of, welfare assistance normally granted to needy persons by a State or local welfare agency.

For the purposes of the act needy persons are defined as those receiving public-welfare assistance or who are in need of such assistance but are ineligible because of State or local law (such as Missouri's employability law).

Mrs. SULLIVAN said: "Many of the bills which have been introduced on this subject since I first put mine in last year, and the surplus-food distribution system itself in some areas, provide for issuance of surplus food to people on unemployment compensation, or on social-security pensions or who have low-paying jobs. I do not oppose that idea at all—I think it is tragic to have people going hungry or not getting enough to eat when we have all this surplus food—but I think the most important part of this whole problem is to get this food to those who need it most. That is, to those on relief, those without jobs or unemployment compensation, those who are living right on the edge of malnutrition.

"Perhaps once we get a food-stamp program actually started and functioning smoothly then we can include all these other groups. My bill calls for a report by the Secretary of Agriculture within 6 months after the food-stamp program starts on the costs and problems of expanding it to include all of these other groups. But I think primarily we should get busy at once on providing a direct and effective system of distribution to those who we know are in real distress."

Mrs. SULLIVAN said that she looks forward to early hearings by the House Agricultural Committee on her bill.

Mr. Chairman, I also include a copy of H. R. 5105:

H. R. 5105

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation, as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food-stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food-stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law,

and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to $1,000,000,000, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food-stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if he will give me an early hearing on my food-stamp plan.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to report that I will be delighted to give you a hearing any time you can arrange to appear. I want to apologize for not having arranged an earlier hearing. I know of your great interest in the subject, and I agree with you that your bill does go much further than this bill, and at an early date we will try to arrange a meeting.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2851. I want to congratulate my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] for his authorship, and our other colleagues, many of whom are here this afternoon, who have sponsored similar legislation.

I think it is a good bill. It shows our people back home that we are interested in helping them to the same extent that we are interested in helping the people across the seas.

I want to point out a similar thought such as was suggested by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. I do not believe this bill goes quite far enough in looking into the various areas of America where people need help, and in trying to give them help. I estimated a couple of years ago that there are 10 million people in the United States, based on information that I had, who were receiving a diet less than the minimum. They are actually in need of more food. I cannot see anything un-American in looking into the problem of using some of these surplus agricultural commodities to try to help our people in this country who are not getting enough to eat.

I have been somewhat intrigued this afternoon by some statements which would indicate that there is no distress in America. I am very thankful that in many of our areas there is no distress. I know that the Committee on Agriculture is not satisfied with the progress we have made, and we want to keep looking into this problem of how we can get good American food into good empty American stomachs.

I shall follow the legislation offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] with a great deal of interest, because I think her bill will give us another possibility of helping our needy people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fortunately we have what is called the American standard of living, which is a very high one, but that is a very deceptive phrase. You have to break it down into economic factors, recognizing that the family is the backbone of any nation in any society. If you have a good strong family life you have a strong society and a strong Government. If you have a weak family life you have a weak society and a weak Government. Right in our own country there are between 15 and 18 million American families constituting anywhere from 75 to 90 million people whose total family income every year is $3,500 or less, and of those 15 to 18 million American families, there are between 4 and 5 million whose total family income is $1,000 or less.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the support for this legislation today. We all regret that we have these distressed areas over the Nation. I happen to represent one of those critical areas. The people that I represent do not want handouts. They prefer to have employment. To me the debate this afternoon points up the need for our governmental authorities to look into the needs of these distressed areas and see just what can be done to relieve the unemployment, particularly in the coal fields where a high percentage of unemployment exists today. There are basic reasons for such a high percentage of unemployment in the coal fields and this Congress should immediately tackle this problem.

Let me speak now in behalf of this bill. Many of the Members of Congress have been laboring under the impression that the Commodity Credit Corporation already possessed authority to process wheat. There cannot be any argument against legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process its surplus agricultural commodities in the same way that it is now processing these commodities which are donated to starving populations in foreign countries.

With more than three-quarters of a billion bushels of wheat on hand, it is unbelievable to find ourselves in a position where a governmental agency does not have authority to process surplus food commodities for the relief of the suffering of unemployed American workers and their families. It was the intent of the 83d Congress to give them the authority. Their argument during the past year has been that they were afraid it would interfere with normal commercial channels. We are only attempting to make flour available for those people who do not have any purchasing power. That is what the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation told me, and I am mighty happy to hear the members of this committee support this legislation almost unanimously here this afternoon. Certainly, our people in this country who are unemployed and do not have any purchasing power should be treated as well as we treat our friends abroad.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what every Member of this House is in favor of using our surpluses to relieve the want and suffering in the distress areas of the United States. My only criticism of this bill is that it does not go far enough. I would like to see it include the thousands upon thousands of old people in this country, who are forced to live on the meager allowances made under the old-age assistance programs, or who are trying to make ends meet on small pensions, and to include our charitable institutions. I know of many instances in my own congressional district where older people, handicapped persons and others in similar categories are having a difficult time to get the necessities of life. Six years ago, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] joined me in sponsoring an amendment to similar legislation, then under consideration, which provided for the inclusion of our older folks and our charitable institutions as beneficiaries of surpluses then on hand.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that, in my opinion, the bill before us illustrates conclusively the value of

the price-support program which made this God-given surplus of food available. Certainly the people who have described our surplus food as a calamity must now see the error of their ways and join with those of us who have urged a strong price-support program that will insure the production of ample food.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I have not much to say on the bill, because everybody knows I am for it; but I am glad to participate in this free debate. On every other occasion when there is any debate going on here we are threatened with the dire results of a veto, but there is no threat of a veto here this afternoon and the Congress can work its will.

There is one thing I am afraid of. I am on the Judiciary Committee where we dislike to give men what they have coming because we might establish a precedent. Somebody has raised that evil influence here this afternoon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING] said we might establish a precedent. When it comes to deciding between a precedent and hungry people I am inclined to overlook the precedent. We had better establish one, we had better establish the precedent in this country that when American people are hungry through no fault of their own and we have oceans of food, the precedent ought to be that they have something to eat.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER].

Mr. SILER. Mr. Chairman, I come from one of the greatest coal-producing counties in America, Harlan County, Ky. With my own eyes I have witnessed some of the financial distress that exists because of the low state of the bituminous coal industry.

I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia on the introduction of his bill. I introduced one of parallel nature. I think it is a good bill. It is a good bill because it accomplishes some worthwhile results at a very low cost. The reason the cost is low is because we already have the grain, the only cost being, as I understand it, the cost of processing the wheat and the corn into biscuits and corn bread.

When the Son of Man was on earth, He gave a parable in which He said:

For I was hungered, and ye gave Me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave Me no drink:

I was a stranger, and ye took Me not in: naked, and ye clothed Me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited Me not.

Then shall they also answer Him, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, or a-thirst or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto Thee?

Then shall He answer them, saying, verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to Me.

So I am glad and happy today that we are about to pass legislation which will do good among our brethren living in some of the underprivileged areas of America.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad indeed to have the opportunity of standing in the well of this House to speak in behalf of this worthwhile legislation. I come from southern Illinois where there are 30,000 able bodied men and women out of work, 25,000 receiving Government surplus food. It pleases me to be able to stand up and speak out at every opportunity I might have, to do something, whether it might be in a small way or large way, to help those suffering people.

I say to you this afternoon very, very sincerely I believe this bill is one that will be good for the people, it is a bill that will help alleviate some of the suffering of the people in my district by giving them bread upon the table.

I think it is time, here in America, that hungry people stop going down the road of want and need and march back up the road to plenty. I believe this bill will be a step in that direction; therefore, I am happy to support it. I introduced a companion bill to this bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS]. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee, from North Carolina, and the members of the Committee on Agriculture for reporting out this bill.

Again I say it should receive your wholehearted support. It is a step in the right direction, only I do not think it goes far enough. We need to do more for the sick and hungry people of America. I wholeheartedly support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of providing emergency assistance to persons determined to be in need in the United States pursuant to section 2 of this act, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare such agricultural commodities or products thereof, including cereals and cereal products, acquired through price support operations as the said Secretary shall requisition pursuant to section 2 hereof. With respect to commodities thus made available the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay processing, reprocessing, packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges up to the time of their delivery to one or more designated central locations in each State.

SEC. 2. Upon certification to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) by the Secretary of Labor that any area in the United States has a substantial surplus of labor (according to standards established by the Secretary of Labor under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 (18 F. R. 6995), or any similar rule, regulation, order or policy), or upon determination by the President that any area has suffered a major disaster warranting assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), and upon certification to the Secretary by the Governor of the State in which such area is located that there is acute distress in such area because of conditions prevailing therein, the Secretary is hereby directed to make available to such State agency or agencies as may be designated by the proper State authority and approved by the Secretary for distribution to families and persons determined to be in need in such area agricultural commodities and the products thereof acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations in such quantity as the Secretary determines can be effectively distributed and utilized and to requisition from the said Corporation such quantities of such commodities as the Secretary determines to be required for such distribution.

SEC. 3 The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available without compensation to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 2 hereof commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be available for donation under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. With respect to all other commodities, including cereals, made available pursuant to section 2, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the acquisition cost of the commodity to the Commodity Credit Corporation or the current support price (whichever is lower) plus the costs of any processing, reprocessing, packaging, transporting, or handling required for delivery of the commodity pursuant to section 2 which the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be in excess of the normal costs incurred in moving such agricultural commodity into normal commercial channels. Expenditures authorized by this act may be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation in advance of appropriations and shall be entered on the books of the Corporation as accounts receivable.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are required for the purposes of this act.

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute committee amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to pay tribute to a new member of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], who has succeeded to the position that was so long and so honorably occupied by our former colleague, Hon. John Flannagan, from the Ninth District of Virginia. Mr. Flannagan served on the Committee on Agriculture for many years, and for a number of years before he voluntarily retired from the Congress he was chairman of our committee and a great chairman and a great leader of agriculture laws. He was not only an agricultural leader but a great friend of the people. We are especially happy to have on our committee a man succeeding John Flannagan who is showing the same traits of leadership and the same interest in the welfare of his district and all of the people of the United States. I think a substantial share of the credit for this legislation must go to the gentleman from Virginia, although, of course, I recognize the fine work that many Members from

other States have performed; particularly the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], and others from West Virginia and from other sections of this country, including Pennsylvania and the other areas which have suffered this discouraging situation. They have shown a great interest in this legislation for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not only a bill for the benefit of the coal-mining areas; it is a bill for establishing a sound and a reasonable working division of functions between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It does separate some of the purely social and relief functions, which are proper functions of government, from the purely business functions, which are also proper functions of government, and it places the responsibility in terms of money where it should be placed, at least as far as storable commodities are concerned.

This bill makes available to the needy people of the United States the storable commodities on the same terms, as far as the recipients are concerned, as they have been receiving the perishable commodities. They would not have an opportunity, as the gentleman from Minnesota so well pointed out awhile ago, to receive these commodities had we not had a sound agricultural price-support program in this country which has resulted in the creation not of a deficit, not of starvation, not of want, but of an adequate supply of commodities.

Those who are not interested directly in the support program should have a very definite and a very personal reason for supporting a sound program that will encourage adequate production throughout America rather than to take the chance of winding up with empty granaries and empty warehouses, as we could so easily do if we followed the will of the wisp of the sliding or fluctuating support program which gives, according to its own supporters, no encouragement for the production of these basic foods that you are finding are so necessary, not simply to the farmer but so necessary to the needy people of America today.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what has been said here today shows very clearly how important it is to the people of the cities, to the people of the mills and the mines of America to see that the farmer is given an adequate reason for producing abundantly.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I only wanted to say that I appreciate what the gentleman has said. I think it is generally conceded that no member of our committee has ever pursued with greater diligence or determination any bill than was manifested by the gentleman from Virginia in pushing the bill that he was sponsoring and is before us here today.

Mr. POAGE. I think it has been a fine exhibition of representing one's district and the needs of his people. I hope that the Members of this House will recognize that their people, too, stand in need of a sound agricultural policy that will assure adequate production and that we have had such a program for a good many years, and now it is all-important to the cities of America as to the rural sections of America to carry out that agricultural program that has made it possible for us to carry out this social program today.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think all on the floor, with one or two exceptions, expect to support this bill. I rise to point out once again that in our efforts to meet serious and immediate problems we frequently overlook the basis background which causes them. There has been enough said here today for some people in Government to begin to give some thought as to why we have this unemployment and why we have these farm commodities. We have had pointed out to the American people repeatedly, in recent months and for the last several years, the huge storehouses of agricultural commodities that we have. Few people have pointed out that we have them because the Department of Agriculture has held them off world markets and would not offer them for sale in world trade at competitive prices. Our losses have largely been in storage charges on the commodities the Secretary of Agriculture would not offer for sale at truly competitive prices. The result of holding our commodities is to cut down exports and as exports are cut down, under our formula of acreage allotments and marketing quotas, acreage is cut down.

As we cut down our exports, then we have on hand a greater supply and under the formula, the greater the supply, the further reduction in acreage we have. So that while we have had 90-percent supports, with ever-increasing acreage reductions because we would not export, the same price times less production has largely brought about reduced farm income. Of course, constantly increasing costs have not helped any. The answer is to sell our commodities and let the farmers farm.

I was called in the last few days and was asked what the action of the subcommittee which I have the honor to head, would be when the President's recommendations for appropriations to aid the small farmer came before us. I said that our committee, I am sure, will do their best for the small farmer. But I cannot see that the President's recommendations would help too much. If the President would tell Mr. Benson to exercise his authority, which he now has, to sell these commodities, so the small farmers could farm that would help—but his recommendations to extend more credit to farmers who make so little now they need help to get by would be no lasting favor to them. They need more income which must come from price times production. Mr. Benson is holding down his production now and would reduce his price. What the small farmers need is more income. The President plans to give the small farmers training so that they can go to work in town. In view of the unemployment that has been discussed here today, I just wonder where the jobs are. The President should tell us.

The best answer to the farm program is sale of commodities to the point of regaining and retaining our foreign markets. This Congress in its wisdom, in creating the Commodity Credit Corporation, provided on the one hand that it would support the price commodities, but on the other, it authorized the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, I tell you, to sell these commodities in world trade, almost $4 billion worth and all the time we pay storage. He will not do it, because he will not make the price competitive. Then, while our Government is following this policy of holding our commodities in our own hands, certainly some of it should be made available for this worthy cause, but we find that we are letting into our country many things that are putting our own people out of employment. We do not offer our commodities in trade, but we let theirs in.

We are now having a study made by the Committee on Appropriations and it is surprising the information that is coming in. So frequently foreign imports into this country are foreign only in origin. Their ownership and the money behind their production are American. And their voice and their power in United States Government councils are, to a considerable extent, responsible for many Government policies. And now this administration is constantly asking us to approve more and more loans and more and more aid which may be necessary, without thinking about why these conditions are arising at this time, when they say we are so prosperous. It is because of the things that I have pointed out here, plus others. We are holding our commodities in our own hands. We are cutting our production volume back. And with a reduced volume, multiplied by the same price, with higher costs, income is going down. And as the farmer's income goes down, so does the income of others. So down goes the sale of coal, for instance. And as we let American interests bring in foreign goods in competition with our own, we thereby put millions of Americans out of employment. So it is high time we, not only do the thing that is suggested here today, which helps relieve those in need at the moment, it is high time somebody gave attention to the basic causes behind the serious situation facing many of our people, before the conditions spread to other areas.

There are so many things that make us think now of 1929—so many, many things. Yes, stocks are high. They are going up, up, and up, because everybody is betting on the other fellow's making money. You read about all the automobiles they are manufacturing and how they are selling them. You know why? They are extending further and further the time of payment until, from the date of sale the owner's equity in the car is not equal to what the owner owes on it. Yes, they are selling houses, but

they are requiring less and less down-payment, to where it is almost 100 percent gamble. If there is nothing in that to make you think of 1929, you had better go back and read your history book.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I love these boys from these farm districts. You can come down here and have a bill having to do with the epistemological probability of teleological agnosticism, and somehow or other these farm men will get into the farm program debate.

I love my friend from Mississippi and my friend from Texas, but I want to keep the spotlight today on the fact that we are considering unemployment and the distressed economic conditions in certain areas of the United States.

The second thing I want to point out is this: Under no circumstances do I want any Member of this House to get the impression that you are doing the people of my district a favor if you pass this bill. You are not distributing largess to second-class citizens. If there is any vestigial remainder of the Bourbon philosophy left here, and I did hear a little bit of a crackling around here this afternoon for a few minutes, if you think we should eat cake in the coalfields because we have no bread, if you still want to tell me, "Après moi le déluge," let me tell you, and I repeat for the purpose of emphasis, you are not doing the unemployed in the coalfields any friendly, kind service. This is a demand we make here today. Keep that in mind. We do not come to you, Mr. Chairman, on bended knee and with our hat in our hands hoping you will do something good for us. Do not forget that. There was a slight indication of that in the early moments of this debate. Let me impress upon you indelibly that we presume it no longer exists.

Finally, let me add this: This is no isolated problem. You heard my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama—you heard the rollcall of the great American States—tell you that the goose does not hang high, that everybody in America is not eating high on the hog. In many cases we do not have the hog. Things are not as good, things are not as glowing as the press and certain politicians would indicate, not with millions of Americans out of work, not with people begging for food.

Many of you cannot believe that today there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who do not have enough to eat tonight for supper. You will not believe that, will you? Well, it is true—not enough to put on the table to eat, in hundreds of thousands of American homes. So do not be so sure that things are as good as has been suggested. Come to the coalfields and you will see. I have 300,000 people in my district. Twenty-five thousand men are out of work today who want jobs—25,000. If there are 4½ people to a family, as is the average, you can see what that condition is. And we yield to no district and no State—farm or otherwise—on our Americanism.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate this committee for having done what they have done and I repeat, as I conclude, we demand this consideration—you are giving us nothing.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I approve of the purpose of this bill as stated in its title, "to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress." But this bill does no such thing. We all believe that our food surpluses should get to hungry, needy people in our country rather than lie in storage and rot, and should be distributed in ways that will not interfere with normal marketing of such food. All this can be done under existing laws.

This bill sets up a Federal relief system in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be financed by that Department. We have had no such Federal relief for many years. I was here when we had such a system. After all kinds of failures, extravagances, and scandals, a vast number of laws were enacted to regulate such relief, and the vast administration needed to administer it. Nothing of the kind is provided in this bill. No standards for relief are set up. Two special groups are singled out, neither of them determined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which is "directed" to furnish the relief. The Secretary of Labor certifies labor surplus areas and the governors of the States certify disaster areas. All "needy" families and persons in such areas are to receive Federal food. Needy, hungry, destitute people in other areas are ignored. No amounts or estimates of cost or limits on cost are provided.

But will this use up surpluses? According to the committee report, the bill authorizes purchase out of Health, Education, and Welfare funds of "equivalent quantities of the processed products, rather than going through the possibly more expensive procedure of arranging for the processing and packaging of grain actually in CCC warehouses." It was stated in debate, and not controverted, that purchase would in practically all cases be cheaper than processing CCC-held grain. I doubt if the Federal Government should go into the milling business to get rid of some of its surplus. I doubt if we should establish a Federal relief dole with as little consideration as this measure has received. We are setting a bad precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COOPER) having resumed the chair, Mr. WILLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2851) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts, pursuant to House Resolution 249, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 102, noes 0.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 1, answered "present" 3, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—344

Abbitt	Carnahan	Frazier
Adair	Carrigg	Frelinghuysen
Addonizio	Cederberg	Friedel
Albert	Celler	Fulton
Alexander	Chase	Gary
Alger	Chatham	Gathings
Allen, Ill.	Chelf	Gavin
Andersen, H. Carl	Chenoweth	Gentry
	Chiperfield	George
Andresen, August H.	Christopher	Gordon
	Chudoff	Granahan
Andrews	Church	Grant
Anfuso	Clark	Gray
Ashley	Cole	Green, Oreg.
Ashmore	Cooley	Gregory
Aspinall	Coon	Griffiths
Auchincloss	Cooper	Gross
Ayres	Corbett	Gubser
Bailey	Cramer	Hagen
Baker	Cretella	Hale
Baldwin	Crumpacker	Haley
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham	Hand
Bass, Tenn.	Curtis, Mass.	Harden
Bates	Dague	Hardy
Baumhart	Davidson	Harris
Beamer	Davis, Ga.	Harrison, Va.
Becker	Davis, Tenn.	Harvey
Belcher	Davis, Wis.	Hays, Ark.
Bell	Dawson, Utah	Hayworth
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Denton	Henderson
Bentley	Devereux	Hess
Berry	Dies	Hiestand
Blatnik	Diggs	Hill
Blitch	Dixon	Hillings
Boggs	Dollinger	Hinshaw
Boland	Dondero	Hoeven
Bolling	Donovan	Hoffman, Ill.
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, N. Y.	Holifield
	Dorn, S. C.	Holmes
Bosch	Dowdy	Holt
Bow	Doyle	Horan
Boyle	Durham	Hosmer
Bray	Elliott	Huddleston
Brooks, La.	Ellsworth	Hull
Brooks, Tex.	Engle	Hyde
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Ikard
Brown, Ohio	Fascell	Jarman
Brownson	Feighan	Jennings
Broyhill	Fenton	Jensen
Buchanan	Fernandez	Johansen
Budge	Fine	Johnson, Calif.
Burdick	Fino	Johnson, Wis.
Burleson	Fisher	Jonas
Burnside	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Bush	Fogarty	Jones, N. C.
Byrne, Pa.	Forand	Judd
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford	Karsten
Cannon	Forrester	Kean
Carlyle	Fountain	Kearns

Keating	Multer	Srivner
Kee	Murray, Ill.	Scudder
Kelley, Pa.	Murray, Tenn.	Seely-Brown
Kelly, N. Y.	Natcher	Selden
Keogh	Nicholson	Sheehan
Kilday	Norblad	Sheppard
Kilgore	Norrell	Sieminski
King, Calif.	O'Brien, Ill.	Sikes
King, Pa.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Siler
Kirwan	O'Hara, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Klein	O'Hara, Minn.	Simpson, Pa.
Kluczynski	O'Konski	Sisk
Knox	O'Neill	Smith, Kans.
Krueger	Osmers	Smith, Miss.
Laird	Ostertag	Springer
Landrum	Passman	Staggers
Lane	Patman	Steed
Lankford	Pelly	Sullivan
Latham	Perkins	Talle
LeCompte	Pfost	Thomas
Lesinski	Pilcher	Thompson, La.
Lipscomb	Poage	Thompson, Mich.
Long	Poff	Thompson, N. J.
Lovre	Polk	Thomson, Wyo.
McCarthy	Preston	Thornberry
McCormack	Price	Trimble
McCulloch	Priest	Tuck
McDonough	Prouty	Tumulty
McDowell	Quigley	Vanik
McGregor	Rabaut	Van Pelt
McIntire	Radwan	Van Zandt
McMillan	Rains	Velde
McVey	Ray	Vinson
Macdonald	Reece, Tenn.	Vursell
Machrowicz	Reed, Ill.	Walter
Mack, Ill.	Rees, Kans.	Watts
Mack, Wash.	Reuss	Weaver
Madden	Rhodes, Ariz.	Westland
Magnuson	Richards	Wharton
Mahon	Riehlman	Whitten
Mailliard	Riley	Wickersham
Martin	Roberts	Widnall
Matthews	Robeson, Va.	Wier
Meader	Rodino	Wigglesworth
Merrow	Rogers, Colo.	Williams, Miss.
Metcalf	Rogers, Fla.	Williams, N. J.
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.	Williams, N. Y.
Miller, Md.	Rooney	Willis
Miller, Nebr.	Roosevelt	Wilson, Calif.
Mills	Rutherford	Withrow
Minshall	Sadlak	Wolverton
Mollohan	Saylor	Wright
Morano	Schenck	Young
Morgan	Scherer	Younger
Morrison	Schwengel	Zablocki
Moss	Scott	

NAYS—1

Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Clevenger	Utt	Vorys

NOT VOTING—86

Abernethy	Fjare	Philbin
Allen, Calif.	Flynt	Phillips
Arends	Gamble	Pillion
Avery	Garmatz	Powell
Barden	Green, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Barrett	Gwinn	Rhodes, Pa.
Betts	Halleck	Rivers
Bolton, Oliver P.	Harrison, Nebr.	Robsion, Ky.
	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Bonner	Herlong	St. George
Bowler	Heselton	Shelley
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Short
Buckley	Holtzman	Shuford
Byrd	Hope	Smith, Va.
Canfield	Jackson	Smith, Wis.
Colmer	James	Spence
Coudert	Jenkins	Taber
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Kearney	Teague, Calif.
Delaney	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Dempsey	Knutson	Thompson, Tex.
Derounian	Lanham	Tollefson
Dingell	McConnell	Udall
Dodd	Mason	Wainwright
Dolliver	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Donohue	Moulder	Winstead
Eberharter	Mumma	Wolcott
Edmondson	Nelson	Yates
Fallon	Patterson	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Short.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Fallon with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Fjare.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. James.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Barrett with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. UTT changed his vote from "aye" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress."

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on H. R. 2851, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LOWERING RETIREMENT AGE OF WOMEN FOR SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress 3 years ago, I introduced a bill which would lower the retirement age for social-security benefits to 60 years for men and 55 years for women, instead of the present limitation which uses age 65 for both.

In the last 2 years, Congress made some very important improvements in our social-security system. I voted for the extended coverage, the increased benefits, and the many liberalizations contained in the 1954 amendments. But much to my regret, no change was made in the obsolete eligibility age of 65.

During the past campaign in my district thousands upon thousands of my constituents commended me for the fight I had initiated in their behalf in the Halls of Congress. I promised them that I would continue my interest in this important legislative measure with a view to cutting the retirement age to 60 for men, 55 for women.

Shortly after this Congress convened, I reintroduced my bill on January 17. I now urge the Members of this 84th Congress to adopt my bill, H. R. 2390, which is of vital importance to millions of Americans throughout this country.

It is only because I am thoroughly convinced that the facts of our time, and considerations of humanity, call for a revision of that age downward, that I have asked for permission to speak here on the floor of the House.

In lowering the retirement age from 65 years to a more realistic age, we will be creating new job opportunities for younger workers, decreasing the hardship of unemployment for older workers, and modernizing our social-security system, and its vital protection, in a very important way.

Now on superficial examination, the revision made by my bill may sound like a relatively minor change in our social-security system. But in the few minutes available at this time I want to outline some of the reasons why it represents, in reality, a broad-scale approach to a variety of problems which have arisen largely as a result of our splendid growth as a country, and the magnificent expansion of our productive power. Briefly, Americans today can, with far fewer work hours, produce goods and services far more abundantly than they could a few decades ago.

We have recognized this change in our economy by a sharp reduction in the workday and the workweek. But it is strikingly true that we have failed, in our social-security system at least, to recognize that the same principle which applies to reduce the workday and the workweek has applied also to reduce the average work life of most of us. Let us, then, look honestly at some of these facts. Studies of average work life in this country shows us that, in 1890, 68 percent of all men over 65 were still working. Sixty years later, by 1950, this figure had dropped to 43 percent, and it is still declining. If this trend continues—and there is every indication that it will—by 1975 a man at age 20 can look forward, on the average, to at least 1 year of retirement for every 6 years of working life.

Now there are several ways to view this development. One is to deplore it. Another is to ignore it. But the fact of the matter is that this is what is happening—for reasons which arise out of a healthy and expanding economy—and it will not change because we cry with alarm or bury our head in the sand. I am convinced that the wise solution is to accept it and adjust to it.

First of all, then, my bill accepts this reality of our time as an evidence of our strength as a nation which calls for appropriate revision of our social-secu-

rity system by proportionately reducing its work-life requirements, and on this point I have been struck by the fact that the only major argument used against my proposal to lower the eligibility age in social security to 60 for men and 55 for women is that it would cost too much. Now, certainly, the cost of retirement payments is a real problem of our time, but it is not simply a ledger problem. It requires the kind of broad-gage thinking which has marked all of our great social advances in this country. It calls for the kind of thinking expressed recently by G. Warfield Hobbs, vice president of the National City Bank of New York and chairman of the National Committee on Aging, who wrote the following trenchant words on this subject of future pension costs:

Let us approach this economic atom bomb with intelligence—not emotion—and with a spirit of cooperation.

Provided management and labor accept and live by the principles of increased productivity, not only can we afford the cost of pensions and other fringe benefits but we can actually increase our economic and moral strength, which is the sole defense of the free world.

To me, our foremost goal is to maintain the liberty, rights, and dignity of the individual, as guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights; and, secondly, through our private enterprise, competitive spirit, research, and ingenuity, to strive for an ever-increasing standard of living for all free men, not only materialistic standards but cultural, physical, and spiritual standards.

This is the kind of thinking which is back of my bill. It is one of the reasons I have been proud to sponsor this bill.

Secondly, I urge this Congress to write H. R. 2390 into the law of the land because such a measure will permit older people to retire earlier, thus creating openings in the labor market for younger persons. Our Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, has recently pointed out the fact that the so-called war-baby boom will soon pour millions of young workers into the labor force. In the 1960's, according to his estimates, there will be an increase of 9 million in the age group 15 to 24. This is far in excess of the rate of increase in the total population. These young people will need jobs—and they deserve jobs. I am convinced that my bill will help to create such jobs.

In the third place, H. R. 2390 would help to alleviate the genuine hardship arising today from unemployment among older workers not yet aged 65. We know the despair and heartache which come to the older worker who has been laid off, or displaced, and is told he is too old. Statistics tell us that, for the Nation as a whole, while 1 out of 3 applicants for work is 45 and over, only 1 out of 7 placements can be made for this age group. The almost insurmountable obstacles faced by older workers in finding work are indicated by surveys throughout the country. A report of the Committee of New England of the National Planning Association states this situation succinctly, as follows:

Job displacement as a result of the liquidation or migration of a mill or factory is particularly hard on the older worker. If a worker past 50 years of age can continue at his present work, he may have many years of productive and remunerative employment left. If he loses his job, most employers will be reluctant to hire him. He may be barred from productive work at a relatively early age and he may be forced to accept such casual employment as comes his way or to withdraw from the labor force entirely.

Now I am entirely in sympathy with the recent efforts which are being made to encourage certain job opportunities for our senior citizens. But I suggest first of all that this is, at best, only a very partial solution for most of our older citizens, since the large proportion of them today are unemployed only because they are unable physically to continue in their old job. And I further remind you that we must always bear in mind the vital importance of preserving job opportunities for young workers with growing families.

Finally, I suggest that my bill takes account of the human problems which arise in so many of our homes because of the untimely and involuntary loss of wages through layoff because of sickness of the worker or death in the family prior to age 65. All of us know that chronological age is no test for ability to work. The carpenter who suffers a heart attack at age 60 is just as anxious to work and just as willing to work as is his more fortunate friend who can continue on his job because his health is good. Is it fair to allow this carpenter, who is unable to work because of his heart ailment, to wait until he is aged 65 before he is entitled to benefits? By lowering the eligibility age to 60 for men and 55 for women, my bill will reach down to provide retirement security for millions of men and women who have been prematurely retired from the labor force either because of illness or through job-displacement or mechanization of our industrial plant.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word, as well, as to my reasons for setting the eligibility age for women at the lower figure of age 55. In the first place, we know that the average age difference between husbands and wives is 2½ years. The bill will, therefore, be especially important because of the earlier protection it provides to the widows of workers who have died—many of them before reaching retirement age. We know, too, that women who have had work experience usually must retire from their jobs earlier than men. Most of our other public retirement systems as well as nearly all private pension plans recognize this fact. One of the strongest arguments for my bill therefore, in my opinion, is the increased security it offers to women workers and to the widows of workers who have died.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing this measure 2 years ago on this floor I said:

I believe we must be prepared to build a social-security system which will encourage production and efficiency, make way for younger workers, and encourage a way of life which, in the democratic pattern, produces a maximum of economic progress and individual security.

Each day that passes has convinced me that the need for such a change in our social security system as H. R. 2390 will make is increasing with the continued expansion of our productive power.

I urge upon each Member of this Congress the vital importance of such a positive approach to the inexorable results of our growth as an industrial Nation. And, most of all, I call for the enactment of this bill because I am convinced that it is concerned with the dignity and self-respect of millions of the veterans of our labor force who can no longer find jobs or who are unable to work for physical reasons. I ask your support for H. R. 2390, so that it may become a part of our social security system without further delay.

I am happy to note that the House Ways and Means Committee has finally indicated a willingness to study possible revision of our social security law with respect to the retirement age. I sincerely hope that in so doing, they will not fail the American people who are vitally interested and concerned in this law. My bill contains the only true and realistic ages for retirement, which I trust will be adopted by this Congress. If we are to do a job—let us do it right and all the way. Let us tell the men and women of America, "We recognize your problem and we are going to solve it. We want you to enjoy the benefits of retirement when you are most able to."

POSTAL PAY RAISE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a bill providing for an average of 8-percent raise for postal employees and retroactive to March 1, 1955.

This is being done in the sincere interest which has been mine for some time of securing for the postal employees a cost-of-living increase which they deserve. It will be recalled that the President recommended an average 6.5-percent increase in his message to Congress, and, of course, many bills for 10-percent increase were introduced. After lengthy hearings over a period of 2 months the Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported a bill for 7.6 percent without the retroactive features of my bill.

Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when originally considering the matter, I made a statement strongly urging a cost-of-living increase giving the postal employees a fair and equitable wage for services rendered. It is important that there be provided a salary that will place the Post Office Department in at least an equal competitive position with private enterprise in order to assure adequate post-office services. I will repeat that request not only to the committee but to the House upon this occasion.

I, like many Members, and especially as a freshman and one who is sincerely interested in acquiring a reasonable pay

increase, having been a postal employee myself on one occasion and being familiar with their problems, have abhorred the apparent political approach taken to this problem by many who would rather create a political issue than to give postal employees a reasonable salary increase to which they are so justly entitled. It has been generally known throughout debate on this issue that a 7.6 percent increase bill as reported by a 16 to 7 vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, could become law as a compromise even though it was substantially in excess by some $20 million of the increase recommended by the President. This increase amounts to a total of $152 million over the present wage payments. It has been well known that, not only the compromise bill as reported by the Senate-House conference committee of an 8.8 percent increase but also the Moss proposal of 59 separate changes and providing for an 8.2 percent increase, would meet with a Presidential veto. It has been equally well known that such a veto could not be overridden by the Senate. Despite these well-known facts some of those who would play politics with the welfare of our postal employees have insisted upon the passage of legislation which has been generally known could not become law.

I do not believe the postal employees should be caused to suffer as the result of such political chicanery and it is for this reason that I have made this bill retroactive to March 1, 1955, which is the date the committee bill could and should have become effective. The President's veto of this bill and the Senate's action sustaining it clearly demonstrate the inadvisability in complex legislation such as this for the House to accept from the floor some 59 amendments to an extremely complicated and technical reclassification bill and clearly contrary to the actions of a large majority of the experienced members of a great committee of the House whose recommendations were made after lengthy and exhaustive hearings and considerations and whose objective was announced to be the reporting of a bill that could become law.

I believe some variances from the original House committee bill are now considered advisable, and under my bill you will find special-delivery messengers placed in the same salary level with letter carriers, clerks, and motor-vehicle operators. The bill provides for a salary range of 7 steps, beginning at an entrance rate of $3,640 and a top rate of $4,360. Three longevity grades are also provided in amounts of $100 each, making a total pay of $4,660.

The bill also calls for a new salary schedule for rural carriers maintaining their relative position in relation to letter carriers as they are today.

Also contained in this bill is the requirement that on January 15 of next year the Postmaster General shall make to Congress a report of actions taken under this bill.

The purpose of my bill is to provide the postal employees on the average nearly the same salary increase as the vetoed bill, and, at the same time, it will tend to correct those inequities that were pointed out by the President in his veto.

It is my sincere hope, and I will exert every effort to see that the bill I introduce, or a similar bill which can become law, is acted favorably upon by the committee and by the House and that the postal employees will receive the pay increase that has for 2 years remained beyond their grasp while the cost of living has ever increased. The Congress has a duty to give this matter unbiased consideration that is not colored by either political ambitions or party politics. I believe this Congress has a duty to pass constructive and effective legislation in this matter, and I am confident that Congress will expeditiously and forthrightly discharge this duty.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if there has been any change in the program?

Mr. McCORMACK. I had previously stated that if we disposed of the legislative program for today, there being three bills on the program, we would then adjourn over until Friday, that there would be no legislative business on Friday, and that it would then be the purpose to adjourn over until Tuesday.

It is very apparent that we cannot finish the legislative business today. There is one more bill to be considered. The best information I have is that it will take at least an hour to complete it, and 2 hours of general debate are provided under the rule. So that bill will come up tomorrow.

I am also announcing that the conference report on the District of Columbia judges bill will come up tomorrow. That report was filed subsequent to my previous announcement. I had frankly told the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia that if we disposed today of the remaining legislative business for this week we could not take up the conference report until Wednesday of next week, in view of the commitment I had made to the Members of the House. However, in view of the fact that we have not disposed of the legislative business today, we will meet tomorrow, and that will enable us also to consider the conference report on the District of Columbia judges bill.

I may say in all frankness that if the conference report is adopted tomorrow it would mean that the increase would be applicable as of the 1st of next month. If it could not be considered until next Wednesday, and it would not have been considered until then if we had completed the legislative business today, for I keep my promises, then the increase would not have gone into effect until July 1. Under those circumstances, as we are going to meet tomorrow, I think the only fair and equitable thing to do is to bring the conference report up for the consideration of the House tomorrow. The conference report will be the first order of business, then the bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

On Friday there will be no legislative business of any kind.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is there any idea of meeting earlier tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no necessity for that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from Massachusetts said there would not be any necessity of meeting tomorrow at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think my friend from Massachusetts misquotes the gentleman from Massachusetts who is speaking. I said that if we finished the remainder of the program we would then go over to Friday for the purpose of adjourning over Monday, which is Memorial Day, and meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That leaves the other gentleman from Massachusetts in the middle here, I think.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I would not want my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON], whom I respect very much, to think for a split second that there is any inconsistency between what I said before and the situation that confronts me now. Does the gentleman think there is? In all frankness I would not want the gentleman to think that, not that the gentleman is in the middle.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on the bill, S. 727.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

MEETING OF THE BIG FOUR POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles were recently attacked by Pravda because of their demand to include the problem of the captive nations on the agenda of the prospective meeting of the four big powers.

When the summit meeting was first mentioned many doubts were expressed about its usefulness but there also was generated a great deal of excitement and conjecture among many people as to the plans that the Western Powers would submit for discussion.

Mr. Speaker, are we to limit and restrict such a conference to Austria and Germany or are we also to discuss the vital problem of the freedom of the people behind the Iron Curtain?

We can be thankful to Mr. Dulles that he brought forth as a part of the listed subjects the matter of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. And we understand readily why the Soviets so violently attack this point of the agenda.

Some ask, What is behind the tactics of the Soviets in their international policy? I, for one, think that it is quite safe to state that Soviet aims and objectives have never changed but their tactics are changing because their position and their growing difficulties are forcing them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets would like to appear as a peaceful, cooperative country in order to gain time and to stabilize the system which they have imposed on the captive people; they masquerade under the cloak of desiring peace in order to deceive the nations of the West of their unaltered intent toward captive people. The Soviets, Mr. Speaker, have their own internal difficulties. Politically, the internal fight for power after Stalin's death is not yet finished. Economically, their enormous failure in the output of their agriculture has resulted in a shortage of food. This shortage of food lowered the output of their industrial production and has generally slowed down work production of Soviet Russia. Because of these premises, Soviet Russia was not able to fulfill its obligation in exports to China—therefore, Soviet Russia forced its satellite countries to produce and deliver more so there would be more for China and thereby brought unrest and resentment in Eastern Berlin and among the workers behind the Iron Curtain. But it did not solve the problem.

What, then, Mr. Speaker, are the further consequences of the obvious failure of the increased pressure of the production problem? Soviet Russia is not able, today, to give China the green light for an armed aggression. Mr. Molotov's political compliments to China are not able to replace Soviet war material necessary for China's planned armed aggression. And, the Chinese Communists are losing time and face which is so important in the Asiatic area. There, too, is a connection with the Bandung Conference where the Communists expected a great political victory. They met instead with the accusation of Chinese imperialism and Soviet colonialism as practiced by the Soviets in the countries of eastern central Europe. Therefore, the Soviets are being compelled to change their tactics in Europe. They tried to kill the Paris treaties concerning armament of Germany; they tried to split the Western allies in Europe; they tried blackmail by canceling the treaties with Great Britain and France and by creating a military treaty and block of Soviet Russia and its satellites. These failed due to their own internal as well as international difficulties and now they consider what they intend to be only a certain temporary withdrawal.

It is opportune, therefore, that the Soviets should be asked to withdraw to their prewar frontiers and to leave free the Baltic States, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania. But they know that such a withdrawal would bring a crisis if not a failure inside Soviet Russia. This is the strongest reason why they are advancing new tactics in the international field by expecting a settlement only on the line ending at the eastern frontiers of Germany and Austria. If such will be the result of the meeting of the four big powers, I am convinced it would be nothing else but a return to a division of Europe on the line which would be even worse than the line agreed upon at Teheran and Yalta. I think that after all the experiences and sacrifices which we made, we cannot accept such a permanent division of Europe. It would lead to a disaster if not finally to world war III. For this reason, our plan for a big four conference cannot be a minimum but must be a maximum plan which must include the whole area occupied illegally and forcefully by the Soviets.

It is significant at this point to quote the expression of our President made during his state of the Union message on February 2, 1953, in regard to the slavery of the people behind the Iron Curtain:

> Our policy, dedicated to making the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices—except breaking faith with our friends. We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask the Congress, at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this Government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret misunderstandings of the past with foreign Governments which permit this kind of enslavement.

The people behind the Iron Curtain believe in this and bind their hopes with the leadership of the United States. They are our potential allies. We have many obligations toward them and it is to the best interest of the whole free democratic world that these people behind the Iron Curtain should also be free.

I expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviets will agree about Germany as they agreed about Austria after many years. But, they are against and will violently oppose freedom for the captive people. Their aim is to create a large neutral zone from many countries in Middle Europe.

Their objectives in the near future?

First. To gain time in the Soviet sphere for stabilizing the communistic system in the occupied countries.

Second. To increase their war production and to satisfy China's need for war materials.

Third. To break up the ameliorating morale of the captive people—the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Albanians, the Bulgarians, the Lithuanians, the Estonians, and the Latvians—by creating a situation whereby these people will have to think that the United States has abandoned them and forgotten and agreed to their permanent slavery.

By achieving these three goals they do not need to appear to the people back in Soviet Russia that a general withdrawal of the Communists from the West has taken place even after withdrawing from Germany.

Simultaneously, such an accomplishment, referring to the neutral zone, would have a moral and physical disarmament effect on the free nations of the West, especially on us, the strongest, the people of the United States of America.

What, Mr. Speaker, could transpire in the neutral zone of Germany itself, for instance, if this neutralizing process becomes a reality. In Germany it would seriously affect the makeup of the Government and practically stop or stall the armament of the Germans. And, as far as France and Italy are concerned, the Soviets can be expected to woo the entire French and Italian nations and help the existing Communist Parties in these countries by increasing anti-American feelings.

The last conference in Warsaw, Mr. Speaker, is openly revealing of Soviet plans for Poland. There it was publicly acknowledged, as had been surmised by the West, that the Soviets intended to build up their military bases in all countries behind the Iron Curtain and to use their peoples in manning the Soviet war machinery. The paramount importance of this fact is shown by the names of the prime ministers, deputy prime ministers, ministers of defense, and military personalities gathered from throughout the entire Soviet sphere including the Ukraine, White Russia—as well as from the captive nations—from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Eastern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, and Bulgaria.

Poland, in this instance becomes a very important factor. The Soviets want to digest her completely while they do not want to provoke the feelings of the other nations behind the Iron Curtain. Strategically for Soviet Russia, Poland is located on the Baltic Sea and the German frontiers, but her people are troubling the Soviets since they are ingrained believers and fighters for freedom and have never accepted their Soviet occupation. Here, too, lies the reason for Mr. Khruschev's more frequent visits and the answer to why one of his closest friends and high officials of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of

Soviet Russia, Mr. Panomarenko, became the new Soviet Ambassador to Poland.

May I indicate another very significant point that evolved from the new military agreement in Warsaw? The Soviets are now officially permitted to bring their armies where they were not stationed until now; namely, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and Bulgaria.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the international conferences as well as meeting of the four big powers can be useful; at least it may and can reveal the actual tendencies of Soviet Russia. However, if the Soviets with their aims and plans continue to oppose the inclusion of the problem of the captive people on the agenda, it seems to me that it would be better not to have such a big four powers conference. If the western powers agree to drop this point, it would immediately and rightfully be interpreted as a sanction of the existing situation behind the Iron Curtain and an agreement to forget the fate of the captive people there.

It is my sincere hope that this important point will remain on the agenda and that the conference of the four big powers will materialize. Therefore, I would like to make some suggestions which we must have in mind going to this conference. I advance nothing new when I recommend a free and unfettered election in each of these countries; this is a recognized and known suggestion. But we have to learn from the painful experience of the past. Before such an election, it is naturally assumed that there must be a withdrawal of the Red Army. But I have to draw your attention to the fact that equally dangerous on the same level are the armed units of the security police and of the Communist Parties controlled by Moscow in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. The conditions for a free election must be the real disarmament of these military police and party armed units.

The second thing I want to stress is the question—which means will be provided to secure the freedom of such an election? In the first years after World War II, for example, in Poland, but it was also the case in other countries, the people made great sacrifices at election time in order to gain freedom and independence even when the Red Army and the military units of the NKVD were there. They believed that the western powers participating in the promise of free unfettered elections would do something to insure that the elections would be free. Many of them exposed themselves, paid dearly later, and we showed our great resentment by sending a paper protest.

We also recognize the principle of the control of such elections by the United Nations but here have also to take into consideration certain bad experiences of certain United Nations Commissions created with the participants of the so-called neutrals even when we knew then that under the name "neutrals" some of them were followers of Communist dictatorships or direct Moscow agents.

Many years now have passed. All free, independent, political, social, and cultural movements behind the Iron Curtain have been completely annihiliated. Therefore, speaking about free and unfettered elections one has to provide also how the voter in these countries will be secure from every future revenge and retaliation from the Communists. If the people there can see only the prospects of fake elections, unnecessary exposure, new deaths, prisons, and other dire consequences, the promise of free elections will not work. In addition, there will be only a new deceit to the people there as well as to the public opinion of the West.

At the Geneva Conference concerning Viet-Nam, the United States did not participate in a repetition of Yalta. Mr. Speaker, if we cannot change the situation it is better not to undersign a verdict which brings intervenience and division of a nation or country. Definitely, such a stand will bring a reward for the good name of the United States and will increase the faith which the people in Poland as well as in other countries behind the Iron Curtain have in the moral and idealogical principles of the American people. To this end, I emphasize that the strength and insistence and the moral principles of our foreign policy are starting to bring results. Let us not forget that due to the difficult internal as well as external situation of the Soviets, we have arrived at a certain corner of history where opportunities arise not only to stop the course of communism endangering the whole world but to force it back inside the frontiers of Soviet Russia. It may be that this will be one of the last opportunities. Perhaps if we now show our determination, wisdom, and courage, we will be able to save the United States and the free world from the disaster of a world war III.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CARNAHAN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. GUBSER in three instances.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. DAVIDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. SADLAK), for remainder of week, on account of illness in the family.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that Committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of following titles:

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

838. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to transfer to the District of Columbia jurisdiction over certain portions of the United States Capitol Grounds and other grounds belonging to the United States for use in connection with the widening of Independence and Constitution Avenues and the rechannelization of Union Station Plaza"; to the Committee on Public Works.

839. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend article I, title V, of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, relating to inheritance taxes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

840. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the law relating to residence of Assistant Assessors for the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

841. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

842. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

843. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide more adequate credit for low-income farmers, including part-time farmers"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 265. An act to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4894. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; without amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1844. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; with amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 226. Resolution ordering the printing of 1,000 additional copies of Study of Newsprint Expansion: Part II, Newsprint Production From Hardwoods; without amendment (Rept. No. 629). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 155. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 154; with amendment (Rept. No. 630). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 24. Concurrent resolution relative to placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 18. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 633). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 6454. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 6455. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6456. A bill to erect in Minden, La., a Federal and post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6457. A bill to erect in Springhill, La., a Federal and post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6458. A bill to erect in Coushatta, La., a Federal and post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6459. A bill to erect in Shreveport, La., a Federal and post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 6460. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6461. A bill to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6462. A bill transferring to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and enacting new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6463. A bill to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6464. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 so as to afford certain preferences to businesses displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6465. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAINS (by request):

H. R. 6466. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6467. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 6468. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 6469. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 6470. A bill to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6471. A bill to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6472. A bill to amend further the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to promote the redevelopment of the southwestern portion of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 6473. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6474. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 6475. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6476. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6477. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6478. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6479. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6480. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 6481. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 6482. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6483. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 253. Resolution to commend Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL for the statesmanship displayed by him at the recent Afro-Asian Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHMORE:
H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:
H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution to change the name of the Argonne National Laboratory to the Enrico Fermi National Laboratory; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BOLAND:
H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:
H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN:
H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:
H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:
H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:
H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:
H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:
H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON:
H. R. 6484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tea Maria Dolcetti Cristo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:
H. R. 6485. A bill for the relief of Teresa Maria Cipollone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:
H. R. 6486. A bill for the relief of Araxe Papazian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6487. A bill for the relief of Christa Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):
H. R. 6488. A bill for the relief of Manfred Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:
H. R. 6489. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bernarda Guzman Elisan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6490. A bill for the relief of Antonio Curiel Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6491. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catarina Perez deGuillen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6492. A bill for the relief of Nobuyuki Tsunomori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 6493. A bill for the relief of Nada Marija Popovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6494. A bill for the relief of Albert Chenet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:
H. R. 6495. A bill for the relief of John Mierzowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:
H. R. 6496. A bill for the relief of Nouran Mateosian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:
H. R. 6497. A bill to amend Private Law 734, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:
H. R. 6498. A bill for the relief of Maria Arocha y Delgado de Sande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

289. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Leo Hagan and 330 other members of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, Woonsocket, R. I., urging the Congress of the United States to enact during this session a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

290. Also, petition of Arthur Blanchette and 325 other members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO, Woonsocket, R. I., urging the Congress of the United States to enact during this session a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

291. Also, petition of Normand Gagne and 330 other members of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, Woonsocket, R. I., urging the Congress of the United States to enact during this session a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

292. Also, petition of Melvyn Gendron and 400 other members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO, Woonsocket, R. I., urging the Congress of the United States to enact during this session a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

293. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of Mary A. Filepas and 76 other members of the congregation of St. Nicholas Serbian Orthodox Church, Steelton, Pa., using action on pending legislation which would give formal recognition to members of the Eastern Orthodox faith by the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

294. By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming: Petition of Mrs. R. A. Paul, Cheyenne, Wyo., and 24 others to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Program of Research and Treatment of Chronic Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the costliest diseases in our Nation is that of chronic alcoholism. Usually, alcoholism is thought of mainly as a social or moral problem, but its devastating impact upon our economy should by no means be underestimated. Diminished production in industry due to absenteeism, increased cost of operation of police departments, courts, jails, and hospitals, as well as the provisions necessary for aid to needy children are reflected in huge dollar figures. So are the costs of increased disability and unemployment insurance and the increase of juvenile delinquency caused by alcoholism. It has been estimated that the problem of alcoholism costs the industry of our Nation alone in the neighborhood of $1,250 million per year. In my own State of California, the costs to the taxpayers are estimated at $150 million per year.

The State of California, and several other States, have created alcoholic rehabilitation commissions and similar institutions to undertake a program of research and study in the field of chronic alcoholism. Though these attempts to find a solution to the problem are notable in scope and purpose, we cannot fail to realize that this is a nationwide problem, and that the Federal Government should assume its proper responsibility in the same manner as it has done in the case of such diseases as mental health, cancer, heart disease, arthritis, poliomyelitis, leprosy, and many others.

The Honorable Glenn E. Coolidge, a prominent member of the California State Legislature from the 28th Assembly District, has long been most active in furthering legislative action designed to cope with the menace of chronic alcoholism in our State. He has recently sent me a copy of Assembly Joint Resolu-

tion No. 36, which he has authored and which was adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, calling upon the Congress of the United States to institute a program of research and treatment of chronic alcoholism and to provide assistance to and cooperation with the several States conducting such programs.

Cognizant of our Federal responsibilities in this matter, and in compliance with the request expressed by the Legislature of the State of California, I have today introduced a bill which will direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to initiate the necessary steps. The powers to do so already are vested in the Secretary and the Surgeon General by previous legislation. It is my sincere hope that early action may be taken on this bill. In a problem facing all America, the States should not be left to shift for themselves.

National Sanitation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Sanitarians is an organization of registered sanitarians who through their national organization strive to educate the people of the United States concerning the need for proper sanitation practices. One of their great aims is to awaken the people of America to the importance of cleanliness and sanitation so as to attain better health in all of our communities.

The president of this fine national organization, Floyd M. Miller, is from my own hometown, Shreveport, La. As a result of his untiring and unrelenting efforts to obtain recognition for the registered sanitarians of the United States, the great work they are doing is now receiving appropriate attention. Mr. Miller, a qualified and capable sanitarian himself, has for many years led the uphill struggle to establish a law in Louisiana requiring sanitarians to possess definite qualifications and be registered by the State. I am happy to say he has been successful in this battle. The efforts of Mr. Miller, however, have not been confined to Louisiana; they are national in scope. As president of the National Association of Sanitarians he has shown the great progress sanitarians have made in obtaining recognition of their splendid work. I quote from a recent letter from Mr. Miller:

The sanitarians of this country have grown in knowledge and ability and have now reached a very high level of professionalism in public health. Great strides have been made in the educational qualifications of the sanitarian and today most States and cities require their sanitarian trainee to be educated in the basic sciences and in most cases they are required to have additional training so as to equip them to give better service in our sanitation problems. In the State of Louisiana, for instance, qualifications of a man to be employed as a sanitarian have reached the level that we now have a registration act set up by the State legislature in 1954, which establishes the sanitarian as a registered sanitarian and in 1959 the person employed as a sanitarian trainee will necessarily have to have a degree in sanitarian science. There are five other States that have such acts and there are many more that are working toward establishing such acts in their States.

"The National Association of Sanitarians has about 1,800 members, 31 States and Hawaii and Panama Canal affiliated. The purpose and meaning of the organization of the National Association of Sanitarians was to raise the standards of the sanitarian personnel throughout the United States and we feel that we are gradually reaching the goal of professional status."

To further promote the great aims of this splendid organization and to greatly benefit millions of Americans, the association has recommended that a National Sanitation Week be established. During this week, the association would present a concentrated educational program to alert all of the people of the United States to the need for sanitary practices at home, at work, and at play.

Should such a week be so designated, "the beacon light of public health" will brighter glow. I endorse the idea and commend it to the consideration of this Congress.

Salk Vaccine—What Are the Facts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that much of the confusion which has beclouded the success of Dr. Salk and his fellow scientists has resulted from a failure to distinguish the issues involved. This confusion, beginning at the very outset on April 12, has mushroomed and, feeding on itself, has created more and more confusion. The result is plain for all to see. Due to fear and scant information, over 30 percent of the children in New York City scheduled to receive vaccinations have failed to appear. How many of these boys and girls may die or be crippled as a result of not receiving the vaccine I do not know, but the thought that one of them may contract polio unnecessarily is horrifying, and I am sick at heart at the prospect.

If I may, I would like to separate the problems involved and perhaps thereby help in some measure to contribute to the solution of this dangerous situation.

There are four basic problems, which I mention in the order of their importance:

First. The safety of the vaccine.

Second. Distribution of the vaccine to all children regardless of ability to pay for it.

Third. The need for a distribution program.

Fourth. Conduct of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before April 12.

The people of the United States are entitled to have all the facts concerning each of these four points. They are vitally concerned and their very lives are at stake in the solution of them. Let us consider the four points individually and see if we can shed just a little bit of light.

First, the safety of the vaccine. The Public Health Service Act provides for the licensing of manufacturers of biologics such as the Salk vaccine; preliminary and regular testing by the Public Health Service of the product and plant of such a manufacturer to insure purity, potency, and safety of these biologics is required by the law. That such testing is being done now by the Public Health Service is quite clear. In general this appears to be a fairly effective part of the Federal program although even President Eisenhower tentatively suggested that something had gone wrong when he said there may have been a little "short cutting." In any event, the safety of the vaccine, except for that manufactured by one firm, Cutter, seems well established and is once again being released by the Surgeon General in limited and exhaustively tested batches. The Cutter vaccine is still being examined. However, it would seem that there can be no further doubt that any vaccine made available by Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele, who has labored manfully under what may be more than merely scientific problems, is entirely safe.

Second, distribution of the vaccine to all children, regardless of ability to pay. Concern over this subject arouses interest only because there initially appeared some question as to whether the vaccine would be available to all or only to those able to pay for it. The President has helped set this portion of the record straight. By so doing, however, he highlighted the failure of his Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to consider that phase. Mrs. Hobby's May 16 report to the President contained a section devoted to this subject which adopted Mr. Eisenhower's direction. Implementing legislation is now under consideration and speedy passage is, of course, assured. That the question ever arose is amazing. This regrettable neglect on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has contributed not only to the confusion, but also to the criticism leveled at that agency. The vaccine should, in fact, be distributed without charge to all our children, from 1 to 19. Only by so doing can further and unnecessary delay based on testing to establish "need" be avoided.

Third, and more controversial, is the heated debate surrounding the administration's insistence that control over the distribution of the vaccine be voluntary.

As I have said before, I strongly favor immediate enactment of legislation to give President Eisenhower standby power to control the price and distribution of the vaccine. I have introduced such a bill as have several other Representatives. Under its provisions, the President would be given standby power to not only insure equitable and full distribution of the vaccine, but to guarantee a full series of inoculations to all children. In addition, under the provisions of my bill the President would have power to establish ceiling prices for the vaccine and would be given certain specific authorization to require reports concerning distribution and sale of the vaccine.

Utilization of any of these provisions is left to the President, he may apply them all, or he may apply any, as he sees fit. The necessity for such standby control is obvious. Any further delay in taking such action would be irresponsible. I am frank to say that I cannot understand the reluctance on the part of Secretary Hobby to agree to such a standby program. The Under Secretary, Mr. Perkins, after much astute questioning by Senator HILL, said he could see "no harm" in enacting such legislation. Yet the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare not only hesitates, it opposes such legislation on the specious ground that it is not necessary now. Well, I disagree. I think it is needed now. And what about the future? There is clearly a shortage of the vaccine; it will remain in short supply for some time. When the peak of the polio season hits us, may not the demand then be so great as to set in operation a full-scale black market? Will the voluntary system be able to insure equitable distribution of the scarce vaccine when every mother in the Nation will be clamoring for her child to have it?

There is now in operation a halting, uncoordinated, and makeshift program for distribution of the vaccine. Enactment of standby legislation now will give the administrative agencies the opportunity to set up their plans and to instantly put them in operation if the President so directs. There should be no additional delay. I sincerely hope and pray that such legislation will be adopted at once.

Finally, we come to the fourth problem. Why did the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have no program at all ready for use on April 12? The only plausible answer to this question is that rigid adherence to a misguided philosophy of Government so warped the thinking of the responsible officials in that Department that they refused to make any plans. As evidence of this state of mind we may look to Mrs. Hobby's own words. To justify her inaction and mismanagement, she stated before a Senate committee that no one could have foreseen before April 12 the great "demand" or "acclaim" for this life-preserving vaccine.

While admitting that the Public Health Service took an active part for 2 years in the development and testing of the vaccine, Mrs. Hobby tells us that the demand for it could not have been foreseen. Why, then, have we had a March of Dimes so long? Why, then, do parents worry? Why was Canada ready on April 12 with a national plan? Why was the New York City Department of Health ready? Why was the announcement made with so much publicity? Why indeed was no plan made by Mrs. Hobby? She tells us she could not foresee the demand. Well, Mr. Speaker, if Mrs. Hobby could not foresee the acclaim which would greet Dr. Salk's discovery, if she could not foresee a great and immediate national demand for this vaccine, if she could not foresee these inescapable conclusions to the long, costly, and painful work of so many scientists and volunteers, then she is blind to reality, immune to feeling, and so lacking in judgment as to belie her previous record of accomplishment. As the New York Times pointed out, "If the Public Health Service knew what was to come, it may well be charged with a dereliction of duty." That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did know the facts is no longer denied.

Mr. Speaker, that is the story as I see it. The task ahead is to promptly provide President Eisenhower with standby authority to control distribution of this vaccine and to pray that the failure in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not cause too many heartbreaking situations. We are much blessed in having men like Dr. Salk and his associates. They have given us their discoveries. It is now up to us to make the best possible use of them for the benefit of all.

MSTS Competes With Private Industry in Ship Repair Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have called the attention of the House to the critical situation in which the Nation's shipbuilding and ship repair industry finds itself because of insufficient work, and to the vital importance of this industry to our national security. The shops in the industry, big and little, are limping along or folding up because there is practically no new construction of merchant vessels and very little repair work to spread among them. The existing facilities are largely idle, no expansion of the industry is taking place, and the skilled employees so essential to our mobilization preparedness are being dispersed and dying off with no replacements trained to take their places.

In the face of this situation our Government should be bending every effort to ward off possible disaster to the shipbuilding and repair industry and to keep it alive. Instead of that, it is my painful duty to report, the Military Sea Transportation Service of the United States Navy, which is by far the largest single cargo and passenger enterprise in this country, is now operating maintenance and repair shops for its vessels and by so doing is helping to drive private industry further in the red and out of the ship repair business. Certainly the Navy must operate and maintain yards and shops to construct and overhaul its warcraft. However, it is equally certain that MSTS has no excuse for setting up a chain of repair shops for commercial type vessels when more than adequate facilities exist in private industry right next door to the shops MSTS has set up.

Three of these repair shops are now being operated—1 in San Francisco, 1 in Seattle, and 1 in New York. These 3 are 3 too many since no one can contend that in either of those areas private industry cannot do the job. The industry is, in fact, crying for it as I well know from the protests of shops in my district in San Francisco. Moreover, on the basis of MSTS' tactics in expanding its shipping empire beyond the actual need and in competition with private shipping, it would not surprise me to see an equally rapid expansion of their repair branch if action is not taken to nip it in the bud.

Mr. Speaker, I present for the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution adopted at a joint conference of the Pacific Coast Shipbuilders Conference and the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, AFL, on May 13 of this year in Long Beach, Calif. The two organizations jointly represent the major segments of the ship repair industry and the shipyard employees on the entire Pacific coast. Their resolution points to the threat this MSTS operation poses to their industry and demands the elimination of MSTS repair shops as an unnecessary extension of the Service's basic function. I fully agree with the resolution and urge that Congress go into the matter fully.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE BETWEEN PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDERS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PACIFIC COAST DISTRICT METAL TRADES COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT WILTON HOTEL, LONG BEACH, CALIF., MAY 13, 1955

Whereas the Military Sea Transportation Service is set up to provide under one authority, control, operation, and administration of ocean transportation of personnel, materiel and other cargoes for all agencies of the Department of Defense of the United States; and

Whereas in the performance of the basic function for which it has been set up the Military Sea Transportation Service has extended its operations to include the operation of maintenance and repair shops in the ports on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas the private shipbuilding plant facilities and skilled personnel employed therein constitute a vital link in an integrated national defense system, and are adequate and sufficient for current needs in the ports in question in servicing the vessels operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service; and

Whereas the continued operation by the Military Sea Transportation Service of

maintenance and repair shops is a serious encroachment on the private shipbuilding industry, and poses a serious economic threat to the industry and the workers employed therein. From a governmental standpoint the operation of the repair shops in the ports in question is uneconomical and unnecessary; and

Whereas representatives of the Seattle Metal Trades Council and the San Francisco Bay Cities Metal Trades Council have on numerous occasions protested to the naval authorities in the port cities in question against these operations, and their continued expansion, and further carried their protests to the commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, and these protests were continuously ignored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That representatives of the Pacific Coast shipbuilding and ship repair industry and representatives of the unions affiliated with the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, meeting in conference at the Wilton Hotel in Long Beach, Calif., May 13, 1955, join in requesting our representatives in the Congress to demand that the Military Sea Transportation Service eliminate the operation of maintenance and repair shops in the ports on the Pacific Coast, and adhere strictly to the basic functions for which it is set up.

WILLIAM H. WAY,
Chairman, Pacific Coast Shipbuilding Conference.
THOMAS A. ROTELL,
Executive Secretary, Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, Corte Madera, Calif.
JAMES C. VAN DYKE,
Conference Secretary, Employers.
A. F. BARTHOLOMEW,
Conference Secretary, Labor.

We Must Win the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, has done this country a great service in proposing creation of a Government strategy board to coordinate efforts to win the cold war.

General Sarnoff's views are similar to those advanced by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, in a great speech before the National Press Club on February 26, this year. Mr. Hearst said at that time that—

Our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected.

The San Francisco Examiner said editorially on May 12 that—

To our thinking the battle for competitive coexistence has entered a new phase that calls for quietly aggressive presentation of all the good things America has to offer and stands for.

By this we mean by word, by picture, by exhibit, by traveling delegations ("Porgy and Bess," the New York Philharmonic, sports teams, for instance) to spread the story that this is indeed a land of plenty in industry, culture, sports * * * for are not these, after all, products of freedom?

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON has called for the "greatest political offensive in history" to win the cold war. Senator JOHNSON spoke at a meeting honoring General Sarnoff which was held only the other day in New York City. Senator JOHNSON urged support of Mr. Sarnoff's thesis that an all-out cold war with communism was not a "preliminary bout but the decisive contest."

One of the Members of the present Congress who not only was one of the first to recognize the importance of the new phase of the cold-war period which we are in but has taken the leadership in developing legislation which would effectuate the most important of the proposals advanced by Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff is Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey's Fourth District.

I include here an editorial from the Trenton Sunday Times-Advertiser regarding the proposals advanced by my colleague, as well as articles from the San Francisco Examiner, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and the New York Times which set forth various aspects of the important proposals made by General Sarnoff, Mr. Hearst, and Representative Frank Thompson, Jr.:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of May 12, 1955]

WE MUST WIN

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, board chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, has done this country a vigorous good service in proposing creation of a Government strategy board to coordinate efforts to win the cold war.

He has summed up his feeling on how vital it is to win in the following concentrated capsule of thought linking defeat in a cold war or a hot atomic war as twin disasters: "We can freeze to death as well as burn to death." The capsule could be the medicine for avoiding both.

The Hearst newspapers go all the way with General Sarnoff in his approach to the problem. In fact, his views are strikingly and happily similar to those advanced by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of our papers, in his speech last January 28 to the National Press Club in Washington.

Mr. Hearst emphasized the enormous importance of winning the battle of competitive coexistence, and urged the establishment of a national planning board to direct such efforts.

We have since come to think of such a board by the name of Competitive Coexistence Council. We like the name because it is simple, it tells the story, and it can be condensed into the alphabetical symbol CCC.

There are some differences of detail and emphasis between General Sarnoff's proposal and Mr. Hearst's.

General Sarnoff suggests the head of the board should have Cabinet status and include representatives of the State and Defense Departments, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the United States Information Service. The Hearst proposal also would give high authority to the head of the board, but would include, besides Government representatives, the highest skilled and experienced civilian personnel that could be found.

Also, if we read General Sarnoff's views correctly, a great deal of stress is placed on massive psychological bombardment of ideas. To our thinking the battle of competitive coexistence has entered a new phase that calls for quietly aggressive presentation of all the good things America has to offer and stands for.

By this we mean by word, by picture, by exhibit, by traveling delegations ("Porgy and Bess," the New York Philharmonic, sports teams, for instance) to spread the story that this is indeed a land of plenty in industry, culture, sports * * * for are not these, after all, products of freedom?

But to General Sarnoff's objective, and the patriotic vigor of his interest, we offer a loud bravo.

And now we would like to make our latest contribution to this battle.

We propose General Sarnoff as chairman of the strategy board.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of April 29, 1955]

HEARST CULTURAL PLAN IN CONGRESS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat of New Jersey, today urged consideration of congressional measures to promote American culture and sports events in line with the program for competitive coexistence with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

Concurrently, the House District of Columbia Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON'S first bill on the subject, providing for the creation of a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass-communications center.

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers and Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing its supremacy at the international games.

NATIONAL IN SCOPE

THOMPSON said his legislation is specifically designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain where he interviewed the four top leaders of Communist Russia.

The measure would create a national advisory committee under the Welfare Secretary to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

CALLED INSUFFICIENT

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby has approved a bill, introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New York, for establishment of a Federal Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes.

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

THOMPSON called attention of Congress to both the warning of Hearst and Olympic Committee President Brundage on the sports challenge from the Soviet Union.

He referred to a current magazine article by Brundage warning that Russia is building "the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

EVERYONE TRAINS

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic Games unless "there is a sudden reawakening in this country."

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex," Thompson said.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system which was started more than 20 years ago was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his recent speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trips, said that sports are a front in which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic Games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world. Especially with sport-conscious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

Thompson added that the legislation introduced by himself, Representative ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, and Representative REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin, was designed to carry out "the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst."

[From the Trenton Sunday Times-Advertiser of May 22, 1955]

ACCENT ON ART

With passage by the House of a bill creating a commission to study plans for a civic auditorium and fine arts center in Washington, Congress has advanced in some measure toward fulfillment a project sponsored by Representatives from New Jersey's Fourth District.

During his service in Congress, Charles R. Howell, now Commissioner of Banking and Insurance, initiated the project of a cultural center in Washington and it has since received vigorous support from his successor, Representative FRANK THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON'S bill provides for the creation of an Arts Commission, also for the construction of an auditorium and an art center in the Nation's Capital. The need for such a center has long been recognized and the idea has received strong endorsement from President Eisenhower and Secretary Hobby of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In his state of the Union message the President said that "in the advancement of the various activities that will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities."

It is the expressed conviction of Mrs. Hobby that "encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny."

In this respect the United States can learn a great deal from the older nations, particularly of Europe, which from their earliest histories were preoccupied with artistic achievement. In consequence, every large city abounds in masterpieces of architectural design and building construction, and in priceless treasures, produced by the masters over the centuries.

It is unfortunate that in the course of our progress as a Nation the heavy emphasis has been on material development, to the neglect of a great deal that is important to the attainment of true greatness. The proposed fine arts center in Washington would meet a vital need.

[From the New York Times of May 16, 1955]

SARNOFF BACKED IN COLD WAR PLEA—AT DINNER FOR RADIO LEADER, JOHNSON CALLS FOR GREATEST POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Democratic leader of the Senate, called last night for the "greatest political offensive in history" to win the cold war.

He said that somewhere along the line the fundamental principle that power rests ultimately with the people had been forgotten.

"Unless we win them to our side," he added, "we are lost."

Senator JOHNSON spoke at a dinner honoring David Sarnoff at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Mr. Sarnoff received the 1955 Gold Medal Achievement Award of the Williamsburg Settlement. The agency is in its thirtieth year of service to the Williamsburg community in Brooklyn.

The Senator's speech was in the nature of a furtherance of Mr. Sarnoff's thesis that an all-out cold war with communism was not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest. In waging it, Mr. Sarnoff held, the United States should be willing to accept the same costs and casualties as a hot war would involve.

SARNOFF PLAN ENDORSED

At his press interview last Wednesday, President Eisenhower approved a memorandum which the chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America had submitted to him on April 5. The memorandum, made public on May 9, embodied the all-out cold war thesis.

Senator JOHNSON said that while prepared for hot war, we had failed to grasp the essential nature of the cold war and to form the strategy to conduct it. The method of cold war was political aggression, he went on, and in this field he said atomic bombs and jet planes were scant protection.

"Atomic bombs did not shield the free Republic of Korea," the Texan continued. "Hydrogen warfare did not save Northern Vietnam [Viet Minh] and may not save the balance of Southeast Asia. And all the powers of nuclear physics will not recover for freedom the vast territory of China."

It took the recent Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, to teach us that the ultimate decision would be made by the people themselves, Senator Johnson asserted.

"We discovered that freedom in Asia had friends," he continued, "and able, forceful leaders. It is to our discredit that we did not know this earlier. It will be to our destruction if we fail to move on their side."

We would be "soft-minded," Senator JOHNSON cautioned, to accept at face value recent Soviet moves to ease some of the tensions building up to World War III.

TRIBUTE TO SARNOFF

The first step in the cold war formation of a general staff that would have the same role in the political drive that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would play in a military drive.

Such a staff, Senator JOHNSON asserted, could coordinate the weapons of cold war—diplomatic, economic and propaganda.

"It could advise the President directly on the many questions upon which he now receives a bewildering number of estimates," he continued. "It could help him decide whether Matsu and Quemoy are worth the risk of losing our Allies."

Senator JOHNSON concluded with a direct tribute to Mr. Sarnoff's idea.

"If David Sarnoff has provided us with a clue to the answer," he said, "and I believe he has—he will have demonstrated once again that free men can always conquer tryanny."

The award to Mr. Sarnoff was made by Bernard M. Baruch, who received the medal in 1949. In a world of vast physical power and mechanical miracles, Mr. Sarnoff said, a balance must be provided by a "robust sense of moral responsibility."

Juvenile delinquents are a minority that make headlines, Mr. Sarnoff said, adding:

"They are not naturally and irrevocably bad but the victims of undirected or misdirected energy and ambition.

"That is why the work you are doing at Williamsburg Settlement is at the very heart of the problem of our day and age. Your concept is correct. Help young people to form the habit of doing wholesome, constructive things, and they will carry the habit into maturity."

Herbert Bayard Swope was toastmaster. The 1,000 guests included Dr. Ralph Bunche, Nobel peace prize winner, and Domestic Relations Justice Nathaniel Kaplan, president of the New York City Youth Board. The Williamsburg Settlement is under the sponsorship of the Brooklyn Philanthropic League, a local organization affiliated with the national United Order True Sisters.

A message of congratulations from President Eisenhower said:

"Please convey my congratulations to David Sarnoff on his receipt of the Gold Medal Award of the Williamsburg Settlement.

"He has displayed in his career the opportunities America offers. A contributor to the development of communications, he has repeatedly insisted that technology must be used to further human welfare.

"My best wishes go to all who honor him."

The invocation was by the Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to send out reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5, 1955. These reprints will not be printed at Government expense and will include excerpts of the debate on the Laird amendment to H. R. 12.

In addition to the remarks which were made by me, I have been given permission to include remarks of the following Members of Congress who participated in the debate on the Laird dairy amendment:

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, Member of Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin. Representative BYRNES is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Hon. VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District of Michigan. Representative KNOX is a member of the Government Operations Committee.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, Member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina. Representative COOLEY is the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Hon. W. R. POAGE, Democrat, Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District of Texas. Representative POAGE is vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Democrat, Member of Congress from the First Congressional District of Mississippi. Representative ABERNETHY is a member of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee.

A Greater Air Service for Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, last summer Pan American-World Airways, which has pioneered in air service all around the world, instituted a new pioneer effort which brought Detroit and all of Michigan in closer contact with our European friends. Pan American began flying from Detroit to London and beyond.

This year, that service has been expanded to a daily basis and we in Michigan are grateful to Pan American for bringing us direct service to London, Paris, Berlin, and Rome—all the colorful and picturesque capitals of the Old World.

I am concerned, therefore, over the difficulty Pan American is facing in being allowed to fly competitively with another American line and two foreign carriers over the Great Circle Route to the Orient.

Certainly the discrimination which Pan American is now facing is something that should be brought to this body's attention. At at time when the Congress is doing such commendable work in reducing subsidy payments to air carriers, it should consider carefully a route situation which is costing taxpayers additional hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

The Detroit Times of May 18 has gone directly to the meat of the case in a hard-hitting editorial which should be read by every Member.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include the Detroit Times editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit Times of May 18, 1955]

GREAT CIRCLE ROUTE

President Eisenhower has in his lap a problem of vital concern to the future of Detroit, and he alone must make the decision.

It results from application of Pan American-World Airways for permission to fly the short Great Circle Route from the United States to the Orient, a route pioneered for that company by Col. Charles Lindbergh prior to World War II.

A competing company now has exclusive rights among American airlines to use this route. Pan American is being compelled by the Government to detour 1,897 miles farther by way of San Francisco, Honolulu, and Wake.

Pan American serves Detroit with daily flights direct to Europe. But as long as the Great Circle Route is closed to all but one airline, Pan Am cannot carry out the Pacific service it contemplated when it employed Colonel Lindbergh to establish the short-cut trail.

The restriction denies to this city and to the Nation the benefits of a truly competitive service to the Orient. Furthermore, as long as airlines are subsidized by the Government, the long detour by way of Honolulu and Wake is costing the taxpayers $220,000 per weekly round trip per year.

Those who contend that passenger business across the Pacific does not warrant more than one American line on the route are as shortsighted as the Government officials of the 1920's who thought plane service to Europe was a preposterous dream.

While this Nation hesitates, and bureaucrats argue, foreign lines are rapidly capturing control. A Japanese airline and the Canadian Pacific already are operating over the northern track, and a Scandinavian line is ready to start service this spring.

This newspaper hopes President Eisenhower will disregard the politics back of this fight and look to the future.

While all factors are studied, it appears that the discrimination against Pan American is unfair to the public and to the company.

Mayor David L. Lawrence Honored for Distinguished Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday of last week Mayor David L. Lawrence of Pittsburgh was awarded the United States Conference of Mayors' award for distinguished public service.

Mayor Lawrence is the first mayor to receive the award. The only other such award was made to Gen. George C. Marshall several years ago.

In making the presentation Mayor Elmer E. Robinson, of San Francisco, chairman of the conference, said:

Active in the affairs of the Conference of Mayors since he first assumed the office of mayor, past president of the conference and now serving his third 4-year term as mayor, Mr. Lawrence is beloved, admired and respected by all of us.

Mr. Robinson said that Mayor Lawrence was the crystallizing force in bringing about a complete transformation of Pittsburgh.

For the outstanding contribution he has made in Pittsburgh and on the national level—

He said—

I now present the United States conference of mayors' award for public service to David L. Lawrence.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 24 entitled "Local Boy Makes Good." As the editorial points out, this award comes as no surprise to us of the Pittsburgh area who have long known of Mayor Lawrence's great contributions and unceasing devotion to the public interest.

The editorial follows:

LOCAL BOY MAKES GOOD

It came as a surprise to him—but it shouldn't have to his fellow Pittsburghers—that Mayor Lawrence was signally honored at the closing session of the annual United States conference of mayors in New York City. He became the first mayor ever to receive the conference's annual award for distinguished public service and only the second person ever so honored, the first having been Gen. George C. Marshall.

Mayor Lawrence was honored for his outstanding contribution both in Pittsburgh and on the national level. In particular, the award was a tribute to the mayor as the crystallizing force behind this city's postwar redevelopment program.

It has long been rightly argued that credit for Pittsburgh's amazing transformation can't be attributed to any one individual or group. It represents the concerted efforts of a great many farsighted and determined citizens.

There can be no doubt, however, that the mayor has played a tremendous role as the governmental expediter who permitted no political roadblocks to obstruct the program and who delivered the needed legislation. Much of the drive and imagination that have sparked the redevelopment efforts of the last 9 years can be traced to the mayor's office. His fellow citizens should applaud a well-deserved tribute.

Contribution of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the Fight Against Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer a comment at this time on a matter that has received a great deal of attention from the people of the United States and to remark on one part of the matter that has received no notice.

As a parent of 3 children, I have followed carefully and with interest the news stories and other reports on the development and handling of the Salk vaccine for polio. When the announcement was first made about the effectiveness of this new weapon against the disease that has inflicted its terrible toll upon man, I felt very happy for all the children and adults throughout the world who would reap the benefits of this wonderful vaccine.

I rise on this occasion to speak, not about the mismanagement and bungling of the present administration's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in handling the program, if indeed it is a program, of distributing the Salk vaccine, but to comment on the vagaries of human memory. Much credit has been given to Dr. Salk, whose final formula was the one that was proven to be effective; to Dr. Francis, of the University of Michigan, who evaluated the results of the tests of the vaccine; to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which financed the research. Credit is also given to all the wonderful men, women, and children in the United States who gave so generously of their dimes to help fight polio. And I do not intend to detract anything from the fine work all of these men have done; they deserve every word of praise and every honor that is being accorded them.

But I wonder about one thing. We hear that the entire program of developing, testing, and proving the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine has been financed by the March of Dimes. In vain I have listened and have looked for one word about the man who was so great an inspiration in inaugurating the March of Dimes, the man who himself suffered from polio, who rose above his disability to become one of the greatest leaders our country has had, who in 1938 called upon the American people to assist by giving their dimes to fight polio.

I speak of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and I wish at this time to call to your attention the fact that he has not been given even an acknowledgment for his efforts in inspiring the March of Dimes. This past Sunday I heard a news broadcast on which the newscaster stated that it was only coincidence that the announcement of the effectiveness of the vaccine was made on Roosevelt's birthday; that an overeager information officer in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare caused the news of the vaccine to be released 3 months too soon. So F. D. R. is denied even this small nod of recognition.

Shakespeare, in his play, Julius Caesar, said: "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." How true. In these days we hear shouts of treason, of sell-out at Yalta; and a hundred and one other terms of censure about one of our greatest Presidents. And how often do we hear from the farmers about how during President Roosevelt's administration they got rural electrification, how often do we hear the people give thanks for the emergency relief measures during the height of the depression, how often do we hear about the good things the Americans received during the 20 years that the Democrats had charge of the affairs of the country. Not too often, do we? But we do indeed hear a lot about the "evil," the faults, the errors. Well, I know of only one man who lived on the face of this earth who was without fault; and He died on the Cross of Calvary.

I would at this time like to give due recognition to just one of the bits of good—among the many—that Franklin Delano Roosevelt did and to give him credit for the part he played in the fight against polio. I want to give an expression of thanks on behalf of my children and all the others who will not have to fear the scourge of polio to the man whose inspiring leadership contributed so much to the success of the March of Dimes, thereby giving our medical forces the means by which to array themselves effectively against a dread enemy of man.

Review of Our Air Strength Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion over the relative strength of our Air Force and Russia's obscures one important fact. The Russians have upset the timetable again, and have achieved air strength faster than we expected them to. With defensive strength achieved, they are now building an offensive, long-range bomber force to deliver the nuclear weapons that they also achieved ahead of the schedule we had set for them.

We are fortunate to have as Chief of Staff of our Air Force a man who understands the implications of what Russia is doing. Last year General Twining warned that the Russians had a bigger air force than ours. This year he has stated frankly that they are pushing us for superiority. The Soviet long-range jet heavy bomber gives us real reason for concern, and General Twining says so. Our problem is to stay ahead of the Russians and hold the technological lead that has been ours up to now.

If this means a review of our own air strength, then let us make it quickly. American industry is capable of expansion to any capacity required. The tremendous effort of World War II can be repeated, and exceeded. There is no other choice for us than to make the effort the struggle for peace requires. We have the men, the technology, the industrial potential, and, thank God, the leaders.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the address in which Gen. Nathan F. Twining, on Armed Forces Day, called on the American people to face up to the facts confronting them. It was made in Los Angeles, and is as follows:

REMARKS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE LOS ANGELES ROTARY CLUB ON ARMED FORCES DAY, MAY 20, 1955

I am very happy to return to Los Angeles. We in the Air Force have many reasons to be grateful to you. Everybody realizes the major contributions west-coast industry has made to aircraft production. You can rest assured that we will do all we can to insure that this contribution is recognized and continued.

The theme of this Armed Forces Day is power for peace. This means power in all our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force. It is no coincidence that power for peace was the theme last year and the year before. Nor is this repetition merely because we could not devise a new slogan.

Continuation of this theme is evidence that power remains the key to peace in these trying times. Power and peace are like links in a chain—a chain that cannot be broken if our Nation is to survive.

Because power is so important it is necessary that we understand it. It is not military power alone that can prevent world conflict. Nor is it only a matter of weapons. It is a combination of strength and determination. Within this combination military strength plays a large part. It is our military strength, particularly our power in the air, that has prevented a third world war.

Our Armed Forces must bear a great burden in the task of keeping us secure and free. Because our freedom is something that each of us enjoy and all of us share, we must all know the nature of the power we must have to insure these vital possessions.

The last decade has brought tremendous changes in military weapons. In earlier times when weapons improved on the order of 1 or 2 times in effectiveness, it was enough to change the face of nations and readjust geography. Today we have weapons that have improved in power a million times. The very existence of these weapons makes a great change in world relations. The fact that we were the first to develop these weapons has kept the Western World free.

Although we have used these weapons only twice in combat, there can be no doubt that these weapons are respected by the Communists. Our nuclear weapons and the ability of the United States Air Force to deliver them have put the damper on their visions of world domination.

The Communists are doing everything they can to counter this power of ours. They are building weapons of their own plus a great bomber force to deliver them.

Short of war, which we will never start, there is nothing we can do to prevent the Reds from producing nuclear weapons and building a great air force. We can improve our defenses and build a better Air Force of our own. These provide protection. But there is no practical way to stop them from building planes and producing weapons.

We can keep our guard up until their sincerity is proven beyond doubt, and until their deeds lend proof to words. This we can do and this we must do.

It is our nuclear airpower and the unity of our alliances that forced them to talk of peace and cutting arms, and it is nuclear airpower and our alliances that have been the target of their propaganda and their political efforts.

If we relinquish these arms, if we falter in attempting to hold the lead over them—or if we lose the strength of unity among our allies—then we throw away our best insurance for peace. For these reasons we must understand the power we have, and the power they have.

No matter how much the people of the world may dislike it, nuclear weapons are here to stay. They are a part of our existence. They are a product of progress. Nucleonics brought not only weapons, but a new horizon for civilization. It can create industrial revolution all over the globe. The air age is sharing the stage with the nucleonic age.

This fact, and the emergence of atomic industries, does not give cause for fear. Nor does the existence of atomic weapons threaten our security. What does threaten us is this: These weapons are in the hands of immoral leaders bent on world domination—and they are building the means to deliver these weapons anywhere against the free world.

This ability to deliver these weapons is the decisive point. We have had new evidence of this in recent days. Weather interfered with the May Day show in Moscow and they paraded only ground forces and new tanks. But in the many rehearsals over Red Square before May Day and before this year's anniversary of V–E Day, the Soviets gave evidence of their growing might in the air.

The models and numbers of modern jet bombers were impressive. The Reds displayed a new supersonic day fighter in operational numbers and a new all-weather fighter also in operational numbers. Both of these are significant developments in a defensive force.

But more important, there was evidence that they are developing and producing the planes for a mighty bomber force, an offensive force that could strike us.

Last year they showed a completely new medium bomber. We had expected that they might develop such an aircraft. They showed us enough of them to make us realize that they had not only developed this bomber, they were already producing it in numbers.

This year they showed us something new again. The Soviets turned out an aircraft powered with turboprops. From its appearance it could be a bomber, a refueling tanker, or a long-range reconnaissance plane. Its appearance is additional proof of the growing ability of the Soviet aircraft industry.

The airplane that gives us real reason for concern here in the United States is the Soviet long-range jet heavy bomber. Last year they showed us one. This year, in the rehearsals for May Day, there were flights of more of these new long-range jets, enough that we have to accept a rate of production.

These observations establish a new basis of our estimate of Soviet production of the heavy jet bomber and the medium jet bomber. This knowledge is evidence of the modern technology of the Soviet aircraft industry and the advances which are being made by them. We must continue to be on the alert and maintain our own forces to insure the lead over the Soviets that we have.

We are producing a heavy jet bomber of our own, the B–52. We have a lot of experience in building big bombers, but it looks as though the Soviets are improving in production. However, we have an expanding production platform here in the United States.

This isn't the first time the Soviets have upset the timetable. For example, we thought they could not duplicate our B–29 in less than 6 or 7 years. They duplicated it in 2 years.

We thought they would have difficulty in making a good copy of the British jet engine. They produced a better one in less than a year.

Some experts thought they could not produce an atomic bomb in less than 6 to 10 years, if at all. They rocked the world with a surprise explosion in about 3 years. This was about the same time it took the United States to produce the first atomic weapon.

They do have the ability to produce nuclear weapons and first-class aircraft to carry them.

On our side we have large stocks of weapons and a first-rate Air Force. What happens when the Soviets reach the stage when they have enough bombs to create great destruction in the United States and the remainder of the free world?

There have been many theories. One theory that has become popular is that when the Soviets have a certain number of weapons and aircraft we arrive at a condition of stalemate. Nuclear stalemate or atomic stalemate have been the terms used to describe this situation.

Before anyone accepts this stalemate theory he should consider some facts of history. For many years there has been enough TNT in the world to kill everybody in it. For hundreds of years there have been sufficient weapons for each side to completely destroy the other. And if any war had been fought endlessly, that is what would have happened.

It is also a fact of history that no nation has ever endured the destruction that our Air Force can deliver in a matter of days. No nation in history has ever taken one-tenth as much without surrendering.

There is nothing in history to indicate that stalemate is possible. When great stocks of weapons are achieved the ability to deliver them effectively then becomes the decisive factor. The offensive ability and the defensive capacity of both sides come into the picture. These are changing constantly. In a changing situation like this, how can stalemate occur?

Under these conditions our problem is to stay ahead—to keep the lead.

How much of a lead do we need?

Of course that depends upon our objective. It is not the objective of our national policy only to defeat an enemy if he attacks us. This means our lead must be so substantial that it reaches the minds of men in the Kremlin—and convinces even those power-hungry leaders that it would be futile to resort to war.

I recognize that superior power is no all-embracing solution. Many factors, including spiritual and moral factors, are essential to peace. But so far, we have discovered no reliable way to do away with the need for physical strength—to disarm—and still be able to preserve our freedom.

As a result of recent Soviet proposals, disarmament has become a prominent topic. It is not the function of a military leader to render national decisions on this latest Soviet plan to disarm.

It is important, however, to recall the record of proposals and agreements made by the Communists in the past. The Soviets have been talking loudly about disarmament since 1948. This date is significant for it also marks the beginning of current growth of Soviet air power. As their talk becomes louder, their air force grows faster and larger.

We should all recognize that the Soviet plan is aimed at the keystones of our strength. It seeks to abolish military bases on foreign territory and it seeks to dismantle the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It purports to ban nuclear weapons.

The Soviet plan argues that armies, navies, and air forces must be gathered in large assembly areas before they can attack. With the weapons of today, and more important, with the weapons of tomorrow, this is not the case.

We devoutly hope that disarmament, in some practical form, can be achieved. But until talk of disarmament matures into some enforceable plan we must continue to build our strength. We must not allow talk of disarmament to lead us into disarming ourselves—psychologically or physically, while our enemies continue to build their military power.

Many people talk about disarmament. But the practical problems of enforcing it are most difficult. Even the latest Soviet proposal realizes that stores of nuclear weapons can be hidden beyond detection.

The Soviets have long argued for a ban on nuclear weapons. This is understandable for our nuclear air power has been the main obstacle to Communist aims. We must all understand what such a ban would mean, it would give the Communists tremendous advantage. It would mean complete reorganization of our Armed Forces and a great increase in men and money required to offset the power the Reds have today.

To give up our nuclear weapons, unless all arms were truly banned, would mean victory for the Communists. Conservatively, it would mean that we would have to substantially increase our land forces, and our tactical air and naval forces. We would have to triple, and to be reasonably safe quadruple, our Strategic Air Command. This would require a defense budget of billions larger than it is now, and I doubt that we could achieve it without some form of mobilization. Even then the security of important areas of Europe and Asia could not be assured.

Nuclear air power is the vital element of modern military power, and it is vital to our security here in the United States. However, great the appeal of a ban on nuclear weapons, without them we would be relatively weakened. Even with nuclear air power on both sides, the dangers we face are not as great.

This is the condition we face today. The military task of war prevention and protection is a vast one. We must maintain our power, particularly nuclear air power in such quantity and quality that the Communists will be unable to gain their aims by military force. We must be able to prevent him from knocking out our striking force and weapons with a surprise attack.

This does not mean we have to be a nation armed to the teeth. Our present program was a sound one under the conditions that existed when it was made. I am confident we are ahead today.

However, these new Soviet advances in air power must be taken into account in the continuous review of our air strength. Our production base for additional effort is available and our output can be stepped up if required.

Unless we have enough forces in being ready for modern war, we invite Communist attack. In a war with today's weapons we must be ready because the opening battle for the air could decide the outcome of the whole war.

We cannot depend on men brought in and weapons to be produced after war starts. Mobilization after D-Day is not good enough. Industrial potential to be used after war begins has lost significance.

The ties of power and peace give us but one choice. We must stay ahead to remain free. This requires us to be ahead in the development, production, and delivery of the most powerful weapons, by the most rapid and effective means.

There is no other choice we can make. We have been pushed into this struggle by Communist effort. There is no turning back. We must have power for peace.

The United States Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I underwent surgery at the United States

Naval Medical Center at Bethesda. I was so impressed with the quality of care and the efficiency of the Center that I feel compelled to make mention of it to my colleagues in the House.

The doctors, nurses, and corpsmen were so proficient in their work, and approached it in such good humor, that I left the hospital convinced that the United States Government is fortunate in having the services of these people.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that the men and women of the United States Navy, be they admirals or apprentice seamen, have access to such magnificent medical care.

Address at Keesler Air Force Base at Armed Forces Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to have been the guest of honor at the Armed Forces Day celebration at Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Miss., located in the district represented by our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM COLMER. Keesler is commanded by Gen. James Davies. It was also my honor and privilege to make the principal address on that occasion.

For whatever value it is worth I here present the address which I made on that occasion:

It is a good thing for Americans to set aside a day when their full attention is given to the armed services; and it is even better when their reflections occur in surroundings so capably manned and so well supplied with every advanced weapon in the art of warfare as is this base.

The air arm does not, of course, have the exclusive responsibility of the defense of this country; but it is no reflection on the other arms to say that the Air Force has a most difficult mission in both strategy and tactics, the spearhead—if you please—should trouble come to our shores.

I will not add more confusion to the current rash of censorship on our weapons program, by discussing our advances in technical design and the improved capability of personnel to use the things that science and technocracy have placed at their disposal. I do not intend this to be a statistical compilation of our capabilities and capacities. I leave that for the propagandists and mathematicians. But every American is entitled to know something of our strength; something of our ability to defend ourselves; and from these to draw assurance and confidence in our international dealings. The line between censorship and caution is one that should be drawn in calm deliberation rather than panic and confusion.

What I am thinking of, however, today, is not a tally of our armed might. But I would like to dwell for a moment of reflection on our posture in the world in which we live, whose horizons and distances are constantly contracting. Neither ocean, nor air, nor the vast expanse of land mass any longer furnishes a barrier of defense. The frightening advance in the use of fissionable material for both the hydrogen and atomic bombs and their lesser uses as tactical weapons, has given everyone pause.

America and the world is frightened at the horror and the havoc which science can produce. While in one sense it may be said that we have won the battle of technical progress and hold the keys to peace—these weapons and that progress are only a complement, if you please, in the ideological warfare.

Our armed might is our aid. It must not ever become our master in this struggle for existence. Man's destiny, whatever be the form of government under which he lives, is not irretrievably committed to warfare as a necessity.

The natural law, as we have come to believe, since the earliest religious concept down through the Christian era, has had a firm belief that our destiny is something else than obliteration and extinction of the species—the scorching of earth and the waste of its resources, in futile and useless contests. But it is equally true to say that some forms of government existing today are not conducive to that end. We must recognize the fact that there are ideological and insoluble differences between governments. What we address ourselves to on Armed Forces Day is the consideration of our posture in that kind of world. Atheistic communism is pitted against a world believing in a God and in the dignity of His creatures.

A short time ago, at Bandung, the lines were clearly and firmly drawn. We have learned and communism has learned, by clear definition and public exhibition, that the contest for men's minds does not succeed upon racial distinctions. We have come a long way from colonialism, exploitation, suppression, subjugation: from the days of the victor and the vanquished. Asiatic powers have joined with Occidental powers and stood up to the silent truth that atheistic communism is not only an ideological concept, but it is also a thinly disguised plan for world conquest—a new and deadly form of colonialism. It has finally been unmasked. Its goal is subjugation and its creed is extermination.

For the first time we are within reach of having allies. In this delicate balance there is no place for cynical political motives, no place for the glamorous phrases of Madison Avenue hucksters. "Massive retaliation" may be a catchword, but it leaves our friends in stone. A dynamic foreign policy does not mean one of fits and starts, of changes and shifts, of bold words and feeble deeds, of bluff, bluster, and blunder, of lofty speech and retreat. Fumbling and bumbling with dynamite is not a dynamic foreign policy. Playing and guessing with the lives and fortunes of men and nations is foolhardiness and all the world knows it. A dynamic foreign policy means one that has a goal that keeps our friendships, that expresses in concrete form the hopes of our friends in the world. It means a policy that will attract to us the minds of men. Our way of life and our hope for ourselves in the world lies in attracting to our side the hundreds of millions of all races in all parts of the world who would live out their lives and work out the destiny of themselves and their children in freedom and in the enjoyment of the natural resources of the earth which are rightfully theirs.

Thus, while I stand for the full development of our armed might in all of the services (and emphatically in the Air Force), I would not confuse our desire and determination to be strong with our more important determination, not only to win any conflict, but to draw to us and to live in harmony with the minds of free people everywhere.

We must learn to welcome the right to freely disagree even as we do within our own boundaries; to be foresighted in maintaining our ability to defend ourselves so long as there are bandits at large; to continue to place our greatest emphasis upon our willingness to live in harmony with the peoples of the world; and to that end, to leave no conference unattended, no weapon unexplored which will further that cause.

We must act from strength—strength of arms and strength of our convictions. While we would leave no opportunity pass which would afford a means of peaceful resolution of differences, in our own interests and in the interests of our friends and allies, neither we nor they can afford to curtail their ability to defend their positions by armed might if need be. In short, our weapons must be ready and the weapons of our friends and allies must be ready for our adversary knows only the might of arms; and our adversary maintains his position only by force of arms and suppression. Those who would leave the orbit of communistic influence must be assured that they are going to a position where they will be protected in their right to live.

In the presence of the awful horrors and the havoc which could be wrought by our weapons, we are no longer privileged to win wars on the battlefield and lose the peace. We must reverse the procedure and seek the peace, with battle as the last resort. We must seek out every ray and follow every hopeful sign of peace. But most of all we must firm up our own philosophy of living in the world which has a right to differ but which need not divide. Right must be the full partner of might in our struggle to win to our side the hearts and hopes of all men of good will wherever they live upon the earth.

Fort Leonard Wood as a Permanent Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked the Missouri congressional delegation to join me in urging Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, to declare Fort Leonard Wood a permanent training center. The letter which follows, signed by all 13 members of the delegation, was sent to the Secretary today. Fort Leonard Wood, located in the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, has for several years been recognized as one of the best engineering training installations in the Nation. The overall economic stability of the area would be greatly strengthened by a designation of permanency. Such stabilization would improve the local environment for the men who train there. Permanent status for the fort would also result in a saving of money for the Federal Government by making possible a more economic administration than is possible in operating the facility on a temporary and indefinite

basis. It is a very definite opinion of the Missouri delegation that the confusion and insecurity in regard to this excellent training center should be definitely settled by declaring the fort permanent.

The letter from the Missouri delegation to the Secretary of Defense follows:

MAY 25, 1955.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated as a permanent installation. It is one of the best equipped Army camps in the United States, yet for the want of a permanent designation this installation is operating on a costly short-time basis. A more ideal location cannot be found for a permanent facility to train engineers as has been stated on many occasions by our military leaders. A permanent declaration would provide for the proper business climate that is beneficial to the soldier. The Missouri delegation in Congress submits that in the interest of realistic national defense and long-range Federal economy, Fort Wood be declared permanent, and we urge that immediate and serious consideration be given to this proposal which we can assure you has enthusiastic support.

Sincerely yours,

STUART SYMINGTON, CLARENCE CANNON, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, RICHARD BOLLING, W. R. HULL, Jr., PAUL JONES, GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., DEWEY SHORT, THOMAS B. CURTIS, FRANK M. KARSTEN, MORGAN M. MOULDER, A. S. J. CARNAHAN.

Report on Questions Raised by Mrs. Jan Howard, East Palo Alto, Calif., Regarding Radioactive Fallout From Weapons Tests Prepared by Division of Biology and Medicine, United States Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent series of nuclear tests conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, honest concern was expressed by a number of thoughtful Americans regarding the radiological effects of these tests upon our population and upon future generations. One particularly good set of questions was submitted by Mrs. Jan Howard, a resident of East Palo Alto, Calif. In order to obtain authoritative answers, I submitted her questions to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Last week, the Commission sent me its report. Since the answers as formulated by the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission are of vital interest to all Americans, I wish to include them in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks. At the same time, I wish to commend the Atomic Energy Commission for the most excellent manner in which these replies were prepared. As I have written to the General Manager of the Commission, this way of handling an inquiry cannot fail to enhance the prestige of the Commission among our people, and further increase their trust in our Government.

The report follows:

"1. What does the Commission mean by no immediate danger? Is there a danger from future tests?"

The radioactive materials released from the detonation of nuclear weapons, whether in tests or in actual warfare, can be harmful or dangerous to human life. The probability of detectable harm, or of any other degree of injury to any individual, either living or unborn, depends upon many factors including the quantities of materials (i. e., the size or energy yield of the bomb) so released. This probability varies from vanishingly small (practically zero) values for the case of single weapons tests as conducted by the United States Atomic Energy Commission to quite large values anticipated from the general use of nuclear weapons in global warfare. The hazards to human life from weapons tests which have been conducted or which may be conducted by the United States in the immediate (or foreseeable) future are insignificant in comparison with the normal hazards of life.

"2. As close as we are to Yucca Flat, are Californians average Americans?"

For purposes of this question, Californians may be considered to be comparable to average Americans, since, while they are nearer to Yucca Flat than is the average American, prevailing winds are from west to east. The total fallout per square mile in California from both Pacific and continental tests has been less, for example, than in the State of New York.

"3. Is it true that radioactivity cumulates in the atmosphere—that it does not totally dissipate for years after the blasts? In other words, are these chest X-rays cumulative? (Note R. Lapp's article, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, February 1955.)"

It is true that some of the radioactivity disseminated in the atmosphere from a weapons test is contained in particles so small that they are retained in the atmosphere, in continuously diminishing amounts, over periods of many years. During retention, the total amount of radioactivity per particle is also constantly diminishing as the result of radioactive decay. This material is not more hazardous as a result of its retention in the atmosphere; it is less hazardous than if it were deposited on the surface of the earth soon after its formation.

"4. Is it true as the January 1955 Bulletin of Atomic Scientists suggests that a debate is taking place in high Government circles on the advisability of testing a more powerful hydrogen bomb, the real trouble being that no one really knows what the radiation hazard would be? A wide variation in the estimates of the danger allegedly exists between the Defense Department and the AEC, the AEC's conclusions being less frightening than the Pentagon's."

We are not aware of the alleged debate referred to in the above quotation. It is not true, however, that "no one really knows what the radiation hazard would be." The Commission's statement of February 15, 1955, a copy of which is attached, is a report to the American people in which the radiation hazards from a thermonuclear weapon are described frankly.

The question implies, however, that debate in high Government circles is undesirable. It is, of course, redundant to point out that debate over important issues is often healthy and the opportunity to express an opinion and to disagree is an important asset of our form of government.

"5. Is it true that Winston Churchill told Commons in November that 'an undue number of atomic and hydrogen bomb explosions might have serious effects on the earth's atmosphere for 5,000 years'?"

The Atomic Energy Commission is not in a position to verify the accuracy of the quotation attributed to Winston Churchill. If he did make the statement, he may have referred to either of two possible effects on the atmosphere of the detonation of a very large number of nuclear weapons:

(a) Neutrons from such weapons interact with the atmosphere to produce carbon 14, a radioactive isotope of carbon. A considerable fraction of the carbon 14 so formed would be found in the atmosphere for many thousands of years. Since the radioactive half-life of carbon 14 is 5,000 years, the number used in the quotation, while incorrectly applied, suggests that this was the effect to which the quotation refers.

(b) A second effect on the atmosphere resulting from the detonation of a large number of bombs at or near the surface of earth would be the dissemination of large quantities of dust into the atmosphere. This would reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the earth and affect the average temperature.

The maximum quantity of carbon 14 which could result from a nuclear detonation of a given yield if all free neutrons were utilized for the production of carbon 14 is easily computed and found to be of negligible biological effect compared to other radioactive materials liberated. "Other radioactive materials liberated" refers to both the highly radioactive, short-lived isotopes of concern in heavy, close-in fallout, and the longer-lived isotopes such as strontium 90 with a half-life of 20 years. The answer to Question No. 1 above briefly evaluates this type of hazard. Also, the Commission's statement of February 15, 1955, deals more completely with the immediate hazards of large-scale detonations.

It should be noted that in the same statement before the House of Commons, Sir Winston, in elaborating on the reference to an "undue number," reportedly went on to say that "On the most cautious assessment it would be, so I am advised, considerably greater than the number which could be conceivably employed in any tests likely to be made by the powers in possession of these weapons."

Some guide as to the possible effects of dust thrown into the air by such a bomb is provided by comparison with the eruption of the volcano Krakatoa in 1883, from which several cubic miles of dust were widely disseminated in the earth's atmosphere for several years.

While it would probably be possible to detonate a sufficiently large number of nuclear weapons near the surface of the earth to produce "serious" effects on the atmosphere (i. e., serious to the inhabitants of the earth), there is every reason to believe that more serious effects would be produced directly on the earth's inhabitants by much smaller numbers of nuclear weapons. In any event, serious effects are to be anticipated from the use of nuclear weapons in warfare, not from tests on the scale at which they are presently performed.

"6. Is it true that 'apart from the immediate danger of injuries caused by fallout, there is a much less understood, but potentially fateful danger of long-range damage, due to the hereditary endowment of the human race, caused by exposure of whole nations or continents to a weak, but widely

persistent radioactivity'? (Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, December 1954.) "That perhaps even the minute rise in the rate of mutations produced by atomic bomb tests (let alone war) may throw a monkey wrench into the delicately adjusted mechanism of the preservation of the species'?"

It is true that rates of genetic mutation in all experimental plants and animals can be increased by exposure to radiation. While no experiments are performed on humans, on the basis of experimental observation on other animals, various geneticists have estimated that from 3 percent to 25 percent of the present rate of genetic mutation in man is due to "natural radiation"—cosmic radiation and radiations from radioactive materials which have always existed in our environment—from which we cannot escape. If this value were 10 percent, for example, doubling the present average level of radiation in the environment would make the average rate of genetic mutation about 1.1 times as high as it has been in past generations; or, to double the average rate of mutation would require adding 10 times as much radiation as is now in the environment. It is generally believed that increases in genetic mutation in humans would be undesirable, but there is little basis for estimating by what factor the present average rate would have to be increased for the effects to become serious.

"7. Is it possible that the question is no longer which nation can blast the other off the face of the earth, but will mankind be radiated off the face of the earth?"

In the event of full-scale warfare, protection of personnel from the effects of radiation will be a major problem. Whether blast effects or radiation effects will be of greater importance will depend upon several factors, including methods of use of weapons and the relative degree to which populations have taken measures to protect themselves against blast and against the radiation from "radioactive fallout." Among the many answers which the AEC is trying to obtain from our own weapons tests is the answer to the question, "What can the population of a country such as ours do to protect itself from both blast and radiation?"

In considering the questions raised by Mrs. Howard, there appears to be preoccupation with the hazards of weapons tests rather than with the catastrophic results to be anticipated if nuclear weapons were to be fully employed in global warfare. Assuming that the weapons which can be fabricated within the next few years would be deliverable at will, it would be possible for warring nations to practically destroy each other. It is imperative that the human race find a positive means to avert such a war. Until such a means is operative, it appears equally imperative for the United States to assure itself that an enemy nation cannot hope to "win" such a war and, consequently, will not engage in such a war. The "undesirable" aspects of weapons tests appear very minor indeed against the background of these urgent considerations.